

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.

'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

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree Doctor of Philosophy in Education
Massey University (Palmerston North) New Zealand**

(William) Mark Sheehan

2008

One might characterise the curriculum reform ... as a sort of tidal wave. Everywhere the waves created turbulence and activity but they only engulfed a few small islands; more substantial landmasses were hardly touched at all [and]...the high ground remained completely untouched.

Ivor F. Goodson (1994, 17)

Abstract

This thesis examines the development of the New Zealand secondary school history curriculum in the late 20th century and is a case study of the transformation of an academic discipline into a senior secondary school subject. It is concerned with the nature of state control in the development of the history curriculum at this level as well as the extent to which dominant elites within the history teaching community influenced the process. This thesis provides a historical perspective on recent developments in the history curriculum (2005-2008) and argues New Zealand stands apart from international trends in regards to history education. Internationally, curriculum developers have typically prioritised a narrative of the nation-state but in New Zealand the history teaching community has, by and large, been reluctant to engage with a national past and chosen to prioritise English history. Also in the international arena the history curriculum is shaped by government agencies but in New Zealand in the late 20th century, a minority of historians and teachers had a disproportionate influence over the process. They eschewed attempts to liberalise the subject by the Department of Education (and thereby reflect contemporary developments in the parent discipline) and shaped the curriculum to reflect their own professional interests.

This thesis puts forward a hypothesis that seeks to explain the nature of continuity and change in the senior history curriculum in the late 20th century with a view to illuminating the origins of recent debates in the history teaching community. It argues that it is the examination prescriptions that dictate what is taught at this level and that there are three key criteria that must be met if a senior curriculum initiative is to be successfully introduced, or an existing area of historical knowledge is to be retained. Firstly, it is necessary that the decision-making elite share a consensus that a particular body of historical knowledge is of higher status than any alternative. Secondly, a successful initiative must reflect the existing scholarly constraints and boundaries of the parent discipline. Finally, advocates of a particular area of knowledge must be able to establish alliances with major stakeholders in a subject community who are sympathetic to their cause. The role of dominant individuals in this process was paramount in the 1980s as Department of Education curriculum committees at this time operated on the ethos of 'consultation', with little explicit philosophical direction and no authentic evaluation. This model is examined by considering the examples of women's history (that was successfully embedded in the 1989 curriculum), Māori history (that was not) and 16th and 17th century English history (that has dominated the history curriculum in New Zealand for over 30 years).

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my principal supervisor, Professor Roger Openshaw, for his guidance, wisdom and perceptive comments during this research project and to Associate Professor Peter Lineham, for his advice and feedback. Both supervisors have been generous in sharing their considerable knowledge in regards to history curriculum matters with me. I am also grateful to the following historians and teachers who made time to consider my research: The final draft of my thesis was read by Professor Giselle Byrnes (Waikato University), Professor Keith C. Barton (Indiana University, Bloomington, USA), Gregor Fountain (Head of History, Wellington College), Bruce Taylor (Head of History, Correspondence School), Michael Harcourt (Wellington High School) and Steve Watters (historian, Ministry of Culture and Heritage). An early draft of my thesis was read by Dr Robert Guyver (University College Plymouth St Mark and St John). I very much appreciate the feedback of these individuals on my work and the insights that they provided.

Victoria University College of Education has been wholly supportive of my research. The Pro-Vice Chancellor, Dugald Scott, and my Head of School, Linda Tod, have been unstinting in their encouragement. The Jessie Hetherington Centre for Educational Research provided financial assistance in the form of an internal thesis grant, that released me from my teaching and other responsibilities for 6 months and Susan Kaiser's proof reading and formatting of my thesis was invaluable. I acknowledge the encouragement of my colleagues in the Social Sciences Department (namely Louise Starkey, Mike Taylor, Andrea Milligan and Bronwyn Wood) who have engaged me in robust and thoughtful conversations about my research that have helped in developing my thinking. Furthermore, I am profoundly grateful for the long-term mentoring by my colleague Dr Joanna Higgins over the last five years. I am also grateful to Massey University for providing financial support that allowed me to travel within New Zealand to conduct the interviews for this study.

It is my good fortune to be a member of a wider community of history educators who share my passion and enthusiasm for teaching and learning history, and have been willing to talk with me informally on history curriculum matters and assist me in any number of ways. These include Graeme Ball, Liz Hay, Paul O'Connor, Carol Jarman, Graham Hucker, Claire Dixon and Richard Manning (who provided assistance in procuring some useful documentary material). I would also acknowledge the enthusiasm and commitment of the student-teachers I have been

lucky enough to have worked with at Victoria University in the *Teaching Senior History* programme. I am especially grateful to Tom Brooking, Geoff Rice, Harvey McQueen, David Wood, Greg Taylor, Cynthia Shaw, David Gledhill, Erik Olssen, John Rosanowski, Myra Kunowski, Robin Gwynn, Jim Peters, Russell Stone, Michael Graves, Gresham Poole, Peter Lineham, Marcia Stenson, Margaret Tennant, Graham and Susan Butterworth, Bill Renwick, Roy Shuker, Nicholas Tarling, Kerry Howe, Judith Binney, Bruce Taylor, John Jenson and Rex Bloomfield who agreed to be interviewed. Their willingness to share their memories of this area of the past was invaluable and some of these individuals generously allowed me to view their private papers for research purposes.

Finally, my thanks are due, as always, to my wife, Natalie Coynash, without whose devotion, support and unfaltering love this thesis would not have been written.

Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Figures	vi
List of Tables	vi
Glossary	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 An integrated Year 11-13 History Syllabus - The National History Curriculum Committee	28
Chapter 3 Theoretical perspectives and Methodological approaches.....	40
Chapter 4 Years of Turmoil and Change: New Zealand in the 1980s.....	67
Chapter 5 Themes and Issues in New Zealand History Education in the 1980s .	86
Chapter 6 ‘As much about pedagogy as about content’: Teaching and Learning History	104
Chapter 7 Competing Histories: International developments in History Education.....	117
Chapter 8 ‘What use is a useable past?’ History and Social Studies.....	135
Chapter 9 ‘Completing the Picture’: Embedding women’s history into the history curriculum	153
Chapter 10 ‘Avoiding painful realities?’ The place of Māori history in the school curriculum	172
Chapter 11 Tudors and Stuarts as the foundation of our heritage? 16 th and 17 th Century English history and the New Zealand curriculum	190
Chapter 12 Conclusion	208
References: Interviews, archival documentary sources, private papers, bibliography, websites	211
Appendices: Membership of the NHCC; letter requesting an interview, ethics approval.....	232

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Year 11 (Form 5) School Certificate history topics 1975-1988	5
Figure 2:	Year 12: (Form 6) University Entrance history topics 1975-1988	6
Figure 3:	Year 13 (Form 7) University Bursary history topics 1977-1989	7
Figure 4:	Criteria for a successful initiative in senior history	27
Figure 5:	Membership of the National History Curriculum Committee	34
Figure 6:	The Embedding of Women's History into the senior History Curriculum: A successful initiative in senior history	155
Figure 7:	Māori and the History Curriculum: An unsuccessful initiative in senior history	175

List of Tables

Table 1:	Senior History examination candidates 1968-82	13
Table 2:	Response to suggested history options in Year 11 (1986)	169
Table 3:	Response to suggested history options in Year 12 (1986)	169
Table 4:	Percentage of candidates sitting bursary options: 1984-86	193

Glossary

- CDD** **Curriculum Development Division (Department of Education):**
This division was made up of a number of subject specialists (including history) who had responsibility for maintaining and developing their subject.
- DMIE** **Division of Māori and Island Education (Department of Education)**
This division was responsible for issues and initiatives concerned with Māori and Pasifika education.
- NHCC** **National History Curriculum Committee**
The Committee was known as both the National History Curriculum Committee (NHCC) and the National History Syllabus Committee (NHSC). The former was more widely favoured in official documents and is used in this thesis.
- NZHTA** **New Zealand History Teachers Association**
The national body to represent New Zealand history teachers, NZHTA was established in 1994.
- NZHA** **New Zealand Historical Association**
NZHA is the national body that represents historians and is affiliated with history researchers and teachers working outside the academy (including NZHTA).
- PPTA** The secondary school teachers' union, The New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association, had curriculum panels in all senior subjects and was closely involved with curriculum design and implementation in the 1980s.
- Prescription** The content that is prescribed for an examination.

- SC** **School Certificate:**
SC was under the auspices of the Department of Education and was a summative examination offered for the first time at the end of three years secondary education (Year 11/Form 5). Students' results were scaled and it served as an exit qualification for those who were not destined for tertiary study, as well as a benchmark for those students going on to the senior school.
- 6FC/SFC** **Sixth Form Certificate:**
6FC was one of two qualifications offered in Year 12/Form 6. It was internally assessed and in 1986, when UE was disestablished, it became the principal qualification offered at this level.
- UE** **University Entrance:**
UE was offered after 4 years of secondary education (Year 12/Form 6) and was the minimum requirement for entry into university. Most students who passed were accredited and only 5% of the total 6th Form cohort passed by sitting the formal examination. In 1986 UE was disestablished and the University Bursaries Examination became the requirement for entry to university.
- UB** **University Bursaries**
Commonly known as Bursaries, students entered this examination at the conclusion of five years' secondary education. UB was a high status qualification that carried some monetary awards for high achievers.
- UEB** **University Entrance Board**
Dominated by subject specialists from the universities (with assistance by teachers), the UEB was responsible for setting and marking UE, UB and US.
- US** **University Scholarship**
When the NHCC was meeting, US was a separate, highly academic examination that was offered at the end of Year 13/Form 7.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Choosing to highlight some aspect of the national past at the expense of other aspects inevitably produces conflict, as history is re-made by competing interest groups, each seeking a dominant voice in constructing what counts as popular memory. This process is ongoing, for the only non-negotiable fact about the past is that it is always open to interpretation as it is continually re-written and redesigned to comply with contemporary issues.¹

Stuart J. Foster and Keith A. Crawford

Debates over history education are as much about the present as they are about the past.² While there is generally a consensus that the young should study history, there is little agreement among historians, teachers, bureaucrats or politicians as to either the epistemological basis of the discipline, or the purpose of the subject in the school curriculum. Thus how the young should interpret the past has been the centre of fierce debates in countries as diverse as Japan, the United States, Australia, Singapore, Germany, Estonia and the United Kingdom.³ This thesis examines the debate over the development of the New Zealand history curriculum that emerged in the 1980s. Although controversy over history education is an international phenomenon, it is argued that in two important ways history education in New Zealand stands apart from international trends. In contrast to the international arena, where curriculum design is controlled by government agencies, the small size of the New Zealand academic and teaching community at this time, combined with the Department of Education's commitment to consensus in decision-making, allowed a minority group of conservative historians and teachers to have a disproportionate influence over this process. They ignored Department attempts to liberalise the subject and shaped the curriculum to reflect their own anachronistic and Eurocentric interests. Also, while internationally history curricula have typically prioritised a narrative of the nation-state, in New Zealand the history teaching community has, by and large, been reluctant to engage with national history.

The debates over history curriculum matters in New Zealand were comparatively muted until 2005, when the question of how New Zealand secondary school history students should interpret the past exploded onto the political landscape. Amidst the controversy

¹ Stuart J. Foster and Keith A. Crawford, 'The Critical Importance of History Textbook Research'. In *What shall we tell the children?* edited by Stuart J. Foster and Keith A. Crawford, 1-23 (Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, 2006), 1.

² Avner Segall. 'What's the Purpose of Teaching a Discipline Anyway? The Case of History.' In *Social Studies - the Next Generation: Re-Searching in the Post-modern*, edited by Avner Segall, Elizabeth E Heilman, Cleo H Cherryholmes, 125-39. (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 125-6.

³ An overview of international themes and issues in history education is provided in Chapter 7.

surrounding the newly implemented standards-based assessment system, the National Certificate of Educational Achievement,⁴ the opposition, centre-right National Party complained to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) that the previous year's history examination paper was biased towards the party's Māori policies. The typical governmental response to a complaint of this nature was to refer the matter to the appropriate bureaucrats who, in turn, would provide an official explanation. However, it was election year and the relationship between Māori and Pākehā had emerged as a fraught issue. The National Party had won considerable support by claiming the Labour government's bicultural policies were overly sympathetic to Māori,⁵ while Labour had alienated both conservatives and liberals over the 'foreshore and seabed' issue.⁶ Claims of bias in the history examination were potentially damaging to the government and they took the unusual step of directing the Parliamentary Education and Science Committee to look into the history curriculum. Consequently history education in New Zealand came under unprecedented scrutiny and although the select committee found 'no evidence of bias' in the paper, the robust nature of the investigation process sent a clear message that school history programmes should avoid controversy.⁷

It was no coincidence that the history curriculum should emerge as the focus of controversy in 2005. The Ministry of Education was in the process of developing a new curriculum, including clarifying and redefining the place of senior subjects in the social sciences. This had seen unresolved tensions within the history teaching community re-emerge as well as a growing concern among politicians, media commentators and historians over school history. Media commentators lamented the lack of factual historical knowledge among the young⁸. Historians also were quick to point out the shortcomings of the subject. Kerry Howe (Massey University) argued

⁴ The standards-based National Educational Certificate of Achievement (NCEA) replaced the norm referenced senior examinations for Years 11, 12 and 13 in New Zealand between 2002- 2005. See: www.nzqa.govt.nz/news/info/ncea-improve-bkgrnder.pdf; www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?indexID=1007&layout=index - 24k.

⁵ In a speech given in January 2004 at Orewa, National Party leader Don Brash criticised the Treaty of Waitangi as an 'outmoded historical artefact' and claimed that the Labour government's 'race-based' policies unfairly advantaged Māori. His speech resonated with many New Zealanders and contributed to a dramatic increase in support for the National Party in the 2005 election. For Don Brash's speech see: <http://www.onenzfoundation.co.nz/DonBrashSpeech.htm>.

For an example of the nature of the debate see:

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/section/1/story.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3551886.

For an analysis of how Māori-Pākehā issues impacted on the 2005 election see:

http://www.colinjames.co.nz/speeches_briefings/Post-election_05Dec02.htm#results.

⁶ The controversy over ownership of the foreshore and seabed emerged after the New Zealand Court of Appeal ruled in June 2003 that Māori were entitled to seek 'customary title' over areas of New Zealand's foreshore and seabed in the Māori Land Court. <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/fsinfo.htm>

⁷ *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, 1-9, 60-61.*

⁸ Sarah Catherall, 'Teen Knowledge of NZ Events is History.' *Sunday Star Times*, 10 February 2002, 23; _____, 'Teaching of New Zealand history a disgrace.' *Sunday Star Times*, 3 February 2002, 10; Steve Rendle, 'Gallipoli? Isn't that somewhere in Italy?' *Dominion Post*, 25 April 2003, 23.

New Zealand's past was presented as 'politico-pop history' that depicted a 'simplistic binary world',⁹ while historian James Belich (Auckland University) described the approach to teaching history in schools as a form of 'cultural self-lobotomy'.¹⁰ History was also the focus of political debate. The centrist New Zealand First Party challenged the emphasis on the Treaty of Waitangi in schools¹¹ and recently National Party leader, John Key, played down the devastating experience of conflict in New Zealand during the 19th century.¹² Alternatively, centre-left Labour led governments' (1999-2008) have highlighted the potential of the Treaty of Waitangi to address past grievances, and have generously funded Treaty education.¹³ They have apologised for past wrongs to Samoans, Chinese and Vietnam war veterans,¹⁴ and have commemorated New Zealand's wartime heritage with the return of 'the unknown warrior', as well as erecting prominent memorials in London, Pusan and Canberra.¹⁵

The intensity and high profile of debates over history and the history curriculum in New Zealand in recent years has been unusual, but the issues are not new. They mirror wider questions over the interpretation of New Zealand's past that emerged in the 1970s and 80s, and in regards to history education they surfaced when the current history curriculum was developed at this time. It is these tensions and challenges that are the focus of this thesis. This study provides a historical perspective on the development of the current senior history syllabus¹⁶ that was reshaped by the National History Curriculum Committee (NHCC)¹⁷ between 1983 and 1987 and remained largely unchanged for the subsequent 20 years.¹⁸ The challenges the NHCC faced in designing the curriculum in the 1980s were unresolved and have seen continuing dissonance among the history teaching

⁹ K.R Howe, 'Making History Our Whipping Boy.' *New Zealand Herald*, November 17 2000, A17.

¹⁰ James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Auckland: Penguin, 2001), 546.

¹¹ http://www.nzfirst.org.nz/content/display_item.php?t=1&i=1977

¹² Vernon Small, 'Key glossing over history says Labour.' *Dominion Post*, 29 June 2008, 3.

¹³ <http://www.treaty2u.govt.nz/>

¹⁴ <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/crown+apology+for+viet+nam+veterans+and+families;>
http://www.ethnicaffairs.govt.nz/oeawebsite.nsf/wpg_url/Advisory-Services-Consultations-New-Zealand-Government-Apologies-To-Chinese-Community;
[http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/state+luncheon+apia+samoa.](http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/state+luncheon+apia+samoa)

¹⁵ For an example of how Labour-led governments' have linked history and notions of national identity see: Helen Clark, 'Concepts of Nationhood': Dominion Day Address (26/09/07).
[http://www.beehive.govt.nz/node/30070.](http://www.beehive.govt.nz/node/30070)

¹⁶ In the 1980s history was offered as a senior option subject that was closely linked to examination prescriptions. It was taught at Form 5/Year 11 (School Certificate), Form 6/ Year 12 (6th Form Certificate/ University Entrance) and Form 7/Year 13 (University Bursary/Scholarship). This thesis uses both terminologies for these year levels as and where appropriate.

¹⁷ The Committee was known as both the National History Curriculum Committee (NHCC) and the National History Syllabus Committee (NHSC). Although the latter was often used informally, the former was more widely favoured in official documents and is used throughout this thesis.

¹⁸ The history curriculum that was shaped by the NHCC remained largely unchanged after it was implemented in 1988/89. It is currently in the process of being redeveloped and a non-prescriptive, outcomes-based history curriculum aligned with the achievement standards is to be introduced in 2010 as part of Ministry of Education curriculum initiatives. See curriculum developments 2008: www.nzhta.org.nz.

community. These debates are ongoing¹⁹ and hence this study contributes to our understanding of current tensions over history curriculum developments.

The NHCC was one of a number of initiatives to address the problem of an academically orientated senior secondary school curriculum that was increasingly out-of-step with the changing nature of the senior school cohort. However, developing a history curriculum posed a number of unique challenges. History education is not simply a matter of intellectual curiosity or the acquisition of a set of useful, transferable skills. Rather, school history is linked with notions of heritage, social cohesion of the nation-state and national identity. Accommodating such concerns has posed a challenge for New Zealand history curriculum designers over the last 30 years, in light of the radical changes to the social, cultural, and economic fabric of society.

In particular, the focus of this thesis is on the transformation of the academic discipline of history into a senior secondary school subject in New Zealand during the final decades of the 20th century. Curriculum design is typically characterised by hegemonic struggles over competing interests and the development of the senior history syllabus was no exception. The 1989 history curriculum, as expressed in the prescriptions, was a cautious response to calls to liberalise the subject and address contemporary social issues. It is argued that those in the history teaching community who held a discipline-based view of the subject dominated the development process. In doing so they ignored issues of social relevance and ensured those areas of historical knowledge that they valued were retained. Although they claimed that the intellectual credibility of academic history was paramount, their view of history was anachronistic and Eurocentric and has increasingly distanced school history from developments in the parent discipline over the last 20 years. There has been little substantial change to the content of history programmes over the last two decades. Many history students in the first decade of the 21st century continue to study constitutional matters and the narratives of war and politics with a largely Eurocentric emphasis, much as their parents (and in some cases grandparents) did. The subject bears little resemblance to the parent discipline or the

¹⁹ http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Journals/Jul2007/nzhta_journal_0707.htm
http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Journals/Feb2007/nzhta_journal_0207.htm
http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Journals/Aug2006/nzhta_journal_06.htm
<http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/the-classroom/teachers-toolbox/brain-food> (Ongoing discussion of issues in New Zealand history education)
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/Curriculum%20Review%20Matters.htm> (Draft review of history curriculum: May 2007)
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/NZHA%20Forum%20responses.htm> (Summary issues in history education NZHA conference 24/11/07)
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/NZHA%20Gregor%20Fountain.htm> (Gregor Fountain's comments NZHA conference 24 November 2007)
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/Reflections%20on%20Curriculum.htm> (Carol Jarman, summary of tensions over draft history review: August 2007).

research interests of contemporary historians. The majority of Year 13 history students grapple with the complexities of 16th and 17th century England as the major component of a 3-year history programme, despite this area of the past having been a low priority for New Zealand historians over the last 20 years. Few of the alternative options in the Year 11 and 12 programmes that were introduced in the late 1980s have ever been taught; the most popular options have been part of history programmes since the 1970s and yet seldom reflect contemporary scholarship in these areas.²⁰

Figure 1: Year 11 (Form 5) School Certificate history topics 1975-1988

(Italics: new topics in 1988: Bold/* - three most widely taught topics in 2005)

1975 Students studied 4 themes	1982 Students studied 4 themes	1988 Students studied 3 themes
Social Welfare: New Zealand since 1891 USA 1932-64 Cultural Interaction: New Zealand 1911-1975 South Africa 1919-1961 Economic Development New Zealand 1918-1980 Japan 1918-1970 International Relations New Zealand and the World 1945-1980 Origins of World War II 1919-1941 Leadership China 1921-1949 Indonesia 1945-1967 Conflict a) Ireland 1910-1949 b) Palestine/Israel 1945-1967 Government Britain 1931-1951 USSR 1924-1957	Social Welfare: New Zealand 1891-1975 USA 1932-64 Cultural Interaction: New Zealand 1911-1975 South Africa 1919-1961 Economic Development New Zealand 1918-1980 Japan 1918-1970 International Relations New Zealand and the World 1945-1980 Origins of World War II 1919-1941 Leadership China 1921-1949 Indonesia 1945-1967 Conflict a) Ireland 1910-1949 b) Palestine/Israel 1945-1967 Government Britain 1931-1951 USSR 1924-1957	Social Welfare: New Zealand 1891-1980 USA 1932-64 Race Relations New Zealand 1912-1980 South Africa 1938-1976 Economic Development New Zealand 1918-1980 Japan 1918-1970 International Relations New Zealand and the World 1945-1985 * Origins of World War II 1919-1941* Leadership China 1921-1949 <i>USSR 1924-1957(1)</i> Conflict a) Conflict: Ireland 1909-1922 b) Palestine/Israel 1935-1967 Social Change <i>Women's Impact on New Zealand Society: Health 1915-85 (1)</i> Black Civil Rights in the USA 1954-1970*

²⁰ See Figures 1, 2 and 3. As in March 2005 58% of schools taught the 16th and 17th century 'Tudor-Stuart' England option for Year 13 and 40% taught 19th century New Zealand (2% taught both). At Year 12 around 85% of schools taught the Vietnam war, the Russian Revolution and the Origins of WW1 and at Year 11 over 90% of schools taught the Origins of WWII, Black Civil Rights in the USA and New Zealand's Search For Security (See NZHTA survey February/March 2005, <http://www.nzhta.org.nz>); These results were consistent with the 2002 survey (NZHTA journal November 2002). The 2008 NZHTA survey on content choices was not available at the time of writing but initial indications suggest that the situation remains much the same (personal communication in author's possession: Paul Enfield, 28/09/09).

Figure 2: University Entrance history topics 1975-1988 (Year 12: Form 6)

(Italics: new topics introduced 1988. Bold/* - three most widely taught topics in 2005)

1975	1982	1988
European States System	European States System	The European States System (1814-56)
Britain 1832-1868	Britain 1832-1868	Britain (1830-1870)
Unification of Italy	Unification of Italy	The Unification of Italy (1848-1881)
Unification of Germany	Unification of Germany	Unification of Germany (1848-1879)
India 1875-1947	India 1875-1947	Ghandi and Indian Independence
Germany 1918-45	Germany 1918-45.	Germany 1918-45.
China 1894-1922	China 1894-1922	China 1884-1928
Russia 1890 – 1922	Russia 1890 -1922	Revolution in Russia *
The Origins of World War I	Origins of World War 1	The Origins of World War 1*
France 1848-1877	France 1848-1877	<i>Vietnam and the Conflict in Indo-China*</i>
The Habsburg Monarchy 1867-1918	The Habsburg Monarchy	<i>New Zealand Economic Change</i>
Europe and Southern Africa 1870-1919	Europe and Southern Africa	<i>Women, Family and Work in New Zealand 1880-1960</i>
USA 1890-1920	USA 1890-1920	<i>Modern Japan 1867-1930</i>
		<i>Case Studies in Industrial Cities</i>
		<i>The Search for Security in the Nuclear Age 1945 – present</i>
		<i>Small Power Conflict since 1945</i>
		<i>The American Revolution and the Making of the Republic 1774-1791</i>
		<i>Australia 1788-1850s</i>
		<i>Women in the emerging British Democratic System 1860-1930</i>
		<i>New Zealand Government 1840-1947</i>
		<i>Māori Leadership in the 19th century</i>
		<i>Growth of New Zealand Identity</i>
		<i>Western Samoa</i>
		<i>The Making of Malaysia)</i>
		<i>Rhodesia and Zimbabwe</i>

Figure 3: University Bursary history topics 1966-1989

1966	1977	1989
<p>Part A (compulsory) England 1603-1815.</p> <p>Option (one choice):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Zealand 1769-1914 • USA 1919-41 • The Crusades 1095-1204 • The French Revolution • The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603. • Modern Japan 1867-1930 	<p>Part A (compulsory) England 1558-1700.</p> <p>Option (one choice):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Zealand 1769-1914 • USA 1919-41 • The Crusades 1095-1204 • The French Revolution • The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603 • Modern Japan 1867-1930 • World War II 	<p>England 1558-1667 or New Zealand 1800-1900.</p> <p>(External examination worth 60%) 40% internal assessment on any historical topic that is different in time and place from examination choice</p>

The Curriculum

The curriculum is an elusive notion to define, as it ranges from Taba's narrow definition of 'a plan for learning', to de Marris and Le Compte's 'total school experience provided to students whether planned or unplanned'.²¹ In the case of the New Zealand senior secondary school, the nature of the curriculum is complicated by the character of secondary school subjects that are conceptualised along disciplinary lines, yet are 'independent entities' with 'their own histories, pedagogical traditions and status within high schools'.²² Furthermore, the explosion of knowledge over the last 50 years has seen a proliferation of new academic fields and a 'growing wealth of information' that has radically changed how curriculum designers have defined the school curriculum and established what young people should learn.²³ This is especially the case in history that is linked with notions of citizenship education, as there is no longer a shared set of common beliefs on which to base a history curriculum. Thus even the process of defining history education is potentially a source of social conflict as 'in deciding what and how we teach our children, we are expressing and thus exposing and risking our identity'.²⁴

²¹ Anne-Marie O'Neill, John Clark and Roger Openshaw, 'Mapping the Field: An Introduction to Curriculum Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand.' In *Reshaping Culture, Knowledge and Learning? Policy and Content in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework*, edited by Anne-Marie O'Neill, John Clark, and Roger Openshaw, 17-45 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2004), 25.

²² Grossman and Stodolsky, cited in Zongji Deng, 'Knowing the Subject Matter of a Secondary-School Science Subject.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 39, no. 5 (2007): 505.

²³ Allan C. Ornstein and Francis P. Hunkins, *Curriculum Foundations, Principles, and Issues* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1998), 151-152.

²⁴ D.F. Walker and J.F. Soltis, cited in Foster and Crawford, *What shall we tell the children?*

Despite the significant role that the history curriculum plays in shaping contemporary social attitudes, beliefs and values it has only recently engendered scholarly interest in New Zealand and this thesis makes a contribution to a growing literature in this field. The history curriculum is a rich site for investigation and empirical study. The way a nation shapes the selection of ‘myth, remembrance and official knowledge’ that it chooses to teach to the young about the past, tells us much about what matters to that society in the present. In the school curriculum, history plays the role of transmitting, storing and disseminating narratives that define notions of national identity, nationhood, citizenship and culture. What is taught in history classrooms (and how it is taught) is an intensely political, highly contested and ideological process that ‘provides a crucial context for analysing the interplay of power and culture’.²⁵

In the 1980s the senior secondary school curriculum was organised around three notions. The first was the requirements of examination prescriptions. Goodson notes that in the ‘modern era we are essentially dealing with curriculum as prescription’ driven by the ‘dominant epistemology’ of ‘pedagogy, curriculum and evaluation’.²⁶ Second at this level the curriculum was organised around subjects. The subject centred approach to curriculum design, with its primary aim of transmitting knowledge, emerged in the 19th century and was popular among teachers, students and parents as they were familiar with the format. For teachers it dictated an emphasis on transmitting an official knowledge (typically outlined in textbooks) and reflected how secondary teachers were trained as subject specialists.²⁷ Third, since the 1960s, senior school subjects have been informed by a parent discipline and, despite the different orientations of both areas, rarely has a distinction been made between school subjects and the academic discipline.²⁸ The discipline-based nature of the senior curriculum was driven by the assumption that the senior school is a microcosm of the academic world and students have been encouraged to see the substantive structure of each subject, including key relationships, concepts and principles.²⁹

The characteristics above capture how learning was organised in the New Zealand senior secondary school in the second half of the 20th century. Recent curriculum developments and curriculum researchers have signalled a shift in orientation in

²⁵ Foster and Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children?* 5-6.

²⁶ Ivor F. Goodson, *Learning, Curriculum and Life Politics* (RoutledgeFalmer: New York, 2005), 45.

²⁷ Ornstein and Hunkins, *Curriculum Foundations, Principles, and Issues*, 243-246.

²⁸ Zongji Deng, ‘Knowing the Subject Matter of a Secondary-School Science Subject.’ *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 39, no. 5 (2007): 505.

²⁹ Joseph Schwab cited in Ornstein and Hunkins, *Curriculum Foundations, Principles, and Issues*, 246.

regards to the senior curriculum,³⁰ but for the last 50 years history has been one of a number of compartmentalised senior school subjects linked to an academic parent discipline. It appeared on a school timetable, delivered a selected body of official knowledge as presented in core textbooks and followed the explicit requirements of examination prescriptions. Although history teachers saw themselves as senior subject specialists, in reality the purpose and orientation of school history and its parent discipline (as with all senior subjects) was markedly different and imposed powerful constraints.³¹ The principal aim of secondary school history was to facilitate learning while the academic discipline was primarily driven by the aim of contributing to the advancement of historical knowledge through research, publishing (and teaching academically able tertiary students).

‘Liberals’ and ‘Conservatives’

While the terms ‘liberal’ and ‘conservative’ serve as useful reference points to establish the competing schools of thought that divided history educators in New Zealand in the late 20th century, terminology, it must be admitted, has posed a problem in this study. In the international literature opponents of change to history education have been described as ‘conservative’, while advocates of change have been depicted as ‘liberal’ and these positions are typically aligned with political divisions. The liberal position is characterised as being activist in orientation, linked to left wing politics and prioritising the histories of the marginalised, oppressed and ignored. Alternatively conservatives are interested in using history to celebrate market-driven policies, promoting the teaching of grand historical narratives, linked with the political right, and the histories of the marginalised (and societies other than their own) are of low priority. However, this juxtaposition does not reflect New Zealand historiography in the 1980s as the political sympathies of New Zealand historians at this time were overwhelmingly with the left. A number of prominent historians were actively involved in left wing politics and radical causes.³² Hence in

³⁰ See: Adrian Alton-Lee, *Quality Teaching for Diverse Students in Schooling: Best Evidence Synthesis* (Wellington: Ministry of Education, 2003); Sandra Cubitt, ‘The Draft New Zealand Curriculum.’ *Curriculum Matters 2* (2006): 195-212; Rachel Bolstead, ‘Questions for a Twenty-First Century Senior Secondary Curriculum.’ *Curriculum Matters 2* (2006): 105-127.
http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/frequently_asked_questions_faq;
http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/the_new_zealand_curriculum

³¹ Zongi Deng, ‘Knowing the Subject Matter of a Secondary-School Science Subject’. 504.

³² For example Michael Bassett became a Labour Cabinet Minister and was an anti-Vietnam protester. Keith Sinclair stood for parliament for the Labour Party in 1969. W.H. Oliver was an anti-Vietnam protester and Tom Brooking and Jock Phillips were anti-apartheid protesters. Trevor Burnard, ‘Bassett Tackles the State the Politician as Historian’. *History Now* 5, no. 1 (1999): 4-8; W.H Oliver, *Looking for the Phoenix: A Memoir* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2002), 133; Keith Sinclair, *Halfway Round the Harbour* (Auckland. Penguin, 1993), 181-2006; Jock Phillips, *A Man’s Country: The Image of the Pākehā Male: A History* (Auckland: Penguin, 1987), 262-263.

New Zealand it was historians of the left who called for grand narratives in schools and, while acknowledging the detrimental impact of colonialism on Māori, highlighted New Zealand's exceptionalism and progress to a liberal democracy. For example, long-time Professor of New Zealand history Keith Sinclair, who had dominated New Zealand history for two decades when the NHCC first met, was described by historians as 'a man of the left' who was '... emphatically on the side of good ... the sufferers and losers and their champions' and saw the writing of history 'as an act of retrospective justice'.³³

Furthermore, one has to be cautious in applying the terms 'liberal' and 'conservative' in analysing debates over pedagogy. Historians and history teachers who wanted a more inclusive curriculum that addressed the growing interest in oppressed, marginalised and previously ignored peoples, were not necessarily more flexible in regards to pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning. However, given the caveats noted above, the terms 'liberal' and 'conservative' do capture the essence of those who advocated change and those who opposed it and hence these terms are employed in this thesis as defined below.

In regards to history education in New Zealand, liberals saw social relevance as the key factor in how the senior history curriculum should be structured. They saw learning as a continuous process in which knowledge was not fixed and were comfortable with the child-centred, process-based initiatives that, by the 1970s, were shaping curriculum design in social studies (which was the integrated core subject that preceded the optional senior history course). Liberals saw history as a subject that equipped young people to not simply understand the social world for 'its own sake', but to participate in a modern, liberal democracy. They reflected the 'open-access' ethos of education that had dominated educational policy since the 1940s³⁴ and had officially guided curriculum developments since this time. In practice, however, 'open-access' was only evident as a guiding principle in core curriculum developments. In the senior school the curriculum was designed to be selective and to maintain the status of an elite minority destined for university, by limiting the number of candidates who could pass prestigious examinations.

³³ W.H Oliver, 'A Destiny at Home.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 2 (1987):13.

³⁴ Peter Fraser's statement as Minister of Education in 1939 that '... every person, whatever his academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in town or country, has a right, as a citizen, to a free education of the kind for which he is best fitted, and to the fullest extent of his powers' has been the central aspiration of liberal educators since the 1940s. For a discussion of how this has impacted on secondary education see John O'Neill, 'Change and Constancy: Half a Century of Secondary Schooling in New Zealand.' *History of Education Review* 33, no. 1 (2004): 44-59.

In regards to historical knowledge, liberals prioritised the experiences of previously ignored or marginalised peoples and wanted to see a focus on contested, topical aspects of history (such as the Vietnam War, apartheid in South Africa and the Civil Rights Movement in the USA). They were informed by British activist historians such as E.P Thompson, Eric Hobsbawn and Shelia Rowbotham.³⁵ In New Zealand they looked to academics such as Keith Sorrenson, Judith Binney and Pat Grimshaw, and activist historians outside the academy such as Dick Scott and Tony Simpson.³⁶ Like their British counterparts the latter were sympathetic to the political left and saw history as informing their social activism. As social relevance was a major concern, liberals also wanted to see a greater emphasis on the contested aspects of New Zealand's history (especially the Treaty of Waitangi and the role of women) that were of contemporary interest.

While liberals were conscious the subject was informed by the parent discipline, they were more open to integrated frameworks of learning than conservatives, especially given the growth of multidisciplinary academic approaches such as women's studies. They also wanted to see much greater use of inquiry-based approaches to teaching and learning and a wider range of assessment models (including internal assessment). These views were neither new, nor unique, to history curriculum matters, but reflected wider curriculum concerns. Since the late 1960s liberals (both in New Zealand and internationally) had argued for a shift away from a discipline-based approach to senior subjects. In regards to history, they wanted a shift from external examinations towards research-based internal assessment and a shift away from essay-based examinations so students could make greater use of historical skills such as resource interpretation. These ideas reflected international trends in history teaching. They had considerable currency among the leadership of the secondary teachers' union, the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) by the late 1960s,³⁷ and in the Department of Education, after W.L Renwick became Director-General in 1973.

The term 'conservative' captures the ethos of those on the NHCC who opposed substantial change and wanted to retain the senior history curriculum as separate

³⁵ For examples of socially activist history writing see: E.P Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1963); Eric Hobsbawn, *Bandits* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1969); Shelia Rowbotham, *Hidden from History. Rediscovering Women in History from the 17th Century to the present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976).

³⁶ Dick Scott, *Go Ask That Mountain* (Auckland: Reed, 1981); Tony Simpson, *Te Riri Pākehā: the White Man's Anger* (Martinborough: Alister Taylor, 1979).

³⁷ New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers Association. *Education in Change: Report of the Curriculum review Group*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1969; New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers Association. *Teachers in Change: Report of the Curriculum Review Group on the Education and Training of Secondary Teachers*. Auckland: Longman Paul 1974.

from the junior secondary school. It did not reflect a political orientation. Conservatives saw the senior school as a microcosm of the university and thus endorsed the existing discipline-based model of the subject (driven by examination prescriptions) that they saw as preparing students to study history at university. Their view of history was largely positivist in that it went it back to the traditional 19th century view of the discipline that had emerged with Leopold von Ranke, who saw the primary purpose of history as being to accurately represent the past 'as it actually was' and conservatives placed a high priority on documentary source interpretation.³⁸ In the 1980s this approach was championed by Geoffrey Elton who eschewed presentist approaches to the past. As a prominent Tudor parliamentary historian (who visited New Zealand in 1983) Elton's *The Practice of History* (1967)³⁹ was especially influential in New Zealand school historiography in the 1980s, as 16th and 17th century English constitutional history had high status here. Conservatives did not see social relevance (or contemporary interest) as a priority. Rather the teaching of the intellectual discipline was an end in itself. Also they did not see New Zealand history as a priority, as they argued that contemporary New Zealand historiography was insubstantial compared to that of the United Kingdom and Western Europe.

The conservative position reflected the ethos of the senior school curriculum that had emerged with the University Entrance Matriculation examination in the early 20th century. In regards to history, it placed the discipline firmly in the western, historicist framework, focussed on politics and the causes of major wars, and showed little concern with the histories of the marginalised and oppressed. In a New Zealand setting conservatives also demonstrated a powerful attachment to English (and to a lesser degree European) history. This orientation largely (but not entirely) reflected the attitude of university historians and senior history teachers on, or close to, the NHCC. However, it did not reflect the contemporary interests of most historians who, by the 1980s, were drawing on theoretically orientated approaches (loosely called 'history from below') to examine areas such as feminist history, social history and radical re-evaluations of the impact of European imperialism on indigenous peoples. Thus despite the insistence of conservatives, that they were maintaining the intellectual credibility of the subject, in reality they showed little concern with ensuring the subject reflected the contemporary ethos of the parent discipline.

³⁸ Marnie Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History* (London: Routledge, 2000), 256-263.

³⁹ G.R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (London: Fontana, 1967).

The Changing Nature of the Senior Secondary School Curriculum

The initiative to reshape the history curriculum in the 1980s reflected the concerns of educators that the discipline-subject based senior curriculum was inadequate to address the increasingly high retention rate of the senior school cohort. In line with international trends by this decade, senior secondary schooling was becoming a universal experience for most young people, as a shrinking job market, social promotion and the credential inflation of qualifications saw adolescents staying on into the senior school.⁴⁰ This trend had a significant impact on compartmentalised, knowledge-based subjects that drew on an academic parent discipline and were orientated to preparing a minority of the academically able for tertiary studies. Although the number of students at this level was increasing, in the case of history, the subject experienced a decline in student numbers. In an age of growing youth unemployment, many students who had no intention of pursuing a tertiary education, looked to subjects with a commercial orientation that appeared to offer viable vocational opportunities (or did not demand such high standards of literacy). Specialist history teachers at this time were generally reluctant to shift the orientation of the subject away from its discipline focus. The isolated and insulated nature of teaching, combined with the pressures and constraints of the classroom, work to discourage collaboration and innovation among teachers. The dominant features of the 'culture of teaching' are presentist, conservative and largely resistant to curriculum change.⁴¹ With some innovative exceptions, history teachers in the 1980s were no exception to this ethos. However, by this time the subject was perceived by the history teaching community to be 'in crisis' and there were serious concerns that as an optional subject, unless history could accommodate the interests of contemporary students, it was unlikely to survive.

Table 1: Senior History examination candidates 1968-82⁴²

History Candidates	1968-74	1982
School Certificate (SC)	1968: 34%	18%
University Entrance (UE)	1974: 35%	21.2%
University Bursary (UB)	1974: 31.5%	27.5%

⁴⁰ O'Neill, 'Change and Constancy: Half a Century of Secondary Schooling in New Zealand,' 44-59.

⁴¹ Andy Hargreaves, *Curriculum and Assessment Reform* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989), 54-55.

⁴² Marcia Stenson, 'History in New Zealand Schools.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 24, no. 2 (1990): 176-177.

The challenges faced in the senior secondary school curriculum were mirrored in the universities, where the rapid expansion of tertiary education in the 1970s and 1980s had placed pressure on universities to accommodate a very different student cohort. The situation was not unique to New Zealand. For example, until the early 1970s, British universities were orientated to the approximately 15% of academically able school leavers who went on to tertiary education (and typically studied full time). However, by the 1980s this percentage had doubled and was increasing. The situation in New Zealand mirrored this experience. Universities were now expected to accommodate mature students who had returned to education, as well as part-time students for whom higher education was simply one component of their lives.⁴³ In regards to history, the impact was similar to the senior secondary school. Despite the rapid growth in tertiary students during the 1960s and 70s (and the creation of new academic positions to accommodate this growth), in the following decade numbers in history declined markedly as students turned to commercially orientated courses. Historians thus faced a parallel 'crisis in history' of falling numbers that they hoped to stem by fostering an interest in the subject at secondary school.

The pressure on the senior school curriculum to address the changing cohort was not unique to history. Just as the Department of Education had responded to junior secondary schooling becoming a universal experience in the 1940s and 50s with the initiatives that came from the Thomas and Currie reports (1944, 1962), the reshaping of the history syllabus was one of a number of Department curriculum initiatives to address wider societal changes. The recommendations of the McCombs Report⁴⁴ (1976) led to major curriculum reviews in the mid 1980s, the partial introduction of internal assessment in the senior school in 1986, and senior syllabus reviews in a range of senior subjects including geography, history, physical education and music.

At a practical level, however, curriculum change at the senior level was complicated by the fundamentally different epistemological orientations of the core curricula and senior subject syllabi. By the 1970s the junior precursor to senior secondary history, social studies, reflected the changes in educational thinking that had radically reshaped primary schooling in the decades following the Second World War. The influence of Piaget placed the child at the centre of all learning, and the stage-based learning models required careful curriculum planning. While not all secondary

⁴³ Geoff Timmons, Keith Vernon, Christine Kinealy, *Teaching and Learning History* (London: Sage Publications, 2005), 29-30; For a New Zealand perspective on changes in the ethos of universities see: Nicholas Tarling and Wilf Malcolm, *Crisis of Identity? The Mission and Management of Universities in New Zealand* (Wellington: Dunmore Press, 2007).

⁴⁴ T.H. McCombs, *Towards Partnership: Report of the Committee on Secondary Education*, (Wellington: Department of Education, 1976).

schools embraced this shift in approach, the core curriculum was increasingly based on social constructivist teaching models that emphasised inquiry and discovery learning. However, the senior school curriculum (Years 11-13) was made up of a series of discrete subjects that (at least in theory) were linked to a parent discipline. For students moving out of the junior secondary school it involved a 'shift away' from a 'learner-centred approach' to a 'knowledge-centred' approach.⁴⁵ History was not part of the junior secondary core curriculum, but rather in the junior secondary school was incorporated into the multidisciplinary, integrated subject of social studies, that adopted a sociological approach to the past and looked to discovery, and inquiry models, to explain the social world. History teachers in the senior school generally perceived these developments to be of little relevance. Rather, the pattern in the senior school curriculum was characterised by prioritising students in what Goodson calls the 'triple alliance between academic subjects, academic examinations and able pupils'.⁴⁶

Until the early 1980s, history teachers largely reflected the academic orientation of the senior school and defined themselves as senior subject specialists. They structured their programmes based on the requirements of the examination prescriptions, largely employed transmission style models of delivery, showed little interest in educational theories and looked to historians for guidance in regards to what should be taught in schools. The 'crisis in history' challenged this ethos at a practical level. It saw the history teaching community engage with calls to liberalise the senior curriculum and make the subject more relevant to the needs of contemporary students. However, while there was widespread agreement over the need for some sort of change to the history curriculum, there was no shared consensus among teachers or historians, about either the epistemological basis of the subject, or the role of history in the school curriculum. The history teaching community was polarised between conservatives, who wanted to retain the exclusive, academic character of the subject, and liberals who believed history should be socially relevant to all students and had an important role in fostering national identity.

⁴⁵ Rachel Bolstead and Jane Gilbert, *Disciplining and Drafting, or 21st Century Learning? Rethinking the New Zealand Senior Secondary Curriculum for the Future* (Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2008), 12-13.

⁴⁶ Goodson, *Learning, Curriculum and Life Politics*, 47.

'The High Ground Remained Untouched'

The initiative to reform the history curriculum was generated by the Department of Education Curriculum Development Division (CDD)⁴⁷ in response to calls from liberal educators. While subjects in the junior secondary school were under no pressure to accommodate the requirements of examinations, at the senior level the prescriptions drove syllabus development. The CDD strategy in liberalising the history curriculum therefore was to link any change with the examinations and integrate School Certificate (SC) with University Entrance (UE), University Bursary (UB) and University Scholarship (US). Integration, however, exposed longstanding and irreconcilable differences between how liberals and conservatives saw the junior secondary curriculum and the senior compartmentalised subject of history.

The Department of Education was responsible for SC and wanted to change the prescription to be more socially relevant and reflect current educational thinking. By the 1980s, SC served both as an exit examination for those who were not destined for the professions, and a benchmark for students who went on to the senior school. The SC history curriculum was orientated towards citizenship education and by the mid-1970s the Department had introduced progressive changes to the examination that reflected international trends in assessment (such as resource interpretation and multi-choice questions) and required more student-centred pedagogical approaches. The University Entrance Board (UEB), however, controlled UE, UB and US. Dominated by academics, the UEB adopted a conservative approach to the curriculum and saw the primary role of these examinations as providing a benchmark for the minority of academically able students who intended to study at university. The UEB saw the academic orientation of these exams as of paramount importance and did not see wider educational considerations (such as social relevance) as a high priority. They were determined to defend what they saw as the intellectual integrity of the discipline at secondary school level.

The challenge of attempting to reconcile these two very different philosophical attitudes to senior school history was a major problem for the CDD and one for which the existing curriculum development process proved inadequate. By the 1980s syllabus development followed a well understood formula. It was driven by the Department of Education in consultation with interested parties who were chosen to reflect the ethos of the CDD. In the core curriculum (such as social studies) the process was regarded as

⁴⁷ The Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) was established in 1963 and changed its name to the Curriculum Development Division (CDD) in 1977.

transparent and consultative, as it involved a range of carefully chosen 'insiders' in the development, trialling and implementation of new initiatives. However, in developing the curriculum at UE, UB and US level, officials also had to negotiate with university academics in the parent discipline. Historians saw themselves (and were perceived by senior teachers) as being the experts in regards to what should be taught in schools. In this setting, CDD officials on the NHCC had to balance the views of liberals and conservatives and, in the absence of firm leadership and an explicit philosophical direction, dominant individuals and groups outside of the Department had the opportunity to pursue their own agendas.

School subjects are 'social systems because they compete for a place in the curriculum'⁴⁸ and the process of selecting what should be taught in the history curriculum also involves a de-selection process. It was the conservatives who prevailed in regards to selecting what should be taught in schools at Years 12 and 13. The final history curriculum (as expressed in the prescriptions) privileged the study of existing areas of the past and reinforced the subject remaining largely the preserve of affluent, academically orientated schools. The prescriptions drove what was taught in senior school history and it is argued that while the SC syllabus was reshaped to reflect the liberal agenda of the Department of Education (and the PPTA) the content of the curriculum for UE, UB and US was shaped to reflect the professional interests of conservatives within the history teaching community. This was despite the implications of a changing senior school cohort, the liberal intentions of the Department of Education and the PPTA to reform history education, fundamental changes within the parent discipline of history and wider societal pressures for history to be socially relevant. Conservatives ensured that the history curriculum at Years 12 and 13 retained an academic, exclusive, Eurocentric character that served the narrow range of interests of a minority of historians (and their senior teacher supporters). They defined the academic ethos of the subject to be of paramount importance and ignored issues of social relevance. Furthermore, it is argued that the central tenet of consensus in decision-making on the NHCC (and the lack of genuine evaluation that was a feature of curriculum implementation) gave dominant personalities in this subject community a significant advantage in promoting the areas of knowledge they valued and marginalising those who opposed their views.

⁴⁸ Clive McGee, *Teachers and Curriculum Decision-Making* (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1997), 134.

Research Focus

This study explores how educational policy over curriculum issues is initiated, developed and constructed. It achieves this by focusing on a case study of the development of the history curriculum in New Zealand in the late 20th century. The primary research problem I address is concerned with how Department of Education officials (in particular school inspectors and curriculum designers) and historians and history teachers transformed the academic discipline of history into a senior secondary school subject. It considers the influence of state control on the construction of the senior history curriculum in New Zealand and the nature of the constraints that impinged upon this influence. The two central questions I am concerned with are firstly, what did the Department of Education hope to achieve by reshaping the history curriculum in the 1980s and secondly, did dominant elites within the history teaching community have a disproportionate influence over the process to their own professional advantage? These research questions are supplemented by the following questions:

- Who selected the historical knowledge that was valued and given high status in the history curriculum?
- How did the formal and informal processes of curriculum development work?
- Whose voices were heard in the process of curriculum development?
- Which group(s) received the most sustained attention in deciding what young people would learn about the past and how this material would be delivered?
- To what extent did the NHCC ignore other views and perspectives and marginalise those who were not seen as important?

The focus of this case study is on the decisions and deliberations of the NHCC and the development of the intended (written) curriculum, as opposed to the implemented (taught) curriculum. The written curriculum is a rich source of study in analysing patterns of schooling providing those interested in curriculum design with ‘...a testimony, a documentary source, a changing map of the terrain: it is one of the best official guide books to the institutionalized structure of schooling’.⁴⁹ The written curriculum also provides some insight into the philosophical ideas that drove curriculum design by the Department of Education in New Zealand at this time. The philosophical orientation of curriculum design was not readily apparent as it was not made explicit in this process. The CDD ‘worked in collaboration with colleagues’ and

⁴⁹ Goodson, *Studying Curriculum*, 19.

'there appeared to be cohesion and unity of purpose within a carefully controlled and managed political process', but there was no 'clearly enunciated overall philosophy of the curriculum'.⁵⁰ Finally the senior history curriculum provides the internal, in-depth view of curriculum change and conflict that allows the opportunity to examine and analyse the more subtle dynamics that are not visible in overarching curriculum studies. Like regional studies in political, social and cultural history, it provides an opportunity to test out major assumptions about historical problems.

An examination of the NHCC is especially useful in analysing assumptions about the nature of curriculum change under the Department of Education, prior to the New Right reforms of the 1990s. The NHCC was sitting in the five years immediately before the Picot Report and the implementation of *Tomorrow's Schools* that shifted the focus of educational policy away from curriculum to administration. As the NHCC was the final syllabus committee to sit before the neo-conservative curriculum changes in the 1990s, it represented the high point of cyclic syllabus change that had been introduced by Clarence Beeby in the 1940s.⁵¹ The 1990s saw a fundamental shift in curriculum design in which economic and vocational matters were prioritised. This was a marked departure from the ethos espoused in the Thomas Report (1944) of a broad general education (in which 'vocational considerations' were only one concern) that had been largely reflected in curriculum developments since the 1950s.⁵² The process of curriculum design in the decades before the Picot Report and *Tomorrow's Schools* has been described as 'inclusive, consultative and transparent', in comparison to the 1990s when outside contractors replaced Department of Education Curriculum Committees and consultation was comparatively brief and minimal.⁵³ Educators have seen the 'rolling revision' of syllabus change that operated in the previous three decades before *Tomorrow's Schools* as making 'steady progress towards equality of educational opportunity and social justice for all'.⁵⁴ The outcomes-based, 'assessment-led' model of curriculum design that was introduced in the early 1990s was a major shift in the process of curriculum development. It has been widely criticised as 'structured, prescribed and

⁵⁰ John A. Clark. 'Rigorous Eclecticism: The Ministry of Education's Bizarre Philosophy of the Curriculum'. In *Reshaping Culture, Knowledge and Learning? Policy and Content in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework* edited by Anne-Marie O'Neill, John Clark, and Roger Openshaw, 127-140 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2004), 128.

⁵¹ Noeline Alcorn, *To the Fullest Extent of His Powers: C.E. Beeby's Life in Education* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1999), 110-112.

⁵² Gregory Lee and Debbie Hill, 'Curriculum Reform in New Zealand: Outlining the New of Restating the Familiar?' *Delta* 48, no. 1 (1996): 19-32.

⁵³ Roger Openshaw, 'Suffering from Enthusiasts'. In *Democracy at the Crossroads*, edited by C. White and R. Openshaw, 233-254 (New York: Lexington Books, 2005), 240-242.

⁵⁴ McGee, *Teachers and Curriculum Decision-Making*, 59.

monitored'⁵⁵ and being overly concerned with standardisation and uniformity. It has been argued that this model has fostered a 'culture of distrust', obsessed with compliance and accountability, that replaced an educational climate that trusted teachers as autonomous professionals.⁵⁶

This study does not directly address the impact of neo-conservative changes on education in the 1990s. Rather, it seeks to illuminate the nature of professionalism in regards to curriculum design, immediately prior to the shift to a 'climate of distrust' within education. As well as highlighting the limitations faced by the Department of Education in designing curriculum change at this level, this study challenges the perception of a 'golden age' of professionalism in regards to curriculum design prior to the implementation of neo-liberal reforms.⁵⁷ When examined closely the politics of the NHCC demonstrate an element of 'provider capture' by interested historians (and their supporters in the history teaching community) who shaped the content of senior history prescriptions to reflect their own professional interests and showed little concern in addressing wider social or educational issues. The decisions these teachers and historians made provided these professionals with better career prospects, as well as opportunities to pursue material self-interest (such as the writing of school textbooks) and the status of being experts in highly valued knowledge.

The development of the history curriculum also provides an opportunity to examine the role of prescriptions in shaping the senior school curricula and the implications of this for pedagogy. The status of a senior subject (in the hierarchy of school subjects) was closely tied to public, written examinations. Although teachers had some autonomy, the decisions they made about history topics were chosen from a narrow range of options in the prescription. It was the prescriptions that largely shaped the historical knowledge that was taught (and how this would be taught) rather than the general syllabus guidelines.⁵⁸ The membership of a particular subject community carries with it a set of shared 'assumptions and practices' or 'pedagogical subcultures' about how that subject is best taught in the classroom.⁵⁹ In senior history this 'pedagogical subculture' was driven by the explicit requirements of

⁵⁵ V.M. Carpenter. 'Curriculum and the (Re)Production of Knowledge'. In *Theory and Practice for Educators*, edited by H. Dixon V. Carpenter, E. Rata and C Rawlinson (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2001), 109.

⁵⁶ See: J.A Codd, 'Professional Accountability and the Culture of Teachers.' *Delta* 50, no. 2 (1998): 149-62; _____, 'Educational Reform, Accountability and the Culture of Distrust.' *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies* 34, no. 1 (1999): 45-53.

⁵⁷ Gary McCulloch, Gill Helsby and Peter Knight, *The Politics of Professionalism* (London: Continuum, 2000), 42-56.

⁵⁸ Department of Education, *History forms 5 to 7 Syllabus for schools* (Wellington: Learning Media, 1989).

⁵⁹ Hargreaves, *Curriculum and Assessment Reform*, 57.

summative examinations. The NHCC was especially conscious of the pressures of the examinations as the committee was sitting at the same time as the Department was initiating a major reshaping of senior school assessment to address the changing nature of the secondary school cohort.

Finally a scrutiny of the NHCC in the 1980s provides an opportunity to consider how the definition of high status knowledge in senior school subjects plays a role in shaping the identity of specialist teachers. School subjects are 'more than groupings of intellectual thought', but are also 'social systems' that 'compete for power, prestige, recognition and reward' within the secondary school system.⁶⁰ The identities of senior teachers are largely formed on subject lines on point of entry to teacher training, and stretch back to their own learning experience as school and undergraduate students. Senior school history teachers liked to think their subject was closely linked to the parent discipline and this provided them with considerable status, as history was seen an academic (as opposed to a vocational or non-examination) subject. Despite the different orientations of school and academic history, the selected knowledge that was taught (and examined) was defined by university historians who saw school history primarily as important in recruiting students into university history courses.

History teachers in turn accepted the constraints and boundaries of teaching a discipline-based subject. Publicly accountable to a far greater degree than their colleagues in the junior school, senior history teachers were required to thoroughly prepare students for the external examinations and typically 'taught to the exam'. As a result they were required to make a considerable personal and professional investment in particular areas of historical knowledge and become 'experts' in the narrow range of prescribed areas that were examined. In this environment history teachers were cautious of new initiatives as these had the potential to cause considerable personal and professional upheaval, by challenging their existing status in their subject and school communities. While the relationship between teachers and interested academics could be characterised as symbiotic, it was largely to the advantage of historians rather than teachers (or students). The close links with the parent discipline, and the hierarchical nature of compartmentalised subjects, rewarded those who focussed on the particular aspects of historical knowledge that were prescribed. It also contributed to specialist history teachers distancing themselves from contemporary issues and areas of social significance, as this was the ethos of most academics who were involved in school history in this era.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 56.

Organisation and Arguments

The thesis is divided into eleven chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the central arguments of the thesis, the major themes and issues that are examined in this project and the outline of the shape of this study. Chapter 2 provides a background to, and outline of, the decisions and deliberations of the NHCC. Chapter 3 outlines the theoretical considerations that have informed this project and the methodological approaches I have adopted. Rather than providing a freestanding literature review, I have opted to interweave the relevant literature throughout the thesis, as and where appropriate. This approach was adopted given the complexity of the research questions that draw on literature from education, history, sociology, psychology and social anthropology. For example, the writings of Ivor F. Goodson have been important in informing this study and thus have been cited as and where they are appropriate and relevant. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the wider social, political, cultural and intellectual developments in New Zealand that impacted on the design of the history curriculum, especially in regards to the relationship between Māori and Pākehā and the advent of second wave feminism. Chapter 5 focuses on the key issues in regards to education in the 1970s and 80s and discusses the main historiographical trends that informed history education at this time.

The debates over history education were not only about content but were also concerned with pedagogy and assessment and this area is discussed in Chapter 6. The NHCC introduced a number of major assessment initiatives (internally assessed research-based studies and resource interpretation) that were driven by history teachers and Department of Education officials. These changes were of little interest to the wider decision-making elite in society but were in line with the orthodox thinking among educationists and had the support of prominent members of the subject community who were responsible for curriculum development. These changes had far-reaching implications for history teaching. Academic historians were largely uncomfortable with the shift away from essay-based examinations, but reluctantly they accepted the changes as they felt these had the potential to address the issue of declining student numbers.

History teaching has generated heated debates in the international arena and Chapter 7 presents an overview of these trends in the last decades of the 20th century. These debates have shared three main features. Firstly, they have emerged at times of political and cultural transformation, and are prevalent in times of crisis (real or imagined) and future uncertainty. Secondly, these debates are as much about pedagogy, as what should be taught to the young. They are part of

wider attacks on child-centred 'discovery and enquiry' teaching models (and in regards to history, single out integrated approaches to teaching history). Finally these debates reflect dissatisfaction with the fragmentation of the discipline of history that has seen a shift away from 'history from above' grand narratives, to approaches that have a theoretical orientation and focus on areas such as gender, class and race. While liberals endorse the potential of these approaches to foster critical thinking, critics see the lack of unquestioned 'facts' and inspiring narratives in the 'new history', as inappropriate for school history. The debates in New Zealand in the 1980s were muted in comparison to those internationally, being largely conducted between the decision-making elites and seldom fostering intense media interest, but they have included many of the same ingredients as those overseas.

Chapter 8 examines the longstanding tension between senior history and secondary school social studies. In the main history teachers and historians have been reluctant to engage with social studies, perceiving that the integrated approach is academically suspect compared to history. In the 1980s there was broad agreement on the NHCC that social studies had not served history well and, although most history teachers taught social studies in the junior school, they largely identified with their senior subject. While it is unremarkable that social studies initially encountered hostility by the history teaching community when it was first introduced in the 1950s (as it supplanted the territory traditionally held by history specialists), the extent and longstanding nature of the rift between these two subject communities is unusual. It reflects the irreconcilable differences between how conservatives and liberals perceived the study of the past as well as providing an insight into the nature of the history teaching community in the 1980s, and the thinking that shaped the senior history syllabus. While liberals on the NHCC did not want to see history replace social studies, they argued that school history should play a wider heritage and citizenship role and this led to tensions with conservatives, who were determined to maintain history as a discrete, academic subject that primarily served academically able students.

Chapters 9-11 put forward a hypothesis that seeks to explain the nature of continuity and change in the senior curriculum at this time. This model offers an explanation for the origin of current challenges in the design and implementation of initiatives in the senior social sciences, in particular by illuminating the differences between curriculum developments in the senior secondary school and the compulsory core. In the 1980s the Department of Education was determined to address the relatively poor achievement of Pasifika and Māori students compared with Pākehā, as well as

girls compared with boys. However, the final curriculum fell short of what the Department and liberals expected. It was the prescription that dictated what was taught in the classroom and without teacher autonomy being restricted, an optional topic that was perceived by teachers to be controversial, of little interest to students or an area about which they knew little, was seldom included in a senior programme. In addition to the need to both restrict teacher autonomy and embed a topic into the prescription, it is argued there are three key criteria that are required in the senior curriculum design process in determining whether or not a particular knowledge base is taught or retained in senior school prescriptions. All three are necessary for an initiative to be successfully introduced (or for an existing knowledge base to be retained).

Firstly, the decision-making elite need to share the view that a particular body of knowledge is of higher status and more important than any alternative. Secondly, a successful reshaping of the knowledge base of the senior history curriculum requires an initiative to be located within the existing orthodoxy of the parent discipline and share the existing scholarly constraints and boundaries of the discipline. Finally, to successfully retain an existing knowledge base (or promote a new initiative) advocates must be able to establish alliances with major stakeholders in a subject community who are sympathetic to their cause. The role of individuals in this process is paramount, especially as Department of Education curriculum committees operated on the ethos of 'consultation', with no explicit philosophical direction and no formal evaluation process. Dominant individuals could (and did) play a profound role in the decisions made by the NHCC.

Chapter 9 applies this model in examining how women's history was embedded into the curriculum as an example of a successful initiative in senior curriculum change. The embedding of women's history into the prescriptions was the only significant change in regards to content that was made by the NHCC and this initiative was successful because it fulfilled the requirements of all the three determinants noted above. Firstly, in the 1980s feminism was an integral feature of the ethos of the liberal decision-makers in education, who shared the view that the curriculum should reflect the interests and needs of girls. Secondly, an interest in women's history was a major feature of the contemporary intellectual world, and was an established branch of academic history. Feminist historians may have asked different questions of the past (and were often involved in radical politics) but they were firmly located within the academic tradition. Thirdly, advocates for women's history to be included in the curriculum established alliances with major stakeholders in the history teaching community. The case for more

visibility of women in history was widely acknowledged by academics and the largely middle class, feminised workforce of history teachers, who were enthusiastic about including contexts that illustrated and explained women's lives in their programmes. These three determinants saw women's history successfully incorporated into the prescriptions of the history curriculum at all senior levels.

Māori history was not embedded into the curriculum and why this was the case is examined in Chapter 10. Māori issues were of concern to the largely sympathetic Pākehā decision-making elite involved in curriculum matters. Māori students were identified as less successful in the senior school than their Pākehā counterparts and Māori issues were among the most salient of the decade. However, Māori history did not meet the requirements of the second determinant, as those who dominated the history teaching community did not perceive Māori history as fitting within the boundaries and parameters of the discipline. Neither were there prominent members of the subject community (either on or close to NHCC) who could establish networks and alliances with major stakeholders. Thus incorporating a Māori dimension into the senior history syllabus proved a major challenge for the NHCC.

There was considerable sympathy among liberal educators that Māori history should have a prominent role in the syllabus, but the NHCC was dominated by those who believed that while this was a laudable goal, it was not realistic. They pointed to the competing narratives of iwi and hapu that characterised Māori views of the past and argued it was unlikely the curriculum could establish a credible Māori narrative that would have been acceptable to Māori scholars. Linked to this point they argued there were no suitable Māori historians who had credibility in both the academic discipline of history and the 'Māori world' who could have been approached. Although as discussed in Chapter 10, the NHCC did have a number of options in regards to scholars it could have called upon, they chose not to do so. In part this reluctance reflected the controversial nature of the contemporary relationship between Māori and Pākehā. By the 1980s it was becoming increasingly uncomfortable for Pākehā historians to write about (or comment on) Māori matters. In the final curriculum, a topic on 19th century Māori history was introduced that provided the opportunity to study local iwi and hapu history at Year 12. However, as teachers only chose 4 topics (out of 29) it was poorly resourced and has not been widely taught over the last 20 years.

While Chapters 9 and 10 offer a hypothesis that explains the success or otherwise of initiatives to change the senior history curriculum at this time, the more typical

response by the NHCC to pressure for change was to 'defend the high ground' and retain the status quo. Despite calls from liberals to restructure the curriculum and pressure from the Department of Education, there was very little substantial change. Chapter 11 examines how a particular body of knowledge was seen as of higher value than any alternatives, and retained in the senior history curriculum. In particular it focuses on the decision of the history committee to privilege the history of 16th and 17th century England over what was seen as the only credible contemporary alternative of 19th century New Zealand. The history of the early modern English nation-state was retained in the prescriptions and has continued to dominate the history curriculum at this level for over 30 years.⁶¹ The central place this area of English history retains in the New Zealand history curriculum not only illustrates the capture of the senior history curriculum by dominant personalities, but also highlights a post-colonial mentality among some history educators that 'real history' happens elsewhere. Ironically, given the high interest in New Zealand history and national identity in the last 10 years,⁶² there was more New Zealand history taught in school programmes in the 1960s than in the first decade of the 21st century.

Although by the 1980s 16th and 17th century England enjoyed high status in the history curriculum, being the compulsory topic for UB and US, it was not popular among contemporary liberal, intellectual circles in the 1980s. Nor (as it was taught in New Zealand) did it have high status within the parent discipline. While it was firmly located within the constraints of historical scholarship, there were a considerable number of liberal historians and teachers who were determined 16th and 17th century England should be replaced with New Zealand history. However, there were few university historians involved in school curriculum matters and those who dominated the NHCC placed a higher value on early-modern English history. As they viewed the subject as an academic precursor to university studies, they pointed to the rich body of resources and the comprehensive historiography. Despite determined opposition from Department of Education officials and liberal historians and teachers, the Early Modern English nation-state was embedded into the UB and US prescriptions.

⁶¹ See figures above (footnote 19).

⁶² For example Michael King's *The Penguin History of New Zealand* (Auckland: Penguin, 2003) sold an 'unprecedented' 189,000 copies in the first 4 years of publication. For a discussion of the place of general histories in New Zealand historiography see: Jacob Pollack, 'Cultural Colonization and Textual Biculturalism: James Belich and Michael King's General Histories of New Zealand.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 42, no. 2 (2007): 180-198.

Figure 4: Criteria for a successful initiative in senior history

Criteria	Women's History	Māori History
1) <i>The decision-making elite share the view that a particular body of knowledge is of higher status and more important than any alternative.</i>	YES: Feminism was an integral feature of the ethos of the liberal decision-makers in education who shared the view that the curriculum should reflect the interests and needs of girls.	YES: Māori issues were a primary concern of the decision-making elite involved in curriculum matters and among the most salient of the decade.
2) <i>The initiative is located within the existing orthodoxy of the parent discipline and shares the existing scholarly constraints and boundaries of the discipline.</i>	YES: Women's history was an established branch of academic history. Feminist historians were firmly located within the academic tradition.	NO: The history teaching community did not believe they could accommodate iwi and hapu history within the boundaries and parameters of the parent discipline.
3) <i>Advocates for the initiative establish alliances with major stakeholders in a subject community who are sympathetic to their cause.</i>	YES: Advocates for women's history established networks and alliances with major stakeholders in the history teaching community. The case for more visibility of women in history was widely acknowledged by academics and history teachers.	NO: There were no prominent members of the history teaching community (either on or close to NHCC) who could establish networks and alliances with major stakeholders.

CHAPTER 2

An integrated Forms 5-7 History Syllabus: The National History Curriculum Committee

At the time, history in New Zealand schools was only offered to senior secondary students as an elective where the content for each level was quite independent. There was no underlying philosophy, rationale, skills or values that could be seen to achieve cohesion and meaningfulness for history as a teaching subject in schools.

David Wood¹

This chapter outlines the changes that were made to the history curriculum in the 1980s. It introduces the key personalities on the NHCC, indicates the aims of the Department of Education and illustrates the nature of decision-making on the history committee. A major review of the history syllabus had long been on the agenda in the Department and among the history teaching community. The policy of rolling syllabus revision saw Forms 5-7 history (Years 11-13) come up for review in the 1980s. David Wood who facilitated the NHCC remembers that history was of major concern in the Department of Education in light of declining student numbers. The Department was also determined to develop an integrated syllabus that reflected the 'growing sense of identity' in New Zealand, incorporated the changing nature of the discipline and placed more emphasis on teaching transferable skills that were useful in the market place.² The need for a review was given momentum by the newly inaugurated New Zealand Historical Association (NZHA) in 1981 who requested the Department of Education rationalise 'the aims, objectives and content of the separate Forms 5-7 history prescriptions.'³

¹ David Wood, amended transcript, 13/05.08.

² Ibid.

³ Department of Education, *History forms 5 to 7 Syllabus for schools* (Wellington: Learning Media, 1989), foreword.

Figure 5: National History Curriculum Committee⁴

	Number of Meetings attended (NMA)
Teachers	David Gledhill (Nominated by PPTA) – NMA: 8 Bruce Cathro (Kaikorai High School) – NMA: 8 Don Hamilton (Christ College: independent schools) – NMA: 7 Anne Jones (Ngā tapuwae College) – NMA: 5 Myra Kunowski (Avonside Girls) – NMA: 5 John Rosanowski: Aranui High – NMA: 6 Bill Rushbrook (Western Heights High School) – NMA: 6 Cynthia Shaw (Correspondence School) – NMA: 9 Marcia Stenson (Epsom College) – NMA: 7 Jim Peters: Mt Albert Grammar – NMA: 3
Department of Education	Harvey McQueen (Curriculum Development Division) – NMA: 5 Gresham Poole (Secondary School Inspectorate) – NMA: 8 Greg Taylor (Secondary School Inspectorate) – NMA: 6 Peter Whitelock (Curriculum Development Division) – NMA: 3 David Wood: (Curriculum Officer Division) – NMA: 6
University History Departments/ Teacher Colleges'	Russell Stone (Auckland) – NMA: 6 Nicholas Tarling: (Auckland) – NMA: 6 Robin Gwynn (Massey - University Entrance Board) – NMA: 4 Erik Olssen (Otago) – NMA: 8 Colin Davis (Massey) – NMA: 6 Peter Lineham: Massey university – NMA: 5 Clyde Downes (Auckland Teachers' College) – NMA: 7

The Pressure for Change

The NHCC was set up in November 1982 by the Minister of Education Merv Wellington who had considerable sympathy for the subject, but was atypical of social conservatives in that he did not see history as central to nation-building. Rather, he wanted a narrow range of changes to the history syllabus that reflected his wider attempts to stem what he saw as the increasing liberalisation of education. An ex-secondary school history and social studies teacher, Wellington was a strong supporter of history as an academic and discrete discipline and was suspicious of social studies. However, despite his personal misgivings, he had no plans to abolish social studies⁵ and unlike the United Kingdom (where Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister made her views on history education very clear and was willing to intervene in the history curriculum development process if necessary) Wellington left these matters to the Department of Education officials.

⁴ This list includes those key players on the NHCC who attended 3 or more meetings and played a major role in the process. A full list of all historians, officials and teachers who attended NHCC meetings appears in the appendices. There were also individuals (such as Margaret Tennant and Kerry Howe) who were involved informally with development of the curriculum but who attended NHCC meetings infrequently.

⁵ Renwick: interview.

Merv Wellington was a social studies man who had also taught history. He didn't need convincing of the importance of history teaching in the curriculum. Like many conservatives in his National Government he was suspicious of social studies as a loose social engineering discipline and he believed he could get more rigour into the subject by including more history in social studies. (D.Wood)

After the election of the Lange government in July 1984 and the appointment of a new Minister of Education Russell Marshall, the history committee was given considerable freedom reflecting the liberal, inclusive, and financially affluent climate of education under Marshall's leadership. Social justice was a key principle of the new government and the History Committee was now expected to address issues of inequality in the curriculum and incorporate Pacific, Māori and female perspectives. This was a significant change. Erik Olssen remembered that when Wellington was Minister 'we were told there were certain things we could discuss and other things we could not ... the rules of the game changed after Labour was elected.'⁶ However, while the NHCC may have enjoyed more freedom under Marshall, unlike his predecessor the new Minister was not personally committed to history as a subject. He had 'a deep and personal interest' in 'conflict resolution techniques' in schools⁷ and in 1985 announced the government's intention to implement peace studies. In the following year the Department produced the *Peace Studies Draft Guidelines* (1986). However, Marshall's enthusiasm for this initiative was short-lived and there was no determined attempt to implement peace studies in any practical sense.⁸ While Myra Kunowski showed some interest in discussing the inclusion of peace studies into the history curriculum, the NHCC stood apart from this initiative and Marshall (like his predecessor) left the final direction of the history committee to his officials.

⁶ Olssen: interview.

⁷ McQueen: interview.

⁸ Department of Education, *Peace Studies in Primary, Secondary and Intermediate Schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Report by Cathy Mulholland (Wellington: Department of Education, 1990).

Changing the Examination Prescriptions

The NHCC was initially facilitated by CDD history curriculum official Peter Whitelock. The history prescriptions had gone through several revisions by the time the NHCC first met in June 1983 and there had already been major changes to SC history. However, there was no integrated history syllabus. The Currie Report (1962) had recommended the senior curriculum needed to take into account the changing nature of the school cohort, especially as SC was being examined after three years of study rather than four (as had been the original intention in the Thomas Report). By the mid-1960s SC served as both a leaving certificate for those who did not wish to pursue a university education and as well as an entry requirement into Year 12/6th Form. In light of this the SC history syllabus was revised in the mid-1960s.

Monitored by the Department of Education, the 1966 School Certificate history prescription was closely linked to building values and attitudes (rather than simply being an academic subject) and the civic value of history was seen as central. The aim was to provide historical knowledge that would contribute to a sense of 'informed citizenship' and provide a guide for the future.⁹ In regards to content there was an emphasis on 20th century history that was driven by the perception that students should move from the familiar to the less familiar. This perception continued into the 1980s:

... the whole concept of time is very difficult. Also, the deeper skills of history require a certain maturity that comes only from experience ... in terms of selection of content it was more sensible to start at the 5th Form (year 11) with 20th century topics or themes that were closer in time and experience to the average New Zealand student. Each following year students could move further back in time. In the 6th form to the 19th century and 7th form further back still.¹⁰

A key aim of the 1965 revision was to reduce the enormous amount of material that was previously examined and which had seen 'one-dimensional' history courses that emphasised 'breadth rather than depth'. The reduction of content was an ongoing theme in history curriculum design at all levels and signalled a growing international trend in history education that encouraged students to develop in-depth rather than superficial understandings. Reflecting the orthodox view of New Zealand at this time being part of the British Commonwealth, as well as a fledgling sense of national identity, the 1966 history SC syllabus required New Zealanders to have '... an awareness of their own background' and 'the land from which most of their

⁹ *Education Gazette*, 1 May 1965.

¹⁰ David Wood amended transcript 13/05/08.

ancestors came from'.¹¹ Examined for the first time in 1966 students studied up to 18 topics (out of a total of 29) with six of these being on New Zealand, six on Britain and six on world history.

The 1966 syllabus was not popular with teachers who struggled with the amount of material that they were expected to cover to prepare for the examination and there were calls for a reduction. Five years later the prescription was revised. There was less content¹² and reflecting the commitment to national identity, topics were linked in thematic comparisons that depicted New Zealand in a favourable light. For example Social Welfare in New Zealand was compared with the United States, a comparison that showed New Zealand's welfare reforms as relatively generous (reflecting the contemporary New Zealand historiography of Social Security) and the United States welfare policies as parsimonious.¹³ In the early 1970s it was still acceptable for New Zealanders to speak of New Zealand's race relations as 'the best in the world' and the history curriculum reinforced this by requiring students to compare race relations in New Zealand with those in South Africa.¹⁴ The thematic model was embedded in the SC syllabus by the 1980s and although there was no genuine or explicit comparative aspect of the theme required in the examination (which dictated what was taught), the NHCC was committed to continuing this approach (See Figure 1).

At Year 12, the UE course was organised around European political history. There were 13 examined topics arranged into the following themes: Nationalism, Government, Imperialism and International Relations. As it was under the auspices of the UEB, the UE course was highly academic in orientation and, unlike the SC syllabus, did not have an explicitly citizenship focus. The UB and US courses were an extension of the European focus of Form 6 and showed a strong bias towards English political history that was aimed at preparing students for history at university. The course was divided into two Parts. Part A was a compulsory broad survey of English history 1603-1815. Few teachers, however, taught the whole period and in the 1977 syllabus it was altered to England 1558-1700. The aim of the compulsory Part A section was to expose students to '... problems of change and continuity over an extended period of time'. In Part B teachers were offered a choice of one topic out of a range of historical contexts (See Figures 2 and 3).

¹¹ J.L Hunt, 'Leap Forward: The Proposed School Certificate History Syllabus.' *Historical News* 3: 1965, 1-2.

¹² National Archives: *School Certificate History*, File 6/14/71, Part 4.

¹³ Department of Education, *School Certificate History Prescription*, Theme I: Social Welfare: a) New Zealand since 1891 b) USA 1932-64.

¹⁴ Department of Education, *School Certificate History Prescription*, Theme II: Cultural Interaction: New Zealand since 1911 and South Africa 1919-1961.

As an academic senior subject, history was closely linked to public examinations and history teachers essentially 'taught to the prescriptions'. The 'narrowing effects of external examinations' had been noted in the Currie Report¹⁵ but twenty years later when the history committee met, little had changed. Despite the increased retention rates in the senior school (which saw proportionately more non-academic students staying at school), SC dominated the Year 11 curriculum. The Department of Education continued to scale all examinations (guaranteeing a quota of students to regularly fail), although by the time the history committee met some moves had already been made to cater for the changing cohort with single subject passes introduced for SC (1968) and for UE (1974). Liberals saw this state of affairs as unsatisfactory and there were calls for more internal assessment.

Formal examinations had dominated the curriculum for over a century when the NHCC first met and appealed to the egalitarian ethos that had long been a key feature of New Zealand education. Despite school inspectors in the late 19th century complaining about the 'constraining influence' of examinations, parents, and teachers, the Department of Education and employers felt that a 'uniform' evaluation of students would guarantee that all would receive the 'same' education (and have the opportunity to attain marketable credentials).¹⁶ The opportunity to gain qualifications by passing examinations was seen as central to secondary education. However, the increasing access to senior secondary education during the late 20th century had seen a decline in the value of existing qualifications (due to a fall in their scarcity value). The notion of examinations being a tool for promoting egalitarianism was essentially contradictory, as Beeby had pointed out in regards to proficiency. While on the one hand there was a determination to improve 'the standard of the examination', on the other there was 'a constant democratic urge to reduce the qualifications demanded for free post-primary education'.¹⁷ Proficiency had been abolished by 1936 and as junior secondary school became a universal experience in the 1950s, it was SC that became the benchmark. By the 1980s when the NHCC was meeting, the pressure was on UE and UB as increasing numbers of students attained SC (and consequently its value on the labour market fell).

Russell Marshall was keen to address the inequities that came from this situation and to this end he established the Committee of Inquiry into Curriculum, Assessment and Qualifications in Forms 5-7 (CICAQ) in November 1984. He was

¹⁵ Department of Education, *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand*, 319-25.

¹⁶ Howard Lee, 'Examining the New Zealand School Curriculum.' In *The School Curriculum in New Zealand: Theory, Policy and Practice*, edited by Gary McCulloch, 123-137 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992), 124-125.

¹⁷ C.E Beeby quoted *Ibid.*, 132.

reflecting the calls for a shift to internal assessment that had first been mooted by liberal educators in the PPTA and the Department of Education in the late 1960s. The CICAQ recognised that UE was an ‘inappropriately placed examination’ as the 6th Form was now more diverse and recommended that an internally assessed 6th Form Certificate (6FC) be the sole national award (with grade allocations based on SC results) and UE shifted to the 7th Form.¹⁸ However, the overriding concern of the NHCC was to revise the syllabus. David Gledhill claimed that the Examinations Board adopted the attitude of ‘you tell us what to do and we will do it’ and the place of examinations did not feature prominently in the discussions.¹⁹

The National History Curriculum Committee

In the 1980s the process of curriculum change operated on a rolling cyclical revision of school subjects that had been set up in the late 1940s. The NHCC was the last example of this model of curriculum development. Central to the Department’s approach was the belief that ‘teacher’s knowledge, professionalism and commitment to practice’ were crucial in the successful implementation of curriculum change.²⁰ By the 1960s, syllabus curriculum committees had evolved into a formal structure which included representatives from subject associations, Department of Education (school inspectors and CDD subject specialists), the PPTA, Teachers’ Training Colleges, independent schools, subject advisors and university academics.²¹ Curriculum committees established content guidelines in the junior school, but in the senior school the examination boards prescribed these guidelines. The UEB was responsible for UE, UB, and US prescriptions while the Department of Education (with input from PPTA) was responsible for SC. It was a ‘cumbersome and slow process’, characterised by ‘consultation and consensus with no formal evaluation.’²²

The NHCC first met in the week of June 20-24 1983 and the final meeting was in March 1987. All committee meetings were at Lopdell House in Auckland and the committee met a total of nine times. The first meeting was typical of curriculum committees of the time and was made up of fifteen members representing academic historians, history teachers, teacher educators, school inspectors, Department of

¹⁸ Department of Education, *Learning and Achieving: Second Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Curriculum, Assessment, and Qualifications in Forms 5-7*. (Wellington, Department of Education, 1986); _____. *School Certificate Examination Prescription: History* (Department of Education Wellington, 1987).

¹⁹ Gledhill: interview.

²⁰ Alcorn, *To the Fullest Extent of His Powers*, 110-112, 123-126.

²¹ O’Neill, Clark and Openshaw, *Reshaping Culture, Knowledge and Learning? Policy and Content in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework*, 31-32.

²² J.G. Jesson, *The PPTA and the state: From militant professionals to bargaining agent – A study of rational opportunism*, (Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Auckland, 1995), 248-249.

Education officials and PPTA representatives.²³ What was unusual about the NHCC, however, was that it included a number of high status leading academics, and that the teachers involved not only had considerable credibility within their subject community, but were also highly academically qualified.

The teachers were chosen by CDD official Peter Whitelock (or, after 1984, by David Wood), and Gresham Poole and Greg Taylor, who were the secondary school inspectors responsible for history. All the teachers were well known within their regions and were seen to have played a leading role in history education. The Department of Education perceived the credibility of teachers within the history teaching community as an important aspect of successful curriculum development. All the teachers were highly academically qualified, with most holding a Masters degree. David Gledhill was the PPTA representative. He had been a visiting teaching fellow at Victoria University in 1980, had an MA (Cambridge) and had worked with David Wood in preparing resources.²⁴ Cynthia Shaw was teaching at the Correspondence School when she was invited to join the committee. She had written a textbook on the popular Year 12 topic, *The European States System*, and was well known in history teaching circles through her involvement with the Wellington Area History Teachers Association (WAHTA).²⁵ Marcia Stenson was the Head of History at Epsom Girls'. She had written an MA thesis (supervised by Keith Sinclair) on New Zealand social history, had taught in Malaysia at an American international school and was on the committee of the Auckland History Teachers Association (AHTA).²⁶ Myra Kunowski had an MA from Canterbury, had been involved in resource preparation and was well known in the Canterbury history teaching community.

The historians were largely nominated by NZHA and most had close links with secondary teachers. As such they had considerable status in the eyes of teachers (although an involvement in history teaching gave them little credibility among their academic colleagues). Auckland and Massey universities dominated the NHCC. Erik Olssen from Otago was the only non-Massey or Auckland historian who played a prominent part on the committee. He also stood apart because he had research interests in social class, had completed his postgraduate research in the United States and saw introducing more New Zealand content into the syllabus as the top

²³ See appendices for full list of participants on the NHCC.

²⁴ Gledhill: interview.

²⁵ Shaw: interview.

²⁶ Stenson: interview.

priority.²⁷ Given the limitations in communication (in an age before email), the Auckland historians had a considerable advantage as they were not only meeting on their own territory but they were part of the largest History Department in the country and were supported by an active history teaching association. The Auckland historians were well established as the dominant force in history education. Russell Stone had taught history in Auckland secondary schools and in England. He had then lectured in history at Auckland Teachers' College, before being appointed to Auckland University in 1963. He published prolifically on the history of Auckland as well as continuing to play a key role in secondary school history teaching. David Gledhill observed that Russell Stone 'stood like a colossus' and 'had credibility with the universities and the teachers.' Professor Nicholas Tarling was Acting Vice-Chancellor at Auckland University and the founding chairman of the Auckland History Teachers' Association (AHTA). The Auckland University History Department had made establishing relationships with history teachers a high priority. The AHTA 'attempted to include all people interested in history – inspectors, teachers and historians' and would meet at the Auckland University History Department.²⁸

Massey University was among the smallest of the universities, counting solely campus-based students, but had an additional large student body who studied part-time through the extramural programme. Many of these were teachers. Massey established a presence on the history committee after the appointment of Colin Davis as Professor in 1984. Peter Lineham noted 'Colin Davis wanted to undercut the influence of the Auckland historians ... he saw himself as someone who could put Massey on the map historically.'²⁹ Massey's academics exploited the close proximity to the Department of Education that, in the highly centralised public service bureaucracy of the 1980s, was very much the centre of power. Colin Davis arranged for Bill Renwick and David Wood to visit Massey to discuss the syllabus,³⁰ and he and his staff often met with officials while in Wellington doing research. As well as the Department of Education, Massey also had close links to teachers through their extramural programmes and in 1989 set up a postgraduate qualification to cater for history teachers who wished to improve their knowledge in light of the new curriculum. The outreach ethos, combined with the willingness of Massey historians to engage with teachers, gave the university a considerable advantage in building 'grassroots' support when it came to consultation and

²⁷ Olssen: interview.

²⁸ Tarling: interview.

²⁹ Lineham: interview.

³⁰ Memorandum: Visit of Bill Renwick and David Wood to Massey University History Department, Monday 28 July 1986 (Robin Gwynn: Private papers).

providing the Department of Education with an alternative viewpoint to the Auckland history teaching community.

As a recently established history department in a provincial university, Colin Davis had to work hard to promote Massey. Only Robin Gwyn had a profile in the history teaching community, as he was subject convenor, and the University Vice-Chancellor's nominee.³¹ Davis was successful because he was able to establish good networks, with key players in the Department (in particular Bill Renwick and David Wood), and to ensure that his colleagues engaged with the process of shaping the syllabus and preparing resources. For example he arranged for Marcia Stenson and Greg Taylor to be seconded to the Massey History Department to prepare resources for teachers. This strategy not only promoted the interests of Massey, but also gave younger historians the chance to work at the level of policy development which (as was the case in Auckland) was something only available to experienced historians. Kerry Howe, as a Pacific historian was well placed to facilitate the introduction of Pacific history into the curriculum. Margaret Tennant was one of the few academic female historians and her involvement with the women's lobby was a crucial factor in ensuring a gender perspective was embedded into the syllabus.³² Although a newly appointed lecturer, Peter Lineham joined the committee on Colin Davis's nomination:

I was very late in becoming involved. It was with the appointment of Colin Davis to Massey in 1984. He had an involvement in the history curriculum committee and had been involved with Robin Gwynn who was subject convenor. He was keen to break the power of Auckland in history circles in New Zealand at this time. I was appointed as a 'sidekick' to Colin Davis and as a younger staff member I ended up doing a lot of the work and was grateful for the opportunities. (P. Lineham)

While the NHCC was expected to consult with stakeholders in the history teaching community, at an individual level there was very little accountability. The lack of formal evaluation was typical of the ethos of how Department curriculum committees worked and decisions were very much based around finding a consensus position that all could feel comfortable with. Erik Olssen observed that '...we would talk around and around and there was a powerful preference to achieve agreement.'³³ At each meeting there were particular areas of focus and a general agenda but as well as the generous timeframe, meetings were informal and unstructured. Peter Lineham found the process 'extraordinary':

³¹ Gwynn: interview.

³² Tennant: interview.

³³ Olssen: interview.

There was an odd sense that I could never work out who was in control of the whole process. You would have expected the Departmental officers to have a very firm sense of purpose. In the early stages this wasn't the case. A good example of how the public service works. People push for something and then it starts and people find the space within it to find what they can do ... this looseness was extraordinary. It was a very large committee. One would put enormous energy into something that would be knocked down in a couple of sentences. It was enormously wasteful.

The Final Shape of the History Syllabus

The History Committee last met in March 1987 and the new integrated history syllabus was introduced in 1989.³⁴ As the syllabus was being finalised, history booklets were published throughout 1987-89 that were known to teachers as *H-Documents*. These provided guidance in planning and structuring history courses to cope with the changing nature of the subject, which now included internally assessed research topics (known as Special Studies). The *H-documents* were initiated by David Wood and in compiling these resources he drew closely on the expertise of history teachers, Department advisors and academics (many of whom had been involved in the NHCC process). The documents aimed to provide guidance for teachers to implement the changing spirit of the new syllabus as well as the content.³⁵

The History Forms 5-7 syllabus (1989) and revised history prescriptions, all required an internally assessed component known as 'Special Studies' which aimed to allow greater flexibility in content choice and also focus on teaching research skills that could not be realistically assessed in an examination. The revised SC prescription required 34% internal assessment, the 6FC programme was fully internally assessed and at Form 7 the new UB prescription required 40% internal assessment. All these prescriptions were first examined in the year following their introduction and the national moderation for the internally assessed components of SC and UB was based on the external exam result as a group reference standard. Teachers had considerable autonomy in how they applied 'special studies' and as a consequence there was 'a wide variability in tasks completed across the senior history programme'.³⁶

³⁴ Department of Education, *History forms 5 to 7 Syllabus for school*, 1989.

³⁵ The 'H-Documents' provided guidelines and suggestions on how teachers could approach the new syllabus and covered the following areas: *Assessment, Women in History, Programme Planning, Special Studies, Australian History, History and Computers, History and Library resources*.

³⁶ Philippa Hunter and Bruce Farthing, *Talking History: Teachers' Perceptions of "Their" Curriculum in the Context of History in the New Zealand Curriculum 1980-2003*, (Hamilton: Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, 2004), 14.

The revision of the history syllabus had resulted in the appearance of a more 'balanced and inclusive' and 'integrated' history curriculum. In 1987 the growing appetite for history saw a number of prominent academics grasp the opportunity to expand the history curriculum into schools in response to the recommendations of the Curriculum Review for 'an enhanced awareness of the past to be communicated to school children'. This call for history to have a more explicit place in the curriculum was evident in the 21,500 submissions to the wider 1987 Curriculum Review. Professor Colin Davis of Massey, acting on the request of the Director-General of Education W.L. Renwick, convened a group of 11 historians, one history teacher and four Departmental advisors to address questions around the nature of historical knowledge that should be included in a future curriculum. Renwick, a trained historian, believed it was essential to clarify the suitable content so that students could '...understand New Zealand's heritage and past, its place in the Pacific, and its relationship with the rest of the world' as required by the 1987 Curriculum Review.³⁷

Renwick (who had trained as an historian) argued that 'heritage, culture and identity' could be 'most usefully dealt with in a historical context'. The group proposed that in primary and junior secondary schools students should study historical themes on the history of New Zealand (including local studies), Europe and the wider world and the history of the Pacific. In the senior school all students should be taught a sequential course in New Zealand's dual heritage. In keeping with the group's commitment to a bicultural approach a hui was held at Whakatō marae (Gisborne) in October 1987 at which the kaumātua present called for Māori history to be taught on a tribal basis and wherever possible taught on Māori terms.³⁸ The Report, however, was not developed despite discussions through Lopdell House history development courses, and NZHA forums during the following year.³⁹ The focus for the Labour government in their last term was on the introduction of *Tomorrow's Schools*. Curriculum issues were no longer a priority.

The 1989 Form 5-7 history syllabus appeared to have made substantial progress in addressing the lack of integration, as well as reflecting the changing nature of history and the need for the subject to be more relevant to Māori, Pasifika and female students. There were radical aspects. The internally assessed research-

³⁷ Departments of History of the New Zealand Universities, *Heritage and History in Schools: A Report to the Director General of Education by the Departments of History of the New Zealand Universities*. (Palmerston North: Massey University, 1988), iv, 1-3.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 49-51.

³⁹ Hunter and Farthing, *Talking History: Teachers' Perceptions of "Their" Curriculum in the Context of History in the New Zealand Curriculum 1980-2003*, 8.

based 'special studies' reflected Bruner's theory of inquiry-based learning and was a departure from assessment based solely on external examinations. The new prescriptions also included a much wider range of contexts that was in keeping with new approaches in Māori, Pasifika, women's and social history. The commitment to being 'balanced and inclusive,' however, was more apparent than real. Any semblance of substantial change was largely illusory, given that the prescriptions drove what was actually taught in the classroom and these ensured that existing aspects of historical knowledge remained dominant.

CHAPTER 3

Theoretical Perspectives and Methodological Approaches

For the classic social scientist, neither method nor theory is an autonomous domain; methods are methods for some range of problems; theories are theories for some range of phenomena. They are like the language of the country you live in: it is nothing to brag about that you can speak it, but it is a disgrace and an inconvenience if you cannot.¹

C. Wright Mills

This chapter outlines the theoretical perspectives that have informed this qualitative research project and the methodological approaches I have adopted. This is a study of what happened in the past (the shaping of the history curriculum in the 1980s), representations of the past (by historians, history teachers, school inspectors and curriculum designers) and the uses of the past (by powerful elites).

A major challenge in examining the social construction of the history curriculum is to find methods and techniques that provide an insight into the ideological nature of the process. The participants in this process were driven by a range of ideological perspectives as to the purposes of school history and the epistemological nature of the discipline. To investigate these perspectives I have employed the qualitative research methodologies of archival and documentary analysis and semi-guided interviews with teachers, historians and bureaucrats. I have also been informed by extensive reading of both New Zealand and international literature on history education matters. The research focus has been on the development of the senior history curriculum in New Zealand in the late 20th century. This project serves as a case study of how a university discipline is transformed into a secondary school subject and has crossed the disciplinary boundaries of sociology, history, psychology, education and anthropology.

McCulloch challenges 'social scientists to recognise the nature and importance of historical thinking and methods and for historians to be more alert to the demands of theory and methodology.'² This study required a theoretical approach that draws on a number of perspectives to explain and analyse these historical events and trends. Thus this thesis is not informed by a single overarching 'grand theory' but rather, has adopted a combination of theoretical perspectives which is a more useful approach when faced with complex problems. The theoretical perspectives that

¹ C. Wright Mills quoted in: Gary McCulloch, *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences* (London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004), 7.

² McCulloch, *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences*, 8.

have informed this study are largely framed by a critical theory paradigm, as this model critiques and interrogates how the structure of the curriculum perpetuates dominant views over knowledge that has value (and ignores and marginalises the views of those who are powerless). This has been at the centre of my research question. Conservative and liberal views as to the purpose and epistemological basis of school history provide a framework for examining the debates, challenges and tensions that emerged in the development of the history curriculum and the theoretical perspectives below serve as lenses through which to examine and analyse these issues and events in this study.

- Theory of social constructionism and social reproduction
- Theory of hegemony in relation to ideological control of dominant beliefs and values
- Standpoint theory

History and Theory

The last thirty-five years have seen the discipline of history accommodate an eclectic range of approaches to explaining and understanding the past. This has posed a challenge in examining history curriculum matters because while curriculum issues have been theorised within the context of wider educational thinking, this has not been the case to the same extent with history. Historians have been generally ambivalent about the place of theory in their work.³

Historians who reject theoretical approaches to the past have seen the major threat to the discipline in recent years as coming from what is loosely known as postmodernism. This approach rejects universal principles, grand narratives and the potential of historians to establish a true and accurate account of the past.⁴ Hayden White argues that historical texts are simply 'literary artefacts' and 'there are no grounds to be found in the historical record for preferring one way of construing its meaning over another'.⁵ Keith Jenkins 'ascribes an ideological importance to moral relativism' and claims the 'past and history float free of each other, they are ages apart'.⁶ In the face of what one historian has seen as *The Killing of History* the

³ Byrnes, Giselle, 'Rethinking National Identity in New Zealand's History'.
<http://www.mch.govt.nz/dominion/byrnes.html>.

⁴ Ann Curthoys and John Docker, *Is History Fiction?* (Sydney: University of New South Wales 2006), 180-210; 137-153.

⁵ Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History*, 350-356.

⁶ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 5-6.

contempt postmodern historians have shown for historical writing has provoked a vigorous response.⁷

Postmodern educators see little to recommend the organising of school subjects in terms of academic disciplines, as they see these as 'social and political constructions'. They also point out that disciplinary knowledge has more to do with 'enforcing and policing the discourse of various disciplines' and bears little relation to students' social experiences.⁸ While the relativism of postmodern historians has caused consternation among the historical community, the response of anti-postmodernists is potentially of greater concern within school history as teachers seldom engage with theoretical ideas about the study of the past. Those who vehemently oppose postmodernism appear to be defending 'the idea of a single knowable truth' and deflect thinking away from the fundamental question of 'how we know what we think we know' that lies at the heart of all genuine historical explanations. The attack on postmodernism has 'crossed all usual boundaries' including 'Marxists, feminists, 'anti-theory historians', 'working historians', 'ex-Marxists turned conservatives' and 'die-hard positivists'.⁹ While postmodernism does present profound ethical dilemmas as to how historians should deal with events such as the holocaust, postmodern attacks on the discipline can be seen as simply a variety of the question of how do we establish the truth of past events. Hence it is not a new notion, having plagued socially aware scholars since the 'fathers of history', Herodotus and Thucydides, began recording and explaining the past over 2000 years ago.¹⁰

It is the issue of the truth of past events that poses a significant challenge when examining history curriculum matters as there is no shared consensus among historians as to the epistemological foundations of the parent discipline. Few historians see history as a science and while (radical postmodernists aside) they generally agree on the facts of an event or an individual's life, there is unlikely to be agreement on the motives, reasons and explanations for the actions of people or groups in the past. Rather to expect history to reach 'final conclusions ... is to

⁷ For examples of the response of historians to the implications of postmodernism for the discipline see: Keith Windschuttle, *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists Are Murdering Our Past*, (New York: Free Press, 1996); Richard J. Evans, *A Defence of History*. London: Granta 1997. See 2nd edition (2003) for the heated nature of historians' views on postmodernism and Evan's riposte to critics in the afterword 254-349.

⁸ Zongji Deng, 'Knowing the Subject Matter of a Secondary-School Science Subject,' 509.

⁹ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?*, 206.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 2-49.

misunderstand its nature'. History is 'an argument without end'¹¹ and is characterised by a range of divergent views among scholars:

... historians with perspectives as varied as Isaiah Berlin, Hannah Arendt, and E.H Carr, all disliked any notion that history could produce laws and should be seen as continuous with or similar to the natural sciences. On the contrary, history should be recognised as possessing its own methods, modes, questions, and ethos.¹²

In this study I have not rejected theoretical models to illuminate my research problem although this does not indicate a lack of awareness of the problems posed by explicitly theoretical history. Overtly theoretical history does have the potential to select the evidence to fit the theoretical explanation. However, I do not share the view of 'anti-theory' historians who argue that theoretical models lack authenticity, as historians can only 'reconstruct events and situations in their unique individuality, on their own terms, and their interpretations only apply to particular sets of circumstances'.¹³ Rather, I would endorse the view that historians who refuse to locate their work theoretically in the interests of objectivity are unconsciously influenced by their own values. All historians have the advantage of hindsight so the past can never be recaptured 'in its own terms', as the writer knows what is going to happen next. Those who subscribe to this view also stand apart from contemporary developments in the discipline that has seen historians engage with areas such as gender history, ethnic history, labour history, urban history, poverty history and the history of crime and deviance. In approaching these problems, historians typically adopt an explicitly theoretical approach to illuminate the past. In this thesis critical theory has provided a number of useful perspectives in examining what happened in the past, how this has been represented and how the past was used by powerful elites. While locating my study within a critical theory paradigm does not necessarily guarantee the accuracy of my findings, by adequately theorising this research, my framework of analysis is transparent and provides a model on which my arguments can be evaluated.

Critical Theory in the Postmodern World

Critical theory accepts the 'modernist idea of progress' that can be achieved through critique¹⁴ and as such stands apart from postmodern historians such as Hayden White who rejects 'truth statements' and argues that in regards to history '... there

¹¹ Pieter Geyl, cited in: Marnie Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History*, 117.

¹² Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?*, 136

¹³ John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History* (Edinburgh: Pearson Longman, 2002), 217-220.

¹⁴ Elizabeth E Heilman and Avner Segall, 'Social Studies Research in the Context of Intellectual Thought.' In *Social Studies - the Next Generation: Re-Searching in the Postmodern*, edited by Elizabeth E Heilman, Avner Segall, Cleo H. Cherryholmes, 14-23 (New York: Peter Lang 2006), 16-19.

are no grounds to be found in the record itself for preferring one way of construing meaning rather than another'.¹⁵ Critical theory acknowledges the value of postmodern insights, but in the context of looking for historical explanations for the shaping of the history curriculum, a postmodern rejection of ultimate truth and promotion of relativism, limits the possibilities for meaningful curriculum change.¹⁶ In this study I am intending to make a contribution to understanding the nature of curriculum development in the senior secondary school, with the aim of informing and improving the process. Critical theory thus provides a useful theoretical perspective to achieve this as it offers a critique of dominant structures and this has important implications for challenging curriculum design, as the curriculum is typically presented as 'natural' (hence unable to be changed) rather than as 'cultural' (hence able to be changed).¹⁷

There is a further reason for scepticism concerning the uncritical use of postmodern theory. While an examination of the socially and culturally specific nature of historical explanations is a key feature of this study, I would question the uncritical adoption of postmodernist approaches to studying the past in schools. It is useful to be reminded that historians recreate the past through language, and that historical texts 'embody more than one level of meaning',¹⁸ but the rejection of truth poses a problem at a practical level. Seixas argues the post-modern approach is overly relativistic and 'present day' orientated to meaningfully guide research into history education matters. He asks 'what sense of the world, of knowledge, of history does the open-ended free play of argument, plot, ideology and narrative trope offer students?'¹⁹ Thus this thesis is guided by the notion that in critiquing the process of the curriculum design in history, this study offers a contribution to understanding how this process could work more effectively.

Hegemony

The hegemonic model illuminates the process in which particular knowledge bases are ascribed value as in the senior school it is the official curriculum that sets out the 'obligations' that specialist teachers are required to carry out and largely shapes and controls how teachers and students work. To this end:

¹⁵ Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, 198.

¹⁶ V. Burr, *An Introduction to Social Constructionism* (London: Routledge, 1995), 63-65.

¹⁷ Paulo Friere cited in: Shirley Grundy, *Curriculum: Product or Praxis* (London: Falmer Press, 1987), 104.

¹⁸ Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, 201.

¹⁹ Peter Seixas, 'Schwigen! Die Kinder! Or, Does Postmodern History Have a Place in the Schools?' In *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, edited by Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg, 19-37 (New York: University Press, 2000), 27.

Curriculum form, structure and content essentially 'do' the work of state, promoting cultural reconstruction by providing a guiding regulatory regime in which teachers and students must work ... provide the parameters within which understanding, possibility, language and sets of institutional practices, obligations and requirements are carried out.²⁰

This thesis is concerned with the 'intended' rather than the 'implemented' or 'hidden curriculum'. While the implemented curriculum is an important factor in understanding curriculum issues, ultimately it is the 'form, structure and content' of the intended curriculum that provides the 'guiding regulatory regime in which teachers and students must work'. Grundy's argument, that the curriculum is a 'cultural construction' that has its origins in particular 'historical circumstances', implies that the implemented curriculum (as demonstrated by the actions of teachers) illuminates much about curriculum in practice, as does the hidden curriculum.²¹ While this is the case in secondary school social studies (where teachers enjoy a high degree of autonomy over what they teach), this is less so in senior school history where teachers are publicly accountable through prestigious, public examinations and limited by prescriptions that are linked to specific aspects of historical knowledge.

The debates and discussions by the NHCC involved a series of hegemonic struggles between academic historians, history teachers, the PPTA, school inspectors and Department of Education officials. Within the politics of curriculum development the debates by this committee reflected Gramsci's hegemonic construct of how particular dominant groups present their ideological viewpoint as 'natural and universal' and thus 'render them unchallengeable, part of the natural order of things'.²² Gramsci's notion of decision-making is encapsulated by the idea of 'organised consent', which operates on a 'non-coercive dimension of domination' that is based around the 'common sense' view of the social world. In this the NHCC represented a 'community of interest' that saw prominent individuals and groups on the NHCC 'naturally' establish and maintain a hierarchical place in regards to making decisions over valued knowledge. The role of historians in this process was crucial as in the development of a senior subject it is academics in the parent discipline that ultimately define the hierarchy of acceptable knowledge in curriculum development negotiations. The development of the history curriculum involved a number of hegemonic struggles between liberals and conservatives over dominant beliefs, values and social practices in school history. Liberals played the primary role in making decisions about pedagogy but Department of Education officials were either unable or unwilling to set an explicit direction for the

²⁰ O'Neill, Clark and Openshaw, *Reshaping Culture, Knowledge and Learning? Policy and Content in the New Zealand Curriculum*, 27.

²¹ Grundy, *Curriculum: Product or Praxis*, 5-7.

²² Antonio Gramsci cited in C. Boggs, *Gramsci's Marxism* (London Pluto Press, 1976), 39.

committee to follow. In this sense the Department did not operate on the basis of unchallengeable authority, but rather reflected the notion of 'organised consent' and the 'non-coercive dimension of domination'²³ that characterised the Department's control of the curriculum development process at this time. This was effective in the development of the core curriculum as the department committees were made up of 'insiders' who shared the ethos of the CDD and shared consensus of 'commonsense'.

The design of the history curriculum by the NHCC demonstrated the ethos of a 'fraternity of insiders' who exercised a degree of (non-coercive) hegemonic control in the face of an autocratic minister. For example, initially the curriculum development process appeared to be dominated by Merv Wellington who had set up the NHCC to address his view of the perceived left-wing leanings of social studies and the social relevance orientation of the 1975 SC history prescription. Wellington was socially conservative and saw history as an academic, rigorous discipline. However, his views were not widely endorsed by the liberal officials who dominated the Department (including the initial facilitator of the NHCC, Peter Whitelock) or the increasingly radical leadership of the PPTA. Consequently the NHCC made little progress during Wellington's time as Minister. It did not begin to make substantial progress until Russell Marshall became Minister of Education and his liberal views on education reflected the ethos of the dominant elites on the NHCC.

Social Constructionism

The school curriculum is a socially constructed artefact that is shaped by the actions of individuals and groups to sustain their view of the social world. The senior history curriculum is no exception to this. In this study, social constructionism has offered a powerful lens through which to view the mystique that surrounds the notion of curriculum, as the prescription is the framework that dominates the senior history curriculum at this level and this serves the interests of both dominant members of the school subject community and academic historians.

Providing nobody exposes the mystique, the two worlds of 'prescription rhetoric' and 'schooling as practice' can co-exist. Both sides can benefit from such peaceful co-existence ... Curriculum prescriptions thereby set certain parameters but with transgression and occasional transcendence being permissible as long as the rhetoric of prescription and management is not challenged.²⁴

²³ John Codd, Richard Harker and Roy Nash, (eds), *Political Issues in New Zealand Education* (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1985), 9-10.

²⁴ Goodson, *Learning, Curriculum and Life Politics*, 133.

Curriculum design is not a neutral or value free process of social and cultural reproduction. Rather as Bernstein argues ‘... how a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control’.²⁵ The notion that knowledge is socially constructed²⁶ has informed this study, as social constructionists adopt a critical stance towards knowledge that is ‘taken-for-granted’.²⁷ They argue the ‘curriculum can only be understood in any comprehensive sense, if it is contextualised socially, economically and politically’.²⁸ Thus even the process of defining the curriculum is a political act that allows the policy maker to decide what form of culture (or society) is desirable, and ensure this is included in a future curriculum.²⁹ This perspective is useful in examining the development of single subjects in the curriculum for as Goodson points out, the curriculum is often accepted by teachers as a ‘given’ rather than a ‘cultural artefact’.³⁰ Social constructionism demonstrates that ‘knowledge is sustained by social processes’ and people ‘construct knowledge’ through negotiated understandings.

Goodson’s analysis of the development of single subjects in secondary schools in the United Kingdom and Canada³¹ uncovered a ‘socially constructed prescription’ in which school subjects had developed a common genealogy that reinforced the idea that ‘the school curriculum is a social artefact conceived of, and made for, deliberate human purposes’.³² Goodson’s analysis of social class illustrates how school subjects play a role in perpetuating social divisions. In the case of New Zealand history, by the 1980s much of the same processes appear to have occurred. The subject had developed into a relatively high status academic subject that was strongest in affluent, single sex schools, closely linked with prestigious written examinations and aimed at academically able students. Those history teachers who dominated the teaching community identified closely with this exclusive view.

²⁵ Bernstein cited in Alistair Ross, *Curriculum Construction and Critique* (London: Falmer Press, 2000), 10.

²⁶ Ross, *Curriculum Construction and Critique*, 136.

²⁷ Burr, *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*, 3.

²⁸ W.F. Pinar, W.M. Reynolds, P. Slattery, P.M. Taubman, *Understanding Curriculum* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995), 244.

²⁹ Ross, *Curriculum Construction and Critique*, 11.

³⁰ Goodson, *Studying Curriculum*, 16.

³¹ Ivor F Goodson, *School Subjects and Curriculum Change*, (Sussex: Falmer Press, 1987); _____, *Studying Curriculum*, 1994.

³² *Ibid.*, 17.

Post-Colonial Theory

A further point worth bearing in mind in analysing the history curriculum at this time is that New Zealand historiography was firmly located within the parameters of the nation-state. The nation-state is increasingly coming under challenge by post-colonial historians and is problematic in the post modern age. A post-colonial approach to history does not indicate the end of the colonisation process (or a reconciliation of past grievances in the colonial past), but rather, it offers a critical approach to interrogate the ongoing legacy of the colonial past. Thus, the theory can be utilised to contribute to our understanding of how New Zealand has grappled with creating a national historical consciousness. Furthermore, in the New Zealand history curriculum the emphasis on nation-building and national identity has been at the heart of liberal approaches to history as a school subject, although an emphasis on the nation as a construct has come under increasing challenge during the last decade.³³ In New Zealand, Peter Gibbons has suggested national identity is a euphemism for 'cultural colonisation',³⁴ and Giselle Byrnes (2007) has written:

From a postcolonial perspective, the idea of the nation with regard to New Zealand history is problematic. After all, those who have been adversely affected by the colonising processes and those who see history through other interpretive and cultural frames, may well see the nation as a particular Pākehā construct from which they feel excluded or marginalised within. But perhaps the greatest weakness of the idea of 'nation' is that it assumes a singular shared identity, whereas in multicultural Aotearoa, the reality is quite different: we all partake of multiple identities and none of these are necessarily fixed.³⁵

In this study the post-colonial perspective is reflected in how many New Zealand history teachers have retained an abiding affection for, and commitment to, English constitutional history and have eschewed the histories of the poor, the marginalised and the oppressed in this country. This has seen the history curriculum operate as a tool of what Belich calls recolonisation in that the historical knowledge of selected aspects of English and European history has been prioritised by the history teaching community. The 'fly in the ointment' of the strength of interest in the origins of the English modern state, rather than New Zealand, stems from the legacy of the 're-colonial system'³⁶ that in this instance contradicts the views of recent commentators of the growing sense of New Zealand identity.

³³ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 177-180, 198-99, 201, 235.

³⁴ Gibbons, Peter, 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 36, no. 1 (2002): 5-17.

³⁵ Giselle Byrnes, 'Rethinking National Identity in New Zealand's History' <http://www.mch.govt.nz/dominion/byrnes.html>, 4.

³⁶ Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000*, 545-6.

Standpoint Theory

Another useful theory to bear in mind when examining the development of the New Zealand history curriculum is standpoint theory. The traditional mainstream history curriculum has excluded the knowledge of those who are socially subordinate and the nature of why this has been the case is to some extent evident, through the perspective of 'standpoint theory' that argues there is a 'link between one's lived experience and grounding of knowledge'.³⁷ Connell, for instance, is motivated by adopting a 'counter-hegemonic' approach to curriculum, that allows the socially subordinate to acquire 'intellectual power' in how knowledge is constructed. His relevance to my work is that his views encapsulate something of the liberal position in regards to developments in history education in the 1980s. However, Nozaki has pointed out how 'the notions of standpoint' do not always accommodate the range of positions that can be held by subordinate social groups, and that there is 'a form of essentialism regarding the relation between one's structural position and his or her knowledge'.³⁸

Case Study

The parameters of this study are the workings of the NHCC and the development of the history curriculum between 1975 and 1990. As such, this study can be regarded as a case study within the qualitative, research paradigm. Miles and Huberman argue that research qualifies as a case study if the topic is specific to a particular place and time and if there is a limit to the number of individuals to be interviewed, and documentary sources to be examined. What they refer to as 'bounded'.³⁹ This case has been bounded by the focus being a particular group, namely academic historians, officials of the CDD, school inspectors and history teachers. This focus allows for close description and analysis of the actions, interpretations, perceptions of the individuals concerned as well as the wider historical context. This case study is also of contemporary interest as the challenges faced in the 1980s are still with us today, and are mirrored in current debates over the place of history in the senior social sciences curriculum.⁴⁰

³⁷ R.W. Connell, *School and Social Justice* (Toronto: Our Schools Ourselves, 1993), 34- 44.

³⁸ Yoshiko Nozaki, 'Riding Tensions Critically Ideology, Power/Knowledge and Curriculum Making.' In *Ideology, Curriculum, and the New Sociology of Education*, edited by Cameron McCarthy Lois Weis, and Greg Dimitriadis, 69-89 (New York: Routledge, 2006), 76-78.

³⁹ Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1984).

⁴⁰ http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/curriculum_project_archives/developing_the_draft/social_sciences; http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/curriculum_project_archives/developing_the_draft/social_sciences/archive; http://centre4.interact.ac.nz/modules/group/group.php?space_key=468&module_key=15826&link_key=16391&group_key=15826.

A Historical Perspective

While the NHCC meets the criteria of a bounded case study (in that there were a specific number of people to interview and documents available to scrutinise), the deliberations and decisions of this committee reflected wider social, educational and cultural issues. As such they can only be understood by being placed in a wider context and hence this study places the debates around history education into a wider national and international historical perspective. This approach has been guided by Kliebard's (1986) study of the American curriculum⁴¹ and Phillip's (1998) detailed analysis of the politicisation of the English history curriculum in the late 20th century.⁴² Both these models have informed the historical methodology of this thesis. McCulloch and Richardson argue that an understanding of context is essential in evaluating the importance and meaning to particular phenomena.⁴³ Curriculum design does not occur in a vacuum but rather reflects social, cultural and political issues and the realities of contemporary society. To explain and understand curriculum change we need to take into account '... the time during which it occurs and the changing educational, social and political context within which it has taken place.'⁴⁴ The decisions made by the NHCC reflected not only the concerns over history teaching and wider educational issues but also responses to contemporary socio-political and cultural transformations. While the debates over curriculum in the 1980s appear to be less polarised than in the following decade, by the time the committee first met in 1983, any sense of post-war consensus over issues such as education had ended and the curriculum had emerged as a contested site.⁴⁵

To present an epistemologically objective and neutral viewpoint of past events places unrealistically high expectations on the authority of the historian. One does not have to accept the relativist tenets of postmodernism to acknowledge that all historical research involves an encounter between the present and the past and historical explanations are informed by hindsight. Furthermore, documentary, secondary and oral sources can only ever provide a partial and selective picture of past events. Such critiques did not emerge in the late 20th century but have long been a feature of the writings of historians, who have considered the limitations of

⁴¹ Herbert Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986).

⁴² Robert Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics* (London: Cassell, 1998).

⁴³ Gary McCulloch and William Richardson, *Historical Research in Educational settings*, (Buckingham: Open University, 2000).

⁴⁴ Gary McCulloch (ed), *The School Curriculum in New Zealand: Theory, Policy and Practice* (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992), 8.

⁴⁵ Roger Openshaw, *Unresolved Struggle Consensus and Conflict in State Post-Primary Education* (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1995).

historical knowledge stretching back to the foundations of written history in the west with Herodotus and Thucydides.⁴⁶ However, historical explanations are not simply the product of the imagination. Despite the legitimate claim that there are aspects of the past that are beyond our grasp, historians provide credible historical accounts and explanations that are the result of meticulous scholarship based on a thorough analysis of the available evidence. Historians ensure their interpretations are as true as they can be at this point in time, by basing their arguments on all the credible evidence available, outlining their own assumptions and beliefs in relation to their research, submitting their work to peer review and putting forward an explicit hypothesis or argument on which their interpretation can be judged.

Subjectivity

By reflecting on my values and background I am in a stronger position to prevent bias in my research. I am an 'insider' in regards to history education. I trained in the discipline of history to Masters level,⁴⁷ taught history in a range of secondary schools for 14 years (including being a Head of Department), have worked in museum education and have been an active member of the history teaching community for almost two decades. This latter role has included being an executive member of the NZHTA, writing school history textbooks⁴⁸ and marking SC and NCEA examinations. In my current position I train secondary school history teachers at Victoria University of Wellington. As an 'insider' this has given me the advantage of 'knowing the landscape' of this area. I have long been aware of tensions in the history teaching community and as a trusted member of this subject community, I have had access to key figures to interview and had a number of private papers made available to me from historians and history teachers. I am involved in current history curriculum developments and my views on history education have been presented in public forums, at academic conferences and published in journals.⁴⁹

A degree of self-knowledge and self-awareness is an essential feature of any qualitative research endeavour and, as this study reflects my personal and professional interests, it is to some extent subjective. However, this has not prevented

⁴⁶ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 12-49.

⁴⁷ William Mark Sheehan, 'They Shall Not Grow Old': Australian, British and New Zealand History Writing on Gallipoli 1915-96, MA, Unpublished Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington 1997.

⁴⁸ _____ *The New Zealand Wars: Making Sense of a shared Past*, (Wellington: Learning Media, 2000); _____ *Ourselves Alone: A Study of Conflict in Ireland 1909-1922*. (Auckland: Macmillan, 1993); *Belonging Here Toi Take Taketake: Treaty of Waitangi Kit* (Wellington: Learning Media, 1990); *Māori and Pākehā: Race Relations 1912-80* (Auckland: Macmillan, 1989).

⁴⁹ 'Never of, Always For', 31st October 2005, NZHTA journal November 2005; For a response to this paper (that was the basis of the panel discussion at the NZHA conference at Auckland University, November 2005) see *Auckland History Teachers Association Newsletter*, March 2006.

me from presenting an authentic, credible and scholarly explanation that contributes to our understanding of this area. I have followed the central ethos of the historian's craft by ensuring my research is adequately theorised, my methodologies sound, my explanations based on a wide range of reputable and credible evidence, my personal views honestly expressed and I have sought feedback from a range of interested, qualified persons. Although as a qualitative study this project will inevitably include some aspects of subjectivity, my findings reflect adequate triangulation in relation to the research process, interpretation and ethical research practice and thus ensure that this project meets the requirements of meticulous scholarship.

Internal Validity

Whilst no researcher can be entirely neutral and objective, I have striven for internal validity. Internal validity indicates the degree of accuracy and authenticity involved in a research project that matches a given reality⁵⁰ and in this thesis I have employed the following research tools to ensure this.

1) Methodological triangulation

A major strength of case study research is the opportunity to use a range of evidence and this study has employed a range of methods to access information, thus ensuring the explanations presented draw on a sufficient range of approaches. This project has drawn on documentary sources (both in public and private collections), websites, secondary literature, interviews with participants long involved in history education matters, as well as conversations with personal and professional contacts (that resulted in subject association material and private papers being made available to me).

2) Data Source triangulation

The interviews provided a baseline of 24 sources of information that was cross-referenced for the validation of the events against other sources of evidence, including departmental documentation, letters, memos, newspaper reports, archival documents, statistics and newsletters.

3) Expert reviews

The input of experts has played an important role in ensuring the authenticity of the research and the accuracy of the findings. Both of my supervisors (Professor

⁵⁰ S. B. Merriam, *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (San Francisco: Thousand Oaks, 1998).

Roger Openshaw and Associate Professor Peter Lineham) have expert status in the field of history education matters. They monitored the research process, provided feedback on individual chapters, made suggestions as to appropriate individuals to interview and provided advice on tracking down primary source material and relevant literature. The final draft was also read by international history educator Professor Keith C. Barton (Indiana University, Bloomington, USA), who gave invaluable advice on international developments and Professor Giselle Byrnes (Waikato University) who is an expert on New Zealand history and theoretical considerations. An early draft was read by Dr Robert Guyver (University College Plymouth St Mark and St John) who provided some very useful feedback, especially on the development of the British history curriculum.

4) Peer debriefing

I have presented five papers to my history educator colleagues at national and international conferences in the spirit of testing out my findings.⁵¹ These provided useful opportunities to engage in dialogue with a range of historians, history teachers, Ministry of Education officials and other interested parties to inform my thinking. As well as frequent discussions and debates about this research with the members of the history teaching community, the final draft was read by four highly regarded history teachers: Gregor Fountain (Wellington College), Michael Harcourt (Wellington High School), Steve Watters (Ministry of Culture and Heritage) and Bruce Taylor (Correspondence School). All these teachers provided written and oral feedback on my thesis.

5) Member checking

Interviewees were sent the interview transcripts and given the opportunity to check these for accuracy. All interviewees were told when approached for an interview that any suggested changes would be accommodated. While there were a number of amendments that came back from the process of member checking, none of these altered the general meaning of the original interview transcript.

⁵¹ *Memory and Forgetting: Teaching World War II in Japan, Germany and France*, New Zealand History Teachers Conference, Wellington, 5 October 2006; *History Wars*, Victoria University History Teachers Day, Wellington, 7 June 2005; *What use is a Useable past? History and Social Studies*, Social Sciences Conference (SocCon), Auckland, 24-26 September 2007; *Whose Story counts? The Hierarchy of Subject Knowledge in Secondary School History*, New Zealand Historical Association, 24th November 2007; *A Case Study of the New Zealand History Curriculum in the late 20th Century*, Australia and New Zealand History of Education Conference, Napier, 5th December, 2007.

External Validity/Replication

As qualitative research occurs within a specific context of time and place, replication as understood within a scientific quantitative context is not guaranteed. Another researcher using the same evidence could potentially reach an alternative conclusion given a different ideological stance and/or personal assumptions in regards to history education. The nature of the qualitative researcher's engagement with a topic is to some extent unique. This can appear problematic in using case study methodology to address historical questions, for as Yin points out this approach appears to offer limited opportunities for generalisation and replication.⁵² In this study I have addressed this question by locating myself as a researcher, adopting a multiple range of data gathering approaches, expressing a clear hypothesis, placing these events into a wider social and historical context and adequately theorising my study. Thus the reader is in a position to evaluate the trustworthiness of my procedures, in that my methodology has left a 'trail' that can be followed to see how I reached my conclusions.⁵³ Although exact replication is not guaranteed, this study does have the potential to generate a 'theoretical proposition'⁵⁴ through further attempts to replicate this case study and cross-case comparisons.

Ethical Issues

Massey University's Human Ethics Committee approved this research study in the initial stages of the project.⁵⁵ An ethical issue concerned with this research was informed consent for the interviews. Informants were contacted by letter with a full outline of the research project, my background and contact details (and those of both supervisors) and a consent form. Participants were told that if they were interviewed they would be asked to sign the consent form, giving me permission to use this information in my research, and informed they would receive a copy of those aspects of the transcript I would use. They were also told they were welcome to have a copy of the tape, that every effort would be made to ensure confidentiality (although it could not be guaranteed), and that they could make any amendments to the transcript if they chose to do so and I would accommodate their suggestions.

⁵² Robert K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, (Sage: Thousand Oaks, 1994), 10-11.

⁵³ Bill Gillham, *The Research Interview* (London: Continuum, 2000), 78.

⁵⁴ Yin, *Case Study Research*, 10-11.

⁵⁵ Project recorded on Low Risk Database (8th October 2004) reported in 2004 Massey University Human Ethics Committee Annual Report. See Letter Professor Sylvia V. Rumball in appendices.

I transcribed the interviews myself, thus issues in regards to confidentiality were minimal. Transcripts were sent out to interviewees towards the conclusion of the writing process and participants were asked to comment on any material. Interviews were not transcribed verbatim but rather I chose which aspects of the interview were relevant to this particular study. By the time I sent out the selected transcript, I had chosen particular aspects of the interview to use as quotations, but I did not highlight these in the text as the entire transcript had informed my thinking and I was interested to see if interviewees still agreed with what they had originally said. Participants were asked to bring to my attention any aspects that they had concerns about, and assured that I would amend the transcript if they requested any corrections or wanted some points more clearly clarified. Not all the interviews were used. Towards the end of the interviewing process I found I was gleaning little new information and the interviews had reached a saturation point. One interview was not recorded due to a malfunction of the tape-recorder. In this case I had taken notes of the interview and I was given access to written documents that proved of more value than the actual interview. The letter requesting an interview, consent form for participants and ethical approval are included in the appendices at the conclusion of the thesis.

The Interviews

I decided early in my preliminary reading that I would interview people (including historians, members of the NHCC, Department officials and secondary teachers) who could provide a valuable perspective for this study. Interviews can be invaluable in providing detail that makes sense and provides added clarification of key events that are not always evident in the documents. Interviews can also 'follow up ideas, probe responses and investigate motives.'⁵⁶ While enormously time consuming, interviews have the potential to provide rich and vivid data that are not always accessible through written sources.⁵⁷ Former members of the NHCC were identified through documentary searches, as well as through informal conversations with individuals who I knew to be either on, or close to, history curriculum matters at this time. Almost all participants were willing to be involved, generous with their time, frank and open in responding to my questions and willing to provide follow-up information on any matters requiring clarification. Only two participants declined to

⁵⁶ J. Bell, *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for Researchers in Education and Social Science* (Buckingham U.K: Open University Press, 1999), 135.

⁵⁷ Gillham, *The Research Interview*, 10.

be interviewed (both now long retired) as it was ‘too long ago’ and ‘they could not ‘remember anything useful.’⁵⁸

I conducted all interviews myself and met with participants in Wellington, Auckland, Christchurch, Dunedin, Nelson and the Waikato region. Twenty-four interviews were recorded with most interviews being conducted in participants’ homes or workplaces. One interview was conducted in my office at Victoria University, and one at my home in Wellington. All interviews were audio taped and the tapes are stored in a secure location at Victoria University (Karori campus). Interviews lasted between 45 and 75 minutes. Prior to the interview the consent form was discussed, and at the end of the interview participants were asked to sign the consent form. Participants were thanked in writing for their assistance and the offer was made to inform them of my progress at any stage if they wished to contact me. The names of all those interviewed are noted in the appendix with the date of the interview. When quoting the words of participants, the words of the interviewees either appear indented from the margin followed by the participant’s name. (e.g. R. Gwynn) or the speaker is identified in the preceding sentence. If I have quoted from the amended transcript (see above) this is footnoted with the name of the interviewee and the phrase ‘amended transcript’ and the date that I received this in writing (e.g. D. Wood: amended transcript, 23/05/08). Participants who were approached to check exact quotations were asked to sign a second consent form (although I already had permission to use this). A number gave me permission to use this material as it stood; several made minor grammatical changes (the transcript reflected the informal nature of interviews) and some made more substantial written changes that clarified key points (although they did not change the meaning of the original transcript).

I adopted a semi-structured approach to the interviews with a minimal number of key questions being asked of all interviewees. These were:

- What was your role in the history teaching community in the 1980s?
- Why were you selected for the NHCC?
- Who did you see as the key players on the committee?
- What was the relationship in the committee between teachers and historians?
- What do you think were the main challenges the NHCC faced?

⁵⁸ Correspondence held in author’s possession.

- How effectively did the NHCC address the challenges posed by the failure rate in secondary schools of Māori, Pasifika and girls?
- What did the committee hope to achieve by introducing internally assessed research studies?
- What led to the decision to narrow the option at Year 13/ Form 7 to a choice between 16th and 17th century England and 19th century New Zealand?

Although these questions were the basis of much of the interview (and I used prompt questions to build on the answers), each informant was invited to talk at length and encouraged to volunteer information that they thought would be useful. Few were reluctant to talk. All the participants were tertiary educated (twelve Doctorates, ten Masters and two Bachelors) and some were widely published authors and well-known public commentators. They were, without exception, highly articulate and keen to comment and share their views.

While interviewing those who have a long history with a particular issue provides a range of multi-layered perceptions that enhance the understanding of the past, such retrospective recall is often subjective, based on hindsight and thus the process of triangulation is essential.⁵⁹ It was important to build into this research process a number of ways to corroborate this information and check for reliability. Personal memory is 'one of the most conservative elements in the historical world', can be partial, contradictory and self-validating yet is 'asserted with vigour and conviction'.⁶⁰ In some cases I was able to address this as I had access to the documents, as well as a wide range of informants who were asked the same questions, thus allowing me to cross-reference the answers. The question of bias became an issue in collecting this oral testimony. In using the oral testimony in this study I was acutely aware that:

Memory can be described as self interested ... individuals tend to employ it, whether knowingly or unconsciously to help justify not only their actions in the present, but also the general pattern of their lives. It is malleable in that it can and does alter in the light of changing events and circumstances.⁶¹

I had initially intended to make far greater use of oral material when I began this study but as the research process progressed, I turned more to document analysis for most of my information. While I acknowledge the inclusion of oral testimony is enormously important in providing additional materials and insights that are not apparent in the documents (and I am enormously grateful for those participants who made time to

⁵⁹ Yin, *Case Study Research*, 91-92, 97-99.

⁶⁰ Jeremy Black, *Using History* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), 27.

⁶¹ McCulloch, Helsby and Knight, *The Politics of Professionalism*, 43.

speak with me), oral data pose some major challenges compared to documentary sources. Aside from issues of the reliability of memory⁶² that can be addressed through cross-referencing, oral material is based on hindsight, whereas the producer of written documentary information does not know what is going to happen next or, if what he or she is writing will be of future importance. Hindsight is not of major concern in history when interviewing 'non-elites' in a life history framework,⁶³ but can pose a problem when interviewing elites who tend to place themselves at the centre of events. Thus if an informant's views were available in the public arena I looked to these sources. The issue of reliability was important in this research and the answers were not taken at 'face-value' being thoroughly checked and cross-referenced where possible.⁶⁴ If information about an event could not be cross-referenced to either documents or interviews with other participants, I did not use this.

Primary Sources

Primary sources refers to those written documents that were produced by those directly involved at the time and the bulk of the written sources examined in this study are held as unserialised Department of Education files in the National Archives in Wellington (W4620). The extensive range of material relevant to the NHCC was scattered widely in various files. It included minutes of meetings, private and public correspondence, Department newsletters and discussion papers. Around a third of those documents I examined were restricted, and I was granted permission from the Ministry of Education to look at these files.⁶⁵

⁶² Elizabeth Loftus, *Eyewitness Testimony* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁶³ Ivor F Goodson and Pat Sikes, *Life History Research in Educational Settings* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2001), 1-18.

⁶⁴ The need to cross-reference was essential when dealing with contested events that did not appear in the documents yet were important in understanding the challenges the NHCC faced. My caution here is illustrated by the following example. When David Wood took over as facilitator in 1984 the committee was very much dominated by the historians. Wood told me he was determined to rectify this and during an early discussion found that a senior history professor was dominating the proceedings and interrupted a teacher who had started speaking. Wood told me he stepped in and told the professor he was 'saying too much' and to 'sit down and shut up'. After a pause the discussion resumed and a short time later the historian concerned put his hand up in jest and asked 'please sir may I say something now?' According to Wood, the professor held no grudge and was 'big enough' to accept the comment in good humour and with good grace. Consequently, the dynamic on the committee improved markedly. This story provides not only some interesting colour but demonstrates the dysfunctional nature of the history committee that Wood encountered when he took over and how he was able to move the NHCC forward. However, typical of interviews with elites, Wood placed himself at the centre of the proceedings and without collaboration this material could not in my view be included. It transpired that the story was collaborated independently by two other participants and by the professor himself (who had recorded this in his personal notes which he made available to me). He bore Wood no ill-will and understood that Wood needed to assert his leadership so that the committee could move on after the frustrations of the previous 18 months.

⁶⁵ There was no information that in these files that warranted a restriction and that this was initially imposed indicated the inserialised nature of this collection at this point in time.

Subject Associations played a key role in shaping the curriculum, as there was no national body representing history teachers until 1990.⁶⁶ I had access to records of the Auckland History Teachers' Association and Wellington Area History Teachers Association. The NZHA also had a number of useful documents that were relevant to history education. The Canterbury University History Department maintained close links with secondary schools and provided some useful material through *The Historical News* (first published in 1960). I also found useful material in the *New Zealand Listener*, *Evening Post*, *Otago Times*, *The Press* and *The Herald*.

As I came to these documents with some prior knowledge of the issues and problems, in the initial stages of my documentary research I simply immersed myself in the records looking at any files that I thought may be of some value. While meandering through the files in this fashion did lead me up some 'blind alleys', gradually key documents and sources started to appear that informed my research. In hindsight this time-consuming approach was enormously useful. It resulted in my accessing a wide range of sources, some of which I may have missed if I had adopted a more narrow and focussed approach in the initial stages.

In using official documents such as Department of Education files, I was acutely conscious that these are government records and as such, they prioritise administrative matters, and reflect the interests of the officials who wrote them. There were many aspects of the debates that do not appear in these records (and that emerged in the interviews) and in examining these sources I was aware of the historians' ethos of reading sources 'against the grain' and asking how and why a document came into being. The craft of historical research requires the researcher to adopt an approach of informed scepticism when studying documentary sources. This approach applied equally to the private and public letters I looked at, as well as subject association material. The private correspondence provided some important insights into the atmosphere of familiarity between key members of the NHCC and political and educational leaders, and tells us something of the 'invisible aspect' of the decision-making process on this curriculum committee. The subject association

⁶⁶ There was no national history teachers association until 1990, although regional subject associations were set up in all 6 university centres during the 1970s (beginning with Auckland in 1971). The CDD was disestablished with the advent of *Tomorrow's Schools* when the Department of Education was replaced with the Ministry. As one his final initiatives as history curriculum officer, David Wood set up the first nation body to represent history teachers, the History Education Council (HEC). HEC was based in Auckland 1990-93 but failed to gain momentum and in April 1994 was replaced by the New Zealand History Teachers Association (NZHTA) chaired jointly by Sheryll Ofner and Graeme Warburton. NZHTA was affiliated with The New Zealand Historical Association (NZHA) and is run by a regional executive that shifts to another region every two years.

newsletters also provided a perspective into the politics of curriculum change (as well as the minutiae of the contemporary concerns of history teachers).

Secondary Sources

While there is an extensive international literature on history educational matters, until the last five years the New Zealand literature on this area has been comparatively thin. The international material was invaluable in identifying key issues and themes for this study and is discussed in some detail in Chapter 7. The existing New Zealand literature that has informed this research is discussed below. There is also a considerable literature on New Zealand's educational, political, social and cultural history that I have drawn on to provide a wider context and this material is used as and where relevant throughout the thesis.

While the main focus of educational history in New Zealand until the 1970s was concerned with administrative matters, the exception to this trend was J.H. Murdoch's *High Schools of New Zealand* (1943). Appearing at the same time as the Thomas Report, Murdoch outlined key features of the secondary school curriculum and discussed contemporary concerns with school subjects (including history). Murdoch's work highlighted the persistent pressures imposed by history courses being driven by the examination prescriptions that were complicated by the role of history as a key component of citizenship education. Murdoch noted history teachers were highly qualified to teach the subject (with most holding honours degrees), yet the standard of teaching in the subject was low. Drawing on Matriculation examination reports over the previous 40 years (when few students went into the senior school) Murdoch painted a picture of the state of school history as 'depressing', in the 'doldrums', and while examiners were 'notoriously divergent in standards and views,' all agreed on 'the poor quality of work submitted'. Murdoch saw the explanation for this state of affairs as a consequence of the lack of sufficient time allocated to a 'complex and demanding' subject on the timetable, as well as the pressure of a two-hour matriculation examination, which encouraged teachers to 'cram' for the examination and 'attempt to second guess the examiner'. Murdoch also pointed out that although 'training in citizenship' was the 'avowed aim of the history teacher', the teaching of history fell far short of what was required. He believed this would only be rectified when the history curriculum focussed on the 'the needs of the child, and not the needs of the university'.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ J.H Murdoch, *The High Schools of New Zealand* (Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1943), 139-146.

While there has been considerable research on social studies over the last 30 years, it has only been in the last five years that a body of research on senior history has emerged. Prior to this the most comprehensive study in regards to history education was Roy Shuker's 1978 PhD thesis (and subsequent article) that traced the development of history as a subject over the previous century.⁶⁸ Shuker's work is located within the paradigm of the 'new sociologists' and he adopted an explicitly social class analysis approach to examine how the history curriculum had been 'moulded by the state, the economy, and by social class'. Shuker argued that while history had emerged as a minor subject in the classically dominated education system, by the 1950s it had gradually become a key part of the academic curriculum, and adopted features of a university-based discipline. This had seen history become an important feature of the academic curriculum by the 1960s but by the following decade, history was declining in popularity (although not in academic prestige).

Marcia Stenson, who was a participant on the NHCC, outlined the nature of the (then) recent changes to the history curriculum. She was optimistic of the potential of the new curriculum to encourage a shift in thinking, especially in light of the decline in student numbers.⁶⁹ The 'crisis in history' had already been noted by David Keen who pointed out that as numbers were falling in history they were increasing in geography.⁷⁰ However, there was little of substance published during the 1990s on history education as the focus of curriculum researchers was on the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF) and supporting documents. Optional subjects in the senior school generated little attention. It was not until 2003 that researchers turned their attention to the senior school in light of the shift to standards-based assessment (NCEA)⁷¹ and the curriculum stock-take⁷² that reflected the government's wider ambitions of New Zealand 'catching the knowledge wave'.⁷³ It also reflected the growing interest in New Zealand history over the last decade.

⁶⁸ R. Shuker, *History in the New Zealand Secondary School: A study in aspects of curriculum development*. Unpublished PhD thesis: Victoria University: Wellington, 1978; _____. 'Cleo in the Curriculum: The Place of History as a Secondary School Subject'. In *The School Curriculum in New Zealand*, edited by Gary McCulloch, 185-200 (Palmerston North Dunmore Press, 1992).

⁶⁹ Stenson, *History in New Zealand Schools*, 168-82.

⁷⁰ David Keen, 'Decline and Fall.' *Education*, 28:6 (1979), 8.

⁷¹ For the impact of NCEA on the senior curriculum see: Rosemary Hipkins, 'The NCEA in the Context of the Knowledge Society and National Policy Expectations.' *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 14 (2004): 27-38.

⁷² See Ministry of Education Curriculum Stocktake Report <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=7823&data=1>; J. Le Metais, 'New Zealand Stocktake: A International Critique'. National Foundation for Education for Educational Research; <http://www.mindu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=7258&data=1>

⁷³ Jane Gilbert, *Catching the Knowledge Wave: "Knowledge Society" Developments and the Future of Public Education in New Zealand* (Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2005).

Alison Derbyshire's thesis (2005) provides a broad survey of the teaching of New Zealand history in secondary schools between 1925 and 2000.⁷⁴ Derbyshire points out that since the 1920s history has been linked with citizenship and (ironically in light of recent criticism) that the introduction of social studies was intended to ensure more New Zealand history was taught. She goes on to argue that social studies failed to meet the expectations and at the senior level British history 'overshadowed' New Zealand content. Her primary interest is in the place of New Zealand history in the curriculum and in the 1980s Derbyshire argues the NZHA and the 'escalating involvement' of university historians and the Department '... saw the inclusion of more New Zealand history across the curriculum'. She goes on to say that the impact of these changes was limited by the increasing flexibility of the curriculum and low history enrolments in the senior school⁷⁵. Derbyshire's broad survey places undue emphasis on the role of university historians as a force to create a more 'balanced and inclusive' curriculum in the 1980s. By placing the NZHA as central to this process she misses the fundamental tensions on the history committee, between the liberals who attempted to address the problems that emerged from a university dominated approach to curriculum change, and conservatives who were determined to retain the status quo.

Hunter and Farthing's (2004) primary concern is with the reluctance of history teachers to engage with new approaches to teaching the subject.⁷⁶ They see the 1989 syllabus as connecting with 'postmodern theory' and inclusive, but argued experienced teachers have largely ignored the opportunities over the last twenty years to study 'gendered, social and Māori histories' and have retained a focus on politics and war. Less experienced teachers they claim, who have been keen to adopt new approaches, have seldom been in a position to implement the intentions of the syllabus. The authors are especially critical of conservative members of the history teaching community, characterising them as 'unquestioning', and having little understanding of the curriculum beyond 'topic selection'. The problem, they argue, has been exacerbated by the reluctance of 'older experienced teachers' who adopt 'traditional approaches to the study of the past' that take little account of the present. Newly qualified teachers are 'assimilated into the dominant and prevailing discourses and pedagogy of school history' and as a consequence New Zealand

⁷⁴ Alison Derbyshire, 'Anyone's but Our Own: The Teaching of New Zealand History in New Zealand Secondary Schools 1925-2000' MA thesis, University of Auckland, 2004.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 55-75.

⁷⁶ Hunter and Farthing, *Talking History*, 10-11.

history is not a priority in many programmes and the subject is 'distanced' from contemporary developments in the discipline⁷⁷.

While the sample is small and centred on one geographical region, Hunter and Farthing's (2004) claims of a 'politics and war' emphasis in history teaching programmes is consistent with recent NZHTA surveys.⁷⁸ However, their explanation for this as being a consequence of experienced history teachers being reluctant to accommodate recent developments in the parent discipline is less convincing. By placing the responsibility for this situation on teachers (rather than on the design of the history prescriptions) they have downplayed the structural constraints of the examination prescriptions on teaching programmes at this level. In this thesis it is argued that those who were determined to maintain the academic features of history dominated the history committee and privileged existing areas of historical knowledge. When viewed through the lens of the prescriptions (which in the senior school determine history teaching programmes), the history curriculum that emerged in the late 1980s ensured that the UE, UB and US programmes reflected the professional interests of dominant groups in the history teaching community, and ensured the status quo was preserved as much as was practicable.

Myra Kunowski (2005)⁷⁹ has examined the superficial knowledge among teachers of the Treaty of Waitangi, despite the political concern about the neglect of teaching New Zealand history and in particular the Treaty. Richard Manning's forthcoming PhD thesis⁸⁰ that looks at how Te Atiawa history in the Hutt Valley/ Wellington can be incorporated into teaching programmes is likely to illuminate these issues and builds on his earlier research into place-based education.⁸¹ The issue of what history teachers choose to teach at Year 13 appears to be dictated by practical considerations as Imelda Bargas found when she examined the longstanding affection and commitment to English history by teachers in Year 13.⁸² Bargas (2005) identified that the English option was favoured by older, more experienced teachers (while New Zealand in the 19th century tended to be taught more widely among younger, less experienced teachers). However, she argues that the majority of Year

⁷⁷ Ibid., i-ii.

⁷⁸ See figures above: Footnote 19.

⁷⁹ Myra Kunowski, 'Teaching About the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the Nature of Teacher Knowledge and Classroom Practice.' (Unpublished D.Ed thesis, Griffith University, 2005).

⁸⁰ Richard Manning, 'Place, Power and Pedagogy: The Status of Te Atiawa Histories in Port Nicholson Block Secondary Schools and the possible application of place-based education models'. Phd thesis: Victoria University of Wellington, Forthcoming 2008/9. (personal communication).

⁸¹ R. Manning, 'History Never Repeats Itself? Colonial Historical Trends Confront National Administration Guidelines.' *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 9 (1999): 63-82.

⁸² Imelda Bargas, 'God Defend New Zealand or Save the Kings and Queens? An Examination of the Status of New Zealand History at Year 13.' (unpublished M.A Applied thesis: Victoria University of Wellington, 2005).

13 history teachers who selected the English option were not making a conscious decision against New Zealand history. Rather, their choice was based on pragmatic factors such as student interest, assessment, and the availability of quality resources.

Michael Harcourt's (2007)⁸³ study looks beyond the question of what should be taught in history programmes and explores the concept of individualism in history education. A concept he claims is underpinned by the ideology of progress and that encourages 'the conditions necessary for a human-induced environmental crisis on a scale the world has never before seen'⁸⁴ Harcourt eschews the 'best story' approach in history teaching and argues that history teachers need to develop an 'ecological philosophy' of teaching to address the environmental challenges faced in the 21st century.

Referencing

This thesis employs the Chicago 15th Manual of Style for bibliographies and footnotes⁸⁵ rather than the American Psychological Association author-date system. I have chosen the Chicago footnoting style because it accommodates the idiosyncratic nature of the source material (such as archival documents and interviews) that I have drawn on in this thesis and enhances the fluency of the narrative for reading. It also allows for the inclusion of supplementary detail that is linked to the text and clarifies key points. Citations appear in footnotes and these are supplemented by a full bibliography and list of references at the end of the thesis. The use of footnotes also makes the location of sources for the reader a more straightforward process than endnotes. The Chicago style does allow for some flexibility⁸⁶ and because of the extensive amount of published material that has informed this project I have not used a short citation when a source first appears. The full details appear when an author is first cited and the basic short form of citation (as for Chicago protocols) is used if the same reference is used later in the text. For example:

⁸³ Michael Edward Harcourt, 'Teaching History to Save the Earth: Towards an Ecological Philosophy of Education.' (M.A, unpublished thesis: Victoria University of Wellington, 2007).

⁸⁴ Ibid., 7.

⁸⁵ *The Chicago Manual of Style: The Essential Guide for Writers, Editors and Publishers*, 15th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 594-616.

⁸⁶ Ibid, 596.

First citation of secondary source:

- ¹ Ivor F. Goodson, *Studying Curriculum* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994), 17.

Second citation of the same source:

(49). Goodson, *Studying Curriculum*, 19.

Bibliographical entry for source:

Goodson, Ivor F. *Studying Curriculum*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994.

All sources referred to (books, articles, dissertations, private papers, websites, archival documents, interviews, personal communications) are identified at the conclusion of the thesis. I have cited full given names of authors (except in the cases of those authors who always use initials) and have used the abbreviation *ibid* for immediately preceding references. In the case of an institution (such as the Department of Education) the institutional name appears in the place of an author and the same protocols as to referencing follow.

The use of acronyms and specialist language are always an issue in research at this level. To this end there is a glossary of specialist terms at the beginning of the thesis. Where each title first occurs in the text it is given its full name. This is followed by the acronym in brackets, and subsequently acronyms are used for this title. If there is a need to provide additional information about this title then this is footnoted on the page where the title first appears. To illustrate in the case of the NHCC the footnote reads:

The Committee was known as both the National History Curriculum Committee (NHCC) and the National History Syllabus Committee (NHSC). The former was more widely favoured in official documents and is used in this thesis.

When primary source material is quoted in the thesis it appears exactly as it does in the document. This protocol also applies with direct quotations from oral testimony unless the transcript was returned with grammatical corrections. The style used for quotations follows Chicago guidelines. Quotations of less than 40 words are included within the text and enclosed in single quotation marks. Longer passages are indented from both margins without quotation marks and set in 10-point font to distinguish them from the main text.

Summary

The research focus for this study is to offer an historical perspective on the development of the senior history curriculum in New Zealand in the late 20th century. As such this serves as a case study of how a university discipline is transformed into a secondary school subject. As well as discussing the relevant New Zealand literature this chapter has discussed the range of theoretical perspectives and research methodologies that have informed this research project. It is an eclectic mix. In regards to theory it has primarily drawn on social constructionism as it applies to social class analysis and theory of hegemony in relation to ideological control of dominant beliefs and values. Post-colonial theory and standpoint theory have also informed my thinking. It reflects how this question has crossed the disciplinary boundaries of sociology, history, psychology, education and anthropology. These perspectives are broadly encompassed within the framework of critical theory, as this approach presents an insight into how the structure of the history curriculum perpetuated dominant views over knowledge and contributes to understanding the development of the senior curriculum. As regards methodologies, I have employed a range of qualitative research methodologies, including documentary analysis, semi-guided interviews and close reading of both New Zealand and international secondary literature on history education.

CHAPTER 4

Years of Turmoil and Change: New Zealand in the 1980s

In common with much of the world, New Zealand has gone through an economic and social convulsion in the last decade.¹

Colin James (1992)

This chapter begins by sketching the nature of the changes in the 1980s, before locating wider themes in relation to feminism and the relationship between Māori and Pākehā that impacted directly on the development of the history curriculum. The 1980s saw profound changes to the fabric of New Zealand society and the history curriculum reflected contemporary societal concerns as well as wider issues within education.

The 1980s - A Decade of Turmoil and Change

The construction of the New Zealand history curriculum in the 1980s reflected contemporary social, political, economic and intellectual concerns. Compared to 2008, New Zealand was a 'distant country' when the history committee first met in 1983.² The Cold War defined international relations, homosexuality was illegal, there were few women or Māori in positions of authority and the government ran a 'control economy' and still believed it could stem financial challenges (including spiralling inflation) by implementing a wage and price freeze. Six years later, when the new history syllabus was introduced, New Zealand had seen a series of changes that shattered many of the fundamental values and aspirations that New Zealanders had adhered to since 1945, including the breakdown of any consensus over social and economic policy, foreign affairs and race relations.

The social, economic and cultural changes of the 1980s were the response of a younger generation that was more open to change and that 'came of age' in this decade.³ The relationship between Māori and Pākehā was renegotiated as a culturally assertive (and an increasingly well educated) Māori leadership refused to accommodate the previously mono-cultural features of New Zealand society. Attitudes to race, and its links to sport, were a particular focus of discontent and

¹ Colin James, *New Territory: The Transformation of New Zealand, 1984-92* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1992), 320.

² The full quote is '*The past is a different country, they do things differently there*' and appears in L.P Hartley, *The go between*, (London, Hamilton, 1953), 1.

³ James, *New Territory: The Transformation of New Zealand, 1984-92*, 8.

generated some of the worst civil unrest that the country had seen for thirty years during the 1981 Springbok Tour. The 1980s also saw a fundamental realignment of New Zealand's foreign policy that became a source of considerable upheaval during the 1980s over issues that included ANZUS and nuclear ship visits, support for Britain in the Falklands war, the sinking of the Rainbow Warrior and French nuclear testing in the Pacific.⁴ Furthermore, the consensus over social and economic policy broke down. In the three decades after 1945 New Zealand had maintained relatively comprehensive health, education and welfare programmes and the idea of egalitarianism bound most New Zealanders into the acceptance of a 'prosperity consensus'.⁵ While New Zealanders were not as generous in state-provided social security as many contemporary commentators liked to believe,⁶ there was a commitment to support welfare, health and education. By the beginning of the 1980s, however, the New Zealand economy was under serious pressure and social spending (including education) came under scrutiny. The 'oil shocks' of the 1970s and Britain's entry into the European Economic Community contributed to a dramatic economic decline that saw a spiral of high inflation, growing unemployment and industrial militancy.⁷

Educational Issues in the 1980s

Education was directly affected by the wider social, cultural and economic changes because of the growing lack of confidence in the public service to successfully deliver social services. The centralised and interventionist policies of the centre-left Kirk/Rowling government (1972-75) and the centre-right Muldoon government (1975-84) had proved inadequate in addressing contemporary challenges and, by the early 1980s, New Zealand was struggling with high inflation, growing unemployment, low economic growth and social turmoil. The compulsory school sector was especially vulnerable to public criticism and echoing like-minded critics overseas in times of anxiety and uncertainty, social conservatives lamented the perceived decline in education standards. The history curriculum was caught up in the calls for a return to educational fundamentals ('back to basics') that gained momentum after the publication of the 'Johnson Report' in 1978, which called for a significant shift in approaches to education, including the recommendation that sex

⁴ Malcolm McKinnon, *Independence and Foreign Policy: New Zealand and the World since 1935* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1993).

⁵ James, *New Territory: The Transformation of New Zealand, 1984-92*, 9-35.

⁶ David Thomson, 'Society and Social Welfare.' In *The Future of the Past*, edited by Colin Davis and Peter Lineham, (Palmerston North: Department of History: Massey University 1990), 100-3.

⁷ Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000*, 394-424.

education should be included in the curriculum.⁸ Combined with neo-conservative calls to reduce the role of the state in education, and introduce market orientated approaches to the sector, the 'back to basics' controversy prompted the National government Minister of Education, Merv Wellington, to instigate a major review of the curriculum.⁹ The NHCC was set up as part of this initiative. Wellington's curriculum review was published in March 1984 and included new initiatives such as taha Māori, health education and computer awareness. However, it reflected the Minister's socially conservative values and his narrow interpretation of curriculum. It was also out of step with the liberal ethos of the Department of Education (and the leadership of the PPTA). Department of Education curriculum officer Harvey McQueen describes the CDD in the 1980s as 'buzzing' with discussions over ideas such as 'schools without walls' and 'considerable bucking of educational shibboleths.'¹⁰

The release of Wellington's curriculum review coincided with National Prime Minister Robert Muldoon calling a 'snap election' in June 1984 and consequently curriculum reform emerged as an election issue. Education was traditionally a major focus for Labour and during the four week election campaign they promised a wide-ranging curriculum review, and criticised both the minimal timeframe Wellington had allowed for consultation and the socially conservative range of the suggested changes. The Labour party led by David Lange won a landslide victory and the socially liberal Russell Marshall became Minister of Education. The NHCC was incorporated into Marshall's wider curriculum review and his attitude to curriculum reflected his liberal and progressive views on educational matters, and went well beyond his predecessor's approach to education. Buoyed by a vibrant economy and a dramatic rise in wealth for the speculative, urban middle-class, these years were underpinned by an appetite for social and economic change and a distrust of existing social and economic structures. Marshall's curriculum review was endorsed by liberals in education and the final document reflected the optimistic and consultative nature of the first term of the Lange Labour government.

The policies of the 1984-90 Labour administration were a major break with the values and attitudes of the past and reflected a reforming zeal that eschewed gradualism and was not content to simply readjust existing systems. As well as

⁸ Josephine Bowler and Roger Openshaw, 'Not Understood: The Bicultural Dimension of the Report of the New Zealand Committee on Health and Social Education, Growing, Sharing, Learning (1977).' *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies* 41, no. 1 (2006): 45-67.

⁹ O'Neill, 'Change and Constancy Half a Century of Secondary Schooling in New Zealand', 44-59

¹⁰ Harvey McQueen, 'Once Were Curriculum Developers.' *Curriculum Matters* 2 (2006): 182-94.

socially liberal initiatives such as homosexual law reform,¹¹ and striking a more independent foreign policy stance, the Lange government imposed extensive structural changes on the Public Service that saw a major shift in the direction of education when they were introduced in 1988. However, during the time the NHCC was meeting (1984-87) educational reform was not a priority for the Labour government. Marshall was at liberty to conduct his generous and liberal approach to education.¹² The design of the history syllabus was thus located in an era of curriculum development that had changed little since the 1960s and was characterised (by those involved in the process) as centralised, consultative and inclusive. It reflected the ethos of an age prior to the advent of neo-conservatism in social policy that shattered the consensus over education. It was not until after the 1987 election (by which time the history syllabus had been finalised) that the Labour government made education a priority. When they did so, the focus for change was on administrative and governance issues rather than curriculum. Despite the fundamental changes in the fabric of New Zealand society, there was a consensus by all the key stakeholders that the government was responsible for both curriculum design and implementation. Members of the history committee expected that after five years of designing a new syllabus, there would be at least another five years to implement any initiatives.

The NHCC belongs to a point in time before the societal, intellectual and economic changes that would emerge as a consequence of globalisation. Since the mid-1990s the development of new electronic media has expanded the amount of information available and access to that information has expanded exponentially. This has profound implications for teaching and learning and curriculum design. The accelerated movement of people, the rapid expansion of new ideas and new technologies and the blurring of national boundaries that have characterised globalisation radically changed New Zealand education, but did not feature when the NHCC was operating.

‘Up from Under’: The Changing Role of Women

By the 1980s, the tenets of the social, political and cultural movement of second wave feminism enjoyed considerable support among the liberals who dominated education and (after the election of the Labour government) wider government

¹¹ Although the Homosexual Law Reform Act (1986) was an independent bill (and passed on a conscience vote) it was promoted by Wellington Central Labour MP Fran Wilde and enjoyed widespread support among the Labour Caucus and minimal support by the National opposition.

¹² O’Neill, ‘Change and Constancy Half a Century of Secondary Schooling in New Zealand’, 55.

policy. The first wave of feminism of the late 19th and early 20th centuries focussed on suffrage¹³ and in the following decades women made considerable advances in areas of social policy (especially health and education).¹⁴ However, second wave feminism challenged the 'historical and structural foundations of male power and women's' subjugation' that rested on the belief that men should be the standard against which normality and equality are measured. The Women's Liberation Movement of the 1970s argued that the 'suffragettes had left unfinished business'¹⁵ and, as well as equal educational opportunities, they sought sexual and reproductive freedom, and full participation in cultural and public politics.

In New Zealand feminists challenged the perception that New Zealand had a proud record of egalitarianism in regards to women's rights, pointing out that while women had won the right to vote in 1893, they did not win the right to enter parliament until 1919, the first woman MP did not enter parliament until 1933 and in the 1970s women were still poorly represented.¹⁶ Even in traditional areas such as teaching, women in New Zealand had not continued to achieve high status, even though many highly qualified women (including Kate Edgar) became teachers. In 1920 almost 40% of principals of state secondary schools were women, but by the 1980s this had fallen to 10% (although 37% of secondary teachers were women). While women ran almost 50% of primary schools in 1920, sixty years later only 3% held leadership positions (although again they made up the majority of primary teachers). Women were also poorly represented in middle management positions in schools.¹⁷

The women's movement of the 1970s challenged both the political and personal nature of the relationship between men and women encapsulated by the slogan 'the personal is political'. Second wave feminism was spurred by Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949) and Betty Friedan's *Feminine Mystique* (1963) but had its origins in the intellectual movements of the 1930s that rejected the prevalent view that the differences between men and women were determined by biology and

¹³ The Women's Franchise Act (1893) saw New Zealand become the first country where women won the vote (women did not win the franchise in the USA and Britain until 1918 and not until 1945 in France). This reflected the comparative independence and status that women enjoyed in late 19th and early 20th century New Zealand. Judith Binney, Judith Basset, Erik Olssen, *An Illustrated History of New Zealand 1820-1920* (Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1990), 241, 246-248.

¹⁴ Otago Girls' High School (established in 1871) was the first state secondary school for girls in the Southern Hemisphere and Kate Edgar became the first New Zealand woman university graduate (and the second in the British Empire) in 1877. See Ruth Fry, *Its Different for Daughters a History of the Curriculum for Girls in New Zealand Schools 1900-1975* (Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1985).

¹⁵ Christine Dann, *Up from Under Women and Liberation in New Zealand 1970-85* (Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1985), 1.

¹⁶ Judith, Aitken, 'Women in the Political Life of New Zealand.' In *Women in New Zealand Society*, edited by P. Bunkle and B. Hughes, 21-26 (Auckland: Allen and Unwin, 1980), 24.

¹⁷ Beryl Hughes, 'Women and the Professions'. *Ibid.*, 118-138.

rather argued that these differences were a consequence of culture.¹⁸ The belief that women's behaviour was determined by the structure of society rather than by biology (as had been previously argued) had significant implications in addressing issues of inequality and discrimination, as it repudiated 'biological determinism and asserted the possibility of sexual equality'.¹⁹

Although this was a minority view among intellectuals in the 1930s, the social changes to women's lives during the Second World War challenged the popular perception of women's traditional role. Betty Friedan's *Feminine Mystique* (1963) shattered the post-war prevailing assumption, that women were content to be 'housewives and mothers and had no interest in a career'. Accessible and engaging, Friedan's book was a best seller. It was enormously influential in spreading the ideas of the Women's Liberation Movement (WLM) among the well-educated young mothers born in the 1940s and early 50s, many of whom felt isolated and frustrated in the growing suburbs of modern developed societies:

.... Women had been denied the past and present knowledge which Friedan was painstakingly reconstructing, the knowledge that women's disenchantment, sense of emptiness was a realistic and rational response to the circumstances they found themselves in ...²⁰

In the socially tumultuous decade of the 1970s feminism found a receptive audience among the 'baby-boomer' generation that was challenging established norms on a number of levels and drawing on international models to do so. By the 1980s this generation was beginning to move into positions of influence in education and the politics of the women's liberation movement had considerable appeal for those who were part of the 'youth revolution.'²¹

The growing interest in the experiences of women saw a need to build a research base that would address the considerable gap in the academic literature. While initially this research was done within existing disciplines such as history and English literature, by the late 1970s Women's Studies programmes were beginning

¹⁸ For examples of the diversity of such feminist thinkers at this time see: Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, (London: Kegan Paul, 1937); Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*. London: Hogarth Press 1929; Margaret Mead, *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilisation*. (New York: William Morrow, 1928).

¹⁹ Curthoys & Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 162.

²⁰ Dale Spender, 'Modern Feminist Theorists: Reinventing Rebellion.' In *Feminist Theorists Three Centuries of Women's Intellectual Traditions*, edited by Dale Spender (London: The Women's Press, 1983), 367.

²¹ Barbara Brookes, 'A Germaine Moment: Style, Language and Audience.' In *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts*, edited by Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, 191-214 (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006), 196.

to appear in some New Zealand universities.²² The academics in this emerging discipline (for example Phillida Bunkle at Victoria University) had trained in traditional disciplines such as history, but in turning to women's studies, they aimed to address the absence of a '...body of accepted knowledge in relation to the invisibility of women's lives and experiences'.²³ At an academic level the emergence of the discipline of women's studies was a response to the influence of feminism that had become an integral feature of the intellectual fabric of New Zealand society. This is evidenced by the plethora of issues that feminists engaged with such as the campaign for the Working Women's Charter, the Women's Health Network, Media women and a number of feminist collectives that were established during this time.²⁴

While New Zealand feminists were part of an international movement, the focus of the women's movement in New Zealand when the NHCC was meeting was on control over health and reproduction, male violence towards women, equal treatment in politics and gender discrimination in the workplace.²⁵ The United Nations had declared 1975-85 as the decade for women and in the 1970s these issues united a broad alliance of feminists from a range of backgrounds at four biennial women's conventions.²⁶ Both National and Labour politicians were acutely conscious of the growing politicisation of women. The *Equal Pay Act* (1972), the *Matrimonial Property Act* (1976), the Domestic Purposes benefit (1973) and the *Human Rights Commission Act* (1977) established a framework for the process of eliminating discrimination against women.

However, while there was considerable sympathy for the women's movement among middle-class liberals (such as those involved in education policy and curriculum design), there was no shared understanding among feminists regarding the goals of the women's movement. By the early 1980s when the history committee was meeting, the women's movement internationally was fragmenting, and New Zealand was no exception. The issue of lesbianism versus heterosexuality (which was linked to the wider gay rights movement) generated a split in the feminist movement, as lesbian separatists redefined feminism as being exclusive to lesbian women. A number of Māori feminists also saw no place for themselves in the

²² Geraldine McDonald, 'Education and the Movement Towards Equality.' In *Women in New Zealand Society*, edited by P. Bunkle and B. Hughes, (Auckland: Allen & Unwin, 1980), 149-150.

²³ Dale Spender, *Feminist Theorists Three Centuries of Women's Intellectual Traditions*, 368.

²⁴ Christine Dann, *Up from Under Women and Liberation in New Zealand 1970-85*, 2-27.

²⁵ James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the year 2000*, 496-498; Sandra Coney, *Standing in the Sunshine A History of New Zealand Women since They Won the Vote* (Auckland: Penguin, 1993), 35-39.

²⁶ 1973; 1975; 1977; 1979.

women's movement, which they viewed as white, middle-class and conformist.²⁷ Ngahuia Te Awekotuku wrote: 'Every Pākehā, no matter how liberal, well meaning or politically sound is racist, because white privilege... operates regardless of gender.'²⁸ In a similar vein Donna Awatere claimed:

The first loyalty of white women is always to the white culture and the white way ... white feminists use their white power, status and privilege to ensure that their definition of feminism supersedes that of Māori women.²⁹

These ideas generated consternation within the feminist movement,³⁰ but even the more moderate strand of feminist activism (that had been incorporated into the Labour Party after 1975) faced strident and well-organised opposition from socially conservative women in the 1980s. This became evident in 1984 when the newly elected Labour government ran a series of consultation forums to gather feedback on the newly created Ministry of Women's Affairs. Feminists who argued for moderate policies such as affordable, quality childcare, found themselves facing vitriolic resistance from socially conservative women who claimed the women's movement was detrimental to 'family values'.³¹

While the fragmentation of the women's movement in the 1980s appeared to be a break with the feminist euphoria of the previous decade, in reality the unity of the women's movement in the 1970s was fragile. Feminism was a potent force among liberal, urban, predominantly middle-class women, but there was considerable opposition from socially conservative women (many aligned with church groups) who had united to halt what they saw as 'the perverting influence of feminism' at the United Women's Convention in 1977. The opposition of women to feminism was especially apparent over the issues of abortion, sex education and censorship. The recommendation of the Johnson Report to introduce sex education into the curriculum sparked opposition from the Society for the Protection of the Unborn Child, Concerned Parents and Society for the Protection of Community Standards.³² While all these groups shared an animosity to feminism (that they claimed was undermining 'the family'), some women's organisations that were working to achieve equality in the workplace were also uneasy with the actions of advocates of what

²⁷ Pat Rosier, *Been around for Quite a While: Twenty Years of Broadsheet Magazine* (Auckland: New Women's Press, 1992), 58-90.

²⁸ Ngahuia Te Awekotuku, 'Paper Read at Piha Women's Congress'. In *Mana Wahine Māori* (Auckland: New Women's Press, 1978), 63.

²⁹ Donna Awatere, *Māori Sovereignty* (Auckland: New Spiral Press, 1984), 42.

³⁰ Rosier, *Been around for Quite a While: Twenty Years of Broadsheet Magazine*, 45-47, 82-83

³¹ Hilary Stace, 'Labour Owes Us – the 1984 Women's Forums.' In *For the Record Lange and the 4th Labour Government*, edited by Margaret Clark, 119-128 (Wellington: Dunmore Press, 2005) 124-125.

³² Josephine Bowler, 'The New Zealand Controversy over the Johnson Report.' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Massey University, 2005), 26-28.

was colloquially known as ‘women’s lib’. For example, the National Council of Women was unimpressed with Germaine Greer’s visit in 1972, claiming many women did not want to be liberated because they were ‘very happy’. Connie Purdue, President of the National Organization of Women, was ‘outraged by Greer’s disdain for the union movement.’

An older generation of women who had been working hard, particularly on the equal pay issue, found the confrontational, radical and impolite style of younger feminists like Greer ill-judged and unnecessary.³³

‘Struggle without End’: Māori Education

The 1970s saw a radical renegotiation of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā and education played a central role in this process. In the first half of the 20th century the priority of Māori education had been on preparing students for agricultural and/or manual work and the narrowness of the Māori educational experience excluded the vast majority of Māori from professional occupations.³⁴ There were few Māori who studied at a senior school level and, as history was defined as an academic subject that prepared a small elite for university courses, there was little incentive to shape history programmes to accommodate the interests of Māori students. In the 1970s the relationship between Māori and Pākehā became increasingly fraught, in particular over the continued alienation of Māori land, the decline in Māori language and the place of the Treaty of Waitangi. Increasing unemployment in this decade also impacted most on those in the agricultural and manual sectors, and as Māori predominantly worked in these areas, an increasing number of Māori students stayed on at school in the senior forms.

With a rapidly growing and youthful Māori population, education was seen by the successive governments as the primary site for addressing emerging racial tensions. At the beginning of the 1970s the prevailing view of the Department of Education was that while Māori should retain aspects of Māoritanga, the priority for young Māori was to take up the social and economic opportunities of modern New Zealand society and blend into the modern world. It reflected the paternalism of the Hunn Report (1961) that identified education as playing a crucial role in breaking the cycle of poverty and developing the social, cultural and intellectual capacity among Māori to become part of modern New Zealand society. The report led to initiatives such as setting up the Education Foundation and trade and technical training for

³³ Brookes, ‘A Germaine Moment: Style, Language and Audience.’ 205-6.

³⁴ J. M Barrington and T.H. Beaglehole, *Māori Schools in a Changing Society* (Christchurch: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1974).

Māori students, but some argued it promoted a ‘culturally deprived view of Māori backgrounds’ in which Māori families were blamed for Māori underachievement.³⁵

The Currie Commission (1962) built on the direction outlined in the Hunn report. While the notion of including a ‘Māori Dimension’ in wider New Zealand society was novel in the 1960s, this was not the case in education circles where there had long been considerable sympathy among Pākehā professional educators to incorporate Māori language and culture into the curriculum. This view rested on a largely romanticised, stereotypical image that had long featured among liberal Pākehā educators. For example, J.H. Murdoch, Principal of the Auckland Graduate Secondary Teacher Training programme, saw the ‘essential spirituality’ of Māori values’ as superior to the ‘selfish individualism’ of the majority non-Māori community.³⁶ This delineation of a ‘two-worlds’ view of Māori and Pākehā, and a romanticisation of Māori traditional culture was prevalent among a number of leading educators, such as Garfield Johnson, principal of Hillary College in the 1960s.³⁷ In the following decade it would emerge as ‘Taha Māori’ and ‘bicultural education’ and by the 1980s when the History Committee was shaping the history syllabus, it was the orthodoxy within liberal educational circles. Liberals argued Māori had ‘lost their traditions’ and it was important a Māori dimension was included in the curriculum. This notion had been very influential in the development of the social studies syllabus that drew on the Currie Report. The Currie Commission claimed schools had a ‘double-task’. To:

... provide the Māori pupil with the educational equipment to enable him to play his part in the modern world and provide him with the same body of learning to master as the non-Māori as well as a sense of belonging to a race of a known and respected culture.³⁸

While the inclusion of a Māori dimension was the ideal for liberal educators, the priority was the implementation of strategies that would advance Māori in the modern world. The Currie Commission assumed that although retaining features of Māori cultural practices had a place in the New Zealand curriculum, the cultural, social and economic practices (and associated knowledge) of the non-Māori majority was superior. This view was still largely the consensus of the NHCC twenty years later. Senior school history was closely linked to the notion that the subject

³⁵ Colleen McMurchy-Pilkington, ‘Māori Education: Rejection, Resistance, and Renaissance.’ In *Theory in Practice for Educators*, edited by H. Dixon V. Carpenter, E. Rata and C. Rawlinson, 161-187 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2001), 164-165.

³⁶ Murdoch, *The High Schools of New Zealand*, 429-431.

³⁷ Bowler and Openshaw, ‘Not Understood: The Bicultural Dimension of the Report of the New Zealand Committee on Health and Social Education, Growing, Sharing, Learning (1977)’, 52-53.

³⁸ George Currie, *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand* (Wellington: Government Print, 1962), 415-416.

was a university-based discipline. While what was then known as ‘race relations’ was important, it was not essential and ‘real history’ was what happened in Europe and the United Kingdom. This view would emerge in the debates over the UE and US prescriptions, and the perceived importance of the early modern English nation-state that drew on a rich historiography based on an abundance of documentary evidence. The contested and increasingly acrimonious nature of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā by the 1980s also contributed to many history teachers and historians being reluctant to engage with Māori history. By this time the process of urbanisation was contributing to the escalation of social problems for young Māori that were reflected in high crime statistics, poor health and underachievement in schools.³⁹ The prevailing assumption of the authorities was that Māori needed to adapt as quickly as possible to the modern world and only retain those features of Māoritanga that did not hamper this. This view was not confined to government officials. The Māori Women’s Welfare League’s campaign in 1964 to ban Ans Westra’s *Wash Day at the Pa* photographs that depicted the rural poverty of an East Coast Māori family, demonstrated that the rapid modernisation of Māori was also a priority for Māori leaders.⁴⁰

By the 1970s the centralised approach of government initiatives to address Māori problems was increasingly being challenged by an articulate, assertive and well-educated younger generation of Māori leaders. The solution to Māori problems they argued was a greater autonomy, and retaining those features of Māori culture that were distinctive. Originating out of the Māori cultural renaissance that had started in the early 1960s (and influenced by the international radicalisation of youth in regards to issues of race), this group focussed on the further alienation of Māori land, the retention of the Māori language and the Treaty of Waitangi⁴¹. All of these features

³⁹ Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 471-472, 480-484.

⁴⁰ Ans Westra was commissioned by the publications branch of the Department of Education in 1964 to take a series of photographs for a School Journal Bulletin *Washday at the Pa*. The Department of Education wanted to introduce a contemporary Māori dimension into the curriculum that would shift away from the ‘traditional Māori life’ approach that dominated the curriculum at this time. Westra chose to depict a poor, rural Māori family on the East Coast who were waiting to move into a state house. While the photographs were not untypical of the conditions in which Māori in rural areas had lived for decades, they caused outrage among the leadership of the Māori Women’s Welfare League (MWWL). The MWWL argued *Washday at the Pa* reinforced contemporary negative stereotypes of Māori and were inaccurate, as Māori were becoming part of modern society. As a consequence of their protests, the Education Department withdrew the Bulletin from schools (Openshaw, *Democracy at the Crossroads*, 238-240).

⁴¹ Signed first at Waitangi in the north of New Zealand on February 6 1840 (and by other chiefs throughout the country) the Treaty of Waitangi was essentially a pact between the British sovereign and Māori chiefs. It was hastily drawn up and not all Māori chiefs signed. There were also significant differences between the Māori and English versions (most chiefs signed the Māori version) especially over whether Māori had ceded full sovereignty to the British and the actual rights and privileges that Māori were guaranteed. The Treaty had no legal standing until the 1980s after which it began to be incorporated into legislation (including the 1989 Education Act).

called for a different approach to the history of colonisation and had direct implications for the history curriculum as contemporary protests had their origins in the past and demonstrated the inadequacies of the current history curriculum in explaining the actions of the protestors. Māori activists drew on a view of history that was not taught in schools (and was only beginning to be taught in universities). As one of the key leaders at Bastion Point, Joe Hawke stated:

This land was declared inalienable by a Māori Land Court in 1868, yet by the end of 1950 the Ngāti Whātua of Tamaki held title to no more than a quarter of an acre at Okahu Bay. They had been legislated and forcibly evicted from their last remaining acres of ancestral land – land that was supposed to be inalienable.⁴²

Such statements demonstrated there was an alternative view of New Zealand's history that challenged the notion of biracial harmony that had been omitted from the national consciousness and was not reflected in the school curriculum.

'The Treaty of Waitangi Comes in from the Cold'

The Treaty of Waitangi became the central focus of the re-examination of New Zealand's colonial past in the 1980s. Twenty years earlier the government approach to Māori issues was to focus on improving socio-economic status, with initiatives such as scholarships for Māori to enter the professions and The Race Relations Act (1971) that made discrimination on the basis of race illegal. A growing number of Māori, however, saw the Treaty as central in negotiating their relationship with the Crown. In the 1970s, Māori activists depicted the Treaty as a 'Fraud' and claimed this was an instrument that had been used by an inherently racist colonial government to 'pacify and amuse the savages'.⁴³ The Waitangi Action Group protested annually on Waitangi Day, claiming the continued celebration of the Treaty of Waitangi was indicative of the unique nature of New Zealand racism that ignored Māori grievances, while promoting the view New Zealand had the 'best race relations in the world'. However, by the early 1980s, the Treaty was increasingly seen as a unifying framework that had the potential to successfully address Māori grievances. The Treaty became the 'ideological cement that joined conservatives

⁴² Joe Hawke as cited in: Michael Belgrave, *Historical Frictions: Māori Claims and Reinvented Histories* (Auckland University Press: Auckland, 2005), 41.

⁴³ The rejection of the existence of Māori rights by the New Zealand Company in this phrase was alluded to by activists in the 1970s as reflecting the government position in the 1840s. The reality was more complex. The New Zealand Company was a private colonisation organisation whose policies were not endorsed by the British government. See Belgrave, *Historical Frictions*, 43-45

and radicals' and by the 1980s 'calls to abandon the Treaty had been jettisoned' and replaced with a call to 'honour the Treaty'.⁴⁴

Liberal Pākehā at this time accepted the notion of the Treaty of Waitangi as the framework for addressing the tensions between Māori and Pākehā. While anti-racism groups such as Halt all Racist Tours (HART) primarily focussed on the campaign to abandon sporting links with South Africa, they also formed alliances with Māori pressure groups and acknowledged that they should address racism in New Zealand. Consequently loose alliances were formed between Māori activists and Pākehā anti-racist organisations. This was especially important in education circles, as many of those who actively supported the anti-apartheid movement were education professionals.⁴⁵

The Treaty of Waitangi was perceived sympathetically in educational circles and had been prominent in school history programmes since the 1928 curriculum. Speeches on the symbolic importance of 'The Treaty' were published annually by the Department of Education in the *Education Gazette*, to be read at school assemblies, and were closely censored to ensure they reflected the official view of the Treaty as New Zealand's 'Magna Carta' and the basis of a racially, harmonious society.⁴⁶ The rhetoric of Hobson that 'now we are all one people' was also promoted in the *School Journal* and *Our Nations Story* where it was claimed the Treaty '... was the fairest Treaty ever made between Europeans and a native race; indeed it was in many ways much fairer to the brown man than the white'.⁴⁷ The prevailing official view among history educators was that the Treaty of Waitangi was the symbol of New Zealand's harmonious race relations, and this was a source of pride (especially in comparison with other settler nations such as Australia and South Africa). This view was evident in the SC history topic on cultural interaction that favourably compared race relations in South Africa with those in New Zealand.

In the 1980s, the Treaty of Waitangi had become the framework for pressure groups determined to hold the government to account for past grievances. It was no longer an historical curiosity that simply played a symbolic role in reinforcing New Zealand's harmonious race relations. Rather the Treaty was now promoted as a

⁴⁴ Ibid, 45-48.

⁴⁵ Anna Aitken and David Mackay, (eds), *Counting the Cost: The 1981 Springbok Tour in Wellington* (Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1982).

⁴⁶ Bowler and Openshaw, *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, 49.

⁴⁷ *Our Nations Story*; Standard 3 (Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1929), 23-4; Cited in Colin McGeorge, 'New Zealand in New Zealand School Books before 1930.' *History Now* 10, no. 2 (2005): 4-11.

legal device through which Māori-Pākehā tensions could be resolved. Liberals saw the history curriculum as part of this process, especially after 1975 when the Waitangi Tribunal was established. Even with its jurisdiction limited to only investigating claims that emerged after 1975, the Tribunal was able to produce three major reports and recommendations to the government that indicated the potential such a Commission of Inquiry would have for addressing the increasing tension between Māori and Pākehā.⁴⁸

When the NHCC was developing the curriculum, the Treaty of Waitangi was the centrepiece of official Māori policy based on principles that had been drawn up by the Waitangi Tribunal (which in turn were based on the three articles and preamble of the Treaty). Under the principles, Māori were defined as tangata whenua and had a unique status and guaranteed specific rights. When Walter Hirsh (a prominent leader in the New Zealand Jewish community and primary school principal) was appointed as Race Relations Conciliator in 1986, his appointment was criticised on the basis that only a Māori who acknowledged the place of the Treaty of Waitangi had the right to perform this role. The Auckland District Māori Council called for the suspension of his appointment. The Rev. Eru Potaka-Dewes wrote:

To have someone who is not tangata whenua and who is not committed passionately to safeguarding the rights of the tangata whenua under the Treaty of Waitangi is to resurrect colonialism in the guise of a Pākehā conciliator.⁴⁹

The historical nature of the Treaty had enormous implications for the history teaching community. In 1985 the government extended the authority of the Tribunal to investigate claims back to 1840. The following year the State Owned Enterprises Act (1986) demonstrated the Treaty was no longer a 19th century historical curiosity or a guiding principle for liberal New Zealanders, but rather a modern device that set the framework for resolving grievances from the past. The ‘two-worlds’ ethos of what in the 1980s was called biculturalism had long dominated liberal education circles, but the *Education Act* (1989) required schools to explicitly acknowledge Māori in their charters as having the unique first-people status of tangata whenua, as well as to consult with local iwi and hapu when and where appropriate. In social studies the notion of Taha Māori and biculturalism had become central to the subject by the 1980s. The 1989 *Guide to the Social Studies Syllabus* noted that ‘New Zealand has experienced a strong affirmation of the place of tangata whenua and the Treaty of Waitangi’. The new guide, it was claimed, would assist schools to ‘fulfil the intentions

⁴⁸ Belgrave, *Historical Frictions*, 2-3, 14-15, 35.

⁴⁹ (Rev) Eru Potaka-Dewes, *NZ Listener*, March 22nd 1986.

of the Treaty of Waitangi makers and partners and to value our dual cultural heritage'.⁵⁰

The history syllabus (1989) made similar claims but there was little discussion of Treaty issues or acknowledging of a 'dual heritage' during the development phase of the history curriculum and there was no evidence of Treaty obligations in the prescriptions. This in part reflected that while historians were initially enthusiastic about the approach of the Waitangi Tribunal to history, they played little part in the Tribunal process. With the exception of Claudia Orange (1987) and Ruth Ross (1974) historians in the 1980s were reluctant to consider the Treaty and were 'embarrassed' by popular references to the Treaty as a 'sacred document'.⁵¹ Although historians generally shared the consensus of liberal New Zealanders that Māori had been treated badly by colonial governments, they were uncomfortable with the presentist, counter-factual nature of the Waitangi Tribunal approaches to the past.⁵²

Māori and 'Mainstream New Zealand'

As well as the tensions over land and language and the role of the Treaty, by the 1970s and 80s there was growing intellectual interest in the Māori world by liberal Pākehā and the emerging Māori middle class. In literature Witi Ihamaera, Patricia Grace, Hone Tuwhare and Apirana Taylor all established themselves on New Zealand's literary scene and Keri Hulme won international success with *The Bone People* in 1984. Pākehā writers had long drawn on Māori motifs in their work. James K. Baxter established a community at Jerusalem on the Whanganui River that questioned the values of the Pākehā middle class and reflected the view of the past in which 'the River [Whanganui Māori] people had all their lands taken from

⁵⁰ Department of Education, *Social Studies in Secondary Schools, A Guide to the Syllabus* (Wellington: Department of Education, 1989).

⁵¹ Belgrave, *Historical Frictions*, 48.

⁵² For a discussion of historians and the Waitangi Tribunal see: Giselle Byrnes, *The Waitangi Tribunal and New Zealand History* (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 2004); Oliver, W.H., 'The Future Is Behind Us: The Waitangi Tribunal's Retrospective Utopia.' In *Histories, Power and Loss, Uses of the Past - a New Zealand Commentary*, edited by Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001); Byrne's and Oliver's arguments generated that all too rare occurrence in New Zealand history writing; a genuine historiographical debate. See Jim McAloon, 'By Which Standards? History and the Waitangi Tribunal.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 40, no. 2 (2006): 194-213; Giselle Byrnes, 'By Which Standards? History and the Waitangi Tribunal: A Reply.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 40, no. 2 (2006): 214-29; Michael Belgrave, 'Looking Forward: Historians and the Waitangi Tribunal.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 40, no. 2 (2006): 230-50; K.R. Howe, K.R. 'Two Worlds?' *New Zealand Journal of History* 37, no. 1 (2003): 50-61.

them by a government that represented the hungry Pākehā settlers. Now in their broken pas, they are plagued by Pākehā bureaucrats....⁵³

In the 1980s New Zealand's film industry looked to the Māori world for stories in *Utu* (1983) and *Ngatī* (1987) and documentaries such as *Tangata Whenua* (1974), *Patu* (1981) and *Natural World of the Māori* (1987). The Māori arts world also became part of the international stage with the *Te Māori* exhibition of Māori Art in New York, where Māori artefacts were displayed as 'art objects' rather than anthropological curiosities. *Te Māori* toured the country after it returned to New Zealand and, despite the artefacts on display being part of permanent collections that had long been exhibited in local museums and galleries, record numbers of people visited the exhibition.⁵⁴ The widespread interest in Māori artefacts generated by *Te Māori* was the impetus for the revamping of Māori exhibitions in museums throughout the country, and the establishing of a new national museum (Te Papa o Tongarewa) that was explicitly modelled on the principle of biculturalism.⁵⁵

Among educated, liberal Pākehā, the growing interest in Māoritanga in the 1980s was demonstrated by an appropriation of Māori cultural icons as fashion statements of identity. These often included the wearing of prominent items of Māori jewellery such as Greenstone or Bone carvings as well as attending Māori language courses on marae and using Māori phrases and/or greetings in everyday speech. Young liberal Pākehā were grappling with what it meant to be a New Zealander in the late 20th century and in the face of an increasingly assertive and confident Māori minority, Pākehā were confronted with the challenge that 'like other settler colonies, New Zealand had a racist past.'⁵⁶ An interest in national identity also emerged as an issue for younger, well-educated and well-travelled Pākehā New Zealanders. There was no longer a shared consensus over what it meant to be a New Zealander. David McGill lamented New Zealanders were 'spiritually deprived' and only connected by sport and television.

The common cause among Pākehās has generally been in fighting abroad and destroying back home – first the whales and seals, then trees and gold, coal and topsoil. We created a green 'paddock land' fit for sheep, and have made a sheepdog our most popular cartoon.⁵⁷

⁵³ James K. Baxter, *Jerusalem Daybook* (Wellington: Price Milburn, 1971), 45.

⁵⁴ Hamish Keith, *The Big Picture*, (Auckland: Random House, 2007) 204-5. See also ____, 'Once a Culture.' *New Zealand Listener*, 20 September 2008, 40-41.

⁵⁵ Gaylene, Preston and Anna Cotterell, (Dir.), *Getting to Our Place* (New Zealand, 1999).

⁵⁶ Miranda Johnson, 'The Land of the "Wrong White Crowd" Anti-Racist Organizations and Pākehā Identity Politics in the 1970s.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 39, no. 2 (2005): 137-57.

⁵⁷ David McGill. 'No Culture to Speak of'. *New Zealand Listener*, April 19th, 1986, 27-28.

By the 1980s the official rhetoric of New Zealanders being ‘all one people’ sounded hollow. In activist quarters it was seen as inherently racist. Those non-Māori who did not identify with the colonial past as British or European adopted the term Pākehā, that they saw as an indication of being anti-racist, anti-colonial and bicultural. Their thinking was built on the older romanticised, stereotypical view of Māori culture as noted above in which the ‘communal values’ of Māori were to be admired and those of ‘individualistic Pākehā’ were to be denigrated. Māori, it was claimed, had a ‘Pākehā problem’ and, rather than Western values being the benchmark for a society, Māori had much to teach Pākehā. The Māori psychiatrist Mason Durie invited ‘individual Māori to help Pākehā by making them aware of a way of life that emphasised people rather than things’. Statements such as this found a ready audience among young New Zealanders who were influenced by the international ideals of the ‘counter-culture’ and ‘alternative’ approaches to society.

The youth revolution of the 1960s and 70s rejected many of the values and central tenets of mainstream Western society and it was this generation that was moving into positions of power in education in the 1980s. One of the features of this phenomenon was a romanticisation of the rural, communal, non-materialistic, pre-modern lifestyle and a rejection of the urban, individualistic and materialistic values of modern developed Western nations. In this intellectual environment, many young New Zealanders who embraced the counter-culture saw value in the Māori world that was, they believed, ‘alienated from mores of individualism of capitalistic Pākehā culture’. The view of Māori as spiritually superior and the victim of oppressive colonial settlers was based very much on the stereotype of Māori as victims yet ‘... associated with rusticity and ... Māori values were naturalized as timeless and intrinsically humanitarian whereas Pākehā values were temporal and insensible’.⁵⁸

At a political level, the counter-culture rejected the values of imperialism and colonialism. These were depicted as inherently oppressive and racist. Pākehā as the descendants of colonial settlers were portrayed in this post-colonial discourse as ‘the oppressor’ and ‘ignorant not simply of Taha Māori but of human nature itself’. The use of the word Pākehā among activist non-Māori became increasingly widespread in education circles, but posed a problem in winning adherents to their cause, as the term was often seen as derogatory. Michael King, in his autobiography *Being Pākehā* (1985), argued for a shared sense of Pākehā being indigenous as well as supporting claims for ‘Māori self determination’ or Tino Rangatiratanga. While cultural nationalists such as King embraced this view, the argument that Pākehā were indigenous and that all New

⁵⁸ Johnson, ‘Land of the Wrong White Crowd’, 141.

Zealanders were migrants and 'had come from somewhere else' was firmly rejected by many Māori. They saw the assertion that Pākehā were indigenous as a threat to their 'First People's Status' as tangata whenua⁵⁹. In the increasingly divisive and fragmented intellectual climate of the 1980s, Māori activists redefined non-Māori as visitors or Tauwiwi (rather than Pākehā, which implied a degree of belonging 'to this place and no other')⁶⁰ and the implications for Pākehā were bleak. Donna Awatere captured the essence of this view:

All immigrants to this country are guests of the tangata whenua, rude visitors who have by force and corruption imposed the visitor's rules upon the Māori. It matters not what generation born New Zealanders they are. Every white is an intruder who remains here only by dint of force and corruption imposed ... upon Māori.⁶¹

In this intellectual environment the alliance between Māori pressure groups and anti-racist groups was an uneasy one. The high point of both radical Māori activists and Pākehā anti-racists confronting racism was the 1981 Springbok Tour. After 1981, however, Māori activists were frustrated to find that, while thousands of Pākehā would turn out on the streets to oppose racism in South Africa, they did not share their view that there were parallels in regards to racism in New Zealand. More difficult for many activists to reconcile was that their views on sporting links with South Africa were not widely endorsed by the Māori community. The relationship between anti-racist groups and Māori activists in the 1980s became increasingly strained and in education this could not be placated by the inclusiveness of Taha Māori. For activists the 'white way and the Māori way' were 'incompatible'.⁶²

The complexity of bicultural issues in the 1980s posed a major challenge for the NHCC in drawing up a curriculum that addressed the changing nature of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. In the 1970s, the notion of including *Taha Māori* or a 'Māori dimension' into school programmes became prevalent. Taha Māori had been introduced in 1975 as part of a government initiative to celebrate cultural difference but generally was 'dependent on the goodwill and knowledge of non-Māori teachers', and did little to address Māori underachievement.⁶³ In the 1980s, the framework of biculturalism emerged as the dominant official discourse. Whereas Taha Māori had simply called for a Māori dimension to be included within the

⁵⁹ Ibid, 142-44.

⁶⁰ See: Augie Fleras and Paul Spoonley, *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Ethnic Relations in New Zealand* (Auckland: Oxford University Press 1999). For an example of how this idea influenced history education see: Ruth Naumann, *The Tauwiwi: The Later Immigrants* (Auckland: New House Publishers 1990).

⁶¹ Awatere, *Māori Sovereignty*, 35.

⁶² Ibid, 14.

⁶³ McMurchy-Pilkington, *Theory and Practice for Educators*, 167.

existing educational framework, biculturalism was a shift to the 'valuing and learning of two cultures'. This had important implications for education in that social anthropologists, Joan Metge and Anne Salmond,⁶⁴ advocates of biculturalism, claimed the Western orientation of the current curriculum alienated Māori students by promoting a world-view that was unsympathetic to their cultural framework. Alienation from the curriculum, it was argued, was a major contributing factor in the high failure rate of Māori students.

Summary

The 1980s saw far-reaching changes to the social, intellectual and economic fabric of New Zealand society and the history curriculum reflected these turbulent times. In regards to history education matters the most profound changes were the advent of feminism and the renegotiation of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā and both of these areas posed a challenge to the teaching of secondary school history that continues to resonate today.

⁶⁴ The 'two worlds' bicultural model was the dominant discourse in how liberals considered Māori and Pākehā issues by the 1980s. See Michael, King, 'Between Two Worlds.' In *Oxford History of New Zealand*, edited by W.H. Oliver 285-307. Auckland: OUP, 1981; For a contemporary expression of the bicultural model in New Zealand writing see Anne Salmond, *Two Worlds: First Meetings between Māori and Europeans, 1642-1772* (Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 1991).

CHAPTER 5

Themes and Issues in New Zealand History Education in the 1980s

It was a radical time. There were big gaps in people's attitudes and we were a divided nation. There was some resentment against women's history in smaller areas and the South Island. The cities were much more liberal in their views than the provinces. This had come out in the Springbok Tour ... The committee was divided on the Māori issue. Some teachers said there was a lot of consumer resistance to Māori topics and this still remains a problem.¹

Marcia Stenson

This chapter discusses the nature of New Zealand historiography and history education in the 1980s. It provides an outline of the relevant educational literature for this study as well as an analysis of the broad trends in New Zealand history writing and research and how these were reflected in the history curriculum (especially in regards to feminism and bicultural issues).

Curriculum Change in the 1980s

The primary focus of educational history until the 1970s in New Zealand was with administrative matters, and curriculum developments have been a relatively recent focus for educational historians.² The social and political turbulence of the 1960s and 70s, however, sparked off major debates in education and the school curriculum came under intense public and academic scrutiny. Curriculum researchers in this decade adopted a far more critical stance to education and 'insisted with increasing vehemence that curricula were in fact instruments of power for the purposes of social control and reproduction of social class patterns'.³ These researchers drew on neo-Marxist theories and stood apart from 'mainstream sociologists of the time', in that their focus was the organisation and production of knowledge, rather than the administration of educational

¹ Stenson: Interview.

² See: A.G Butchers, *Education in New Zealand* (Dunedin: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1930); ___ *After Standard IV, what? An analysis of recent reports upon the New Zealand Education System* (Invercargill: Craig Printing, 1929); A.E. Campbell, *Educating New Zealand* (Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs, 1941); Leicester Webb, *The Control of Education in New Zealand* (Wellington: NZCER, 1937); John L. Ewing, *The Origins of the New Zealand Primary School Curriculum 1840-78* (Wellington: NZCER, 1960).

³ See: B. Bernstein, 'On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge.' In *Knowledge and Control*, edited by M.F.D Young. (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971); Michael W Apple, *Education and Power* (New York: Routledge, 1995); ___, *Ideology and curriculum*, New York: Routledge. 1979; G. Whitty, *Sociology and School Knowledge* (London: Methuen, 1985); P. Bourdieu and J. Passeron, *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1977).

institutions. They argued that the 'social reproduction' of knowledge 'serves to keep particular elite groups in control of the official curriculum.'⁴

New Zealand educational historians were slow to integrate the work of the 'new sociologists in education'. J.L Ewing's history (1960, 1970) of the primary school curriculum was typical in that it largely celebrated the liberal achievements of Hogben and the impact of the Thomas report in creating a more egalitarian education system. Collections by Ramsay (1980) and Minogue (1983) included claims that suggested 'school subjects are artefacts of social control' and considered the 'role of social and political factors', but there was little attempt to analyse curriculum issues using historical perspectives.⁵ By the 1980s this situation had changed. A number of leading New Zealand educationalists who were adopting an explicitly critical stance to curriculum and reflecting international trends, were providing a historical perspective on contemporary debates.⁶

The introduction of major curriculum change in the 1990s generated a substantial body of historical research on curriculum matters. The outcomes-based model of the NZCF (1993) was a significant shift in direction and engendered considerable scholarly interest, being generally perceived as narrow and flawed by leading educationists.⁷ The major focus of curriculum research at this time was on the core compulsory subjects. Senior options were not a priority for the NZCF and thus generated little research interest. However, social studies included a substantial component of history within an integrated framework and, because of the controversial nature of this learning area, there was extensive research into the shaping of this subject.⁸

⁴ Greg Dimitriadis, Lois Weis, Cameron McCarthy, 'Introduction.' In *Ideology, Curriculum, and the New Sociology of Education*, edited by Lois Weis, Cameron McCarthy and Greg Dimitriadis, 1-13 (New York: Routledge, 2006), 2-4.

⁵ Gary McCulloch, 'History and the Curriculum' In *Reinterpreting the Educational Past: Essays in the History of Education*, edited by R. Openshaw and D. Mckenzie (Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1987).

⁶ For examples see: Roger Openshaw and David Mckenzie, (ed.). *Reinterpreting the Educational Past: Essays in the History of New Zealand Education*, (Wellington: New Zealand Council for Education Research, 1987); Roy Shuker, *The One Best System? A Revisionist History of State Schooling in New Zealand*, (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1987); Ruth Fry, *Its Different for Daughters a History of the Curriculum for Girls in New Zealand Schools 1900-1975* (Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1985).

⁷ See Anne-Marie O'Neill, John Clark and Roger Openshaw, (eds). *Reshaping Culture, Knowledge and Learning? Policy and Content in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework*, 2004; John Codd, 'Professional Accountability and the Culture of Teachers.' *Delta* 50, no. 2 (1998): 149-62; ____, 'Educational Reform, Accountability and the Culture of Distrust', *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, 34, no 1 (1999): 45-53.

⁸ Roger Openshaw, (ed). *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.

Developing a History Curriculum

By the late 1960s the PPTA, the Department of Education and a growing number of historians (Keith Sinclair, Auckland University) were keen to reform the history curriculum. Quality classroom resources were seen as a priority. As well as making the curriculum more able to cater for students who were not destined for university, the Currie Report (1962) had highlighted the need to resource curriculum areas as this was seen as one factor in thwarting the aims of the Thomas Report. In the early 1960s the Department of Education established the Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) that was staffed by officials who assumed responsibility for subjects (including history). Along with the school inspectors (and working closely with PPTA curriculum panels), the CDU officers played a key role in providing practical assistance for classroom teachers including organising professional development, resource preparation and curriculum design.

The PPTA was closely involved in this process and had been a major force in curriculum development for almost twenty years when the history committee first met. While the main priorities for secondary teachers in the 1950s had been salary and conditions (in response to the rapid increase in school rolls in this decade), by the early 1960s the Association was turning its attention to curriculum matters and in 1964, PPTA subject panels (including in history) were set up. By the 1970s and 80s, the PPTA and the Department of Education worked closely in a mutually beneficial partnership based on shared common educational goals. The PPTA representative on the NHCC, David Gledhill, remembers 'in those days representatives met with the Minister. It was not just about salary and conditions. There was much more consensus.' The PPTA had considerable influence over who sat on curriculum committees and the interrelationship between teacher associations and the Department of Education has been described as a 'curriculum generating elite.'⁹

After the appointment of Bill Renwick as Director-General, the Department of Education was keen to see a shift from a 'discipline based' curriculum model to a 'social concerns' model, to address the changing nature of NZ society. The PPTA curriculum panels also challenged the place of external examinations in driving assessment and called for a 'balanced' curriculum that focussed on acquiring values that were 'relevant' to students' lives and responsive to the needs of the community.¹⁰ In part this would be addressed, they argued, by focusing on how

⁹ Jesson. 'The PPTA and the State', 249-51.

¹⁰ New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers Association, *Education in Change: Report of the curriculum review Group*, 40-49, 57-73.

secondary teachers were trained to deliver the curriculum. They challenged the model of secondary teachers being 'concerned with imparting knowledge about subjects' and rather, argued that students needed to be adaptable, able to keep learning, skilled in human relationships and communication. Student teachers therefore had to develop 'open-minded attitudes towards secondary school subjects.'¹¹ This liberal ethos was shared by both the leadership of the PPTA and the Department of Education. Both saw education as an instrument of progressive, social change. The PPTA had published highly regarded volumes on educational issues, and having 'earned its place at the education decision-making table', was able to 'participate actively in curriculum and assessment reform as a matter of course.'¹²

The close ties between the PPTA and the Department were evident during Marshall's 1987 Curriculum Review. Operating at the same time as the NHCC, the common principles of the review were evident by the history committee's recommendations that history programmes should be 'balanced', 'responsive', 'co-operatively designed', 'inclusive', 'enabling' and 'enjoyable'.¹³ The Curriculum Review consulted widely (receiving 21,500 submissions), and attempted to address a curriculum and assessment system that was perceived by many as outdated and 'out-of-touch'. The review recommended a more flexible curriculum, the rationalisation of qualifications, the elimination of scaling, and UE moved to the 7th Form/Year 13.¹⁴

While curriculum developments of this time coincided with the radical socio-economic changes of the Lange government, Openshaw (2004) argues that the 1980s were not a clean break with the past, but rather the end product of years of educational turmoil that had its origins in the previous decade, when a 'radicalised, fragmented left challenged liberal educational reform'. By the 1970s with the economy weakened, growing youth unemployment and neo-liberal 'market forces' entrenched in the Treasury Department, there was a strong pressure for accountability in education and a sense that the Thomas Report and the changes that had followed, had led to a breakdown in standards. With the Department of Education and the PPTA in broad agreement after appointment of Bill Renwick and Peter Boag in 1973, Openshaw (2004) argues that the leadership of the PPTA by the 1970s was influenced by 'younger, more radical, union orientated feminists and

¹¹ New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers Association, *Teachers in Change: report of the curriculum review group on the education and training of secondary teachers*, 34-35.

¹² O'Neill, 'Change and Constancy: Half a Century of Secondary Schooling in New Zealand', 53.

¹³ Department of Education, *Curriculum Review*, (Wellington: Department of Education, 1987), 10-11.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 12-15.

bi-culturalists'. These activists drew on 'neo-Marxist discourses' and saw the reforms of the 1940s as anti-democratic. They rejected 'enlightenment universalism' and argued for a 'new democratic localism' that promoted cultural relativism and ethnic particularism' and went beyond 'Māori and female knowledge' to advance 'bi-cultural and feminist platforms'. The cautious 'middle-course' reforms of Renwick (who was working with a socially conservative Minister 1978-84) frustrated both radicals and educational conservatives. In an unlikely alliance they united against 'provider capture' and called for increased parental choice, education vouchers, school charters and institutional accountability.¹⁵

The Shape of the Discipline in the 1980s

University and school history was closely linked in the 1970s and 80s. University historians wrote and oversaw school textbooks and the content of school courses was largely based on the research interests of historians. Political and constitutional history had dominated university programmes and this was reflected in the school history curriculum, with a focus on Europe and Britain. New Zealand history was only beginning to garner the interest of historians. Although all universities had undergraduate programmes on New Zealand history by the beginning of the 1980s, these were relatively recent. Auckland University had been the first to introduce an undergraduate New Zealand history paper in 1957¹⁶ but in other universities, specific New Zealand courses at this level did not become a major feature of undergraduate history programmes until the early 1970s.¹⁷

Students who aimed to be professional historians were encouraged to travel overseas to complete doctoral studies.¹⁸ It was unusual for professional historians in the 1980s to have taken their doctoral research in New Zealand universities and academics who were writing New Zealand history in the 1980s had typically completed their research in Britain, United States or Australia on non-New Zealand topics. Keith Sinclair was an exception to this trend. He took his PhD in the early 1950s from the University of New Zealand (although much of his research was in

¹⁵ Roger Openshaw, 'Preparing for Picot: Revisiting the "Neoliberal" Educational Reforms.' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 38, no. 2 (2003).

¹⁶ Sinclair, *Halfway round the harbour*, 171

¹⁷ See **University of Otago Calendars**: 1967, 74-75; 1968, 155-157; 1969, 157-160; 1970, 151-153; 1971, 163-164; 1972, 125-126; 1973, 151-153; 1974, 166-167; 1975, 169-170; 1976, 239-240; 1977, 241-242; 1978, 200-202; 1980, 192-193; 1981, 196-197; 1982, 195-196; 1983, 199-200; **University of Auckland Calendars**: 1967, 273-276; 1968, 183-186; 1969, 193-196; 1970, 201-204; 1971, 225-228; 1972, 235-239; 1973, 255-261; 1974, 209-213; 1975, 208-213; 1976, 180-184; 1977, 182-187; 1978, 191-195; 1979, 195-201; 1980, 199-205; 1981, 199-205; 1982, 192-199; 1983, 169-175.

¹⁸ Keith Sinclair, *Halfway Round the Harbour* (Auckland:Penguin, 1993), 173.

London) at a time when 'overseas degrees were the high road to success.'¹⁹ Twenty-five years later it was still unusual for doctoral students who intended an academic career in history to take their doctorates in New Zealand universities. Erik Olssen was the only historian on the NHCC who saw the inclusion of more New Zealand content in the curriculum as a priority, but after writing his MA on John A. Lee at Otago he went on to Duke University to do his PhD on progressivism in America. Peter Lineham completed his PhD at the University of Sussex on an aspect of English religious history. Although over the last 20 years he has researched and published prolifically on New Zealand history, Lineham (like most of his contemporaries who wrote New Zealand history) had not covered any New Zealand history in his undergraduate studies.²⁰

The British connection was an important factor in the shaping of the history syllabus. Several of the senior historians who played a major role on the committee had research interests that were based on early modern England. By the mid-1970s early modern England was the compulsory topic for UB and US at Form 7 and European political and imperial history dominated the UE 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. Professor Colin Davis (Massey) was an English historian who dominated the history committee and was a highly regarded early modernist who specialised in the English Civil War. Professor Michael Graves (Auckland) was an enthusiastic proponent of 16th century England, had trained at Cambridge under Geoffrey Elton and then taught secondary school students. Historian Robin Gwynn (Massey) was Form 7 subject convenor for history. Like Michael Graves, he had a secondary teaching background.

I had taught all ages before I went into the university. I was an early modernist which was important because of the Tudor-Stuarts being important. My training was in Cambridge and University College, London. My research was on the Huguenot refugees. I came to NZ in 1969 and continued my research here ... Like Colin Davis I was part of an international historical community. (R.Gwynn)

In essence, historians who specialised in English (and to a lesser degree European) history trained teachers in what was perceived to be the most valued knowledge base in the school curriculum. Many teachers in turn became enthusiastic proponents of various aspects of English or European history that they had studied

¹⁹ W.H Oliver, *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 2 (1987): 9-15.

²⁰ Lineham: Interview.

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 political history. Given the pressures for their students to achieve well in public examinations, and the public accountability of the senior school, senior teachers were reluctant to abandon this. As a secondary school inspector, Harvey McQueen observed history classes where:

Many teachers had been teaching Tudor Stuarts all their teaching life. This was their comfort zone. They did not want to move into new areas. There was a safety in the old syllabuses and they knew how to get high marks from their students.

The New Zealand academic history community in the 1970s was small by international standards with close links to the United Kingdom. It was a 'cosy club' where historians 'did not hold grudges'²¹ and there were few genuine historiographical debates. While there was little New Zealand history being taught at an undergraduate level until the 1970s, by the time the NHCC was meeting a considerable amount of research was being done at postgraduate level.²² The primary concerns were with the 19th century where historians were 'anchored between two paradigms'. The first saw 'colonisation of New Zealand as inevitable and if British benign', and adopted a 'self consciously provincial and even inferior' attitude to New Zealand in comparison to English 'culture and civilisation'. The second stressed the importance of the frontier in seeing New Zealand develop as 'an adventuresome and democratic society' that was 'the world's social laboratory'.²³ It would be a variety of the latter view that dominated academic history writing by the 1970s. Most New Zealand historians were sympathetic to the left and showed a special admiration for the Liberals, and their perceived successors, Labour. Except for the experience of Māori, historians saw New Zealand as a successful society, in that it had few of the social problems of the United Kingdom or other settler societies.²⁴

There was little emphasis on theory in the training of historians in these decades. Historians were not only reluctant to engage with theoretical perspectives but, except for feminist historians, most adopted a positivist approach to the past and few were willing

²¹ W.H. Oliver, 'A Destiny at Home', *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 2 (1987), 9-15.

²² For examples: See *New Zealand Journal of History* 19:2, pp 196-199, 20:2 202- 205; 21:2 298- 302

²³ Erik Olssen, 'Where to from Here? Reflections on the Twentieth-Century Historiography of Nineteenth-Century New Zealand.' *New Zealand Journal of History* (1992): 54-77.

²⁴ Keith Sinclair, 'Why Are Race Relations in New Zealand Better Than in South Africa, South Australia or South Dakota?' *New Zealand Journal of History* 6, no. 2 (1971): 121-127.

to accept that all history is to some extent theorised. This also applied to Marxist analysis. While New Zealand historiography at this time was often referred to as ‘the land of the long pink cloud’ with some notable exceptions²⁵ class analysis did not generally feature in New Zealand history, and there was no strong Marxist tradition in history writing.²⁶ The main thinker who informed historians about the nature of the discipline was E.H. Carr. His *What is History?* (1961) had become a standard undergraduate text for history students by the 1970s. Carr argued that historians make meaning out of the historical facts they choose and concluded ‘history is an unending dialogue between the present and the past’. Yet although he encouraged his readers to ‘study the historian before you study the facts’, few were aware of his life-long admiration of the Soviet Union, a nation he saw as ‘the embodiment of human progress.’²⁷

Transforming a Fragmenting Discipline

In transforming the discipline of history into a school subject, the NHCC faced the challenge that the parent discipline was fragmenting into a number of genres. There was no single orthodox narrative of the past that could be transferred to the classroom. By the 1980s a new generation of younger historians was challenging existing, orthodox views. Internationally the nature of academic history changed markedly in the second half of the 1970s, in particular with the advent of social history. Historians were asking very different questions about the past and looking to new methods to answer these. Reflecting the changing nature of the discipline in North America and the United Kingdom, New Zealand historians were interested in areas such as a critical reappraisal of Māori–Pākehā relations, gender history and social history. While the shift away from political history was in keeping with similar international trends in history writing, New Zealand history by the 1980s had its own unique ‘narrow spectrum of concerns’ that saw race and gender play a central role.²⁸ Emerging out of social history and the interest in ‘history from below’, feminist historians saw the opportunity to both restore women to the historical record, as well as to scrutinise the societal structures that had constrained women’s lives.

²⁵ Erik Olssen was a determined advocate of more New Zealand history and was researching in the area of social class. With Tom Brooking he had set up the Caversham Project which adopted an explicitly class-based approach to social history in Dunedin. For a sense of the heated debate that class based history generated among New Zealand historians see reviews of Richard Hill’s, *The Iron Hand in the Velvet Glove: the Modernisation of Policing in New Zealand, 1886-1917* (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1995). *History Now*, Vol. 2, no. 2 October 1996, 52-55 for review by Tom Brooking; Hill’s response (Vol. 3, no. 1 April 1997), 31-32; Brooking’s rejoinder (Vol. 3, no.2, July 1997, 36-37).

²⁶ For a discussion of class in New Zealand historiography see: Jim McAloon, ‘Class in Colonial New Zealand.’ *New Zealand Journal of History* 38, no. 1 (2004): 3-19.

²⁷ Evans, *In Defence of History*, 225-229; Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History*, 24-31 (Entry on E.H. Carr); John Lukas, *Remembered Pasts* (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2005) 132-139.

²⁸ Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, *Disputed Histories Imagining New Zealand’s Pasts*, 11-15.

The concern with gender in the 1980s was a new addition to history writing, but an interest in Māori and race relations had a much older pedigree and had been a '...key theme for historians ... since A.S. Thomson produced *The Story of New Zealand* in 1859'.²⁹ However, historians in the 1980s were more critical of New Zealand's race relations than their predecessors and their research was influenced by the international critiques of the impact of colonisation on indigenous peoples in Australia and North America. The new approach to race relations reflected contemporary tensions around Māori-Pākehā relations that had emerged over issues such as the Treaty of Waitangi, the alienation of Māori land, and the renaissance of Māori culture and language.

As well as gender and race, the issue of identity re-emerged as a strand of historical writing that had a major impact on school history. This was due to the influence of Keith Sinclair on New Zealand historiography. While Sinclair did not sit on the history committee, he was a powerful figure in the history community having set up and edited *The New Zealand Journal of History* between 1967 and 1986, and he had long played a role in history curriculum matters. He had close links with the Labour government and prominent figures in education policy, including W.L Renwick. Sinclair was arguing for a distinctive brand of Pākehā cultural nationalism and identity that defined itself by breaking away from Britain's 'apron strings'.³⁰ In his popular narrative history, *A History of New Zealand*,³¹ Sinclair's definition of identity emphasised the distinct aspects of New Zealand society, as opposed to Bill Oliver who was interested in emphasising the connections between Britain and New Zealand.³² Sinclair had also introduced the first New Zealand history course into undergraduate programmes at Auckland University and his views of cultural nationalism played an important role in shaping history teachers' attitudes to New Zealand history. Secondary teachers either trained at Canterbury or Auckland (the latter being the largest), and not only did Sinclair play a key role in the training of many history teachers, but his *History of New Zealand* was an engaging and accessible text in an age when there was little other material available on New Zealand.

As well as Sinclair, Michael King had, by the early 1980s, become important in developing ideas about identity in New Zealand history, especially in regards to the

²⁹ Ibid., 12-14.

³⁰ Sinclair's views on the growth of New Zealand identity were clearly expressed in *A Destiny Apart: New Zealand's Search for National Identity* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1986).

³¹ Keith Sinclair, *A History of New Zealand* (Harmondsmith: Penguin, 1959). At the time of writing, *A History of New Zealand* has been re-printed eight times (The most recent reprint being in 2000).

³² W.H. Oliver, *The Story of New Zealand* (London: Faber and Faber, 1960).

relationship between Māori and Pākehā. King's ideas were 'firmly in the cultural nationalist camp'³³ and his books were accessible and widely read. While King's views on identity did not enjoy widespread support among historians, his role in shaping teachers' (and students') perceptions of New Zealand's past was important. The 'national identity' narrative, as presented by King (building on the work of Sinclair), was relatively uncomplicated and transferring this to school history programmes posed few problems. His books were used by teachers, as given the practical constraints and pressures of classroom teaching, the primary factor in being able to successfully teach a topic was the accessibility of a core text rather than historiographical authenticity.

Sinclair's 'uncritical assertion' of the evolution of a national identity did not reflect the views of the majority of New Zealand historians (despite this being repackaged in Michael King's enormously popular history in 2003).³⁴ The interests of a new generation of historians were reflected in the theses and monographs being written during the 1970s (which focussed on gender, race and local history) and in the *Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981) which was the work of a range of authors. Written as an academic text and aimed at undergraduate history students (and far too difficult for most senior secondary school students to read), *The Oxford* did not attempt to 'present a personal vision of New Zealand's past' as Oliver and Sinclair had previously done. Rather, it reflected the historiographical era of the 1980s where there was no longer a consensus over the past. *The Oxford* drew on an enormous amount of research that had been undertaken by a younger generation of historians, who were moving into junior academic positions at this time and indicated that there was a substantial New Zealand historiography emerging. The 'basic character' of *The Oxford* was 'social history', and the 'development of Māori society and race relations figured prominently.'³⁵ It was also a text that focussed almost exclusively on New Zealand and indicated the direction of New Zealand historical writing over the subsequent decade.

There had been a strong comparative component to New Zealand history writing since the 1950s, but this largely disappeared during the 1980s. New Zealand history had previously been seen as part of the broader British Imperial or Commonwealth narratives. As such it generated an interest in comparative history. The first substantial debate in New Zealand historiography was sparked off by American

³³ See Caroline Daley, Review of Michael King's 'The Penguin History of New Zealand'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 38, no. 1 (2004): 77-70.

³⁴ Pollack, 'Cultural Colonization and Textual Biculturalism: James Belich and Michael King's General Histories of New Zealand, 18-27.

³⁵ Oliver, *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, vii-viii.

scholar Harrison Wright and his view that the ‘fatal impact’ of Europeans on indigenous peoples explained Māori conversion to Christianity. By the early 1980s the focus of historians was increasingly on New Zealand as a distinct entity. There was a shift in focus towards the exceptional aspects of New Zealand society and a reluctance to place New Zealand experiences into a wider context unless they showed New Zealand in a favourable light. For example, there was significant literature on the history of Social Welfare, which presented New Zealand as a world leader in implementing social security. In the 1980s the emphasis among historians and commentators who saw national identity as a priority was to focus on the distinctive character of New Zealand’s past. The narrative presented was also a ‘progressive tale ... from Polynesian homeland to colonial outpost to independent Pākehā-dominated nation-state’.³⁶

The inaugural NZHA national conference held at Victoria University, August 29-31 1981, provides a snapshot of the state of contemporary New Zealand history at the beginning of the decade. The programme included a symposium on ‘revisionist approaches’ to New Zealand history but also included presentations on the history of slavery in the Americas, Australian urban history, Tuvalu, French History, Mao’s leadership and comparative history.³⁷ While this inclusive approach to the discipline did not altogether disappear, the increasing focus of New Zealand historians during this decade was on New Zealand as a separate and cohesive entity. This was the central tenet of New Zealand historiography during the time the NHCC was deciding how to include New Zealand history. Ten years later the NZHA conference included few papers on international topics and focussed on race and gender with an exclusively New Zealand flavour. A further indication of the changing interests of New Zealand historians during the 1980s was *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* (1990) which, although focussing on New Zealand, adopted a more inclusive approach to official history and demonstrated a ‘fondness for eccentrics, deviants, mystics and the better sort of criminal’.³⁸

The insular focus of historians interested in New Zealand’s past at this time reflected both the breakdown of the consensus over the nature of the discipline (which was a feature of the wider fragmentation of the intellectual landscape) and the increasing

³⁶ Byrnes, ‘Rethinking national identity in New Zealand’s history’. The case for New Zealand being exceptional has been recently challenged by Miles Fairburn, ‘Is there a good case for New Zealand exceptionalism?’. In Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney (eds). *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand’s Pasts* (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006).

³⁷ New Zealand Historical Association Bulletin, Conference programme (1981). Bruce Taylor private papers.

³⁸ W.H., Oliver, ed. *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* Vol. One (Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1990), viii.

number of qualified historians emerging (which in turn saw more history being written and different questions being asked). Aside from NZHA, by the 1980s groups such as the Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society, the Early Modern Studies Association, the Women's Studies Association, the Federation of New Zealand Historical Societies, the Oral History Association and the New Zealand Society of Genealogists had all created their own distinct historical communities. Furthermore, non-professional historians were publishing prolifically at this time. Local history had long been popular among amateur historians and was flourishing in the 1980s, with a number of professional historians also showing an interest in regional approaches. While race and gender were emerging as popular among undergraduates and new researchers interested in New Zealand history, British and European political and constitutional history still featured in history programmes as well as areas such as decolonisation in Africa and Asia, American history and Pacific history.

There were notable absences in New Zealand's historiography in the 1980s. Except to castigate the missionaries for their cultural insensitivity and misdemeanours, academic historians largely ignored religion, although as in the case of local history, church history did generate a considerable amount of research by amateur historians. Despite the prominent place of agriculture in New Zealand, rural history was neglected and there was little scholarly work published on the experience of British immigrants to New Zealand³⁹ or on New Zealand's ethnic minorities.⁴⁰ Although it was enormously popular with the book-buying public, military history was also largely ignored within academia, reflecting the interest in the causes of wars, rather than the actual combat.⁴¹

The most striking characteristic of New Zealand history writing in the 1980s that set it apart from international historiographies was the paucity of historiographical debate. This feature was a key factor in the argument against including New Zealand history in the UB and US courses. The only arguably genuine debate by the 1980s was the question of 'fatal impact' that had seen John Owens and Judith Binney testing out Harrison Wright's thesis in a New Zealand setting.⁴² This debate had generated a number of research projects to test out this theory and made a

³⁹ The exception in this area was Rollo Arnold, *The farthest promised land: English villages, New Zealand immigrants of the 1870s* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1981).

⁴⁰ Colin Davis and Peter Lineham, (eds.) *The Future of the Past Themes in New Zealand History* (Palmerston North: Department of History, Massey University, 1990).

⁴¹ Deborah Montgomerie, 'Reconnaissance Twentieth-Century New Zealand War History at Century's Turn.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 37, no. 1 (2003): 62-79.

⁴² John Owens, 'Christianity and Māori to 1840.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 2, no. 1 (1968): 18-40; Judith Binney, 'Reply to Owens.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 3, no. 2 (1969).

⁴² Erik Olssen, 'Where to from Here? Reflections on the Twentieth-Century Historiography of Nineteenth-Century New Zealand.' 54-77.

significant contribution to understanding Māori–Pākehā contact, but there was little else. Miles Fairburn was working on his atomisation thesis and had written several important articles, but was as yet to publish *The Ideal Society and its Enemies*⁴³ that would spark off a major re-evaluation of New Zealand's social history in the 1990s. Popular history published in the 1980s did not generate the level of historiographical scrutiny that would be typical twenty years later as there were few historians researching in the same area. This was a reflection of how small the academic history community was. For example, James Belich's *The New Zealand Wars* and Jock Phillips' *A Man's Country* were major reinterpretations of New Zealand's past, yet they stood alone in that there was little else recently published in these areas. They were either uncritically accepted or rejected by an interested public but engendered little scholarly debate.⁴⁴

Secondary School History: A Subject 'in Crisis'?

The history teaching community saw their subject to be 'in crisis' in the 1980s and 'teachers of history were becoming a rare breed.'⁴⁵ The decline in student numbers and a growing interest in 'relevant' subjects with a commercial orientation saw history teachers and historians combine forces to justify the 'value' of history, and historians called on teachers to make history 'come alive'.⁴⁶ Ironically, while the numbers of students studying history at school (and universities) was falling, by the middle of the 1980s the demand for history from the wider community was growing. As noted above, the record numbers of the public who visited *Te Māori* in 1985 was a key factor in the Labour government setting up Te Papa o Tongarewa in the mid 1990s which focussed on New Zealand identity and was explicitly bicultural. The Army Museum at Waiouru opened in 1982 and attracted record numbers of visitors. Local history and genealogy flourished, as did nostalgia for old buildings, antiques and heritage sites.

In the 1980s, history was a declining school subject in an era where commercial subjects were increasingly being seen as the valued knowledge of the future. As an option subject, history competed with other options such as economics, accounting and business studies that to many students appeared to be more directly 'relevant'

⁴³ Miles Fairburn, *The Ideal Society and Its Enemies* (Auckland: Penguin, 1989). Fairburn's thesis of atomisation generated a major historiographical debate that saw a special issue of the *New Zealand Journal of History* 25 no. 1 (1991).

⁴⁴ James, Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* (Auckland: Penguin, 1986); Claudia Orange, *The Treaty of Waitangi* (Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1987); Jock Phillips, *A Man's Country? The Image of the Pākehā Male: A History*, (Auckland: Penguin, 1987).

⁴⁵ Stenson, *NZJH*, 1990:176-177; A. Low-Beer, 'The Eclipse of History in New Zealand Schools', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 21, no. 2 (1986): 113-22.

⁴⁶ M. Mayer, 'America between the Wars: The Seventh Form American Option Revised'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 19, no.1 (1987), 164.

to the contemporary commercial world. Although the neo-liberal reforms of the curriculum did not win acceptance among educational professionals (and remained generally unpopular among the PPTA and teachers),⁴⁷ economic imperatives were a powerful feature of the intellectual climate of the 1980s, and influenced attitudes in the history teaching community. The exclusive, academic and elitist orientation of senior school history resulted in many secondary students perceiving the subject irrelevant and too demanding, and they thus chose other options.

In reflecting the commercially driven climate of the 1980s, the strategy of the history teaching community was to position the subject as being 'relevant' to students entering the commercial world. Motivated primarily by what appears to be a sense of self-preservation, the NZHA and regional history subject associations re-branded history as a subject that prepared students for the commercial world. They were determined to 'sell history' as numbers were declining in both schools and universities. Peter Lineham remembers '...enrolments in history at university in the 1980s sank to the lowest point ever in relation to other subjects'.⁴⁸ Historians believed that fostering an interest in history in schools would flow through to address the decline in history numbers in the universities. The decline in numbers at school, the NZHA claimed, was 'of great concern' and 'alarming', especially as geography numbers were almost twice those of history, and increasing. New Zealand, it was claimed, ran the risk of '... becoming a nation of xenophobic and ignorant isolationists, ill-equipped to assess current developments in a long-term development'.⁴⁹

The solution to this problem, teachers argued, was to adopt a skills-based approach to history that would add another dimension to the subject. Analysis, information gathering and presentation were promoted as essential research skills that not only prepared students for academic studies, but also for the commercial world. The promotion of skills became an important feature of 'selling history' as an attractive senior option subject that was relevant as well as useful. John Rosanowski recalls:

... history was under siege. Numbers were falling. It was certainly a numbers game if you wanted to keep your job. The typical call was 'history doesn't get you a job.' I remember Geoff Rice trying to address this by making long lists of jobs that you could get as a historian.

To address this challenge teachers focussed on the skills aspect of the subject in an attempt to convince students history was a 'vocationally useful subject'. The focus on the essential skills for success in history (e.g. essay writing, analysis of sources,

⁴⁷ Alister Barry (Dir), *A Civilised Society* (Wellington, Vanguard Films, 2007).

⁴⁸ Lineham: interview.

⁴⁹ New Zealand History Association Bulletin: 1981.

research skills and the organisation and classification of information) had significant implications for the pedagogy of history teaching. It was a key feature in introducing an internally assessed research component into senior history.

History taught skills that were very useful in the market driven world. If history was to gain credibility then it had to show value in the commercial world and not just be seen as an academic liberal arts subject. (D.Wood)

The NZHA enthusiastically engaged with the contemporary commercial orientated social climate of the 1980s. In 1982 they procured an 'independent consultant' who compiled a 'fully integrated marketing strategy'. History teachers and historians, it appeared, had a 'good product' that was 'misunderstood by potential customers' and faced the challenge of 'consumer resistance'. As well as a marketing strategy, the NZHA was keen to make links with the commercial world and to this end commissioned a survey of employers in Christchurch and Palmerston North. The survey demonstrated that the business community was 'largely ignorant' about history in schools, and 'sceptical of its usefulness', but this 'unhappy situation' could be addressed, it was claimed, if history students promoted their 'marketable skills' to employers. The NZHA produced two booklets that aimed to encourage students to opt for history in the senior school and emphasised the vocational aspects of the subject.⁵⁰

The strategy of the NZHA and subject associations to build close links with the commercial world signalled a shift away from the liberal arts, academic orientation of history. By the 1980s the subject had high status within a general academic education but the commercial imperative that promoted the subject as teaching essential skills signalled a shift in the development of the subject. The ethos that history is a commercially useful and viable subject that taught essential skills and had much to offer the business community, became something of a mantra among the history teaching community during the 1980s. While undoubtedly history did teach important skills of 'relevance' to the commercial world (especially those that were useful in preparing students to think about and process information), these skills were not unique to the subject. Furthermore, the re-branding of history as a subject that taught the essential skills for commercial success was a marked departure from the view of history as either an academic subject (that was a preparation for university) or as a subject that played a role in teaching about citizenship by providing an historical perspective on contemporary events.

⁵⁰ New Zealand History Association Bulletin (1983). The booklets *Looking back to look Forward* (1981) and *History and the Job Market* (1983) were both published by Auckland University History Department and widely distributed to secondary school history departments.

Historians and the Secondary School History Curriculum

In the early 1980s history teachers and historians enjoyed a symbiotic relationship and historians were keen to contribute to maintaining the academic position of the subject in secondary schools. Canterbury University established *History News* in 1960, specifically aimed at ensuring history teachers stayed abreast of changes in the discipline. Published twice a year, and drawing on the expertise of teachers and historians, *History News* was important in regularly updating teachers on recent developments. Although much of the content taught in schools reflected the interests of particular historians, teachers in turn felt a strong affinity to those areas of history in which they had been trained. For example, there was a strong attachment to the Crusades by those teachers trained at Canterbury and to either the early modern English nation-state or to New Zealand by those who trained at Auckland. Greg Taylor observed:

What was taught reflected who had come out of the various universities. If you had gone Christchurch you would have studied the crusades. If you had come out of Auckland you would have taught the Tudor and Stuarts. And if you had had Keith Sinclair you would have taught New Zealand. I remember when the committee was sitting a number of people wrote in complaining about dropping the crusades topic. There were more letters in about the crusades than actually sat it in that particular year! (G.Taylor)

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 with Keith Sorrenson, Russell Stone, Keith Sinclair, Michael Bassett and Bill Oliver all writing on their areas of expertise.⁵¹ John H. Jensen (Professor of History at Waikato) edited the UE textbooks that were written to focus on 19th century and early 20th century European constitutional history.⁵² For UB and US, teachers relied extensively on British text-books to teach the compulsory English topic until 1984 when Michael Graves and Robin Silcock published a textbook specifically for New Zealand students.⁵³ Historians also were prominent in writing and advising for public history forums, such as the popular magazine *New Zealand's Heritage* that was used widely in schools.⁵⁴ Most shared the view that what interested them was of interest to secondary students. This reflected the

⁵¹ M.P.K Sorrenson, *Māori and European since 1870*; E.C.J Stone, *Economic Development 1870-1890*; Keith Sinclair, *The Liberal Government 1891-1912*; R.M. Chapman and E.P. Malone *New Zealand in the twenties*; M.E.R. Bassett, *The Depression of the Thirties*; W.H. Oliver *Further Steps Towards a Welfare State since 1935*. New Zealand History Topic Books, Heinemann, Auckland, published between 1967 and 1971.

⁵² John H. Jensen (ed), *Forces of Change Vol.1; The Balance of Power (Vol.2); The Bigger Battalions (Vol.3); In Africa and India (Vol.4); Society Under Siege (Vol. 5)*. Reed Education (1969-72).

⁵³ See Chapter 11 for discussion of the impact of Michael Graves and Robin Silcock's UB/US textbook.

⁵⁴ Ray Knox (ed), *New Zealand's Heritage*. Volumes I-V (Paul Hamlyn: Wellington, 1972).

university departments' approach of academics designing their own teaching programmes that (aside from broad survey undergraduate courses) were based on their research interests. While this approach had merit in a university setting, most teachers were generalists and only a minority of secondary students went on to university in the 1980s (and of those that did, few chose to study history).

Historians showed little interest in pedagogy. The transmission-style lecture as a model of content delivery (combined with tutorials and seminars) may have been suitable for very able students, but was unlikely to engage the growing number of less academically inclined students who were studying in the senior school by the 1980s. The role of textbooks and resources was also not well understood by all historians. The primary focus of classroom history programmes was teaching and learning, and teachers needed accessible resources that could engage students. Despite his intense interest in reshaping the curriculum, Erik Olssen encapsulated the lack of understanding that historians had of the practical requirements of classroom teachers:

.... I was an academic. I didn't like textbooks with all the answers. I would give my students reading lists. I compromised in the end but I was not familiar with, nor did I understand, the nature of school textbooks. This was one of my learning curves...⁵⁵

In light of the lack of knowledge most historians had about the practicalities of classroom teaching, those historians who did understand teachers' needs had a significant advantage in ensuring the knowledge they valued was included. Russell Stone as an ex-secondary school teacher and teacher educator had a firm grasp of teachers' requirements and consequently played an important role in making practical decisions about the curriculum. British academics were also more familiar with the need to produce accessible resources as several (Michael Graves, Robin Gwynn, Colin Davis) had experience as, or had worked closely with, secondary school teachers. This gave them an advantage in promoting their specific areas of knowledge among the secondary teaching community, as they could access highly engaging material from the United Kingdom as well as understand the practical requirements of classroom teachers. As will be explored in Chapter 11, this was a factor in why 16th and 17th century England has remained such a popular topic in the UB and US programmes for over 30 years.

In the hierarchy of senior subject disciplines academic historians saw themselves as placed higher than teachers, as they were 'experts'. This had the potential to cause

⁵⁵ Olssen: interview.

major tensions as David Wood observed when he took over facilitating the committee in 1984:

... this was one of the strongest 'top heavy' committees that was ever set by the Department ... it was unusual to have so many university people involved in this sort of committee and my fear was the teachers would be subservient. The Department policy was that it should be teachers that determined curriculum and I had to ensure that the university people did not control the teachers but this was not easy.⁵⁶

Peter Lineham, who joined the committee in 1984, was very aware of this tension at the first meeting:

It was clear to me how the conversations were controlled by university historians. The teachers didn't respect the way they were treated by the university historians. If you look at the people involved these were strong people within the university setting. The Auckland historians were living in their own city and meetings were arranged to suit them. It was (and always has been) the biggest department.⁵⁷

Although teachers on the committee did not always engage enthusiastically in the debates and appeared to be 'out-of-their-depth,' those teachers interviewed recalled that their reluctance to participate in these debates did not indicate a sense of inferiority. Rather, they remembered this dynamic as reflecting impatience with the abstract nature of academic conversations that for practitioners seemed to be of little practical relevance. John Rosanowski remembers: 'The university guys were the best historians although they were not the greatest teachers. I thought I was every bit as good at my job as they were at theirs'. Marcia Stenson put it this way:

... I was used to a school and doing six things at once. I wanted to move through and 'get on with it'. I found it very frustrating we seemed to go round in circles and I would sit there thinking this is a waste of time. There were quite a few times when I switched off and came in later.

Despite the tensions noted above the participants on the NHCC largely shared a view of the purpose and nature of history curriculum matters. The high degree of consensus reflected that the committee did not include historians or scholars, who may have challenged the prevailing view the NHCC had of history education. For example, scholars such as Ranginui Walker, Pat Hohepa, Tony Simpson, Dick Scott, Jock Phillips, James Belich and Miles Fairburn were not invited to participate. Russell Stone insightfully observed the lack of tension reflected the fact that the academics involved were already sympathetic to secondary school history and that the 'true attitude of university was not reflected on the committee'.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ See Chapter 3 footnote 64 above for more on this issue.

⁵⁷ Lineham: interview.

⁵⁸ Stone: interview.

CHAPTER 6

‘As much about pedagogy as about content’

Teaching and Learning History

No one likes the way history is taught. Conservatives think it is too multicultural and multiculturalists think it is too conservative. Politicians say it doesn't promote patriotism, and social reformers say it doesn't promote critical reflection. Advocates of social studies fret that history receives too much emphasis, and history specialists fret it doesn't receive enough. Lawmakers argue schools should teach to the test, and schools argue they should teach the way they think best. Researchers criticize teachers for not using primary sources, teachers criticize students for not wanting to learn, students criticise textbooks for being deadly boring. What a mess!¹

Keith C. Barton, Linda S. Levstik

Introduction

The debates over the history curriculum in New Zealand and overseas were as much about pedagogy as they were about content, and it was history teachers rather than historians on the NHCC who drove the initiatives over assessment and pedagogy. In the transformation of the discipline of history into a senior school subject, there was a shifting dynamic between the authority of academics (who dominated the debates over content knowledge) and history educators (who were acknowledged as experts in assessment and pedagogy). While the senior history prescriptions largely retained the privileged positions of existing areas of historical content, in a major departure from the continuity of the previous curriculum, liberals substantially reshaped the orientation of the examination papers and introduced a compulsory research-based internal assessment component at all levels.

Teaching and Learning History

The last thirty years has seen a significant body of research on students' ideas about history² but the literature on the distinctions between disciplines and senior school subjects is comparatively thin. Shulman argues parent academic disciplines provide the 'knowledge, understandings, skills and disposition' for what is taught in secondary schools and thus the senior history curriculum is derived from the parent

¹ Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 2004), 1.

² Keith C. Barton, 'Students' ideas about history'. In L. S. Levstik and C. A. Tyson (eds.), *Handbook of research on social studies*, (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), in press (Draft text in author's possession, 2008).

discipline.³ School subjects are 'construed as providing a frame of reference for defining and delineating what classroom teachers need to know about the subject matter they are going to teach.' In this model, teachers transform previously learned subject matter of the discipline into suitable subject matter for the classroom. While the academic discipline differs from the school subject, it is 'the teacher's orientation to, and understanding of, the intellectual discipline that is the foundation for the transformation'. The process of transformation is continuous⁴ and the school subject is a derivative of the discipline with the only difference being the level of difficulty. The assumption here is that school history deals with the same facts, concepts and principles that drive the parent discipline, albeit at a simpler level.

Those who see school subjects as different from academic disciplines reject the 'subject-precedes-discipline' model. Nodding and Martin argue school subjects are organised around 'centres of care rather than the configuration of academic disciplines'. They largely ignore the contribution of disciplines to school subjects and argue the development of school subjects is 'discontinuous' from the academic world. Rather, the primary aim of school subjects is that of 'preparation for life'. As such students are introduced to a wide range of human activities (such as artistic appreciation, child-rearing, family living and community action) many of 'which are over and above the activities of academic disciplines'.⁵

Dewey saw the 'logical-psychological distinction' in which the 'academic discipline (study as a logical whole) and the school subject (study as a psychological whole) as dialectically related:

... the academic discipline is developed with a primary reference to the end-product of academic inquiry, the school subject is formulated in a way that takes into account the immature learner... [and] provides the avenue for getting to know the academic discipline [and] necessarily precedes the academic discipline.⁶

Dewey argued the school subject involves distinct psychological, epistemological, logical and social issues. Linked to the psychological dimension of a school subject is the epistemological aspect of the discipline, the establishing of how knowledge 'comes to reach its present abstract and refined form'. It is the psychological and epistemological aspects combined with the logical aspect of the parent discipline that constitutes 'the basis for the selection and the formulation of the subject matter

³ Lee Shulman, 'Those Who Understand; Knowledge and Growth in Teaching.' *Education Researcher* 15, no. 2 (1986): 4-14.

⁴ Deng, 'Knowing the Subject Matter of a Secondary-School Science Subject' 505-508.

⁵ Nel Nodding and Jane Martin cited in: Deng, *ibid*, 509-510.

⁶ Dewey cited in: Deng, *ibid*, 511.

of a school subject'. The way this knowledge is organised in the school curriculum is social in nature, as it is driven by the need to reflect the needs of contemporary society.

The academic discipline and the school subject are related in a dialectical fashion. The former supplies the guidance and direction for the latter and reveals the possibilities of growth inherent in the experience of the learners. The latter is considered the means of leading the learner towards the realization of those possibilities.⁷

By the 1970s historians and psychologists were exploring the concept of historical thinking in school history that at this time was largely constrained by Piaget's stage model of cognitive development.⁸ Piagetian theory in regards to history had been challenged by Jerome Bruner in 1960, who argued students should study the structure of the subject in order to learn the mode of inquiry of the specialist.⁹ Schwab went on to argue students could engage with the substantive features of a discipline once they understood its structure.¹⁰ Bruner's approach to the teaching of history had a major impact on the history curriculum in the United Kingdom and later New Zealand.

By the early 1980s senior school history was an academic, evidence-based option subject linked to a longstanding university discipline, and examination prescriptions determined the shape of history programmes. This reflected the platonic approach to education that saw the purpose of education as giving students a 'privileged, rational view of reality' that came from the 'disciplined study of increasingly abstract forms of knowledge'.¹¹ Because it dealt with abstract knowledge, history had similar status in the hierarchy of stratified school knowledge as mathematics, physics, or chemistry but this had not always been the case. Initially school history had struggled in a classics dominated curriculum being perceived as a 'callow intruder' as it was only taught in primary schools and had tenuous links with university history. However, by the 1970s the status of history had increased.¹² It was now taught by university trained history teachers, had credibility as an academic school subject and met the criteria of Layton's final stage of subject development:

⁷ Ibid., 513

⁸ Sam Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 28-60.

⁹ Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press, 1960).

¹⁰ J. Schwab, 'The Structure of the Disciplines: Meaning and Significance.' In *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum*, edited by G. Ford and L. Purgo. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964).

¹¹ Kieran Egan, *The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape Our Understanding* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997) 13.

¹² R. Shuker, 'Cleo in the Curriculum: The Place of History as a Secondary School Subject,' 1992.

.... The teachers now constitute a professional body with established rules and values. The selection of subject matter is determined in large measure by the judgments and practices of specialist scholars who lead inquiries in the field. Students are initiated into a tradition ...¹³

These 'established rules and values' rested on the shared view of both historians and history educators that the subject was an evidence-based discipline and an important component of an academic education. As such it had higher status and was distinct from non-examination subjects such as social studies and vocational subjects. In the hierarchy of school subjects, history's status came in part from the high level of literacy and analytical insight that was required by students. Textbooks were written by (or in consultation with) university historians and had an advanced reading level that seldom featured illustrations or visual aids to assist understanding. To achieve success in history, students required a sophisticated grasp of both written presentation skills (especially essay writing) and information gathering (in particular note-taking). With this subject profile, history was strongest in affluent academic schools and embedded into an exclusive academic knowledge base that 'reproduced a stratified class-based society.'¹⁴ The history teaching community derived high status from the academic demands of the subject and history teachers were consequently cautious of any initiatives that were seen to threaten the academic status of the subject.

The Changing Face of History Education

The 'cognitive revolution' in education saw dramatic changes to history teaching in the international arena¹⁵ although few history teachers in New Zealand in the 1970s were familiar with these. The New Zealand history curriculum at this time drew on the United Kingdom for its theoretical basis and this in turn was largely based on the framework of Piaget's stage development model. In regards to history this model was informed by the research of Roy N. Hallam who concluded that 'history should not be too abstract in form, nor should it contain too many variables'. History in the United Kingdom was taught as a discrete and compulsory subject at all levels of the core curriculum and consequently historians were more closely involved than their New Zealand counterparts with teaching and learning history. However, not all history educators were convinced that the Piagetian stage model could be successfully applied to history and a number of practically-based research studies challenged this view.¹⁶

¹³ Layton cited in: Goodson, *School Subjects and Curriculum Change*, 10.

¹⁴ M.D. Young cited: *Carpenter Theory and Practice for Educators*, 115.

¹⁵ Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*, 5-9.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 37-40.

The most influential initiative that challenged Piaget's model and influenced history education in New Zealand was the Schools Council History Project 13-16 (SCHP). It generated a major shift in the teaching and learning of history in the United Kingdom. The SCHP was influenced by Bruner's spiral curriculum model that argued that each discipline had an inherent logical structure and if students could understand the structure of the discipline, then learning would be meaningful. Bruner's argument that a discipline could be simplified for young people to focus on the syntactic knowledge of history, was a significant shift from Piaget's stage model. It complemented Vygotsky's notion of knowledge being socially constructed and also drew on Paul Hirst's theory that although educators needed to be cautious of placing too much emphasis on a subject's methodology, academic disciplines were forms of knowing with distinctive concepts, vocabulary, methods of inquiry and ways of establishing truth claims. As well as rejecting the stage model, these ideas signalled a shift away from the traditional, narrative based approach that characterised history education in the 1960s. It had major implications for assessment and pedagogy in the subject. The SCHP eschewed the chronological approach to history. Students were to be exposed to the problems of historical reasoning based on evidence by setting up intensive research inquiries into topics that were highly relevant to students' lives.¹⁷ This approach that stood apart from the narrative-based 'best-story' model that dominated history teaching in the United States.¹⁸

School Certificate

The Department of Education was aware of the shifts in thinking about history education in the United Kingdom and the 1975 revised SC history prescription owed much to the approaches of the SCHP. In the new prescription students were required to 'develop an understanding of historical inquiry and interpretation' and rather than a 'comprehensive survey of 20th century history.... they were to think and work like historians'. Furthermore students were to 'interpret historical resources', 'classify, contrast and compare', 'recognize varying points of view', 'distinguish between primary and secondary sources' and 'present an argument ... supported by relevant examples'. This was a significant shift away from an emphasis on essay writing, to the interpretation and analysis of historical evidence. It had significant implications for teaching history in the classroom. The accurate interpretation and analysis of photographs, cartoons, documents and other primary sources in

¹⁷ Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 17-20, 35-5, 91-92.

¹⁸ Barton and Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good*, 191-202, 246-247.

examinations required history teachers to adopt activity-based and student-centred approaches in their teaching that placed more emphasis on discussion than had previously been the case.¹⁹

The Department of Education saw SC as both an 'exit examination' for those students who did not intend to go on to university as well as a benchmark for entry to Form 6/Year 12. However, in light of the increasing numbers of students staying on into the senior school, SC was seen by teachers, students and parents as the first stage in a three- year academic programme. This was a key factor in Department initiatives to establish integrated Form 5-7 syllabi (including history) in the 1980s, as the division between SC and the more academic orientation of the UE at Year 12 was becoming artificial. History at SC, however, was very different in orientation than the UE, UB and US programmes as it was linked with citizenship education. Reflecting this ethos, the 1975 revision of SC focussed on the 20th century and did not include terminal dates for the New Zealand topics (so that teachers could include current issues in their courses).

The revised SC prescription signalled a marked change in direction and did not meet with universal approval by teachers. The new prescription, it was claimed, appeared to adopt a presentist approach to teaching history that had more in common with social studies than a senior academic subject. History teachers saw their subject as linked to the parent discipline rather than social studies and were not enthusiastic about addressing contemporary controversial concerns. David Eddy, chair of the Christchurch History Teachers Association, encapsulated these views when he complained on behalf of his organisation that:

... every year we are obliged to teach an ever increasing amount of content on the New Zealand topics, cramming more and more into an already over-loaded syllabus ... this trend disturbs us and places an over-reliance on present day 'history' which we are not prepared to teach in any depth.²⁰

In the early 1980s the Department was acutely aware of the potential problem the lack of terminal dates posed given the turmoil of the 1981 Springbok Tour and in 1982 a terminal date of 1975 was introduced for all New Zealand topics,²¹ a move that was supported by 80% of history teachers.²² Teachers were not only reluctant

¹⁹ National Archives: School Certificate History Prescription; Examinations: School Certificate. Subject: History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 Part 1, 1964-72. (Preamble).

²⁰ National Archives: Correspondence: D. Eddy (Chairman, Christchurch History Teachers Association) to P.W. Boag (Chairman, School Certificate Examination Board), 3rd May 1979. Examination: School Certificate Revision Sub-committee. 25/3/77-25/3/80.

²¹ *Education Gazette*, 1 July 1981.

²² National Archives: Examinations School Certificate Revision History sub-committee. File 20/5/18. 25/3/77 – 25/3/80.

to engage with contemporary issues but also concerned with the enormous amount of content they were required to teach. Cynthia Shaw remembers that in the early 1970s teachers 'covered a topic like Hitler's Germany in ten days'.²³ Teachers were adamant the topics should be reduced in length and this was in line with the SCHP research. The NHCC was determined that the broad survey narrative orientated approaches be replaced with more in-depth studies.²⁴

The Teaching of Skills

While SC incorporated major changes that reflected the thinking of Hirst, Schwab, Shulman and Bruner by the 1970s, this was not the case in regards to the UE, UB and US prescriptions. These were driven by summative essays and were closely aligned with university models of assessment. The approaches modeled in the SCHP were seen by historians as of little relevance and inappropriate to senior academic history courses. The UEB ignored pressure from liberal history educators to accommodate the changing nature of the senior school cohort and to break down what they saw as the artificial divisions between subjects.

The debate over skills versus content altered the dynamic of the debates and discussion on the NHCC. Teachers were not only confident that they understood what was needed in the classroom but also believed that academics had little to offer in this regard. Teachers acknowledged historians' expertise in the area of content but some saw the academics as intellectually self-indulgent and having little understanding of the 'real world' of the classroom. David Wood remembers that there was division between the historians who saw content as being the priority and teachers who saw skills as being an essential feature of history education.

Universities did not want a loose system. Teachers wanted more emphasis on skills – getting kids to do their own research. ... They could see kids were getting excited about this.... My approach was it doesn't have to be either/or (content versus skills) but it can be both. You just have to get the right balance.

Not all teachers shared an enthusiasm for the increasing emphasis on skills in the history curriculum. For some the shift away from the broad richness of narrative history was seen as reducing the subject to a fragmented series of tasks. David Collier, an experienced history teacher, saw the emphasis on skills as 'disturbing',

²³ Shaw: interview.

²⁴ For example at Year 11 the topic on *Ireland* in the 1966 SC syllabus was one of 18 topics studied and covered over 80 years (1868-1949). By 1988 the prescription only required 6 topics to be taught and in this case only the 11-year period of Ireland 1909-1922 was studied. For UB/ US in 1966 the compulsory topic on English history ran for 212 years (from 1603-1815) and this was reduced in the 1989 prescriptions to a 109-year period (1558-1667).

having 'little to do with the art and practice of history' and called for history teachers to 'teach the discipline and ideas of their subject'.²⁵ The emphasis on skills also did not meet with approval by educationists such as L.E. Massey (Acting Principal Lecturer, Auckland Secondary Teachers' College), who was disappointed that the focus on information gathering, information processing and presentation missed what he saw as the most important feature of history teaching, the exploration of values.²⁶ Professor A.H. McNaughton of Auckland University went further when he pointed out that the emphasis on skills had the potential to 'distort the reality of a person's thinking about a particular topic'.²⁷

Assessment

Despite the misgivings of some academics, the final 1988/89 prescriptions radically altered assessment in history and this had implications for teaching and learning. Teachers were expected to employ a 'wide range of methods ... to cater for different stages of a student's development'. The differences were the most marked at UE, UB and US, whereas for SC they were simply a continuation of the developments that had emerged in the previous decade. The changes reflected the calls for a more liberal and inclusive model of secondary education that emerged in official circles when Phil Amos (1972-75) became Minister of Education and appointed Bill Renwick as Director-General of the Department of Education. Contemporary educators such as Garfield Johnson in the Johnson Report (1978) called for a radical shift in thinking about education.²⁸ The increasingly radical leadership of the PPTA also argued for fundamental changes to the nature of secondary schooling.²⁹

The Department outlined its views of how they wanted history education to change in the *H-Documents* guidelines that were distributed in 1988-89. There was no longer an emphasis on the 'end product'. Rather, the key skills of information gathering, processing and presentation were central to all three levels of senior history. Teachers were expected to 'employ a wide range of learning activities in a balanced programme' that placed an emphasis on interpretation and analysis of cartoons, speeches, photographs, graphs, maps and films. In the writing of essays,

²⁵ David Collier, Auckland History Teacher's Association Newsletter, February 1988 (Nicholas Tarling, private papers).

²⁶ National Archives: Correspondence L.E. Massey (Acting Principal Lecturer, Secondary Teachers College Auckland) to David Wood (Department of Education), 28th May 1985. Nicholas Tarling, private papers - copy in author's possession.

²⁷ National Archives: Correspondence Professor A.H. McNaughton (Auckland University) to David Wood (Department of Education) 29th April, 1985. Nicholas Tarling, private papers.

²⁸ Bowler and Openshaw, 'Not Understood: The Bicultural Dimension of the Report of the New Zealand Committee on Health and Social Education, Growing, Sharing, Learning (1977)', 45-67.

²⁹ Roger Openshaw, 'Preparing for Picot: Revisiting the "Neoliberal"', 137-142.

teachers were required to follow clear criteria (that was shared with students before the assessment) that 'identified their strengths and weaknesses and thus enabled them to improve their performance in the future.'³⁰ This was a substantive shift. The teachers who drove these changes understood that at the senior level it was the prescriptions that drove teaching programmes and the only effective way to effect real change was to reduce teacher autonomy and embed these initiatives into the curriculum. Greg Taylor who was the inspector of history in Auckland, remembers:

The only way to change that was to change the curriculum. To get away from note taking, just turning the page of the textbook and copying things out. We needed to provide other activities. We could still have academic rigour but students could discuss things. There wasn't a lot of discussion in those days in history classes The process of using pictures and cartoon analysis was underway by the 1980s ... It became clear to me that the only way to change things was to change the exams. The exams were the drivers back then.³¹

Special Studies

The major shift in teaching and learning history in the 1980s was the introduction of an internal assessment component to all three levels based on historical research. This was known as 'special studies' and was promoted by history teachers as a strategy to engage student interest, as well as reflect the growing interest in local history. It provided an opportunity for students to study any topic that was of interest to them using methodologies such as oral history, and required a shift to 'student-centred rather than teacher-centred learning'.³² It was not unique to history. Many educators were becoming increasingly uncomfortable with the solely summative examination model that only measured a narrow range of students' abilities. Geography and French both included an internally assessed component in the revision of the syllabus.³³ Although 'special studies' had significant workload implications it encountered little opposition from teachers, as it was seen to have a practical benefit. Myra Kunowski recalls:

Special Studies didn't come from the university people, it came from the teachers. This was a way to measure historical skills. The teachers pushed it and schools were very enthusiastic. Schools didn't see a problem with workload. There was more work on interpreting sources which teachers liked.

The introduction of special studies was driven by Peter Whitelock, Bruce Cathro, Bill Rushbrook and John Rosanowski. Initially their primary aim was to introduce a local studies aspect of the history programme at all three levels, as well as to offer

³⁰ Department of Education, *Assessment, Forms 5-7 History Resource* (Wellington: Department of Education, 1987).

³¹ Taylor: interview.

³² Bill Rushbrook, 'Oral History for High School History Courses', *Historical News*, May 1991.

³³ National Archives: Report of the Meeting of the Board's Sub-Committee on History 22-24 April 1986. School Certificate Examination Board 6/14/71: part 3.

opportunities to grapple with different interpretations of the past. The emphasis on local history reflected a wider public interest in heritage and identity, as evidenced in the growth of museums, the preservation of heritage sites, the membership of organisations such as the Historic Places Trust and a nostalgia for the buildings of the past. Bill Rushbrook, who had toured the United States in 1986 to look at proposals for studying local and oral history on a New Zealand-United States Educational Foundation grant, was an enthusiastic proponent of what was called 'hands-on history' or activity-based learning. He noted the growing momentum among teachers for this approach during the 1980s.³⁴ The focus on local history was especially strong in the South Island and although some historians such as Jim Gardner, Laurie Barber, David Hamer and Erik Olssen engaged with local history, it was predominantly the concern of non-professional historians. The call for a local history study to be part of the SC prescription had emerged as a recommendation at a history Teacher Refresher course in January 1977 and teachers were enthusiastic. Signalling a shift away from summative examinations the course suggested students could either be assessed on a local study during the formal examination or submit a folder of work which would be internally assessed.³⁵ John Rosanowski recalls:

I was involved in getting teachers to set up their own special studies – local studies. Kids loved this sort of approach. It was making things relevant to students. You had to sell your subject. History was always being reviewed. Many of the kids would say the documentary doesn't agree with the book and ask how do we know the book is right? I had introduced this thing called special studies around the South Island. I was the advisor. I would say things like 'why don't you introduce your own syllabus?'

Historians were ambivalent about special studies and especially uncomfortable with this approach at Year 13. Russell Stone questioned the assumption that all history teachers would be able to make valid professional judgments when it came to marking research studies at this level. Stone (who was himself a prolific provincial historian of Auckland) pointed out that it was no coincidence that special studies was driven by South Island teachers, as the issues in local history research were far less contested than in the North Island.

Special Studies was especially strong in South Island but you had to consider what primary sources are available. Otago is well served by sound secondary work. In the North Island this is not the case. This was why the South Island local studies were more straightforward. In the South Island

³⁴ Auckland History Teachers Association Newsletter, July 1987.

³⁵ National Archives: Examinations: School Certificate Revision sub-committee, File 20/5/18. 25/3/77-25.3/80.

there is a much more celebratory attitude to history (remembering our colonial forebears).³⁶

However, the criticism of historians was by and large intuitive, for as academics they generally showed little interest in these matters (except to ensure that students intending to enter university had reached an appropriate standard). For most historians school history programmes were of little value to universities except to generate enthusiasm for the subject.

...the general feeling was that there is nothing that students bring of benefit from their school history programmes. The teaching in university began from scratch. (P. Lineham)

The consistent opposition to an internally assessed research component came from the Auckland historians. Erik Olssen, who wrote local history and along with Tom Brooking had set up the Caversham Project to study the development of social class in a Dunedin suburb, eventually became a supporter. The Massey historians, who had close links with classroom teachers through their extramural programmes, were also more positive. They recognised this approach had the potential to engender interest not only in schools, but also among students enrolling in university history courses. Peter Lineham remembers:

Historians saw this as fostering an enthusiasm for the subject. There was some concern but there was also a sense that students should be building up skills and methodologies. There was a degree of excitement about special studies and the Massey position was very much in favour.

Eventually it was the enthusiasm of the teachers for special studies that won historians over and ensured that this approach was embedded into the curriculum. This was in part because the advocates of special studies (Bill Rushbrook, Bruce Cathro and John Rosonowski) formed networks with other history educators. In particular they formed an informal alliance with the women's lobby. Cynthia Shaw was won over by the opportunity to teach social history and the fact that it gave 'students a chance to practise the art of doing real history' as well as being 'more than simply passive learning'.³⁷ Also the ethos of consensus in decision-making on the NHCC, worked in the favour of enthusiasts who had sufficient social and intellectual capital to advance their cause. Marcia Stenson remembers:

Decisions were made by voting. And we achieved a consensus after more voting. It was a negotiated consensus. I worked out that if I supported people who wanted the local history (which I thought was a bit of a side-issue), then they would support me in what I wanted. Local history and research did present problems as we had large numbers of students so we ran into the

³⁶ Stone: interview.

³⁷ Shaw: interview.

issue of finding resources. Workload is always a problem with the introduction of anything new, but the counter argument was the enthusiasm of students for this approach, and this was what it was all about – getting students doing history. I was eventually convinced and it was also another way of ensuring we did some New Zealand history.

Teachers were also aware of the practical implications of special studies and how if this innovation was to be accepted by their colleagues then a corresponding reduction in workload was required including a reduction from a three-hour to a two-hour exam, a reduction in content, and the provision of professional development.³⁸

Special studies could be comfortably accommodated in SC as this course had been dramatically altered in the 1970s. The Department of Education presented this initiative within the context of a 'shorter exam', with 'reduced content' and the 'time to develop skills'. The influence of the SChP was evident in the shaping of special studies with an emphasis on 'pupil-centred historical activities' and 'investigation exercises that were problem based'. This approach, it was suggested, would make history more appealing to students and parents.³⁹ At Year 12, special studies could be accommodated as 6FC was fully internally assessed and was the principal qualification at this level after 1986. This opened up an enormous number of possibilities at this level.

The great thing here was that it was internally assessed. Teachers could teach what they were interested in. This was the way history had been taught in England up to the 1950s. If the skills and arguments for studying history are valid what did it matter what you studied? This thinking carried through to the 6th form. Resources weren't an issue as if it's up to the teachers then they can decide. (D. Gledhill)

While Special Studies was a radical shift for history teachers at all levels, the academic status of the examination was unchanged. The issue of comparability between schools emerged early in the debate and this was of concern to both teachers and historians. All shared a determination to preserve the academic credibility of the subject and the shared assumption was that this should be based on a final examination. This issue was eventually addressed by determining a student's final mark by linking all internal assessment results at SC and UB to the school external norm-referenced examination. The grades in the fully internally assessed 6FC were determined by the previous year's SC marks, and teachers were instructed that the 'purpose of assessment was to rank students accurately' and the marking grid 'should add up to a high total so that the marks of students be

³⁸ National Archives: NHCC Report from Special Studies Working Party, March 1985, School Certificate Examination Board File 6/14/71, Part 2.

³⁹ Department of Education, *The Curriculum Review: Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools*, 1987.

spread'.⁴⁰ Thus although the intention of internal assessment had been to provide a shift away from summative examinations driving teaching programmes, in reality the external examination continued to determine the final mark, so that in the eyes of the history teaching community 'academic credibility' was retained.

Conclusion

In the process of curriculum development the success or otherwise of initiatives depends on the ascribed status of particular individuals and/or groups. In the case of teaching and learning history it was educators who played the major role in driving pedagogical and assessment change. While history teachers looked to historians to provide the direction for content, initiatives over the examination and research-based internal assessment were substantial and far reaching. They reflected almost twenty years of progressive thinking on education and did much to invigorate the subject over the subsequent two decades.

⁴⁰ Department of Education, *History Forms 5 to 7 Syllabus for Schools*, 1989.

CHAPTER 7

Competing Histories:

International Developments in History Education

The history we select in classrooms and how we choose to engage students with it send students powerful messages both about the world – how it was, how it is, how it could be ... That these large issues are (and have always been) at the heart of history education is evident, not only from the continuous struggle over the history curriculum, but also from the fact that this struggle has so heavily involved political (in both upper and lower case 'p') groups outside the education system proper, each advancing its own views on history and its study and attempting to put its own version – its 'best story' forward.

Avner Segall¹

Introduction

This chapter places the development of the New Zealand history syllabus into wider context by briefly examining major international issues and themes concerned with history education. It draws on the secondary literature and does not offer a comprehensive account of the international issues but rather provides an international context for the examination of history education in New Zealand. Although they had much of the same ingredients, New Zealand debates over school history in the 1980s were muted in comparison to those overseas. They primarily involved Department of Education officials, historians, school inspectors and history teachers and only occasionally generated the intense interest of the media or politicians. However, the low profile of school history in New Zealand was not typical of most education systems where history is one of the few mandated curriculum subjects² and history teachers have little autonomy over what they teach. Internationally history education with its strong links to notions of national identity, citizenship and heritage, and its explicit role in developing (or maintaining) the social cohesion of the nation-state, has been at the centre of vigorous high-profile debates over what version of the past young people should learn.

The history taught in schools plays a powerful role in transforming people into citizens as well as fostering a sense of belonging to 'imagined communities'³ and providing legitimacy and authenticity for governments, leaders and politicians. International debates over history education have shared three features. Firstly they

¹ Segall, 'What's the Purpose of Teaching a Discipline Anyway? The Case of History', 125-126.

² Foster and Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children?* 1.

³ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

have been part of wider concerns over identity, citizenship and issues of public history. At the centre of establishing what young people should learn about the past is a concern over the social cohesion of the nation-state, and for democratic, liberal societies, selecting a past that reinforces or maintains a sense of belonging is challenging. Consequently these debates have emerged in times of political and cultural transformation, and are prevalent in a social climate of crisis, anxiety and future uncertainty.

Secondly, debates about history education are as much about process (pedagogy) as they are about content. They are central to wider educational concerns over whether the primary role of a curriculum is to pass on a valued body of knowledge to the young, or to teach students transferable skills (including the capacity to think critically). In regards to history, concerns about pedagogy are characterised by the perception that young people do not know enough factual content about the past. Critics attribute this state of affairs to the shift away from transmission teaching models to child-centred 'discovery and enquiry' teaching approaches, as well as history being diluted within integrated subjects such as social studies.

Thirdly, these debates are about the changing nature of the discipline of history that has seen a shift away from 'history from above' grand narratives that focus on the nation-state, to the fragmented approaches of 'history from below' that often have a theoretical orientation, and focus on areas such as gender, class and race. Critics claim the 'new history' is negative, unduly scathing of dominant elites, exaggerates the importance of marginalised and previously ignored peoples, and focuses on the minutiae of the past. The 'new history' is seen by political conservatives as especially inappropriate for the school curriculum, as it no longer celebrates events, groups and individuals that can inspire the young.

International debates over history education have been particularly intense because there is a shared belief that the education that young people receive about the past has implications for the future of society. Conservatives claim young people need a firm sense of historical identity based on factual material and that 'the new history' undermines personal and national pride and promotes 'dangerous' radical ideas to which the young are vulnerable. Their liberal counterparts agree that the young are vulnerable, but argue that in a complex world, young people need to learn to think critically, and understand the values of others. They claim that a healthy society needs to be aware of the troubling aspects of the past if they are to make sense of, and address, the challenges of the present.

The demand by conservatives for a history that provides a sense of cohesion coincides with the rising interest in popular history, including the use of history in feature films, novels, television period-dramas, documentaries and the theatre. Furthermore, the dramatic rise of interest in genealogy, the restoration of old buildings and the growth of museums, memorials and heritage parks as sites of entertainment and commemoration are all evidence of how the past has become linked with heritage, nostalgia and identity.⁴ This variety of history is largely conservative in orientation and seldom encourages a questioning approach to the past that is at odds with the interrogation of the past that lies at the heart of academic history.

The unprecedented expansion of interest in history in liberal democracies in the last 30 years has to some extent been driven by advancements in technology (allowing access to historical information and the transmission of ideas) and prosperity (that has allowed for increased leisure time for the affluent middle-classes). Historical documentaries have done much to generate an interest in history for the interested general viewer and have a long pedigree in filmmaking. The focus is typically on military history (especially the Second World War), or national history and features archival footage, interviews with historians and in recent years, 'reconstructions' of historic events.⁵ Classic documentaries such as *The World at War* that are replayed on dedicated history channels (and on public national holidays) that commemorate war have played a major role in maintaining a particular national perception of the past, that in the case of the Second World War 'accentuates the experiences of their own people.'⁶ This propensity is also evident in feature films which, despite errors of historical fact, these narratives are enormously influential in shaping and reinforcing current values and beliefs about the past. Film seeks moral clarity and clearly distinguishes between heroes and villains. For liberals, who see school history as promoting tolerance and critical thinking, 'the interaction of filmic values and audience reactions is problematic' as typically films eschew the complexity of the social world and encourage stereotypical responses especially in terms of 'right' and 'wrong'.⁷

⁴ Timmons, Vernon, Kinealy, *Teaching and Learning History*, 25-28; Also see: David Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past: The heritage crusade and the spoils of History* (New York: Free Press, 1996).

⁵ Black, *Using History*, 28-32.

⁶ Norman Davies, *Europe at War 1939-1945 No Simple Victory* (London: Macmillan, 2006), 11-13.

⁷ Black, *Using History*, 33.

'History Wars – A Sign of the Times'

The debates over history education (or 'history wars') have been a feature of wider cultural concerns in liberal democracies. Although they have become prominent in the last decades of the 20th century, a concern over the teaching of the past in schools is not new. Politicians and governments of all persuasions have seen the past as a tool that can be exploited in support of contemporary policies and to provide legitimacy. The history taught in schools is always a simplified, partial and sometimes distorted view of the past, and the selective nature of history education has ensured that some knowledge has received privileged status, while other knowledge has been ignored.

In totalitarian regimes history teaching is used to promote specific ideologies that provide legitimacy for the ruling regime and the public version of history is closely monitored to ensure that public commemorations, memorials, civic celebrations, museums (and school history) all reflect the official version of the past. Nation-states that are in the process of re-inventing themselves after a period of colonial rule or oppression (real or perceived), also use history teaching to promote a sense of national social cohesion that at its worst can 'sponsor, maintain and justify xenophobic hatred, racism and the obscenity of ethnic cleansing'.⁸ For example in Israeli textbooks Arabs are portrayed, as 'extremists' while anti-Semitism is evident in the history textbooks of Jordan, Syria and Egypt, and in Indian social studies textbooks Muslims and Christians are often described as 'alien villains'.⁹

The exploitation of the past by politicians and governments in liberal democratic societies has been more subtle. It is only in the last decades of the 20th century that widespread debate has emerged over the nature of how the past should be remembered. This is not unrelated to the relative decline of Europe and North America on the world stage in the last 30 years. Debates over history education emerge in times of social and political transformation and are not a feature of nation-states that are socially secure and culturally confident. History education in societies with a high degree of social cohesion is characterised by a broad consensus over the grand narratives of the past (at least among the decision-making elite in authority), and troubling aspects of the past that reflect negatively on those currently in power are ignored. When this is the case, there is seldom any requirement for a prescribed history curriculum, as the dominant narrative is

⁸ Foster and Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children?* 6-7.

⁹ *Ibid.* 6-10.

accepted and taught without question. For example, prior to the introduction of a national curriculum in the United Kingdom in the late 1980s, British teachers had considerable autonomy as far as teaching content was concerned, as most shared a consensus as to the diet of school history.

Content was largely British, or southern English, Celts looked in to starve, emigrate or rebel; the north to invent looms or work in mills; abroad was of interest once it was part of Empire; foreigners were either sensibly allies or rightly defeated.¹⁰

In the selective tradition of history education, teachers did the work of the state and reinforced popular common beliefs and notions about who was 'British' and who was 'other'. There was a strong emphasis on Britain's role in the Second World War. History textbooks portrayed the Germans as 'crude and thoughtless' and drew on examples of British heroism such as the Blitz and Dunkirk. This portrayal has continued to resonate as Michael Nauman, a recent German culture minister, observed. According to Nauman the British have 'decided to make the Second World War a sort of spiritual core of its national self, understanding and pride.'¹¹

The uncritical nature of history as a dominant narrative was also a feature of the United States and Australia. History in the Cold War era of United States in the 1950s was characterised as 'consensus history' which reflected a highly romanticised view of the past.¹² Until the 1970s, textbooks in American schools promoted the master narrative of a 'triumphant march forward' that played down the trans-Atlantic slave trade and the brutality against Native Americans during the process of European colonisation and largely ignored women and ethnic minorities.¹³ Likewise in Australia until the 1970s, school history was dominated by an idea of 'history as progress.' Although there was a strand of Australian nationalism around the 'Anzac legend' that was critical of the British military leadership in World War 1, school textbooks placed the advance of the British Empire at the centre of the Australian grand narrative, and played down the devastating impact of colonisation on aboriginal peoples.¹⁴

¹⁰ J. Slater cited in: Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 14.

¹¹ Foster and Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children?* 11.

¹² G. Nash, C. Crabtree, R. Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the teaching of the past* (Random House: New York, 1997), 56-58.

¹³ Dianne Ravitch, *The Language Police How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn* (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 2003), 134.

¹⁴ Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2003), 173.

The End of Consensus

In the final decades of the 20th century the consensus over the national historical narratives in school curriculum disintegrated. This was a consequence of the widening of the human rights discourse which saw rights ascribed to the individual rather than the nation, the assertion of the rights of formally colonised people and the ethos in western, liberal democracies of the principle of 'separate but equal'.¹⁵ History was no longer only what conventionally had counted as national history. Hand in hand with these reconstructive endeavours came the critique of the notion of continuous progress in history as Eurocentric. The idea of a clear upward motion of historical development was discarded as the dominant Western narrative gave way to narratives of different histories of different value.¹⁶

While this process sparked off debates among academic historians as to the nature of the discipline, these were mild in comparison to how these concerns were addressed in relation to school history and wider public history issues. In this setting the debates were robust and vociferous, with little respect shown to opposing viewpoints. Critics of 'new history' looked nostalgically back to a time of school historiography when the exclusive, dominant grand narrative sustained and reinforced the beliefs that the powerful in society had about their past (and justified their position in the present). They were alert to what they saw as the dangers of shifting away from a 'common' history narrative. However, the notion of a shared view of a consensus over the teaching of the past was an illusion that ignored the dispossessed and marginalised. It excluded those aspects of the past that challenged the dominant narrative, although in some cases a version of the past that sustained a sense of identity and belonging was kept alive outside of official channels (including the schooling system). For the 'stolen generation' in Australia, the descendants of slaves in the United States and the descendants of poverty-stricken Irish in Britain, 'their' narrative seldom featured in the school historiography, but was 'kept alive', albeit in a fragmented manner. In an environment where the marginalised are ignored, the 'official history' is publicly subscribed to, but it is the 'unofficial' 'narrative that is emotionally sustaining. This narrative, however, is a fragmented history. It is widely believed but not thoroughly known, as it does not have the social, economic and social capital of the official narrative. The 'unofficial' history emerges when the consensus over the grand narrative is shattered, although

¹⁵ Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal and Hanna Schissler, 'Teaching Beyond the National Narrative.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World*, edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004), 3-4.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 5.

it typically will face opposition from those who have a substantial personal and professional investment in maintaining the status quo.

Post-Soviet Europe offers an opportunity to examine this recreation of an older history that has been kept alive. National narratives are re-appearing that draw on older 'unofficial histories' that were maintained during Soviet domination. While governments in democratic nations control how the past is taught in schools indirectly (and there are opportunities to safely challenge this state of affairs), this is not the case in totalitarian societies. In the USSR the official view of the past was closely controlled by the regime.¹⁷ No other country regulated history teaching as closely as the USSR where the subject was seen as important in inculcating loyalty among Soviet citizens. History teachers enjoyed considerable prestige (their training took a year longer than teacher training for any other subject) and history textbooks were closely controlled, subject to approval by the Politburo and regularly reviewed to ensure they reinforced the current orthodoxy of Soviet history.¹⁸

While Estonia was part of the USSR (1940-1991), history school textbooks emphasised how the Soviets had 'liberated' the country from fascism and replaced this with a socialist state that served the interests of the people. The history curriculum reinforced the view that Estonia and Russia had been closely connected for centuries before the First World War. This state-supported version of the past was not widely shared by Estonians. They saw themselves as an independent people who had been invaded rather than liberated, and for most the connection between the two countries was unwelcome. Consequently, in Estonia school history as 'official history' had two quite different structures that reflected the marginal nature (for the majority of Estonians) of living under an imposed Soviet controlled regime. The first was the official and coherent narrative that gave legitimacy to the Soviet seizure of power in 1940. This was taught in schools and backed up by textbooks and academic historians. To function successfully in this Soviet satellite, Estonians had little choice but to publicly engage with this narrative. However, the account was not widely believed. There was also an 'unofficial history' that drew on an older claim (albeit one which was not as thoroughly known). Although this older account was fragmented and incoherent (and publicly dangerous to subscribe to), it

¹⁷ J.V Wertsch, 'Is It Possible to Teach Beliefs as Well as Knowledge About History?' In *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*, edited by Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg, 38-50. (New York: New York University Press, 2000).

¹⁸ Robert Maier, 'Learning About Europe and the World: Schools, Teachers, and Textbooks in Russia after 1991.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World* edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal (New York: Bergahn Books, 2005),140.

was to the older narrative that Estonians turned to for the 'emotional dimension' that sustained their sense of identity.¹⁹

The experience of Estonia illustrates why this juxtaposition of the official and unofficial historical narratives lies at the heart of what makes school history so fraught. The Estonian experience is not unique but to a greater or lesser extent is a feature of the histories of invaded and dispossessed peoples throughout the world. For the marginalised and excluded in society the official version of the past may be widely known, but not believed, while the unofficial version of the past is believed and emotionally sustaining but only partly known. Coherent grand narratives that are at odds with what marginalised people believe is the truth also make an obvious target for resistance and re-emerge to challenge the dominant narrative in times of political and social transformation.

Breaking Down the Consensus

School history is a feature of the 'organised memory that holds a society together and what is required is not simply the past but a heroic past ... expunged of embarrassing episodes.'²⁰ When a society faces a crisis (real or imagined) the national myths about the past come under serious scrutiny and the debates that emerge about history school curriculum matters become part of wider cultural anxieties over identity and heritage. In the final decades of the 20th century the consensus over history education in modern liberal democracies broke down and the 'embarrassing episodes' came to the surface.

In the United Kingdom, history education emerged as an issue in the 1980s. Although the British history syllabus had changed little during the 20th century, by this time any consensus about school history was all but gone. By the 1980s the United Kingdom was undergoing a serious crisis of confidence facing the challenges of post-war immigration, the Miners' Strike in Yorkshire, resurgent Welsh and Scottish nationalism, terrorism in Northern Ireland, high unemployment and economic stagnation. In this tumultuous political and social climate, Margaret Thatcher's neo-conservative government saw school history as playing an important role in restoring a sense of unity and national pride which was seen as part of building a more modern and economically dynamic United Kingdom.²¹ This view, however, was seriously out of step with liberal thinking on curriculum matters. By

¹⁹ Wertsh, 'Is It Possible to Teach Beliefs as Well as Knowledge About History?' 54.

²⁰ F. Furudi, *Mythical Past, Elusive Future: History & Society in an Anxious Age*, 27.

²¹ Norman Davies, *The Isles A History* (London: Macmillan, 1999), 801-802, 846-852.

these decades a history curriculum that placed England at the centre appeared to have no place given the emergence of social history, women's history and ethnic history.

In the United States the attempt to introduce voluntary history content standards in the mid 1990s sparked off an acrimonious and bitter debate that was of major political importance with the proposed standards finally being defeated 99:1 in the Senate. Despite the inherent diversity of American society (made up of a plethora of minority groups who retained their ethnic and cultural identity and wanted their vision of the past included in the national story), the American narrative of exceptionalism, freedom and progress was widely taught, and accepted, in school history programmes.²² Although this narrative had little credibility among academic historians, this view of the past seemed all the more important to maintain in the 1980s given the humiliating defeat in Vietnam, the Watergate scandal, the hostage crisis in Iran, the perceived successes of the USSR in the Third World, and the economy reeling from the competition of the rising economic giants of Asia (including Japan).

In the face of these challenges the neo-conservative Reagan Administration adopted a patriotic stance that aimed to foster pride and unity, while introducing radical neo-liberal economic policies. The education system was targeted as being seriously inadequate. The government argued there was a crisis in schools and a need to develop national (knowledge-based) standards that could be tested. The Federal Government would make some funds available but the money would be linked to content standards in key curriculum areas (including history) and it was these standards that would explode into a bitter and controversial debate during the 'culture wars' of the 1990s.²³

Australia faced similar socio-economic pressures to New Zealand in the 1980s including racial tensions and a flagging economy that was struggling to adjust to the rapid expansion of Australia's Asian neighbours. The debates around history education in Australia shared the international conservative/ liberal divisions over how the nation's past should be taught in schools, with the greatest tensions being over European-Aboriginal contact. While historians and history teachers had largely ignored the aboriginal past until the 1970s, by the beginning of the following decade, aboriginal perspectives had become a mandated feature of State curricula. In

²² Barton and Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good*, 28-31.

²³ Nash, Crabtree and Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 105-127.

particular, history educators drew on the work of Henry Reynolds²⁴ whose accounts portrayed the brutal nature of European and Aboriginal interaction on the frontier, which he provocatively described as an 'invasion'.

This view became the orthodoxy among academics and history educators during the 1980s although it was denigrated by conservative commentators as 'black armband' history. Despite issues such as the 'stolen generation' and aboriginal deaths in police custody, conservatives criticised such history as unduly negative. As well as conservative politicians, some academics shared this view. Geoffrey Blainey, John Hirst and Geoffrey Partington all saw the 'Black armband' approach to history as unnecessary, negative and overstating the extent of violence and brutality. Keith Windschuttle in *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History* (2002) took this a step further, arguing that the number of aboriginal deaths in Tasmania (and accounts of brutality) had been vastly exaggerated. Historians, he claimed, shared a pessimistic and left-wing agenda. He argued that aboriginal population loss was due to rising infertility (a consequence of aboriginal prostitution with sealers and whalers) and disease, and claimed British colonisation was 'the least violent of all of Europe's encounters with the New World'.²⁵

In Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom there was no need for the state to impose a history curriculum until the 1980s, as teachers essentially did the work of the state in presenting a celebratory version of the past that reinforced the hegemony of the decision-making elites. However, the collective memories of nations scarred by their past (especially the Second World War) proved more problematic. For the victors, World War 2 was an opportunity to celebrate defining moments. The British remembered the Blitz and the Battle of Britain, the United States Iwo Jima and D-Day and the Australians Kokoda trail and Tobruk. However, the defeated nations of Japan and Germany found presenting an acceptable past in the school curriculum posed a challenge, as the memories of atrocities and war crimes committed by these nations have continued to be kept alive by the victims and their descendants.

²⁴ See: Henry Reynolds, *The Other Side of the Frontier: Aboriginal resistance to the European invasion of Australia* (Townsville: Penguin, 1982). _____, *Dispossession: Black Australians and white invaders* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1989).

²⁵ Keith Windschuttle, *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History. Vol. 1, Van Dieman's Land 1803-47* (Paddington New South Wales: Macleay Press, 2002), 3.

Japan

Given the furore that has emerged over Japan's reluctance to teach the atrocities perpetrated by the Japanese army during World War 2 (despite this being widely documented and known by historians outside of Japan), it is ironic that immediately after 1945, the history curriculum depicted Japan's aggressive (shiryaku-teki) policies as the source of much misery for the Pacific and Asia (including Japan). By the early 1950s, however, the Japanese government (supported by a strong United States anticommunist policy) was reorientated to reflect 'the spirit of patriotism'.²⁶ This posed few problems until the 1990s, as Japan not only enjoyed considerable social and economic success, but was a staunch ally of the USA. In this climate Japanese governments were under little pressure to apologise (or even admit) wartime atrocities. In the 1990s, however, the Japanese economy began to experience major problems, and it became necessary to establish more amicable trade relationships with its Asian neighbours.

The tension over the 'construction of official knowledge' in Japan was a consequence of how history textbooks are 'standardised and nationalised'.²⁷ While there had always been a minority of historians who had called for Japan to confront its wartime past, it was not until the 1990s that Japanese governments finally acknowledged, and apologised for, 'acts of aggression'.²⁸ Asian nations (especially China and the two Koreas) have generally seen apologies as insincere. Although both Koreas disagree on much, they share the view that Japanese textbooks have 'distorted history and deliberately misled impressionable children about the truth of the past'.²⁹ Nationalists in Japan have contributed to this view, as they have been determined to ensure that Japan does not accept responsibility for past misdeeds. Their strategy has been to introduce their version of history into schools. Leading nationalist academic Nobukatsu Fujioka's *The New History Textbook* has claimed that Nanking was an anti-Japanese fabrication and never happened and that the war in the Asia/ Pacific was a war of liberation against white colonialists. In the 2005 textbook authorisation, *The New History Textbook* was accredited as one option and this generated riots and demonstrations in China.³⁰

²⁶ Y. Nozaki, 'Japanese Politics and the History Textbook Controversy, 1945-2001.' In *History Education and National Identity*, edited by Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 275-305 (New York: Routledge, 2005), 277.

²⁷ Keith Crawford, 'Culture Wars: Japanese History Textbooks and the Construction of Official Memory.' In Stuart, Foster and Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children?*, 51.

²⁸ Erna Paris, *Long Shadows: Truth, Lies and History* (Montreal: Bloomsbury, 2000), 23-27.

²⁹ Chris Wilson, Danton Ford and Alisa Jones, 'The History Text: Framing Ethno-Cultural and Civic Nationalism in the Divided Koreas.' In *History Education and National Identity in East Asia* edited by Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones (New York: Routledge, 2005), 227.

³⁰ T. Beal, Y. Nozaki, J. Yang, 'Ghosts of the Past: The Japanese Textbook Controversy'. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 3, no. 2 (2001): 177-188.

While Asian nations who endured Japanese imperialism in the 20th century typically perceive the experience as brutal and negative, outside of the issue of Japanese textbooks there is little agreement over school history. In China the history curriculum is closely monitored and the major concerns in history education have been over combining a Marxist class-based view of the past with the economic reforms of the last 20 years (as well as accommodating foreign policy issues such as Tibet, Taiwan and Hong Kong). In Korea students on both sides of the border:

.... learn in their history classes that their state is superior and the true representative of the nation, and that the other Korea is the enemy, desecrating the memory of a once great kingdom with wrong headed values and political ideologies ... at the same time however they have learned that the people of Korean peninsula share a common ethnic and cultural ancestry that unites them physically and spiritually as a nation ...³¹

Not all Asian nations have a standard view of the Japanese occupation. In Singapore it is seen as both brutal and as a contribution to the nationalist independence movements that demonstrated that the British Empire was not invincible. History textbook writers struggle with the question of whether Japan should be seen as a friend or as a foe. The question of whether to stress the brutality of the Japanese or the muddled and uncoordinated efforts of the Allied forces is complicated by the enormous contribution Japan has made to the economic growth of Singapore.³²

Germany

In Germany the compelling issue for history education has been the portrayal of the Nazi period, and in particular the Holocaust. Pingel argues that the treatment of these issues has been largely determined by the prevailing socio-political context. A sense of historical amnesia followed 1945 that saw school history textbooks portray National Socialism as an unfortunate phase of Germany's history, attributed to a small group of Nazi leaders. However, this changed in the 1960s, where the 'youth revolution' openly confronted the Nazi past. By the beginning of the 21st century German history textbooks 'disavowed' German inclinations to nationalism (including the Nazi era) and characterised 'pride in one's nation' as linked to 'hatred and devaluation of other peoples.'³³ In German school historiography, 'representations

³¹ Wilson, Ford and Jones, *History Education and National Identity in East Asia*, 228.

³² Goh Chor Boon and Saravanan Gopinathan, 'History Education and the Construction of National Identity in Singapore, 1945-2000.' In *History Education and National Identity in East Asia* edited by Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 203-23. (New York: Routledge, 2005), 203-208.

³³ Falk Pingel, 'From Evasion to a Crucial Tool of Moral and Political Education.' In *What Shall We Tell the Children?*, 131-135.

of national heroes' have posed major challenges.³⁴ However, the last five years have seen schools begin to address the long-submerged view of Germans as victims of Soviet mass rape in 1944/5,³⁵ massive allied 'carpet bombing'³⁶ and the forced removal of Germans from Poland and Czechoslovakia,³⁷ as well as examine examples of German resistance to Nazism. This switch from Germans as perpetrators, to Germans as victims and resisters has not been without its critics, but also reflects the changing nature of public history in Germany.

Pedagogy

International history curriculum debates have been concerned with pedagogy as well the content. Conservative commentators argued that the child-centred liberal approaches to education that flowed from these ideas had a detrimental impact on the young and called for a return to chronological grand narratives. In the case of history education conservatives argued there was too much emphasis being placed on skills, values and critical thinking and not enough on teaching a broad chronological narrative framework of factual history. Liberals believed it was essential to make history more relevant to adolescents and also reflect the changing theories that were informing teaching and learning (especially those of Jerome Bruner).

In the United Kingdom the liberal position in regards to curriculum change was encapsulated by the SCHP which encouraged students to explain change and causation using the tools of academic historians, and to empathise with those in the past. The empathy aspect of the 'new history' was controversial (and lampooned by the popular press) but most teachers saw merit in the skills aspect of the SCHP material. These approaches were largely implemented, as there was no national curriculum and teachers had considerable autonomy over content and teaching methods at this time.³⁸ This situation was at odds with the role Margaret Thatcher believed school history should play. Her neo-conservative government believed a coherent history curriculum framework was needed to ensure that history played a unifying role in the transformations that were emerging out of her government's

³⁴ Soyol, Yasemin, Nuhoglu. Bertilotti Teresa and Sabine Mannitz, 'Projections of Identity in French and German History and Civics Textbooks.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World*, edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyol, 13-34 (Greenwich: Information Age, 2005), 16-21.

³⁵ Davies, *Europe at War*, 431-439, 436-437.

³⁶ W.G. Sebald, *On the Natural History of Destruction* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2003).

³⁷ See Rainer Ohliger, 'Privileged Migrants in Germany, France and the Netherlands: Return Migrants, Repatriates, and Expellees after 1945.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World*, edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyol, 35-60 (New York: Bergahn Books, 2005).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

reforms. Thatcher's government was strongly opposed to the focus on multiculturalism, anti-racism and child-centred learning, which they perceived was dominating education. Education was performing poorly, they argued, as a direct result of the teacher monopoly of schools and teachers who were not training a highly skilled workforce that could adapt and cope with the modern world.

Prior to 1988 the only prescribed subject in the British curriculum was religious education (organised by local educational authorities). The government blamed the perceived inadequacies of the education system on the lack of a common curriculum core and no national standard of assessment. While reflecting the neo-conservative ethos of 'parents as consumers' and opening schools to 'market forces', Thatcher's government also saw that it was essential to have a national curriculum to monitor what was taught. Neo-conservatives saw this as a betrayal of the philosophy of minimal state involvement, but the government thought history was too important to be left to the autonomy of teachers, who they suspected were promoting a left-wing agenda. They argued for a return to a narrative chronology of British history rather than a focus on historical skills, concepts, key ideas and themes.³⁹

In the United States, conservative critics mirrored their counterparts in the United Kingdom and Australia and lamented the perceived shortcomings of child-centred pedagogy. In the United States social studies was blamed for the perceived lack of factual historical knowledge among the young although in reality the paucity of knowledge young Americans had about their past was not a new issue but had been seen as a problem since 1917.⁴⁰ The criticism of history in Australia was in a similar vein and focussed both on progressive teaching methods and the integrated, thematic approach of Studies of Society and Environment, an approach critics argued was politically biased, lacking academic rigour and was the 'study of good causes'.⁴¹

'History is just not history any more'

The third feature of the 'history wars' in the international arena has been the fragmentation of the parent discipline that has challenged the notion of a dominant narrative that can be easily transformed into a school subject. The new approaches to academic history that emerged in the 1970s illuminated the experiences of

³⁹ Robert Phillips, *Reflective Teaching of History 11-18*, (London: Continuum, 2002), 17.

⁴⁰ Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and other Unnatural Acts*, vii-viii.

⁴¹ Macintyre and Clark, *The History Wars*, 186-189.

previously ignored peoples (loosely described as 'history from below') and shattered any consensus over the essential nature of the discipline in universities. Similar attacks upon the canon of English literature also sparked furious debates in universities.⁴² The fragmentation of the parent discipline had a major impact on the teaching of school history. It was no longer an option to transfer a grand narrative into the school curriculum that would be acknowledged by historians as having any credibility. While Margaret Thatcher's view (endorsed by the popular press) was that 'children should learn the great land-marks of British history and be taught them at school',⁴³ this view was not widely endorsed by British historians.

In the United States, historians had little to do with school history. By the 1980s most academics were primarily interested in areas of gender, ethnicity, culture, class and race, and the history taught and researched in universities was far removed from the grand narratives of exceptionalism and progress that continued to be taught in school history programmes. University history departments at this time, however, were coming under severe criticism in what came to be called the 'Culture Wars'. Lynne Cheney attacked several university history programmes as being 'politically correct' while others (including William Bennet, Dinesh D'Souza, Allan Bloom, and Harold Bloom) criticised university programmes that focussed on multiculturalism and ignored America's European heritage.⁴⁴ The nature of these attacks attracted widespread media interest and was characterised by exaggerated rhetoric that polarised the arguments. Critics charged the new scholarship in universities as '...nihilistic, divisive and politically correct' and, as Allan Bloom claimed, 'the barbarians are not at the gate. They without knowing it have taken over the citadel.'⁴⁵

History education was implicated in these broader neo-conservative attacks on education. Hirsch's bestseller *What Every American needs to know*⁴⁶ (1983), reflected the conservative position, with an overwhelming emphasis on facts and dates about America's past that had much in common with the grand narratives of the 1950s. The government report *A Nation at Risk* (1983) pointed out '...if an unfriendly foreign power attempted to impose on America the mediocre education that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war.' However although

⁴² Peter Watson, *A Terrible Beauty: The People and Ideas That Shaped the Modern Mind* (London: Phoenix, 2000), 720-23.

⁴³ Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 15-17.

⁴⁴ Watson, *A Terrible Beauty*, 729-731.

⁴⁵ Nash, Crabtree, Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 101-105.

⁴⁶ E.D. Hirsch, *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).

there was considerable distance between conservative and liberal views of history, all shared a consensus that young Americans should know more about their own history. The culmination of this bi-partisan concern was the Bradley Commission *Building a History Curriculum* (1987) that recommended that ‘...history should be required of all students.’⁴⁷ The intention was that there would be a voluntary, national history curriculum for all American states, which each State could accept, reject or amend as they saw fit.

The fall of communism in the early 1990s saw cultural politics replace anti-communism as the central debate in American society. The end of the Cold War changed the dynamic of educational debates in the USA and threw into stark relief the lack of a consensus over school history that had existed for two decades. In the 1990s the ‘culture wars’, which had largely been confined to universities, spilled into education and generated a bitter and vociferous debate over the introduction of national history standards. The debate threw into sharp relief the major differences emerging as to how Americans saw their past, with conservatives calling for a grand narrative that celebrated the past, while some historians argued for a radically new interpretation such as Martin Bernal’s *Black Athena* that sparked a furious debate among classical scholars.⁴⁸

These debates were not simply of relevance to school history. In 1995 a commemoration exhibition at the Smithsonian on the use of the atomic bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki planned to include material on the moral and philosophical dimensions of Truman’s decision. Veteran groups were outraged that the Japanese could be perceived as victims rather than aggressors. Although many historians argued that the dropping of the bomb was more to do with demonstrating atomic power to the USSR rather than ending World War 2, the Senate unanimously condemned the exhibition as ‘revisionist, unbalanced and offensive’. The exhibition was cancelled. The curators had run counter to a ‘deeply held national narrative’ and feature of American collective memory that the atomic bomb was dropped to bring a speedy end to the war and had saved enormous numbers of American lives.⁴⁹

In this climate the national history standards for schools were vigorously attacked by the neo-conservatives as ‘politically correct’ and presenting a fragmented, unduly negative history that left out important events and individuals who had played a

⁴⁷ Nash, Crabtree and Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, 111-113.

⁴⁸ Watson, *A Terrible Beauty: The People and Ideas That Shaped the Modern Mind*, 723-724.

⁴⁹ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 221-223.

central role in the shaping of America. The debate was bitter and polarised and generated intense interest by the media. There was little room for placing the wider issues into context; ‘...those who wrote the standards were traitors; those that opposed them racists’.⁵⁰ In such a climate the standards had little chance of being accepted and as the Clinton administration did not see any political advantage in continuing this initiative they abandoned support for the standards.

The pressure for the school curriculum to provide ‘uncritical history’ has been a feature of the Australian political landscape since the 1980s.⁵¹ Federal Education Minister in the Howard government, Julie Bishop, in 2006, called for a return to teaching history as a discrete discipline. She reiterated her Prime Minister’s call that ‘the time had come for a root and branch renewal of teaching Australian history in schools’. Bishop, reflecting the conservative position, called for a history curriculum ‘rich in dates, facts and events’ and attacked the thematic integrated approach of Studies of Society and Environment. While the then opposition leader Kim Beazley responded that history in schools did not matter and what was needed in education was ‘encouraging young men and women into trades’,⁵² in 2007 the Howard Federal government launched a major history curriculum initiative that would see Australian history taught at all schools in Years 9 and 10.⁵³ Despite the previous reluctance of the opposition to make history a priority in schools, the new Labour Rudd government has expanded the scope of history in schools, addressing senior school history rather than just focussing on Years 9 and 10.⁵⁴

Conclusion

This brief outline of international developments provides an international context for the examination of New Zealand’s history curriculum and serves to illustrate that history education debates share several common features. Internationally these debates have been fierce and reflected the nature of historical controversies that emerge when countries confront those aspects of the past that are troubling. In times of turmoil and transformation the critics have lamented the ‘killing of history’ and claimed that young people do not know enough history because schools do not

⁵⁰ Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*, vii-viii.

⁵¹ Anna Clark, ‘Whose History? Teaching Australia’s contested past’. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36, no. 5 (2004): 533-542.

⁵² *The Australian*, 6 July 2006.

⁵³ Guide to the Teaching of Australian History in Years 9 and 10: http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/key_issues/Australian_History/#Australian_History_Curriculum_Reference_Group.

⁵⁴ <http://www.historyteacher.org.au/?p=20>.

teach it (or teach it badly as part of an integrated programme that lacks rigour and is 'politically correct'). In reality, however, what such commentators lament is the decline of chronological, political nation-building grand history narratives that are a perceived feature of the consensus history in the past. Although part of wider 'culture wars' and debates about heritage and identity, debates about history education are especially intense as they involve the young and as such they are as much about the present as the past.

CHAPTER 8

‘What use is a useable past?’ History and Social Studies

New Zealand social studies has never been ‘value free’. Neither, save in a limited sense, has it encouraged genuinely open-ended inquiry... Far too many people in social studies remain ahistorical in outlook. Far too often the response to any inquiry concerning the nature of social studies is the simplistic assertion that ‘social studies is about people’, rather than about structures, pre-selection or inculcation ... social studies falls short of the earlier history programmes which at least provided knowledge (albeit laced with patriotic rhetoric) which could be, and sometimes was, employed in an individual’s later life to serve more critical ends.¹

Eric Archer and Roger Openshaw 1992

Introduction

The secondary school history teaching community in the 1980s perceived their subject as being of high status compared to social studies, which was dismissed as inferior. This perception has played a key role in how the two subject communities have developed over the last 50 years and an examination of this provides an insight into the nature of the history teaching community in the 1980s, as well as the thinking that shaped the senior history syllabus. Within the hierarchy of school subjects, history was a senior option linked to a university-based discipline and prestigious public examinations. Social studies had neither of these features and consequently historians and history teachers perceived social studies as a low-status subject that had little credibility in regards to the study of the past. Even the minority of history teachers who were willing to engage with social studies found it difficult to understand the epistemological basis of the subject.² While it is unremarkable that social studies initially encountered hostility by the history teaching community when it was first introduced (as it supplanted the territory traditionally held by history specialists), the extent and longstanding nature of the rift between these two subject communities is unusual. In the 1980s it reflected the irreconcilable differences between how both communities perceived the study of the past.

Although school history and academic history were very different in orientation (the primary purpose of the former being learning and teaching while the latter placed a high priority on original research and publications), the perception of historians was that school history was a microcosm of the parent discipline. Social studies as a

¹ Eric Archer and Roger Openshaw, ‘Citizenship and Identity as “Official” Goals in Social Studies.’ In *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Roger Openshaw, 19-33 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992), 29.

² Graeme Aitken, ‘Curriculum Design in New Zealand Social Studies: Learning from the Past’ (Dr. Education unpublished thesis, University of Auckland, 2005), 86.

core compulsory component of the junior secondary school curriculum was secure as a subject but faced the challenge of an increasingly overcrowded curriculum and there were few specialist social studies teachers. Also as it was only taught as a junior subject its status was not high in the secondary school curriculum. While most history teachers taught social studies, the perception of many was that the 'crisis' in their senior subject could be attributed to the poor teaching of history in social studies.

These respective subject communities developed different characteristics that were manifested in their approach to knowledge. Social studies teachers enjoyed a high degree of autonomy in regards to the content of their courses and as their subject was closely linked to senior primary school programmes, they were more open to social constructivist pedagogical approaches. There was little pressure from students, parents or colleagues to develop an in-depth grasp of the content of what was taught, as the subject was exclusively taught at a junior level, with no links to examination prescriptions. Social relevance was a key feature of the social studies curriculum and what was required from history was a 'usable past' that illuminated key concepts within a multidisciplinary, integrated model. History teachers, however, had little autonomy in regards to the content of their programmes. They chose their contexts from the narrow range of options as outlined in the examination prescriptions. As a consequence, history teachers (as subject specialists who were publicly accountable through examinations) became 'experts' in the narrow range of topics in the prescriptions. To teach senior history demanded considerable personal and professional investment in building and maintaining a comprehensive knowledge base, as well as the preparation of resources. Consequently, history teachers (unlike social studies teachers) were cautious of any reorientation in regards to content as this had considerable personal and professional implications.

History and Citizenship

Until the advent of social studies history played a key role in civics education. History had been taught in New Zealand primary schools since the 1880s and became part of the compulsory core in 1929, with an explicitly citizenship/ civics requirement. In the same way that social studies required a 'usable past' to illustrate the concerns of the present, the 1929 history syllabus adopted a presentist approach to the past that reflected the ethos of liberal educators in the 1920s. The 'supreme aim of history', the syllabus stated, 'was the interpretation of today in its political, social, industrial and religious aspects'. New Zealand teachers were

reminded not to forget the sacrifices of those who had fought in past wars, but were extolled to 'implant in the minds of their pupils a detestation of war as a means of settling differences' as well as to avoid a 'narrow nationalistic interpretation of history'.³ The 1929 curriculum reinforced the advantages of New Zealand being part of the British Empire, but had a strong pacifist orientation, which reflected contemporary trends in the citizenship emphasis of the British curriculum.⁴

By the 1940s history had a firm place in the secondary school curriculum. While it was of lower status than English and mathematics, as a subject that dealt with abstract and non-vocational knowledge, it was nevertheless seen as an important academic component of the curriculum and widely studied.⁵ Although only a minority of adolescents attended secondary school in 1930, of those who did, 93.1% boys and 95% of girls studied history.⁶ However, in the 1940s few stayed at school beyond the legal leaving age of 15 years, and the largely academic curriculum was increasingly seen by the Department of Education as of little direct relevance to the majority of students. The Thomas Committee was set up to investigate how the curriculum could be reshaped to cater for a less traditionally academic student cohort (in the same way as the senior school curriculum would come under pressure in the 1980s). The Thomas Report (1944) was critical of the traditional academic approach of subject specialisation and recommended a common core for the first three years of secondary school. In regards to history, the Thomas Report recommended the subject be integrated into a social studies course made up of history, civics, geography and economics. Social studies would replace history and geography in the junior school but both subjects would retain their status as discrete subjects in the senior school.⁷ In this the Thomas Committee were reflecting a similar shift from history to social studies in the United States⁸ as the latter was seen as a more effective vehicle to deliver notions of citizenship.

Social studies was not initially endorsed by either geography or history teachers. As well as supplanting the territory of both subjects, attempting to persuade teachers to accept a shift in thinking on the basis that their current practice lacked 'relevance

³ Department of Education, *Syllabus of Instruction for public schools, 1930* (Wellington: Government Printers), 270. In Roger Openshaw, *Current Issues in the Teaching of Social Studies 187.708* (Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education: Massey University, 2002).

⁴ Robert Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 1998, 13-14.

⁵ Shuker, (1978), *History in the New Zealand Secondary School: A study in aspects of curriculum development*, 4-15.

⁶ Stenson, 'History in New Zealand Schools', 178-180.

⁷ Department of Education, *The Post-Primary School Curriculum* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1944: reprint 1959), 5, 55.

⁸ Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958*, 125-127.

and appeal' was unlikely to win adherents.⁹ There was vigorous opposition¹⁰ to social studies, although in reality until the late 1950s the divisions between the two subjects were more apparent than real. History already had a citizenship orientation and the 1947 social studies syllabus largely retained an emphasis on history and geography. The integrated model of social studies did not become a feature of the secondary school curriculum until the late 1950s.¹¹ Social studies teachers continued to reflect their subject backgrounds (including seeing their primary role as preparing students for SC in history and geography)¹² and social studies assessments were 'frequently based on SC geography and history papers'.¹³

The early advocates of social studies saw the multidisciplinary, integrated nature of social studies as a progressive advance that would allow teachers the flexibility to address wider social issues that fulfilled the demand of citizenship education in a liberal democracy.¹⁴ However, the history teaching community continued to call for history to be taught as a separate subject.¹⁵ At the heart of this tension over compartmentalised 'academic' history versus integrated social studies was the question as to 'whether education should be concerned primarily with cultivating the intellect, preparing students for a vocation or producing the ideal citizen for a democratic society'.¹⁶ History teachers firmly opted for the former while social studies advocates saw the latter as the priority.

The reluctance of history teachers to initially accommodate social studies was unsurprising given the defensive hostility all new subjects encounter when they are first

⁹ Spillane cited in: Aitkin, 'Curriculum Design in New Zealand Social Studies: Learning from the Past', 85.

¹⁰ W. Anderson, *The Flight from Reason in New Zealand Education* (Auckland: Catholic Teachers' Association of Auckland, 1944).

¹¹ Social studies was not mandated as a compulsory subject until 1955 (Department of Education, 1955) and did not become a common feature of secondary school programmes until the late 1950s. The first professional development course for Social Studies was not held until 1959 and a primary school integrated social studies syllabus that was explicitly multidisciplinary was introduced in 1962. See Roger Openshaw, 'Reporting on social studies classrooms: then and now. How far have we come in four decades?' In Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw (eds.), *Towards Effective Social Studies*, 35-50 (Palmerston North: Kanuka Grove Press, 2005), 37-40.

¹² Meikle, cited in: 'Aitkin, Curriculum Design in New Zealand Social Studies: Learning from the Past', 87.

¹³ Kivell, 1970 cited: Ibid. 87.

¹⁴ H.J. Whitwell, 'Vegetables and Vitamins. A Reply to Gorrie.' *Education* 12 (1963): 23-26; A. Gorrie, 'Jam for Breakfast, Dinner and Tea.' *Education* 12 (1963): 23-26; P.C. Meikle (1960). 'What is Social Studies?' *NZPPTA Journal*, Vol. VI, section 1, no. 4 (May 1960): 9-11; section 2, no. 5 (June 1960): 11-14; section 3, no. 6 (July 1960): 11-12. All the above articles were reprinted in Openshaw, Roger (ed) *Current Issues in the Teaching of Social Studies* 187-708 (Palmerston North: Massey University Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education, 2002).

¹⁵ R. Openshaw, and E. Archer, 'The Battle for Social Studies in the New Zealand Secondary School 1942-1964.' In *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Roger Openshaw, 49-64. (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992); R.C.J. Stone, 'Humane Studies Are Not Enough.' *NZPPTA Journal* 10, no. 6 (1963): 27-29; R.G. Lockstone, 'The Neglect of Mind. Social Studies in the Primary School', *Landfall* 17, no. 1 (1963): 49-55.

¹⁶ Openshaw, 'Suffering from Enthusiasts', 40.

introduced. Social studies was positioned as a threat with little academic credibility. Layton argues the evolution of school subjects goes through three stages.¹⁷ Firstly, a new subject is a 'callow intruder' taught by enthusiastic but low status teachers, 'justifying its presence on the grounds of pertinence and utility'. Secondly, 'a tradition of scholarly work on the subject emerges' and this attracts teachers of higher status. Finally, the subject becomes an accepted academic school subject taught by specialist teachers. In the 1980s social studies hovered between the first and second stages. However, the dissonance between history and social studies did not dissipate over the following decades even as the new subject built up a degree of credibility.¹⁸

When the NHCC was meeting, history teachers regarded social studies as being of low status and had done so for almost 30 years. This long-term hostility was unusual. The geography teaching community had had a similar reaction to social studies when it was initially introduced. Professor of Geography Kenneth Cumberland saw social studies as 'quite unnecessary' and claimed it 'diminished the knowledge base for better understanding of society deriving from the distinctive chronological viewpoints' of both history and geography.¹⁹ However, by the 1980s geography had accommodated social studies as a junior partner in the hierarchy of school subjects. In part this was because geography was a more recent addition to the university curriculum and was in the process of becoming established at the same time that social studies was being introduced.²⁰ The 1950s also saw the publication by the Department of Education of Cumberland's school bulletins on regions of New Zealand and he played a major role in training and supporting teachers. The approaches and concepts of geography were evident in social studies although the Department of Education was aware this was not the case for history.²¹

'Social Change' and 'Social Control'

The reluctance of history teachers to engage enthusiastically with social studies was not helped by the lack of specific guidelines for secondary social studies until the late 1980s. In 1977 a social studies syllabus was introduced that addressed secondary social studies but for history teachers the new document was frustrating. It provided little

¹⁷ Layton cited in: Goodson, *School Subjects and Curriculum Change*, 10-11.

¹⁸ Rowena Taylor, 'Credible Subject or Callow Intruder? Social Studies in the Secondary School.' *New Zealand Review of Education* 15 (2005): 169-186.

¹⁹ Cumberland cited in: Aitkin, 'Curriculum Design in New Zealand Social Studies: Learning from the Past', 85-86.

²⁰ Gary McCulloch, 'Defining and Defending Subjects: The Case of the New Zealand Geographical Society.' In *The School Curriculum in New Zealand* edited by Gary McCulloch, 165-84 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992).

²¹ Renwick: amended transcript 05/05/08.

specific guidance in regards to history and highlighted a significant difference in orientation between social studies and history. The 1977 syllabus reinforced perceptions of history teachers that social studies was orientated to primary schooling. It maintained the 'spirit' of the 1962 primary school syllabus in that the 'prescriptive element was kept to a minimum' and it adopted a sociological framework based around the themes of 'social control' and 'social change'.²² In this context history appeared to be integrated into a presentist, sociological framework that epistemologically was at odds with the evidence-based model that drove how the subject was taught in the senior school. Aitken argues that history was included in the 1977 syllabus but 'not in any transparent sense' and that while some of the ideas that informed the document were drawn from history, they were simply indistinguishable from broader ideas that were drawn from the social sciences and humanities. There was little in the 1977 syllabus that resonated for history teachers:

The 1977 curriculum design shifted the focus of social studies even further away from history and geography than the Thomas Report, but failed to acknowledge and address the powerful schema for history and geography that were still prevalent among secondary teachers and that were reinforced by increasingly critical reports of the state of knowledge of New Zealand history.²³

The epistemological differences between the parent disciplines of social studies and history in part account for the longstanding dissonance between these two school subjects. In school subjects that draw on the natural sciences or social sciences (such as geography) there is a measure of consensus on widely accepted explanations that have emerged out of competition between different schools of thought²⁴. These orthodoxies may be widely shared but there will often be anomalies and if they cannot be set aside (and if social, cultural and political circumstances are amenable), they can lead to a 'scientific revolution' and a 'paradigm shift'.²⁵ However, despite the enthusiasm for shifting paradigms and explicitly theoretical models in some schools of historical scholarship, this notion is generally at odds with historical explanations, since historians do not generally look for all encompassing laws and theories to explain the past.²⁶ Rather, history is an 'argument without end'²⁷ and characterised by a range of interpretations of the same historical phenomena.

²² Department of Education, *Social Studies Syllabus Guidelines Forms 1-4*. (Wellington, Department of Education, 1977).

²³ Aitken, 'Curriculum Design in New Zealand Social Studies: Learning from the Past', 89-90.

²⁴ Edgar Jenkins, 'School Science.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 39, no. 3 (2007): 270-271.

²⁵ Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History*, 186-194.

²⁶ John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, 184. For a discussion of how historians approach research problems see: John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

²⁷ Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History*, 114-120.

The 1977 syllabus had its origins in the recommendations of the Currie Commission (1962) to develop a coherent Form 1-4 social studies syllabus. Social studies teachers had been keen to experiment and be 'imaginative' but there was 'no accepted pattern of matter and method.' The Commission was concerned at the lack of curriculum alignment between the senior primary and the junior secondary curriculum. Social studies had not developed into a three-year programme (as the Thomas Report had envisaged) but rather was taught as a two-year junior course before students at Form 5/ Year 11 opted to study history and/or geography in the senior school. In light of this the Currie Report recommended the development of a coherent Forms 1-4 social studies syllabus.²⁸

The 1977 'theme-centred', non-prescriptive syllabus demonstrated that by this time, the ethos of senior history and junior social studies had developed into markedly different subject areas. The differing orientation of both subjects had been manifested a decade earlier. The pedagogical and conceptual models of the Forms 1-4 social studies syllabus were given form at the Department of Education conference in 1965.²⁹ The national social studies conference was known as the 'guidelines course'. It defined social studies as 'the study of people'. The aim of social studies was to 'deepen the understanding of human affairs' and develop 'the rights and responsibilities of people as members of communities'. The five key concepts³⁰ promoted at the conference drew on the new thinking on culture and society that was emerging out of social anthropology, social psychology and sociology. These were influential in the social sciences (including geography) but not as yet in history. By the late 1960s there was strong commitment to the multidisciplinary social sciences approach in social studies:

Viewed as the study of man in society, social studies must be a synthesising subject. It is concerned with applying the knowledge obtained from the social sciences to promote an understanding of man and the problems he faces. To do this it is obvious ... to move beyond what geography, history and civics can tell us ... Social studies is an applied field of the social sciences.³¹

While there were concepts, suggested contexts and skills that linked with history, these were linked to the aim of developing citizenship and thus placed historical contexts into the realm of a 'usable past' that explained the present. This was

²⁸ Currie, *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand*, 268.

²⁹ Rex Bloomfield, private papers: Joint National Conference on the Curriculum in Social Studies, Forms I-IV held at Frank Lopdell House, Titirangi, 16th - 20th August 1965. Report of Course Director: A preliminary course to address issues of a Forms 1-4 syllabus had been run the previous year.

³⁰ Ibid., 20-23. 'Communities, Needs of Man, Interdependence, Change, Cultural Heritage'.

³¹ National Archives: Department of Education, *Curriculum Development Unit Bulletin* No. 28, Social Studies, 1968, 15.

evident in the emphasis on attitudes and values that were the basis of 'responsible citizenship.'³²

The attitude of historians and history teachers towards social studies became apparent when the SC history prescription was reshaped in the 1960s. There was an emphasis on specific topics that were linked to the parent discipline and a reluctance to engage with contemporary issues. The SC History Revision Committee had been set up in September 1963 and largely drew on the Auckland history teaching community.³³ The revision took place at the suggestion of Professor N.C. Phillips (Canterbury University) who was responsible for organising a revision of UE, UB and US prescriptions and in light of the Currie Commission recommendations it was felt that it 'would be wise' to revise all the examinations at the same time.³⁴

The existing SC history prescription allowed for considerable autonomy on the part of history teachers, but was increasingly seen by teachers as imprecise and the new SC prescription (introduced in 1966) aimed to reduce the 'scope of the examination' by reducing the 'breadth of material'.³⁵ Thus SC history by the mid 1960s had evolved into a 'topic specific' subject area that the history teaching community saw as closely linked to the parent discipline.³⁶ The pressure by history teachers for specific chronological topics had become apparent during the consultation process. Although the Department of Education wanted a more flexible approach that would provide 'continuity and a sense of interrelationships,' teachers wanted precise beginning and finishing dates for topics, and clear outlines of content on which they could base their teaching programmes. The SC Revision Committee also set out to move the previous starting dates for topics forward, but this met with strenuous opposition from many teachers, who were 'averse to the whole notion of contemporary history that ... was not history all'.³⁷

³² Ibid., 19.

³³ **Committee members:** Mr. C.R. Hemus (Mt Albert Grammar); Miss H. Ryburn (Westlake Girls); Dr. O.W. Parnaby (Auckland University Department of History), Mrs M.A. Roberts (Department of Education); Mrs B. Goodfellow (Auckland Girls' Grammar); Mr J.A. Whelan (Kings College); Mr R.C.J. Stone (Auckland University History Department); Mr R.M. Bean (Department of Education).

³⁴ **National Archives:** A.N.V. Dobbs (Director General of Education) to K. Sinclair (Auckland University History Department) 6 March 1972. Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1). In the event there was little correlation between the 1966 redrafted SC, UE, UB and US prescriptions and this was the key issue that the NHCC attempted to resolve in the 1980s.

³⁵ **National Archives:** K.J. Sheen, memo to Minister of Education, School Certificate Examinations, Revised Prescriptions in Geography and History, 18 March 1965. Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1).

³⁶ In the 1966 School Certificate Prescription there were 29 options in 3 sections (New Zealand, British and world history). A minimum of 18 topics would be examined in any one year with 6 questions on each of the 3 options. *Education Gazette*, 1 December 1965.

³⁷ National Archives: Statement on the New School Certificate Prescription Ak.7507/40/12/64. In Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1).

As well as a reluctance to engage with contemporary issues (in contrast with the orientation of social studies) and the insistence on precise topics, the history teaching community placed great emphasis on the accuracy of historical detail. N.J. Northover, Inspector of Secondary Schools, captured the flavour of this ethos when he wrote to Harry Reeves in the CDU to point out that the 1966 SC syllabus topic *The 1917 Revolution in Russia* was an ‘unsatisfactory’ definition and noted ‘...it is the second *in* that creates the confusion’. He asked ‘Does it mean ‘implemented in’, or merely ‘formulated in?’³⁸ In a similar vein Keith Sinclair (who was an original member of the Auckland committee engaged in redrafting the SC history syllabus) wrote to the Director-General of Education, Dr K.J. Sheen to complain about the wording of the 1966 SC welfare topic that he felt overemphasised the welfare reforms of the Liberals. Reflecting the current historiographical debate among historians he pointed out the topic *First Steps towards a Welfare State: The Liberal Government 1891-1912* should read *The Liberal Government 1891-1912: First Steps towards a Welfare State*.³⁹ This attention to detail reflected an ethos among history teachers and historians who insisted on a high degree of precision in regards to the details of history that to social studies enthusiasts appeared bewildering, pedantic and of little consequence.

The high priority placed on accuracy in SC set history teachers apart from their social studies colleagues although in reality, the SC course did not cater for an academic clientele which the Year 12 and 13 programmes did. The perception of the history teaching community was that SC was an academic programme that was the first step in an academic three-year history programme, but as Clyde Downes pointed out in 1984 this was far from reality:

History in New Zealand secondary schools has been completely restructured and updated since 1975... history topics now studied relate directly to content areas of particular interest and relevance to students ... The approach to knowledge is essentially the same as social studies (concept-based) and the topics studied particularly at fifth form level, correlate closely with studies undertaken by many social studies classes. The methods and resources build on those used in social studies: inquiry-type research activities, analysing pictures, cartoons and video clips; interpreting documents, maps, graphs and diagrams, discussion debate and role play.⁴⁰

³⁸ National Archives: N.J. Northover to H.A. Reeves 27/2/1967. The SCRC accepted Northover’s suggestion and in the 1968 paper the topic became ‘The 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. Leaders and Policies.’ In Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1).

³⁹ National Archives: K. Sinclair Professor of History (Auckland University) to K.J. Sheen (Director of Education) 10/ 11/1966. In Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1). The 1968 SC paper was reworded in accordance with Sinclair’s suggestion.

⁴⁰ Clyde Downes, ‘The Place of History in Social Studies’ (Unpublished paper prepared on behalf of the Auckland History Teachers Association, 30.9.84.) (Nicholas Tarning/ Robin Gwynn private papers).

There was a belief among many history teachers that social studies teachers were too casual with the facts and details of history (if they taught history at all). It was of special concern to the history teaching community that very little history (especially New Zealand history) appeared to be taught by the 1980s. An anecdotal view that was reinforced by the Department of Education survey in 1987 that found only 1% of social studies teachers focussed on New Zealand history.⁴¹ Historians were also disturbed at the apparent failure of history to be well taught in social studies. They expected to be consulted and involved in any syllabus revision matters in regards to SC (despite this being under the auspices of the Department of Education). The universities complained when the SC Examination Board sub-committee (established by the Department of Education in 1970 to 'produce a more realistic examination') did not include any academic historians.⁴² Keith Sinclair wrote to the Director General that this was 'deplorable' and pointed out that while university historians controlled the UE and US prescriptions, they had also been involved in the SC developments in 1964-5.⁴³ W.P. Morrell complained there was a 'lack of correlation' between SC and UE and suggested the SC Examination Board and the UEB needed to work together to address this.⁴⁴ Complaints from such senior historians were taken seriously and during the consultation process on the 1972 SC draft prominent historians from all six universities were approached for their views.⁴⁵

The Review of Social Studies in the 1980s

Merv Wellington set up a review of the social studies curriculum in 1983 and he expected the review to address the lack of a clear place for history.⁴⁶ The review was facilitated by Rex Bloomfield who saw social studies as 'the corner stone of a multicultural awareness in the curriculum' that would 'help children cope with social

⁴¹ Aitken, .Curriculum Design in New Zealand Social Studies: Learning from the Past., 98.

⁴² The sub-committee was made up of D.J. Francis (Department of Education Curriculum Development Unit); J.R Hagland (Secondary Inspectorate, Christchurch); N.J Northover (Secondary Inspectorate, Hamilton); J. Nuttall (Diocesan School) and S.F Newman (Secondary Division, Christchurch Teachers College).

⁴³ National Archives: K. Sinclair (Auckland University History Department) to Mr Dobbs (Director-General of Education) 25/2/1972. In Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1).

⁴⁴ National Archives: W.P Morrell (Otago University) to L.J. Mochan (New Zealand Secondary School Boards Association. 6 April 1972. In Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1).

⁴⁵ National Archives: Copies of the Draft Prescriptions were sent to Professor P.N. Tarling (History Department, Auckland University); Professor A. Ross (Department of History, Otago University); Professor G.W.O Woodward (Department of History, Canterbury University) ; Professor P. Munz (History Department, Victoria University); Professor W.H. Oliver (Department of History, Massey University); Professor J. A. Jenson (Department of History, Waikato University). See letters dated 28/29 May 1973 from J.L. Cable to all of the above. In Examinations: School Certificate, History Revision Committee, 20/5/18 (Part 1).

⁴⁶ Nicholas Tarling, Private papers: Correspondence M.L Wellington (Minister of Education) to Professor Nicholas Tarling (Auckland University History Department). 17 April 1984.

changes' and 'take pride in cultural differences.' Teachers of social studies, he claimed, needed to be 'adaptable and relevant' in how they structured their programmes,⁴⁷ and go beyond simply learning about the culture of others (what was known in the 1980s as the 'feeling for' approach) and to 'uphold social justice'.⁴⁸

Social studies advocates were aware that the subject needed to be redefined in light of the changing nature of the curriculum. Colin Knight, who sat on the PPTA curriculum panel, claimed the subject was 'under siege' by newly emergent subjects that overlapped with social studies and were used as a 'parking space' for a proliferation of areas (such as consumer education) that reflected contemporary community concerns. Social studies teachers were also apprehensive in engaging with controversial topics, especially in light of the lack of adequate resources and the widespread perception of students that social studies was 'boring' and was of low status.⁴⁹

These challenges required the Social Studies Review to redefine a distinct place for the subject in the curriculum, especially in connection with the teaching of values, concepts, skills and attitudes. Historical knowledge was given a low priority. Colin Knight claimed the teaching of 'historical facts' would suit the purposes of politicians and that 'knowledge was not the main determinant of attitude formation'. Social studies advocates in the 1980s saw an opportunity for significant revision of the curriculum. Knight called for seven core learning areas with social studies becoming 'Human Society'. This subject would 'develop skills and attitudes and understandings that will enable people to participate in society'.⁵⁰ In his submission to the Ministerial Review of Curriculum and Assessment, Rex Bloomfield called for a broad core (including social studies) to cover the first four years of secondary education. Bloomfield believed the curriculum should include a flexible approach that allowed for a school-based curriculum (although this would still include a place for 'traditional subject syllabuses' including history).⁵¹ Bloomfield's suggestions were evident in *The Guidelines for Social Studies* (1989) that did provide a firm indication

⁴⁷ Rex Bloomfield private papers: E.R Bloomfield (c.1981). *Into the Eighties: School Programmes in Social Studies*. This article was a personal view of the direction of social studies but many of the ideas mentioned appeared in E.R. Bloomfield, 'What did your pupils learn today?' *Social Studies Observer*. Waikato Social Studies Association, November 1980.

⁴⁸ For a summary of Bloomfield's views of social studies see: Rex Bloomfield/ Kelvin Smythe, 'Successful Social Studies: Forum.' In Roger Openshaw (ed). *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*. (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992), 147-157.

⁴⁹ Bloomfield private papers: C. Knight, 'Social Studies as a part of Today's Curriculum'. *Social Studies Observer*, 17:1 1984, 20-21, 26.

⁵⁰ Bloomfield private papers: Colin Knight, 'Curriculum or Climate?' *PPTA News*. 5:17. November 1984. The other six areas were personal development, environmental education, mathematical studies, science and technology, the arts and language studies.

⁵¹ Bloomfield private papers: R. Bloomfield, *Curriculum or Syllabus? Some Issues or problems. A submission to the Ministerial Review of Curriculum and Assessment*. 15 February 1986.

of the place of history in social studies (and was the basis of the 1991 social studies handbook). The handbook included recognisable history (and geography) topics at Forms 3 and 4. It retained the 'intent of the 1977 syllabus' but in a way that was recognisable and familiar to secondary teachers, with features such as focusing questions.⁵²

The NHCC in part blamed the inadequacy of history teaching in social studies on the lack of prescription, where teachers (who often had no background in history) enjoyed a high degree of autonomy over content choice. The contemporary-based, integrated model assumed a sophisticated grasp of history. To integrate genuine historical contexts into a presentist framework that was socially relevant was a demanding requirement, even for teachers who were trained in the discipline. The lack of prescription not only concerned New Zealand history educators but also generated international criticism. Visiting British history educator in the mid-1980s, Anne Low-Beer, was surprised that New Zealand did not explicitly teach history. She was unimpressed by the 'chronological chaos' and 'lack of coherence' in how history was taught in social studies. The historical dimension, she claimed, was often 'a gross distortion' and the topics studied may have been of 'relevance to the present' but 'did not do justice to the past.'⁵³ As well as publishing her findings in an academic journal her views sparked off a popular debate when she wrote an article in *The NZ Listener* that was critical of social studies:

History taught within social studies is like the smile of the Cheshire cat; in the process of vanishing altogether... It is not easy to see how balanced history courses can exist within social studies. Indeed the word history is never used in social studies reports; there is a discussion only of 'our heritage' and 'topics on the past'..... The whole structure of social studies is unhistorical. A historical perspective requires a much bigger time-span.⁵⁴

While her views were not wholeheartedly endorsed by the Department of Education, Low-Beer was influential on the NHCC. Her paper was included in the submission to the Ministerial Review on the School Curriculum and it recommended that '...New Zealand history be made a compulsory, identifiable part of the Forms 1-4 curriculum.'⁵⁵

⁵² Aitken, Graeme, 'The Purpose and Substance of Social Studies: Citizenship Education Possibilities.' In *Towards Effective Social Studies*, edited by Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw 85-112 (Palmerston North Kanuka Grove Press, 2005), 91.

⁵³ Ann Low-Beer, 'The Eclipse of History in New Zealand Schools', 113-115.

⁵⁴ Ann Low-Beer, 'History by the Board', *New Zealand Listener*, November 29, 1985, 45.

⁵⁵ National History Curriculum Committee. *Submission to the Ministerial Review on School Curriculum*, 1 April 1986. (Nicholas Tarling: private papers).

The sociological orientation of the 1977 document, combined with the absence of prescribed content and the lack of links with public examinations, reinforced the prevailing perception of history educators that social studies was not an academic subject and detrimental to history.⁵⁶ History (unlike social studies) was driven by the prescriptions of prestigious public examinations. History teachers were more concerned with the precise requirements of examination prescriptions than the broad vision of the syllabus.⁵⁷ Goodson (1987) argues school subjects compete for a place in the curriculum and within the hierarchy of competing school subjects, the link to public examinations is the key factor as to whether or not a subject is perceived as having 'academic' status.⁵⁸ Because examinations provide such high status for senior subjects, it is the prescriptions that determine what is taught to a far greater degree than the syllabus.

The lack of explicit links to a discrete university discipline⁵⁹ or to examination prescriptions generated widespread condemnation of social studies among the university historians. This was evident when submissions on the wider curriculum review were called for. Nicholas Tarling wrote that social studies 'may have some merit for children at primary school level, but is not appropriate for many secondary school adolescents.'⁶⁰ Keith Sorrenson called for social studies to be 'abolished' with 'history and geography resuming their autonomous status.'⁶¹ Robin Gwynn claimed only history could 'provide the perspective needed to ... develop a sense of identity' and should be studied in its own right not 'merely as part of the social sciences umbrella'. Social studies, he claimed, had 'been disastrous for the study of history in schools'.⁶² J.M.R Owens (president of NZHA) pointed out that social studies had 'failed to provide students with a real understanding of the processes of change and continuity'⁶³ and G.W.O. Woodward argued history should 'permeate the whole of the curriculum' and that social studies could only achieve this if it was

⁵⁶ Cubitt, Sandra, 'Understanding Social Studies. Addressing the Challenges Posed by Recent Reviews of the Curriculum Statement.' In *Towards Effective Social Studies*, edited by Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw, 7-11 (Palmerston North: Kanuka Grove Press, 2005).

⁵⁷ Department of Education, *History Forms 5 to 7 Syllabus for schools* (Wellington: Learning Media, 1989); The History Syllabus was expressed in the following prescriptions: Department of Education. (1987). *School Certificate Examination Prescription: History*. Wellington; Department of Education. (1988). *Sixth Form Certificate History: National Course Statement*. Wellington; Department of Education. (1990) *University Entrance, Bursaries and Scholarships History*, Wellington

⁵⁸ Ivor Goodson, *School Subjects and Curriculum Change: Studies in Curriculum History* (London: Falmer Press, 1987), 5-12, 17-21.

⁵⁹ Critics in the history community were fond of pointing out that social studies was not explicitly linked to a university parent discipline although as an integrated subject social studies did draw on the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, geography, economics, history and philosophy.

⁶⁰ Nicholas Tarling, letter to AHTA 30.9.84 (Nicholas Tarling: private papers)

⁶¹ K. R. Sorrenson (Auckland University History Department) to C.P. Brice (Department of Education). 14 October 1986. (Robyn Gwynn private papers).

⁶² Robin Gwynn, Submission to Committee, 1986 (R. Gwynn private papers)

⁶³ Dr. J.M.R. Owens (President), New Zealand Historical Association submission to Department of Education on Curriculum Review, 21 September, 1986. (R.Gwynn private papers).

taught by teachers with 'a good historical training.'⁶⁴ Even Erik Olssen (who was a social historian and comfortable with the sociological orientation of the subject) argued that while history could be taught through social studies '...this has very rarely been done' as 'very few social studies teachers have had any training in history'.⁶⁵

The negative view historians had of social studies reinforced history teachers' sense of superiority in dismissing the subject as inferior. Secondary senior subject teachers tend to establish their identity through links to the parent discipline and history was no exception.⁶⁶ Within the hierarchy of senior subjects, history teachers saw themselves as teaching an academic subject that was informed by the 'parent discipline' of university history. Thus the integrated approach of social studies in their eyes had little academic status. The NZHA reinforced the view that social studies was responsible for the demise of school history, and served the interests of geography.⁶⁷ The social studies syllabus was described as 'half baked' and NZHA applauded the introduction of junior history as an alternative to social studies in a number of Wellington schools.⁶⁸

The reluctance of history teachers to engage with social studies was not only a response to the lack of prescription, the presentist approach to the past and their own territorial defence of their subject; there were also differences in regards to content and pedagogy. These differences were of a more fundamental nature and account for the longstanding dissonance between the two subjects. History educators were alarmed by the low priority social studies educators appeared to place on historical content. David Wood commented:

... the senior education officer for social studies in the Department was strongly committed to continuing the centrality of Social Studies in the school curriculum and because of the skills, values and attitudes the subject offered students, he was less concerned with content. I remember him saying to me that providing recognised socially constructive values and attitudes and skills were being emphasised and learned, it didn't matter what content was taught in social studies. I disagreed.

The strong emphasis history teachers placed on having a firm grasp of the relevant content to prepare students for examinations contributed to history teachers

⁶⁴ G.W.O. Woodward (Professor of History Canterbury University History Department). Submission to Curriculum Review 10 October 1986. (R. Gwynn private papers).

⁶⁵ Erik Olssen, Submission to Review the Curriculum in Schools, 10 October 1986 (R.Gwynn, private papers).

⁶⁶ R. Reynolds, 'A Framework for Researching Syllabus Development and Curriculum Change.' *Curriculum Perspectives*. 21, no. 3 (2001): 1-2.

⁶⁷ NZHA Bulletin, December 1980.

⁶⁸ NZHA Bulletin, May 1981.

adopting different pedagogical approaches to those employed in social studies. History teachers were suspicious of approaches such as co-operative learning that had emerged in the 1960s and were encouraged in the 1977 social studies syllabus. Influenced by the university transmission teaching model, typical senior history lessons at Years 12 and 13 were largely based around 'chalk and talk' transmission styles of delivery with a strong emphasis on textbook summaries and note taking. Textbooks played a major role in school history programmes and therefore made it difficult to generate change in the subject. The strong emphasis history teachers placed on having a firm grasp of the relevant content to prepare students for public examinations meant history teachers became 'experts' in the narrow range of topics that were examined. Because of their links with the university this pedagogical approach was seen as appropriate for senior classes. Social studies teachers, however, were not constrained by examinations and were more open to different pedagogical models.

The history and social studies communities could not easily reconcile their differences in the 1980s. As well as the lack of a link with a university discipline and a public examination, the presentist approach to content in social studies and differences in pedagogical approaches were compounded for history teachers by wider criticism of social studies as 'propagandist'. History teachers dismissed social studies as lacking in credibility, while social studies enthusiasts tended to portray history critics as unenlightened elitists from universities and academically exclusive secondary schools.⁶⁹ Consequently history teachers concentrated on their senior subject and distanced themselves from social studies.⁷⁰ Ironically, as many history teachers taught social studies, the situation had the potential to address declining numbers, as this was the vehicle by which at least some historical content was primarily delivered in the first two years of secondary school.

The fundamental differences between history and social studies became apparent in the late 1990s, when it seemed the major differences in approach by both subjects had been resolved. Although it is not directly related to the work of the NHCC, it is worth considering these developments as they illuminate the extent of dissonance between these two subject communities that impacted on the shaping of the history curriculum. By the late 1990s social studies had a loose prescription and the integrated approach now reflected the multidisciplinary approach of the parent

⁶⁹ Openshaw and Archer, 'The Battle for Social Studies in the New Zealand Secondary School 1942-1964', 52-56.

⁷⁰ R. Shaker, 'Social Studies as Curriculum History'. In *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Roger Openshaw, 34-48 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992).

discipline. The social studies curriculum (1997) drew on features of the 1991 handbook in that there was a recognisable, explicit, history 'strand' in the document, 'time, continuity and change'.⁷¹ Many history teachers, however, were still ambivalent about social studies, at best seeing it as a recruiting ground for their senior subject,⁷² and this reflected the deep seated epistemological differences between the social sciences and history. The animosity between the two subjects has only begun to disappear recently as it has become clear to history teachers that few students have opted for senior social studies (thus it is not a threat) and that history has an explicit place in the new curriculum.

The NZISSC (1997) was devised as part of a major curriculum reform by the neo-liberal National government of the 1990s⁷³ and the development was controversial, with the first two drafts being rejected.⁷⁴ The first social studies draft (1994) was seen as too radical by neo-conservatives (such as the Business Roundtable advisory group, the Education Forum) while the second (1996) was criticised by liberal educators as paying little attention to biculturalism, gender equity and multiculturalism. The Education Forum saw social studies as left-wing social engineering, while liberal educators defended the subject as a vehicle for addressing contemporary concerns of racism, sexism and inequality. In this context history as an evidence-based subject became a weapon for neo-conservatives to attack social studies. Geoffrey Partington, an Australian sociologist, who contributed to the Education Forum submission, attacked the social studies drafts as ignoring New Zealand's European/ British heritage, with an emphasis by 'politically correct Pākehā' on what he called 'Waitangism'.⁷⁵ The Education Forum's submission called for a return to a traditional, chronological approach to history.⁷⁶ At the other end of the spectrum Kay Harrison, a history teacher (who was involved with the

⁷¹ An outcomes driven curriculum model with eight levels The *New Zealand Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* (NZISSC:1997) extended Social Studies to the senior school and was first examined under the NCEA in 2002. While welcomed by the social studies community, it is argued *SSiNZC* presented 'society as static, ordered and predictable' rather than fluid and complex. For discussion of the epistemological problems with the *SSiNZC* see: Andrea Milligan, 'Representing the Social World: New Zealand's Social Studies Curriculum in Change.' (M. Ed unpublished thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2006).

⁷² See Paul O'Connor. *Surviving or Thriving? School History in the 21st Century. Keynote address to New Zealand Historical Association Conference, November 25 2007* (<http://www.nzhta.org.nz>)

⁷³ The current document was written by social studies experts at Waikato University in 1997 after almost 3 years of controversy and their views on citizenship were encapsulated in a position paper written earlier in the same year. See Social, Physical and Health Education Department, School of Education, University of Waikato (1997), Position Paper, Social Studies in NZ Curriculum, p. 5. (cited in Cubitt, 'Understanding Social Studies'. 2005).

⁷⁴ Roger Openshaw, 'Citizen Who? The Debate over Economic and Political Correctness in the Social Studies Curriculum'. In *New Horizons for New Zealand Social Studies*, edited by Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw, 19-42 (Palmerston North: ERDC Press, 1998).

⁷⁵ Geoffrey Partington, 'Social Studies in the New Zealand History Curriculum.' In *ibid.*, 83-102.

⁷⁶ Education Forum, 'Social Studies in the New Zealand curriculum: A submission on the draft', (Wellington, Education Forum, 1995).

NHCC women's sub-committee), reflecting the felt need for a useable past, saw the revised social studies draft (1996) as woefully inadequate and a 'continuation of the colonisers schooling process'. What she wanted from history was a weapon that would help in the 'battle against ethnocentrism' and address 'the injustices of the past.'⁷⁷

Senior history teachers largely distanced themselves from this debate (as they saw social studies as not only inferior, but as unconnected with their subject community) and focussed on history as a senior subject. They saw their role as building on the new history syllabus and the Year 11-13 prescriptions, and were studiously apolitical, focussing primarily on preparing resources for teachers. Consequently, history teachers were largely absent from the debate and this gave neo-conservatives the opportunity to use history as a weapon to attack the perceived relativism of social studies. It also locked senior history into a 1970's approach to the subject that has largely eschewed the radicalisation of the discipline over the last 30 years, as historians have engaged with social history, women's history and cultural history. Although the 1989 history syllabus did encourage teachers to draw on contemporary approaches to the past, the majority of history teachers continued to teach topics that were based around politics and war and were historiographically anachronistic.⁷⁸

Conclusion

The NHCC perceived history as an academic subject that was closely linked with the parent discipline with the shape of the programmes being dictated by the examination prescriptions. Both liberals and conservatives on the NHCC shared the view that history, as a senior subject, was not closely connected with social studies. Although liberals (unlike their conservative counterparts) wanted to see a greater emphasis on those aspects of the past that were of contemporary concern, they saw history as an evidenced-based senior subject and eschewed the integrated model of social studies. Thus in the 1980s the social studies and history teaching communities appeared to have little in common. The prevailing view on the NHCC was that social studies was inferior and a threat, and this reflected a longstanding animosity between the two subjects. This was unusual. While geography educators had held similar views as history teachers to social studies in the 1950s, by the

⁷⁷ Kay Harrison, 'Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum. Dosing for Amnesia or Enemy of Ethnocentrism?' *Ibid*, 63-82.

⁷⁸ See NZHTA surveys. Chapter 1: Footnote 19.

1980s social studies was seen as 'junior partner' and a valuable precursor to senior geography. The distancing of history from social studies in the 1980s had a major impact on the shaping of the history curriculum. While the 1989 syllabus encouraged teachers to adopt new approaches to the subject, this was not the case in regards to the examination prescriptions that were designed to protect the professional interests of key stakeholders in the history teaching community. As classroom teachers have little autonomy over what is taught at a senior level, history became locked into an anachronistic, Eurocentric framework that changed little over the subsequent two decades.

CHAPTER 9

‘Completing the Picture’

Embedding women’s history into the history curriculum

Women are missing from history not by accident or chance but because of the dominant view of what constituted history. The absence of women’s experience from the historical record has had the effect of devaluing that experience, both for men and women. It has led women in particular to distrust their own experience as a basis for verification and interpretation ... above all the neglect of women has produced an incomplete, inaccurate and somewhat distorted view of the past.¹

Myra Kunowski

Introduction

In a significant departure from the continuity of the previous curriculum, a women’s perspective on the past was explicitly embedded into the senior examination prescriptions and consequently became an integral feature of history teaching programmes. This chapter examines a successful initiative in the development of the history curriculum and presents a hypothesis as to the key factors that determine success in curriculum developments at this level. It is argued the introduction of this genuinely new initiative was due to a combination of three determinants in designing the prescriptions and that all of these are necessary for successful syllabus reconstruction at this level.

Firstly, a successful curriculum initiative in history needed to reflect the values and beliefs of the contemporary decision-making elite. By the 1980s the women’s movement was an integral feature of middle-class, liberal, urban New Zealand and was active across the spectrum of society, from lesbian separatists in minority pressure groups, to the membership of the socially conservative National Party. Second wave feminism was especially influential in the liberal environment of educational policy making, where it was widely accepted that the existing curriculum reinforced male and female stereotypes and needed to be reshaped to be non-sexist and inclusive of the interests of girls. Reflecting this dominant ethos the history committee was sympathetic to introducing women’s history into the new syllabus.

¹ Myra Kunowski, *Women in History* (Department of Education, Wellington, 1988). 5.

Secondly, a proposed initiative in history needed to be located within the existing paradigm of the discipline and pose no threat to the current orthodoxy of academic history as the history teaching community saw their subject as being closely linked to the parent discipline. Women's history had credibility as a legitimate international field of historical scholarship and was closely linked to social history, a primary research interest of academic historians in the 1980s. Although feminist historians were often linked with radical politics and asked different questions of the past, they were nevertheless located within the evidence-based framework of academic history.

Finally, it was essential that advocates of change were able to establish alliances with key stakeholders who were sympathetic to their cause. Advocates of women's history played a key role in the curriculum decision-making process and teachers who prioritised introducing women's history into the syllabus established effective networks with both historians and department officials. There were also a number of historians (either on or close to the committee) who supported the inclusion of women's history in the curriculum.

The combination of all these factors saw a version of women's history embedded into the prescriptions and consequently future history teaching programmes. While the syllabus provided the broad aims and directions for history education, at senior level it was the examination prescriptions that determined the history programmes that were delivered in schools. Although women's history was generally unpopular among teachers, the NHCC ensured that women's history was embedded into the senior prescriptions. As well as providing several options for enthusiasts, the SC prescription linked what was then known in history teaching circles as a 'women's topic' with a high-interest popular SC topic,² and women's history was explicitly required in both bursary/scholarship options. By shaping the prescriptions to make women's history a requirement, the minority of teachers who were keen to include a feminist dimension into their programmes had ample opportunity to do so, while the majority of teachers (who opposed the initiative) were still required to teach some women's history.

² The SC topic *Women and Health 1915-80* was thematically linked with *Black Civil Rights in America 1954-70* and teachers were required to teach both topics if they chose this theme: (Department of Education: School Certificate Prescription, 1988).

Figure 6: The embedding of women's history into the senior history curriculum: a successful initiative in senior history

Criteria	Women's History
1) <i>The decision-making elite share the view that a particular body of knowledge is of higher status and more important than any alternative.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feminism an integral feature of middle-class, liberal New Zealand society (especially in education circles) ▪ Widely accepted that the existing curriculum reinforced male and female stereotypes and needed to be reshaped to be non-sexist and inclusive of the interests of girls.
2) <i>The initiative is located within the existing orthodoxy of the 'parent discipline' and shares the existing scholarly constraints and boundaries of the discipline.</i>	<p>Women's history:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was an established branch of historical scholarship that was closely linked to social history (a primary research interest of academic historians in the 1970s and 80s). ▪ Posed no threat to the current orthodoxy of academic history ▪ Was not locked into an inflexible ideological framework; thus women's history was able to develop and grow as a genre of the parent discipline (from the invisibility of women in history to the role of gender in the past).
3) <i>Advocates for the initiative establish alliances with major stakeholders in a subject community who are sympathetic to their cause.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advocates of change were able to establish alliances with key stakeholders who were sympathetic to their cause (including historians and department officials) and played a key role in the curriculum decision-making process. ▪ A number of academic historians (either on or close to the committee) who had high status in the parent discipline supported the inclusion of women's history in the curriculum.

Staying within the Paradigm

For any radical movement in which the marginalised or ignored are claiming increased recognition, a version of the past that gives such claims legitimacy is a crucial aspect of this process. Women's history was no exception. It had emerged as a major area of research in the 1970s, being located within the field of social history. Until this time women were largely excluded from university professional positions although they were involved in producing history 'outside the academy for the marketplace'. With women's history marginalised from the mainstream, a 'separate feminine historical tradition' was created that eschewed the interest in war and politics of contemporary historians and rather focussed on women's experiences. These were documented in memoirs, autobiographies, biographies and historical fiction.³ New Zealand history writing reflected this trend in that while women were 'interested in their history there was little crossover between popular or family histories and academic history' and women were largely absent from the

³ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?*, 154-163.

historical record. Sinclair's *A History of New Zealand* (1959) made no attempt to focus on the unique experience of women and Oliver's *A Story of New Zealand* (1960) was similarly minimalist in his approach to women in history. Women's experiences featured either only in passing or conformed to the dominant discourse of war and politics.⁴

The absence of a women's dimension in New Zealand historiography in part reflected the lack of professional female historians before the 1970s. The history profession in New Zealand was small at this time although the absence of female historians did not indicate a lack of suitable qualifications. The lists of theses 1927-37 reveals that almost a third of thesis writers were women. None were appointed to the academic staff of a university⁵ and it was rare for women to write academic history at this time. This had an important impact for history education as almost 'three-quarters of the women who graduated from the University of New Zealand between 1878 and 1920 went teaching.'⁶ the most common occupation for female history graduates was to become secondary school teachers.

Practically the only women in the historical profession before the Second World War and centennial celebrations were secondary school teachers. Most taught British or European history to girls taking academic courses.⁷

Women did write history outside of the university. Eileen Soper wrote the centennial publication *The Mothers of Otago* (1948), Ruth Allen wrote a history of Nelson (1954), and in 1957 Nancy Taylor was appointed to write a history of the home front in World War 2, which was eventually published in 1986.⁸ A small number of history graduates also worked as research assistants to prominent male historians and some later became academics. According to historian Mary Boyd, this generation of women 'had little or no interest in separate women's organizations or women's history' and wanted 'to enter the profession in the same way as men, not as token women'.⁹ Nancy Taylor, Mary Boyd, Ruth Ross and Frances Porter all worked as research assistants to J.C Beaglehole in his publications during the 1940s but later went on to publish academic history in their own right.¹⁰

⁴ Barbara Brookes, 'Women's History.' In *The Future of the Past*, edited by Colin Davis and Peter Lineham (Palmerston North: Massey University Department of History, 1990), 76.

⁵ Mary Boyd, 'Women in the Historical Profession: Women Historians in the 1940s.' *Women's Studies Journal* (1988) no. 4, 78.

⁶ Kay Morris Matthews, *In their own right: women and Higher Education in New Zealand before 1945* (Wellington: NZCER Press, 2008), 12.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 77.

⁸ Nancy M. Taylor, *The New Zealand People at War: The Home Front* (Wellington: Government Print, 1986).

⁹ Boyd, 'Women in the Historical Profession: Women Historians in the 1940s', 83.

¹⁰ Timothy Beaglehole, *A Life of J.C Beaglehole New Zealand Scholar* (Wellington: Victoria University Press), 286-288.

Feminist historians were explicitly located within the activist tradition of social history. Unlike the women above who sought to 'enter the profession in the same way as men' the feminist historians of the 1970s saw themselves as part of the tide of activism that aimed to change society on a number of levels. There had been attempts to write social history prior to the 1970s but this was simply 'history with the politics left out'. Social history as it emerged in the 1960s was radically different. It grew out of the study of the working classes and 'common people' by predominantly left-wing historians,¹¹ whose aim was not simply to uncover the untold histories of the ignored, but to improve the lives of the poor and the marginalised in society. As influential social historian E.P. Thompson (1963) claimed:

I am seeking to rescue the poor stockinger, the Luddite cropper, the 'obsolete' hand-loom weaver, the 'utopian' artisan ... from the enormous condescension of posterity.¹²

This approach to social history was reflected in New Zealand university history departments by the 1980s. Social historian Erik Olssen, who was an enthusiastic proponent of women's history on the NHCC (and the only historian determined to ensure a sizable component on New Zealand history was included), saw the 'new social history' as something of a revolution.

The 'new social history' and its multiplying sub-genres, such as women's history and labour history, urban and cultural history, business history and econometrics, aspired to understand the experience not of elites' but of ordinary people in their everyday lives, many of them previously neglected, while making explanations more rigorous.¹³

By the 1980s social history had had a profound influence on New Zealand historiography including on those historians who had previously ignored it. The lack of a women's dimension in the previous historiography did not spring from a conscious effort to exclude women from the past. Rather, it reflected that for historians in the 1950s and '60s at this time the experiences of non-elites (including women) were not a primary interest and their focus was on politics and constitutional matters. By the 1970s, however, historians were becoming aware of the influence of social history and included women's experiences in their accounts. Sinclair included women's history in his later editions of *A History of New Zealand* and on a personal level was supportive of women becoming historians. He supervised Marcia Stenson (one of the advocates of women's history on the NHCC) for her MA thesis in 1962/3. She recalls that Sinclair was unusual among his colleagues, in that he not only

¹¹ Tosh, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and new Directions in the Study of Modern History*, 97.

¹² Edward Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Victor Gollanz, 1963).13.

¹³ Olssen, 'Where to from Here? Reflections on the 20th Century Historiography of 19th Century.' 58-62.

encouraged her in her work, but also did not question her ability to complete her research, despite her being the mother of a small child.¹⁴ Although Oliver was reluctant to revise his *Story of New Zealand* to include a women's dimension when asked by his publishers,¹⁵ as a social historian he was committed to including women's experiences in his future projects. As editor of *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981) Oliver ensured the record of women was as well documented as the literature allowed. He also edited the first volume of *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* (1990), where working with Charlotte Macdonald, he ensured that over 20% of all entries were on a wide range of women.

Activist History

While feminist historians initially saw themselves as located within the tradition of social history (and used similar methodological tools of analysis), by the 1970s they had moved beyond the concerns with social class and shared a view that 'patriarchy' was 'the critical determinant of women's history' rather than class.¹⁶ They argued women were oppressed by a patriarchal society and saw their research as informing attempts to address the existing inequality between the sexes. This went beyond the objective of simply explaining the past. Feminist historians saw their role as to investigate inequality between the sexes, to explain how this came about and to work to change this situation. To this end many feminist historians were involved in a range of political issues that were typically aligned with the radical politics of the New Left and neo-Marxism. Feminist historians were prominent in the anti-Vietnam war and anti apartheid movements as well as working for civil rights and opposing racism.¹⁷

In regards to school history, the primary motive of feminist historians was to address the invisibility of women, and by doing so to breakdown the contemporary stereotypes of women as simply mothers and housewives. This was the central ethos of the NHCC in approaching the place of women's history in the curriculum. Feminists claimed conventional history had ignored women and drew on historians such as Shelia Rowbothan who researched women's subservient role in a male dominated society.¹⁸ The aims of feminist historians were closely aligned with the activist objectives of the History Workshop movement that saw the 'historical

¹⁴ Stenson: interview.

¹⁵ Radio New Zealand, interview 22/11/2002; W.L Oliver and Kim Hill (tape in author's possession).

¹⁶ Tosh, *Pursuit of history* (1984), 8.

¹⁷ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 164-172.

¹⁸ Rowbothan, *Hidden from History*, 1.

reconstruction of working people's experiences as giving back a sense of inspiration and understanding' to working people and 'rescuing working class memories of work, locality, family and politics.'¹⁹ For example, British feminist historian Anna Davin (daughter of New Zealand writer Dan Davin) studied with E.P. Thompson and, as well as organising the first women's history conference at Ruskin College, Oxford, she played a key role in the History Workshop movement, working with left-wing historian Raphael Samuel.²⁰ It was a commitment to the activist nature of social history that primarily motivated advocates of women's history on the NHCC. In the school curriculum social history had major implications for pedagogy, as it required a greater emphasis on research. Marcia Stenson recalls:

On one hand we wanted to get more social history and women's history, but there was also a determination to have a different style of teaching. More research projects ... I thought there should be more social history (not just women's history) and New Zealand history. I was reading the feminist literature ... but I was also reading a lot of social history and reading about ordinary people.²¹

While some feminist historians adopted conventional methods of using documentary research to uncover women's experiences (in areas such as migration patterns), the interest in health and the family required new approaches. Feminist historians found themselves inhabiting the same intellectual territory as sociologists, demographers and social anthropologists, who were also interested in the structure of society and areas such as age, gender, race, occupation and social mobility. This gave women's history an inclusive, multi-disciplinary ethos that was more open to different methodologies (such as oral history). Margaret Tennant pointed out because feminist historians were aware of how women had been excluded from narratives about the past they were not as constrained by traditional approaches to history.²² Tennant, who in the 1980s had recently finished her PhD supervised by W.H Oliver at Massey, recalls:

Women's history was on the up and there was a great demand. Charlotte Macdonald and Barbara Brookes both came back from overseas and I had been working within the field within New Zealand. It was much more multidisciplinary then. I was working with psychologists and sociologists. We all mixed at these women's studies conferences. There was a real openness. I used to go to seminars around the campus. Women's history wasn't hierarchical. I was learning a lot from the school teachers. There was a sense of community engagement ... it was really exciting. Academics and people in the community were working together. And many of these women had been, or were, teachers. (M. Tennant)

¹⁹ Tosh, *Pursuit of History*, (1984), 8.

²⁰ Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 166-169.

²¹ Stenson: interview.

²² Tennant: interview.

The primary focus of feminist historians in the 1970s was on the family²³ and the initial aim of feminist historians was to uncover what had been hidden and to recover a unique and distinctive women's world (colloquially known in the 1980s as 'herstory'). However, by the 1980s when the NHCC was meeting feminist historians were beginning to look beyond this model and focus on gender (the social organisation of sexual difference). An interest in gender also saw the beginnings of research into male stereotypes and masculinity.²⁴ The shift towards gender saw some feminists look to poststructuralist thinkers to inform their work rather than locating 'women's history' within social history. After working with E.P. Thompson, Joan Scott became aware that in *The Making of the English Working Class* the notion of class was represented as a masculine construct. Social historians, she argued, typically wrote within a Marxist tradition which had an economic focus and assumed women were simply one group of 'ordinary' people who had been exploited. Scott was also highly critical of 'herstory' approaches to the past that isolated women as a separate topic of history. Rather, drawing on Derrida and Foucault, she argued that the concept of gender is a more sophisticated model for examining the shape of institutional structures in the past.²⁵ The activist approach to gender orientated writing that informed advocates of women's history in the 1980s was encapsulated by Natalie Zemon Davis. In *The Return of Martin Guerre* (1983) Davis presented an account of a 16th century French farmer whose identity was assumed by an impostor with whom his wife colluded for her own advantage. While *Martin Guerre* was based on Court records, her account was criticised as speculation and that while keeping with the values of contemporary feminist beliefs in the 'strength and ingenuity' of women, was largely a series of 'unjustified' interpretations.²⁶ Not all feminist historians however shared an enthusiasm for poststructuralism or 'herstory' and looked to an approach to women's history that had emerged with in the 1940s when Mary Beard 'questioned the proposition that women were members of a subject sex' and eschewed the view of women as victims.²⁷ The debates within feminist historiography echoed those in other genres of the discipline and this division had become apparent in the Berkshire History Conferences in the early 1970s.²⁸

²³ Tosh, *Pursuit of History*, (1984), 98.

²⁴ For example, see Jock Phillips 'Mummy's Boys: Pākehā men and Male Culture in New Zealand'. In P. Bunkle and B. Hughes, (eds), *Women in New Zealand Society* (Auckland: Allen and Unwin, 1980), 217-243; ____, *A Man's Country? The Image of the Pākehā – a History* (Auckland: Penguin, 1987); Michael King, (ed). *One of the Boys? Changing Views of Masculinity in New Zealand*. (Auckland: Heinemann, 1987).

²⁵ Hughes-Warrington, *50 Historical Thinkers*, 276-282.

²⁶ Ibid, 55-62; Evans, *In Defence of History*, 245-7; Curthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 202-203.

²⁷ Cuthoys and Docker, *Is History Fiction?* 157-161.

²⁸ Ibid, 170-72.

An Emerging Literature

By the time the NHCC met there was a considerable body of both academic and popular literature on women's history that could be drawn on to include a women's dimension in the syllabus. Much of the initial research in New Zealand was on 'recovering foremothers' and adopted a biographical approach. The *Herstory Diaries* documented a new type of celebratory history that not only portrayed heroines and notable 'firsts', but also reminded readers of current injustices, such as the abortion law.²⁹ Along with *Broadsheet*, the *Herstory Diaries* largely served a popular audience but there was also a growing body of academic literature. By the early 1980s all universities had Women's Studies Departments and *The Women's Studies Journal* (and the published conference papers of Women's Studies conferences) disseminated material on women's experiences.³⁰

The first major scholarly work on New Zealand women's history was Patricia Grimshaw's *Women's Suffrage in New Zealand* (1972).³¹ This was followed by Raewyn Dalziel's article *The Colonial Helpmeet* (1977). Dalziel argued that in reality the 'vote appeared less to liberate women, than to confirm their domestic, nurturing role'.³² Grimshaw and Dalziel's work was immensely important in New Zealand and Australia, and was the beginning of a substantial body of historical research that was published over the following decades in this part of the world. This was firstly a consequence of female academics becoming prominent in the humanities and social sciences by the 1980s (as evidenced by almost half of the articles published in the *New Zealand Journal of History* in this decade being written by professional female academics). Secondly, it reflected a burgeoning interest in documenting the experiences of previously ignored people and groups (including women).

A range of women's history was published during the 1980s such as *Women in New Zealand Society* (1980) that was made up of a wide-ranging number of articles by various authors. In a similar vein *Women in History: Essays on European Women in New Zealand* (1986) demonstrated by the middle of the decade the diversity of approaches to women's history.³³ Biography continued to be important in the growing historiography as evidenced by the wide range of women who appeared in the *New Zealand Dictionary of Biography* (1990). Frances Porter's biography of

²⁹ Brookes, *The Shape of History*, 90-91.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 78

³¹ Pat Grimshaw, *Women's Suffrage in New Zealand* (Auckland: Penguin, 1972).

³² Raewyn Dalziel, 'The Colonial Helpmeet: Women's Role and the Vote in 19th Century New Zealand,' *New Zealand Journal of History* 11, no. 2 (1977).

³³ Barbara Brookes, Charlotte Macdonald and Margaret Tennant, (eds), *Women in History, Essays on European Women in New Zealand*, (Wellington Allen and Unwin 1986).

Jane Maria Atkinson *Born to New Zealand* (1989) reflected the typical 'worthy women' approach of an earlier generation of female historians. However, Mary Findlay's *Tooth and Nail* (1974) documented the experience of illegal abortion and showed the interest feminist historians had in the hidden aspects of women's past. Biography also featured prominently in Sandra Coney's *Every Girl: A History of the Auckland YMCA* (1986), and Māori women were not entirely absent from the record with Michael King's accounts of *Te Puea* (1977) and *Whina Cooper* (1983). Furthermore, Judith Binney and Gillian Chaplin's *Nga Morehu: The Survivors* (1986) drew on oral history to document the lives of eight Māori women who were followers of Te Kooti.

Feminist historians (both popular and academic) not only focussed on women-centred history such as health and education (where women had played an obviously important role), but also looked at areas where women's contribution had been ignored, such as the Second World War. Bathia Mackenzie (1982) wrote of the experiences of women in the WAAF, Iris Latham (1986) of the WAACs and Eve Ebbet's *When the Boys were away* (1984) documented women on the Home Front. Lauris Edmond's *Women in Wartime* (1986) used personal accounts of women in war and in the same year, Nancy Taylor's comprehensive account *The Home Front* was finally published. Deborah Montgomerie's thesis on female war workers was published in the *New Zealand Journal of History* in 1989.³⁴

General histories played a crucial role in school history programmes as few teachers had time for extensive reading in more than the few specialist areas dictated by the prescriptions. By the 1980s it was inconceivable that a general history would not include a women's dimension. The previous 10 years had seen a plethora of articles and theses being written focussing on women's history, as well as a high public interest in wider issues of social history.³⁵ While New Zealand had had several single author general histories over the previous eighty years, *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981) was the first comprehensive scholarly account to appear. It adopted a multi-authored approach that reflected the considerable amount of research that had occurred in the previous ten years. As well as published research, the sixteen historians who wrote the chapters drew on (as yet) unpublished, postgraduate research that became available as books and articles during the decade. While it had an economic and political dimension, *The Oxford History* was

³⁴ Deborah Montgomerie, 'The limitations of wartime change. Women war workers in New Zealand.' *New Zealand Journal of History*, 23:1 (1989), 46-77.

³⁵ Jacob Pollack, 'Cultural Colonization and Textual Biculturalism: James Belich and Michael King's General Histories of New Zealand,' 180-198.

primarily a social history. It included material on women and work, Māori women, women's franchise, family, immigration and feminism as well as specific entries on female leaders such as Kate Sheppard, Te Puea Herangi and Jane Maria Atkinson.³⁶ Reflecting the changing nature of the New Zealand academic history community, four of the sixteen historians who contributed were women.

Networks and Alliances

By the time the NHCC met, women's history was a major force in New Zealand historiography. There was a considerable body of historical material available for teachers to use in their programmes and advocates of women's history enjoyed considerable support among the decision-making elite. On the history committee (and in the Department of Education) there was not only sympathy for the view that women's history should be embedded into the syllabus but also the belief that history should challenge the stereotypical expectations of girls, a view that was encapsulated in the 'Girls can do anything campaign'. In the late 1980s Barbara Mabbitt was appointed to the Department of Education to have oversight of the place of girls and women in the Department. When David Wood took over as facilitator from Peter Whitelock in 1984, he was determined to ensure a women's perspective would be included in the syllabus and saw this as more than simply including a number of 'worthy women'. He argued for a radically different approach that reflected the changing nature of New Zealand historiography (and New Zealand society). Wood recalls:

Women were noticeably absent from much of the history being taught in schools and universities. During the 1970s and early 80s a group of women historians were lobbying for a greater place in the sun. The women's perspective was coming through in social studies and in the curriculum review but not as a philosophical underlying commitment... The women on the NHCC were naturally keen to ensure that the syllabus reflected this development. I encouraged them to set up their own women's subcommittee. I said that I didn't just want some topics. I wanted a philosophical approach. They produced, to the best of my knowledge, the first substantial women's document to be published for a specific subject syllabus in the Department. I wanted them to be adventurous and had confidence in their ability and intelligence to produce sensible reform. None appeared to me to be radical feminists or extreme, who would embarrass the Minister of Education or senior departmental officials, and thereby undermine the rest of the work of the NHCC. In my view, their contributions achieved one of the more significant developments of the new syllabus.³⁷

The women's working group set up by David Wood was made up of Cynthia Shaw, Marcia Stenson, Kay Harrison and Margaret Tennant. Judith Aitken was also approached and Myra Kunowski was involved in the latter stages. They first met in

³⁶ Oliver, *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, 1981.

³⁷ David Wood. Amended transcript, 23/05/08.

early March 1985 to shape the direction of women's history in the syllabus. The aim of the subcommittee was to present women 'as active participants in society'. Although they saw 'certain experiences as unique to women', reflecting the ethos of feminist history, they argued the syllabus needed a greater emphasis on social history. The subcommittee initially thought that the contribution of women should feature in all the existing topics, rather than there being a topic that focussed exclusively on women, but later recommended there should be both. The working group suggested new social history topics for 6FC (Year 12) as well as specific women-centred topics on *Women, Family and Work in New Zealand* and *Women in the British democratic system*. In regards to the UB and US prescriptions the group was encouraged by the 'potential for the inclusion of women's history' in both the English and New Zealand options, but recommended that the New Zealand topic (which was planned to finish in 1880) should be extended so that it included the *Women's Franchise Act of 1893*.³⁸

The working group not only enjoyed considerable support from David Wood but also included individuals who had considerable credibility in the history teaching community. John Rosanowski observed that Marcia Stenson 'had a good power base'.³⁹ As well as having credibility in the Auckland history teaching community, Stenson held an MA from Auckland University and had recently written *The Story of New Zealand* (1985) with Keith Sinclair and Judith Bassett. This gave her additional status within the hierarchy of the academic history community. Margaret Tennant also informed the working group. Having an academic historian involved in this process was an essential factor in the successful development of a senior secondary subject such as history. It gave the recommendations of the group intellectual credibility and also guided members as to the latest historical research. Cynthia Shaw remembers:

Margaret Tennant was the person who informed us over these issues. So when we met as the women's caucus she came and talked to us about women's history...about gender analysis not just women

While Tennant played a key role in informing the women's subcommittee, like most feminist historians in the 1980s she was not prominent in the academic hierarchy at this stage in her career. She needed the support of a more powerful figure in the academic history world. That her views on women's history encountered little opposition on the NHCC from traditional historians was in part because she enjoyed

³⁸ Report of the Working Group on 'Women's Issues' in the Revision of the Forms 5-7 History syllabus. (Nicholas Tarling, private papers).

³⁹ Rosanowski: interview.

the full backing of her Head of Department at Massey, Professor Colin Davis, who was an enthusiastic proponent of social history and a powerful figure in the academic history community. As she remembers:

I was still pretty junior and not yet a senior lecturer, but because there weren't too many women with PhDs in New Zealand history, I got to do lots of things in the political life of the university and I had had considerable experience by the 1990s. Colin Davis was very encouraging of my work. He was intellectually engaged with the research interests of everyone in the department.

Not all historians were enthusiastic about women's history. University disciplines (like senior school subjects) operate within shared assumptions and under agreed boundaries and parameters.⁴⁰ Any emerging genre within a discipline encounters initial opposition and within the hierarchy of university history departments, women's history was seen by some historians as insufficiently robust and driven by presentist and activist concerns. However, as an emerging sub-field of history, women's history had legitimacy, as it was located with the field of social history (as well as being popular with students). Consequently historians were reluctant to speak out against it. In an era when history numbers in universities (as in schools) were falling dramatically, women's history played an important role in maintaining student numbers in history departments.

Most historians and teachers on the NHCC supported a women's history dimension. Erik Olssen was co-author (with his then wife Andree Levesque) of the article, 'Towards a History of the European Family in New Zealand' (1978) which has been described by leading feminist historians Bronwyn Dalley and Bronwyn Labrum as pivotal in the development of women's history in New Zealand.⁴¹ Teachers were also supportive. David Gledhill recalls:

People were sympathetic. There was no reference to any women in the syllabus (except Mabel Howard) and people were aware that we were ignorant of women's stories. We thought it would be good to include more.⁴²

The recommendations of the working group were largely accepted by the NHCC. There was little opposition to including a substantial women's perspective into the curriculum and embedding this into the prescription. David Wood outlined how it was 'fundamental that women be represented as active participants in history' and that

⁴⁰ Tony Becher, *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines* (Bristol: Open University Press, 1989).

⁴¹ Bronwyn Dalley and Bronwyn Labrum, 'Introduction.' In *Fragments: New Zealand Social and Cultural History*, edited by Bronwyn Dalley and Bronwyn Labrum (Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 2000).

⁴² Gledhill: interview.

the Committee should 'move to topics of social history.'⁴³ The issue therefore was to determine what to teach. As noted above, women's history had fragmented into a number of genres by the 1980s and given that the essence of school history is to simplify an aspect of the parent discipline, this posed a challenge (especially as few history teachers were enthusiastic).

What to Teach?

While there was a consensus on the NHCC that women's history should be included in the syllabus (and there were abundant resources) the question of what should be taught was more controversial. Women's history was in transition when the NHCC was meeting, reflecting the wider fragmentation of the feminist movement. There was no longer a consensus that the primary purpose of women's history was to simply make women visible within the discourse of a traditional male dominated historiography. While areas such as family and health were well documented and suitable to be included in a history curriculum, there was a growing interest in areas such as prostitution, crime, divorce, mental illness, domestic violence, lesbianism, 'baby-farming' and cross-dressing. These studies often drew on postmodern theoretical approaches and painted a highly critical picture of New Zealand's past that while of interest to academics, posed a dilemma for the NHCC. Teachers well understood the advantages of controversial topics to engage student interest, but school history programmes (unlike university courses) were expected to conform to the socially acceptable mores of the wider community and veer towards the socially conservative. As the recent controversy over the Johnson Report recommendation over sex education had demonstrated, many parents expected the school curriculum to reflect socially conservative values. Controversial aspects of women's history, it was thought by the NHCC, would make the notion of teaching women's history unattractive to conservative teachers (especially in traditional girls' schools where it was hoped women's history would be popular). Sandra Coney and Jane Tolerton encapsulated this dilemma in their classroom resource *Outlook: Women of Aotearoa* that juxtaposed Kate Sheppard (who was a key individual in women winning the franchise in 1893) with the controversial figure of Ettie Rout.⁴⁴

The inclusion of women's history was a radical shift from the previous curriculum (and as will be seen, unpopular with many teachers) and the NHCC decided to

⁴³ Department of Education, circular to National History Syllabus Review Committee, 24 April 1985. (Peter Lineham: private papers)

⁴⁴ Sandra Coney and Jane Tolerton, 'Outlook: women of Aotearoa', *Dominion*, 24 March 1987.

adopt a moderate approach that was designed to engender as little controversy as possible, while ensuring that women's history would be taught. Firstly, teachers were encouraged to modify existing topics and include, where possible, a women's dimension throughout their programmes. For example, they were asked to include Winnie Mandela in their study of South Africa, Constance Markievicz in Ireland and Madame Chaing Kai-Shek in revolutionary China. The intention of this approach was to ensure women were visible within the traditional topics taught.⁴⁵ A third of the UB/US prescriptions were made up of social and economic history (including women's history). This approach generated little opposition as it allowed teachers considerable autonomy. Unsympathetic teachers could, to some extent, ignore the women's aspects of traditional topics if they chose to do so, while enthusiasts could include a women's dimension in their programmes. The inclusion of women's experiences in the UB/US prescriptions also created few problems, as this course was explicitly linked with the parent discipline in which feminist history was a legitimate feature. While many teachers were unhappy with this development, few felt intellectually confident enough to publicly challenge it.

However, the new syllabus also included three women-centred topics for 6FC and SC and the latter generated some vigorous debate.⁴⁶ The women-centred topics at Year 12 passed almost unnoticed. Teachers had considerable autonomy at this level as 6FC was fully internally assessed, so there was no pressure from external examinations in regards to the content taught. The Year 12 women-centred topics were simply two of 29 choices and could (and largely were) ignored by teachers who did not prioritise feminist history. However, the SC topic *Women and Health* was explicitly embedded into the prescription by being thematically linked with *Black Civil Rights in America*. Teachers who taught the latter topic were also required to teach *Women and Health* and this generated considerable opposition among teachers. While Black Civil Rights was seen by most teachers as engaging and of high interest to students, *Women and Health* was generally seen as of little interest.

The *Women in Health* topic reflected the contemporary research interests of feminist historians and was seen as an uncontroversial choice that would engage students and challenge stereotypes. It was also an area in which there was a considerable

⁴⁵ Myra Kunowski, *Women in History* (Department of Education, Wellington, 1988), 23-53.

⁴⁶ Women's Impact on New Zealand Society: Health 1915-1985 (Year 11/ Form 5); Women Family and Work in New Zealand 1880-1960 (Year 12/ Form 6); Participation of Women in the Emerging British Democratic System 1860-1930 (Year 12/ Form 6). Department of Education, School Certificate Examination Prescription: History. (Wellington, 1987); Department of Education. *Sixth Form Certificate History: National Course Statement*. (Wellington, 1988).

literature and thus could be well resourced. Margaret Tennant did not see *Women and Health* as a difficult topic to engage student interest. She recalls:

...most of the research being done on women's history was focussing on reproduction in areas such as nursing, motherhood and domesticity. It was a reflection of what the interests of historians were at the time, but it also linked in with contemporary issues such as abortion.

While women's history was popular in a university setting, teachers on the history committee were aware that this topic could potentially create problems in attracting students. History was an option subject that was experiencing declining student numbers and one of the key aims of the NHCC was to provide options that would attract students to the subject. The linking of *Black Civil Rights* with *Women and Health* was a deliberate attempt to ensure that in the face of considerable opposition women's history would be taught (in the hope that this would eventually create interest).⁴⁷ Cynthia Shaw remembers:

I was aware that there were people who didn't want a bar of it, but there were people that did. One of the reasons we tied the women's topic to the Black Civil Rights topic is that we knew Black Civil Rights would be popular. The linking of themes was a deliberate approach to get women's history taught.

While the members of the history committee largely shared a consensus that the history syllabus should include women's history, the choices that they made did not win universal approval. Some thought women's history was 'not real history' while others thought the emphasis on traditional women's occupations such as health were dull and uninspiring. In part this came from there being little impetus to introduce new approaches from history teachers. Myra Kunowski recalls:

There were no calls for change. That came from the Department. The committee was leading the way. There was no call for women's history (or for that matter a different way of looking at Māori history).

Consultation was a key factor in curriculum design in the 1980s. The opposition of teachers to the *Women and Health* topic posed a problem, as in the early stages of this process there was hostility. Cynthia Shaw remembers at a consultation round a history teacher challenged the inclusion of women's history claiming it 'as an entirely new interpretation of history... this is not history, as we know it'.⁴⁸ Marcia Stenson also noted that there was 'some resentment against women's history in smaller areas in the South Island'.⁴⁹ The full extent of opposition to the *Women and Health*

⁴⁷ Shaw: interview.

⁴⁸ Shaw: interview.

⁴⁹ Stenson: interview.

topic, however, emerged when the Department of Education sent out questionnaires on the draft history prescriptions for SC and 6FC. They received responses from 199 schools (50% of those approached) and 384 teachers,⁵⁰ and the *Women in Health* topic was the most unpopular of all topics. While there were some comments to the effect that *Women and Health* was 'long overdue' and 'pleasing', most comments were negative. The topic was described as 'patronising', 'stunningly boring', 'uninteresting', 'unacceptable' and a topic for 'trendy lefties'. The point was made that it ignored 'good material (e.g. war)', that it 'should deal with more than health' and that it 'emphasized traditional roles'.⁵¹ The Year 12 survey showed an equally negative response to the women-centred topics in comparison to traditional themes such as war and politics. As with the SC survey the comments were negative with women's history being depicted as 'feminist, sexist, tokenism'.⁵²

Table 2: Response to suggested history options in Year 11 course (1986)⁵³

Topic	Disapproving	Approving	Neutral
Women and Health	30%	40%	30%
Origins of World War	1%	93%	6%
Ireland	3%	85%	12%
Palestine/ Israel	1%	94%	5%
New Zealand foreign policy	0%	99%	1%
Revolutionary China	0%	88%	12%
The Black Civil Rights in USA	7%	84%	9%

Table 3: Response to suggested history options in Year 12 History (1986)⁵⁴

Topic	Disapproval	Approval	Neutral
Women, Family and work	35%	24%	41%
The Origins of the First World War	5%	79%	16%
Unification of Italy	8%	69%	23%
Russian Revolution	8%	65%	27%
Nazi Germany	8%	64%	26%

Some of this opposition reflected a reluctance of teachers to engage with social history or 'history from below', and a preference to stay with the 'best-story' grand narratives of political, constitutional and military history that were claimed to engage the imagination of students. This was borne out by the NZHTA surveys almost 20 years after the syllabus was introduced, indicating that few schools chose to teach

⁵⁰ National Archives: School Certificate Examination Board, Draft History Prescription, File 6/14/71, part 3.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Department of Education, Form 6 survey. (Peter Lineham private papers).

⁵³ Department of Education, Form 5 survey (Peter Lineham private papers)

⁵⁴ Department of Education, Form 6 survey. (Peter Lineham private papers)

social history topics.⁵⁵ In the surveys social history was described as ‘uninteresting’ and some teachers claimed it was difficult to engage students in this approach. In the Department of Education survey, *Social Change* (like women’s history) was described as ‘of no intrinsic interest’, ‘vague’ and a ‘mish-mash’. While the demand to deliver high interest, engaging topics in a senior option subject was certainly a factor, the reluctance to engage with social history by history teachers also reflected a discomfort with the commitment to social activism that drives social history. History teachers largely adopted a non-controversial approach to their subject and social history (especially women’s history) appeared to require a ‘useable past’ that was seen by history teachers as more closely linked with social studies rather than the ‘academic rigour’ of history.

Not all the opposition to *Women and Health* was based on a criticism of feminist history. For some the topic reinforced existing stereotypes and did little to address issues of sexism. D.R. Chapman, Deputy Principal of Nayland College in Nelson, argued *Women and Health* ‘perpetuated the stereotype of the woman bound to the house, looking after her husband and caring for sick children.’ He suggested the topic should be replaced with a study of ‘the contribution of women to the war effort.’⁵⁶ Barry Brailsford, principal lecturer at Christchurch Teachers College, claimed the topic was ‘a disservice to women’ and reinforced stereotypes. What was needed, he claimed, was a wider range of role models.⁵⁷ J. Bruerton wrote to the Ministry of Women’s Affairs asking the newly created Ministry to ensure women became an integral part of the new syllabus rather than simply relegated to health.⁵⁸

While there were dissenting voices about the women-centred topics it ultimately made little difference. The topic was slightly amended when the SC Examination Board sub-committee for history met in on August 1986, but remained largely intact⁵⁹ despite considerable disquiet among the history teaching community. Advocates of women’s history enjoyed considerable support on the committee and were part of the decision-making process that reflected the dominant intellectual ethos of liberal New Zealanders. While the *Women and Health* topic might not be currently popular, in the long term it was hoped it would generate interest.

⁵⁵ See NZHTA surveys. Chapter 1.

⁵⁶ National Archives: Letter D.R. Chapman (Nayland College) to D.M Steer, Examination and Assessment Unit, 29 May 1986; File 6/14/71, Part 2.

⁵⁷ National Archives: Letter B. Brailsford (Christchurch Teachers College) to D.M Steer, Examination and Assessment Unit, 25 July 1986; File 6/14/71, Part 2.

⁵⁸ National Archives: Letter J. Bruerton, (160 Westminster Street, Christchurch) to Anne Hercus, Minister of Women’s Affairs, 17 September, 1986. File 6/14/71: Part 3: Examinations: SC examination board.

⁵⁹ National Archives: D.M Steer, School Certificate Examination Board Sub-committee for History, Report of meeting Monday 18 August 1986, Wellington. File 6/14/71: part 4.

... The ideal would be for all topics to incorporate a women's perspective. This is being pursued, but in the meantime it is necessary to include topics where women's participation in history is quite explicit and where there are ample resources to support such a topic.⁶⁰

Conclusion

Women's history was a new initiative that was firmly embedded into the 1989 history syllabus and the senior history prescriptions. It reflected the prevailing ethos among the elite decision makers of the time. It did not threaten the current orthodoxy in regards to the discipline of history and a number of advocates for women's history were part of the NHCC. There was considerable opposition to the women-centred topic by many in the history teaching community, but despite the rhetoric of consultation in reality this counted for little. However, the embedding of women's history at Year 11 did not generate a long-term interest in women's history as had been hoped. When the thematic linking of *Women and Health* with *Black Civil Rights* was abandoned with the introduction of Level 1 NCEA in 2002, most teachers stopped teaching this topic but continued teaching *Black Civil Rights* (which has remained one of the three most popular topics). While the inclusion of women's history illustrates the nature of successful change in a senior school subject, this was not the case for Māori history and this is discussed in the following chapter.

⁶⁰ National Archives: Memo: Russell Marshall to Anne Hercus, 17 October 1986, File 6/14/71: part 3.

CHAPTER 10

‘Avoiding painful realities?’

The Place of Māori history in the School Curriculum

... what is so often called Māori history is a tainted product formed between the intellectual encounters between missionary and convert, officials and chiefs, ethnographers and informants ... I keep hearing my colleagues talk of the need for objectivity as historians: can Māori history, and our inevitable entanglement in it as New Zealanders, be anything else but profoundly subjective? So far as I can see, the notion of objectivity in our teaching practice, at least in this situation, is a convenient way of avoiding painful realities ... whereby the content is softened so as not to cause offence to the Pākehā majority.¹

Michael P.J. Reilly

Introduction

The disparity of achievement between Māori and Pākehā secondary students was a major preoccupation for educators in the 1980s² and liberals argued the inclusion of Māori history in the curriculum would encourage Māori to remain at school, as well as develop in Pākehā an appreciation of New Zealand’s bicultural past. These views were prominent in *The Curriculum Review* (1987) that recognised Māori as having the unique status of tangata whenua and called for explicitly Māori content. However, the NHCC continued to privilege existing areas of historical knowledge that were largely Eurocentric in orientation.³ Despite the Department of Education promoting a bicultural ethos (and there being sympathy among educators to include Māori world-views in the history curriculum), Māori history did not feature prominently in the history prescriptions. Although the decision-making elite saw the inclusion of Māori history as important (thus meeting the requirements of the first determinant for a successful initiative in curriculum design), Māori history did not easily fit within the western academic framework at this time, nor did the NHCC include historians with expertise in this area.

¹ Michael Reilly, ‘Messy Entanglements in Teaching Māori History.’ *History Now* 1:2 (October 1995): 21.

² Kuni Jenkins and Alison Jones, ‘Māori Education Policy: A State Promise.’ In *Politics, Policy, Pedagogy: Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, edited by Eve Cotton James Marshall, Kuni Jenkins, Alison Jones, 139-53 (Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2000).

³ The syllabus continued to offer a Form 5 option in Māori- Pākehā relations (1912-80) which was thematically compared with South Africa. A topic on 19th Māori leadership was introduced in Form 6 but it was one of 29 topics (out of which teachers chose to teach 4), was poorly resourced and consequently it was taught by very few schools. The 19th New Zealand option at Form 7 included a Māori-Pākehā/ race relation’s component within the wider broad survey of New Zealand history (which was taught if the New Zealand option was chosen).

The second determinant for a successful initiative was that any change needed to reflect the ethos of the parent discipline (as was the case with women's history). However, the bicultural model that dominated contemporary educational thinking on Māori issues was difficult to reconcile with Māori and Western approaches to history. The bicultural model rested on the assumption there was a single 'Māori' approach to history that could be accommodated within the history syllabus, whereas the tribal nature of Māori history was more complex than this model allowed.

Furthermore, the historians and teachers who dominated the History Committee, defined the subject as an evidence-based, academic discipline, open to scholarly scrutiny and this was incompatible with the nature of Māori tribal history. Western historical scholarship (that had its origins in enlightenment universalism) did not typically reflect the ethos of Māori historians, who were located within an iwi and hapu context. Unlike their Pākehā counterparts, they were embedded within their communities and their primary responsibility was to ensure their view of history maintained the authority of their people. While vigorous historical debates were a feature of discussions on the marae (and within tribal contexts), for Māori historians, knowledge was not to be lightly shared and open to public scrutiny outside this arena. They were also aware that the shaping of tribal historical narratives was not a neutral process and had implications for the present and the future. This characteristic was accentuated after 1985 when the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal was extended to investigate historical claims back to 1840 and thus history became the primary vehicle in establishing legitimacy for claimants. In this environment, history was subject to competing claims on the past between iwi and hapu versus the Crown.

An additional factor in the reluctance to include an authentic Māori dimension into the curriculum, despite the professed sympathy by historians, teachers and government officials for this notion, was the criticism by activists of Pākehā writing Māori history. By the 1980s it was becoming increasingly uncomfortable for non-Māori historians to write Māori history and most academic historians writing in this area were Pākehā. Māori featured prominently in New Zealand school histories based on the work of academic historians (especially in regards to 'race-relations' and 'traditional life'), but by the 1980s the authority of non-Māori to write on Māori areas of history was no longer universally accepted. In some quarters such writing generated vociferous criticism from Māori activists and liberal Pākehā.

The third determinant that was necessary for a successful initiative in the senior history curriculum was the potential of key individuals and stakeholders to influence

the process. This was not the case in regards to including a Māori dimension in the history curriculum. There were no scholars invited on to the NHCC who had acknowledged expertise in Tikanga Māori and could either inform the NHCC on the complex nature of Māori history or challenge the Eurocentric definition of history that the committee adopted. The consensus on the NHCC was that there were no contemporary Māori historians who had credibility in both the academic community and the Māori world. This claim rested on the definition of a historian as one that worked within the western framework of the discipline (preferably linked to a university history department) and excluded Māori historians who worked within an iwi or hapu context. While including an iwi and hapu dimension into a senior subject linked to an academic parent discipline did pose real challenges, there were scholars the NHCC could have approached. Both Keith Sorrenson and Buddy Makaere were academic Māori historians and there were several Pākehā historians who had an in-depth, working knowledge of the Māori world. Furthermore, Māori academics, who worked in related fields such as social anthropology and Māori studies, could have provided valuable insights. While a delegation (including David Wood) of the History Committee met once with prominent Māori anthropologist Ranginui Walker to discuss Māori history, there was little scholarly Māori input into the curriculum development process. Rather, the role of providing a credible 'Māori voice' was left to a Māori history teacher, Jim Peters, with some assistance from John Tait, a Pākehā teacher who 'spoke Māori and had gained the confidence of Māori whānau and iwi he was associated with.'⁴

The absence of a powerful 'Māori voice' on the NHCC made the inclusion of a Māori dimension in the history curriculum unlikely. The presence of dominant individuals was essential in the process of curriculum development at this level. The informal way in which the committee operated privileged those participants who had the cultural, intellectual and social capital to dominate the decision-making process. There was also little clear philosophical direction provided by the Department on the issue of Māori history (or for that matter on the epistemological nature of the subject). As the case of embedding feminist history into the history curriculum demonstrated, the informal nature of how the NHCC operated opened up opportunities for well-connected individuals and groups to work this system to their advantage. The successful introduction of tribal Māori contexts into the history curriculum required clear leadership from Department of Education officials, combined with a willingness on the part of members to engage with authentic Māori approaches to the past. Neither of these features were apparent.

⁴ David Wood, amended transcript, 13/05/08.

Figure 7: Māori and the History Curriculum: An unsuccessful initiative in senior history

Criteria	Māori History
1) <i>The decision-making elite share the view that a particular body of knowledge is of higher status and more important than any alternative.</i>	<p>YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision-making elite involved in history curriculum matters was sympathetic to notion of including an authentic Māori component in the curriculum • Māori issues were among the most salient of the decade. • Māori topics had long been a feature of school history programmes.
2) <i>The initiative is located within the existing orthodoxy of the 'parent discipline' and shares the existing scholarly constraints and boundaries of the discipline.</i>	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHCC believed Māori history could not be accommodated within the parameters of the discipline. • Growing Māori opposition to Pākehā writing Māori history. • The bicultural model rested on the assumption there was a single 'Māori' approach to history but iwi/ hapu history was more complex than this. • Iwi and hapu historians were embedded within their communities and their primary responsibility was to ensure their view of the past maintained the mana and authority of their people. Knowledge was not to be lightly shared and open to public scrutiny.
3) <i>Advocates for the initiative establish alliances with major stakeholders in a subject community who are sympathetic to their cause.</i>	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No scholars from the parent discipline on NHCC who had acknowledged expertise in Tikanga Māori. ▪ Excluded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Iwi and hapu historians - Māori academic historians (e.g. Keith Sorrenson) - Māori academics who worked in related fields such as social anthropology (e.g. Ranginui Walker) - Pākehā historians who had expertise in Māori history (e.g. Judith Binney)

The challenges the NHCC faced in incorporating a Māori dimension could have been successfully addressed if this issue had been prioritised earlier in the process. The Hui to discuss the history curriculum, held at Whakatō Marae in Gisborne, identified the key features of Māori history and demonstrated the history syllabus could have been shaped to take into account the complex nature of iwi and hapu histories. The Hui was held in late October 1987 and, as discussed later in this chapter, was a genuine attempt by the Department of Education to consult and engage with Māori (at an iwi and hapu level) as to how their history could be taught in schools. In reality, however, the NHCC had met for the final time six months before and not only had the major decisions (including the place of Māori history in the syllabus) been finalised, but the government priorities had shifted away from curriculum matters to focus on administration.

Finding a 'Māori voice'

The question of who could 'speak for Māori' on issues such as history education was a challenge for the Department of Education in the 1980s. The preference of government officials had been to look to traditional leaders as spokespeople for Māori. However, younger urban-based Māori adopted different tactics than their traditional leaders. Pressure groups such as Nga Tamatoa, were predominantly composed of young, university educated, urban Māori and they employed the contemporary strategies of popular protest, such as demonstrations, picketing and petitions, and made effective use of the media. The causes they addressed had long been of concern in the Māori world (such as the decline of Māori language and tribal lands),⁵ but while the sentiments behind such a campaign enjoyed support in the Māori world, traditional Māori leaders were uncomfortable with these tactics. In the 1970s activists were dismissed by Department of Education officials as 'radicals' and generally ignored. Consequently these younger leaders worked outside the traditional structures of the Māori world and official circles. Māori activists saw traditional leadership as part of the problem they faced in addressing Māori grievances. Donna Awatere (1984) captured the uncompromising tenor of this view:

Māori leadership is largely irrelevant to the new directions mainly because mana, status and leadership are derived from white models. They are accountable to white people and culture and not us. They attack the rest of Māoridom, particularly the urban youth from a white cultural perspective [they] are fluent in Māori and hold many taonga from their tipuna which they use as weapons directed against our children. Like animals who eat their young to survive.⁶

By the 1980s a new generation of Māori leaders, who were more sympathetic to the views of activists, were assuming positions of authority in universities and the public service, as well as emerging as kaumātua within Māoridom. This posed a challenge for largely Pākehā government officials, in that they could no longer clearly identify who could be seen to speak on behalf of Māori. The new generation of Māori leadership (e.g. Ranginui Walker, Tipene O'Regan, Wiremu Kaa and Mason Durie) eschewed the confrontational tactics of activists, but largely shared their sentiments over land, language and the Treaty of Waitangi. Unlike most Pākehā officials, these Māori leaders were bicultural in that they held university qualifications and had considerable credibility in both the Māori and the non-Māori worlds.

⁵ Joan Metge, *The Māoris of New Zealand* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1976), 99.

⁶ Awatere, *Māori Sovereignty*, 94.

Māori issues were among the most salient and widely debated of the time when the NHCC was designing the curriculum. It was widely expected by Department of Education officials that the problems of Māori education would be a priority in the development of a new history syllabus (especially after Russell Marshall became Minister in 1984). The 1970s had also seen the emergence of race-based Polynesian and Māori gangs such as the Mongrel Mob and Black Power on the urban landscape and escalating Māori crime.⁷ These factors, combined with the relatively low socio-economic status of Māori, left authorities and commentators in no doubt that there was a 'Māori problem' to address, even if there was a divergence of views as to the solution.

The Place of Māori in New Zealand Historiography

Māori have always been highly visible in New Zealand history writing and there is an extensive historiography of Pākehā writing on Māori that stretches back to the late 18th century. Although Māori were seldom involved in how they were portrayed, Māori history generated the interest of Pākehā historians and featured in historical and popular narratives. Māori subjects were 'numerous and prominent' in the first *New Zealand Dictionary of Biography* (1940) with around 8% of 'soldiers, politicians and other (usually male) Māori leaders being featured'.⁸ During the second half of the 19th century and early 20th century, Percy Smith, Elsdon Best, John White, Edward Tregear, John Macmillan Brown, J.E. Gorst and James Cowan researched and published Māori history. While these scholars all approached Māori history in different ways, they shared a sympathetic interest in the Māori world that was driven by a belief that they were recording the past achievements of a dying race.

The scholarship of these writers was widely disseminated in the school curriculum and largely shaped Pākehā perceptions of the Māori world. Although sympathetic, they brought their own preconceptions to their historical work and judged Māori according to the standards of Victorian middle-class British society that, at this time, was held up as the benchmark to which all peoples in the British Empire should aspire. In a number of cases they attempted to fit the oral testimonies that they were told by Māori into a universal narrative and ignored the tribal complexities of the Māori world. Consequently, several narratives on New Zealand's Māori past were thoroughly taught in schools and came to be widely accepted, yet were incorrect. Stephenson Percy Smith is credited with promoting the myth of 'Kupe and The

⁷ Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 481-484.

⁸ W.H. Oliver, 'Taha Māori in the DNZB: A Pākehā View.' In *Telling Stories*, edited by B. Attwood and F. McGowan, 143-160 (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001).

Great Fleet' that brought Māori to New Zealand in 1350. While this was probably a result of a synthesis between both Māori informants and Smith,⁹ the story was discredited in the 1970s.¹⁰ The naming of New Zealand as Aotearoa was also a fabrication, yet like the 'Great Fleet', was widely disseminated through the school curriculum and came to be accepted by both Māori and Pākehā. The most enduring and pervasive myth was Smith's claim that a race of Melanesians called the Moriori, who were intellectually and culturally inferior to Polynesians, were the first inhabitants of New Zealand and were conquered (and exterminated) by the ancestors of the Māori.¹¹ This myth was exploded in scholarly circles in the 1930s but continues to endure today as evidenced by letters to the editor in newspapers and the views of Members of Parliament.¹²

Māori were highly visible in school histories of New Zealand, especially after 1929 when the new syllabus was introduced. In the volumes of *Our Nation's Story*, that served as the major school text in the 1930s and 40s, Māori featured prominently. Māori were admired as 'great orators and poets as well as warriors' but were not yet on the same level as the 'British race'. They were 'apprentice Europeans' and 'had a lot of catching up to do' to attain the 'superiority of European culture.' The wars of the 1860s were characterised in *Our Nations Story* by heroic deeds such as Rewi Maniapoto's stand at Orakau and the claims of respect and admiration that both sides held for each other. *Our Nations Story* went on to claim as a result '...white man and brown man now live side by side as friends and fellow citizens of New Zealand.' Racial stereotypes played a prominent role in school history textbooks. The English speaking descendants of the 'British race' were the benchmark by which all others were judged, but unlike 'aborigines, Tierra del Feugans and Papuans, Māori were a noble savage and firmly at the head of the B-team.' Like the ancient Britons they had the potential to progress to the civilised standards of the 'British race' and should be 'grateful for European settlement'.¹³

One of the central tenets in New Zealand popular and academic historiography until the 1960s was that New Zealand was a biracial paradise. This notion had appeared in New Zealand's first substantial general history, William Pember Reeves' *The*

⁹ Margaret Orbell, *Hawaiki a new approach to Māori Tradition* (Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1985), 40-43.

¹⁰ M.P.K Sorrenson, *Māori Origins and Migrations*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1979).

¹¹ King, *Penguin History of New Zealand*, 38-37.

¹² See Newsletter (2005) of ACT Member of Parliament Dr Muriel Newman: <http://www.nzcpr.com/nl211005.htm>

¹³ Colin McGeorge, "New Zealand" in New Zealand School Books before 1930.' *History Now* 10, no. 2 (2005): 4-11. See also: Colin McGeorge, 'What was 'Our Nation's Story'? New Zealand Primary School History Textbooks between the Wars'. *History of Education Review* 28:2 (1999).

Long White Cloud (1898). Reeves' idea of New Zealand being justifiably proud of having the 'best race relations in the world' was unchallenged until the mid-1950s when Keith Sorrenson's thesis on the proceedings of the Māori Land Court demonstrated how the government conducted hearings to disadvantage claimants and this led to massive loss of land. Sorrenson's thesis 'has an iconic place' in New Zealand historiography, as it explicitly linked land selling as a deliberate process that was 'allowed by the government to demoralise and debauch Māori landowners.'¹⁴ In much the same vein, Keith Sinclair's *Origins of the Māori Wars* (1957) demonstrated the perfidy of the government in land purchases at Waitara and the government's willingness to use force to acquire Māori land.¹⁵ However, both Sinclair and Sorrenson saw New Zealand's racial past as comparatively benign and Sinclair argued New Zealand enjoyed better race relations than other settler colonies, such as South Africa, Australia and the United States.¹⁶

The optimism of historians in regards to race relations in the 1960s gave way in the following decade to a far more critical and polemic stance towards New Zealand's biracial past that reflected the emerging tensions between Māori and Pākehā. Ian Wards (1968, 1973) 'concluded that racial amalgamation had not saved but subjugated Māori.'¹⁷ Tony Simpson (1979), while not an academic historian, in *Te Riri Pākehā* focussed on the inherent racism that drove government policies against the Māori and 'riled academic historians' because of his 'errors and fatal impact argument.'¹⁸ The new body of work on race signalled a challenge to the authority of academic historians such as Oliver, Sinclair and Sorrenson, by a younger generation who were influenced by the Civil Rights movement in the United States, the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and activist Native American historians such as Dee Brown.¹⁹ Their work reflected an impatience with positivist approaches to history, and emphasised Pākehā racism, the extent of violence in the process of colonisation and the Crown's contravention of the Treaty of Waitangi. Angela Ballara's *Proud to be White?* (1986) captured the tone of this emerging body of work on race relations. Its 'slightly inhumane and moralizing tone' and 'condemnation of European derived race and culture' reflected a presentist approach to history in

¹⁴ Graham Butterworth, 'Historical Revisionism in New Zealand: Always Winter and Never Christmas.' In *Public Policy and Ethnicity* edited by Elizabeth Rata and Roger Openshaw, 185-200 (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006).

¹⁵ Sinclair, Keith, *The Origins of the Māori Wars*. (Wellington: New Zealand University Press, 1957).

¹⁶ Sinclair, 'Why Are Race Relations in New Zealand Better Than in South Africa, South Australia or South Dakota?' 21-7.

¹⁷ Olssen, 'Where to from Here? Reflections on the Twentieth-Century Historiography of Nineteenth-Century New Zealand', 62-66.

¹⁸ Belgrave, *Historical Frictions*, 49.

¹⁹ Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West* (London: Pan, 1976).

which 19th century Pākehā were judged by the standards of the late 20th century, and found wanting.²⁰ Patricia Burn's revisionist history *Te Rauparaha* (1980) took a similar approach, chastising Pākehā whalers, traders and colonial and New Zealand company officials for their perfidy and cunning while emphasising the statesmanlike nature of the Ngāti Toa leader.²¹

By the time the History Committee met there was a considerable body of historical material being written and research being done on the area of Māori-Pākehā relations. *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981) featured four chapters on Māori and race relations history (Janet Davidson, Anne Parsonson, M.P.K. Sorrenson and Michael King) and the bibliography gave an indication of the significant number of theses being written in this area. In light of the contemporary context of the Māori land claims and the centrality of the Treaty of Waitangi, there was a heightened interest in New Zealand's biracial past. James Belich's reinterpretation of the New Zealand wars (1986)²² challenged the prevailing orthodoxy that had largely been created by James Cowan (1922).²³ It was described by Alan Ward (a leading expert in the 19th century Māori past) as 'seminal.'²⁴ The Treaty was also the subject of intense interest for liberal New Zealanders in light of the Labour government's pro-Treaty policies and the forthcoming commemorations in 1990. As a consequence, Claudia Orange's *Treaty of Waitangi* (1987) became a best seller and she wrote a simplified version that was distributed to schools.²⁵

While the NHCC claimed there were no credible historians, as the examples above indicate this was not the case (even given the Eurocentric definition of an historian that the committee followed). Rather, it appears to have provided a convenient explanation to largely ignore Māori contexts. The NHCC had the opportunity to draw on an increasingly rich historiography that was of contemporary interest and Pākehā historians who had considerable credibility in writing and researching Māori history. As well as historians James Belich and Claudia Orange, as mentioned above these included Michael King, Judith Binney, Ann Salmond, Ruth Ross, Hazel Riseborough and Ann Parsonson. All had credibility as historians and had published in the area of race relations. There were also Māori academic historians who could have assisted

²⁰ Angela Ballara, *Proud to Be White? A Survey of Pākehā Prejudice in New Zealand* (Auckland: Heinemann, 1986); See review: Andrew Sharp, *New Zealand Journal of History*, 22: 2, 1988.

²¹ Patricia Burns, *Te Rauparaha: A New Perspective* (Auckland: Reed, 1980).

²² James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* (Auckland: Penguin, 1986).

²³ J. Cowan, *The History of the New Zealand Wars and the Pioneering Period* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1922).

²⁴ Alan Ward review, *New Zealand Journal of History*; 21:2, 1987, 270-274.

²⁵ Ministry of Education, *Belonging Here Toi Take Taketake: Treaty of Waitangi Kit* (Wellington: Learning Media, 1990).

them. The most obvious was Auckland University historian Keith Sorrenson (Ngāi Pukenga), Buddy Mikaere (Director of the Waitangi Tribunal) and Ngāi Tahu historian, Tipene O'Regan (who had a background in teaching and teacher education).

There were a number of prominent Māori social anthropologists (such as Sidney Mead, Ranginui Walker and Pat Hohepa) who could have provided advice and guidance.²⁶ There was considerable popular interest in the work of anthropologists in the 1980s. *The Natural World of the Māori* (1987) was researched by anthropologist Margaret Orbell and presented by Ngāi Tahu historian Tipene O'Regan²⁷ and was shown on prime time television. That the programme was so popular was in part a result of the *Te Māori* exhibition that was a 'breakthrough' in how Māori artefacts were displayed. The exhibition of Māori *taonga* exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum of Art and History in New York to critical acclaim, was toured in New Zealand when it returned in 1985. Typical of the diffidence that New Zealanders felt about their cultural heritage, it was not until a high status overseas institution appreciated Māori artefacts that the wider public showed an interest.²⁸ There were also Pākehā anthropologists (such as Margaret Orbell and Joan Metge) who were familiar with Tikanga Māori.

Anthropologists in the 1980s, however, worked differently from historians in regards to Māori and the notion of multi-disciplinary approaches was seen by many historians as a threat.²⁹ The NHCC shared this view. They saw the senior history syllabus as linked to the university discipline of history and not anthropology (or for that matter Māori Studies). The History Committee approached history as a discipline founded on a methodological framework that drew primarily on documentary sources and other written evidence that could be cross-referenced. As such, they viewed oral testimony of indigenous peoples (including Māori) with suspicion, unless backed up by written sources. Also unlike anthropologists, whose work was highly theorised, historians in the 1980s, as noted above, were largely uncomfortable with theoretical approaches. Postmodern approaches to history that could accommodate the multifaceted nature of the Māori past were as yet to feature in New Zealand historiography. By locating the NHCC history within the framework

²⁶ Personal correspondence 15/16 June 2006 Author and Associate Professor Dr Danny Keenan.

²⁷ Margaret Orbell, *The Natural World of the Māori* (Auckland: Collins, 1985).

²⁸ Conal McCarthy, *Exhibiting Māori* (Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2007), 137-156.

²⁹ For an example of the suspicion and hostility that some historians of this era felt towards anthropologists see Peter Munz, 'The Two-Worlds of Anne Salmond in Postmodern Fancy-Dress.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 28, no. 1 (1994): 59-75; Anne Salmond, 'Antipodean Crab Antics.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 28, no. 1 (1994): 76-79.

of the western discipline (and not including any scholars who could challenge this view), the history committee was largely able to ignore the issue of including Māori history in the curriculum.

The failure of the NHCC to include a prominent Māori dimension in the curriculum is in part explained by the membership of the committee that was drawn from a small pool of invited historians and teachers, whose views of the subject were largely acceptable to the Department of Education officials. This was glaringly apparent to David Wood who took over facilitating the history committee in 1984 and observed that the committee was struggling to include a Māori dimension as there was no Māori scholar. Jim Peters, an Auckland history teacher of some standing, was placed in the invidious position of being expected to provide a Māori viewpoint without the presence of any historians or academics to support him. The role of academics from the parent discipline in the process of senior curriculum development was crucial, as in the history teaching community they played the role of 'experts'. Teachers were confident that they understood how to engage students in learning history (and how the curriculum needed to be shaped to achieve this), but in regards to content they acknowledged it was historians who had the expert knowledge. As the previous chapter demonstrated this was a crucial factor in the successful inclusion of women's history in the curriculum. To expect a history teacher to have carried this burden (given the weighting of the committee) without the support of academics was unrealistic. Peters (Ngatī Wai) did have high credibility in his field as a history teacher and as a member of his Māori community. He had grown up in a rural Māori community north of Whangārei and gone on to Auckland University where he had chaired the Māori Leaders' conference in 1960.³⁰ However without the support of academic historians (or other experts) it is unlikely he could have successfully challenged the prevailing view of the committee on Māori history.

'Race Relations' History

The primary focus of Pākehā historians writing on Māori in the 1980s was what was called 'race relations'. This approach rested on the bicultural, 'two-worlds' view of Māori and Pākehā which was embraced in liberal educational circles. It was explicitly promoted by the Department of Education and was reflected in the SC history curriculum with the theme of *Race Relations in New Zealand*³¹ that was compared (favourably) with South Africa. However, historians were selective about

³⁰ Interview: Peters.

³¹ Mark Sheehan. *Māori and Pākehā: Race Relations 1912-80* (Auckland: Macmillan, 1989).

the aspects of the past they approached and school historiography reflected this. In the intellectual climate of the 1980s, where non-Māori historians' writing on Māori topics risked evoking strident criticism and accusations of racism, historians were careful not to portray Māori in a manner that could be construed as critical.

James Belich's reinterpretation of the New Zealand wars (1986) was seen as a major shift in New Zealand historiography in the 1980s. Belich argued Māori had in reality won many of the battles (and the Northern war) and that historians had incorrectly claimed these were government victories because it fitted with their Victorian view of racial superiority. His work was well received. He gained considerable publicity and was invited to be a keynote speaker at the 1988 History Teachers' Conference at Victoria University. His work overturned James Cowan's version of the wars, which claimed that Māori were defeated after a heroic, but ultimately futile, resistance against numerically and technologically superior forces. Belich argued that British accounts exaggerated British successes and minimised Māori victories. He also claimed Māori had invented trench warfare. *The New Zealand Wars* reinforced the contemporary ethos of an increasingly assertive, confident Māori leadership that eschewed the 'victim ideology' of the 1970s. The intellectual climate of the 1980s was characterised by a consensus among liberals that Māori grievances were legitimate and must be addressed. In this environment, Belich's views were enthusiastically endorsed by an audience that was largely unfamiliar with the details of military history and unlikely to critically evaluate his claims. A decade later Television New Zealand took the unusual step of producing a five-hour series based on his book that was shown on prime time television and fronted by Professor Belich.³² The series included little historiographical debate or discussion of the merits of his argument, despite military historians being critical of Belich's views.³³ The series was widely distributed to secondary schools with accompanying resource material.³⁴ The response to *The New Zealand Wars* reflected the insular nature of the contemporary scholarly history in New Zealand, in which historiographical debate was not encouraged, as well as reluctance on the part of liberal Pākehā in education to be seen to be critical of Māori. Military historians (who did not accept Belich's claims) were largely shut out of the academic world and their views were not valued by educationalists.

³² James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* (Auckland: TVNZ and landmark productions, 1998).

³³ Christopher Pugsley, 'Māori Did Not Invent Trench Warfare in New Zealand,' 1998.

³⁴ Mark Sheehan, *The New Zealand Wars: Making Sense of a shared Past* (Wellington: Learning media, 2000); _____, *The New Zealand Wars: Changing Perceptions of a shared Past* (Wellington: Learning Media, 2000).

Some important areas of Māori history at this time were largely ignored. The role of Kūpapa (who fought with the government in the New Zealand wars and played a prominent role in the eventual defeat of anti-government Māori) generated little interest, as did the majority of Māori who remained neutral during the years of conflict. Despite geographical tribal boundaries of 1840 being the basis for Waitangi claims by the 1980s, historians were reluctant to look at the inter-tribal 'musket wars' of the early 19th century. These wars had created the current tribal boundaries and were arguably the most devastating experience for 19th century Māori, resulting in many thousands of deaths and dislocation.³⁵ The first serious evaluation of the musket wars would not appear until R.D. Crosby's *Musket Wars* (1999) and the author (who was not a trained historian) was harshly criticised.³⁶ It would not be until almost twenty years after the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal was extended that an academic historian would focus in detail on this area.³⁷

As well as the lack of debate over Māori history, liberals in education believed that a critical scrutiny of the past could hamper the resolution of Māori grievances. This view was especially prevalent in regards to school history that was not subject to the same degree of scholarly scrutiny as academic history. As the case of Michael King demonstrates, by the 1980s it was difficult even for sympathetic Pākehā to write on Māori matters, as activists and their supporters saw this as a form of colonialism, especially if Māori were depicted in an unflattering manner. Michael King's account of the Moriori that included the violent conquest of the Chathams by Ngātī Tama in 1835 (and subsequent slavery) was criticised as undermining the process of Māori gaining recompense and acknowledgement of past injustices.³⁸

Te Kete Raukura: Leaders and their People

Michael King was the most prominent of popular New Zealand historians who focussed on Māori subjects in the 1980s. Consequently he played an important role in school history programmes, as teachers found his work to be accessible and engaging. By the 1980s he had produced the groundbreaking television documentary *Tangata Whenua* (1974), written two widely acclaimed biographies of the Māori leaders Te Puea Herangi (1977) and Whina Cooper (1983), edited two books of Māori scholarship and written a

³⁵ K.R. Howe, 'Two Worlds?', 50-61.

³⁶ See review *New Zealand Journal of History* 34:1 (2000).

³⁷ Angela Ballara, *Taua: 'Musket wars', 'Land wars' or Tikanga? Warfare in Māori Society in the early 19th century* (Wellington: Penguin, 2003).

³⁸ Michael King, *Mori: A People Rediscovered* (Auckland: Viking, 1989). For a discussion of this matter see Peter Munz, 'Te Papa and the Problem of Historical Truth'. In *History Now*, May 2000 6:1, 13-16.

photographic social history of Māori (1981).³⁹ His work was not only well regarded by the history teaching community but also by academic historians, with King being the only non-university historian to contribute to the *Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981). However, in the 1980s King was the target of increasing criticism by activists who accused him of making a profit from documenting the lives of Māori.⁴⁰ By the time the NHCC was meeting, King was coming under increasing pressure by activists to stop writing on Māori topics, as they argued only Māori should write about Māori.

The NHCC was aware of this tension. Erik Olssen as well as acknowledging that the dearth of Māori historians was 'an uncomfortable issue', pointed out the committee was aware that Michael King was 'getting a hard time.'⁴¹ In Department of Education circles, however, King was highly regarded as someone who wrote accessible material on the Māori world, and could bridge what was seen in the Department as the 'two-worlds' of Māori and Pākehā. However, in a development reminiscent of the *Washday at the Pa* controversy, King found himself excluded from writing school textbooks on Māori history.

In 1981 Michael King was commissioned by the CDD and the Division of Māori and Island Education (DMIE) to write a series of four booklets *Te Kete Raukura: Leaders and their People* on four prominent Māori leaders. The leaders chosen were Te Whiti o Rongomai (Te Ati Awa), Apirana Ngata (Ngāti Porou), Whina Cooper (Nga Puhī) and Te Puea Herangi (Tainui). The Department of Education placed a priority on both gender and geographical balance in developing resources and these choices covered several major iwi and provided a gender balance. Whina Cooper and Te Puea Herangi both had a profile in wider New Zealand society. King was already working on Whina Cooper's biography and had written a popular biography of Te Puea. Te Whiti had recently come to prominence as a pacifist leader with Dick Scott's biography, *Go Ask That Mountain* (1976) and Apirana Ngata was widely acknowledged as one of the most important Māori leaders in the 20th century.

With a budget of \$100,000 and an estimated print run of 20,000 copies for each book, *Te Kete Raukura* was a major project for the Department of Education. The books had a reading age of around 13-16 years and were suitable for being used in social studies and history programmes. They were to be distributed free to schools,

³⁹ King, Michael. *Te Puea* (Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1977); _____ *Whina*, (Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983); _____, ed. *Te Ao Hurihuri: The world moves on* (Methuen: Auckland, 1975); _____ ed. *Tihe Mauri Ora: Aspects of Māoritanga*. (Methuen: Auckland 1978); _____ *Moriori: A People Rediscovered*, (Auckland: Viking, 1989).

⁴⁰ Awatere, *Māori Sovereignty*, 94-95.

⁴¹ Olssen: interview.

and would include a teachers' guide and in the case of Te Puea and Whina Cooper, an audio-cassette and visual images. Department officials were to ensure there was consultation with the 'appropriate' tangata whenua so that what was eventually produced would be acceptable to the whānau and hapu of the individuals concerned⁴².

It took King over three years to write these textbooks and in 1985, after the books had been printed, sample copies were sent out to the respective hapu and whānau representatives. While the initial consultation process by the Department officers during the preceding years had been positive, by 1985 the social and intellectual climate had changed. A formal deputation from a group of Tainui elders (Te Puea) and Parihaka Trustees (Te Whiti) met with the director of the DMIE and members of the CDD 'objecting to the inclusion of certain material and the lack of consultation in the process of developing the scripts.' The divisions between Whina Cooper and her whānau 'raised doubts that she was a suitable subject for the resource' and in the case of Apirana Ngata 'the general non-reaction' from the whānau was perceived by Department officials as 'a sign of an unfavourable reception'. All groups objected to a Pākehā being the author and in some cases were adamant that Michael King should not have any further involvement with the books.⁴³

The Department of Education was acutely aware of the sensitivity of the situation under the Directorship of W.L. Renwick, who saw genuine consultation as of 'paramount importance' in fostering biculturalism.⁴⁴ It was decided that further negotiations with 'appropriate representatives' were necessary and only material that those authorities sanctioned would be distributed. Consequently, only the book about Te Puea Herangi was distributed in 1985. Over the following three years, the textbooks on Whina Cooper, and Apirana Ngata were distributed to schools with little publicity.⁴⁵ The textbooks on Te Whiti o Rongomai were never distributed and their whereabouts at the time of writing are unknown.

⁴² National Archives: W.M Kaa (Director MIE) and R. O'Connor (Director CDD), Minutes of combined management meeting 29/10/1985 (ABEP/ W262; Box 971, 17/14/51 part 2).

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ W.L Renwick, 'Show Us These Islands and Ourselves Give Us a Home in Thought.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 2 (1987): 197-214.

⁴⁵ Michael King, *Te Puea Herangi: from darkness to light*, (Wellington: School Publications Branch, 1984); ____, *Whina Cooper*, (Wellington: School Publications Branch, 1987); ____, *Apirana Ngata: e tipu rea*, (Wellington: School Publications Branch, 1988).

A Māori Dimension

To have incorporated authentic Māori contexts in the curriculum demanded that the committee think very differently about the nature of the subject in a school setting. This was a challenge but not one that was insurmountable even in the 1980s, as the Hui organised by Jim Peters, David Wood and John Tait demonstrated. If the NHCC had made this a priority, the inclusion of genuine Māori contexts could have been achieved, especially as there were both Māori and Pākehā scholars who could have assisted in this process. The orientation of academic history in New Zealand in the 1980s, however, was at odds with the tribal nature of Māori history. Māori historians worked differently and to include a Māori dimension into the history syllabus was a significant challenge as the comments of Tuhoe Kaumātua John Rangihau demonstrate:

My being Māori is absolutely dependent on my history as a Tuhoe person against being a Māori person ... there is no such thing as Māoritanga because Māoritanga embraces all Māori. And there are so many aspects about every tribal person. Each tribe has its own history. And it is not a history that can be shared among others. How can I share with the history of Ngāti Porou, of Te Arawa, or Waikato because I am not of those people? I am a Tuhoe person and all I can share is Tuhoe history.⁴⁶

This view was in part why Michael King came under intense scrutiny for his work on Māori, combined with his high profile as a writer who published on a range of subjects.⁴⁷ Judith Binney, however, who had been working on Māori contexts for over a decade did not face the same level of criticism, although she was acutely aware of the sensitivities of writing about Māori at the time. Binney's books *Mihaia* (1979) and *Ngā Mōrehu* (1985) were groundbreaking, in that they not only drew widely on oral history and oral testimony, but they were well received by both academia and the local people she had drawn upon for her research.⁴⁸ As noted above, Binney was not invited to be on the NHCC (despite her obvious credibility) but she attended the Hui at Whakatō Marae in Gisborne in the Rongowhakaata tribal district to discuss Māori history in the curriculum. The Hui ran over the weekend of 30 October – 1 November 1987 and was to 'discuss ways of teaching Māori history and Māori perceptions of their history'. David Wood's intention was to give a shape to the 19th century Māori leadership topic, which he hoped would be 'based on local, tribal and Rangatira history'. This topic was one of twenty-nine Year

⁴⁶ John Rangihau, 'Being Māori'. In *Te Ao Hurihuri Aspects of Māoritanga*, edited by Michael King, 221-33, (Wellington: Hicks Smith and Sons, 1975), 232-233.

⁴⁷ As well as Māori subjects noted above, King wrote on *New Zealanders at War* (1981), *The Rainbow Warrior* (1986) and political and literary biographies

⁴⁸ For an insight into Binney's success in using oral histories of Māori see: Judith Binney, 'Māori Oral Narratives, Pākehā Written Texts.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 1 (1987): 16-28.

12 history topics that the NHCC had already decided on (out of which teachers could choose four). Wood's vision was:

... for the local school to approach the local marae and establish who they could write about and study. They (local iwi) would determine who could be studied, how they could be studied and how the students' work could be appropriately assessed.⁴⁹

Wood was more than aware that the committee had failed to successfully grapple with the issue of Māori contexts and he held high hopes for the 19th century Māori leadership topic that had the potential to allow for an iwi and hapu dimension to be included in the curriculum. Officials had little to do with how the Hui ran. Almost all the dialogue was in Māori and this was seldom translated for non-speakers. The Hui was run by Māori leaders who included Wiremu Kaa, Api Mahuika, Koro Dewes (Ngatī Porou) and Rose Pere (Tuhoe). Kaa was the director of the DMIE. The Māori leaders at the Hui were initially suspicious of the Department's intentions. They were aware of the controversy over *Te Kete Raukura: Leaders and their People* and David Wood recalls '... they were clear they didn't want a government booklet on someone in the 19th century written by a Pākehā.'⁵⁰ The atmosphere was initially tense and many Māori leaders were hostile to Department approaches to developing the history syllabus as the following comment by Judith Binney indicates:

The first meeting on the marae started in a very tough atmosphere. Someone from the Department of Education made a formal whaikōrero in the meeting house. He greeted the backbone of the house. He referred to the ridgepole/ backbone of the house as tāhuhu. That is he doubled the end of the word, but there is a dialect version in this area, which does not do this. It is simply tāhū. He got it the wrong way round for the house he was in. The kaumātua was so angry. He picked up on the dialectical slip and said 'You people trample all over us and you do not know what you are talking about.'⁵¹

Despite this inauspicious beginning, the initial tension was resolved and the Hui was a success in that a measure of trust was established between the Department and the local people. It also saw a series of clear messages emerge about a way forward for teaching Māori contexts. The Hui emphasised that Māori history 'must be taught on a tribal basis' and that 'any idea of a national Māori history does not exist in Māori terms. It also defined 'tribal history as a taonga', 'inseparable from the mana of the tribe' and only the tribe has the 'right to disseminate its history.' Furthermore, it was agreed that tribal history must be taught 'on Māori terms if possible on the marae, in Māori, and that oral history and oral testimony have a major role to play as a resource.' Finally, the Hui emphasised that the Māori

⁴⁹ David Wood, Amended transcript 23/05/08.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Judith Binney: Conversation March 28th 2006/ personal correspondence.

timeframe is different to that in Pākehā society and that the 'linear notion of sequential history through time' is not part of the Māori world view.⁵²

Conclusion

The history curriculum continued to privilege existing areas of historical knowledge that had value and authentic Māori contexts did not feature prominently in teaching programmes over the next twenty years. The NHCC did achieve dramatic changes to the teaching and learning of history through the introduction of an internally assessed component at each level (as well as embedding women's history into the prescriptions). However, despite Māori issues being among the most salient of the day (and the NHCC being sympathetic to including a Māori dimension), the commitment to retaining the Eurocentric features of the existing curriculum was a more powerful ethos, and it is to this issue that we now turn.

⁵² Judith Binney, 'The Teaching of Māori History: Two Reports'. *Heritage and History in Schools: A Report to the Director General of Education by the Departments of History of the New Zealand Universities* (Massey University: Palmerston North, 1988).

CHAPTER 11

‘Tudors and Stuarts’ - The Foundation of our Heritage? 16th and 17th Century English History and the New Zealand Curriculum

I have never been in the slightest doubt that Tudor-Stuart England is highly relevant to New Zealand and New Zealand identity ... How can you understand our law and our churches without knowing about Tudor-Stuarts? Pākehā heritage comes out of Britain. The later Stuart period is the foundation of our heritage. People forget that at their peril.

Robin Gwynn¹

Introduction

The NHCC largely retained the dominance of existing Eurocentric history topics in the curriculum. In the early 1980s, the political, social and constitutional history of the early modern English nation-state was the dominant area of historical knowledge within the hierarchy of the New Zealand history curriculum. Although this area was a minority interest among New Zealand historians, 16th and 17th century English history had high status as the single compulsory topic in the UB and US prescriptions.² It enjoyed the patronage of prominent individuals within the history teaching community who were determined that the dominant position of this area be retained in any syllabus revision at this level and they were largely successful in ensuring this was the case. Despite the endeavours of Department of Education officials, New Zealand historians and a number of history teachers, to substitute ‘Tudor-Stuarts’³ with New Zealand history in the UB and US prescriptions, 16th and 17th century English history retained a dominant place (albeit in a reduced state).⁴ The successful retention of this topic demonstrates firstly how dominant individuals within the history community had a disproportionate influence over curriculum design at this level and secondly, the symbiotic relationship between teachers and ‘experts’ in the parent discipline in negotiating curriculum change.

¹ Gwynn: Interview.

² As well as the compulsory English topic (which aimed to provide a broad survey topic over an extended period of time) the 1977 syllabus offered five in-depth topic options. These were the French Revolution, The Crusades 1071-1204; World War II; United States 1919-41; Modern Japan 1876-1945 and New Zealand 1769-1914 (see figure 3; Chapter 1).

³ The 16th and 17th English topic was widely known as ‘Tudor-Stuarts’ within the history teaching community although it began with Elizabeth 1 (the final Tudor monarch) and concluded in 1700 after the final Stuart King (James II) was deposed in 1688. In the 1989 prescriptions the end date was reduced to 1667 and thus ended in the initial stages of the reign of Charles II.

⁴ The 1989 bursary and scholarship prescriptions offered two options: 19th Century New Zealand and England 1558-1667. The examination made up 60% of the final mark with 40% being internally assessed and linked to the examination mark. The internal assessment topics were required to be different in time and place from the examined topic.

The three determinants that are necessary for a successful initiative in the senior curriculum are also required for the maintenance of a particular area of historical knowledge. Firstly, for an existing area of history to be maintained within the hierarchy of a school subject community, it is necessary that the decision-making elite of the parent discipline share a common assumption that a particular body of knowledge is of higher status than any alternative. In this case, Tudor-Stuart England was defined by prominent members of the history teaching community as of more value and of more intrinsic interest to students than the alternative of 19th century New Zealand history. The elevation of a particular area of history within the hierarchy of the subject community required the patronage of prominent individuals, who enjoyed high status, and the role of historians at this level was crucial. The UB and US course was seen as an academic programme that prepared students for entry to university studies and historians were closely involved in the setting and marking of examination papers, professional development for teachers and overseeing the preparation of resources. Thus, without the advocacy of the majority of university historians involved in this community, any challenge to the dominance of 16th and 17th century English history was unlikely to be successful.

While Department of Education officials (and a number of teachers) were determined to introduce New Zealand history into the UB and US prescriptions, Erik Olssen was the only historian on the NHCC who was a keen advocate of New Zealand history. Colin Davis, Robin Gywnn and Michael Graves⁵ were all English historians whose research interests were early modern Europe and they were determined to retain 'Tudor-Stuarts' as a compulsory topic. Other historians on the NHCC were either too junior in the hierarchy to drive any major change, or had different agendas that were catered for in the Year 12 syllabus changes.⁶

Secondly, curriculum development at this level is a negotiated process based on a symbiotic relationship between senior teachers and the decision-making elite of the parent discipline. The retention of the history of 16th and 17th century England in the UB/US programmes required the cooperation of the majority of senior teachers. By the 1980s the English topic reflected the professional and personal interests of many contemporary history teachers who had made a considerable personal

⁵ Michael Graves was active in the early stages of the committee only.

⁶ Peter Lineham was relatively junior in the hierarchy of academia at this time (although he enjoyed the patronage of Colin Davis). He was beginning to write New Zealand religious history but typical of most historians of his generation he had completed his PhD overseas on a non-New Zealand topic. Russell Stone had a background in teaching and teacher training and while he had researched and published New Zealand history, he only taught European history at Auckland University. Nicholas Tarling was an Asian specialist whose primary aim was to see more Asian history included in the curriculum and this was accommodated at Forms 5 and 6.

investment in this area of knowledge and they were enthusiastic proponents of this topic. To prepare students thoroughly for the prestigious UB/US examinations, teachers needed to have read widely and have a firm grasp of current historiographical developments. Many had studied early modern Europe at tertiary level as part of their training, and as subject specialists at this level they were confident they could deliver programmes that met the rigorous requirements of the examinations. They were also publicly accountable. It was expected that their students achieved good examination results and this not only contributed to their professional standing but also the academic status of their schools.

For these reasons, history teachers at this level were cautious of elevating an alternative area of knowledge to the same status as Tudor-Stuart history. Such a change not only represented a major reorientation in regards to their professional practice, but also challenged their personal status within their schools and local history teaching communities, where they were perceived as specialists in an area of highly valued knowledge. Furthermore, history teachers were not under pressure to change from academic historians. This would have made a difference as school history at this level was informed (and had status) as a result of close links to the parent discipline. As the case of women's history demonstrated, teachers would accept unwelcome initiatives if such change was reflected in the parent discipline. In the case of English history, teachers who were advocates of 'Tudor-Stuarts' were aware that a number of prominent historians saw this area as superior.

At a practical level, curriculum change had implications for access to quality resources (which was a primary concern for teachers) and the early modernists were in a better position to provide suitable resources to teach the English topic. As Bargas (2005) has shown, the availability of resources was a key factor in teachers choosing to deliver the English option. Resourcing was also a consideration in winning over proponents for the New Zealand option on the NHCC to allow teachers the autonomy to choose between either New Zealand or England. Advocates of New Zealand history hoped that as the resource base for this area improved, teachers would shift from Tudor-Stuarts. This was a forlorn hope. Reflecting a post-colonial mentality (that placed English history at the pinnacle of the hierarchy of school history programmes), many teachers at this level have continued to retain a commitment to Tudor-Stuart England. This topic was still dominant in the majority of schools almost twenty years after the syllabus was introduced, by which time there were abundant resources for New Zealand history (which was widely taught in

universities) and prominent historians were critical of the teaching of the topic.⁷ Despite the ongoing contentious nature of this issue in the history teaching community, the less academic orientation of the Year 13 cohort and the lack of value New Zealand scholars ascribed to early modern England, Tudor-Stuart history has been thoroughly embedded into the UB and US prescriptions and widely taught for over thirty years.

Table 4: Percentage of candidates sitting bursary options: 1984-86⁸

All students studied England 1558-1700 (Part A).

Part B Options	1984	1985	1986
<i>USA 1919-41</i>	33.7%	38.4%	37.4%
<i>New Zealand 1769-1914</i>	30.4%	28.7%	31.0%
<i>World War II</i>	13.4%	13.0%	14.0%
<i>French Revolution</i>	16.9%	14.0%	14.0%
<i>Crusades</i>	3.3%	3.8%	2.5%
<i>Japan</i>	2.0%	1.3%	1.3%

Tudor-Stuart: The Compulsory option

The UB and US history prescriptions were under the auspices of the UEB and it was historians who determined the content to be examined and oversaw marking. While curriculum designers placed a high value on English history (as this was thought to cater well for the small number of academically orientated students at this level), by the 1980s early modern England was a minority interest among New Zealand historians. This is illustrated by examining the history programmes offered by New Zealand's largest history department at Auckland University. Despite Auckland having a strong research base on early modern England (by New Zealand standards), it had long been a minority interest among historians in this country when the NHCC was meeting. By 1967 Auckland was at the forefront of New Zealand history. It included prominent New Zealand specialists such as Keith Sinclair, Keith Sorrenson and Judith Binney, and Auckland had just established *The New Zealand Journal of History* (the only academic journal specifically on New

⁷ See NZHTA surveys. The 60:40 ratio in favour of England and New Zealand has been generally consistent over the last 6 years. Final figures as to the NZHTA 2008 survey were not available at the time of writing but preliminary results indicate that little has changed (correspondence Mark Sheehan – Paul Enfield, NZHTA executive, 23.09.08; in author's possession). For historians views on this matter see Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the year 2000*, 546; <http://www.mch.govt.nz/dominion/belich.html>; Sinclair, *Half way Round the Harbour*, 170-171.

⁸ Source Department of Education, University Bursary examiners reports 1984-86. Approximately 1/3 total bursary candidates sat the history paper.

Zealand history). Students who intended to take history for Honours or Masters were 'strongly advised' to take New Zealand history at stages 2 and 3 and the majority worked on New Zealand research problems. Early modern and medieval British history was offered but as well as New Zealand history, there were courses in African, Asian, Russian and North American history.⁹ The interests of historians reflected the current issues of concern and consequently Auckland was '... strong in Southeast Asian history, British imperial history, medieval history and American history'.¹⁰

A decade later, when the compulsory place of Tudor-Stuart England was cemented into the 1977 UB and US prescriptions, Auckland had expanded its courses in Asian, New Zealand and American history and now included the histories of Australia and the Pacific and the philosophy of history. Only four of the 37 topics offered were on early modern Europe and these largely catered for teachers.¹¹ By the mid-1980s 'early modern' still retained four topics out of 34 options in the Auckland History Department but now only one of these was at stage 3.¹² Auckland, as the largest Department in a multi-cultural city with the highest proportion of Māori and Polynesians, had a wider range of options than other universities (including an emphasis on New Zealand history). However, even at smaller universities such as Otago, early-modern Europe did not feature prominently¹³. Erik Olssen recalls:

In my Department (Otago) we were not so keen on Tudor/Stuart history. I was trained here at Otago – in those days you couldn't do New Zealand History. It was not part of the curriculum at any point in the late 1960s. You could do New Zealand history as part of a course that included Australia and the Pacific but this could not be part of a history major. Not until the mid 1970s could this be part of a history degree and in 1977 a New Zealand history paper introduced as a third year paper and a fourth year paper on documents. But if you wanted to go on and do research then you had to do New Zealand.

The dominant position English history held in the school curriculum was not therefore driven by the interests of the majority of contemporary historians. Rather, it was due to the advocacy of early modern specialists, who were willing to involve themselves in school curriculum matters and build alliances with teachers. These historians were well placed to promote the English topic as they understood the practical needs of secondary school teachers. Michael Graves (a high profile early-

⁹ Auckland University Calendar, 1967, pp. 273-277.

¹⁰ Sinclair, *Halfway Round the Harbour*, 172.

¹¹ Auckland University Calendar 1977, 182-184.

¹² Auckland University Calendar 1987, 116-117.

¹³ See Otago University Calendars 1967-87.

modern scholar who was well regarded in international circles) had a background in secondary teaching:

I trained at Cambridge under Geoffrey Elton and I always knew I wanted to do early modern. As soon as I left Cambridge I had to get a job. I worked in a private school for four years and then I worked for a firm of private tutors who trained people for sitting university entrance exams. I was there until I got the job in New Zealand. I was brought out to New Zealand to teach early modern England.¹⁴

Robin Gwynn (who was UB and US subject convener in the early 1980s) had also trained at Cambridge and had taught in secondary schools before he became an historian at Massey. Although this was not the case with Colin Davis, he had worked closely with teachers in the United Kingdom and was aware that it was essential to establish and maintain good working networks with teachers. He felt the NHCC fell short in this regard:

On the whole I feel we did not listen enough to teachers ... I came away with considerable admiration for the teachers I met who were on the whole, doing a great job often in very adverse circumstances (very limited library resources and the like).¹⁵

English historians had an advantage in working in curriculum development as they were more familiar with issues facing history teachers than their New Zealand counterparts. History in the United Kingdom was a discrete subject taught at all levels until Year 11 and thus drew on the expertise of historians to a greater extent than in New Zealand (where historians were not involved in social studies and only a minority were involved in senior courses). Russell Stone was unusual among New Zealand academics, in that he had first-hand experience as a secondary teacher of both social studies and history. Because of their grasp of the practical issues facing classroom teachers, Tudor-Stuart specialists understood that resourcing was of central concern to senior secondary teachers. They were able to draw on the rich resource base available in Britain where this area was taught and (with a much larger school population), where there were abundant resources. Early modern historians were also linked to an international scholarly community and arranged speaking tours for students of prominent English historians such as Geoffrey Elton, Christopher Haigh and Austin Woolrych who provided an exotic flavour to this topic in a post-colonial New Zealand that in the 1980s was only beginning to value its own history.

¹⁴ Graves: interview.

¹⁵ J.C. Davis to Mark Sheehan, personal correspondence, 10 July 2006. (Letter in author's possession).

While Davis, Gwynn and Graves all valued the English option, they differed in their approach to early modern history. Colin Davis wanted to retain Tudor-Stuarts at Year 13 but saw the New Zealand approach to the history of 16th and 17th century England as out-of-step with current historiography in this area. Although an early modernist, he was also committed to New Zealand history including Miles Fairburn's radical new interpretation of New Zealand's social history: Peter Lineham observed:

Colin had done much to bring the new approaches to early modern to New Zealand. He was starkly opposed to the Hill [Marxist] interpretation and passionately committed to seeing English history within its wider contexts. It was quite clear that Erik was leading the campaign to abolish the Tudor-Stuarts and Colin was leading the defence. Colin's emphasis was that we must not lose early modern. He did believe that New Zealand history could be stronger and more productive if it were shaped in the right way. While Colin believed passionately in importance of the early modern he did not like the Tudor aspect ... he saw this as historiographically very conservative and anachronistic. (P. Lineham)

For historians to maintain a support base among teachers, what was required was a comprehensive textbook, explicitly aimed at preparing New Zealand students studying Tudors-Stuarts for UB and US. In 1984 Michael Graves, working with history teacher Robin Silcock, published what would become the definitive text for students on this topic.¹⁶ It was guided by a questionnaire circulated to teachers by the publishers the previous year, organised around the themes as outlined in the prescriptions and included historiographical perspectives. It was well received by teachers and historians with an interest in school curriculum matters.¹⁷ The publication of 'Graves and Silcock' provided a firm platform for reinforcing the cultural and intellectual hegemonic position of this topic that would prove difficult to dislodge. It profoundly influenced how this area was interpreted over the subsequent twenty years, as it became the basis of UB and US programmes and typically for many students, it was their sole text. For the classroom teacher an accessible school textbook such as 'Graves and Silcock' was the 'official knowledge' and, as Michael Apple notes, 'such knowledge carries impressive weight and most teachers neither dismiss it nor publicly substitute other knowledge for it.'¹⁸ The role of school textbooks in shaping the implementation of the curriculum is crucial, as 'textbooks are ... conceived, designed and authored by real people with real interests' and 'are published with the political constraints of markets, resources and power'.¹⁹ History

¹⁶ M.A.R Graves and R.H. Silcock, *Revolution, Reaction and the Triumph of Conservatism: English History, 1558-1700* (Auckland: Longman Paul, 1984).

¹⁷ M, Peters. 'Review of *Revolution, Reaction and the Triumph of Conservatism: English History, 1558-1700*.' *Historical News* (1985): 11-12.

¹⁸ O.L. Davis, Jr. cited in: Foster and Crawford, *International perspectives on School History Textbooks*, xiii.

¹⁹ Michael Apple, *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age* (London Routledge, 1993), 46.

textbooks play a central role in determining what is taught in schools as they 'contain the information that society expects students to know.'²⁰

Textbooks do not just convey knowledge; they represent what generations of pupils will learn about their own pasts and futures as well as the histories of others. In textbooks we find what a society wishes to convey to the next generation ... the chronologies and narratives of 'us' and 'them' underscore the moments, events and developments to be celebrated.²¹

While historians who promoted the English topic had a firm grasp of the need for resourcing, they did not have a realistic sense of the changing nature of the Year 13 cohort. This was reflected in a prescription that was aimed beyond all but the academically able. The equivalent Year 13 history programme in Britain did not equate with New Zealand as British students specialised to a far greater degree than their New Zealand counterparts. The New Zealand curriculum was driven by the ethos of a broad general education that had emerged in the Thomas Report. British students at this level not only studied history in greater depth, but because history was an integral feature of the compulsory curriculum in the United Kingdom, they had studied the subject during their primary schooling.

The 1977 UB prescription reflected this academic emphasis and caused problems for history teachers. The syllabus was an attempt to improve the previous prescription that had been introduced in 1965. It had positioned England 1603-1815, as the compulsory Part A topic and the reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603) was the most widely taught Part B option.²² While the aim of Part A was a broad survey of 'change and continuity ... over an extended period of time', few teachers taught beyond 1660 and the popular Elizabethan option was seldom covered in its entirety. It was an 'unsatisfactory state of affairs' because there was 'no guidance on the aims and purposes of the various parts of the prescriptions.' In reality teachers prepared students for a narrow selection of examination questions and the broad survey was seldom taught.²³

The 1977 syllabus aimed to address these problems by reducing the terminal date to 1700 and, absorbing the popular Elizabethan option into the previous 17th century topic. This almost 150 year survey (England 1558-1700) aimed to 'introduce young students to the techniques and aims of historians ... and the problems of

²⁰ Davis cited in: Foster and Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children?*, xiii

²¹ Soyal and Schissler, *The Nation, Europe, and the World*, 7.

²² Department of Education. *1965 Bursary Prescription*. As well as England 1603-1815 being the compulsory topic, there were five options. Elizabethan England 1558-1603, Medieval England, New Zealand 1769-1914; French Revolution; Japan 1867-1930. In 1977 the medieval topic became The Crusades (See Chapter 1).

²³ G.R Rice, 'The New Bursaries/Entrance Scholarships Prescriptions.' *Historical News*, (1978), 9.

interpretation and historiographical controversy in an interesting and yet manageable way'.²⁴ The UB paper, however, took little account of pedagogical changes in history education in the 1970s and continued to be highly academic in its approach. The examination required four essays, no short answers or resource interpretation, and was too challenging for most contemporary New Zealand students, some of whom were accepted into Year 13 history having not studied the subject previously.²⁵ This problem was compounded by the lack of familiarity many New Zealand students had with the topic of 16th and 17th century England. A consequence of the academic emphasis of the Tudor-Stuart topic (and the advanced requirements of the UB and US examinations) is that Year 13 history increasingly became a subject that flourished in academically orientated schools and this served to reinforce the existing class divisions over knowledge. Anne Jones of Ngā Tapuwae College (which was made up of predominantly Māori and Polynesian students) pointed out, 'the English section of the paper ... is most difficult for all my students, none of whom are European. To them, it seems only marginally relevant'.²⁶ Historians did not fully appreciate this problem. Robin Gwynn admitted that students were 'less likely to have a societal understanding' of Tudor-Stuarts but saw New Zealand students had an 'advantage' because contemporary New Zealand had a 'similar population density' to 16th century England'.²⁷

Even the majority of teachers who had personally and professionally invested in English history were far from happy with this state of affairs. History was an optional subject and numbers were declining. It was perceived that this was a consequence of the changing nature of the senior school cohort. Increasing numbers of students who perceived history as difficult chose 'easier' options. When the 1977 syllabus was introduced teachers criticised the 'vast amount of historical ground' that students needed to cover in a working year of 30 weeks (and which included other subjects). Teachers 'strongly felt' they should be more closely involved, in the 'setting, moderating and marking of the UB and US examinations' to provide a more realistic sense of current student abilities.²⁸

Teachers wanted to see less emphasis on essays in the UB/US programmes and the inclusion of a documentary resources section that was explicitly linked to the

²⁴ *Education Gazette*, 30 March 1976.

²⁵ O'Connor, 'Surviving or thriving', 2007

²⁶ Correspondence: Anne Jones to Greg Taylor (inspectorate, Department of Education), 23 October 1984. Nicholas Tarling, private papers. Anne Jones sat intermittently on the NHCC.

²⁷ Gwynn interview.

²⁸ National Archives: University Bursaries and Scholarship History, Lopdell House Course, 1977, File 40/13/11, part 2, In-service Training History.

skills taught in SC and UE.²⁹ As discussed above, the emphasis on skills was a key feature of history teaching in the 1980s and there were real fears that the overly academic focus of the UB and US courses could potentially damage the subject in the long-term. Les Macaskill (Inspector of Secondary Schools) made a number of specific suggestions that highlighted how the prescriptions did not reflect the capabilities of contemporary Year 13 students. The views of teachers were encapsulated in his comment that 'examiners should be aware of the capabilities of Form 7 (Year 13) students when setting and marking questions.'³⁰

Historians were not unaware of this problem that by the 1980s had manifested itself at both UB and US level.³¹ While the 1985 UB examiner was reassured by the 'proportion of candidates who had been well taught,' there were 'far too many' who had little grasp of the topic at this level and 'the writing skills of all but the best, required attention.'³² In the following year the examiner claimed 'a disturbingly large number of entrants seemed barely literate' and 'many otherwise quite able candidates could not spell...'³³ Even at US level, the 1985 examiner lamented the 'greater number of brief, uncompleted or blank scripts, greater unevenness of standard within answers, a deterioration in grammar and spelling and more factual errors'.³⁴ However, while the historians who oversaw the UB and US examinations were largely concerned with the academically able, by the 1980s they were finding that the academic standard at university was changing. The 1986 scholarship examiner acknowledged:

Now that University staff are placed under greater pressure by worsening staff-student ratios some of us are becoming more appreciative of the difficult conditions under which most secondary school teachers labour. We know your classes are too big and that there is little time for reading and research. Given the current difficulties it is a miracle that pupils have been so well taught.³⁵

Not all historians, however, were impressed by the UB/US examination paper. Michael Mayer, an American specialist at Auckland University, claimed the 1984 UB and US papers were characterised by grammatical and factual errors and historiographical anachronism. The 'vagueness', 'lunacy' and the 'unintelligible'

²⁹ National Archives: G.R. Rice. Form 7 History: Department of Education National Residential Course. Lopdell House, Auckland, 4-8 August 1980. File 40/13/11. Part 2. In-service Training.

³⁰ National Archives: Macaskill, Department of Education Report. 7th Form History. Lopdell House Course 4-8 1980. File 40/13/11.

³¹ The 1977 UB and US prescription was last examined in 1989. The terminal date for the topic was reduced in 1984 to 1688. The new Bursary/scholarship prescription was first examined in 1990.

³² Department of Education, *Examiners Report, University Bursaries* – History 1985.

³³ Department of Education, *Examiners Report, University Bursaries* – History 1986.

³⁴ Department of Education, *Examiners Report, Entrance Scholarships* – History 1985.

³⁵ Department of Education, *Examiners Report, Entrance Scholarships* – History 1986

nature of some the questions, he claimed, made it difficult for any student to provide a lucid and comprehensive answer.³⁶

While broad support for 16th and 17th century England continued into the 1980s, the problems noted above were seen as key issues to be resolved by the NHCC. It was evident that there were serious concerns about the length of the topic, the complexity of the historiography required and the academic nature of the paper. In response to these concerns Robin Gwynn recommended a reduction in the terminal date but left any further developments to the History Committee. Gwynn also noted there was a 'ginger group' which wanted New Zealand to become the compulsory topic, as well as calls for local history and internal assessment.³⁷ However, the early modernists had put themselves in a dominant position. In doing so they were not untypical of other stakeholders in the history teaching community, but they were more committed to maintaining effective networks with teachers, building a resource base and providing professional development. Thus they provided what the majority of teachers wanted at a practical level. As a consequence it was their area of historical knowledge that was perceived by the majority of teachers either to be of higher value or a more practical option to teach.

Tudor-Stuarts Versus 19th Century New Zealand

New Zealand history was emerging as the dominant research interest among New Zealand historians by the 1980s and a growing number in the history teaching community wanted this reflected in the curriculum. Historians who were interested in New Zealand history tended to be younger and as yet to achieve status in the hierarchy of the academic world. Most had written Masters' theses on New Zealand topics but typically had studied for their doctorates overseas, on non-New Zealand topics. A number of historians were becoming increasingly vocal in their criticism of the Tudor-Stuart option and expected this issue to be addressed by the NHCC. Keith Sinclair, for example, was critical of the dominance of Tudor-Stuart history. He saw the area as 'irrelevant' and he was disappointed that teachers were so reluctant to 'give the topic up.'³⁸ The Department of Education was also determined that New Zealand history should feature prominently in the curriculum. David Wood summarised this view:

³⁶ Memorandum, M. Mayer to Russell Stone (copy to Nicholas Tarling). Auckland University History Department, 9 July 1985. (Nicholas Tarling private papers).

³⁷ R. Gwynn. Report on meetings of Regional Syllabus Committees 1982. History Department, Massey University, January 1983. (Robin Gwynn private papers) Also reprinted in *Auckland History Teachers Association News*, April, 1983.

³⁸ Sinclair, *Halfway Round the Harbour*, Auckland, 70.

It was an indictment on our school system that our kids knew so little of New Zealand. I agreed with Keith Sinclair and Erik Olssen that New Zealand history was just as exciting, controversial. It had all the problems in it.

The UB and US prescriptions were the most contentious of all the curriculum decisions that NHCC had to grapple with. It was not resolved until early 1988 (a year after the final meeting of the full committee). It was widely acknowledged that there were problems to be addressed. The course was too long, academically too challenging and took little account of changing pedagogical approaches in history education. There was a widespread acceptance among the history teaching community that changes were needed, although few teachers or historians wanted to abandon their particular area of interest and hoped that any shifts in content would not impact on them.

The original proposal did little to reduce the amount of content. The UB and US courses were to have three parts. Part A would be externally assessed and be a choice between a reduced English topic (1558-1660) and a New Zealand topic (1830-1871). Part B would be internally assessed and made up of the options that already existed in the prescriptions, while Part C was a new internally assessed research-based topic that was to be on local or New Zealand contexts. This proposal did little to address the central problems in that it added to the workload of teachers and students. It generated considerable discussion around the shape of the New Zealand and England options as to how much of the internally assessed course in Parts B and C should be worth and whether or not New Zealand or Tudor-Stuart should be compulsory. For the Tudor-Stuart advocates while reshaping the topic was not ideal, it did not pose major problems. It was simply part of a longer process that had begun in 1977 with the reduction of terminal dates of the previous topic. There was a common agreement among Tudor-Stuart specialists that their knowledge base was valued and must be retained. Furthermore, it was possible within the suggested timeframe to both incorporate the new research in social history that was an important feature of this topic in the United Kingdom, and organise the topics into broad, conceptual themes that reflected international thinking in history education.³⁹

Establishing a broad survey New Zealand topic was more challenging. Although there already was a New Zealand option (1769-1914), this had not been organised into themes but rather had been based around in-depth topics. It was also

³⁹ Auckland University History Department memo, Nicholas Tarling, 20 February 1985, Seventh Form History: Proposed part A English topic. (Nicholas Tarling private papers).

necessary to substantially reduce the timeframe of the course. The original New Zealand syllabus proposal was drawn up by Erik Olssen and Russell Stone in December 1984 and adopted a 'topics' approach. This format did not meet with universal approval when it was circulated in the history teaching community. There was a 'strong preference' for themes and 'extending the chronological time span'.⁴⁰ The Auckland University History Department was especially concerned that New Zealand history had not 'been given a fuller place in the syllabus' (having to be 'merely co-equal with the English topic') and that the New Zealand topic was 'too short'.⁴¹ They were also uncomfortable that 50% of the course would be externally examined and internal assessment would count for the rest. The response of Olssen to this (and similar feedback) was to shift the focus to three broad thematic questions and extend the topic out to 1800-1900. It was this framework that would be eventually adopted by the University Entrance Board.⁴²

The major criticism of the dominant role of Tudor-Stuarts came from proponents of New Zealand history.⁴³ The historian who encapsulated the view that New Zealand should be central to the UB and US prescriptions was Erik Olssen. He was determined to challenge the dominance of Tudor-Stuarts as he saw this topic as not only of little relevance to New Zealand but also as anachronistic and English-centric. He saw it as his 'mission to get New Zealand as a compulsory topic'.⁴⁴ The advocates of Tudor-Stuart history based their case on three central arguments. They firstly argued this topic was crucial to understanding the legal and religious origins of New Zealand society. Secondly, they pointed to the abundance of interesting resources and the rich historiography in this topic, a claim that given the emerging state of New Zealand history in the 1980s, few New Zealand advocates could deny. Advocates of the English option also argued that this topic had the advantage of having been taught for several decades and thus all teachers were familiar with the content and could thoroughly prepare their students for UB and US

⁴⁰ Five topics were drawn up: Peopling the Land; Government (Imperial, provincial, tribal) Māori and the quest for autonomy; the changing economy; and society Correspondence: Erik Olssen (University of Otago) to Russell Stone (University of Auckland) 1 July 1985 (with attachments). Nicholas Tarling private papers.

⁴¹ Correspondence: M.P.K. Sorrenson (Auckland University History Department) to Erik Olssen (Otago University). 18 June 1986. Sorrenson's letter was a summary of the views of Keith Sinclair, Russell Stone, Judith Binney, Raewyn Dalziel, Hugh Jackson and Judith Bassett. Nicholas Tarling private papers.

⁴² New Zealand c.1800 –c.1900. A) To What extent did competition for land and mana shape Māori-Pākehā relationships in the 19th century?; B) What were the main changes to the economy during the 19th century; C) What sort of society was created in the 19th century? Correspondence; 30 June 1986. Erik Olssen (Otago University) to M.P.K. Sorrenson (Auckland University History Department). Nicholas Tarling private papers.

⁴³ Department of Education, University Bursaries/ Examiners Reports 1985 and 1986 and Universities Entrance Board. History – Recommendations from the National Syllabus Committee, July 1987.

⁴⁴ Olssen: interview.

examinations. This was an important factor for academically orientated schools, whose status was based on achieving high marks in public examinations.

The division between England and New Zealand at this time was a choice between the insular approach to New Zealand history that characterised New Zealand historiography in the 1980s and the argument that New Zealand's heritage was part of a wider British imperial narrative. Michael Graves saw 16th and 17th century English history as part of a wider international story. He was suspicious of history that reflected the interests of the present. When interviewed in 2005 he cautioned '...if you are going to start teaching about current politics then it really shouldn't be in the history department. It should be in political science'.⁴⁵ Advocates for the English option thus not only valued their own area of interest but were highly critical of the insular approach to New Zealand history that was dominant at this time, in which global trends and wider issues such as imperialism were seldom considered. Michael Graves remembers:

There was a tension between those who were pushing New Zealand versus Tudor-Stuart. The thing that struck me about that time was the parochialism. Not a national parochialism but more provincial. There were those who said that as we live here we should teach New Zealand history. My response was that New Zealand is very small and other countries have had an impact on us. Knowledge must extend beyond New Zealand. British history is part of our inheritance.

Robin Gwynn also saw himself as 'part of an international historical community' and saw this area of English history as highly relevant in that it offered an insight into the origins of New Zealand's religious, constitutional and legal systems.⁴⁶

Advocates of the New Zealand option were unconvinced by the argument that the focus of the three-year senior history course should be on 16th and 17th century England. While this area was obviously part of New Zealand's heritage, there were many who thought this topic did little to inform students of the current issues that faced New Zealand in the 1980s. In addition, except for an abiding interest in Tudor costume drama in the popular media, novels and feature films, early modern England was not of high interest to contemporary New Zealand historians. Furthermore while New Zealand historiography at this time was comparatively thin in relation to 16th and 17th century England, it was potentially in a healthy state as *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981) and the increasing number of articles in the *New Zealand Journal of History* demonstrated. It was thus only a matter of time

⁴⁵ Graves: interview.

⁴⁶ Gwynn: interview.

before a substantial historiography would emerge that would satisfy what was, in reality, a minor historiographical aspect of the UB and US prescriptions.

Teaching and Learning UB and US History

Regardless of the preference in relation to content, teachers wanted to see a greater range of skills included in the UB and US courses. While the aim of the 1977 broad survey course had been to foster ‘... higher-order skills of seeing relationships,’⁴⁷ teachers and historians felt this aim had not been achieved. There was pressure from teachers to introduce more explicit historical skills. The most significant change in the curriculum at this level was the introduction of the internally assessed research component (‘special studies’) that had already become a feature of SC and 6FC programmes as discussed earlier. This was a radical departure from the previous UB and US prescriptions. David Wood captured the tenor of the issue:

Peter Whitelock had done the groundwork here in building enthusiasm for local studies and demonstrating that kids could be involved in research. Many of us thought this was viable. Tom Brooking had been working with Bruce Cathro and said ‘I am finding information from these students work that I can’t find anywhere else’. In other words the kids could be the initiators of those finding information and this would be of benefit to all ... they could uncover material that was quite unique. We got very excited about this. Some wanted as much as 50% but that was too much. We followed the model of the geography syllabus. The geography syllabus had a bit of influence on us and especially the work of Chris Davidson. Geography certainly started these processes. We went further than them though. 40% was quite dramatic. (D. Wood)

Once special studies became part of the equation, the debate over Tudor-Stuart or 19th century New Zealand assumed a different dimension, as it would now only count as part of the final mark and therefore would not make up the course for the entire year. Peter Lineham recalls that special studies was a ‘solution to the problem of whether we go the English way or the New Zealand way.’ However historians were cautious of special studies at this level. Nicholas Tarling had ‘reservations’ given the ‘sophisticated’ nature of research work and Erik Olssen pointed out few teachers had experience of doing historical research. In the final analysis, however, as with Years 11 and 12, historians endorsed special studies as it had the potential to engage students and arrest the decline in numbers.

⁴⁷ G.R Rice, *Historical News*, 1978.

Final Choices

On July 10 1987 a working party⁴⁸ of the UEB met to consider the NHCC's suggested changes and to finalise the UB and US prescriptions. The SC⁴⁹ and a fully internally assessed 6FC prescription had been revised. The NHCC had met as a full committee for the last time in March. The working party had considered the feedback of teachers and historians who were uncomfortable with increasing the requirements of the course. The working party suggested that there should be two aspects to the course. Part A. would be a choice between 16th and 17th century England and a 19th century New Zealand. This would be externally examined in a 2½ hour examination that was worth 70%. The research component of the course was a 'stand-alone achievement-based assessment' worth 30% of the total mark and required a different context to Part A.

The examination was markedly different than the previous prescription. The paper was made up of two essays as well as written and visual resource short answer questions that tested skills such as the ability to summarise evidence, recognise a viewpoint and assess historical interpretations.⁵⁰ Both options required students to engage with social, economic and political history. It was this shape that was discussed by the prescription committee⁵¹ when they met on 11 August and it was decided to send out this draft with a questionnaire to teachers and historians for comment. The full detailed draft prescription was sent out to schools in October 1987. It explicitly provided guidance on what was to be taught for the examination (as well as the skills objectives) and the requirements of the internally assessed special studies.

When the prescription committee reconvened in April 1988 the responses showed that most teachers appeared to be positive about the suggested changes. However, there was not universal approval. In regards to the New Zealand topic some claimed the 'content was unmanageable', that it must include 'culture contact' (and begin before 1800). There was a serious issue of a lack of suitable resources and in

⁴⁸ The working party met at Massey University was made up of Mike Murtagh (Department of Education: Examinations Division); David Wood, Marcia Stenson, Robin Gwynn and Colin Davis.

⁴⁹ Made up of 34% internal assessment and 66% examination.

⁵⁰ Universities Entrance Board, Universities Bursaries Working Party minutes. 10 July 1987. (Nicholas Tarling private papers)

⁵¹ The Universities Entrance Board Prescription Committee met in Wellington and was attended by Tom Brooking (Otago University); David Gledhill, Robin Gwynn; Don Hamilton (Christ's College); Geoff Rice (University of Canterbury); Marcia Stenson; Jill Strugnell (Rangitikei College) and David Wood. David Mackay (Victoria University) was unable to attend.

particular the absence of a suitable textbook.⁵² With the English option, teachers still saw the topic was 'too big' and 'there was too much to cover'.⁵³

As a result of these responses, in the final prescription teachers were to be allowed to choose either 19th century New Zealand (1800-1900) or a truncated 16th and 17th century England (1558-1667) for the examination which was to be worth 60%. The internally assessed research component was increased to be worth 40% and rather than being a stand-alone assessment, was scaled based on the school's examination results in the UB examination. The contexts studied in the research were required to be 'different in time and place' from the examined topic. The committee believed that even if teachers continued to teach the English option, many teachers would choose New Zealand as the context for the internally researched aspect of the course, given the ample opportunities for documentary research in this area.

Summary

The final UB and US prescriptions fell well short of the aims of the Department of Education and liberals in the history teaching community who had hoped to introduce a substantial component of New Zealand history into this programme. However, teachers who continued to study the English option with their students enjoyed a considerable advantage. They had access to high quality teaching resources and a substantial existing resource base, as well as being able to draw on the expertise of a number of historians and educators who understood their requirements for professional development. Furthermore, teachers of the English option were familiar with this area and given the pressure of high status examinations, could continue to thoroughly prepare their students for the prestigious UB and US examinations. Thus the 'either/or' compromise reinforced the dominance of 16th and 17th century England, although to a lesser extent than had previously been the case. Liberals were not entirely disappointed. The introduction of the internally assessed special studies did signal a major shift in history teaching at this level (especially as it linked the Year 13 programmes with the previous two years).

⁵² Many teachers who wanted to study the New Zealand option felt they needed a single textbook that would contain all the material for their course (as those who chose to teach the English option drew on Michael Graves and Robin Silcock's *Revolution and Change*). This perceived necessity was addressed in 1989 when Erik Olssen and Marcia Stenson published *A Century of Change* (Heinemann, 1989) that catered for the New Zealand 1800-1900 option and adopted an explicitly thematic approach closely modelled on the prescription.

⁵³ Universities Entrance Board, Memorandum to prescription Committee, 25 March 1988. (Nicholas Tarling private papers).

The examination paper was also changed to reflect the use of resource interpretation that was so much a feature of the SC and 6FC prescriptions. When interviewed, the prevailing view of those on the NHCC who were advocates of New Zealand history was that Tudor-Stuarts remained dominant because of the demise of the Department of Education in 1990. The Department, they argued, could have ensured the New Zealand option was adequately resourced. However, this argument is less than convincing given that Tudor-Stuart history has had little status in New Zealand universities for over twenty years and there is now an abundance of accessible and engaging material on New Zealand history. New Zealand history is also of high interest in the public arena. In reality, in light of the determination of dominant members of the New Zealand history teaching community to advocate for Tudor-Stuarts (regardless of wider social concerns) and the high autonomy model that allowed teachers to choose which option to teach, it is unsurprising that advocates for New Zealand history should be disappointed.

CHAPTER 12

Conclusion

The shaping of the New Zealand history curriculum in the 1980s was a highly contested, political process that provides an insight into the values and beliefs of the curriculum generating elite at this particular point in time. It was a contest between competing schools of thought and groups with a vested interest in, and commitment to, a particular body of historical knowledge and/or a pedagogical approach. In light of the changing nature of the senior school cohort (that called for a more inclusive approach to senior secondary schooling), the Department of Education expected the history curriculum to be reshaped to be socially relevant, include more New Zealand history and mirror contemporary changes in the discipline as well as history education. In this they reflected the liberal ethos that dominated education policy-making at this time (including the leadership of the PPTA). However, the increasing fragmentation of the parent discipline, the lack of consensus among teachers and historians as to the epistemological features of the subject and the long-standing dissonance between history and social studies made the development of a socially relevant history curriculum a fraught process.

In the international arena it is government agencies that drive curriculum change, but in New Zealand in the 1980s a small number of dominant individuals in the history teaching community were able to have a disproportionate influence over the process. While the Department was able to reshape the SC curriculum to reflect its aims and introduced an internally assessed research component at all levels, the 1989 history syllabus (as expressed in the examination prescriptions) was a cautious response to liberal demands to reform the curriculum. Anachronistic and Eurocentric in orientation, the prescriptions largely reinforced existing divisions over what knowledge has value and perpetuated the hierarchical nature of a subject that has continued to primarily serve the interests of the academically able in affluent schools. The marginal status of New Zealand history in the curriculum also stood apart from the international arena as typically most nations prioritise their own history.

The divergent views on the committee as to the purpose of school history were complicated by the Department of Education's reluctance to promote an explicit philosophical direction in regards to the development process and its commitment to continuing to operate on an ethos of consensus in regards to decision-making. The informality of the curriculum development process was perceived by the curriculum

generating elite as transparent and inclusive. It was also largely successful in designing curricula in the common core subjects and for senior subjects that were relatively uncontested (such as physical education). In such areas curriculum design was characterised by consensus and compromise among a carefully chosen group of like-minded 'insiders' (who shared the values of the Department of Education). However, this was not the case with the senior academic subject of history that was informed by a parent discipline. Within the hierarchy of the history teaching community it was historians who enjoyed high standing and the status of teachers was achieved by making alliances with those historians who involved themselves with history education matters. The views of these dominant personalities was that the senior secondary school was a microcosm of the university and that the primary role of the curriculum at this level was to prepare students for tertiary study. They placed a low priority on social relevance in the history curriculum as promoted by liberals in the history teaching community.

The commitment of the Department to achieving a consensus privileged the views of those who had high status and could dominate proceedings (or those who could form networks and alliances with dominant groups and/or individuals). For example, there were a number of high profile advocates of women's history on (or close to) the NHCC and thus the only substantial shift in regards to content, a women's history component, was embedded into the curriculum. The absence of dominant personalities to advocate for Māori history saw this area marginalised. However, the overriding feature of the model of consensus was that there was little substantial change to the history curriculum. The final shape of the history curriculum reflected a compromise between conservatives, who were determined to maintain the dominant place of those aspects of historical knowledge that reflected their own professional interests, and liberals who wanted the curriculum to be socially relevant and reflect the changing nature of the parent discipline. While liberal history educators were able to incorporate a women's history component into the prescriptions, conservatives were largely successful in ensuring that those aspects of history that they saw of value were retained. Liberals did, however, generate one major change to the history curriculum and this was the introduction of the internally assessed research 'special studies' that had significant implications for the future of history teaching.

The cautious response to calls to liberalise the history curriculum by the NHCC largely accounts for the lack of substantial change in history teaching over the subsequent two decades. With some innovative, courageous and determined

exceptions, history teachers have ignored the histories of marginalised groups and retained an anachronistic, Eurocentric approach to school history that has much in common with the 1970s. This study has highlighted how curriculum design in the senior school poses different challenges to those in the compulsory core curriculum in the junior school. Teachers make a considerable personal and professional investment in the narrow range of prescribed historical areas that are examined, and are consequently cautious of any dramatic change in what is to be taught. Thus at this level it is the prescriptions that play the major role in determining what is taught and the broad general direction of the syllabus in the case of history has had little direct impact. While many history teachers (supported by a dwindling number of historians) have gone to extraordinary lengths to justify programmes of little direct relevance to students' lives, the responsibility for this state of affairs lies with the decisions made by curriculum designers rather than the teaching community (who have little real autonomy at this level).

The extent to which the transformation of the academic discipline of history into a senior school subject in New Zealand is unique, calls for more investigation. Zongji Deng (2007) has pointed out there is seldom a distinction made between school subjects and the academic discipline, as it is assumed that senior subjects and the parent discipline are the same. This is not the case in regards to history. While secondary school history is largely orientated towards teaching and learning, academic history is largely driven by the aim of contributing to the advancement of historical knowledge, through research and publications. There is a paucity of local research into the development of senior subjects and given current senior curriculum developments this is of pressing concern. The extent to which the challenges and tensions that have been examined in this thesis can be generalised can only be illuminated by further research into other senior subjects. Current initiatives in the senior social science curriculum are attempting to accommodate both the different orientations of the senior discipline-based subjects, with the junior subject-based curriculum. It is proving to be a fraught process in regards to history. It is hoped that by illuminating the nature of how the current history curriculum was shaped twenty years ago, new initiatives can be designed to reflect the needs and interests of young people at the beginning of the 21st century. If not, then once more 'the high ground will remain untouched'.

References

Interviews (in order of interview)

Interviewee	Date and place of interview
Harvey McQueen	13/04/05 (Interviewee's home)
David Wood	05/05/05 (Interviewee's home)
Greg Taylor	08/06/05 (Mt Albert Grammar)
Cynthia Shaw	13/06/05 (Teacher's Council: Wellington)
David Gledhill	14/06/05 (Hutt Valley High School)
Erik Olssen	14/08/05 (Interviewee's home)
John Rosanowski	25/08/05 (Christchurch College of Education)
Myra Kunowski	25/08/05 (Christchurch College of Education)
Robin Gwynn	02/09/05 (Victoria University)
Jim Peters	9/09/05 (New Zealand First headquarters – Wellington)
Russell Stone	19/09/05 (Interviewee's home)
Michael Graves	19/09/05 (Interviewee's home)
Gresham Poole	20/09/05 (Interviewee's home) – Notes only
Peter Lineham	22/ 09/ 05 (interviewee's home)
Marcia Stenson	23/09/05 (Interviewee's home in Auckland)
Margaret Tennant	9/2/06 (Massey University: PN)
Graham/ Susan Butterworth	28/02/06 (Interviewee's home)
Bill Renwick	21/03/06 (Interviewee's home)
Roy Shuker	23/03/06 (Interviewee's home)
Nicholas Tarling	27/03/06 (Auckland University)
Kerry Howe	27/03/06 (Massey University: Albany)
Judith Binney*	28/03/06 (Interviewee's home)
Bruce Taylor	19/04/06 (Authors home – Wellington)
John Jenson	1/09/06 (Interviewee's home)
Rex Bloomfield	07/11/06 (Interviewee's home) – audio malfunction: tape inaudible: Notes taken and private papers made available.

NB: Interviews/conversations with Geoff Rice (Canterbury University) and Tom Brooking (Otago University) 8th and 9th November 2006 respectively. Interviews not recorded.

* Tape returned to interviewee, 08/05/08.

Primary Documents

National Archives of New Zealand, Wellington: WC4262: ABEP (Unserialized files)

File number	Name of File	Date file opened/closed
20 – 5 – 18	Revision History sub-committee	9.3.53 – 23.3.73
20 – 5 – 18	Revision History sub-committee	19.10.73 – 23.3.77
20 – 5 – 18	Revision History sub-committee	25.3.77 – 31.3.82
G/26/2	Examinations Sc/UE	26.2.79 – 84
G/83	syllabuses	1965-71
27/8/51	Curriculum Development Unit	9.7.75 – 25.7.82
27/1/92	Caucus Education Committee	20.8.76 - 22.12.76 \ 23.12.76 – 31.12.76 1.1.78 – 25.7.82
	Inquiry into curriculum & assessment & qualifications	19 files
37/2/23/3	Examination division: Parts 1 and 2	1) 14.8.62-1/8/79 2) 2.8.79 –1.8.82
30/ 1/ 33	Curriculum Liaison Committee Part 1	20.11.88
30/ 2/ 8	History - Parts 1 & 2	1) 18.5.35 – 17.10.66 2) 18.10.66 – 20.11. 88
30.2.21	Suggestion re syllabus	20.6.28 – 20.11. 88
34/1/62	McCombs Committee : Secondary Education Review	1) 20.12.74 –6.7.76 2) 20.12.74 –6.7.76 31-1-62 – 25.11.88
34/1/13	Review of secondary curricula: Parts 1-7	18.7.56 – 1988 (range of files)
34/ 2/ 20	Teaching History Part 1	25.11.88
34/1/38	National Social Studies Committee	16.4.69- 25.11.88
32/7/6	Requests for syllabuses (5 parts)	1) 15.3.56 – 31.12.60 2) 4.1.61 – 10.8.63 3) 11.8.63 – 3.8.67 4) 4.8.67 – 19.6.74 5) 20.6.74 – 1.4.82
30/2/15	Social Studies (parts 1-8)	7) 21.7.85 – 20.11.88 8) 1.11.80 – 20.7.85
NS50/1/c –H	CDD – History	3.6.85
NS41/17/ 224	Oral History perspectives on curriculum	2.5.89 – 30.9.89
NS41/ 1/ 3	Social Science liaison committee	1.11.85 – 30.9.89
53/ 2/ 28 (2 parts)	History (2 parts)	Not cited
NS50/2/HI/CA	History (27 Files)	3.6.85 – 24.7.86
NS50/1/ CU - S	Curriculum syllabus and prescription	3.6.85
NS41/29/TC	Historical and comparative	1.2.84 – 30.9.89

File number	Name of File	Date file opened/closed
NS6 – 14 – 28 Part 1	Committee – National Social Studies syllabus	1/ 4 / 82 – 30 /6/90
40/ 13/ 11	History - Parts 1 and 2	1) 1/1/65 –19/10/78 2) 20/10/78 – 21/7/85
NS6/ 14/ 71	History Revision Sub-committee - Four parts	a) 1/4/82 – 30/ 11/ 84 b) 1.12.84 – 21.1.86 c) 22.1.86 – 26.8.86 d) 27.8.86 – 30.6.90
42/ 8/ 7	Curriculum Committee	28 parts 1967 - 68
NS19/ 2//76	Curriculum Development – Parts 1 and 2	1) 2.8.82 – 9.10.87 2) 10/10/87 – 30.9.89
42/8/7	Curriculum committee: 28 files	2/8/67 – 5/ 10/ 88
NS71/ 4/ 1	History	27.7.85 – 30-6.90
NS51/2/ PM –HI NS51/2 NFL - HI	History	22/ 03/ 88 – 30/ 09/ 89 7.7.87 – 30.9.89

Printed Books, Chapters in Books and Journals

Apple, Michael. *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. London: Routledge, 1993.

_____. *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Routledge, 1979.

Aitken, Graeme. 'The Purpose and Substance of Social Studies: Citizenship Education Possibilities.' In *Towards Effective Social Studies*, edited by Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw, 85-112. Palmerston North: Kanuka Grove Press, 2005.

Aitken, Judith. 'Women in the Political Life of New Zealand.' In *Women in New Zealand Society*, edited by P. Bunkle and B. Hughes, 21-26. Auckland: Allen and Unwin, 1980.

Alcorn, Noeline. *"To the Fullest Extent of His Powers": C.E. Beeby's Life in Education*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1999.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Anderson, W. *The Flight from Reason in New Zealand Education*. Auckland: Catholic Teachers Association of Auckland, 1944.

Archer, Eric and Roger Openshaw. 'Citizenship and identity as "official" goals in Social Studies.' In *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present & Future*, edited by Roger Openshaw, 19-33. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.

Arnold, Rollo. *The Farthest Promised Land: English Villages, New Zealand Immigrants of the 1870s*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1981.

Awatere, Donna. *Māori Sovereignty*. Auckland: New Spiral Press, 1984.

Ballara, Angela. *Proud to Be White? A Survey of Pākehā Prejudice in New Zealand*. Auckland: Heinemann, 1986.

Ballara, Angela. *Taua: 'Musket wars', 'Land wars' or Tikanga? Warfare in Māori Society in the early 19th century*. Wellington: Penguin, 2003.

Ballantyne, Tony and Brian Moloughney. 'Angles of Vision.' In *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts*, edited by Brian Moloughney and Tony Ballantyne, 9-24. Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006.

Barrington J.M. and T.H. Beaglehole. *Māori Schools in a Changing Society*. Christchurch: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1974.

Barton C. Keith and Linda Levstik. *Teaching History for the Common Good*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004.

Baxter, James K. *Jerusalem Daybook*. Wellington: Price Milburn, 1971.

Beaglehole, Timothy. *A Life of J.C Beaglehole New Zealand Scholar*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2006.

Beal, T., Y. Nozaki and J. Yang. 'Ghosts of the Past: The Japanese Textbook Controversy.' *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 3, no. 2 (2001): 177-88.

Becher, Tony. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Bristol: Open University Press, 1989.

Belgrave, Michael. 'Looking Forward: Historians and the Waitangi Tribunal.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 40, no. 2 (2006): 230-50.

_____. *Historical Frictions: Māori Claims and Reinvented Histories*. Auckland University Press: Auckland, 2005.

Belich, James. *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000*. Auckland: Penguin, 2001.

_____. *The New Zealand Wars*. Auckland: Penguin, 1986.

Bell, J. *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for Researchers in Education and Social Science*. 3rd ed. Buckingham U.K: Open University Press, 1999.

Bentley, Michael. *Modern Historiography*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Bernstein, B. 'On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge.' In *Knowledge and Control*, edited by M.F.D Young. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Binney, Judith. 'Reply to Owens.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 3, no. 2 (1969).

_____. 'Māori Oral narratives, Pākehā Written Texts'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 1 (1987): 16-28.

_____. 'The Teaching of Māori History: Two Reports'. *Heritage and History in Schools: A Report to the Director General of Education*, 1990.

Binney, Judith, Judith Bassett, and Erik Olssen. *An Illustrated History of New Zealand 1820-1920*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1990.

Black, Jeremy. *Using History*. London: Hodder Arnold, 2005.

Black, J. and D.J. MacRaid. *Studying History*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.

Boggs, C. *Gramsci's Marxism*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.

Bolstead, Rachel. 'Questions for a Twenty-First Century Senior Secondary Curriculum.' *Curriculum Matters* 2 (2006): 105-27.

Bolstead, Rachel and Jane Gilbert. *Disciplining and Drafting, or 21st Century Learning? Rethinking the New Zealand Senior Secondary Curriculum for the Future*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2008.

Boon, Goh Chor and Saravanan Gopinathan. 'History Education and the Construction of National Identity in Singapore, 1945-2000.' In *History Education and National Identity in East Asia*, edited by Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 203-23. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Bowler, Josephine and Roger Openshaw. 'Not Understood: The Bicultural Dimension of the Report of the New Zealand Committee on Health and Social Education, Growing, Sharing, Learning (1977).' *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies* 41, no. 1 (2006): 45-67.

Boyd, Mary. 'Women in the Historical Profession: Women Historians in the 1940s.' *Women's Studies Journal*, no. 4 (1988): 76-87.

Brookes, Barbara. 'Women's History.' In *The Future of the Past*, edited by Colin Davis and Peter Lineham. Palmerston North: Massey University Department of History, 1990.

Brookes, Barbara. 'A Germaine Moment: Style, Language and Audience.' In *Disputed Histories Imagining New Zealand's Pasts*,. edited by Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, 191-204. Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006.

- Brookes, Barbara, Charlotte Macdonald and Margaret Tennant, (eds). *Women in History Essays on European Women in New Zealand*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1986.
- Brown, Dee. *Bury My Heart and Wounded Knee: an Indian History of the American West*. London: Pan, 1976.
- Bruner, Jerome. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge M.A: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Burnard, Trevor 'Bassett Tackles the State the Politician as Historian'. *History Now* 5, no. 1 (1999): 4-8.
- Burns, Patricia. *Te Rauparaha: A New Perspective*. Auckland: Reed, 1980.
- Burr, V. *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Butterworth, Graham. 'Historical Revisionism in New Zealand: Always Winter and Never Christmas.' In *Public Policy and Ethnicity*, edited by Elizabeth Rata and Roger Openshaw, 185-200. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
- Byrnes, Giselle. 'Jackals of the Crown? Historians and the Treaty Claims Process'. In *Going Public: The Changing Face of New Zealand History*, edited by Jock Phillips and Bronwyn Dalley, 110-22. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2001.
- _____. *The Waitangi Tribunal and New Zealand History*. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- _____. 'By Which Standards? History and the Waitangi Tribunal:A Reply.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 40, no. 2 (2006): 214-29.
- Carpenter, V.M. 'Curriculum and the (Re)Production of Knowledge.' In *Theory and Practice for Educators*, edited by H. Dixon, V. Carpenter, E. Rata and C. Rawlinson. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2001.
- Carr E, H. *What Is History?* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961.
- Chicago Manual of Style: The Essential Guide for Writers, Editors and Publishers*, 15th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Clark, A. 'Whose History? Teaching Australia's Contested Past.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36, no. 5 (2004): 533-42.
- Clark, J.C.D. 'National Identity, State Formation and Patriotism: The Role of History in the Public Mind.' *History Workshop* 29 (1990): 95-102.
- Clark, John A. 'Rigorous Eclecticism: The Ministry of Education's Bizarre Philosophy of the Curriculum.' In *Reshaping Culture, Knowledge and Learning? Policy and Content in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework*, edited by John Clark Anne-Marie O'Neill, and Roger Openshaw, 127-140. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2004.
- Codd, J.A. 'Professional Accountability and the Culture of Teachers'. *Delta* 50, no. 2 (1998): 149-62.
- _____. 'Educational Reform, Accountability and the Culture of Distrust'. *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies* 34, no. 1 (1999): 45-53.
- Codd, John, Richard Harker and Roy Nash, (eds). *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1985.
- Coney, Sandra. *Standing in the Sunshine A History of New Zealand Women since They Won the Vote*. Auckland: Penguin, 1993.

- Connell, R.W. *School and Social Justice*. Toronto: Our Schools Ourselves, 1993.
- Connolly, Chris. 'Historical Method, Postmodernism and Truth.' *History Now* 9, no. 1 (2003): 17-21.
- Crawford, Keith. 'Culture Wars: Japanese History Textbooks and the Construction of Official Memory.' In *What Shall We Tell the Children?*, edited by K. Stuart, J. Foster and A. Crawford, 49-68. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 2006.
- Cubitt, Sandra. 'Understanding Social Studies. Addressing the Challenges Posed by Recent Reviews of the Curriculum Statement.' In *Towards Effective Social Studies*, edited by Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw, 7-11. Palmerston North: Kanuka Grove Press, 2005.
- _____. 'The Draft New Zealand Curriculum.' *Curriculum Matters* 2 (2006): 195-212.
- Curthoys, Ann and John Docker. *Is History Fiction?* Sydney: University of New South Wales, 2006.
- Daley, Caroline. 'Review of Penguin History of New Zealand.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 38, no. 1 (2004): 77-79.
- Dalley, Bronwyn and Bronwyn Labrum. 'Introduction'. In *Fragments: New Zealand Social and Cultural History*, edited by Bronwyn Dalley and Bronwyn Labrum. Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 2000.
- Dalziel, Raewyn. 'The Colonial Helpmeet: Women's Role and the Vole in 19th Century New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of History* 11, no. 2 (1977).
- Dann, Christine. *Up from Under Women and Liberation in New Zealand 1970-85*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1985.
- Davies, Norman. *The Isles a History*. London: Macmillan, 1999.
- _____. *Europe at War 1939-1945 No Simple Victory*. London: Macmillan, 2006.
- Davis, Colin and Peter Lineham, (eds). *The Future of the Past Themes in New Zealand History*. Palmerston North: Massey University Department of History, 1990.
- Deng, Zongi. 'Knowing the Subject Matter of a Secondary-School Science Subject.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 39, no. 5 (2007): 503-35.
- Dimitriadis, Greg, Lois Weis, Cameron McCarthy. 'Introduction.' In *Ideology, Curriculum, and the New Sociology of Education*, edited by Lois Weis, Cameron McCarthy and Greg Dimitriadis, 1-13. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Docker, John. *Postmodernism and Popular Culture: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Egan, Kieran. *The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape Our Understanding*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Evans, R.J. *In Defence of History*. London: Granta, 1997.
- Fairburn, Miles. *The Ideal Society and Its Enemies*. Auckland: Penguin, 1989.
- _____. 'Is There a Good Case for New Zealand Exceptionalism?' In *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts*, edited by Brian Moloughney and Tony Ballantyne, 143-67. Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006.
- Fleras, Augie and Paul Spoonley. *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Ethnic Relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Foster, Stuart J. and Keith, A. Crawford. 'The Critical Importance of History Textbook Research.' In *What Shall We Tell the Children?*, edited by Stuart J. Foster and Keith A. Crawford, 1-23. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, 2006.

Fry, Ruth. *Its Different for Daughters a History of the Curriculum for Girls in New Zealand Schools 1900-1975*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1985.

Furudi, F. *Mythical Past, Elusive Future: History and Society in an Anxious Age*. London: Pluto Press, 1992.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Landscape of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Gibbons, Peter. 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 36, no. 1 (2002): 5-17.

_____. 'The Far Side of the Search for Identity.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 37, no. 1 (2003): 38-49.

Gilbert, Jane. *Catching the Knowledge Wave: "Knowledge Society" Developments and the Future of Public Education in New Zealand*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 2005.

Gillham, Bill. *The Research Interview*. London: Continuum, 2000.

Goodson, Ivor F. *School Subjects and Curriculum Change*. Sussex: Falmer Press, 1987.

_____. *Studying Curriculum*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994.

_____. *Learning, Curriculum and Life Politics: The Selected Works of Ivor F. Goodson*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2005.

Goodson, Ivor F. and Pat Sikes. *Life History Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2001.

Gorrie, A. 'Jam for Breakfast, Dinner and Tea.' *Education* 12 (1963): 23-26.

Graves, M.A.R and R.H. Silcock. *Revolution, Reaction and the Triumph of Conservatism: English History, 1558-1700*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1984.

Grimshaw, Pat. *Women's Suffrage in New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin, 1972.

Grundy, S. *Curriculum: Product or Praxis*. London: Falmer Press, 1987.

Guyver, Robert. 'National Curriculum: Key Concepts and Controversy.' *Teaching History* 88, no. 7 (1997): 16-19.

_____. 'History Curricula in England and New Zealand: identity, belonging and the case for valuing an historical perspective.' *Subject Centre for Education, ESCalate*, (Spring, 2008). Accessed online: <http://escalate.ac/uk/2017>

Guyver, Robert and Jon Nichol. 'In my view'. *Primary History: The Historical Association* (Spring), 2006, 8-10.

Hargreaves, Andy. *Curriculum and Assessment Reform*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989.

Harrison, Kay. 'Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum. Dosing for Amnesia or Enemy of Ethnocentrism?' In *New Horizons for New Zealand Social Studies*, edited by Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw, 63-82. Palmerston North: ERDC Press, 1998.

Heilman, Elizabeth E. and Avner Segall. 'Social Studies Research in the Context of Intellectual Thought.' In *Social Studies - the Next Generation: Re-Searching in the Postmodern*, edited by Elizabeth E Heilman, Avner Segall, Cleo H. Cherryholmes, 14-23. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.

Hilliard, Chris. 'Colonial Culture and the Province of Cultural History'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 36, no. 1 (2002): 82-97.

Hipkins, Rosemary. 'The NCEA in the Context of the Knowledge Society and National Policy Expectations.' *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 14 (2004): 27-38.

Hirsch, E.D. *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Howe, K.R. 'Two Worlds?' *New Zealand Journal of History* 37, no. 1 (2003): 50-61.

Hughes, Beryl. 'Women and the Professions'. In *Women in New Zealand Society*, edited by P. Bunkle and B. Hughes, 118-138. Auckland: Allen and Unwin, 1980.

Hughes-Warrington, Marnie. *Fifty Key Thinkers on History*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Hunt, J.L. 'Leap Forward: The Proposed School Certificate History Syllabus.' *Historical News* 3 (1965): 1-2.

Hunter, P. and B. Farthing. *Talking History: Teachers' Perceptions of "Their" Curriculum in the Context of History in the New Zealand Curriculum 1980-2003*. Hamilton: Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, 2004.

Husbands, Chris. *What Is History Teaching?* Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996.

James, Colin. *New Territory: The Transformation of New Zealand, 1984-92*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1992.

Jenkins, Edgar. 'School Science.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 39, no. 3 (2007): 270-1.

Jenkins, Keith. *Re-Thinking History*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Jenkins Kuni and Alison Jones. 'Māori Education Policy: A State Promise.' In *Politics, Policy, Pedagogy: Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, edited by Eve Cotton James Marshall, Kuni Jenkins and Alison Jones, 139-53. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2000.

Jenkins, Kuni and Kay Morris Matthews. *Hukarere and the Politics of Māori Girls Schooling*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1995.

Johnson, Miranda. 'The Land of the Wrong White Crowd Anti-Racist Organizations and Pākehā Identity Politics in the 1970s.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 39, no. 2 (2005): 137-57.

Keen, David. 'Decline and Fall.' *Education*, 28:6 (1979), 8.

Keith, Hamish. *The Big Picture*. Auckland: Random House, 2007.

Kelsey, Jane. *Economic Fundamentalism*. London: Pluto Press, 1995.

_____. *New Zealand and the Global Economy: Reclaiming the Future*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1999.

- King, Michael. (ed). *Te Ao Hurihuri: The World Moves On*. Auckland: Methuen, 1975.
- _____. *Te Puea*. Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1977.
- _____. (ed). *Tihe Mauri Ora: Aspects of Māoritanga*. Auckland: Methuen, 1978.
- _____. *Whina*. Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983.
- _____. *Te Puea Herangi: From Darkness to Light*. Wellington: School Publications Branch, 1984.
- _____. *Being Pākehā*, Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985.
- _____. *Whina Cooper*. Wellington: School Publications Branch, 1987.
- _____. *Apirana Ngata: e tipu rea*. Wellington: School Publications Branch, 1988.
- _____. *Moriori: a People Rediscovered*. Auckland: Viking, 1989.
- _____. *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin, 2003.
- Kliebard, Hebert M. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.
- Lee, Gregory and Debbie Hill. 'Curriculum Reform in New Zealand: Outlining the New of Restating the Familiar?' *Delta* 48, no. 1 (1996): 19-32.
- Lee, Howard. 'Examining the New Zealand School Curriculum.' In *The School Curriculum in New Zealand: Theory, Policy and Practice*, edited by Gary McCulloch, 123-37. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.
- Lockstone, R.G. 'The Neglect of Mind. Social Studies in the Primary School'. *Landfall* 17, no. 1 (1963): 49-55.
- Loftus, Elizabeth. *Eyewitness Testimony*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Low-Beer, A. 'The Eclipse of History in New Zealand Schools'. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 21, no. 2 (1986): 113-22.
- Lowenthal, David. *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. New York: Free Press, 1996.
- Lukas, John. *Remembered Past*. Wilmington: ISI Books, 2005.
- Macintyre, Stuart and Anna Clark. *The History Wars*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2003.
- McAloon, Jim. 'Class in Colonial New Zealand.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 38, no. 1 (2004): 3-19.
- _____. 'By Which Standards? History and the Waitangi Tribunal.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 40, no. 2 (2006): 194-213.
- McCarthy, Conal. *Exhibiting Māori*. Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2007.
- McCullagh, C.B. *The Truth of History*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- McCulloch, Gary. 'History and the Curriculum'. In *Reinterpreting the Educational Past: Essays in the History of Education*, edited by Roger Openshaw and David Mckenzie. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1987.

_____. 'Defining and Defending Subjects: The Case of the New Zealand Geographical Society'. In *The School Curriculum in New Zealand*, edited by Gary McCulloch, 165-84. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.

_____. *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2004.

_____. (ed). *The School Curriculum in New Zealand: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.

McCulloch, Gary, Gill Helsby and Peter Knight. *The Politics of Professionalism*. London: Continuum, 2000.

McCulloch, Gary and William Richardson. *Historical Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000.

McDonald, Geraldine. 'Education and the Movement Towards Equality'. In *Women in New Zealand Society*, edited by P. Bunkle and B. Hughes. Auckland: Allen and Unwin, 1980.

McGee, Clive. *Teachers and Curriculum Decision-Making*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1997.

McGeorge, Colin. 'New Zealand in New Zealand School Books before 1930.' *History Now* 10, no. 2 (2005): 4-11.

McKinnon, Malcolm. *Independence and Foreign Policy: New Zealand and the World since 1935*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1993.

McKiernan, D. 'History in a National Curriculum: Imagining the Nation at the End of the 20th Century.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 25, no. 1 (1993): 33-51.

McMurphy-Pilkington, Colleen. 'Māori Education: Rejection, Resistance and Renaissance'. In *Theory in Practice for Education*, edited by H. Dixon, V. Carpenter, E. Rata and C. Rawlinson, 161-87. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2001.

McQueen, Harvey. 'Once Were Curriculum Developers.' *Curriculum Matters* 2 (2006): 182-94.

Maier, Robert. 'Learning About Europe and the World: Schools, Teachers, and Textbooks in Russia after 1991.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World* edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal. New York: Bergahn Books, 2005, 140.

Manning, Richard. 'History Never Repeats Itself? Colonial Historical Trends Confront National Administration Guidelines.' *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 9 (1999): 63-82.

Marwick, A. *The Nature of History*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Mayer, M. 'America between the Wars: The Seventh Form American Option Revised.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 19, no.1 (1985): 164-181.

Miles, Matthew B. and Michael A. Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1984.

Merriam, Sharan B. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Thousand Oaks, 1998.

Montgomerie, Deborah. 'Reconnaissance Twentieth-Century New Zealand War History at Century's Turn'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 37, no. 1 (2003): 62-79.

- Morris Matthews, Kay. *In their own Right: Women and Higher Education in New Zealand before 1945*. Wellington: NZCER Press, 2008.
- Munz, Peter. 'The Two-Worlds of Anne Salmond in Postmodern Fancy-Dress.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 28, no. 1 (1994): 59-75.
- Murdoch, J.H. *The High Schools New Zealand*. Christchurch: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1943.
- Nash, Gary, Charlotte Crabtree and Ross Dunn. *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*. New York: Random House 1997.
- Nauman, Ruth. *The Tauwiwi: The Later Immigrants*. Auckland: New House, 1990.
- New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers Association. *Education in Change: Report of the Curriculum Review Group*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1969.
- _____. *Teachers in Change: Report of the Curriculum Review Group on the Education and Training of Secondary Teachers*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1974.
- Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Nozaki, Yoshiko. 'Japanese Politics and the History Textbook Controversy, 1945-2001.' In *History Education and National Identity*, edited by Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 275-305. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- _____. 'Riding Tensions Critically Ideology, Power/Knowledge and Curriculum Making.' In *Ideology, Curriculum, and the New Sociology of Education*, edited by Cameron McCarthy, Lois Weis, and Greg Dimitriadis, 69-89. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Ohliger, Rainer. 'Privileged Migrants in Germany, France and the Netherlands: Return Migrants, Repatriates, and Expellees after 1945.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World*, edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal, 35-60. New York: Bergahn Books, 2005.
- Oliver, W.H. *The Story of New Zealand*. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.
- _____. ed. *The Oxford History of New Zealand*. Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- _____. 'A Destiny at Home'. *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 2 (1987): 9-15.
- _____. 'Taha Māori in the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography: A Pākehā View.' In *Telling Stories*, edited by B. Attwood, F. MCGowan, 143-60. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001.
- _____. 'The Future Is Behind Us: The Waitangi Tribunal's Retrospective Utopia.' In *Histories, Power and Loss, Uses of the Past - a New Zealand Commentary*, edited by Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001.
- _____. *Looking for the Phoenix: A Memoir*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2002.
- _____. 'A Reply to Jim McAloon.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 41, no. 1 (2007): 82-87.
- Olssen, Erik. 'Where to from Here? Reflections on the Twentieth-Century Historiography of Nineteenth-Century New Zealand.' *New Zealand Journal of History* (1992): 54-77.
- Olssen, Erik and Marcia Stenson. *A Century of Change*. Auckland: Longman Paul, 1989.

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

Openshaw, Roger. *Unresolved Struggle Consensus and Conflict in State Post-Primary Education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1995.

_____. 'Citizen Who? The Debate over Economic and Political Correctness in the Social Studies Curriculum.' In Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw, eds. In *New Horizons for New Zealand Social Studies*, 19-42. Palmerston North: ERDC Press, 1998.

_____. 'Preparing for Picot: Revisiting the "Neoliberal" Educational Reforms.' *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 38, no. 2 (2003), 135-150.

_____. 'Suffering from Enthusiasts.' In *Democracy at the Crossroads*, edited by Cameron White and Roger Openshaw, 233-254. New York: Lexington Books, 2005.

_____. 'Reporting on Social Studies Classrooms: Then and Now. How far have we come in four decades? In Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw (eds), *Towards Effective Social Studies*, 35-50. Palmerston North: Kanuka Grove Press, 2005.

_____. (ed). *Current Issues in the Teaching of Social Studies 187.708*. Palmerston North: Massey University Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education, 2002.

_____. 'Putting Ethnicity into Policy: A New Zealand Case Study.' In *Public Policy and Ethnicity: The Politics of Ethnic Boundary Making*, edited by Elizabeth Rata and Roger Openshaw, 113-27. New York: Palgrave, 2006.

Openshaw, Roger and Eric Archer. 'The Battle for Social Studies in the New Zealand Secondary School 1942-1964'. In *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Roger Openshaw, 49-64. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.

Openshaw, Roger and David McKenzie, eds. *Reinterpreting the Educational Past: Essays in the History of New Zealand Education*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Education Research, 1987.

O'Neill, Anne-Marie, John Clark and Roger Openshaw. 'Mapping the Field: An Introduction to Curriculum Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand.' In *Reshaping Culture, Knowledge and Learning? Policy and Content in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework* edited by Anne-Marie O'Neill, John Clark and Roger Openshaw, 25-45. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2004.

O'Neill, John. 'Change and Constancy Half a Century of Secondary Schooling in New Zealand.' *History of Education Review* 33, no. 1 (2004): 44-59.

Orange, Claudia. *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1987.

Orbell, Margaret. *Hawaiki: A new approach to Māori tradition*. Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1985.

Ornstein, Allan C. and Francis P. Hunkins. *Curriculum Foundations, Principles, and Issues*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1998.

Osborne, Ken. 'Teaching History in Schools: A Canadian Debate'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 35, no. 5 (2003): 585-626.

Owens, John. 'Christianity and Māori to 1840.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 2, no. 1 (1968): 18-40.

Paris, Erna. *Long Shadows: Truth, Lies and History*. Montreal: Bloomsbury, 2000.

- Partington, Geoffrey. 'Social Studies in the New Zealand History Curriculum.' In *New Horizons for New Zealand Social Studies*, edited by Pamela Benson and Roger Openshaw, 83-102. Palmerston North: ERDC Press, 1998.
- Peters, M. Review of 'Revolution, Reaction and the Triumph of Conservatism: English History, 1558-1700.' *Historical News* (1985): 11-12.
- Philips, David. 'Curriculum Development in New Zealand.' *Educational Review* 45, no. 2 (1993): 155-64.
- Philips, Jock. *A Man's Country? The Image of the Pākehā Male: A History*. Auckland: Penguin, 1987.
- Phillips, Robert. *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. London: Cassell, 1998.
- _____. *Reflective Teaching of History 11-18*. London: Continuum, 2002.
- Pinar, W.F., W.M. Reynolds, P. Slattery and P.M. Taubman. *Understanding Curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Pingel, Falk. 'From Evasion to a Crucial Tool of Moral and Political Education.' In *What Shall We Tell the Children?* edited by K. Stuart, J. Foster, A. Crawford, 131-53. Greenwich: Information Age, 2006.
- Pollack, Jacob. 'Cultural Colonization and Textual Biculturalism: James Belich and Michael King's General Histories of New Zealand.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 42, no. 2 (2007): 180-98.
- Pooley, Craig. 'Conflict and Tension - an Analysis of the Dichotomy Which Exists within the Science Curriculum.' *New Zealand Science Teacher*, no. 110 (2005): 18-27.
- Popkewitz, Thomas S. and Lynn Fendler, eds. *Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Pugsley, Christopher. 'Māori Did Not Invent Trench Warfare in New Zealand.' *New Zealand Defence Quarterly* 22 (1998).
- Rangihau, John. 'Being Māori.' In *Te Ao Hurihuri Aspects of Māoritanga*, edited by Michael King, 221-33. Wellington: Hicks Smith & Sons, 1975.
- Rata, Elizabeth. 'Teachers and Socioeconomic Class in Education.' In *Theory and Practice for Educators*, edited by H. Dixon, V. Carpenter, E. Rata and C Rawlinson. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 2001.
- Ravitch, Dianne. *The Language Police How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 2003.
- Reilly, Michael P.J. 'Messy Entanglements in Teaching Māori History'. *History Now*, 1:2, (1995), 19-22.
- Reynolds, Henry. *The Other Side of the Frontier: Aboriginal Resistance to the European Invasion of Australia*. Townsville: Penguin. 1982.
- _____. *Dispossession: Black Australian and White Invaders*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1989.
- Reynolds, R. 'A Framework for Researching Syllabus Development and Curriculum Change.' *Curriculum Perspectives*, 21, no. 3 (2001): 1-2.
- Rice, G.R. 'The New Bursaries/Entrance Scholarships Prescriptions.' *Historical News*, (1978).

_____. 'A Revolution in Social Policy, 1981-91.' In *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, edited by G.W. Rice, 482-97. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Rosier, Pat. *Been around for Quite a While: Twenty Years of Broadsheet Magazine*. Auckland: New Women's Press, 1992.

Ross, Alistair. *Curriculum Construction and Critique*. London: Falmer Press, 2000.

Rowbothan, Shelia. *Hidden from History*. London: Pluto Press, 1973.

Rushbrook, Bill. 'Oral History for High School History courses'. *Historical News*, May, 1991.

Salmond, Anne. *Two Worlds: First Meetings between Māori and Europeans, 1642-1772*. Auckland: Bridget Williams Books, 1991.

_____. 'Antipodean Crab Antics.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 28, no. 1 (1994): 76-79.

Schwab, Joseph. 'The Structure of the Disciplines: Meaning and Significance.' In *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum*, edited by G. Ford and L. Purgo. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Sebald, W.G. *On the Natural History of Destruction*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 2003.

Segall, Avner. 'What's the Purpose of Teaching a Discipline Anyway? The Case of History.' In *Social Studies - the Next Generation: Re-Searching in the Postmodern*, edited by Avner Segall, Elizabeth E., Heilman, Cleo H Cherryholmes, 125-39. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.

Seixas, Peter. 'Schwigen! Die Kinder! Or, Does Postmodern History Have a Place in the Schools?' In *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, edited by Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg, 19-37. New York: University Press, 2000.

Sheehan, Mark. *Māori and Pākehā: Race Relations 1912-80*. Auckland: Macmillan, 1989.

_____. *The New Zealand Wars: Changing Perceptions of a Shared Past*. Wellington: Learning Media, 1990.

_____. *The New Zealand Wars: Making Sense of a shared Past*. Wellington: Learning Media, 2000.

_____, 'Never of, Always For', 31st October 2005, NZHTA Journal, November 2005.

Shuker, Roy. *The One Best System? A Revisionist History of State Schooling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1987.

_____. 'Cleo in the Curriculum: The Place of History as a Secondary School Subject.' In *The School Curriculum in New Zealand*, edited by Gary McCulloch, 185-200. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.

_____. 'Social Studies as Curriculum History'. In *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future* edited by Roger Openshaw, 34-48. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1992.

Shulman, Lee. 'Those Who Understand; Knowledge and Growth in Teaching'. *Education Researcher* 15, no. 2 (1986): 4-14.

Sinclair, Keith. *The Origins of the Māori Wars*. Wellington: New Zealand University Press, 1957.

- _____. *A History of New Zealand*. Harmondsmith: Penguin Books, 1959.
- _____. 'Why Are Race Relations in New Zealand Better Than in South Africa, South Australia or South Dakota?' *New Zealand Journal of History* 6, no. 2 (1971): 121-7.
- _____. *A Destiny Apart: New Zealand's Search for National Identity*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1986
- _____. *Halfway Round the Harbour*. Auckland. Penguin, 1993.
- Slattery, Patrick. *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Sorrenson, M.P.K. *Māori Origins and Migrations*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1979.
- Soyal, Nuhoglu Yasemin and Hanna Schissler. 'Teaching Beyond the National Narrative.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World*, edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal, 1-13. New York: Berghahn Books, 2004.
- Soyal, Nuhoglu Yasemin, Teresa Bertilotti and Sabine Mannitz. 'Projections of Identity in French and German History and Civics Textbooks.' In *The Nation, Europe, and the World*, edited by Hanna Schissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal, 13-34. Greenwich: Information Age, 2005.
- Spender, Dale. 'Modern Feminist Theorists: Reinventing Rebellion.' In *Feminist Theorists Three Centuries of Women's Intellectual Traditions*, edited by Dale Spender. London: The Women's Press, 1983.
- Stace, Hilary. 'Labour Owes Us – the 1984 Women's Forums.' In *For the Record. Lange and the 4th Labour Government*, edited by Margaret Clark, 119-128. Wellington: Dunmore Press, 2005.
- Stenson, Marcia. 'History in New Zealand Schools.' *New Zealand Journal of History* 24, no. 2 (1990):168-82.
- Stone, R.C.J. 'Humane Studies Are Not Enough.' *NZPPTA Journal* 10, no. 6 (1963): 27-29.
- Tarling, Nicholas and Wilf Malcolm. *Crisis of Identity? The Mission and Management of Universities in New Zealand*. Wellington: Dunmore Press, 2007.
- Taylor, Rowena. 'Credible Subject or Callow Intruder? Social Studies in the Secondary School.' *New Zealand Review of Education* 15 (2005), 169-186.
- Te Awekotuku, Ngahuia. 'Paper Read at Piha Women's Congress.' In *Mana Wahine Māori*. Auckland: New Women's Press, 1978.
- Thatcher, Margaret. *The Downing Street Years*. London: Cassell, 1993.
- Thomson, David. 'Society and Social Welfare.' In *The Future of the Past*, edited by Colin Davis and Peter Lineham. Palmerston North: Department of History, Massey University, 1990.
- Timmons, Geoff, Keith Vernon and Christine Kinealy. *Teaching and Learning History*. London: Sage Publications, 2005.
- Tosh, John. *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*. London: Longman, 1984.
- _____. *The Pursuit of History*. (3rd) Edinburgh: Pearson Longman, 2002.

Vickers, Edward. 'History, Nationalism and the Politics of Memory.' In *History Education and National Identity in East Asia*, edited by Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 1-29. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Watson, Peter. *A Terrible Beauty: The People and Ideas That Shaped the Modern Mind*. London: Phoenix, 2000.

Wertsch, J.V. 'Is It Possible to Teach Beliefs as Well as Knowledge About History?' In *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*, edited by Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg, 38-50. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Wilson, Chris, Danton Ford and Alisa Jones. 'The History Text: Framing Ethno-Cultural and Civic Nationalism in the Divided Koreas.' In *History Education and National Identity in East Asia*, edited by Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 227-254. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Windschuttle, Keith. *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists Are Murdering Our Past*. New York: Free Press, 1997.

_____. *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History. Vol. 1, Van Dieman's Land 1803-47*. Paddington New South Wales: Macleay Press, 2002.

Wineburg, Sam. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Whitwell, H.J. 'Vegetables and Vitamins. A Reply to Gorrie.' *Education* 12 (1963): 23-26.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, 1994.

Official Publications

Alton-Lee, A. *Quality Teaching for Diverse Students in Schooling: Best Evidence Synthesis*. Wellington: Ministry of Education, 2003.

Department of Education. *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer, 1962. (Currie Report)

Department of Education *The Post-Primary School Curriculum*. Wellington: Government Printer, 1944, Reprint, 1959. (Thomas Report)

Department of Education. *Learning and Achieving: Second Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Curriculum, Assessment, and Qualifications in Forms 5-7*. Wellington, Department of Education, 1986.

Department of Education. 'The Curriculum Review: Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools.' Wellington: Department of Education 1987.

Department of Education, *Social Studies in Secondary Schools, A Guide to the Syllabus*. Wellington: Department of Education, 1989.

Department of Education. *School Certificate Examination Prescription: History*. Department of Education: Wellington, 1987.

Department of Education. *History forms 5 to 7 Syllabus for schools*. Wellington: Learning Media, 1989.

Department of Education. *History Documents H Documents*. Auckland: Kohia Centre, 1987, 1988, 1989. (Assessment, Women in History, Programme Planning, Special Studies, Australian History, History and Computers, History and Library resources).

Department of Education. *Sixth Form Certificate History: National Course Statement*. Wellington: Department of Education, 1988.

Departments of History of the New Zealand Universities. *Heritage and History in Schools: A Report to the Director General of Education by the Departments of History of the New Zealand Universities*. Palmerston North: Massey University, 1988.

University of Auckland Calendars: 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987.

University of Otago Calendars: 1967, 1968, 1969; 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987.

University of Victoria Calendars: 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987.

Newspapers, magazine articles, pamphlets, audio and films,

Aitken, Anna, and David Mackay, eds. *Counting the Cost: The 1981 Springbok Tour in Wellington*. Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1982.

Cannadine, David. 'The State of British History.' *Times Literary Supplement*, 10 October, 1986.

Catherall, Sarah. 'Teen Knowledge of New Zealand Events is History'. *Sunday Star Times*, 10 February, 2002, 23.

_____. 'Teaching of NZ history a disgrace.' *Sunday Star Times*, 3 February 2002, 10

Howe, K.R. 'Making History Our Whipping Boy.' *New Zealand Herald*, 17 November, 2000, A17.

Keith, Hamish. 'Once a Culture.' *New Zealand Listener*, 20 September 2008, 40-41.

Low-Beer, Ann. 'History by the Board'. *New Zealand Listener*, 29 November 1985, 45.

Preston, Gaylene and Anna Cotterell, Dirs. *Getting to Our Place*. New Zealand, 1999.

Radio New Zealand, interview 22/11/2002; W.L Oliver and Kim Hill (tape in author's possession)

Rendle, Steve. 'Gallipoli? Isn't that somewhere in Italy?' *Dominion Post*, 25 April 2003, 23.

Small, Vernon. 'Key glossing over history says Labour.' *Dominion Post*, 29 June, 2008

Theses and unpublished papers

Aitken, Graeme. 'Curriculum Design in New Zealand Social Studies: Learning from the Past'. Unpublished Doctor of Education dissertation: University of Auckland, 2005.

Bargas, Imelda. 'God Defend New Zealand or Save the Kings and Queens? An Examination of the Status of New Zealand History at Year 13.' Unpublished M.A dissertation: Victoria University of Wellington, 2005.

Bowler, Josephine. 'The New Zealand Controversy over the Johnson Report.' Unpublished PhD dissertation: Massey University, 2005.

Derbyshire, Alison. 'Anyone's but Our Own: The Teaching of New Zealand History in New Zealand Secondary Schools 1925-2000.' Unpublished M.A dissertation: University of Auckland, 2004.

Guyver, Robert. 'The development of knowledge bases for the effective teaching of primary history: case studies of postgraduates' reflections on initial teacher training'. Unpublished PhD dissertation: University of Exeter, 2003.

Harcourt, Michael Edward. 'Teaching History to Save the Earth: Towards an Ecological Philosophy of Education.' Unpublished M.A. dissertation: Victoria University of Wellington, 2007.

Jesson, J.G. 'The PPTA and the state: From militant professionals to bargaining agent – A study of rational opportunism.' Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Auckland. 1995.

Milligan, Andrea. 'Representing the Social World: New Zealand's Social Studies Curriculum in Change.' Unpublished M.Ed dissertation: Victoria University of Wellington, 2006.

Kunowski, Myra. 'Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the Nature of Teacher Knowledge and Classroom Practice'. Unpublished D.Ed dissertation: Griffith University, 2005.

Shuker, Roy. 'History in the New Zealand Secondary School: A study in aspects of curriculum development'. Unpublished PhD dissertation: Victoria University of Wellington, 1978.

Wood, David. 'The Political Origins of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework Development.' Unpublished paper: Wellington, 1995.

Websites

Ministry of Education Curriculum Developments:

Le Metais, J. 'New Zealand Stocktake: A International Critique.' National Foundation for Education for Educational Research,
<http://www.mindu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=7258&data=1>.
<http://www.minedu.govt.nz/index.cfm?layout=document&documentid=7823&data=1>
http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/frequently_asked_questions_faq
http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/the_new_zealand_curriculum
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/Curriculum%20Review%20Matters.htm>

Ministry of Education: Social Sciences Curriculum Developments:

http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/curriculum_project_archives/developing_the_draft/social_sciences
http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/curriculum_project_archives/developing_the_draft/social_sciences/archive
http://centre4.interact.ac.nz/modules/group/group.php?space_key=468&module_key=15826&link_key=16391&group_key=15826

History Curriculum Developments:

http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Journals/Jul2007/nzhta_journal_0707.htm
http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Journals/Feb2007/nzhta_journal_0207.htm
http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Journals/Aug2006/nzhta_journal_06.htm
<http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/the-classroom/teachers-toolbox/brain-food>
<http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/the-classroom/teachers-toolbox/the-role-of-school-history>
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/NZHA%20Forum%20responses.htm>
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/NZHA%20Gregor%20Fountain.htm>
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/Reflections%20on%20Curriculum.htm>

O'Connor, Paul. Surviving or Thriving? School History in the 21st Century. Keynote address to New Zealand Historical Association Conference, November 25 2007.
<http://www.nzhta.org.nz/Linked%20Items/Curriculum/NZHA%20Conference%20Paper.htm>

International History Education

http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/key_issues/Australian_History/#The_Australian_History_Summit
http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/key_issues/Australian_History/#Guide_to_the_Teaching_of_Australian_History_in_Years_9_and_10
http://www.history.org.uk/news_details.asp?ID=17
www.apa.udel.edu/apa/governance/committees/teaching/orc/worksArticles/000011.html
www.histori.ca/benchmarks/
www.oah.org/pubs/magazine/standards/nhs1.html
www.historicalmind.com/2008/07/what-is-historical-thinking.html - 62k
www.uppercanadahistory.ca/intro/histthink.html
<http://centres.exeter.ac.uk/historyresource/index.htm>
<http://www.thinkinghistory.co.uk/Index.html>
<http://www.facinghistory.org/home>
<http://historymatters.gmu.edu/>
<http://www.history.ilstu.edu/nhp/intro.html>
<http://www.uea.ac.uk/~m242/historypgce/welcome.htm>
<http://chnm.gmu.edu/>
http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/key_issues/Australian_History/

New Zealand National Identity

James Belich. 'Globalization and the Nation': Dominion day address (26/09/07):
<http://www.mch.govt.nz/dominion/belich.html>

Giselle Byrnes. 'Rethinking national identity': Dominion day address (26/09/07):
<http://www.mch.govt.nz/dominion/byrnes.html>

Clark, Helen. 'Concepts of Nationhood': Dominion day address (26/09/07):
<http://www.beehive.govt.nz/node/30070>.

Personal Communications (copies in author's possession)

Judith Binney
Colin Davis
Robert Guyver
Jock Phillips
Danny Keenan
David Keen
Anne Low-Ber
Richard Manning

Private Papers (copies of relevant originals in author's possession)

Rex Bloomfield
Robin Gwynn
Peter Lineham
Nicholas Tarling
Bruce Taylor

Name	20-24 Jun. 1983	28-2 Dec. 1983	18-22 June 1984	4-8 Feb. 1985	5-6 June 1985	29 July – 2 Aug. 1985	22-24 April 1986	18 Aug. 1986	10-12 Mar. 1987
Myra Kunowski: Avonside Girls' High School	1	2	3	a	a	4	a	a	5
Mike Murtagh: Department of Education- (Examinations Division)	1	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Michael Graves; Auckland University	a	1	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Beryl Hughes: Victoria university	a	1	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Peter Lineham: Massey university	a	a	1	2	a	a	3	4	5
Greg Taylor, Department of Education	a	a	a	1	2	3	4	5	6
John Rosanowski: Aranui High School	n	n	n	1	2	3	4	5	6
David Wood: Department of Education	a	a	a	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nicholas Tarling: Auckland University	a	1	2	3	a	4	5	6	a
Bruce Deverell: Lynfield College (Auckland)	a	a	a	1	a	2	a	a	a
Colin Campbell, Correspondence School	a	a	a	1	a	2	a	a	3
Mike Reid: Riccarton High School	a	a	a	a	1	a	2	a	a
Warwick Elley: Canterbury University	a	a	a	a	1	a	a	a	a
Geoff Rice: Canterbury University	a	a	a	a	1	a	a	2	a
Anne Jones: Ngatapuwa College	1	a	a	2	a	3	4	a	5
Jim Peters: Mt Albert Grammar	a	a	a	a	a	1	2	3	a
Mike Cleary: Hasting Boys High School	a	a	a	a	a	1	a	a	2
Warwick Tyler, Massey University	a	a	a	a	a	1	a	a	a

Appendix 2: Request for an Interview (including Consent Form)

Mark Sheehan
School of Primary & Secondary Teacher Education
Victoria University of Wellington College of Education
PO Box 17-310
Karori
Wellington
Ph (04) 463 9687 (wk:dd); (04) 934 9176 (home)
Email: mark.sheehan@vuw.ac.nz

Dear >>>>

I am currently engaged in a Doctoral research project (Massey University Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education) looking at the work of the National History Curriculum Committee that met and shaped the current history syllabus during the 1980s. I would very much like to interview you for the purposes of my research.

My PhD supervisors are Professor Roger Openshaw (Social and policy Studies in Education, Palmerston North) and Associate Professor Peter Lineham (Social & Cultural Studies, Albany). I been working on my thesis since May last year and thus far I have scutinized the relevant archival material, completed a preliminary literature review and interviewed over >>> history teachers, university historians and Department of Education officials who sat on this committee.

I am aware that I am required to abide by the appropriate ethical protocols regarding the use of information gathered for research purposes and my project has been granted permission by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee and recorded on the Low Risk Human Ethics Database.

I would be most grateful if you would be prepared for me to interview you. It would be ideal if I could tape this interview and include this information in my thesis. If you were agreeable to this and wish to have a copy of the tape I will make one available to you after I have used this information. If you wish to view any of the information in the interview that I am making use of in my thesis I am happy to make those relevant aspects of the thesis available to you within and up to 3 months after the interview and heed any amendments or deletions that you wish to make. The information (both tape and written material) will be stored in a secure site at The Victoria University of Wellington College of Education and only I will have access to this stored information. I will make every effort to ensure confidentiality but absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. At the interview I will ask you to sign an informed consent form as below.

I am happy to make any arrangements to fit in with whatever is the most convenient for you. If you require clarification on any of the above points please contact me or if you wish to speak to either of my supervisors they would be willing to answer any questions about my work.

I look forward to your reply.

Yours truly,

Mark Sheehan
Informed Permission Slip

I give informed consent for Mark Sheehan, Doctoral student in the Massey University Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education to use the written and oral information provided in this interview for his research on the work of the National History Curriculum Committee. I understand that I am entitled to a copy of the tape if I so wish and I have the right to view any of the information from this interview that is to be used in this thesis within and up to 3 months after the interview and make any amendments or deletions that I see fit. The information (both tape and written material) from this interview will be stored in a secure site at The Victoria University of Wellington College of Education and every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality.

- I wish/ do not wish to view the information gathered at this interview with 3 months of the date below and take the opportunity to make any deletions and amendments that I see fit.

Signed

(Participant) _____

Mark Sheehan _____

Date _____

Appendix 3: Human Ethics



Massey University

8 October 2004

William Sheehan
60 Bedford Street
Northland
WELLINGTON

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
TO THE VICE-CHANCELLOR
(ETHICS & EQUITY)
Private Bag 11 222
Palmerston North
New Zealand
T 64 6 350 5573
F 64 6 350 5622
humanethics@massey.ac.nz
www.massey.ac.nz

Dear William

Re: Re-making history: The shaping of the New Zealand History Syllabus 1982-1987

Thank you for the Low Risk Notification that was received on 8 October 2004.

Your project has been recorded on the Low Risk Database which is reported in the Massey University Human Ethics Committee Annual Report.

Please notify me if situations subsequently occur which cause you to reconsider your initial ethical analysis that it is safe to proceed without approval by a campus human ethics committee.

Please ensure that the following statement is used on Information Sheets:

“This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University’s Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor Sylvia Rumball, Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor (Ethics & Equity), telephone 06 350 5249, email humanethicspn@massey.ac.nz”.

Please note that if a sponsoring organisation, funding authority, or a journal in which you wish to publish requires evidence of committee approval (with an approval number), you will have to provide a full application to a Campus Human Ethics committee. You should also note that such an approval can only be provided prior to the commencement of the research.

Yours sincerely

Professor Sylvia V Rumball, Chair
Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor (Ethics & Equity)

cc Professor Roger Openshaw
Social and Policy Studies in Education
PN900

Associate Professor Peter Lineham
Social and Cultural Studies
ALBANY

Professor Wayne Edwards
HoD, Dept Social & Policy Studies
PN900

Ms Caroline Teague
Graduate School of Education
PN900