

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.

•

Geography fieldtrips in New Zealand at secondary school
and undergraduate level in the second half of the 20th
century and beyond.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of PhD in geography

at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

Susan Stirling

2006

Abstract

This research involves an exploration of the practice of geography fieldtrips in New Zealand. Fieldtrips are often part of geography courses at university and secondary school, but little research has been undertaken as to why they are so frequently a part of geography courses, how they relate to geographers' theoretical understandings, and what geographers hope to achieve by running fieldtrips.

A humanist approach was chosen for the study. A number of university lecturers and secondary school geography teachers were interviewed, who have organised, executed, and evaluated fieldtrips. Drawing on Buttimer's (1983a) work, the concepts of milieu, metaphor, and meaning have been used as key foci for the research. Using structured interviews, the background and memories, or milieu, of the geographer was established to understand influences on his or her academic development. Textbooks read and published, courses attended and given, and the school curriculum were discussed in relation to how they affected fieldtrips. A second theme constructed the nature of the fieldtrip as metaphor or narratives, and showed how the geographer demonstrated his or her geographical knowledge and values. The third theme determined meaning by eliciting the values and convictions important to the geographer in the fieldtrip.

The meaning of fieldtrips related to geographers' own approach to the subject, their episteme or philosophy of geography, which transcends their teaching and research interests. This affected the manner in which the geographers run fieldtrips, the metaphor that they practised, from a focus on mapping, to foci on gathering statistics, understanding society, and concentrating on matters of difference in society. Four main approaches were identified: classifying the world, applying general theories to explain the world, using structures to interpret the world, and deconstructing the world.

This study contributes to understanding the role of geography fieldtrips in New Zealand. Insights are provided into geographical learning and teaching by reflecting on the extensive history of fieldtrips in geography, clarifying how geographers' theoretical underpinnings relate to fieldtrips, and explaining how the essence of fieldtrips relates back to lecturers' and teachers' philosophies of geography.

Acknowledgements

Considerable assistance was received from a large number of people who were involved in the interview process for this thesis. Many lecturers from Otago, Canterbury, Victoria, Massey, Waikato, and Auckland Universities and teachers from the Canterbury, Manawatu, and Taranaki regions willingly participated in this research. Support was also received from Awatapu College, where I am employed, both monetary help and a year's unpaid leave. Great assistance has been received from the School of People, Environment and Planning especially my supervisors, Juliana Mansvelt and Michael Roche.

During the second half of 2005 when I was beginning to write up this thesis I was based in Britain. The geography department at the University of Reading was extremely helpful in providing excellent accommodation, facilities, and personal support during that crucial time. Lastly my family and friends have provided unstinting support. I thank all involved.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, PN Application 04 / 125.

Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Contents	vii
List of Figures	xi
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Initial ideas	1
1.2 Epistemes and fieldtrips	7
1.3 A humanist approach	10
1.4 Attributes of fieldtrips – metaphor	18
1.5 Using a humanist lens – milieu and meaning	23
1.6 Conclusions	29
CHAPTER TWO - METHODOLOGY	33
2.1 Introduction	33
2.2 Humanistic methodologies	34
2.3 Grounded research	38
2.4 Understanding milieux	48
2.5 Oral testimony	56
2.6 Analysis	60
2.7 Conclusions	68
CHAPTER THREE - GEOGRAPHERS WHO CLASSIFY THE WORLD (THE EARLY YEARS).....	73
3.1 Introduction	73
3.2 Capes and bays, commercial geography and travel writing	75
3.3 Mathematical geography and physiography	79
3.4 Environmental Determinism	81
3.5 The Berkeley School	84
3.6 Emergence of Geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand	85
3.7 Areal differentiation and regional geography	88
3.8 Regional geography in New Zealand from the 1940s to the 1960s	90

3.9 Meanings	95
3.9.1 People and the land studied	97
3.9.2 Inductive method as the dominant approach	100
3.9.3 Mapping and sketching	105
3.9.4 Showing contrast	107
3.10 Conclusions	111
 CHAPTER FOUR – GEOGRAPHERS WHO USE GENERAL THEORIES TO EXPLAIN THE WORLD119	
4.1 Introduction	119
4.2 General theories	120
4.3 Universities and positivism in New Zealand	124
4.4 Schools and positivism in New Zealand	128
4.5 Meanings	132
4.5.1 Hypothesis testing	133
4.5.2 Transfer of knowledge between localities	137
4.5.3 Skill acquisition	142
4.5.4 Encouraging students to go on as postgraduates	146
4.6 Conclusions	148
 CHAPTER FIVE – GEOGRAPHERS WHO USE STRUCTURES TO INTERPRET THE WORLD.....155	
5.1 Introduction	155
5.2 The Marxian, radical, and structural geographers	156
5.3 New Zealand’s Marxian, radical, and structural geography lecturers	159
5.4 The Phoenix lecturers	162
5.5 Teachers who are <i>structuralists</i>	165
5.6 Phoenix school teachers	167
5.7 Meanings	168
5.7.1 Perfect learning opportunities	169
5.7.2 Using experts	173
5.7.3 Having a desire to change the world	177
5.7.4 Understanding concept of place	179
5.7.5 A means of promoting the discipline	182
5.8 Conclusions	186

CHAPTER SIX - GEOGRAPHERS WHO DECONSTRUCT THE	
WORLD	193
6.1 Introduction	193
6.2 Deconstruction	194
6.3 Absence of fieldtrips amongst cultural geographers	200
6.4 Geographies of deconstruction in New Zealand universities	201
6.5 The lack of teachers	206
6.6 Meanings	208
6.6.1 Reflexivity and positionality	209
6.6.2 Uncertainty, unpredictability and difference	213
6.6.3 Deconstruction	216
6.6.4 Reconstruction	224
6.7 Conclusions	228
CHAPTER 7 - CONCLUSIONS	235
7.1 Introduction	235
7.2 Key findings	238
7.3 Review of the humanist approach	247
7.4 Review of grounded approach	250
7.5 Further meanings and milieux that emerged from the interviews	254
7.6 Differences between lecturers and teachers	256
7.7 Approaches in the six universities	260
7.8 Differences	263
7.9 Concluding remarks	265
7.10 Further research possibilities	270
APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF MY CAREER IN GEOGRAPHY	275
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	276
APPENDIX 3: NAMING OF PARTICIPANTS	279
BIBLIOGRAPHY	283

List of figures

Figure 1.1 Epistemes and fieldtrips in university geography.....8

Figure 1.2 Epistemes and fieldtrips in school geography..... 10

Figure 1.3 A humanistic method of interviewing respondents about
fieldtrips..... 26

Figure 1.4 Responses summarised and linked to meaning, metaphor,
milieux, and dynamism..... 27

Figure 2.1 Timeline of fieldtrips, government influences, teaching and
trends in school and university departments in New
Zealand..... 51

Chapter One – Introduction

1.1 Initial ideas

This thesis is a voyage to discover and understand the place of fieldtrips in the academic discipline of geography in New Zealand. The following questions are probed: why are fieldtrips used so extensively in the teaching of geography? How does this mesh with the geographers' own understandings of the practice of geography as an academic discipline?¹ What do teachers and lecturers hope to achieve by exposing their students to fieldtrips? These questions are threaded through the study, together with historical information to further inform the research, as the story of fieldtrips unfolds. This thesis takes a different approach from most previous work on fieldtrips, and focuses on those who practise fieldtrips, in order to gain an understanding of the reasons why people organise and execute fieldtrips.

Fieldtrips are part of the 'taken-for-granted' teaching of geography and have been integral to the academic discipline for over a century. Fieldwork is seen as 'a traditional means of data collection within geography, founded uncritically on the Enlightenment presupposition that seeing is believing' (Johnston et al., 2000, 267). An unquestioning reliance on the presupposition that 'reality is present in appearance' (Johnston et al., 2000) has its origins in the era of exploration and discovery, particularly in the 19th century when the Royal Geographical Society was established, and the great era of exploration in Africa was underway. This emphasis on exploration and discovery has led to feminist criticism of 'geographical masculinities in action' (Rose, 1993, 43). Other school subjects such as biology and history and university disciplines for instance ecology and sociology do take fieldtrips but these are sporadic and are not central and 'taken-for-granted' aspects of these disciplines in the way that fieldtrips are in geography.² Frequent mention of the centrality of fieldtrips to geography

has been made: Panelli and Welch (2005) declare that fieldtrips have 'iconic status within geography'; Pawson and Teather (2002, 275) state that 'fieldtrips have long been an accepted pedagogical characteristic of geography' and that 'fieldtrips are in part the way in which the discipline brands itself'; Fuller et al. (2006, 89) express similar viewpoints, 'fieldtrips are perceived by many geographers as being at the heart of geography' and '[fieldtrips] are considered as intrinsic to the discipline as clinical practice is to medicine'; and Bland et al. (1996, 165) comment that 'geography without fieldwork is perceived as being like science without experiments'. This thesis considers an exclusive subject, geography that has had a century long history of fieldtrips. The thesis is distinctive in focusing on fieldtrips in a New Zealand setting over a long time period.

Only limited research has taken place into fieldtrips and geography. The only substantial studies of geography fieldtrips in New Zealand are by Nairn and these take a feminist approach (1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003). Berg (1994) also using a gendered perspective sees fieldwork in New Zealand as a 'frontier' discipline and argues that it has both a masculine focus and creates a dominance of the empirical over the theoretical in New Zealand geography. Pawson and Teather (2002), Welch and Panelli (2003), Spronken-Smith, (2005) and Panelli and Welch (2005) have all contributed papers on courses that have contained fieldwork, which they have run at their respective universities, Canterbury for Pawson and Spronken-Smith, Otago for Welch and Panelli. Detailed material emerges on aspects such as group work, research methodologies, individually run fieldwork excursions, and other meticulous details of these specific courses. Fuller, a lecturer at Massey University, has contributed to the discourse (Fuller et al., 2000; Fuller et al., 2003; Scott et al., 2006) but most of this material is based on research undertaken in the United Kingdom, apart from a recent paper in which a small segment focuses on New Zealand fieldtrips (Fuller et al., 2006). The purpose of the fieldtrip in New Zealand that is used as an example in his paper is found to be 'understanding of the subject [is] enhanced by seeing real-life examples, which reinforce the theory covered in the lecture programme' (Fuller et al., 2006, 101). Another aspect of the work that Fuller has been involved with is that one of the pieces of research

does focus on the perceptions of students' lecturers in the United Kingdom on fieldtrips (Scott et al., 2006) and is discussed further in Section 1.4. Scott, Fuller and Gaskin (2006) have produced one of the only pieces of research to focus on the intents of the lecturers but have not linked this topic to the philosophy of fieldtrips in the way that is suggested by Driver (2000) below.

In both the international and New Zealand literature, there have been no publications on the history and philosophy of fieldtrips. Driver (2000) noted in an editorial in the *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* that 'strangely most textbooks on the history and philosophy of geography barely touch on the significance of these ventures [fieldtrips] for the making of geographical knowledge, past and present. Perhaps it is time they did so' (Driver, 2000, 268). He notes that little attempt has been made to look at fieldtrips from an historical and philosophic angle and in the context of their place in the academic discipline of geography. Interestingly, fieldtrips do not rate a mention in a recent history of geography in Britain (Johnston and Williams, 2003). Writings about fieldtrips in New Zealand are also rare.

This thesis addresses this omission by considering the place of fieldtrips in New Zealand in the academic discipline of geography and their position in geographers' philosophy and teaching. New Zealand has a relatively long history of geography being taught as an academic discipline with over 100 years at school level and nearly 70 years at degree level. The subject is taught for three years, at secondary school, and for three years of undergraduate study, and one of postgraduate study at university. This provides a relatively tight framework that is possible for one researcher to investigate. New Zealand is also small enough to consider all six universities that teach geography to degree level, together with a range of geography teachers.

As outlined below, the links between tertiary and secondary geography are strong in New Zealand, and so studying both levels of geography was deemed worthwhile. I considered that in this study there should be

continuity through the six or seven years of geography teaching in New Zealand (Year 11 in a secondary school to possibly the end of a four year degree course of university teaching) so as to focus on the full range of geography teaching in New Zealand. Nevertheless there are considerable differences between school and university geography. Buttimer recognised that:

school geography is ... very different from academic geography, the former being directed to world orientation by teaching students to recognise typical physical forms and social ways of life ... in reality, the latter is directed toward critical evaluation of these forms and ways of life (Buttimer, 1983a, 211).

Roche (1998a) and Jeffrey (2003) have called for more linkages between the two. The wide gulf that can emerge between the two levels of institution has been a persistent sentiment for over a century. Sir Halford Mackinder who was the head of geography at Oxford University in the latter years of the 19th century noted this 'I have watched with grief and consternation the widening gap in this association between the school and university teaching of the subject' (Mackinder, 1893). More recently, and also in the United Kingdom, Rawlings expressed the same sentiment 'if geography is not healthy at school then it won't be at university' (Rawlings, 1996, 305).

There are links between school and university fieldtrips as a teacher may 'use' a fieldtrip that he or she undertook at university when an undergraduate in his or her own school. This effect is noted:

A 'trickle-down' process has occurred to A-level syllabuses with fieldwork exercises previously used at degree level entering the school curriculum through geography graduates who have become teachers, using or adapting exercises and approaches that they themselves experienced while on their original geography degree (Kent and Gilbertson, 1997, 317).

In New Zealand, geography is one of the older social sciences taught in schools and universities. At university level, it was established at Canterbury in 1937 and it has been taught at school level for over a

century. Secondary school geography teachers and university lecturers belong to the same professional organisation, the New Zealand Geographical Society, and attend the same conferences run by the Society. Now (2006) the *New Zealand Geographer*, the journal of the Society, is jointly published for teachers and lecturers rather than as previously as two separate publications of the *New Zealand Journal of Geography* (largely for teachers) and *New Zealand Geographer* (mainly for lecturers). Even at branch level within the Society there are combined university and teacher member meetings and fieldtrips, which contrasts with the situation in Australia, and the United Kingdom, where the organisations for school and university geographers are formally separate. As a result of the joint activities between New Zealand's university and school geographers, any study of New Zealand geography fieldtrips should be undertaken at both university and school level. Some teachers have made the transition from schoolteacher to university staff member, for instance, Tony Binns (Otago), John Flenley (Massey), Garth Cant (Canterbury), Paul Keown (Waikato), and Ruth Panelli (Otago), which enhances these linkages. Rumley and Hall (1987) comment favourably on 'the co-operative relationship between geography school teachers and academics in New Zealand, generally lacking in the United States, Britain and Australia, has done much to foster a positive public image of the discipline' (Rumley and Hall, 1987, 107). This is also mentioned by Marcus (1987) who states 'the quantity and quality of contact between geographers in the country's universities, teachers' colleges, and secondary schools is astounding compared to other places. Even better, there are 'trickle up' as well as 'trickle down' effects' (Marcus, 1987, 19). Marcus visited the geography department at Canterbury University in 1972 and 1981, was one of the contributors to a retrospective consideration of geography in New Zealand, *Southern Approaches* (1987) and served as President of the Association of American Geographers.

Although accepting that such collegiality is commendable, I am aware of fundamental differences between the secondary school teachers of geography and the university academics in the discipline. The gulf has widened as academics have been forced to focus on research publications to maintain their own employment credibility in an increasingly competitive

and corporate model that is being imposed on universities (Berg and Roche, 1997). Teachers have a prescriptive syllabus, and one that shows little change in New Zealand over a 25-year period, apart from the recent introduction of the new nationwide assessment, National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA).³ The NCEA restricts the ability for teachers to be innovative in their teaching as much material must be made available nationwide for assessment. Craymer (1998) is concerned that there is increased pressure on geography teachers to reduce the amount of time they spend doing fieldwork as other subject areas complain it is disruptive to their programmes.

The focus of this thesis is geographers who have organised, executed, and evaluated fieldtrips. What fascinates me is that this country has an imperial heritage and its education system was a direct import from Britain. This reflects my own hybrid nature having spent half my life in Britain, where I undertook most of my education, and half in New Zealand, where the majority of my working life has been spent see Appendix One. Up to the 1980s the regional geography of the British Isles formed a significant part of the geography syllabus in New Zealand. Geography has since developed its own distinctive syllabus in New Zealand with an emphasis on topics such as natural hazards that have a particular relevance to the New Zealand experience.

Another rationale for the study was that geography as an academic discipline has been a large part of my world for over 40 years; fieldtrips have been a component of this 'total immersion in geography'. I studied geography from age eleven in high school in England, took a four years honours degree in it in Scotland, began post graduate work in geography, and have taught geography at secondary school in England, Australia, and New Zealand for almost thirty years. In the course of this long association with the subject I have run or attended approximately 200 geography fieldtrips [Appendix One]. Recently I became aware of a 'taken-for-granted' acceptance of fieldtrips in geography teaching. Partly prompted by current questions of cost, risk management, and demands of other curriculum areas, I have been forced to re-consider my own acceptance of fieldtrips in

geography, and began to question their position in the academic discipline of geography.

1.2 Epistemes and fieldtrips

As a result of preliminary reading about fieldtrips mainly from the international literature, some initial ideas were formulated on how epistemes strongly influenced the type and nature of fieldtrips.⁴ These are noted below (Figures I.1 and 1.2) and show the links between university and secondary school geography and fieldtrips (Stirling, 2003). The concepts are related to the changing philosophical approaches that have dominated geography over the last century (Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). It is accepted that these approaches are not demarcated as rigidly as shown in these figures, but the figures do help to demonstrate the widening gulf between university and school geography over the period. Up to the early 1960s university and school geography used the same episteme to construct knowledge. However, most geographers at universities adopted positivist approaches by the early 1960s before schools did and the two institutions have remained out of step since.

Figure 1.1 Epistemes and fieldtrips in university geography

Dates	Episteme and constructed knowledge	Type of fieldtrip
1890s to 1930s	Environmentalism Environment causes culture. Mapping important.	Recording features on maps
1940s to early 1960s	Regionalism Landscape approach.	Observation of physical and human world.
Late 1960s to mid 1970s	Positivism Models to simplify reality. Highly quantitative.	Division into human and physical. Human, - reality in relation to models. Physical, measuring phenomenon and processes.
Mid 1970s to late 1980s	Structuralism Infrastructure and superstructure. Humanism Focus on people as individuals.	Socially aware fieldtrips aimed to initiate social change Empathy, values, attitudes and perceptions
1990s to present	Post-structuralism Deconstruction and critique.	Urban deconstruction. Reading the landscape

From initial readings of the international literature, it appeared to me that the changing nature of fieldtrips reflected movements in geography over the past century. Making maps was a very important element in geography initially and students were taken outside to do this in the first years of the 20th century, a process which reflected the discovery era when the earth was still being mapped. With the advent of aerial photographs in the 1930s and still more so of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) in recent decades this practice largely stopped and a change occurred from mapping the unknown to using a topographical map or cadastral map for a land use survey. Although it was not until the 1940s that topographic maps covered New Zealand.

Generally by the 1940s the fieldtrip was of the “Cook’s Tour” type that coincided with the high point of regional geography. This was common until the mid 1960s as mentioned by Clark (1996).⁵ As with a lot of school geography, fieldtrips at school level lagged behind changes in university fieldtrips, and they remained of this Cook’s Tour type until the mid 1970s. Thus the dates in Figures 1.1 and 1.2 do not entirely match. This lag is partly due to geography teachers at school level continuing to teach their students using the methods with which they were taught and also due to school geography evolving in a different way from university geography (Buttimer, 1983a).

The positivist episteme was reflected in New Zealand school geography fieldtrips from the mid 1970s to the end of the 20th century (see Figure 1.2). This was largely because the New Zealand school geography syllabus has not changed since the 1970s, when this positivist approach was in ascendance in the universities. Since 2002, with the advent of the new NCEA qualification, most fieldtrips in New Zealand secondary schools are being incorporated into a single inquiry based assessment and are approaching the problem based inquiry fieldtrip characteristic of some university fieldtrips (Spronken-Smith, 2005).

This was only a preliminary interpretation based on the literature search, primarily of material on fieldtrips from international journals. This approach considered only a limited amount of information about the practice of fieldtrips. I considered that it would be beneficial to look wider in order to obtain a more complete picture. Was there a relationship between epistemes and the type of fieldtrips being practised by geographers? Individual geographers run fieldtrips, and insufficient regard was being given to human agency in the approach outlined in Figures 1.1 and 1.2, which were based on epistemes, identified by these constructs. An approach was sought that firmly focused on geographers’ own aspirations for their fieldtrips.

Figure 1.2 Epistemes and fieldtrips in school geography

Dates	Episteme and constructed knowledge	Type of fieldtrip
1890s to 1930s	Environmentalism Links man and land. Features shown on maps.	'Excursion' mapping, surveying - use of map in 'discovery'
1940s to mid 1970s	Regionalism Physical and human strongly linked	Links man and land emphasis on physical. Maps used to demonstrate patterns
Mid 1970s to 2000	Positivism Quantitative models. Measuring of physical geography phenomenon and processes	Models applied to urban situations. Survey and measuring instruments used to measure physical phenomenon and processes
2001 to present	???	Inquiry based fieldtrips

1.3 A humanist approach

Humanist geography literature privileges the concept of human agency and emphasis is placed on the actions, thoughts, and values of human beings. Its origins stem from Renaissance humanism, which was a plea for the individual to seek understanding through a mix of reasoning, scientific experiment, imagination, and ingenuity rather than by assenting to dogma. A re-discovery of classical writings and the realisation of the strength and breadth of human wisdom sparked this renaissance. Its essence is the idea of human free will as against the view of predestination and it marks the difference between Erasmus, the humanist and Luther, a believer in predestination (Buttimer, 1989). Humanistic geography emerged as an approach in the 1970s to construct knowledge by studying human awareness, agency, consciousness, and creativity. It overcomes the

distancing of the positivist approach and is an intermingling of the philosophies of existentialism, phenomenology, and idealism.

Existentialism is a search to discover knowledge through the life that we live in the world. Experience is viewed as the key to understanding, and it is only through consciously reflecting on experience can that knowledge can be found. It is based on the ideas of philosophers such as Heidegger and Sartre and can be considered as the history of human effort to overcome or eliminate detachment, which is to remove distance by creating meaning out of place. The classical model of an existential being is one who is always wandering in search of place, and who is epitomised by the wandering Jew, the gypsy, the nomad, and the alien (Ley and Samuels, 1978).

Phenomenology is based on Husserl's views where, by putting oneself in the place of another and grasping their motivation, understanding is achieved and distancing between object and subject is removed. Meaning can only be constructed by lived experience in the lifeworld of others. In both phenomenology and existentialism knowledge is formed by concrete rather than abstract means. It is built up using a grounded approach based on actual experiences and not by the application of general laws. Humanistic geography as developed by Buttimer (1976, 1978, 1980, 1983a), Tuan (1974, 1976, 1977), Relph (1976), and the various essays in *Humanistic Geography Prospects and Problems*, (Ley and Samuels, 1978) includes elements of existentialism and phenomenology but emphasis is also placed on past experiences and wider events in society, an approach known as idealism. In idealism the thought patterns of the individual are reconstructed or rethought by placing that individual in their world in terms of both time and place (Guelke, 1981, 134). Guelke, drawing on Collingwood (1946) rather than Husserl, develops this further, in a later paper that emphasises the necessity of considering human activity within its historical period and context. By doing this, the theories that informed people, who carried out the activities, in that context, become apparent (Guelke, 1997). This is of particular use when exploring a historically-rooted study (Hay, 1987).

Humanistic geography is the approach taken in this thesis. To understand fieldtrips in New Zealand it is necessary to consider both what happened in the past, as reconstructed by present participants in the academy, and from reading the wider literature, and to discover what is happening in the present, both of which are recalled by those who are living through these experiences. None-the-less it is important to recognise that when people reminisce they tend to do so in relation to the present.

The main way of discovering narratives of peoples' lives is to ask them about these experiences and record their responses. A way of examining this concept is to use biographies, as explained by Buttimer, who is one of the chief proponents of this episteme, 'in each person's life echoes the drama of his or her times and milieu; in all, to varying degrees, the propensity to submit or rebel. Through our own biographies we reach toward understanding, being and becoming' (Buttimer, 1983a, 3). Narratives and wider memories contribute in this way to constructing meaning both for the individual who is recalling their life and for those who hear their stories. The experiences are the day-to-day events in a person's life that are often taken-for-granted but become the very fabric of existence and, when recalled and relived in story form, generate ideas.

The external influences on a person's life have a dynamic affect, as a person grows older. These influences, whether they are of place, events, participation in institutions, work, political events, wars, family, and a multitude of other narratives from the networks of society, have a twofold effect on people. They are imposed from the outside as external influences but are also internalised and in this case are embodied (Laws, 1995; Mansvelt, 1997). It is these internalised 'taken-for-granted' aspects of a person's being that are explored in the context of geography fieldtrips in this thesis; these are the acknowledged memories of the individuals, and other, deeper, subconscious memories that are rarely articulated. Eyles (1989) pursues the idea of the 'taken-for-granted' aspects of everyday life. He states that although we believe that everyday life is under our control, it is also shaped, and even determined, by forces outside our control.

Fieldtrips are full of 'taken-for-granted' aspects that can be explored through discussions with geographers who run fieldtrips.

The emphasis in this thesis is on fieldtrips as a teaching tool rather than fieldtrips as fieldwork, which is a research undertaking. A feature of fieldtrips is that they are informal and individually practised because they have a person developing or running them. Buttmer acknowledges that 'many colleagues ... may have devoted so much time and energy to teaching, field work, administration or non-academic employment that they had neither the time nor inclination to write their ideas down' (Buttmer, 1983a, 5). An approach, which allows people to tell their stories about fieldtrips and situates a person in his or her milieu, in this case the context of fieldtrips through memories, is ideal for this study to explore the essence of fieldtrips. This is one aspect of geographical education where, at least in New Zealand, the written record is thin with only ephemera such as handouts made available to students sometimes being procurable. In this thesis the oral record must be tapped for information. Much of the material comes from interviews with those who have practised geography fieldtrips. Consideration is also given to the discourses on fieldtrips from publications, institutions, government practices, media reports, places, and a host of other structures in society that open windows on the participants' worlds upon which participant, researcher, and for members of the academy can build knowledge. I was aware that some element of history and development should inform the study, as the story of geography fieldtrips in New Zealand is long, going back into the first half of the 20th century. This historical element provides an inter-weaving braid throughout the thesis and contributes to an understanding of geography fieldtrips in New Zealand, as it contextualises the worlds of those who have practised fieldtrips in their own time and place. In this thesis the stories of students have not been included as the focus is on the intent of those who run fieldtrips.

As the purpose of this thesis was to understand what made geographers run fieldtrips in the second half of the twentieth century and beyond, I considered that only a very partial view would be obtained if I acted as an observer on fieldtrips run by the lecturers and teachers interviewed in the

manner that Nairn (1998c) used in her study of fieldtrips in New Zealand. It would have only been possible to attend a small proportion of fieldtrips run by the many lecturers and teachers interviewed. As the intention was to understand fieldtrips over time in New Zealand, a snapshot view would be obtained if the focus was solely on observed fieldtrips that would contribute only marginally to understandings of fieldtrips. An observation method was not used in this study because the majority of the fieldtrips that participants in the study mentioned had happened a number of years ago and it would have been impossible for me to be present on these occasions. This thesis follows the type of research that Buttimer (1983a, 8) undertook to ascertain 'how the discipline developed' by devoting her study to 'the authors of geography themselves' whom she considers to be 'the best sources of insight into relationships between thought and context'.

Buttimer (1976, 1980, 1983a, 1990, 1993), Tuan (1974, 1976), Eyles (1985, 1989), Ley and Samuels (1978) and Moss (2001) have all taken a humanist approach that uses biography and brief consideration will be given to some of their writings. Buttimer intermingles her own elucidation of humanism, with a cry for clarity and for the rise of the human spirit above the petty, the mundane, the constraining structures of society, as ways of approaching the environment (1990) and the academy (1983a) that are informed by focusing on the intents of people. She recognises how these intents are revealed, rather than being fitted into preconceived models. Eyles' (1985) work, *Senses of Place*, incorporated the use of autobiography as well as biographical accounts into understanding what was seemingly a very 'ordinary' place. Tuan (1974, 1976) turns to the interplay of people and places, and puts people at the forefront, considering that an individual's responses to a physical setting is mediated by his or her own culture. Ley and Samuels (1978) view humanism as merging the sciences and arts, which goes back to the very origins of humanism in the Renaissance when those who followed the views of human agency, over dogma, were the inventors, the scientists, as well as the artists. All these humanist geographers see the individual's own spirit as trying to rise above the constraints of society. Moss (2001) follows the autobiographical form that Buttimer introduced in her *The Practice of Geography* (1983a), to illuminate

the lives of practitioners of geography. In this thesis care was taken in the research questions to allow geographers to explore their own practice of geography and to share their unique stories.

Buttimer identifies three components in her humanistic studies of geographers, in order to maintain a coherency between different voices (Buttimer, 1983a). The same approach is used in this thesis. Milieu is the physical, historical, social, and political context, which is considered significant, and worthy of mention, by the interviewee, or the participants as those who take part in this study are referred to. That is, their memories. For geographers who run fieldtrips, this encompasses their own educational experiences, fieldtrip encounters when students themselves, their sense of place, and of places that have been important to them, and the political and social movements that have influenced them. Historical details are elaborated upon when participants in the study have acknowledged their influence on running fieldtrips. Thus Section 7.5 considers in some depth health and safety issues which all participants mentioned as having an increasing influence on the way in which they run fieldtrips. However little mention was made by participants of some features of societal change such as alterations to the funding of schools and universities, technological advances, and gender equality and so these aspects were only briefly acknowledged in the thesis as they were not viewed as an important features of running fieldtrips by the participants.

Metaphor is the key mode of expression by the geographer practitioner. These are the narratives that reflect meanings and memories of the geographer. In the case of this study, narratives are the books, journal articles, and fieldtrips that the practitioner writes or organises. Meaning, as identified by Buttimer, concerns values and convictions developed by the practitioner about geography. Complexities emerge as convictions are also expressed in the books and journal articles that the geographer writes.

Meanings are the main focus of the thesis and the metaphor and milieu emerge through participant narratives in order to illuminate meaning. Sometimes the meanings are explicitly stated: at other times they become

apparent to the participant, as he or she recounts his or her own experiences, and a level of understanding about his or her own practice is discovered by the participant during reflection on the practice of fieldtrips throughout the interview. These were then shared with me and I gained a greater comprehension of why fieldtrips are practised in the way described. To gain further understandings, I look at aspects of society that have affected how lecturers and teachers run fieldtrips and participate in them. Thus the discourse ranges from textbooks in geography, to New Zealand government curriculum documents, and educational reports, anniversary publications by individual geographical departments, and New Zealand geography and educational journals.⁶

Buttimer (1990, 1993) introduced an idea of dynamism into humanistic geography studies, by using the motifs of Phoenix, and Narcissus. Human beings' views change, as old ideas, become institutionalised and embedded in the structures of society, the Faustian analogy. Some individuals reflect on these accepted values, the Narcissian idea, of seeing one's reflections and views, and turn their attention to developing new approaches, the rise of the Phoenix. In this thesis, I have been alert to changes of approach and the historical backdrop has contributed to these understandings. The Phoenix analogy has been utilised in this thesis when referring to a number of lecturers' and teachers' lives to give coherency to the concept of change in participants' philosophies and approaches to geography during their careers.

Humanism has encountered opposition from feminists, for example Rose (1993). She saw humanism as very much dealing with male, white issues. Opposition has also come from applied geography where geographers aim to offer their skills to the decision makers in society.⁷ This type of geography became important when tertiary educational institutes in a number of countries were forced into a corporate model and had to attract outside funds for their research programmes (Johnston, 1995). It was not so much that humanism disappeared, for its proponents continued producing material of a humanist nature, especially when dealing with topics such as the academy of geographers and of other disciplines such as

in the book *Nature and Identity in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Buttimer and Wallin, 1999), but other approaches have dominated recent research in geography. Approaches such as postmodernism and post-structuralism have become important in the academy and are explored in more detail in Chapter Six. For the purposes of this thesis some aspects of these approaches have been useful. The development of methodologies, used by some post-structuralists to facilitate interviews and to open dialogue between participants and researchers, have been used and will be discussed more fully in Chapter Two. As my research was privileging the stories of members of the academy rather than considering the tales of students who participated on fieldtrips, a humanistic approach was deemed to be the most appropriate method of study because it gave participants the opportunity to reflect on their own lives as geographers in part by practising fieldtrips, which allowed them to consciously build their own knowledge.

Humanism continues to be debated periodically in current literature. Consciousness and intentionality are central concepts of a humanistic approach. Graham observes that our whole legal system is based on understanding the intentions of humans who are ultimately morally responsible beings and have the choice of whether or not to act in particular ways. Humanists believe that ultimately 'power remains with people' (Graham, 2005, 27). This is the import of this thesis that understanding the reasons those who run fieldtrips give for their practice is paramount to understandings of why fieldtrips are so important in geography. Other geographers have also, in recent times, continued to promulgate an approach that puts a major focus back on humanism. Thrift (2004) discusses what could be termed a 'modern humanism'. This is the re-imagination of practices of good encounter and interaction which can often only be partially sensed. It requires practices and ethics of listening, talking, and contemplating which can produce a feeling of being in a situation together with the interviewee. Thrift sees the importance of every day life is best attained by looking at the small and the discrete. Thus in this thesis the accounts of individual fieldtrips and the reasons for running these fieldtrips build up knowledge. Thrift views knowledge as being very linked to experience which is a fundamental tenet of humanism. The construction of

knowledge occurs in small discrete steps and is in a constant state of flux with no 'true' meaning ever discovered, just portions of knowledge illuminated. Gregson (2005) has also writes of humanism in recent publications and see human agency as important with some human agents more important than others in their ability to change and influence society and polity. In the case of fieldtrips those who run the fieldtrips are of paramount importance in gaining understandings of fieldtrips. They have enormous influence on their practice and execution and so are the chief sources of information in this thesis.

1.4 Attributes of fieldtrips – metaphor

Six main attributes of fieldtrips were identified drawing on personal knowledge and from the secondary literature (Buttimer, 1983a; Clark, 1996; Higgit, 1996; McEwen, 1996; Nairn, 1998a; Healey et al., 2002; Scott et al., 2006). They are, the places used for fieldtrips, the skills taught, the theories expounded on the fieldtrip, the use of experts or interpreters, the mechanics or day to day aspects of the fieldtrip such as sleeping arrangements, food and transport and students themselves, and the type of socialisation. Place is considered in the works of Daniels (1992) and Nairn (1998a) and will be dealt with later in this section. Higgit (1996) considers the transferable skills learnt on fieldtrips in a similar way to McEwen (1996). There is considerable emphasis on skills in the literature on fieldtrips but it is more difficult to find examples of where theory is mentioned. McEwen (1996, 372) lists amongst the 'aims of fieldwork', 'to allow text-book derived knowledge to be sorted and clarified' and 'to allow fragmented or compartmentalised knowledge to be integrated as a whole'. This appears to indicate that theories taught in class or in textbooks will be consolidated on fieldtrips. This type of geography was based on the theoretical assumptions of 'empirically grounded observations of differences and similarities on the surface of the earth. The geographer's task was to represent what he (or she) saw, to analyse it carefully, and to render his (or her) results articulate

in verbal, graphic, or cartographic language which summarized and corresponded, allegedly as closely as possible, to the reality studied' (Buttimer, 1983a, 63). Such aims were found by Scott, Fuller and Gaskin (2006) after surveying views on the purpose of fieldtrips of nine physical geography lecturers in the United Kingdom and they noted 'the lecturers' main objectives for fieldwork are to put theory into context'.

Scarfe, a New Zealand geographer, noted the scientific, observational, experiential aspects of fieldtrips in a discussion on school geography. He considers the theoretical basis of fieldwork to be linked to the idea that:

Geographic knowledge that is not born of direct contact with mother earth or direct observation and investigation and is not refreshed constantly by springs of research in the field is practically worthless. The scientific method implies that observation comes first, collection and recording second, organisation arrangement and selection third and conclusion and generalisation last (Scarfe, 1945, 171).

Experts or interpreters of fieldtrips can be considered a social construct. They are usually the teachers or lecturers who run fieldtrips although they can also be people nominated by organisers to talk on fieldtrips. Experts are those who see themselves as having comprehensive or authoritative knowledge in an area. In the literature on fieldtrips the experts used on fieldtrips are rarely named and become faceless, intangible entities.⁸ It is far more likely that if someone, other than the leader of the trip writes the account, the expert will be named and their expertise will be acknowledged. An account in the *New Zealand Geographical Society Record* is of this type. Hewland gives an account of activities of the Canterbury Branch and mention is made of a fieldtrip 'round the Port Hills led by Dr Jobberns' [for further information on Jobberns see section 3.6]. Aspects of the landscape that that Dr Jobberns points out to members of the fieldtrip are cited, such as the drainage problems near Halswell, 'this', said Dr Jobberns, 'was tied up directly with the level of Lake Ellesmere' and later when 'the party saw ... scrub associations of second growth forest. It was believed by Dr Jobberns that this reversion to bush was taking place in the absence of grazing and he suggested that members could profitably observe the stages of this

process at regular intervals in future years' (Hewland, 1946, 15).

Sometimes the expert on the fieldtrip or part of the fieldtrip is not the teacher or lecturer but another person who provides information. This is noted in an account of a school geography field trip where a farmer provided a lot of information for students (Lewis, 1970).

The mechanics or day-to-day operation of fieldtrips has been identified in the literature on fieldtrips. Such operations range from providing food to arranging transport, organising sleeping arrangements to assessing potential risk. Such 'housekeeping matters' can take a lot of the leaders' time and energy. 'Mechanics' overlaps with 'students' as an aspect of fieldtrips since issues such as sleeping arrangements both effect and are affected by students. Nairn (1999) suggests these aspects of fieldtrips directly impinge on students' physical experiences. There are accounts of risk analysis by Higgitt and Bullard (1999) and Kent and Gilbertson (1997), which explain the level of detail required in risk assessment prior to a fieldtrip. Nairn suggests that sleeping arrangements vary between secondary school and university fieldtrips (1998c, 2003). Thus the mechanics of the fieldtrip, for example where students sleep, can have a direct bearing on the students' perceived enjoyment and acceptance of the fieldtrip and their appreciation of the socialisation aspects of fieldtrips.

Recently, British writers have discussed the importance of, and challenges associated with, incorporating disabled students into fieldtrips. This has been particularly noticeable in the journal *Planet* and much of the literature is a result of the Disabilities Act passed in the United Kingdom in 2001. This together with the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Higher Education's (2000) Code of Practice states 'institutions should ensure that where-ever possible disabled students have access to academic and vocational placements including fieldtrips and study abroad' (QAA 2000, Precept 11). This legislation has changed the way in which institutions organise fieldtrips in the United Kingdom (Healey et al., 2002). Care must be taken to make the fieldtrip inclusive rather than exclusive so that all students can take part. The physical aspects of the fieldtrip, such as climbing mountains or being exposed to extreme weather conditions, have to be assessed to judge

whether it is absolutely necessary to undertake activities that expose students to such extreme conditions. Some recent work has considered virtual trips as a way of overcoming safety concerns (Hirsch and Lloyd, 2005; Stainfield et al., 2000). In New Zealand there have been changes to the safety legislation with the introduction of the 'Health and Safety in Employment Act' of 1992 which states that all practicable steps have to be taken to keep students safe. The Department of Occupational Health and Safety administers this act, by setting out guidelines that have to be followed to keep within the law. Such aspects stem from the milieu or background that influences how fieldtrips are practised and were examined in this thesis.

Fieldtrips are visits to a place or places. This is more than a site; it is a mindset that informs the fieldtrip. The concept of place has been much explored in academic geographic literature over the years. Buttimer looks back at Vidal de la Blache's view of place as perceived by the French rural dwellers of the pays seeing it as 'an enveloping entity' (Buttimer 1980). Doreen Massey considers local places as a construct of processes and structures (Massey and Allen, 1984, Massey 1997a, 1997b). Eyles and other humanistic geographers do not describe a place from outside but attempt to portray what it is like to be part of that place. For Eyles (1989) both existentialism and phenomenological approaches are used to study attachment to place in the geography of everyday lives. He views place as a fundamental human need with the most immobile, the poor, and disabled, infirm, and aged being most strongly attached to one place. Everyday interactions with family, neighbours, and friends influence attitudes to place in a variety of ways. In *Topophilia* (1974) the affective bond between people and their place or setting is investigated. Topophilia is a word invented by Tuan (1974) to describe the bond between people and places or settings. He takes a look at place as a construct of the mind, at symbols of place and how civilisations thought of themselves at the centre of the earth and how novelists depict landscapes. Thus different geographers have differing interpretations of place and it was important to understand the concept of place of those geographers who were part of this study of fieldtrips since it is places that are visited on fieldtrips.

Daniels (1992) considers the educational value of immersion in place on fieldtrips to Venice using the notion of constructed knowledge rather than a spectator's view of place and Cosgrove (1989) emphasises that a sense of wonderment of place must be encapsulated in geography. Nairn (1998c) considers place in considerable depth in her work on fieldtrips from a feminist viewpoint. To some, fieldtrips tend to favour difference rather than sameness in place so those sited further away from the educational institutes are favoured over those nearby. For Goss (1993, 678) 'the structure of a fieldtrip combines the familiar with the different. The familiarity of students and staff in school mode, combines with the difference of a fieldtrip destination to achieve 'an exotic' experience within the security of familiar, spatial, cultural and temporal order'. Place is complex; it is not just a container in which a fieldtrip occurs. It can be thought of as being part of the belief system of geographers in contextualising a fieldtrip in a specific place, and thus demonstrating meaning. Place can also be evaluated as a narrative or event and part of metaphor.

Much of the literature on fieldtrips has focused on the attributes of fieldtrips rather than on the biographies of those who run fieldtrips (Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003; Kent and Gilbertson, 1997; Higgitt, 1996; Healey, et al., 2002). In this research, the attributes of fieldtrips that geographers have run are discussed but also geographers are given an opportunity to consciously reflect on their own practise. More detail of how information about these attributes was gleaned from discussions with New Zealand geographers will be considered in the following chapter on methodology.

1.5 Using a humanist lens – milieu and meaning

Published and unpublished material has been consulted to contribute to an understanding of milieu. Few studies have considered New Zealand geography textbooks nor has there been a review of government publications in relation to geography fieldtrips. Hammond's thesis did find that some official publications in relation to the institutionalisation of geography were more important than others (Hammond, 1992). The main studies to date on the history of geography as a discipline in New Zealand are those by Gorrie (1955), Johnston (1970), Johnston, (1984), Marcus (1987), McCaskill (1987), Hammond (1992), and Roche (1994, 1998b). The studies by Hammond, Marcus, and McCaskill consider a long time period in New Zealand geography, which is echoed in this thesis. Roche incorporates material on textbooks of geography, which is also considered in this thesis.

Moving from a consideration of literature on New Zealand to material on Britain, work has been published on British geography textbooks in a period, prior to that when oral accounts are accessible, by Ploszajska (1998) and she uses other written sources on fieldwork. Even though I have the benefit of oral accounts, by concentrating on the second half of the 20th century in New Zealand when the majority of geographers who ran field trips in that period are still alive, it is beneficial to explore geography textbooks used by the geographers in the project, and in some cases written by them over the period, for this conceptualisation of milieu.

Marcus (1987) comments directly on the 'field experience' of New Zealand geography. He considers field experience to be a strength of New Zealand geography and gives a considered account of his perceptions of the New Zealand field tradition. Such an account is rare in the literature on New Zealand geography. This thesis extends the knowledge base of the New Zealand geography academy on the fieldtrip experience, by also using oral sources. Currently there is a proposal for a large study of New Zealand geographers using oral interviewing (Roche, 2003; Mansvelt, 2003 and Pawson, 2003), which will have similarities with the work carried out in

Australia to record the practices and thoughts of Australian geographers (Stratford, 2001 and Hay 2003a) and the more ambitious international project by Buttimer (1983a, 1993). My research adds to the fledgling body of knowledge about the history and philosophy of geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand by focusing on the work of a group of geographers in the practice of fieldtrips.

This method of research is one that gives ascendancy to the responses of those involved with the running of New Zealand geography fieldtrips. Geographers, who take part in the study, are encouraged to tell their own stories, using as prompts, discussion points, and motifs, relating to the attributes of fieldtrips.

Fieldtrips are explored through the lens of the humanist approach, studying actions or narratives, understanding human endeavour, considering memories, or 'milieux', studying values or meaning, understanding social structures and taking a dynamic look at life change. These are derived from Buttimer's views of humanism and those of Hay, when he discusses using humanism in qualitative research (Buttimer, 1976; Hay, 2000). Hay's six characteristics of humanism are seen as a way of giving structure to a humanistic piece of research. This structure is outlined in Figure 1.3. The attributes of fieldtrips or motifs are shown on the horizontal axis and the characteristics of humanism are on the vertical axis. A series of elements has been developed on the matrix, which indicates the types of material that can be learnt from interviewing those who have run fieldtrips. This was used as the basis for developing the interview schedule, which is discussed further in Chapter Two. From the responses in these interviews, emerge the voices, and convictions, of those who organise, and execute, fieldtrips. Figure 1.3 gives a notion of how the attributes of fieldtrips were examined through the lens of humanistic characteristics.

This approach is supported by Buttimer's views on the importance of biographical accounts from those who create and are part of a community, culture, and discipline:

Should the authors of geography themselves not be the best sources of insight into relationships between thought and context into what might constitute a 'geographic sense' of reality and how in fact the discipline developed? I claimed that conventional methods of research, relying as they do on documentary evidence (i.e. already published works) could only yield an opaque, outsider view of history (Buttimer, 1983a, 8).

Although not all documentary material is published, much remains as letters, and notes for lectures, fieldtrips, and study guides. Only a very small portion of this survives in archives for later perusal by a researcher, The vast majority of this unpublished material is destroyed not long after its construction and so is not available for researchers who are trying to re-construct such events and thus understand the aspirations of a community.

To return to Figure 1.3, it is possible to see the next stage, whereby the meaning of geography and of fieldtrips for that participant become apparent. These are the responses to the elements in Figure 1.3 from interviews and they are shown in Figure 1.4. The fieldtrip attributes have now been 'collapsed' and are shown in relation to the meaning, metaphor, milieu, and the changes over time (dynamic nature) that are illuminated by these responses. This figure shows how responses to the interview schedule, which was based on the concepts introduced in Figure 1.3, are instrumental in understanding respondents' actions and values about fieldtrips and the wider influences that have affected how they run fieldtrips.

Figure 1.3 A humanistic method of interviewing respondents about fieldtrips

(Horizontal axis – attributes of fieldtrips; Vertical axis – characteristics of humanism)

	Finding out about place	Skills and topic taught	Underlying theory	Experts or interpreters	Mechanics	Socialisation
Studies actions or narratives 'metaphor'	Decisions about where to go on field trips	Types of skills and topics covered in field trips	Theories considered in running fieldtrips	Kind of expert or interpreter used	Day to day aspects of fieldtrips recorded	Organisation of students on fieldtrips
Understanding human endeavour or 'meaning'	Aspects of place to be discovered on fieldtrips	Reasons for skills and topics taught	Ways of helping students to understand theory	Considering why experts or interpreters are used	Appreciating the commonplace on fieldtrips	Ways of encouraging students to socialise on fieldtrips
Wider influences 'milieux' or memories	Influences on where to go on fieldtrips	How own experiences have affected the skills and topics taught on fieldtrips	Influences from own life on theories introduced on fieldtrips	Impacts of own life on use of experts or interpreters	Influences in own life in deciding on the day to day running of fieldtrips	Influences from own life, and wider society, on the types of socialisation initiated on fieldtrips
Studies of values and 'meaning'	Importance of place on fieldtrips	Importance placed on developing skills and exploring topics on fieldtrips	Importance of the application of theory on fieldtrips	Importance of using experts or interpreters on fieldtrips	Importance of the practical aspects of running fieldtrips	Importance of student socialisation on fieldtrips
Understanding social structure 'milieux' or memories	Influence of aspects of own institution and wider society on the places go to on fieldtrips	Influence of aspects of textbooks and/or the curriculum and/or journal articles and/or other social structures on the skills and topics explored on fieldtrips	Influences of textbooks and/or the curriculum and/or journal articles and/or other social structures on theories implemented on fieldtrips	Influences of institution and wider society on the use of experts or interpreters on fieldtrips	Influence of institution and wider society on the practical aspects of running fieldtrips	Influence of aspects of own institution and wider society on the socialisation on fieldtrips
Dynamic look at life change	Influences from changes in society, and own life on places used on fieldtrips	Influences from changes in society, and own life, on changes made in the skills and topics covered on fieldtrips	Influences from changes in society, and own life, on the theories introduced on fieldtrips	Influences from changes in society and own life on the use of experts or interpreters on fieldtrips	Influences from changes in society and own life on practical aspects of running fieldtrips	Influences from changes in society, and own life, on the types of socialisation advanced on fieldtrips

Figure 1.4 Responses summarised and linked to meaning, metaphor, milieux, and dynamism

Characteristics of humanism	Revelation of meaning, metaphor, milieu and dynamism
Studies actions	The metaphor is revealed as the attributes of fieldtrips important to geographers became evident.
Understand human endeavour	Further revelation of metaphor – the type of fieldtrip the geographer is satisfied with.
Wider influence - milieux	The geographer picks significant events from his or her life that he/she considers important for the running of fieldtrips.
Studies of values and 'meaning'	The respondent is delving deeper into what they consider significant for students to achieve on fieldtrips and so reveals the meaning of fieldtrips for him/her.
Understanding social structure	Other outside influences on the geographers' running of fieldtrips – more is revealed on milieux.
Dynamic look at life change	How geographers have changed their fieldtrips over time.

This thesis applies Eyles' position that respondents 'tell' what is significant in their stories by picking these aspects. As the geographers who took part in this project told their stories of fieldtrips they picked out items that they perceived to be significant (Eyles, 1985). The method is one that is contextual. It 'enclose(s) a 'pocket' of the world as it is found with its mixed assortments of being, including time and space' (Hägerstrand, 1984, 377). Hay (2000) discusses the advantages of interviewing for researchers who wish to take a grounded approach. He views researchers as immersing themselves in particular settings, institutions, or regional groupings of geographers that allow multiple viewpoints to emerge, be heard and acknowledged (Hay, 2000). In the same volume Hay gives reasons for interviewing which are also appropriate for this research. He views

interviews as filling a gap in knowledge when other methods are unable to bridge that gap. As individuals run fieldtrips and details of a fieldtrip are rarely written down there is a large gap in the academic community's knowledge of both the details of fieldtrips, and of the thinking behind them. Hay sees interviews as useful when complex behaviour and motivations are being investigated. As can be seen from Figure 1.3, and the discussion so far on fieldtrips, the running of fieldtrips has multitudinous facets to investigate. Finally he states:

When a method is required that shows respect for, and empowers those people who provide the data an interview is useful. In an interview the informant's view of the world should be valued and treated with respect. The interview may also give the informant cause to reflect on the experiences and the opportunity to find out more about the research project than if they were simply being observed or if they were completing a questionnaire (Hay, 2000, 52).

Buttimer (1983a) used an interview approach for discovering the history of geographers from their recollections and memories, as has Moss (2001). More recently Daniels and Nash (2004) and Withers (2006) consider these biographical approaches as a means of researching geography as an academic discipline. In this thesis, geographers had plenty of opportunity to reflect on their fieldtrip practice and on the reasons for these practices in the interviews, since the interview was structured so that participants had a chance to think over their own education and career, prior to discussing the meaning of geography for them, the actual details of the fieldtrips they ran, and other influences on the running of fieldtrips. The idea of the interviews was to hear stories that the geographers told of the fieldtrips that they have been involved with, and for me to consider common threads and differences that emerged between the responses of the geographers who participated in this research.

The ordering of questions in the interview moved from the small and concrete to the large and abstract. Early questions dealt with skills and topics taught, and moved to influences on the geographer – their memories, which may include textbooks they read, courses attended, or taught, and political and social events that have been important in their

lifetime. One other aspect included in the study was my own experiences of fieldtrips that I have been involved with geography learning and teaching over the years. These experiences helped to inform the attributes of fieldtrips that have been discussed above and engendered empathy with the participants in the interviews, with someone who had encountered the same sort of experiences. In putting myself into the thesis, I echoed the approaches of Eyles and Buttimer when using a humanist approach. Eyles (1985) includes a chapter on self-reflection of his own sense of place in *Senses of Place* and Buttimer (2001) started keeping a journal of her own values when challenged by students that she was unaware of her own 'taken-for-granted' values. Although I am aware that as Rose (1997) argues, we can never fully know our own positionality.

1.6 Conclusions

This study fills a gap in the knowledge of the academy of geography in New Zealand. These key questions form the basis of the research:

- Why are fieldtrips used in geography?
- How do fieldtrips fit with the theoretical understanding of geographers?
- What do geographers hope to achieve by practising fieldtrips?

Fieldtrips have been part of the taken-for-granted aspects of geography for over a century but little research work has been undertaken into why they are used extensively at least in New Zealand. Furthermore no one has examined fieldtrips via the narratives of those who led them.

My initial ideas focused around the general concept that fieldtrips are part of teaching in the academic discipline of geography and, as approaches to geography in both teaching and research have changed, so have fieldtrips. I began to realise that it was those who practised fieldtrips in New Zealand

who held the key to understanding this topic. These people were engaged in the study, and it was possible to ask them what they hoped to achieve for their students on fieldtrips. After an extensive literature search, both looking at work already done on fieldtrips and at the theoretical approaches used in human geography, I decided to adopt a humanist approach to gain an understanding of why and how geographers practise fieldtrips in New Zealand. Within this method a biographical approach was chosen whereby those who led fieldtrips constructed meaning from their experiences and the narratives of their fieldtrips to build an understanding of their practice.

The humanist approach chosen for this study reveals the milieu of the geographers in their world. It identifies their metaphor, the narratives of fieldtrips that they ran, or in some cases participated in, and from these discoveries the main purpose of the thesis emerged, the meaning of geography fieldtrips for geographers as both the participants and I reflected on this knowledge. Such discoveries aided in understanding why fieldtrips are used so extensively in geography. An appreciation was also gained of how this was associated with the geographers' own understandings of the subject and of why geographers used fieldtrips. As many geographers took part in the project it was possible to shape the overall understanding by studying the various stories told. To facilitate further understandings of the practice of fieldtrips the history and philosophy of fieldtrips in New Zealand were examined using published sources of material. With these findings and a grouping of ideas from geographers in both schools and universities around New Zealand who were invited to participate in the study, it was possible to come to some understandings of the nature and purpose of geography fieldtrips in New Zealand over time. More details of the methodology adopted follow in the next chapter.

Notes

1 The practice of geography refers to the habitual procedures of geography, and the practice of fieldtrips refers to the planning, organising, executing, and evaluation of fieldtrips.

2 A number of publications have been produced on the pedagogy of fieldtrips in a range of disciplines from science (Michie, 1998) and ecology (Fail, 1995) to geology (Kean and Enochs, 2001) and sociology (Mooney and Edwards, 2001). A great number of these publications deal with specific projects and are limited to one fieldtrip in one subject.

3 Currently (2006) there are discussions in progress at the Ministry of Education to develop a new Social Studies Curriculum with geography included in the senior levels. The draft Essence Statement and Achievement Objectives that have been developed from these discussions show virtually no change from the current geography syllabus (Centre 4, 2006).

4 Episteme is an expression devised by Foucault to express the idea of a system of thought. Such systems have changed over time from the Renaissance episteme of the 16th century to the modernist episteme of the 19th and 20th centuries. He viewed each episteme as having a discontinuous break from earlier epistemes and ways of knowing the world. The term episteme has been used rather than paradigm in this thesis as paradigm is considered to be confined to science whereas Foucault's episteme refers to a wider range of discourse. When referring to positivism the term paradigm is used as this is viewed as a scientific way of viewing the world.

5 Cook's Tour is a term, which is often used to describe a fieldtrip where students spend most of their time in a bus and cover large distances. A commentary is usually given by the lecturer or teacher describing features that can be observed. The name's origin came from Thomas Cook who was an early tourist operator in Britain, taking tours to the Continent in the 19th century and the founder of the Thomas Cook Travel Company.

6 There are a number of anniversary publications:

Anderson, A., Kearns, R. and Hosking, P. 1996: *Fifty years of geography at the University of Auckland 1946-1996*, Department of Geography Occasional Publication No.32, Auckland.

Holland, P., Kidd, H. and Welch, R. 1995: *From Mellor to Hocken: Fifty years of Geography at the University of Otago*, Department of Geography, University of Otago, Dunedin.

O'Riordan, T., Johnston, R., Slaymaker, O., Wilson, J.P., McKendry, I., Dunn, R., Overton, J. and Harris W. 1987: *Geography: A Celebration Proceedings of the geography Golden Jubilee Celebration, August 1987*, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.

7 Applied geography refers to a move by geographers to see their geography as more relevant to the world around them. This was partially prompted by an unfavourable comparison to economists in geographers' influence on organisations such as the World Bank (Steel, 1974).

8 This does make one reflect on the rich oral tradition of New Zealand amongst Maori, where 'everyone who is to be remembered is named. No name, no memory' (McKinnon et al., 1997, 19).

Chapter Two - methodology

2.1 Introduction

The discussion in this chapter is centred on how those who have run geographical fieldtrips in New Zealand were encouraged to reflect on their own practices, as a way of constructing knowledge about the practice of fieldtrips to find answers to the key questions:

- Why are fieldtrips used in geography?
- How do fieldtrips fit with the theoretical understandings of the geographers who run them?
- What do geographers hope to achieve in pedagogical by practising fieldtrips?

As the approach chosen to elucidate these meanings is based around a humanist epistemology, further informed by existential phenomenology, Section 2.2 considers how humanist geographers have constructed knowledge. This is followed in Section 2.3 by a more general discussion of the methods used by geographers who use grounded approaches to build understandings. Implications for the current study are noted. Sections 2.4 and 2.5 examine in more detail sources and methods used in this research. In Section 2.4 the contribution of textual material is considered and in Section 2.5 the way in which the oral information was obtained is discussed. In the following section an examination is made of the methods of analysis and the ways in which meanings about the practice of fieldtrips were discerned using the grounded research methodology. Finally, in Section 2.7, a summary is given of the methods used in this thesis and of how these link back to approaches to their research taken by other geographers.

2.2 Humanistic methodologies

Humanist geographers have sought to build up knowledge by consciously taking many small pieces of evidence and grouping these together to discover meaning, focusing all the time on human constructs. Knowledge is further formulated by considering these pieces of evidence in the context of wider events and objects that have become constructs to those influenced by these narratives. Humanist approaches suggest that everything that we know comes from our own consciousness. An associated philosophical approach the central tenet of which is the human subject's being in the world is existentialism. Existentialists believe that the way in which individuals create themselves is by building up knowledge from their own existence, from the facets of their own lives. These can be minute and particular facts from people's lives. It is only by considering these in a conscious way that ideas can be formulated about one's existence. Various aspects of these approaches form the basis for this study on the practice of fieldtrips.

Buttimer used a grounded approach in her humanist work, *The Practice of Geography* (Buttimer, 1983a). She modelled her work on the story telling of her own family in Ireland and stories of Lapland. Her approach included dialogue and discussions with notable geographers, who reflected on their own background and how this had informed their own practice of geography, how they had demonstrated this in their writings, the courses they had taught, and the steps in their career path. Buttimer intended to 'evoke appreciation for the uniqueness of each person as well as the diverse strands of similarity and context which make geography a complex and exciting venture' (Buttimer, 1983a, 23).

Buttimer experimented with in-depth biographical accounts by the geographers, reflecting on their own lives, and careers, to establish a story of their practice of geography. Working with Hägerstrand, the Swedish geographer whose work on diffusion and time geography are his most famous contributions to the academy of knowledge in geography, Buttimer

tried to construct a 'common denominator' among the authors, by imposing a way of making sense of the voices.¹ Enmeshing the accounts, she constructed the three-fold shifting nets of meaning, milieu, and metaphor to provide common denominators between the geographers who took part in their study. Employing a grounded approach, using the concepts that their participants revealed, they were able to build up knowledge of what their values and beliefs about the practice of geography were by reviewing memories, through working with Buttimer and Hagerstrand.

Tuan, now Professor Emeritus at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, considered that a humanistic geographer must have linguistic skills and be aware of nuances of language and the ambiguous meaning of key words, so that meanings can be understood. A probing approach, that penetrates into the unsaid, and the spoken, is required (Tuan, 1976). For a humanist to acquire understandings, and enhance the knowledge base, he or she must interpret human experience in its 'ambiguity, ambivalence and complexity' (Tuan, 1976). Tuan used his own understandings of readings and knowledge that he had amassed over his years as a scholar and took a philosophical approach to construction of the meaning of place for people. This formed the focus of the volume *Topophilia* (1974). Although Tuan's work lacked an empirical approach that included participants, which was the hallmark of some of Buttimer's work, it was steeped in fragments of evidence collated from Tuan's own experiences, which he used to compile his own meaning of place.

To obtain sufficient depth in penetrating the worlds of the participants, it is necessary to delve deep into their own lives (Buttimer, 1976). Buttimer views experience as a fluid continuum which can not to be separated into sections. To penetrate a person's psyche the researcher must work closely with the person and, by listening to his or her life story, the researcher will hear of experiences, and hopes, and fears. To do this a dialogue is created where the stories unfold. As the aim in humanism is for understanding, rather than prediction, the ability to listen to people's stories is imperative, if a wholeness is to be achieved (Buttimer, 1978). According to Buttimer (1983a) situations need to be created, where participants can reflect on the

significance of places, people, networks, events, and general intellectual milieux for their own creative work. Buttimer achieved this in her own work where she brought a number of geographers together as part of her study in the practice of geography and they reflected collectively on their own background through memories and told stories of narratives in their lives to elucidate their views and values (Buttimer, 1993). Others produced autobiographical essays after receiving written comments from students who had viewed interviews that they had had with Anne Buttimer, and which had been videotaped and played to groups of students. Contemplation was encouraged in these practices by allowing the participants time to reflect on their lives in relation to geography.

Ley and Samuels (1978) take a similar view that the approach must be inclusive and allow time for contemplation. It must use a method that maintains the richness and variety of experience. There should be chances for reflection, and interpretation, and understanding. Although Ley and Samuels (1978) emphasise the use of rich interviews, they also talk of including a variety of sources, such as archival material, literary works, governmental, and organisational documents, and even statistical data, as further informing material gleaned from interviews. This enriches the study of the milieux of the participants. Rowles (1978a) provides one of the fullest early accounts published in humanist geography. He undertook in-depth research with a small group of elderly people in the United States of America, immersing himself in their lifeworlds for three years, during which time two of the five elderly people that had worked with him, died. Rowles used a grounded approach and identified, from his work with the elderly people, four aspects of their life: 'action', 'orientation', 'feeling', and 'fantasy'. He used audiotapes in his conversations with these people. These were conversations, not interviews, and were unstructured. Rowles found that the tapes were not to be intrusive in the dialogues that he had with the elderly participants in his study and they were effective in allowing material to be examined carefully at a later date. Rowles felt that to record information from memory after an interview was a poor substitute, as material could be forgotten.

Harvey Perkins (1988a) used a variety of approaches in his humanistic work on residents' perceptions of growth in their area, a neighbourhood in America. He carried out 17 intensive interviews with residents and used documentary evidence so that he as a researcher could become familiar with the environment in which he was working, since this was not one in which he had lived before the research study was undertaken. He could construct understandings of unfamiliar surroundings for himself of using the milieux of these written sources as well as constructing meanings from the narratives in the lives of respondents that were discussed in the interviews. Such a mix of textual and oral sources is extremely useful in providing the researcher with understandings as participants construct their own meanings out of narratives in their lives and influences from their milieux. This is particularly useful when the researcher is working in an area, be this a place or a time period that is unfamiliar. A shortcoming of this approach is the tremendous amount of work entailed in the researcher attempting to fully immerse herself in such a place or time period.

Moss's work has brought this perspective into the 21st century, in her examination of autobiography, and the practice of geography (Moss, 2001). Rather as in Buttimer's *Practice* (1983a) a number of geographers were encouraged to write about narratives from their lives in geography and their own reflections on their lives in an autobiographical format, as a way of discovering and understanding their own métier and so helping to construct meaning for geography from the perspective of geographers at various stages in their careers. Eyles' work on place, *Senses of place*, (1985), commenced using an autobiographical account in an attempt to discover the meanings that lie beyond immediate recognition and so constructs meanings out of the facets and narratives in the places in which he immersed himself.

2.3 Grounded research

The proposed methodology for this thesis is grounded in the life experiences of people who run fieldtrips. To discover the meanings of the practice of geography fieldtrips it is necessary to engage those who run fieldtrips in a dialogue so that they can reflect on their own practices and so construct meanings. Although humanistic approaches do not totally preclude quantitative methods, it is the rich nature of qualitative research, where the written and spoken word provide the vividness of storytelling that is necessary if participants are to tell their own stories of fieldtrips and to reflect on the narratives that occur to construct their own meanings of fieldtrips to share with the researcher. Qualitative research is a set of interpretive practices, privileging no single methodology over any other with no distinct theory or paradigm that is its own (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). This is the strength of qualitative research - it is not constrained. Qualitative methodologies have many approaches that are committed to 'a naturalistic perspective, and to the interpretive understanding of human experience' (Nelson et al., 1992). They embrace a number of approaches ranging from postmodern, and feminist, to humanist. A grounded methodology focuses on the 'socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). This type of methodology privileges people and their actions, thoughts, and emotions, which is appropriate for the humanistic approach that is being taken in this research. It contrasts with a methodology based on general theories that 'emphasise[s] the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). This relies on the supposition that the human world can be reduced to mathematical, and precise measurements, which in turn results in an oversimplification of the world as only a relatively small number of attributes can be measured, and mathematically considered, in any given piece of research.

Eyles (1986) was an early proponent of a grounded method in research in human geography. He sees qualitative research as having its own attributes

rather than being a reaction against the inability of quantitative methods to solve the pressing issues of the era such as 'inequality, deprivation, and oppression' (Eyles, 1986). The importance of the association between grounded and qualitative research and the humanistic approach is noted by Winchester, 'much of the drive for qualitative research [coming] initially from humanistic geographers of the late 1970s focused geographers sharply on values, emotions, and intentions in the search to understand the meaning of human experience and human environments' (Winchester, 2000, 17). Humanist geographers have used qualitative research methods extensively (Buttimer, 1983a, 2001; Rowles, 1978a, 1978b; Eyles, 1985, 1989; Moss, 2001). Bailey White, and Pain (1999) acknowledge that there is increasing acceptance of qualitative approaches, provided that the research has theoretical sensitivity, and is well grounded in academic literature, and professional, and personal, experience.

This thesis is embedded in a humanist approach, where the goal is appreciation and understanding of the particular (Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). Research participants are asked what they are doing, and why they are doing it. This approach was informed by Bradshaw (2001) who recognised that a rich and interactive means of generating information about human life was achieved by talking with research participants. Inspiration was also derived from Wynn (2004) who reflected on how useful humanism is for understanding how human life differs from place to place. Further support for this *modus operandi* was provided by Bailey, White and Pain (1999) as they considered that everyday life could be comprehended by locating information in a broad historical setting. Such extensive issues are examined in this research in a dual manner, the testimony of participants in their own milieu, and wider readings of their published works, their own readings, journal articles, anniversary publications, and government documents.

The use of written and visual texts in geographical research has a long history but the privileging of reading to discover 'multiple meanings, ideologies, and interpretations' is a more recent phenomenon (Forbes, 2000, 123). Ploszajaska's (1998) study of fieldwork in English schools is

based on various texts. Written text was one of the only sources of information available to Ploszajaska for the period that she was studying, 1870 to 1944, as in most cases, the people who ran the fieldtrips had died by the time Ploszajaska was doing her study, although she did make contact with participants of fieldtrips that had taken place in the 1930s. She uses government documents to give information about benchmark decisions, in the delivery of geography as a school subject, in England. She charts the trends of mapping the local school area in the early years at school, using texts published by government inspectors, and reports of government committees to obtain a 'special knowledge of the country in which the school is situated' (Ploszajaska, 1998, 757). Ploszajaska's approach informs the reader about the background to fieldwork in the period 1870 to 1944 by charting narratives in the English education system during those years. I have used similar written texts, but of New Zealand origin, in this thesis to provide milieux for the academy and me of the period and to create greater understandings of the narratives from their own fieldtrips that the participants in the study discuss [see section 2.4 and Figure 2.1].

One of the texts that prompted this study is a New Zealand Government publication, New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) Achievement Standards, (2003). This made fieldwork mandatory for one achievement standard at each level of secondary school geography. Official publications are used, in this research, to chart trends in geography education in the period under study, in a similar way to those used by Ploszajaska, in her charting of central government decisions on how geography should be delivered at secondary school level. Another way in which texts were used by Ploszajaska and other writers, (e.g. Nash, (1996), Morgan, (2003), and Maddrell, (1996, 1998)) was to critically study school textbooks used in geography classes in English schools, to understand the 'values and norms current at the time of writing' (Maddrell, 1998, 83). Using these procedures, texts were set in the milieux of practitioners of geography at that time. Ploszajaska used geographical education journals and general education journals, written during the time under consideration, to discover information about fieldwork during her period of study. Practitioners of

teaching, inspectors, teachers, and members of geographic societies wrote the articles in these journals. They provided useful evidence of the practice of fieldtrips and geography education at the time they were written.

Interviews provide information on the milieu of the geographer, their geographical metaphors, the fieldtrips and the values they hope their students will gain. One of the most effective ways of gaining information from people is to get them to tell stories of incidents in their lives. This study privileges narratives, sequences of events that have a significance for the narrator of the story and for giving the researcher insights into the practice of fieldtrips (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). Narratives are stories that have a beginning, middle, and end as well as a logic that (at least) makes sense to the narrator (Denzin, 1989). Stories are ways in which people 'produce, present, and contextualise experience and personal knowledge' (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, 54). Autobiographical stories are about actual events that have happened in a person's life and they can also demonstrate the dynamic quality of that experience as stories of different events at different time periods unfold. Such stories are sometimes called life histories and they can be a more effective way of investigating events, influences, and thoughts of a person than more generalised accounts, which do not relate to specific events (Holloway and Jefferson, 1997). Life histories both produce information on a person's milieu and their own actions and feelings as individuals (Dunn, 2000). In this research, geographers tell their own stories about fieldtrips and an open ended approach has been devised but framed around the concepts shown in Figures 1.3 and 1.4 which link with the main motifs of humanism, and also allow the development of narrative from the responses of the geographers involved.

Schoenberger (1991) alluded to the benefit of story telling in contrast to the boredom element of filling out a questionnaire. Telling stories does afford the possibility of encouraging participants to think things through as a result of having a greater level of interest in the encounter (Schoenberger, 1991). A dialogue, of the type undertaken in qualitative research, allows the participant to engage with the researcher in a way that promotes more

interest than the somewhat repetitive action of filling in a questionnaire or responding to closed questions. Most people enjoy talking about themselves and sharing their experiences with others. If an encounter is enjoyable, it is usually more profitable than one which is boring and has little interest to the participants. This is more likely to occur when participants, in an interview situation, are totally directed by the researcher and do not have an opportunity to add their own flair, expertise, knowledge, and experience to the encounter. Dyck (1993) discusses how 'the sharing of common references and familiarity with culturally specific terms and practices' around the topic of her research, mothering, allowed Dyck as the interviewer, to respond to comments in a way that promoted the flow of conversation (Dyck, 1993, 54). Dyck achieved dialogue with the participants in her study, as the topic was one that both the interviewees, and the interviewer, had direct knowledge of, and it became a common starting point for shared dialogue.

A way of achieving successful grounded research, is to be constantly reflective. I frequently interrogated my findings and used a number of methods to do this, for example the research diary. I was aware of aspects such as the position and power relations between those interviewed and myself. Bailey, White and Pain, (1999) cite keeping a research diary to document the research encounter and to link between empirical findings and theoretical knowledge. In a similar way in this research, on the practice of fieldtrips, a reflective diary was completed after each interview, where the theoretical stance of the participant was noted, together with other details which had implications on the validity of the research process. Such aspects as positionality in the power relations of researcher and participants were recorded for reasons which are discussed below.

Awareness of power positions between participant and researcher were raised in Schoenberger's (1991) work on interviewing members of the corporate world. The participants in Schoenberger's study were people, who were used to being in power and control situations. There is a risk that such people will impose their agenda on an interview. Schoenberger was aware that she, as the researcher, did not want to impose military discipline on

the interview as this would compromise the flexibility and comprehensiveness that are the advantages of a qualitative methodology (Schoenberger, 1991). I aimed in my research for a collaborative dialogue that engaged the participant in working through the research problem. In this way the participant contributed to shaping the content of the discussion without controlling it.

Such reflexivity is crucial to qualitative research. This is discussed in recent literature. Bailey, White, and Pain (1999) consider that what one researcher produces will not be the same as what another researcher will produce, when faced with researching the same issue. To establish the rationale for their position, the researcher must discuss elements of their own biography. Plowman (1995) and England (1994) also provide insights into this issue considering reflexivity as self-critical, sympathetic introspection and self conscious analytical scrutiny of the self as researcher. In this thesis I was able to gain insights into my own experiences of fieldtrips as I learnt of different approaches used by others.

One element of reflexivity that Twyman, Morrison, and Sporton (1999) point out is how, during the research process, there are shifts from researcher as observer to researcher as observed. This idea of betweenness, between the world of the researched and the researcher's world is also commented on by England (1994). To maintain openness in an interview this betweenness is the area where participant and researcher converse and establish dialogue, which help to overcome differences. Shah (1999) sees that, in any meeting between people, there are power plays in operation, lead roles, supporting cast, and understudies. In many research studies, the researcher is concerned that the participants are empowered. Kindon (1995) and Doyle (1999) view the situation where a researcher's experiences are closely allied to their respondents as being beneficial for the production of insights by the researcher. In this situation the relationships are non-exploitive and open. I was also aware of the insider/outsider debate that a number of researchers mention. Twyman, Morrison, and Sporton (1999) are aware of being outsiders with cultures other than their own but

the antithetical is not necessarily true, they do not necessarily feel 'insiders' with their own culture.

Various means have been chosen by researchers to become accepted by another culture, such as learning another language by Watson (2004) and scatological references (Besio, 2003). I am aware of the dual nature of my status, as part of the secondary school geographical community, in my role as a geography teacher, and as 'outsider', in the academic community of geography lecturers. Such positioning provided insider knowledge and acceptance in numerous encounters throughout the research process, but awareness remained of the fluctuating nature of positionality, from situations where the participant was in a more powerful position to my own, to those where the reverse was true.

Whenever such situations were encountered, in this research, Rose's (1997) work was helpful in enabling me to consider the interview with a double reflexive gaze, inwards to the actual research, and outwards to the relationship of the researcher and the world. Everyday experiences, which include the nuances of the interview itself, can be connected to higher forces that operate in the wider world. Exploration of the background of the participant before, during, and after an interview, aids in this positioning of the encounter in a wider context. The blending of a humanist approach in this research, where wider milieux are considered, together with appreciation of work by feminists, such as Rose, into power issues, has provided a platform for participatory research, in this study, which has resulted in rich dialogue being acquired.

At times in interviews, openness is generated to such a degree that participants respond to questions with considerable emotion. Widdowfield (1999) has recognised this. She believes that researchers should articulate the potential influence of emotions on their research. She feels that emotions result in further information being revealed, so that openness and ability to recognise emotion and sustain the situation, leading to further information being revealed. Researchers have talked of their own emotional responses to research encounters, as well as recognising emotions that

participants may express. England (1994) felt such discomfort in her relationships with participants that she abandoned a project, and Widdowfield (2000) went through a kaleidoscope of emotions when researching in a 'no-go' council estate in West Newcastle, England, ranging from being angry and demoralised to being totally disillusioned. She eventually reflected on her own emotions, and realised that she must be careful not to focus on the physical undesirability of the environment, because if she did this, she ignored the positive, but less visible, sides of living. I encountered emotional responses in some of my interviews, which did often result in the participants opening up further. I never felt emotionally overwhelmed by the material I was receiving, or the attitudes that I was encountering, but was always alert to such possibilities.

None-the-less the autobiographical element of the process is important, and in itself can create strong emotions. Use of autobiography in research is worthy of further comment. Harrington uses a story from his own life in a particularly poignant manner. He is ever present in the text and interprets the actions around him. Harrington both reflects on the incident at the time and goes further and reflects on this a year later:

My journey begins in the dentist's chair. The nurse...and the doctor are [telling] funny stories about their kids, when in walks another dentist... 'I've got a good one,' he says cheerfully, and then he tells a racist joke. I can't recall the joke, only that it ends with a black man who is stupid. Dead silence. It's just us white folks in the room, but my dentist and his nurse know my wife, who is black, and they know my son and daughter, who are, as they describe themselves, tan and bright tan. How many racist jokes have I heard in my life? ...for the first time....I am struck with a deep sharp pain. I look at this man, with his paste face, pale hair and weak lips, and I think: This idiot is talking about my children (Harrington, 1992, 1).

Later, in fact a year later, Harrington reflects on the same incident:

What I discovered while waiting in the dentist's chair more than a year ago ... still remains the greatest insight I have to share: *The idiot was talking about my kids!* (Harrington, 1992, 447).

Harrington's work in sociology demonstrates the depth of emotion that can be captured in the autobiographic genre and also the intensity of an experience that leads to recollection of an incident a year later and an equally extreme reflection on the occasion. Although geographers have found biography and autobiography to be 'one of the most fruitful ways to access the process of building [the] discipline of [geography]' (Moss, 2001, 7), no such harrowing reflection, as Harrington's, appears in biographical works on the discipline. Harrington is considering the association of an incident in his own life to a belief held by many people in society based on prejudice and discrimination. When autobiography and biography in geography have been used to investigate the ways in which the academic discipline of geography has been built, intense emotions have not always been expressed (Buttimer, 1983b, 2001; Eyles, 1985, 2001). The responses, and reflections, recorded in these autobiographical works are measured and constrained. Feminist geographers have used autobiography to assess their own experiences in a slightly more intense manner than those exploring development of the discipline. Autobiographical work, specifically by females about fieldwork in geography, demonstrates an engagement of some intensity in the field (Katz, 1994; England, 1994; Gilbert, 1994). More recently a discourse on what is termed 'geography's emotional turn' is explored by Davidson, Bondi and Smith, (2005), demonstrating the increasing interest in emotion in the academic subject of geography. Although I had expected to take the measured approach akin to Buttimer and Eyles, I did encounter some emotion as participants recounted intense events that they had experienced on fieldtrips. Such revelations, demonstrated that trust had been established between the participants and me in these situations and this resulted in more detailed information being revealed in interviews.

A researcher should always strive to obtain clarity of meaning. She needs to set up situations where participants are honest, and also provide the participants with an opportunity to recall as much as possible, but she needs to be aware of people's time limitations (Bailey, 2000). The question of individual, or multiple interviewing, is an issue in such situations. Valentine (1999) acknowledges that individual interviews give participants

more freedom to express their own personal views than can occur when people are interviewed jointly. However, corroborating evidence and jogging another's memories, or throwing up themes for discussion, are advantages of interviewing two, or more participants, together. Problems can occur when tensions are exposed between those who are being interviewed in multiple interviewing situations. All except one interview in this thesis were individual. In one case two teachers requested that they were interviewed together. Advantages could be seen in the ability of one to remind the other of incidents, but fewer personal comments were made, and I noted, in my reflexive diary, that there were power differences between the two teachers, which created tensions and a lack of material, perhaps more controversial items, being revealed. One would tend to endorse the comments of the other, without really thinking out her views.

Varying numbers have been interviewed in recent qualitative geography research depending on the purposes of the research and the understandings sought. Herbert and Pritchard (2004) interviewed 31 participants in their research on tractor dealerships in Australia and this was considered to be large enough to provide adequate information to discuss geographies of power and control. Baxter and Eyles, (1997) applaud Valentine's (1993) methods of recruiting her respondents in her research on lesbian perceptions, and experiences of everyday spaces. She interviewed 40 people and, because of the sensitive nature of the material, she located her interviewees via other interviewees, by using initial contact points. Plowman, (1995) also used snowballing techniques to get participants for her research on single parents, whom she interviewed about housing choices. By using such methods of locating participants, it is possible to obtain access to what are, in fact, very small and specialised communities. Similar purposeful sampling of interviewees and snowballing techniques were used in this study, to locate individuals, who would be prepared to take part in the study. These individuals become narrators of stories.

The narrator of a story has a stock of knowledge about the practice of fieldtrips but how the story unfolds will depend on the role the respondent is taking at that time. They may talk about one fieldtrip that they participated

in as a student and another that they attended as a junior lecturer and a third that they organised and ran themselves. This phenomenon of talking with different voices has been termed 'shifting vessels' by Holstein and Gubrium (1995). They also acknowledge that, in the course of an interview, a respondent may construct knowledge 'for the very first time', by considering a situation from another perspective (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995, 67). If an interview is planned in such a way that the respondent has the scope to reflect on his or her experiences, as they tell their stories of fieldtrips, then knowledge will be constructed. This results in participants constructing their own understanding of fieldtrips, as the story develops, and this understanding is shared with the researcher, and provides insights into the practice of fieldtrips.

2.4 Understanding milieu

To enrich the study of the milieu of those who run and ran fieldtrips in New Zealand, a variety of published sources of material were used. These range from government documents, geography journals and anniversary publications of geography departments, to school textbooks, course booklets, and current geographers' own writings.

Government publications range from syllabus statements to statutes. Syllabus statements in geography, from the whole of the 20th century, were consulted to ascertain what was being taught in geography in New Zealand schools throughout this period. Examination prescriptions, and papers for the external examinations in geography in New Zealand, were perused to discover the areas that were assessed. Material was produced by the Department of Education in the "G" series to complement curriculum changes in the 1980s and these did have substantial amounts of material on the practice of fieldtrips.² Since the 1990s separate, internally assessed, papers have been part of the external qualification in geography, first with Unit Standards and then with NCEA. As previously noted, it was this latter

type of assessment that created initial interest in the topic of fieldtrips, as some fieldwork is required in one of the standards at each of the levels of secondary school geography.

Government statutes that were reviewed were either referred to by participants, or appeared likely to aid the researcher's understanding of the topic. Statutes on education, and other particulars, that impacted on the practice of fieldtrips were read. The 'Health and Safety Act' of 1992 was mentioned by participants as being crucial to the changes expected about safety on fieldtrips; this was further enhanced by the 'Crown Organisations Criminal Liability Act' of 2002. The 'Education Act' and 'Public Finance Act' of 1989 gave more autonomy to schools. The Commission of Education (1962) recommended abolishing the University of New Zealand and allowing the various Colleges, which had made up the university to establish as different universities. As a result of the reforms, that were implemented due to the *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand (1962)*, the University Grants Committee was set up to oversee not only the universities but also the setting of the bursary examination, the last examination in secondary school, which had previously been administered by the University of New Zealand.

Ploszajaska (1998) consulted educational and geographical journals in her work on fieldtrips in the United Kingdom, and the British journal, *Geography* was used in the initial stages of this research to determine possible sources of material on fieldtrips. This contained detailed accounts of fieldtrips practiced by schoolteachers from the early years of the 20th century. I had hoped that New Zealand geography journals and educational journals would provide similar rich material on fieldtrips in New Zealand. The *Education Gazette*, *New Zealand Geographer*, *New Zealand Record*, and *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, together with *Proceedings of the New Zealand Geographical Society Conferences*, were all consulted. Material was obtained on changing approaches to geography but very little direct information on fieldtrips, was discovered. A more profitable source of direct information on fieldtrips was found in the various anniversary publications published by some of the geography departments. Auckland, Otago, and

Canterbury universities all produced publications that contain some anecdotal accounts by former graduates, which frequently include material on fieldtrips (Anderson, Kearns, and Hosking, 1996; Holland, Kidd, and Welch, 1995; Macaulay, 1987). Saunders, (2003) wrote a more personal account of Massey University's Geography Department that did include a few anecdotes on fieldtrips. These sources proved of particular use in understanding how fieldtrips operated in the early years of geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand, much of which is too far back in time for oral testimony to cover.

Figure 2.1 summarises the chronological development of geography teaching in New Zealand linking fieldtrips, the main features of school teaching and the textbooks used in school together with government influences and a brief idea of what was being taught in the universities. It presents a lot of the information obtained from textual sources during the literature searches and added to the understanding of milieux and metaphors by providing background information on the development of geography teaching and actual examples of publications produced and attributes of fieldtrips to enhance the understanding of metaphors and milieux.

Textbooks that had been used in New Zealand schools were consulted to gain an understanding of the approaches used throughout the period that was being studied. Again very little direct information on fieldtrips was gleaned but an understanding of the changing theoretical approaches over the 20th century was furthered by this study of textbooks. A summary of these is given in Figure 2.1. These textbooks were varied, the first being British books such as Chisholm, (1889, 1891). Later New Zealand texts were produced, examples being Marshall (1912) and Jobberns (1930). Cumberland produced a host of regional texts in the 1950s (Cumberland 1950, and 1955) [see Figure 2.1]. By the 1960s systematic textbooks were being produced on geography and in these there was brief mention of farm fieldtrips (Mayhill and Bawden, 1966). Schools often referred to British books such as Barton (1985) to provide detailed material on the practice of

fieldtrips. The Hensman series of textbooks in the 1990s demonstrated the way forward for a vast number of New Zealand schoolteachers and again their approach has been informative for me, (Hensman, Hensman, and Coombe, 1990; Hensman, 1998). They contain a small amount of material directly on fieldtrips [see Figure 2.1].

Figure 2.1 Timeline of fieldtrips, government influences, teaching and trends in school and university departments in New Zealand

Date	Fieldtrips	School teaching	Textbooks	Government	Universities
1870s		Geog taught in some high schools and primary schools. Matriculation subject at university level		1877 Education Act	No Geography at Universities
1880s		As above			As above
1890s		As above			As above
1900s	Teachers encouraged in 1908 syllabus for primary schools to take pupils into local area but in fact few did	Very detailed geography syllabus for primary schools but few teachers had expertise to teach it	Extensive list of textbooks with 1908 syllabus – e.g. <i>Imperial geography for New Zealand schools</i> by Gregory (1906)	1908 Primary school syllabus mathematical geography emphasised. Links to trade and Empire	Geography taught as part of commerce at the universities (link to economics and trade)
1910s	Teachers encouraged in syllabus for primary schools to take pupils into local area but in fact few did	Geography taught in Teacher Training Colleges. Idea of racial superiority of whites underpinned determinism taught in schools.	As above plus a NZ text: Patrick Marshall's 1912 <i>Geography of New Zealand</i>	1919 Primary school syllabus still had mathematical geography but also determinism	Geography taught as part of commerce at Auckland University (link to economics and trade)
1920s	As above	As above	As above	1928 Primary school syllabus still had mathematical geography but also determinism	Geography taught in teachers' colleges.

Date	Fieldtrips	School teaching	Textbooks	Government	Universities
1930s	As above	As above	Jobberns' 1930 <i>Whitcombe's Regional Geography of New Zealand</i>	1937 Primary school syllabus still had mathematical geography but also determinism	Jobberns worked in University Geology Department at Canterbury - began geography department in 1937 at Canterbury. Links to UK Geography with arrival of Cumberland 1938.
1940s	Social Studies fieldtrips began with regional survey in 1940s. NZ Geographical Society established 1946 and local branch fieldtrips.	Dwindling of mathematical geography. Geography and History teachers in disarray over Social Studies.	No textbooks for Social Studies. 6 th edition of Jobberns' text from 1930 published in 1945. <i>Whitcombe's intermediate geography: for junior & middle forms</i> by Jobberns and Britton (1946).	1942 Thomas Report - very critical of geography in schools. End of geography at primary schools and first years of secondary. Social Studies introduced. 1945 School Certificate mainly regional geography.	Links to US Universities established with Jobberns visit to Sauer at Berkeley 1939 - 40. Cumberland started Auckland Department 1946. Regionalism very important at Auckland. 1946 geography established at Otago.
1950s	Dwindling of above fieldtrips.	Teaching very regional - not much else taught.	Regional texts published by Cumberland	School Certificate, University Entrance and Scholarship totally regional.	1950 Buchanan introduced politicised geography to Victoria on becoming Professor.

Date	Fieldtrips	School teaching	Textbooks	Government	Universities
1960s	<p>First farm fieldtrips mentioned in textbooks.</p> <p>Credit to be given in School Certificate Exam if candidates mention some field study.</p> <p>From 1966 some fieldwork in Bursary syllabus</p>	<p>Regional science taught to reflect new syllabus.</p> <p>More emphasis on map work to reflect new syllabus from 1965.</p>	<p>Jobberns and Macauley produced regional books but the Mayhill thematic text published in 1967: <i>New Zealand Geography</i> only one to reflect the new syllabus with focus on regional science. First textbook solely on mapwork published: <i>Map reading in geography</i> by Cumberland and Sparrow (1968).</p>	<p>After 1962 University entrance Exam and UE Scholarship Exam administered by University Grants Committee. 1965 New School certificate syllabus – more regional science. Bursary introduced 1966.</p>	<p>1960 Parry Report established University Grants Commission. Massey and Waikato Geography Departments established. 1962 Dissolution of University of New Zealand. Quantitative geography becoming important in universities. Physical/human geography divide 1962 Chair of Geography at Otago established.</p>
1970s	<p>Tentative beginning of fieldwork becoming more prevalent as mandatory for Bursary.</p>	<p>Specialised geography teachers at high school trained at university who have gone on fieldtrips as part of their university training</p>	<p>Mayhill's text first published 1966 remained the main text.</p> <p>1970 Geography Resource Centre established provided teacher guides to support new syllabi. Action publications commenced-thematic texts to support syllabus changes.</p>	<p>Mandatory fieldwork in University Bursary from 1974. Mention of scientific method in Bursary prescription.</p>	<p>Quantitative geography still important. Marxist geography begins.</p>

Date	Fieldtrips	School teaching	Textbooks	Government	Universities
1980s	Fieldwork mandatory for School Certificate, Sixth Form Certificate and Bursary and most teachers do some fieldwork throughout their Senior Geography classes.	Great enthusiasm amongst teachers for the new curriculum.	Regional texts used until new syllabus in 1986 e.g. <i>North American Studies</i> by Curham, McMurray, and Gavin. Book on skills: <i>Skills for social studies and geography</i> by Chittenden. GRC and Action publications continue. UK book on fieldwork used in NZ schools: <i>Fieldwork for geographers. Practical work for pupils</i> , Barton (1985).	Mandatory fieldwork as part of the new internal assessment component of School Certificate Geography from 1986. Mandatory fieldwork for both Sixth Form Certificate and Bursary.	Feminist geography and structural geography introduced.
1990s	Fieldwork consolidated. Many teachers now have standard fieldtrips that have been running for many years.	Teaching profession split into those who favour a continuation of the old qualifications and those in favour of the standard based assessment of unit standards	A number of books have been published by Hensman et al. for the 5th, 6 th and 7 th form syllabi: e.g. <i>New Zealand senior geography series natural processes, volcanic processes, fluvial processes, coastal processes</i> (1990) by Hensman et al GRC continues to produce material to support the syllabi and Action Publications continue until the end of the decade.	Unit Standards introduced in 1994/5 by NZQA as a standard based form of assessment.	Structural geography still practiced by many. Physical geography still quantitative and highly technical. Postmodernism increasingly important.

Date	Fieldtrips	School teaching	Textbooks	Government	Universities
2000s	Mandatory fieldwork in one of the achievement standards at each level: Levels 1, 2 and 3. Split between those teachers who feel they have more flexibility for fieldtrips with the Achievement Standards under NCEA and those who feel they are more constrained.	After initial resistance, teaching profession embraces the new NCEA qualifications. Schools begin to choose which parts of the syllabus (which achievement standards) to offer.	Hensman et al books republished to match the new Achievement Standards. Special skills books by Nausman for each level of the NCEA qualification: <i>My skills book</i> (2002).	A new method of standards based assessment (NCEA) replaces bursary, sixth form certificate and school certificate with Achievement Standards	Physical geography continues in the same way. In human geography social and critical geography become important as these aspects of geography often attract funding

A further source of material has been course booklets and course material produced by both university lecturers and, in some cases, teachers. This includes two main types of information. One type consisted of course handbooks, produced by university geography departments, that detail courses available to students. Second, both teachers and lecturers, produce handouts and booklets, to give to their students. On a few occasions, participants in this research project gave me examples of fieldtrip booklets that they had put together and used with their students. Another related source of material was information produced on the World Wide Web by individual university departments. Some of this was replications of material produced in the course handbooks; in addition, there was information on the staff in the departments and their interests. This information was very valuable for this research, as often lecturers would declare their approach to the subject on their own web page, which aided in my personal understanding of participants' meanings of geography. Associated with this, and useful for understanding a geographer's approach to the subject, were the writings of the lecturers in journals and books. These are valuable metaphors that illustrate geographers' understandings of geography in a visual manner and they were often referred to by the geographers who took

part in this study showing stages in their own progression through the subject.

Textual resources contributed, in some way, to all three strands of this research, meaning, milieu, and metaphor. They were most useful in providing an understanding of milieu for the academy and me, by placing the material obtained by oral testimony, in a wider historical context. Some information was obtained directly on the meanings of geography for geographers at the universities, although this was of a more limited nature. Published material by the university geographers themselves was informative in establishing the metaphors for those who practice geography at tertiary level in New Zealand. Metaphor is the concrete factor that provides the motifs and symbols of a geographer's teaching. These can be the books published, the attributes of fieldtrips run, and the journal articles published. Only two of the teachers had written books on geography, so this information was rarely available to provide an understanding of teachers' views of their discipline. Written accounts of fieldtrips that had been run were very sparse. However, this also endorsed the initial conceptualisation of this topic for research, namely to examine an area that was not documented in New Zealand, and so to gain an understanding of an area of the academic discipline that barely rates a mention in the literature on the development of geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand. Oral testimony was the second main area of information on the practice of fieldtrips and was used extensively as there was so little information available on this topic in the textual record.

2.5 Oral testimony

Early on in this research project, I realised that talking to geographers about fieldtrips would form a major part of the research, if an understanding of why, and how, fieldtrips are practiced in New Zealand was to be achieved. At the 2003 New Zealand Geographical Society Conference,

I gave a paper on some initial findings about the practice of fieldtrips in New Zealand (Stirling, 2003). Personal contacts were made at the conference, with at least one academic in every geography department in New Zealand, where geography degrees are awarded; these are the universities of Auckland, Waikato, Massey, Victoria, Canterbury, and Otago. All these lecturers agreed to be contacted, at a later stage, to talk about fieldtrips and to provide introductions to other lecturers in the departments, who would also be prepared to talk about fieldtrips,

Teachers attended the same conference, and all Board of Geography Teacher representatives for each region in the country were present. Contact was made with some of these geographers after the conference. They were aware of the proposed research and were agreeable to put me into contact with teachers, who practice fieldtrips. Thus snowballing techniques were used to recruit participants. Ethical approval had to be obtained from Massey University Ethical Committee before people were invited to take part in the research.

The type and number of participants had to be envisaged, prior to the application for ethical approval, together with a copy of the interview schedule to be used at the interviews. These aspects of the research project were informed by my readings about research undertaken by humanist geographers and by others who had used similar approaches of talking to people to gain an understanding of practices operating in the world (Buttimer, 1983a; Eyles 1985 and 1986; Moss, 2001). The number approached was informed by the opinion that a range of views should be obtained to inform a humanist approach (Bailey, White, and Pain, 1999; Bradshaw and Stratford, 2002). Encounters should be of high quality and should indicate, as representatively as possible, the attitudes and beliefs of the geographic community in New Zealand. It was decided that all universities in New Zealand should be covered in the research, as each had begun, and evolved, with very different experiences. To maintain the high quality of interviews, a limit of four or five interviews at each of the six universities were considered to be suitable. A similar number of teachers were interviewed to give the teaching community an equal hearing in the

study. For practical purposes of carrying out the interviews, the teachers were grouped together into three regions, two North Island, and one South Island, to complement the four North Island universities and two South Island universities.

The length of interviews varied between 45 minutes and two hours with most being about one and a quarter hours in duration. I was able to schedule the interviews at times when teachers and university lecturers were relatively free. At the end of term, or the very beginning of the school year, was a time suitable for teachers or within the university vacation for most of the lecturers.

Consideration was given, after each interview, in a reflective diary, to positionality in the interview. Power differences were observed, as was the depth of material that the participant shared (Bailey, White, and Pain, 1999). An examination was made as to whether participants did reflect on the significance of places, people, networks, events, and general intellectual milieux for their own practice of fieldwork (Buttimer, 1983a). Rich material was obtained from nearly all interviews and the original group of participants envisaged in the research appeared sufficient to gain an understanding of narratives, memories, and convictions, to build 'knowledge' integration (Buttimer, 2001). This process was aided by an interview schedule that has been informed by Buttimer's work (1983a) and sought to draw out participants to talk of their own background in the subject, how they practice it in their classes and fieldtrips, and what are their own perspectives on the subject and on fieldtrips.

Initially, it had been thought possible for participants to tell their stories of fieldtrips and that by listening carefully, I would be able to glean an understanding of the purpose, form, content, and delivery of fieldtrips. Early on in the conception of the research, an elderly geographer kindly agreed to be interviewed. Although he gave valuable material, the account was very much a chronological listing of fieldtrips, with which he had been involved. There was very little insight into why these fieldtrips had been run in the way he described, and little discussion of his episteme, or approach to the

subject, and to fieldtrips. Another aspect that was absent was the 'taken-for-granted' facet of fieldtrips.

Dyck (1989) in her study of women's daily lives in a Canadian suburb considers how 'everyday experiences and actions, are connected to wider social and economic processes ... what new issues might be addressed in the interpretation of the complex relationships between agency space and structure' (Dyck, 1989, 329). She is aware of the need to explore the women's own active agency in ordering their lives and how they order aspects of their work. To do this she contextualises the study, considering the women's actions and how these are embedded in their local context.

To comprehend these 'taken-for-granted' aspects, and to understand the rationale for running fieldtrips, an interview schedule was therefore devised [Appendix Two] to address the broad areas, of the geographers' beliefs about fieldtrips. The schedule also provided an avenue for considering their own memories, which helped to inform both the participant and me of influences from their education and own general intellectual background on the practice of their fieldtrips. Participants were also given the opportunity to share narratives on fieldtrips that they had run and so share experiences and stories of these occurrences. By using the schedule as a guide, when talking to those who have run fieldtrips, it was possible to appreciate and understand the particular, which was one of the aims of this humanist research on fieldtrips. Individuals' viewpoints were acknowledged and the research participants told me of how they run fieldtrips, and why they are doing it, as they had an opportunity to reflect on their practices themselves.

The participants were very welcoming; most interviews were held, either in the offices of lecturers, or in the resource rooms of schoolteachers in their own school. Initial contact was usually by electronic mail, which proved a most effective and rapid means of communication. I took a home-baked morning or afternoon tea to the interview to share with the participants. Kesby (2004) discusses how being part of an interview is hard work for all concerned, so refreshments are appreciated to keep up energy levels. To share food and drink is a way of recompensing the participants for the effort

and time that they are giving to the interview. It also has the added benefit of making the interview less formal, which in itself helps to create a feeling of trust and openness. I also took note of the type of dress that those who worked in the institution where I was conducting research normally wore, and endeavoured to wear similar clothes myself to create a feeling of ease and acceptance amongst those who were being interviewed. Burgess (2003) mentions being aware of what one wears as an interviewer, in her chapter on techniques of interviewing, to create a feeling of ease and acceptance. Each interview was taped, using a small battery operated tape recorder with a very strong, but unobtrusive microphone. The recorder being battery operated, and the microphone having the ability to pick up sound from afar, meant that I was quite flexible in where the interview was carried out in a room. This would range from being perched on the edge of a desk in some rooms to working around a small occasional table in others. Reflective diaries were written immediately after each interview, recording items such as positionality, and the main theories and concepts that emerged from the interview. The diaries provided a reference point for material that might have otherwise been overlooked. For instance one or two participants suggested other aspects that could be explored in the study; these were reflected upon by me and sometimes additional points would be added to the interview schedule and used in subsequent interviews.

2.6 Analysis

Tapes were transcribed and, together with the reflective diaries and publications of the participants, were used to gain an understanding of the practice of fieldtrips. This was done, initially, by concept mapping the interview, and other material, to gain an understanding of that person's convictions, memories, and of the narratives they gave about fieldtrips. Each transcription was analysed separately around themes that emerged from that person's responses. The understandings that I reached, after

considering individual responses and denoting common denominators and differences between these, are discussed in detail in Chapters Three to Six.

The main rationale, meanings, or belief about the practice of fieldtrips, given by participants, is that they operate fieldtrips in the same episteme as the one in which they teach and research. They told of their perspectives, experiences, hopes, and fears. The very open dialogue, created in the interviews, facilitated this. Aspects such as the sharing of food and the fact that I am an insider in the geography community, a characteristic which the participant and I shared in common, assisted in these conversations. I spent much of the time listening to the participants' unfolding stories, and I endeavoured not to interrupt the participant but to strive to indicate appreciation of what I was hearing by giving encouraging nods and glances. The events that participants unfolded, of actual fieldtrips that they had run, provided rich material for me. These details demonstrated how the participants ran fieldtrips and contributed to providing material for reflection, by the participants, on their own practice of fieldtrips. This would often spiral into more in-depth discussions, on how such narratives had come about, and what had actually caused these fieldtrips to be run in the way discussed. Participants would allude back to their own readings, or education, in order to understand, for themselves, the narratives that they were sharing with me.

The interview schedule was informed by others who had used a humanist approach, in particular Buttimer's ideas of how milieu and metaphor, and ideas of the Phoenix, Faust, and Narcissus, contributed to an understanding of meaning (Buttimer, 1990, 1993). It was also informed by my readings of New Zealand textual resources and my own experiences of fieldtrips as a geography teacher [Appendix One]. This helped participants to reflect on their own perspective concerning fieldtrips and this aided me in discovering what these approaches are. As participants talked about their own readings, research, and education, they were able to acknowledge how their milieux had influenced their approach to fieldtrips. Such ideas were usually articulated by focusing on aspects of how the epistemology that they follow, was marked. Gradually, as I studied the transcripts, reflective diaries, and

writings of the geographers who were interviewed, I began to see common denominators between some participants and to perceive differences that emerged. These focused around the meanings that geographers held about geography teaching and so this aspect of the research is given more emphasis in the analytical chapters than are metaphor and milieu which though not so prominent in the discourse do inform meaning. Although these are only veiled understandings as no one can be classified in a very constrained manner, as with all individuals, there are elements that have resemblances amongst groups of the participants.

These shared features focused around the epistemology that these geographers followed in their approach to geography in terms of their teachings, research, and the way they ran fieldtrips. These groupings, based around the epistemologies of the participants, and informed by the metaphors that these participants practise on fieldtrips, have established the basis for my analysis. This is informed by the humanist approach used, whereby the participants had a chance to reflect on their own milieux and so were able to articulate their own approaches to the practice of fieldtrips.

The structure of the interview schedule aided this reflection. In the first section the participant told of their educational background, their milieu, the second part began to probe what was the meaning of geography for the participant. In the third section, metaphors of individual fieldtrips were shared. The last section allowed the participant to reflect back on what influences there had been on different aspects of their practice of fieldtrips [Appendix Two]. This, in turn, assisted me in also noting approaches that participants followed, and I could then see common denominators between participants as I began to analyse the material collected. Buttner (1983a, 14) had commented on this: 'some common denominators of style can be observed among our authors'. These insights were further informed by the general readings that I undertook into the philosophical movements within geography, and thus I was able to discover how the approaches used by these geographers in the way they run fieldtrips, are in fact markers of various philosophies that have underpinned geography over the last half century. Some early understandings had been reached on the influence of

different philosophies on the practice of fieldtrips, in my initial ideas, after initial readings, which were re-produced in Chapter One in Figures 1.1 and 1.2. Some of these were validated in the light of further readings and discussions with participants; others, such as the placing of all school geography in a positivist episteme (see Figure 1.2) from the 1970s, were challenged. Once I had the opportunity to talk to geographers, and listen to them reflecting on their own practice of fieldtrips, and on how this blends with their philosophies of geography, I noted more variance in approaches than had initially been postulated.

Although the greater proportion of geographers are incorporated in a Faustian theme of structures and established ideas, a number of the geographers had altered their approach as they had read about, and been exposed to, new ideas and philosophies. Sometimes these had been wholly embraced, and the geographers have incorporated new approaches in their research and teachings, on other occasions geographers have used the new approaches simultaneously with older ones. Frequently geographers have incorporated aspects of new approaches in their work in a way which seemed more appropriate to that person, to build knowledge for themselves and their students. This can be viewed as the partial rising of a new Phoenix, after the geographers had reflected, Narcissian style, on the limitations of previous structures, or epistemes that had been followed.

In this thesis earlier approaches are considered as the milieu of that geographer, in the same way that their undergraduate training, or journals that they consult, are part of their milieux. Buttimer (1993) considers the dynamic in a person's life as a cyclical occurrence, whereby views and approaches are adopted as a new Phoenix is discovered and rises from the ashes of the old. Some do not fully adopt their new findings, and maintain an approach mainly informed by the original episteme that they worked in, but their milieu contains some of their new findings, from more recent publications that they have consulted, from wider social and political contexts operating in the world, and influences that they have imbibed. Others may work using a range of philosophical approaches at once but will usually favour a dominant approach. This element of dynamism was

approached in the analysis by placing geographers in the main episteme, in which they currently work, but acknowledging influences from earlier approaches, or current readings, that take a different epistemology. So there are shifts, adaptations, and nuances in the views of geographers, and these change as the geographers' own career moves on.

The result of these melded approaches was that there is a blending at the edges of all philosophical approaches to geography which has been noted by Graham, (2005). She attributes these changes to spatial and temporal circumstances that are in constant flux, often in response to the shortcomings of an approach and as a result geographers examine and re-examine strengths and weaknesses of various ways of doing research. No approach is wholly rigid, each has a core which defines it, and can be observed in the metaphors which crystallise the approaches. These vary from mapping to gathering statistics, and from understanding society to concentrating on matters of difference in society. They are discussed in more detail below in this section when considering how geographers were grouped in this thesis. All approaches have outer edges that overlap, some of those geographers whose main metaphors are mapping or understanding society use quantitative material as do the majority of those whose metaphor is gathering statistics. Another example of overlap occurs between those whose main metaphor is concentrating on matters of difference and some whose metaphor concentrates on gathering statistics but are prepared to also take account of difference.

Buttimer (1983a) saw the boundaries as relatively distinct entities and commented that:

Many practitioners saw the world as a set of maps, a mosaic of spatial or regional patterns, while at another time one looked for mechanisms underlying the spatial or functional organization of phenomena on the earth (Buttimer, 1983a, 14).

Nonetheless Buttimer went on to say that individual geographers cannot be identified unequivocally with any one of these global metaphors, most

scholars have moved among different modes of argument. In this thesis the participants would sometimes acknowledge some influences from another philosophical stance that they incorporated in their approaches to fieldtrips. As Crang (2005) discusses there are grey areas in any account that has sections organised into categories, codes, and segments. The categories identified in this thesis are not rigid. Those who practice as structuralists may still incorporate in their fieldtrips elements that they used themselves as students when attending fieldtrips that were primarily run using the general theorist approach or they may be influenced by readings of the deconstructivists in the ways in which they accommodate students on fieldtrips. Scott viewed the changing approaches in geography to be a reflection of how 'the concrete questions that society faces at any given historical moment tend also – in one way or another- to become burning questions and problems for practising social scientists' (Scott, 2000,19). He is of the opinion that although geographers, as do other social scientists, explore these changes in society, at any given point in time these differing episodes are not exclusive to one another. He views them as extending over several decades and inter-weaving taken place between the approaches.

Although credence is given to the view of overlapping philosophical approaches to geography, in this thesis, the approach has been one what Aitken (2005) terms sensitive generalisations. Aitken specifies that sensitive generalisations are not overgeneralisations or essentialisms but are a means of communicating more effectively with others the understandings reached. The categories that have been used in this thesis should be viewed in this way, they are not distinct entities there is overlap between them. Essentially understandings are reached by focusing on the main metaphors and meanings that participants discussed in the course of this study. Sometimes geographers would actually articulate an episteme such as deconstruction, but more often their main rationale for fieldtrips would be one of the markers of an episteme. Such structures are the Faustian themes that demonstrated established viewpoints. I formulated these around four main groupings which are discussed below.

A few geographers talked of how they wanted to find similarities, in a selected range of phenomenon, in the landscape, and see how these differed from those manifested in another area. This is one of the main attributes of the regional approach to geography, where geographers classify the world; similarities, usually of items of economic significance are noted and grouped together and mapped so that regions possessing similar characteristics are elucidated. As this was such an important belief for a small group of the participants, it informed much of their approach to the practice of fieldtrips, such as gathering information and then coming up with a theory or idea about the data later, thus using an inductive approach. These geographers were grouped together in the analysis. The common denominators that these participants expressed as their main rationale for fieldtrips are to teach their students ways of combining information so that regions could be demarcated on maps. This was the metaphor for these geographers. Ways of classifying the world are of fundamental importance to this group and I use the term *classifiers* to denote these geographers in the analysis that follows. They are studied together as a group in Chapter Three.

Another group of participants discussed how they use fieldtrips for their students to test hypotheses that they have been encouraged to develop, based on general theories that the lecturers, or teachers, have taught their students in lectures or classes. Their view of the world is that of believing that the observer is detached and distanced. It is possible to collect data from the world that the student gazes upon and to use this to validate theories about the world. Their metaphor on fieldtrips is to collect data. This is one of the markers of the positivist episteme, whereby statements about the theories are enshrined in direct, immediate, and empirically accessible experience of the world. I saw common denominators between this group of geographers who develop general theories to explain the world and grouped them together as *general theorists* and they are studied in Chapter Four.

A large group of participants talked of how they encourage students on fieldtrips to study underlying designs and beliefs, beneath the visible, empirically identifiable items, to gain an understanding of places visited on

fieldtrips. Some of these geographers also referred to their radical leanings, wanting to change the social and political fabric of the world. Many of these geographers acknowledged their own milieu as being placed in the period when Marxist ideas of capitalist constructs forming the basic structure of society, were very prevalent in geography. I was able to discern that these geographers had the commonality of believing that underlying structures in society are the means by which students should be taught to understand the world around them, and that this includes how students should operate on fieldtrips to construct meanings of social processes in the places that they are visiting. The metaphor that this group of geographers considered important on fieldtrips was constructing the meaning of place from structures in society. I use the name *structuralists* for them; they are discussed in Chapter Five.

The remaining geographers, who were interviewed, had the view that students should be given the opportunity to appreciate that nothing in the world has just one meaning. Everything is open to contradictions and multiple meanings. For every presence, there is an absence, and the aim, for students, is to resolve these binaries, and move between the physical and metaphysical worlds in all their encounters, including fieldtrips. Before, during, and after fieldtrips, students are encouraged by these geographers to critique their experiences; the lecturers do this themselves, often together with their students, to explore the layered meanings that emerge with such experiences. These geographers, as a group, reflect the views of the deconstructivists and the metaphor for their fieldtrips is one of difference, considering minorities in society. I term these geographers *deconstructivists* and they are considered together in Chapter Six.

Of particular note was the finding that *deconstructivists* are very concerned with the production of knowledge and have made explicit their views on the running of fieldtrips in the literature (Nast, 1994; Hume-Cook, and Kindon, 1998; Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003). Aspects of fieldtrips such as sleeping arrangements, taking account of gender and sexual differences, disability, and phobias are all aspects that these geographers and others of recent times have written about. Other geographers, those categorised here

as *classifiers, general theorists, and structuralists*, had often realised that aspects of difference amongst the student body needed to be addressed on fieldtrips but these convictions were taken-for-granted aspects of fieldtrips that were not usually formally acknowledged. Although this is beginning to be acknowledged in the literature by physical geographers who are primarily general theorists such as Scott et al., (2006). They discuss aspects such as providing advance warning of fieldwork to allow students to plan for both financial and time commitments, as well as stating learning objectives clearly and recognising the importance attached to housekeeping arrangements by some students.

Two decisions were made during the writing up of the discoveries found, and the understandings reached, to both aid the discussion and at the same time to maintain a flow in the narrative. All teachers were designated as female and all lecturers were designated as male when they were being referred to in Chapters Three to Six. The majority of teachers interviewed were female and the majority of lecturers interviewed were male. To maintain anonymity and to avoid cumbersome designations of interviewees, a system was devised which is elaborated in Appendix Three whereby each teacher and lecturer was allocated a number and a letter so as to make it simple to refer to them in the narrative and yet maintain anonymity for the participants.

2.7 Conclusions

The methodology devised, was based around the humanist approach that has been chosen for this research. Using this approach, I delved deeply into the lives of those who agreed to be part of this research project, and practice fieldtrips in New Zealand. Following in the tradition of Buttimer, in studying the practice of geography as an academic discipline, this research concerns itself with the participants, or actors, in the geographic world in New Zealand. The research strives to penetrate the psyche of these

geographers, and give them an opportunity to reflect on their own practice, to create understandings for them and, from this, for the academy and for me.

The approach considers the three-fold shifting nets of the practice of fieldtrips. These are convictions about: the subject as meaning; memories, the milieu; and narratives of fieldtrips, the metaphor. By studying these intersecting constructs new understandings of how and why fieldtrips are practised are created. Knowledge is constructed by the respondents and by me, from reflecting on these shifting expositions, giving new insights into the practice of fieldtrips in New Zealand. To fully understand the milieux it is necessary to look expansively into literature and documents that were current, during the time in which the participants have practised geography. In all this, there is a focus on the particular, the discrete although common denominators have been found, particularly in the approaches taken to fieldtrips. These tend to be located in the epistemes, in which the geographers operate, and this has formed a common thread, which has been used to separate the analysis into a consideration of groups of geographers. Each is based around the episteme in which they mainly operate for research, teaching, and fieldtrips and the metaphors of the ways in which fieldtrips are practised. I was always aware of the fluidity between these epistemes and how geographers can be influenced by elements and nuances from other epistemes that they have encountered.

My own status, as an insider in the geographical community, has been highly significant in being accepted into people's lives [Appendix One]. It opened up the gulf, the betweenness, which lies between researcher and participant. This was further enhanced by small practical efforts, such as providing food, dressing in a similar way to which people in that institute dressed, and attempting to be a 'good' listener, who did not intervene unnecessarily and gave quiet encouragement as a story unfolded. At times the participants did recount emotional experiences, which gives some indication of the level of ease they felt with me and the strength of the reminiscing of memories that may have lain dormant for a long time. At such times I endeavoured to be sympathetic.

The material that I received from participants was rich and forms the main basis of this thesis and the analysis that follows. Although written accounts of fieldtrips were limited, I used primary sources of material such as statutes and syllabus documents, textbooks and anniversary publications to aid in the understanding of the milieu, academic, social, and political, of those who participate and have participated in geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand.

The methodology is informed by the humanist concept of the importance of human beings in creating their own destinies, in this case the destinies of the geography fieldtrips. Some would reflect on the approach taken and, Phoenix-like a new way of approaching fieldtrips would arise. Melding the voices of those who engage in fieldtrips are the histories and literatures that inform the participants, of their own practice.

Notes

1 With Torsten Hägerstrand (Sweden), Anne Buttmer initiated an international dialogue project (1978-1988) *Geographers of Norden. Reflections on Career Experiences*, Lund University Press, Lund, Sweden.

2 The G Documents are:

G1 Organising and Teaching Geography Notes to assist Heads of Department and teachers Central Region Inspectorate Curriculum Development Division Department of Education Wellington 1978.

G2 Practical Studies Including Fieldwork in Form Seven Geography Teacher Resource Material, Department of Education Wellington 1979.

G3 Geography Field Studies Teacher Resource Material, Davidson Chris Department of Education 1981.

G4 Learning Activities Using Audio-Visual Materials Department of Education 1979.

G5 Planning School Certificate Geography Teacher Resource Material Department of Education 1979.

G6 Skills in Geography Forms 5-7 Teacher Resource Material Department of Education 1980.

G7 Assessment in Geography Teacher Resource Material Department of Education 1983.

G8 Teaching in Geography Units 1-15 Department of Education 1983.

G9 Planning a co-ordinated forms 5-7 Geography Programme Teacher Resource Material Department of Education 1985.

G10 Guidelines for Partial Internal Assessment of S.C. Geography Department of Education 1985.

Another document to aid in the implementation of the new syllabus that was developed by the NGCC was:

Phillips, B. 1980: *Working with behavioural objectives in fifth form geography*, Education Department University of Canterbury Research report No 80-81.

Chapter Three - geographers who classify the world (the early years)

3.1 Introduction

Geographers whose research and teachings are based on approaches that endeavour, in various ways, to classify the myriad of phenomena that occur in the world and their fieldtrips, termed the *classifiers*, are the focus of this chapter. This is the first of the chapters concerned with analysis of material gathered at the interviews and from other sources of information ranging from official publications on New Zealand education to contemporary textbooks and the anniversary publications of university geography departments. The ordering of these analytical chapters (Chapters Three to Six) is approximately chronological with the earlier period of geography being dealt with in Chapter Three and later periods in subsequent chapters. Of necessity this chapter is based largely on published material.

The first type of geography that was taught as an academic subject in the late 19th century in Britain was the 'capes and bays' geography. Named items of the coastline that were important to shipping were taught plus other notable features such as mountains and rivers. Shipping was crucial to the way in which Britain was connected to remote parts of her empire, the most remote being New Zealand and this type of geography developed into commercial geography with an emphasis on factual material that was useful for trade. Early academic geography was further fuelled by explorations in the 19th century into Africa and other parts of the globe that Europeans had not yet penetrated and early travel writing.

Discussion begins with the first years of geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand. Section 3.3 deals with mathematical geography, which is closely linked to aspects such as latitude and longitude and surveying and the creation of maps. Latitude and longitude were in turn

connected to navigation and the means used to explore the oceans of the world in search of territories to colonise, and extract resources from, in colonial times. Maps are a means of ordering information on a two dimensional surface and decisions have to be made as to which pieces of information will be transferred onto a map out of the vast amount of detail in the world. As few commercially produced maps were available at this time, part of instruction in geography was to create maps and much of this was done outside the classroom. These were some of the first fieldtrips. Physiography (physical geography) began to be taught in the late 19th century, and a general acceptance that any adequate understanding of this aspect of the world could only be understood by local study prompted fieldwork to be undertaken. Thus the study of mapping and physiography led to the first fieldtrips in New Zealand schools. This will be discussed further later in this chapter.

Section 3.4 considers the approach known as environmental determinism, which was an attempt to classify the world into regions delimited by physical characteristics of landform and climate. This theoretical perspective put too much emphasis on physical characteristics and not enough on the agency of people for some geographers, and the next section considers the approaches that took more autonomous note of people and the land. Such ways of considering geography include those of the French school of geography as promoted by Vidal de la Blache, which took an approach that studied how people used the landscape, and is sometimes termed possibilism and the Berkeley School under Carl Sauer which focused on cultural landscapes. These ontologies viewed people as having an active role in overcoming natural obstacles to existence in an area. Following this are sections which discuss theoretical perspectives which attempt to create analytical and/or descriptive order out of the chaos of the world; one is the areal differentiation approach popularised by Hartshorne (1939) which provided a basis for regional geography. Where information has been found to support these comments, reference to fieldtrips that used these ways of constructing knowledge are made.

This is followed by an analysis of contemporary writings from the time when the theoretical perspectives discussed earlier were at their zenith. It also uses material from interviews with geographers, who took part in this study and talked of using fieldwork approaches that classified findings about the world, either, when they were students themselves, or in their own teachings. Meanings related to fieldtrips, from either contemporary writings or those which emerged from the interviews as being important, are also discussed. Narratives or metaphors of these meanings that were reported in the contemporary literature, or emerged from the fieldtrips that the participants experienced, are described. The milieux that informed these meanings are also discussed. The last part of the chapter, examines, more generally, the various beliefs about fieldtrips that have emerged. These are considered in relation to the meanings, metaphors, and milieux of the *classifiers*.

3.2 Capes and bays, commercial geography and travel writing

Geography teaching began in New Zealand schools with the teaching of names from the holy land in the early missionary schools in the 1840s. This has been termed Scriptural Geography by Gorrie (1955). The first secular teaching was from 1853 using a book published by Archbishop of Dublin on history and geography of the world with occasional comparisons to New Zealand. Education in New Zealand was formalised and made compulsory under the 1877 Education Act. Textbooks, such as Park's *A School Primer of the Geography and History of Oceania for Young People* (1866), expanded a little further, into the country beyond the capes and bays, to include rivers and towns. Geography continued to be taught in schools until the turn of the 20th century with a 'capes and bays' type of encyclopaedic knowledge building approach. Children often learnt these names by rote, as there were few textbooks available. Fieldtrips did not feature in this period of the second half of the 19th century.

This approach was followed by the emergence of commercial geography, a type of geography designed to make children familiar with the great trading routes that linked New Zealand with the rest of the British Empire, of which it was part, and with the commodities that were traded. Other aspects of geography that emerged in connection with the interest in trade and empire were an interest in exploration, travel writing, and environmental determinism (Peet, 1985). Maddrell (1996, 1998) has discussed the dominance of patriotism and citizenship in the context of the textbooks, used in Britain, in the latter part of the 19th century and early 20th century. Radcliffe (1999) and Morgan (1999, 2003) argue that school geography has been implicated in nation building as it takes it into the common literature and educational teaching by expressing statements on geopolitics as 'common sense', normalising certain relationships, and making others invisible. New Zealand geography teaching was thus linked to informing children of the importance of the British Empire and New Zealand's place in the Empire in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Determinism will be dealt with in later sections of this thesis but commercial geography and exploration will be considered here. Geography began in a small way at New Zealand universities, being taught as a first year paper in courses of commerce. This placing of geography in the Department of Commerce is indicative of the strong link to trade at that time and empire in the latter years of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th century. As early as 1904 there was provision within the University of New Zealand regulations for the teaching of Physical and Commercial Geography (later Economic Geography) at Stage One level (first year level) in the Schools of Commerce (Anderson, Kearns, and Hosking, 1996).

Popular textbooks at this time were by George Chisholm, the *Handbook of Commercial Geography*, (1889) and *Britannic Confederation III, The Commerce of the British Empire* (1891). The second of these was reissued by Dudley Stamp, a prominent British geographer in the middle of 20th century, and was still being re-printed as late as 1966 as *Chisholm's Handbook of Commercial Geography / Entirely Rewritten by Dudley Stamp*,

and was used in some New Zealand schools until that time. The influence of commercial geography and its descendent, regional geography, was prominent until the 1980s in New Zealand schools.

The school syllabus in New Zealand in the early 20th century mentioned that children should be taught about the production of commercial items for trade within the Empire and the causes of the rise and importance of the British Empire (Department of Education, 1908). Such geography had its ways of classifying the world by focusing on different aspects of commercial activity, such as trade routes, industrial cities, the production of commodities that entered trade, and the types of physical landscape that were able to produce different products such as cotton, sugar, and tea that entered trade within the Empire. This geography was about promoting the concept of Empire to the general population. Initial expansion of the Empire had emerged from exploration.

An interest in exploration resulted in a separate aspect of geography emerging as an area of interest and study. Fieldtrips have links to these early explorations of the world in that they create a sense of discovery for students. New Zealand experienced strong influences from Britain in the 19th century, being part of the British Empire. The Royal Geographical Society was founded in 1830 in London, to promote exploration in various parts of the world. Promotion of exploration was achieved by financing explorers and subsequently receiving accounts of these explorations at meetings of the Society, which were published in the Society's journals from 1831.¹ New Zealand, although well known to its indigenous population, was being explored by Europeans at this time in order to discover its potential resources and to record these by survey and mapping. In a volume of the *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society* from 1857, there is a report by Turnbull Thomson, the Chief Surveyor of Otago, on his explorations of 1857, which included 1500 miles of difficult country, and he categorises the area into forest land, moss and swamp, agricultural and pastoral land, and barren land. It also talks of how 'in the last two years the purchase of country from the aborigines opened it up to civilization' (Thomson, 1857, 357).

Thomson was making maps of Otago, as well as classifying the land, as were many other surveyors in New Zealand and around the British Empire at this time. This was widely viewed as a necessary preliminary to colonisation. The ability to order on a map the seemingly endless array of features on the earth's surface is one of the first forms of classifying that is evident in the work of these early geographers. This will be considered in more detail in the next section on mathematical geography. Another feature of Thomson's account is what has been termed travel writing. Thomson's accounts of his explorations created interest in travelling to New Zealand. Accounts of exploration identified areas that were picked out to be visited and then written about. It also created a type of writing that promoted a pride in Empire and characteristically did this by stereotyping the inhabitants of the area, talking of features such as 'opening up to civilisation', which implied that the 'aborigines', in the extract quoted previously by Thomson, the indigenous inhabitants of New Zealand, the Maori, were viewed as 'uncivilised' (Thomson, 1857).

Exploration and mapping continued to be a dominant force in British geography in the period from 1830 to the early years of the 20th century with the Antarctic expeditions completing the exploration by Europeans of areas of the world that had not previously been traversed and mapped by them, though many areas had indigenous populations, who had detailed knowledge of their own surroundings. Geography in the 19th century in Britain was very much related to exploration and geographers felt that they had to go on expeditions to give themselves the necessary credentials to be accepted in the geographical world of the time. Mackinder climbed Mount Kenya for this reason in 1899. The association of exploration and expedition, and, later, field excursion and field trip, can be traced back to this early affiliation between geography, exploration, and mapping. Many of the early educationalists in New Zealand, such as Hogben, who is discussed in more detail below, had been educated in Britain and were aware of these associations.

3.3 Mathematical geography and physiography

The origins of mathematical geography in the English-speaking world, go back to the early 17th century at Oxford when a chair of astronomy was established to teach amongst other things 'the rules of navigation' (Withers and Mayhew, 2002). Concerns such as the determination of longitude at sea and compass variation continued to dominate in this period (Livingstone, 2003). Physiography began as a study in its own right in the last two decades of the 19th century in Britain, prompted partially by the publication of T.H. Huxley's *Physiography*, in 1877. Huxley used an inductive method of approaching this subject that remained prevalent until the second half of the 20th century. He talked of how aspects of the world such as 'rainfall and climate, glacial erosion and marine erosion' should be observed, 'facts collected, proceeding to classification, facts arranged and ending with induction, facts reasoned upon and laws deduced' (Huxley, 1877, 67). Some of these elements also found their way into the teaching of geography in New Zealand by a gentleman who had been born and educated in England, George Hogben.

George Hogben was appointed to lead the Department of Education in the country in 1899. He was a very advanced educational thinker, who oversaw the development of a new primary school syllabus for all subjects (Department of Education, 1908). A Cambridge graduate who had emigrated to New Zealand in 1881, Hogben had taught mathematics and science, had a great interest in seismology and physiography, and also wrote in French. He was instrumental in developing a school syllabus that produced children who were thinkers and were able to pursue their talents, whether these were academic or practical. He abhorred the amount of memory work in geography which used the 'capes and bays' approach and advocated that one solution to this problem was to teach a different aspect of the subject, namely surveying. His keenness to take students out of the classroom and experience the geography around them, draw maps, build models to show landforms, and take weather readings were all part of the practical and seemingly scientific approach to learning in which he believed.

This initiative marked the beginning of geography fieldtrips for children in New Zealand.

During the early 1900s various changes were made in school education to include a more practical component in many subjects. This was made more urgent as the School Attendance Act which had been passed in 1901, which was the most effective law to that date in attempts to introduce compulsory schooling to New Zealand.² Hogben believed that for pupils from a wider background than had hitherto been the case in New Zealand schools, it was important to create a syllabus that was attractive to both children with academic leanings and those interested in matters that were more practical. With his mathematical training to the fore, Hogben included a lot of practical mathematics in the geography syllabus of 1908 for primary schools. Children were to be taught 'elementary geographical notions' such as the length of shadows at noon, cardinal points, and phases of the moon and of high and low tide. There were other components of this syllabus that will be considered in the section on regional geography about knowledge of places in the Empire but a primary focus was on learning how to make maps. Map-making and map interpretation were important for exploration and for understanding the workings of the Empire and trade within the Empire.

To teach children how to make maps, teachers were encouraged, in the syllabus developed for the 1908 Education Act, to take children out to the playground or local area (Education Act, 1908). Children were to 'make maps or plans of the district from their own measurements increasing in exactness from year to year with a view to making them understand how maps are made' (Education Act, 1908, 25). A study of the physical environment was also prescribed in the same syllabus, in much the same way that Huxley had advocated with field study of the local, including observation and collection of facts, which led to the development of ideas that could be applied to the major physical features of the world such as the great rivers. Children were to note the effects of a shower of rain in the playground or on a road to help them study the action of rivers. This concept used the idea of modelling the action of a river by noting the small-

scale effect of small rivulets after rain. If the school was near the sea or an area of snow and ice, teachers were encouraged to take their pupils to observe these features. These were the first geography fieldtrips for children to be mentioned in New Zealand literature. The map-making had an empirical and practical approach, as promoted by Hogben for the whole educational syllabus. River, sea, snow, and ice action were to be observed and their features noted. Such ideas demonstrated the beginning of a search for rationality and science in geography. Emphasis was placed on the concept of observing features and accepting that these could be empirically mapped and understood. Ideas of transferring knowledge from a small rivulet formed in a playground to the action of actual rivers demonstrated the view that there was 'knowledge' and 'truth' to be grasped and that these were applicable in a range of situations. These concepts were based on theories put forward by Hutton (1795) and Lyell (1830) on landscape evolution and the processes that shape landforms.

These characteristics of geography teaching, surveying, map-making, exploration, physiography, and commercial geography, continued for those children who went on to secondary education. The University of New Zealand set the entrance examinations for university at this time (by the 1930s) and these were based around mathematical geography, physiography, and commercial geography with some regional geography (University of New Zealand, 1939). These approaches to geography at secondary school continued in to the post war era when regional geography began to take over as the major form of teaching. This shift was prompted by changes at university level, which will be considered in more depth under the section on regional geography.

3.4 Environmental Determinism

Aspects of mapping were important to the environmental determinists. They held the view that the world could be classified according to physical characteristics which explained why people carried out the activities that

they did in places on the earth. There was also a strong belief that features of the environment controlled people's development in this approach, and this had political overtones. It was contended that those in temperate areas of the world had greater ability to rule than those in tropical areas thus supporting the concept of colonisation by Europeans of areas in the tropical world. At school level in New Zealand environmental determinism was introduced in the 1919 syllabus and continued in the syllabi for use in primary school up to 1937. Ideas of determinism were developed from the strong influence of the environment in much scientific work of the 19th century including Darwin, (see Peet, 1985 for a discussion of Darwin's influence on determinism). The American, Ellen Churchill Semple, is often attributed with bringing determinism to the fore in geography, (Semple, 1903, 1911). Such ideas were widely held in general literature in the early years of the 20th century and were based on concepts of racial superiority. Another American, Ellsworth Huntington (1915, 1945), advanced theories on how the advance of civilisation was linked to climate and climate change, so promoting the idea of superior races.

Mackinder was a proponent of environmental determinism. He was interested in the interrelationships of man (sic) and the environment and attributed industrial, agricultural, racial, and historical features of communities, as he called them, to the underlying rock structures in his textbook, *Britain and the British Seas*, (1902). Griffith Taylor (1880-1963), another eminent geographer, was educated in Australia at Sydney Grammar School and The King's School, Parramatta, and his first degree was from the University of Sydney. He was also a proponent of environmental determinism. Powell (1979, 141) states that Griffiths Taylor is 'often remembered principally as one of the last modern exponents of environmental determinism'. Taylor's views on climatic limitations to the spread of European settlement and farming in South Australia unleashed huge criticism in Australia. Both men were attempting to give geography a scientific base with general theories formulated by inductive reasoning from example to general theory that would stand amongst the other natural sciences as they were studied at university at the time.

Environmental determinism did not feature strongly in the New Zealand school syllabus until 1919. In New Zealand, Marshall's book of 1912, *The Geography of New Zealand*, had some elements of determinism, although this has been argued by Roche (1994) to be limited. A book published a year later by Shrimpton and Hight (1913), *A Junior Geography of New Zealand and Australia*, had less of a deterministic focus but still advocated ideas of the environment determining the type of activities that people could carry out on the earth's surface. Such writing tended to be very general and at the scale of large regions or continents that did not readily convert to use in the field although a study of the physical environment, which caused the differences in human activity noted in determinism could be demonstrated in the field. In fact there is little evidence of fieldtrips in New Zealand being linked to the approach known as environmental determinism. It appears to have been rather an armchair pursuit for the geographers involved, and they relied on surveyors and mapmakers to provide the information on which they based their theories.

Peet, (1985) links environmental determinist theories back to Darwin's work on evolution and survival of those best adapted to their environment. He takes a Marxian view and sees this as justifying imperialism. Peet goes on to propose that regional geography is derived from environmental determinism. Aspects of regional geography (areal differentiation), which is considered below, do follow a similar format of discussing regions, and of always dealing with the physical environment, including climate and vegetation, before the human activities are enunciated. These take the position of following the more important physical landscape features portrayed as an extensive backcloth in most regional texts. Early moves to this approach could be seen in the work of the British geographer, Mackinder in the way he sought to link industry, agriculture, and even racial characteristics to the geography of an area (Mackinder, 1902). These views began to be challenged by the third decade of the 20th century.

3.5 The Berkeley School

The importance of environmental determinism began to wane after the First World War with the break up of European empires beginning and the hegemony of these nations being displaced. Its tenets, based on cause and effect principles of humans controlled by their environment, were questioned by even those who could be considered as proponents of environmental determinism such as Griffith Taylor in Australia and Halford Mackinder in Great Britain. Although, interestingly, this was the time (1919) when environmental determinism appeared in the New Zealand curriculum for primary schools. This is ongoing evidence of school geography following developments in university geography, with school textbooks being produced a few years after an approach had become accepted in university courses. In New Zealand this would have been mainly the indirect influence of geography at the British universities as geography at that time was only taught as a first year subject in the University of New Zealand in the form of commercial geography, located in Auckland University College.

Carl Sauer, an American geographer, who had been initially influenced by Ellen Churchill Semple when at the University of Chicago, promoted an alternative to the belief in the natural environment determining people's activities on the earth. In 1923 he moved to Berkeley and was influenced by anthropologists. He began to focus on the role of humans in creating their own cultures. Sauer developed these ideas and advanced the view of people as active agents in the creation of cultural landscapes. Sauer concentrated on change in the landscape and gave weight to the idea of culture being made up of humans able to create landscape change with ideas and inventions diffusing from one culture to another (Sauer, 1925). A much greater emphasis was placed on fieldwork by Sauer than had been the case with the environmental determinists to elucidate the finer details of landscape and cultural change. The type of geography that was taught by Sauer at Berkeley for half a century is now called the Berkeley School. Although Williams (2003) thought it had little influence on British geography because the immense influence of humans on the landscape for millennia,

rendered Sauer's views of human adaptation and modification of a landscape less pertinent, it was of a lot more relevance to the study of the relatively unscathed New Zealand landscape.

New Zealand geography received influences from British and American geographers during the 1930s and 1940s. British geography continued in a more strongly applied format. During the First and Second World Wars in Britain, Admiralty Handbooks that summarised material on various areas involved in the War were produced. Dudley Stamp's land use survey of the whole of Britain in the early in the 1930s and 1940s continued this applied and empirical focus of geography. Fox (1956) tried to implement a classification system similar to Dudley Stamp's in New Zealand to less effect as he did not receive the support from schools and universities that Stamp had done, in view of his role as a well known figure in British educational circles. New Zealand geography was also strongly influenced by two Americans, Carl Sauer and Richard Hartshorne. The next section deals with the influence of Carl Sauer on New Zealand geography, and the subsequent one concentrates on Hartshorne's influence. An important marker in the development of New Zealand geography occurs during the 1930s. The 1930s saw academic geography in New Zealand enter the university as a subject in its own right rather than its previous role as an adjunct of geology or commerce departments.

3.6 Emergence of Geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand

Sauer's work influenced George Jobberns, who was in 1937, the first appointee to establish a geography department that taught to degree level in New Zealand. This department was at Canterbury University College, which was part of the University of New Zealand at that time.³ Jobberns, a former pupil-teacher, worked at the Christchurch Teacher Training College as lecturer in physiography, where he taught trainee teachers aspects of

geography in the 1920s and the early 1930s. He led fieldtrips for the trainee teachers in which he demonstrated ideas on the physiography of the landscape. Jobberns' views on the concept of people both influencing, and being influenced by, the environment were formulating when he wrote the school texts, *Whitcombe's Regional Geography of New Zealand* (1930) and *Whitcombe's World Regional Geography* (1931) [see Figure 2.1]. His theories were further developed when he visited Berkeley in 1939 and met Carl Sauer resulting in considerable influence of the Berkeley School on Jobberns. Although these theoretical perspectives were derived from generally accepted ideas of regions being constructed around physical characteristics, there is evidence of geographers at the time (late 1930s) initiating a focus on the human activities undertaken in these regions. Such ideas followed on from early ideas on regional geography in Britain in the first decades of the 20th century, which included Mackinder's attempts at linking physical characteristics of a region to the activities of its people in the early 20th century (Mackinder, 1902).⁴ These ideas took a grander focus under Mackinder's successor as head of department at Oxford, Andrew Herbertson, and Osbert Howarth, who had studied under Mackinder at Oxford. They at first jointly, and then after Herbertson's death in 1915, solely under Howarth, published a six volume series, the *Oxford Survey of the British Empire* (1915).

Jobberns' influence on geography in New Zealand cannot be underestimated. He believed strongly that it was important to show the influence of how people both affect, and are effected by the environment, through taking students on fieldtrips. Jobberns criticised environmental determinism as it appeared in the syllabi of 1928 and 1937, although he acknowledged the vast classical training of Ellen Churchill Semple, one its main proponents (Jobberns, 1959). Jobberns enjoyed going out with his students on fieldtrips to see how people were using the land of the South Island, around Canterbury, where he taught, first at the Teacher Training College and later at the university. He felt that this type of geography was well demonstrated in the outdoors and termed it 'developing an eye for the country'. Early on, with the formation of the Canterbury Branch of the New Zealand Geographical Society, he took a fieldtrip to the Port Hills, which was

warmly reported as considering both physical features and how people used these features. Reference is made to quarries at Halswell, the problems of drainage; mention too was made of gullying and mud flow (Anon, 1946a). Jobberns' trip was in the 'man and land' tradition for which he became so famous, seeing how people used the physical environment around them and ushered in change to that landscape. Aspects of his own early training and teaching in physiography were also to the fore in his knowledge of, and appreciation of, landscape features and the emphasis he placed on looking at local examples to deduce more general applications of the river action and other physical processes observed on fieldtrips.

When appointing young lecturers, Jobberns successively chose two from the Berkeley School, Robert Bowman and Andrew Clark, and they had a strong influence in establishing at Canterbury a type of geography that linked people and the land in an interactional manner. People were no longer helpless bystanders in a predetermined scenario as proposed by the determinists. Jobberns' love of the outdoors was also influenced by his early training in geology, as was Sauer's. They had knowledge of the landforms that were part of the environment that they were studying and liked to take their students out on fieldtrips to see these landforms and the uses people were making of the land. Geography in universities from the late 1930s and until the late 1950s incorporated physical and human aspects, the physical being seen as intertwined with how people used the landscape. Consequently, university fieldtrips were not divided into human and physical components at this time. Jobberns appointed a young British geographer to the staff of the Canterbury University College, Kenneth Cumberland, who was later to promote a rather different approach to geography, areal differentiation.

3.7 Areal differentiation and regional geography

The environmental determinists had sought to make the subject into a science based on the theoretical perspective that there were causal relationships between the environment and how people used it. In contrast to this were geographers, such as those from the Berkeley School, where more emphasis was placed on culture and how people shaped the land to their own ends. There were those who sought to give geography more credibility amongst others in the universities, and outside the geographical academy of scholars, and who thought that a more science based study would aid this. Although the extremes of the environmental determinists were abhorred by some, a new theoretical perspective of geography emerged, regional geography, where the world was split into areas based on some of the identifiable characteristics that distinguished each region. The divisions were based on the physical landscape or on some form of economic activity such as the coalfields, or the iron and steel manufacturing areas. Again the world was classified and mapped. Emphasis was placed on where things were located on the earth's surface and this saw the development of geographers considering their subject as a spatial science. This aspect was developed by the approach to geography that followed, namely positivism which is discussed in the next chapter.

It was Hartshorne who most forcefully put forward the view that geography studied location, the distribution of features on the earth's surface and how these features related to each other to form regions (Hartshorne, 1939, 1959). He called this study areal differentiation, and it was based on seeing areas of the world as idiographic entities. In fact regional geography had been taught since the beginning of the 20th century. The difference between the geographers of the 1940s and 1950s and those who had gone before was a greater emphasis on the economic, and what have later been termed other 'adjectival geographies' including population, settlement, urban resources, marketing, recreation, agricultural, mineral production, transport, soils, animal, and medical (Johnston and Sidaway, 2004).

Hartshorne had traced back, the various ways in which geography had been studied in the 19th century, and concluded that a blending of a scientific approach which sought rationalisation and order could be incorporated with localised studies, by picking out certain attributes of the landscape, both human and physical that showed causal relationships between them. By doing this, regions where similar relationships were found could be identified (Hartshorne, 1939). Hartshorne saw mapping as crucial to identifying and showing these causal relationships. Fieldwork had to be undertaken to be able to identify features to be put on the maps and was thus promoted by this theoretical perspective.

The close link between regional geography and mapping allowed boundaries of regions to be drawn on maps. Fieldwork was important in this both for the geographers who were teaching regional geography and for their students. Murray McCaskill, a graduate of, and young lecturer at, Canterbury University College, who went on to be the foundation geography professor at Flinders University, noted the links:

The first and foremost aid is the map. The pupil should be able to see through the map to the place of earth it represents. He best learns to do this through mere practice in making for himself maps of a portion of the earth's surface that he can see; hence the importance of mapping the local area from direct observations (McCaskill, 1948).

In New Zealand the greatest proponent of regional geography was Kenneth Cumberland. Initially, Cumberland had been influenced by both the Berkeley School and applied geography as espoused by Dudley Stamp in Britain. He had worked with one of the early visitors to Canterbury from North America, Andrew Clark, and toured New Zealand with Clark when he was gathering material for his ground breaking monograph *The Invasion of New Zealand by People, Plants and Animals: the South Island* (Clark, 1949). This tour made a lasting impression on Cumberland and he established a strong movement in New Zealand to continue work that he had already begun investigating, namely the soil erosion problems that were manifesting themselves in the country at that time (Cumberland, 1943). Information from the United States of America on soil erosion was of

importance in these investigations. But an even stronger influence on Cumberland was the work of Hartshorne and his work on 'areal differentiation' (Hartshorne, 1939). Cumberland's early publications on soil erosion adopted a regional perspective (Cumberland, 1944a, 1944b, 1944c). These works represent a combination of the applied geography that Cumberland had encountered as an undergraduate in Britain and the strong regional focus of Hartshorne.

Cumberland left Canterbury in 1946 to found the geography department at Auckland University College. He also encouraged the adoption of regionalism in the New Zealand geography syllabus at secondary school level. Tweedie, who graduated in 1948, talks of how the new graduates of the late 1940s were to be Cumberland's 'shock troops' to establish the teaching of areal differentiation in New Zealand schools (Tweedie, 1995). The 1949 School Certificate had a strong element of regionalism in it and, by 1953, the School Certificate Syllabus was totally regional in content and it continued in this manner until 1966.⁵ Cumberland wrote numerous regional texts from the 1950s until the 1970s (Cumberland and Pownall, 1950; Cumberland and Whitelaw, 1970). Regional geography dominated New Zealand geography as it was taught at school level throughout the late 1940s, 1950s and into the 1960s (Department of Education, 1949, 1953, 1963).

3.8 Regional geography in New Zealand from the 1940s to the 1960s

The 1940s was also a time of radical change for the fortunes of geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand schools. The Thomas Report of 1942 changed the nature of education in New Zealand. Prior to this education at post-primary level had been elitist, selective, and of either a very academic nature or in some cases of a technical nature with the advent of the new technical schools in the 1920s. As a result of the

recommendations of the Thomas Report, this was transformed into a post primary education for all, with more general subjects in the lower years of the secondary school such as general science and social studies.

This latter development was what caused considerable disquiet amongst geographers, as no longer were geography and history taught as separate subjects at this level, they were subsumed into the more general subject of social studies. Hewland (1947, 87) suggests that this move may have been: 'because of old texts against environmentalism and the appearance of regionalism'. Jobberns, (1945), and Cumberland, (1946) both spoke out against the loss of geography in the primary school and junior years of the secondary school. They acknowledged that the new subject of social studies was to teach children about aspects of society but felt this was best understood by careful reference to the physical characteristics of the environment in which a society existed which would best be served by continuing to teach geography. Others within the geographic community realised that geography was alienating students from the discipline. Garnier was one of these geographers. He had been on the staff at the University College Auckland and later at Otago. He wrote of the need in geography for 'more emphasis on relief and soils in relation to man' (Garnier, 1944, 14). He felt that human geography was the best type of school geography at least up to matriculation, and a greater emphasis should be placed on New Zealand and the Pacific in a regional manner (Garnier, 1944).

To gather information for the division of the land into regions, extensive fieldwork was necessary. Some of the early fieldtrips, noted in the literature in New Zealand at school level, were combined history and geography fieldtrips or social studies fieldtrips looking at the development of regions. Two were regional surveys, rather of the type that had been reported in the British literature in the 1920s and were examples of the type of study that had been promoted in the Thomas Report as a more suitable type of geography for children to undertake than the mathematical and regional geography that was being taught. Rongotai College, Auckland reported on a regional survey of the local area that included a survey of 'a random sample of households' and a study of the history and industry of the area that boys

at the College had undertaken (Marcus, 1944, 105-06); and Wyndham District High School in Southland also reported on a regional survey in their area (Stent, 1944). Two years later a 'History and Geography' trip was reported (though by this time Social Studies would have been in place) from a local primary school in New Lynn to an industrial area, finding established industry, looking at how 'growing families find employment' and a visit to a textile factory (Anon, 1946b, 152).⁶ Again this was very much a look at the economic development of a region, rather in the mould of the geography taught earlier in the century focusing on trade. Further development of fieldtrips at school level took place during the 1950s and 1960s and this will be examined in more detail later in this chapter.

Regional geography maintained its ascendancy in university departments from the 1940s to 1960s. Auckland, was dominated by the regional approach, 'the undergraduate papers listed in the Auckland calendar remain[ed] almost unchanged for this period' (1946 to 1961), (Anderson, Kearns and Hosking, 1996, 16); but this did not mean that only regional geography was taught: other papers in the department were taught on physical geography and map work but most papers listed had a regional approach. Cumberland (1946) had laid the foundation of this approach, based on the work of Hartshorne (1939) in his inaugural address at Auckland.

What of the other departments in New Zealand in the 1950s? George Jobberns was head of geography at Canterbury University College from 1937 until his retirement in 1960. Under his leadership, geography took on an approach where both the physical and human aspects of the subject were blended together in his focus on people and land following the manner of the Berkeley School.

Otago Geography Department, from its inception in 1946, taught regional geography, and was strong on the philosophy of geography and according to one of the ex-undergraduates, determinism, and regional geography (Jackson, 1995). In the late 1940s and the 1950s there was an emphasis in the fieldtrips at Otago on surveying and mapping. The lack of equipment is

much commented upon by those who were part of the Department in those early years and the lack of large scale maps of New Zealand prompted map-making, although partial coverage of New Zealand at a one inch to the mile scale had been made during the Second World War (Holland, Kidd and Welch, 1995). Alan Tweedie reports that in the early years under Garnier (1946 to 1950) they did not follow fully Cumberland's doctrine on regionalism, and 'were stimulated by a modicum of heretical thinking' on climatology and physical geography (Tweedie, 1995, 12). Lister, who arrived in 1951, had worked with Cumberland at Auckland and previously at the University of London, strongly put forward the regional view, but by 1965 he was critical of the way in which regional geography had been implemented in many New Zealand secondary schools. He said that schools studied too many regions and that 'the valuable element in regional study is basic field observations', which had been the practice in Otago for the past two decades, had been lost (Lister, 1965, 13-14).

Geography at Victoria, the only other department established at this time, was, according to Emeritus Professor Harvey Franklin, an assemblage of people; a doctrine was never espoused. He went on to talk of the department as a maverick. 'We have stuck to our guns ... It is true we are unbranded, we have never associated with many of the fashionable, and sometimes fleeting branches of geography' (Franklin and Winchester, 1993, 6). He says the main emphases had been regional, cartography, and physical geography; but this was regional with a substantial difference to the Cumberland version based on the notion of areal differentiation and the causal association of features in a region. Under Buchanan, who was appointed to the Chair of Geography at Victoria in 1953, the Department moved to a focus that had an economic, political, and often a left wing, politicised agenda. Buchanan had come to Victoria from Britain, and had also worked in Africa. He continued to research and teach about places distant from New Zealand, mainly Asia (1966, 1968). His approach was what Ray Watters (1999) has termed, 'humanist radical' geography, where he sought for equality in how the earth's resources are distributed (Buchanan, 1964, and 1972). Buchanan's approach was overlain by a strong economic and political focus, which had begun with his training and

early professional life in Britain. He had come to New Zealand from a position at the London School of Economics, which was one of the most revolutionary universities in Britain in the post war period. Buchanan's radical streak did not endear him to Cumberland who was trying to establish acceptance of geography as a science based study of the earth using areal differentiation as the approach.

In 1960, on the recommendation of the Commission of Education the University of Otago and the University of New Zealand with its separate colleges of Auckland, Canterbury, and Victoria were disestablished and the colleges became autonomous universities. Massey University was established. It had been a college of Victoria since 1926. Waikato University was inaugurated in 1965; it had been an outpost of the Auckland College. Both developed their own characteristic geography. Massey followed the regional trend in the 1960s under Keith Thomson, with a blend that was very much influenced by regional science, which linked economics to the discipline but maintained a spatial focus (Johnston et al., 2000). Aspects such as transport geography and population geography were foci of this approach. Three of the early lecturers were amongst the last of the generalists, teaching both physical and human geography papers (Saunders, 2003). Physical geography still had a descriptive character under Saunders and was seen as closely linked to how people used the land. Fieldtrips had been introduced by Saunders in 1960 and were a regular feature by the mid 1960s with a number of day and half-day trips at Stage One (first year) and a five-day trip at second year level introduced in 1963 by the Head of Department, Keith Thomson, with a blending of human and physical aspects. Waikato began as a branch of Auckland University College and the teaching of geography was undertaken by two geographers, the late Professor Dame Evelyn Stokes, who taught all the human geography and Michael Selby who taught all the physical geography. The approach taken by Evelyn Stokes had a strong focus on culture and there was pure physical geography from Selby, who later moved into a completely separate earth sciences department. Thus fieldtrips were split into human and physical at Waikato from its inception.

Another momentous moment, in the beginnings of geography as a discipline, was the first geography conference held in New Zealand by the New Zealand Geographical Society, which took place in Auckland in August 1955. This was 10 years after the founding of the New Zealand Geographical Society. The opening address was by Cumberland, who gave a controversial address, very much promoting orthodox regionalism and stridently against the 'false and misleading tenets of environmentalism' (Cumberland, 1955, 1). This was mainly a criticism of Buchanan and the type of geography that he was promoting at Victoria. Cumberland considered that Buchanan was undermining the strenuous efforts that were being made under the approach of areal differentiation to promote the subject as a spatial science and so gain credibility in the wider scientific world. The majority of the papers in the proceedings were regional in character, as one would expect at a conference instigated by Cumberland; there were a number of papers by teachers on educational matters including some mention of fieldtrips that were beginning to be run at school level. University fieldtrips were established by the 1950s in all university departments, which gave graduates who went on to be teachers the experience of attending fieldtrips. The next section looks in detail at fieldtrips run by the *classifiers*.

3.9 Meanings

This chapter, on the *classifiers*, primarily regionalists, is a little different from subsequent chapters where meanings are derived from understandings gained from interviews with practicing geographers. Only a handful of participants, had knowledge of fieldtrips from this early period, or were still running fieldtrips in a similar manner to those run in the period up to the 1960s and based on a regionalist approach to geography. Material from interviews with these geographers has been analysed to discover the main meanings about the practice of fieldtrips. Each meaning is considered, together with narratives of fieldtrips, the metaphors, and the memories or

milieux, which have influenced the meanings. As with the other analytical chapters that follow, meanings about fieldtrips are ordered by the way one meaning informs another. Printed material on geography fieldtrips in New Zealand from publications such as, the *New Zealand Geographer*, the *New Zealand Geographical Society Record of the Proceedings of the Society and its Branches*, the proceedings of the various New Zealand Geographical Society conferences of the period and a number of anniversary publications from the university departments, have also been used to further expand the understanding.

Only four participants' dominant belief about geography still resides amongst the main tenets of a geography that aims to classify the world. Although this is a small group some important insights have been gleaned from them. Their theoretical perspective to teaching and lecturing in geography was regionalism. Some flavour from Jobberns' view of geography permeates this approach with its concentration on the causal relationships between people and land, which in turn led to a strong emphasis on economic matters such as transport networks, energy production, industry, and farming. These four participants, one lecturer and three teachers, all attended Canterbury University as undergraduates, which reflect Canterbury's position as the oldest geography department in New Zealand. They have all been strongly influenced by regionalism and the Jobberns' view, to such an extent, that they still view that approach to geography as their main rationale in their teachings and the way they practice fieldtrips. Four main meanings were identified from interviews with these geographers and from readings of material about fieldtrips that were undertaken in New Zealand in the 1950s and will be examined in detail:

- People and the land studied on fieldtrips
- Inductive method as the dominant approach on fieldtrips
- Mapping and sketching on fieldtrips
- Showing contrast on fieldtrips

3.9.1 People and the land studied

The *classifiers* see a strong relationship between people and the land, which they consider can be demonstrated effectively to students on fieldtrips. Lecturer A1 and Teacher A1 mentioned Jobberns' classic phrase, 'developing an eye for the country' and this is what they have strived to teach their students to do on fieldtrips. Teacher A1 talked of how 'the Jobberns' view was that fieldtrips were integral to looking at the country and people working the country' (Teacher A1). The sole lecturer amongst these geographers talked of the types of fieldtrips that he had taken students on, which involved talking to, and seeing people, who were employed in some capacity that used the land. He took students to various locations in the South Island, over a number of years of fieldtrips with different classes of students, to see how people were using the land. Some of the activities he recounted included:

[C]alling in to see a sheep farm near Hamner went through Haast and Franz Josef and Fox and called in at a State Forest over to the other side of Manapouri and down into the power house back home via Queenstown and a jet boat ride on the Shotover back up to Picton and tobacco and over to Westport and the coal mine at Denniston (Lecturer A1).

Maps were produced by the students as part of their fieldtrip reports which gave them the basis for their written accounts which were to produce a classification of the South Island based on the way the land was used. Economic features observed on the fieldtrips, and the type of farming or mineral extracted, were mapped together with aspects such as the relief of the land, taken from topographical maps. Spencer Hale (1987, 54) in the Canterbury anniversary publication recounts how a fieldtrip run by George Jobberns in 1952 gave 'a tremendous sense of "feel" for the North Canterbury landscapes and the role of early squatters in the area as well as the geomorphology'. Another experience that Hale recounts, being showered by an aerial topdressing plane, would have further enhanced the

demonstration by Jobberns of how people used, and were able to change, the world around them.

The focus for these geographers, when taking students on fieldtrips, was to let them see how people were using the land. The mapping of the land that is mentioned above was viewed as a way of students producing, in visual terms, the varying features that could be causally linked to form the basis of a region such as the coalmining area of the West Coast or the area of cropping on the Canterbury Plains. To understand interactions between people and land was an over-riding interest for Jobberns, which he taught tirelessly throughout his career at Canterbury University and reflected on in a retrospective contemplation of his own career in geography (Jobberns, 1959). One of the factors that came through strongly was his desire for physical geography to be taught so that students would understand the land that people were using for farming, mining, or forestry. Fieldtrips at this time entwined the physical and human aspects of the landscape, the physical being described to help in the explanation of why people used the land in the ways observed, rather than by geomorphological processes being taught.

A great emphasis was placed on the use of primary resources, which come directly from the land such as minerals, or agricultural produce. Lance McCaskill, who taught at Lincoln College, worked with members of the Canterbury University College Geography Department on matters to do with land use in the South Island in the mid-20th century period, and published on agricultural matters (McCaskill, 1953a, 1953b).⁷ Directly linked to this, was the interest that McCaskill and others had in the abuse of the land by people, and work they undertook on soil erosion in the South Island stems from this. As mentioned earlier, Cumberland, as a staff member at Canterbury University College, was also involved in this consideration of erosion problems in the early 1940s when he was still working at Canterbury with various visiting lecturers from the United States and Canada (Cumberland, 1943, 1944a, 1944b, 1944c).

The narrative to inform metaphor that Lecturer A1 gave, was of a melding of human and physical to create understanding. The emphasis was on seeing the features present and describing these rather than looking at the processes that had gone to forming these factors, whether they be physical or human:

The purpose of geography field trips is where the totality of things come together whether it is the theory and practice, or whether it is human and physical, or whether it is - not so enthusiastic about form and process - certainly enthusiastic about things to do with people, and things to do with physical environment, so there is that strand of it the totality of geography coming together (Lecturer A1).

The milieu for this lecturer was being an undergraduate in the department at Canterbury when George Jobberns was professor and head of department. Lecturer A1 had been taught with elements of applied geography, looking at the emerging problems of soil erosion that were becoming obvious by the 1950s, when Lecturer A1 was an undergraduate, and which had already been studied extensively by McCaskill and Cumberland, amongst others. A second influence was from the Berkeley School of cultural geography, seeing people as constructing their own livelihood and culture out of the environment. As Lecturer A1 notes in the quote above, process is not seen as important in this approach, a description of what is visible is the main rationale. Both human and physical attributes are considered in a geography fieldtrip and the main rationale is to explain how these inter-relate.

The milieux for all these teachers and Lecturer A1 were that they had been on geography fieldtrips as undergraduates when at Canterbury University. The fieldtrips had been a week or more in length and ranged over extensive areas of the South Island to demonstrate the different types of land and people that were there. Without exception, they had thoroughly enjoyed these experiences and could recall in some detail the places they had visited and the activities carried out. The influence of the integrated 'man and land' trips from Canterbury, as they were termed at that time, was very great for

these geographers and they have kept this interest in how people use the land throughout their careers and used fieldtrips to demonstrate this to their students. The immense influence of George Jobberns in showing the interrelationships of people and their environment has permeated both Canterbury geography and New Zealand school geography. The Secondary School Syllabus has strong elements of this connection and Canterbury graduates have spread far and wide across New Zealand in teaching institutions, especially secondary school geography departments. Of the teachers interviewed for this research a third had been undergraduates at Canterbury as were about one fifth of the lecturers.

The four *classifiers* in this research project had experienced as students themselves rich fieldtrips of the Jobberns' type, which interwove the land and the people who live on it in a mix, with the aim of establishing areas of similar use of the land, in a regional synthesis, for the students. Fieldtrips were designed to aid students in understanding how people used the land and how this was closely connected to the physical attributes of the earth's surface. Jobberns synthesized the human and physical by focusing on how people had adapted their way of life to the land rather than concentrating on geomorphological processes or on society without relating back to the physical environment in which people were living.

3.9.2 Inductive method as the dominant approach

An important meaning of fieldtrips for all these geographers was for their students to collect information so as to be able to come up with theories about, and classifications of, features that they observed in the landscape. Scientific theories can be established by grouping together empirical information in this way and by the scientist establishing ways of organising this information; this is usually termed the inductive approach to science. Most scientific theories have some element of this within them but for these geographers the emphasis for fieldtrips is on the empirical first, with the development of theory a secondary consideration.

An early instance of this approach is recorded by Murray McCaskill recalling how George Jobberns and his father, Lance McCaskill, in the early 1930s, went with their respective families, including Murray as a young boy, to the Ocean Beach near Lake Ellesmere (McCaskill, 1987). George Jobberns and Lance McCaskill were planning what they would show their students on a forthcoming student excursion to the area. Both were lecturers at that time at Christchurch Teachers' Training College. Murray recounts the empirical musings of Jobberns when Murray picked up a stone:

Amongst the predominantly grey pebbles of the beach I picked up a reddish stone and was referred to the tall, learned looking geologist for an opinion. George Jobberns examined the stone quizzically for a few moments then said that it was probably a piece of rhyolite from a volcanic eruption at Mount Somers millions of years ago. He traced the stone's probable journey of about a hundred miles from the inner margins of the Canterbury Plains down the Ashburton River to the sea, thence by wave movement along the coast to the 'trap' formed at Birdlings Flat by the projection of Banks peninsula. I marvelled at the man's knowledge and his power of reasoning from a fragment of evidence (McCaskill, 1987, 29).

Jobberns' early training in geology and teaching of physiography formed the background his knowledge of the physical aspects of the landscape. A collection of pebbles could open up the wealth of information that these lecturers and teachers held. They viewed themselves as experts and the knowledge they held as a truth that existed and should be shared with others. These pieces of information were later grouped together in the students' reports to make some general statements about, or come up with a general classification of, the areas visited, based around theories that were also established about the interrelationships of people and the land as the information was gathered.

The geographers interviewed for the purposes of this research similarly taught their students on fieldtrips to look at their surroundings with a view to gathering lots of information that would be used for the purposes of later classification, by noting causal relationships between the features noted. On

a fieldtrip to look at irrigation schemes and farming on the Canterbury Plains, Teacher A2 talked of taking students:

[T]o watch how the Winchmore irrigation system works, the water dyking system on the Canterbury Plains how it works, and then we went to a farm they saw the shelter belts and all those sorts of things also sort of analysing, yes just analysis of different soils. Jim Martin's farm had a dry part and a wet part, so going down recognising that this is a stony part. So analysing, and comparing, and contrasting, there is something that is quite an important skill (Teacher A2).

She talked of how, prior to going on the fieldtrip, the students would have been taught the climatic and vegetational background and they would have known how the land was formed. Many of these early fieldtrips led by teachers were to farms. They represented in microcosm the interrelationships of people and the land, which is the main rationale for these geographers. Students were able to gather information on relief from maps on their return to school. They linked this with information they could observe on the farms about livestock, grasses, crops, and yields. Often information had already been provided to students from text books that were by then being published in New Zealand to aid in the teaching of geography. These will be further discussed later in this section and see Figure 2.1.

Students were encouraged to assemble lots of descriptive detail about how people used the land when they were on a fieldtrip and to consider this in relation to material that they had been taught in class on the physical and climatic features of the area they were visiting. In this way, these geographers considered that students would understand more about the regions that they were studying and how it was possible to separate one area of the country from another. So the Canterbury Plains would be studied as a unit looking at the farming, the irrigation, the land, and climate. Later this would be compared with a different region such as the West Coast of the South Island and the students would be taken to that

location to study the mining, the forestry, the climate, and physical landscape as a contrast.

One of the main narratives for the teachers in this group was the farm fieldtrip. All the teachers included in this group had taken a number of farm fieldtrips. For two of the three teachers these were the first fieldtrips that they had taken, one in the mid 1960s and the other in the late 1960s and they continue to take such fieldtrips up to present time. Farms have been a fundamental element of the economy of New Zealand and are one the main ways in which New Zealanders are linked closely to the land. The element of change, establishment of culture, and diffusion of culture as noted in the Berkeley School approach earlier in this chapter are manifest here. Farms are places where people use the land.

One aspect of the milieu for these teachers was textbooks that provided information on the regional geography of New Zealand and in some cases, suggestions for farm fieldtrips. Early textbooks were by Jobberns, (1930), Cumberland and Pownall, (1950), and Cumberland and Fox (1957, 1958). Later ones by Mayhill and Bawden (1966), had a more systematic approach than the early ones by Jobberns and Cumberland, which were regionally focused [see Table 2.1]. Teachers A1 and A2 both talked of these textbooks and even produced copies of the later ones. They also used maps extensively; Teacher A2 talked of how:

I try and read about the area that I am going to and we always send away to the Department of Conservation for things. I read a lot of maps before I go so I know exactly what's happening, where things are, and how long it will take to get between places and all those sorts of things (Teacher A2).

Resources were also published in the *New Zealand Geographical Society Record of the Proceedings of the Society and its Branches*, during the 1940s and early 1950s in a photogeography section, which provided visual information on various regions of New Zealand. Teachers could order extra copies of these photos and information sheets to supplement the information that was beginning to appear in textbooks at this time.

All these geographers recounted how much they had loved learning about the characteristics of places and enjoyed the fieldtrips they had attended as undergraduates at Canterbury University. Teacher A1 had been on a fieldtrip in 1947 run by Lance McCaskill and George Jobberns for a Stage Three paper where they looked at vegetation geography and soil conservation. Teacher A1 also attended earlier trips led by George Jobberns, who took teachers from the Christchurch Teachers' Training College to Birdling Flat in Teacher A1's second year at the College (1943). On the first day it looked at beach erosion and the types of vegetation along the coast. Probably this was a later version of the very fieldtrip that he had been preparing with Lance McCaskill in 1936 as recounted in McCaskill (1987). On the second day of the fieldtrip, the group carried on by train up Arthur's Pass and McCaskill showed them the special vegetation growing in that area and samples were brought back to the College. The third and final day consisted of going to Stuart's Gully by train and walking through tussock and also noting other vegetation before returning to Christchurch by bus. This was very empirically based with a vast area of country being traversed and various samples and observations taken to demonstrate to students the varying vegetation and land use differences between the Canterbury Plain and the alpine areas around Arthur's Pass.

Only one of this group of participants had been on geography fieldtrips at school. She had been a pupil of Eileen Fairburn, who was a teacher at Christchurch Girls' High School from the 1930s to the 1950s and took her pupils on fieldtrips (Peddie, 2000). Teacher A3 from the Christchurch region talked of how Fairburn's students were passionate about the subject. Eileen Fairburn had been the first woman geography graduate from Newnham College, Cambridge and she had actually applied unsuccessfully for the first lectureship in geography at Canterbury University in 1936 which was taken up by George Jobberns (Macauley, 1987).

None of the other participants, who have been grouped in this episteme, went on fieldtrips at school. One recounted:

[T]here wasn't much classroom excitement about geography; social studies was very exciting. We had at least one social studies teacher who had a flair for contextual things and I guess that was what gave me a flair for geography and social studies. It was A.G. Wilson who had also been a mountaineer in the 1930s, heyday of mountaineering, so that was interesting (Lecturer A1).

Life was much more exciting for them at Canterbury University and so their main experiences of fieldtrips came from this time in their life, which has continued to influence them in the way they run their own fieldtrips.

3.9.3 Mapping and sketching

One important rationale for this group of geographers is to produce maps so that the various features, which causally interrelate, can be viewed in a spatial manner so that boundaries can be drawn around areas where similar relationships occur, so creating regions. One of the main objectives of fieldtrips for these geographers is to let their students learn to map and sketch the features that they observe. All these geographers talked of getting students to map on fieldtrips. The first voice is from an anniversary publication; later ones recorded below are from the teachers and lecturer interviewed as part of this thesis.

Whatman, in the Canterbury anniversary publication, recalled a Stage 2 paper in 1938 when he was taught map-making by a member of the School of Engineering. He spent Saturday mornings in Hagley Park learning this:

But the main commitment was an extended field exercise over the Easter Break at the Canterbury College Biological Station at Cass. We were required, in groups of three or four, to establish some contour lines, which represented some rugged country... The Abney level was added to the compass and tape that had been used in Hagley Park (Whatman, 1987, 20).

The Canterbury Field Station at Cass has featured prominently in fieldtrips led by lecturers from Canterbury and is still being used. Teacher A1 recalled the same activities in Hagley Park when she was an undergraduate in the 1940s at Canterbury University. Teacher A3 was a Canterbury undergraduate in the 1950s. She recollected:

I was fascinated on the field trips we were taken on to the northern part of the South Island. I remember getting out and doing some plane tabling in the mist and the fieldtrip was to do with landscape changes, land use changes mainly (Teacher A3).

The production of maps on fieldtrips is the main narrative for these geographers and the metaphor of the map can be considered as a motif for how these geographers practise fieldtrips. Teacher A2 talked of 'mapping is an important skill, definitely a couple of sketch maps of the landscape for Canterbury Plains and what they saw, the shelterbelts and all those sorts of things'. Recording and then classifying the information into regions on a map of similar land uses was a primary focus for all geographers in this group.

At university level from the 1960s onwards sketching a landscape or making a sketch map of a region took over from the more accurate map-making of earlier days, as more large scale maps of New Zealand became available. The milieu for map-making on fieldtrips is that the earliest mapping had been done very much to teach the skills of surveying and can be linked back to the early surveying and map-making that was taught in New Zealand schools.

By the 1950s, mapping was directed at recording a limited number of features in the landscape and placing these on a map with the aim of delimiting regions for study. As Teacher A3 recorded, the mapping was associated with looking at how people's use of the land was changing and contrasts in use between different areas. The objective was for students to pick out a few features that would show the coherency of a region. These might be how land was farmed or forested and would be linked to the

steepness of slope and other such physical features that would be placed on the map. Map-making helps to simplify the world by identifying a small range of features, out of the myriad items on the earth's surface that could be recorded.

Map-making was an important part of fieldtrips particularly in Otago and Canterbury Colleges at Stage Two level, from the 1930s, in the case of Canterbury, in the 1940s and 1950s, and in Otago to the 1960s. With the advent of aerial photography, and a nationwide coverage with topographical maps of large-scale, map-making to produce a map that was unavailable elsewhere gradually ceased on fieldtrips. Yet these geographers who classify the world, have continued to encourage their students to put features on a sketch map as a means of simplifying the world and understanding the coherency of a region or landscape.

Map-making began almost as an art in itself to give students at school and university level a chance to do something experiential. There was also a practical need for such documents in New Zealand up to mid 20th century as there were few maps available. Such work continues to this day on fieldtrips run by the teachers in this episteme as mapping is considered a method of showing the 'essential' features of an area that is being studied. They also view it as a practical exercise for school students, which is the sort of activity that they had to undertake as students themselves and they have not really questioned that the rationale for this has now changed with the advent of readily available large-scale maps in New Zealand. There is further discussion on delimiting regions in the next meaning that is considered, namely how contrasts between areas are shown on fieldtrips.

3.9.4 Showing contrast

A fundamental tenet for fieldtrips practiced by these geographers was to show how one landscape area contrasted with another, each being an idiographic entity. Metaphors of fieldtrips for this meaning are that students

were taken to places far and wide so that they could observe a variety of landscape types and discover at first hand how people used these landscapes, to make the delineation of regions easier by traversing a vast array of landscapes with very different uses. Spencer Hale described the places visited on the 1952 Jobberns' fieldtrip:

Clearly in my mind is the old shoreline, in the form of a low ridge just south of Leithfield. Onwards we made a stop in the Omihi Valley, only to be showered by a top dressing plane! Romantic names of the past, Moore of Glenmark, Clifford of Stoneyhurst and 'Ready Money' Robinson of Cheviot Hills brought out the role of early squatters in the area. The Greta Valley Cuttings, exposed Tertiary strata, the Hurunui River, the Weka Pass limestones and the Middle Waipara Valley — the geomorphology of these features will always remain in my mind (Hale, 1987, 45).

The milieux for all the *classifiers* interviewed was attending fieldtrips as undergraduates that took in a large area of country, so that distinct differences could be seen between the contrasting parts:

We lived in the day of the grand tour, we set off from Christchurch and in over ten days we went through Central Otago, we went through Western Southland, we went through Invercargill, we went through the Catlins and we went to Dunedin and we went back to Christchurch; and we all wrote our regional geography of the South Island where we actually divided that great sweep of country into what-ever regions we decided that it could be divided into; and it was magnificent going to those places over that chunk of time (Lecturer A1).

Teacher A2, who is still teaching geography, talked of how she takes students across to the West Coast of the South Island and they contrast the physical features and farming practices between the two sides of the island.⁸ She picks out a very few features for her pupils to focus on and was particularly keen on the rainfall statistics between the two sides of the South island:

When I'm standing in Mr C's farm at Franz Josef glacier and the kids go, "how much rain do you get Mr C?" And he goes, "last year we got about 5.5".

And the kids thought this was millimetres. And they say, "but Christchurch get 764 mm". And he says, "that's metres". So here they are in a place that gets 5.5 metres of rain (Teacher A2).

Teachers A2 and A3 also teach tourism and both were very keen on this. They viewed it as more linked to the regional geography that they had studied at university themselves in the 1950s and 1960s than the current syllabus, which does not reflect their approach to geography to the same degree.

Even though regional geography is no longer taught as a separate topic within the New Zealand geography curriculum, the teachers who work in this episteme of classifying the world, still like to point out the regional differences within the South Island. They run fieldtrips to the West Coast from the Christchurch area to see how it varies from the Canterbury Region.

There is metaphor and milieu in Lecturer A1's fieldtrip, described above, which he attended as an undergraduate in the 1950s, and shows how fieldtrips were used to teach regional geography at that time. He has taken fieldtrips to a number of locations in the South Island and North Island and particularly liked trips that were over a number of days so that students could visit a variety of places and begin to understand the variations that they saw.

A metaphor that Teacher A1 gave was of the flying classrooms that she took part in during the 1960s. South Pacific Air New Zealand ran DC3s and took a whole class for a day trip over the North Island. The teacher talked of how it was linked to the 1953 syllabus based on regional classification of New Zealand by Cumberland. Teacher A1, who was teaching in Auckland at the time, had plotted the course. They flew from Whenuapai, near Auckland. The teacher had a map prepared and the students described what they were seeing as they flew over an area south of Auckland to Taupo and then stopped at Tauranga, where they ate lunch, and often went to visit one of the forestry areas in the Central North Island as part of the trip.

The air trip was a way of showing students the map that lay under them in terms of landscape variation and the trip was very closely linked to the regional geography that was being taught at the time. The places viewed and visited were those that showed how people were using the landscape for various economic ends. Milieux for the *classifiers* were from regional geography which dominated schools throughout the 1950s and the 1960s as the syllabus was regional from 1953 until the mid 1960s. Thereafter, although regional science, cartography, and physical geography appeared, regional geography was still present in the syllabus until the mid 1980s. Fieldwork was suggested for the first time at school certificate level in 1965 and in the bursary syllabus. It was not made mandatory in the bursary syllabus until 1973 and not until 1986 in the school certificate syllabus [see Table 2.1],

Other milieux for these geographers were readings that were very much contextually based and focused on the places that the fieldtrips were going to. Teacher A2 cited consulting maps, of the area to be traversed on the fieldtrip, as an important part of the preparation as she took her students on fieldtrips that covered a big land area to give them a taste of the many different types of region that they were visiting. Thus empirical descriptive sources were deemed important.

No mention was made of any theoretical readings by any of these geographers in preparation for themselves or for their students for fieldtrips. This very much supports the view of these fieldtrips being run as a means of gathering information that was used for inductive knowledge creation. In this case such information contributed to the formulating of regions and their boundaries.

3.10 Conclusions

The teachers and the one lecturer, who were interviewed and are informed by the episteme of geography that seeks to classify the world, follow traditions in the subject stretching back over a century in New Zealand schools, and a century in New Zealand universities. Mapping, showing contrast, inductive reasoning, and demonstrating the interrelationships of people and the land were the milieux, much of which the participants took for granted themselves, and did not identify in the interviews, but which had a significant bearing on the geography that they experienced at school, university, and in their own working lives. Maps are the metaphor of fieldtrips run by these geographers.

The first teachings of geography in New Zealand were at school level and were of factual material, which helped children to gain knowledge about their own country and other countries of the world. In order to make some sense of this for children, a division of countries was made in some of the earliest textbooks written, and used in the 19th century. Towards the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, teachings in geography focused more around trade and empire in schools and the beginnings of geography as commercial geography at the University of New Zealand. The link between maps, exploration, and travel writing also emerged in these early years. A need for accurate maps, and the ability to read and interpret maps to understand items such as trade routes led to a realisation of the importance of mathematical geography, which included, amongst other things, rudimentary surveying at school level. Pupils were encouraged to make maps for themselves so that they would also have an appreciation and understanding of printed maps, and were encouraged to go into their local area to do this. These were amongst the first geography fieldtrips run in New Zealand for children.

Another rationale for the first fieldtrips was to show children in microcosm the action of physical forces such as running water as it operated in a playground or in the local area after a rainstorm. Such processes were

observed and facts collected about these processes so that the findings could be applied to larger scale studies such as the main rivers of the world. Similar suggestions were given for fieldtrips if teachers had access to where they could see the work of the sea or the work of ice operating. Teaching physiography strongly encouraged early fieldtrips for school children in New Zealand. Teachers of physiography at teachers' training colleges, such as George Jobberns, aided this movement to take children out into the field by running early fieldtrips themselves for student teachers, who later went out to teach in schools themselves and instructed their own pupils in a similar way.

Another method of ordering geographical material was the approach to geography called environmental determinism, which linked people's activities to the physical environment in which they lived. Maps and books were produced showing a variety of regions of the world, based on physical characteristics, and the human activities that are linked to these characteristics. The agency of people was very much missing from environmental determinism, where people were seen as rather helpless bystanders to the forces of nature. A focus on people as agents of their own destiny was manifest in the Berkeley school of geography, which sought to look at the world in regions but with an emphasis on the use people make of the world. This was the type of geography that Jobberns introduced to Canterbury and which has had such impact in New Zealand pedagogy as a whole. Under this approach fieldtrips were encouraged as a means of showing to students how people use the physical world.

Cumberland, making full use of Hartshorne's (1939) arguments, fostered a type of regional geography with less focus on people than that of the Berkeley School. Regional boundaries were often based on physical characteristics and human economic activities were studied in a generalised form such as areas of manufacturing industries or pastoral agriculture. The focus was on spatial location. This was the beginning of geography being considered to be a spatial science. The regionalists did demonstrate on their fieldtrips, some elements of simplification, to classify the land, focusing on a few attributes of the landscape rather than trying to comprehend a

multitude of influences. The participants in this research showed this element of regionalism from their milieux.

Geographers who worked in this episteme, valued fieldtrips as a means of showing their students how people use the land around them, and as providing an opportunity for their students to observe the features which can be grouped together, or seen to have association with one another, so that regions of similar characteristics can be formulated. They believe there is a truth to be discovered and imparted to their students about this and see themselves as an authority figure who can disseminate this information. These findings are linked to the ways in which they classify the land by areas of land use and link attributes of the physical world and how humans use it, such as different farming types or areas predominantly used for forestry or mining. The origin of this type of geography goes back to the Jobberns' way of teaching and running of fieldtrips, which was in turn influenced by the Berkeley School under Sauer but with an element of the applied focus of Mackinder, and the Oxford School as exemplified by Herbertson and Howarth, in early 20th century Britain and later by the Dudley Stamp Land Use Survey.

Information was gathered as an end in itself in order to describe and delimit the regions. The observations came first and then some attempt was made, after the facts had been collected, to formulate these into a coherent whole providing regional entities that could be transferred onto a map. Elements of the Dudley Stamp Land Use Survey, which Fox had attempted to introduce into New Zealand, are present here, and are indicative of an applied focus in New Zealand geography amongst the *classifiers*. Early attempts at presenting geography as a subject worthy of academic study had resulted in a desire for a scientific base and this was achieved by assembling facts to create generalities about the world as viewed on fieldtrips. The metaphor of making maps on fieldtrips, first as an end in itself when few large scale maps were available of New Zealand, and later to note the assemblage of features observed on fieldtrips so as to provide a base for classification, was the fundamental rationale and motif for these geographers.

The metaphor of fieldtrips that these geographers practiced was as a survey instrument. The fieldtrips ranged over vast areas of the countryside so as to show students the various contrasts that could be observed. The most extreme version of this was the air trip described by teacher A1, but even the grand tour described by Lecturer A1 has elements of surveying a huge sweep of country to be able to elucidate contrasts between landscape types and how people use these; always there was the belief that there was certainty in the findings and that truth could be discerned by the students with the aid of their teacher or lecturer as the specialist who interpreted this landscape for them in the way that Jobberns had interpreted the landscape for the participants in his fieldtrips to the Port Hills reported above.

This group of geographers cited few influences on the way they ran fieldtrips other than their own training as undergraduates at Canterbury University, the fieldtrips that they attended and their textbooks. Readings only formed a small part of their acknowledged background for running fieldtrips. These geographers did not acknowledge the theoretical underpinnings of their fieldtrips. Their rationale depended on direct observation to formulate a classification of the world based on a limited range of features. They demonstrate their milieux and meaning in their teachings and fieldtrips in a metaphor whereby students are encouraged to gather information with a view to formulating general statements once this information has been analysed. Emphasis is placed on the location of features and on causal associations of these features. General statements are made about areas where the same features are located and other areas (regions) where a different collection of similar features are found. Mapping of these features forms a fundamental part of this episteme and is an activity undertaken by students on geography fieldtrips run by the *classifiers*.

Little evidence was found of fieldtrips led by teachers in the early period of geography teaching in New Zealand, even though this was encouraged in the syllabus from 1908. However, with support and fostering from teacher training lecturers and university lecturers this changed from the 1930s

under the strong influence of George Jobberns. These interviewees participated in these early regional fieldtrips when they were undergraduates or teacher trainees and have gone on to run similar fieldtrips themselves in their professional careers as teachers and lecturer. Fieldtrips practiced by the lecturer and teachers in this episteme were very similar to those they had experienced themselves at university. With an increasing domination of regional geography in the school syllabus, and its strong emphasis at university level throughout the 1950s and 1960s, fieldtrips were designed to show contrasts in the landscape, and how people use these landscapes. Observations that students made of these features were mapped and reported upon with the aim of classifying areas with similar landscape features and economic activities. A few geographers continue to be influenced by this approach to the present day and their experiences have formed the basis for discussion in this chapter. Even in the international literature there are still occasional pleas for a continuance of this approach (Wade, 2006).

The main meaning that the *classifiers* use is an inductive approach to move from empirical findings to the generalities of formulating regions of similar characteristics. This episteme has been much criticised by subsequent generations of geographers. The group of geographers considered in the next chapter, the *general theorists*, were particularly dismissive of the regionalists and their attempts to classify the world without overarching theories using a deductive approach.

Notes

1 The Royal Geographical Society (RGS) was founded in 1830 as the Royal Geographical Society of London. Its aim was the advancement of Geographical Science. The Society was granted a Royal Charter by Queen Victoria in 1859. In 1995 the RGS merged with the Institute of British Geographers (IBG) to create the Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers). Since 1831 the Society has published a journal, initially containing the principal papers read at

the Society's evening meetings and abstracts of geographical works published elsewhere, it is now a refereed academic publication.

2 An attempt to introduce compulsory schooling in New Zealand was first made under the Education Act of 1877. More effective legislation was passed in 1894 with the School Attendance Act. The most successful legislation that was passed was the 1901 School Attendance Act, which compelled children to stay at school until the age of fourteen (McKenzie, 1982).

3 The University of New Zealand had been established under the University Act of 1874, it incorporated Otago University College (Dunedin) which had been established in 1869 and Canterbury University College (Christchurch) established in 1873. Two further colleges were incorporated, Auckland University College in 1882 and Victoria University College (Wellington) in 1897. The University of New Zealand held examining rights until the disbanding of the University of New Zealand in 1961. At this point the four individual autonomous universities of Otago, Canterbury, Victoria, and Auckland were established.

4 Halford Mackinder (1861-1947) was an influential geographer in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. He was made Reader of Geography at Oxford University in 1887 and went on to various other academic and government positions. He incorporated his ideas in geography with a politicised agenda in the Heartland Theory with the submission of a paper titled "*The Geographical Pivot of History*" to the Royal Geographical Society in 1904.

5 The last three years of schooling in New Zealand saw three separate external examinations at this time, one for each year. School Certificate was taken at the end of fifth form by students aged about 16. This was originally perceived as a leaving certificate, although by the 1950s it was realised that that a number of students stayed on at school beyond this time. In sixth form, the University Entrance Examination, administered by the University of New Zealand until 1961 and then by the University Grants Committee, was taken. In the seventh form, students took the University Bursary examinations, again administered by the University of New Zealand until its dissolution and the advent of the University Grants Committee in 1961.

6 The first fieldtrip that I ever attended would have occurred in about 1959 and this was a visit from my Primary School to a factory that made boxes.

7 Lancelot (Lance) William McCaskill (1900-1985) was a lecturer in agriculture and biology at Dunedin Training College (1928-32) and Christchurch Teachers' College (1933-44). From 1944 to 1965 he lectured in rural education at Canterbury Agricultural College (later Lincoln College). He had become aware of soil erosion problems in 1929 through work on deer damage in the Otago forest. He worked closely with others such as Cumberland and Jobberns, which extended his knowledge on matters of soil erosion and he worked out methods of soil conservation (Perry, 2000). Lancelot McCaskill's son was Murray McCaskill (1926-1999) who was an undergraduate at Canterbury University and lecturer there for 17 years until he moved to Flinders University in 1964 where he was the Foundation Professor of Geography.

8 Teachers A2 and A3 are still practicing teachers; Teacher A1 is retired.

Chapter Four – geographers who use general theories to explain the world

4.1 Introduction

This, the second of the analytical chapters, focuses on fieldtrips at a time when geographers used the concept of general theories to explain aspects of society and its functioning, and of the land and its processes. Their suppositions were based on a set of hypotheses, which if validated empirically gained the status of laws. Information or data was gathered and analysed to test whether the general theory was correct or false. This is a crucial metaphor of fieldtrips for those geographers who are termed *general theorists* because of this focus. Their theoretical perspective is positivism. Many geographers in New Zealand draw on this episteme and a large group of the participants, who were interviewed as part of this research, use this approach for their teaching, research, and in their approach to the practice of fieldtrips.

Published sources provide background information to the approach taken by *general theorists* as described in the first part of the chapter. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 consider the introduction of this episteme to New Zealand; Section 4.3 looks at university geography and Section 4.4 at school geography. The bulk of the analysis from the interviews with these geographers comes after this. It is divided into a number of sections, clustered around the main meanings about fieldtrips that emerged from the interviews with these geographers. These are: fieldtrips are used to demonstrate scientific method and hypothesis testing and they provide examples, which allow students to support or reject hypotheses; fieldtrips are sites where examples of theories taught in lectures or in the classroom can be illustrated; specialised skills should be learnt on fieldtrips, often relating to the practitioner's own research methodologies; and (university) fieldtrips are a means of encouraging students to carry on as postgraduates in the

discipline. The narratives that inform these metaphors are described for each meaning. Examination of the milieux that were identified by participants as contributing to the approach they take to fieldtrips completes the discussion.

The last segment, 'Conclusions', provides insights into the practice of fieldtrips by these geographers, constructed with reference to the material that has been assembled in preceding sections of the chapter. Reflection on the practice of fieldtrips by the *general theorists* in relation to the *classifiers*, and the *structuralists* and *deconstructivists* discussed in subsequent analytical chapters, is given.

4.2 General theories

The approach to geography used by these geographers follows on from the attempts by those who had endeavoured to classify phenomena on the earth's surface by grouping together aspects of society and the land that were perceived as having causal relationships. The difference is that these geographers sought to establish and use general theories rather than classifications which were valid for limited areas, thus moving to a more nomothetic approach rather than the idiographic approach used previously. The geographers who followed this approach in the academy, and explain the world as dependent on laws, have been termed positivists (Johnston et al., 2000). In some cases these laws are viewed as similar to the laws of physics and in fact on occasion laws of physics, such as the law of gravitation have been used by geographers to explain aspects of human geography (Johnston et al., 2000; Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). The basis for this approach stretches back to the Enlightenment and the work of the French philosopher and sociologist, August Comte, whose main aim was to separate science from metaphysics and promote the idea of logic and reason. He saw science as advancing by the establishment of general theories, which if verified empirically, achieved the status of laws.

The ontology in geography under this theoretical perspective was that there is a real world, which can be fully explained by detached observers. In human geography some ideas were based on theories about society, which had been firstly expounded in the 19th or 20th centuries. Theories such as Von Thunen's model of land use, which had first been developed in 1826, Burgess's model of urban zones proposed in 1924 and Christaller's theories on central place, which had been advanced in the 1930s in Germany, were used. Geographers in the USA, Britain, and Sweden extended such theories in the 1960s. An American, Bunge, in 1962 wrote of how geography was the science of spatial relations and took the ideas of central place theory into the world of geometry and mathematics. McCarty at Iowa linked theories of location, derived from central place theory, with economics. Haggett and the Cambridge group took the ideas to Britain and Haggett (1965) published *Locational Analysis in Human Geography*, which sought to show how geometry could be used to develop models in geography.

Another major attempt by human geographers at this time in the search for general laws was that made by the Swedish geographer, Torsten Hägerstrand, who developed theories on diffusion, which were based around Monte Carlo simulation methods and the comparison of observed and predicted patterns of adoption. Others viewed given aspects of the world as systems with selected inputs, outputs, and throughputs in order to explain what is happening in a complex environment; this methodology was derived from outside the discipline in a Cold War project showing the workings of military systems and it was later developed in a number of sciences in America ranging from engineering to political science (Johnston et al., 2000; Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). Haggett is credited with influencing a wide audience with the principles he put forward in his text, *Locational Analysis in Human Geography*, (Johnston et al., 2000). Johnston and Sidaway, (2004) view this as one of the texts that helped to establish the transmission of the episteme of positivism to undergraduates in the late 1960s and early 1970s, via the ideas of pattern and order.¹ The models utilised by these geographers were designed to simplify the complex world and to see if patterns discerned in one part of the world could be replicated

elsewhere. Mathematical modelling was utilised to produce 'generalisations of reality'. A lot of the data used by these geographers was obtained from published material for example, census data.

In both human and physical geography theories were presented concerning causal relationships between features in society and the landscape. To test whether these theories actually existed in the society, community, or landscape under study, statistical methods were used to show causal relationships in both areas of geography between a limited array of features that were chosen for analysis. The relationships that were discovered were tested against a general theory that had been suggested. Generalised empirical mathematical relationships were sought. If sufficient replications of a theory can be seen to be accurate then the theory is accorded the status of a law. Similarly models such as the central place or diffusion models were tested by gathering data, whether from published sources such as census reports or using survey or sampling techniques as part of fieldwork. This is where fieldwork was used in this theoretical perspective. Selected empirical information was collected and recorded before being taken back to the laboratory for analysis, which was often undertaken using quantitative techniques. Analysis led to rejection or support for the theory that was being tested. The number of theories put forward was limited, and usually stemmed from published material by eminent geographers such as those mentioned above.

Geographers at university level in the United States of America, started using such approaches in the 1950s, in a search for order and for an episteme that would be rigorous and be accepted by other academics. The 1950s was the time of the Hartshorne and Schaeffer debate, which has been considered as marking the beginning of positivism in geography. Hartshorne reiterated his ideas, first put forward in 1939, that geography is a science of regions, (Hartshorne, 1939, 1954a, 1954b, 1959). Schaeffer (1953) believed geography to be a systematic science, for which general laws could be established. Johnston and Sidaway (2004) consider that too much weight has been placed on this debate and McCarty and others were leading the move to positivism from Iowa in the 1950s. Positivists believed

in grand theory and looked for support of these theories in findings from experiments concentrating on associations between variables that operated in the world. This led the way for the study of geography as a spatial science, (McCarty, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1958, 1979). It was in the era of the early computers, when large quantities of data could be more efficiently manipulated than had been possible previously. Initially, these were mainframe computers and only a few universities and departments had access to these machines (Forer and Chalmers, 1987). Loading data was time consuming, and slow, but none-the-less substantial research of a quantitative nature was undertaken during the 1960s in both human and physical geography.

A shift also occurred in other social sciences, such as psychology and sociology, during the 1950s and 1960s, towards a more scientific approach to knowledge construction in their disciplines. Physical geography was also becoming more scientifically based, as more emphasis was placed on a deductive approach to landscape studies, which has persisted to this day in physical geography rather than the inductive approach, which had preceded it and was discussed in Chapter Three. Gregory (2003) reflecting on the history of physical geography in Britain saw a divergence from human geography in the period from 1960, and similar trends occurred in New Zealand. Physical geography took a path more akin to the physical and natural sciences in formulating general theories that were supported or rejected by experimentation that was laboratory based and mathematically informed.

Positivist geographers often refer to geography as a spatial science; and see themselves as providing explanations of the location of features on the earth's surface (Haggett, 1965; Harvey, 1969; Johnston et al., 2000; Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). The fieldtrips that these geographers practise are designed to show spatial relationships in the area that is being studied, using a very small range of attributes, to which quantitative techniques such as regression analysis can be applied to ascertain relationships (Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). This contrasts with the determinist empiricist science discussed in Chapter Three.

In the early days of positivism in geography, classroom and laboratory work dominated human geography and to a lesser extent physical geography rather than fieldwork, which was limited under the positivist approach of the 1960s and 1970s. From information gained from interviews with geographers who are currently practising in this episteme, the amount of fieldwork has increased since that time, as the physical geographers have developed this approach, so that emphasis is now (2006) placed on accurate and substantial collection of data and samples in the field, with much emphasis on skill acquisition in the various methods used to collect this data although much analysis of the material collected and the recordings made is still carried out in the laboratory at the end of the fieldtrip. Human geography lecturers, as will be discussed in more detail, have adopted other approaches to understanding geography, and none who took part in this study, still operate in this paradigm. The human geographers are examined in Chapters Five and Six, with the exception of the sole lecturer considered in Chapter Three. A substantial group of teachers in New Zealand who were interviewed continue to practise human geography fieldtrips using this approach, whereby students collect data on the fieldtrips to support, or reject theories such as Christaller's Central Place Theory. This dichotomy between teachers and lecturers in their approach to human geography fieldtrips is examined in the last section of this chapter.

4.3 Universities and positivism in New Zealand

In the 1950s in New Zealand a number of papers were published in geography that showed a desire for order and for a graphical portrayal of information in a spatial manner, based around the inductive approach of classifying material by producing maps that showed features. Boundaries were drawn around regions where similar features were observed. These often took the form of a map of New Zealand with various graphs drawn to portray statistical information gleaned from the New Zealand Government's

Department of Statistics. Such a paper appeared in the *Proceedings* of the second New Zealand Geography Society's Conference in 1958, where Linge (1958) illustrated the geography of manufacturing in New Zealand with a statistical map; and Pirie produced a similar sort of graphical analysis to show population density in Western Samoa in the same volume (Pirie, 1958). These papers show a search for the development of theories and categorisations that is also a feature of positivist approaches. The other aspect of geography that these papers demonstrate is a focus on regional geography (dealt with in detail in Chapter Three). Regional geography was taught in all the colleges of the University of New Zealand at this time and was the main feature of the school syllabus in geography.

However, Jobberns (1959) passed comment on the changing approaches to the discipline of geography in a nostalgic piece entitled: 'The time has come to talk of many things'. Although he felt that more physical geography should be taught, Jobberns' search for a geography that brought together the physical and human worlds had found expression in regional geography, which was then passing out of favour. Jobberns retired from Canterbury in 1960 and there was a passing of the mantle to those geographers strongly influenced by positivist methodology and a deductive approach rather than the inductive approach of the regionalists. This was the theoretical perspective that was adopted by many geographers internationally at this time. It also was a period when the Jobberns' view of geography both in New Zealand and internationally, considering the centrality of landscape as a whole, was waning and separate human and physical camps emerged.

To begin with human and physical geography were unified by positivism and so the new episteme was an integrating factor (Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). Fieldtrips at university level, in the early years of positivism in New Zealand, continued to be combined, with most universities running fieldtrips for all second years or all third years with no division into separate physical and human geography fieldtrips. Data on physical and human processes in the landscape were collected in a quantitative manner and used to support, or reject, theories that had been put forward. The unifying factor of positivism continued in the practice of university fieldtrips for nearly twenty

years, from its inception in the early 1960s to the mid 1970s when departments started splitting geography fieldtrips into human and physical geography fieldtrips. By this time, many human geographers had moved to using a structural approach in their teachings and research, with the realisation that general theories were not an appropriate means of constructing meaning in geography. Physical geography fieldtrips have continued to be practised, using an approach based on the positivist paradigm to the present.

The move to positivism and the 'quantification revolution' in New Zealand was prompted primarily by trends to the use of statistical testing of theories and hypotheses overseas, especially in the United States of America; and the New Zealand tradition of the time of sending graduates overseas to do their postgraduate training accelerated these changes. Some of these graduates returned to New Zealand to lecture and brought with them ideas from overseas.² Furthermore, the practice of lecturers from overseas coming to Canterbury for periods under the Erskine Fellowship, set up two decades before, and a visiting lectureship which visitors from overseas held, provided rapid movements of ideas on positivism from its heartland in the United States of America to New Zealand. Harold McCarty, a visiting lecturer to Canterbury in 1962 of Iowa was a 'persuasive advoca[te]' of this move to quantification according to McCaskill (1987).

Other departments followed the quantification trends. Auckland followed later because of the strong influence of the professor and head of department, Kenneth Cumberland, a committed regionalist and follower of the Hartshorne branch of geography. It was not until Peter Hosking's arrival at Auckland, in 1968, that there was a move to quantification in the Department (Hammond, 1992). Brad Paterson, who went to Massey in 1972 from Victoria claimed he had never learned about quantification there (Hammond, 1992). Geography, when Keith Buchanan held the chair at Victoria, had a very different focus, dealing with the different and the political. Otago was somewhat of a backwater in relation to new trends at that time and missed out on the main progression towards quantification in the 1960s, although Garnier worked on quantitative climatology data.

Another Otago geographer, Bill Brockie, was using hypothesis testing to investigate periglacial formations in Otago by 1967 (Brockie, 1967). In fact by 1967 a number of papers presented at the fifth geography conference of the NZGS had varying amounts of statistics and hypothesis testing in them. This ranged from Garth Cant's use of statistics in demonstrating migration of farm workers (Cant, 1967), to Kissling's paper where a 'classic linear programming solution to the transportation problem was used to estimate routeway importance' (Kissling, 1967, 146); both of these linked to the general theories that were in vogue at the time.

Many human geographers had excursions into positivism in the 1960s and 1970s but turned to other philosophical bases, especially after the publication of Harvey's *Social Justice and the City* in 1973. Amongst a number of quantitative papers in the 1970 edition of the *New Zealand Geographer* there was a paper on central place evolution by Badcock who had written a Master of Arts thesis at Auckland on the same topic two years earlier (Badcock, 1968, 1970). In his editorial to the same edition, Ron Johnston, as the new editor of the publication, was concerned about the lack of copy arriving on the editorial desk and made the comment 'one rumour, I have heard more than once, is that the *New Zealand Geographer* is not interested in 'quantitative geography' (whatever that might be)' (Johnston, 1970, 114). He went on to say that the journal is interested in work by any geographer that meets the standards of scholarship that its editors and referees have set. A mixture of quantitative research informed by the positivist episteme and qualitative research informed by the regionalist episteme, continued to feature in the *New Zealand Geographer* throughout the 1970s. The sister journal, the *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, aimed at geography teachers rather than the academics, also published a lot of positivist quantitative research during the same time frame. The 1977 edition of the *New Zealand Journal of Geography* had a number of such articles, which indicated that teachers were being informed about geography with a positivist approach by this time. These ranged from a paper on residential mobility in Hamilton (Poulsen 1977) to ones on industrial location (Taylor and McDermott, 1977). Both papers discussed a very limited range of factors, all of which could be quantified statistically.

Although physical geographers have continued to publish papers using a positivist approach, human geographers began to question this approach by the early 1980s.

In 1980 Peter Haggett, a human geographer, and one of the most influential figures internationally in the quantitative revolution in geography in the 1960s, was an Erskine Fellow at Canterbury. He wrote in a special publication that geography was moving on from model building.³ Haggett stated that the identification of the geographic region had been found to lie beyond the capability of the essentially limited quantitative tools available. He also talks of how it would be 'disappointing to see a run down of regional geography in the school curriculum at a time when the pendulum of the university geography may be swinging the other way' (Haggett, 1980, 9). A new regionalism never emerged, Haggett himself continued publishing positivist papers but many human geographers were already moving to using structures and social theory to inform their approaches to geography, having rejected the idea of general theories informing geographical thought (Tuan, 1972; Sayer, 1976; Gregory, 1978). However, the secondary school curriculum that was being re-written in the 1970s and early 1980s emerged with a decided positivist slant, which will be discussed in the next section on school geography.

4.4 Schools and positivism in New Zealand

The 2006 geography school syllabus used in New Zealand, which was initially developed in the 1970s and early 1980s, reflects the paradigm of positivism (Ministry of Education, 1990). Students are very much encouraged to see landscapes as systems with inputs, throughputs, and outputs. The use of quantitative techniques and hypothesis testing is encouraged even though this has been disputed as a main attribute of positivism (Johnston et al., 2000). The use of models is suggested for aspects of the syllabus, and as already noted, teachers in New Zealand,

continue to use fieldtrips to test hypotheses based on some of these models. When students undertake their own research the scientific method is encouraged. It is usually suggested to students, by their teachers at school, that a hypothesis is tested for such research projects and the data for this is usually collected on fieldtrips. Fieldtrips became a compulsory part of geography at bursary level (Form Seven and Year 13) from 1973, reflecting some of the early suggestions of the National Geography Curriculum Committee (NGCC), which first met to discuss the new syllabus in 1973 [see Figure 2.1]. Many of the participants of that committee had attended university in the 1960s during the era of positivist geography in New Zealand and this strongly influenced them in the writing of this document. The syllabus has had an enormous influence on school geography teaching for over thirty years. It is connected with the increase in fieldtrips being run in school geography, with fieldtrips becoming compulsory firstly at bursary level, and then at school certificate level (Form Five and Year 11) from 1986 [see Figure 2.1].

Work on the syllabus began in the 1970s and work carried on into the early 1980s. It was finally implemented as the 'Coordinated Geography Curriculum for Forms 5, 6 and 7' in 1987, although not finally published until 1990 as the *Syllabus for schools Forms 5, 6 and 7* (Learning Media Ministry of Education, 1990). The purpose of school geography is given as 'aim[ing] to help students develop an understanding of the environment as the home of people' (Ministry of Education, 1990). It has a strong blending of the earth and people, very much in a manner that would have been familiar to George Jobberns but underlying this is a powerful move to scientific method as the means of instruction with a definite empirical and practical focus. Interestingly, by this time, a lot of human geographers at university level had rejected the idea of it being possible to construct general theories to explain human behaviour and they had moved on to a consideration of how the various underlying mechanisms of society operate in order to arrive at geographical explanation.

Accompanying the syllabus changes, a number of documents were published by the New Zealand Geographical Society, the Board of

Geography Teachers and Resource Centre to give practical advice to teachers on the implementation of the new curriculum. These are of particular note in the manner of running of fieldtrips that is the focus of this research. There was a series of G documents published throughout the 1980s [Endnote 2, Chapter Two]. The G6 document discusses geographic skills and takes a scientific method approach to school geography. Items under discussion are: data gathering, comprehension, such as relationships shown by a diagrammatic model, processing, synthesis, and evaluation, testing a tentative model against reality the example given being von Thunen's land use model for Canterbury, (p30) G6.

The *G3 Geography field Studies Forms 5-7 Teacher Resource Material* and G2 documents are amongst the few documents that have been published by the Department of Education solely to help geography teachers with fieldwork and these documents also strongly emphasise a positivist approach. The G2 document consists of practical tasks (both fieldwork and class activities) submitted by a number of New Zealand secondary schools. G3 differs from G2 as this is the work of a single named author Chris Davidson, who was a teacher at a New Zealand Secondary School in the Manawatu region at that time (Davidson, 1981). Worksheet activities are provided to keep students active whilst on a bus trip, farm visit, mountain visit, including detailed questions and activities on soils and vegetation. There is a move from the G2 document which suggests collecting statistics to the G3 document where interpretation of the land using hypothesis testing is demonstrated. This is positivism, with hypothesis testing, collection, and analysis of data to the fore. The sections on the human impact on the environment are kept well separated from the considerations of soils and vegetation and a more quantitative approach is used for the sections on the natural environment. This separation of the human and physical sides of geography pervades the whole syllabus. This is characteristic of the compartmentalisation that occurs under positivism, where variables are often considered on an individual ad hoc basis.

The suggestions for fieldwork, given to teachers in the late 1970s and early 1980s by the G documents, and the syllabus, are for fieldwork in the positivist paradigm. There is also mention of a behaviourist approach, which has strong links to positivism and the construction of theories, this time on the 'basis of postulates regarding human behaviour' (Johnston 1974a; Johnston and Sidaway, 2004). The syllabus puts the behaviourist approach second, after what it calls a systematic approach. This was an attempt to introduce humans into the decision making process. Humans were regarded as making rational decisions; another characteristic of positivism. Behaviourism is used as a favoured approach to teaching in New Zealand secondary schools to this day. The systems approach is still used, according to the syllabus, to simplify and organise the complex environment in order to promote easy understanding (Ministry of Education, 1990).

The syllabus that was being put together in the 1970s, under the direction of the NGCC, thus had a range of approaches to the study of geography but emphasis was placed on a systematic approach; this was further developed in the accompanying G documents, designed to aid teachers in the implementation of the syllabus. It is little wonder that a number of the teachers, interviewed for the purposes of this research, teach in the positivist episteme as this is the syllabus which is current in New Zealand secondary teaching of geography. The suggestions for fieldwork, put forward in the G documents of the early 1980s, are of huge importance to the way in which many teachers in New Zealand run geography fieldtrips. These documents remain the only information published on fieldtrips for New Zealand teachers and thus form an important source of information for teachers in planning and executing fieldtrips.

Teachers also have access to geography textbooks, although in the interviews with participants, they rarely acknowledged influences from these on their fieldtrips. This is a case of the taken-for-granted, everyday nature of textbooks for teachers, (Ley, 1977). They use them so much in the course of their teaching, that the material becomes absorbed, and they fail to recognise the source of their knowledge. From the mid 1960s textbooks have been written from a positivist angle. The first of these that

was produced and used in New Zealand was by Mayhill and Bawden (1966), [Figure 2.1] which was also notable as the first textbook to move beyond the regional to a systematic approach to the teaching of geography. It also marked the beginning of secondary school teachers in New Zealand writing textbooks, which had previously been the territory of university and teacher training college lecturers. A British book by Barton (1985) on fieldwork, with a strongly positivist flavour, which included exercises on traffic flow outside a school, and observing and recording weather, was used by some New Zealand teachers. No such books have been published in New Zealand on fieldwork, and so teachers would often look overseas for ideas on practical activities to use on fieldtrips. Most New Zealand teachers have used the various Hensman et al. (1990, 1998) publications that have been published to complement the geography syllabus. There are a few fieldwork suggestions in these texts such as how to carry out practical exercises of measurement of slope, and longshore drift on a beach and how to undertake an urban transect which many teachers have utilised [see Figure 2.1]. All of these texts take a positivist approach to fieldtrips and have informed some of the teachers, who are *general theorists*.

From the interviews it became evident that teachers who are *general theorists* continue to get students to test models on human geography fieldtrips, particularly in the urban geography section of the Level Two NCEA Achievement Standards.⁴ The milieu that informs this is the *Syllabus for Schools Geography* and the *Achievement Standard 2.2 Explain an urban settlement*, which cite testing land use models as part of the syllabus. Models of land use are also covered in the texts such as Hensman et al. (1990,1991) and Hensman (1998), which are preferred textbooks in many New Zealand school geography departments.

4.5 Meanings

Concepts that emerged from the interviews are discussed using a grounded approach. Firstly, the meanings, which are the understandings of geography and of the place of fieldtrips within geography that emerged from the

interviews with the *general theorists*, are examined. The demonstration of each meaning by these participants as metaphor on actual fieldtrips is considered next. The milieux, any influences on the geographers which contribute to these understandings are considered last.

Over a third of the participants in the thesis research exercise are positivists. These are made up from ten teachers, spread evenly across the three regions, and twelve physical geography lecturers, interviewed from five of the six universities, where geography is a subject in which students can major in New Zealand.⁵ A number of distinct meanings about fieldtrips emerged from the interviews with these geographers, these are:

- Hypothesis testing
- Transfer of knowledge between localities
- Importance of skills
- Training for postgraduates

4.5.1 Hypothesis testing

The positivists' main rationale is to gain an understanding of the world through the construction of general theories. Both the lecturers, who followed this paradigm, and the teachers, adhered to this viewpoint. The main way in which this approach is demonstrated on fieldtrips, is that students are encouraged to develop hypotheses, that could be applied to the processes they are going to study, prior to the fieldtrip, based on information that they had been given on theories, models, laws, or systems. They collect information in the form of data and samples, on the fieldtrips, analyse the information collected in the laboratory, or classroom work afterwards and come up with findings that either support or reject the initial hypothesis.

Participants identified the most important meaning of fieldtrips as places, where data can be collected to test hypotheses. Some were specific about

the kinds of data collected such as identifying trees, collecting botanical specimens, and counting the trees in a unit area. Many of these geographers were keen for their students to obtain this very specific type of knowledge. More often the term, 'collecting data' was considered by the 'positivist participants' as a very important aspect of fieldtrips with no further unpacking of what the term actually meant. Some participants also mentioned sampling frames used to collect data, and the analysis of the data that had been collected, which took place on their return to the university or school in laboratory classes or the classroom:

'Always a focus, as a physical geographer, on the field work, going out and getting the data and analysing it as scientifically as possible and getting results that are reasonably reliable. I guess that is my philosophy. Unlike a lot of the human geographers, I still have a lot of faith in the scientific method for all its flaws and political influences. I guess logical thinking and that's what I try and get across to my students (Lecturer B1).

This lecturer is also explicit in his views of how human and physical geographers differ philosophically. Teachers were identical in their views on the meaning of fieldtrips as being places where scientific theories could be tested:

Yes [I do still use the scientific method as a basis] probably for what I have been doing this year for the coastal one [fieldtrip]; the groups did work on a hypothesis, proving or disproving it, and I was just trying to think for cultural [processes], yes we did for that as well.... they came up with a hypothesis because for research for Level Two, it is 'guidance' so they have to come up with the hypothesis was a bit of guidance [chuckle] (Teacher B1).

Some British literature on fieldtrips views them as promoting experiential learning (Mellor, 1991; Ellis, 1993; McEwen, 1996). This is seen as a primary focus of fieldtrips by participants, although Higgitt (1996, 393) is of the view that each of the four stages of 'thinking, planning, doing and reflecting' must be present to achieve maximum learning potential. Most of

the *general theorists* did include all the stages and many have introduced a complete research fieldtrip where the students consider an issue, develop an hypothesis, plan out their research, collect data, analyse the data to support, or reject the hypothesis, present findings, and evaluate the research process.

The narratives that inform metaphor for fieldtrips as practised by this group of geographers are that they are part of research projects that are to support, or reject hypotheses. Such projects are now in place in courses at the five universities where these participants are identified. These are Canterbury, Otago, Auckland, Massey, and Victoria; only at Waikato, with its emphasis on human geography, did I not encounter any participants, who are *general theorists*, in the interviews.⁵ The Canterbury physical geographers have moved from fieldtrips that have a structure of individual days on different aspects of physical geography, with a final student project day, to fieldtrips totally focused on student projects. Work commences prior to the fieldtrip, with the formulation of an hypothesis, and the fieldtrip is to gather data, to support or reject this hypothesis; on the students' return from the fieldtrip they analyse and present results, in support of, or rejecting, their original supposition.

This move to students working on totally student project orientated fieldtrips tends to be a feature of second and third year fieldtrips in New Zealand universities. This metaphor is also now present at school level in New Zealand, and is associated with reasons of national assessment. Since the advent of the NCEA assessment, teachers, who are *general theorists*, have used the inquiry achievement standards to instil a simple form of scientific method in students.⁶ One aspect that is common to all teachers who are *general theorists* is the emphasis placed on hypothesis testing. Lonergan and Anderson (1988) stated that fieldwork is regarded as a way in which hypotheses can be tested and this group of teachers and lecturers, who were participants in this study, believe in this as one of their main rationales for fieldtrips. One teacher described in detail what her students do on a trip to Tongariro:

They have to do vegetation quadrats, they have to think, they have to have to hypothesise, they have to come up with a hypothesis, where they can prove or disprove it. We give them some ideas the night before they go out, like the shape of a valley where a stream is, or it might be rock sizes in different areas, or that vegetation will decrease as they are further away from the track, or increase further away from the track or whatever they want to do; and it gives them a chance to prove or disprove that (Teacher B2).

The milieu for these geographers is their own undergraduate training as physical geographers, who were instilled in the concepts of laws, rules, systems, models, as ways of providing explanations for geographical processes and for the location of geographical features, spatial analysis, and how these interact, which is locational analysis. Those geographers trained in the 1960s and early 1970s would have also encountered such an approach in their human geography courses. This approach has been further influenced, in the case of lecturers, by their own readings of other academic papers in physical geography. The milieu for teachers has been their own syllabus and the 'G' documents, discussed earlier in this chapter, and with the recent inquiry achievement standards under NCEA assessment. As with the lecturers in this paradigm, all the teachers took some papers in physical geography when undergraduates.

Lecturer B2 discussed how his own milieu had influenced him in hypothesis testing. He had regard for the idea of wonderment and discovery on fieldtrips, which he attributed to his own undergraduate training, where he was encouraged to provide supporting evidence to reject a hypothesis, rather than provide evidence to support it. The concept of proving hypotheses false has a wider backdrop, as Popper (1970) talks of how hypotheses can never be verified, only falsified, so that disciplines are in constant revolution as members of that discipline try to prove each other's theories wrong. If a hypothesis is disproved, new knowledge can be constructed as a fresh theory is put forward to replace the rejected hypothesis.

At the more specific level of the practice of fieldtrips for undergraduates and school children that is being discussed here, hypothesis testing, whether to reject or support hypotheses is viewed as crucial to an understanding of geography by this group of lecturers and teachers. The next point to discuss that they consider important is linked to the ability to impose theories that are universal.

4.5.2 Transfer of knowledge between localities

An important meaning for geographers, who use positivist philosophy, is that knowledge can be transferred between localities with ease. Once a theory is established it can be applied in many settings. It is viewed as being independent, largely, of the context. Thus the theories can be viewed in various localities and a physical geographer feels that he/she can make statements about features in a new locality from his/her knowledge of them in other localities that he/she has visited. This has a number of implications for the meaning of fieldtrips for these geographers. One lecturer said:

I would be very happy going to anywhere in the world, possibly one that I have never studied before and be able to look and to draw something out of that system and inform students, or researchers, or whatever (Lecturer B3).

Teachers also mentioned the same idea of being able to transfer knowledge between localities by applying theories that had been tested in one locality to another, seeing themselves as experts. Even though Lecturer B3 talks of being able to go anywhere in the world, this group of geographers usually choose places for their students to visit on fieldtrips, which show 'the best' examples of the features that are being studied. Lecturer B3 went on later in the interview to name places that he had taken students to, which had 'perfect' examples of certain geomorphological features.

Both teachers and lecturers will often try to find the 'best' example of a physical or cultural feature or process to show their students on fieldtrips to use as an illustrative case study. The real world is used as an 'exemplar'. Thus an extreme environment such as the Tongariro National Park is used by many of the teachers to demonstrate volcanic processes or Queenstown is used to illustrate tourist processes at it 'is a tourist mecca for the whole of New Zealand' (Teacher B3). Teacher B4 also mentioned this, talking of how she took students to the Gold Coast for similar reasons.

Teachers have to teach both human and physical parts of the geography curriculum, and teachers amongst this group usually keep these separate. Teacher B3 ran separate trips for the natural processes and cultural processes as part of the seventh form geography syllabus. For both she took students to the best locality she could find, Karitane for coastal processes, and Queenstown for cultural processes.

Natural processes only touches on humans being there whereas cultural aspects only briefly touches on the fact that we are in the natural environment; so basically they are very cut and dried which for the kids is quite good because they know that is to do with that, and that is do with that; there is no merging and melding. I see that as positive (Teacher B3).

The group saw fieldtrips as providing examples of the laws or theories that had been dealt with in their lectures. The fieldtrips were kept separate so that by considering a limited range of features individual theories could be tested. If the human and physical trips had been combined it was perceived by the teacher that there would be muddling of the theories by students, as there would be too many variables to consider. The positivists consider a limited range of features, both when establishing theories and when they are tested.

Many teachers talked of using fieldtrips as case studies for their students, to use later in examination answers, Teacher B4 mentioned that 'I'm always trying for that data [from fieldtrips] to be the case study data that they will

incorporate into whatever answers they are doing for whatever topic that they are doing that is relevant' (Teacher B4). The converse to the individual example or case study, which teachers and lecturers regularly mentioned as a meaning of fieldtrips, was the idea of a fieldtrip giving the bigger picture. Again this was place independent and is the same concept as the individual case study at a different scale. This was frequently noted, and indicates a tension between reliance on the particular and the immense. McEwen (1996, 381) gave it as a commonly stated aim of fieldtrips, the integrating of 'fragmented or compartmentalised knowledge into a coherent whole'.

Linked to this is another idea that McEwen mentioned, a number of the teachers, who are in this group, talked of making the information in a textbook clearer. This idea of understanding a textbook is analogous to a term that some of the lecturers used namely 'reading the landscape'. As the interview progressed, in each case when this was mentioned, I realised that 'reading the landscape' was not the Cosgrove and Daniels (1988) and Daniels (1985) approach of deconstructing meaning of place, but rather an unpacking of the natural processes that led to the formation of that landscape. This unpacking was done by teachers as a way of linking the textbook to the landscape that was being studied on the fieldtrip. It was in fact another example of general theories being applied to the landscape to focus it into small manageable parts for an understanding that is the overarching rationale for all *general theorists* on geography fieldtrips. As with the teachers in this group, lecturers kept their fieldtrips distinct as physical geography fieldtrips. Even those who were aware of the impact of the landscape on people, and peoples' impact on the landscape, kept their own teaching and fieldtrips as distinct physical geography by ignoring features such as human settlement.

The Cook's Tour landscape day was an image given by teachers and lecturers in this episteme that informs metaphor for this meaning, transfer of knowledge between localities. A number of universities and schools run such tours at the beginning of a residential fieldtrip, where students are taken in a bus around a large number of localities and the lecturer or

teacher gives a commentary on the features that can be observed before students go off to work on their own projects [Endnote 1, Chapter One]. Teachers did not indicate any knowledge of the origin of the term Cook's Tour and used the expression as referring to any bus tour of considerable length (usually at least one day in duration). Explanations are designed to explain how a limited range of processes operates in the landscape to give students an overview of the area. Another way of linking the component parts of a landscape mentioned by this group is the way in which teachers link the textbook to the landscape by applying systems analysis to the geographic processes that are being observed. In this way theory is often linked to actual examples that can be observed on fieldtrips. One teacher explicitly mentioned this 'I take the approach that one thing affects another and change in one part of a system affects another' (Teacher B5).

Another narrative of fieldtrips that informs metaphor is that of general theories taught in the classroom or lecture hall which can be seen 'in action' on the fieldtrip. A particular relationship is established between theory from the textbook, studied in the classroom and then observed 'outside' (in the field). One mentioned how the examples were linked together to give the bigger picture:

We went to a series of beaches, which look quite different; and also following the sediments along the river from the top of the river, along to the bottom, and to the coast, and measuring the sediment; measuring the profiles having a look at the processes that were going on and trying to tie it together in a story (Lecturer B4).

Another talked of how fieldtrips, were used to show examples of material taught in the classroom and were often used at first year level to set the scene for students:

The fieldtrip was a day long, a 'look and see' at examples of what we have been studying in the lecture. So for example in 'Physical Geography and Global Environments', we take them out, for a day, just in the local area, looking at examples of landscapes and landforms that we have studied in the

class. So that they can see for themselves that this is how things are put together in the landscape in physical geography (Lecturer B3).

The milieux that influenced the geographers in this group, are their own undergraduate, and in the case of the lecturers, also their own graduate training, at university. All the lecturers and teachers had attended physical geography courses at university during which they went on fieldtrips. Many recounted these in detail and talked of how their own ability to 'read a landscape' came from such fieldtrips. Usually a dynamic lecturer was also mentioned as the person who had enthused them in this activity and many would choose to go on extra fieldtrips so that they could become more adept at interpreting the landscape, by understanding the individual physical processes that had were acting upon it. They had been taught to build knowledge in geography by a process of deduction. General theories were expounded in the lecture hall when they were undergraduates and they went on fieldtrips to see examples of such theories in operation in the world. Such ideas have formed an important rationale for these geographers in the way they teach geography and this rationale is a prime objective for the running of their own fieldtrips. Teacher B6 related her own views to her own university experience, on how theory, taught in the classroom, was associated with fieldtrips:

It is the practical almost hands-on experience of a field trip.... what they are seeing relating to the issues, the theories, the areas of study in the geography course and that is really so important. That was done at university field trips that I went on and that did influence me on how important that was in learning, and the tools for learning, and why geography was such a strong subject and it was a subject where field trips are part of that learning (Teacher B6).

Most of the teachers who are *general theorists*, fully planned, ran, and executed only physical geography fieldtrips. Another teacher in the school, who had specialised in human geography at university and used the approach of applying structures to interpret the world, planned, ran, and executed human geography fieldtrips. If there was no other teacher

currently teaching in the school, who could design the human geography fieldtrips, teachers would use unchanged a fieldtrip that had already been set up in the school by a previous teacher. Teacher B3 had done this. As noted she organised the coastal fieldtrip herself to Karitane but used a fieldtrip organised by a former teacher in the school to Queenstown to study the cultural process of tourism. Alternatively, general theory teachers would use a human geography fieldtrip that another school had arranged. Teachers liked to be experts in the topics that they were taking students to study on fieldtrips.

Teachers B2, B3, and B4 had a different background to the other teachers whose approach to fieldtrips was in this paradigm. They had been at university as undergraduates in the 1990s and had taken courses in human geography with a deconstructive approach. However, their approach to fieldtrips had not been influenced by these courses, they could not recall any details of them. What they remembered were the physical geography fieldtrips that they had attended and they modelled their own fieldtrips on the approach taken in these fieldtrips, which was a positivist approach. This was further enhanced by the New Zealand secondary school geography syllabus, and documents such as the G documents, about organising and running fieldtrips, all written in the positivist episteme.

4.5.3 Skill acquisition

All the geographers in this group, both teachers and lecturers, viewed fieldtrips as essential for the acquisition of skills. One aspect of skill formation is acquiring 'taken-for-granted skills' that one lecturer described as the very basic skills that students learn on fieldtrips, and are rarely commented upon, but are crucial to data collection:

And they learn skills like the difference between recording in the laboratory and recording in the field, that it is more difficult; it is difficult to keep your notes dry; it is difficult not to make the pencil make holes in the wet paper and all this sort of stuff; you need to be organised and prepared; you've got to know each day as you go out, have I got a notebook, the pencil, the reserve pencil, the anorak, this list of things you have to think about each morning, otherwise the day can be a complete disaster, leave the vital piece of equipment behind you traipse five miles; 'x' says: 'I didn't bring it'. They are not very popular (Lecturer B2).

A tension emerges here between the accurate recording and collection of data required under the scientific method and the reality of wet paper and difficult weather conditions. This lecturer views such skill development as disciplining mind and body. The collection of data was viewed as being a way of actively engaging students that this group encouraged, even under adverse weather conditions. This is linked with the view, taken by *general theorists* that fieldtrips are essential to knowledge acquisition, and should be run even if there are logistical problems. Most geographers in this group run fieldtrips in every course that they teach, a teacher talked of how she did this:

When I was a HOD, I made sure that each level for 11, 12, and 13 had at least two trips and sometimes more; they would vary, Year 11s would sometimes only have been a couple of half days, or one half day and one full day; it would be variety in building up to Year 13, and when I had Year 9 and 10 geography, we always... we were at a school where we split the social studies curriculum into geography history and economic components; and so that's why you would run it through from Year 9 to 13; and I would always have at least one trip, generally two trips each year, for each class; it's just something I've always incorporated (Teacher B1).

Lecturers, too from this group, ran fieldtrips in every course that they taught. Lecturer B5 said 'I cannot conceive of teaching any level course without running field trips within it'. He considered that fieldtrips were the only way that students could learn to operate equipment in an environment with

harsh conditions such as a glacial area. Fieldtrips had been established at the inception of the course, and this occurred at all stages in the career of these lecturers. New, young lecturers would establish fieldtrips in all courses in their first year of teaching, and older lecturers who had been teaching for decades, continued to run fieldtrips for all courses that they taught. They also believed that there is a progression in skill acquisition as a student progresses through the years of studying geography. These lecturers saw fieldtrips as a necessity and took their students out 'into the field' at the earliest opportunity in their courses.

A teacher talked of basic skills taught in the first year of teaching geography at school level 'we did a lot of sketching, the field sketching and the naming of the volcanoes, even things we take for granted like which way is north' (Teacher B7). By the time students are in the fourth year at university, skills, taught and considered essential by the lecturers, are more specialised and require more equipment:

[A]ugering the sand samples, and analysing the sand and surveying profiles across sand country, and looking at sea level changes, and things like that, I still incorporate in my teaching and with graduate students (Lecturer B1).

All these participants mentioned the importance of skill acquisition and this is a narrative that informs metaphor for these fieldtrips. Details were often given of their meticulous nature, and of how this should be linked back to the analysis of the items measured, so relating back to hypothesis testing, measurement is another main rationale that has been identified:

[M]easurement, what is the meaning of precision, how can you improve the quality of measurements, what can go wrong in measurement regime; it is what message can you find in a set of measurements, those are the most important things to me (Lecturer B6).

Most of these participants talked of how it was essential for students to co-operate together to be able to implement skill acquisition successfully, and these geographers viewed this as a positive process that took place on

fieldtrips. Often there would only be a few pieces of equipment and to operate them successfully students had to work together:

I think they all need to make a contribution for it to work well, often with jobs we do like boring holes in the ground to get samples, and levelling and so on. They need to take turns. Augering is quite hard work, the same with the levelling they need to help each other it's a technique that takes a little while to learn to do properly so they need to cooperate and everybody really needs to help out (Lecturer B1).

The milieu for these geographers, in skill acquisition on fieldtrips, are their own training in the subject, and for the lecturers, their own current research. The lecturers were all active researchers. Without exception, they continue in a research topic that they began at university themselves, when undergraduates or graduate students, thus a lecturer who did his PhD on coastal processes, continues to research in this area. Similarly Lecturer B7 talked of how his research links back to his own graduate, and postgraduate research, and is linked to fieldtrips that he takes with his students to support the courses that he teaches:

In terms of university career, and what I do with students, fieldwork has always been part of what I do. As you can imagine the fact that my thesis topic was in the high country of Canterbury, and my PhD topic was in the Canadian Rockies so obviously a huge part of my life (Lecturer B7).

Teachers too, ran physical geography fieldtrips that reflected topics that they had researched when undergraduates, or graduates. Teacher B1 talked of how she had changed the topic taught after moving to a new school, from a study of volcanic processes, which the previous teacher had run, to coastal studies. She linked this back herself to the third year undergraduate fieldtrip that she had taken part in when a student at Auckland University, which had been coastal. She had even done extra fieldwork on coasts to help some Masterate students, when she was an undergraduate, as she was so keen about this topic, and mentioned that if she had a chance to do research now would study coastal features. Teacher B8 had also been an

undergraduate at Auckland and went on to do a Masterate in vegetation on sand dunes. She put a lot of emphasis on her students doing studies of vegetation, when on their seventh form fieldtrip to Tongariro. Again she had changed this from the emphasis placed by the previous teacher who ran the course. In both these cases the teachers were aware of having specialised knowledge about the equipment required and skills needed for the particular environments in which they had been trained.

4.5.4 Encouraging students to go on as postgraduates

A final meaning of fieldtrips for this group of geographers is that they are an important means of encouraging students to carry on with geography into postgraduate work. This particular objective of fieldtrips is only of relevance to the lecturers. However, combined with this concept, is the general promotional nature of fieldtrips throughout geography undergraduate, and school courses, considered as important by most of this group. This is a concept that is mentioned by geographers considered in other chapters, but here it is discussed specifically in relation to the retention of students into Masterate and Doctoral research in geography. Further to this view, is a belief not only in the academic nature of how fieldtrips enthuse students in geography, but reflection is made on the social nature of fieldtrips. Again, this is a view expressed by geographers whose approach to the subject is in other areas than the paradigm considered in this chapter. Here it is linked with the way it encourages students to pursue geography to higher levels.

Some lecturers were explicit about how they selected students, who were already considering a postgraduate qualification, to accompany them on the lecturers' own research fieldwork:

One sort of fieldtrip that I haven't talked about is the research fieldtrip that's my fieldwork. I almost always do that with students as well; and that is trips to Antarctica. They are really small groups, four to six people at a

time, and the bulk of the other people are students, or academics, from other institutions. We go in the summer and they are pretty special experiences for me and I think for the students as well. I usually select them on the basis of keenness and that they are achieving at a high level and they are actually on track to do a masters qualification; and they will usually have done my courses on the way through (Lecturer B5).

Fieldtrips for this lecturer were viewed as training in learning specialised methodology, knowledge, and skill acquisition in the Antarctic environment for prospective postgraduate students. At Victoria University, physical geography lecturers run a large fieldtrip each year for their fourth year students. Mention was made of the twofold purpose of academic knowledge being gained and there being a social agenda to make lecturers appear more personable:

All physical geographers go on field trips; the physical geography staff go; it also has a dual purpose, it exposes students to who the staff are, and their research, so it is not just this funny fellow who stands at the front, they are actually people; and showing them the research aspect; often we have demonstrators and graduate students; they will come along as well to give a hand; the main academic structure and leadership will come from the academic staff (Lecturer B8).

The dual nature of social and academic objectives was mentioned by many of the lecturers, some were keen on developing ways to make geography enjoyable for students and attract them to the subject in this way:

I try and make fieldtrips fun, and try and make sure the students learn something. I think that's it really just to try and make them fun and make them worthwhile, so that the students learn something (Lecturer B9).

Others were more specific about the social interaction that occurs on fieldtrips and the beneficial nature of this for staff/student relationships:

When you get out in the field, the main benefit for students is the fact that they are in small numbers and so they get to know the lecturers much better. So it breaks down all those power barriers that you get in the lecture theatre. So it is much more conversational and you can chat about things related to the course, and things related to their life, and find out about each other and so it is having that space for dialogue (Lecturer B10).

All lecturers in this group were keen to express the positives of encouraging social interaction on field courses to stimulate a fun element and less formal interaction between staff and students than those geographers in any other episteme. Their own milieux were that as undergraduates and postgraduates themselves they had enjoyed their experiences on fieldtrips both socially and in terms of knowledge acquisition and saw these as positive events, resulting in their continuation in the subject. Together with this they viewed the specialised nature of gaining skills and building expertise in their chosen research area that took place in an environment such as a coastal area or glacial environment as essential if a student was to go further in the subject. All these lecturers believed that it was possible to fully understand the processes and landscapes that were being studied and if a student had lots of experiences in a particular type of environment understanding would be extended.

4.6 Conclusions

All the *general theorists* are physical geographers. This is a contrast to the other groups of geographers considered in this study. A significant difference in meaning emerges between the approach to fieldtrips of the *classifiers* and the *general theorists*. Primarily, this stems from the former using an inductive approach to geography, and the latter group a deductive approach. This means fieldtrips led by both these approaches are very strongly informed by general theory. Though geographers informed by

positivism used maps these played a less crucial role than they did for the geographers considered in Chapter Three.

The *general theorists* are the most place independent of any of the groups of geographers who participated in this study. They view fieldtrips as places where the theory that they teach students in lectures or in the classroom is demonstrated. Sometimes they call these case studies, such examples are viewed as being transferable across localities and so can be said to be place independent. These case studies can be used as examples of the theoretical concepts in examination answers. This is in contrast to the *classifiers*, as they see fieldtrip location as contexts where information can be amassed to produce regions that have similar attributes.

The *general theorists* draw no such boundaries. Instead, the meaning of a place visited on a fieldtrip, is as a laboratory, in which a number of processes that have been discussed previously in class or in the lecture room may be identified. The narrative that, informs metaphor is that on some fieldtrips, these features are described to the students, but on others students are expected to be able to come to some understanding themselves of how the features formed, and to use these understandings to substantiate, or refute, the hypothesis that the student had established about the landscape features being studied. This is usually achieved by students collecting data or samples in the landscape and taking them back to the laboratory or classroom for analysis, after which a statement can be made as to whether the suppositions can be supported or not. Hypothesis testing is a main rationale of the *general theorists* to construct knowledge and separates them from the other groups of geographers studied.

The main motif of fieldtrips practised by these geographers is one where students are shown exemplars of features that have been studied in the lecture hall or classroom. Lecturers and teachers alike would travel considerable distances to take students to the 'best' example of a physical feature. Once at the site of the physical feature the main activities engaged in by students were measuring and recording mathematically measurable

aspects of the feature. This is related to the theoretical perspective whereby statistical techniques are used to 'test' hypotheses.

This group of geographers sees landscapes as being capable of being completely understood by the observer who is seen as impartial and does not effect nor is affected by the landscape studied. The features studied on any one fieldtrip are limited as the general theories examine only a few variables. Many aspects of the landscape are not considered, especially features constructed or influenced by people. In fact often there is very little mention of how people use the landscape, which is very different from the *classifiers*, and the geographers who are studied in the next chapter, who use structures to interpret the world and approach fieldtrips with different meanings. For this group structures are described to students in order to help them to understand what is happening in a specific place that is visited on a fieldtrip. Place and people become more important to these geographers, and students are encouraged to gain a deep understanding of places visited by investigating and probing the structures in the locality. This is in significant contrast to the *general theorists*, who see knowledge as transferable between localities and often as independent of the influence of people in the landscape.

The milieux, which inform these geographers' fieldtrips, are their own research interests. For physical geographers these become very specialised at an early stage in their career and all preferred to take fieldtrips in their specialised research area rather than in any other, where they are not so expert. Even teachers, whose approach to the practice of fieldtrips is in this paradigm, organise their trips to be about topics that they researched in their undergraduate, or graduate training. These geographers believe that they have specialised knowledge and can share this with their students so that they too can become authorities about the environments studied.

Another important meaning of fieldtrips for this group of geographers is the acquisition of skills, appropriate to the landscape area being studied. Lecturer B1, who had specialised in coasts, since his own graduate days, talked of taking students to learn skills such as augering on sand dunes.

These geographers thought that fieldtrips were essential to their teaching, because these skills could be imparted to their students. To do this they had to go to particular places to demonstrate how the equipment could be used in the type of landscape that they were studying, as often the skills were particular to that landscape study.

This in turn is associated with another meaning of fieldtrips for these geographers, as a training ground for their graduate and postgraduate students. Gaining expertise in skills, and the knowledge of the landscape, were viewed as crucial to encouraging students to carry on with the discipline. By giving them opportunities, such as is done at Victoria University, to actually lead aspects of fieldtrips, provides opportunities for training future lecturers as well as the actual research elements of the study.

Further encouragement to carry on with studying geography into postgraduate work, is seen as coming from fieldtrip socialising. This includes socialisation between lecturers and students and socialisation between students. For some of the activities in physical geography this was essential as a lot of the equipment requires more than one person to operate it. So group work becomes obligatory and was described in depth by some of these geographers. Lecturers see fieldtrips as sites for learning the discipline of scientific method and schooling the mind and body. There was also the idea of motivating students to continue in geography, by encouraging them to have a good time on fieldtrips.

Teachers and lecturers alike see fieldtrips as necessities in geography teaching and cannot conceive of running any geography course without fieldtrips. They introduce a fieldtrip into a course, often in their first year of teaching that class.

Teachers and lecturers described very similar meanings to fieldtrips and these were informed largely by their own milieux as undergraduates and graduate students. In New Zealand since the 1960s, geographers have established an approach to physical geography, using general theories to

explain the world, and using fieldtrips as examples where these can be demonstrated, or as places where hypotheses are tested, in fieldtrips. From the 1980s, there was a parting of the ways between most human and physical geographers at university level. This is examined further in the next chapter. Most human geographers moved to approaches to fieldtrips that were informed by using structures to explain the world. Physical geography lecturers have continued in the paradigm of using general theories to understand the world on the fieldtrips that they run and this has informed the milieu of generations of undergraduates who have attended these trips. This even includes some undergraduates whose main interest at university was in deconstructivist human geography in the 1990s. Because the geographers who deconstruct the world run few fieldtrips, a point which is discussed more fully in Chapter Six, their undergraduates, when they became teachers themselves, followed the metaphor given to them on the physical geography fieldtrips that they had attended. This was to run fieldtrips in the positivist episteme.

Another dichotomy between the university lecturers and teachers is that the teachers who are *general theorists* continue to get students to test models on land use and urban size on human geography fieldtrips and university lecturers do not do this. Nearly all teachers in New Zealand include activities on fieldtrips on testing land use models. For the teachers, who use structures to understand the world, the hypothesis-testing model is only a minor part of the way they practice fieldtrips. For the teachers who have been studied in this chapter it complements their other positivist approaches of hypothesis testing that they practise on fieldtrips.

The discussion moves on to a group of geographers whose approach to the practice of fieldtrips contrasts with that of the *general theorists*, as it is not so empirically based. Instead, the underlying structures which create the world are investigated. It is very much an episteme that is used by human geographers and is examined in the next chapter.

Notes

1 I was an undergraduate at St Andrews University in the early 1970s, and substantiate this view, recalling the emphasis placed on *Locational Analysis in Human Geography* in courses at that time, especially from a young lecturer, Dr Andrew Dawson, who is still in the Geography Department at St Andrews University.

2 One of the Canterbury graduates who undertook a PhD in the USA and returned to Canterbury as a lecturer was:

'Leslie King, as a Canterbury graduate, [who] went to Iowa on a Fulbright scholarship to do a PhD in 1957 and became part of the quantification thrust. The influence of Schaeffer, who had created such a stir in the geographical world in the 1950s with his paper outlining a systematic approach in the subject (1953), was still strong at Iowa though Schaeffer had died. King returned to Canterbury as a lecturer and introduced quantitative methods to the Department. In this he was supported by the Professor who had recently succeeded George Jobberns, Leigh Pownall, who approved of the new geography coming into the Department' (Hammond, 1992,195-6)

King published widely in quantitative geography in the 1960s (King, 1961, 1962, 1964, 1969a, 1969b).

3 Haggett, P. 1980: 'Emerging trends in regional geography', in *Futures in Human Geography*, Forer, P. (ed.), Canterbury Branch of the NZGS 1-11, publication in honour of George Jobberns 1895-1974 CBE Hon LL.D (Cant) M.A. D.Sc. (NZ) honorary fellow of Geographical Society, foundation and life member of New Zealand Geographical Society. Haggett's article is from a public lecture given in Christchurch on March 30th 1979.

4 Achievement Standard 2.2 'Explain an urban settlement'.

5 At Waikato there is a Department of Earth Sciences and a Department of Geography. I only interviewed members of the geography department, who are all human geographers and so this is the 'missing' department amongst the positivists.

6 The inquiry achievement standards for geography are:

NCEA Level One Geography Achievement Standard 1.5 'Carry out directed geographic research',

NCEA Level Two Geography Achievement Standard 2.5 'Carry out guided geographic research',

NCEA Level Three Geography Achievement Standard 3.5 'Carry out geographic research' with consultation'.

Chapter Five – geographers who use structures to interpret the world

5.1 Introduction

In the early 1970s, an epistemological shift occurred for some human geographers that saw a change in the way that they constructed knowledge. Instead of the detached observer of the positivist episteme, there was a philosophical movement towards considering social processes as a means of attaining knowledge (Harvey, 1973). To understand the intricacies of the world, the underlying relationships, of society, of culture, and the economy were examined. A distinction was made between the empirical surface appearance of the world and the underlying structural relationships where primacy was given to economic relationships.

On fieldtrips the metaphor for these geographers is understanding the social, cultural and political structures of the places visited and studied. Thus the term *structuralist* is used for this group of geographers. Although covering a number of separate epistemes these geographers are grouped together and this grouping is discussed in Section 5.2. A longer section follows, on those university lecturers in New Zealand, who practise this type of geography. In Section 5.4 there is consideration of those lecturers who have changed their approach to geography over the years, since a number of the geographers who use structuralist approaches, and are in this grouping, formerly worked in other paradigms.

As the discussion in Section 5.4 unfolds, mention is made of key figures in New Zealand geography who help to demonstrate this approach to geography. The section on teachers who are *structuralists* draws on material from the interviews, as there is no published material on this paradigm at the secondary level. Many of these teachers demonstrate some

aspect of the changing theoretical approaches that was discussed in relation to university lecturers.

In the following portions of this chapter, perspectives that show meanings that have emerged from interviews with these geographers, are discussed in detail to reach an understanding of how these geographers run fieldtrips in the ways that they describe. To gain a fuller understanding of their approach, the memories that give rise to their beliefs are examined. A description of, and analysis of, the narratives, or the practical details of how these geographers run fieldtrips then follows in order to show the metaphors involved in their field trips experiences.

5.2 The Marxian, radical, and structural geographers

Marxian, radical, and structural geographers focused on different means of understanding society, space, and environment than those used by the positivists. In the early 1970s, after the publication of *Social Justice and the City* (Harvey, 1973) and Bunge's work in deprived areas of North American cities (Bunge 1973), geographers began to acknowledge the role of structures, of capital, of government, and of networks between countries and between institutions in the production of place. Harvey's work focused on social production of space, Marxism, and the influence of capital accumulation on society and the implications that this has for class struggle and exploitation. This approach, with its strong emphasis on social, capital, and political structures is termed Marxist geography and Harvey still expounds this as a formidable theory in terms of its significant explanatory value (Harvey, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2002).

Radical geographers took ideas such as those of Marx and in a few cases sought to apply these to transform society. Such political pressures as the Prague Spring of 1968, the student movements in Paris of the same year, the Civil Rights movements in America, and the women's' liberation

movements of the 1960s are for these geographers memories which inform their milieux. They included the early feminist geographers, who saw societal structures as promoting a male hegemony and the subjugation of the female in structures such as the rise of suburbs (MacKenzie and Rose, 1983). Feminists critiqued the binary distinction between the public and private spheres. This included consideration of how the distribution and separation of different land uses divided, and segregated women, confining and restricting them (McDowell, 1983). Another group of feminist geographers, influenced by welfare geography, concerned themselves with descriptions of the effects of gender inequality on individuals (Bowlby et al., 1989). Currently many feminist geographers use a post-structuralist approach and deconstruct the stabilities of gender and society. Butler (1990, 1993) has shown how the body is informed by such constructs, as has Longhurst (1997a, 1997b, 2003); these later approaches to geography by feminist geographers are considered in more detail in Chapter 6.

There was fierce debate about politicised issues in *Antipode*, the journal of radical geography, which began in 1969. Bunge began his fieldwork in urban areas in the early 1970s in order to teach his students about the political and economic injustices in society. The revolutionary zeal of these early radical geographers in the late 1960s and early 1970s was succeeded by a more sober intellectual atmosphere that became more contained within the accepted political movements of society for some of these academics. Emphasis was placed, less on changing society by political means, and more on understanding the social production of existence by economic structures. Fieldtrips reflected these movements, students were taken to government and local government departments to hear about changing frameworks in society such as new transport networks being constructed or alterations such as gentrification which sought to re-vitalise areas of blighted inner cities. Some have seen such moves to gentrification as a way of capitalist society trying to impose economic pathways of movement of capital and so reproduce class differences in capitalist society (Smith, 1979; Zukin, 1982).

This approach, considering political ideology and putting forward left wing views, was very much the approach that human geographers at Victoria

University, Wellington had been practicing under Buchanan for two decades by the time Harvey wrote *Social Justice and the City* (Buchanan, 1962, 1964, 1970, 1972). Many in New Zealand viewed Buchanan as a left wing firebrand in the 1950s and 1960s as he wrote and lectured from a very political angle on the emerging communist state of China (Cumberland, 1955). An institutionalisation of the approach occurred in the 1970s and 1980s as theoretical writings, such as those by Harvey, became more prominent (Harvey, 1973, 1982; Brenner, 1977; Storper and Scott, 1986).

Overlapping with some of the views of the Marxists and radical geographers are those who considered that the way to understand the world is by concentrating on the structures that underlie society. They were influenced by the French philosopher Louis Althusser (1969); see also Althusser and Balibar, (1970) and Levis Strauss in anthropology, who studied the dynamic relations between the whole, and the parts of, the capitalist system. Such ideas of focusing on structures came from linguistic work by de Saussure (Johnston and Sidaway, 2004), pivoting on the rules and conventions that enabled language to operate. From such ideas of emphasising underlying structures, has come work by those such as the geographer, social theorist, and feminist, Doreen Massey (1984, 1995) to consider how such structures operate at a local scale. She regards the differences that occur between places as being due to different histories. She interweaves ideas of space and place, dealing with both the general and the individual.

As an alternative to the strong emphasis placed on structures and social processes, a smaller group of geographers promoted views based on the importance of human agency in knowledge production. This is the humanist approach, which was discussed in Chapters One and Two and is the approach of the whole of this thesis. In an attempt to overcome the voluntarism associated with humanism and the determinism of structural approaches, realist and structuralist theories were put forward largely by Sayer (1982, 1984a, 1984b, 1985a, 1985b). These were adapted from the works of the sociologist, Giddens, (1979, 1981, 1984, 1985) as ways of approaching human geography. Realists see an element of human agency, as well as an understanding of structures, as being necessary elements in

the creation of knowledge. Some of the university lecturers, interviewed for this research, acknowledged some influence from these theories that were prevalent in the late 1970s and early 1980s. All felt that there were difficulties in putting humanist ideas into practice, as has been noted by Johnston et al. (2000) and they therefore preferred the approaches that were informed by structure.¹

5.3 New Zealand's Marxian, radical, and structural geography lecturers

By the late 1970s, a large number of human geographers in New Zealand were beginning to use ideas put forward by the Marxian, radical, and structuralist geographers in their teaching, research, and construction of knowledge. These are epistemes that many human geographers are still using in all geography departments of the universities in New Zealand. A great number of those interviewed are at the University of Auckland School of Geography and Environmental Sciences, which is partially a function of the snowballing technique that was used to invite participants into the research. At Auckland, a geographer was approached, whose main research is in the structuralist and radical epistemes, and he suggested other geographers, the majority of whose approaches to geography were in the same epistemes. At some universities, no geographers in these epistemes were interviewed, even though it is known that there are geographers at these universities whose main research and teaching are in these areas as they did not respond to invitations to be interviewed, or were not suggested as possible interviewees by the lecturer, who was initially approached in their departments. This was perhaps because they did not run fieldtrips but it was not possible to substantiate reasons for their lack of communication with me.

The shift of approach from positivism to Marxism was not as abrupt for most geographers as it was for David Harvey. He had barely published the

quantitative tome, *Explanation in Geography* (1969) when on arrival in the United States during the late sixties, he became aware of the huge social, economic, and cultural differences between the various racial and socio-economic groups in American society (Harvey, 2000). The result of this was Harvey's Marxist geography opus, *Social Justice and the City* (1973), which was reviewed by Johnston (1974b) in the *New Zealand Geographer*. This was its first exposition to a New Zealand audience.

Some human geographers continued researching and teaching in the positivist paradigm throughout the 1970s and beyond, but others read and were inspired by the Marxist and radical works, which was the milieu in which they were then operating, and they incorporated some of Harvey's ideas into their own research and teaching; two such lecturers at Massey in the 1970s were the late Geoff Thomas and Richard Le Heron. Le Heron has continued to be interested in what he termed the 'underlying structures' (Le Heron, 1987, 262) and 'the linkages, technological change, information networks, and location preferences' in society (Le Heron, 1987, 271). He felt that it was imperative that these factors be taken into consideration, when considering regional development rather than adopting the empirical approach of looking at individual regions to account for differences and setting up programmes to equalise economic development. Others in New Zealand, in the 1970s and 1980s, were also researching this issue. Cant (1974) and Johnston (1973), concentrated their attention at the regional rather than the macro-national level. looking at observed patterns. Their work was heavily informed by a social theoretical base, as was that of Le Heron and McDermott (of the University of Auckland) (McDermott, 1974, 1979; McDermott Associates, 1981, 1983; Le Heron, 1984, 1985). Regional development was an important political issue in the 1970s in New Zealand.

One similarity in Harvey's and Le Heron's work is the emphasis on capital accumulation and economics. This was also present in Cant's and Johnston's approach. In fact their approach was part of the branch of geography, known as economic geography, which has its origins in New Zealand as far back as the early 20th century when commercial geography was taught at Auckland College, University of New Zealand. An early textbook of economic

geography is Chisholm (1891). By the 1930s, some regionalists referred to economic conditions in relation to farming and industry and made early calls for linkages between cultural and economic geography (Buchanan, 1937).

As so much of New Zealand's governance is based upon notions of trade, and primarily export trade, this emphasis on the economic linkages in society has formed a major focus of research for those New Zealand geographers, whose main research interest is in the structures of society. The change from the work of the regionalists, who had studied economic geography, to that of the *structuralists*, was a focus on the underlying relationships and processes that had produced the economic patterns that the regionalists described, but did not seek to explain. New Zealand geographers were further informed by the rapid restructuring that took place in the New Zealand economy under the two Labour governments of the period 1984 to 1990. An emphasis on economic structures with a governmental focus dominated the extensive works in political economy: *Changing Places in New Zealand. A Geography of Restructuring* (1992) and a later volume looking at similar issues of the impact of rapid restructuring led by the governments of New Zealand in the late 1980s and the 1990s, *Changing Places, New Zealand in the Nineties* (1996).

This economic focus dominated these fieldtrips organised in the 1980s by the lecturers who were *structuralists*. Fieldtrips characteristically took the form of investigations into a provincial town that was heavily dependent economically on its surrounding rural area. Students began to investigate the networks that operated in these areas, although much of the data collection was still of the quantitative survey type that had been used by human geographers in the positivist era. The difference was an emphasis on encouraging students to understand the underlying structures and networks that made that place unique rather than collecting data to support pre-taught general theories or individually developed hypotheses. A variety of sources was used for these endeavours ranging from quantitative material such as local government records to survey material collected by students.

As discussed earlier there were significant moves to a humanistic approach to geography in the 1970s and 1980s, Tuan, (1974, 1976, 1977), Buttimer, (1980, 1983a, 1989) and Ley and Samuels (1978). In New Zealand there were some geographers whose philosophical approach was in this area Pawson (1987), Perkins (1986, 1988a and 1988b) and Kearns (1984). They have, continued to publish some works informed by the place aspects of humanism, Pawson (2004), Perkins (1992, 1993) and Kearns (1997). Amongst the participants in this thesis, however, no fieldtrips were informed by this approach perhaps because they can be considered now to be informed more strongly by the structuralist approach to geographical understandings.

5.4 The Phoenix lecturers

Some of the *structuralists* have not maintained a singular approach to knowledge construction in geography throughout their lives. Sheppard shows that a majority, of the most cited geographers in human geography, began their careers publishing in the 'research traditions of spatial science' (Sheppard, 1995). Those such as David Harvey, Ron Johnston, Bill Bunge, and Allan Pred moved on to publish extensively in social theory (with its variants: Marxism, radicalism, structuralism, and realism) during the 1970s and 1980s. Others moved rapidly from spatial analysis to social theory such as Dear (1982), Massey (1984), and Peet (1985). These are the geographers who arise like a Phoenix from the ashes, rejecting one episteme and embracing another, and this affected their whole research, teaching, and the ways in which they practiced fieldwork.

Mention was made in Chapter Two of those geographers who changed approach during their career. Some geographers in New Zealand are of this type, Le Heron moved from his early training at school in regionalism, through the quantitative revolution as a positivist, during the years of his doctorate, to a re-identification as a social theorist, with a structuralist

focus to his research and teaching in the 1980s and 1990s. Le Heron, now at the University of Auckland, still draws on the social theory approach, but also makes use of the post-structural and deconstructivist approaches, which are viewed more closely in the next chapter, where issues such as gender, power, and racial difference are considered. Similarly, Robin Kearns (University of Auckland) researched and wrote in the area of social theory (Kearns, 1984), and later incorporated aspects of the cultural turn in his work, critiquing difference, power relations, and racial issues (Kearns and Lindsey, 1994).

The profiles that these lecturers provide, on their respective university websites, also reflect what would have been termed radical geography and could now be argued as a branch of critical geography (Johnston et al., 2000). Ross Barnett (University of Canterbury) lists public sector restructuring and health care reform, globalisation, and corporate involvement as research interests on his web profile (Barnett, 2005). Robin Kearns states that he has 'a concern for structure as well as agency and an enduring interest in urban as well as rural processes' (Kearns, 2005). Le Heron writes that his interests are:

[P]olicy and governance in New Zealand's agri-food economy, globalisation, governmentality and geography, supply chain realignment and competitive repositioning, nature-society relations, discourses and practices of sustainability, post-structuralist political economy, sites of research-led learning, learning regions, networks and governance (Le Heron, 2005).

Such geographers are considered here as *structuralists*, because their writings, teachings, and the way they run fieldtrips are heavily informed by the linkages and networks of society about the places visited. Lecturer C1 discussed how he had changed his approach to geography a number of times in a search for the most effective way of understanding the world. He talked of how this had meant a repositioning of his treatment of fieldwork in relation to these transformations.

Another factor that encouraged geographers to continue in the structuralist episteme was funding. Since the late 1980s there were cuts to the funding

of tertiary institutions in New Zealand. Under the 1989 Education Act, and the Public Finance Act of the same year, the funding to tertiary institutions was based on a bulk grant, which in turn was calculated from the Equivalent Full Time Students (EFTS) at the institution. This was part of the market driven policies of neo liberalism Berg and Roche (1997) have explored its effects on New Zealand tertiary educational institutions. A result of these changes in funding was that the basis for financing departments in universities was on numbers of students enrolled in that department and, if numbers fell then the jobs of academic staff were at risk. To try and provide extra funds, beyond those generated by EFTS, many academics turned to industry, and regional, or local authorities to give support to their research. Links to government agencies, local government, Department of Conservation, and private industry all helped in this. Thus work by *structuralists*, for instance, funded by various health authorities was a lucrative source of research funding and, in some cases of prestige within their own institutions. As this research was funded by organisations that are part of the structure of society much of the research generated by this revenue focused on the contribution of such structures to the area of study under investigation. The move to social awareness, under the umbrella of critical geography, as well as an attempt to make their research more relevant to society's problems also proved to be a means of securing funding for research projects. New Zealand's research funding has always had a much more practical focus than is the case in Britain where such work is well funded by institutions such as the Economic and Social Research Council. One implication of academics being encouraged to concentrate on research, sometimes funded by outside agencies, such as those mentioned above, is that there is less time to organise and run fieldtrips, and this has resulted in fewer fieldtrips being practised.²

Since 2004 another dimension has been added to university funding by the government, the Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF). This is part of a new scheme to fund universities using the Tertiary Education Strategy which is based on excellence of research as well as the number of students. Universities are assessed on their research performance and a part of their funds is allocated according to their research ranking. Both individual

universities and subjects are given a ranking. Interestingly, in the 2003 ranking, earth sciences ranked third highest amongst subjects and human geography eighth, ahead of physics (Tertiary Education Commission, 2003). PBRF may influence research undertaken by academics as the rankings are based largely on publications in refereed publications. Due to this focus on rankings, applied research in geography may lessen as no longer are contestable funds the main thrust of research. This could lessen the need to attract the type of practical funding that was cited above and which was strongly favoured by *structuralists*. PBRF now holds weight within the academic community. This, however, has a similar outcome for the number of fieldtrips run in that fieldtrips are part of a lecturers' teaching time not research time and thus take lecturers' time away from research, which could adversely affect their university's/department's PBRF rankings. The foregoing discussion has solely focused on university lecturers; the discourse now moves to consider teachers.

5.5 Teachers who are *structuralists*

Teachers in this group study geography by considering underlying structures of society, culture, economy, or the physical world and using these to construct understandings of place for their students on fieldtrips. One of the main factors that link the geography teachers to this approach is their strong interest in the planning and decision-making, development, and global sections, of the syllabus. These areas of the syllabus study the presence of a variety of networks and linkages in society, and this has a strong association with work by Marxian, radical, and structuralist geographers. A number of teachers also identified an interest in environmentalism and often teach in this area, for the current issues achievement standards.³ Global causes of environmental change, such as global warming, energy production, or capitalist consumption practices, are taught in New Zealand secondary school geography classes as case studies on this topic.

This approach to studying world trends by considering global structures is associated with the ideas of those who believe that an appreciation of mechanisms can create an understanding of the world. Strong underlying structures have existed throughout the world for centuries, such as the involvement of companies linked to trade and shipping, in the early spread of European colonies, going back over 600 years, and in the huge multinationals of today. These phenomena were 'taken-for-granted', in many cases, until they were identified by the Marxist, radical, and structuralist geographers as major factors in the shaping of society. Development studies, now popular amongst undergraduates, is also a section of the Year 12 syllabus in geography at secondary schools. These studies may be taught through a local approach, but they are linked to major movements around the world, such as aid distribution or monetary policy. All these areas of study, development studies, global studies, environmental studies and, at a more local level, the study of planning, are significant interests of the teachers who are considered in this chapter.

Few New Zealand geography teachers ignored the positivist parts of the syllabus that were identified in the last chapter, when they used to teach the full syllabus because this approach was used in external examinations, and permeated the whole syllabus. However, with the advent of NCEA in 2002, teachers can drop sections of the syllabus that they either feel do not suit their students, or they are not confident in teaching themselves.⁴ Teacher B9, one of the teachers discussed in Chapter Four, dropped the old 'inequalities in development' section of the Form Six syllabus, now termed, 'disparities in development', an achievement standard at Level Two. Her reasons for doing this were two-fold, information overload for her students, whom she perceived as not being very academic, and the fact that she had not done any papers on this section of the syllabus when at university. Students can still study a year's geography by working hard on the other sections of the syllabus. In contrast to this Teacher A2, one of the *classifiers*, did not approve of sections of the syllabus being dropped and felt all parts should be taught to ensure that her students had a wide coverage of the subject. Teacher C1, a *structuralist* dropped the urban

achievement standard at Level Two and included more work on the environment and its global connections as she had done some research on this herself and felt herself to be an expert in this field. This demonstrates how, under the new assessment regime of NCEA, it is possible for teachers to only teach aspects that they feel expert in, or which fit relatively closely to their own philosophy of geography. This is a significant change in the approach to teaching geography at school level.

Teachers who are *structuralists*, noted in their interviews that the syllabus and achievement standards, influence how they operate fieldtrips and this can be considered as part of the memories that constitute the milieu for these teachers, together with other aspects of their own background. This is further discussed in the section on 'Meanings'. It is possible to be more selective in fieldtrips than in general class work, where most sections of the syllabus are covered, as it is only ever logistically possible to run fieldtrips on part of the course. It is also more possible to combine the talents of different members of a department in a school in fieldtrips than in ordinary classroom teaching. Teachers who are *structuralists* have tended to specialise in human geography fieldtrips that use experts and focus on the structures of society. Other members of the department in a school, who are *general theorists*, would often run the physical geography trips.

5.6 Phoenix school teachers

The Phoenix element of some university geographers has been noted; how they abandoned one episteme, in their main approach to research, and teaching, in favour of another. They discard an old approach and adopt a new one, after substantial reflection on the inadequacies of the old approach. One geographer has mentioned how they saw this as necessary to maintain relative ease of publication.⁶ A note should also be made on the teachers. Of the fourteen teachers, who are *structuralists*, only Teachers C1 and C3 were at university as geography undergraduates in the early 1970s,

most of the remainder attended university in the 1980s when radical and structural geography were at their zenith and this contributes to the memories that inform their milieux. The teachers do not seem to change epistemologies as rapidly as some of the university lecturers do. Most have stayed in the main episteme in which they were taught as undergraduates at university. Of the two, who were undergraduates in the early 1970s and had been taught with a positivist approach, Teacher C5 was sceptical of the accuracy of the quantitative methods as an undergraduate, and Teacher C1 had attended further courses in geography in the 1980s and 1990s when radical and structural geography were being taught.

There are differences between the teachers and the lecturers in this group, since the teachers often run physical geography fieldtrips as well as human geography fieldtrips, and yet they have often not taken physical geography at university or did a lot better in their human geography papers. Only one of the teachers in this group had been keen on physical geography at university, the others all favoured human geography. This tension, and predicament for teachers, of having to teach in areas that they are not confident in is less usual for university lecturers; this point will be further explored at the end of this chapter, after the meanings to emerge from interviews are discussed.

5.7 Meanings

In this section, beliefs that inform meanings are identified using a grounded approach which incorporates concepts that emerged from the interviews. These are discussed by following through the beliefs that were identified therein. Firstly, convictions, which reflect the respondents' understandings of geography, and of the place of fieldtrips within geography, are examined. The demonstration of each meaning, as a narrative, which illuminates metaphor, is considered next. Milieux or memories, any aspects of their

wider life remembered by the geographers, which contribute to their understanding of milieux and meaning, are considered last.

A substantial number of the participants in the whole research exercise are *structuralists*. These are made up from fourteen teachers, spread evenly across the three regions, and nine geography lecturers, interviewed from three of the six universities, where geography is a subject in which students can major in New Zealand. A number of distinct meanings about fieldtrips emerged from the interviews with these geographers, these are:

- Fieldtrips as perfect learning opportunities
- Using experts
- Having a desire to change the world
- Understanding concept of place
- A means of promoting the discipline

5.7.1 Perfect learning opportunities

The meaning of fieldtrips for the lecturers and teachers considered in this chapter is that they are a perfect way of learning for their students because they provide a range of sources of information for students' extended research projects. They are therefore considered essential by these geographers. They construct scaffolding to interpret the world by using a structuralist approach and construct teaching methods for their students to be able to do this for themselves. The lecturers characteristically saw the fieldtrip as part of a large research project, with extensive preparatory work before the fieldtrip, acquainting students with research methodology, specific techniques, and contextual material on the place that they would be visiting. Lecturer C1 was one of many who talked of how his main rationale is to engage his students in discussion and make learning a constructive process. He mentioned how other social sciences give research projects of similar weighting in a course, but geographers have more opportunity than most to actually go and practise research methods (on the fieldtrips).

Similarly, although geographers who use other theoretical perspectives on the subject incorporate fieldtrips into some aspect of research projects, none are as well cemented into the fabric of the whole teaching process as the ones that these geographers practise.

Narratives that inform metaphor are extensive, extending over the whole course, with the fieldtrip itself being embedded in the middle. Lecturer C2 explains how such a course fitted into a research methods course:

[G]o to another area, do some survey work, go on a fieldtrip within that time, and get the students to do independent research. We thought of it as a way of extending the introduction to research for them (Lecturer C2).

Substantial work was undertaken after the fieldtrip, in terms of analysis of the material gathered, and report writing. Such fieldtrips took a fair amount of organising but there was limited actual teaching on the fieldtrip. Lecturer C1 saw himself as a facilitator, rather than a teacher on a fieldtrip:

It is quite an easy thing to teach, though to run a field course takes time, but is quite fulfilling and if you set the thing up right with the right ingredients, you take the students to the field, they are having a learning experience, in most cases without us being there. They are doing their projects; we are not with them pointing it out. They are having eighty experiences all at once and I am sat in a café having a coffee (Lecturer C1).

Teachers too saw the fieldtrip as part of a larger learning process. Mostly these are the teachers who are confident with the NCEA internal assessments^{3,4 and 5} [Endnote 6, Chapter Four]. They often ran an internal inquiry achievement standard, current issue, or planning achievement standards as part of their fieldtrip work. As teachers became more conversant with these achievement standards, they were happy to adapt assessments to their particular fieldtrip. Teacher C6 incorporated a current issue on the lahar on Tongariro, with a current issue achievement standard

on a fieldtrip, which was also to study natural processes in Tongariro, to enrich the learning experience for her students.

Lecturer C1 explained how at Auckland on the 300-level course, a research proposal is developed about three weeks before the field camp. Techniques such as interview procedures, ethics, and survey design are taught before the trip. The field course is integrated into a twelve-week programme and, after the camp, oral presentation and techniques of analysis are taught. Formal activities then stop and there are more oral presentations. Lecturer C1 talked of how they are trying, at Auckland, to put a whole research package together, from the conception, to finally designing a web page summary and a written report. He mentioned how 'I have tried to formalise some of the steps that were either implicit or weren't explained to me or the other staff' (Lecturer C1).

The memories that inform the milieux, of many of these geographers, were that they had become interested in educational literature on learning and often talked about this at an early stage in their interview. A number of the Auckland lecturers did this. Interestingly, many of these geographers, both teachers and lecturers, had been drawn into geography by a project that they undertook, usually at 300-level at university. Lecturer C3, who had found the school fieldtrips that he attended a waste of time, was captivated by the project that he undertook when on a 300-level Auckland geography fieldtrip himself. Teacher C7 considered that she would research shopping malls if given a chance to do research, twenty years after she had studied shopping malls as part of her 300-level fieldtrip at Otago University. The idea that such projects attract students into geography will be discussed as a further meaning to emerge from this study.

Teachers and lecturers see the teaching opportunities of fieldtrips as immense and have harnessed these as part of whole courses in geography. There have always been elements of seizing the moment on fieldtrips but these geographers have emphasised this in a conscious manner. Often by concentrating on the positive experiences, when on fieldtrips themselves;

they see the value of these in constructing knowledge in geography. Complete research methods courses have been set up in a number of the universities, most prominently in Auckland at 300-level, where students spend a number of weeks setting up the research they will undertake on the fieldtrips, by learning techniques to use, and getting knowledge of the underlying structures that operate in the place they will go to on the fieldtrip. Full reports are written afterwards, after substantial analysis of results back at the university. This occurs as part of the course, after the fieldtrips.

Kent and Gilbertson (1997) have noted the trickle down effect of experiences from university fieldtrips on the way teachers run fieldwork. This is also the case with many of the fieldtrips that university lecturers run, where they see the value of the extensive projects that they undertook at 300-level themselves. Many of these lecturers and teachers have become interested in the educational literature on teaching methods which are more student centred and this too has increased the influence that they place on the value of fieldtrips as teaching tools. Lecturers C2 and C4 have published on aspects of geography teaching. Although all lecturers and teachers see some value in the teaching potential of fieldtrips, these geographers have harnessed this in the structures in their own departments' openness to a greater degree than the others. The courses that include the fieldtrips, practised by those lecturers, are usually compulsory for those majoring in geography and require a large number of lecturers and postgraduates to support the fieldtrip. Lecturer C5 mentioned that, when a large number of lecturers are involved in a course, it tends to be less innovative, as all have to agree on any changes that are made. This is probably why, in the large Auckland course, the structuralist approach that was first used over twenty-five years ago, is still in vogue as the core of the fieldtrip organisation and experience.

5.7.2 Using experts

Lecturers and teachers in this group have a strongly held belief or main rationale of the desirability of telling their students about structures in society in order to help them begin to penetrate the complex nature of the world and build up their knowledge of place. They teach about networks and constructions that they have detailed knowledge of from their own milieux of readings and research. Some of the teachers' and lecturers' milieux includes professional qualifications in specific areas that are defined or associated with societal institutions such as law or planning, and they use this experience in their own teachings. Both teachers and lecturers use people who are expert in these areas, plus other individuals, and groups from varied and distinct sections of society to share their knowledge and to help students to understand place. These experts are normally kept separate from other activities involved with the fieldtrip. Usually students go and visit these experts in their own base. This may be a planning, tourist, or local government office or a marae.

The use of Maori as experts has connections with the interests of some of these geographers in ethnic issues, and with giving a voice to the indigenous population, and this is informed by their cultural and political concerns. A metaphor that Lecturer C2 details is how this element is included in the 300-level fieldtrip from Auckland University as almost a stand-alone activity at the beginning of a week-long fieldtrip, and how this contributes to knowledge building for the students:

[O]ur field camp experience in human geography is a very indigenous Aotearoa model. The first night is now on the marae and so this is the point of entry into the regionby the time they have been through the process they have a view of how to construct an experience in a region, to construct their understanding of life in New Zealand; for many it can be very, very different, quite transformative; we see the field camp as being thought about in the research terms as an extension of research process, so it is about developing the individual capacities, and at the same time developing a composite knowledge (Lecturer C2).

All the lecturers from Auckland University alluded to how opportunities are created on the 300-level human geography fieldtrips, for students to engage with Maori and other groups in the area that they were visiting for the fieldtrip. A marae stay is incorporated in the trip so that students can encounter Maori in a structured manner and have opportunities to understand their viewpoints on issues. This is followed by an opportunity to meet with planners, business people, and others from the community that have expertise to share on issues and aspects of the local environment. Lecturer C2 mentioned that even the students themselves are sometimes experts and their knowledge is incorporated into the fieldtrip to aid in understanding issues and aspects of the environment:

I should say that at Auckland in our courses, we are finding that we have a very wide age spread and career spread of the students, which means there are likely to be people in the class who have got different sorts of well developed resources to lecturing staff; and a way of making that available to the group is actually a crucial matter; and so when you go on any field camp you are likely to have a lot of experts in the room including many experts in the student group and so it is a matter of seeing how you can mobilise that; the field camp becomes a way of assembling it because you enrol people from the local area to help to serve on many projects, but at the same time you are also enrolling the students into it; enrolling the staff to participate in particular ways (Lecturer C2).

Such people or groups can be termed experts as they have specific, often professional knowledge. Lecturer C2 illuminates metaphor further by talking of going on a 'policy circuit around fisheries', with students, to inform them of the opinions of gatekeepers amongst Maori, and government departments and commercial enterprises in the fishing industry. The narrative that informs metaphor, and is used by this group of geographers, is that planners are frequently invited to participate in forums that lecturers or teachers in this group set up on fieldtrips to give students detailed contextual knowledge of the structures in that place. Tourist operators are

another group that has been identified as having the potential to provide detailed expertise on structures in an area used as a fieldtrip location.

Teacher C8 talked about the metaphor of a fieldtrip she had been involved with, where a panel of experts on tourism, in the Waitomo area, was assembled to give information, and answer questions, from students on the area they were visiting. The school stayed on a marae throughout their four-day trip to the Waitomo area and this enhanced the cultural experience for their students, in the way that Auckland University is doing, and thus making students aware of this cultural dimension is society:

[W]e link the geographic issue to the field trips and the internal assessment for Waitomo. They have to look at the possible development of a new cave for tourism that hasn't been used for quite some time, and they were going to open it up to the public again and that's when they listen to a panel of speakers; reasons for opening it up, keeping it the same, and a different level of development; I think that is the 2.6 achievement standard (Teacher C8).

Planning issues are frequent topics for school fieldtrips, run by this group of teachers, and planners help to set the scene and provide the underlying structures for such ventures. Teacher C6 used the issue of whether a retaining wall should be built on Mount Ruapehu to contain a potential lahar. She assembled a group of planners from the regional planning authority and some Department of Conservation personnel to talk to her students and inform them of views from different sides on the issue. These geographers often mentioned a focus around politicised issues as a central concern for fieldtrips.

The background that informs the milieux of these participants is based on reading articles by Marxist, radical, and structuralist geographers, which all had read at some stage in their career. For teachers this was often when they were undergraduates. Some recent articles discuss the policymakers such as central government and local government officials (Larner, 2002). Mcleay (2003) considers other experts or gatekeepers, such as developers,

the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer of the local council, in his article on the new urban politics of the Western Bay of Plenty. Fieldtrips practised by *structuralists* use similar types of people, who have expert knowledge about the structures that operate in a given place, to inform students of the area visited on a fieldtrip.

Lecturers acknowledge the influence of theoretical readings but some teachers are less sure of where their changing views on society have originated. Some feel that they have to continue teaching in a positivist manner as they perceive that this is what the syllabus dictates even though they are philosophically opposed to it. They lean to an approach which is informed by looking at issues that affect society and can be explored by an emphasis on structures and underlying relationships in society. As a result of this uncertainty Teachers C7, C9, and C10 are no longer teaching geography, two have moved into other Social Sciences in their school, and one is going to move out of mainstream teaching in secondary schools. In all cases they are Head of the whole Social Science Faculty in their schools and have been Heads of Geography in the same school. All three felt that geography did not provide an avenue for them to convey an adequate understanding of the world for their students. One was particularly eloquent on this issue:

I think that my perspective on geography is really being challenged at the moment and it is changing so I would say I had a pretty traditionalist education in geography which was basically hypothesise, measure, deduce, and come to some conclusion; and it was pretty much cultural this side and physical that side so I would see it is becoming more and more irrelevant to how I see geography moving in the future in schools. I think it is going to be more problem based much more people based, I suppose along the line of critical issues, and I believe a lot of the physical background will come into it but will just be viewed in a different way (Teacher C7).

5.7.3 Having a desire to change the world

Lecturers and teachers, amongst this group of geographers, have a strong regard for other people, and for the places that they inhabit. This is a third rationale or belief for these geographers. They see people, who were termed experts above, as conduits of information about the world, but lecturers were aware of the added dimension that these experts can also be receivers of information for their own further knowledge and development. Lecturers in this group, expressed a desire stemming from radical geography, to facilitate change in society by contributing to emancipatory politics. Lecturer C6 linked these views with his own interests:

It seems to me that geography integrates the social frameworks that govern behaviour alongside an ecological understanding and geography is about the only subject that offers that; this combines with my own interest in environmental protection issues (Lecturer C6).

The milieux for these lecturers were Marxist, radical, and structuralist geography and there are elements of this in their desire to see research that they have initiated as creating social change. Teacher C9 also expressed such views, linking it to her university experience at Massey University in the early 1980s and to a fieldtrip that she had attended as an undergraduate:

[A] friend and I were put into do surveys in this rough arealots of state houses and that certainly opened my eyes to how people lived. We had really good discussions after on what sort of impact it had on us and how we had to ask questions and what kind of feedback we got. That was really interesting. It was Geoff Thomas who took us there.....in terms of actually readying me for what I teach in school nothing, [from university experience] except the fact that it made me much more socially aware of issues because we were given Marxist geography, radical geography, humanist stuff and it gave me paradigms from which to hang some my beliefs and philosophy, so I took the passion I have got about people and the environment that I got at University, into my classroom (Teacher C9).

Others were more reticent about what had formulated their views but most had been at university in the late 1970s and early 1980s when Marxism and other aspects of radical geography were to the fore. This belief in radical geography was expressed as a metaphor by many of these lecturers who required their students to write a report, or put findings on the World Wide Web, so that those communities who had provided expertise for the fieldtrips could read and be made aware of the understandings that the students discovered.

Certainly a large number of teachers in this group had a desire to facilitate change in society but through different means. Conservation movements and concern for the environment, stemming from global agencies such as Greenpeace and Worldwide Fund for Nature that had made them aware of the denigration of the planet, have informed these teachers. Rather than informing the experts through reports, as the lecturers suggest, they see their own students as becoming informed on environmental issues and effecting change in the society that they live in as the students move to adulthood.

The fieldtrips that these environmentally informed geographers particularly enjoyed were of a more outdoor wilderness type than those run by the lecturers in this group. One of the Taranaki teachers said 'I am really interested in environmental ideas or something to do with preserving the environment in Taranaki' (Teacher C11). She took her students on tramping trips up Mount Taranaki for the seventh form fieldtrip and to a local beach for the sixth form fieldtrip. Teacher C11 believes that it is her duty to inform students about their local environment and she was dismissive of those who took students further a field to study landscapes because she felt it was important for the students to appreciate their own local environment. Teacher C3, who had taught in Westland, considered this the highlight of her teaching career, being able to take her students to wilderness areas in Westland so that they appreciated the pristine environment in which they lived and she encouraged them to maintain this for future generations.

These geographers saw a link between the human and physical sides of geography as being imperative on fieldtrips and as an integral part of their interest in focusing on the environment.

Associated with this desire to effect change in the environment, or maintain the environment, amongst these teachers is a strong feeling of association with place. This is worthy of further discussion as a fourth meaning for this group of geographers.

5.7.4 Understanding concept of place

Place is viewed as an individual entity by *structuralists*. Each place is considered to be unique and to be the result of various complex mechanisms operating in one specific locality. Place is the image that informs the metaphor of structures, which are themselves invisible, but become visible in concrete terms as an individual locality. A fieldtrip, run by these geographers to a place, is a way of coming to terms with this myriad of complexities. Both lecturers and teachers were emphatic as to how people and places created one another, and about the power that geographers can bring to understanding the complexities of places and about what makes places different from one another:

Place is the dynamic between place and location and the process of people locating themselves locally, regionally, globally, and nationally that all comes into it. My understanding of place is the recursive relationship between people and locations and that has all sorts of connotations about identity, the idea of people having a place in the world being placed and placing other people. In some ways it fractures into other social sciences. But in another sense I think we underestimate the degree of our own geographic insight as geographer (Lecturer, C3).

'S]tudents should be aware of how people change places and places change people (Teacher C10).

Lecturer C1 associated his notion of place with deep seated structures in society quite explicitly, and picked out the idea of places being unique entities:

[Place is the] site for the resolution of the fairly complex and diverse economic, social, cultural and political processes that are at work. In any given place there will be ultimately a unique outcome because of the various elements that go into a community in any given place so it's a site that is the working of all those broader, global things in one place is one way of conceiving it which means it is inherently complex (Lecturer C1).

All the university geographers from Auckland, were of the opinion that, by taking their students on a fieldtrip to one place for periods of up to a week and embedding this fieldtrip in to a longer course, students would familiarise themselves with the structures that operated in these locations and would thoroughly understand the place. The narratives, which construct metaphor for these geographers, create an understanding of society for their students by prolonged exposure to one place on a fieldtrip; their students also come to appreciate that those who live in the area construct their own meanings of place based on the networks and structures of the society in which they operate.

Geographers from the other universities took fieldtrips of more limited length. Some were just day trips and the reasons that Lecturer C7 gave for this are discussed below in the section on 'Promotion'. Lecturer C8 was new and had not yet taken fieldtrips of his own, but had attended a residential marae based fieldtrip, which impressed him with the emphasis placed on culture and constructions of place. Lecturer C4 used field trail booklets to overcome logistical problems of large numbers, and endeavoured to immerse students in the place of their local city by this method. Lecturer C9 took a relatively short residential trip and immersed his students in place for a more limited period but endeavoured to give an intense experience for students of how structures intersected to give the essence of the places they were visiting. A lot of print material was made available to students

about the place prior to, during, and after the fieldtrip, to extend their knowledge and experience.

A memory that informs knowledge construction of the concept of place can be obtained from reading works by other geographers who have used structures to interpret society. Lecturer C4 gave an account of influences on his own understanding of place:

'[T]here is another sense in which place acts as a fluid means, by which a series of influences, it might be notions of capital accumulation for example, come together, and this is a sort of Doreen Massey sense of place. She has some wonderful essays where she describes the dynamics of place, both in terms of functional linkages at any one time, working at any one time, or in terms of layers or accumulation, or accumulations of investment over time. I find that quite a useful way to approach the concept of change in human geography (Lecturer C4).

An interest in the construction of knowledge about landscape and place has been strongly argued as a social and political construction by Daniels (1982) and Cosgrove and Daniels (1988). Lecturers in this group are aware of these views and they form part of their milieux in understanding the power of place and environment, which they seek to demonstrate through their fieldtrips. One of the Auckland lecturers linked this idea with environmental change as a fundamental meaning for him 'understanding environmental change embedded in social processes is the key thing I like' (Lecturer C6). A main motif or metaphor of the fieldtrips practised by these geographers was understanding the society in a place rather than fieldtrips whose motif was measurement and collection of data such as those practised by *general theorists*.

Although the motif of understanding the society in a place was not so specifically articulated by the teachers in this group, they also expressed the view that students would have a greater understanding if they are exposed to places in a variety of ways when on a fieldtrip and heard views on that place from a number of individuals. The idea of prolonged exposure

to the place and a prolonged study of the place was mentioned by both teachers and lecturers in this group. This is strongly associated with a concept that has important meaning for these geographers, the notion of fieldtrips being integrated in a whole learning experience for students.

5.7.5 A means of promoting the discipline

As with the lecturers discussed in Chapter Four these lecturers have a belief that fieldtrips are a way of promoting geography as a subject. The difference is that *structuralists* view fieldtrips as a method of promoting the type of transferable skills that are suited to the job market rather than encouraging students to consider postgraduate study in geography. Some lecturers who are *structuralists* talked of how the skills learnt on fieldtrips can be viewed as a training ground for the workforce:

[I]t is about giving an opportunity to practice research methods and increasingly that is a career skill and we position that for our 300-level students and encourage them to utilise it as a career prospect - employers are interested, and it is a whole dimension that they don't expect students to have had in university (Lecturer C1).

Importantly [fieldtrips] also have a series of social purposes. And I think there are a lot of teaching opportunities we have to create in universities for purposes of student socialisation. And I don't just mean giving students a chance to make friends with people they wouldn't have otherwise known, I mean those sorts of situations in which they are able to practise all those sorts of invaluable transferable skills. One, which is very important for the average New Zealand student, is to speak in English to people so they can speak to employers with some confidence. So we've always put a lot of emphasis on group work in anything we do in laboratories in this department for instance. That is another of our guiding philosophies at first year level. So I think field trips are very important in the socialisation sense, and when I describe small group work we do it in different contexts, and learning how

to work in a group, we know from the small amount of work we have done with employers, is incredibly important. People have to be able to work alongside other people; people very rarely end up in jobs where they work just on their own (Lecturer C4).

The socialisation aspect of fieldtrips, mentioned by Lecturer C4, has been extended by others to include engendering a feeling of 'esprit de corps'. The *classifiers* and *general theorists* expressed similar views. The difference here is that a number of *structuralists* acknowledged that if not handled successfully, fieldtrips could create negative social experiences. Strategies are used by most of the *structuralists* to be inclusive in fieldtrips to a greater degree than what was acknowledged by geographers considered in the two previous chapters. The *deconstructivists* considered in Chapter 6 are the geographers who are most aware of the literature of taking account of difference on fieldtrips (Rose, 1993; Nast, 1994; Katz, 1994; Gilbert, 1994; Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999).

Lecturers in the structuralist episteme acknowledge being informed by their readings on gender, disability, alcohol use, and race in academic geography journals, popular literature, and news media. The narrative they demonstrate on their fieldtrips, which informs their metaphors, is to include those who are different. These can be foreign students whose knowledge of English is limited and understanding of New Zealand culture is scanty. It can be to accommodate drinkers and non-drinkers, or females on a trip as expressed by one lecturer from this group:

[S]o we were pretty sensitive to how people might come into particular positions within the course framework and the field camp experience; this was particularly women and also drinkers and non-drinkers and suchlike so the culture that everybody had to go down to the pub is not the way we work it; we talk about how some people might want to stay behind, some people might want to go off and do something else; they may wish to have a beer, they may not wish to; so it is much more socially informed relationship management (Lecturer C2).

This was the group of geographers that most frequently mentioned the topic of alcohol on fieldtrips. Some of these geographers took a view that alcohol opened doors between people on fieldtrips, often student to staff as well as student to student. Teacher C9 recounted that she enjoyed the fact that the geography lecturers drank with their students and would pay for their drinks. She was talking of a time twenty-five years ago but Lecturer C6 talked of how he encourages drinking on the trips that he leads and would be the last to go to bed himself on any trip.

Using alcohol as a means of socialisation was controversial with these geographers; Lecturer C7, expressed disquiet and disgust about the behaviour of students on some residential fieldtrips that he had attended. This was so troublesome that the lecturer no longer attends or runs residential fieldtrips and confines the fieldtrips that he runs to one day trips or the students go on self directed fieldtrips so that he can avoid such unpleasant encounters. This was at the extreme end of the spectrum for these geographers and is more indicative of some opinions discussed with the *deconstructivists*. However, it does demonstrate a feeling of sympathy for others, which is very strong amongst this group of geographers.

These lecturers instigate specific, structured, strategies to deal with social problems that arise on fieldtrips and make the fieldtrip accessible to as many as possible and to suit the majority of fieldtrip participants. They would not tolerate those who might make it unpleasant and dealt with such issues quickly and usually before they got out of hand. In the extreme case of Lecturer C7, who no longer runs residential fieldtrips but runs day trips and field trails, this was his way of adopting a strategy that was inclusive and allowed students to have experiences of fieldtrips as safely as he could manage.

Some of the university lecturers mentioned Nairn's work on fieldtrips (Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003) and acknowledged that that she had identified a selection of problems that occur on fieldtrips for some females and for students who feel different from the norm. They felt that they personally ran fieldtrips that were sympathetic and could not be accused of

excluding students in the way that Nairn considered many geography lecturers and teachers do.

The metaphor for teachers who are *structuralists* was to be inclusive and even those who enjoyed tramping and the outdoors themselves, and were physically very able, were sensitive to the needs of students on fieldtrips. They talked of cancelling as many trips as they had run to avoid poor weather on trips, of limiting the walking on trips to accommodate the less able and providing detailed lists of clothing requirements and taking extra clothing for students to keep them warm and dry.

To move to *milieux*, the academic memories shared by these geographers contribute to a belief in the promotional nature of fieldtrips. Some participants had received some encouragement from the projects that they undertook as part of their fieldtrip activities, usually at 300-level at a New Zealand university, but they often had some reservations about the way they had been trained and wanted to improve on this for their students.

Lecturer C2 talked of accolades that he had received after presenting work from a student project based around the 300-level fieldtrip that he had undertaken, but he was scathing about the amount of assistance that he had been given when deciding on a research topic:

I began with the notion it should be some sort of location studybut in fairness, there was never any kind of guidance about how a research question could be derived out of the literature, there was a notion that valid research questions could come out of problems of people were working on in society (Lecturer C2).

Lecturer C1, who had been an undergraduate overseas, was critical of his own undergraduate training on fieldtrips and felt it was a very disjointed experience. He viewed positively the 300-level human geography course at Auckland, where the fieldtrip is embedded into a research methods course and student projects are well supported. He wanted his students to receive

a better learning experience from their fieldtrips and projects than he had received at the overseas university.

Based on their own experiences on fieldtrips, and all had attended fieldtrips at university, the *structuralists* emphasise group work, the fieldtrip project, and development of research methods as the most positive experiences from fieldtrips and emulate this in the fieldtrips that they run. Such experiences are viewed by these geographers as providing students with skills and encounters that train them for the work force. Work has been published by a *structuralist* from the University of Auckland on the employment prospects of geography graduates, which makes practical suggestions of the type of skills that geographers possess that can be classed as employment skills (Le Heron and Hathaway, 2000). This focus, on the career prospects of graduates, is very strong at Auckland University and is one of the main beliefs about running fieldtrips as part of a large structured research project for the lecturers who follow this approach to the subject.

5.8 Conclusions

As can be seen from the discussion on meanings that emerged from the interviews there are a lot of similarities between teachers and lecturers who are *structuralists* in their understandings of the meanings of fieldtrips in geography, in their own milieux in aspects of geography, and in their metaphors, the way they run their fieldtrips.

All want to help their students to understand place by using structures and networks to aid in this. Either they were informed in these ideas by their own readings, in the case of the older lecturers who had been brought up under the positivist paradigm or, more usually, were taught in a structuralist or Marxist episteme when at university themselves. The differences between the teachers and lecturers is the lack of

acknowledgement or recognition of this theoretical base amongst most the teachers, whereas all the lecturers mentioned to some degree the milieu which had informed them in this episteme. This presented profound difficulties for some teachers. Three of the teachers in this group were either no longer teaching geography and had moved to teaching other social sciences or had moved out of mainstream teaching altogether. In all cases this was because they found in other subjects the theoretical underpinnings that they thought were lacking in geography. Another factor that has affected teachers recently is the ability to 'drop' sections of the syllabus that they either do not feel familiar with or judge that their students could not cope with. This has meant that geography teachers can concentrate on areas in which they are confident. Similarly, as fieldtrips are only run on sections of courses, teachers pick the areas in which they feel they have expertise. In the case of *structuralists* this is in human geography sections of the syllabus.

To try and interpret structures in society teachers and lecturers alike made frequent use of experts on their fieldtrips. These experts ranged from local Maori, to planners and tourist operators. Teachers made more use of experts than did the university lecturers, who often considered themselves experts. A few teachers and lecturers had professional qualifications in law or planning. Teachers and university lecturers alike were sympathetic to some forms of radical geography, even if not with Marxist geography itself. They directed their attention to some form of social justice such as sustainability.

The main rationale for fieldtrips practised by *structuralists* is that fieldtrips are events where all the structures in society that are studied come together in a local area and can be studied as part of major student research projects. The majority of the fieldtrips, run by lecturers were part of large student projects that began life well before the fieldtrip and continued for many weeks after. They were seen as part of a large research methods course in many cases and so the relationship between the classroom and the world outside was very close in the fieldtrips run by these geographers. Material has been published about courses at

Canterbury where a focus on problem solving in field courses is paramount (Spronken-Smith, 2005). Although teachers could not run their whole course in the way that some of the university lecturers ran their methods courses, because of constraints from the syllabus, they did try to include protracted research for their students. In some cases, with the advent of NCEA, they joined together achievement standards so that their students had substantial research projects to undertake as part of the fieldtrip experience. All considered fieldtrips as ideal ways of promoting student learning.

These geographers all have developed some sense of the underlying mechanisms in society. Lecturers and teachers are informed by their readings in this. All lecturers and most teachers read the *New Zealand Geographer* and *New Zealand Journal of Geography* and have read some of the articles that have appeared in these journals over recent years on Marxist, radical, and structural geography and have moved on from the idea of geography as a spatial science to which most *general theorists* adhere. All expressed some interest in current affairs as portrayed by the media in their work. Lecturers read more widely in journals and new books that have appeared on structures in society. Some teachers only had a very peripheral grasp of the theoretical underpinnings of Marxist, radical, or structural geography. None-the-less teachers and lecturers have a desire for their students to contextualise their understandings on a fieldtrip and go to one place so that they can get a thorough understanding of it from an examination of the intersecting networks and mechanisms that operate there. Some are keen for their students to thoroughly understand their own local environment and few take their trips very far a-field.

The lecturers are accepting of some elements of a deconstructivist approach, as considered in the next chapter, and have incorporated ideas on gender, racial equality, and other ideas on difference into their fieldtrips. They try not to exclude those who are different and develop structures to accommodate these people. Teachers are aware of politically correct information in the wider mass media and have also adopted some of these

principles. None would push students beyond their physical limits in the way that was noted amongst some of the positivist group of geographers.

Lecturers view both the social aspects of fieldtrips, and the development of research methodology, as having lead-on effects for the workforce. Many now position field courses in this manner and some have published material on this issue (Le Heron and Hathaway, 2000; Pawson, 1998; Pawson et al., 2006). Teachers were not aware of this aspect of fieldtrips and none mentioned that facet. Another point where teachers and lecturers differ is that teachers have to teach physical geography as part of the school syllabus as well as human geography. Nearly all the teachers who are *structuralists* specialised in human geography papers at university rather than physical geography. Many talked of struggling with physical aspects of the syllabus and sometimes relied on other members of their department, who had done more physical geography papers, to teach those aspects or to run the physical geography fieldtrips. The three teachers, who are leaving the discipline, are all of this type and two moved to teach subjects where there is a stronger people focus, psychology and social studies.

Lecturers who are *structuralists* were very well aware of what I was trying to achieve in my research as they were familiar with the literature on teaching geography and on fieldtrips themselves (Le Heron and Hathaway, 2000; Pawson and Teather, 2002; Pawson et al., 2006; Le Heron et al., 2006). For this reason their answers were very full, the abstract concepts connected with the thesis were quickly grasped, and the interviews were often extremely long, some over two hours in length.

The *structuralists* see each place as an individual construct emanating from the structures and networks that operate in that place. They take their students to a location to interpret these intersecting mechanisms. They are positioned between the *general theorists*, who rely on the establishment of universal laws and see these as being visible in various locations on the earth's surface, and can be investigated on fieldtrips by collecting and analysing data, with minimal regard for place and the *deconstructivists*, who analyse an area with their students, and see messiness and shifting

knowledge bases emerging whenever they try to construct understandings of places on a fieldtrip. The discussion now moves to a more detailed consideration of those who deconstruct the world to gain understandings, the *deconstructivists*.

Notes

1 A number of university lecturer interviewees, considered in this chapter, mentioned that humanism and realism did not provide sufficient structure for their research.

'There's another way in which you can use place which is through some of the humanistic literature on senses of place, which is never one I have been terribly enamoured of, a useful enough concept in an impressionistic sort of way, but has led to some remarkably boring work when people try to pin it down, I think' (Lecturer C4).

2 Interviewees and other academics from both New Zealand and British universities raised these points about funding in discussions on the thesis topic, often after I gave seminars in their institutions.

3 Each level of NCEA Geography has a current issue achievement standard, which is an internal achievement standard and can be based on a local, regional, national, or international issue. It could be used to study an issue, which is particular to the area that students are taken to on a fieldtrip, because there is a lot of flexibility in the content of assessments that are used to assess this standard.

Level One - Examine a contemporary geographic issue and evaluate courses of action

Level Two - Explain a contemporary geographic issue and evaluate courses of action

Level Three - Analyse a contemporary geographic issue and evaluate courses of action

4 Each achievement standard has an allocated number of credits. A full geography course at any one of the three levels has a total of 24 credits made up from seven achievement standards. The available standards and credits for Level Two are given

below. It is possible for students to 'miss out' on one achievement standard and still attain sufficient credits to be able to attain the necessary number to be able achieve their Level Two certificate. Only 80 credits are required for this and most students will be studying six subjects, each of which has available approximately the same number of credits as geography. This would make a total of 144 credits for the year. This is nearly twice the number that is required to fulfil the requirements of a Level Two course. Students therefore often drop achievement standards that they are either not so good at, or they consider unnecessary for their course of study. It is also possible for teachers not to offer certain achievement standards, especially amongst those that only have three credits attached to them.

Level Two Geography NCEA achievement standards:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| Geography 2.1 - Explain a natural landscape | - three credits |
| Geography 2.2 - Explain an urban settlement | - three credits |
| Geography 2.3 - Explain disparities in development within or between countries | - three credits |
| Geography 2.4 - Apply skills and ideas, in a geographic context | - four credits |
| Geography 2.5 - Carry out and present guided geographic research | - five credits |
| Geography 2.6 - Explain a contemporary geographic issue and evaluate courses of action | - three credits |
| Geography 2.7 - Explain a geographic topic at a global scale | - three credits |

Results of a survey based on the 2005 examinations were that:

Only 44% of survey respondents indicated they were offering 'all' of the Level 2 achievement standards for credit in their Year 12 programmes (Fastier, 2006).

5 Each level of NCEA Geography has an inquiry achievement standard, which is a research project for students. As the levels progress, the degree of teacher involvement lessens and the research becomes more student-driven.

Level One – Carry out and present directed geographic research

Level Two - Carry out and present guided geographic research

Level Three - Carry out geographic research with consultation

6 Although I had speculated that this was the reason for keeping within the episteme that was favoured by ones contemporaries as a necessity of being published, none of the New Zealand geographers that I interviewed mentioned this. In conversation with the head of a prestigious geography department in the United Kingdom (a physical geographer), he gave as his main reason for staying in the positivist paradigm, the fact that otherwise he wouldn't get published in any journals. Similarly human geographers whose approach in the 21st century is in the positivist episteme are largely limited to *Geographical Analysis* and the *Journal of Regional Science* for publication.

My inclusion here of the ballad 'The Vicar of Bray' refers to this rather contentious point.

A ballad:

The Vicar of Bray

I will be Vicar of Bray still
And this law I will maintain
Until my dying day
That whatsoever King shall reign
I'll be Vicar of Bray

Chapter Six - geographers who deconstruct the world

6.1 Introduction

This is the last analytical chapter and it focuses on the geographers in New Zealand whose research and teachings are based around the epistemes that can be generally termed postmodern or post-structural. Their understandings of knowledge construction have their foundations in questioning the epistemologies of positivist, radical, Marxist, and structural geography, and deconstructing or destabilising the accepted norms and meta theories about society. Hence they are termed the *deconstructivists*. They are concerned about the dominance of economic matters and the insufficient emphasis placed on culture and social experiences. A large number of geographers work in this episteme, which has also been termed the 'cultural turn' and encompasses an array of 'posts' that question, evaluate, and criticise the epistemes of positivism and structuralist geography and are concerned with difference and how meanings are constructed in society. Of particular importance for this thesis is work by feminist geographers who have worked in this episteme and have undertaken work on deconstructing fieldtrips (Rose, 1993; Nast, 1994; Katz, 1994; Gilbert, 1994; Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999). This chapter concerns geographers who deconstruct the world to re-build geographical knowledge.

First is a general discussion of deconstruction in geography. A discourse on critiques of fieldtrips by geographers, whose approach is deconstructivist, forms the next section. Consideration of New Zealand geography and deconstruction follows, and this section ends with a discussion on why no teachers have been included the participants considered in this chapter. This is followed by an analysis of interviews with geographers who took part

in this study and who consider that an epistemology of deconstruction is what best informs their geographies. As with the other chapters, meanings about fieldtrips, important to the participants that emerged from the interviews are discussed. Each main meaning is considered informed by background from the participants' memories and narratives of their fieldtrips. In this case the main metaphor of fieldtrips run by these geographers is one of carefully analysing difference. The last part of the chapter discusses more generally the various meanings that have emerged and are considered in relation to the meaning, metaphor, and milieu of these geographers who deconstruct the world.

6.2 Deconstruction

Deconstruction is a method used to critique society by those human geographers who consider that too much emphasis was placed on meta theories in an effort to understand society certainly by the *structuralists* and to an extent by the geographers of earlier epistemes, notably the *general theorists*. Instead they view any interpretation to be context bound and partial rather than detached and universal. One group is the postmodernists who critique the ideas of grand theory and the impartial observer. The epistemology that postmodernists work in is to deconstruct, to analyse accepted knowledges with a view to destabilising these knowledges. Deconstruction, as put forward by Derrida (1991), interrogates the central core of an argument and produces a counter argument in an effort to achieve clarity, with the aim of reconstructing new meanings and knowledges. Postmodernism privileges difference over conformity and can be viewed as a break with the modernity that went before it. This in itself is a point of difference. There is no linking of cause and effect, instead multiplicity and fragmentation lead to indeterminate knowledge production.

Postmodernism has permeated all spheres of society from architecture to the deconstruction of literature and political systems. Postmodernists

deconstruct modernist architecture that is unsympathetic to the needs of people and they deconstruct texts to demonstrate the positioning of an author in terms of class, culture, race, and gender.¹ Political systems are not exempt. The communist states of Eastern Europe and the USSR were viewed by some post modernists as examples of severe modernity. They dissolved at the end of 1980s into individual autonomous states based on ethnic and racial groupings (Johnston et al., 2000).

The collapse of communism led to the emergence of nation states such as Lithuania, Ukraine, and Estonia, which rose on a tide of nationalism that spread across the globe in the last decade of the twentieth century. Dissatisfaction with centralised government and politics led to the rise of increased national identity for groups as diverse as the Scots in the United Kingdom with the establishment of a Scottish Parliament and Maori in New Zealand with an increasing focus on Treaty Issues.² The end of apartheid in South Africa in the early 1990s was another fundamental change in world political terms which similarly led to a focus on different ethnic groups within a country rather than domination by one ethnic group. Other minority groups also found a voice at this time. Huge strides were made in many countries during the last twenty years of the twentieth century to eradicate discrimination based on race and sexual orientation. Again this can be viewed as an acceptance and awareness of difference. Anti-racism was given prominence after the Civil Rights campaigns in the 1960s in the USA. Acceptance of differing types of sexual orientation, arose from the 'Gay Rights Movement' of the 1970s in the USA. In the UK under the Sexual Offences Act (1967) certain homosexual activities were decriminalised but legislation was not passed until 2000 to create equality in the age of consent between heterosexual and homosexual sexual acts in the UK. In New Zealand homosexuality was decriminalised in 1986 and since then more measures have been taken to eradicate anomalies between those of heterosexual and homosexual orientation such as the Civil Union Act (2004), which allowed couples united under it the same rights as those united by marriage.

Geographers have absorbed these ideas of difference and marginalised communities into their knowledge frameworks, although they were a little later than those in some other knowledge areas to embrace postmodernism. The Swedish geographer, Gunnar Olsson (1980, 1991), was one of the earliest geographers to work in the area of multiple meanings and alternative readings of texts known as deconstruction. Landscape has been deconstructed by Cosgrove and Daniels (1988), maps by Harley (1991), and discourse by Barnes and Duncan (1991). These varied works of deconstruction consider that culture is a signifying element and that it represents a new episteme whereby culture is privileged over other aspects of society such as the economy, society, and polity. What drew a lot of geographers into this way of thinking was the critical edge that deconstruction uses, an edge which Berg, Duncan, and Cosgrove, (2005) view as a more political, crucial version of humanism. Barnes (1994) has used deconstruction to critique the positivist turn within geography.

Connected to these critiques, and alternative ways of looking at the world, are approaches which geographers have used over the past twenty years to deconstruct society. These theories are based around the works of a group of French philosophers Foucault, Lefebvre, and Derrida. Such ideas involve moves to understand society by concentrating on that 'other' side of rational modernity, exemplified by the peasant, the female, colonised victims, disciplinary institutions, schools, prisons, and psychiatric clinics (Peet, 1998). The foci are those who are different in society. Those who work in this paradigm are the post-structuralists, who use these ideas to consider knowledge as a discontinuous thing full of contradictions and messiness. There are significant links with the postmodernists since emphasis is placed on the power of language and texts in post-structuralism, and this can lead to different interpretations of so-called reality in which truth is viewed as an elusive entity that can never be attained (Poster, 1989). Derrida sees the relations between reality and the mind as not direct but instead as being linguistically mediated and historically specific.

Such views are incorporated in studies of post-colonialism and post-imperialism, which are particular critiques that explore the impacts of colonialism and how current issues and problems are connected to past eras. Said (1978), in his critique of orientalism, brought this view to the fore, and this has had impacts on development studies and other branches of geography in the last quarter century, where geographers have probed the significance of imperialism (Driver, 1992; Pratt, 1992; Peet, 1998). Historical geography has been influenced by the deconstructivists; the contextual nature of historical sources has been recognised, and deconstructed. Deconstruction is the method that post-structuralists and postmodernists often use to critically examine discourse in a variety of areas. Work has been undertaken in for instance, understanding the urban form and, within that, specific monuments and icons (Morgan, 2001; Pawson, 2004; Hay, Hughes, and Tutton, 2004).

Many feminist geographers moved in the 1990s to a geography which questions accepted attributes of society and even the academic fabric of geography. These range from critiques of humanistic geography by Rose (1993) to geographies of modernity and postmodernity by Deutsche (1991) and Massey (1991) and critique of the whole discipline by Rose (1993). Feminists began to look at differences within the feminist community in the 1990s, on geographies of differing sexual orientations by Johnston (1993, 1997, 2002) and differing body types by Longhurst (2004, 2005a, 2005b). A number of strands to feminist geography have developed over time, but the one that is most prevalent currently is a commitment to situating knowledge (Johnston et al. 2000). Feminists now work in this area, which considers interpretations to be context bound and partial rather than detached and universal. Similar views emerge to those held by postmodernists and post-structuralists namely that truth is created. Some have expanded beyond this to trace the interconnections between all aspects of daily life.

To counter accusations of irrelevance, some post-structuralists have incorporated contextual features of deconstruction but have also turned their attention to the margins of applied geography. These geographers

consider issues of social concern such as homelessness or health issues. The excesses of the neo-liberalism through the 1980s under Reagan and Thatcher and carrying on into the 1990s fuelled some of these research forays. Some New Zealand geographers have been written about the effects of neo-liberalism on New Zealand society particularly in education (Berg and Roche, 1997; Longhurst, 2001; Lewis, 2004a,). Lewis (2004a) writes of how neo-liberalism has effected NZ education for 20 years and considers its influence in NZ schools and the development and practises of the auditing body the Education Review Office. He argues strongly that neo liberalising forces of social control are continuing in New Zealand promulgated by such government agencies. In Lewis (2004b) he considers neo-liberalising policies in wider society and the effects of budget cuts on social welfare.

A very good summary of the excesses of neo-liberalism is made by Bondi and Laurie (2005), who link the need for contextualisation, in the way that the cultural turn has demanded this, with current political thinking and social action. In so doing some of Derrida's own ideas of how deconstruction should be used in the defence of democracy, to construct a better world, are being enacted (Dixon and Jones, 2005). Thus, they seek to demonstrate a purpose in critiquing the accepted norms so that they can be deconstructed and reformulated in a more socially accepted manner. In this thesis influences on fieldtrips acknowledged by participants are the aspects of society and polity considered in depth.

Geographers, who work within the epistemes of postmodernism and post-structuralism, have contributed to the literature on fieldwork. They began a critique of fieldwork in the early 1990s. This critique is closely tied to the essence of the current thesis namely to consider the place of fieldtrips in the academy of geography. Rose (1993) questioned the extent to which fieldwork is an appropriate vehicle for exploring the kinds of issues and approaches now taught in many social and cultural geography courses under deconstructivist approaches. With the rejection of the world and of aspects and places within it as totally knowable, and with only elements of truth emerging from any study, the idea of going out to see, and so

understand the real world, which was the essence of fieldtrips under *classifiers* and *general theorists* is placed in question.

A wide examination of fieldwork was made in a special issue of *The Professional Geographer* (1994). Concern was expressed as to how research affects the communities that are being researched (Nast, 1994). This is due to the critique of the idea of a detached observer and the realisation that all researchers are subjective and that they affect those being researched. The taken-for-grantedness of the field and fieldwork and its embodied nature is acknowledged and the realisation that this leads to a questioning of the knowledge claims about the efficacy of fieldwork is noted by Nast (1994). Unease about displacement from the subject of research and issues of power were explored by England (1994). To overcome these difficulties, geographers have chosen to have dialogue with those researched, to be involved in the research and focus on the mutual nature of the research process between researcher and researched (Gilbert, 1994). They have become aware of the power relations that can occur in any research encounter and this has caused them to re-assess the impact this has on the research process.

A reassessment of the whole issue of the field and fieldwork and fieldtrips formed the topic for Nairn's thesis on New Zealand fieldtrips (Nairn, 1998c). She considered fieldtrips and confronted the taken-for-granted assumptions of such fieldtrips and their embodied nature by deconstructing fieldtrips. Her approach was to focus on those who were different and to analyse whether these students were made to feel comfortable or uncomfortable by the fieldtrip experience. Nairn was influenced by writers, such as Gilbert and Nast and their work on the positionality of being a researcher (Gilbert, 1994; Nast, 1994). The result of many of these machinations was to cause workers in this episteme to question whether fieldtrips are necessary as a method of teaching in geography as they only serve to reinforce the view of positivists and regionalists that what we see on fieldtrips is what is really there and that there is a truth to be grasped. Geographers, who deconstruct the world, together with those who use structures to understand the world,

dispute such claims of a reality to be observed and a truth to be discovered as an objective of fieldtrips or of geographical knowledge.

6.3 Absence of fieldtrips amongst cultural geographers

May (1999) has remarked upon the lack of fieldtrips run by many geographers, who deconstruct the world. He attributes this to a critique by these geographers of fieldtrips, where the unfamiliar is made to seem exotic and where there is a reliance on expert knowledge to interpret, and give the only variant on truth that is acceptable. He sees these geographers as particularly dismissive of field sketches and surveys that obscure other experiences and ways of knowing about society. May adopts a more constructive view and sees fieldtrips as vehicles for working through some of the issues of gender, disability, and race exclusion that have been identified and which he uses in his own fieldtrips with students.

More articles on fieldtrips have been published in the *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* in the last fifteen years than any other geography journal. A number of articles concentrate on specific skills such as data collection (Clark, 1996), or defined methods such as field trails (Higgit, 1996) or how field work can be accommodated by changing structures in a university for instance modularisation (McEwen and Harris, 1996). McEwen (1996) put forward the idea of fieldwork as a means of developing transferable skills (a very applied approach) as are many articles such as those by McEwen (1996), Clark, (1996), and Higgit, (1996), which discuss the merits of fieldwork. There is an absence of theoretical debate or position in these articles in the *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*. Geographers who deconstruct the world have not engaged in the discourse.

6.4 Geographies of deconstruction in New Zealand universities

One university department in New Zealand where there is a strong emphasis on geographies of deconstruction is Waikato University. This department will be considered in some detail as it has a large clustering of these geographers and is the department with a strong feminist approach, which has already been discussed in regard to fieldtrips. Only brief mention will be made of a few individuals and their areas of research interest in the other universities, as there are fewer *deconstructivists* in these departments.

Geography at Waikato University has taken a different path from that at the other New Zealand universities that teach geography as it teaches only human geography within the department. What would be termed physical geography in other departments is taught in the 'earth sciences' department at Waikato. This is partially a result of the interests of the foundation professor, Craig Duncan, who was appointed in 1965. He set about establishing geography in the School of Social Sciences and a separate Department of Earth Sciences was established (Porteous and Bedford, 1993). This has allowed the Geography Department at Waikato to follow solely social science interests. It is the only university where Maori geography is taught. This development was nurtured under the late Professor Dame Evelyn Stokes, and continues to this day (Johnson, 2005). This is part of the cultural turn at Waikato, which is also exemplified by feminist geography, which continues to be an important aspect of research and teaching in the Department.

The appointment of Ann Magee to the staff at Waikato in 1976 ushered in the philosophical change of feminism (Porteous and Bedford, 1993). This was timely as feminist geography was at its beginning on an international scale and it has meant that Waikato has maintained its position at the forefront of feminist geography in New Zealand ever since. The department at Waikato made its mark on the New Zealand scene when the New Zealand

Geographical Society Conference took place there in 1985. A number of papers were given on geography and gender (Magee, 1985; Dooley, 1985), which mark the beginning of a major research and teaching interest in this area at Waikato. This has been maintained at Waikato, but it has moved from a feminism which embraced features of the social theorists of the late 1970s and 1980s with an emphasis on structures in society, patriarchy, and sexual division of labour to one which prioritises a deconstructivist approach, critiquing the very structures and accepted norms of society, considering those who are different and deconstructing in order to reconstruct a more socially inclusive society.

A number of women geographers at Waikato have continued to research and publish widely in feminism, sometimes in collaboration with others from outside the department (Johnston 1993; Longhurst, 1997a, 1997b; Longhurst and Johnston, 1998; Longhurst and Wilson, 1999; Berg and Longhurst, 2003; Longhurst 2004, 2005a, 2005b;). These papers show interests in post-structuralism and post modernism combined with feminist interests in a critical approach to knowledge construction. Concerns that are being researched combine these areas to look at the body as an embodied space, looking at positionalities, and at social exclusion on the grounds of difference. A special issue of the *New Zealand Geographer* (1995) was devoted to a series of papers by feminists that were given initially at a workshop held 29-31 July by the Department of Geography, University of Waikato. A study, of the list of contributors to this publication, even eleven years on, gives the names of the chief feminists in New Zealand geography today – Longhurst and Johnston of Waikato, Kindon of Victoria and Scheyvens of Massey, whose approaches encompass issues of gender.

These individuals continue to work in areas of post-structural, postmodern, and feminist geography in current research, taking a critical approach in their work. Two of these feminists also appeared in the special edition of the *New Zealand Geographer* (1997) that focused on cultural geographies in New Zealand and consisted of a series of papers that had a very critical flavour (Johnston, 1997: Longhurst, 1997a). The link between feminism and cultural geography in New Zealand is evident in this publication. Of the

other contributors to the special edition on cultural geography, some have left the New Zealand scene, for instance, Berg. He made a significant contribution to the growth of cultural geography in New Zealand with the paper cited above on education and neo-liberalism (Berg and Roche, 1997), a paper on gender (Berg, 1994, 1998, 1999) and a paper that has a post-colonial approach (McClean, Berg, and Roche, 1997). He continues to publish with other geographers in the cultural geography movement, Cosgrove and Duncan (Berg, Duncan and Cosgrove, 2005). Kearns' contributed to the *New Zealand Geographer* special edition on cultural geographies (Kearns, 1997) and he teaches a graduate paper in the area of cultural geography. His main research interests are informed by a mixture of cultural, humanist, and structural ideas, in what may be termed critical cultural geography with an element of social relevance (Kearns and Barnett, 1999; Barnett, Coyle and Kearns, 2000; Kearns and Barnett, 2000; Kearns and Barnett, 2003; Barnett, Moons and Kearns 2004). Pawson wrote an early cultural paper in *Southern Approaches* (1987) and he has published in areas of environmental history and awareness of landscape formation, which encompass the ideas of landscape in cultural geography (Pawson, 2004).

Mansvelt's research on retirees draws on post-structural themes (Mansvelt, 1997). Mansvelt has researched in social theory with insights from the cultural approach in her studies on geographies of leisure and consumption (Mansvelt, 2005). Mansvelt has now been joined by Henry at Massey University who works in the area of space and governance within a cultural deconstructivist geography framework (Henry, 2004, 2006). Scheyvens', also at Massey University, work continues to be informed by gender and she complements this emerging hearth of cultural geography in New Zealand, which is growing due to the active academic record of these lecturers (Scheyvens and Storey, 2003).

Other New Zealand universities have appointed only isolated cultural geographers. At Victoria University, Sara Kindon is the sole cultural geographer. She maintains an active research portfolio and continues to maintain a point of difference in a department that was, under Buchanan,

the most divergent geography department in New Zealand (Kendon, 1998, 1999, 2000). At Otago, the main research interests of the human geographers are in gender, critical, and applied geography with a focus on development studies. One of the new lecturers, Andrew McGregor's research interests do cross the boundary between critical and cultural geography with work on discourse in relation to overseas aid provision (McGregor 2004a, 2004b, 2005). Ruth Panelli, also at Otago, works in rural geographies, health, and gender with a critical approach that explores cultural themes and she publishes and teaches in these areas (Little and Panelli, 2003; Panelli, Stolte and Bedford, 2003; Panelli and Gallagher, 2003; Nairn, Panelli, and McCormack, 2003).³ Robin Law, a lecturer at Otago until her death in 2003, undertook research from a gendered perspective on a range of social concerns including health provision, urban transport, and daily mobility. She worked on changing definitions of what it means to be a man in New Zealand Society (Law, 1997; Law et al., 1999). Cupples is the leading feminist geographer from the University of Canterbury and she publishes work that has a strong cultural deconstructive basis (Cupples, 2002) and other work with a gendered approach (Cupples and Harrison, 2001). She teaches most of the courses at Canterbury that are offered in cultural geography.³ Auckland University is sparsely represented in cultural geography considering that it is the largest geography department in New Zealand. Only Kearns teaches in this area in a graduate paper² but, as noted in the previous chapter, his interests are also strongly informed by humanist, radical, and structural geographies.

Research fieldwork by these geographers is varied. Cupples has undertaken significant fieldwork in Nicaragua and has written extensively on the problematic nature of field experiences both on her own (Cupples, 2002) and in partnership with Sara Kendon, (Cupples and Kendon, 2003a; Kendon and Cupples, 2003). These accounts deconstruct the fieldwork experience and reveal issues of concern that veil the knowledge construction that is possible in such fieldwork encounters. Johnston has undertaken research on marginal groups in society, which has necessitated fieldwork with the groups such as the gay community in Auckland and Sydney, very much dealing with those who are different in society (Johnson, 1997, 2002). Ruth

Panelli's research interests focus on rural and gender issues and she works with people in small communities as part of these studies (Panelli et al., 2003; Panelli et al., 2004). In all these cases the fieldwork component is discussed critically and such issues as power and gender are appraised in the commentary of these articles. Often 'the field' constitutes use of textual resources such as textbooks and archives. Fieldwork is only undertaken when these geographers perceive a definite necessity and they analyse and critique the process in their published papers. Such critical views are also reflected in their practice of fieldtrips.

Discussions in various departments revealed that attitudes to the practice of fieldtrips vary amongst these geographers. A number have carefully deconstructed and reconstructed discourse on fieldtrips and have come to the conclusion that fieldtrips are not necessary in an undergraduate geography course. Others are parts of large departments, where big human geography fieldtrips are run annually, and they take part in these just as other members of the department do. Often a few insights from a post-structural or postmodern standpoint are included on such trips, but many of the geographers involved in these fieldtrips still maintain a major interest in considering the structures of society as a way of building knowledge and their views have been considered in the previous chapter. A few of these geographers run fieldtrips with a deconstructivist approach, where the boundaries of fieldtrip experience are challenged. Priority is often no longer given to the visual as a means of acquiring knowledge on the fieldtrip, there is no expectation that a real and knowable world will be discovered. Instead the fluid nature of knowledge, the binaries of opposites, the shadows and nuances of society are considered. The metaphors for these fieldtrips are aspects of difference in society, access for disabled in a city, or the provision of entertainment for those on the margins of society, which can be the concerns of courses in postmodern and post-structural geography.

All geography departments in New Zealand now teach some courses from a deconstructivist viewpoint and have been doing so for the last decade or more. Geography teachers, who have been to university in the last few years will have been exposed to some teaching about deconstruction in

geography. All general courses in human geography will make some mention of this but the amount will depend on the university attended and courses taken. This is a point of dichotomy. Teachers are being taught, as undergraduates, in cultural, deconstructive geography but there is limited evidence of this perspective being taught in schools.

6.5 The lack of teachers

Teachers have not embraced the cultural turn. No teacher, who was interviewed, is currently working in this approach. Some who had been to university in the 1990s were taught in postmodern, post-structural, post-colonial, and feminist epistemes. However, none were using these approaches in their teaching. They teach either the positivist or structuralist approaches which have been considered in the last two chapters. To some extent this is because the syllabus that they are teaching was developed in the 1970s and early 1980s, before cultural deconstruction had currency in university geography.

There are other reasons for the total absence of teachers working in this episteme. There has been a lot of criticism about the postmodern and post-structural approaches at academic level. The most well known critic is Harvey (1989) who sees postmodernity as another manifestation of a structural change in society. Even one of those whose research and teachings has been in the cultural turn, McDowell, has noted that there has been anger and disquiet regarding the cultural deconstructive turn (McDowell, 2000). Hamnett (2003) is very critical of the inward gazing approach of cultural geographers and of their detachment from 'contemporary social issues and concerns'. Although few of these criticisms have infiltrated into discourses that teachers have ready access to, it is indicative of general disquiet about this episteme.

A lot of the criticism stems from a feeling that postmodernism is not reaching its apogee. Doel, a committed cultural geographer, contends that Derrida's approach was not deconstructive but sought ultimately to reconstruct after deconstructing (Doel, 2005). This view is similar to that of Dixon and Jones (2005) but is only now being recognised. If these views of postmodernism are accepted more widely then work flowing from this may produce results from which an element of social justice emerges. General objectives in the current geography syllabus are:

Geography students are encouraged to:

Contribute to society through being able to participate in making soundly based decisions about the relations between people and the natural environment and associated issues;

Develop an empathy with people in our own and other societies,

(Ministry of Education, 1990, 5)

A cultural geography that critically evaluated society in order to create new constructions would be an appropriate method of reaching these objectives.

The cultural geography that most New Zealand teachers have been exposed to, through the journals of the *New Zealand Geographer* and *New Zealand Journal of Geography* is one of difference, collapsing of structures, and accepted norms in the papers that have been described above. They have focussed on feminist concerns, or geographies of space and place. In general they appear to offer only deconstruction and no reconstruction. Teachers want to give their students hope and a path forwards and, unlike the university lecturers who are aware of the reconstruction that follows deconstructive approaches, they see only despair in the tenets of deconstruction.

The path which school geography in New Zealand has taken in recent years, which teachers view as having a constructive approach, is applied geography and particularly Geographic Information Systems (GIS). Current discussions in the New Zealand Board of Geography Teachers newsletters focus around applied geography. Scholarships that had been awarded by the Royal Society to geography teachers are similarly grounded in applied

geography areas. Teachers have by-passed the cultural turn and continued to be involved in applied geography. They believe that the technical aspects of GIS will attract students to the discipline and realise quite correctly that this is the way to attract funding themselves for scholarships.

6.6 Meanings

In this section, meanings are discussed, as they emerged from the interviews, with five *deconstructivists*. The number was limited because of close association with the lecturers at Massey University (Mansvelt and Roche being supervisors of this thesis). Two geographers who approach fieldtrips using a deconstructivist approach said that they did not run fieldtrips as it did not inform their teachings. Most others agreed to be interviewed. *Deconstructivists* from Otago, Victoria, Massey, and Waikato contributed to the material in this section.

All the geographers, whose views are represented in this chapter, acknowledge that they were prepared to deconstruct fieldtrips and reconstruct them by putting in place measures to make those who are different feel more comfortable and untroubled on their fieldtrips. Students are treated very much as individuals, with their differences, and needs taken into account.

As with the other chapters, meanings about fieldtrips are ordered by the ways in which one meaning informs another. Demonstration of these meanings in the metaphors of fieldtrips is given. The main metaphor is one of difference being explored on fieldtrips and these geographers get their students to critically consider its constructs. The milieux which informed these perspectives are discussed in the last section. The four main meanings that were identified will be explored in more detail below. They are:

- Reflexivity and positionality
- Uncertainty, unpredictability, and difference
- Deconstruction
- Reconstruction

6.6.1 Reflexivity and positionality

An important meaning for all these geographers, who drew on post-structural, postmodern or other deconstructive perspectives, is that on a human geography fieldtrip students are given awareness of their own place in a landscape. This includes interaction with the landscape, with the people in the landscape, and their own positionality. The geographers interviewed contrasted this with physical geography fieldtrips where they viewed students as almost being cocooned in space, with no awareness of the people or place around them. For *deconstructivists*, interaction with place on fieldtrips by their students is viewed as extremely important. They consider that when on a physical geography fieldtrip:

[Y]ou are digging it up or measuring it or getting wet or whatever but somehow you are not instilled with an awareness of being reflective about your impacts on that landscape. So there is a distance from it. I guess the land and the people within the land are more objectified to some extent (Lecturer D1).

These participants were keen to immerse their students in a place:

[T]he smells, the ways of life and pace of language and the language that they are hearing (Lecturer D2).

For *deconstructivists*, on the human geography fieldtrips that they run, there is an awareness of other people's positions, or power situations, or what they do. Discussions are held with students to instil an awareness of

their position as an observer and how they have to negotiate positions with those people who are encountered on a fieldtrip.

Together with an awareness of where they stand in the landscape and where they want their students to stand is an awareness of difference in gender, sexuality, power, race, and class. These geographers acknowledge that they are aware not only of the differences amongst those who live in the communities visited, but also of differences amongst the class of students themselves, than is acknowledged by the other groups of geographers considered.

Further to this awareness of difference is an awareness of those who are culturally different. In particular, an interest is shown by these geographers in indigenous cultures especially those that have been marginalised by a colonising group. Some of the geographers in this group carried out participatory research with indigenous people. The fieldtrips that they ran were to marae and students were encouraged to engage with local people and to discuss issues that were important to them.

We sat on the marae and talked about the significance of whakapapa and Maori mythology for an understanding of Bluff Hill for example and the Tiwai islands (Lecturer D2).

Deconstructivists are aware of multiple subjectivities and how 'cultural difference' is actively shaped by experiences. Here the dualities of the two cultures merge and nuances of variation are discussed and appreciated. The lecturers tackle issues of power, which shape identities, with their students in order to search for meaning and understandings.

An image that Lecturer D2 gave of awareness of one's positioning on a fieldtrip, was when he took students to investigate, in a local area, on a day trip, pluralities and nuances of construction that operate in rural communities. He talked of how this fieldtrip was built on theory:

We have done a series of weeks understanding the social values of plurality of a social control of rural societies, the ideas of consuming the rural, and a different sort of social relations and power relations within rural society (Lecturer D2).

Efforts were made to ensure that students understood the type of behaviours that they might encounter and treat others with courtesy:

So we had talked about treating the people they were going to see with dignity and respect but being open to, and encouraging the interviewees to stay in character. One of the issues we were looking at, in terms of the social dynamics of the community, was questions of sexuality. In fact they felt it was impossible to ask some interviewees about issues of sexuality, and in other cases they had to actually put up with a fair degree of what you would call laddish behaviour from the interviewees ...So that was quite challenging for them (Lecturer D2).

Students were well prepared by this lecturer to experience such extreme forms of social behaviour as they had been well versed by him beforehand in issues of gender and difference and how these might play out in actual life, pushing the boundaries of tolerance and dignified behaviour. In turn the lecturer had been influenced by his own milieu, as had other lecturers whose milieux included extensive readings of postmodern and post-structural works. From such readings they have constructed an ability to be aware of one's position in the world and more specifically on a fieldtrip. These are conveyed to their students in lectures and tutorials prior to the fieldtrip. They have studied works on the deconstruction of landscape by some of the post-structuralists (Duncan and Duncan, 1988; Duncan, 1990), which have made the *deconstructivists* aware of the multi-layered facets of a landscape. They have knowledge of the works on place and individuals' attachments to places. These are informed by the writings of humanists such as Relph (1976) and Tuan (1977) and the work of feminists such as Rose (1993).

Lecturer D2 acknowledged his readings on gender, sexuality, positionality, subjectivity, and power issues and the influence that this had on the way he runs fieldtrips:

We still have a Pakeha dominated student body and therefore you could argue on a number of other fronts say, class, gender, and heterosexuality you are likely that certain norms are operating within the student body. I think these affect how they observe on human geography field trips, how they conduct themselves, and what they are expecting to see. Sometimes, depending on the objectives of the field trip, you may, or may not, challenge those so there is a wider social context and I think for me, as a social geographer, is choosing my locations carefully and taking care of the host society that we are going into (Lecturer D2).

Work by feminists working in a post-structural or postmodern framework, informed notions mentioned, by this group, of an awareness of difference, which became a main focus of feminist geographers the 1990s and beyond (Bowlby, 1992; Pratt, 2000). The geographers who deconstruct the world are keen for their students to understand the differences they see around them and to help their students to interpret these differences on fieldtrips. Such interpretations lead to a reconstruction of what is encountered on a fieldtrip so that accommodation is made, in an informed manner, for those who are different or have different needs in the world around them. Positionality is also discussed by such geographers who acknowledge the works of writers such as Rose (1997) on these issues, which help in their understanding of power issues for students on fieldtrips with those they encounter in the communities that are visited.

Several participants mentioned milieux associated with awareness of indigenous issues. There has been a growing awareness amongst cultural geographers of plural positions in a community. These views are informed by work on post-colonialism and post-development (Escobar, 1995). The imprint of a colonial power on an indigenous people has been deconstructed and this has even more purchase in New Zealand where deconstruction of the Treaty of Waitangi has gone on throughout the last three decades since

the Treaty of Waitangi tribunal was set up in 1975.² The *deconstructivists* have been influenced by such works and incorporate a greater understanding of minority cultures in their fieldtrips. This sometimes takes the form of working with an indigenous or minority community or of being aware of the needs of students from minority cultures on the fieldtrip.

Deconstructivists accommodate the individual differences of students within a fieldtrip. Similarly, they encourage their students to be aware of differences in the community they are visiting on a fieldtrip and to understand these differences in an informed manner using the theories that have been discussed in their classes such as feminist approaches, post-colonial and post-structural approaches.

6.6.2 Uncertainty, unpredictability and difference

Another important meaning for lecturers informed by deconstructing the world is that they have uncertainties about their own positioning and their students' positioning on fieldtrips, and take care how they place themselves in their search for geographical knowledges:

So it's always about walking this fine line between respecting difference, walking alongside, identifying with, but of course not being the same as, all of those things; constantly having to question my motives for developing particular philosophical perspectives (Lecturer D1).

Lecturer D3 talked of: 'look(ing) at the messiness of the materiality of life', and how he searches to find meaning in the mixtures, the hybrids of understanding the world. These uncertainties thread through their fieldtrips where there are no 'correct' answers to find. The 'field' is a place of change, uncertainty, and difference for these geographers and they want their students to experience the same changes, uncertainties, and differences. They talk of there being no real world and contend that the purpose of fieldtrips is to challenge their students with these uncertainties.

Lecturer D1 talked of shifting students slightly out of their 'comfort zone' or normal life experiences but in a very controlled manner:

Getting out into a more unpredictable environment. This enables students to discover that there is a whole range of other stimuli other than the lecturer that can stimulate learning. I think that can sometimes help to ground, sometimes to challenge, and extend students' learning. And usually make them realise that it's a lot more complex out there than when we theorise or talk about things within the classroom; that's what I would see as the benefit of field trips within geography (Lecturer D1).

When these geographers, who deconstruct the world, talk of getting students out of their comfort zone, this is not in the way that the *general theorists* talked of this idea, where sometimes the students are left to flounder with no resolution or discussion of uncomfortable feelings and situations ensues. With these geographers their students are supported so the shift will be controlled and slight and meaningful.

For these geographers there are no 'taken-for-granted' meanings in the real world. Instead there is a fluidity between observer and observed. There is no subject (the observer) and object (the observed); a researcher affects those whom he or she researches as much as they are affected by him or her. In a similar way it is acknowledged that control cannot be established over people and those whom one researches should be encountered in an open and inter-subjective manner. A fieldtrip is a place to show students this metamorphosis of life and yet to maintain some control and framework to support students. They shift the boundaries for their students but are always in control of these shifts. The students are well supported and do not flounder in the situations that they face on fieldtrips.

One aspect of this awareness of the unpredictability of, and differences within, the world that they and their students would encounter in their fieldtrips, led to these occurrences being carefully devised. Lecturer D4 talked of:

Looking at practicalities before the fieldtrip with students, things that go wrong and if people can't participate to the level that is required thinking of alternatives. I am very aware of people's busy lives. Those things need to be discussed. I would like to meet with everyone individually if possible.

Preparation would be more crucial than the fieldwork. The worse scenario would be to leave people in the field not understanding why they were there (Lecturer D4).

He went on to talk of how he scheduled meetings before fieldtrips to ensure that students were prepared and the forthcoming events were discussed and explored. On the actual fieldtrip itself lecturer D4 was very active ensuring that students were aware of the differences in ways places are experienced, which in itself generates feelings of unpredictability; another metaphor from his fieldtrips illustrates this point:

A really good goal for a fieldtrip in terms of thinking through ideas about place is to look at place as multiple and conflictual. So how you might experience a place, I might experience it differently. Then I would ask students to do some individual work on their understanding of place. And we would compare notes in an evening session about my understanding of a place and that would hopefully elicit a response about conflictual, contradictory responses... so lots of different ideas about place would come out. So it is well suited to a fieldtrip - lots of people working in one area and coming up with different stories and making it heterogeneous (Lecturer D4).

This lecturer tries, on fieldtrips, to interrogate the differences that his students experience and so they learn to articulate, and so eventually accept these by linking to other views that they hear in the discussion and to theories of difference in society. Thus knowledge of society is built from fragments and nuances rather than totalities and certainties.

The milieux for these views are firmly embedded in the theoretical readings and interpretations of these readings by these geographers. A number mentioned by name the influence of Foucault and his hostility to modernity

and its repressive totalising mode of thought. He abhors the total view of history and it only being about the powerful members of society and instead Foucault wanted to respect differences and the less and more powerful, to think of knowledge as emerging from a huge variety of sources and be informed by the micro rather than the macro. These geographers view the *minutiae* of the *locale* on a fieldtrip as an ideal location for such micro studies to occur.

Readings were shared with their students and discussed extensively before, in some cases, during, and after fieldtrips. Efforts were made to examine issues such as culture, gender, class, and sexuality prior to a fieldtrip. Such examinations prepared the students to deal with situations that they might encounter when dealing with people on the fieldtrips of different culture, gender, class, or sexual orientation than themselves and be able to deal with these in a non-confrontational manner and build positive experiences and knowledge from such differences. This was essential so that students felt comfortable, and also gained as much knowledge as possible from interviews, or observational situations, that occurred on the fieldtrip.

6.6.3 Deconstruction

A profound meaning for all these geographers is to deconstruct fieldtrips to critique and analyse them with a view to destabilising taken for granted and accepted forms of meaning about fieldtrips. Ontologies such as that there is a real world that can be fully understood by seeing and analysing its component parts on a fieldtrip are overturned, as are ideas of analysing the cause and effect of processes and coming up with the single right answer or truth about that process.

These are the lecturers who critique the world; they question and interrogate to elucidate meanings from such challenges. Students are encouraged to do the same about the very fieldtrip itself. Lecturers talked of debriefing sessions immediately after the fieldtrip to unpack and discuss

the things that had happened on the fieldtrip and to put this in some theoretical context:

We went to look at dolphins and didn't see any dolphins. So we would look at how the fieldtrip works after, reflecting on being sick on the dolphin trip. We had given them critical awareness beforehand of the trip and we reflected on this later (Lecturer D4).

The same lecturer also took students to a museum. There was preparation in class before and an information sheet to be filled in at the museum. Students had to critically reflect on the whole trip. In this way the lecturer was encouraging his own students to personally critique fieldtrips with a view to dislodging taken for granted views of museum fieldtrips. Lecturer D5 critiqued fieldtrips he had attended during the interview itself and thus deconstructed fieldtrips as part of the knowledge building process of the interview for himself, and for the interviewer:

I know there were other courses that had field trips that I decided not to do in geography and I suspect that one of the reasons I didn't was because they had field trips (Lecturer D5).

He went on to explain why he did not like fieldtrips as a student himself, and now, as a lecturer, rarely runs them and then only after much careful consideration of alternatives:

There are probably two things going on, one is a personality thing I don't like coaches, I don't like the sense, a form of claustrophobia, a fear of being stuck somewhere, being stuck on a coach I have always wondered about the pedagogic value of conducting them and I guess my experience as a student, and then through to a graduate student as a tutoring role, they just seemed to be full of busy work (Lecturer D5).

This lecturer went on to say that he would not want any of his students to experience the feeling that he had suffered. Lecturer D2 had refused to go down a narrow hole in a limestone landscape because of claustrophobia on

a fieldtrip as an undergraduate, and he ensured that students on his trip were supported in their differences. All shared concerns that there should be a justified pedagogic reason for the fieldtrip. These lecturers reflected very critically on whether one needed to run a trip. If they did run a fieldtrip, they desired to have sound reasons, closely linked to theory that was being taught in the classroom:

There was a very specific reason in the context of place power identity course and that was to work with the concept of deconstruction from Derrida, Jacques Derrida. It was to try and give students an embodied understanding of a difficult concept a difficult theoretical concept by actually giving them an experience of shifting understandings. And raising questions about the certainty of knowledge that then informed the rest of the course and how to approach the rest of the course (Lecturer D1).

Others brought up the issue of why travel to study aspects that could be studied locally, which examines the notion of difference, being privileged over sameness:

There is a thing I have about this notion that a fieldtrip has to take you, or seems to involve going somewhere distant to look at something different. I always wonder why aren't we studying what is local; geographers sometimes ignore the local in favour of the distant as opposed to saying there's a thousand and one geographic issues on our doorstep. Why do we have to sit on the bus for an hour to go and look at that and there could be an equally interesting issue that's right on our backdoor? It could be much more effective and efficient if we did it that way (Lecturer D2).

If difference is privileged over sameness then there are further questions that emerge such as by merely listing all the differences we may imply a universal approach whereby universal knowledge will be achieved when all differences are listed (Veijola and Jokinen, 1994). Nairn argues that we should look at sameness in order for difference to be examined. She goes on to explain that if the best, and the biggest, and the most different, exemplars are chosen to show students on fieldtrips then it results in a

fascination with difference for differences sake (Nairn, 1998a). Ideas of searching out the 'best' example also create the need to travel long distances to find this. As seen in the extracts above, lecturers in this episteme question the need to go far on a fieldtrip when there is perfectly good material locally. This material may not be 'the best' or 'the biggest' but will provide experiences on which the students can build knowledge.

Geographers considered in this chapter critique sameness and difference in a way that has also informed feminists, and cultural geographers, who deconstruct the world. They use the findings, from such deconstructions, to go on and reconstruct the world. Concepts such as the 'busy work' are also questioned and examined. These geographers have a desire for fieldtrips to be firmly embedded in theory and not just add-ons to a course. Lecturer D2, who facilitated an element of deconstruction for students in his fieldtrips, by shifting understandings, very specifically addressed this idea of incorporating theory firmly within the fieldtrip. In this case the theory was a post-structuralist consideration of binary meanings, acceptance that there is no central knowledge only shifting meanings, and although the aim may be to collapse boundaries, and distinctions, this is an ideal that is only strived for, never realised (Derrida, 1991; Johnston et al., 2000).

Some lecturers have concerns over the notion of students having to be physically able on fieldtrips; others are concerned about students who are unhappy to travel on coaches. These geographers attempt to accommodate these different views of fieldtrips by reconstructing the fieldtrips to take account of these concerns.

Deconstructivists view the world of fieldtrips differently from most of the *classifiers, general theorists, and structuralists*. *Deconstructivists* examine various aspects of fieldtrips, with a view to collapsing the empirical attributes of fieldtrips and acknowledging their metaphysical qualities to form a greater clarity of purpose. They believe that the factual should not be privileged ahead of the metaphysical. What people feel about a trip, be it feeling uncomfortable, feeling 'trapped' on a bus, or pushed to physical limits climbing a steep slope, should be examined. By carefully critiquing

various aspects of fieldtrips, both empirical and metaphysical, these geographers construct fieldtrips, which address some of the issues that they identify about fieldtrips and with which they are uncomfortable. They avoid fieldtrips that push students beyond their physical capabilities such as climbing steep slopes at high altitude and keep their trips to a more manageable level physically. As mentioned in Chapter Five, some *structuralists* also acknowledge such aspects of fieldtrips and thus there is a melding of approaches in this regard.

An example of a metaphor of a fieldtrip is the already cited fieldtrip that Lecturer D1 took, to give his students an experience of Derrida's theories of deconstruction. Students were taken to a familiar place but wore blindfolds and so experienced it in a different way, using other senses to compensate for their blindness to attune to the world they were experiencing. Realities were shifted slightly, in a controlled and safe manner for the students, so that they came to discover there is no reality, only the partly perceived realities that the so-called observer construes. Here there is no observation by visual means and so the visual is not privileged as it usually is on fieldtrips.

A metaphor was given by Lecturer D2 of a fieldtrip that he had taken to investigate, pluralities that operate in rural communities in a local area, on a day trip. He talked of how this fieldtrip was built on theory:

We have done a series of weeks understanding the social values of plurality of a social control of rural societies the ideas of consuming the rural and a different sort of social relations and power relations within rural society (Lecturer D2).

Lecturer D1 grounded his students in Derrida's theories before the fieldtrip and used the fieldtrip to reinforce their understanding of these theories. All these lecturers were very committed in this regard and intertwined their fieldtrip with theory before, during, and in debriefing sessions afterwards to a far greater degree than any other lecturers who were interviewed.

Care to alert students to the nuances of interviewing style prior to the fieldtrip illustrates the care that these lecturers go to when they reconstruct fieldtrips. The binaries of practically carrying out an interview, and the underlying emotions of both interviewer and interviewee are considered by the lecturers with their students prior to the fieldtrip. Such care for students, in their encounters with the public on fieldtrips, creates a base from which knowledge can be built successfully. Their milieux included writers such as Philo who recognises that a postmodern geography that takes account of uncertainties and deals with 'difference, fragmentation, and chaos' with 'humility and respectfulness', brings forward a sustained base for building geographical knowledge that differs from mere description of spatial distributions (Philo, 1992). New Zealand geographers in the deconstructivist episteme are aware of these fragments and shards in society and provide a cushioning context in which their students examine them. They instruct their students to be alert to what Katz describes as 'the inherently unstable space of betweenness' that exists between researcher and researched to provide support for them in their early research encounters (Katz, 1994).

Part of the milieux for these geographers was their own experiences as undergraduates or school children themselves on fieldtrips. All had attended fieldtrips at university and some also at school; they had mixed responses. Some had not enjoyed either school or university fieldtrips that they had attended, due to feelings already noted of claustrophobia and that the whole proceeding was meaningless. One took exception to the Spartan physical conditions on his university fieldtrips stating that 'I certainly didn't like sleeping on the floor in an old cold school and we did all feel like we were primmers again and it diminished the experience' (Lecturer D4). He went on to say that as a result of this experience, he paid attention to people's comfort on fieldtrips that he ran now as a lecturer. There were other issues that emerged concerning some students who did not participate fully and cheated. Again he ensured that such things did not happen on his own trips by putting strategies in place regarding the peer assessment for groups to avoid such eventualities:

In retrospect I don't want any of my students to feel like I did. I was a bit older and I was aware that some students were getting away with doing all sorts of things in that sort of situation. They were filling in their own questionnaires; and two guys sat in the church to avoid being found whilst doing this...and a lot of drinking during the day and some went and played golf (Lecturer D4).

Lecturer D1, who had been an undergraduate at a British university, had not enjoyed his first year fieldtrip that was very strongly physical geography and all he could remember was it was 'cold and wet'. He had a more positive experience on his second year university fieldtrip, which has resulted in a profound interest in development issues and he takes account of the physical well being of students to a marked degree.

The second year was two weeks in northern Greece and that was much more my cup of tea because it was much more orientated to human geography; and development though it wasn't called development; and we looked at urban landforms, and change, and we looked at issues around ethnic conflict, society, culture, agricultural transformations. How people actually eked out a living in this incredibly dry Mediterranean landscape (Lecturer D1).

Another who went to university as an undergraduate in the early 1980s and then did his doctorate in the 1990s, was influenced by post-structural readings:

I think things have changed for me. As an undergraduate I saw things very much black and white. I would say that, theoretically now, I am much more influenced by post-structural ideas and so I am influenced by the idea of the world as a construction, as a social construction, and a cultural product. I am more conscious of giving a diversity of views and when I do field work now, say with my fourth years, I will get them, when we are in different situations, to consider contrasting views of this particular site, wherever we are (Lecturer D2).

The feelings expressed by Lecturer D4 about the fieldtrips that she had attended whilst a student at university have echoes of the students' experiences that Nairn (1999) recorded. Lecturer D4 was very unhappy at the level of hygiene involved in washing dishes on the fieldtrip that he attended. Other concerns about personal comfort were the restriction on time allowed for showering and type of food available. The geographers who deconstruct the world consider emotional concerns important. Often they run day or half-day trips to accommodate the concerns regarding leaving family behind, rather than residential fieldtrips. In fact residential fieldtrips were rare amongst these geographers, only Lecturer D3 mentioning such a trip.

Four of the *deconstructivists* had been to university as undergraduates in the late 1980s or the 1990s when post-structuralism and postmodernism were first being taught in the universities. The other *deconstructivist* completed his doctorate in the early 1990s, when the approach of post-structuralism was very much to the fore and he now deconstructs fieldtrips for his students.

None of these geographers were fieldtrip enthusiasts in their youth, as school children, or undergraduates. They ranged from Lecturer D5 who positively avoided fieldtrips after he discovered he did not like them, to others who enjoyed only specific fieldtrips that they attended. They have used their own unfortunate experiences to construct fieldtrips for their own students that are less intrusive in their lives and create positive experiences for them.

Most of these geographers had some of their training at the time when deconstruction was being first debated in geography departments around the world. Three of these geographers had attended, as undergraduates and postgraduates, British, Canadian, and Australian universities; the other two had been wholly trained in New Zealand, although one of these had worked overseas as a lecturer in Britain. These geographers demonstrate a strong adherence to the deconstructivist approach and still use it in their teaching, including the way they run fieldtrips, and in their research.

6.6.4 Reconstruction

An important meaning for geographers in this episteme was using the ideas of critiquing and examining taken for granted notions of fieldtrips to re-build or reconstruct fieldtrips that took account of the metaphysical as well as the physical elements of fieldtrips and of differences in society. Binaries were examined and both the certainties and doubts of students were accommodated in the planning, preparation, and execution of fieldtrips.

Lecturer D4 strongly believed in reconstructing his fieldtrips:

In geography courses that I have been teaching, I make the geographers suspicious researchers before I go on any trip. Can we the do course without doing a trip? So I want them to go into the field being critical and suspicious of the processes around them. I prefer students to realise that they can use web sites, or popular magazines, or archives rather than go as a particular group to a place. I think it depends on the course. I think it is okay to come through a geography degree without ever doing a fieldtrip (Lecturer D4).

All made mention of how fieldtrips have to be firmly embedded in theory and of how information on different discourses on fieldtrips is examined prior to a fieldtrip. As well as preparing students in terms of theory all these lecturers were solicitous of their students' welfare and their understanding of what the fieldtrip entailed. Awareness of ethical issues is also evident, as is the element of non-compulsion. Students who feel extremely uncomfortable with the prospect of a fieldtrip are not pushed to attend. Alternatives are found. These students are accommodated.

Nairn (1998c) builds on her deconstruction of fieldtrips to reconstruct them in ways that destabilise the binaries of fieldtrips. She discusses how the devalued and feminised side of binaries such as body/mind and private/public take on new meanings in the context of fieldtrips. Nairn sees a way forward in the utilisation of the binary of work and play on fieldtrips

to discuss issues such as sleeping arrangements and activities before they occur and in allowing students to choose their own food. The deconstructivists use similar strategies on their fieldtrips to what is going to happen on the trip negotiate with students. There are no surprises; this is in contrast to *general theorists* who liked to have surprises on fieldtrips as they felt this contributed to students' interest and knowledge accumulation.

In terms of knowledge accumulation on fieldtrips *deconstructivists* interrogate themselves and their students, to ascertain as to whether a fieldtrip is necessary or just an "add-on" experience. *Deconstructivists* acknowledge some of these issues, such as privileging the visual and privileging difference over other means of acquiring knowledge, which leads them to question whether textual information rather than a fieldtrip experience can be used for knowledge construction.

Reconstruction occurs after careful and considered reflection on the practice of fieldtrips. A metaphor of such thought processes was given in an interview with Lecturer D3, when he considers how students can be immersed in place on fieldtrips and he comes up with a resolution of how this can be attained, even in a fieldtrip of a week's duration:

Lecturer D3: The point is research isn't a formidably abstract encounter. It is a process in which we assemble it from odd sods and bits and it's also a process that's ongoing. You don't go to a place sort of only once; it's an ongoing process. The more embedded you can be within a place the better you will start to understand and to know it. That's the problem with say the one-week fieldtrip. We are only there for a week, which is not really long enough. And they can do it two or three times over a year or two years. They really get a notion of trying to untangle the networks that make places work. Networks through which places are assembled as distinctive entities.

Interviewer: Do you see that as a problem then in fieldtrips?

Lecturer D3: It is a problem but I don't think it really is a problem. I'm not sure we can do that much about it. Well I guess the way we go about

organising the encounter, say through the week we go back to the same place two or three times to start to read the landscape as a methodology. Rather than doing it once, they go back two or three times and each time they go back they will see something different. That iterative process of reflection and examining the landscape through reflection, so there are opportunities because you do have a week so there's a reasonable amount of time

He can see there are difficulties with the practicalities of fieldtrips often being in a solid chunk of time which does not allow for an opportunity to for re-visit and to encounter place again and again. However, Lecturer D3 is able to resolve these difficulties in his own mind by encouraging return visits to a place during week long fieldtrips so that students build up a sense of different experiences and of the multi-faceted attributes of place. He also has a narrative of fieldtrips as a mix of the theoretical and contextual, which is at the very essence of any reconstruction of fieldtrips by these geographers in order to ensure that they provide a link to the theoretical underpinnings of the post-structural or postmodern theorists.

I think it's the notion that places are different. The knowledge is perhaps contextual but that we can use various theoretical frameworks to give us an insight, a lens with which to see those networks in operation. That's one - the importance of the interrelatedness of the contextual and the theoretical. That's one thing that I like students to get. The second is actually an experience of actually having to implement methods and to see what works and what doesn't work. To try and to try and negotiate how to get around things that don't work and improve things that do work. (Lecturer D3).

As with their other meanings about the practice of fieldtrips, a strong influence on the milieu of these geographers is their readings. They were the only geographers, amongst those interviewed, who were very firm in acknowledging the readings that influenced them in the practice of fieldtrips. Many lecturers, amongst this group mentioned the influence of Derrida. To turn in more detail to Derrida's theories of deconstruction, such

theories when they confront the very fabric of society or, in this case, the academic discipline of geography, can be viewed as being subversive. Doel (2005) talks of this in his recent consideration of Derrida's influence. Deconstruction destabilises the accepted norms about fieldtrips that existed amongst those geographers who have been grouped together in the preceding three chapters and others in the academy of geography. Lecturer D3 reads fictional writers such as Iain Banks who overturn the accepted norms of society in a post-modern fictional world, to further enhance his appreciation of this framework of deconstruction (Banks, 1998, 2003).

Some misconception has occurred that Derrida was only interested in deconstructing linguistic text but Doel (2005) strongly refutes this and discussed other arenas in which deconstruction can take place. These geographers show this refutation to be true; they contend that have destabilised in order to reconstruct the very essence of geography fieldwork and the fieldtrip. Most geographers from other epistemes reveal real and indisputable truths about the world to their students. The geographers who are deconstructivists seek to overturn such established beliefs. Such deconstruction can take place in any context and to deconstruct a fieldtrip is as valid as to critique the judicial or political system.

These geographers incorporated their own understandings of differences between people to instruct and aid their own students in fieldtrip encounters. They reconstruct fieldtrips by collapsing the binaries of the empirical and abstract worlds. Students' emotions and feelings and knowledge gathering are considered alongside the practical issues of using a bus, sleeping accommodation, and practical work accomplished on the fieldtrip. In so doing the lecturers present themselves as understanding people who take account of people's physical and mental differences when they organise fieldtrips. Care is taken to run fieldtrips only when necessary, and to ensure that they are well founded on theoretical underpinnings that the students are very aware of, before they commence the fieldtrip.

Deconstructivists organise fewer fieldtrips than the geographers who were discussed in the earlier chapters because they must be convinced in their

own mind that a fieldtrip is really necessary before they run it. Fieldtrips must be firmly scaffolded around theoretical underpinnings. Students and the communities that are visited are treated with courtesy and respect. Difference is accepted and discussed with students prior to the trip and at debriefing sessions immediately afterwards, or even during the fieldtrip, to further support encounters where there are issues of power relations or other discontinuities.

6.7 Conclusions

The milieu for these geographers is their readings, and the way they were taught as undergraduates, about theoretical work on deconstruction. These included the French philosophers such as Derrida and Foucault, who have been reinterpreted by many geographers on the international stage such as Philo (1992), Soja (1989, 1996), and Barnes (1994). Assumptions about the real world have been challenged by such philosophies. *Deconstructivists* search for new meanings amongst shifting uncertainties about the world. The empirical world is posed alongside the metaphysical world in an attempt to find a knowledge base. These philosophies have become the meanings about geography that the participants in this group use in their own research, teaching, and fieldtrips.

Included in their milieu is an interest in feminists' writings. The feminists have frequently adopted deconstructivist approaches in their research, writings, and teachings, which include material on fieldtrips. Early work on deconstructing the 'field' was by feminists and they challenged taken-for-granted assumptions about fieldwork in geography. Sometimes this has taken the form of questioning even the need for fieldwork. Nairn addressed issues on fieldtrips in New Zealand in her thesis and subsequent writings (Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2000, 2005). She examines the role of experiential logic in the running of fieldtrips and concludes these are deficient in theoretical, practical, and ethical terms (Nairn, 2005).

Interestingly, a number of geographers in New Zealand, who use a deconstructivist approach in their work do extensive fieldwork for their own research.

Deconstructivists acknowledge that they have been informed by the French philosophers on deconstruction, and this forms the theoretical base for all their research and teachings. Of all the geographers who were interviewed for this research, this group most closely located their teaching in the classroom and on fieldtrips with their theoretical base. To an even greater extent than *structuralists* these participants, understood the direction of this thesis and provided theoretically informed responses in the interviews. Interviews were long and informative with long quotes being used in this chapter drawing on their thoughts and ideas. Most of these geographers were trained when geography departments in universities around the world were teaching their undergraduates postmodernism, post-structuralism, and deconstruction. Often those who taught these courses were young and inspirational, and participants in this research commented on these influences.

The main rationale that informs the narrative of the human geography fieldtrips run by these geographers, is an awareness of issues of position or power that may emerge. Discussions are held with students to instil an awareness of their position as an observer, and how they have to negotiate with those people from the fieldtrip area. They work through issues of differences in gender, culture, sexual orientation, and power, with their students prior to trips to ensure that they are well prepared for the encounters that they have with people on the fieldtrip. Students are enveloped in a safe framework to sustain them in their interactions with others. Harsh experiences are mediated and discussed to lessen their impact.

The whole tenor, of the fieldtrips that these geographers run, is to support students by critiquing and reflecting on fieldtrip practices. The aim is to achieve a balance between the practicalities of, for instance, completing a number of informative interviews and enabling the students and

participants, in the research process engendered on the fieldtrip, to feel comfortable.

These geographers carefully consider fieldtrips that they attended as students, or other fieldtrip experiences that they read about in the literature. They acknowledge the complexities of knowledge construction in the field. Features such as the positionality between participant and researcher and power relations that may emerge are considered. Practical considerations such as the distance to be travelled, the time away, distance from family for the students are reflected upon by these geographers in an effort to deconstruct fieldtrips and reconstruct them. Other practicalities, such as ability to choose food that they will eat, sleeping arrangements, if the trip is residential, are negotiated. An example the reconstruction of fieldtrips by the *deconstructivists* is that efforts are made to fit the fieldtrips into a day or half day to suit the students so as not to disrupt their personal lives too much.

Paramount is the comfort, safety, and well being of the students and other people, who participate in some way in the fieldtrip, whether these are people interviewed, or observed, by the students. *Deconstructivists* aim to achieve an ultimate resolution of knowledge accumulation so that the nexus is attained of a balance between, the abstract world of theories and ideas, and the experiential findings on fieldtrips. Students are supported in this intention by considering the emotional and practical aspects of fieldtrip construction.

As a result of these questionings over the construction of fieldtrips, based on careful deconstruction of fieldtrip experiences known to the geographers, few fieldtrips are run by these geographers. They question as to whether a fieldtrip is necessary for knowledge production. Often they view the benefits as being out weighed by the perceived difficulties, and a trip is not conducted. When they are run, the fieldtrips are well embedded in theoretical underpinnings. The participants' objectives are to support knowledge production by further exploring theories in the messy and unpredictable world that is explored on a fieldtrip.

Only one of the *deconstructivists* expressed the aim of using fieldtrips as a way of training undergraduates on fieldtrips in research methods and exposing them to research issues. This is quite different from the geographers who were considered in Chapters Four and Five, who all mentioned fieldtrips as a training ground for postgraduate work, in the case of *general theorists*, and for the job market by *structuralists*. Most *deconstructivists* interrogated the process of the fieldtrip as has been discussed above, often with the end result that no fieldtrip is run, as the problematic nature of the fieldtrips seemed to be more significant than any learning that might have been achieved. One metaphor for the fieldtrips practiced by these geographers is the absent fieldtrip. They decide that knowledge can be constructed in other, less problematic ways. Some have run fieldtrips, after much thought has been given as to whether this is the correct course of action, and these trips are usually related closely to their own research interests. The metaphor for these is one of difference, looking at the marginalised and minorities of society, and taking account of differences within the student body itself on a fieldtrip

As one *deconstructivist* noted, fieldtrips do help future geographers by providing them with ideas of how to conduct their own fieldwork in future years when they are postgraduates. They encounter the messiness and ambiguities of the research process at first hand. If deconstruction occurs without sufficient weight being given to reconstruction of fieldtrips then students are deprived an experience that they might find to be a useful training ground in their own research encounters later in their academic or working lives.

The *deconstructivists* have been fully immersed in post-structural and postmodern theory for most of the years in which they have been involved with geography as an academic discipline at tertiary level. Their aim of deconstruction is to reconstruct, to some better resolution of knowledge production, than that they believe to have been available before the deconstruction. Teachers in New Zealand have generally not been exposed to such reconstructions of knowledge, only deconstructive aspects of the

postmodern episteme through their limited reading of the literature on postmodernism. As previously argued, teachers do not teach or run fieldtrips with a deconstructivist approach as they have not full knowledge of the episteme, and are not aware of the constructivist elements that follow on from deconstruction. Teachers, even when they have been trained in post-structural and postmodern theories, quickly get subsumed into the New Zealand geography syllabus with its strong positivist and structural theoretical base. Hence teachers are not running fieldtrips with this approach but a small number of committed lecturers in New Zealand, who have fully absorbed themselves in the episteme of deconstruction, continue to immerse their students in it, in their teachings and on fieldtrips. Some of the *deconstructivists'* writings have also influenced geographers who work predominantly in other epistemes notably the *structuralists* in the way in which they take account of difference on fieldtrips and even more recently some of the *general theorists* on their fieldtrips (Scott et al., 2006).

The thesis now moves on to its concluding chapter where the original questions on fieldtrips are considered.

Notes

1 Dear (1988) views postmodernism as having begun in linguistic and literary contexts and spread later to other textual disciplines including architecture and politics. He considers that in areas such as architecture, postmodernism could be considered more as a style which is divorced from philosophical underpinnings.

2 The Waitangi Tribunal

The Treaty of Waitangi Act was passed in 1975. This gave the Waitangi Tribunal the powers to investigate any Crown breaches of the Treaty in the future. In 1985 this was extended so that claims could be brought about cases that had occurred since 1840.

Up until 1975 many attempts by Māori to get a hearing for their protests and petitions were ignored or dismissed.

The Waitangi Tribunal investigates claims by Māori against any act, policy, action or omission that affects them in a negative way.

The Waitangi Tribunal is instructed to make its decisions based on both the English and the Māori text, as both were signed, even though by different people. Where there is any doubt about the meaning of the text, according to international law, the indigenous language text (in this case Māori) comes first.

However the Tribunal must also take into account the cultural meanings of words, the circumstances of the time, comments made then, and the objectives of the people who made the Treaty, so that practical solutions that support the spirit of the Treaty and that will work today can be found.

The Waitangi Tribunal only has the power to make recommendations to the Government. It is the Government who makes the final decision on what is to happen, and whether the Tribunal's recommendations will be carried out.

3 A selection of courses with a cultural flavour that are offered at the six universities that teach geography in a full degree programme are listed:

Auckland –

GEOG 726 – Geographies of Health and Place

Canterbury –

GEOG 443 - Kaitiakitanga and Resource Management.

GEOG 315 – Gender, space and cultural change –

GEOG 450 – Development culture and identity –

Massey –

145.701 Historical Geography - Exploration of the ways in which human geography is inextricably bound up with relations of power-knowledge. Introduction to a critical perspective on some of the histories of Anglo-American geography.

Otago –

GEOG210 Social Geography – “Geographies of difference - class, gender, ethnicity and sexuality - are reviewed before contemporary studies of identity, power, and social action are mapped through difference case studies and scales”.

GEOG381 Social Geography – “Geographies of difference - class, gender, ethnicity and sexuality - are reviewed before contemporary studies of identity, power, and social action are mapped through difference case studies and scales. (Geography Te Ihowhenua, 2005)

Victoria –

GEOG 406 – Geography of Place, Power and Identity

Waikato –

GEOG 101-05B – People and Place: Introduction to Social and Cultural Geography

GEOG 209-05B – Contemporary Cultural Geographies

GEOG 309-05A – Gender, Place and Culture

Chapter 7 - Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

Fascinating and significant findings have emerged in the analytical chapters about the practice of fieldtrips in New Zealand. In this, the final chapter, key findings are presented about meanings of fieldtrips that emerge from the analysis, in relation to the milieux and metaphors of participants. A consideration of the merits of the humanist approach and grounded research method used are given. The diversity of university lecturers' and school teachers' approaches to fieldtrips, differences in the six university geography departments and the variation of physical and human geographers approaches to fieldtrips are discussed. Two aspects that transcend all the ways in which fieldtrips are run are reflected upon. In Section 7.8 summary remarks on differences in the approaches to fieldtrips are noted. Section 7.9 concerns overall findings and their significance. Lastly suggestions are made for further research on geography fieldtrips in New Zealand.

Geographers in New Zealand have produced a variety of works on the discipline, ranging from Gorrie's encyclopaedic work (1955) through Hammond's (1992) interest in the institutionalisation of geography and Nairn's feminist account of fieldtrips (Nairn, 1998) plus various shorter pieces in journals, conference proceedings, and special publications (Johnston, 1970, 1984; Marcus, 1987; McCaskill, 1987; Hammond, 1992; Roche 1994, 1998b). Apart from Nairn's work, little attention has been given to fieldtrips. It would have been difficult to find answers to the key questions of this thesis from studying these published accounts alone. An approach that focused on illuminating the rationales for the practice of fieldtrips was needed. Previous studies of geography fieldtrips have taken other approaches, ranging from the New Zealand feminist (Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003) to accounts in the international literature that

and on the practicalities of fieldtrips by Lonergan and Andresen (1988), Clark (1996), Kneale (1996), McEwen and Harris (1996), Kent and Gilbertson (1997), Higgitt and Bullard (1999), (Healey et al., 2002) and Hirsch and Lloyd (2005). In these studies, emphasis was placed on the attributes of fieldtrips, rather than the underlying rationale behind fieldtrips something that could only be ascertained by discussions with those who practised them. A very partial view of fieldtrips thus emerged with selected items such as sleeping arrangements (Nairn, 2003) or concerns over disability being given prominence (Healey et al, 2002). I think that by using a humanistic approach in my study, and focusing on the various epistemes underlying fieldtrips organised by teachers and lecturers, a new and more comprehensive interpretation has been created. Those who run fieldtrips were approached to reflect on their own practice, in so doing they and I gained an understanding of how and why geography fieldtrips are run in New Zealand at both school and university level. As a large number of geographers from a range of institutions and areas in New Zealand took part in this research, many ideas were given to answer the key questions.

The voyage was to discover:

- Why are fieldtrips used in geography?
- How do fieldtrips fit with the theoretical understandings of geographers?
- What do geographers hope to achieve by practising fieldtrips?

Succinctly these key questions can be answered as follows: Fieldtrips have been used extensively in teaching geography because there has been a long history of fieldtrips. In most cases lecturers and teachers had enjoyed the fieldtrips that they had attended as students and wished to carry on this positive experience for their own students. Thus a culture of fieldtrips has continued through generations of geographers, which has maintained the use of fieldtrips in New Zealand geography. This has resulted in conscious rationales associated with beliefs about what geography is about and this includes the use of fieldtrips. All participants in this research had attended geography fieldtrips as students at either school or university, indicating the

wide and longstanding level of adoption of the fieldtrip as a teaching tool in geography.

Fieldtrips 'fit' with the diverse theoretical stances of the various geographers who practise fieldtrips. Differing metaphors were used to describe the four main groups of geographers discussed in this thesis, *classifiers*, *general theorists*, *structuralists*, and *deconstructivists*.

Understandings of what the geographers hope to achieve by running fieldtrips became apparent from the focus of fieldtrips described by geographers' narratives of fieldtrips they had run. There are fieldtrips whose focus is mapping and sketching; there are those which emphasise surveys and data collection; for some prominence is given to construction of meaning about place and the understanding of society in that place; for others the metaphor is one of difference, where a small minority aspect of society is studied.

Fieldtrips have their origins in the early exploration and mapping of the world that was prevalent in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The reasons for running fieldtrips have changed over time. Firstly teachers and lecturers instructed their students in similar surveying and mapping ventures due to the lack of maps available at that period, in order to give their students the satisfaction of and expertise in making the map for an area and thus to ensure that the discipline was steeped in a professional attitude to fieldwork which distinguish geographers, as Duncan (1993) has argued, from the amateurs who travelled. As more maps became available the idea of taking students out to see the 'real' world continued, firstly on the grand scale of the Cook's Tour to gather information and identify regions possessing similar characteristics. The belief in the existence of a 'real' world that was found amongst the *classifiers and general theorists* in this research and correlates with Berg's (1994) argument that fieldwork has had an undue dominance in the history of New Zealand geography, privileging the real over the theoretical. Later fieldtrips were run to 'test' hypotheses and theories about the world. More recently some fieldtrips have been run to immerse students in a place and to help them understand the structures that intersect and contribute to the making of that place. This is the all-

encompassing meaning of place that Buttimer (1980) recognises as encapsulating an understanding of society in a place. Even more recently a few lecturers have focused on the element of difference in society and a small number have questioned the relevance of fieldtrips and critiqued whether these are necessary additions to a teaching programme in geography at university level. More detailed findings are addressed below.

7.2 Key findings

In the course of this research meanings were fully informed by the milieux identified by participants, and the narratives of fieldtrips constructed the metaphors. When these narratives were considered together, with memories that participants identified as influential to their fieldtrips, common denominators were recognised. The main reason discovered in this thesis for conducting fieldtrips in geography is a strong association between the identified philosophical base, the meaning that participants distinguished, and the metaphor, the way this was demonstrated on fieldtrips practised by the geographers, which is what Buttimer (1983a) found when examining the practice of geography. In this research on New Zealand fieldtrips geographers' views on how fieldtrips should be run were closely linked to their own philosophical understandings and their desire to teach this to their students through the medium of fieldtrips. This meaning is very significant as it puts the focus of fieldtrips back on understanding theory rather than on practicalities, which much of the previous papers on fieldtrips have proposed (Berg, 1994; Jenkins, 1994; Kneale, 1996; McEwen, 1996; McEwen and Harris, 1996; Higgitt and Bullard, 1999). This makes us realise, as geographers, how important it is for students to obtain a thorough grasp of the philosophical underpinnings of their course if associated fieldtrips are to be successful learning opportunities.

Most of the findings presented here, unless they are linked to a specific reference, are solely from discoveries made in the course of research for

this thesis. Although the meaning of fieldtrips as being based on theory was the most important finding in the research, a second finding was also highly significant. This is that a prominent memory or milieu for participants was their own undergraduate experience, which, for a great number, still strongly influences their own research and teaching. Kent and Gilbertson (1997) suggested that teachers in the UK used ideas from fieldtrips that they had attended when undergraduates in fieldtrips that they ran for school students. In my research I found that all the geographers who were interviewed had attended fieldtrips as undergraduates and most viewed them as a way of training geographers that is a necessity in the discipline and so they use fieldtrips for the same purpose themselves. This has resulted in the continuance of a large number of fieldtrips being practised in geography and is a key finding in the understanding of why fieldtrips are practised in geography in New Zealand.

It is highly significant that attending fieldtrips as undergraduates or teacher trainees has had an immense impact on how teachers and lecturers conduct their own fieldtrips as this is what leads to the continuance of the fieldtrip in the academic discipline of geography. This is a third significant finding. Fieldtrips are viewed as being iconic in geography (Panelli and Welch, 2005) and have continued for almost a century in New Zealand due to teachers and lecturers being trained in fieldtrip methods and philosophies when students themselves, particularly at undergraduate level. What will happen in the future? It has been noted that many postmodernists run very few fieldtrips as they choose other methods to build knowledge for their students. Teachers base their own fieldtrips on ones that they attended as undergraduates, if they attend few or possibly no fieldtrips in the future this rich training ground will disappear. It is important to acknowledge the differences between teachers and lecturers in this regard. Teachers are influenced to a greater degree than lecturers by their undergraduate fieldtrips as often they have had little time or opportunity since their undergraduate years to carry on with tertiary level academic study of geography as a discipline.

Views about fieldtrips differed markedly between geographers who approached the subject with differing epistemes but with some blending and merging between the categories. Findings are discussed by grouping the geographers in the main episteme that they used for the practice of fieldtrips and the metaphor, which they practised on the fieldtrip.

- For the *classifiers*, the meaning of fieldtrips is as a means of gathering information that could later be grouped together and they often took their students on wide ranging fieldtrips. Such Cook's Tours have been alluded to previously and were a focus of comment by Clark (1996) who suggested they were 'designed to provide students with a broad overview of the field area'. On fieldtrips of this type, teachers and lecturers point out to their
- students ways in which people use the land and resources on the land, so that areas, where the land is used in a similar manner can be identified. To do this, students are taught to gather a lot of information when on a fieldtrip and this is analysed by drawing maps to show where the features identified are located in the landscape. The aim of such activities is to show regions where land is used in a comparable manner, and other regions where land is used differently. Cosgrove and Daniels (1989) noted a regional focus to fieldtrips. A finding from my research is that the main metaphor for these geographers is the maps that are produced from the fieldtrip. Classifying the world according to certain attributes, which could be an economic activity such as farming, or a certain type of mining, is the main rationale of these geographers who follow the perspective known as regionalism. Textbooks of this period focus on this approach (Jobberns, 1930, 1931; Cumberland and Fox, 1957, 1958). A small number of geographers, whose milieu stretches back to the time when they were undergraduates and regional geography was the dominant episteme in New Zealand education, continue to focus on classification of features on the land surface to form regions, by encouraging their students to use inductive methods when on fieldtrips, such as grouping together similar types of land use.

In contrast to the inductive approach of *classifiers*, *general theorists* practise fieldtrips that have a deductive approach. Teachers and lecturers

- instruct students in theories, or inform them about models, that can explain processes that occur in the world. Hypotheses, based around the theories taught about a particular process to be observed on a fieldtrip by students, are constructed usually with assistance from the teacher or lecturer. A metaphor was discovered in this research for the *general theorists*, which is that students collect data to support hypotheses, or in some cases to discover that the hypotheses are insupportable. Data collection was heralded as the major focus of fieldwork by Clark (1996) who remarked that it consists of 'questionnaire survey results, rock samples, landscape measurements or archaeological evidence. ... Data collection commonly involves the use of specialised field techniques and equipment'. Geographers who use general theories tend to consider that a hypothesis, that is supported in one location, is equally valid in another location; place becomes relatively unimportant other than as a laboratory in which to test hypotheses. Such fieldtrips were advocated in the G documents produced by the New Zealand Department of Education to assist teachers in running fieldtrips [Endnote 2, Chapter Two]. For these geographers, to understand a
- ~ landscape, means breaking it up into component parts to be analysed. They view fieldtrips as an essential part of their teaching and see no alternative to practising fieldtrips.

Further findings from my research are that both of these groups of geographers (*classifiers* and *general theorists*) regard what they show to their students on fieldtrips as being real and indisputable and they often talk about taking their students out to see the real world. The visual is emphasised by *classifiers* and *general theorists*. This finding from the research strongly reinforces the views of Rose (1992, 1993) and Hume-Cook and Kindon (1998) on the prominence of the visual in fieldwork. Buttimer (1983a) discovered similar reliance on the visual amongst geographers in her research into the practice of geography. Often lecturers would search out the 'best' example to show their students on fieldtrips and travel large distances to source this material. Similarly Nairn (1998a) has argued that difference is privileged over sameness on geography fieldtrips,

and that this has contributed to geography students being taken to places that were far from the institution from which the fieldtrip originated.

In this project all the lecturers who are *general theorists* are physical geographers. Nearly all the teachers in this episteme were more interested in physical geography than human geography, when undergraduates, and took more papers in this area of the subject. The few remaining teachers only remember physical geography fieldtrips, even if they took, and were more interested in, human geography papers. Their milieux were their training, as undergraduates, to use a positivist approach, to establish hypotheses, and support or reject these hypotheses with data collected on physical geography fieldtrips. This reflects the findings of Lonergan and Andresen (1988) and McEwen (1996). Such an approach is still the only approach taught to students by these physical geographers. This finding runs counter to Powell's (2002) argument for fieldwork to engender a dialogue in geography between human and physical geographers based on both dealing with only 'clues' rather than certainties when in the field.

For lecturers who are *general theorists*, the fieldtrips that they practise are very closely informed by their own research and they will often re-direct a previous fieldtrip in their institution that had been run by another lecturer to one that reflects their own research interests. Le Heron et al. (2006) have remarked on how the combination of teaching and research is a desirable outcome for lecturers and cites fieldwork as a venue where this can operate. One of the meanings about fieldtrips, that is important to the lecturers in this paradigm, is to train and enthuse students on fieldtrips so that they carry on with the subject in postgraduate work. This factor was mentioned by Fuller et al. (2000) as a key finding of their research on fieldtrips in the United Kingdom. Often lecturers and teachers in my research on New Zealand fieldtrips recounted how lecturers had been mentors, taking them on interesting field experiences in their own undergraduate education and that this was what had persuaded them to carry on with the subject. They sought to do the same, and to inspire their own students, by taking them on fieldtrips. This key finding is crucial to understanding why fieldtrips have continued to be an important part of

geography teaching in New Zealand for decades. Groups of geographers are trained over the years and carry on with the same taken-for-granted assumptions themselves, training their own students on fieldtrips in data collection which has been cited by Clark (1996) as one of the main purposes of fieldwork.

The remaining two groups of geographers to be considered, *structuralists* and *deconstructivists*, contrast with the two groups just discussed in that they are of the opinion that the researcher constructs knowledges. In my study I found that students of these geographers are encouraged to build up their own ideas of the world by constructing knowledge from a variety of sources; there is no real indisputable answer to be found only shades of meaning. This follows the ideas of Poster (1989) who argued that there is no reality only searching for a truth that can never be grasped.

Structuralists have considerable interest in the learning benefits of fieldtrips for their students, but with a different emphasis from the *classifiers* and *general theorists*. One of the important meanings of fieldtrips for these geographers is as perfect learning opportunities for their students in much the same way as May (1999) acknowledges for his British students on an extended social and cultural geography fieldtrip to Los Angeles. For these geographers, fieldtrips are frequently part of a large research project but they differ from the way in which *general theorists* regard research on fieldtrips, namely as a means of obtaining data to support hypotheses. It was found in my research that *structuralists* work extensively with their students, before a fieldtrip, teaching and informing students about the main frameworks in society that operate in the place which they are visiting. These may range from global structures such as trade networks or more localised structures and institutions such as regional planning authorities and indigenous communities. Teachers and lecturers set up situations on the fieldtrips for students to meet experts from these entities who then inform them about issues that are of current interest in their area. Students will normally pick a particular issue to investigate and will interview various people in the local community, who can provide information on this topic.

Another important meaning of fieldtrips that was discovered in this project for many *structuralists* is that they use fieldtrips as a method of changing the world. The milieu for a substantial number of these geographers was an immersion in Marxism and social theory when they were undergraduates. They are radical geographers who desire to see social justice put into action. In order to facilitate these objectives, students are encouraged to publicise their findings from research undertaken on fieldtrips. The metaphor for these fieldtrips may be the sending of reports to some of the institutions, or communities, that they worked with in a locality, or putting findings on the World Wide Web, so that the various authorities, institutions, and communities can access the findings. Teachers who are *structuralists*, are similarly keen on changing the world but with a more specific focus on environmental issues. They encourage students on fieldtrips to develop an interest in, and love of, the environment so that they will become keen at initiating change towards a more environmentally friendly world. This may involve lobbying people who are in authority, or joining global organisations such as Greenpeace.

A final main meaning about fieldtrips that *structuralists* consider important is an emphasis on place as a social and political construction. This reflects Massey's argument that local places are a construct of processes and structures (Massey and Allen, 1984; Massey 1997a, 1997b). However this concept has not previously been identified as a main rationale for fieldtrips in existing literature. *Structuralists* aim, on fieldtrips, to expose their students to one place for a considerable period of time to engender an understanding of the society in that place. The metaphor for these fieldtrips is knowledge of place and society. Usually these geographers take trips of a week in duration to an area that has been extensively studied, by the students, before the trip, and that will be discussed further after the fieldtrip. The aim is for students to be taught to construct the place out of their exposure to various structures within the community. These may be a local Maori community, business people in the area, or local planners who are gatekeepers to structures that mould that place. Another finding of my research was that some elements of a deconstructive approach are evident amongst fieldtrips practised by some *structuralists* since readings of

material that takes a deconstructive approach, forms part of the milieu of these geographers. Thus these lecturers make students feel comfortable and at ease on fieldtrips. They take care not to push students to extreme physical limits and consider differences in gender, race, disability, and sexual orientation, when organising trips. In this regard, they possess similarities to the *deconstructivists*. Differences occur in the degree to which such concerns take priority in the trip. For this last group of geographers to be discussed concerns over those who are different from their main rationale; their concerns are discussed more fully below.

Deconstructivists are a small, coherent group in New Zealand universities. One of the important meanings, of fieldtrips for these geographers, has already been mentioned in connection with the preceding group that was studied, their awareness of positioning on a fieldtrip. They seek to be inclusive of the different needs of, and types of, students in their fieldtrips, and make their own students aware, before the trip, of differences that they may encounter on the fieldtrip, between people in the communities that they visit, and how members of these communities may be different, in their outlook, and views, from the students themselves. The milieu for these geographers is a strong theoretical base in deconstruction. They have knowledge and appreciation of concepts such as the binaries that operate between the physical and metaphysical world, so that the lecturers take note of both the physical, and emotional well being, of students and the communities that they visit on fieldtrips with students. The metaphor for these geographers' fieldtrips is studying how a minority group or different group in society construct knowledge, for example blind people, or gay people. Lecturers both before the fieldtrip and after the fieldtrip explore feelings about situations encountered on fieldtrips with students so that they have an opportunity to deconstruct their experiences and reconstruct them to facilitate the building of new knowledges. A number of these feature difference, deconstruction, minority groups, and giving students an opportunity to reflect on the field experience after that event. These features have been recognised by Hume-Cook and Kindon (1998) and were incorporated into a fieldtrip that they ran in Wellington, New Zealand.

Deconstructivists to a greater extent than geographers in any other episteme are never certain of what has been, or will be, encountered on a fieldtrip. There are doubts, and debate, in encounters for these geographers. Certainties, and indisputable answers to knowledge production are not sought on their fieldtrips. Theoretical writings of French philosophers such as Derrida and Foucault inform them that there are no certainties, only veiled understandings. The observer affects what is being observed, there are nuances and shifts of lightness, and darkness, in all the meetings between people, in all encounters, including those on fieldtrips. Lecturers in the deconstructivist episteme teach, to a greater degree than geographers with other approaches, such theories in considerable depth before going on a fieldtrip, so that students are well prepared for the uncertainties of encounters that they may experience. To fully engage in a fieldtrip situation, geographers who deconstruct the world to gain understanding, critique fieldtrips that they have had experience of, or their students have experience of. The various attributes of a fieldtrip are considered, carefully, and in detail. This is part of a process of reconstruction that then takes place to create a fieldtrip that considers people's emotional and metaphysical wellbeing as well as their physical wellbeing. In reconstructing concepts about fieldtrips, sometimes, these geographers conclude, often in consultation with their students, that a fieldtrip is not necessary as so many uncertainties arise when they are critiqued. For these geographers there is no real world to be discovered in the field only constructs from fleeting experiences and sometimes these are so ephemeral that other ways of constructing knowledge than going on fieldtrips are chosen using other sources, published material, videos, and magazines for instance.

The main finding was that the meaning of fieldtrips is to demonstrate the geographers' own philosophical approach to geography. The episteme in which geographers were taught at university frequently became the episteme in which they have operated as teachers, or lecturers, in their professional lives. This includes the way geographers teach and the way they practise fieldtrips. Further readings on more recent approaches in geography informed some lecturers and so aspects of these approaches

were incorporated simultaneously into their original approach, which had been informed by their undergraduate training. Most notable amongst these influences were the deconstructivist views on taking account of a whole person on a fieldtrips rather than just their physical well-being, which also informs some of the *structuralists* in fieldtrips that they run and significantly is even affecting how *general theorists* run fieldtrips (Scott et al., 2006). Work such as the deconstructivist work by Nairn (1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003) was cited by some *structuralists* as being influential as to how they currently run fieldtrips. The second most significant finding in the thesis concerns milieux. The geographers' own undergraduate training strongly affects how teachers and lecturers run their own fieldtrips. This in turn results in the third notable finding which is that fieldtrips are used extensively in geography because there has been a history of them in the subject and all geographers attend fieldtrips as students which they often use as models for the fieldtrips that they run with their own classes.

7.3 Review of the humanist approach

A humanistic geography approach was chosen because this philosophical approach considers knowledge construction as emanating from the experiences of people. Thus one of the attributes of humanism, a focus on human agency, rather than on structures was maintained. As events are reflected upon in a conscious manner people acknowledge their taken-for-granted assumptions about society and construct meanings and understandings from these experiences. Understandings are enhanced further by taking into consideration external events in society from the time period of the narratives or events being examined.

Studies of the academic discipline of geography have already been successfully undertaken using a humanist approach. Buttimer (1983a) views understanding biography as a way of comprehending where an individual has come from, and where they are going. This approach, based

on Buttimer's (1983a) work, was successfully applied by engaging a group of geographers who have run fieldtrips in New Zealand at both university and school level. These geographers recounted narratives of fieldtrips that they had experienced in their own lives. By also providing them with opportunities to discuss other aspects of their educations and careers in geography and other external influences on how they practice fieldtrips, these geographers were able to conceptualise why they practised fieldtrips. Teachers and academics, who participated in this research, without exception, responded warmly to the opportunity for reflection on aspects of their careers.

To facilitate an understanding of the stories that were told, and to maintain a coherency between the voices, three components to stories were identified, as proposed by Buttimer (1983a), milieu, metaphor, and meaning. The milieux of the participants are the aspects of the world around them that they identify in terms of educational experiences, social, and political influences. Participants in this study, on fieldtrips in New Zealand, provided rich accounts of their own education, changes in society that they noted, and influences from government. This material was used to gain understandings of why fieldtrips were practised as they described them. In this undertaking, elements of embodied qualities, regarding the background of the teachers and academics, and the influence of society and government, emerged from the interviews. Sometimes participants would exclaim that they had not realised the impact of certain aspects, from their own background, on their practice of geography, thus acknowledging their own milieux, and constructing knowledge about the way in which they practise fieldtrips.

In this study, the narratives of a fieldtrip are the metaphors for these geographers. It is the mode of expression that is used in his or her teachings of geography. Participants talked about one or more of the fieldtrips that they had practised in varying detail. Using the humanist approach chosen for this thesis these memories were used together with accounts of events on fieldtrips to construct meanings about the practise of fieldtrips for the participants. The use of recall, by participants, in this

thesis, was highly significant. It linked their own experiences, their teachings, their fieldtrips, and led to a resolution in terms of imparting their own meanings of geography, their own philosophies of the subject. Those who forgot some aspects had rich recall in other areas and so an extensive knowledge base was established. The richness of a multitude of memories of an academic discipline, as it has unfolded across the second half of the 20th century and into the 21st century, stories of fieldtrips, lifeworlds, and changing philosophies, have become part of the collective memory that has contributed to knowledge and understanding of fieldtrips as part of the practice of the discipline of geography in New Zealand.

In this way, the meanings of geography fieldtrips for participants in this study emerged, by examination of their milieux and metaphors. As Buttimer (1983a) found in her work on the practice of geography, geographers reflected on the theories that informed the events in their lives, and the way their own milieux contributed to their understandings of geography. Some would reflect on changes in approach to the subject that they had made over their years of professional life. They would recount differences in the fieldtrips that they had been associated with, over the period in which they had been affiliated with geography as an academic subject. Close links, between the geographers' perspectives on the subject of geography, and their stances on the significance of fieldtrips, unfolded as the research progressed. As Guelke (1997) recounts, by considering the human activity of people, in this case those who practise fieldtrips, within the context of their own backgrounds, and the society in which they operated, the theories, which informed them, become apparent.

In some cases, teachers and lecturers would explicitly state the theories and approaches that informed their fieldtrips. At other times, it was possible to glean the information, by considering the approach taken in publications of the lecturers, or the courses that a lecturer taught. Teachers talked of philosophies that they had encountered when undergraduates themselves, and how these continue to influence the ways in which they teach geography to their students and practise fieldtrips for their students. The humanist approach that is advocated by Buttimer (1983a) with its emphasis

on the practitioners' milieux and metaphors to gain an understanding of their values and convictions about the subject, is a very sound approach to gaining an understanding of the practice of an academic discipline, and was found to be very appropriate for this study. Most previous work on geography fieldtrips has focused on attributes of the fieldwork, whether these are practical details such as accommodation provided, skills taught, or the facilities provided for less able students, rather than on the human agency that facilitates the fieldtrip.

7.4 Review of grounded approach

A methodology using a grounded approach was used in this study, as this is an approach that privileges people, their actions, thoughts and emotions, and which complements the humanist approach to the study (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). Material from interviews, with those who have practised fieldtrips in New Zealand, formed a major part of the research. Other material was also accessed in the form of anniversary publications from various geography departments and proceedings from conferences held by the *New Zealand Geographical Society* since 1955. This was supplemented with journal articles from New Zealand geography journals, *The New Zealand Geographer*, *The New Zealand Geographical Society Record* and *The New Zealand Journal of Geography*. Textbooks that have been used in schools during the 20th century were consulted, as were statutes with regard to education, syllabi, curriculum statements, the *Education Gazette*, and other material on New Zealand education. These sources helped to provide material for the early period of geography as an academic discipline in New Zealand, which was too far back in time for any of the participants to be able to recall.

Lecturers, from all the geography departments in New Zealand universities, were invited to participate in the project, as were teachers from three regions within New Zealand, two North Island regions, and one South

Island. The response to these invitations was positive, with a great number of those approached, responding in the affirmative.

Ethical considerations did change the nature of this thesis from what was originally proposed. It had been envisaged that real names could be used throughout the project but this proved impossible under the current ethical regulations of Massey University. The Massey University Human Ethics Committee (2004) expressed concern at protecting the identity, particularly of the lecturers, who are relatively small in number, and so are easily identified. Even if names were masked, I realised that other information that was provided at the interview, about educational institutes attended, or places of employment, could make it easy to identify an individual. As a result such detail was not quoted. Similarly, a whole life story would have identified an individual quite clearly so this was not used, instead sections of an interview were used to illustrate and illuminate the thesis.

To facilitate the interview and work within the ideas of milieu, metaphor, and meaning, the interview schedule discussed earlier and shown in detail in Appendix Two was used. The open-ended nature of the questions provided a flexibility that was extraordinary. Some participants would talk for ten minutes; whereas others would answer the same question in seconds. It did mean that participants could dwell on the areas that they had interest in, or could remember well. Themes in the schedule were grouped around the three main concerns of the thesis, meaning, milieu, and metaphor, and these proved helpful when I analysed responses to provide understandings about New Zealand geography fieldtrips.

Participants accepted me at the interviews courteously. I am very much an 'insider' in the geographical community and this had advantages in being accepted for the interview, being welcomed whilst there, and in the various geographers being very open in their discussions. Dowling (2000) saw advantages in being accepted as an insider. There were interesting dichotomies; I am more of an insider amongst the teachers as I am a teacher myself. Amongst university lecturers, I am less of an insider, only being a temporary member of the university community, as a research

student. Nonetheless my age (older than about two thirds of the participants) often countered the difference in rank within the university. I kept a diary of the interviews, recalling any details such as power differences and very few emerged. It was none-the-less instructive to keep the diaries for reflection of such issues. Participants treated me as an equal and were open in their discussions. One lecturer said:

I have come pretty clean on most of what went on. Those 70s trips got a bit wild; that was partly the students at the time; it was all flower power, long hair, and this kind of thing. I am sort of embarrassed about it now. I think that is a time probably not to be repeated [Lecturer interviewed].

I provided a small morning or afternoon tea for the participants, which was greatly appreciated by most and facilitated a feeling of trust and openness.

The initial stages of this research were informed by my experiences as a teacher who has practised many fieldtrips. Aspects that were strongly informed by this experience were choosing the initial topic to research as one of which I had knowledge and interest in. I was able to identify the various attributes of fieldtrips from those fieldtrips practiced by others and me. Not only does my autobiography inform this research [Appendix One], the study focuses on biography and this did prompt considerable emotional response from the participants at times in the way that Harrington (1992), Katz (1994), England (1994), and Gilbert (1994) have described in biographical works. Again, this shows the openness of participants and their willingness to share, what were sometimes harrowing stories, with me, and this added to the rich and detailed material gleaned from the interviews. As participants were aware that their names were not going to be used, in the final thesis or any other publication from this research, this may have led to more openness in interviews than if they were identified.

Early on in this research, a paper was given at the 22nd *New Zealand Geographical Conference*, and was subsequently published in the proceedings (Stirling, 2003). This laid out the idea that the nature of fieldtrips is closely linked to epistemes that have coursed through

geography in the last century and into this century (see Figures 1.1 and 1.2). As the material from the interviews was reviewed to gain an understanding of the meanings that informed the fieldtrips that participants practised, such links became clearer. The reasons that those geographers discussed in Chapter Three gave for practising fieldtrips were quite different from those who are examined in Chapter Four, and they are also different from those in the subsequent analytical chapters. In all cases they were closely linked to the identified episteme. These differences in approach to geography became the basis for structuring the material in this research. The participants' meanings were found to be closely allied with their own milieux, primarily their own educational backgrounds, and the metaphors, the foci of fieldtrips that they ran.

However, one issue that did emerge, was where to place those geographers who have altered their theoretical and practical stances over the years as they have been informed by various epistemes, or whose work is simultaneously informed by a number of differing epistemes. Understanding of these issues came about as I focused more closely on how the concepts of milieu, meaning, and metaphor could inform this matter. The geographers' previous experiences, which they recounted in the interviews, of teaching, researching, and practising fieldtrips in a different episteme from the main one they are now practising in, is considered as part of their milieux, and contributes to their current understandings of geography fieldtrips and the meanings of geography fieldtrips for them. A valuable insight gained was that the metaphors of the fieldtrips that the geographers practise locates them. Thus geographers who currently put a lot of emphasis on students collecting data to support or reject hypotheses were located in this study as *general theorists* those who put emphasis on interrogating difference in society were *deconstructivists*. The changes in philosophical stance that some geographers demonstrated is where the element of dynamism enters this study and this can be likened to the rising of the Phoenix from the ashes of previous philosophical underpinnings.

7.5 Further meanings and milieux that emerged from the interviews

Two concepts were mentioned by all the groups of geographers and these will be considered briefly here. They are the ability of fieldtrips to provide social opportunities for students and increased governmental and institutional directives on safety issues on fieldtrips.

Nearly all participants mentioned how fieldtrips contribute to the socialisation of students. This took a number of forms, ranging from comments on collegiality between staff and staff, students and staff, and students and students, to fieldtrips providing training in group work, and students having the opportunity to learn the attributes of being both leaders and followers. Geographers from all approaches mentioned these points. The social aspects of fieldtrips are mentioned in literature on fieldtrips. Clark (1996) talked of the social benefits that may accrue such as the building of group identity and team spirit and Fuller, Gaskin and Scott (2003) found the social advantage of getting to know your course mates and lecturers better was cited by students as an important aspect of fieldtrips.

In this research *general theorists* and *structuralists* mentioned fieldtrips as being a very useful means of encouraging students to, either take geography in the first place, or carry on with the subject, once they had the experience of a fieldtrip. *Classifiers* viewed fieldtrips as creating recreational opportunities for students. Such views were critiqued by *deconstructivists*, as they are aware that some students do not enjoy fieldtrips and so these students would view fieldtrips as reasons not to do geography. However, one of the *deconstructivists* was very positive about the staff to staff relationships that are engendered on fieldtrips.

- An aspect of their milieux mentioned by many participants is about safety on fieldtrips. Nearly all mentioned something about safety on fieldtrips and

changes in the law, which had generated more paperwork for those who practise fieldtrips.¹ This has resulted in a tightening up of safety regulations for fieldtrips. All staff at universities and schools have to carry out a risk assessment of possible dangers and potential risks prior to any fieldtrip, and this assessment has to be approved by a safety officer in the institution before the fieldtrip can go ahead.

There were a variety of comments regarding the new safety regulations from participants. These varied. One of the older lecturers, said he was going to totally ignore all requests for paperwork if there was an accident on one of his trips he would cite his thirty years of taking fieldtrips without incident, in dangerous locations, such as on glaciers, to prove that he was competent to lead trips. Teachers were more careful. Some talked of how they had always been careful about safety, even before the recent legislation, especially in mountainous areas, and this was often because of some dangerous incident that they had witnessed.

The literature contains similar mixed responses to safety concerns. Higgitt and Bullard (1999) attempt to take away some of the perceived burden of risk assessment, by saying that risk assessment is merely an examination of how a planned activity can go wrong and cause possible harm to yourself or others. Kent and Gilbertson (1996) see scattered groups of students engaged in student led projects as a far greater risk than the type of trip where all the class are undertaking the same activity, at the same time, and in the same location. None of the participants in this research exercise commented on the difference in safety risk on student directed fieldtrips, where students operate in small groups, to those where the class is all together. Kent and Gilbertson (1996) give practical hints such as checking the time of tides, checking when nightfall is going to occur, and checking weather forecasts. None of the participants made such explicit safety references, although one teacher did say that she had forgotten to check the tides for a coastal trip and had to cancel the fieldtrip because it was not possible due to the high tide.

From observations made by participants in this study, teachers and lecturers alike are coming to terms with the recent legislation on safety in New Zealand and it is difficult to ascertain the effect it is making on trips. Some were quite extreme; one said, as his final comment on fieldtrips 'I think if OSH [Occupational Health and Safety] is allowed to kill fieldtrips it would be the death of geography'. For many of the participants fieldtrips are the very essence of the subject and anything that causes these to be under threat in any way is viewed with suspicion and dismay. This view on how essential fieldtrips are to the teaching of geography is examined further in the next section

7.6 Differences between lecturers and teachers

The findings in this section are solely as a result of research undertaken for this thesis, chiefly from material gleaned from the interviews.

A significant difference that emerged between lecturers and teachers was that no teachers were present in the final group of geographers studied in this thesis, the *deconstructivists*. There are no elements of deconstruction in the New Zealand secondary school syllabus, which indicates that teachers may have insubstantial knowledge of theories of deconstruction, and how this can be put into geographic pedagogic practice. A limited range of articles has appeared in the main journals that teachers in New Zealand consult, *The New Zealand Journal of Geography* and *The New Zealand Geographer*, and these have tended to concentrate on deconstruction, focusing on difference, and the collapsing of structures and accepted norms. Teachers, who are members of a community that favours established and accepted norms, find this difficult to comprehend. If the next step, of reconstruction, were to be included, then teachers may be more accepting of theories of deconstruction. Teachers, who have sought professional development in their subject area, over recent years, have largely pursued knowledge in the applied geography area of GIS. This has been further

encouraged by scholarships in geography for teachers to work in this area of the subject.

Some teachers, who had encountered deconstructivist approaches, when undergraduates in their human geography courses, had encountered positivist approaches in their physical geography courses, and most notably on the physical geography fieldtrips that they had attended. When they started practising fieldtrips at school themselves, their approach to practising fieldtrips was in the positivist episteme. This was informed by the fieldtrips that they had experienced, which had been mainly physical ones, in which the physical geography lecturers had used a positivist episteme. Often they had attended few or no human fieldtrips because the deconstructivist lecturers organised a very limited number, due to concerns over the knowledge building capacity of fieldtrips amongst *deconstructivists*. Also there were influences from the school syllabus in the way they ran fieldtrips which has a strong positivist element. Furthermore the older teachers in their school, or lecturers that they encountered at teacher training college continued to teach with a positivist approach as this was the way that they had been trained themselves. Lack of time to initiate new fieldtrips was also cited as a reason to continue with existing fieldtrips. The teachers and lecturers cited such aspects of their milieux as major influences on the way they practise fieldtrips.

The total lack of teachers who are *deconstructivists* contrasts with the university community, where, in a number of institutions that teach geography in New Zealand, small groups of geography lecturers research, teach, and practise fieldtrips, with a deconstructivist approach. Most of these geographers have similar educational milieux of being undergraduates or postgraduates in the 1990s. This was the time when the 'posts' were being taught in university geography departments around the world, often by young and enthusiastic lecturers, who were cited by some of these geographers as being the people who inspired them in this approach to knowledge construction. Lecturers, who are *deconstructivists*, have a strong theoretical background in the way they practise fieldtrips. Both they, and the *structuralists*, provided reflective material in the interviews which linked

back to their own theoretical underpinnings in the subject to a far greater extent than *classifiers* and *general theorists*.

Considering this difference in theoretical background between teachers and lecturers, the way in which lecturers and teachers practise fieldtrips, within one philosophical approach, is remarkably similar. I would argue that this is because both groups have been informed in their knowledge of fieldtrips by their own undergraduate experience, most of which has been at one of the six geography departments in New Zealand. The main rationales for fieldtrips, as given informed by the participants' own responses in the interviews, were the same for teachers and lecturers within the same episteme. The only exception to this is one meaning of fieldtrips for lecturers, who are positivists that of training postgraduates in the positivist episteme.

Teachers were usually informed by their own undergraduate training in an episteme. An intense aspect of their milieu for lecturers, in the practice of fieldtrips, was their own readings, as well as their undergraduate training, whereas their own educational background as undergraduates was the most intense aspect of their milieu for teachers. This would indicate that the undergraduate experience could be very powerful and formative for students, particularly those who go on to make geography their career as schoolteachers. The power of the theoretical background, that these teachers experienced when students at university, was often further enhanced by experiences on fieldtrips that they attended as undergraduates. This was particularly so with teachers who use the positivist approach on fieldtrips for their students. Most of these teachers had been interested in physical geography when students and had acquired a lot of their knowledge, and expertise about geography, and how to interpret it for their students, when attending a physical geography fieldtrip, frequently as third year students, at a university in New Zealand. Teachers who were *general theorists* often avoided practising human geography fieldtrips for their students. They would delegate responsibility to another teacher in their school, who had more background in human geography, or follow closely the outline of a human geography fieldtrip that a former

teacher in their own school, or another school, had established as they lacked confidence about their own expertise in this area.

Teachers who were *structuralists* contrasted with the lecturers who used this approach and with teachers who were *general theorists* in one aspect of their practice of fieldtrips. Teachers who were *structuralists* were all human geographers but they ran both human and physical geography fieldtrips. Often they found the physical geography fieldtrips problematic but felt, due to the demands of the New Zealand secondary school curriculum, that they needed to run fieldtrips for their students in physical geography to maximise the learning opportunities for their students. They delegated, or copied fieldtrips from other teachers or schools to a lesser extent than the teachers who were *general theorists*. With the advent of NCEA it is now possible for teachers to specialise in areas of the syllabus with which they feel more comfortable and to avoid teaching aspects of which they have relatively little knowledge. Thus a dynamic element emerges where some teachers now, and possibly into the future, will only run fieldtrips in the areas in which they feel knowledgeable.

Just as the lecturers who were *structuralists* were human geographers, so were the teachers. As with the teachers who were *general theorists*, the most powerful aspect of their milieu as *structuralists*, which informed their teaching and fieldtrips, was their own undergraduate training. Most had been at university in the early 1980s and were strongly influenced by Marxian, radical, and structural geographies that were being taught at universities in New Zealand at that time.

The four *classifiers* were three teachers and one lecturer. Very little difference was noted between the two groups in their approach to fieldtrips. Both groups saw fieldtrips as providing opportunities for students to see the real world and felt that if they gathered sufficient information, they would be able to discover true and indisputable facts about that area. This approach to geography is inductive and classifications occur after collection of material. Theoretical underpinnings to regionalism are limited, and both teachers, and the lecturer, concentrated on the empirical features of

fieldtrips. All these participants had been undergraduates at Canterbury University and the contribution of the six universities to this discourse on fieldtrips is considered below.

7.7 Approaches in the six universities

Comments regarding the approaches of the six universities to fieldtrips can only be tentative as there was unequal coverage between the universities in terms of participants interviewed. Again these findings are from material gathered at the interviews. This was largely due to differences in the number of geographers interviewed in geography departments at the various institutions, this ranged from eight at Canterbury and at Auckland, five at Massey, five at Otago to three at each of Waikato and Victoria. Similar numbers were invited to participate at each university but at some universities, few lecturers were interviewed. The variation in numbers interviewed between universities is also a function of the size of the departments, Auckland has over forty staff, Victoria fewer than thirty, and the others range from Massey at twelve to Canterbury at eighteen. These are tentative numbers as some departments list part-time lecturers and tutors; whereas others only list full-time lecturers. One aspect that provided information about the universities' approach to fieldtrips was from their own undergraduates. Nearly all the teachers, and just over half of the lecturers, had been undergraduates at New Zealand universities; they referred to their own undergraduate training as part of their milieu. Participants were spread unequally across the universities as undergraduates, Thirteen were at Canterbury, nine at Otago, seven at both Auckland and Massey and three at both Waikato and Victoria. From these various sources, a few comments are worth considering.

Participants who had been undergraduates at Canterbury and Auckland universities, expressed most strongly, and positively, the influence of their own undergraduate training on fieldtrips and how this had influenced the

way in which they practised fieldtrips themselves. Frequently those who had been undergraduates of these departments could recount, in considerable detail, their own fieldtrip experiences and a lot of these geographers continued to practise fieldtrips in a very similar manner to that which they had experienced as undergraduates. This is particularly true of the physical geographers and this point is developed in the last part of this section. The exception was some of the human geographers, who had been trained in a positivist approach when undergraduates, but now approached their research, teaching, and the way they ran fieldtrips using a different episteme. This was usually a transfer from a positivist approach to one in which structures inform the way in which they view the world. From discussions with current lecturers in the departments at Auckland and Canterbury, fieldtrips continue to form a compulsory part of the programme for those who major in the subject. Considerable staff time and expertise is put into these fieldtrips. Often a number of staff are involved in the large compulsory third year trips at Auckland and the second year and third year ones at Canterbury, which certainly contributed to the willingness of staff in these departments to be interviewed about fieldtrips for this research. One lecturer, involved in one of these large trips, would recommend that I talked to others involved in the same fieldtrip, as they had close association with these members of staff and knew that they would have knowledge of fieldtrips to share with me.

Otago has a similar rich heritage of fieldtrips and some of those, who had been undergraduates there, cited fieldtrips as a reason why they were still in geography. However, there appeared to be more tensions at Otago over fieldtrips as the large physical geography trip, which had always been held jointly for second and third years, was due to be split (in 2006) into the separate year groups because of very large student numbers. The result appears to be that most third years in physical geography will no longer go on the traditional week long fieldtrips but will have days out with lecturers who are supervising their projects. Second years will continue to have week long fieldtrips in physical geography and third year human geographers have a compulsory field school. A greater number of fieldtrips were being reduced at Otago than in any of the other universities. This is partially

influenced by the administration in the university which requires all fieldtrips to be held in term time. This is not the case in any other New Zealand university.

Small numbers interviewed at the other universities make it difficult to comment on the place of fieldtrips in these universities. Currently at Massey University, two new lecturers in physical geography have introduced a number of new fieldtrips, some of which are residential. Emphasis is placed on graduate fieldtrips at Victoria, with a number of day trips for undergraduates. Waikato, similarly, concentrates on day trips for undergraduates with a very few individual lecturers taking an odd overnight trip for their own courses. Although, those who had been undergraduates at these three universities spoke of attending fieldtrips, none of these participants spoke with great enthusiasm of the experience. In fact some saw them quite negatively. To this day, these universities do not have the strong fieldtrip tradition that is present at Canterbury and Auckland and to a lesser extent, Otago. There are no large compulsory second or third year fieldtrips for all students who major in the subject at Victoria, Massey, or Waikato. It is of interest that *deconstructivists*, who took part in this research, are from Otago, Waikato, Massey, and Victoria universities, with none from Auckland and Canterbury, the universities with the strongest tradition of fieldtrips, and the ones that currently have compulsory fieldtrips for both their physical and human geographers who major in geography.

Deconstructivists questioned whether fieldtrips are really a necessary adjunct of geography courses, and they often find other ways of building knowledge using published textual material and items such as film. They were all in the departments that do not emphasise fieldwork. In contrast the Auckland and Canterbury departments were the first established in New Zealand and have had a strong tradition of residential fieldtrips from their earliest inception. Otago follows as a close third in traditional residential fieldtrips but the other three have had lesser emphasis on the fieldtrip tradition and fieldtrips have been much more the province of individual lecturers in these departments. This is in contrast to the large fieldtrips for

second or third years, attended by a number of lecturers, that have been the tradition at Auckland, Canterbury, and until recent years, Otago.

7.8 Differences

As differences have been recognised between the various departments of geography in New Zealand, a difference between physical and human geographers in New Zealand in their approach to fieldtrips was also observed. An understanding of this dichotomy emerged in the analysis of the interviews that contributed to this thesis. Most notable was the fact that all physical geographers were grouped together because of their use of the approach of positivism. They used fieldtrips to collect data to support hypotheses based on laws and models, which they formulated to explain processes in the landscape. None of the human geographers still worked in this episteme for fieldtrips. Some have worked in it previously but have moved to using other philosophical perspectives, mainly to an approach that uses structures as a way of explaining the world.

Amongst the university lecturers, who are physical geographers, another feature, separates them particularly from geographers who are *structuralists* and *deconstructivists*, as they see themselves as experts on a fieldtrip. From what participants in this study mentioned, this was because the field was viewed as a laboratory where processes could be analysed. These processes were viewed by physical geographers as independent of place, so that physical geographers interpreted a river in one place, based on theories that they had learnt, or established, and used those same theories, to interpret another river in a different place. *Structuralists* and *deconstructivists* do not consider themselves as expert in this way on fieldtrips as every place has different contextual features, which need to be taken into account before it can be understood. *Deconstructivists* see the world as always in flux, with a myriad of attributes that can never be fully understood and so never consider themselves as experts on a fieldtrip.

Structuralists saw each place as being a result of the operation of different structures, and they used those who were gatekeepers of these structures, such as members of the local planning authority, or the Maori community to interpret these structures for their students. They viewed each place as different, in the combination of structures that are present, and so did not see knowledge as transferable between places in the way that *general theorists* did.

Links can, however, be seen between *general theorists* and *classifiers*. For the latter group their main rationale for fieldtrips was about classifying places that are similar. They saw themselves as expert, in the same way that *general theorists* did, directing their students very closely on fieldtrips, and choosing the elements that were to be used for classifying the land. The similarities of *general theorists* and *classifiers* in this regard could be understood by considering their approach to geography fieldtrips as one of establishing order by either classification or imposition of theories, and either collecting information, to do this by an inductive method in the case of *classifiers*, or by a deductive method, in the case of *general theorists*. To achieve these ends both groups of geographers extracted only a limited number of attributes to analyse on fieldtrips. Both saw themselves as authorities regarding their knowledge of the landscape and imparted this knowledge to their students on fieldtrips, directing them on the attributes to be studied.

It is notable that these differences, which have been discovered in this thesis about the way that geographers who are primarily *classifiers*, *general theorists*, *structuralists*, or *deconstructivists* practise fieldtrips, are acknowledged. It has been noted that there is some adoption of deconstructivist ideas on fieldtrips by *general theorists*, and *structuralists* who has begun to address some of the fundamental differences in the approach to fieldtrips. This is largely due to material on deconstructivist approaches to fieldwork being published (Nairn, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003) and some of the ideas postulated in these works being adopted. None-the-less there is the potential for disagreement within departments between lecturers who have very different philosophical

approaches to fieldtrips if some of these differences are not addressed. A significant contribution of this thesis to the academy's knowledge of fieldtrips is to make practitioners aware of the importance of philosophical underpinnings to fieldtrips and how these may differ amongst the academic body of geographers. Being aware of difference is a first step in acknowledging that there are other valid viewpoints to how fieldtrips should be executed.

7.9 Concluding remarks

By using an approach, informed by humanism, that places an emphasis on human agency in the construction of fieldtrips, an understanding has been reached of geography fieldtrips at both secondary school and university level in New Zealand and answers to the key questions have been found. The benefit of the approach is in the way that the concepts of metaphor, milieu, and meaning have been used to combine the stories about fieldtrips, and geographers' own backgrounds and views on the practice of fieldtrips, from a large number of lecturers and teachers of geography in New Zealand. The recounting of geographers' experiences on fieldtrips plus memories of fieldtrips and other narratives related to the practice of fieldtrips assisted in constructing meaning and understandings related to the key questions of why and how fieldtrips are run and how this links to a geographers' own understandings of their subject. It was found that there has been a history of fieldtrips from the subject's earliest beginnings in New Zealand based on ideas of exploration and mapping. The culture of fieldtrips was thus established at an early stage and each succeeding generation of geographers has continued this approach to the subject apart from the *deconstructivists*. As geographers' philosophical views of the world have changed so have their fieldtrips.

Answers to the key questions were found from analysis of the interviews and by comprehending the common denominators between them. Strong

links emerged between the approaches that geographers took to their subject and the ways in which they practise fieldtrips with the metaphor noted on fieldtrips being their rationale for practising them whether this be making maps, collecting data, identifying a sense of place, or investigating differences in society. Fieldtrips are informed by the differing epistemes, depending on what the geographers who conduct them use as their dominant approach to the subject in their other teachings and research. Each group of geographers, who approach geography using a similar episteme, practise fieldtrips in a similar way, but these have differences from the practices of groups of geographers whose approach is from another episteme although there are meldings and blurrings between epistemes in the approaches of individuals. Other differences were also noted between certain groups. Sections of the geographical community, *classifiers* and *general theorists*, believe there is a real world that can be fully known and understood in a way that can be replicated and others, *structuralists* and *deconstructivists*, believe that each individual constructs knowledge in their own way.

A long history of fieldtrips in New Zealand has been documented in this study, stretching back to the Jobberns' era at Canterbury, and even further to links with the American and British geographers. It is this history of fieldtrips that has produced a culture of fieldtrip use in geography in which succeeding generations of undergraduates were trained by using fieldtrips, by finding the practice useful, and by going on to use fieldtrips with their own students when lecturers or teachers themselves. The links between school and university geography in New Zealand began in the early era of the subject as an academic discipline and they continue to this day through the New Zealand Geographical Society. The decision to include both teachers and lecturers in this study was advantageous in understanding the role of fieldtrips in New Zealand geography. Understandings were attained that the practice of fieldtrips by both groups, teachers and lecturers, is strongly informed by the approach to geography of the person who runs the fieldtrip. Fieldtrips continue due to the strong conviction of many New Zealand geographers, that fieldtrips are an important part of the academic discipline of geography, and as all geographers in this study had been on

fieldtrips themselves the replication of this process was viewed as an important part of the discipline of geography. The exception to this rule is provided by the *deconstructivists*. They often feel that knowledge can be constituted in a different way from running fieldtrips by using a variety of published sources of material.

It should be noted, that the humanistic approach used in this thesis, could be used in other countries or regions, to gain an understanding of the practice of geography fieldtrips. Buttimer (1983a) used this approach, informed by the concepts of milieu, metaphor, and meaning, to gain an understanding of the practice of the discipline of geography at an international level. In a similar way, in this study of the practice of fieldtrips, the memories of geographers concerning this aspect of their lives and the events that they have participated in on fieldtrips have been used to construct meanings as the geographers consciously reflected on the actual narratives of fieldtrips they have experienced. By considering the common denominators in the stories that participants have told some similar threads and differences have been noted about the way fieldtrips are run in New Zealand and about the significance of this for the academy as a whole, in this long voyage of discovery.

The wider significance of the thesis is considerable. It is the only study of its kind that provides a substantial body of knowledge on fieldtrips in NZ over the second half of the 20th century and into the 21st century and is a major addition to the written material on the subject. Nairn (1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003) provides a contemporary account of a very small number of fieldtrips at one point in time. This thesis covers a much longer time period and many more fieldtrips. Pawson and Teather (2002), Welch and Panelli (2003), Spronken-Smith, (2005) and Panelli and Welch (2005) concentrate on fieldtrips in their own institutions focusing on single courses where new fieldtrips have been introduced. Emphasis in these papers is placed on students' learning outcomes and how the course that is discussed has aided students' learning. My thesis, in contrast, is wide ranging dealing with fieldtrips in many places of geographical learning over many decades. It provides a theoretical framework for the study of fieldtrips and takes the

study beyond the focus on attributes of fieldtrips that has dominated the literature for so long. Studies such as those by Jenkins (1994), Kneale (1996), McEwen, (1996), McEwen and Harris (1996) and Higgitt and Bullard (1999), are of this type. This thesis undertakes to gain understandings of the reasons for running fieldtrips by focusing on those who practise them, which has not been accomplished previously (Driver, 2000). By using a humanist approach it has been possible to show how people construct their own worlds and the approach that Buttimer (1983a) used is pertinent to such a study.

The thesis has shown the changing nature and meaning of the geographic fieldtrip as different theoretical and methodological perspectives or epistemes have impacted on disciplinary practice. Although lecturers do, on the whole, acknowledge these epistemes, it is rare for teachers to acknowledge them. Teachers who are aware of the findings of the thesis, will have a chance to gain understandings of the effect of theoretical stances as to what actually happens on fieldtrips. It is important that findings are published in a journal such as the *New Zealand Geographer* which teachers read to promulgate these findings. The similarities and differences noted between teachers and lecturers and between the way fieldtrips are practised in the various universities are significant discoveries made in this thesis which have not been noted elsewhere.

It is of significance that this thesis showed the influence of the deconstructivists' work on difference. This has been acknowledged by a number of geographers, beyond those who work with a deconstructivist philosophical stance, and has influenced the way in which they run fieldtrips. Many of these 'taken-for-granted' aspects of fieldtrips have been made explicit by the deconstructivists (Nast, 1994; Nairn (1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, 2003; Hume-Cook and Kindon, 1998). This has made it more usual and acceptable to include elements which accommodate divergence in fieldtrips and so make them more accessible to a wider range of society.

Of consequence for knowledge about the discipline of geography are the findings in this thesis that fieldtrips have a profound impact on students'

future careers. Fieldtrips are viewed as team-building operations which have attributes sought in the world of work. This has been noted by Le Heron and Hathaway (2000). Fieldtrips are viewed by *general theorists* as a training ground for postgraduates in the discipline which has on-going ramifications for the continuance of fieldtrips in geography. Teachers of geography nearly always adopt and adapt fieldtrips that they attended as students and use these in their schools (Kent and Gilbertson, 1997). They usually use, as their philosophical approach in their teachings, including fieldtrips, the same episteme in which they were taught at university. The most significant finding of this thesis is that geography fieldtrips are designed to demonstrate that a teacher's or a lecturer's philosophical stance to his or her students. Fieldtrips are iconic in geography as there is such a long history of them, which is promoted by the teachers and lecturers themselves who attended fieldtrips as undergraduates and aim to replicate these experiences for their own students.

The thesis has demonstrated that through developing a series of sensitive generalisations (Aitken, 2000) about approaches to fieldtrips it has been possible to demonstrate the main meanings that a variety of geographers in a range of institutions in New Zealand aim to achieve by running fieldtrips. The generalisations are sensitive as it is acknowledged that no geographers can be compartmentalised in one episteme. Each takes attributes from other philosophical approaches to the subject, sometimes acknowledging these attributes and sometimes subconsciously including an aspect from another episteme in a fieldtrip.

A final significant point to be made concerns the manner in which this thesis contributes to knowledge about the academic discipline of geography. Such knowledge is in a constant state of flux (Graham, 2005) and there is never a 'final word' on fieldtrips (Thrift, 2004). This contribution adds to the creation of knowledge about fieldtrips and is significant in this regard. New philosophical approaches to geography will emerge as the 21st century unfolds that will be the focus of new studies on fieldtrips. The finding of this thesis that it is the philosophical approach of those that run a fieldtrip that is the most important meaning attributed to fieldtrips by geographers is of

supreme significance for the academy of geographers in understanding their essence and challenges the focus of previous studies on the attributes of fieldtrips. This discovery has been possible because the focus was made in this thesis on understanding the rationale of those who run fieldtrips rather than focusing on features of the fieldtrip as had been done in previous research on geography fieldtrips.

Although the original key questions have been addressed in this thesis suggestions are made, in the final coda (Section 7.10) of future approaches that could be made to the study of fieldtrips in New Zealand if knowledge accumulation about fieldtrips is to continue.

7.10 Further research possibilities

In the research for this thesis, due to constraints imposed by the ethical committee at Massey University, it was not possible to divulge the actual names of participants. Initially, it had been intended to include the names of geographers and to explore their lifeworlds. Participants would reveal their own meanings, milieux, and metaphors, from their life stories. Due to privacy issues this was not possible, and so a way of combining the rich information given by participants, was constructed, whereby the meanings from groups of geographers, who have a similar perspectives on geography, could be discussed. There are a number of possibilities of taking this research topic further. The oral interviewing project, to record the thoughts and practices of New Zealand geographers could be expanded to include a section on the practice of fieldtrips (Roche, 2003; Mansvelt 2003; Pawson, 2003) [see earlier section, 1.5 on this project].

Milieu and metaphor were combined for groups of participants, in a similar way, so that an understanding of the way in which these geographers practised fieldtrips, was informed by the milieux of geographers, who had a similar approach to the practice of fieldtrips. This was successful in

providing an understanding of how fieldtrips are very closely affiliated to the approach which geographers take to their subject, but individual nuances were lost in the combined approach. The opportunity of being able to focus in a more individual way on each geographer, telling his or her life story, is one that can be examined in a future study. With permission from participants, life stories that give both description and analysis of a person's educational background and other aspects that they feel are of relevance to the tale will give colour and depth to the study. Associations that currently could not be clearly demonstrated, for an individual, between the various stages in their education, their thoughts on what geography means, and the ways they practise fieldtrips, can be constructed if considerations of anonymity are not an issue.

Although many interviews were undertaken for this thesis, and rich and varied material was acquired, coverage of some of the New Zealand universities could have been greater. Again, there were problems due to the constraints of the ethical approval that was given. I could only invite geographers to participate, and if they refused or did not answer the invitation, I could not pressure them into accepting the invitation for an interview. With the higher prestige of the oral interviewing project, it is likely that the great majority of geographers will agree to participate. If research into the practice of fieldtrips is incorporated, within this large project, then there will be a greater coverage of New Zealand geographers. In this research, those who do not practise fieldtrips were not interviewed, which led to some problems in interpretation. If all, or most, geographers in New Zealand are interviewed then those who choose not to practise fieldtrips will be able to tell their stories and add to the collective knowledge obtained on the practice of fieldtrips as part of the academic discipline of geography in New Zealand. Similarly a focus on the stories that students tell would also illuminate another dimension of geography fieldtrips as would a focus on learning styles and more detailed work on just what aspects of learning are covered on fieldtrips.

Other avenues for further research are to use a similar humanistic method to understand the role of fieldtrips in another area such as Scotland or

Wales, which would be of comparable size in terms of population and number of tertiary institutes to New Zealand. The issue of gender on fieldtrips could be investigated further. Are there differences in the way in which men and women practice fieldtrips? In this thesis there was no differentiation made in this regard and further work is envisaged in this area.

Nonetheless this voyage has produced a remarkable story that spans decades of the teaching of geography in New Zealand. The conceptualisation of how fieldtrips are informed by the underpinning philosophies that geographers hold is strongly suggested by this study. The majority of geographers, both those teaching undergraduates and secondary school students, will adjust, and adapt their practices to suit current thinking about matters as varied as safety concerns and consideration of gender equality. This is so that they can demonstrate to their students how the theories expounded in the lecture hall or classroom can be shown in the world around us by map-making, data collection, understanding society, or concentrating on matters of difference in society. Fieldtrips have been, and will continue to be, an important part of geography teaching in New Zealand and it is this very culture of fieldtrips as part of geography courses that allows the practice to continue. By taking a humanistic approach it was possible to achieve understandings which have not been accomplished before of this enormous sphere of study, including both university and secondary school teaching of geography. In previous studies of fieldwork an emphasis has been placed on specific aspects of fieldtrips and not on the underlying philosophy of how and why fieldtrips are run as they were accomplished in this thesis.

Note

1 There are two main parliamentary acts, which have changed the laws on safety over the last few years. The 'Health and Safety in Employment Act' of 1992 states that all practicable steps have to be taken to keep students safe, and the

Department of Occupational Health and Safety administers this act, by setting out guidelines that have to be followed to keep within the law, as expressed by the 1992 Act. Although it has always been possible to prosecute under the New Zealand Crimes Act of 1961 if negligence was proven, in fact it proved difficult to apportion blame in the case of Crown institutions. Hence, a new law was introduced, the 'Crown Organisations Criminal Liability Act' of 2002. This act was to implement recommendations of the report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the collapse of a viewing platform at Cave Creek near Punakaiki on the West Coast in 1995, where a number of young people were killed, and badly injured, when on an educational outing. No convictions resulted from this case. However, under the Crown Organisations Criminal Liability Act, institutions such as government departments, universities, and School Boards of Trustees, can be prosecuted if they can be proved to have been negligent.

Appendix 1: Summary of my career in geography

As a student:

School

- Primary in England (1957-63) – first fieldtrips including factory fieldtrip
- Secondary in England (1963-70)– geography fieldtrips including physical geography fieldtrips

University

- University of St Andrews, Scotland (1970-75) – Honours degree in geography; attended fieldtrips in Scotland, England and Denmark
- Massey University 1998 – Honours Paper in Historical Geography
- Massey University (2003-2006) – PhD in Geography

As a teacher:

Tutor

- University of St Andrews, Scotland (1975-76)

School Teacher

- Parmiter's School, England (1976-78) – ran fieldtrips including a canal fieldtrips
- Presdale's School, England (1979-1980) – ran fieldtrips to farms
- Palmerston North Girls' High (1980-81 and 1997-1999) – ran fieldtrips to Tongariro (physical geography) and Wellington (cultural fieldtrips)
- Feilding Agricultural High School (1989-1997) – attended fieldtrips organised primarily by Head of Geography
- Awatapu College (2000-2006) – organised a new set of physical and cultural geography fieldtrips in the school

Appendix 2: Interview schedule

Themes to be discussed during individual interviews

Section 1

General information about:

- Current position
- Career highlights
- Papers/courses/levels taught
- Length of time running fieldtrips
- University attended and when
- Other subjects studied at university
- Interest in geography at university
- Fieldtrips attended at school and university
- Influences on perspective of what geography is, and how they interpret it for students
- Own research interests
- Concept of geography
- Being a geographer
- Human/physical geographer

Section 2

Geography fieldtrips:

- Purpose of fieldtrips
- Aims of running fieldtrips
- Reasons for running fieldtrips
- Special attributes of geography fieldtrips
- Meaning of 'place'

Learning as geographers on fieldtrips:

- Important aspects for students to learn in geography
- How students should develop as geographers
- Aspects for students to learn
- Preferred experiences for students
- Aim/purpose for students
- Skills students will learn

- What students will learn about place
- Desired learning outcomes of fieldtrips for students
- Fieldtrips as a learning method

Section 3

Specific fieldtrips – choose a memorable fieldtrip:

- Location
- Timing
- Year level of students
- Number of students
- Aim/purpose of fieldtrip for students
- Skills learned by students
- Places visited and reasons for using these places
- Other features learned by students
- Ideas that underpinned fieldtrip objectives
- Reasons for choosing to run a fieldtrip rather than other methods to achieve course objectives
- Reasons for choosing this fieldtrip to talk about
- Organisation of students
- Interaction of students
- Social behaviour encouraged
- Social behaviour discouraged
- Positive aspects
- Negative aspects
- Strategies to avert negative aspects

Section 4

Changes to fieldtrips concerning – look back as well as forwards:

- Aim/purpose
- Skills covered
- Places used
- Types of student interaction
- Aspects avoided

External/Internal influences on fieldtrip development from:

- Own experiences as a student –school and university
- Wide-ranging factors in society
- Own career
- Current School/Department

Concerning:

- Aim/ purpose
- Skills taught
- Places visited
- Ideas that underpinned fieldtrip objectives
- Organisation of students
- How students, and staff and students, interacted
- Mitigation of student behaviour

Other factors:

- Links between theoretical orientation, stance, research that others have done and fieldtrips
- Influences from readings, own research and papers/courses
- Influence of experience of others
- Influence of curriculum
- Influences from government documents or, documents produced by own institution
- Influences from links such as key texts or textbooks
- Methods used to ensure that students linked their findings to theory

Other comments

Appendix 3: Naming of participants

Ordering is by their appearance in the text, thus lecturer A1 appears before lecturer B1.

Geographers who classify the world (the early years)

Lecturer A1 – Lecturer interviewed January 2005

Teacher A1 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005

Teacher A2 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005

Teacher A3 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005

Geographers who use general theories to explain the world

Lecturer B1 – Lecturer interviewed March, 2005

Lecturer B2 – Lecturer interviewed December, 2004

Lecturer B3 – Lecturer interviewed December 2004

Lecturer B4– Lecturer interviewed January 2005

Lecturer B5 – Lecturer interviewed March 2005

Lecturer B6 – Lecturer interviewed March 2005

Lecturer B7– Lecturer interviewed January 2005

Lecturer B8 – Lecturer interviewed December 2004

Lecturer B9 – Lecturer interviewed December 2004

Lecturer B10 – Lecturer interviewed March 2005

Lecturer B11 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004

Lecturer B12 – Lecturer interviewed January 2005

Teacher B1 - Teacher in the Taranaki region interviewed November 2004
Teacher B2 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed February 2005
Teacher B3 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005
Teacher B4 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005
Teacher B5 - Teacher in the Taranaki region interviewed November 2004
Teacher B6 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed October 2004
Teacher B7 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed December 2004
Teacher B8 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed November 2004
Teacher B9 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed October 2004
Teacher B10 - Teacher in the Taranaki region interviewed November 2004

Geographers who use structures to interpret the world

Lecturer C1 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer C2 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer C3 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer C4 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer C5 - Lecturer interviewed January 2005
Lecturer C6 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer C7- Lecturer interviewed January 2005
Lecturer C8- Lecturer interviewed January 2005
Lecturer C9 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004

Teacher C1 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005
Teacher C2 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed November 2004
Teacher C3 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed October 2004
Teacher C4 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005
Teacher C5 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed November 2004
Teacher C6 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed November 2004
Teacher C7 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005
Teacher C8 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed February 2005
Teacher C9 - Teacher in the Canterbury region interviewed January 2005
Teacher C10 - Teacher in the Taranaki region interviewed November 2004
Teacher C11 - Teacher in the Taranaki region interviewed November 2004
Teacher C12 - Teacher in the Manawatu region interviewed October 2004
Teacher C13 - Teacher in the Taranaki region interviewed November 2004
Teacher C14 - Teacher in the Taranaki region interviewed November 2004

Geographers who deconstruct the world

Lecturer D1 – Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer D2 – Lecturer interviewed March 2005
Lecturer D3 – Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer D4 – Lecturer interviewed December 2004
Lecturer D5 - Lecturer interviewed December 2004

Bibliography

Aitken, S. 2005: Textual analysis: reading culture and context, in: Flowerdew, R. and Martin, D. (eds.), *Methods in Human Geography A Guide for Students doing a research project*, Pearson, Harlow.

Althusser, L. 1969: *For Marx*, Verso, London.

Althusser, L. and Balibar, E. 1970: *Reading Capital*, New Left Books, London.

Anderson, A., Kearns, R. and Hosking, P. 1996: *Fifty years of geography at the University of Auckland 1946-1996*, Department of Geography Occasional Publication No.32, Auckland.

Anon, 1946a: Branch report, *New Zealand Geographical Society Record of the Proceedings of the Society and its Branches*, 2.

Anon, 1946b: History and Geography in Primary School, *Education Gazette*, 26, 152.

Badcock, B. 1968: *The Viability of a South Auckland Regional Centre*, M.A. Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.

Badcock, B. 1970: Central Place Evolution and Network Development in South Auckland, 1840-1968: A Systems Analytic Approach, *New Zealand Geographer*, 26, 109-35.

Bailey, C. 2001: Geographers doing household research: intrusive research and moral accountability, *Area*, 33(1), 107-10.

Bailey, C., White, C. and Pain, R. 1999: Evaluating qualitative research: dealing with the tension between 'science' and 'creativity', *Area*, 31(2), 169-83.

Banks, I. 1984: *The Wasp Factory*, Scribner, New York.

Banks, I. 2003: *Dear Air*, Time Warner, London.

Barnes, T. 1994: Probable writing: Derrida, deconstruction and the quantitative revolution in human geography, *Environment and Planning A*, 26, 1021-40.

Barnes, T. 1996: *Logics of Dislocation: Models, Metaphors and Meanings of Economic Space*, Guilford, New York.

Barnes, T. 2002: Performing economic geography: two men, two books, and a cast of thousands, *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 487-512.

Barnes, T. and Duncan, J. (eds.), 1991: *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape*, Routledge, London.

Barnett, J. 2005:

<http://www.geog.canterbury.ac.nz/departments/staff/rossb.shtml>, (14 January 2005).

Barnett, J., Coyle, P. and Kearns, R. 2000: Holes in the safety net? Assessing the effects of targeted benefits upon the health care utilisation of poor New Zealanders, *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 8, 1-13.

Barnett, J., Moon, G. and Kearns, R. 2004: Social inequality and ethnic differences in smoking in New Zealand, *Social Science and Medicine*, 59, 129-43.

Barton, T. 1985: *Fieldwork for Geographers: Practical Work for Pupils*, Edward Arnold, London.

Baxter, J. and Eyles, J. 1997: Evaluating qualitative research in social geography: establishing 'rigour' in interview analysis, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS 22, 505-25.

Berg, B. 1989: *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Berg, L. 1994: Masculinity, place and a binary discourse of 'theory' and 'empirical investigation' in the human geography of Aotearoa/New Zealand'. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1, 245-60.

Berg, L. 1998: Proclaiming native rebels, affirming European masculinity, in Forer, P. and Perry, P.J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1995 Conference of the New Zealand Geographical Society, New Zealand Geographical Society Conference Series No. 18*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Hamilton, 174-77.

Berg, L. 1999: A (white) man of his times? Sir George Grey and the narration of hegemonic masculinity in Victorian New Zealand, in: Law, R., Campbell, H. and Dolan, J. (eds.), *Masculinities in New Zealand*, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, 67-83.

Berg, L., Duncan, J. and Cosgrove, D. 2005: Social formation and symbolic landscape, *Progress In Human Geography*, 29(4), 475-83.

Berg, L. and Longhurst, R. 2003: Placing Masculinities and Geography. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 10(4), 351-60.

Berg, L. and Roche, M. 1997: Market metaphors, neoliberalism and the construction of academic landscapes in New Zealand, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21(2), 147- 61.

Besio, K. 2003: Steppin' in it: postcoloniality in northern Pakistan, *Area*, 35(1), 24-33.

Bland, K., Chamber, B., Donert, K. and Thomas, T. 1996: Fieldwork, in Bailey, P. and Fox, P. (eds.), *Geography Teachers' Handbook*, Geographical Association, Sheffield.

Bondi, L. and Laurie, N. 2005: Introduction, working the spaces of neoliberalism: activism, professionalisation and incorporation, *Antipode*, 37 (3), 393-401.

Bowlby, S. 1992: Feminist geography and the changing curriculum, *Geography*, 77(4), 349- 60.

Bowlby, S., Lewis, J., McDowell, L. and Foord, J. 1989: The geography of gender, in Peet, R. and Thrift, N. (eds.), *New Models in Geography, Volume 1*, Unwin and Hyman, Boston, 157-75.

Bradshaw, M. 2001: Contracts and member checks in qualitative research in human geography: reason for caution? *Area*, 33(2), 202-11.

Brenner, R. 1977: The origins of capitalist development; a critique of neo-Smithian Marxism, *New Left Review*, 104, 25-30.

Britton, S., Le Heron, R. and Pawson, E. (eds.) 1992: *Changing Places in New Zealand: A Geography of Restructuring*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch.

Brockie, W. 1967: A Contribution to the study of frozen glacial ground phenomena – preliminary investigations into a form of miniature stone stripes in East Otago, in *Proceedings of the Fifth New Zealand Geography Conference*, Department of Geography, Canterbury, Christchurch, 191-96.

Bryan, P. 1935: Value of local surveys, *Geography*, 20, 201-04.

Buchanan, K. 1962: West wind, east wind, *Proceedings of the Third New Zealand Geography Conference*, 7-20.

Buchanan, K. 1964: Profiles of the third world, *Pacific Viewpoint*, 5, 97-126.

Buchanan, K. 1966: *The Chinese People and the Chinese Earth*, Bell, London.

Buchanan, K. 1968: *Out of Asia, Asian Themes 1958-66*, Sydney University Press, Sydney.

Buchanan, K. 1970: *The Transformation of the Chinese Earth*, Bell, London.

Buchanan, K. 1972: *Geography of Empire*, Spokesman, London.

Buchanan, R. 1937: The pastoral industries of New Zealand: a study in economic geography, *Institute of British Geographers publication*, 2, Philip, London.

Bunge, W. 1973: The geography of human survival, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 63, 566-68.

Burgess, J. 2003: The art of interviewing, in Roger, A and Viles, H. (eds.), *The Student's Companion to Geography*, Blackwell, Oxford, 93-109.

Butler, J. 1990: *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, London and New York.

Butler, J. 1993: *Bodies that Matter: on the Discursive Limits of Sex*, Routledge, London and New York.

Buttimer, A. 1976: Grasping the dynamism of lifeworlds, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 66, 277-92.

Buttimer, A. 1978: Charism and context: The Challenge of la geographie humaine, in Ley D. and Samuels, M. (eds.), *Humanistic Geography Prospects and Problems*, Croom Helm, London.

Buttimer, A. 1980: 'Home, reach, and the sense of place', in Buttimer, A. and Seamon, D. (eds.), *The Human Experience of Place*, Croom Helm, London, 176-89.

Buttimer, A. 1983a: *The Practice of Geography*, Longman, London.

Buttimer, A. 1983b: Perception in four keys, in Saarinen, T. and Seamon, D. (eds.), *Environmental Perception and Behaviour: Inventory and Prospect*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Buttimer, A. 1989: *The Wake of Erasmus Saints, Scholars and Studia in Mediaeval Norden*, Lund Studies in Geography Series B Human Geography (54), Royal University of Lund, Department of Geography, Lund University Press, Lund.

Buttimer, A. 1990: Geography, humanism and global concern, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 80, 1-33.

Buttimer, A. 1993: *Geography and the Human Spirit*, John Hopkins University, Baltimore.

Buttimer, A. 2001: 'Home-reach-journey', in Moss, P. (ed.), *Placing Autobiography in Geography*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 22-40.

Buttimer, A. and Hägerstrand, T. 1988: *Geographers of Norden. Reflections on Career Experiences*, Lund University Press, Lund, Sweden.

Buttimer, A. and Wallin, L. 1999: *Nature and Identity in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht.

Cameron, J. 2000: Focusing on the focus group, in Hay, I. (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Cant, G. 1967: A Case Study in Outmigration: movement of adult farm workers from the Selwyn Ashburton electoral districts during the period 1963-6, in *Proceedings of the Fifth New Zealand Geography Conference*, Department of Geography, Canterbury, Christchurch, 41-48.

Cant, G. 1974: Research in Progress: Towards a rural ecology for New Zealand, *Pacific Viewpoint*, 15, 68-74.

Centre 4, 2006: Curriculum/Marautanga Project Online,
<http://centre4.interact.ac.nz/spaces/space.php?space%20key=468&javascript1%20.&javascript=1>.

Chisholm, G. 1889: *Handbook of Commercial Geography*, Longmans, Edinburgh.

Chisholm, G. 1891: *Britannic Confederation. III, The Commerce of the British Empire*, Longmans, Edinburgh.

Clark, A. 1949: *The Invasion of New Zealand by People, Plants, and Animals*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Clark, D. 1996: The changing national context of fieldwork in geography, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(3), 385-91.

Clifford, N. and Valentine, G. 2003: *Key Methods in Geography*, Sage, London.

Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P. 1996: *Making Sense of Qualitative Data. Complementary Research Strategies*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Collingwood, R.G. 1946: *The Idea of History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Cole, G. 1921: Why we teach geography, *The Journal of Education and School World*, 53, 90-95.

Commission on Education in New Zealand, 1962: *Report*, Government Printer, Wellington.

Cosgrove, D. 1989: 'Geography is everywhere: Culture and Symbolism in Human Landscapes', in Gregory, D. and Walford, R. (eds.), *Horizons in Human Geography*, Macmillan, London.

Cosgrove, D. and Daniels, S. 1988: *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cosgrove, D. and Daniels, S. 1989: Fieldwork as theatre, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 13(2), 169-92.

Craymer, C. 1998: Some thoughts on the New Zealand geography curriculum, *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, 106, 30-31.

Cresswell, T. 1996: *In Place/out of Place, Geography, Ideology and Transgression*, University of Minnesota Press, London.

Cumberland, K. 1943: A geographic approach to soil erosion in New Zealand, *Australian Geographer*, 4, 120-31.

Cumberland, K. 1944a: Contrasting regional morphology of soil erosion in New Zealand, *Geographical Review*, 34, 77-95.

Cumberland K. 1944b: High country 'run' – the geography of extensive pastoralism in New Zealand, *Economic Geography*, 20, 204-20.

Cumberland K. 1944c: Survey and classification of land in New Zealand: a basis for planning, *Transactions of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 74, 185-95.

Cumberland K. 1946: The Geographer's point of view. Inaugural address. Auckland University College April 2 1946, Auckland, 17-19.

Cumberland, K. and Pownall, L. 1950: *Northland-Coromandel Region*, School Publications Branch, New Zealand Education Department.

Cumberland, K. 1955: Presidential address, in Cumberland, K. (ed.), *Proceedings of the First Geography Conference*, Auckland, 6-12.

Cumberland, K. and Fox, J. 1957: *New Zealand a Regional View*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch.

Cumberland, K. and Fox, J. 1958: *New Zealand a Regional View*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch.

Cumberland, K. and Whitelaw, J. 1970: *New Zealand*, Longman, London.

Cupples, J. and Harrison, J. 2001: Disruptive voices and boundaries of respectability in Christchurch, New Zealand, *Gender, Place and Culture*, 8(2), 189-204.

Cupples, J. 2002: The field as a landscape of desire: Sex and sexuality in geographical fieldwork, *Area*, 34(4), 382-90.

Cupples, J. and Kindon, S. 2003a: Far from being 'home alone': The dynamics of accompanied fieldwork, *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 24(2), 211-28.

Cupples, J. and Kindon, S. 2003b: Returning to university and writing the field, in Scheyvens, R. and Storey, D. (eds.), *Development Fieldwork: A Practical Guide*, Sage, London, 217-31.

Daniels, S. 1982: Humphrey Repton and the morality of landscape, in Gold, J. and Burgess, J. (eds.), *Valued Environments*, Allen and Unwin, London, 124-44.

- Daniels, S. 1985: Arguments for a humanist geography, in Johnston, R. (ed.), *The Future of Geography*, Methuen, London, 135-56.
- Daniels, S. 1992: Place and the geographic imagination, *Geography*, 77(4), 310-22.
- Daniels, S. and Nash, C. 2004: Lifepaths: geography and biography, *Journal of Historical Geography*, 30, 449-58.
- Davidson, J., Bondi, L. and Smith, M. 2005: *Emotional Geographies*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Davis, M. 1985: 'Chinatown', Part two? The 'internationalization' of downtown Los Angeles, *New Left Review*, 151.
- Dear, M. and Taylor, S. 1982 *Not on our Street: Community Attitudes to Mental Health Care*, Pion, London.
- Dear, M. 1988: The post-modern challenge: reconstructing human geography, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS, 13, 262-74.
- Denzin, N. 1989: *Interpretive Interactionism*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Denzin, N. 2001: *Interpretive Interactionism. Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 16*, Sage, Thousand Oaks CA.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (eds.), 1994: *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Department of Education, 1908: *Public Regulations for Inspection and Syllabus of Instruction*, Department of Education, Wellington.

Department of Education, 1928: *Syllabus of Instruction for Public Schools*, Department of Education, Wellington.

Department of Education, 1937: *Syllabus of Instruction for Public Schools*, Department of Education, Wellington.

Department of Education, 1949: *The Education (Post-primary Instruction) Regulations. Syllabuses of Instruction and Prescriptions for the School Certificate Examination*, Department of Education, Wellington.

Department of Education, 1953: *The Education (Post-primary Instruction) Regulations. Syllabuses of Instruction and Prescriptions for the School Certificate Examination*, Department of Education, Wellington.

Department of Education, 1963: *The Education (Post-primary Instruction) Regulations. Syllabuses of Instruction and Prescriptions for the School Certificate Examination*, Department of Education, Wellington.

Department of Education, 1959: *The Post-primary school curriculum Report of the Committee appointed by the Minister of Education in November 1942, (Thomas report)*, Department of Education, Wellington.

Department of Employment, 1990: *EHE Guidelines for Higher Education*, DOE Training Agency, Sheffield.

Derrida, J. 1991: *The Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.

Deutsche, R. 1991: *Boy's town, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 9, 5-30.

Dixon, D. and Jones, J. 2005: *Derridean Geographies, Antipode*, 37(2), 242-45.

Doel, M. 2005: Deconstruction and Geography: Settling the Account, *Antipode*, 37(2), 246-49.

Dowling, R. 2000: Power, subjectivity and ethics in qualitative research, in Hay, I. (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 53-67.

Doyle, L. 1999: The Big Issues: empowering homeless women through academic research, *Area* 31(3), 239-46.

Driver, F. 1992: Geography's empire: histories of geographical knowledge, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 10, 23-40.

Driver, F. 2000: Editorial: fieldwork in geography, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS, 25, 267-68.

Duncan, J. 1990: *The City as Text: the Politics of Landscape Interpretation in the Kandy Kingdom*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Duncan, J. 1993: Sites of representation: place, time and the discourse of the Other, in Duncan, J. and Ley, D. (eds.), *Place/Culture/Representation*, Routledge, London and New York, 39- 56.

Duncan, J. and Duncan, N. 1988: (Re)reading the landscape, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 6, 117-26.

Dunn, K. 2000: Interviewing, in Hay, I. (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 37-56.

Dyck, I. 1989: Integrating home and wage workplace: women's daily lives in a Canadian suburb, *The Canadian Geographer*, 33(4), 329-41.

Dyck, I. 1993: Ethnography: a feminist method? *The Canadian Geographer*, 37, 52-57.

Ellis, B. 1993: Introducing humanistic geography through fieldwork, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 17(2), 131-39.

England, K. 1994: Getting personal: reflexivity, positionality and feminist research, *Professional Geographer*, 41(1), 80-89.

Escobar, A. 1995: *Encountering Development*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Eyles, J. 1985: *Senses of Place*, Silverbrook, Warrington.

Eyles, J. (ed.), 1986: *Qualitative Approaches in Social and Geographical Research*, Occasional paper 26 Department of Geography and Earth Science, Queen Mary College, University of London, London.

Eyles, J. 1989: 'The geography of everyday life', in Gregory, D. and Walford, R. (eds.), *Horizons in Human Geography*, Macmillan, London, 102-17.

Eyles, J. 2001: Been there, done that. What's next? in Moss, P. (ed.), *Placing Autobiography in Geography*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse NY.

Eyles, J. and Smith, D. (eds.), 1988: *Qualitative Methods in Human Geography*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Fail, J. 1995: Teaching ecology in urban environments, *American Biology Teacher*, 57(8), 522-25.

Fastier, M. 2006: NZBOGT – 2005 Examination Survey Results, "The Network" *The NZBoGT Newsletter for Geography Teachers*, 30, 5.

Flenley, J. 1993: Departments of geography in the Asia Pacific region, *Pacific Viewpoint*, 34 (1), 77-100.

Forbes, D. 2000: Reading texts and writing geography, in Hay, I. (ed.), *Qualitative Methods in Human Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. 78-90.

Forer, P. and Chalmers, L. 1987: Geography and information technology: issues and impacts, in Holland, P.G. and Johnston, W.B. (eds.), *Southern Approaches: Geography in New Zealand*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch, 33-58.

Fox, J. 1956: *Land Use Survey: General Principles and a New Zealand Example*, Auckland University College Bulletin No 49 Geography Series No. 1, Auckland University College, Auckland.

Franklin, H. and Winchester, D. 1993: *Victoria Geography Teaching and Research. 'A Casual History from the Fifties to the Nineties*, Working Paper No 20, Prepared expressly for the 1992 review of the Department of Geography Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

Fuller, I., Gaskin, S. and Scott, I. 2003: Students' perceptions of geography and environmental science fieldwork in the light of restricted access to the field, caused by foot and mouth disease in the UK in 2001, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 27(1), 79-102.

Fuller, I., Edmondson, S., France, D., Higgitt, D. and Ratinen, I. 2006: International perspectives on the effectiveness of geography fieldwork for learning, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 89-101.

Fuller, I., Rawlinson, S. and Bevan, R. 2000: Evaluation of student learning experiences in physical geography fieldwork: paddling or pedagogy? *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 199-216.

Garnier, B. 1944: Social aspects of geography, *New Zealand Education Gazette*, 44, 14.

Geography Te Ihowhenua, 2005: Papers offered in Geography, 100-Level, <http://www.geography.otago.ac.nz/Geography/Courses/Courses.html>, 2nd September, 2005.

Giddens, A. 1979: *Central Problems in Social Theory*, Macmillan, London.

Giddens, A. 1981: *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism, Vol. 1: Power Property and the State*, Macmillan, London.

Giddens, A. 1984: *The Constitution of Society*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Giddens, A. 1985: *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism, Vol. 2: The Nation State and Violence*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Gilbert, M. 1994: The politics of location: Doing feminist research at 'Home', *Professional Geographer*, 41(1), 90-96.

Gorrie, A. 1955: *The History of Geography in New Zealand*, unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.

Goss, J. 1993: Placing the market and marketing the place: tourist advertising of the Hawaiian Islands, 1972-1992, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 11(6), 663-88.

Graham, E. 2005: Philosophies underlying human geography research, in: Flowerdew, R. and Martin, D. (eds.), *Methods in Human Geography A Guide for Students doing a research project*, Pearson, Harlow, 8-26.

Gregory, D. 1978: *Ideology, Science and Human Geography*, Hutchinson, London.

Gregory, D. 2004: *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Gregory, J. 1906: *Imperial Geography for New Zealand schools*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch.

Gregory, K. 2003: Physical geography and environmental science, in Johnston, R. and Williams, M. (eds.), *A Century of British Geography*, The British Academy, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gregson, N. 2005: Agency and structure, in Cloke, P and Johnston, R. (eds.), *Spaces of Geographical Thought*, Sage, London, 21-41.

Gubrium, J. and Holstein, J. 2002: *Handbook of Interview Research Context and Method*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Guelke, L. 1981: 'Idealism', in Harvey, M. and Holly, B. (eds.), *Themes in Geographic Thought*, St Martin's, New York, 56-69.

Guelke, L. 1997: The relations between geography and history reconsidered, *History and Theory*, 36(2), 216-34.

Hägerstrand, T. 1984: Presences and absences: a look at conceptual choices and bodily necessities, *Regional Studies*, 8, 373-80.

Haggett, P. 1965: *Locational Analysis in Human Geography*, Edward Arnold, London.

Haggett, P. 1980: Emerging trends in regional geography, in Forer, P. (ed.), *Futures in Human Geography* Canterbury Branch of the NZGS, Christchurch, 1-11.

Hale, S. 1987: Recollections of Spencer Hale, in Macaulay, J. (ed.), *Geographical Windows: Chronicle of the Geography Department University of Canterbury 1937-87*, Department of Geography, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, 45.

Hammond, J. 1992: *The Institutionalisation of Geography in New Zealand: an interpretation*, Ph.D. Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Hamnett, C. 2003: Contemporary human geography: fiddling while Rome burns? *Geoforum*, 34, 1-3.

Harley, B. 1991: Deconstructing the map, in Barnes, T. and Duncan, J. (eds.), 1991: *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape*, Routledge, London, 231-47.

Harrington, W. 1992: *Crossings: A White Man's Journey into Black America*, Routledge, New York.

Hartshorne, R. 1939: *The Nature Of Geography. A Critical Survey Of Current Thought In The Light Of The Past*, Association of American Geographers, 29, (3 and 4), Lancaster, PA.

Hartshorne, R. 1954a: Comment on 'Exceptionalism in geography', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 44, 108-09.

Hartshorne, R. 1954b: 'Exceptionalism in geography' re-examined, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 45, 205-44.

Hartshorne, R. 1959; *Perspectives On The Nature Of Geography*, Rand McNally, Chicago.

Harvey, D. 1969: *Explanation in Geography*, Edward Arnold, London.

Harvey, D. 1973: *Social Justice in the City*, Edward Arnold, London.

Harvey, D. 1982: *The Limits To Capital*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Harvey, D. 1989: *The Condition Of Postmodernity*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Harvey, D. 1996: *Justice, Nature And The Geography Of Difference*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Harvey, D, 1999: *The Limits To Capital*, Verso, London.

Harvey, D, 2000: *Spaces of Hope*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Harvey, D, 2002: Memories and desires, in Gould, P. and Pitt, F.R. (eds.), *Geographical Voices: Fourteen Autobiographical Essays*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 149-88.

Harvey, D. 2003: *Paris, Capital of Modernity*, Routledge, New York.

Hay, I. 1987: Optical analysis: (pr)isms in geographic thought, *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, 83, 2-7.

Hay, I. 2000: *Qualitative Research Methods In Human Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hay, I. 2003a: From 'Millennium' to 'profiles': Geography's oral histories across the Tasman, in Gao, J., Le Heron, R. and Logie, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd New Zealand Geographical Conference*, 6-11 July, University of Auckland, Auckland, 5-6.

Hay, I. 2003b: Ethical practices in geographical research, in Clifford, N.J. and Valentine, G. (eds.), *Key Methods in Geography*, Sage, London.

Hay, I., Hughes, A. and Tutton, M. 2004: 'Monuments, memory and marginalisation in Adelaide's Prince Henry Gardens', *Geografiska Annaler B*, 86 (3), 200-15.

Healey, M., Robert, C., Jenkins, A. and Leach, J. 2002: Disabled students and fieldwork: Towards inclusivity? *Planet-Special Edition 3 Special Education Needs and Disabilities – Learning Teaching Guidance for Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences*, 3, 24-27.

Henry, M. 2004: *Matthew Henry*, The School of Environment, People and Planning, Massey University, <http://www.massey.ac.nz/>

Henry, M. 2006: Making New Zealanders through commemoration: Assembling Anzac Day in Auckland, 1916-1939, *New Zealand Geographer*, 62(1), 13-24.

Hensman, J., Hensman, J. and Coombe, P. 1990: *New Zealand Senior Geography Series Natural Processes Volcanic Processes Fluvial Processes Coastal Processes*, New House, Auckland.

Hensman J., Irvine, J. and Eaton, M. 1991: *6 Geography*, New House, Auckland.

Hensman, J. 1998: *Level Seven Geography Our Planet Our Home Natural Landscapes*, New House, Auckland.

Herbert, B. and Pritchard, B. 2004: The changing geographies of power and control in rural service provision: recent restructuring within the Australian tractor dealership system, *Australian Geographical Studies*, 42(1), 18-33.

Hewland, J. 1946: Canterbury Branch, *New Zealand Geographical Society, Record*, 2, 9-15.

Hewland, J. 1947: Geography and Social Studies, *New Zealand Geographer*, 3(1), 83-91.

Hewland, J. 1952: Sixth form fieldwork a comparison New Zealand/England *New Zealand Geographer*, 8(1), 151-56.

- Higgit, D. 1996: Addressing the new agenda for fieldwork in higher education, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(3), 391-99.
- Higgit, D. and Bullard, J. 1999: Assessing fieldwork risk for undergraduate projects, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 23(3), 441-49.
- Hirsch, P. and Lloyd, K. 2005: Real and virtual experiential learning on the Mekong: Field Schools, e-Sims and cultural challenge, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 29(3), 321-37.
- Holland, P., Kidd, H. and Welch, R. 1995: *From Mellor to Hocken: Fifty years of Geography at the University of Otago*, Department of Geography, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Holloway, W. and Jefferson, T. 1997: Eliciting narrative though in depth interview, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(1), 53-71.
- Holmes, W. 1878: General report on the county of Yorkshire, in *Report of the Committee of Council on Education*, Parliamentary papers volume 79, 597-609.
- Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. 1995: *The Active Interview. Qualitative Research Methods Series, Volume 37*, Sage, London.
- Howarth, O. 1915: *Oxford Survey of the British Empire*, Oxford University, Oxford.
- Hume-Cook, G. and Kindon, S. 1998: Deconstructive geographic Fieldwork: Dimensions of Theoria and Praxis in "Place, Power and Identity", in Bliss, E. (ed.), *Conference Proceedings of Geo. Ed.97/ Kaupapa Aro Whenua Geographical Education Conference*, New Zealand Geographical Conference Series No. 19, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Huntingdon, E. 1911: *Civilization and Climate*, Yale University Press, New Haven CT.

Huntingdon, E. 1945: *Mainsprings of Civilization*, John Wiley, New York.

Hutton, J. 1795: *Theory of the Earth: with Proofs and Illustrations*, Cadell, Edinburgh.

Huxley, T. 1870: *Physiography*, Macmillan, London.

Jackson, M. 1995, in Holland, P., Kidd, H. and Welch, R. (eds.), *From Mellor to Hocken: Fifty years of Geography at the University of Otago*, Department of Geography, University of Otago, Dunedin, 19.

Jameson, F. 1989: *Postmodernism: or the Cultural Logic Of Late Capitalism*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Jeffrey, C. 2003: Bridging the gulf between school and university teachers, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 27(2), 201-15.

Jencks, C. 1993: *Heterotopolis: Los Angeles, The Riots And The Strange Beauty Of Hetero-architecture*, Academy Editions, London.

Jenkins, A. 1994: Thirteen ways of doing fieldwork with more students, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 18(1), 143-54.

Jobberns, G. 1930: *Whitcombe's Regional Geography of New Zealand*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Auckland.

Jobberns, G. 1931: *Whitcombe's World Regional Geography*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Auckland.

Jobberns, G. 1945: Geography and National Development, *New Zealand Geographer*, 1(1), 7-8.

Jobberns, G. 1959: The time has come to talk of many things, The Presidential Address delivered to the Second New Zealand Geography Conference at Christchurch on 28 August 1958, *New Zealand Geographer*, 15(1), 1-18.

Johnson, L. 2005: Stoking the fires of enquiry – Evelyn Stokes' contribution to Waikato and New Zealand geography, 1988-90, *New Zealand Geographer*, 61(2), 6-7.

Johnston, L. 1993: Body shaping: At home with the Lesbian, in Whittaker, W. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Geography Conference*, Victoria University, Wellington, 397-403.

Johnston, L. 1994: The politics of the pump: hard core gyms and women body builders, *New Zealand Geographer*, 51(1), 16-18.

Johnston, L. 1997: Queen(s') Street or Ponsonby poofers? Embodied HERO parade sites, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 29-33.

Johnston, L. 2002: Borderline bodies at gay pride parades, in Bondi, in Avis, L., Bingley, A., Davidson, J., Duffy, R., Einagel, V., Green, A., Johnston, L., Lilley, S., Listerborn, C., Marshy, M., McEwan, S., O'Connor, N., Rose, G., Vivat, B. and Wood N., (eds.), *Subjectivities, Knowledges and Feminist Geographies*, Rowman and Littlefield, London, 167-89.

Johnston, L. 2004: *Staff profile – Lynda – Johnston*, The University of Waikato Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, <http://www.waikato.ac.nz/wfass/subjects/geography/staff/lynda/> 12 December, 2004.

Johnston, R. 1970: Editorial, *New Zealand Geographer*, 26, 109-35.

Johnston, R. 1974a: *Spatial Planning and Social Goals in New Zealand*, Auckland Branch, New Zealand Geographical Society.

Johnston R. 1974b: Continually changing human geography revisited: David Harvey, *Social Justice in the City*, *New Zealand Geographer*, 30, 180-92.

Johnston, R. 1976: Inter-regional and inter-urban income variations in New Zealand, *Pacific Viewpoint*, 17, 147-58.

Johnston, R. 1983: *Geography and Geographers Anglo-American Geography since 1945*, Edward Arnold, London.

Johnston, R. 1995: The business of British Geography, in Cliff, A., Gould, P., Hoare, A. and Thrift, N. (eds.), *Diffusing Geography: Essays for Peter Haggett*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Johnston, R. 1997: *Geography And Geographers. Anglo-American Human Geography Since 1945*, Arnold, London.

Johnston, R., Gregory, D., Pratt, G. and Watts, M. 2000: *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Johnston, R. and Sidaway, J. 2004: *Geography and Geographers Anglo-American Human Geography Since 1945*, sixth edition, Arnold, London.

Johnston, R. and Williams, M. (eds.), 2003: *A Century of British Geography*, The British Academy, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Johnston, W. 1970: Geography in national development, in Chapman, J. and Johnston, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th New Zealand Geographical Conference*, August Vol II, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, 6-22.

Johnston, W. 1973: The debate on regional planning and development in New Zealand, *New Zealand Geographer*, 29, 188-93.

Johnston, W. 1984: An overview of geography in New Zealand to 1984, *New Zealand Geographer*, 40(1), 20-33.

Katz, C. 1994: Playing the field: questions of fieldwork in geography, *Professional Geographer*, 41(1), 67-72.

Kean, W. and Enochs, L. 2001: Urban field geology for K-8 teachers, *Journal of Geosciences Education*, 49(4), 358-363.

Kearns, R. 1984: Sources and implications of policy for irrigation: the Maungatapere example, *Proceedings of Twelfth New Zealand Geography Conference*, 140-45.

Kearns, R. 1997: Constructing (bi)cultural geographies: Research on, and with, people of the Kohianga District, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 3-8.

Kearns, R. 2005: The people, Geography at University of Auckland, http://www.geog.auckland.ac.nz/the_school/our_people.shtm (9 August 2005).

Kearns, R. and Barnett, J. 1999: To boldly go? Place, metaphor and the marketing of Auckland's Starship Hospital, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17, 201-26.

Kearns, R. and Barnett, J. 2000: "Happy meals" in the Starship Enterprise: Interpreting a moral geography of health care consumption, *Health and Place*, 6, 81-94.

Kearns, R. and Barnett, J. 2003: Placing private health care: reading Ascot hospital in the landscape of contemporary Auckland, *Social Science and Medicine*, 56, 303-15.

Kent, M. and Gilbertson, D. 1997: Fieldwork in geography teaching: A critical review of the review of the literature and approaches, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21(3), 313-23.

Kesby, M. 2004: Images of Qualitative and Participatory Research in Practice (includes written descriptions for the visually impaired).
<http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/gg/People/Staff/mgk/imagepage.htm>.

Kindon, S. 1995: Dynamics of difference. Exploring empowerment methodologies with women and men in Bali, *New Zealand Geographer*, 51(1), 10-12.

Kindon, S. 1998: "Of mothers and men: questioning gender and community myths in Bali", in Gujit, I. and Shar, M. (eds.), *The Myth of Community*, IIED, London, 152-64.

Kindon, S. 1999: Contesting development: Being willing to risk an open future, in Le Heron, R., Murphy, L., Forer, P. and Goldstone, M. (eds.), *Encountering Place: Explorations in Human Geography*, Oxford University Press, Auckland, 172-200.

Kindon, S. 2000: Destabilising 'maturity': women as tourism producers in Southeast Asia, in Apostolopoulos, Y., Sonmez, S. and Timothy, D. (eds.), *Women as Producers and Consumers of Tourism in Developing Regions*, Praeger, Westport, 45-59.

Kindon, S. and Cupples, J. 2003: Anything to declare? The politics and practicalities of leaving the field, in Scheyvens, R. and Storey, D. (eds.), *Development Fieldwork: A Practical Guide*, Sage, London, 197-215.

King, L. 1961: A multivariate analysis of the spacing of urban settlement in the United States, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 51, 222-33.

King, L. 1962: A quantitative expression of the pattern of urban settlements in selected parts of the United States, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 53, 1-7.

King, L. 1964: Population growth and employment change in New Zealand cities, *New Zealand Geographer*, 20, 30-42.

King, L. 1969a: The analysis of spatial form and relationship to geographic theory, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 59, 573-95.

King, L. 1969b: *Statistical Analysis in Geography*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliff, NJ.

Kissling, C. 1967: Accessibility and Urban Economic Activity Structure, in *Proceedings of the Fifth New Zealand Geography Conference*, Department of Geography, Canterbury, Christchurch, 143-52.

Kneale, P. 1996: Organising student-centred group fieldwork and presentations, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(3), 65-74.

Larner, W. 2002: Globalisation, Governmentality and Expertise: Creating a Call Centre Labour Force, *Review of International Political Economy*, 9 (4), 650-74.

Law, R. 1997: Masculinity, place and beer advertising in New Zealand the Southern man campaign, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 22-28.

Law, R., Campbell, H. and Dolan, J. (eds.), 1999: *Masculinities in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North.

Laws, G. 1995: Embodiment and emplacement: Identities, representation and landscape in Sun City retirement communities, *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 40(4), 253-80.

Lefebvre, H. 1991: *The Production of Space*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Le Heron, R. 1984: Changing structures and the structuring of knowledge about corporate power, in Taylor, M. (ed.), *The Geography of Australian Corporate Power*, Croom Helm, Sydney, 15-21.

Le Heron, R. 1985: Theoretically-informed analysis: a comment on Morrison's exploring patterns of company takeovers in New Zealand, *New Zealand Geographer*, 41, 64-65.

Le Heron, R. 1987: Rethinking regional development, in Holland, P. and Johnston, W. (eds.), *Southern Approaches: Geography in New Zealand*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch, 33-58.

Le Heron, R. 2005: The people, Geography at University of Auckland, http://www.geog.auckland.ac.nz/the_school/our_people.shtm (9 August 2005).

Le Heron, R., Baker, R. and McEwen, L. 2006: Co-learning: Re-linking research and teaching in geography, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 77-87.

Le Heron, R. and Hathaway, J. 2000: An international perspective on developing skills through geography programmes for employability and life: narrative from New Zealand and the United States, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 271-76.

Le Heron, R. and Pawson E. (eds.), 1996: *Changing Places, New Zealand in the Nineties*, Longman Paul, Auckland.

Lewis, J. 1970: Geography in High Schools, in Chapman, J. and Johnston, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th New Zealand Geographical Conference*, August Vol II, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, 38-46.

Lewis, N. 2004a: Embedding the reforms in New Zealand schooling: After neo-liberalism? *Geojournal*, 59(2), 149-60.

Lewis, N. 2004b: Geographies of 'The New Zealand Experiment', *Geojournal*, 59(2), 161-66.

Ley, D. 1974: *The Black Inner City as a Frontier Outpost*, Monograph No. 7, Association of American Geographers, Washington, D.C.

Ley, D. 1977: Social geography and the taken-for-granted world, *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers NS*, 2: 498-512.

Ley, D. and Samuels, M. 1978: *Humanistic Geography Prospects and Problems*, Croom Helm, London.

Linge, G. 1958: The geography of manufacturing in NZ 1840 – 1936, in *Proceedings of the Second New Zealand Geography Conference*, Department of Geography, Canterbury, Christchurch.

Lister, R. 1965: Presidential Address: The Geographer's Role in the Modern Age, *Proceedings of the Fourth New Zealand Geography Conference, Dunedin August 1964, New Zealand Geographical Society Conference Series*, No 4, 7-16.

Little, J. and Panelli, R. 2003: Gender research in rural geography, *Gender Place and Culture*, 10, 281-89.

Livingstone, D. 2003: British geography 1500-1900: an imprecise review, in Johnston, R. and Williams, M. (eds.), *A Century of British Geography*, The British Academy, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 3-21.

Lonergan, N. and Andresen, L. 1988: Field-based education: some theoretical considerations, *Higher Education Research and Development*, 7(1), 63-77.

Longhurst, R. 1997a: 'Going nuts': Re-presenting pregnant women, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 34-39.

Longhurst, R. 1997b: (Dis)embodied geographies, *Progress in Human Geography*, 21, 486-501.

Longhurst, R. 2001: Geography and gender: looking back looking forward, *Progress in Human Geography*, 25(4), 641-48.

Longhurst, R. 2004: Situating Bodies, in Nelson, L. and Seager, J. (eds.) *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, Blackwell, Oxford, 337-49.

Longhurst, R. 2005a: Man breasts: narratives of abjection, in van Hoven, B. and Hoerschelmann, K. (eds.), *Spaces of Masculinity*, Routledge, London, 165-78.

Longhurst, R. 2005b: Fat bodies: developing geographical research agendas, *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(3), 247-60.

Longhurst, R. and Johnston, L 1998: Embodying places and emplacing bodies: pregnant women and women body builders, in Du Plessis, R. and Alice, L. (eds.), *Feminist Thought in Aotearoa New Zealand: Connections and Differences*, Auckland, Oxford University Press, 156-63.

Longhurst, R. and Wilson, C. 1999: Heartland Wainuiomata: rurality to suburbs, black singlets to naughty lingerie, in Law, R., Dolan, J. and Campbell, H. (eds.), *New Zealand Masculinities*, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, 215-28.

Lyell, C. 1830: *Principles Of Geology: Being an Attempt To Explain the Former Changes of the Earth's Surface, by Reference To Causes Now in Operation*, John Murray, London.

Macaulay, J. (ed.), 1987: *Geographical Windows: Chronicle of the Geography Department University of Canterbury 1937-87*, Department of Geography, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.

MacKenzie, S. and Rose, G. 1983: Industrial change, the domestic economy and home life, in Anderson, J. et al., (eds.), *Redundant Spaces in Cities and Regions*, Academic Press, New York.

Mackinder, H. 1893: as cited in Wooldridge, S. (1955) The status of geography and the role of fieldwork, *Geography*, 40(2), 73-83.

Mackinder H. 1902: *Britain and the British Seas*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Maddrell, A. 1996: Empire, emigration and school geography: changing discourses of Imperial citizenship, 1880-1925, *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 373-87.

Maddrell, A. 1998: Discourses of race, gender and the comparative method in geography school texts, 1830-1918, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 16, 81-103.

Mansvelt, J. 1997: Playing at home? Placement, embodiment and the active retiree in New Zealand/Aotearoa, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 57-61.

Mansvelt, J. 2003: Profiling New Zealand geographers: Ethical and methodological issues, in Gao, J., Le Heron, R. and Logie, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd New Zealand Geographical Conference*, 6-11 July, University of Auckland, Auckland, 7-9.

Mansvelt, J. 2005: *Geographies of Consumption*, Sage, London.

Marcus, T. 1944: Social Studies, *Education Gazette*, 24, 105-06.

Marcus, M. 1987: 'New Zealand geography from a distance', in *Southern Approaches: Geography in New Zealand*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch, 13-24.

Marshall, P. 1912: *The Geography of New Zealand*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch.

Massey, D. 1984: *Spatial divisions of labour: social structures and the geography of production*, Macmillan, London.

Massey, D. 1991: Flexible sexism, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 9, 31-57.

Massey, D. 1995: *Spatial Divisions of Labour: Social Structures and the Geography of Production*, second edition, Macmillan, London.

Massey, D. 1997a: A global sense of place, in Barnes, T. and Gregory, D. (eds.), *Reading Human Geography: the Poetics and Politics of Inquiry*, Arnold, London, 315-23.

Massey, D. 1997b: The political place of locality studies, in McDowell, L. (ed.), *Undoing Place? A Geographical Reader*, Arnold, London.

Massey, D. and Allen, J. (eds.), 1984: *Geography matters! A Reader*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Massey University Human Ethics Committee, 2004: Personal communication by e-mail, Wednesday, 1st September, 2004.

Maunder, W. 1962: Monthly and seasonal rainfalls at Dunedin: 1913-1961, *New Zealand Geographer*, 18, 183-202.

May, J. 1999: Developing fieldwork in social and cultural geography: illustrations from a residential field class in Los Angeles and Las Vegas, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 23(2), 207-25.

Mayhill, R. and Bawden, H. 1966: *New Zealand Geography*, Blackwood and Janet Paul, Auckland.

McCarty, H. 1952: *McCarty on McCarthy: the Spatial Distribution of the McCarthy Vote, 1952*, Unpublished Paper, Department of Geography, State University of Iowa, Iowa City.

McCarty, H. 1953: An approach to a theory of economic geography, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 43, 183-84.

McCarty, H. 1954: An approach to a theory of economic geography, *Economic Geography*, 30, 95-101.

McCarty, H. 1958: Science, measurement and area analysis, *Economic Geography*, 34, facing page 283.

McCarty, H. 1979: Geography at Iowa, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 69, 121-24.

McCaskill, L. 1953a: *Agriculture and Nature Study Notes*, Lincoln Agricultural College, Lincoln.

McCaskill, L. 1953b: *Opportunities in Agriculture*, Simpson & Williams, Christchurch.

McCaskill, M. 1948: Canterbury Branch, *New Zealand Geographical Society Record of the Proceedings of the Society and its Branches*, 5, 10-11.

McCaskill, M. 1987: 'Growing up in New Zealand geography 1936-1965', in *Southern Approaches: Geography in New Zealand*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch, 25-32.

McCaskill, M. 1999: Murray McCaskill, School of Geography, Population and Environmental Management, Flinders University, www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/geog/staff/mccaskil.php.

McClean, R., Berg, L. and Roche, M. 1997: Responsible geographies: Co-creating knowledge in Aotearoa, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 9-15.

McDermott, P. 1974: Market linkage and spatial monopoly in New Zealand manufacturing, *New Zealand Geographer*, 30, 1-17.

McDermott, P. 1979: *Hawkes Bay Area Planning Study*, Employment Development Planning and Research, Silverdale.

McDermott Associates, 1981: *West Coast Resource Development Study*, McDermott Associates, for Ministry of Works and Development and West Coast United Council.

McDermott Associates, 1983: *Regional Implications of Closer Economic Relations with Australia*, McDermott Associates, for Ministry of Works and Development.

McDowell, L. 1983: Towards an understanding of the gender division of urban space, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 1, 59-72.

McDowell, L. 1993: Space, place and gender relations: Part II. Identity, difference, feminist geometries and geographies, *Progress in Human Geography*, 17, 305-18.

McDowell, L. 2000: Economy, culture, difference and justice, in Cook, I., Crouch, D., Naylor, S. and Ryan, J. (eds.), *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns Perspectives on Cultural Geography*, Prentice Hall, Harlow, 182-95.

McEwen, L. 1996: Fieldwork in the undergraduate programme, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(3), 379-85.

McEwen, L. and Harris, F. 1996: The undergraduate geography fieldweek: Challenges and changes, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(3), 411-21.

McGregor, A. 2004a: Doing groups: situating knowledge and creating stories, *Australian Geographer* 35, 141-50.

McGregor, A. 2004b: Sustainable development and 'warm fuzzy feelings': discourse and nature within Australian environmental imaginaries, *Geoforum*, 35, 593-606.

- McGregor, A. 2005: Geopolitics and human rights: unpacking Australia's Burma, *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 26, 191-211.
- McKenzie, D. 1982: *Education and Social Structure, Essays in the History of New Zealand Education*, New Zealand College of Education, Dunedin.
- McKinnon, M., Bradley, B. and Kirkpatrick, R. (eds.), 1997: *New Zealand Historical Atlas Ko Papatuanuku e Takoto ne*, Bateman, Auckland, 21.
- McLeay, C. 2003: Urban governance in late capitalism – strategies for Western Bay of Plenty, in Gao, J., Le Heron, R. and Logie, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd New Zealand Geographical Conference*, 6-11 July, University of Auckland, Auckland, 150-54.
- Mellor, A. 1991: Experiential learning through integrated project work: an example from soil science, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 15(2), 135-49.
- Mitchie, M. 1998: Factors influencing secondary science teachers to organise and conduct fieldtrips *Australian Science Teacher's Journal*, 44(4), 43-50.
- Ministry of Education, 1990: *Syllabus for Schools Geography Forms 5 – 7*, Learning Media, Wellington.
- Ministry of Education, 1993: *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* Learning Media, Wellington.
- Mooney, L. and Edwards, B. 2001: Experiential learning in sociology: service Learning and other community-based learning initiatives, *Teaching Sociology*, 29, 181-94.
- Morgan, J. 1999: Imagined Country: National environmental ideologies in school geography textbooks, *Antipode*, 35(3), 444-62.

Morgan, J. 2001: Sites of Memory, Memorialisation in the Landscape, unpublished M.Sc. thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.

Moss, P. 2001: Writing one's life, in Moss, P. (ed.), *Placing Autobiography in Geography*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse NY, 1-21.

Moss, P. 2002: Textures of place: Exploring humanist geographies, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 92(3), 601-03.

Moss, P. 2003: Culture/place/health, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93(3), 773-75.

Nairn, K. 1998a: Geography fieldtrips: what a difference place makes, *Proceedings of 18th Conference New Zealand Geographical Society, University of Canterbury 27-30 August 1995*, 190-93.

Nairn, K. 1998b: The 'real' world of geography fieldtrips, *Proceedings of Geographical Education Conference New Zealand Geographical Society, University of Waikato 6-9 July 1997*, 113-15.

Nairn, K. 1998c: *Disciplining Identities: Gender, Geography and the Culture of Fieldtrips*, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Nairn, K. 1999: Embodied fieldwork, *Journal of Geography*, 98(6), 272-82.

Nairn, K. 2000: International perspectives on fieldcourses, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 240-54.

Nairn, K. 2003: What has the geography of sleeping arrangements got to do with the geography of teaching spaces? *Gender Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 10(1), 67-81.

Nairn, K. 2005: The problems of utilizing 'direct experience' in geography education, *Journal Of Geography in Higher Education*, 29(2), 293-309.

Nairn, K., Panelli, R. and McCormack, J. 2003: Destabilising dualisms: young people's experiences of rural and urban environments, *Childhood*, 10, 9-42.

Nash, C. 1996: Geo-centric education and anti-imperialism: theosophy, geography and citizenship in the writings of J.H. Cousins, *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 391-411.

Nast, H. 1994: Women in the field: Critical feminist methodologies and theoretical perspectives, *The Professional Geographer*, 46 (1), 54-66.

Nelson, C., Treichler, P. and Grossberg, L. 1992: Cultural studies, in Grossberg, L., Nelson, C. and Treichler, T. (eds.), *Cultural Studies*, Routledge, New York, 88-101.

New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) Achievement Standards, 2003:
http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/ncea/e_prof/achievement.shtml (2 June 2003).

Olsson, G. 1980: *Birds in Egg: Eggs in Bird*, Pion, London.

Olsson, G. 1991: *Lines of Power/Limits of Language*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

O'Riordan, T., Johnston, R., Slaymaker, O., Wilson, J.P., McKendry, I., Dunn, R., Overton, J. and Harris W. 1987: *Geography: A Celebration Proceedings of the Geography Golden Jubilee Celebration, August 1987*, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.

Panelli, R. and Gallagher, L. 2003: "It's your whole way of life really": Negotiating work, health and gender, *Health and Place*, 9, 95-105.

Panelli, R., Little, J. and Kraack, A. 2004: A community issue? Rural women's feelings of safety and fear, *Gender, Place and Culture*, 11(3), 445-67.

Panelli, R., Stolte, O. and Bedford, R. 2003: The reinvention of Tirau: landscape as a record of changing economy and culture, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 42, 379-400.

Panelli, R. and Welch, R. V. 2005: Teaching research through field studies: a cumulative opportunity for teaching methodology to geography undergraduates, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 29(2), 255-77.

Park, J. 1866: *A School Primer of the Geography and History of Oceania for Young People*, A.R. Livingston, Dunedin.

Pawson, E. 1987: Order and freedom: a cultural geography of New Zealand in Holland, P. and Johnston, W. (eds.), *Southern Approaches: Geography in New Zealand*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch, 305-30.

Pawson, E. 1991: *Geographers at Work*, Canterbury Branch, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch.

Pawson, E. 1997: Branding Strategies and languages of consumption, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 16-21.

Pawson, E. 1998: *GeoJobs*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Hamilton.

Pawson, E. 2003: Whose profiles, for which purposes? In Gao, J., Le Heron, R. and Logie, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd New Zealand Geographical Conference*, 6-11 July, University of Auckland, Auckland, 10-11.

Pawson, E. 2004: The memorial oaks of North Otago: a commemorative landscape, in Kearsley, G. and Fitzharris, B. (eds.), *Glimpses of a Gaian Future. Essays in Honour of Peter Holland*, University of Otago, Dunedin, 115-31.

Pawson, E., Fournier, E., Haigh, M., Muniz, O., Trafford, J. and Vajoczki, S. 2006: Problem-based learning in geography: towards a critical assessment of its purposes, benefits and risks, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 103-16.

Pawson, E. and Teather, E. 2002: 'Geographical Expeditions': assessing the benefits of a student-driven fieldwork method, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(3), 275-289.

Peddie, B. 2000: Fairburn, Eileen 1893-1981, *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography Volume five 1941-1960*, Auckland University Press, Auckland.

Peet, R. 1985: The social origins of environmental determinism, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 75(3), 309-33.

Peet, R. 1998: *Modern Geographical Thought*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Perkins, H. 1986: *Bulldozers in the Southern Part of Heaven: Defending Place against Rapid Growth*, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Geography, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA.

Perkins, H. 1988a: Bulldozers in the southern part of heaven: Defending place against rapid growth. Part 1: Local residents interpretations of rapid urban growth in a free standing service class town, *Environment and Planning A*, 20, 285-308.

Perkins, H. 1988b: Bulldozers in the southern part of heaven: Defending place against rapid growth. Part 2: The Alliance strikes back, *Environment and Planning A*, 20, 435-56.

Perkins, H. 1992: 'Central and local government reform and interaction, case study 9.3, recreation service provision in Christchurch', in Britton, S., Le Heron, R. and Pawson, E. (eds.), *Changing Places in New Zealand: A Geography of Restructuring*, New Zealand Geographical Society, Christchurch, 56-72.

Perkins, H. 1993: 'Human geography, recreation and leisure', in Perkins H. and Cushman, G. (eds.), *Leisure Recreation and Tourism*, Longman Paul, Auckland.

Perry, P. 2000: Lancelot William McCaskill, Agricultural instructor, lecturer, conservationist, writer, *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography Volume five 1941-1960*, Department of Internal Affairs, Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington.

Philo, C. 1992: Foucault's geography, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 10, 137-61.

Pirie, P. 1958: The geographical implications of population growth in W Samoa, in *Proceedings of the Second New Zealand Geography Conference*, Department of Geography, Canterbury, Christchurch, 45-53.

Ploszajaska, T. 1996: Constructing the subject: geographical models in English schools 1870-1944, *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22(4), 388-98.

Ploszajaska, T. 1998: Down to earth? Geography fieldwork in English schools. 1870-1944, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 16, 757-74.

Plowman, S. 1995: Engaging reflexivity and positionality. Qualitative research on female single parents and residential location choice, *New Zealand Geographer*, 51(1), 19-21.

Popper, K. 1970: Normal science and its dangers, in Lakatos, I. and Musgrave, A. (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, Cambridge University Press, London, 51-58.

Porteous, D. and Bedford, R. 1993: Commentary Departments of Geography in the Asia Pacific Region. The Department of Geography at the University of Waikato, *Pacific Viewpoint*, 34(1), 77-100.

Poster, M. 1989: *Critical Theory and Post-structuralism: in Search of Context*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Poulsen, M. 1977: Sectoral mobility and the restricted image, *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, 33(1), 15 -25.

Powell, J. 1979: Thomas Griffiths Taylor, in Freeman, T. and Pinchmemel, P. (eds.), *Geographers Bibliographical Studies*, 3, Mansell, London, 141-47.

Powell, R. 2002: The Sirens' voices? Field practices and dialogue in geography, *Area*, 34(3), 261-72.

Pratt, M. 1992: *Imperial Eyes: Studies in Travel Writing and Transculturation*, Routledge, London and New York.

Pratt, G. 1997: Stereotypes and ambivalence: The construction of domestic workers in Vancouver, *Gender, Place and Culture*, 4(2), 159-77.

Pratt, G. 2000: Feminist geographies, in Johnston, R., Gregory, D., Pratt, G. and Watts, M. (eds.), *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, Blackwell, Oxford, 259-62.

Pred, A. 1984: Place as historically contingent process; structuration and the time geography of becoming places, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 74, 279-97.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's (2000) *Code of Practice for Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education*, 2000: HMSO, London.

Radcliffe, S. 1999: Popular and state discourses of power, in Allen, J., Sarre, P. and Massey, D. (eds.), *Human Geography Today*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 219-42.

Rawling, E. 1996, School geography: some key issues for higher education, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(3), 305-23.

Relph, E. 1976: *Place and Placelessness*, Pion. London.

Roche, M. 1994: Geography Determinism and Empire, in Hawke, D. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Inaugural Joint Conference New Zealand Geographical Society and Institute of Australian Geographers*, Vol II January 1992, New Zealand Geographical Society, Palmerston North, 394-97.

Roche, M. 1997: Protest, police and place: The 1981 Springbok Tour and the production and consumption of social space, *New Zealand Geographer*, 53(2), 50-56.

Roche, M. 1998a: Space 1999: Geography and the future in the university, *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, 106, 113-15.

Roche, M. 1998b: George Jobberns as a human geographer, in Forer, P. and Perry, P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th New Zealand Geographical Conference*, 27-30 August, 1995, New Zealand Geographical Society, Hamilton, 394-97.

Roche, M. 2003: Disciplinary directions: Insights from New Zealand geographers, in Gao, J., Le Heron, R. and Logie, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd New Zealand Geographical Conference*, 6-11 July, University of Auckland, Auckland, 1-4.

Rose, G. 1992: Geography as a science of observation: the landscape, the gaze and masculinity, in Driver, F. and Rose, G. (eds.), *Nature and Science: Essays in the History of Geographical Knowledge*, Historical Geography Research Series, 76-92.

Rose, D. 1993: *Feminism and Geography*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Rose, G. 1997: Situated knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics, *Progress in Human Geography*, 21, 305-20.

Rowles, G. 1978a: 'Reflections on experiential fieldwork', in Ley, D. and Samuels, M.S. (eds.), *Humanistic Geography Prospects and Problems*, Croom Helm, London, 173-93.

Rowles, G. 1978b: *Prisoners of Space: Exploring the Geographical Experience of Older People*, Westview, Boulder.

Rowles, G. 1988: What's rural about rural aging? An Appalachian perspective, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 4(2), 115-24.

Rowles, G. and Savishinsky, J. 2001: Breaking the watch: The meaning of retirement in America, *Generations, Journal of the American Society on aging*, 25(3), 75-77.

Rowles, G., Beaulieu, J. and Kuder, L. 2001a: Current research in rural models of integrated long-term care, *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 20(4), 379-85.

Rowles, G., Beaulieu, J. and Kuder, L. 2001b: State and local initiatives and research questions for long-term rural care models, *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 20(4), 471-79.

Rumley, D. and Hall, C. 1987: New Zealand geography: neither phoenix nor ladybird, *New Zealand Geographer*, 43(2), 107.

Said, E. 1978: *Orientalism*, Random House, New York.

Sauer, C. 1925: *The Morphology of Landscape*, University of California Press, California.

Saunders, B. 2003: *Massey University Geography Forging a Distinctive Place in Massey's World*, Geography Programme, School of People, Environment and Planning, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Sayer, A. 1976: A critique of urban modelling: from regional science to urban and regional political economy, *Progress in Planning*, 6, 3.

Sayer, A. 1982: Explanation in human geography: abstraction versus generalization, *Progress in Human Geography*, 6, 66-88.

Sayer, A. 1984a: *Methods in Social Science: a Realist Approach*, London, Hutchinson.

Sayer, A. 1984b: Defining the urban, *GeoJournal*, 9, 279-85.

Sayer, A. 1985a: Realism in geography, in Johnston, R.J. (ed.), *The Future of Geography*, Methuen, London, 159-73.

Sayer, A. 1985b: The differences that space makes, in Gregory, D. and Urry, J. (eds.), *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, Macmillan, London, 49-65.

Scarfe, N. 1946: The school geography room pictorial equipment, *New Zealand Geographer*, 1&2, 165-71.

Schaeffer, F. 1953: Exceptionalism in geography: A methodological examination, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 43, 226-49.

Scheyvens, R. and Storey, D. 2003: *Development Fieldwork: a Practical Guide*, Sage, London.

Schoenberger, E. 1991: The corporate interview as a research method in economic geography, *Professional Geographer*, 43(2), 180-89.

Scott, J. 1992: Experience, in Butler, J. and Scott, J. (eds.), *Feminists Theorize the Political*, Routledge, New York, 22-40.

Scott, A. 2000: Economic geography: the great half-century, in Clark, G. , Feldmann, M. and Gertier, M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Scott, I., Fuller, I. and Gaskin, S. 2006: Life without fieldwork: some lecturer's perceptions of geography and environmental science fieldwork, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(1), 161-171.

Semple, E. 1903: *American History and its Geographic Environment*, Houghton, Mifflin, Boston.

Semple, E. 1911: *Influences of Geographic Environment*, Henry Holt, New York.

Shah, A. 1999: Power plays: reflections on the process of submitting an undergraduate dissertation, *Area*, 31(4), 307-12.

Sheppard, E. 1995: Dissenting from spatial analysis, *Urban Geography*, 16, 283-303.

Shrimpton, A. and Hight, J. 1913: *A Junior Geography of New Zealand and Australia*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch.

The Special Needs and Disability Act (SENDA), 2001: HMSO, London.

Soja, E. 1989: *Postmodern Geographies: the Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, Verso, London.

Soja, E. 1996: *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real and Imaginary Places*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Smith, N. 1979: Toward a theory of gentrification: a back to the city movement by capital not people, *Journal of the American Planners Association*, 45, 538-48.

Spronken-Smith, R. 2005: Implementing a problem-based learning approach for teaching research methods in geography, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 29(2), 203-21.

Stainfield, J., Fisher, P., Ford, B. and Solem, M. 2000: International virtual field trips: a new direction? *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 255-62.

Stamp, L. 1966: *Chisholm's Handbook of Commercial Geography / Entirely Rewritten by Dudley Stamp*, Longmans, London.

Steel, R. 1974: The Third World: geography in practice, *Geography*, 59, 189-207.

Stent, W. 1944: Regional survey, *Education Gazette*, 24, 167-69.

Stirling, S. 2003: Fieldtrips: A glimpse into their place in the New Zealand geography education, in Gao, J., Le Heron, R. and Logie, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd New Zealand Geographical Conference*, 6-11 July, University of Auckland, Auckland, 43-47.

Storper, M. and Scott, A. 1986: Production, work, territory: contemporary realities and theoretical tasks, in Scott, A. and Storper, M. (eds.), *Production, Work, Territory. The Geographical Anatomy of Industrial Capitalism*, Allen and Unwin, London, 3-15.

Stratford, E. 2001: The Millennium Project on Australian geography and geographers: An introduction and agenda, *Australian Geographical Studies*, 39, 91-95.

Taylor, M. and McDermott, P. 1977: Perception of location and industrial decision-making: the example of New Zealand manufacturing, *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, 33(1), 26-33.

Taylor, P. 1976: An interpretation of the quantification debate in British geography, *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers* NS, 1, 129-42.

Tertiary Education Commission, 2005:
http://www.tec.govt.nz/downloads/a2z_publications/pbrf_report_overview.pdf.

Thomson, J. 1857: Journal kept during the performance of a Reconnaissance Survey of the South District of the Province of Otago, New Zealand, *Proceedings of Royal Geographical Society*, 2(1), 357.

Thrift, N. 2004: Summoning life, in Cloke, P., Crang, P. and Goodwin, M. (eds.), *Envisioning Human Geographies*, Arnold, London, 81-103.

Tuan, Y. 1972: Structuralism, existentialism and environmental perception, *Environment and Behaviour*, 3, 319-31.

Tuan, Y. 1974: *Topophilia. A study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Tuan, Y. 1976: Humanistic geography, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 66, 266-76.

Tuan, Y. 1977: *Space and Place: the Perspective of Experience*, University of Minnesota, Minnesota.

Tweedie, A. 1995: Alan Tweedie, in Holland, P., Kidd, H. and Welch, R. (eds.), *From Mellor to Hocken: Fifty Years of Geography at the University of Otago*, Department of Geography, University of Otago, Dunedin, 9-12.

Twyman, C., Morrison J. and Sporton, D. 1999: The final fifth: autobiography, reflexivity and interpretation in cross-cultural research, *Area*, 31(4), 313-25.

University of New Zealand, 1939: *December 1938 Examination Papers Entrance Matriculation*, Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch.

Valentine, G. 1993: (Hetero)sexing space: lesbian perceptions and experiences of everyday spaces. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 345-413.

Valentine, G. 1999: Doing household research: interviewing couples together and apart, *Area*, 31(1), 67-74.

Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. 1994: The body in tourism, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 11, 125-51.

Wade, C. 2006: Editorial: A historical case for the role of regional geography in geographic education, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(2), 181-89.

Watson, E. 2004: 'What a dolt one is': language, learning and fieldwork in geography, *Area*, 36(1), 59-60.

Watters, R. 1999: Classics in human geography revisited, *Progress in Human Geography*, 23(2), 253-66.

Welch, R.V. and Panelli, R. 2003: Teaching research methodology to geography undergraduates: rationale and practice in a human geography programme, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 27(3), 255-77.

Whatman, N. 1987: A Student's perspective of the first three years, in Macaulay, J. (ed.), *Geographical Windows: Chronicle of the Geography Department University of Canterbury 1937-87*, Department of Geography, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, 19-22.

Widdowfield, R. 2000: The place of emotions in academic research, *Area*, 32(2), 199-208.

Williams, M. 2003: The creations of humanized landscape, in Johnston, R. and Williams, M. (eds.), *A Century of British Geography*, The British Academy, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Winchester, H. 2000: Qualitative research and its place in human geography, in Hay, I. (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Withers, C. 2006: History and philosophy of geography 2003-2004: geography's modern histories? – International dimensions, national stories, personal accounts, *Progress in Human Geography*, 30, 79-86.

Withers, C. and Mayhew, R. 2002: Re-thinking 'disciplinary' history: geography in British universities, c1580-1887, *Transactions Institute of British Geographers* NS, 27, 1-19.

Zukin, S. 1982: *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.