

2016

PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE
EDUCATION PROGRAMME AT PUKEAHU
NATIONAL WAR MEMORIAL PARK



Image: Nathan Young, Wraight + Associates

Michael Harcourt, Andrea Milligan,
Mark Sheehan.

Copyright

ISBN 978-0-478-18482-2 (Online)

© Crown copyright 2016

Published in November 2016 by:
Manatū Taonga – Ministry for Culture and Heritage
PO Box 5364
Wellington 6140
New Zealand
Phone: +64 4 499 4229
www.mch.govt.nz

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence (Creative Commons Attribution Licence). In essence, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to Manatū Taonga – Ministry for Culture and Heritage and abide by the other licence terms. To view a copy of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence, visit creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/nz/

Disclaimer

While every effort has been made to ensure that the information set out in this document is accurate, the Crown does not accept any liability or responsibility, whether in contract, tort, equity or otherwise, for any action taken as a result of reading, or reliance placed on the Crown because of having read, any part, or all, of the information in this document, or for any error in or omission from this document.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Why visit the Pukeahu National War Memorial Park? | 3 |
| Using principles to support teaching | 4 |
| Overview of the principles | 5 |
| Guiding principles to support school visits to the park | |
| 1. Foreground the purpose of the visit | 6 |
| 2. Prioritise conceptual approaches to learning | 7 |
| 3. Embed visits within a pre, during and post framework | 8 |
| 4. Collaborate with educators | 9 |
| 5. Discuss controversial issues | 10 |
| 6. Balance emotional and critical responses | 11 |
| 7. Separate memory and history | 12 |
| 8. Use sites as opportunities to explore Māori history | 13 |
| 9. Use collective pronouns carefully | 14 |
| References | 15 |

Why visit the Pukeahu National War Memorial Park?

The *Pukeahu National War Memorial Park*¹ is a significant place for many New Zealanders. Photographs of the opening of the Carillon in 1932 and of Anzac Day in 2015 demonstrate the memorial's ability across the decades to attract tens of thousands of people in a spirit of reverence. Many more people, young and old, visit the site outside of important commemorative occasions. They visit the Park's memorials, museum and Tomb of the Unknown Warrior to pay their respects to those who served in war, to learn about New Zealand's involvement in conflict and to commemorate important moments in New Zealand history. However, the *educational* reasons for visiting the Park with young people may be different from the reasons young people visit with their family and whanau.

Young people should come to the Park as part of their school programme because of its potential to be a *transformative space*. In transformative spaces, teachers and educators explore with students a range of perspectives and challenge and extend the way they think about their society (Cameron, 2003, p.16). In a seminal lecture, in 1971 museologist Duncan Cameron differentiated between cultural institutions that functioned as 'temples' for learning important cultural knowledge versus those that functioned as a 'forum' for engaging in civic debate. Cameron's preference for cultural exhibitions to act as a forum is supported by a large-scale research project funded by the Australian Research Council in 2002, *Exhibitions as Contested Sites*. This research found that young people *expected* cultural institutions to be "places that challenge generally accepted views on important topics and for the unfearful examination of contentious subjects" (Cameron, 2003, p.20). Teachers and educators who use the Park as a *forum* are also well positioned to meet the requirements of the New Zealand Curriculum with its focus on "critical and creative thinkers" and its numerous references to citizenship across the different learning areas (2007, p.8).

Citizenship is an important cross-curricular theme of The *New Zealand Curriculum* (NZC, Ministry of Education, 2007), a curriculum which envisions young people as confident, connected, actively involved, lifelong learners. Citizenship education develops young people's understandings of society, and the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they need to contribute to, and transform, society. Citizenship education does not just happen in the classroom – young people learn to be citizens from a wide range of life-experiences. A visit to the Park is one opportunity for citizenship learning, particularly when the focus is not just about the information that can be gathered and accepted behaviours such as reverence and respect. Rich opportunities for citizenship learning lie in exploring how this site enfolds different visions for society, even to ask 'whose voices, values, and experiences are missing here'? A visit to the Park can invite young people into conversations about *their* society and its future, and to consider the *so what?* and *now what?*² in relation to their active citizenship.

¹ Referred to simply as "the Park" within this document.

² Ministry of Education (2009).

Principles as tools for curriculum design

Educational experiences at the Park need to be deliberately designed or ‘curated’. When preparing for learning outside the classroom, teachers need to ask “what experiences do I want students to have? What do I want them to be able to do?” (Gee, 2004, p.118). Questions like these encourage teachers to go beyond an information transmission model of education and toward a more active, and cognitively sophisticated approach. This document presents a series of nine principles that are intended as ‘design tools’ for developing powerful learning experiences. The principles are for teachers and educators of all age groups and subject areas, though they have been written especially with the social sciences, humanities and the arts in mind.³

Using these principles

The principles are not intended as a checklist, though the first two or three are likely to be at the forefront of any teacher’s thinking. Teachers might design their learning programme and retrospectively use the principles as an evaluative framework. Alternatively, they might start with the principles to plan their visit. Although this document has been written with the *Pukeahu National War Memorial Park* in mind, the principles within it could be used to design educational experiences at any site. For example, teachers who bring students to Wellington from other parts of New Zealand should find the principles useful to shape learning experiences at places such as Te Papa, Government House or the Treaty of Waitangi exhibition at the National Library. They could also be used at places not recognised as sites of *national* significance such as local cemeteries, community memorials and other museums and historic sites.

In addition to supporting classroom teachers, this document is written to help educators construct their programmes and collaborate with other educators across institutions. It provides a common framework for educators to compare, contrast and refine existing practice. Traditionally educators have been very good at “outreach” programmes, taking great effort to publicise their institution and its resources to teachers. However, in addition to supporting educators to work together, it is hoped that these principles will encourage and support “inreach” by schools and classroom teachers. Wright-Maley et al argue that the boundaries between schools and public institutions such as museums need to be more porous, stating: “it seems as though teachers and museum staff working together is the best way to bridge the real classroom and the museum experience” (2013, p.210). This document provides a set of common principles for teachers and educators to try out, adapt to their different contexts and ultimately extend as they work together to link the classroom/public institution divide and develop pedagogically rich out-of-school experiences.

³ Classroom teachers and educators based at cultural institutions are all “teachers” in the broader sense of the word. Within this document the term *teacher* refers to both groups of educational professionals, except when clearly discussing their different roles.

Brief overview of the principles

1. Foreground the **purpose** of the visit
 - Why do you want to visit this site? What difference to students' learning do you hope to see as a result of the visit?
2. Prioritise **conceptual approaches** to learning
 - What conceptual understanding or big idea do you want students to develop at this site? How might these ideas be transferred to other sites and other contexts?
3. Embed visits within a **pre, during and post framework**
 - How does what you want students to learn at the site connect to what they have already learned, and to what you want them to learn next?
4. **Collaborate** with educators
 - Have you discussed your goals with any available educators? What opportunities for collaboration exist, whether your visit is self-guided or not?
5. Discuss **controversial** issues
 - How can you use the site as a place for thinking critically about controversial issues that affect young people and New Zealand society today?
6. Balance **emotional** and **critical** responses
 - How will this visit elicit from students empathetic consideration of others AND critical thinking?
7. Separate **memory** and **history**
 - How can a visit to the site support students to tell the difference between what happened in the past, and the myths and narratives that have developed around the past?
8. Use sites as opportunities to explore **Māori history**
 - How could I use this visit to explore Māori history with students?
9. Use **collective pronouns** carefully
 - What effect does using collective pronouns such as "we", "our" and "us" have on students in New Zealand's multicultural schools?

Principle One: Foreground the purpose of the visit

A coherent learning experience at the Park has a clear sense of purpose. The *Effective Pedagogy in Social Sciences/Tikanga a Iwi (BES)* identifies five outcomes for learning that apply to all other learning areas in the NZC:

- Cultural identity,
- Knowledge,
- Skills,
- Participatory and
- Affective (2008, p.37).

Teachers need to be explicitly aware of which outcome(s) they are focussing on so they can design appropriate learning activities (see principle two and three for elaboration). *Crafting questions* and *setting clear objectives* are two methods teachers have used successfully.

Crafting questions: Carefully crafted questions foreground the outcomes for students. A good history question, according to Riley (2008):

- [captures] the interest and imagination of your pupils
- [places] an aspect of historical thinking, concept or process and the forefront of pupils' minds
- [results] in a tangible, lively, substantial, enjoyable 'outcome activity' (i.e. at the end of the lesson sequence) through which pupils can *genuinely answer* the enquiry question (2008, p.8).

Riley's criteria only need slight adaptation to work for other disciplines. In New Zealand, Wood (2013) proposes that teachers craft 'social inquiry questions' which go beyond information gathering and reflect the transformational goals of the social sciences to change society. By bringing together the student's interests and concerns with wider societal issues, social inquiry questions make it easier for teachers to meet affective, cultural-identity and participatory outcomes of the curriculum. Principle five has some examples of social inquiry questions that relate to the Park.

Setting clear objectives: Other teachers advocate for learning to be made purposeful through setting key objectives and designing learning experiences that align to those objectives. For example, Marcus et al, describe a teacher in the United States who explicitly uses museums in his teaching programme. The teacher aligns activities to broad objectives such as "Students will explore the human experience of civilians and soldiers, and the features that shape human activities during war" (Marcus, et al, 2012, p.41). An English example for the Park could read "Students will understand how memorials and inscriptions work together to create meaning". Whatever method teachers use to foreground the purpose of visiting the Park, students should experience a sense of perplexity or "felt difficulty" that draws students in to want to know more (Dewey, as cited in Barton & Levstik, 2004, p.199). Only then are students likely to visit the Park in a spirit of inquiry, asking thoughtful questions and exploring important issues.

Principle Two: Prioritise conceptual approaches to learning

A conceptual approach to learning emphasises key ideas, or concepts. It has a greater impact on student learning than traditional teaching, which requires students to passively listen to experts disseminate facts (Barr, 2005, Erikson, 2002, Milligan & Wood, 2010, Milligan & Rusholme, 2016). The Ministry of Education defines a concept as “a general thought, or understanding embodying a set of things that have one or more properties in common. A concept can be expressed in a single word, such as *democracy* or *needs*, or a simple phrase such as *social decision making* or *cultural practices*” (2009, p.5). As well as emphasising concepts, a conceptual approach to curriculum design plans for students’ *conceptual understanding*, demonstrated when learners use concepts to form generalisations. Teachers who take this approach can more proactively encourage progression in students’ learning because they can look for weak and powerful generalisations, deliberately pushing students toward the latter.

Commemoration as a concept: A concept particularly relevant to the Pukeahu National War Memorial Park is *commemoration*. Students at all levels can relate this idea to their own lives, comparing different ways they commemorate birthdays, the anniversaries of important family events, New Zealand’s involvement in war on Anzac Day or the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi on Waitangi Day. Building from this prior knowledge, a student who understands that ‘*commemoration is contested because people have different values about war*’ has a more powerful understanding than a student who understands that ‘*commemoration of war is important to New Zealanders*’ or much more simplistically ‘*we should be thankful to the many soldiers who have died in wars for us*’. Other concepts relevant to the park include citizenship, national identity, or *turangawaewae*. All of these concepts are further strengthened when students have the opportunity to apply them in different contexts (Milligan & Wood, 2010). For example, students asked to consider the concept of commemoration at the National War Memorial *and* the National Library’s Treaty of Waitangi exhibition are forced to think about the concept of commemoration beyond its relationship to war. With an understanding of how values shape commemoration, students can make informed decisions about how they might participate in contested social issues concerning commemoration and remembrance.

Resources for teachers: The document *Approaches to conceptual understanding* (Ministry of Education, 2009) has useful examples of concept-led activities that teachers can use to assess learners’ progress before, during and after a visit to the Park. Additionally, the Wellington Museum Trust’s resource *ChangeAgents resource for teachers bringing students to Wellington*⁴ has a range of activities that illustrate how to develop students’ understanding of concepts. Included in *ChangeAgents* is a unit plan called “Commemorating the Gallipoli Campaign” which provides a good illustration of teaching for conceptual understanding across different sites.

⁴ Accessed July 17, 2016: *ChangeAgents resource for teachers bringing students to Wellington*: <http://www.wellingtonnz.com/assets/Uploads/resources/change-agents-resource-for-teachers.pdf>

Principle Three: Embed visits within a pre, during and post framework

Students learn more when teachers embed visits to places outside the classroom within a pre, during and post framework (Milligan & Rusholme, 2016, Marcus, Levine & Grenier, 2012, Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012). This means clarifying the conceptual focus of the visit and exploring students' prior knowledge before coming to the Park. During the visit, the learning tasks are aligned with the conceptual focus of the unit plan. Finally, to establish the effectiveness of the visit on students' thinking, students are asked to reflect on their experiences. Students need to consider how much the visit supported their learning, questions the visit generated for them, and any 'next steps' required. Teachers can then use this information to inform further, post-visit learning.

Traditionally teachers have struggled to make the most of visiting sites such as museums and memorial parks. Instead of embedding them in a sustained teaching programme, out-of-school experiences are treated as one-off, self-contained experiences (Milligan & Rusholme, 2016, Marcus et al, 2012). All teachers are familiar with the barriers to running pedagogically rich field-trips. Just arranging a field trip in the first place is a demanding exercise. The focus on the actual learning experience is often the last thing to be considered. One researcher found that some teachers "only thought about the plan of action during the bus ride or upon entry to the museum that morning" (Marcus, Levine & Grenier, 2012, p.72). There are, however, immense advantages to putting in the extra level of planning to address curriculum issues.

Linking visits to the classroom: Milligan & Rusholme found that teachers who designed field trips to Wellington's sites of national significance as part of a broader programme of learning had a much bigger impact on students' thinking than those who did not (2016). Successful teachers spent time in the classroom introducing students to key concepts that were linked to an inquiry question (see principle one for elaboration). During the visit to Wellington they visited more than one site, explicitly linking each location to the key question and its conceptual focus. Finally, both during and after the visit, these teachers deliberately cultivated a critical orientation to learning. In contrast, students who visited without this level of organisation enjoyed their time, but tended to "perceive the institutions as authoritative and the exhibitions as uncontroversial", demonstrating only surface-level engagement with each place (Milligan & Rusholme, 2016, p.4). In addition to highlighting concepts and establishing a rich inquiry question Milligan & Rusholme found that successful teachers made use of concept-based strategies that aligned to the overall goals of the visit.⁵ This research demonstrates the clear advantages of treating sites as extensions of a classroom, with the same high expectations of conceptual clarity and curriculum planning. In this way, out-of-school experiences become nodes, bound in complex ways to a broader programme of learning.

⁵ For practical examples of concept-led activities used by these teachers see the Wellington Museums Trust's resource: *ChangeAgents resource for teachers bringing students to Wellington*: <http://www.wellingtonnz.com/assets/Uploads/resources/change-agents-resource-for-teachers.pdf>

Principle Four: Collaborate with educators

Whether or not a visit to the park is self-guided or with an educator, teachers and educators are advised to collaborate. For self-guided tours, collaboration may take the form of educators offering teachers advice and guidance and pointing them in the direction of particular resources. The educators at the *Pukeahu National War Memorial Park* are also available to discuss the conceptual focus of a visit and the kind of self-guided tour that may best meet a teacher's curriculum goals. For example, the educators could advise what aspects of the Park they have found to be particularly powerful for students and suggest an appropriate route or sequence of places to see within the Park. At a practical level, contacting the educators also means teachers ensure they are not visiting confined spaces such as the Great War Exhibition, Hall of Memories or the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior at the same time as other schools. For further information about the education programme at Pukeahu and how to book a visit teachers can make direct contact with this facility's educators).⁶

Collaboration approaches: Several approaches exist for collaboration between teachers and educators at the Park. In addition to the advice and guidance approach described above, the educators deliver programmes on:

- war and its impact on New Zealand society
- nationhood and identity
- the role of ceremony and ritual in New Zealand society⁷

Teachers can connect these themes to their own programme of learning, using the educator's tour as a key learning activity toward students' conceptual understanding (see principle three). However, these themes are not exclusive: educators can work with teachers to develop something that is more tailored to their curriculum objectives. A more complex model of collaboration involves teachers and educators dividing responsibilities and both taking on a teaching role. Students learn best at places such as the Park when a "blended approach" is used that allows some choice to freely move around but within the context of a guided inquiry (Marcus et al, 2012, p.72). Teachers and educators could work together to design this blended approach, each contributing their particular area of expertise to students' learning.

The level of collaboration between teachers and educators will to some extent depend on the length of time students spend at the park. Teachers should also be aware of *The Queen Elizabeth II Pukeahu National War Memorial Park Education Centre*, which provides a useful teaching space to support a wider visit to Pukeahu or in addition to the park itself.

⁶ Contact details can be found at: <http://www.mch.govt.nz/pukeahu/education>

⁷ More specific information about the programme can be found at: <http://www.mch.govt.nz/pukeahu/education/education-programme>

Principle Five: Discuss controversial issues

Educators should use Pukeahu as a forum for students to critically evaluate their own and others' beliefs about society and to consider what actions they think should be taken to improve it. For some teachers, the Park may be a particularly difficult place to do so. It may seem awkward or inappropriate to invite controversy and discussion at a site that is often associated with solemnity and quiet remembrance. However, the Park is inherently "perspective-laden" and therefore controversial (Hess, 2007). Milligan, Hunter and Harcourt argue that "controversy is essential to democratic life and that democratic well-being depends on a knowledgeable, articulate and politically engaged citizenry" (2017, forthcoming). Not to invite students into this debate denies students their role as young citizens of New Zealand.

Contemporary controversies: One way to critically discuss controversial issues is to present students with historical or contemporary public debates relevant to the Park. They could be asked to consider which behaviours are acceptable at this site and which are not. For example, in 2010 the vodka company 42 Below caused debate when they projected their company logo onto the side of the Carillon.⁸ In a similar example of how this space is contested, in 2015 young people were challenged for using the park for skateboarding.⁹ Students could be asked "why do people in society have different values toward certain places?" and "If you were to write a guide on appropriate versus inappropriate behaviour at this site, what would it include?" These questions could lead students to look at the space as an anthropologist might, observing the behaviour of visitors and considering how a place is a "space invested with meaning in the context of power" (Cresswell, 2004, p.12).

Historical controversies: It is not just contemporary controversies that can engage students to think critically. An historical controversy relevant to the Park is military conscription, introduced in 1916 for World War One and in 1940 for World War Two. Conscription reveals the power of the state to forcibly make its citizens bear arms on its behalf. Teachers could build tasks for students around the questions: What do you think about conscription? Under what circumstances, if ever, is it justified? Should the park differentiate between the ways it remembers conscripts versus volunteers? Should the park memorialise those who refused to fight for the state? If so, how? If not, why?

Social inquiry questions and controversy: Another way to use the site as a place of deliberation is to ask students "how should we remember New Zealand's involvement in war? Should a war memorial emphasise the suffering and remembrance of soldiers, or the horror and carnage of war? If the National War Memorial was destroyed by an earthquake, how should it be rebuilt?" Students could be given the task of redesigning the memorial space according to particular perspectives on war and remembrance.

⁸ Accessed on May 14, 2016: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/news/3524992/Anger-over-vodka-firms-carilln-publicity-stunt>

⁹ Accessed on May 14, 2016: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/news/local-papers/the-wellingtonian/68466004/skateboard-problem-at-pukeahu-war-memorial-park>

Principle Six: Balance emotional and critical responses

Visitors to the *Pukeahu National War Memorial Park* are confronted with war, death and suffering. Young people need to respond to these issues with their hearts, as well as their heads, balancing their emotional and critical responses. Students who respond purely at an emotional level may demonstrate exaggerated sentimentality or an inability to think critically (Clark, 2008, Milligan & Rusholme, 2016). Trofanenko highlights the frustration one young person felt who did not have the tools to make critical sense of a World War Two veteran's testimony: "I don't know what I'm to learn other than being sad" (2011, p.489). Alternatively, students who only engage with the themes of the Park with their heads are less likely to care about their learning or find motivation to put in more effort when asked to do more cognitively challenging work (Barton & Levstik, 2004, pp.228-229).

A framework for connecting the critical and emotional: Teacher Martyn Davison designs his history lessons around cognitive *and* affective dimensions of historical empathy, successfully supporting his students to balance emotional and critical responses (2012, p.13):

| Cognitive (thinking) | Affective (feeling) |
|---|---|
| Building historical contextual knowledge | Using imagination to recognise appropriate feelings |
| Being aware of the past as being different from the present | Listening to and entertaining other points of view |
| Tying interpretations of the past to evidence | Being caring, sensitive and tolerant towards other people |

Davison's rationale for teaching these two dimensions is that it "enables students to understand the lives of others, past and present, by affectively tuning in to shared human traits and by cognitively comprehending why another person holds a different set of beliefs"(2012, p.14). Davison's table is useful to teachers bringing students to the Park because it gives a structured set of criteria to design more specific tasks that clearly balance students' emotional and critical responses. As part of their visit, students might also explicitly explore the emotions being invoked at the site, whether they be hope, despair or sadness. Students' could journal their findings and consider "how their own emotional response influences their historical understanding" (Trofanenko, 2011, p. 482).

Traditionally a museum is a place of objectivity that "demands a separation of emotion from a topic to engage rational thinking" (Cameron, p. 16, 2003). On the other hand, war memorials are places of reflection where visitors experience feelings such as pride or sorrow (McClean, Phillips, 1990). Teachers who are aware of these distinctions are better positioned to discuss them with their students. They can deliberately design learning experiences that encourage genuine care about the people, past and present, who have experienced the trauma of war or other past events. At the same time, teachers can help students remain critically alert to the kinds of emotions they experience or are being encouraged to experience at sites of national significance.

Principle Seven: Separate memory and history

Teaching programmes should separate memory and history to prevent sites of national significance becoming ‘temples’ where a single, mythic narrative is presented as the truth. This is particularly relevant when designing educational experiences at the Park. Educationalist Peter Seixas warns that “the memory of war is the gold standard as an instrument to shore up the coherence of the national story, the valourizing of national heroes, and the significance of the nation on the national stage” (2009, p.19). The first step is to be clear about the difference between memory and history. Historian Peter Novick explains that

“to understand something historically is to be aware of its complexity, to have sufficient detachment to see it from multiple perspectives, to accept ambiguities, including moral ambiguities, of protagonists’ motive and behaviour. Collective memory simplifies; sees events from a single, committed perspective; is impatient with ambiguities of any kind; reduces events to mythic archetypes” (cited in Wertsch, 2008, p. 145).

Teachers in New Zealand may well find that their students exhibit a ‘memory’ approach to their learning about war (Milligan & Rusholme, 2016). An Australian researcher has termed this tendency among young people “a form of spiritual nationalism” (Clark, 2008, p.46). One way to counter this is to put historical thinking at the heart of the learning experience. Historical thinking is what students do when they use the intellectual tools of the historian to make sense of the past (tools sometimes referred to as procedural or second-order concepts). They include determining what makes a place or event historically significant, weighing the relative importance of causes and consequences, using evidence in support of claims about the past and considering why people held views that might seem strange to us today.

Historical thinking and places: New Zealand has an emerging literature on historical thinking (Harcourt and Sheehan, 2012, Davison, Enright and Sheehan, 2014). However, much of this has focused on what historical thinking might look like in a classroom context. A visit to the park, on the other hand, offers teachers an excellent opportunity to use a built environment as a ‘text’ to be interpreted. The key question to ask is ‘how can students use sites as places for thinking historically?’ Harcourt had students make *sound walks*, or place-specific audio tours that determined why specific sites were historically significant (2016). Others have suggested that students use a ‘sourcing heuristic’ designed especially for built environments, posing questions such “How did this building come to be in this place?” and “what are the multiple time periods evident in this building, and what do they tell me about its history?” (Baron, 2012, p.884). Harcourt, Sheehan and Fountain suggest two models of criteria that students could use to build their own interpretations of why a site is significant and provide a scaffold for the types of critical historical questions someone could ask of a memorial space (2011, p.29). Finally, students might ask questions about the development of certain memorials within the park, exploring the perspectives of the creators, the intended purpose of the memorial and its public reception at the time of its creation.

Ultimately, students need to be encouraged to think of the park as a site of analysis, a place with multiple layers of history that need to be peeled back and critically interpreted, not merely accepted. Then they are more likely to differentiate between memory and history, thus meeting the goals of the New Zealand Curriculum for students to become “critical, informed, and responsible citizens” (p.17).

Principle Eight: Use sites as opportunities to explore Māori history

Young New Zealanders need opportunities to explore Māori history to “[place] themselves in the broad historical past of Aotearoa New Zealand” (Ministry of Education, 2015, p.2). Without this wide perspective New Zealanders are less able to understand the present or consider options for the future. Looking at the past from a Māori perspective also broadens students’ understanding of the world, which is often limited to the history and experiences of people and places far away (Manning, 2008, Penetito, 2009, Sharples, 2012). Māori history, broadly defined, is

the complete human history of Aotearoa New Zealand – from the earliest Polynesian navigators to the people that English colonists named Māori, to the occupiers of land and the settlers of grievances, to the movers and shakers of our parliamentary system.¹⁰

Māori history foregrounds the historical experiences of Māori from whānau, hapū and iwi perspectives.

Resources to support the teaching of Māori history: The documents *Tātaiko: Cultural Competencies for Teachers of Māori Learners* (Ministry of Education, 2011) and *Te Takanga o Te Wa - Māori History: Guidelines for Year 1-8* (Ministry of Education, 2015) are excellent starting points for New Zealand teachers to draw from. They provide a range of practical ideas and theoretical frameworks for a visit to the Park. Teachers could design tasks that support students to ask questions about indigenous experiences of conflict, and their association with, and representation within memorial spaces. The following questions could provide a useful starting point:

| Critical questions adapted from Houlston (2012, p.78) | Critical questions adapted from Cresswell (2005, p.141) |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What objects [or memorials] have been selected to represent Māori and non- Māori perspectives?• What language, symbols and text are used to describe the relationship between Māori and non-Māori New Zealanders?• How could this memorial space or museum have been created differently? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How is place linked to history?• What memories are memorialised in the material landscape?• What memories are hidden in this place?• How is memory and history contested at this site? |

Students might consider the layered history of the site well before it became a national memorial asking questions such as: What is the Māori history of this place? How did this land come to be in the power of the Government? The Parihaka memorial, Nga Tapuwae o te Kahui Maunga and the Pohutukawa trees are memorials that mark some of this Māori history.¹¹

¹⁰ See Te Maire Tau (2011) for a discussion of the underlying complexities between indigenous ways of knowing the past and ‘Western’ approaches to historical thinking.

¹¹ Accessed July 9, 2016: <http://www.mch.govt.nz/pukeahu/park/significant-sites/nga-tapuwae>

Principle Nine: Use collective pronouns carefully

When teachers use collective pronouns such as “we”, “us” and “our” they encourage a sense of belonging and allegiance to the nation of New Zealand. These words help to establish a community of people who consider themselves New Zealanders, distinct from other groups of people. Collective pronouns slip of the tongue easily, forming an unconscious part of many teachers’ and students’ vocabulary (Levstik, 2000, Barton and Levstik, 2004). They are embedded in the names of national institutions and their exhibitions such as *Te Papa Tongarewa – Our Place*, or the exhibition *Gallipoli: The Scale of Our War*. However, the uncritical use of collective pronouns is problematic for teachers because it creates in-groups and out-groups, defining in subtle ways who belongs and who does not. Educationalist Linda Levstik writes that “pronouns are shape-shifters, and it is useful to pay attention, particularly when antecedents shift around. Who are “we,” and what is “our”?” (2000, p.287)¹². Furthermore, New Zealand historian Giselle Byrnes argues that “national identity is a synonym for, and a device that masks, ongoing colonising practices” (2009, p.1).

Is there a way of thinking about national identity that recognises its ‘dark side’ but also considers how it might be used to promote a commitment to critical, participatory forms of citizenship? Barton and Levstik acknowledge the deep harm that has been created by schools, and especially history curriculum in promoting exclusionary, Eurocentric allegiances to the United States (2004, pp.60-62). However, they also argue that “some form of identification is necessary for democratic life, because without attachment to community, individuals would be unlikely to take part in the hard work of seeking the common good” (2004, p.46). Their advice is to ensure that “themes of pluralism and participation [form] the basis for the history curriculum at an early age” and that “history educators should avoid promoting identification with stories that encourage exclusion” (2004, p.61). Such advice, of course, is not restricted to history education.

Approaches for teachers: At the Park teachers could explore how national identity has developed historically and how it is maintained in the language we use and in the symbols and iconography at places of national significance. Students could also explore their family histories and consider the extent to which their ancestors might have felt a sense of belonging at the park, comparing each other’s findings. New Zealand’s increasingly diverse classrooms will ensure lots of opportunities for discussion about the appropriate use of collective pronouns at sites such as the *Pukeahu National War Memorial Park*.

¹² Barton and Levstik argue that the use of collective pronouns is much more pronounced in the United States than the United Kingdom. In interviews with New Zealand students, Barton found a similar situation, supporting Sheehan’s argument that New Zealand’s history curriculum is not used to cultivate national identity to the same extent as other countries (2011, p.108). However, in his interviews Barton did find Pākehā students who used collective pronouns in relation to New Zealand’s involvement in war. Until prompted, they found it difficult to recognise how these terms might exclude some Māori students, such as those whose ancestors refused to fight for the Crown during World War One (Pers. comm, June 21, 2016).

References

- Aitken, G., & Sinnema, C. (2008). Effective pedagogy in social sciences/tikanga ā iwi: Best evidence synthesis iteration (BES). Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Barr, H. (2005). Planning and assessing social studies. In R. Openshaw and P. Benson (Eds), *Towards Effective Social Studies*. Palmerston North: Kanuka Grove Press.
- Baron, C. (2012). Understanding Historical Thinking at Historic Sites. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 104, no. 3, pp. 833-847.
- Barton, K.C., & Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Buchanan, R. (2009). *The Parihaka album: Lest we forget*. Wellington: Huia.
- Byrnes, G. (Ed). (2009). *The New Oxford history of New Zealand*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, D.F. (1971). The Museum, A Temple or the Forum. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 14:1, pp.11-24.
- Cameron, F. (2003). Transcending Fear - engaging emotions and opinions - a case for museums in the 21st century. *Open Museum Journal*, vol. 6: New Museum Developments and the Culture Wars.
- Clark, A. (2008). *History's children: history wars in the classroom*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.
- Creswell, T. (2004). *Place: A short introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davison, M. (2012). Teaching Historical Empathy and the 1915 Gallipoli campaign. In M. Harcourt & M. Sheehan, *History matters: Teaching and learning history in New Zealand secondary schools in the 21st century*. Wellington: NZCER Press.
- Davison, M., Enright P., Sheehan, M. (2014). *History Matter 2: A Handbook for teaching and learning how to think historically*. Wellington: NZCER Press.
- Erickson, H. L. (2002). *Concept-based Curriculum and Instruction: Teaching Beyond the Facts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gee, J.P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. New York, N.Y: Routledge.
- Gibbons, E. (2015). Museums and Marginalized Historical Narratives: Learning the Truth about Indian Residential Schools at the UBC Museum of Anthropology. In D. Anderson, A. de Cosson, & L. McIntosh (Eds), *Research Informing the Practice of Museum Educators: Diverse Audiences, Challenging Topics, and Reflective Praxis*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Harcourt, M., Fountain, G., & Sheehan, M. (2011). Historical significance and sites of memory. *SET: Research Information for Teachers*, 2, 26-31.
- Harcourt, M, Sheehan, M. (2012). *History Matters: Teaching and Learning history in New Zealand secondary schools in the 21st century*. Wellington: NZCER Press.
- Harcourt, M. (2016). Historical Significance: Giving Meaning to Local Places. In C. Counsell, K. Burn, A. Chapman (Eds), *MasterClass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning*, Bloomsbury: London.

- Hess, D. (2007). From "Banished" to "Brother Outsider", "Miss Navajo" to "An Inconvenient Truth": Documentary Films as Perspective-Laden Narratives. *Social Education*, vol. 71, no.4, pp. 194-199.
- Houlston, B. (2012). Museums and historical literacy: Unpacking the narratives of war and nationhood. In M. Harcourt & M. Sheehan (Eds), *History matters: Teaching and learning history in New Zealand secondary schools in the 21st century*. Wellington: NZCER Press.
- Levstik, L. S. (2000). Articulating the silences: Teachers' and adolescents' conceptions of historical significance. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds), *Knowing, Teaching, & Learning History*. New York: NYU Press.
- Manning, R. (2009). The status of Te Ātiawa histories of place in Port Nicholson Block (Wellington, Hutt Valley) secondary schools: Some research findings, *Curriculum Matters*, 5, 5-24.
- Marcus, A.S, Levine, T.H., Grenier, R.S. (2012). How Secondary History Teachers Use and Think about Museums: Current Practices and Untapped Promise for Promoting Historical Understanding. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 40:1, pp. 66-97.
- Marcus, A.S., Stoddard, J.D., Woodward, W.W. (2012). *Teaching History with Museums: Strategies for K-12 Social Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Mclean, C., Phillips, J. (1990). *The Sorrow and the Pride: New Zealand War Memorials*. Government Print Books: Wellington.
- McGregor, H. (2013). Is teaching history "for social justice" working well for indigenous students? [Weblog]. Retrieved from <http://thenhier.ca/en/content/blog-contest-teachinghistory-%E2%80%9Csocial-justice%E2%80%9D-workingwell-indigenous-students>
- Milligan, A., Wood, B.E. (2010). Conceptual Understandings as transition points: Making sense of a complex social world. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 42:4. 487-501.
- Milligan, A. & Rusholme, S. (2016). Making the most of citizenship learning across cultural institutions, *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, forthcoming.
- Milligan, A., Hunter, P., & Harcourt, M. (2017). Issues-based social inquiry in social studies and citizenship education. In M. Harcourt, A. Milligan & B. Wood (Eds). *Teaching social studies for critical, active citizenship in Aotearoa New Zealand*. NZCER Press: Wellington, forthcoming.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media
- Ministry of Education. (2009). *Building conceptual understanding in the social sciences: Approaches to building conceptual understandings*. Learning Media Ltd.: Wellington: <http://ssol.tki.org.nz>
- Ministry of Education. (2011). *Tātaiako: Cultural competencies for teachers of Māori learners*. Wellington: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.teacherscouncil.govt.nz/required/tataiako.stm>
- Ministry of Education (2015). *Te Takanga o Te Wa - Maori History: Guidelines for Year 1-8*. Retrieved from <http://maorihistory.tki.org.nz/assets/Te-Takanga-o-te-Wa-Maori-History>
- Penetito, W. (2009). Place-Based Education: Catering for Curriculum, Culture and Community. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 18, 5-29.

- Riley, M. (2008). Into the Key Stage 3 history garden: choosing and planting your enquiry questions, *Teaching History*, 99, pp.8-13.
- Sharples, P. (2012). Opening Speech, New Zealand History Teachers' Association Conference. In M. Harcourt & M. Sheehan (Eds), *History matters: Teaching and learning history in New Zealand secondary schools in the 21st century*. Wellington: NZCER Press.
- Sheehan, M. (2011). 'Little is taught or learned in schools': Debates over the place of history in the New Zealand school curriculum, in R. Guyver, & T. Taylor (Eds). *History wars and the classroom: Global perspectives*. Charlotte: N.C.: Information Age Publishing.
- Seixas, P. (1999). National history and beyond. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(6), pp.719-722.
- Te Maire Tau, R. (2011). Tirohia Atu Nei Ka Whetū Rangitia, Minding the Past, *Te Pōuhere Korero*, 5, pp.7-31.
- Trofanenko, B.M. (2011). On difficult history displayed: The pedagogical challenges of interminable learning. *Museum Management and Curatorship*. 26(5), pp.481-495.
- Wellington Museums Trust (2016). ChangeAgents resource for teachers bringing students to Wellington. <http://www.wellingtonnz.com/assets/Uploads/resources/change-agents-resource-for-teachers.pdf>
- Wertsch, J.V. (2008). Collective Memory and Narrative Templates, *Social Research*, Vol. 75, No. 1, pp. 133-156.
- Wood, B. E. (2013). What is a social inquiry? Crafting questions that lead to deeper knowledge about society and citizenship participation. *SET: Research Information for Teachers*, 2013(3), pp. 20-28.
- Wright-Maley, C., Grenier R., & Marcus A. (2013). We Need To Talk: Improving Dialogue between Social Studies Teachers and Museum Educators. *The Social Studies*, 104(5), pp. 207-216.