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Abstract

Knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi, as the founding document of the nation and as a living document today, is seen as crucial for the capacity of New Zealanders to accommodate cultural differences and to handle the challenges of the future. It is also outlined in the national social studies curriculum, *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1997), as an essential area of learning for students in New Zealand schools. For these reasons, this study examines the nature of social studies teachers’ subject matter knowledge for teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi, how it has been interpreted over time and how it is applied in New Zealand in the present day. Informed by Shulman’s (1987) categorisation of a knowledge base for teaching, this study builds on a growing literature on the important role of pedagogical content knowledge.

Four social studies teachers participated in the study which focuses on years 9 and 10, where the majority of New Zealand secondary school students acquire their knowledge of New Zealand’s history. Using a collective case study design, multi-method triangulation is adopted for tapping into and representing the teachers’ conceptual and practical knowledge. Methods include a semi-structured interview, a concept mapping exercise, a lesson planning activity, and a video-stimulated recall interview of a classroom lesson. The latter is a key data gathering method and is confirmed as a very valuable technique for gaining insight into the implicit theories and beliefs of teachers, and the relationship between their beliefs and actions.

The study demonstrates that discipline knowledge of history is an important ingredient in social studies teachers’ knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and its implementation in New Zealand since 1840. Discipline knowledge informed their pedagogical content knowledge, which is central to effectively teaching this essential area of learning about New Zealand in the secondary school classroom. The teachers with this knowledge were able to place events in the context of time and comprehend historical ideas. In addition, they applied their understanding of historical inquiry and the historical relationships of cause and effect and continuity and change, to their teaching. These teachers also more readily accessed recent historical scholarship in New Zealand’s history, and thus were aware of historical interpretations and the different perspectives from which Māori-Pākehā issues in the past and present can be examined.
In accord with research in the United States and Britain, the evidence in this study indicates that the presence or absence of pedagogical content knowledge significantly affects the learning opportunities that teachers provide for their students. The findings suggest that there are both beginning and experienced social studies teachers who have limited historical knowledge for teaching the Treaty of Waitangi topic area. The teachers who lacked mastery of topic content were unable to easily use stories or examples to illustrate and clearly explain ideas and events. In attempting to simplify topic material, content was sometimes misrepresented and superficial responses were given to students’ more challenging questions. Teaching also incorporated some information errors. It was these teachers who also regarded the area of learning as contentious. Concerned to avoid dissension in the classroom, and wary of adverse parental and community opinion, they were reluctant to engage in class discussion on Māori and Pākehā matters that have been controversial, or that are subject to current national debate.

Three areas are highlighted where teachers considered help and direction would enhance their teaching. Firstly, more specific curriculum guidelines, in relation to achievement objectives for teachers and desired learning outcomes for students, could be provided in the Treaty of Waitangi topic area. Secondly, classroom implementation would be advanced by assistance for teachers in assimilating current historical interpretations of New Zealand’s history and in developing the appropriate subject matter knowledge for teaching. Thirdly, training in critical inquiry skills would provide teachers with the expertise to handle contentious questions in the classroom and ensure they are better prepared to teach students to think critically and participate in society as informed and responsible citizens.
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Chapter 1

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Ka haere whakamua, ka titiro whakamuri
We walk into the future facing the past

Contextual background to this study

Historians, educators and others can provide many reasons for the importance of teaching and learning about the past. It is not my intention to discuss them all here. But the whakatauki (Māori proverb), ‘Ka haere whakamua, ka titiro whakamuri’ – ‘We walk into the future facing the past’, affords a compelling rationale. It is very applicable to this research study which focuses on teaching secondary school students about the Treaty of Waitangi and its relevance to understanding contemporary issues in New Zealand. This Treaty, signed in 1840 between Māori as the tangata whenua (people of the land) and the British Crown, is regarded as the founding document of the nation. It is also a living document in that the principles emanating from this formal agreement are implemented today in government policies, within all state organisations, and enshrined in current legislation.

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993), which provides the direction for teaching and learning in the country’s schools, reflects the partnership between Māori and Pākehā and recognises the place of the Treaty of Waitangi within education. This central position is noted in an international critique of The New Zealand Curriculum Framework and the accompanying seven national curriculum statements (Le Metais, 2002), with the observation that “the dominant feature of the New Zealand curriculum, from an outsider’s perspective, is the strong emphasis on recognizing and protecting New Zealand’s bi-cultural heritage” (p.10). Similarly, the Australian Council of Educational Research Report on the New Zealand National Curriculum (Ferguson, 2002), also highlights the “strong emphasis” on New Zealand peoples’ cultures and groups and the “prominence given to the Treaty of Waitangi” in the social studies curriculum document (p.1, section 7).

Governments throughout the world have been interested in what is taught about the past in schools. As Phillips (2000) explains:
history is closely related to issues of power, values and cultural transmission. ... What history we teach and how we teach it has a direct impact upon how young people will view their own identity, and crucially their country’s identity. (p.10)

In the last twenty years much politicised discourse over school curricula and nationhood has taken place in many countries including England, the United States, Canada and Australia (A. Clark, 2004; P. Clark, 1998; Husbands, 1996; Macintyre, 1997; McKiernan, 1993; Nash, Crabtree & Dunn, 1997; Phillips, 2000, 2002; Steams, Sexias & Wineburg, 2000). In the New Zealand setting, knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and its implications has been seen by recent governments to be fundamental to knowing who we are. The New Zealand Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Helen Clark (2003, 2004), has frequently stated that she would like to see more history taught in schools in order that New Zealanders do not grow up in ignorance of the past and, when articulating official government policy, has also made clear that the Treaty of Waitangi cannot be locked away as an historical document and considered to be no longer relevant. This message received tangible support in the 2003 Budget (Cullen, 2003) which allocated $6.5 million for a programme of public information on the Treaty to assist both Māori and Pākehā in arriving at a better understanding of the agreement and its significance in the present day.

A critical knowledge of the country’s history is also a fundamental component of citizenship. Advancing a rationale for Australian history in schools, Peel (2000) argued that an understanding of national history encourages active rather than passive citizens, people who can knowledgeably debate, vote, and grant or withhold consent, and so shape the present and the future. For these reasons, both citizenship and national identity are integral elements of the social studies curriculum statement that comes under the umbrella of *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993). *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1997a) was designed in the 1990s to meet the requisite citizenship education, and basic knowledge and understanding about New Zealand society. Included in this document is a summary list of nineteen areas of “essential learning about New Zealand society” (p.23) because “it is important that all New Zealand students understand their society and environment and develop a sense of belonging to their community and their nation” (p.20).

Learning about the country's past, with particular emphasis on knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand, has been a continuing subject of national debate over recent years. Academic historians,
educators, politicians and media commentators have all participated in the controversy which has centred on the sufficiency and the adequacy of the New Zealand history being taught in schools (Catherall, 2002a, 2002b), and the extent to which New Zealand’s bicultural heritage is being addressed (Belich, 2002; King, 2001). The alleged lack of cultural understanding in our society has been attributed to New Zealanders’ limited knowledge and awareness of their history, and misunderstandings and ignorance in the community seen as a result of ‘not knowing the stories’ which leads to difficulty contextualising the social and racial issues we are trying to grapple with today (Adds, 2000). Treaty educator Robert Consedine goes further. He considers that:

until New Zealanders are educated about New Zealand’s colonial history, the potential remains for increasing social polarisation and disintegration of social relationships. (R. Consedine & J. Consedine, 2001, p.137)

Leading New Zealand history scholars and researchers contend that the ramifications of knowing our past are far-reaching for society as a whole. Writer and New Zealand historian, the late Michael King (2001), believed that more knowledge and understanding, particularly about the Treaty of Waitangi and the following years of colonisation, would enable New Zealanders to gain more tolerance and empathy with each other and give coherence to the nation. Such sentiments are echoed by academic historian James Belich (2000, 2002). He has consistently commented in the public arena that New Zealanders need an understanding of the past to appreciate the politics of the present, and that knowledge of the country’s history is crucial for our capacity to handle a challenging future and accommodate cultural differences.

**Purpose of the study**

The stimulus for this research study has been the discourse of historians and educators, and the media debate on the perceived lack of knowledge and understanding of the country’s past held by New Zealand secondary school students. As a history and social studies educator of secondary school trainee teachers I have been drawn to question the reasons for the discrepancies that appear to exist between the aims and objectives of the national social studies curriculum, articulated government policies, and the alleged limited knowledge and understanding about aspects of New Zealand’s history in the wider community. My particular interest in this study resulted from a preliminary inquiry I conducted among social studies student teachers at the Christchurch College of Education in 2003. Fifty-five trainees were surveyed on how much and what New Zealand history they had observed or taught in
social studies classes, in fifty-one schools throughout the country, during a teaching
practicum. Most trainees had been involved with teaching at least two topic areas in the
social studies programme in the five week period. The results indicated possible
causes for concern. In over 100 social studies topics named, only twelve were
identifiable as relating to New Zealand’s past, bicultural history, or issues arising in the
country today.

There have been limited studies in the last thirty years that have addressed the issue of
student learning about New Zealand’s history in schools. Research carried out in the
1980s endorsed survey results of a decade earlier, that most New Zealand school
students had little experience of studying their history and that as a consequence had
no coherent view of the past (H. Barr, 1988; Keen, 1977; Low-Beer, 1986). A few years
later, a study of Year 13 students (Simon, 1992), all of whom had had compulsory
social studies in the junior secondary school, found there was “a high degree of
ignorance coupled with prejudice” in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi (p.267). Another
more recent survey of first year university students studying history (Graham 2001,
cited in Catherall, 2002b), found that less than 10 per cent had much knowledge of
important issues and events in New Zealand’s past. The most comprehensive recent
investigations of the outcomes of social studies education have been the National
Education Monitoring Reports (Flockton & Crooks, 1998, 2002). Assessment of Year 8
social studies students in the later study revealed that understanding of New Zealand
history was quite limited (p.39), and that only 50% of students had a moderate
knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi (p.28). Results showed little change in knowledge
between the two assessment years of 1997 and 2001. The consistency of these survey
results over the last twenty years suggest that it is unlikely that another study, of
randomly selected secondary students’ knowledge and understanding of their society
in the past, will produce different findings. Therefore the focus of this research inquiry is
on teachers and their practice.

My study centres on social studies teaching in the area of “essential learning about
New Zealand” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23) that is outlined in the national social
studies curriculum document as:

the Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New
Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to
current systems, policies and events. (p.23)

I have chosen to investigate teaching in the curriculum area of social studies because
the New Zealand history that is learned by the majority of secondary school students is
acquired in Years 9 and 10 within social studies, a mandatory school curriculum
subject until the end of Year 10. In the senior secondary school, history is an elective subject and is only studied by a minority of students: 11.5% at year 11, 10.5% at year 12 and 18% at year 13 (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2003).

Social studies in New Zealand schools is taught by teachers from a variety of disciplines; commonly history, geography, English and economics. They have trained as teachers under a system whereby university education is followed by a one year teacher education course. The latter concentrates on pedagogical knowledge: teaching strategies and classroom management, curriculum requirements and assessment. Content knowledge that is introduced in pre-service teacher training is incidental to learning about curriculum and pedagogy. This policy assumes that a graduate in a teaching subject, or related field, has acquired sufficient discipline knowledge in their university degree to teach secondary school subjects. In reality it is possible that for some graduates, there is very little alignment between the papers completed in the university courses and the content of school subjects that they will be expected to teach.

My objective in this study has been to examine the understandings and practice of four social studies teachers with varying teaching experience and subject specialisations, teaching within the essential learning area of New Zealand’s history outlined above. The study contributes to the fields of teacher knowledge and classroom research by providing detailed insight into the discipline knowledge held by these teachers. It also demonstrates how they interpret and apply their knowledge to teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi and its significance, in their secondary school classrooms. These aspects highlight the importance of teacher subject knowledge in the transformation of policy into practice.

**Significance of the study**

Little empirical research has been conducted in New Zealand specifically in the area of history and social studies teaching and learning over the past decade, and I have located no specific studies on teachers’ subject matter knowledge related to the teaching of New Zealand’s history. Previous work has largely been confined to theoretical critiques of curriculum development, the history of social studies as a subject, assessment, teaching strategies and student learning activities. The few studies that have centred on student knowledge have employed surveys, questionnaires and assessment tests. This research study focuses on teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge which provides a different perspective. The
methodological approach, utilising video-stimulated recall of classroom lessons, has also been little used in this country and is a powerful technique for uncovering the tacit knowledge of teachers that is part of their classroom teaching. The findings contribute to the existing New Zealand literature on teaching, inform understandings of social studies curriculum implementation, and provide new insights into what teachers know about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in the past and in the present day, and how that is put into effect in the secondary school classroom.

Although no qualitative studies are generalisable in a statistical sense, the findings may be transferable (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Conclusions drawn from the data in this study could have implications for teacher education programmes of pre-service secondary social studies teachers relating to subject matter knowledge for teaching. The study could also make a contribution to the delivery of professional development for practising teachers in an area of essential learning about New Zealand. Further potential significance lies in informing current and future development of the national social studies curriculum.

**Research design**

The conceptual and methodological framework for this study on ‘Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice’, is summarised in Figure 1.1.
**Research Design**

Qualitative Research Design: Denzin & Lincoln; Guba & Lincoln; Maykut & Morehouse

Constructive/Interpretive Paradigm
- relativist ontology
- subjectivist epistemology
- naturalist methodology
- Denzin & Lincoln

Research Strategy: Case Study
- Collective/Instrumental
- Educational
- Explanatory/Descriptive
- Bassey, Merriam; Stake

**Context of the Study**

Theoretical Literature:
- Ball & McDiarmid; Chen & Ennis; Cohn et al; Feiman-Nemser & Parker; Hashway; Grossman et al; Gudmundsdottir; Lee and Ashley; Lenthardt et al; Loughran et al; Marks; McDiarmid et al; Meredith; Nespor; Reynolds et al; Romanowski; Schermpp et al; Shulman; Steams et al; Turner-Bisset; Van Sledright; Wilson et al; Wilson & Wineburg; Wineburg; Yeager & Davis.

Content Literature:
- Barr; Flockton & Crookes; Keen; Lee & Hill; Low; Beere; McGeorge; McGee; O’Neill; Opiashaw; Patea & Marshall; Shuker; Simon; Stenson; Taba, Tyler.

**Research Question**

How is teacher knowledge about the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation in the past and application in the present day, implemented in social studies classrooms?

What do social studies teachers know about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand?

When and where have they acquired their knowledge for teaching?

Why does teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi learning area occur as it does in the social studies classroom?

**Research Methods**

Data Gathering
- Semi-structured interviews
  - Kvale; Lincoln & Guba; Patton
- Concept map
  - Novak & Gowin; Artiles & McClafferty; Clark & Peterson; Jones & Vesilind; Markham et al; McMeniman et al.
- Think-aloud protocol
  - Ericsson & Simon; Smagorinsky
- Video-stimulated recall
  - Calderhead; Danken et al; Lyle; McMeniman et al; Meade & McMeniman

Data Analysis
- Concept identification and elaboration
  - McMeniman et al.
- Categorisation of sources of teacher knowledge
  - Shulman, McMeniman et al.
- Categorisation of forms of teacher knowledge
  - McMeniman et al; Shulman
- Cross analysis
  - Merriam, Miles & Huberman, Patton

**Trustworthiness**

- Prolonged engagement
- Triangulation
- Audit trail
- Member checking

- Flick; Lincoln & Guba; Marshall & Rossman; Maykut & Morehouse; Miles & Huberman; Schofield
The major question which has formed the focus of my research study is:

- How is teacher knowledge about the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation in the past and application in the present day, implemented in social studies classrooms?

The inquiry has been guided by the following questions:

- What do social studies teachers know about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand?
- When and where have they acquired their knowledge for teaching?
- Why does the teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi topic area occur as it does in the social studies classroom?

This research study is situated within the conceptual framework of research on teachers' professional knowledge for teaching. Since Shulman's (1987) categorisation of teacher knowledge, a body of research focusing on teachers' subject matter knowledge has been generated. This provides a theoretical foundation which underpins the study and is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

Within a qualitative paradigm, the research strategy for this investigation is the case study. Methods employed include semi-structured interview, concept mapping, think-aloud protocol, and video-stimulated recall. The methodological framework which supports the investigation is elaborated in Chapter 3.

**Organisation of the thesis**

The research study is divided into seven chapters. Each chapter begins with a brief overview outlining its purpose and structure. The main points are summarised at the end of each chapter and links are established to the following chapters.

The first three chapters explain the background and approach to the study. Chapter 1 introduces the study and sets the contextual background. It also explains the purpose of the inquiry. Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature which informs the research study. This includes the content literature relating to New Zealand history within the social studies curriculum, and the theoretical literature associated with teachers' professional knowledge. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology underpinning the study as well as explaining the methods of data collection and methods of analysis that have been employed.
Chapters 4 to 6 discuss the data from the implementation of the study. Chapter 4 introduces the social studies teachers who participated in the investigation and also examines the sources of each teacher’s knowledge base. Chapter 5 reports on the concept mapping of the teachers’ knowledge and their conceptual understanding of the learning area chosen for the study. Descriptions of the maps produced by each of the teachers is followed by a qualitative analysis of the diagrammatic maps and accompanying interview transcripts. The chapter concludes with summary conclusions that can be drawn about the teachers’ subject matter knowledge for teaching the topic area related to the Treaty of Waitangi. Chapter 6 examines how teaching about the Treaty and its significance occurs in four social studies classrooms. The chapter reports the outcomes of the research inquiry which follows the teachers in action: planning a lesson and then teaching that lesson. Following the narrative descriptions of the lesson planning and video-stimulated recall of the classroom lesson data, there is a discussion of the findings. Also included in this chapter is a cross case analysis of the knowledge base for the four teachers.

A review and summary of the major findings of the study is presented in Chapter 7. Strengths and limitations of the study are acknowledged, and the implications of the research for pre-service training, in-service teacher professional development and social studies curriculum revision are outlined. This final chapter concludes with directions for future research.

Having set the study in context and outlined its purpose, I now move to Chapter 2 which examines the theoretical and contextual literature underpinning the study.
Chapter 2

A REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Overview

This chapter reviews the literature that has informed this research study examining the nature of teachers’ knowledge and their classroom practice when teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi, how it has been interpreted over time and how it is applied in New Zealand today. The review is organised into two sections which relate to issues raised in Chapter 1. Firstly, I consider the contextual literature associated with New Zealand history and its place in the national social studies curriculum. Secondly, I provide a more detailed review of the research literature pertaining to teachers’ professional knowledge, in particular subject matter knowledge. This area of teacher knowledge, which is the focus in this study, has taken its direction from the work of Shulman (1986a, 1986b, 1987) who identified the area of subject content knowledge and how it is conveyed in the classroom, as a central feature of teaching. My underlying purpose is to investigate social studies teachers’ discipline knowledge of an “essential area of learning about New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23), and their pedagogical approach to using that knowledge for teaching in the classroom. In this chapter, I also clarify and explain for the reader my use of the terminology relating to the varying forms of teacher knowledge which can be a source of confusion because of the inconsistent use of the terms among researchers. The chapter concludes with a summary discussion of the key points arising from an analysis of the salient literature.

New Zealand history and the social studies curriculum

The nature of the nation's history, and reasons for teaching it, has changed significantly since the compulsory subject was included in New Zealand’s primary school curriculum in the nineteenth century. A study by McGeorge (1983) suggests that the early history textbooks fulfilled the purpose of encouraging patriotism and giving the country a good image. Later work (Shuker, 1992; Stenson, 1990) indicates that by 1930 ‘history and civics’ was a subject that was expected to contribute to the moral welfare of the state through its value as training for citizenship. It was studied by 93.1% of boys and 95.5% of girls in secondary schools (Stenson, p.174).

The thorough reform of the New Zealand school curriculum in 1944 brought in a compulsory core of subjects to be studied by all the country’s students until the end of
Form 4 (currently year 10). One of these mandatory subjects was social studies, intended to be an integrated course of history and civics and geography. At first, history and geography were taught separately within social studies but in the 1970s a new more sociologically influenced social studies was introduced, resulting in a course organised around general themes of cultural difference, interaction, social control, and social change. These provided the foundation of four years of compulsory social studies from Forms 1-4 (currently years 7-10). It also signalled a distinctive move from the very traditional, factual, British heritage approach to the history aspect of social studies that had been previously taught, because that was increasingly felt to be irrelevant (Stenson, 1990). Although some historical topics were suggested in the national syllabus that was compulsory for schools until 1997, *Social Studies Guidelines: Forms 1-4* (Department of Education, 1977), there was no historical framework or focus, and very little New Zealand history was indicated.

**Socio-political context of the curriculum**

The philosophical direction of New Zealand governments was a major influence in curriculum development in the 1990s when the country's education system was completely reshaped. It was in response to New Zealand's economic decline, and the associated unemployment of the 1980s, that successive governments determined to extend New Zealanders' business, management and technical skills, as part of a strategy to increase New Zealand's competitiveness within the global marketplace. All curriculum documents are informed or shaped by particular views of the world (Grundy, 1987) and in the New Zealand context the changed political climate impacted significantly on curriculum development. As education analysts Lee and Hill (1996) observed:

> Historical scholarship has upheld the view that political as well as economic and social considerations have underpinned the New Zealand curriculum since at least 1877; although such considerations have seldom been as transparent as they have become since 1990, with the proposals advanced for recasting the school curriculum. (p.19)

From the early 1990s, curriculum decision making in New Zealand came under the centralised control of the Ministry of Education, and the new underlying ideology of *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993) was to highlight knowledge, skills and attitudes that would be useful in terms of generating an ‘enterprise culture’ (O’Neill, 2004; Peters & Marshall, 1996). Further critique of *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Lee & Hill, 1996), considered that the National government of the 1990s had assigned priority in citizenship education to serving economic and vocational needs ahead of “the full development of the adolescent as a
person" (p.27). The changed commitment heralded a new era in education. It also demonstrated the tension between vocational, utilitarian and instrumental functions of curriculum that are often advocated by governments, and the liberal, humanistic and general education frequently advocated by educators and many parents and students (C. McGee, 1997).

History, with its emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge for cultural and social value, did not sit easily with the vision of a curriculum framework designed to meet outcomes oriented towards producing a skills-based, economically competitive society. The seven essential learning areas identified in The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993) did include social sciences, although the Ministry of Education priority lay with mathematics, science and technology. The centralised decision made concerning the social science learning area was that a curriculum document would be developed for social studies only. History as a curriculum subject was retained as an elective subject in the senior school and the 1980s senior syllabus statement, History: Forms 5 to 7 syllabus for schools, (Department of Education, 1989) was left without revision or updating; a situation existing to the present day. It was a new social studies curriculum that was designed in the 1990s to meet the required citizenship education, as well as key knowledge and understandings about New Zealand society.

Three traditions were identified by R. Barr, Barth and Shermis (1978) as fundamental to modern social studies. These traditions are summarised by H. Barr, Graham, Hunter, Keown, & J. McGee (1997) in A position paper: Social Studies in New Zealand School Curriculum, which informed the final redrafting of the current national social studies curriculum. They include the citizenship transmission tradition (an accepted body of knowledge focusing on the country’s history, heritage and beliefs, which should be passed on to students), the social science tradition (concerned with gathering, processing and applying information), and reflective inquiry (emphasising students’ ability to make reasoned and rational decisions based on critical reflection). While the transmission of citizenship ideals has been seen as underpinning all social science syllabi in New Zealand since the inception of social studies as a core curriculum subject in 1944 (Openshaw & Archer, 1992; J. McGee, 1998), it was suggested by H. Barr et al. (1997), that any new curriculum should also be cognisant of the other social studies traditions. According to H. Barr (1998), the currently implemented document, Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a), reflects all three of the social studies traditions in that:
The (citizenship) transmission tradition is evident in much of the content, the reflective inquiry tradition is evident in the student centred inquiry learning … and the social science tradition is evident in the curriculum structure and classroom practice. (p.108)

A different perspective is held by Openshaw (1998), who sees the continuation of the citizenship emphases of previous syllabi overshadowing the social science and reflective inquiry traditions. Citizenship education in Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a) is highlighted in two significant ways. Firstly, it is emphasised in the sole major general aim:

Social studies education aims to enable students to participate in a changing society as informed, confident and responsible citizens. (p.8)

Secondly, citizenship is addressed by the inclusion of a summary outline of areas of “essential learning about New Zealand society” (p.23). Openshaw also observes that there is a tendency in the national social studies curriculum towards “inculcating values conformity while neglecting independent, critical thinking skills” (p.267).

**Essential learning about New Zealand**

Mandatory for all New Zealand students from J1 to year 10 since 2000, the national social studies curriculum is based on a rational planning model (Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949) and is outcomes driven. It is structured in a linear and sequential fashion setting out achievement objectives for each of the five learning strands (one is a history strand: time, continuity and change) and three social studies processes, at eight levels of learning. The eighty achievement objectives in the social studies curriculum do not specify topic content. Teachers are instead provided with ‘indicators’ which suggest approaches to study that can enable the achievement objectives to be met.

Sitting uncomfortably within the curriculum, outside the rational planning structure dominating the rest of the document, is a one page summary list of nineteen areas of “essential learning about New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23) referred to previously. The generally worded statements have no achievement objectives and the only specifically recognised historical event is the Treaty of Waitangi. Apart from a requirement that each school should develop a balanced programme that includes essential learning about New Zealand, there is no suggestion in the curriculum as to how often these studies should occur in a student’s schooling, nor is there any elaboration of the learning that should emerge from these studies. As Openshaw (1998) observes, the “thorny question of topic definition and interpretation is mainly left up to teachers and schools” (p.37). Teacher choice, which gives teachers freedom to include topics they consider are appropriate for their students, also provides
the opportunity for teachers to avoid the challenging task of grappling with contestable and controversial issues in the classroom.

Research in two Auckland schools conducted by Simon (1992), illustrated the complex nature of teachers making decisions about contentious topic areas where teachers are unfamiliar with the subject content. She observed that the omission of specific content guidelines had allowed teachers’ own values and prejudices to predominate when selecting topics and developing their social studies programmes. In her study investigating how the previous social studies curriculum, *Social Studies Syllabus Guidelines: Forms 1-4* (Department of Education, 1977) had been interpreted in schools, particularly the place given to Māori-Pākehā relations, she presented a very dismal picture. A majority of social studies teachers interviewed had little or no training in history, and the year 13 students she surveyed who had had ten years of social studies teaching, revealed not only a high level of ignorance but also prejudice related to the Treaty of Waitangi topic area. In her view, social studies was ‘cultivating social amnesia’, allowing New Zealand’s past to be forgotten.

From 2002 to 2003 a Curriculum Stocktake of New Zealand curriculum developments over the previous decade was undertaken by the Ministry of Education. It was informed by international critiques of the New Zealand curriculum (Le Metais, 2002; Ferguson, 2002) and assessment data including the National Education Monitoring Projects (Flockton & Crooks, 1998, 2002). Results from the social studies section of this latter project indicated that only 50% of Year 8 students had a moderate understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and that they had a limited understanding of the significance of historical events. Also feeding into the Curriculum Stocktake was a report on the New Zealand curriculum from the Education Review Office (2001). This advised that “most teachers would benefit from more explanatory material that interprets the achievement objectives and outlines key expectations about what teaching programmes should cover” (p.3). In view of the accumulated findings, the recommendations made in the *Curriculum Stocktake Report to the Minister of Education* (Ministry of Education, 2002), were unsurprising. The recommendation that “professional development should be provided that focus[es] on developing teachers’ understanding of the content knowledge that underpins each of the curriculum statements” (p.4) is particularly relevant to my study findings which are summarised in Chapter 7. The programme of curriculum modifications, labelled the Curriculum Project 2003-2006, includes social studies and is currently on-going.
The above developments provide some background and context to this study of the nature of teachers’ subject matter knowledge for teaching one of the topics of “essential learning about New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 1997a), namely:

The Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to current systems, policies and events. (p.23)

To set this study in a theoretical context I now turn to the research literature related to teachers’ professional knowledge.

**Teachers’ professional knowledge**

Within the research literature, varying usage of terms relating to teachers’ professional knowledge demands that I initially clarify my interpretation of the words: content knowledge, discipline knowledge, subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, as these terms have been used in my research study. This section is followed by a description of the knowledge base for teaching, which I have used as a conceptual framework for the inquiry. The research that has been generated in the field, and which is pertinent to my investigation, is then discussed.

**The terminology**

Shulman and his colleagues at Stanford University, who became involved in the Knowledge Growth in a Profession Project in the later 1980s, used the term “content knowledge” to refer to the “stuff” of a discipline (Grossman, Wilson & Shulman, 1989, p.27). This relates to the major facts, key concepts, ideas and understandings of a discipline area. Content knowledge in this sense is also often referred to in the literature as substantive knowledge. Lee and Ashby (2001) explain that “substantive history is the content of history, what history is about” (p.199). Content knowledge has also sometimes been equated with subject matter knowledge but for Shulman (1986a, 1987) the latter goes beyond content. He contended that subject matter knowledge also includes what Schwab (1961/1978) identified as the substantive and syntactic structures of the discipline. The substantive structures of a discipline are the “conceptual devices which are used for defining, bounding, and analysing the subject matters they investigate” (p.246). In the discipline of history this may include organising frameworks such as chronology, or perspectives from which historians ask their questions: political, social, economic, cultural, gender and others. The syntactical structures, or the procedural knowledge which informs the discipline, include the methods used to guide inquiry, which for historians encompass systematic analysis, evaluation and argument. Examining the validity of ideas and perspectives, and
considering major disagreements in the field are all part of this process. Lee and Ashby (2001) clarify further that:

concepts like historical evidence, explanation and change are ideas that provide our understanding of history as a discipline or form of knowledge. They are not what history is ‘about’ but they shape the way that we go about doing history. (p.199)

Knowledge of the content, as well as knowledge of the substantive and syntactic structures of the discipline, is what defines discipline knowledge. It is in this way that I have used the term discipline knowledge in this study. Shulman (1987) maintains that discipline knowledge is required by teachers in that they:

must understand the structures of subject matter, the principles of conceptual organisation, the principles of inquiry… (They must) first comprehend the ideas to be taught and understand the skills in the domain, in order that they can adequately represent subject matter to students. (p.9)

Discipline knowledge had usually been more closely aligned to academic study of a field within universities and was not usually associated with schools. But Shulman and his team saw a distinction between discipline knowledge of the academic and the discipline knowledge of the teacher. This had been noted many years before by Dewey (1916/1966) who observed differences between subject matter knowledge of the discipline and subject matter knowledge necessary for teaching. He argued that scholarly knowledge of the discipline is different from the knowledge needed for teaching because the teacher’s context is different and, unlike scholars, teachers cannot just focus on content. While some of what teachers need to know about their subject overlaps with the knowledge of scholars of the discipline, teachers also need to understand their subject matter in ways that promote learning. Teachers must restructure their content knowledge to make it pedagogical and take into account many other factors related to the teaching context and the students they teach. The beliefs teachers hold about their subject matter and their orientation towards it, is another dimension that identifies subject matter knowledge of the discipline (Grossman 1991; Grossman et al., 1989; Turner-Bisset, 1999; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988).

Central to Shulman’s (1986a) argument is that the knowledge of the effective classroom teacher goes beyond knowledge of subject matter knowledge per se to the dimension of subject matter knowledge for teaching. He categorised this concept of subject matter for teaching as pedagogical content knowledge – an amalgam of pedagogy and content which takes place in the classroom. He posited that the teacher uses ways of representing and formulating the subject to make it comprehensible to students through the use of analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations and
demonstrations. Pedagogical content knowledge also includes an “understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult” (p.9) and, because students often have misconceptions of a subject, “a knowledge of strategies that are most likely to be fruitful in reorganising the understanding of learners” (p.10). In summary, pedagogical content knowledge is different from content knowledge in that the focus is on communication between teacher and student, and different from general pedagogical knowledge because of the direct relationship with the subject content.

The studies undertaken in the Stanford University projects, which developed Shulman’s ideas, focused on the role that subject matter knowledge and pedagogy played in the classroom of beginning secondary school teachers. They illustrated how “teachers’ subject knowledge per se undergoes a transformation as they prepare to teach and as the initial knowledge of content is enriched by their knowledge of students, curriculum and teaching context” (Grossman et al., 1989, p.27). The researchers also observed that this transformation of discipline knowledge, into a form of knowledge that is appropriate for students and specific to the task of teaching, was one of the greatest challenges facing new teachers.

In this study I have used the terms content knowledge, discipline knowledge, subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge as I have outlined above. I make the distinction between subject matter knowledge of the discipline, which I refer to as discipline knowledge, and subject matter knowledge for teaching. The latter is identified as pedagogical content knowledge and has been used interchangeably.

**A knowledge base for teaching**

Shulman’s (1987) categorisation of the professional knowledge base for teaching has been used as a conceptual framework in which to situate my study. It is acknowledged, as Shulman pointed out, that a knowledge base is “not fixed and final” (p.12) because teacher knowledge is not neatly organised into compartments and is not static. Rather it is a dynamic and changing entity. Recent research (Loughran, I. Mitchell, & J. Mitchell, 2003), which attempts to capture and portray teachers’ professional knowledge, highlights the difficulty of attempting to capture, categorise, and portray the very complex interactions of teaching and learning. However, a theoretical framework of the teachers’ knowledge base does provide a useful analytical tool to use in my study, and with which to discuss the important issues relating to teachers’ work in the classroom.
Educational researchers do not all agree on what constitutes appropriate teacher knowledge (Tom & Valli, 1990) and various schema of knowledge for teachers have been generated by researchers in the field (including Cochran, De Ruiter & King, 1993; Elbaz, 1983; John, 1991; Leinhardt & Smith, 1985; Marks, 1990; Meredith, 1995; Tamir, 1988; Turner-Bisset, 1999). I have chosen the Shulman (1987) categorisation as an appropriate framework for this study because of the position given to teachers' subject matter knowledge for teaching which is central to my purpose.

Shulman’s (1987) categorisation of a knowledge base for teaching was developed as a response to advocates of teacher professionalisation in the U.S. who assumed that good teachers’ possess a specific knowledge base. Educational policy-makers requirements also demanded that pre-service teachers’ knowledge of subjects and application of subject matter knowledge in the classroom, be a substantial element in teacher training courses. Shulman’s model comprises seven components that he viewed as essential to the work of teachers. These include:

- content knowledge; general pedagogical knowledge, with special reference to those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organisation that appear to transcend subject matter;
- curriculum knowledge with particular grasp of the materials and programs that serve as ‘tools of trade’ for teachers;
- pedagogical content knowledge, that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding;
- knowledge of learners and their characteristics;
- knowledge of educational contexts, ranging from the workings of the group or classroom, the governance and financing of school districts, to the character of communities and cultures; and
- knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds. (p.8)

Shulman gave special mention to pedagogical content knowledge, or subject matter knowledge for teaching, as the most important part of the knowledge base because it distinguished the teacher from the scholar and the expert teacher from the novice (Shulman, 1986a, 1987). The effective teacher is expected to be able to transform discipline knowledge to pedagogical content knowledge. This transformation takes place claim Wilson, Shulman & Richert (1987), in a series of stages they call pedagogical reasoning: the teacher firstly clarifies and interprets the discipline knowledge, then identifies and determines representations for presentation of the discipline knowledge. The final stage in the development of pedagogical content knowledge is adapting and tailoring the transformed discipline knowledge to meet students’ characteristics and needs. In an analysis of the ways later researchers have elaborated on the concept of pedagogical content knowledge, Van Driel, Verloop and De Vos (1998) found two elements that are considered essential by them all: teachers have knowledge about representations and teaching strategies appropriate for the
particular subject content and they also have knowledge about specific conceptions and learning difficulties with respect to their specific subject.

Questions have been raised by a number of researchers (Bennett & Turner-Bisset, 1993; Bullough, 2001; Marks, 1990; McEwan & Bull, 1991; McNamara, 1991) about whether in practice it is possible to make a clear distinction between subject discipline knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Meredith (1995) has also been critical of pedagogical content knowledge as a teacher directed, didactic model of learning that does not encompass alternative approaches such as problem solving and investigative activities, in which students are constructing their own understanding of the subject matter. A similar constructivist view of learning, and its application to teaching, led Cochran et al. (1993) to develop a modified concept of pedagogical content knowledge. In their developmental model of ‘pedagogical knowing’, the knowing is created rather than transferred or passively received. They also emphasise the importance of teachers knowing about the learning of their students, and the environmental context in which learning and teaching occur. Influenced by Vygotsky, they also see the constructive processes of knowledge growth and transformation occurring in a social context as a result of interpersonal interactions.

Withstanding some criticisms as outlined above, Shulman’s original concept has been found by researchers of teacher knowledge, focusing on specific content domains, to be a helpful analytical category for investigating how teachers translate their understanding of subject matter of the discipline into classroom practice. Underlining the importance of his work, Wilson (2001) considers that since Shulman added subject matter to the research on teaching equation “we are learning a great deal about what happens in classes of accomplished history teachers, about what it takes to teach well, and about what it takes to prepare teachers well” (p.530).

While the work of Shulman and his associates constructed a theoretical foundation for understanding the roles of subject matter and pedagogy in the process of teaching, their research projects have been a starting point for subsequent studies. It is this research, and later work, that has provided a framework to examine the nature of teacher knowledge and practice in the New Zealand social studies classroom, and to which I now refer.
Lack of content knowledge

If teaching entails helping others to learn, then understanding what is to be taught is a central requirement of teaching (Ball & McDiarmid 1990). Although what subject content teachers and students need to know is still an undeveloped area of research, a large literature has developed in the last twenty years reporting on studies which have demonstrated how a lack of subject matter knowledge affects many aspects of teaching and learning.

In the area of content and instruction, several studies (Hashweh, 1987; Grossman et al. 1989; Gudmundsdottir, 1991; McDiarmid, Ball & Anderson, 1989; Reynolds, Haymore, Ringstaff & Grossman, 1988; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988) have demonstrated that curricular choices, lesson content, the selection of learning activities, the teachers’ capacity to ask questions, and evaluating students’ understanding, are all dependent on how well teachers themselves understand the subject content. When teachers are unfamiliar with this material they adopt tactics to cope, such as relying heavily on the textbook to provide the necessary knowledge (Reynolds et al. 1988; Grossman et al., 1989). The problem with this reliance is that without understanding the concepts and content of a topic, teachers cannot appraise the adequacy and accuracy of the text (Hashwey, 1987) and they use the texts uncritically (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990). Other studies (Wilson et al., 1987) reveal that due to a lack of content knowledge teachers may pass on their inaccurate or narrowly conceived ideas to their students, and they may also fail to challenge students’ misconceptions. These factors, to which I refer later in Chapter 7, are a significant concern when contentious or sensitive issues are part of the teaching programme in the social studies classroom.

In her review of history teaching research, Wilson (2001) asserts that she has not located any studies in the past decade which indicate any significant changes since a study she had undertaken in social studies classes in 1988. Her impression at that time was that the non-specialist history teachers teaching social studies classes displayed naive and narrow views of the historical content and viewed teaching about historical topics as high school students did: factual and dull. In her opinion “the teachers who saw history as ‘the facts’ or had little historical knowledge, fell into the age-old routines of uninspired history teaching” (p.535).

The importance of discipline knowledge

Many of the earlier studies conducted through Stanford and Michigan State Universities, and also research in Britain (Bennett & Turner-Bisset, 1993), has
demonstrated that teachers with more developed discipline knowledge are able to teach at a higher level of competence. Studies include Wilson and Wineburg’s (1988) investigation of beginning social studies teachers teaching about the Great Depression in the USA. This revealed that the lack of discipline knowledge of the two history non-major teachers was the most decisive factor in their teaching because, not knowing that history is as much interpretation as fact, they did not know enough to seek out alternative interpretations. They believed they had learned history once they had accumulated dates and events and had read the textbook accounts. In Yeager and Davis’s (1995) account of their work focusing on the reading and interpreting of historical texts, the social studies teachers without history education resembled the young teachers found in the Wilson and Wineburg study. Downey and Levstik (1991) conclude, in their review of research findings from classroom studies, that while knowledge in the subject disciplines is only one aspect of teachers’ professional knowledge, it is a critical ingredient in teacher performance. Feiman-Nemser and Remillard (1995) agree and also suggest that the accumulating findings of studies in the last twenty years provide, “a compelling case for why teachers need deeper and more flexible subject matter knowledge [of the discipline] than they generally have the chance to learn” (p.73).

Teachers’ disciplinary orientations can also play a significant role in social studies teaching (Gudmundsdottir, 1991; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988). Wilson and Wineburg argue that teachers’ disciplinary lenses, developed as a result of their university disciplinary specialisation, can skew and misrepresent the content they are teaching. The non-history social studies teachers, in the 1988 study mentioned above, had wanted their students to enjoy social studies classes, but they saw the study of history as a necessary evil, “once dispensed with, the teacher might then move on to more interesting schoolwork” (Wilson, 2001, p.535). By contrast, in Wineburg and Wilson’s study (1991) of two history majors teaching about the American Revolution in social studies classes, a different orientation to the subject content and a very different approach to their teaching was demonstrated. Not only did these teachers have a large store of information at their command, they also had a “vision of history” and perceived the discipline as a “human construction, an enterprise in which people try to solve a puzzle” (p.331). When they taught, they represented the topic in ways to help students see the complexity of historical understanding.

Other effects of greater discipline knowledge have also been discernible in empirical studies. Hashweh (1987) observed in his study of science teachers that those with a high level of discipline knowledge were the most likely to challenge textbook
representations of knowledge, detect student misconceptions and clearly identify which subject concepts were the most difficult for students to comprehend. They could also find ways to relate subject content to other relevant areas, exploit opportunities for “fruitful digressions” (p.118) and correctly interpret students’ comments. Wilson and Wineburg (1988) found that social studies teachers with knowledge of the history discipline were also more likely to be aware of the significance of chronology, of the meaning of causation, and of the importance of seeing events in a broad context.

Studying a discipline has been seen as essential to becoming an expert subject teacher (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Grossman, 1990; Marks, 1990). This conclusion is supported by later studies such as that by Schempp, Mantross, Tan, and Fincher (1998). Their study of physical education teachers established that the difference between those teaching in their expert subject area, and those in a non-expert area, manifests in the quantity and variety of learning activities to accommodate a range of learners’ skills and abilities. Teachers in their expert subject area identified a greater number of activities and described them in greater detail. They could also recognise problems in student learning and provide specific remedies to overcome student difficulties. A notable finding, which is reflected in my study of the social studies teachers, was the level of comfort and enthusiasm expressed by teachers for teaching a subject in which they had discipline knowledge, compared with “their trepidation in teaching subjects in which they had little expertise” (Schempp et al., p.352).

**Pedagogical content knowledge**

Strong discipline knowledge is a key factor in teaching but without an understanding of how to use disciplinary understanding in the classroom, a teacher cannot be effective. The transformation of discipline knowledge into pedagogical content knowledge is, Wilson et al. (1987) argue, at the heart of teaching in secondary schools. To implement this transformation the teacher must have a substantial pedagogical content knowledge repertoire that can be used to identify useful representations for effective teaching (Chen & Ennis, 1995). While teachers are provided with some representations through text-books, worksheets or other teaching materials, they construct other representations themselves. As McDiarmid et al. (1989) point out, “whether they are aware of it or not, teachers are constantly engaged in a process of constructing and using instructional representations of subject matter” (p.194).

Wilson et al. (1987) and Grossman et al. (1989) describe some teachers as being unable to perform this transformation and represent the concepts and ideas to the
students they were teaching. Without adequate discipline knowledge teachers’ representations tend to be more superficial and often inaccurate (Wilson et al., 1987) because they need discipline knowledge to inform their pedagogical knowledge (Grossman, 1990). Use of appropriate representations and story-telling are central to pedagogical content knowledge to enable teachers to make complex ideas accessible to students. This requires that teachers thoroughly understand the topics they are teaching (Leinhardt, Putman, Stein & Baxter, 1991). Teachers also need this deeper understanding of their topic content in order to know which ideas are central, which are peripheral, how different ideas relate to one another, and how these ideas can be represented to students (Grossman et al., 1989; Shulman, 1986a; Wineburg, 1997).

It cannot always be assumed that teachers with discipline knowledge of the subject will necessarily also have pedagogical understanding. This caution is sounded by VanSledright who found in his 1996 study of a high school history teacher, with thorough and current discipline knowledge of history, that very little historical knowledge was being transferred into practice over a 35 lesson unit. The acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge requires learning and experience, and in the opinion of Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1990), “experienced teachers need to help beginning teachers learn how to enact the curriculum by sharing and appraising ideas that have worked for them, and by guiding novices in generating their own representations” (p.41). The teachers’ ability to learn how to transform their knowledge into a form accessible to students is a crucial component in learning how to teach because it is a key factor in students’ learning. This is emphasized by Feiman-Nemser and Remillard (1995) who claim that “the presence or absence of this kind of knowledge affects the learning opportunities that prospective and practising teachers provide for their students” (p.73). It is also noteworthy that it can be teachers who lack pedagogical content knowledge who are more likely to inappropriately attribute the students’ lack of understanding to student lack of motivation or lack of ability (Grossman et al., 1989).

Teacher beliefs and attitudes to subject content
Shulman and his colleagues were led into investigating teacher beliefs about teaching students and about subject matter because as Grossman et al. (1989) observed “it is frequently the case that teachers treat their beliefs as knowledge. The distinction therefore becomes blurry” (p.31). Teacher beliefs about a topic have been found to be very powerful (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Evans, 1989; Grossman, 1990; Gudmundsdottir 1990a, 1991; Nespor, 1987) with Ball and McDiarmid asserting that teachers “develop dispositions towards subjects, tastes and distastes for particular topics, propensities to pursue certain questions and kinds of study and avoid others” (p.441). As
Gudmundsdottir (1991) succinctly states, “values act as filters for what it is considered important to know …” (p.268).

Another revealing perspective on teachers’ beliefs and attitudes about subject content is provided in Nespor’s (1987) account of his findings. Even among the history teachers in his study, three of the four believed that:

- teaching the ‘facts’ and details of history should not be a primary goal in courses because, in their evaluation, students could not be expected to remember such information for any length of time: the content was ‘short term memory stuff’ … Rather than focusing their energies on imparting historical facts and details, the teachers developed other types of teaching goals, which in their view might have some lasting impact on the students: for example, teaching students’ manners and how to behave in the classroom, or teaching general learning skills, such as how to outline a chapter, or organise a notebook. (p.319)

Beliefs and attitudes about students

Topic choice and topic content is also influenced by teacher attitudes to, and expectations of, the students they will teach. Individual teachers often modify their subject content material in order to fit their personal style and what they judge to be acceptable practice in the school and in the local community (McKee, 1988, cited in Romanowski, 1996). Teachers also consider the attitudes and expectations that their students bring to the classroom when planning their teaching programmes (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990). Two studies carried out by Romanowski (1996) on the teaching of U.S. history are particularly relevant in light of my study of the Treaty of Waitangi topic, where many preconceived ideas are held by students and the wider community. Romanowski claims that in his experience, teacher concern about student resistance to certain topics played a role in determining their content and instructional decisions. Teachers also evaded opportunities to challenge students’ and the community’s beliefs. In similar vein, VanSledright (1996) observed in his research that “fear that creating controversy in the classroom may spill over into the home caused many teachers to back away, to find safer courses of action” (p.287). Teachers’ understanding of their subject content appears to be an important factor in influencing such decisions as indicated in an Australian study of teacher knowledge and the teaching of civics and citizenship. Dunkin, Welch, Meritt, Phillips and Craven (1998) suggest that:

- teachers’ knowledge of the community context in which they practice sometimes affects their choice of substantive content in their lessons. Particularly controversial content is likely to be excluded, especially if teachers lack confidence in their mastery of that content. (p.150)
Other ways of ensuring a conflict free, controlled classroom are for teachers to 'stick to the facts', and attempt to remain politically neutral. They may also structure the lessons in a manner that requires little effort on the students' part to make sense of the material. As has been documented by other researchers (Banks & Parker, 1990; Cornbleth, 1985), pleasing students and maintaining order in the classroom is often a higher priority for teachers than the subject content of the lesson.

Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the literature relating to the teaching of New Zealand’s history within the national social studies curriculum that is relevant to my study, as well as reviewing applicable literature in the field of teachers’ professional knowledge. A theme running through this literature, both the contextual and the theoretical, is the importance of subject matter knowledge for teaching in the social studies classroom.

Although Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a) is largely a non-prescriptive, outcomes based document, teachers have the opportunity to teach about events and issues in the country’s past through the learning strand of ‘time, continuity and change’. They are also directed to areas of “essential learning about New Zealand society” (p.23). However, as identified in the content literature, implementing these learning areas, especially those related to New Zealand’s history, has proved problematic for many teachers. The apparent difficulties relate to the interpretation of the curriculum and the lack of teaching objectives, as well as teachers’ lack of content knowledge to teach all the disciplinary aspects of social studies (Education Review Office, 2001; Ministry of Education, 2002, 2003).

The work of Shulman (1986a, 1986b, 1987) has focused an increasing amount of the research on teaching in the last twenty years on the role of subject matter knowledge and pedagogy. He and his associate researchers have emphasised the importance of teachers’ discipline knowledge, and the transformation of that knowledge into a form that is comprehensible to students, as a critical factor in effective teaching. Wilson (2001) observes that defining ‘good’ teaching needs to be linked to student learning and there is still much more research to be done in that area. What has emerged from many of the growing number of studies on subject matter knowledge for teaching is that the presence or absence of teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge manifestly affects their students’ opportunities to learn.
Having summarised key ideas which emerge from the literature that are relevant to my study into teacher knowledge and its implementation in the New Zealand social studies classroom, I proceed to the next chapter to examine the methodology and design of the research study.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Overview
This chapter establishes the design of the study and methods used to carry out the inquiry. The over-arching paradigm of qualitative research is explained as an appropriate framework for investigating the knowledge and practice of individual classroom teachers, with naturalistic and interpretive methodologies providing the theoretical underpinning. A rationale is then presented for the case study research strategy. The selection of the case study participants is described and ethical issues related to the study are addressed. Data collection methods, which include semi-structured interviews, concept maps and video-stimulated recall are then outlined, followed by an explanation of the data analysis process. In the last section of the chapter, issues concerning trustworthiness and transferability of the research findings are discussed.

Methodological framework
The qualitative paradigm
A qualitative approach was adopted as the most appropriate for my study which conforms to a variety of distinctive features highlighted by Maykut and Morehouse (1994) as characterising such research. These features include an exploratory and descriptive focus, an emergent design, a purposive sample and data collected in a natural setting. The researcher plays a key role in the research process both as collector of data and as one who derives meaning from it. Further, the data collection methods capture peoples’ words and actions, the analysis is inductive, beginning early and is on-going, and the results are most effectively presented within a rich narrative.

A set of philosophical beliefs and abstract principles shapes how the qualitative researcher sees the world and acts upon it. The researcher, as Denzin and Lincoln (2000, p.19) contend, is “bound within a net which contains [her] epistemological, ontological and methodological premises [that] may be termed a paradigm, or an interpretive framework”. This study, examining the nature of teacher knowledge and practice, is specifically situated within what Denzin and Lincoln refer to as:

a constructivist-interpretive paradigm assuming a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjectivist epistemology (the knower and
In education, qualitative research is frequently called ‘naturalistic’ because “the researcher frequents places where the events he or she is interested in naturally occur, and the data are gathered by people engaging in natural behaviour” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p.3). The natural setting for this research study is the secondary school classroom where, as the researcher, I have studied the experience (or phenomena) of teachers teaching an important aspect of New Zealand’s history in their social studies classes. The context is particularly important in the interpretive research orientation because it is in the natural setting that the qualitative researcher “attempts to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p.3). The researcher also becomes an integral part of the research process. This is because as Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) argue:

the individual’s behaviour can only be understood by the researcher sharing their frame of reference: understanding of individual’s interpretations of the world around them has to come from the inside, not the outside. (p.20)

In this sense, in the search for meaning, the research study is a subjective rather than an objective undertaking.

While the qualitative study addresses the question “what is happening here?” (Preissle-Göetz & Le Compte, 1991, p.56), the aim of the qualitative researcher is not to discover but to construct a clear reality (Stake, 2000). The purpose of the interpretive inquiry then, is to find meanings which yield insight and understanding (Cohen et al., 2000). This intention provides further reason for choosing a qualitative approach and interpretive orientation for my study. As is usual in such research, experiences and understandings are not reducible to simplistic interpretation and therefore ‘thick descriptions’ (Geertz, 1973) are necessary. The data are accordingly reported in a detailed descriptive form that presents everything the reader may need to know to understand the research findings. Ultimately, as Stake (1995) observes:

the interpretations of the researcher are likely to be emphasised more than the interpretations of the participants studied, but the qualitative researcher tries to preserve the multiple realities, the different and even contradictory views of what is happening. (p.12)

Moving from the paradigm to the empirical world, the research strategy I have employed to conduct this inquiry is that of the case study.
Case study research strategy

A case study can be either quantitative or qualitative or a combination of both, although most lie within the realm of qualitative methodology. Case study has been defined by Robson (1993) as:

> a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context using multiple sources of evidence. (p.5)

My study falls within this general definition as a contemporary issue (teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi) in a real-life situation (the secondary school classroom). Case studies also have been defined in terms of the research process (Yin, 1994), the unit of analysis as a ‘bounded system’ (Stake, 1995, 2000), or the end product as rich ‘thick’ description of the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 1998). Case studies focus on the particular not the general (Stake 1995), are a unique interpretation of events (Merriam 1988), and their hallmark is “significance rather than frequency, offering the researcher an insight into the real dynamics of situations and people” (Cohen et al., 2000, p.185).

The major question being asked in this study is ‘How is teacher knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation in the past and application in the present day, implemented in social studies classrooms?’ The choice of a case study strategy for this investigation follows the guidance of Yin (1994, p.9) who suggests that “case study strategy has a distinct advantage when a ‘how’ or ‘why’ question is being asked about a contemporary set of events”. Direction was also taken from Merriam (1998) who advises that case study might be selected for “what it can reveal about a phenomenon, knowledge we would not otherwise have access to” (p.33).

The case methodology of my study is most closely aligned with Stake (1995, 2000) and Merriam, 1988, 1998). It is bounded by a social studies learning topic, and the secondary school classroom. Meanings and understandings are derived from each of the individual teacher cases, the data and findings presented in holistic description and explanation. The usefulness of case study strategy for this research is captured by Grossman and Wilson (1987, cited in Grossman, 1990) when they maintain that:

> The case study approach to research on teacher knowledge represents an attempt to gather in depth data on the content, character and organisation of an individual’s knowledge for the purposes of contributing to a broader conceptualisation of teacher knowledge and its use in teaching. (p.150)

Within the interpretive paradigm, Stake (1995, 2000) identifies three main types of case study: the intrinsic case study (which refers to research into a particular situation for its
own sake, irrespective of outside concerns), the instrumental case study (where a particular case is examined to provide insight into an issue, to understand an outside concern), and the collective case study. My study, encompassing four teacher participants who are each studied as individual cases, fits into Stake’s collective case study design. This he describes as an instrumental study extended to several cases:

They may be similar or dissimilar, redundancy and variety each having a voice. They are chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to a better understanding about a still larger collection of cases. (Stake, 2000, p.437)

This study can also be identified as an educational case study located in the field of educational research, as opposed to discipline research in an educational setting. As Bassey (1999) explains:

Educational research is defined as critical enquiry aimed at informing educational judgments and decisions in order to improve educational action, whereas discipline research in education is critical enquiry aimed at informing understandings of phenomena which are pertinent to the discipline. (p.59)

While my study focuses on the teaching of an area of New Zealand’s history, the significance of the case study is in the meaning generated by the researcher and the participants about teacher subject knowledge and pedagogy, not the discipline of history itself.

In summary, this research study lends itself to the selection of a case study research strategy for a variety of reasons. Firstly, it is centred on a specific issue (teacher knowledge and practice), secondly, the participants are studied in a natural setting (the secondary school classroom), thirdly, multiple methods are used for the collection of evidence (interviews, concept map, video-stimulated recall), and fourthly, the case study results in comprehensive rich description to support findings. I am also guided by the fact that case study methods have been used widely in the social sciences and education research. Two studies which demonstrate the effectiveness of the methodology, and had an influence on my decision to adopt this type of qualitative research, are Grossman’s (1990) U.S. study focusing on the role of subject matter knowledge in learning to teach, and the British research of Husbands, Kitson and Pendry (2003) into what history teachers do in history classrooms. Particularly relevant to the objectives of my research inquiry is also Merriam’s (1998) argument that case study is an appealing design in applied fields of study such as education because:

educational processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice (p.41).
The study participants

Selection of participants for this research inquiry was by purposive sampling taking into account Patton’s (2002) contention that:

The logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry. (p.230)

Advice is also proffered by Stake (1995) that “balance and variety are important; opportunity to learn is of primary importance” (p.6). Acquiring information-rich cases was very important to this investigation into teacher knowledge and practice in order to illuminate the questions under study. The strategy that was chosen therefore, to select the purposive sample, was criterion sampling (Patton, 2002).

Several criteria were established for choosing the sample. The participants were to be teachers of social studies (the Treaty of Waitangi topic is an essential component of study in the national social studies curriculum), and that they should vary in degree specialisation (non-history specialists also teach social studies). It was also established that they should differ in years of teaching experience from early career to later career teachers because New Zealand’s history has undergone substantial revision in the last fifteen years and could be a factor in current teachers’ subject knowledge. Geographical location of the secondary schools was taken into account because community attitudes can differ between rural and urban areas which could affect teacher practice relating to a controversial societal issue.

The planned research project involved several data collecting methods. These included the video-stimulated recall of classroom lessons, which it was anticipated could be time-consuming and potentially threatening for some teachers. Consideration was therefore given to being able to gain regular access and, most importantly, being able to achieve a level of trust between researcher and participant. I decided to seek out four participants from an initial list I had devised that comprised eight teachers that met the above criteria. The first four teachers I contacted expressed a verbal willingness to be involved in the research project and this was then followed up with written consent.

The four participants include two beginning teachers with eighteen months and two years of teaching practice, and two experienced teachers with eighteen and twenty years in the classroom. The latter are also heads of their social studies departments. Two of the teachers have a history degree, and two have majored in geography. All currently teach social studies in co-educational secondary schools with one teacher
located in a small rural centre, one in a town on the urban fringe and two practitioners in urban secondary schools.

**Ethical considerations**

At the heart of qualitative research is the connection between the knower and the known:

The knower and the known are interdependent therefore there must be integrity between how the researcher experiences the participants in the study, how the participants experience the situation and their participation in it and how those results are presented. (Maykut & Morehouse 1994, p.37)

The underlying philosophy of the qualitative researcher requires that the researcher develops a relationship characterised by trust and respect with participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Glesne, 1999; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). A good rapport and level of trust existed at the beginning of this research study and the goodwill and cooperation of the participants was retained as the study proceeded. The teachers who agreed to take part in the research were previously known to me, as the researcher, because of my position as a teacher educator, as a facilitator of professional development for in-service teachers, and also through mutual involvement in regional teacher organisations. The issue of reciprocity was initially addressed by all four participants expressing an enthusiasm to be part of a study that could make a contribution to improvement in teacher education and further professional development for in-service teachers. As the study progressed, the teachers considered there were further benefits for them associated with the video-stimulated recall methodology. These are discussed further in Chapter 7.

To ensure the overall integrity, quality and worthiness of the research, Miles and Huberman (1994) consider that the main ethical issues to be addressed include acquiring informed consent of the participants, ensuring the privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of those involved, considering the ownership of the data and conclusions, and having regard for the use or misuse of the results. When proceeding with written consent, each of my participants was furnished with additional details about the nature of the research, the voluntary nature of their participation, the steps toward maintaining confidentiality, and the data gathering procedures (see Appendices A and B for the research information sheet and participant consent form). When written consent was gained, an approval to carry out the research in the teachers’ classrooms was then sought from Principals of each of the four schools (see Appendix C for the letter to Principals and Principal’s consent form). Prior to the classroom lessons in video-
camera, consent was attained from parents/caregivers of the students (see Appendix D for the student consent form). One of the Principals requested that the student/parent consent form be forwarded under the school letterhead together with his acknowledgement and support for the research study. Application for ethical clearance from Griffith University’s Human Research Ethics Committee was sought and granted before the data collection commenced.

Ensuring confidentiality of schools and the participants in a research project can be problematic in the relatively small New Zealand educational community. Ethical considerations therefore determined that all data emanating from this study be treated in every way possible to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of the case study participants, the schools, and the students involved in classrooms. Several steps were taken to minimize disclosure. Participants were given a pseudonym and their right to privacy was also protected by coding used during the gathering and processing of interview notes, audiotapes, videotapes and transcripts. All the interviews were audiotaped with the interviewees’ permission. The latter were given the opportunity to verify the interview transcripts and make modifications although only one participant did so, making two minor amendments to her statements. The participants were keen to read the drafts of their particular cases and were asked to comment if they wished. Three were very satisfied with the presentation and interpretation only correcting very minor factual details. The fourth provided further explanation of her lesson objectives and indicated that more emphasis be placed on her pedagogical approach to meet the needs of her students.

Participants were advised both orally and in written form about the ownership of the data. While the written findings can be used in publications beyond submission of the thesis, the videotapes are for the use of this research study only and will then be destroyed. In an educational climate which places emphasis on the measurement of teacher performance, it was important to ensure that the data and findings would be in no way connected to teacher appraisal and evaluation. The level of trust between researcher and teacher participants enabled them to feel confident that the data would remain confined to the purpose of the research. All four Principals connected to this study neither sought, nor were given, any evaluative comment on the knowledge or practice of the teachers from their schools.
Data collection

This section of the chapter records information about the data gathering process. In this study, multiple sources of data were used to address the research question from as many perspectives as possible. For each teacher case, methods of collecting data included a semi-structured interview, concept mapping exercise, lesson planning task, and a video-stimulated recall interview of a classroom lesson.

The timeline for collecting the data extended over seven months from November 2003 to May 2004. In order that the research not be disruptive to each school’s social studies programme, it was mutually agreed that the classroom teaching data be gathered when the teachers would normally be teaching the Treaty of Waitangi topic with their class. The data collecting phase took longer than anticipated because of changes of social studies classes timetables which interrupted planned videotaping of classroom lessons. In addition, one of the teacher participants encountered family problems that led to the postponement of the organised classroom lesson and the concept mapping exercise on two occasions. When she became available again she was teaching another social studies class in the new school year, which required modifications to the lesson plan and necessitated another set of student consents.

The data gathering procedure for three of the participants adhered to a pattern of the introductory semi-structured interview, followed one or two weeks later by the lesson planning task which preceded the teaching of the classroom lesson by one or two days. The video-stimulated recall interview followed immediately after teaching the lesson in all cases. The concept mapping activity became the final data collected for three of the study participants because it was more flexible to move that particular data gathering exercise, when it was necessary to accommodate an alternative date for the videotaping of the classroom lessons. The data collection for all the teachers was carried out in their schools, apart from two of the introductory interviews which took place in the participants’ homes during the school holidays.

Table 3.1 summarises the data sources, the research questions they address, and the data analysis.
The data gathering process was guided by the research questions. Each of the data gathering methods used in the study is now described in further detail.

**Semi-structured interview**

A research interview is a conversation with a purpose (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Kvale, 1996) and an opportunity to find out from people those things we cannot directly observe (Patton, 2002). The initial interview with the participants was semi-structured, a common interviewing format in qualitative research, because as Merriam (1998) explains:

> Usually specific information is desired from all the respondents, in which case there is a highly structured section to the interview. But the largest part of the interview is guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, and neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions is determined ahead of time. This format allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging world view of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic. (p.74)
Further, the open ended questions encourage individual responses while the broad structure that frames the questions ensures that data across participants will be comparable (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992).

The purpose of the introductory interview (interview procedure details are included as Appendix E) was to elicit information about the teacher’s background, the school social studies programme, and the place within it that is given to teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand. Further, the interview was to contribute preliminary information about the teacher’s discipline knowledge of New Zealand history, and provide data on sources of the teacher’s knowledge. Each of the teacher interviews was audio taped and transcribed prior to analysis.

**Concept mapping**

Concept maps, developed from the work of Novak and Gowin (1984), have been used widely as a research and evaluation tool in science education. Since the later 1980s they have been increasingly utilised in the study of teachers’ cognitive processes because they provide access to teachers' tacit knowledge (Chen & Ennis, 1995; Clark & Peterson, 1986; McMeniman, Cumming, Wilson, Stevenson & Sim, 2000), and can gauge conceptual changes when more than one map is constructed over a period of time (Artiles & McClafferty, 1991; Jones & Vesilind, 1995; Van Leuvan, 1997).

Concept mapping was employed in this study to address the guiding research question: what do social studies teachers know about the Treaty of Waitangi learning area? The concept map was chosen as an alternative strategy to assessment testing for ascertaining breadth and depth of discipline knowledge because the technique avoids undermining the relationship between researcher and teacher. By providing a two dimensional representation of knowledge structures, concept maps are superior to conventional assessment procedures which fail to recognise that most disciplinary knowledge is based on an understanding of relationships between concepts (Markham, Mintzes & Jones, 1994).

The participants were introduced to concept mapping consistent with the procedures of Novak and Gowin (1984) before commencing the concept mapping task. They were then asked to construct a modified version of a concept map (procedural details are included in Appendix F). The teachers were presented with thirty terms and concepts that had been selected from relevant social studies textbooks and are commonly used in New Zealand schools (Ministry of Education, 1997b; Naumann, 2002; Naumann,
Harrison & Winiata, 1990; Stenson & Williams, 1990). The concept labels were: Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori, Pākehā, founding document, living document, tangata whenua, sovereignty, governorship, chieftainship, mana, kāwanatanga, rangitiratanga, confiscation, land sales, assimilation, grievances, wars, passive resistance, Parihaka, Land March, Bastion Point, Māoritanga, biculturalism, language, taonga, land claims, Waitangi Tribunal, fisheries, foreshore issue, and the Principles of the Treaty (a glossary of Māori words is included in Appendix I).

Each teacher’s task was to create a concept map by organising the set of labels on a large sheet of paper (the concept maps are reproduced as Figures 5.1-5.4 and included in Chapter 5). The map was to represent how they individually conceptualised this area of learning and to visually outline their thinking in terms of teaching the topic. During the mapping activity the participants were encouraged to think-aloud about the arrangement of the concepts, how they were linked in their mind, and the meanings of the relationships they made. When satisfied with the structure of the concept labels, these were glued to the sheet of paper and the teacher was then instructed to draw lines between what they considered to be associated concepts. They then labelled the connecting lines with a word or phrase identifying the nature of the prepositional relationships. The teacher then ‘walked’ me, as researcher, through the map, the key purpose being to allow him/her to explain the links and relationships between the concepts and facts presented. Semi-structured interview questions at the end of the activity sought any further justification of the arrangement of the concepts, the thinking behind the map, and why various concepts were linked together. This process followed Novak and Gowin’s (1984) advice that conducting an interview with the participants during or shortly after the construction of the map minimizes researcher misinterpretation of the structures of the map and explores more fully the meanings intended. Both the verbalised thinking during the mapping exercise and the interview dialogue were audio taped for later transcription.

**Think-aloud protocol: lesson planning**

In think-aloud protocol the subject utters every word that comes to mind as they carry out a cognitive task. Smagorinsky (1989) sees the think-aloud protocol researcher as one who seeks to understand what mental processes take place as someone attempts to solve a problem. A reservation about think-aloud protocols has been that the act of thinking aloud while undertaking a task could disrupt the natural process, but several studies identified by Smagorinsky have indicated that verbalisation does not interfere with the cognitive processes. In his opinion, think-aloud protocol is a “very useful addition to the repertoire of research tools for studying the composing process” (p.465).
It is also asserted by Ericsson and Simon (1980) that the verbal data collected simultaneously with the performance of a task can be very valuable data, particularly if what the person says they will do is corroborated by their behaviour.

The think-aloud protocol was used in this study not only during the concept mapping exercise but also while planning a lesson within the Treaty of Waitangi topic area (procedural details are included in Appendix G). The lesson was later to be taught in the classroom. While they constructed their lesson the teachers articulated their thinking about the lesson content, the teaching strategies they would use, and the learning outcomes. The audio taped verbalisation was gathered simultaneously with the written lesson plan. This provided data, not only on the teachers’ discipline knowledge but also on his or her ability to demonstrate how they would transform knowledge of subject matter into a form that year 9 or 10 students could understand.

**Video-stimulated recall interview**

A very effective data gathering technique, which has been used quite extensively in educational research, is video-stimulated recall. It is a valuable methodology for gaining insight into the implicit theories and beliefs of teachers, and the relationships between beliefs and actions (Calderhead, 1981; Dunkin et al., 1998; Ethell & McMeniman, 2000; McMeniman et al., 2000; Meade & McMeniman, 1992), as well as capturing the complexity and subject specificity of classroom interaction (Lyle, 2003). Cognitive processes can be followed by inviting interviewees to recall, when prompted by a video replay, their concurrent thinking during the particular event.

Many commonly used research methods do not allow access to the thinking of teachers at the time of teaching (McMeniman et al., 2000). Thus, a drawback to observation alone is that it can be fallible and highly selective, and limitations of interview and survey data are that they are removed from the teaching/learning context and can be, for a variety of reasons, unreliable predictors of actual classroom behaviour. An advantage of video-stimulated recall methodology is the naturalistic context and the holistic approach to the cognitive system (Lyle, 2003). Also, ‘pious bias’ or self presentation of interviewees is minimised (McMeniman et al., 2000) because the videotape presents correlation or otherwise, between what the teacher claims they know and believe, and what they actually do. Recalling the events of the lesson by this method also plays an important role in teacher reflectivity (Wear & Harris, 1994).
Video-stimulated recall was chosen as a key data gathering method in my investigation into why teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi occurs as it does in social studies classrooms. Each teacher participant’s classroom lesson was filmed on video camera. Immediately after the lesson, the videotape was replayed during an unstructured interview, following the technique outlined by Nespor in his 1985 study (cited in Meade & McMeniman, 1992). The video recorder was stopped by either the teacher or researcher at particular points, in order that the teacher elaborate on decisions they were making at the time about the lesson content, how they were conveying that to the students, or how students were reacting to it (video-stimulated recall interview protocol is included in Appendix H). This session was audio taped for later transcription. Using this technique after the classroom lesson allowed access to the teacher at the time of teaching. As the teacher explained incidents and decisions in more detail, the researcher gained more insight into how they used their subject matter knowledge for teaching, in other words how they applied Shulman’s (1986a, 1987) pedagogical content knowledge.

**Data analysis**

Data analysis is summed up by Merriam (1998) as a “process of making sense out of data”, the goal of qualitative data analysis being “communicating understanding” (p.192). Consistent with the qualitative, interpretive methodology used in this study, data analysis proceeded concurrently with the data collection.

**Transcriptions**

The first step in the data analysis was to transcribe the four interviews held with each of the four teacher participants. The sixteen interview transcripts have been recorded as 1a-1d (introductory interview), 2a-2d (concept mapping), 3a-3d (lesson planning), 4a-4d (video-stimulated recall of the classroom lesson). During transcribing, each line was numbered so that when a section of thirty or more words from an interview is cited in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, it is referenced according to the participant’s pseudonym, the transcript code number, and the line numbers.

The first unit of analysis was the individual cases which were analysed independently, consistent with case study methodology. Repeated readings were made of all the transcribed interviews to gain familiarisation with the data and enable individual case studies to be written in descriptive narrative. The data were then interpreted with reference to the research study questions.
Categorisation of sources of teacher knowledge

In Shulman’s (1987) work on teachers’ professional knowledge he enumerated four major sources of the teaching knowledge base: scholarship in the content disciplines, educational materials and structures, formal educational scholarship, and wisdom of practice. Re-readings of my transcribed interview data suggested that a framework adapted from Shulman and from the McMeniman et al. (2000) study on the impact of educational research on teacher knowledge in action, would be appropriate to use in this study to categorise the sources of teacher knowledge. Key adaptations that have been made for my data analysis are the addition of ‘secondary schooling’ ‘textbooks’, ‘school organisation’ and ‘teachers’ professional organisations’ which were visible in my data. ‘Self motivation’, and ‘teacher as researcher’, which are included in the McMeniman et al. study, were not highlighted in the analysis of my interview transcripts, therefore I have omitted those categories.

The specific categories of sources of teacher knowledge developed for coding the interview transcripts are shown in Table 3.2.
The results of the attributions of the sources of knowledge for each individual teacher are summarised, with verbatim sample statements, as Tables 4.1-4.4 in Chapter 4.

**Concept map analysis**

The purpose of the concept map exercise was to examine the breadth and extent of the teachers’ discipline knowledge of the social studies topic area associated with the Treaty of Waitangi. Concept maps can be analysed quantitatively using a scoring method which considers numbers of concepts, relationships, crosslinks and examples (Artiles & McClafferty, 1991; Markham et al., 1994; VanLeuvan, 1997) or the Pathfinder
computer networking programme (Chen & Ennis, 1995). However a scoring rubric is not used in this study because the focus is on discipline knowledge and the relationship between ideas and concepts. A quantitative weighting was not seen as appropriate in this instance. Other researchers have approached concept map analysis in a qualitative fashion, for example Jones and Vesilind (1995), McMeniman et al. (2000) and Meade and McMeniman (1992). The method used in the latter study has informed the analysis of the concept maps which add to my data.

The transcripts of the concept mapping interview (Interviews 2a-2d) and the reproduced concept maps (included as Figures 5.1-5.4 in Chapter 5) were examined to identify the use of all the concepts/terms presented to the individual teachers. The concepts were then examined in terms of their relationship to each other as demonstrated by the formation of the map, the explanations of the concepts, the development of the concepts and ideas with illustrative examples, and the understanding of chronology, historical causation, continuity and change over time.

The concept map interview transcripts were also analysed and coded for sources of teacher knowledge, following the categorisation procedure outlined earlier in the data analysis section of this chapter.

**Analysis of transcribed lesson plan and video-stimulated recall interviews**

The focus on teachers’ knowledge in action, as represented by the lesson plans and explanations given by the teacher when viewing the videotape of the classroom teaching episode, seeks to address the question of why teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi topic area occurs as it does in the social studies classroom. Firstly, the lesson plans and video-stimulated recall interview transcripts (3a-3d and 4a-4d) were re-read to seek evidence of implicit as well as explicit forms of teacher knowledge. Careful examination indicated that Shulman’s (1987) categorisation of the teacher knowledge base would provide a useful schema for the classification of my data.

The organising framework I have used for coding forms of teacher knowledge revealed in the teacher discourse is illustrated in Table 3.3. Elaboration of each form of teacher knowledge has been included for clarification purposes.
Table 3.3 Categorisation of the Teacher Knowledge Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of the teacher knowledge base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on Shulman (1987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **content knowledge** - understanding of the substantive structures of the field or discipline that inform the learning area (factual information and concepts)
- **general pedagogical knowledge** - understanding of the generic features of teaching, with particular reference to classroom management, organisation and planning, teaching strategies, assessment
- **curriculum knowledge** - knowledge of curriculum documents and programmes of work
- **pedagogical content knowledge** - an amalgam of content knowledge and pedagogy that is a unique form of professional understanding held by teachers, which makes the subject comprehensible to students
- **knowledge of learners** - knowledge of student characteristics, how students learn, motivation, developmental levels
- **knowledge of educational contexts** - class size, classroom environment, school support for teachers, school government, community character and culture
- **knowledge of educational aims, goals and purposes** - philosophical and historical grounds helping teachers put their own goals in a larger perspective

The number of attributions of each category of knowledge for each individual teacher, which illustrate the major areas of pedagogical focus for the participants, are recorded in Tables 6.1-6.4 in Chapter 6. They include verbatim examples.

The collective case study involves two levels of analysis; within case analysis and cross case analysis (Merriam, 1998). Therefore in my study, after each case has initially been treated as a comprehensive case in and of itself, a cross case analysis is undertaken which, Miles and Huberman (1994) assert, deepens understanding and explanation. Using the categories of the teacher knowledge base described above, cases were compared and contrasted not only for their pedagogical focus but also to assist in illuminating answers to the research questions.
Trustworthiness of the study

The question of trustworthiness essentially asks: “to what extent can we place confidence in the outcomes of the study? Do we believe what the researcher has reported?” (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p.145). Within a constructivist-interpretive paradigm, the concept of trustworthiness (comprising the elements of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability) is put forward by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as an alternative to the positivist criteria of internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity. Lincoln and Guba argue that the research design and methods can establish the trustworthiness of qualitative inquiry and they vigorously counter criticisms that naturalistic studies are undisciplined, and are merely subjective observations. Their suggestions for considering trustworthiness are now examined in relation to my study.

Credibility of the inquiry can be established by prolonged engagement and by member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). During the course of this research study interaction with the participants was ongoing over seven months which enabled the establishment of rapport and mutual trust. Credibility of the research findings is also provided by the process of member checking, whereby transcripts and case study descriptions were given back to the participants to correct factual errors, to verify that their ideas and experience had been accurately represented, and to offer the opportunity to add further information. Peer review has added a further measure of credibility whereby two other researchers, familiar with the work of Shulman (1987) and McMeniman et al. (2000), have checked the categorisation of the data. Dependability, paralleling the conventional criterion of reliability, is concerned with the stability of the data over time (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). It is therefore important that documentation of the study should reveal the logic of the process and decisions made about the method, a process Guba and Lincoln refer to as a dependability audit. For the duration of this research all interview transcripts and notes, all unitised data and comparative data, have been coded and retained to contribute to an audit trail or chain of evidence. This documentation will allow people to judge the trustworthiness of the outcomes by being able to track the work from beginning to end. Dependability of the research also includes providing explicit description of the role of the researcher (Miles & Huberman, 1994) which I have clarified both in the introduction to the study and in this chapter under ethical considerations.

To achieve confirmability, methods and processes have been described explicitly throughout the actual sequence of the research process (Miles & Huberman, 1994).
For this reason the research design and process have been outlined in detail earlier in this chapter. Further, a multiple method approach or triangulation has been used “not as a tool or strategy of validation, but an alternative to validation” (Flick, 1998, p.230). Triangulation has also provided multiple perspectives to clarify meaning by identifying different ways the phenomenon is seen (Stake, 2000). The semi-structured interview and concept mapping task are used to capture teacher knowledge, beliefs and conceptual understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in the New Zealand setting. Cognitive tasks including the concept mapping and lesson planning activity, as well as the stimulated recall of the classroom lesson, are employed to uncover teachers’ tacit knowledge and to examine the interaction of thinking and practice. Together the data present a comprehensive picture of teacher knowledge in an area of essential learning about New Zealand society (Ministry of Education, 1997a), and the implementation of this knowledge in the classroom. The combination of multiple practice, empirical materials, and perspectives in a single study is, according to Flick (1998), “a strategy that adds rigour, breadth, complexity, richness and depth to any inquiry” (p.230).

Transferability parallels the positivist measure of external validity or generalisability. Critics have suggested that case studies provide little basis for scientific generalisation but this is countered with several arguments from a qualitative perspective. Some researchers such as Guba and Lincoln (1989), reject generalisability as a goal in qualitative inquiry but see transferability referring to extensive and careful descriptions, so that readers can apply “the study to their own situations” (p. 242). Merriam (1998) Schofield (1993) and Stake (2000) also suggest that rich detailed in-depth description provides sufficient evidence for transferability. Stake alleges that:

> case studies which describe cases in sufficient descriptive narrative so that readers vicariously experience these happenings can draw conclusions … [and] make steps towards generalisations. (p.439)

My study of four individual teacher’s knowledge and classroom practice, related to a contemporary issue in New Zealand society, has usefulness and relevance when considered in light of Stake’s (2000) argument that it is possible to use ‘naturalistic generalisation’ to take findings of one study and apply them to understanding another similar situation. He suggests that “illustration as to how a phenomenon occurs in the circumstances of several exemplars can prove valuable and trustworthy knowledge” (p.444).
It is also possible to use the case study to generate what Yin (1994) has referred to as ‘theoretical propositions’. Using the more traditional paradigm to justify generalisability in qualitative inquiry, he argues:

case studies … are generalisable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes … . The investigator’s goal is to expand and generalise theories (analytic generalisations) and not enumerate frequencies (statistical generalisations). (p.10)

My intention has not been to produce a standardised set of results that another researcher in the same situation or studying the same issue would produce. But Yin’s (1994) analytic generalisation or Bassey’s (1999) ‘fuzzy generalisation’ support the transferability of the findings of the study. What Bassey labels a fuzzy generalisation “arises from studies of singularities and typically claims that it is possible, or likely, or unlikely, that what was found in the singularity will be found in similar situations elsewhere” (p.12).

It has been my objective in this research inquiry to use the case studies and the cross case comparisons to produce "a coherent and illuminating description of and perspective of a situation that is based on, and consistent with, detailed study of the situation" (Schofield, 1993, p.202). In this way it is possible for the reader, or other researchers, to maximise learning from the collective case study. As Schofield notes, the consensus now emerging among qualitative researchers is that:

generalisability is best thought of as a matter of the ‘fit’ between the situation studied and others to which one might be interested in applying the concepts and conclusions of that study. (p.202)

Summary

In this chapter I have explained and justified the methodology and research design for this study. An interpretive approach is adopted to examine teacher knowledge and practice of an essential area of learning about New Zealand. A case study strategy is used to examine what four teachers of social studies know about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand, and to investigate how they apply their pedagogical content knowledge. The sample of study participants, and ethical issues surrounding this inquiry, have then been described. Data gathering methods which include interviews, concept mapping, think-aloud lesson planning, and stimulated recall of the classroom lesson, have been outlined in some detail, as are the data analysis procedures based on Shulman’s (1987) categorisation of the teachers’ professional knowledge base. Finally, the steps taken to address the trustworthiness and transferability of the research have been discussed.
In the following chapters I present and analyse the data for this study. In Chapter 4 the four individual cases and the sources of teacher knowledge will be presented. Chapter 5 examines teacher knowledge and conceptual understanding of the social studies topic area under investigation, and Chapter 6 reports on the examination of teacher knowledge in action, as the participants plan their lessons and implement them in the classroom.
Chapter 4

THE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

Overview

This chapter introduces the four social studies teachers who agreed to be participants in this study. Each individual is described in narrative form using data from the first semi-structured interview. The teachers provide details of their academic background and teaching career, information about their school social studies teaching programme, their attitudes to the inclusion of New Zealand’s history in the social studies curriculum, and their approach to teaching the “essential learning area about New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23) being investigated in this study. Within each of the case descriptions, short comments or phrases have been included verbatim in direct speech while longer quotations which augment the narrative have been indented. The narrative descriptions have been subject to teacher participant checking.

In this chapter I also address the question: when and where have the teachers acquired their knowledge for teaching? The primary data used to examine the sources of each teacher’s knowledge base have been derived from the introductory semi-structured interview (transcripts 1a-1d) which particularly sought this information. Data have also been gathered from an analysis of the concept mapping, lesson planning and video-stimulated recall interviews (transcripts 2a-2d, 3a-3d and 4a-4d), where sources of teacher knowledge occasionally entered the dialogue.

Analysis of this data suggested that a framework to categorise the sources of knowledge adapted from Shulman (1987) and McMeniman et al. (2000) would be appropriate to use to display this information. Key adaptations that have been made are the addition of ‘secondary school’, ‘text-books’ ‘school organisation’ (head of department, management practices) and teachers’ professional organisations, which were visible in the data. The organising framework I have used for this study is detailed in Chapter 3 and includes: university/tertiary study; teacher training; secondary schooling; curriculum documents; textbooks; school organisation and practices; teachers’ professional organisations; professional development; critical other; professional reading: books, journals, internet, other media; own learning; intuition; personal characteristics; peer influence.
The categories are not always mutually exclusive. For instance, when a person within ‘school organisation’ was the head of department and could have been classified as a ‘critical other’ I have used the former category because of the significant role of the department leader in the guidance and source of knowledge for young teachers. Similarly, sources of knowledge classified under ‘own learning’ could also have derived from teacher understandings gained from another source such as peer influence. Unless that was stated specifically I have used the category ‘own learning’.

As the sole researcher for this study, the categories have been allocated from my interpretation of the data. Therefore, to increase the rigour and trustworthiness of the data analysis it has been checked by another researcher familiar with the work of Shulman (1987) and McMeniman et al. (2000) on classifying sources of knowledge.

Tables 4.1-4.4 accompany each of the four teacher cases and summarise the classification and mention of sources of knowledge for each teacher. Enumerating the sources of knowledge was not always straightforward because in some teacher statements more than one source is mentioned. When this has occurred, both sources have been recorded. The numbers for each source include both brief mentions and longer explanations and therefore cannot be viewed as precise numerical data. Their purpose is to provide an indication of the sources that are significant for each of the participants. The verbatim examples in the tables are not exhaustive of the teacher comments but are included to illustrate the diversity of the sources of teacher knowledge. Tables 4.1-4.4 are followed by a discussion of the key findings in each individual case.

The chapter concludes with summary comments about the four teachers involved in this study and the major sources of knowledge that underpin their classroom teaching of the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation in New Zealand since 1840, and its application in New Zealand society.

Individual teacher cases and sources of teacher knowledge

Case 1: Rachel

Rachel graduated from university with B.A. Hons. in history. The four undergraduate years were then followed by a year of teacher training in which Rachel took history and social studies as her major teaching subjects, supplemented by English as an additional teaching area. After gaining her graduate diploma of teaching and learning
she commenced her teaching career. At the time of this study Rachel had been teaching for two years.

In her first year as a qualified teacher, Rachel taught English at a girls’ secondary school in a provincial New Zealand town. Although this provided very good teaching and classroom management experience, there were some frustrations, such as the lack of opportunity to teach her preferred subjects, history and social studies. There were also limitations to social life for a young person in a small town. Rachel was not unhappy when the long-term relieving position ended after one year and she then moved to a larger urban centre. Fewer history teaching opportunities mean that, in her present co-educational school, Rachel is once again employed primarily as a teacher of English with only one social studies class.

As a teacher of social studies Rachel feels that she was well prepared during her teacher training with the requisite curriculum knowledge and is very comfortable about implementing the national social studies curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a). She also considers that her social studies content knowledge, particularly the historical aspect is well grounded, claiming “I’ve got quite a good understanding of the New Zealand history that is covered in social studies. There is some that I would need to brush up on but I like that sort of thing and it would come back to me very quickly”. She is also very familiar with the outcomes based curriculum structure of learning strands, knowledge and skills objectives, settings and perspectives for the required social studies learning.

Rachel first became interested in history during her secondary school years when she elected to study the subject in Year 12 because “my friends were and there was a nice teacher”. She continued with the subject due to encouragement from her school history teacher. She does not recollect learning any New Zealand history within social studies in junior secondary school because “we did the overseas stuff”, but she clearly remembers studying New Zealand history in Year 13, her final year at secondary school. During her university years Rachel was enthusiastic about the study of history. She undertook a compulsory paper on the nature and study of the discipline which she “found most interesting because it totally challenged me”. Several papers, relevant to the secondary school history and social studies curricula, were concerned with early Māori settlement and New Zealand society. She was also familiarised with later twentieth century academic research which has revised earlier understandings of New Zealand’s history and relations between Māori and Pākehā. In her senior school and
tertiary education years Rachel attended lectures and seminars delivered by academic New Zealand historians such as James Belich, Ann Parsonson, and Miles Fairburn.

As a young teacher and new to her current school, Rachel has not had input into the school social studies programme which is divided into units of study for both Years 9 and 10 (junior classes for whom social studies is mandatory). The units have general themes such as ‘People on the Move’, ‘People and Identity’, ‘Human Rights and Social Justice’, and ‘People and Resources’. Rachel points out that many of the nineteen areas of essential learning about New Zealand summarised in the curriculum document are integrated into her school programme, because each unit of work studied by students incorporates a New Zealand setting. There is not one specific unit that covers the whole area of essential learning about the Treaty of Waitangi. All teachers in the social studies department have the opportunity to teach the New Zealand aspects and are resourced to do so but Rachel explains that while “some of the units are related to Treaty (of Waitangi) issues, you do not have to focus on that”. Despite the school programme appearing inclusive, and meeting Ministry of Education requirements to address the essential learning about New Zealand, she points out that in reality “the studies are optional … teachers do not have to teach them. They are just suggested ways to approach the units of work”. While Rachel herself is motivated to teach the New Zealand history components whenever she can, because she sees these aspects as “her strength”, she admits that “I know that some of my colleagues that I’ve talked to avoid them”.

Rachel believes that lack of confidence with the subject content is a major reason for social studies teachers avoiding the New Zealand topics. This view reinforces findings of several studies (Grossman et al., 1989; Hashweh, 1987; McDiarmid et al., 1989; Reynolds et al., 1988; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988) referred to in Chapter 2, in which topic choices and lesson content were dependent on how well teachers themselves understood the subject matter. Rachel concludes that this is caused by her social studies colleagues having done little or no study of New Zealand history at a tertiary level and is compounded by the daily demands of classroom practice which prevents the teachers having the time or inclination to pursue greater subject knowledge. She provides an example of this situation when describing a fellow teacher who approached her for assistance with a unit of work on ‘Place and Environment’. The unit suggested a study of why particular geographic areas of New Zealand are significant for people. Rachel focused on events concerning the Māori loss of land and “why different areas are important (to Māori) and why today the Māori people are seeking redress for things
that took place after 1840”. But she contends that her colleague, amid the pressure of her other work:

could not get her head around what I was trying to say at all …. like why Māori wanted places like Mt. Cook renamed and all those different things. She could not understand why it was important to have kids understand that. So she flagged it and did her own unit on something else. (Rachel, 1a, 124-128)

Rachel perceives that it is teachers’ attitude to the subject matter that is the basis of teacher reluctance to find the time to acquire more content knowledge. It was similarly noted by Ball and McDiarmid (1990) that teachers “develop dispositions towards subjects - tastes and distastes for particular topics, propensities to pursue certain questions and kinds of study and avoid others” (p.441). Rachel considers that if her social studies teaching colleagues had more in-depth understanding of historical issues they might hold a different attitude and see more relevance for teaching topics incorporating knowledge of New Zealand’s history. She observes that currently “some of them don’t see (the past) as important … they don’t value it. Some of them say ‘Well what history?’ New Zealand is just a young country”.

The value of learning about events and issues in New Zealand’s past is very obvious from Rachel’s perspective. “If people have no understanding of what happened back then, that creates tension within people today because they do not understand why people are seeking redress and things”. Comparable comments have been made in the public domain by historians James Belich (2000, 2002) and Michael King (2001) regarding greater acquisition of knowledge about the country’s history leading to greater tolerance and understanding between Māori and Pākehā and providing more coherence to the nation. Rachel emphasises the point when she adds:

I think it is really important. And that kids can relate to it because they don’t understand [current issues] and they want to know what is going on. They hear what their parents are saying, who perhaps do not really know, so it’s good to give them some clarification. (Rachel, 1a, 157-160)

She also expresses a wish that people her age knew more New Zealand history so that they would understand more about Māori-Pākehā relations after the 1840 Treaty, and be able to discuss current national issues more knowledgably. Outside her teaching role, she finds discussions with friends fraught with difficulty such as:

trying to explain to them why it is that Ngai Tahu [a major iwi/tribe] have just got all that money, and the land that has had names changed. They don’t want to hear because they don’t understand it. (Rachel, 1a, 373-376)

Every teacher who teaches social studies in a New Zealand secondary school “should include some New Zealand history in their university degree or it should be
incorporated into their teacher training" in Rachel's view. She expresses her frustration that “at [teacher training] College you see these people that are going to teach social studies and you are doing a unit of work on New Zealand’s history and they have got no idea what they are talking about”. Further, the problem extends into schools. Rachel has only been in two schools in her two years of teaching but she has noticed that teachers from any discipline are called upon to teach a social studies class if there is a gap in the timetable. She concludes:

the one thing that really concerns me is that we’ve got people that are teaching social studies who don’t have a good understanding or confidence to teach about the Treaty and things, and they’ve got a specific attitude towards it … and that attitude comes across to the kids, and the kids pick up on it and it goes from there. *(Rachel, 1a, 421-425)*

Table 4.1 provides a summary of the various sources of Rachel’s knowledge for teaching the essential learning area about New Zealand that is being investigated in this study. Also included is the incidence of mention of sources, which provides a general indication of their relative influence.
The data presented in Table 4.1 establishes university education and teacher training as very important sources of Rachel's knowledge for teaching in this learning area. Equally important is her ongoing research for teaching in the form of professional reading of history books, access of internet sites for historical articles, and the social studies on-line facility developed by the Ministry of Education. She does not rely heavily on textbooks and makes no mention of seeking help and advice from her peers.
Critical others who have been influential in establishing Rachel’s knowledge base have been past teachers at secondary school, lecturers at university and the school librarian. Personal characteristics based on her life experiences have also impacted on Rachel’s classroom teaching in that she is able to use this knowledge to provide illustrations and examples to capture student imagination and interest, and to clarify historical understanding.

**Case 2: Amy**
The youngest participant in this study, Amy is a motivated, keen and enthusiastic teacher who relates well to teenage secondary school students. In her second year of teaching she teaches more social studies than any of the other participants, with five classes of Years 9 and 10 students. Amy also has the least history background in the group. She majored in geography gaining a B.A. at university and followed this with a year of teacher training. Her first teaching position was as a part-time relieving teacher of geography and social studies in a co-educational school until she accepted a full-time position in an urban single sex girls’ school.

Amy acknowledges that her historical knowledge acquired during her schooling and tertiary education has been minimal. She remembers no New Zealand history studied at senior secondary school because “we focused on the Tudors and Stuarts”. She does recollect learning some New Zealand history in social studies in the junior secondary school which she says was over ten years ago. “I remember doing star diagrams, and where the Treaty (of Waitangi) was signed, and that there was an immense injustice done to the Māori. But I actually couldn’t tell you how or why”.

Training as a teacher provided Amy with some foundation to teach social studies. She acknowledges that “I knew how to interpret the curriculum and (prepare) lesson plans and in terms of being able to plan units (of work)... basically I felt that I had a good start in that direction”. She considers that she was not prepared with content knowledge for social studies although concedes that “there is no way that you could possibly cover all the content in a one year training course that could get taught in the different topic areas in social studies anyway”. Meanwhile, when embarking on a teaching career as a social studies teacher, Amy felt quite confident about her specialisation geographical topics but admits her “historical content knowledge was definitely lacking”.

In her present school Amy works in a well organised social sciences department and receives continuing assistance, help and advice from her colleagues. Each year the
department as a group establishes goals and discusses the teaching programme although Amy observes that “my head of department makes the final decisions”. The programme for both Years 9 and 10 has been designed to comply with the national social studies guidelines, meet what the department considers are the learning needs of their students, and be viable with the resources available. It is a clearly prescribed programme for all the teachers and coverage of all the units of work is mandatory. Amy considers it to be well balanced with both historical and geographical topics and significant emphasis on the essential learning about New Zealand. Referring to the coverage of New Zealand’s history she explains that a large nine week unit at each year level addresses this aspect. In Year 9, a unit called ‘Turangawaewae – a Place to Stand’ looks at “early Polynesian migration to New Zealand, their culture and lifestyle, and how they adapted to life in this country”. The Year 10 unit ‘Through the Looking Glass’ focuses on “when Europeans first came to New Zealand, and the Treaty”. This latter unit of work specifically addresses the topic area investigated in this study.

Amy is happy in her teaching environment. She is directed by the department programme into the topic areas to teach, she has plenty of up-to-date textbooks and other resources, and a supportive team surrounding her. She enjoys teaching many parts of the social studies programme, particularly the units with a geographical basis which relate to migration and settlement and “we’ve obviously done quite a bit of mapping and looking at different areas of New Zealand and the landscape and things like that”. Where appropriate Amy says that she also likes to focus on current events and issues and “tries to pull that into each unit”. Her language and intonation convey her enthusiasm and interest in this sphere of her teaching. When discussing classroom delivery of the more historically based area of learning, Amy’s demeanour changes and she communicates quite candidly:

I can honestly say that I felt incredibly unconfident about teaching anything to do with the Treaty of Waitangi. Embarrassed about my lack of knowledge and yeah, just quite a daunting, a daunting task. The pronunciation of the Māori language, like being able to do that correctly, all those sorts of things. I was just very uncomfortable. I felt very uncomfortable. (Amy, 1b, 104-109)

Later on in the interview, she reiterates her unease and dissatisfaction with how she taught the topic for the first time:

I felt so uncomfortable and out of my depth. I found it hard to present the information; I found it hard to pronounce the language. I found it intimidating when I had Te Reo Māori kids in my class, … I found it really difficult, particularly because I do not have an understanding myself or any historical background. To be honest with you, if I had the choice of teaching the unit I wouldn’t. That is the nitty gritty. (Amy, 1b, 267-274)
Amy’s depth of concern about her lack of content knowledge led her to enlist the support of a history teacher colleague. She came into Amy’s social studies classes and “gave a lecture on the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi” and Amy took some notes at the time. She claims that this has given her “a bit more basic knowledge”. Elaborating on what she had assimilated through listening to her colleague she related some recollections about the Treaty of Waitangi:

... What the day was like, you know, like I’ve got that in my mind quite well now. Who was there and what was happening behind the scenes … A bit of background behind the Treaty, how it got signed … then what actually happened afterwards. So the Chiefs go away, they you know, think about it. You know that kind of thing, and all the Europeans go off in the boats and so, I’ve sort of got it in my mind’s eye, that whole section. Because that’s pretty much what I ended up focusing on with the kids. (Amy, 1b, 304-312)

Her simplistic view led me, as the interviewer, to query whether she had read any New Zealand historians’ works, such as Claudia Orange’s writing on the Treaty of Waitangi (Orange, 1987) and James Belich’s (1996, 2001) or Michael King’s (2003) histories of New Zealand, to provide more depth to her content knowledge. It drew a very clear response:

No, no, no, it’s all sounding like a foreign language. No, I’ve never read any of those books … the reason why is because I’ve never had to. I’ve never wanted to. In my tertiary education I’ve never come across it at all. …The last time that I had any type of interaction or anything to do with this kind of topic was when I was a fourth former at high school. (Amy, 1b, 346-360)

The area of learning includes taking the topic beyond 1840 to a study of how the Treaty has been interpreted and applied over time. Amy acknowledges that she “personally didn’t do that this year” because she ran out of time, so she focused on what was in the exam which centred on the discrepancies between the English and Māori versions of the Treaty of Waitangi. This was Amy’s first year of teaching the whole topic, and because she was so unfamiliar with it, she spent a lot of time floundering in the 1840’s period and progressed little beyond. In the future she contends:

I think that I need to basically cut out a lot of stuff. Because I had no real knowledge of it myself I ended up doing a lot I probably didn’t need to do. Just because I had to work it out in my own mind first. It was sort of me and the kids learning together I guess. (Amy, 1b, 284-287)

Amy openly admits her lack of content knowledge about New Zealand’s history. She has had no preparation for it and is “learning on the job”. It is difficult to find time for equipping herself with more historical knowledge and understanding when her energy is often sapped from dealing with the management challenges of five junior classes on a daily basis. She reveals an ambivalence about teaching this social studies topic
associated with the Treaty of Waitangi and its related issues as she concludes, “you have to look back in order to understand what's going on today”. Yet she thinks:

   New Zealand’s history can be incredibly boring and needs to be presented in a more contemporary manner … like our rugby team, and the way we dress, and current music … it’s really important to try and reach teenagers.  
   (Amy, 1b, 234-243)

The similarity with the non-history specialists in Wilson and Wineburg’s (1988) study of beginning social studies teachers reported in Chapter 2 is noteworthy. They too wanted their students to enjoy social studies classes but saw the teaching of a history based social studies topic as a ‘necessary evil’ and once dispensed with the teacher could move onto more interesting work. Amy shared the same sentiments.

Table 4.2 provides a summary of the various sources of Amy’s knowledge for teaching in the essential learning area about New Zealand that is the subject of this inquiry. Also included is the incidence of mention of sources which provides a general indication of their relative influence.
The summary findings presented in Table 4.2 indicate that Amy’s knowledge base for teaching the topic related to the Treaty of Waitangi is heavily reliant on the resources available in her current school environment. This includes the head of department, a history teacher mentor, and textbooks. She is also influenced to some extent by other colleagues who provide a diverse mix of advice and assistance. The significant proportion of mentions of teacher knowledge that have been categorised under ‘own learning’ more often refer to general pedagogical knowledge than to subject content.
knowledge. Although still a novice teacher, Amy rapidly assimilates pedagogical knowledge from her observations of others and from previous personal experiences of her own classroom teaching. Teacher training is mentioned on three occasions as assisting her pedagogical and curriculum knowledge but she makes no reference to any university study that helped her develop discipline knowledge of the history components of the social studies programme.

Case 3: Stephen

Stephen is the head of the social sciences department in a small rural school. After leaving university with a B.A. in history he completed teacher training, then decided to try farming as an occupation before returning to full-time teaching. Living in an agricultural community, Stephen has retained some side-line farming interests but teaching has been his major career focus for the past eighteen years. In the co-educational school comprising Year 7 to Year 13 students, Stephen is the sole history teacher and also teaches three social studies classes. Although he has remained settled in the one geographical area for a long period of time for environmental and family reasons, he has been actively involved in his teaching subject areas beyond the school. He has had roles in local subject associations, attends professional development courses, regional and national conferences, and is an assessor of national history examinations.

Stephen considers that he has a sound foundation for teaching history. He studied history in his senior years at secondary school, and took a wide variety of history papers towards his degree major which included colonisation of the Pacific, Asian history, and Commonwealth history. While he did not engage in much New Zealand history at university level he has developed a keen interest in that area during his years of teaching. He reads widely and watches television documentaries related to historical issues, people and events in the country’s past and present. He is very familiar with the writings of New Zealand’s academic historians and has read Claudia Orange’s (1987) seminal work on the Treaty of Waitangi, a number of Michael King’s books on New Zealand’s history (1991, 1999, 2003), and possesses James Belich’s video series on the New Zealand Wars. As head of department Stephen has a budget to purchase resources for the social sciences and he says “I buy resources that will enable me to deliver things better. I’ve got the spending power and I use it”.

Four years of a student’s schooling is encompassed in the social studies programme that Stephen organises and directs. Years 7 and 8, which are usually included within
primary or intermediate schools in urban areas, are part of the secondary department in his rural school. Stephen acknowledges that these two extra years have the advantage of developing a social studies programme over an extended length of time, which can thoroughly address all the learning areas about New Zealand. Teachers in the department have input into the programme objectives and the content, but Stephen has the oversight. He can therefore ensure that coverage of essential learning is comprehensive and duplication of learning material is avoided. Stephen explains that liaison with the local primary school avoids crossing over the same content areas and giving students the opportunity to say “oh, we’ve already done this, we’ve already done that”.

The social studies programme is very clearly structured with five units of work for each year level and one or two at each level are clearly identifiable as learning about New Zealand. Year 7 looks at New Zealand identity, culture and heritage, the local area, Māori migration and early Māori settlement of New Zealand; Year 8 moves onto the migration of Europeans and other cultural groups, and investigates the lives of pioneers; Year 9 examines New Zealand through the eyes of migrant children; and Year 10 considers the Treaty of Waitangi, how it has been implemented in the past and present, and the impact on race relations. Stephen maintains that New Zealand people, places and events are integrated throughout all topic studies that are taught. Current events are scheduled for classes once a month but he emphasises:

> Every day in our classes I’m encouraging staff to have a discussion on local or national issues … We’re always trying to relate things to real life situations, including the development of our sort of identity.  

*(Stephen, 1c, 209-214)*

Stephen’s department is very well equipped with good textbooks, videotapes, and pictorial resources. In his view “no teacher can expect to be trained at university to come out with the knowledge of all the things” [all topics in a school programme]. He considers that “it is really up to the teacher to do their own learning about things they do not know”. As the head of department he provides the unit plans, resources and a common assessment, and the department has a “fairly open sharing policy”. But he expects that social studies teachers “will read the resources we have got in the department and go over them and prepare before they deliver [lessons] in their class. They do have to do the research”.

The area of learning about the Treaty of Waitangi is one of the largest units in Stephen’s school programme. It is covered comprehensively. Attention is given to the nature of a treaty, the context of the Treaty signing, followed by a study of the
document itself. The unit progresses to cover events and issues “where the Treaty was ignored or cast aside later in the nineteenth century, in particular, aspects that impacted on Māori European relations”. Stephen claims:

Relevance is a key factor when students are only Year 10 and living in a predominantly conservative, Pākehā community … We look at what some of the issues are today and really try and explore them … we also get the students to actually come up with their own ideas on how they could solve things … a bit of De Bono problem solving …. (Stephen, 1c, 431-445)

Stephens’s attitudes and beliefs about the value of understanding the past to make sense of the present underpin his social studies teaching and influences the social sciences department. He operates an exemplary, well resourced social studies programme with a comprehensive focus on New Zealand. He feels:

the students come out of it, by the end of Year 10, having had the opportunity to learn an awful lot about our cultural heritage and the issues that are facing us as a country. (Stephen, 1c, 576-578)

Stephen also sees students’ understanding of the past as important not just nationally but in the sense of global citizenship. He believes:

…if kids can understand their own country then they’ve got something to compare and contrast with when they are dealing with other cultures from past, present and future. (Stephen, 1c, 300-303)

Table 4.3 provides a summary of the various sources of Stephen’s knowledge for teaching in the essential learning area about New Zealand that is the subject of this inquiry. Also included is the incidence of mention of sources which provides a general indication of their relative influence.
The summary findings presented in Table 4.3 indicate that Stephen’s knowledge for teaching in this learning area derives strongly from his professional reading of books and viewing television documentaries, as well as familiarity with as many of the appropriate school textbooks, video and CD Rom resources as are available. His frequent mentions of the national curriculum point to a detailed knowledge of the
structure and content of that document and also to an understanding of how the essential learning about New Zealand fits into his social studies teaching.

University study and teacher training, which took place over twenty-five years ago, are no longer significant as sources of substantive content knowledge but they do provide an understanding of the procedural and organisational concepts of the discipline of history. Since the 1980s, new scholarly research both in New Zealand’s history and on teaching and learning has made it inevitable that older teachers must develop their knowledge base in other ways if they are to remain informed and up-to-date effective teachers. It is therefore significant that professional development is prominent as an influence in Stephen’s knowledge base. On several occasions he refers to conferences, courses and workshops which have extended his knowledge and understanding of Treaty issues, of teaching strategies including co-operative learning, and of helping Māori students learn. In a smaller rural school, and in his position as a head of department, Stephen is more likely to offer advice and assistance to fellow social studies teaching colleagues than vice versa. Peer influence and critical other do not feature strongly as sources of knowledge.

Case 4: Kate
A teacher with twenty years experience, Kate heads a social science department in a co-educational school situated on the rural outskirts of an urban area. Kate began her teaching career as a teacher of English, geography and economics after having graduated from university with a B.A. in geography. An interest in social studies began almost accidentally when she was asked to take over a social studies class. Her university study in physical geography and some 200 level history papers in economic history and about World War II provide useful background for aspects of her social studies teaching. She did not study any specifically New Zealand history papers at tertiary level nor in her senior years at secondary school.

A move of geographical location, and a new school, led to a developing interest and focus on social studies. Kate was brought into working contact with a leading educator in the subject and she became involved with national consultation on the new social studies curriculum and in a road-show to explain the document to teachers. Ever since she has maintained a high level of commitment to the subject and has carried out a variety of leadership roles at a regional and national level alongside her full-time teaching position. Together with teaching three social studies classes, a geography
After four years of mandatory implementation of the national social studies curriculum, *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1997a), Kate is very conversant with any shortcomings. She identifies one of the issues as concerning the essential learning about New Zealand and refers to the nineteen point summary that outlines the learning from Year 1 to Year 13:

I feel that ELANZ [essential learning about New Zealand] is a bit of an afterthought really. It’s stuck in a page at the front of the book which is a strategic place to have it. However when you look at the achievement objectives, and then you look at ELANZ, you think well where do you put these? It’s an added layer if you like and I think it makes it very artificial. And this is a strong criticism that I make, it is quite difficult to actually implement. There is no clear pathway about how to implement ELANZ. I understand the reasoning behind it and the thought to bring social studies with a clear focus on New Zealand; I just don’t know whether it has actually hit the mark. *(Kate, 1d, 101-111)*

The curriculum does not provide direction as to when, or how often, each area of learning about New Zealand should be taught over the ten years of a student's compulsory schooling. It is up to each social studies department to work out a way of incorporating the essential learning areas into their social studies programme which Kate says in her school “is planned on a co-operative basis”. As the head of department, she takes various factors into account:

I’m the leader of the group and there are nine others … next year we have 12 junior classes at each level. It is quite a big school, and there are various strengths of the staff that have to be taken account. And we’ve got a young staff who are all highly committed, and highly opinionated, and have got really strong strengths in some areas. So what we do is look at what is working for the students and for us. *(Kate, 1d, 139-145)*

The key focus for the implementation of the curriculum is the learning needs of the students. While it is common in many schools to teach four or five units of work in each year of the junior secondary school, Kate’s department has decided to reduce the number of teaching units to three because she says “we are trying to do less better”. Over two years they do not cover all the achievement objectives specified in the curriculum and Kate considers that they “are actually doing a better job of delivering social studies and the concepts and ideas behind the achievement objectives by ditching some of them”.

Learning about New Zealand is integrated into most of the three social studies units at both Years 9 and 10 in the junior secondary school. At Year 9, a unit called
‘Turangawaewae - a Place to Stand’ develops “an understanding of the essential elements of what makes New Zealand New Zealand and what makes a New Zealander”. Another unit, ‘Tauiwi’ looks at ancient cultures and includes a focus on pre-European Māori and the third unit called ‘Neighbours’ considers New Zealand’s place in the Pacific. At Year 10 Kate describes the focus as moving to “what then is New Zealand’s place in the world and what are the possibilities for the future for New Zealand?” Appraising the whole programme she comments that:

the approach is to look across cultures and look at the contrasts and the similarities and differences … we’re looking at the environmental issues, we’re looking at societal issues, we’re looking at the students’ connections with all these things … that’s the basic philosophy for those two years. (Kate, 1d, 129-134)

Aspects of the learning area surrounding the Treaty of Waitangi are addressed in various units of work over the two year levels rather than concentrated in one big topic. Kate explains that “at Year 9 a platform is established for discussion of the Treaty in the ‘Neighbours’ unit, where the students gain an understanding of the effects of the process of colonisation”. In Year 10 the Treaty is dealt with in a more detailed way, with a focus on the lead up to the Treaty, and the signing of the agreement.

In their school programme Kate says that they have tried three different teaching approaches to the subject. The first is “as a human rights issue”, and the second is through simulation games such as “a foreign group arrives in a planet … they’re a small group and there is a huge group on the planet. Several things happen and it ends up where the small group takes over the big group”. The third approach is “a straight, basically an historic linear approach … a very directive sort of teaching”. She adds that they have not followed the latter method for the last ten years. After exploring the situation around the 1840 agreement, teaching and learning about Treaty issues shifts to the present day. Kate explains:

the choice we are making is to make it as active as possible and we see the leverage is in the actual signing of the Treaty and then, ‘so what?’ And the ‘so what?’ is, trying to get the person to see what’s happening now and why it is happening now. (Kate, 1d, 327-331)

For Kate, student engagement with the issues is more important than a detailed knowledge of the events relating to the implementation or disregard of the Treaty in the last 160 years.

Current information about Treaty issues is available but Kate feels that it is dispersed quite widely. She searches the internet and reads newspapers, uses the textbooks, and seeks out information from the Year 13 history teacher. She does not have the
time to read larger works of revisionist history by historians such as Michael King (2003) and James Belich (1996, 2001), and nor she claims, do most of her social studies teachers. Ready access to straightforward information, in order to teach this topic area, is a major issue. Kate believes:

that the social studies curriculum could be much better implemented and much more exciting if there was a lot more structured, factual information there … a pool of information that teachers could call on, so if you could dial up somewhere 'Treaty of Waitangi/current issues', and something would flick up and it's informative, great. The ‘Treaty of Waitangi, 1860s’, and there would be information there. Then I know my staff would take that and they could use it and manipulate it and create wonderful lessons out of it. (Kate, 1d, 335-342)

She feels that the textbooks are activity based and lack depth of content. "They are not information rich at all ... the clients of those books who miss out are the very able students and the teachers who want information". She sees possibilities for resolving the problem at two levels. Firstly, Kate considers that further development of social studies on-line, such as Te Kete Ipurangi (the Ministry of Education website), would be a great investment in assisting teachers and engendering student interest. At school level Kate has attempted to plug the information gap when employing new staff. She notes that two new young teachers she recently appointed “have more New Zealand history in their degree than my generation ever had access to … (and) if you have an open faculty like we’ve got, everybody feeds in some really good possibilities into the social studies programme development”.

Table 4.4 provides a summary of the various sources of Kate’s knowledge for teaching in the essential learning area about New Zealand that is being investigated in this study. Also included is the incidence of mention of sources to provide a general indication of their relative influence.
The summary findings of sources of influence presented in Table 4.4 demonstrate that there is no one particular source that is a significant contributor to Kate's knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi and its application over time. Social studies curriculum knowledge is evident, but there are few mentions of the acquisition of a specific New Zealand history knowledge base either in previous education and training, textbooks, or ongoing professional reading. The areas of greatest assistance are the internet and social studies teacher colleagues.
Kate’s strength is her comprehensive knowledge of pedagogy. This is pronounced in the number of mentions that have been classified as ‘own learning’; a source included under ‘wisdom of practice’ in Shuman’s (1987) teacher knowledge base. Many teaching strategies and beliefs about teaching that Kate possesses appear to have been gained through personal experiences both inside and outside of the classroom, and through acquiring an extensive understanding of the learners that she teaches.

**Discussion**

The narrative descriptions of each of the four teacher participants in this study establish the variations in their discipline backgrounds for the teaching of social studies and other differences relating to their years of teaching experience. The nature of their schools’ social studies programmes and attitudes to the inclusion of New Zealand’s history and teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi also become apparent.

Rachel and Stephen have discipline knowledge of history while Amy and Kate bring specialist geography knowledge to their teaching. Despite differences in their historical knowledge base, all four, as current social studies teachers, are expected to fulfil the requirements of the New Zealand social studies curriculum and teach the area designated as essential learning about New Zealand society, namely “the Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to current systems, policies and events” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23).

The topic area is identified by all four teachers as being incorporated in their school social studies teaching programme for Years 9 and 10, either as one large learning unit or integrated throughout the two years. Amy and Stephen clearly state that teaching of the topic in their school is mandatory. Kate suggests that aspects of the topic are covered in several larger ‘thematic’ studies, although it is unclear what specific topic content is dealt with, within the thematic units, and to what depth it is taught. In Rachel’s school the national curriculum requirement is interpreted very liberally. Issues related to the Treaty are included within some of the social studies units in the department programme of study, but in practice the teaching is optional and there is overt avoidance by several of the social studies teachers. This is reminiscent of Simon’s (1992) research into social studies programmes in a group of New Zealand primary and intermediate schools where she found a paucity of teaching topics involving Māori-Pākehā relations, and “teacher values and interests determined both the selection of social studies topics and the way they were developed” (p.259).
A foundation of formal study of history provides Rachel and Stephen with discipline knowledge of history that advantages them in their teaching a history based social studies topic. Their understanding of Schwab’s (1961/1978) substantive and syntactic structures of a discipline was indicated in the first interview (transcripts 1a, 1c), where they demonstrated an understanding of history that goes beyond knowledge of the content detail to a procedural knowledge, which includes methods guiding historical inquiry such as historical interpretation and argument. Both teachers conveyed an ongoing interest in the topic area of the Treaty of Waitangi, leading them to continue with professional reading in the form of history books, television documentaries, and seeking out historical and current events internet sites. These sources are cited as extremely important in augmenting their content knowledge for teaching. Stephen in particular, with his eighteen years of teaching experience, conforms to Wineburg and Wilson’s (1991) description of their ‘expert’ teachers having a large store of information at their command and a ‘vision’ of history.

Geography is the disciplinary specialisation of both Amy and Kate. In the initial interviews (transcripts 1b, 1d), their references to historical content within social studies, specifically to the Treaty of Waitangi topic, were very limited. Although both are prepared to seek out some relevant internet sites as sources of knowledge they profess to have no extra time to devote to professional reading of revised and updated history, and Amy acknowledges little interest in doing so. When discussing her approach to teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi and its implications, Amy concentrated on superficial events such as the “day the Treaty was signed” with little recourse to the bigger issues involved. Her naive and narrow view of the social studies topic reflects the perspective of the novice non-specialist social studies teachers in Wilson and Wineburg’s (1988) study, referred to in Chapter 2: not knowing that history is as much interpretation as fact, they do not view issues with a wider lens, and do not know enough to seek out alternative interpretations. Amy is concerned that her “historical content knowledge is definitely lacking” and is “very uncomfortable” teaching this social studies topic. It is a “daunting task”, not only becoming conversant with the basic content relating to facts and events, but grappling with the historical context and understanding the historical relationships such as cause and effect. Such comments echo the responses of the teachers in the Schempp et al. (1998) study in which they expressed “trepidation when teaching subjects in which they had little expertise” (p. 352).

Kate’s disciplinary orientation also influences her approach to teaching the historically based topic. She is unperturbed by her lack of historical content knowledge, including
understanding of the chronology, and attributes much of what she does know about the Treaty of Waitangi and related issues to prior teaching experience. She dismisses most textbooks as very activity focused and lacking depth of content and suggests that more specifically focused information for the topic should be available for teachers on a Ministry of Education website. Her interview captures extensive pedagogical knowledge, a heavy reliance on broad generalisations about the topic area, and a focus on student needs. Kate is an experienced teacher with firmly held beliefs about the subject content and its representation, which earlier researchers (Grossman et al., 1989; Gudmundsdottir 1990a; Nespor, 1987) have found to be very powerful and significant in teacher decisions. Kate sees the Treaty of Waitangi and its application over time, as a series of issues to be introduced to illustrate thematic studies at different points in the school social studies programme, not as one large area of learning to be considered in-depth. For her, the students engage with key ideas and concepts and not with historical content knowledge. In Kate’s authoritative position as the head of a large social sciences department she has significant influence over her teaching staff and oversees the programme content and teaching approaches. Illustrating Gudmundsdottir's (1991) claim that teacher beliefs and values can “act as filters for what it is considered important to know” (p.268), Kate is very influential in determining what a large number of students will learn.

Rachel and Amy are the novice teachers with two years and eighteen months teaching practice respectively. Their disciplinary orientations differ, affecting their familiarity and understanding of the topic area under investigation, but they do share some common factors. In their initial years of teaching it is unsurprising that tertiary study, teacher training and secondary schooling are still influential as sources of knowledge. It is the influence of a ‘critical other’, in the form of a university lecturer and senior teacher in the school that is also important for these young teachers, reinforcing findings that a graduate degree is not confirmation that novice teachers have sufficient subject knowledge for teaching secondary school students. In their study of mentor and novice teachers Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1990) argue in favour of the mentoring of young teachers by more experienced teachers, to help them acquire pedagogical content knowledge. This is embraced by Amy in her teaching. Another similarity between Rachel and Amy is their lack of involvement in professional organisations. Out-of-school activities are allotted a lower priority, because their time and energy is committed to lesson preparation and more regular student contact, generated by heavier class teaching loads, than the senior teachers.
As practitioners for eighteen and twenty years, Stephen and Kate are the experienced teachers in this study. They currently lead social science departments and are well acquainted with the national social studies curriculum document (Ministry of Education, 1997a), which is fundamental for their school programme planning. Further similarities evident in the first interview (transcripts 1c, 1d), are their involvement in their subject areas beyond their school environment, awareness of staffing for implementing their teaching programmes, and cognizance of resourcing implications in their social studies departments. They are also mindful of the type of school community they serve and their students' learning needs. The main area in which they differ is their disciplinary orientation, which influences their perspective of which historically based topics will be included in their school programmes and how such topics will be taught. This resonates with Wilson and Wineburg’s (1988) finding that “disciplinary backgrounds wield a strong – often a decisive influence on teachers instructional decision-making” (p.526). For Stephen, the inclusion of New Zealand’s history is a very significant part of his social studies programme because of the relevance for young peoples’ understanding of today’s society. For Kate, any history content is incidental to providing studies that will exemplify important and over-arching social studies ideas and concepts such as individual and group responsibilities, social justice and human rights.

**Summary**

In this chapter I have introduced the four social studies teacher participants and broadly discussed their knowledge and understanding of the area of essential learning about New Zealand being inquired into in this study. I have also elaborated upon their sources of knowledge for teaching in this topic area. In the next chapter I will investigate, in more detail, the discipline knowledge held by the four teachers for teaching the social studies topic associated with the Treaty of Waitangi and its application to policies and events in New Zealand’s past and in the present day.
Chapter 5

MAPPING TEACHER KNOWLEDGE AND CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING

Overview

This chapter reports on the results of the investigation of teachers’ concept maps which represent four social studies teachers’ knowledge and conceptual understanding of an area of learning of New Zealand’s history. The question examined is: What do social studies teachers know about the topic area summarised in Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a) as:

the Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to current systems, policies and events. (p.23)

As explained in Chapter 3, the teachers were asked to construct an adapted version of a concept map (Novak & Gowin, 1984) with a range of 30 concepts/ideas that I had chosen from social studies textbooks (Ministry of Education, 1997b; Naumann, 2002; Naumann et al. 1990; Stenson & Williams, 1990) most commonly used in New Zealand schools for teaching the area of learning outlined above. The concepts/ideas selected were: Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori, Pākehā, founding document, living document, tangata whenua, sovereignty, governorship, chieftainship, mana, kāwanatanga, rangitiratanga, confiscation, land sales, assimilation, grievances, wars, passive resistance, Parihaka, Land March, Bastion Point, Māoritanga, biculturalism, language, taonga, land claims, Waitangi Tribunal, fisheries, foreshore issue, Principles of the Treaty.

The teachers were instructed to organise these concepts/ideas into a map that represented for them how they conceptualised this area of learning and the way they thought about their teaching of this curriculum area (procedural details are outlined in Appendix F). As the teachers participated in the mapping task they thought aloud about the arrangement of the concepts, how these were linked in their mind, and the meanings of the relationships they made. They did not have access to any textbooks or historical resource materials during this activity. The exercise was followed by a semi-structured interview which asked for justification of the arrangement of the concepts, the thinking behind the map, and why various concepts were linked together.
The data are reported in this chapter firstly as the concept maps created by the four teachers which are reproduced as Figures 5.1-5.4. Secondly, narrative descriptions of teacher knowledge and understanding of the social studies topic, as evidenced in the maps, are presented. These are amplified by the think-aloud and interview data (transcripts 2a-2d) and include verbatim quotations. In the descriptions of the concept maps, references to the concept labels are shown in italics. A discussion on the nature of the teachers’ substantive knowledge and conceptual understanding of the area of learning associated with the Treaty of Waitangi follows. A summary of the findings concludes the chapter.

Concept mapping teacher knowledge

Rachel
Figure 5.1 is a reproduction of Rachel’s concept map illustrating her knowledge and understanding of the key concepts/ideas and terms embodied within the area of essential learning about New Zealand outlined in the introduction to this chapter.
Figure 5.1 Concept Map: Rachel
When Rachel began the mapping exercise she immediately recognised the concepts and terms provided and declared that she could “see a pattern to it”. There was no pre-arranged organisation but her familiarity with most of the concepts enabled her to unhesitatingly begin sorting them into a format that charted her thinking about this area of learning. As she proceeded with the activity, she explained the reasoning underlying the development of her map. The central focus of Rachel’s thinking was Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) which she placed at the top of her map. A chronological approach was adopted although she did not follow a linear path in her construction. After some consideration of the Treaty itself in 1840, she moved to present day implications and applications of the Treaty, and then began to fill her visual picture with other concepts and ideas.

Beneath the Treaty of Waitangi label Rachel arranged Māori and Pākehā as the signatories of the founding document for the coexistence of the two races in New Zealand after 1840. She also sees it as a living document in the sense that the Treaty promises are now incorporated in current laws and regulations associated with central and local government. Rachel is clearly acquainted with the phraseology consistently used in government policies and official statements. She is also familiar with the Māori concepts and terms. Some of them have become regularly used in New Zealand writing and speaking but she commented:

Pākehā do not have a good understanding of them … I don’t mean all Pākehā, I just mean those who haven’t had the opportunity to understand where the Māori are coming from with those terms. Because I know my grandmother wouldn’t understand them at all. (Rachel, 2a, 133-137)

She noted on her map that key ideas within the Treaty are mana, Māoritanga and tangata whenua and verbally she was able to give the approximate English translations. She referred to tangata whenua as “people of the land” and mana as respect and prestige, but indicated greater understanding as she elaborated:

there is no English translation for a real understanding of tangata whenua. It’s more than just owning something … there’s so much more to it than that, the whole spiritual side … if the Pākehā took that quite literally, the people of the land, they’d just think the ownership of the land was important … You can have mana, you can give mana to someone … or you can have mana taken away from you … . (Rachel, 2a, 59-74, 89-90)

Content knowledge is illustrated in Rachel’s early decision to give attention to issues arising from the three clauses of the Treaty. She is well informed about the problems of the language in the English version of the Treaty as opposed to the version translated into Māori which the indigenous people signed. She accurately identified kāwanatanga in the Māori version as literally meaning governorship but which appears as
sovereignty in the English version. Likewise she matched rangitiratanga in the Māori version with chieftainship in the English version. The interpretation issues underlie much of the discontent that has existed since the early years of the existence of the Treaty. Rachel highlighted the concepts because she is aware that they are still contentious in New Zealand society today and are related to modern day issues “that kids want to know about”.

Further evidence of content knowledge was demonstrated by the placement of the Waitangi Tribunal in the present day section of her chronologically arranged map. She knew that this body was established in the last twenty years, to investigate Māori grievances that have arisen over 160 years and to make recommendations to the government for appropriate redress. Rachel arranged the specific examples of grievances as land sales, land claims, fisheries and foreshore issues and then linked these together with the concept of taonga. She explained that “taonga … are their prized possessions, and it’s not just things that are tangible”.

The third identifiable part of the concept map exhibiting a fairly detailed content knowledge, is related to the series of Māori protests against their loss of lands. Key events such as Parihaka, the Land March and Bastion Point are correctly connected with passive resistance. Only three concept labels relating to events had been provided by me as the researcher, but Rachel was able to add other examples and wrote latter day protests, “Moutoa Gardens 1995 and Hīkoi of Hope 1998”, onto her concept map.

Once key events were visually in place, Rachel saw relationships and linkages between the concepts/ideas. Moving beyond the 1840 Treaty she commented on the government policy of assimilation of Māori which, together with confiscation of their lands, led to an accumulation of injustices into the twentieth century. At the bottom of her map, Rachel placed the concept of biculturalism which, as the present day official government policy, she observed is the “desired outcome”. Reflecting on the relationship of biculturalism to grievances she wrote “we can’t have biculturalism until grievances have been addressed”. The relevance of the concept of biculturalism, to students’ understanding of current issues for New Zealand society, led her to comment further about wanting to challenge students to think beyond dates and events when examining these ideas in the classroom:

I’d get the kids to deal with this idea of biculturalism and put it to them ‘Are we really a bicultural nation?’ … and they can start making some predictions … even getting them to come up with solutions.

(Rachel, 2a, 483-486)
One area of uncertainty which was illustrated in the mapping task relates to the *Principles of the Treaty*. Rachel interpreted this concept label to mean principles implicit in the treaty document, such as *mana* or respect, acceptance of Māori as the *tangata whenua* or people of the land, and acknowledgement of *Māoritanga* or Māori culture. Rachel made no reference to the Principles of the Treaty as a set of explicit principles which have been established through the work of the Waitangi Tribunal and Court rulings since the mid 1980’s.

During the mapping exercise Rachel indicated that she could use her personal experiences and recollections of living in Wanganui in 1995 during the lengthy Moutoa Gardens protest, to help develop historical understanding and hook students into the issues involved. While adding the event to her map she recollected:

> While it was scary living in Wanganui at the time ... it was an experience I could talk to the kids about. And I often do when I’m talking about the Treaty. They (Māori) knocked down the statue of Balance (Pākehā Premier in 1890’s) and knocked his head off. He was a symbol, it was all about symbolism ... (and mostly) ... it was passive resistance, they didn’t fight anyone. ... my granddad was very anti-Māori and anti their redress and their grievances (over land). He didn’t have any understanding of it. ... ‘bloody Māoris’ was all he ever said. But he took a big box of apples down to the kids who were at Moutoa Gardens. He didn’t want the kids to go hungry ... and he was on TV for it. (Rachel, 2a, 348-362)

Rachel sees the use of anecdotes as a way of discussing symbolism and explaining the concept of *passive resistance* and what land *grievances* are all about. She also demonstrates an empathy with the students she teaches, knowing what will ignite their interest and what can make historical events relevant to present day issues.

Contemplating her concept map and its implementation in the classroom, Rachel said, “This is how I’d go about it”. She sees the big picture of the area of learning “as a timeline where you do not have all these ideas going all over the place. You can see the order of it, a logical order”. There would be flexibility, she considered, in the breadth and depth that might be developed with able students compared with a less able group. Rachel’s final comments indicated that for her the mapping exercise was not a difficult task, “I knew all the terms ... I just played with them a bit and thought about the way I would teach it really”.

**Amy**

Figure 5.2 is a reproduction of Amy’s concept map illustrating her knowledge and understanding of the key concepts/ideas and terms incorporated within the area of essential learning about New Zealand outlined in the introduction to this chapter.
Figure 5.2 Concept Map: Amy

Te Tiriti o Waitangi

The Treaty of Waitangi

Historical

- The founding document

Principles of the Treaty

- Pākehā
- Māori

What did it mean for these 2 groups?

- tangata whenua
- kāwanatanga
- rangatiratanga

Results of the Treaty and its principles

- confiscation of land by Pākehā
- land sales
- wars
- mana

Led to:

- between the tribes
- between Pākehā/Māori
- loss of tangata whenua

The ultimate result was:

- assimilation of the indigenous culture (Māori) by the dominant one (Europeans)

Contemporary

- Results of Conflict between Māori & Pākehā
- Govt. recognised issues of Treaty. Made NZ legally, trying to stop loss of Māori culture e.g. Te Reo legal language
- Body appointed for Resolution of contemporary conflicts & issues arising from the Treaty

- The living document
- NZ/Aotearoa
- biculturalism
- language

- Waitangi Tribunal

- Deals with grievances
- taonga
- land claims
- fisheries
- foreshore issues

Led to:

- Māori saw the Treaty as more of an 'Agreement' for peace etc. and that their society/culture/land/resources etc. would remain intact.

Results of Conflict between Māori & Pākehā

- Land March
- Parahaka
- Bastion Point
- passive resistance

Loss for tangata whenua
Providing Amy with thirty terms and concepts associated with the Treaty of Waitangi topic area made the task far less intimidating than asking her to complete an achievement test in order to ascertain breadth and depth of subject knowledge. In a previous interview Amy had indicated that, as a visual learner herself, she used diagrams, tables and charts regularly in her teaching as she felt they summarised key ideas and made learning easier for her students. When Amy was presented with the concept labels therefore, she was eager to begin creating a visual representation of how she viewed the learning area. Verbal explanation and justification for the placement and linkages between the concepts and terms accompanied the activity.

*Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (the Treaty of Waitangi) was identified as the key concept at the top of her map. Amy’s structured approach to the mapping activity was to divide the concepts into historical and contemporary sections under which she sees the Treaty as the *founding document* in the past and a *living document* in the present. Early on she singled out Māori and Pākehā as associated with the *founding document* “because the Treaty was signed in the hope that Europeans and the Māori people would come to some kind of agreement so that they could live together in New Zealand”.

Having taught the historical section earlier in the year, Amy had a good recollection of the important terms of the Treaty and the language used in both the Māori and English versions. Under Māori Amy placed the Māori words tangata whenua, kāwanatanga, rangitiratanga, Māoritanga, and then explained that Māori as tangata whenua (people of the land) signed the Māori version of the Treaty. Their version meant to them that they retained rangitiratanga or chieftainship. She commented that Māori understood that “the hierarchy of their society would still be kept together and the chiefs could make decisions … so the way they ran their society was not going to change too desperately”. They also retained kāwanatanga which Amy correctly translated as governorship. This conveyed to Māori that they “would still be able to govern their own land and resources as they knew it”. The concept of sovereignty was recognised and associated with the English version. She placed the word on her map under Pākehā and commented correctly that “Pākehā thought that the Treaty said that Māori gave up sovereignty”.

Amy arranged results of the Treaty in the historical section of her map as confiscation, land sales, and wars between Pākehā and Māori, and loss of mana for Māori. She did not clarify that these were not the results of the document itself but were the effects of the way the Treaty was set aside in the later nineteenth century. An understanding of
assimilation as the policy of absorption of the indigenous culture by the dominant Pākehā one, is an accurate interpretation in the historical context.

On the contemporary side of her map, Amy correctly sorted out many of the concept labels that fit appropriately into the later twentieth century and present day. Her knowledge was more hazy in this section as she explained:

there are some problems that occurred before proper bodies were appointed in order to sort out the grievances and deal with the Treaty of Waitangi for each party … until that occurred we had problems and Bastion Point and Parihaka were two examples of that, that I know of. I don’t know them well because I haven’t taught them. But they were two examples of problems that occurred sort of around the 1960s or 1970s perhaps. This comes from when I was small myself. I remember it sort of happening but I don’t understand the ins and outs and whys and whatnots and things like that about it. But I would if I had more time. (Amy, 2b, 399-421)

Several other protests over land have taken place in the later twentieth century but these did not come to mind and Amy did not add any other examples to her map.

Amy’s preparation for a lesson on the Waitangi Tribunal, set up to address Māori grievances arising from the way the Treaty has been interpreted in the past, meant that she was familiar with the terms and ideas associated with this body. In the mapping activity she accurately pinpointed grievances, land claims, fisheries and foreshore issues as matters that have been, and could be, investigated by the Tribunal. She appropriately included taonga and refers to this as “all things sacred” for Māori. While arranging the group of concept labels Amy commented, as she thought aloud, that she “does not understand, some of the time, some of the grievances”. However, an understanding of the concept of the Treaty of Waitangi as a living document is illustrated when Amy placed the labels biculturalism and language directly beneath. She explained that the government has established biculturalism as an official government policy and made Te Reo Māori an official language of New Zealand.

The completed map contained only a few inaccuracies. Amy sees wars between Māori tribes as one of the results of the Treaty when in reality inter-tribal warfare featured pre-1840 (Naumann et al., 1990). Amy also commented that “something tells me that passive resistance has something to do with Parihaka. I don’t actually know the story (Māori protest against sale of their land in 1881) but I know the song by Tim Finn”. The association of Parihaka with passive resistance is correct but by placing the event in the contemporary section of her map she chronologically misplaced the protest by a century. The Principles of the Treaty was placed in the historical section, having been interpreted as implicit principles within the Treaty document rather than the Principles
which have emerged over the last twenty years from the Waitangi Tribunal and Court rulings.

At the end of the mapping session, Amy acknowledged that she enjoyed doing the mapping activity because “I like doing things like that” and “this is how I would like to teach the topic area”. Doing the exercise, with the key concepts and ideas provided, had shown her a way of identifying what is significant in the learning area. Being unable to differentiate the important from the unimportant had been the problem when Amy taught the unit for the first time, and she could not progress beyond the 1840s. She became bogged down with detail and explains how she:

never got around to (the contemporary issues). I had eleven weeks in which I taught the actual unit. It wasn’t enough, it was too messy. And I had to cut out of it, the whole of the land wars section. It (the unit) was just absolutely ginormous and not being an historian, I’m a geographer; I don’t know all that sort of stuff. … It’s a very in-depth unit the way it is written. …I tried to cut some things out but there were some things I had to do for my own understanding that I couldn’t cut out, that I could recognise that the kids would need to know as well. (Amy, 2b, 477-492)

Amy considers that when she teaches the unit again she will have a better overview because having done the mapping exercise she is able to visualise the whole learning area. She was happy with her arrangement of the concepts and commented that “my knowledge is marginal but I think it’s really good to sort it out in my own mind”. She is keen to acquire more depth and breadth to her knowledge because she says:

‘I think that the contemporary issues are the more important today. I mean it is very important that you have an understanding of the Treaty and how it is applied [in the present]. That is what is affecting the kids today.
(Amy, 2b, 520-524)

Stephen

Figure 5.3 is a reproduction of Stephen’s concept map illustrating his knowledge and understanding of the key concepts/ideas and terms embodied within the area of essential learning about New Zealand outlined in the introduction to this chapter.
Figure 5.3 Concept Map: Stephen Te Tiriti o Waitangi
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When Stephen laid out the thirty concepts he suggested that his initial approach to arranging them as an overview of the Treaty of Waitangi topic area would be chronological. He immediately sorted the concept labels into groups associated with the Treaty document, nineteenth century issues, later twentieth century protests and present and future ideals. After introductory comment about his own Ngai Tahu ancestry, he began to arrange the concepts providing verbal explanation and reasoning for the placement and linkages as he did so. He selected Te Tiriti o Waitangi as a central concept label because it was the founding document that established “the relationship between the British Crown and the Māori tribes of New Zealand”. Linked as signatories to the Treaty in 1840 are Māori as the tangata whenua or people of the land and Pākehā as tāuiwi (foreign race). He noted that “for Māori, the Treaty is still a living document”.

Stephen is familiar with the clauses of the document itself and referred to the missionary Henry Williams, who translated the English version into Māori which was the version most Māori understood and signed. Stephen observed “that the United Nations acknowledges treaties in the indigenous language and this is the version that is recognised”. He then correctly identified the key concepts in both the English and Māori versions which have continued to cause problems in the translation and interpretation. On his map he lined up rangatiratanga and chieftainship with sovereignty. He did not make propositional links on the map but verbally explained that Māori understood they would retain rangatiratanga (meaning chieftainship) while the English version talked about giving up sovereignty (the authority to rule and make laws). He indicated thorough understanding as he elaborated:

the Māori word for sovereignty is rangatiratanga which interestingly wasn’t used in the translation. The Henry Williams translation used kāwanatanga which means governorship. Māori were not prepared to give up sovereignty; they were prepared to give up governorship. (Stephen, 2c, 71-76)

Implementation of the Treaty was the next focus in Stephen’s layout. While arranging a series of labels in the nineteenth century section of his map, he thought aloud about the issues important for Māori at that time:

The Treaty was one of the things that was supposed to protect them from illegal land sales … They weren’t supposed to forcibly have their land taken from them. But it became an issue when the Treaty did not provide the protection that it should have done. It led to conflict which provoked wars. And in response, because they came out on the losing end … . A lot of land was confiscated. (Stephen, 2c, 80-88)

Expanding further on this section he talked about the pressure on Waikato and Taranaki Māori to give up their land for increasing Pākehā settlement, and the conflict
arising over land being bought from (Māori) people who were not entitled to sell it because of the collective iwi (tribal) ownership of land. Communal ownership contrasted with the Pākehā view of property ownership as individual tenure. He also decided to add the King Movement, centred in the Waikato, to his map and observed that “a lot of tribes did not actually sign the Treaty, some of the Waikato ones”. So, he asked “should the Treaty have been binding on them anyway?”

Māori reaction at the Pākehā government’s disregard of the Treaty was considered when Stephen linked a series of concept labels under the heading ‘19th century attempts to achieve justice’. He chose passive resistance at Parihaka, under the leadership of Te Whiti, as one way in which Māori tried to withstand the takeover of their lands. He described further Māori initiatives to seek justice, beyond the basic set of 30 concept labels he was presented with, including political movements like the Young Māori Party, and Kotahitanga or separate Māori parliament. Assimilation was recognised as the official government policy which resulted in “a lot of Māori language and culture dying out.” He amplified this in a reference to the main character in Noel Hilliard’s novel Māori Girl:

> Whose whole life was one of low self-esteem and that whole assimilation process actually advantaged European and Pākehā society but was really detrimental to those Māori, particularly those living in poorer areas. (Stephen, 2c, 228-231)

Stephen developed this idea by explaining that the government policy of assimilation continued until 1960. There were attempts (by Māori) to bring about change, “but the old ways of political parties and church groups, like the Ratana Movement … were not successful”.

The remainder of the concepts were allocated to the later twentieth century and divided into three groups; the protests of the 1970’s, government responses to Māori concerns, and ideals for the future. Articulating more in-depth historical knowledge than he included on his map, Stephen introduced the later concepts and ideas by explaining that the urbanisation of Māori by the 1960’s highlighted new issues of poverty, low educational achievement and poorer jobs. Further, in the 1970s there was “an increasing awareness among Māori that they needed to re-establish their culture, reaffirm it”. The Land March and the Bastion Point protests, which he noted were led by Whina Cooper and Joe Hawke respectively, were attempts to increase awareness of the issues affecting them. Stephen also mentioned the Raglan Golf course protest as another instance where Māori brought their sense of grievance over the loss of their lands to national attention.
The final segment of the map Stephen tied together as ‘government responses’. He recorded the setting up of the *Waitangi Tribunal* to investigate grievances, which he imagines “is a much longer process than I think they anticipated in 1975”. Secondly, when adding the *Principles of the Treaty*, he commented that the government “established (these) to clarify the Treaty but (they) are not accepted. The Māori still go back to the Waitangi Tribunal, and they go back to what the Treaty says”. He accurately depicted the grievances to be addressed by the Tribunal as *fisheries, land claims, language* and the *foreshore issue*. Drawing a link between government responses and language, he observed that he often draws his students’ attention to changing attitudes over time. He also referred to the practice up to fifty years ago where “young Māori were beaten at school for speaking their language” whereas today Te Reo Māori is included in all schools’ curriculum, and government have set up kura kaupapa Māori [Māori schools which teach all subjects in the Māori language].

Conversant with current government measures, Stephen was aware [at the time of this mapping activity] of controversial legislation pending. He made a propositional link labelled ‘laws’ between government responses and the *foreshore issue*. Amid grievances being addressed by the Waitangi Tribunal, Stephen added the concept of *taonga* (sacred things or treasures) and *mana* (prestige). No written link was made but verbally he suggested that if grievances related to *taonga* were addressed, then *mana* would follow.

The concepts *Māoritanga* (Māori culture) and *biculturalism*, that Stephen considers ‘ideals for the future’, had been placed on his map quite early on in the activity. He linked the words ‘tolerance’ and ‘respect’ with the ideals and then clarified his thinking:

> Biculturalism might be the way of the future you know, that … Māori and Pākehā and other New Zealanders can live alongside and have their culture accepted and acknowledged as of value, I think that is important. *(Stephen, 2c, 151-154)*

Stephen completed the concept map activity relatively quickly and accurately. It followed a chronological pattern over the 160 years with the concepts/ideas pertaining to various sections of the time period grouped together. Looking over his visual representation Stephen agreed that it summarised most of the key events, issues and ideas that he teaches his students. A significant amount of other detailed knowledge was added both verbally, in the propositional linking statements, and in some extra written examples on his map. For instance, he pointed out that he also covers other issues and events including “the pre 1840 background, the 1840s wars, Hone Heke and the issue of rejecting the Treaty, and the Wairau Massacre as examples of
conflict”. In concluding Stephen commented that he found the activity very straightforward and considered it a useful exercise that he could use with his students as a summary learning activity at the end of a social studies topic.

Kate

Figure 5.4 is a reproduction of Kate’s concept map illustrating her knowledge and understanding of the key concepts/ideas and terms embodied within the area of essential learning about New Zealand, outlined in the introduction to this chapter.
Kate’s approach to the mapping exercise mirrored the way in which the learning area is incorporated into her school social studies programme: a thematic rather than a chronological approach. *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23) is used as a guide from which the school department has been able to develop a programme that reflects their social studies interests and beliefs and is appropriate for their students’ needs. Through years 9 and 10 different aspects related to the Treaty of Waitangi are introduced into units of work on government, human rights and justice. Kate explains the approach:

> I think it goes back to the philosophy of teaching and learning really. We’re trying to hook in to students’ current understandings and their way of thinking and embroider on that and take them to a different place. … Here we’re looking at the human rights, the problem solving. We’re looking here at justice, the pressures, and then attempts at resolution. And students can understand that, that’s the way they think. (Kate, 2d, 212-217)

During the arrangement of the concept labels Kate articulated few explanations for their placement, or justifications for any propositional links, unless clarification was sought by me as the interviewer. The concept map was headed with the phrase ‘Human Rights’, which Kate introduced as an over-arching key concept. She explained that prior to considering the Treaty of Waitangi itself she would set the background structure or context by addressing issues such as *language, taonga, mana, tangata whenua*, and *chieftainship*. The concepts would be explored in the classroom, relating them to both Māori and Pākehā cultures, highlighting similarities and contrasts.

The pathway into the section of a unit of work relating specifically to *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* is a problem solving exercise ‘How were the issues that existed in 1840 solved?’ Under the Treaty Kate included concepts of *Māoritanga, kāwanatanga, rangatiratanga*, and *governorship* and linked them to the word “interpretation”. This alludes to issues which have arisen over the way that the words in both the English and Māori versions of the Treaty have been interpreted differently since the 1840 signing. Not all the key words causing differences in interpretation are included with the Treaty grouping on Kate’s map. Some appear later in another section of the concept map.

The remaining concept labels were separated out and come under a heading of ‘Justice’. Within another unit of work called ‘A Just World’, Kate suggested that the ideas/concepts of *land confiscation, land claims, grievances* and *sovereignty* can be developed. These issues have led to a “build up of pressure” so that “attempts at resolution” (in the opposite box in the map) are made in response. In this latter grouping, *Bastion Point*, the *Land March*, *land claims*, *foreshore issues* and *fisheries*, appear as issues of more recent times. Both sets of concepts are connected by arrows
to the *Waitangi Tribunal* which is the body set up to deal with grievances dating back to 1840. Kate referred to the huge sweep of time that these ideas/events/concepts cover and stated that “this allows you to go across decades and all the rest of it. Big ideas”.

In the last twenty years, the Treaty of Waitangi has been referred to as the *founding document*, and also as a *living document* because it is currently applied through recommendations made by the Waitangi Tribunal, Court rulings, and government legislation. Kate did not make any propositional links between these concept labels, nor did she elaborate on these during the concept map interview. However the way in which Kate grouped them together at the bottom of the map suggests that they may be dealt with in discussion of present day issues in social studies classes. Finally, in a box to the side of her map she placed *assimilation* and *biculturalism* as “ideas to be tested” with students in the classroom.

After completing the arrangement of the concepts and terms, Kate moved the discussion from knowledge and conceptual understanding of the topic area to further clarification of the teaching process. She feels that their school approach has an advantage in that:

> It’s a way for us, taking it (the Treaty topic) out of the context of conflict. Because it is still such a hot potato in New Zealand … it threads it through in different ways so that they can look at it from different angles.  

*(Kate, 2d, 185-187)*

She sees a further advantage in that the approach provides flexibility in the area of assessment. Rather than traditionally structured assessments for each social studies topic it is understanding of the key ideas of ‘human rights’ and ‘justice’ that is assessed. Students have a choice of choosing a Treaty related issue to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of these key ideas if they wish to do so.

The mapping activity stimulated further thinking related to development of the teaching and learning about the Treaty topic area. Kate commented that:

> Having discussed this with you, and having some time to think about it, my inclination is that I’d like the opportunity to actually bring it all together at some stage. We don’t actually give them that. … It evolved like this because it did achieve some important concepts but it did it in a way that it was not doing the Treaty again, and that was really important so I think we’ve achieved that. … But what we haven’t achieved in the end is actually pulling it all back together again and saying ‘and now you know etc’. Part of reason is that we have formulated the big question. We need to formulate a big question that would facilitate that … we may move toward that.  

*(Kate, 2d, 188-200)*
Discussion: the nature of the teachers’ knowledge

The four teachers structured their task in different ways; Stephen and Rachel assumed a historical perspective and took a chronological approach, Amy considered the concepts/ideas from the angle of contemporary and historical issues, while Kate viewed the activity in a thematic fashion. Although they had all been familiarised with the procedure of concept mapping, the final maps did not all follow the suggested hierarchical structure of concept maps (Novak & Gowin, 1984). The formats the teachers produced were more akin to flow charts which represented their individual understanding and approach to teaching the learning area associated with the Treaty of Waitangi.

A quantitative assessment of the maps has not been attempted. Rather, a qualitative analysis has been made with regard to accuracy, the knowledge demonstrated by the propositional links, and the development of the maps through illustrative examples. More content knowledge, or lack of it, was also revealed in the verbal explanations and justifications made while undertaking the exercise and thinking aloud.

The concept maps produced by Rachel and Stephen suggest historical content knowledge which goes well beyond facts, dates and events in New Zealand's history. Their maps and accompanying verbal elaborations reflect procedural and propositional knowledge of the discipline. Not only were they both able to provide more explanations, make more associations between the concepts and include more examples than Amy and Kate, they were more focused on the principles of historical inquiry and viewed the whole area of learning in the context of cause and consequence and change over time. Similar to the history majors in Wilson and Wineburg’s (1988) study of social studies teachers, Rachel and Stephen were more sensitive to the role of interpretation, and more aware of the significance of chronology and the importance of seeing historical issues and events in a broad context.

During the cognitive task Stephen’s prime concern was to demonstrate what he knew and he concentrated on mapping his substantive knowledge and conceptual understandings of the topic area exactly as he had been instructed. The concept map produced was an accurate chronological representation of Māori-Pākehā relations over 160 years although it did not reflect all the additional elaboration on social and economic issues, Māori movements, leaders’ names and events that Stephen introduced into his verbal explanations. The more minimalist visual representation
suggests that Stephen is a teacher who relies more heavily on the oral and written word rather than depicting historical content and ideas visually. He communicated a sound history discipline knowledge which was the most extensive of the four teachers and it reflected his 18 years of teaching, regular updating of resources, reading researched histories, and following current political issues. Stephen was also more aware than the other three teachers of the organising frameworks of history, specifically the political underpinning to this particular topic under investigation.

Rachel demonstrated the flexible understanding of the topic area which Grossman et al. (1989) maintained “entails the ability to draw relationships within the subject as well as … to make connections to the world outside of school” (p.193). Not only did she express confidence with the historical content, and produced a map that demonstrated accuracy and depth of understanding, she also consistently related her knowledge to pedagogical issues of teaching. She sees herself not as an independent operator, but as part of a community of learners and she associated her knowledge and how she structured it, in terms of how she would teach. The think-aloud during the mapping task, and responses to interviewer questions, were interspersed with stories and examples that could be used in the classroom to explain and represent ideas to make the subject more comprehensible to secondary school students.

Rachel's map representation and accompanying commentary were an excellent illustration of what Shulman (1986a, 1987) referred to as pedagogical content knowledge. Her analogies used during the concept mapping interview (transcript 2a) were unprepared, but they sprang readily to mind as she thought about teaching this topic to her class. These stories highlight Rachel's awareness and 'feel' for what will interest and appeal to Year 10 students as she teaches about contentious issues. Her command of the subject matter is thorough but she explained how she wanted to do more than just transmit historical content matter to her students. She wanted to challenge their thinking and considered a critical question relating to this topic to be “Are we really a bicultural nation?” For her, the historical content is important so that students have some knowledge from which to consider and debate what is relevant to living in New Zealand today.

Amy has limited conceptual understanding of the whole topic area related to the Treaty of Waitangi. As a novice teacher without history discipline knowledge she largely considered the content in terms of basic knowledge she needed to know to be able to teach in front of a class. Similar to non-specialist history teachers in other studies (Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Yeager & Davis, 1995), she considers she has learned the
history once she has accumulated names, dates and events. Amy had acquired an appreciable amount of content in terms of facts and ideas from her reading of the textbook and clarifications from colleagues. She acknowledged that she is a visual learner herself and that she emphasises the visual in her teaching; therefore she enjoyed organising the concepts and ideas and augmented them with a surprising amount of written material. Her concept map represents a broad coverage of the learning area with only a few of the concept labels obviously incorrectly placed. It was the generalised comments made while ‘thinking aloud’ during the mapping activity that revealed Amy’s lack of in-depth subject knowledge.

Amy was unable to be precise and specific with factual detail, and had difficulty providing illustrative examples. Her comments also indicated that hindsight had led to some historical confusion. Amy suggested that in 1840, *sovereignty* meant that Pākehā thought they could “confiscate land, fisheries and resources, and it meant assimilation in terms of language, and teaching them English”. *Sovereignty*, in the English version of the 1840 Treaty document, did mean that British rule would apply to Māori as well as European, *confiscation* of lands did take place in the years after signing the agreement, and *assimilation* did later become government policy (Naumann, 2002). But it is inaccurate to suggest that in 1840 Governor Hobson or the British government had intentions of confiscating land and other resources and assimilating Māori into Pākehā culture.

Unlike Amy, Kate expressed no concerns or lack of confidence about teaching the Treaty of Waitangi topic area, despite appearing to be unacquainted with several of the concept labels. It was unclear how many were recognised as little verbal clarification was provided. It was also difficult at times for me, as the researcher, to follow the cognitive process involved in the arrangement. For example *chieftainship*, which was a word associated with interpretation issues in the Treaty document, was not included with that grouping of concepts, yet *Māoritanga* was included although that was not a word that was not incorrectly translated. *Sovereignty* was a key issue that was written into the English version of the Treaty, but that concept was omitted in that context on the map and included in another grouping. Apart from *taonga* (treasures), none of the Māori words that have been critical to understanding the translation problems and sources of Māori grievances over the past 160 years were elaborated upon. This is not necessarily evidence that Kate was not conversant with their meanings and usage, but the elucidation and explanation which were part of the talk for Stephen and Rachel during their construction of the concept maps, did not occur as Kate thought aloud when completing the activity.
Kate’s arrangement of concepts under “attempts at resolution” was another ambiguous component in her diagrammatic representation of the learning area. Three instances are cited to elaborate. If events such as the Land March, and Bastion Point are seen as Māori attempts to resolve the land issue then one would have expected to see Parihaka in the same grouping. Fisheries, foreshore and passive resistance were included with protest events, in a box labelled “attempts at resolution” which was unexplained. Kate’s suggestion that assimilation and biculturalism are ideas to be tested with students sheds little light on whether she herself has an understanding of the government policy of assimilation up until the 1960s, and the current government policy of biculturalism.

The mapping activity illustrated Kate’s awareness of some important ideas and issues related to the Treaty of Waitangi and its interpretation, but there was little evidence of detailed knowledge on the implementation of the Treaty clauses over time. Several of the concepts/ideas which appear misplaced on the map could perhaps have been justified with some verbal explanation but neither the think-aloud process nor the subsequent interview provided this. There were also very few propositional links made between the concepts that could have qualified or justified the organisation. Kate heavily emphasised pedagogy, social studies processes and student needs. She articulated her preference for looking at the “big ideas” and visualised teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi in the context of the “bigger picture”. This relates to using examples from the topic area to illustrate important social studies concepts such as ‘justice’ and ‘human rights’ because she saw these ideas as relevant to student understandings in the present day. In the same way, she prioritised social studies processes as she considers problem solving and negotiation skills to be more useful than content knowledge for her students.

**Summary**

The concept mapping activity allowed me, as the researcher, to gain an understanding of the underlying knowledge held by three of the teachers and make tentative assumptions about the fourth teacher. As an observer of the mapping exercise, I witnessed how these teachers organised their knowledge and visualised relationships between the concepts/ideas. But it was the think-aloud, which accompanied the task, that enabled me follow the cognitive process and revealed the tacit knowledge held by the individual participants.
The data enriches and provides a more in-depth perspective of the teachers’ knowledge and conceptual understanding of the “essential learning about New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23) that the participants had begun to address in their initial interview (transcripts 1a-1d). In that interview the teachers spoke in general terms and provided a more sweeping overview. The concept mapping task and related interview (transcripts 2a-2d) required that the teachers be more specific, revealing with greater transparency what the teachers did, or did not know, about the topic area being investigated. What can be ascertained from the knowledge mapping task is that Stephen and Rachel could not only recall and recognise more concepts and terms than Amy and Kate but they could also make more meaningful linkages and talk at greater length about issues related to their map. They were able to more easily determine what concepts and ideas are peripheral as opposed to what is essential. This ability has been highlighted by several researchers (Stanley, 1991; Wilson et al., 1987; Wineburg, 1997) as fundamental for competent teaching of subject content.

For Amy and Kate, the Treaty of Waitangi learning area is outside their discipline specialisation. Amy’s admission that her historical knowledge lacks depth and that her understanding is limited was confirmed during her thinking aloud while carrying out the cognitive mapping exercise. Kate’s initial interview was non-specific in terms of historical content but significant curriculum knowledge and approaches to teaching the learning area were clearly expressed. However the arbitrary arrangement of many of the concepts on the map and the few propositional links that were made between the concepts/ideas signalled a limited explicit content knowledge. Grossman et al. (1989) found in their studies that understanding the larger map of the topic area is more likely to be the case when teachers are able to effectively teach their subject. Kate verbally implied that she was familiar with the topic area under investigation in this study, but it remained for implementation in the classroom to provide more substantial evidence of breadth and depth of content knowledge.

In this chapter I have examined the teachers’ substantive knowledge and conceptual understanding about the area of learning surrounding the Treaty of Waitangi. The differences in the ways that each individual teacher thinks about the prescribed area of learning will, I contend, have implications for what these teachers can teach to their students. Chapter 6 moves forward to looking at the teachers in action: planning a lesson that comes within the Treaty topic area and then delivering that lesson to their students in the classroom.
Chapter 6

TEACHER KNOWLEDGE IN ACTION: THE OUTCOMES

Overview

This chapter examines how teacher knowledge of the topic area under investigation in this study is implemented in social studies classrooms. The four teacher participants were followed in action: planning a lesson within the Treaty of Waitangi learning area and then teaching that lesson in the classroom, recorded on video camera. A video-stimulated recall interview with each teacher followed immediately afterwards. This chapter reports on the findings.

As discussed in Chapter 3 the teachers were asked, during the audiotaped lesson planning, to think aloud as they considered their lesson objectives, the lesson content and their proposed teaching strategies. In the audiotaped video-stimulated recall interview, they were requested to stop the videotape at points in the lesson when they made decisions about topic content and how they were conveying that to students. They could also comment on student reactions to that content and other aspects of the lesson delivery that they felt was significant.

Both the lesson plan interviews and the video-stimulated recall interviews were transcribed (transcripts 3a-3d and 4a-4d respectively). These were then examined and categorised using Shulman’s (1987) classification of the forms of teacher knowledge. The categorisation framework, which was detailed in Chapter 3, in summary includes:

- Content knowledge
- General pedagogical content knowledge
- Curriculum knowledge
- Pedagogical content knowledge
- Knowledge of learners and their characteristics
- Knowledge of educational contexts
- Knowledge of educational ends, purposes and values
As the sole researcher in this inquiry the forms of knowledge have been classified according to my interpretation of the data. To provide rigour and trustworthiness to the data analysis, the categorisation has been subject to peer review by two other researchers familiar with the Shulman categories of the knowledge base for teaching.

In this chapter both the think-aloud lesson planning and the stimulated recall interview of the classroom lessons of the four study participants are reported in narrative form. Verbatim comments of the teachers are included in the descriptions. Tables 6.1-6.4, which accompany the descriptions, classify and summarise the incidence of forms of teacher knowledge identified in the interview transcripts. Sample verbatim comments only are included in the tables. Short comments as well as longer explanations are included in the number attributed to each category of knowledge; therefore the figures cannot be viewed as precise statistical data. The purpose of the allocation of numbers is to provide an indication of the focus placed on specific forms of knowledge by the individual teachers in their discourse.

Following the narrative descriptions for each teacher’s lesson planning and teaching a lesson, is a discussion of the findings. Finally a cross case analysis of the knowledge base of all four teachers is carried out in which attention is directed to the emphasis of this research inquiry; the participants’ subject matter knowledge for teaching or pedagogical content knowledge.

The chapter concludes with a summary of what the four teachers have demonstrated in terms of how teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation over time and its application today, occurs in their classrooms.

**Rachel**

**Planning a lesson: “relating it to the present day”**

Rachel planned a social studies lesson for a co-educational Year 10 class of twenty-six students of mixed ethnic composition: two thirds of the class were New Zealand Pākehā while the remaining third comprised Asian students from India, Malaysia, Korea, China and one recent British immigrant. The class make-up was an underlying factor when Rachel planned her lesson based on understandings about New Zealand society because she had to assume little prior knowledge held by a number of the students. Her lesson on the 1975 Land March was chosen as an example of Māori concern and frustration about more than a century of disregard of the Treaty of Waitangi in relation to land. In the think-aloud lesson planning interview (transcript 3a),
Rachel did not refer to the curriculum structure of learning strands, and knowledge and process learning objectives, but she revealed considerable content knowledge and clearly had objectives for her lesson in mind stating that “at the end of the lesson I want them to have an understanding of how the Land March came about, who was involved, and then what were the after-effects of it.” She elaborated on this by explaining that she needed to “look at the Treaty, both in 1840 and how that had an effect in 1975, and I want somehow to relate that to the present day”. Cognizance of the level of students she would teach and the desire to make the subject relevant was immediately evident with her comment that “there’s no point in leaving it in 1975 because that’s before the students were born”.

Content knowledge of her lesson topic was apparent. Rachel was very familiar with the facts and details about Whina Cooper as the key figure, about the events of the Land March itself, and the issues underlying the event that were associated with dishonouring the Treaty of Waitangi by past New Zealand governments. Rachel acknowledged that some of her content knowledge for the lesson had been previously acquired during tertiary study and for this lesson she would not be reliant on a social studies textbook. She was also familiar with historical books and internet sites from which she could access supplementary information and resources for student use.

The lesson structure and chosen learning material displayed evidence of pedagogical knowledge and content knowledge. Rachel suggested she would begin with a starter activity, a photograph of Whina Cooper to capture student interest. She also wanted to establish prior knowledge held by the class because “I don’t know what they know and often with their questions and the little bits of information they do give, you can build on that”. Her objective was to incorporate a variety of different learning activities to make the subject content understandable to students. A pair share learning strategy to answer questions relating to the photograph of Whina Cooper would be followed by teacher led discussion on the Treaty of Waitangi, written summary points, and then an examination of some extracts containing historical evidence about the Land March.

A feature of Rachel’s talk while planning was not only her concern with building knowledge but also with developing understanding and challenging students to think. She made clear, “I want them to be able to pull things out for themselves. I don’t want to say, here are the facts, here is what happened. I want them to interpret it themselves”. Rachel also built in a review of the lesson, a recapitulation of the main points of the lesson and an over-arching question for discussion, “Why do you think the land issue was important to Māori?” Homework questions were set as an extension of
the lesson in which students would be asked to express their opinions about the role of protests in highlighting Treaty issues, and about the future of the Treaty of Waitangi for New Zealand.

Throughout her think-aloud lesson planning, Rachel interspersed comments relating to the class of students she was going to teach. She indicated a very thorough knowledge of the students as learners; “they are very able writers”, “three are ESOL (English as second language) students so they might have difficulty especially with the Māori words”, and “they are the sort of class that ask each other for help”. She considered the composition of the class “we have a student from Britain, and lots of Asian students who have no sense of Māori language or of New Zealand history” and wanted to construct a lesson in which they could participate equally with the others. Rachel was also aware of the developmental level of many in her class, pointing out that “they are ready to start making judgments and analyse”. Yet she also had to take account of the fact that several of the students, particularly the recent immigrants, would not readily comprehend some historical resources noting that “I have the biography (of Whina Cooper) that Michael King (1991) wrote, but it’s a bit much for these students”. Her pre-lesson planning also displayed an understanding of what motivates students to learn. She explained, “I will show them pictures of it (the Land March), make it visual for them”, and “the students have to have something to hold onto from today’s world that they can relate to”.

**Teaching the lesson: “challenging students to think about Treaty issues”**

The video-stimulated recall interview (transcript 4a) followed immediately after delivery of the classroom lesson. General pedagogical knowledge with particular reference to organisation and planning of the teaching, and to management strategies, were very significant for Rachel at the beginning of this interview. She stopped the video recorder regularly to explain how she organised her classroom and her lesson and how she informed students of the lesson direction:

I like to give them an introduction at the beginning … I often put on the whiteboard in the corner, I’ll give them an agenda if you like, so I’ll be specific about what we’re covering. And I’ve got a heading or lesson title and I’ll underline it and then I’ll outline the lesson. So they know where they’re heading, they know what the expectations are. *(Rachel, 4a, 29-36)*

Rachel’s initial concerns were centred on establishing a secure, inclusive learning environment for the students. She ensured that they were not seated in positions that could give rise to management issues commenting, “I put them in pairs around the room so that the groups they hang out in are not dominating”. Similarly she is mindful
of potential management problems when giving instructions, writing them on the board as well as giving them verbally. Corrective management is very low level. Appropriate behaviour appeared to be an expectation rather than a concern overriding the learning. Rachel pointed out that, “if you can keep them at this noise level you don’t need to use any major management tools. You just need names and waiting for quiet with stopping in the middle of a sentence, that works”. Management of the class is intertwined with instructional strategies. Rachel observed that with the mainly able group of students, a regular change of learning activities and keeping up the lesson pace and momentum retains their interest and curtails any difficulties that could arise. She explained “they like it to be full on … keep the continuity going”.

Rachel was particularly clear from the beginning of the lesson as to what particular historical ideas she wanted students to understand. She demonstrated an in-depth knowledge of the ‘who’ and ‘what’ of her topic area relating to the 1975 Land March, and a wide ranging understanding about people and events in the past that had some bearing upon the 1970s issues. She considered that it was necessary in the lesson to address “the Treaty, the three clauses. I talked about ownership then I talked about land confiscation and how that happened after the 1860 war, and then about the Native Land Court”.

A central issue was the nature and complexity of the topic content, particularly linking together the historical ideas and time periods 1840, 1975 and the present day. In that context she commented:

The thing I found hardest about this lesson was linking things together … going from Whina Cooper to the Treaty …and my aim was for them to understand that the 1975 Land March had a huge impact on New Zealand’s society in terms of changing thoughts, and relating it back to the Treaty. (Rachel, 4a, 197-201)

To engage students with the historical ideas and make these comprehensible, Rachel followed her planned variety of short activities incorporating different teaching strategies. These included a pair sharing activity for photograph interpretation questions then moved on to a general teacher-led discussion designed successfully to secure all student participation, and to establish prior knowledge and understanding that students held about the Treaty of Waitangi and related historic events since 1840. Deviating from her original lesson plan slightly, a summary diagram was constructed to simplify complex connections rather than giving the students written notes.

As the teacher, Rachel acknowledges she continually attempts to remain objective. “When I’m putting my resources together, I’m very aware of the bias … I try really hard
not to give a perspective either way, like pro-Māori or pro-Pākehā”. As an historian, she also appreciates the nature of historical inquiry and referred to the use of historical evidence in her teaching. She incorporated the interpretation of two historical extracts in her lesson:

> What I do here is read out two parts about the 1975 Land March. One’s quite useful in that it’s quite factual and tells us it was significant and that it was internationally televised and that sort of thing. So they get impact of it, and then the other one is from a man that was actually there and he gives his account of what happened … talks about the spiritual side of it and the effect it had, and it gives it a bit of balance. (Rachel, 4a, 494-499)

Rachel conveyed emphatically that she does not want students learning historical facts in isolation but is concerned to stimulate thinking and challenges the students to consider the relevance of the issues raised, in the light of the present day.

Knowledge of her students and what motivates their learning, which had been evident in her lesson planning, became explicit in Rachel’s classroom teaching and stimulated recall. Students as learners are consistently referred to in a positive light. Rachel communicated a distinct awareness of the levels of learning of her students and the learning approaches favoured by them. She frequently referred to the learning needs of groups or individuals such as “I got them to do the pair share thing because there’s a couple of the kids in the class who are quite weak, they’re not as strong as the others … this helps them”.

At the end of the lesson Rachel was satisfied that her objectives had been achieved. She felt that the students had gained an overview of the 1975 Land March, the cause, the key events, the relationship with the Treaty of Waitangi, and had connected to present day land issues. Towards the conclusion of the stimulated recall session she reflected on her students’ opinions about the lesson:

> I did ask (student), she said to me, ‘oh thanks Miss that was really cool. I didn’t know what I was doing on that march; I did not know what it was for in (city). Now I do, that’s really cool, thank you’. And then (students) at the front said ‘oh it’s good to know stuff like that’. (Rachel, 4a, 694-697)

**Discussion: Rachel**

Analyses of the interview data of Rachel’s lesson planning and video-stimulated recall of her classroom lesson (transcripts 3a, 4a) reveals three significant categories of teacher knowledge: knowledge of learners, general pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge. A summary of the classification and incidence of mention of forms of teacher knowledge discernible in both interview sessions with Rachel is displayed in Table 6.1.
Nearly 40% of the talk came within the categories of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge because Rachel was very familiar with the subject content and the wider historical context. Her history discipline knowledge, gained during four years of university study, has given her an understanding of historical frameworks, a sense of chronology and continuity over time. She reflected on the complexity of the topic content and the importance to students of seeing the linkages between the past and the present. Her content material for the lesson was gathered from a variety of sources rather than a sole textbook and her historian’s understanding...
of historical inquiry led her to introduce two varying accounts of the same event so that students become cognisant of interpretations of history.

In her planning and lesson implementation in the classroom, she was able to transform her discipline knowledge into subject matter knowledge for teaching or that referred to by Shulman (1986a, 1987) as pedagogical content knowledge. The stories and analogies that were part of the think-aloud concept mapping activity are also visible in the teaching process. As has been found in previous work (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Leinhardt et al., 1991), having discipline knowledge enables more effective use of appropriate representations in teaching and also results in more conceptual explanations. Rachel is also sufficiently secure in her knowledge of content to field student questions and to facilitate class discussion. Her facility to make relevant digressions, and to encourage relevant stories from the students, is reminiscent of Hashweh’s (1987) teachers with a high level of discipline knowledge. The young people in Rachel’s class were interested in what has happened in the past and how it is relevant to society today, and the appreciation they felt in having a teacher with an informed knowledge base was expressed at the end of the lesson by several of the students in the class.

The other category of knowledge which is very significant for Rachel is knowledge of learners and their characteristics. This is strongly emphasised in over one third of mentions in the interview discourse. Most references were directed not only to the class of students as a whole but to the learning characteristics of individuals and small groups, their developmental levels, and how they can be encouraged and motivated to learn. The third important component in Rachel’s teacher knowledge base is general pedagogical knowledge. This is represented in nearly one quarter of mentions in both interviews and, for a relatively new practitioner, reflects a rapidly acquired understanding of the generic aspects of teaching. Classroom management and teaching strategies were the main focus of discussion.

Curriculum knowledge is implicit rather than explicit. Rachel conveyed an understanding of the curriculum requirements and learning objectives in the initial semi-structured interview (transcript 1a) when discussing the school social studies programme, but it was not unexpected that no reference was made to curriculum in the planning and teaching of one lesson. Similarly, in a one lesson context it was not expected that Rachel would make many mentions of educational aims, goals and purposes. Her two references to educational contexts showed she is conversant with,
Rachel’s strength as a teacher derives from her ability to use her content knowledge in combination with her general pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of learners and their characteristics. She is a competent classroom manager maintaining the respect of her students. In the two years that Rachel has been a full-time teacher she demonstrates that she has become extremely effective in developing her subject matter knowledge for teaching. She articulates an understanding of how young people learn and presents as a teacher in charge of the learning in her classroom.

Amy
Planning a lesson: “the textbook was the main inspiration”
Amy planned a social studies lesson on the Waitangi Tribunal. This lesson topic comes within the area being investigated in this study because it illustrates aspects of the implementation of the Treaty of Waitangi in the present day. Amy had completed her unit of work in the area of learning relating to the Treaty earlier in the year, but she indicated in her first interview that she had not extended the study beyond the 1840s. Although she had moved on to another unit labelled ‘Having a Say’, she considered she could include a series of lessons on the Waitangi Tribunal, set up to hear Māori grievances and make recommendations to the government for their redress, because that would provide a useful exemplary study of peoples’ democratic right to speak. The class Amy planned to teach was a year 10 class of 24 female students comprising 21 Pākehā and 3 Māori. This mixed ability group included several with literacy difficulties and behavioural problems.

Amy had conveyed in an earlier interview (transcript 1b) that she was familiar with the national social studies curriculum structure. While she did not refer to the curriculum during the think-aloud planning of an individual lesson (transcript 3b), she developed her lesson plan on a curriculum focused template. Her planning therefore was structured around the curriculum strands, and knowledge and process objectives. Two clear learning outcomes for students were in Amy’s mind as she began thinking about her lesson. “I want the students to be able to identify social and economic injustices for the Māori people as a reason why the Tribunal was set up … and also that they will be able to describe how the Waitangi Tribunal works”. Her lesson was textbook based (Naumann, 2002) because she considered that it was at an appropriate level for her students and they liked its presentation.
Before planning the lesson Amy had gained some overview of her topic area as evidenced by generalised comments about the topic content “the Māori people were suffering in terms of their human rights”, and “they were badly affected by colonisation and assimilation into European culture”. For this particular lesson Amy indicated that not only had she read the textbook but she had consulted a colleague about terms which were unclear to her. During her planning, the one specific mention of content that applied to her particular lesson was that “the Waitangi Tribunal has been the way that the Māori people of New Zealand have been able to air their grievances and it is a forum for them to be heard”. She admitted to gaps in her content knowledge of the whole topic, and commented that “I don’t know anything about the Land Wars. You know I don’t feel confident enough to actually teach that”. She communicated awareness that she needs a lot more in-depth understanding of many issues and events before she will really feel confident in front of a class to respond to student questions.

The focus of Amy’s planning for this lesson was on the needs of the learners. She had a very good understanding of the mixed range of students in her class. As a group they can be unsettled and need firm management, therefore she stated that “we’re going to share a reading together which is a good way of settling them down”. There were slower students who she acknowledged “I will have to help with this”. Amy incorporated a variety of activities in her plan, with the aim of retaining student interest and maximising participation. A further consideration was that, because she herself has had to learn the content quickly from the textbook and colleagues, she was very conscious of presenting it to students in a comprehensible way. After a shared reading activity including class discussion, she would have the students collating this key information about the Tribunal on a star diagram. To examine grievances brought to the Tribunal Amy decided to introduce a sorting and classifying exercise from the textbook, in which the students would identify social and economic grievances and categorise them in to two columns. In her eighteen months of teaching she has acquired a realistic sense of timing and observed that she would not achieve any more within a one hour lesson. She noted in her plan the essential parts she wanted to cover and that if time was running short, because of digressions and diversions that this group could bring into the class, she would modify the classification activity. Her plan still allowed for a short review of the key points of the lesson before bringing it to a conclusion.

Teaching the lesson: “being careful not to be too controversial”

In the video-stimulated recall interview (transcript 4b), which took place after Amy had taught the lesson in the classroom, she was asked to stop the tape whenever she
wished to comment about the lesson content, teacher decisions relating to the subject matter, or student reactions. As a young teacher with five junior social studies classes, management issues and teaching strategies were foremost in Amy’s mind. She recalled some of her initial concerns:

Basically I decided when I got this job at the start of the year that in order to survive I had to develop some techniques that were going to mean that I relaxed. Otherwise I would’ve gone absolutely out of my mind and given up. Having a really difficult class didn’t help that … but I think I’m a lot less afraid [now] to be myself and use my personality and my own knowledge. Yeah, and I think it’s developing that rapport over time with the kids of course …. (Amy, 4b, 396-405)

Throughout the stimulated recall of the lesson, Amy stopped the video to draw attention to management strategies that she has learned during training, through observing other teachers, and through trial and error. She has built up an extensive repertoire that she now uses automatically. To avoid student distractions or their getting confused, she explained that she reinforces all her verbal instructions in written form. She “likes to set out instructions clearly”, put “page numbers on the board” and provide clarification by “writing difficult words on the board with their meanings”. A crucial preventative management strategy she mentions is “I just have to make sure that I’m thoroughly prepared and I often include a variety of activities for them”. She also noted that, “with this particular group they’re a lot better doing structured activities than actually working on their own … they do tend do get a little bit off task when they’re left to their own devices”. Other techniques are described as simple measures like “I set these two up the front near me” and “I walk around and gauge how fast people are moving”. Amy claims to have set routines and expectations of appropriate behaviour. “This is our routine, this is what we do … they know what my expectations are”. She added, as she observed herself on the video sitting down beside a student, that “I do try and model the kind of behaviour that I am expecting”.

In conjunction with her rapidly developing pedagogical knowledge was Amy’s very thorough knowledge of the students in her classroom. The ideal learning situation, she feels, “is where the students feel comfortable and relaxed” and she emphasised “the classroom environment is very, very important”. Teacher-student interaction is ongoing throughout the lesson. Amy stopped the video on several occasions to make observations that illustrate her awareness of the connection between pedagogy and understanding the learners. She considered that “it’s sort of quite nice I feel, when I sit down with them, after we’ve had a bit of shared reading. I feel like I’m on their level and we all have a bit of a discussion together. And it’s quite good because everybody’s ideas are taken into account”. The continuous stream of positive feedback includes
“great idea”, “excellent”, “you are right”, but also the use of language such as “wicked” and “you’re onto it” that these students identify with. References to “guys” and at other times “team” convey the sense of all working together.

Amy was adamant that “what the key is for me, is to keep them interested” and expressed her strongly held belief in the importance of developing a rapport with the students. “It is really important to smile” she said, adding “I mean, who wants to be in class with a sad sack?” She is very satisfied with the relationship that now exists between her and the students because “they’re a nice bunch of kids and often we enjoy the hour we have together and I know they love social studies. I know that from their form teacher”. Acknowledging that an understanding of the students as learners, and developing a rapport with them, did not just happen, she said “it has taken some time to get to this point”. For Amy, knowledge of learners and a good relationship with them is paramount for learning to take place.

Amy progressed with her lesson according to her plan, based on the textbook chapter (Naumann, 2002). She began with the shared reading to establish the key details about the Waitangi Tribunal and interspersed this with a two-way discussion and clarification of difficult words. The students then created a star diagram to summarise main points they had read about the Tribunal using the ‘five w’s and an h’ strategy – who is on it? what is it? when was it established? where is it? why was it set up? how does it operate? Amy feels this technique is a helpful way to represent material. The final section of the lesson involved the students in a classification task. They were given a photocopied page from the textbook containing a range of Māori grievances that have been presented to the Tribunal, and were required to sort them and list each grievance under the headings of social and economic.

Little comment was made about the historical content of the lesson until Amy was prompted by me, as the interviewer. She admitted that she is:

always a wee bit unsure about content and that is why I tend to like to engage them [the students] in discussion because I often can feed off their ideas and we tend to sort of clarify things together. (Amy, 4b, 58-60)

Elaborating on her uncertainty about the topic content she explained that before she planned the lesson she had no specific knowledge about the Waitangi Tribunal at all:

Absolutely none. I mean, I know they are there, I know about their existence and I know they do settle grievances. But other than that, in terms of like how it actually works and how it is broken down and who, what, where, why, how kind of thing, I have absolutely no idea. (Amy, 4b, 95-99)
Apart from the textbook account, and seeking some clarification from colleagues, she had had no time to do more investigation.

Amy’s lack of knowledge of chronology and historical context resulted in some imprecise information being transmitted. One example was reference to “the New Zealand Land Wars [that] occurred after the Treaty signing” which were more accurately two decades later. Amy also had some difficulty clarifying student answers and correcting their misconceptions because she does not have in-depth historical knowledge on this topic. Instances such as the Māori students’ interest to know more details about whether a Māori or Pākehā chairs the Tribunal were left unanswered, and the attempt to use a relevant analogy about the effects of colonisation and the Australian movie ‘Rabbit Proof Fence’ was not followed up with any elaboration on similarities and differences with New Zealand’s colonisation experience. In the interview session Amy reflected that she “sometimes exaggerates things for dramatic effect”. When questioned about her concerns for accuracy she pointed out that she is “careful not to be too controversial and get into dangerous territory”.

This social studies lesson was held at the end of an extremely hot day in a small stuffy classroom. Amy provides further context, towards the end of the stimulated recall session, as she spoke about her fears for the lesson,

I actually thought they were going to be quite diabolical today to be honest. For starters they’re in mufti, because they had had a field trip this morning, and for seconders they had a water fight at lunchtime and a lot of them got in trouble … And the class didn’t have their logbook with them today which is never a good sign. Often it could be conveniently left at the last class if it isn’t too favourable. (Amy, 4b, 283-291)

The conditions did not bode well for a lesson that was being observed by an outsider. Given the set of circumstances Amy’s classroom lesson was quite remarkable. While for Amy “it wasn’t the easiest lesson to teach” and she “felt nervous about teaching it because of my lack of content knowledge”, she achieved her basic objective of the students gaining some understanding of the working of the Waitangi Tribunal. But the greatest accomplishment, given the less than favourable situation, was that Amy maintained a very positive learning environment, she had the goodwill of her students and a high level of participation. For a second year teacher, teaching a challenging class, she was a star performer.

**Discussion: Amy**

In the analysis of the interview data of Amy’s lesson planning and stimulated recall of her classroom lesson (transcripts 3b, 4b), general pedagogical knowledge and
knowledge of learners and their characteristics stand out very clearly as the dominant forms of knowledge underpinning Amy’s teaching. A summary of the classification and incidence of the mention of forms of teacher knowledge made by Amy during the interview sessions is displayed in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2 Classification and incidence of mention of forms of teacher knowledge: lesson planning and stimulated recall interview - Amy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
<th>Stim Recall</th>
<th>Verbatim Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I’ll actually keep it specific to the Waitangi Tribunal. This has been the way that Māori people of New Zealand have been able to air their grievances and the Waitangi Tribunal is a forum for them to be heard. (3b, 160-162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Pedagogical Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Very quickly we’re going to share a reading in class together which I find is a really good way of a settling them down … (3b, 72-73) Sometimes when they’re working I go and sit down with them. … I do try and model the kind of behaviour that I’m expecting … (4b, 139-140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Content Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We are going to do a star diagram of the Tribunal on the one page. So- when, why, who, what, how, when in relation to the Waitangi Tribunal. … I find that it’s quite good to set it out in a diagram so they can understand. (3b, 79-90) … that’s where I started talking about the Rabbit Proof Fence because that’s a very similar situation. I’m thinking of … colonisation. (4b, 125-126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Learners and their characteristics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>We have slower students. There are (names). Probably I should help (name) with this … she’s quite switched on but in terms of actual writing, no she hasn’t got the same ability as the others. (3b, 130-133) (Student name) is actually fairly able but she’s been a real problem this year, like for a lot of teachers getting into heaps of trouble. So I have got these two up the front … they are really good friends but they’re right in front of me and they’ve just gone so well. (4b, 538-544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Educational Contexts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I found some terms I didn’t understand such as raupatu, I wasn’t sure what that was … I asked my head of department. … I don’t know anything about the land wars. (3b, 60-67) Classroom environment is very, very important. (4b, 159-160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge were focused on very infrequently. Amy’s apprehension about her limited content knowledge led her, during the interview, to digress and divert the conversation to general pedagogical issues and in-depth information about her students, which is very important to her and underlies her teaching approach. The content knowledge that Amy had acquired for teaching this lesson was restricted to basic facts and concepts obtained from the textbook.
(Naumann, 2002). When teachers cannot avoid teaching unfamiliar material, other researchers (Reynolds et al., 1988; Grossman et al., 1989) have also noted that the textbook is relied on heavily to provide the necessary content knowledge. However, without fully understanding the concepts and content of the topic teachers cannot determine the adequacy and accuracy of the text (Hashweh, 1987) and they use the text uncritically (Ball and McDiarmid, 1990). In Amy’s situation, the textbook chosen by her head of department is arranged to cover key ideas and a variety of student activities, and provides a useful guideline for a beginning teacher unfamiliar with the topic. But Amy’s justification for its use does not relate to the appropriateness or reliability of the content material, rather it is connected with the students who “like the way it is set out because it is presented attractively, it has cool diagrams ….” Her emphasis is on ideas for a variety of activities and concern for student satisfaction.

In lesson delivery, Amy’s lack of context and historical perspective accounts for her inability to easily draw on metaphors, examples and other representations to explain concepts and ideas, and to elaborate on issues. To deal with unfamiliar content she unconsciously employed tactics that have been observed in other studies. These include evading talking about the topic (Grossman et al., 1989) and avoiding asking questions of the students (Ball and McDiarmid, 1990). She also confirmed findings from the latter study, that lack of substantive knowledge leads to difficulties correcting student misconceptions. Amy admitted to being wary of some students who were likely to be confrontational and to sidestepping when the discussion became too controversial, a strategy Romanowski (1996) suggests is common when teachers want to avoid conflict in the classroom.

The strength of Amy’s practice is her general pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of learners. Incidences of mention of these two forms of teacher knowledge accounted for nearly 80% of all her talk during her lesson planning and stimulated recall interviews. The observations focused on student abilities and interests, and pedagogical issues connected to management and teaching strategies. Amy’s method of operating reflects findings in previous studies (Banks and Parker, 1990; Cornbleth, 1985) which have demonstrated that for some teachers, pleasing students and managing order in the classroom is much higher on their priority list than the topic content.

Curriculum knowledge is not explicitly mentioned in the planning or stimulated recall interviews although Amy’s lesson was structured in a way that complied with the national curriculum learning strands and achievement objectives. Her knowledge of
educational contexts was only mentioned twice and centred on the classroom environment and her social science teaching department.

Amy’s teaching practice demonstrated how one teacher, without history discipline knowledge, confronts the issue of dealing with an area of learning that requires knowledge and understanding of the country’s history. It highlights how a young teacher is able to draw upon her comprehensive knowledge of the learners, and an impressive pedagogical knowledge, to design and deliver a well structured, appropriately pitched social studies lesson. The question that this lesson presents is the depth of substantive content knowledge of a topic that is necessary if the teacher has the pedagogical skills to motivate and engage learners and maintain order in the classroom. It is a problematic issue when the topic area is deemed to be “essential learning about New Zealand society”. (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23)

**Stephen**

**Planning a lesson: “put (New Zealand Wars) in perspective for students”**

Stephen’s year 10 social studies class, comprising fourteen Pākehā and three Māori students, was underway with a unit of work thematically named ‘David and Goliath’ which covered the Treaty of Waitangi topic. Stephen had already taught several lessons in the topic area focusing on concepts of discrimination and racism and the nature of treaties, before considering the background to the Treaty of Waitangi and then a study of the treaty document itself.

While thinking aloud, Stephen planned a lesson (transcript 3c) in which he wanted students to gain an historical understanding of the issues and events affecting Aotearoa/New Zealand 1840-1870. Underlying Stephen’s planning was a very thorough knowledge of his students; a diverse learning group mostly in the middle ability range. Contemplating their likely interest level, and the difficulty factor of the content and concepts involved, he observed:

> I just see [the Treaty and issues relating to it] as really hard for some of our students to embrace. Particularly our South Island rural students who aren’t all really that interested in issues like this. They don’t see it as relevant because the community that they live in doesn’t really reflect that or consider it relevant. They’re essentially monocultural, even the Māori kids are pretty much Europeanised. (*Stephen, 3c, 66-70*)

Stephen suggested that he would begin the lesson with his routine quick discussion of current events and then introduce a summary of the events and issues 1840-1870 in a powerpoint presentation he had prepared. Rather than allow the students to become overwhelmed with factual detail he hoped to focus on the main ideas and stimulate
interest by introducing short video clips of selected excerpts of war in Taranaki, the King Movement, and the lead-up to war in the Waikato.

Following familiarisation with the time-period, supported and reinforced by visuals, Stephen next thought about a co-operative learning activity. He explained:

I then intend dividing the class into groups of three where I’m going to be issuing them with a folder of the text from the powerpoint presentation which is all jumbled up and I’m going to get them to put it back in order … so it is a summary and they’ve got to put it in some sort of chronological order to help them see sense of the events. *(Stephen, 4c, 140-153)*

The other objective for deciding to incorporate a co-operative learning activity was because he is “trying to include all of the kids. When I set up the groups I’m looking at combinations that can help each other and complement each other”. This part of the lesson is to accentuate historical understanding, not every fact, date and event. Stephen clarified that this section of the topic was not part of his assessment programme and “I am happy for it to be a learning activity and they’ll get an understanding of what it is about and I think that is important”. To conclude the lesson he planned to get the students to construct a timeline based on some information in the textbook *(Naumann, Harrison & Winiata, 1990)*. This would enable them to practice skills of selecting key information, and developing a chronological perspective. Although not written on his plan he verbally conveyed that he would include a short review of the lesson at the end.

Clearly discernible during the think-aloud planning was Stephen’s knowledge of *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* *(Ministry of Education, 1997a)* and its requirements. He saw his lesson within the learning strand of ‘social organisation’, and the achievement objective ‘how and why people seek to gain and maintain social justice and human rights’. Demonstrating a well developed discipline knowledge, which included attention to historical relationships such as continuity and change and an appreciation of cause and consequence, he commented:

Actually no one event caused the war, it was a build up of tension … and then there was a final sort of catalyst both in Waitara and in the Waikato. *(Stephen, 3c, 153-156)*

Stephen’s familiarity with the key resources available for teaching in this learning area is also a great advantage. He could quickly identify what material was pitched at an appropriate level, what needed modifying, and which resources could be used to effectively present the material so as to engage Year 10 students and enhance their understanding.
Teaching the lesson: “to understand issues today we have to look at the past”

Stephen adhered to his lesson plan throughout most of his classroom delivery. During the unstructured video-stimulated recall interview of his classroom lesson (transcript 4c) Stephen stopped the videotape frequently to refer to aspects of his teaching where his content knowledge had been adapted and simplified so that it could be grasped by his students. After the initial classroom routines he introduced the lesson with his planned short current events discussion. He had chosen to focus on some current politician’s comments in the media about race relations noting that, as the teacher, he “is always trying to get the students to think about propaganda and how facts can be manipulated”. Connecting the lesson content about Māori-Pākehā relations 1840-1870 to current controversies, he observed that “if they are going to understand the issues today they’ve got to look at the past and they have got to look at what happened”.

Generic features of teaching such as classroom management, planning, organisation and teaching strategies play a significant part in Stephen’s knowledge base for teaching. He mentioned these aspects regularly throughout the stimulated recall. Well established routines are part of the start of the lesson such as lining them up outside, checking attendance, writing an overview and intended learning outcomes of the lesson on the whiteboard, checking homework and starting the lesson with current events. Teaching strategies were a major feature of Stephen’s talk as he recalled the lesson. He made specific reference on several occasions to his use of co-operative learning and explained, “We do bring in co-operative learning into our lessons. It’s just part of the process of learning, but it is a really good way of getting inclusive learning”. The establishment of groups is viewed in the context of not just learning content, but of teaching social and co-operative skills as well as being used as a management practice.

The lesson proceeded with an overview of 1840-1870 in a powerpoint presentation, which Stephen had prepared using a range of resource books. At intervals he introduced video clips to elaborate on or explain particular events. The learning level of the students was foremost in Stephen’s mind and to aid their understanding of the historical issues he said, “I like to integrate a bit of this sort of thing because this (video extract) really picks the heart out of what caused the war in the Waikato”. The subsequent co-operative learning activity, in which students in groups placed extracts on a continuum, was another learning strategy for students to comprehend the sequence of events and major issues in the 1840-1870 period. Stephen commented, “it was really just trying to reinforce content they had been exposed to (in the powerpoint
presentation). I’m hopeful they have got a better understanding of some of the issues now”. Although time prevented the planned construction of a more detailed timeline, the co-operative learning activity enabled the students to demonstrate a developing sense of chronology and the historical relationship of cause and effect.

Alongside his strong pedagogical knowledge base is Stephen’s knowledge of learners and their characteristics. Comments attributed to the learning process and his particular students are interspersed throughout the interview, as their participation is observed on the videotape. He noted individuals who are able, “he’s a clever boy but gets sidetracked”, and “an able girl but very distracted this period”, others like (student) “who struggles with his behaviour… but is very manageable if you keep an eye on him” and (student) “who normally has learning support one day a week, who is actually quite clever but he is a bit disorganised, he’s got poor visibility…”.

The classroom lesson was an inclusive lesson with students of all ability levels participating. Reflecting on the progress the groups of students made in their co-operative learning activity in sequencing and classifying the historical material, Stephen commented:

I thought that some groups were better than others. But that was a reflection of, I guess, attitudes ... it wasn't perfect and I didn't get perfect results. But I think they were all endeavouring to try and put things in, they were using clues like dates and events to get things in order.

(Stephen, 4c, 329-333)

Recall of the classroom lesson during the video replay reaffirmed the impression of a well managed classroom, a teacher with a thorough command of his subject matter, and a good rapport with his students. These factors were fundamental towards Stephen achieving his desired outcome in this lesson. He had consistently noted the difficulties that students at this level have with assimilating large amounts of content in the form of facts, dates, people and events. As the teacher he successfully attempted to simplify the subject matter of a complex period of time, without losing sight of the main historical issues and ideas. As Stephen summed up the lesson he observed:

I think it covered what I wanted to do. Which was overview something that was really hard for kids to pick up, and in a reasonably simple way... so I’m quite happy with the outcome. (Stephen, 4c, 466-468)

Discussion: Stephen
Analyses of the interview data of Stephen’s lesson planning and video-stimulated recall of his classroom lesson (transcripts 3c, 4c) reveal three significant categories of teacher knowledge. Those most strongly emphasised are the two pedagogical
knowledge bases and knowledge of learners. A summary of the classification and incidence of mention of forms of knowledge evident in both the interview sessions is presented in Table 6.3.

**Table 6.3 Classification and incidence of mention of forms of teacher knowledge: lesson planning and stimulated recall interview data – Stephen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
<th>Stim Recall</th>
<th>Verbatim Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actually no one event caused the war, it was a build up of tension … and then there was a final sort of catalyst in Waitara and in the Waikato. (3c, 153-156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>… the Waikato War, it was not Māori that decided or provoked it. And again that’s something that I’ve only just picked up in the last year or so. (4c, 188-190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The area of essential learning is part of the social studies strand, social organization, and particularly the one which is ‘How and why people seek to gain and maintain social justice and rights.’ (3c, 17-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Pedagogical Knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>In my classroom, unless I feel that there is a need for it, I tend to let kids sit where they are comfortable. Unless I start having some problems … in which case then we might have some rules. (3c, 223-226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So they know that they are going to get group work from time to time with me … a good way of learning too. (4c, 273-284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Content Knowledge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I introduce it by using some of the ‘In-tune’ resources produced by the race relations people. Looking at headlines and a poem and some cartoons which focused them in on the idea of discrimination and racism and how it is an issue that is affecting New Zealand. (3c, 79-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Another thing I thought about doing was getting them to use that information and get them to construct their own simplified flowchart, in their books … To record down the key points. (4c, 348-351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Learners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I want students to be able to describe and understand the issues and events affecting New Zealand Aotearoa from 1840 to 1870 … It’s an extremely difficult period for year 10 students to try and understand. (3c, 41-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Educational Contexts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>There’s some really good textbooks (in the school). The school has also got things like this Holmes documentary, and this Length of a Memory video is great. (3c, 293-294)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The very significant feature of this data analysis is that content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge are highlighted in over 40% of mentions related to teacher knowledge. What is reflected here is a teacher with soundly based discipline knowledge, together with many years of teaching experience and professional development. Stephen referred on several occasions throughout the interviews to aspects of the lesson content that would be easy or more complex, and to concepts in the subject matter that students would find difficult to comprehend. The teachers with
this ability were identified in Hashweh’s (1987) study as those having a high level of discipline knowledge.

The significant proportion of mentions that illustrate pedagogical content knowledge indicate Stephen’s ability to transform discipline knowledge into a format that makes it easier for young learners to comprehend. This special understanding of the subject matter for the purpose of teaching is generated by a process that Shulman (1987) and Wilson et al. (1987) have called pedagogical reasoning. During his think-aloud lesson planning and video-stimulated recall of his teaching, Stephen described the learning activities in more depth than the non-history specialist social studies teachers in this study. A similar difference was found in the Schempp et al. (1998) research, between those teachers teaching in their expert subject area and those in a non-expert area. Stephen also makes very successful use of appropriate representations of the subject matter in order to enhance students’ understanding which, according Leinhardt et al. (1991), requires a deep knowledge or thorough understanding of the topic being taught. The application of pedagogical content knowledge is also greatly enhanced in Stephen’s classroom by his knowledge and use of appropriate written and visual resources, and his ability to access and employ new technologies for learning.

Stephen’s teaching is set in a context that illustrates that he is conversant with curriculum requirements, aware of community expectations, and mindful of the school involvement in a Ministry of Education professional development contract. His general pedagogical knowledge, which is referred to in one third of mentions of forms of teacher knowledge, is demonstrated clearly in well established classroom routines, capable student management, and expertise in a wide variety of teaching strategies. Equally important, nearly one third of mentions in the data analysis summary relates to his understanding of his students as learners, what motivates them and how they learn.

Stephen’s students come from a rural conservative background and he claims that it is a difficult task to persuade them that an understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and its subsequent issues are of relevance to them. The research studies conducted by Romanowski (1996) led the latter to suggest that student resistance to particular subject matter plays a role in determining what content teachers will teach, and that those teachers without a sound subject knowledge are more likely to evade having to challenge students and community beliefs. Stephen confirms these findings from the perspective of a teacher with a command of his subject content not being afraid to confront resistance. He feels that the issues have relevance to all young people living
in New Zealand today and therefore he continues to expose his students to historical facts, differing interpretations and current debate.

Kate

Planning a lesson: “quite careful not to politicise the topic”

Kate was teaching a mixed ability Year 10 class at the end of the school year when she planned a social studies lesson on the lead up to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. As she had explained in her first interview (transcript 1d), the learning area relating to the Treaty is not taught as one large unit of work within her school. Aspects of the essential learning area outlined in the national curriculum are integrated into various units of work at both years 9 and 10. This lesson, which was part of a three lesson sequence focusing on students understanding of the situation in New Zealand in 1840 and the signing of the Treaty, came within an umbrella unit on ‘Justice and Human Rights’.

The aim of the lesson planned during the think-aloud (transcript 3d), was to use a problem solving approach that would enable students to stand in the shoes of others and gain an understanding of people in the past. Initially the students would be faced with a simulation activity called the ‘planet zee problem’. Kate explained very broadly how it operates:

There is a planet which has a large population in it already. There's another all powerful but much smaller group that comes along. And I give a description of what happened in that situation. Then they [students] have to make decisions along the way about what they would do ….

(Kate, 3d, 30-33)

Following group activity, where the class attempt to solve problems that face them, Kate planned to read a story that revealed what really happened in the New Zealand situation. A general class discussion would then centre on the comparisons between the hypothetical situation and the actual circumstances and events. In very general terms, Kate referred to the remainder of the lesson as “a little bit of talking, a little bit of listening, a little bit of writing down in the section, and a little bit of pulling it all together at the end”.

Kate’s awareness of her school community, her comprehensive knowledge of the students in her class, and her focus on how students learn, were all influential factors in adopting her particular teaching strategy. Significant periods of the planning session were spent considering these aspects which underpin her approach. She described her class as “very verbal … a politically aware group”. Also:
they’re an interesting mix. There are people of the land; there are a number of farmers in the group. There are urban middle class, periphery urban people … there are maybe five Māori … two or three of them are fluent speakers of Te Reo, and there is a little Phillipino boy who can’t speak any English … So, it’s quite a complex class… because of them being so wide ranging we actually find that we’ve got these really broad interests which they bring into the class. So you have to be quite careful not to politicise it. (Kate, 3d, 160-172)

Firstly, she chose an abstract problem solving activity as appropriate because she felt it would capture their imagination and stimulate the thinking of students of this ability level. Secondly, there is an awareness that many students come from relatively conservative backgrounds where Treaty issues can be contentious. She observed that:

when they first brought in the Treaty, the stuff on the Treaty at [school], we got a number of written and verbal complaints from parents and there is still, I’ve had two this year. (Kate, 3d, 190-192)

With Kate’s teaching experience and well developed general pedagogical knowledge, she intended to choose a teaching strategy that would deal with the issues in a more objective way. She elaborated:

Well the philosophy for doing it in this way is to actually take it away from any preconceptions they have, or values that have been put on the whole process, the whole set-up of how the Treaty was formed and why it was… So that they can actually look at it in quite an abstract way. Divorce themselves from any opinions and views that they may have had embedded in their own story that they have invented in their heads, from parents, from community, from wherever, about what the Treaty is about. (Kate, 3d, 52-59)

The intended lesson outcome was that students would develop an empathy with people in the past, they would be challenged to think about the issues involved, and this would give them Kate explained “a platform from which they can then look at Treaty issues facing New Zealand today”.

**Teaching the lesson: ‘the social studies concepts not the historic details’**
The challenges and uncertainties of conducting classroom research surfaced with the attempt to videotape Kate’s classroom lesson. Pre-determined dates could not be met on two occasions because of unforeseeable family circumstances affecting the research participant. Some months later Kate obligingly agreed to continue in the research study when she was once again teaching the learning area being investigated. At this time however, she was teaching a new social studies class which necessitated amendments to her lesson plan, and employing a different learning strategy, to meet the needs of lower ability students.
Kate taught the videotaped lesson on the same topic area, looking at the situation in 1840 for both Māori and European and setting the scene for the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. In the stimulated recall interview (transcript 4d), held immediately afterwards, Kate explained that she had varied her approach with her less able students in order that they could better develop an understanding of the perspectives of people in the past. Centring her lesson on three concepts of war, land and nationhood, her instructional strategy was for her to adopt the roles of Captain Hobson and a Māori chief in 1840, and ask the students to interview both of these individuals in turn. The focus of the questions was on the three main ideas or concepts. She commented that her reasoning behind this strategy was that “the students in this class are very resistant to the print word and print resources … but they like pictures and they like stories”.

The majority of the students would have had little prior knowledge of Captain Hobson or of Europeans and Māori in 1840, but Kate’s purpose for introducing the interview as an instructional technique was that “it is a way of involving them in their learning, and giving quite a lot of information quite quickly”. It was also “a way of gathering these students into the era [and] a good method of adapting to the needs of this particular class”. She pointed out that during the role-play some of the students “would prefer if they were given something to write down rather than think, that would be their preference”. But she sought to encourage them and find a way to get their co-operation and involvement. Her role-play/interview was successful in getting majority participation and retaining student interest. Many of the questions were lower level but Kate was surprised and pleased with one or two students who were quite perceptive in their inquiries.

Following the role-play interviews Kate constructed a summary chart on the whiteboard, using the categories of war, land and nationhood, to display differences and similarities in both Māori and European cultures. She acted as a scribe and attempted to draw from the students the understandings they had acquired about the concepts/ideas during the interview session. In the stimulated recall of the lesson, Kate elaborated:

Firstly … I would try and get the words from the students and then I would put the words on the board verbatim. What the students were saying fitting into the categories. If they’re not giving it to me orally in a way that I think that all the kids will understand then I will try and tease it out some more, capture it, and then put it on the board. I’m trying not to use my language or my words in there. (Kate, 4d, 100-105)

Kate feels that for students who have literacy problems, do not like dense text, and find interpretation of the written word difficult, it is important that they “use information that
they have gained (orally) and that they create meaning from that information”. Together Kate and the students completed the chart comparing and contrasting the two cultures in 1840. As the students were recording in their notebooks she observed, “it’s the social studies concepts behind it that I’m really interested in, rather than the historic details”.

An important factor in Kate’s teaching is setting up a climate for learning in her classroom. This is begun at a practical and organisational level and she explained how she has worked consistently to establish this:

One of the key focuses that I have with this class is trying to focus on the habits of mind and one of the things for them is trying to be organised and you know focused… and what we’re focusing on is organization… and part of that is dating of their work and their finishing of their work, use of rulers … bringing their pen. All those critical building things are really important for these kids so that’s what I’m trying to build there, in their learning.

(Kate, 4d, 256-268)

Kate made some additional comments on New Zealand learning in the social studies curriculum as the lesson recall drew to its end. She would like to see each area of New Zealand learning more clearly detailed in the future, although she cautioned about having a prescribed statement which “can be somebody’s idea of what the essential learning about New Zealand should be about and that is always up for debate”. She does contend that one of the key areas of learning should be about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application today, and that it is “up to social studies teachers to provide some of that knowledge”. But she qualified ‘knowledge’ explaining that in her teaching she is “focusing on conceptual knowledge with a smattering of factual, date, time details”. Kate emphasised that “it’s the actual concepts that I think are more important and that is quite a change”. The Treaty of Waitangi and related issues up to the present day are “still high risk, high stakes to teach” and this is further motivation for an alternative approach to teaching about the subject. Kate concluded that:

... if your programme generally is based on concepts and [skills] processes in social studies, but also the process of thinking and learning, then there is an element of having that ability to get rid of some of the angst. Because you’re not actually talking about this, you’re actually talking about perspectives and actually putting yourself in somebody's shoes. And you’re trying to look at it through similarities and differences, through justice. So we don't teach the Treaty of Waitangi, we teach justice.

(Kate, 4d, 320-326)

**Discussion: Kate**

In the analyses of the interview data of Kate’s lesson planning and stimulated recall of her classroom lesson (transcripts 3d, 4d), general pedagogical knowledge and
knowledge of learners and their characteristics, are the most strongly emphasised categories of teacher knowledge. Together they comprise nearly 80% of the teacher talk during the interview sessions. A summary of the classification and incidence of the mention of forms of teacher knowledge is displayed in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4 Classification and incidence of mention of forms of teacher knowledge: lesson planning and stimulated recall interview data - Kate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
<th>Stim Recall</th>
<th>Verbatim Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>They may have had a little bit of a discussion about it in their class as a Treaty, as the founding document of New Zealand. (3d, 132-136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Knowledge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think perhaps ELANZ (essential learning about New Zealand) in terms of the curriculum document has been something that has only recently been highlighted really, as being very important. And people are really learning to unpack that and incorporate that into their programmes. (4d, 279-282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Pedagogical Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>… by changing the pace really, is why it’s keeping them engaged and there will be a time where I’m literally leaving off them … . (3d, 146-147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>… this idea was generated by looking at some large old oval photographs that I had of my ancestors at home and wondering what they would say … . where they were in that time. I’m thinking that’s a wonderful way for the students to understand, to put themselves in somebody else’s shoes, of interviewing those people. (4d, 127-132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Content Knowledge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We’ll be looking at the demographics of this situation … and using some statistics so that they can actually get a further picture of what it was like in New Zealand at the time in terms of the population … and also looking at N.S.W. because the whole idea of the link between New Zealand and New South Wales … it actually shows them how isolated New Zealand was and how the rest of the world saw New Zealand. So that’s another contextual thing, just getting them to understand that. (4d, 221 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Learners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>This plan has got a risk for one of the boys … he’s quite good; he’s got some form of dyspraxia. Orally he’s quite good, he can listen quite well but if he has to write down, and in a set time-frame, that puts a great deal of stress on him. (3d 79-81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>… what I was tending to do there is focus on students who I knew would be capable of giving answers which would lead others into the learning. (4d, 153-155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Educational Contexts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>When they first brought in the Treaty stuff at school, we got a number of written and verbal complaints from parents and there is still, I’ve had two this year. (3d, 190-192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two verbal mentions attributed to curriculum knowledge illustrate Kate’s position as a head of department and her current active role in curriculum implementation in settings beyond her school. But it is a comprehensive knowledge of teaching methodology and knowledge of students that is a real strength for Kate, and is a requisite part of the teaching process. Her years of teaching experience are reflected in her extensive
general pedagogical knowledge, which accounts for a greater proportion of the mentions. Particularly evident is her knowledge of a wide variety of instructional strategies from which she chooses to accommodate differing students’ needs, as well as to introduce variety and interest into lessons.

Closely linked to knowledge of pedagogy is Kate’s knowledge of learners and their characteristics. This category of knowledge also comprised a significant proportion of the unstructured stimulated recall interview conversation. Most of the mentions were associated with individual students and student learning in general, and two references were made to the students’ background and the community from which they were drawn. Just as Romanowski (1996) had found in his research, where teacher concerns about student reaction to subject matter played a role in instructional decisions, so too did vocal students from higher socio-economic backgrounds influence Kate’s teaching approach. She was very conscious of “contentious Treaty of Waitangi issues” which she did not want to “politicise” in the classroom.

Very significant in the data analysis is the almost minimal representation of content knowledge or pedagogical content knowledge. Mentions of specific content in the lesson, and ways subject matter had been reconstructed into a comprehensible format for student understanding, were only indicated on three occasions over two interview sessions. Kate drew attention to the fact that her approach to teaching history based topics in social studies was not to concentrate on facts and details, but rather to emphasise social studies concepts such as human rights and justice. This approach, and the use of the role-play strategy, could work very successfully in the social studies classroom, but the effectiveness was limited on this occasion. The class had little prior knowledge of the topic area and were not provided with any information about the two historic characters prior to the role-play interview in class. Consequently, with no context or understanding about the individuals, most students were unsure what to ask and resorted to very general questions. Kate had no pre-determined agenda of content knowledge that she wanted the students to gather, and her answers were in turn generalised and non-specific about dates, names, and events. Choosing war, land and nationhood as concepts on which students were to base their questions was surprising, firstly because of the difficulty of the concepts for lower ability students, and secondly because Māori were unfamiliar with the idea of nationhood in 1840.

Kate had stated that the role-play strategy was being used so that students could “get the information quickly” and they did gain some general information about Māori living in fortified villages, growing kumara, trading with Europeans for muskets and engaging
in warfare over land. But many factual details were fuzzy and students were provided with little idea of a chronological context. Content detail was glossed over and sometimes inaccurately represented. Information given to students that the Māori population was only 22,000 in 1815 is incorrect since it is estimated that about 100,000 Māori lived in New Zealand when Captain Cook arrived in 1769 (King, 2003, p. 90-1), and between 90,000 and 200,000 by 1840 (Naumann et al., 1990. p. 27). Students would have inferred, from references to the musket wars, that these had taken place around the time of the 1840 Treaty, when more accurately they were prevalent in the 1820s (Naumann, 2002, p.12). Further, Kate did not clarify that these wars were inter-tribal and that Europeans were not involved. By simplifying to the point where the content “bears little resemblance to its disciplinary referent” (Wineburg & Wilson, 1991, p.333) Kate was responsible for misrepresentations that confused students. Other researchers (Hashweh, 1987; Wilson et al., 1987) have also noted that lack of content knowledge of teachers’ teaching outside their specialist subject area, such as Kate, can lead to representations that tend to be superficial and sometimes inaccurate.

The instructional strategy of building a chart together on the whiteboard, showing similarities and differences between Māori and European in 1840, again highlighted the lack of specific content knowledge of teacher and students. Kate’s aim was for student words to be used verbatim and for them “to create their own meaning”. This constructivist view of learning aligns with Cochran et al. (1993), whose model of ‘pedagogical knowing’ suggests that knowing is created rather than transferred or passively received. This was a very difficult task for Kate’s lower ability students when they had little historical context, and a negligible knowledge base, on which to build.

Kate’s lack of emphasis on imparting historical facts and details bears a strong resemblance to the teachers without discipline knowledge in Nespor’s (1987) study, who focused their energies on aspects that they considered would have a more lasting impact on their students. While his teachers emphasised teaching students “manners” and how to behave in the classroom, Kate directed attention to learning “habits of mind” such as “being organised, dating work, bringing pens, using rulers and finishing off work”. She felt that the lesson’s success lay in the students developing their general learning skills and through engaging in their learning by the instructional strategy of the role-play/interviews. It is questionable how much understanding Kate’s students gained about what led Māori and European to sign a Treaty in 1840 and the perspectives held by the two cultures at that time. Very little substantive content knowledge was embedded within the lesson and student understanding was not evaluated during or at the end of the teaching session.
Cross case analysis

In this section of the chapter a cross case analysis of the four teachers and the categories of knowledge for teaching is presented. A bar graph display highlights the major differences in the forms of knowledge held by Rachel, Amy, Stephen, and Kate. This will be followed by an interpretive discussion of the visual representation.
Figure 6.1 Summary classification and incidence of mention of forms of teacher knowledge: lesson planning and stimulated recall interviews – Rachel, Amy, Stephen, Kate
Figure 6.1 is a summary representation of the areas of pedagogical focus revealed in the discourse of the four teachers during both the lesson planning activity and the video-stimulated recall of their classroom lesson. It illustrates that for all the teachers in this project, as in the McMeniman et al. (2000) study of teacher knowledge in action, general pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of learners and their characteristics are identified as dominant areas of knowledge for their teaching. For teachers, both with and without content knowledge, these components of the knowledge base were very important. The other noteworthy feature in the graphic display is the significant variation in the participants’ content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Elaboration upon the visual summary representation in Figure 6.1 follows:

**Content knowledge**
This area of knowledge varies between those teachers with history discipline knowledge and those without history expertise. Specific historical content details were regularly introduced into the talk by both Stephen and Rachel when constructing and analysing their lessons, as the nature and complexity of the subject matter was a very important issue dictating how they approached their teaching. What they wanted their students to understand was the most important consideration and influenced their lesson objectives, choice of resources and learning activities. During lesson delivery they used their content knowledge to ask students questions and to probe student responses. By contrast, very few comments about actual subject content were made by Kate and Amy during their lesson planning and recall of teaching the lesson. They directed the focus of their attention to the learners and issues of a general pedagogical nature.

**Curriculum knowledge**
Knowledge of the national curriculum, *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1997a), had been demonstrated by the early career teachers Rachel and Amy in the initial interviews (transcripts 1a, 1b), and their written lesson plans showed where the lesson fitted within the curriculum structure. But the teachers did not make specific mention of curriculum during the planning and stimulated recall interviews (transcripts 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b). This is not surprising in the context of one lesson. Stephen’s and Kate’s occasional references to curriculum reflect the probability that it is more likely to be to the forefront of their thinking as heads of department and overseers of their school social studies programmes.
**General pedagogical knowledge**

General pedagogy was a very important focus for all the teachers. All were effective classroom managers who sought to motivate, interest and involve students and keep them on task throughout lessons. Therefore they all often sought to point out aspects in the interviews which were related to achieving these objectives. A distinctive feature in the analysis of the interview transcripts (3a-3d, 4a-4d), is that nearly 40% of the observations made by Kate and Amy during their planning, and when they stopped the video player during their lesson recall, were about classroom organisation, preventative class management and varying teaching strategies not connected to the lesson topic content. For them, these issues regularly assumed greater importance than the subject content in the lesson because they were much easier to discuss compared to their more uncertain content knowledge.

**Pedagogical content knowledge**

Pedagogical content knowledge, identified by Shulman (1987) as the special form of knowledge that is the domain of the teacher, was demonstrated to a far greater extent by Stephen and Rachel, the teachers with greater history discipline knowledge, who were both focused on teaching subject content in a way that would develop historical understanding. Rachel included examples and illustrative stories in her dialogue while Stephen spoke about a variety of teaching activities and resources that he used to convey historical ideas and assist students to learn. Less than 10% of Amy and Kate’s discourse contained mention of subject content in connection to their teaching and ways of presenting material. They rarely stopped the video player to highlight issues related to pedagogical content knowledge and attempts by me, as the researcher, to redirect the talk from knowledge of learners and general pedagogy back to the subject content, how it was being delivered and student reactions to it, were not always very successful. Linking the topic content with their teaching strategy, to enable students to grasp the ideas more easily, did sometimes occur in their practice but it was not a key focus in their reflection on their teaching.

Shulman’s (1986a) argument, that pedagogical content knowledge includes an awareness of areas of subject content that students will find difficult to follow, was illustrated by both teachers with history discipline knowledge. Stephen emphasised the complexity of the chronology in the period he was teaching and the necessity to simplify this for the learners. Rachel highlighted the problems of moving between different eras within one lesson and how this required careful clarification. Kate, as an experienced teacher, was conscious that the concept of nationhood would be difficult for her lower ability class to grasp and attempted to illustrate the idea in a role play.
interview. It was her lack of content knowledge when explaining what nationhood meant to Māori and Pākehā in 1840, which confused rather than clarified student understanding.

Both Stephen and Rachel expressed a belief in the importance of challenging students to think, and of their being able to use historical evidence and to distinguish facts from opinions. The substantive knowledge held by these two teachers gave them the confidence to discuss issues, to allow differences of opinion and as Stephen, in a conservative Pākehā community observed, “to try to foster non-racist attitudes’. In contrast, Amy and Kate were much less confident about confronting varying viewpoints within their classrooms. Kate, in a higher socio-economic urban fringe community spoke about “avoiding politicising the topic”. Likewise Amy, in a school with the greatest proportion of Māori students of the four study participants, was intent on “avoiding controversial issues” because the students confronted her and wanted answers to their questions. Such comments confirm findings of Romanowski (1996) that “in an attempt to avoid conflict and secure a controlled classroom teachers often avoid raising controversial issues, in turn evading opportunities to challenge students’ and communities’ beliefs” (p.307).

Knowledge of learners and their characteristics
All four teachers related well to their students and their knowledge of them was quite extensive. Students and their learning were to the forefront of thinking when planning and recalling their classroom lesson. One third or more of the talk alluded to individual student interests, their capabilities and learning needs, and to characteristics of the classes as a whole. The greater number of mentions attributed to Kate and Amy did not appear to be that they necessarily had greater knowledge of their learners than Rachel and Stephen, but could be accounted for by the fact that they knew far less subject content and focused their comments on the learners instead.

All lessons were designed with the learning abilities of their students in mind. Rachel was particularly concerned about the non-English speaking students in her class and Stephen was focused on making the subject relevant to young learners at different stages of understanding. Amy was aware of behavioural challenges and consistently commented on establishing rapport and a positive environment as a key objective to aid classroom management, as well as making the students more receptive to learning. For Kate, the affective domain dominated her teaching. Establishing a foundation for learning through developing organisational capability, ensuring that the students
believed in themselves and saw value in gaining knowledge and skills, were quite central. She was also very cognisant of literacy difficulties faced by her class of students.

Knowledge of educational contexts
Comments from the teachers which indicated knowledge of contexts beyond the lesson and the students were intermittent. References were made by Rachel and Amy, as the newly graduated teachers, about support from the head of department and school policies within which they operated. Kate and Stephen as senior teachers were more aware of community expectations and relationships that impinged on their teaching, such as teaching effectiveness reviews by the Educational Review Office and school learning contracts with the Ministry of Education.

Knowledge of educational aims, goals and purposes
Within the confines of planning and teaching one lesson it was not expected that significant comment would be made about wider philosophical issues. Very little was specifically distinguishable in the teachers’ dialogue that could be classified within this component of the knowledge base for teaching.

Summary
In this chapter I have reported on the investigation into the pedagogical content knowledge of four social studies teachers when they planned and taught a lesson within the Treaty of Waitangi learning area, determined in Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a) as essential learning about New Zealand society. Analysis of the interview data of the teachers ‘in action’ shows that a blend of forms of knowledge is integrated in these teachers’ thinking and practice. While general pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of learners and their characteristics are important forms of knowledge for all the teachers, variations are clearly evident in their content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.

Evidence presented in this chapter suggests that it is not necessarily the more experienced teachers that have developed greater content knowledge for teaching the Treaty of Waitangi topic area in the classroom, despite a common belief that teachers acquire more content knowledge as their teaching career progresses. The findings of this investigation show that the teachers with history discipline knowledge not only have a more comprehensive understanding of this topic content but are more able to use metaphors, analogies and stories to make the subject content more readily
accessible to learners. The conclusion that the teachers with greater discipline knowledge would have more content knowledge to teach a historically based topic was not an unexpected finding. What was surprising was the extent of the variance in the content knowledge and conceptual understanding, and the ability of the teachers to make this knowledge comprehensible to their students. Informed by a disciplinary knowledge of history, two of the teachers had developed a pedagogical content knowledge that significantly differentiated their teaching about issues related to the Treaty of Waitangi. This knowledge provided a more substantive basis for student learning, engendered more student-teacher interaction about the lesson topic content, and gave the teachers more confidence to discuss a wider range of Treaty related matters in the classroom.

I now turn to the final chapter in which the major findings of this study will be reviewed and presented in relation to the research questions. From this, implications that have emerged will be discussed, together with directions for future research.
Chapter 7
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Overview
This study set out to examine the nature of social studies teachers’ knowledge about the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation in the past, and its application in present day New Zealand. Teacher discipline knowledge has been examined in terms of conceptual understanding of this topic area described in the national social studies syllabus, Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a), as an essential area of learning about New Zealand society. The study has also investigated how teachers implement this knowledge in the secondary school classroom.

Gaining insight into the discipline knowledge held by social studies teachers was considered to be pertinent for several reasons. Firstly, I wanted to acquire empirical evidence for causes of concern voiced by academic historians, politicians and media commentators that poor understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and its implementation leads to a lack of tolerance and empathy between Māori and Pākehā and has the potential for social polarisation within New Zealand society (Adds, 2000; Belich, 2001, 2002; Catherall, 2002a, 2000b; R. Consedine & J. Consedine, 2001; King, 2001). Secondly, teacher pedagogical content knowledge is an important factor in students’ learning about New Zealand’s past and in their developing an ability to constructively discuss and debate contemporary societal issues. My objective has also been to add to a growing literature on subject matter knowledge for teaching, cognisant of the fact that very little research in this area of teacher knowledge has been conducted in a New Zealand context.

Four social studies teachers participated in this research study. These teachers were purposefully selected to represent different areas of subject specialisation and varying levels of pedagogical expertise. Two were experienced teachers and two were early career teachers; two had a history major qualification, and two were non-history specialists. In this interpretive inquiry, a case study design (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995) was adopted and multi-method triangulation was used for tapping into and representing the teachers’ conceptual and practical knowledge. The semi-structured interviews, the think-aloud protocol during a concept mapping exercise and lesson planning activity, and a video-stimulated recall interview of a classroom lesson enabled me, as the researcher, to capture the teachers subject content knowledge in a variety
of ways. I was also able to gain detailed insight into the application of their content and pedagogical knowledge in the classroom.

Underpinning this research is Shulman’s (1987) work on the categorisation of a knowledge base for teaching. The data were analysed using his categorisation of forms of teacher knowledge and his classification of sources of that knowledge. The findings have been described as individual case narratives in Chapter 4 and the teachers’ knowledge and conceptual understanding was mapped in Chapter 5. The following Chapter 6 then presented the outcomes of the implementation of teacher pedagogical content knowledge in the classroom. It also included a cross case analysis which highlighted the similarities and differences in the forms of knowledge held by the participant teachers. This concluding Chapter 7 begins by identifying strengths and limitations of the study. However, the main focus of the chapter is a review of the major findings of the study which have been examined and discussed in the previous three chapters. Implications of the study findings for pre-service teacher education, for in-service teacher professional development and for future curriculum policy development and implementation are then considered. Finally, areas for further research are suggested.

Strengths and limitations of the study

The small size of this study sample could be viewed as not providing enough evidence to determine what teachers know about the social studies topic centred on the Treaty of Waitangi, and how it is taught in the classroom. However, this is a qualitative study not concerned with the traditional quantitative concepts of external validity and the generalisability of results. As discussed in Chapter 3, I argue in favour of credibility and transferability to establish trustworthiness of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The study presents, in detailed description and analysis, a rich picture of teachers’ knowledge and conceptual understanding of the topic area, what is happening in their classrooms, the judgements the teachers make and how they justify what they do. As Stake (2000) points out, “the illustration of how a phenomenon occurs in the circumstances of several exemplars can prove valuable and trustworthy knowledge” (p.444). Careful and extensive description also provides the opportunity to maximise learning from a collective case study (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Schofield, 1993).

The nature of the purposive sample of the teachers participating in this study may be identified as a limitation because not all social studies teachers are represented. The majority of teachers of this subject hold a history or geography degree, as did those
involved in my study, but I acknowledge that there are also social studies teachers from English, economics and other discipline areas that are not included. Since the topic being investigated is a history based topic, an assumption was made that those teachers with a geography discipline background were likely to be representative of other non-history specialists. The study sample was also limited geographically to the South Island of New Zealand which has a lesser proportion of Māori students than in most North Island schools. While this may impact on pedagogical decisions relating to lesson planning and teaching approaches, I maintain that it is unlikely to be a significant factor in teachers’ content knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi social studies topic area.

A further issue, referred to in Chapter 3, is that the New Zealand educational community is relatively small and the participants in this study were known to me in a professional sense, because of my work as a teacher educator and as a member of professional associations. This did enable me to establish a rapport with the teachers more rapidly than otherwise may have been the case, and assisted the facilitation of the research process incorporating the videoing of their classroom lessons. To counter any concerns of a particular interpretation being placed on an interview or cognitive activity, triangulation of research methods was carried out to ensure credible and dependable findings. The two teachers who were beginning their teaching career were accustomed to having their teaching observed and may have initially expected more feedback from me relating to their teaching performance. However, once my role as researcher was clarified they were happy to accept that, until the research was completed, I would not give advice or make recommendations about their teaching.

The visible and constructive advantage that the video-stimulated recall methodology demonstrated was that the teachers, by confronting themselves in action during the video replay, articulated advice to themselves as they reflected on their teaching. Although time consuming and labour intensive, it is a very effective method for teachers to identify the aspects of their teaching where they are competent and the areas in which they can improve. Three of the teachers in this study were particularly interested in observing their presentation and delivery, often commenting in various forms that they were learning a lot about their teaching. Further evidence of its acceptance by teachers, as a beneficial and constructive learning technique, was that three of the four teachers requested a copy of the videotape of their lesson in order to view and reflect on their teaching in their own time. Two sent written messages, post research interviews, expressing their appreciation at being part of the study and that for
them it was a “two-way process,” an “excellent learning experience,” and “the most useful professional development.”

Measuring historical knowledge and understanding is a difficult task because history is more than a compilation of dates and facts. Concept mapping was used for this purpose although there is no ‘correct’ arrangement of the concepts and terms associated with the Treaty of Waitangi topic area, and I did not attempt to provide a quantitative measure of the linkages and relationships presented in individual maps. It is not possible in one mapping exercise to arrive at unequivocal conclusions about each teacher’s substantive knowledge since only a sample of key concepts had been chosen for them to work with. It is conceivable that, in a longer time period and without a tape recorder running, further ideas and relationships would have been forthcoming. However, the completed maps furnished an informative overview representation of each teacher’s knowledge and conceptual understanding of the topic area, and provided an opportunity to corroborate the interview data.

**Summary of the major findings**

To review the major findings of this study I return to the key research question: How is teacher knowledge about the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation in the past and application in the present day, implemented in social studies classrooms? Arising from this central question were three areas of focus which guided my inquiry. These included what social studies teachers know about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand, when and where they have acquired their knowledge for teaching, and why teaching the Treaty of Waitangi topic area occurs as it does in the social studies classroom. A summary of the findings in each of these areas is now addressed in turn.

**Teachers’ content knowledge and conceptual understanding**

The four social studies teacher participants in this study are all capable and committed teachers, but analysis of the research data in Chapter 5 identified significant differences in their knowledge and understanding of the social studies topic area. The evidence presented in this research suggests that a key factor was discipline knowledge of history. Discipline knowledge, as I have used the term in this study, goes beyond knowledge of content to knowledge of the substantive and syntactical structures of the discipline (Schwab, 1961/1978). Accurate factual details were very important for both Rachel and Stephen, the teachers with a formal education in history, but they were also aware of the substantive structures or organising frameworks of the
By seeing chronology intertwined with continuity, and placing events in the context of time, they avoided what Denis Shemilt (2000) calls “plundering history for bits and pieces to validly and usefully inform the present” (p.100). They were also aware of multiple perspectives, including political, social and cultural, from which Māori-Pākehā issues in the past can be examined. Further, knowledge of the syntactic structures of the discipline of history, or the procedural methods which guide historical inquiry, was also very apparent in the dialogue of these teachers. They were familiar with documentary evidence and the importance of historical interpretation when considering Māori and Pākehā perspectives of past events.

The teachers without history discipline knowledge implied that learning about the past is ‘knowing’ dates, people and events, without setting these in a context. Amy referred to her limited historical knowledge in terms of not knowing all ‘the facts’. Kate emphasised her desire not to ply students with “names and dates” suggesting that she also saw history in the same light. Both teachers provided few verbal or written explanations or examples to clarify their knowledge and understanding. Neither did they view the area of learning in the context of cause and effect and change over time. As a consequence, during the interview discourse and cognitive activity to ascertain conceptual understanding, they rarely made links that demonstrated the relevance of the past to contemporary issues.

A conclusion that can be drawn from the findings of this study is that comprehension and understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi topic area requires knowledge of factual details such as people and events, a sense of chronology, an understanding of historical relationships, and an awareness of historical interpretations. The study demonstrated that discipline knowledge of history is a critical ingredient in providing the teachers with these understandings of this essential area of learning about New Zealand society.

**Sources of teacher knowledge**

The knowledge of subject content and of pedagogy that was held by the teachers, derived from a variety of sources. In common with studies of English and social studies teachers in USA (Palonsky, 1993), and secondary school teachers in Australia (McMeniman et al., 2000), the New Zealand teachers were not dependent only on university training and pre-service teacher education for this knowledge. These fields still impacted on the early career teachers, notably Rachel who has recently completed a university degree incorporating study of New Zealand history. But all the teachers
acknowledged the importance of other sources. A critical other and school heads of department were influential for the beginning teachers, while the more experienced teachers cited curriculum documents and their own learning as being significant.

Since the 1980s, New Zealand’s history has undergone considerable revision because of increased academic research in this area. This is important in the sense that many older social studies teachers received their university training in the years before this new information was readily available and, like Kate, have not updated their New Zealand history knowledge for teaching historically based social studies topics. It has also been suggested that comparatively few social studies teacher trainees have been exposed to New Zealand history courses that draw upon the wealth of scholarly research now in existence (Openshaw, 2004). Effectively teaching about New Zealand’s history, specifically about the Treaty of Waitangi and its relevance from 1840 to the present day, demands that new historical thinking and scholarly research be accessed. While it can be assumed that teachers develop more content knowledge over their teaching career, my study suggests that without discipline knowledge of history there is little evidence that teachers’ conceptual knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi topic area will change without external assistance. The non-history specialist teachers in the study expressed quite adamantly that workload and classroom management issues left little time, energy or motivation to develop this knowledge. The findings discussed in Chapter 4 indicate that while older experienced teachers may not have gained New Zealand history knowledge in their undergraduate training, those with general history discipline knowledge are more predisposed to the professional reading of scholarly books and journals to keep them informed. These teachers continue to develop their subject matter knowledge for teaching because they have sufficient understanding of the nature of history, and an intrinsic interest in keeping abreast of research into historical issues.

It was noteworthy that all the teachers in this study, beginning and experienced, those with discipline knowledge of history and those without, accessed the internet for topic content information. They also expressed interest in using this source more regularly if appropriate teaching resources are made available and informative and instructive material is specifically identified through the Ministry of Education on-line learning website.
Implementation of teacher knowledge
Transforming discipline knowledge into subject matter knowledge for teaching, or that which Shulman (1987) referred to as pedagogical content knowledge, has been identified as central to effective classroom teaching (Chen & Ennis, 1995; Grossman, 1990; Grossman et al., 1989; Leinhardt et al., 1991; McDiarmid et al., 1989; Van Driel et al., 1998; Wilson et al., 1987; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991). The implementation of this knowledge by the four participant teachers in this study, revealed noteworthy variation in the areas of classroom teaching, the approach to contentious issues, and school social studies programmes.

Classroom teaching
The classroom teaching data, analysed and presented in Chapter 6, establishes that all four teachers participating in this study had sound understanding of pedagogy through the ways they structured their lessons, the activities they used and the ways they involved themselves in the classroom. They all sought to engage their students, to motivate and keep them interested, and they wanted them to enjoy social studies. The difference between the teachers was the understanding held by the teachers with history discipline knowledge about the nature of history, and the content that they wanted their students to know and comprehend. This was a very significant factor influencing their lesson objectives, choice of resources and learning activities. While history was interesting to the history specialists, they were also aware that it may not be so interesting to their students. They thought about ways to develop enthusiasm and interest in the topic content through providing examples and illustrations, and incorporating stories in their lessons. They also used the depth of their substantive knowledge to ask focused questions and probe student responses. Both Rachel and Stephen consistently articulated their concerns about connecting the topic content to the lives of the students. They emphasised relevance and spoke about the importance of giving students an historical perspective to the present and of helping students to think critically about Māori-Pākehā issues that New Zealand society faces today. They also included documentary evidence in their lessons, for students to learn to develop historical explanations and discuss events and controversies in the country’s history.

For Amy and Kate, the teachers without history discipline knowledge, concerns for pedagogy and learners were centre stage and prioritized above subject content. With limited historical knowledge and understanding themselves, they often avoided student questions or provided responses at a superficial level. Neither was able to easily use metaphors or examples to illustrate and explain the topic material with clarity and make it more understandable to the learners. Mirroring earlier research studies, where
teachers displayed narrow views of the historical content (Wilson et al., 1987; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991), the attempts of Amy and Kate to simplify the topic led to instances of misrepresentation of content and to some information errors.

The pedagogical content knowledge of the teachers in this study, similar to that reported in previous research (Grossman et al., 1989; Turner-Bisset, 1999; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988), is also influenced by the beliefs they hold about the subject matter and their orientation towards it. Although both Amy and Kate, as geography majors, acknowledged the importance of teaching students in New Zealand about the Treaty and its related issues, they were demonstrably less comfortable teaching a history based social studies topic. Throughout the data gathering, Amy regularly made reference to her lack of preparation and training to teach the topic area. She openly stated that if she were given the choice she would not teach the historically based topic at all. Kate was much less explicit about her content knowledge. Discussion of pedagogical approaches and overriding concerns for students’ understanding of social studies concepts masked an uncertainty about historical details, and an understanding of historical relationships. Further analysis of the research data reflected findings of other studies (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Grossman, 1990; Gudmundsdottir, 1990a, 1991; Nespor, 1987), where disciplinary orientation and beliefs about the subject were influential in determining the approach to teaching. Kate did not see historical context as important and adopted a teaching approach that she felt concentrated on wider issues of social justice and human rights. It was also discernible in this current research that teachers of experience and authority are influential in determining the primacy of particular social studies topics, the manner in which they are taught by themselves and others, and the learning outcomes for students.

An extensive knowledge of learners, with specific emphasis on their students’ abilities and interests, was demonstrated by all four teachers. They were all aware that students learn in different ways and they shared a belief in a variety of teaching and learning strategies, including the importance of visual materials to aid or reinforce learning. The areas of difference were the aspects of student learning that were emphasised. The social studies teachers with limited historical knowledge concentrated on literacy issues and appropriate behavioural skills. The history specialist teachers were equally knowledgeable about their students but they were more acutely aware of content specific learning difficulties that could arise, for example gaining a sense of chronology and comprehending abstract historical ideas. Teachers with history discipline knowledge also recognise that empathising with people in the past is a
difficult skill, although they acknowledge that role play is a viable teaching strategy for presenting and discussing perspectives of individuals in the past. The evidence emerging from this study is that for historical role play to work effectively in the classroom, the teacher requires a depth of subject content knowledge in order to steer the learning activity and enable students to build on current understandings, as well as acquire new knowledge that is accurate and meaningful.

The finding that teachers with knowledge of a discipline are able to teach more competently in a relevant topic area is not new. This conclusion aligns with the findings of several studies which have been conducted in the U.S. and Britain (these include Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Bennett & Turner-Bisset, 1993; Grossman et al., 1989; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Yeager & Davis, 1995). It is my contention that for teachers to teach effectively about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand, social studies teachers not only require knowledge of the discipline of history, they must also be able to transform this knowledge into subject matter knowledge for teaching, or pedagogical content knowledge, in order that it be comprehensible to secondary school students.

Contentious issues in social studies
Earlier research has documented that teachers who lack confidence in their mastery of content fear creating controversy in the classroom and that contentious issues are likely to be avoided wherever possible (Dunkin et al., 1998; Romanowski, 1996; VanSledright, 1996). In this current study, the teachers without a command of their subject content either avoided class discussion surrounding topic details and ideas or, as foreseen by Openshaw (2004), reverted to “the comparative safety of broad generalisations” (p.272). Further, in the interview dialogue about teaching the Treaty of Waitangi topic, Amy and Kate expressed concerns about parental and community opinion, “not becoming too controversial”, and “avoiding politicizing the topic.” It was ventured that it is “a high risk, high stakes topic to teach”. In this sense very little appears to have changed since Simon’s (1992) study in two Auckland schools, where most social studies teachers tended to steer away from potentially controversial topics involving Māori-Pākehā relations in order to avoid the possibility of conflict in the classroom.

School social studies programmes
This study also reveals a disparity between schools, and among teachers within schools, in the approach to teaching this area of “essential learning about New Zealand society” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.23). In some schools, teaching the Treaty of
Waitangi topic is mandatory, in other schools segments of the topic area are taught as exemplars in thematic studies (such as social justice and human rights), providing no guarantee that the students will eventually gain a coherent overall picture of the Treaty and its implications up to the present day. At the other end of the continuum are schools where the topic is included in the social studies programme, but it remains optional to teach. As a consequence it may be taught comprehensively by some teachers, it may be addressed in a perfunctory manner by others, or in some cases not taught at all. The results of the enactment of the curriculum, as opposed to what is delineated in school programmes and in Ministry of Education policy regarding ‘essential learning’ (Ministry of Education 1997a), points to variation in the learning opportunities that are available to Years 9 and 10 students. These are the final years of social studies as a compulsory curriculum subject, when the majority of New Zealand students are exposed to teaching and learning about the Treaty of Waitangi and related issues for the last time during their secondary schooling. Yet one of my study participants, from a large social studies department commented, “I know that some of my colleagues avoid any New Zealand history related social studies topics because they lack the confidence to teach the content”.

Implications of the research findings

The findings arising from this research have practical implications that are relevant to pre-service teacher education and to the professional development of in-service teachers. The study conclusions also provide insights that could inform the review of the national social studies curriculum document and its later implementation.

Evidence in Chapters 5 and 6 of this study suggests that there are beginning teachers, and others with many years of practice, teaching social studies classes in secondary schools with limited subject content knowledge for teaching the topic area which centres on the Treaty of Waitangi. My research suggests that this situation exists firstly because most one year secondary teacher training courses, which are completed after university graduation in a subject discipline, focus on pedagogy and curriculum knowledge. Subject content knowledge of teacher trainees may be minimal because many of the university papers that prospective teachers choose to study do not provide knowledge that is related to topics that teachers are expected to teach. Secondly, subject content knowledge is often taken for granted within the secondary school environment with school managers assuming that a degree major provides beginning teachers with enough knowledge to teach their school subjects. My findings resonate with other research (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1990), that beginning teachers and
their school supervisors are so preoccupied with concerns relating to discipline and classroom management that lesson topic content is often ignored. Finally, but very significantly, social studies is made up of many disciplines. Teachers do not have mastery of them all and cannot therefore be expected to know everything about the subject when they begin to teach. However a competent social studies teacher can be expected to be aware that there are different ‘ways of knowing’ and different forms of knowledge that can be applied to disciplines other than the one in which they graduated (Stanley, 1991; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988).

**Pre-service teacher education**

Since Shulman’s (1986a, 1987) call for an emphasis on subject matter knowledge for teaching, classroom research has highlighted the fact that teachers’ understanding of subject content, and their ability to communicate this knowledge, is a crucial factor in effective teaching (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Grossman, 1990; Grossman et al., 1989; Hashweh, 1987; Marks 1990; Gudmundsdottir, 1990b, 1991; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991). Research has also found that teachers who have demonstrable expertise in subject content are found to be more assured, confident and enthusiastic in their work (Schempp et al., 1998). In Britain and USA, policymakers’ assimilation of these findings since the late 1980s has led to pre-service teachers’ knowledge of subjects, and application of subject matter knowledge in the classroom, becoming a key element in the reform of teacher training (Bennett, 1993; McNamara, 1991; Sosniak, 1999).

If the aim of social studies education in New Zealand is “to enable students to participate in a changing society as informed, confident and responsible citizens” (Ministry of Education, 1997a, p.8) then teachers of social studies must be adequately prepared to meet this objective. In the context of pre-service social studies education, more emphasis could be placed on pedagogical content knowledge of the areas of essential learning about New Zealand outlined in the national curriculum. Thornton (2003) suggests that another possibility for improving teacher subject content competence is the facilitation of a better alignment between academic courses that prospective teachers take as undergraduates and what they will be expected to teach in schools. Where teacher education has become amalgamated with universities, Sosniak (1999) alleges that there is a greater probability that academic subjects will be taught in a manner that calls attention to, and promotes professional knowledge about teaching, and pedagogy will be taught in the context of the subject content that prospective teachers expect to teach. In Shulman’s (1999) view, “until teachers in Colleges and Universities recognise that they are all teacher educators and thus take
the responsibility for the knowledge of their students, little progress on the subject matter front will be achieved" (p.xiv).

**Professional development of in-service teachers**

The educational reform movement in USA through the 1990s has seen improving teaching as the best path to improved learning and has thus placed particular emphasis on the professional development of in-service teachers. A key feature in the effectiveness of this programme is a focus on deepening teachers’ content knowledge and knowledge of how students learn particular content (Birman, Desimone, Porter & Garet, 2000).

In a New Zealand context, appropriate training and guidance to develop subject matter knowledge for teaching in the Treaty of Waitangi topic area would be helpful and advantageous for many in-service social studies teachers. This could include assistance in developing pedagogical content knowledge appropriate for secondary school students, understanding new historical interpretations in New Zealand’s history and, as advocated by Palonsky (1993) and Simon (1992), training in critical inquiry skills. Although the latter are considered by H. Barr (1998) to be reflected in the current national social studies curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997a), my findings of teachers’ enactment of that policy document, detailed in Chapter 6, suggest that Openshaw’s (1998) view, that independent critical thinking skills are not emphasized in the curriculum, is also reflected in classroom practice. The reluctance of two of my study teachers to confront controversial issues suggests that teachers have to learn to develop the expertise to handle contentious questions in the classroom, which will ensure that they are better prepared to teach students to think along critical dimensions to become socially informed, active and knowledgeable citizens.

Following the programme of curriculum modifications being undertaken from 2003 to 2006, the New Zealand Ministry of Education (2002) has recommended that “support materials and professional development should be provided that focus on developing teachers’ understanding of the content knowledge that underpins each of the curriculum statements” (p.4). A commitment to this professional development is essential because, as VanSledright (1996) points out with reference to teachers bringing current subject matter knowledge into secondary classrooms, “teachers can hardly be expected to accomplish subject matter knowledge reform entirely on their own” (p.287).
Social studies curriculum development

Recognition should also be given to the implications for future curriculum development. When the current New Zealand Curriculum Framework was established in 1993, curriculum policy shifted from a focus on content to a focus on outcomes (Ministry of Education, 2002). As with all the curriculum documents produced in the 1990s, *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1997a) is a non-prescriptive document, apart from an outline list of nineteen areas of “essential learning about New Zealand society” (p.23). The Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been implemented over time, and how it has been applied to current systems, policies and events, is one of the nineteen areas. To counter the disparities this research study has uncovered in the way that schools adhere to the national curriculum, and the differences in teachers’ interpretation of the requirement to teach the Treaty of Waitangi topic, more specific guidelines on achievement objectives for teachers and the outcomes of student learning are necessary. This has also been recommended in a report on the New Zealand Curriculum by the Education Review Office (2001). Without becoming unnecessarily prescriptive, and still allowing for school ownership of their social studies programme, such clarification would enhance teachers’ understanding of what should be taught and in what ways aspects of the topic area could be addressed over the years of compulsory curriculum study.

Video-stimulated recall methodology

A further implication highlighted by this study is that video-stimulated recall is a valuable methodology for investigating teachers’ cognitive processes underlying classroom actions, as well as being a very powerful reflective tool for teachers to capture the complexity of their practice. My experience with the implementation of video stimulated recall also demonstrated its potential value as a methodology for using with pre-service teachers. It not only allows self-monitoring to improve teaching practice, but as a technique enables an individual to grasp the more tacit and intuitive aspects of teacher knowledge which can give teacher trainees access to the knowledge and cognitions of experienced teachers (Ethell & McMeniman, 2000). Its use by supervisors during teaching practicums could also prove more effective than observational note-taking of a trainee’s classroom teaching because it allows beginning teachers to explain and reflect on their classroom actions which, as Schön (1987) highlighted, can provide the link that bridges the gap between the theory and practice of professional preparation. Utilising the technique in this way also allows appraisal to be a more collaborative process and a more empowering experience for teachers (Grainger, 2003).
Suggestions for future research

Research outside New Zealand in the last twenty years affirms the centrality of subject matter knowledge for teaching. This study adds to such research and to work on teacher knowledge that is still limited in this country. More classroom research into subject specific aspects of teacher knowledge would very usefully inform the work of teacher educators, policy makers and school managers.

As an essential learning area in compulsory social studies, emphasised in its importance by Government, the Ministry of Education and the Education Review Office, the Treaty of Waitangi topic area justifies further qualitative study with a wider sample to learn more about implementation in social studies classrooms. Further, including schools with a greater percentage of Māori students would provide information viewed through a wider lens and a more varied perspective.

There has been little research on how student knowledge of subject content relates to effective instruction and this was outside the scope of my study. However, accessing information from secondary school students themselves regarding their learning about the Treaty of Waitangi topic area in Years 9 and 10, the final years of compulsory social studies, warrants more investigation.

Another avenue for greater exploration is the use of video-stimulated recall as a research method in New Zealand educational settings. Enabling researcher access to teachers’ thinking during the complexity of classroom interactions, through stimulated recall with video replay, provides another dimension to classroom research.

Summary

This final chapter has provided some insights that have emerged from a study focusing on what four social studies teachers know about the area of learning surrounding the Treaty of Waitangi and the ways these teachers implement that knowledge in the secondary school classroom. Implications of the study findings for future social studies curriculum development, the education of pre-service teachers and the professional development of in-service teachers have been discussed, followed by suggestions for further research.

Comment about the four teachers, who saw value in this research and willingly accepted to be study participants, deserves mention here. By my choosing an historically based topic for the study, the two social studies teachers without history
discipline knowledge may be seen to be reflected less favourably. Yet both these teachers possess very significant general pedagogical knowledge and an extensive knowledge of their learners. It is important to note that had I focused on a more geographically based topic in my study, the geography discipline knowledge held by these two teachers may well have meant that the outcomes would have been considerably different.

This study began with the Māori whakataukī: Ka haere whakamua, ka titiro whakamuri, (we walk into the future facing the past). In the context of understanding the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document of a bicultural nation, its status as a living document applying to systems and policies in the present day, and its relevance to future issues that New Zealand faces as a society, the Māori proverb is a very significant truth. Evidence of its relevance lies in the 2005 Mood of the Nation Report (Laugesen, 2005), which cites race relations and the Waitangi Treaty as a major issue of current national concern. It is of crucial importance therefore that, although New Zealand is becoming an increasingly multicultural society, secondary school students should have the opportunity to acquire an understanding of New Zealand’s bicultural heritage, and gain accurate and informed knowledge of the issues that surround the relationship between Māori and Pākehā.

Over a decade of research outside of New Zealand has informed educators that knowledge of a subject, or lack of it, exerts a powerful influence on teaching. It is also recognised however, that subject matter expertise alone is not the singular determinant of good teaching. Knowledge of pedagogy, curriculum, learners and learning, and educational contexts, as well as subject content knowledge, are emphasised in knowledge bases that have emerged in work on the professional knowledge required for teaching. The critical factor for Shulman (1986a, 1987, 2004), is the meeting of subject matter and pedagogy, the interface he called pedagogical content knowledge. The focus of this study has been on teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge, or subject matter knowledge for teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi, its place in New Zealand’s history and in contemporary society. It has highlighted an issue of concern for educators and policymakers in that the research findings indicate that even competent classroom teachers, with acknowledged pedagogical skills and understanding of their learners, can inadvertently restrict the opportunities of their students to learn if their pedagogical content knowledge is limited. In a topic area regarded as essential learning for New Zealand students it is imperative that cognizance be taken of Shulman’s argument that, “subject matter, matters” (Wilson, 2004, p.9).
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Information sheet for Participants and Principals

Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice

Investigators:
Myra Kunowski
Christchurch College of Education
Phone 348 2059 ext 8460
Email: myra.kunowski@cce.ac.nz

Dr Cheryl Sim
School of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
Griffith University
Phone 61 7 387 55926
Email: c.sim@mailbox.gu.edu.au

Dr Lindsay Parry
Christchurch College of Education
Phone 348 2059 ext 8007
Email: lindsay.parry@cce.ac.nz

This research project will fulfil part of the requirements of the Doctor of Education at Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia, for Myra Kunowski, who will be gathering and analysing the data. The project will be supervised by Dr Cheryl Sim from Griffith University, an experienced researcher in the area of teaching and classroom practice and Dr Lindsay Parry, a researcher in social sciences and Associate Principal at the Christchurch College of Education.

This study involves research into the teaching of the Treaty of Waitangi in social studies at years 9 and 10. It is often contended by academic historians, media commentators and politicians, that New Zealand students’ have a poor knowledge of their history which impacts on their understanding of important issues in society today. The researcher is interested to gaining more in-depth information about the place of New Zealand’s history and the Treaty of Waitangi within schools’ social studies programmes, the acquisition of teachers’ discipline knowledge of New Zealand history, and how that knowledge is used in the classroom.

In this qualitative project the information will be gained from practicing teachers of social studies. Early in the project the participant will meet individually with the researcher to provide biographical data, discuss the social studies programme followed, and show diagrammatically their understanding of the essential learning
area about New Zealand associated with the Treaty of Waitangi, its interpretation and application in New Zealand as outlined in Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum. This will take approximately ninety minutes. At a further meeting the teacher will plan a lesson that fits within the curriculum guidelines. The teacher will then teach the lesson to their social studies class which will be in video camera. The focus will be on teaching the subject content, not on the students in the class or classroom management. The lesson will be followed by a stimulated recall interview in which the videotape is replayed and the teacher explains aspects of the lesson to the researcher. This unstructured interview will take about sixty minutes.

All the interviews will be audiotaped and transcribed prior to analysis. The audiotapes and the videotape will be erased following transcription and writing up the project. Neither the participant’s name nor the name of the school will be used at any time, and information provided will remain confidential to the participant and the researcher. The participant will receive feedback at the end of the data gathering process and data analysis phases and they will be given an opportunity to check that the data accurately represents his/her point of view.

It is hoped that participation in the research may provide useful information for the teacher, as well as making a valuable contribution to information that will be instructive and helpful for pre-service teacher education and to planning for professional development programmes for in-service teachers.

Participants may contact any of the investigators, through the contact numbers provided, about any matter regarding the research. Involvement in the project is completely voluntary and participants may withdraw from the project at any time without explanation.

Griffith University requires that all participants be informed that if they have any complaints concerning the manner in which the research project is conducted that it be directed to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred,

either

The University’s Research Ethics Officer, Office for Research, Bray Centre, Griffith University, Kessels Road, Nathan, Qld 4111, Phone (07) 3875 6618,

or

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Administration), Bray Centre, Griffith University, Kessels Road, Nathan, Qld 4111, Phone (07) 3875 7343.

Thank you very much for your assistance with this research project.

Myra Kunowski
Senior Lecturer
Christchurch College of Education
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Participant Consent Form

Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice

As explained in the Information Sheet, this project seeks to gain a better understanding of the teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi and its application in New Zealand in the past and in the present day, within social studies in secondary school classrooms. This will be done through interviews, a lesson planning exercise, and a social studies lesson observation. Feedback will be provided to participants at the end of the data gathering and again when the data has been analysed. All information collected will be treated as confidential. Neither the name of the school nor the name of the participants will be used in any written record of the project.

Would you please complete the consent form below, and return it in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Myra Kunowski

____________________________________________________________________________

I have read the information sheet and the consent form. I agree to participate in the ‘Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice’ research project and give my consent freely. I understand that the project will be carried out as described in the information statement, a copy of which I have retained. I realise that whether or not I decide to participate is my decision and will not affect my studies/ my employment/ my involvement with the school. I also realise that I can withdraw from the project at any time and that I do not have to give reasons for withdrawing. I have had all questions answered to my satisfaction.

Signatures:

Participant

Date

Investigator

Date
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Letter to Principals

The Principal
...... High School

Date

Dear ......

This letter is provide you with information regarding research I am undertaking on Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice, in which ................... has agreed to participate.

This research study will fulfil part of the requirements of the Doctor of Education at Griffith University, Australia. I am seeking to identify sources of teachers discipline knowledge of the above aspect of New Zealand’s history, and how this is transformed into pedagogical content knowledge in the secondary school social studies classroom. Attached is an information sheet for you, detailing the required involvement by ......... It includes the videotaping of one lesson agreed to by him/her in which the focus will be on the teaching rather than on the students. The data will be used solely for the purpose of this research project.

I greatly appreciate the willingness of ............ to participate in this research and hope to get your agreement to go into his/her classroom in your school. I have enclosed a letter which you may wish to use when he/she seeks parents/caregivers permission for their son/daughter’s class to be videoed.

If you agree with this research focusing on .......... teaching a social studies class in your school, would you please complete the consent form below, and return it in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

Myra Kunowski
Senior Lecturer
School of Secondary Teacher Education
Christchurch College of Education
Principal Consent Form

Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice.

I have read the information sheet detailing the required involvement by …………… in the above research project. I understand that the project includes the videotaping of one lesson agreed to by him/her in which the focus will be on the teaching, rather than on the students, and that the data will be used solely for the purpose of this research project.

I give my approval for this research to be carried out during a classroom lesson in ……………… school.

Principal  Date
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Student Consent Form

Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice

Myra Kunowski from the Christchurch College of Education is undertaking a research project on teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi within social studies, as part of the requirements for the Doctor of Education at Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia. To do this she plans to videotape selected teachers teaching a social studies class.

Your son/daughter is a member of a class which will be videotaped.

The videotaping of one lesson, which has been agreed to by the teacher, will take place on .................. The focus is on the teaching of the subject matter. The video will be used solely for the purpose of the research project and all confidentiality requirements will be met.

You are being asked for permission for your son/daughter to be included in the videotaped lesson. If you do not wish him/her to be videotaped he/she will still be able to attend the lesson out of the video camera view.

Thank you in anticipation of your cooperation of this research project. Please complete the form below and return to the teacher by ......................................

I .................. Agree/do not Agree

for my son/daughter .................. to be videotaped during the lesson which is part of the ‘Teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi: Examining the nature of teacher knowledge and classroom practice’ research project.

Date .............
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Semi-structured interview protocol

The teacher participant is informed that the introductory interview will fall into three parts: firstly, a series of questions about academic and teaching background, secondly, a discussion about the essential learning about New Zealand society section of Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997), and thirdly more specific details about the topic area: *the Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to current systems, policies, and events* (p.23). The researcher also indicates interest in sources of knowledge of this area of the curriculum and where the Treaty of Waitangi topic fits into the social studies programme in the participant’s school.

The teacher is asked if there are any questions and whether the format is understood before proceeding.

1. Academic background.

- What is your degree major?
- If not history what area did you specialise in?
- Did you complete any history papers in your degree?
- What were these?
- What can you remember about any New Zealand history that you studied at school in history classes or within social studies?

Teaching career.

- How long have you been teaching?
- Have you always taught social studies?
- What courses or subjects have you taught throughout your teaching career?
- Do you remember being prepared during teacher training to teach social studies?
- In what aspects particularly?
- Have you ever taught very much of New Zealand’s history?
- Is there any part that you feel particularly confident teaching/?
- Are there any parts of New Zealand’s history that you feel least confident about teaching?

2. The section of the social studies curriculum on the 'essential learning about New Zealand society'.

- Have you got any general comments to make about this section of learning about New Zealand?
- The summary on p.23 of the curriculum document covers all the years of compulsory schooling. What aspects of that New Zealand learning are covered in your social studies programme at years 9 and 10?
Who makes the decisions about what is included or excluded in the year’s programme of work?
Are there any whole topics/units of work that deal specifically with New Zealand’s history?
Do you see advantages or positive aspects about students learning about New Zealand’s history within social studies?
Conversely do you see any disadvantages or difficulties that teachers have in teaching New Zealand’s history?

One of the nineteen areas of essential learning about New Zealand is ‘the Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to current systems, policies, and events’

- From your point of view what is some of the content and ideas that you feel should be covered in this topic area?
- How familiar are you with knowledge of how the Treaty has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied currently to policies and events?
- Where did you acquire that knowledge?
- Have you had any opportunity to be familiar with the work of New Zealand historians that give new perspectives on many of the past issues and events in New Zealand’s history?
- How do you feel that other social studies colleagues deal with the ‘essential learning about New Zealand society’ section of the curriculum?
- Are there any further comments you would like to make about this area?

Teaching in the classroom about the Treaty and its application to the present day.

- In your school’s social studies programme how you do approach teaching about the Treaty of Waitangi?
- What aspects do you highlight or concentrate on? Are there any parts that you leave out? Why?
- Teaching about the Treaty and New Zealand’s history overall within Social studies did not reflect at all well in the national Curriculum Stocktake report that has just been undertaken by the Ministry of Education. Have you got any comments to make about this?
- Do you think teachers need more assistance in the topic area about the Treaty and its application to the present day? In what ways do you see that this could be done?
- Any further comments?
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Procedure for concept mapping exercise

1. Prior to beginning the concept map the researcher explains to the teacher how the concept mapping procedure will work. The researcher explains that concept maps are intended to represent meaningful relationships between concepts or ideas, and that the aim of this exercise is to provide a visual road map of understanding of one of the nineteen areas of essential learning about New Zealand. The area, chosen by the researcher, because of it’s importance to understanding cultural and social issues in New Zealand society today, is outlined in the New Zealand Social Studies curriculum as the Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to current systems, policies, and events.

2. The teacher is provided with some examples of completed concept maps on unrelated topics and the following points are made:
   - Concept maps are usually hierarchical
   - The most inclusive or general concept is placed at the top of the map. Other inclusive concepts are then placed in a rank order
   - The remaining concepts/ideas are arranged in a manner that best illustrates an understanding of the topic area.
   - Arrows are drawn linking any concept labels which are considered to be related
   - A word or phrase is written beside the arrow to identify the nature of the relationship between the concept labels.

   This procedure should be applied when the participant creates his/her concept map.

3. The teacher creates a concept map using a series of 30 concepts/ideas provided by the researcher, chosen from social studies texts commonly used in New Zealand secondary schools for the Treaty of Waitangi topic area. This part of the session is audiotaped.

4. The teacher thinks aloud as he/she considers the concepts, what they know about them, and where they might place them on the map. They are arranged on a sheet of A3 paper.

5. When the teacher is satisfied with the placement of the concepts, the labels are glued onto the A3 sheet. Arrows are drawn between any labels that the participant feels are related, and the meaning of that relationship is indicated by a word or short phrase.

6. On completion of the map a series of semi-structured interview questions are asked by the researcher about the justification for the arrangement of the map, thinking behind the map, and why various concepts are linked together.

7. Further questions seek information on sources of knowledge for ideas shown in the map (from tertiary education? own reading? teacher training? significant other? professional development?).
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Procedure for lesson planning task
think-aloud protocol

The teacher is asked to think about a lesson to be taught to a social studies class that would fit broadly into the essential area of learning summarised in Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum document as the Treaty of Waitangi, its significance as the founding document of New Zealand, how it has been interpreted over time, and how it is applied to current systems, policies, and events.

The teacher is asked to plan aloud the social studies lesson that they are going to teach. They are instructed to tell the researcher everything that passes through their mind about content, teaching and learning strategies as they are doing the task. While thinking aloud they are requested to put their ideas for the lesson plan down on paper. The researcher interrupts only to seek any clarification or elaboration.

The teacher is asked if there are any questions and whether the procedure is understood before proceeding with the lesson planning activity.

During the think-aloud (questions to elicit information)

- What are the learning outcomes you hope to achieve in this lesson?
- Do you anticipate any student difficulties with understanding the content? the activities?
- Do you feel you will need to make any changes/ adaptations for students of higher or lower ability?
- Why have you structured the lesson in this way? Where have you gained the knowledge on how to do this? (teacher training? curriculum knowledge? previous experience? knowledge of students? knowledge/beliefs about the subject?)

Further probes:

- How will you know what students have learned?
- Where did you learn that?
- Explain that to me?
- I’m not quite clear…
- Why do you think you might do that?
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Video-stimulated recall interview protocol

Before viewing the taped video lesson:
The researcher explains to the participant teacher that this part of the research study is to find out how teachers convey knowledge and understanding about the Treaty of Waitangi topic, identified as essential learning about New Zealand in the national social studies curriculum. It also seeks to find out why teachers do the things they do in the classroom.

The researcher explains that the teacher is in control of the session, and that when he/she watches the videotape they are asked to stop the tape at various points where they see themselves making decisions about the lesson content, or how the students are reacting to it. They should comment on what they are doing and why. They should also stop and explain decisions they have to make about routines, management of the classroom if that is affecting the delivery of the lesson. If there are other things on the tape that they wish to comment on, they should just stop the tape and talk about those happenings. The researcher explains that if there is something she would like to clarify or explore she may also stop the tape and ask for comment.

The teacher is asked whether the procedure is understood and whether there are any questions before viewing the tape.

Viewing the videotape:
The teacher stops the videotape of the classroom lesson and comments on decisions made, lesson content, etc.

Some questions from the researcher:
- Why did you decide to do that?
- What influenced you decision there? (e.g. knowledge of learners, classroom environment, class management, curriculum knowledge, knowledge of content, discipline knowledge, making the subject comprehensible to young learners, beliefs about the subject)
- What is the basis or origin of using this technique?
- Why did you do that?
- How would you justify that?
- What evidence have you that that is a good thing to do?
- Where did you learn that? (e.g. university, teacher training, secondary school, curriculum document, textbook, professional development, professional reading, other teachers, head of department, own experience, knowledge of learners).
## Appendix I

### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bastion Point</td>
<td>1978 Māori land protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biculturalism</td>
<td>two cultures referring to Māori and Pākehā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hīkoi</td>
<td>march</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone Heke</td>
<td>northern Māori chief, the first to sign the Treaty of Waitangi, later felt it was dishonoured and led opposition to sale of Māori land in 1840s and loss of Māori mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāwanatanga</td>
<td>governorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kura kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>schools teaching curriculum in Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land March</td>
<td>1975 march through the North Island protesting loss of Māori land, led by Whina Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>prestige, standing, authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>indigenous people of Aoteaoa/New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māoritanga</td>
<td>Māori culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngai Tahu</td>
<td>Māori tribal group of the South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>non-Māori New Zealander of European descent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parihaka</td>
<td>1881 Māori protest against land confiscation using passive resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of the Treaty</td>
<td>principles implicit in the Treaty of Waitangi which have emerged from the Waitangi Tribunal and Court rulings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangitiratanga</td>
<td>power to rule and make laws, sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raupatu</td>
<td>land confiscation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata whenua</td>
<td>literally meaning ‘people of the land’ politically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recognising Māori as the indigenous people of New Zealand with particular rights and privileges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taonga</td>
<td>treasure, valuables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tauiwi</td>
<td>foreign race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Reo Māori</td>
<td>the Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</td>
<td>the Treaty of Waitangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairau Affair</td>
<td>a dispute over land in the early 1840s resulting in 8 Māori and 22 Pākehā killed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitangi Tribunal</td>
<td>set up by government in 1975 to hear Māori grievances and recommend compensation where proven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakataukī</td>
<td>Māori proverb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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