# Investigating Holocaust education
# through the work of the museum educators
# at the Durban Holocaust Centre : a case study

Brenda Raie Gouws

Department of History Education

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of M. Ed. (History Education)

University of KwaZulu Natal

2011

Supervisor:       Prof. Johan Wassermann

Date of submission:   January 2012

# Abstract

What is the work of the Durban Holocaust Centre museum educators and how are they shaping Holocaust education there? These questions provided the impetus for this study. Education about the Holocaust has been included in curricula not only in South African schools but in various countries around the world. The reasons for this extends beyond the hard historical facts and figures and go to the heart of a human search for meaning and the desire to promote democracy and human rights in society. The Holocaust was an event in which millions of Jewish men, women and children were murdered as well other ethnic groups. The dilemmas they faced and the decisions taken at that time differentiated the participants into victims, perpetrators, bystanders and upstanders. In the years since the end of World War II, people have strived to extract meaning from those events and to teach it to new generations in order to create a better world - a world in which bullying, racial and ethnic taunts and tensions, violence, discrimination against minorities and strangers, and genocide still occur. The findings show that as in other places in the world, this is the educational focus at the DHC. Teaching the history and events is the bedrock on which this social Holocaust education rests but it takes second place in the educational programme to this social goal. The findings show the local context for this learning is significant and that apartheid, racism and xenophobia all underpin the museum educators' educational philosophies while mother-tongue language moulds their teaching strategies. The museum educators play a pivotal role in presenting the educational programme and in so doing shaping the Holocaust for the visiting learners and teachers.

# Declaration

I, Brenda Raie Gouws, declare that:

1) The research reported in this dissertation, except where otherwise stated, is my own original work.

2) This dissertation has not previously been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

3) This dissertation does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.

4) This dissertation does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:

   i) Their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced;

   ii) Where their exact words have been used, their writing has been placed inside quotation marks and referenced.

5) This dissertation does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the thesis and in the Bibliography section.

23 January 2012

_____          _____

Brenda Raie Gouws                                        Date

## Ethical Clearance Certificate

**UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL**

*University of KwaZulu-Natal*
*Research Office*
*Govan Mbeki Centre*
*Westville Campus*
*University Road*
*Chiltern Hills*
*Westville*
*3629*
*South Africa*
*Tel No: +27 31 260 3587*
*Fax No: +27 31 260 2384*
*E-mail : naidoos4@ukzn.ac.za*

24 October 2010

Mrs B R Gouws
Education Studies
EDGEWOOD CAMPUS

Dear Mrs Gouws

**PROTOCOL:  Investigating Holocaust Education through the work of the guides at the Durban Holocaust Centre:  a case study**
**ETHICAL APPROVAL NUMBER:  HSS/1178/2010 M:  Faculty of Education**

In response to your application dated 15 October 2010, Student Number: **210551782** the Humanities & Social Sciences Ethics Committee has considered the abovementioned application and the protocol has been given **FULL APPROVAL**.

**PLEASE NOTE:**  Research data should be securely stored in the school/department for a period of 5 years.

I take this opportunity of wishing you everything of the best with your study.

Yours faithfully

..........................................................................................................
**Professor Steve Collings (Chair)**
**HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE**

SC/sn

cc:  Prof. J Wassermann (Supervisor)
cc:  Mr. N Memela

Founding Campuses:  ▬ Edgewood  ▬ Howard College  ▬ Medical School  ▬ Pietermaritzburg  ▬ Westville

# Acknowledgements

Firstly I would like to thank the Aaron Beare Foundation and Julian Beare in particular for all the financial assistance and support that I have received over the course of the last two years of my studies.

I would also like to thank Lesley Greenbaum who was the catalyst for this dissertation. It was thanks to her positivity that I was motivated to approach the University of KwaZulu-Natal after many years of threatening to study.

When I became a museum educator at the Durban Holocaust Centre, I was driven by a passion for education, but thanks to the many courses I have been privileged to attend under the auspices of the Durban Holocaust Centre, Holocaust education has opened up an entirely new world for me, both academically and personally. I want thank Mary Kluk for her support of my studies but most especially I want to thank the museum educators who participated in my study and shared their stories with me. Their enthusiasm and warmth permeated my interactions with them and their love of the work they undertake, mostly as volunteers, was admirable and inspiring.

A very special thank you goes to my supervisor and mentor, Prof. Johan Wassermann. I am constantly blown away by the huge amounts of time, energy and effort that he has ploughed into assisting me with my studies. I am indeed fortunate to have stumbled into his office wanting to undertake a masters' degree after many years in the academic wilderness and that he was willing to take me on. His professionalism, humour, intelligence, guidance, insight and understanding have made this journey more worthwhile and challenging than I could have hoped for. His sage advice that life is like a boat journey has not gone unheeded.

To my special friends, who have listened patiently to my endless ruminations during the ups and downs of my academic journey, thank you for providing me with much needed support and words of encouragement. And last but certainly not least, I want to thank my wonderful family for their love, constant support and patience. Mom and Dad, you are always there for me – no matter what. And to Stephen and Jessica, thank you for the love and inspiration you constantly provide – you are the wind beneath my wings.

# List of Abbreviations

CTHC          Cape Town Holocaust Centre

DHC          Durban Holocaust Centre

DoE          Department of Education

DJC          Durban Jewish Centre

FRA          European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

HEDP          Holocaust Education Development Programme

ITF          Task Force for International Education, Remembrance and Research

IWM          Imperial War Museum

JHGC          Johannesburg Holocaust and Genocide Centre

KZN          KwaZulu-Natal

Nazi          National Social German Workers

NCS          National Curriculum Statement

SAHGF          South African Holocaust and Genocide Foundation

SS          Schutzstaffel

UK          United Kingdom

UKZN          University of KwaZulu-Natal

UN          United Nations

USA          United States of America

USHMM          United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

# Table of Contents

# CHAPTER 1
# INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

## 1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate Holocaust education through the work of the museum educators at the Durban Holocaust Centre (DHC). Holocaust education is a broad and sometimes problematic term used to describe education about the Holocaust, which occurs in an educational setting such as schools and museums. According to Eckmann (2010) there are two issues that make the term problematic: firstly the fact that it is not well defined and secondly that it does not clearly lay out the bounds of the definition. She goes on to explain that although the term is used to recognise a specific field, it has an "institutionalised dimension" and the term "does not exactly explain what it addresses" (p. 8).

Using a case study format within the qualitative interpretivist paradigm, my research investigates the work of the museum educators at the DHC in order to better understand Holocaust education. The DHC, the setting of my study, represents an easily identifiable bounded system, with the museum educators the lens through which I examine Holocaust education.[1] I have chosen to investigate the work of the museum educators as they are an integral part of the museum's educational programme and through their pedagogy shape its educational practices. In order to better understand this phenomenon, my study needs to be placed in its historical, conceptual and educational contexts. In Chapter 1 I therefore examine not only the history of the Holocaust but also define the various concepts that inform my study. I also look at the evolution of Holocaust education and Holocaust museums with a focus on Holocaust survivors as a catalyst.

---

[1] I have used the term "museum educator" to describe all the people who work at the DHC in an educational capacity. There are two categories of museum educators - facilitators and guides. All museum educators are guides. They accompany the visitors through the exhibition. There are also specialist guides, called facilitators. They also accompany visitors through the exhibition but have the added responsibility of organising each school tour and conducting the introduction and wrap-up sessions.

## 1.2    Background to the study

### 1.2.1    Placing the study in context

Between 1933 and 1945 the National Social German Workers' (Nazi) Party and their collaborators co-ordinated and systematically carried out the state-sponsored persecution and mass murder of approximately six million Jews – this was the Holocaust (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010g). The Holocaust became part not only of European, but also of world consciousness being unprecedented in history (Bauer, 2009; Holocaust Education Development Programme, 2010) for although other mass killings had taken place previously, this was the first time a group had been targeted for total annihilation (Bauer, 2009; Silbert & Petersen, 2007).

The Jews were murdered not because of anything they did or did not do, but simply because of their ethnicity and ancestry (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a). The Nazis embraced the concept of racial purity believing that certain groups of people were superior to others, with the Jews being regarded as the most inferior, a sub-human race, and a danger to the purity of German blood (Silbert & Wray, 2004). However, the Jews were not the only victims of Nazi persecution and murder. Millions of others including the German disabled, political opponents, Roma and Sinti, Poles, Blacks, homosexuals and Jehovah's Witnesses were also targeted - although the Nazis did not attempt to systematically annihilate them as they did the Jews (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010g). Their suffering was, of course, no less than that experienced by the Jews nor should it be compared but for the purposes of this study the term Holocaust will be used according to the most current definitions and will refer predominantly to the Jewish experience.[2]

---

[2] The word holocaust (with a small h) was "in broad secular use before the Nazi killings" (Petrie, 2000, p. 33) and during World War II was generally used as *a holocaust* when describing mass killing. By the late 1940s it became more closely linked with attacks on Jews, but it was during the 1960s that the term was narrowed by scholars and writers to refer only to the systematic annihilation of European Jewry and this remains the standard reference today (Niewyk & Nicosia, 2000; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010e). Thus terms such as "African Holocaust" as sometimes seen in

After the end of World War II, politically and intellectually, people sought concepts to describe the enormity of what had happened. Although prior to the Holocaust other mass killings had taken place, for example in Armenia in 1915 where at least one and a half million Armenians were killed by the Ottoman Turks (Astourian, 1990), the word genocide did not exist (Bauer, 2010). It was coined by a Polish Jewish lawyer, Raphael Lemkin, in 1944 to document war crimes committed by the Nazis and their collaborators. Lemkin defined genocide as any systematic policy designed to destroy the foundations of other peoples' way of life and ultimately leading to the group's destruction (Freeman, 1995; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010b). It has also been defined in various ways by others but Bauer (2009) cautions that one should be wary of definitions as any definition of the Holocaust is too simple compared to the complexity of the reality of the event and he cautions that not every attack on a group is genocide.

Further defining mass murder, the United Nations (UN) adopted the Convention on Genocide in 1948 outlining the range of acts that constitute genocide and condemning it under international law (United Nations, 2010). In the same year the General Assembly of the UN adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Astourian, 1990). In line with these concepts but only many years later, many countries acknowledge the pedagogical value of the Holocaust by including it in History and other school curricula (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010d). This includes South Africa where "the Department of Education (DoE) recognizes that the study of genocide history is a key tool in addressing current issues in South African society" (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2010, p. 15).

Bauer asserts that genocide can happen anywhere in the world (Bauer, 2010; Yad Vashem, 2005). Human beings can and do repeat their behaviour which is illustrated by the fact that since 1945, there have been more than 50 genocides and political

---

the literature are not in line with generally accepted current definitions. The Hebrew word "Shoah" meaning calamity or the Yiddish word "Churban" meaning destruction are also used to describe the Holocaust.

mass murders worldwide with a loss of between 12 and 22 million civilian lives (Harff, 2003). For example, approximately 800,000 Tutsis were killed in the 1994 Rwandan genocide (Nates, 2010) and xenophobic attacks in South Africa in May 2008 remain fresh in the South African consciousness (Human Sciences Research Council and the High Commission of the United Kingdom, 2008). The racism, violence, xenophobia and genocide that characterized the Holocaust remain features of the contemporary historical and political landscape. Thus the teaching of the Holocaust both in schools and at Holocaust museums is regarded by Bauer (2010) as an essential element in future genocide prevention.

In the period leading up to the Holocaust, Adolf Hitler not only wanted to dominate Europe and become the most powerful leader in the world but he also wanted to create a master race of pure Aryans. In order to achieve this, he established a totalitarian state founded on racist ideology, rejecting the democratic platform that had brought him to power (Silbert & Petersen, 2008). Using insidious propaganda to feed the flames of antisemitism, which had persisted for hundreds of years in Europe, the Nazis sought to stir up a German population humiliated by its defeat in World War I and suffering economic hardship and political turmoil. They were thus able to create an environment conducive to the persecution and murder of millions of Jews and others.

To enforce this totalitarian regime, concentration camps were initially established in Germany and then across Europe to intimidate, terrify and silence all opponents to Hitler's policies. With approximately 20,000 concentration camps dotted around Europe (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010h) prisoners were subjected to hard labour, deplorable living conditions leading to the spread of deadly diseases, daily unprovoked violent attacks by the captors, medical experimentation and starvation. Various types of concentration camps existed such as those for political prisoners, prisoners of war, forced labour prisoners, or prisoners in transit but there were also camps which were established for a multiplicity of purpose such as Buchenwald which housed criminals, political prisoners, Soviet prisoners of war,

German Jews and others (Monteath, 1994). These were not camps purpose built for killing Jews – that was to come later.

Between 1933 and 1941 approximately 500,000 Jews lived in Germany, comprising less than one per cent of the population (Silbert & Petersen, 2007). On condition that they left everything they owned behind, the Jews were allowed, and in fact encouraged, to leave Germany (Yad Vashem, 2010f), a country they regarded as home and where they were fully integrated into all aspects of social, political, educational, military and other walks of life. Finding countries that would accept them, however, proved problematic, with most countries having immigration quotas, particularly for penniless Jews and many Jews found themselves in a situation where they were unable to emigrate even though they were desperate to do so (Wood, 2007), particularly after the targeted attacks on Jews in Germany, Sudetenland and Austria on 9 November 1938, known as *Kristallnacht* or The Night of Broken Glass.

In 1939 Germany invaded Poland and approximately three and a half million Jews fell under Nazi control, the largest Jewish population in Europe (The History Place, 2010). On 21 September of that year, Reinhard Heydrich, chief of the Nazi Security Police, the Security Service and the Reich Security Main Office, gave the instruction for the all the Jews of Poland, from both rural and urban areas, to be transferred to ghettos (Yad Vashem, 2010d).[3] The ghettos were established by the Nazis across Europe to concentrate and contain the Jews through forced removals into small, sealed-off areas of cities such as the Warsaw Ghetto, which existed from 1940 to 1943. They remained there in appalling living conditions until they either died of disease, starvation, Nazi violence or the ghettos were liquidated - that is, the inhabitants were sent east to Poland by rail in cattle trucks ultimately to be killed in death camps.

---

[3] Heydrich was "a key player in the planning and execution of the Final Solution [to the Jewish Problem]" (Shoah Resource Center, 2011, p. 1) that was devised by the Nazis to eliminate all the Jews of Europe (Silbert & Wray, 2004).

As Germany conquered more European countries and the numbers of Jews that had to be dealt with grew exponentially, expulsions were no longer an option for the Nazis and other solutions had to be found. In 1941 Germany invaded the Soviet Union, a country which also had a population of approximately three million Jews. The Einsatzgruppen, which consisted of groups of Schutzstaffel (SS) officers, local collaborators and police, fanned out in four groups behind the invading German army with the intention of clearing the areas predominately of Jews but also of Roma and Sinti people, Socialists and Communists (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010g). This was done by herding men, women and children out of their villages to areas where they were forced to dig pits or stand by those that had already been dug and then shot, their bodies falling into the mass graves (Schrire, 2007). Almost one and a half million Jews died during these attacks.

However, this method proved to be wasteful of bullets and it was taking its toll on the men who were doing the killing, many of whom began drinking heavily. So a more efficient, less personal method of killing was devised and the Nazis embarked on what they termed the Final Solution to the Jewish Problem, that is, the annihilation of every Jewish man, woman and child in Europe (Silbert & Wray, 2004). Once shooting became too problematic, the Jews of Europe would initially be gassed in moving vans at Chelmno and then in permanent structures that were purpose-built for mass murder - the gas chambers. The Nazis established six death camps in Poland to carry out this task. Auschwitz-Birkenau and Majdanek served as both labour and death camps, whilst Belzec, Chelmno, Sobibor and Treblinka existed for one purpose only, the execution of Jewish men, women and children, an act that was carried out on their arrival (Yad Vashem, 2010e). Mass deportations of Jews in cattle trucks via the vast, well-established European rail networks were undertaken to transport the victims to these killing centres.

The Nazis did not start with killing; they ended with killing (Silbert & Petersen, 2007). They started with hatred, laws and expulsions, using democratic processes. Ordinary people including doctors, architects, scientists, judges, engineers, lawyers, teachers, builders, train drivers and others either knowingly or through circumstance

became part of the chain of events that eventually led to the deaths of millions of Jews on the streets, in ghettos, in concentration camps and ultimately, in death camps whose "sole purpose was the destruction of the Jews" (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010b, p. 12).

### 1.2.2 Holocaust awareness goes global

After World War II ended and the concentration and death camps were liberated, the survivors of the Holocaust, as well as the perpetrators, bystanders and liberators all came back into a new world. But it was the survivors of the Nazi atrocities whose previous lives had been irrevocably ripped from them, who had to start from scratch. With their properties appropriated, their belongings stolen, their families decimated and their lives shattered, they began to pick up the pieces. Some found their way back to their home countries, others emigrated and they began to build new lives (Durst, 2010; Yad Vashem, 2010c). They married, had children and created new homes and careers, but at the same time most survivors carried their traumatic experiences with them as hidden, private memories. Many had no wish to make their memories public by speaking of their experiences during the Holocaust or, even if they did, what they had endured was beyond comprehension for most of the people around them and in many cases even their families did not want to hear their stories (Durst, 2010).

Publicly too Holocaust survivors' life stories were largely ignored with the Holocaust being considered a taboo topic for many years (Amcha, 2010; Bourguignon, 2005). Even history museums exhibited the Holocaust as a footnote rather than the main event. In addition there were several decades of educational silence during which time teachers and textbook writers mainly ignored the subject and the content of textbooks was either flawed or insufficient (Hirshfield, 1981; Short & Reed, 2004).

The world's collective amnesia regarding the Holocaust began when the camps were liberated by soldiers whose culture, language and circumstances divided them from the survivors. The traumatized people who were liberated from the concentration and death camps were seen objectively rather than as individuals. It was as though they

were a reminder of everything that the world at large wanted to forget – the guilt of the Diaspora at not being able to prevent the Holocaust; the depths of bestiality to which man could descend (Schrire, 2007); the lack of action of individuals and countries in assisting them; the almost unimaginable trauma of their lives in the concentration and death camps; and their foreignness.

In order to alleviate their trauma and sense of isolation, survivors around the world gathered in small communities. Groups evolved, such as in Cape Town, where a survivor support group, She'erith Hapletah, the Association of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, was established in 1951 (Schrire, 2002). They found solace in their common knowledge and could share, without much explanation, their pain and memories of those who had perished, with others who could understand their trauma (Durst, 2010; Schrire, 2007).

To record the fate that had befallen European Jewry, testimonies began to be recorded even during the Holocaust when underground archives were created and hidden in places such as Warsaw (Yad Vashem, 2009). And by the end of 1942, the testimonies of many of the first survivors were taken by The Jewish Agency (Beer, 2009). However, these early survivor accounts were generally only used to "document the geographical scope" of the Holocaust (Kushner, 2001, p. 85).

Prior to the establishment of the first Holocaust Museum, Yad Vashem, in 1953 approximately 15,000 survivor testimonies were collected at established centres across Europe, information that was later sent to Yad Vashem to be used as a basis for future education, documentation and research (Beer, 2009). But in other parts of the world there was no such imperative to collect survivors' stories although in some community groups, survivors unofficially recorded their experiences for private publications that honoured their lost family members, friends and decimated communities (Kushner, 2001; Schrire, 2007). The Holocaust was not yet in the public eye.

It was not until twenty years after liberation of the concentration and death camps, at the 1961 trial of Adolf Eichmann, the SS officer responsible for the organisation and logistics of transporting the Jews of Europe to ghettos and camps in Eastern Europe, that the world's focus was brought to the Holocaust (Kushner, 2001). In the Jerusalem courtroom where Eichmann testified from within a bullet-proof glass booth, survivors were called as witnesses. Their testimonies generated an interest in Jewish resistance, which provided them with greater courage to speak out (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010d) and to give a voice to the voiceless millions who had perished in the Holocaust. The Israeli authorities imposed very few restrictions on the broadcast of the trial from Jerusalem in order to bring Nazi atrocities to the attention of the international community (Crespi, 1964). The Eichmann trial was described as "one of the major news events in 1961, attracting the attention of an overwhelming majority of Americans" (Crespi, 1964). But the trial lasted almost a year and as Novick noted, "month after month passed, and press and public lost interest in the case as a 'spectacle'" as well as in the survivor witnesses (Novick & Baron, 2004, p. 360). During this and other Nuremberg war trials of captured Nazis, the survivors were, in fact, generally treated with little respect both inside and outside courtrooms with post-liberation images of emaciated piles of entangled bodies shown repeatedly in the media and with no thought given to their thoughts or feelings (Kushner, 2001). It appeared that the media fed on the headline value of the trial but forgot about the people involved.

In the ensuing years, the mass media kept the Holocaust in the broad public domain through film, the internet, television, books, magazine articles and other printed media. Television series such as *The World at War*, the documentary *Genocide,* and movies such as *Schindler's List* and *The Pianist* made the stories, people and events of the Holocaust more accessible to the general public. And as new information came to light, such as that which became available after the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union, it too was disseminated to the general public via the media. One instance of this was the work done by Father Patrick Desbois, a French Roman Catholic priest who published his book, *The Holocaust by Bullets,* in 1998 after Ukraine became a sovereign state. In it, he conducted interviews with local Ukrainians, who had

witnessed the murder of their fellow countrymen, in order to identify mass Jewish graves and provide proper burials for the victims of the Einsatzgruppen (Nelson, 2009). The media therefore continued, and still continues, to play a role in educating and sensitising the public to the Holocaust as well as in its memorialisation although it should be noted that a great deal of negative reporting is also disseminated via the media and Holocaust denial, particularly on the internet, is rife (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010c).

Today, as a result of the awareness generated by the mass media, the members of the public are more willing to visit and engage with the material at places such as Holocaust museums in order to learn more about the events that unfolded between 1933 and 1945 and to gain knowledge of other genocides as well as to explore the manner in which the Holocaust is relevant to modern society. David Flemming, Director of National Museums, Liverpool, noted, "… museums can play an important role in encouraging people to reject racism …" (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2010, p. 22). This interest in the way that institutions engage with current issues such as racism, human rights and genocide has in turn led to new academic research.

Apart from public interest generated by the mass media, the increasing willingness over time of the survivor community to speak out has also led to greater documentation and research. As the events and pain of their experiences have receded somewhat, people have become more embracing of survivors, more understanding of the trauma they experienced and more willing to listen to their experiences. As a result increasing numbers of survivors have become aware after years of silence that they need to speak out in order to document their stories not only for their families and loved ones but also to let the world understand what they went through, especially as there are no physical burial places or headstones, which are traditional in Jewish culture, but also to assist in preventing future genocides and to address Holocaust denial (Bourguignon, 2005; Durst, 2010; Freedman, 2009). Thus in recent years they have allowed their stories to be officially recorded both audibly and

visually at Holocaust museums around the world, including at the DHC. Indeed, the current number of recorded survivor testimonies at Yad Vashem alone is currently in excess of 100,000 (Yad Vashem, 2009). Through greater visibility and documentation, survivors have transformed over time from "unwanted aliens" to admired individuals whose memories and insights are revered and sought after and through their activities the Holocaust has become the "moral touchstone of the twentieth century" (Kushner, 2001, p. 85). It should be remembered, however, that Holocaust survivors are people with flaws, and as such, they should not be mythologized (Sternin, 2010). Yet, like a stone tossed into a pond, the influence of their testimonies continues to expand in ever-widening circles.

As part of ongoing educational developmental strategies, survivors' stories are highlighted at Holocaust museums where they personalise an event that is for many almost unimaginable in its scale and brutality. Whilst the presentation of survivor testimony is generally accepted as an important part of museum exhibitions and educational programmes, Kushner (2001) questions if the life histories of survivors can indeed be successfully represented in a museum environment as they are inevitably truncated and generally delivered in snippets, thus providing only a glimpse of survivors' full experiences. Even so, it has emerged that many Holocaust survivors will not share their personal memories with everyone, asserting that some learners do not necessarily understand what they experienced and it remains an upsetting exercise for them to reveal their trauma in the face of lack of empathy so they choose only to speak to adult groups or Jewish schoolchildren (Bourguignon, 2005; Geschier, 2005). In fact, this repeated personal exposure has been criticised by Finkelstein (2003), whose parents were both Holocaust survivors, as he believes that survivors are exploited to relive their trauma repeatedly for the sake of what he terms, The Holocaust Industry.

Nevertheless most people believe that it is critically important to have this testimony as survivors are experiencing memory loss, both as the historical events recede in time and through their advancing years and with the knowledge that due to the passing of time, they will soon no longer be with us (Beer, 2009; European Union

Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a; Fowler, 2004; Schrire, 2002; Short & Reed, 2004; Staub, 2006).[4]

### 1.2.3   Holocaust museums and Holocaust education

The genesis and evolution of Holocaust museums is a complex issue starting with the evolution of the awareness of the Holocaust that was addressed in the previous section as well as through political, historical and educational forces. Like the Big Bang, the Holocaust moved from being a taboo subject for a long period of time to quickly becoming a hot topic on the educational stage and in the process generating Holocaust museums that reflect this pedagogy. The temporal gap between the opening of the first Holocaust museum and the subsequent opening of other Holocaust museums can best be explained as the result of the cohesion of various phenomena.

The genesis of Holocaust museums began with Yad Vashem, which, as discussed previously, came into being in 1953 as a documentation and research centre for the recording of survivor testimony. It was also created to educate about and to commemorate the Holocaust. Although the mass media and the Eichmann trial had gone some way to bringing the Holocaust into the public arena, politically America in particular was not focused on Israel or on Jewish matters nor was there any educational or other imperative to spotlight events related to the Holocaust (Finkelstein, 2003). Thus almost thirty years lapsed before the next Holocaust museum, the Holocaust Memorial Centre Zekelman Family Campus, in the United States, was established in 1984 by President Rabbi Charles H. Rosenzveig, himself a Holocaust survivor. Originally intended only as a Jewish memorial, over the twenty

---

[4] Although Holocaust survivors are not the subject of my thesis I have discussed them at length, as they are critical to the unfolding story of Holocaust museums and Holocaust education, both important elements of my study. Survivors carried and continue to carry, "the weight of memory upon their shoulders" (Rosenberg, 2010, p. 2) but it is the generalisations or lessons gleaned from these memories that have been regarded as a means to generate a better understanding of people and the world around them (Bourguignon, 2005) and it is these lessons which have driven Holocaust education beyond memorial.

years of its planning the Holocaust Memorial Centre also transformed into an educational centre teaching the lessons of the Holocaust to help create a better world (Holocaust Memorial Center Zekelman Family Campus, 2010). Survivors were also instrumental in creating other museums, particularly in Australia (Berman, 2001) and in fact, according to Short and Reed (2004, p. 25), "the single most important determinant of the genesis and development of Holocaust education … seems to have been the level of activity of the survivor community".

Other Holocaust museums followed. This was almost two generations after the end of World War II, time which served not only as a salve but also as an initiator. By the mid-1980s survivors were able to speak more openly and freely about their experiences and at the same time, Holocaust memory was beginning to be perceived to be in danger of being lost. In addition, genocide had continued unabated in various places around the world so the question arose if anything had been learned from the Holocaust (Harff, 2003).

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) with its focus on the entire experience of the Holocaust and with an extensive educational programme was opened in 1993, albeit amidst some controversy. Its development had been recommended by the Carter Administration but as a result there were accusations that the museum was based on political rather than humanitarian motives. Also amongst the issues raised was the question of whether this was a Jewish or an American museum (E. Linenthal, 2001; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010a). The creation of the USHMM was followed in 1995 by the Beth Shalom Holocaust Memorial Centre (now known as The Holocaust Centre). This was the first Holocaust museum to be established in the United Kingdom (UK). In line with a burgeoning interest in the Holocaust, even more traditional museums such as the Imperial War Museum (IWM) began documenting a more global record of the Jews' experiences in World War II than it had done previously and in 2000 a permanent Holocaust exhibition opened there (Kushner, 2001).

In essence, Holocaust museums are Jewish memorials. Many evolved in response to Jewish communities worldwide who wished to honour those who had survived the Holocaust, to keep alive and preserve the memory of families, friends and communities who were murdered by the Nazis and also to pass this historical information on to future generations (Cowan & Maitles, 2007; Yad Vashem, 2010a). There are inevitably exceptions to this Jewish *raison d'être*, such as the Tokyo Holocaust Education Resource Centre, which was created by "an anonymous Japanese donor, who wanted to contribute to global tolerance and understanding, deciding it was important for young people in Japan to learn more about this aspect of world history" (Levine, 2008, p. vi) and the genesis of the Beth Shalom Holocaust Memorial Centre came only after its creators, Stephen and James Smith, visited Yad Vashem in 1991. Prior to this visit, they had considered the Holocaust a Jewish matter but were inspired to build this centre, "driven by [the] conviction that the Holocaust is most decisively not a Jewish concern" (M. Du Preez, 2008, p. 12).

Layered over the primary function of memorial is the educational imperative, which occurs on two levels. Firstly, inextricably intertwined with any visit to a Holocaust museum or centre is education about Jewish history. At many museums, visitors encounter information about Jewish life before the Holocaust, followed by the traumatic journey experienced by European Jewry and finally they learn how Jewish life was reconstructed after World War II through the stories of the survivors. Also in many instances, the Holocaust narrative is placed in a contemporary local context so Holocaust museums generally show a connection between local history and Jewish history. For example, at the Sydney Jewish Museum, visitors learn not only about the Holocaust but also about the history of Jews in Australia and in South Africa, visitors to the local Holocaust museums are made aware of the similarity between the discriminatory laws that were promulgated in apartheid South Africa and those of Nazi Germany.

Secondly, Holocaust museums draw on the lessons derived from the Holocaust to teach about individual responsibility, civic awareness, ethical leadership, human rights, and genocide prevention (Imboden & Hopeck, 2008; South African Holocaust

& Genocide Foundation, 2009b). On this level, Holocaust museums attempt to go beyond the narrow interests of a single group, teaching on a local and global scale about the dangers of racism, discrimination and prejudice. Through their exhibits and educational programmes, they educate not only about the history of the Holocaust but also highlight the moral values inherent in the Holocaust narrative and point to where unbridled hatred and xenophobia can end (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a; Freedman, 2009; Salmons, 2001). Using the Holocaust as a case study, they examine the dangers of stereotyping and prejudice and the importance and consequences of the choices one makes (Nates, 2010). Holocaust museum programmes therefore engage learners on morally complex issues and in so doing create the potential for them to experience personal growth. They do this by encouraging the learners to explore dilemmas that they might experience when confronted with discrimination, stereotyping and violations of human rights. The rationale behind this is that through a confrontation with the dilemmas of others and an understanding of the possible implications of remaining silent, the learners might in turn stand up for others (Silbert & Petersen, 2008). However, these lessons are not always explicit. According to Paul Salmons, Holocaust Education Co-ordinator, the IWM's Holocaust exhibit was created to document the historical facts about the Holocaust and not to tell people how to feel about it or to be a catalyst for social change, as he believes that visitors can and do draw their own parallels and conclusions regarding moral behaviour today (Salmons, 2001).

Genocide education and prevention is one of the stated missions of many Holocaust centres and museums and is included in their educational programmes (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2009b; The Holocaust Centre, 2010; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010a; Yad Vashem, 2005). For example, the Johannesburg Holocaust and Genocide Centre (JHGC) "focuses on Holocaust and genocide education through projects and events concerning genocide, with a particular emphasis on the genocide in Rwanda" (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2009a). In this respect, Holocaust museums engage not only in genocide prevention but they do so by teaching about human rights and for many Holocaust museums worldwide, this has become their primary educational thrust.

Underlying this narrative and a possible hidden agenda of Holocaust museums is that they wish to show that Jews are no longer victims. The very existence of Holocaust museums asserts that Jews are taking control of their own history and stories and have, in fact, survived an assault on their existence, remaining to tell their tale. Another sub-agenda is that through the creation of Holocaust museums and memorials the Jewish community has found a way to enshrine its heritage, fight assimilation and make Jews' past suffering relevant (Finkelstein, 2003).

Today there are Holocaust museums and educational centres in many parts of the world, having been established in such diverse countries as Japan, Argentina, Australia, Canada and Ireland (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010a). Here they have come to be perceived as "crucial educational sites that document and symbolise the transition and facilitate the building of 'the future'" (Geschier, 2005, p. 45). However, they seem to be a First World phenomenon for, with the exception of South Africa, currently there do not appear to be any Holocaust museums or educational centres in Africa or other Third World countries.

In addition, while their educational value is always at the fore, it is clear that these institutions form part of a global educational business. Visits to many Holocaust museums are free but attached to these institutions are shops that operate either online or nearby, selling Holocaust educational material generated either by themselves or others such as books, videos, memorabilia and so on. Indeed many Holocaust museums are on the official tourist trail and, according to Bremner (2007, p. 86), "memory infrastructures … are seen as key instruments in the selling of South Africa to tourists and visitors".

Finally, Holocaust museums are repositories for information about a living past but due to the limited available space and vast amount of available material, they inevitably exhibit an edited, truncated history, with necessary omissions. In addition, Bremner (2007, p. 94) notes, "Every act of remembering includes a forgetting" and as such, "Institutionalized memory is inevitably partial memory". This means that in

many respects the presentations by museums and their associated educators are, in fact, re-interpretations of the Holocaust narrative. So it is only possible to know about the Holocaust through the many ways in which it is interpreted and represented to us such as through diaries, memoirs, academic research, exhibits and so on (Young, 1990) and at Holocaust museums and educational centres, museum educators are instrumental in the interpretation of this material for visitors and are therefore the lens through which visitors understand and experience the Holocaust. Hence the focus and purpose of this study is an exploration of the work of the museum educators who teach and guide at the DHC in order to investigate Holocaust education as it is taught at this institution.

### 1.2.4   South Africa and the evolution of Holocaust awareness

Historically, Holocaust awareness in South Africa unfolded in parallel with the rest of the world. Survivors who had immigrated to South Africa remained out of the public eye between 1945 and 1990, simply getting on with rebuilding their lives. However, Schrire (2002) records that they did not have closure about the events that had befallen them, their families and their people in Europe and they had no formal place of commemoration or memorial. So they began, like others around the world, to hold small private ceremonies to honour the victims and survivors of the Holocaust as explained previously.

Publicly in South Africa there were some travelling exhibitions and Holocaust related memorial events that took place annually (Schrire, 2007). However, in response to a travelling exhibition in 1993-1994 entitled *Anne Frank in the World*, which included panels on human rights abuses in South Africa's own history, the first permanent Holocaust exhibition was opened in 1999 at the Cape Town Holocaust Centre (CTHC) (Cape Town Holocaust Centre, 1999). In line with international trends, its aim was to honour the six million Jews who had died in the Holocaust and to recognize local Holocaust survivors but also specifically to promote education about the consequences of racial policies through seminars such as *Teaching for Tolerance* (Cape Town Holocaust Centre, 1999). The CTHC's education team at the time

worked closely with the DoE in order to create educational programmes and materials with a human rights focus (Freedman, 2009). They also endeavoured to ensure that the Holocaust was seen not simply as a Jewish event but rather that it would be used educationally as a case study to build racial harmony and reduce incidents of discrimination, prejudice and xenophobia in South Africa.

Post 1994, although many aspects of the educational landscape in South Africa changed, formal moral education in South African schools was lacking (Swartz, 2006) and there was no pedagogical reflection of the values inherent in the South African Constitution and Bill of Rights. With this in mind, in 2002 the new History curriculum for Grades R to 12 embraced the concept of education with a human rights focus and the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) – History Grade 9 stated, "The values of our Constitution form the basis of all values in the Social Sciences Learning Area. These values, together with human rights ... issues, are integral to teaching and learning in Social Sciences." (Department of Education, 2002, p. 6). Consequently, the NCS – History for Grades 10 to 12 Learning Programme Guidelines stated:

> History should make a crucial contribution to transforming society by helping learners to apply the values that are embodied in the Constitution to their lives and to those around them. ... In teaching History teachers should explore issues of race, gender, class, xenophobia and genocide and the impact that these have had in the past and present. These are critical issues that need to be challenged. When working with content, teachers should raise questions concerning human rights. (Department of Education, 2008, p. 7)

This instruction had strong resonance with the lessons stemming from the Holocaust so when developing the curriculum and in searching for ways in which to help learners understand the devastating social effects of racism and xenophobia, the Holocaust was a perfect fit. In addition, there was a strong ideological link between Nazi Germany prior to 1939 and apartheid South Africa. In recognition of its value in connecting these two histories and as the result of powerful voices, such as Gail Weldon of the Western Cape Education Department (Wassermann, 2011a) and the CTHC, which already had an educational programme, the Holocaust content was introduced nationally in 2002 into the Grade 9 and 11 History curricula as a tool to

make learners aware of the dangers of discrimination and stereotyping and to build a more understanding society.

Currently some schools choose to teach the Holocaust before teaching apartheid, which is also included in the curriculum, as the Holocaust is geographically, temporally and historically a step removed from the emotionally charged exploration of apartheid. This allows learners and teachers to deal with the many common controversial and emotive issues more objectively (Freedman, 2009). One unexpected result of this link has been the surprise expressed by black learners that white people can also be the object of discrimination and persecution and that they have suffered at the hands of other whites (Freedman, 2009; Nates, 2010).

With Holocaust memory, memorial and education now firmly rooted in official history in South Africa, the DHC has gained an opportunity to tell its own story. At the same time local Holocaust museums have become part of the educational establishment and acquired a powerful educational voice, leading the way in how the Holocaust is taught in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) through the educational programmes and teacher training workshops[5].

## 1.2.5   The Durban Holocaust Centre

For almost ten years the CTHC was the only Holocaust Centre in South Africa until the DHC (originally called the Durban Holocaust Resource Centre) was opened in March 2008. It embraced the worldwide trend to integrate education and memorial. The Centre was initiated and funded by members of the Durban Jewish community, with the initial volunteer museum educators and administrative staff being drawn

---

[5] According to the South African Museums Association (2012), museums are defined as,"dynamic and accountable public institutions which both shape and manifest the consciousness, identities and understanding of communities and individuals in relation to their natural, historical and cultural environments, through collection, documentation, conservation, research and education programmes that are responsive to the needs of society" (no page).  This description is in line with the activities of the DHC, so although it is referred to as an educational centre, it nevertheless fits this definition of a museum. The function of each museum depends on its nature and thus as an evolving centre, the DHC functions according to its own guidelines.

from it. The official opening was attended by the then Mayor of Ethekwini, Obed Mlaba, and approximately 350 guests that included "members of the diplomatic corps, civic leaders and representatives from communal organisations" (Durban Holocaust Centre, 2009, p. 2).

Located on Durban's Beachfront, the DHC initially occupied a relatively small space in an old colonial building, the Durban Jewish Centre (DJC), which is a landmark in Durban. However, as a result of the number of schools visiting the DHC, a decision was made to move it to larger new freestanding premises, which are also part of the DJC but which has doubled the size of the exhibition space.

For many years the DJC, formerly called the Durban Jewish Club, was used exclusively by the Jewish community as a cultural and social space. The Jewish community held functions, meetings and socials there, patronized its restaurant and many were members of the bowling and tennis clubs. However, over time, with a dwindling Jewish community and changing political landscape, but the DJC has been opened to all communities in order to keep it viable. The sporting facilities are now defunct nevertheless it is still used for Jewish communal events such as lectures, wedding parties and other social functions. In addition it houses the Durban Jewish community offices but is no longer used primarily as a Jewish social venue.

The DHC came into being in response to and as support for the DoE's inclusion of the Holocaust in the History curriculum (Durban Holocaust Centre, 2009). With the Holocaust now grounded in official history and the link between the Holocaust and apartheid established, it was believed by leaders within the Durban Jewish community that a local resource centre, like that in Cape Town, would be necessary to assist teachers and learners unfamiliar with this topic in coming to grips with the complexity of Holocaust education. It was felt that with the knowledge and support of the existing CTHC, the DHC could take the lead in Holocaust education in KZN by conducting educational tours, providing educational material to local schools and through teacher training workshops. This would also be an opportunity for the Durban Jewish community to tell its own story, with the DHC serving as a memorial

to both those Jews who had perished in the Holocaust and a tribute to the survivors who still live in Durban. Finally it was believed that such an educational centre would make a valuable contribution in the field of genocide prevention.

So, following a temporary exhibition called *Seeking Refuge,* which had a strong educational component and which was visited by many local schools (Durban Holocaust Centre, 2009), Mary Kluk, then President of the Council of KZN Jewry, initiated the creation of the local Holocaust museum. Designed by Linda Bester, the exhibition included multimedia displays, panels with text and photographs, survivor testimonies, archived documents, film footage and a few artefacts (Naidoo, 2010). These artefacts are silver Judaic ceremonial objects found after the Holocaust, which had been stolen from the Jews by the Nazis and were donated to the Durban Jewish Community by the Jewish Cultural Reconstruction Committee (Claims Conference, 2012). They are on display in a glass cabinet in the museum. A unique feature of the DHC is the "Anne Frank Room". Being virtually the same size as the original in Amsterdam, Holland and with the same wallpaper and physical layout, its purpose was to help learners understand the dimensions of one of the spaces in which Anne and her family hid for two years during the Nazi occupation.

According to the Task Force for International Education, Remembrance and Research (ITF), learners are not used to learning from museums and therefore the displays require interpretation (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010b). At the DHC this is done by approximately 20 volunteer and three paid museum educators.[6] There are two categories of museum educators at the DHC: facilitators and guides.[7] The work of the guides entails accompanying the learners through the exhibition and interpreting and discussing the information presented in selected panels. The guides are able to

---

[6] The full-time staff members of the DHC are the director, administrator (who also works as a museum educator), two full-time educators, the domestic worker and the guard. The part-time museum educators work in a voluntary capacity.

[7] The terms museum educators, guides, facilitators and docents are generally used in a fairly interchangeable manner in the literature. Docents for example are described as "trained volunteer teacher-guides" (Burcaw, 1997 cited in Grenier, 2009). In South Africa however, the term guides is used most commonly and colloquially. For the purpose of this study however, "museum educators" will refer to all those people working as educators at the DHC.

highlight information of their choice, for example, the link between the apartheid laws and the Nuremberg laws, both of which introduced the prevention of mixed marriages, imposed forced removals and enforced job reservation. The facilitators, on the other hand, are specialised guides who apart from taking learners though the exhibition also conduct the introductory and wrap-up sessions. The introductory session is used to introduce relevant concepts to the learners while during the wrap-up learners are encouraged to come to grips with the effects of bystander behaviour on events both then and now. The facilitators also help to unpack learners' reactions to issues raised during the exhibition in this post-exhibition debriefing session (Silbert & Petersen, 2008). This is a crucial part of the programme as it is in this session that the facilitators assist the learners to confront their own thoughts and feelings with regard to the concepts they have encountered, such as moral dilemmas, choice, racism and upstander behaviour.

Although some adult groups, members of the Jewish community and some individuals visit the DHC, more than 90% of its visitor population is made up of school groups. Since its inception thousands of learners have visited the DHC and participated in the educational programme, all of whom have been hosted by museum educators (Durban Holocaust Centre, 2010). The demographics of the visiting schools taking part in the educational programme vary, ranging from deep rural state schools with predominantly black learners to highly sophisticated, well-equipped, well-resourced independent urban schools with learners who encompass the full spectrum of South African society. In addition, the DHC works in close co-operation with the DoE in KZN and apart from its schools programme runs regular training programmes for teachers not only from the greater Durban area but also from the Eastern Cape (Durban Holocaust Centre, 2009).

It is in this context and against this background that my study is located with my focus falling on the museum educators of the DHC and their pedagogical practices.

## 1.3    Motivation and rationale for the study

My interest in Holocaust education was initiated by my own training as a volunteer museum educator at the DHC in 2007. Prior to its opening, a call was put out for volunteer museum educators to take part in intensive training that was to be conducted by senior educators of the CTHC. Even though I had no previous educational background in Holocaust education or history, I thought it would be a wonderful way to use my teaching skills and also to give something back to the Durban Jewish community. I had no expectation of what this endeavour would entail other than that I would occasionally guide visitors through a new permanent exhibition. I was excited to gain new knowledge and being Jewish, with my family having originated in Eastern Europe, the Holocaust was part of my personal history.

Once I started my training, however, I realized that this would be much more than simply teaching Jewish history. It began to dawn on me that through guiding I would be able to instruct learners not only about the historical events of the Holocaust, but more significantly for me, to engage with them on the complex ethical and moral issues arising from a confrontation with the Holocaust such as prejudice, discrimination, racism, moral dilemmas, propaganda and choice. Initially it did not occur to me that teaching the Holocaust was so closely aligned to the teaching of human rights and it was only during the course of my reading for this thesis that I began to understand this more global purpose. I understood the commonly drawn parallels between the laws of apartheid South Africa and those of early Nazi Germany and how these parallels could be used to make the lessons of the Holocaust more relevant to South African learners and at the same time generate discussions about the importance of making responsible choices. I was intrigued by the scope and possibility of the applications that this knowledge might have on the learners themselves, on South African society and on the world in general. I also became aware that as an accredited museum educator, I needed to know as much as possible about my subject, so I was motivated to expand my knowledge, which I did by reading extensively and watching whatever I could find on this topic on television.

My wish to study Holocaust education formally grew gradually during the course of my experiences at the DHC. A contributing factor was that I was unable to guide learners groups as I had originally intended, as they visit the DHC in the mornings when I have work commitments. Although I became increasing isolated from the guiding programme, I continued to read and think about the work being done there.

As my thinking evolved through my personal learning and the fascinating courses that I was invited to attend with other museum educators to supplement our guiding skills, my academic curiosity was piqued so I sought to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomena I observed at the DHC. It seemed to me that as museum educators we were dealing with what would usually be classroom instruction although Feldman (1983, p. 48) instructs that museums should be seen as "an extension, an arm, of the intellectual life of the school". This prompted me to contemplate the issues more deeply and to have discussions with friends about the purpose of the DHC's educational programme. I wanted to discover if and how the educational programme could impact the lives of the learners and what the wider implications for society might be.

I was particularly intrigued by the idea that we might not simply be teaching the events of the Holocaust, but were, in fact, providing education about human rights and as I read, listened and thought more, I realised that this lay at the heart of the DHC's educational programme. This raised questions for me about whether or not other museum educators were aware of the depth of this distinction and if this was, in fact, their personal preference when teaching the Holocaust. I was curious about what the museum educators were actually teaching, if they followed the conceptual framework of the exhibition or if they added their own bias or emphasis during their guiding. This raised further questions for me regarding the lens through which they viewed Holocaust education and what their pedagogical practices might be. I also wondered how they dealt with some of the controversial or difficult issues that we encountered as museum educators, how they maintained and expanded their expertise, and how they dealt with the learners' concerns in the post-visit debriefing sessions. And finally, I wondered what their own concerns might be, if these were

unique to individual museum educators or common to the group. Were the museum educators instrumental in shaping the very fabric of Holocaust education in KZN? And if they were, how were they doing this?

This prompted me to realise that through formal study I could possibly find answers to these questions and through educational research make a contribution to what I consider to be a valuable but under-researched field of education. I therefore hoped to investigate and come to some understanding of the role and impact of the museum educators on Holocaust education and through them, explore the impact of the implementation of the DHC's educational programme in the local context.

## 1.4    Focus of the study

The focus of my study is the museum educators at the DHC, as they constitute the core of the implementation of the Holocaust education programme and are critical to its success. In fact, museum educators are seen as "pivotal in ensuring a successful visit by learners" (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 9). My study examines who the museum educators are; what drives them to volunteer; how they see their role; what their educational focus is; how they deal with powerful and complex issues; and how they engage with learners during their visits to the DHC. I also examine how the museum educators maintain and develop their expertise. In short, the study focuses on the work done and pedagogy employed by the DHC museum educators. As they work in the context of a Holocaust museum this study also addresses issues pertaining to Holocaust museums as well as Holocaust education, which is the conceptual umbrella under which the museum educators operate.

## 1.5    Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to understand Holocaust education through the work of the museum educators at the DHC. My research therefore investigates their practices,

pedagogy and the role they play as teachers of the Holocaust. This is done by asking the following research questions:

1. What is the work of the museum educators at the DHC and what is their educational focus in terms of Holocaust education?

2. How are the museum educators shaping Holocaust education?

3. Why are they shaping Holocaust education in this manner?

In doing this, my study seeks to add to the body of knowledge regarding Holocaust education in South Africa as well as Holocaust museums and the museum educators who work there. Through a document analysis of the post-visit evaluations written by the teachers, one-on-one interviews with six museum educators, and photo-elicitation, this study also seeks to close some of the gaps that exist in the current research literature.

## 1.6    Overview of chapters

This is a linear dissertation made up of six chapters that unfolds in the following way. Chapter 1 focused on the background to this study.

In the next chapter, I review the current body of research through the available literature, looking for the gaps that exist and examining the work of the leading researchers in the field. My reading included literature on Holocaust museums, Holocaust education and museum educators and it informed the theoretical frameworks underpinning this research. The first theoretical framework posits that Holocaust education is a compound concept can be viewed through two lenses: the Historical Holocaust, in which the focus lies on history; and the Social Holocaust where the focus lies on the impact of the Holocaust on society. The latter is viewed through the lessons of the Holocaust, the consequences of various types of behaviour and how this is used to encourage social activism. The second theoretical framework discusses how learning takes place in museums and, in Chapter 2 I review the literate pertaining to this.

The methodology and methods employed in my study to collect the data are discussed in Chapter 3. This includes one-on-one interviews with the six museum educators who agreed to participate in this study, as well as a document analysis of the post-visit evaluations written by the teachers who accompanied the learners to the DHC. Photo-elicitation techniques are incorporated as a separate research tool during the latter part of the interviews. In Chapter 3 I also expand the discussion on the theoretical frameworks within which this study is located.

Chapter 4 is the analysis and presentation of the findings. In this chapter I categorise the various themes and support this with evidence from the interviews, the documents I examined and the photo-elicitation portion of the interviews. I also discuss what the museum educators said about their work, their educational focus and their pedagogy.

Second level analysis takes place in Chapter 5 where I compare and contrast the conclusions drawn in Chapter 4 to the body of research literature that I reviewed in Chapter 2, comparing and contrasting the available literature to my research data. Here new areas of knowledge are identified.

Finally Chapter 6 is an overview of the research in which the results, key findings and conclusions drawn from my research are outlined and discussed. The threads of data analysis are drawn together and recommendations and suggestions for future research are provided. Limitations of the study are also discussed.

# CHAPTER 2
# LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1    Introduction

Before engaging with the data and randomly drawing conclusions, it was necessary to undertake a review of the current body of literature underpinning the theoretical frameworks of this study. This was done to listen in on the intellectual conversation that exists between researchers in my field of research and hence become familiar with the views and scholarship of different authors (Wassermann, 2011b). This was necessary as knowledge does not exist in isolation but is located within the body of research conducted by others. By examining the literature I was able to discover the most prominent voices and to identify where gaps exist and later I was able to draw on the related research to support my findings (De Vos, Strydom, Fouche, & Delport, 2005).

The literature reviewed was drawn from the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) Library Off-Campus Databases, internet searches on academic search engines and printed material. All references were either exported to or created in EndNote®, a software programme for managing and publishing bibliographies, which I obtained from the university's website. Version 4 was used for this study. As many references were exported, the capitalisation of words was automatically generated.

With the evolution of Holocaust museums as places of formal education, the work of museum educators is increasingly coming to the fore and the question of their expertise is becoming more relevant. The purpose of this chapter was thus to investigate the literature on Holocaust museums, Holocaust education and museum educators in order to identify the main researchers, to uncover the best practices of Holocaust museum educators around the world and to understand the implications of their work at the DHC. This chapter deals thematically with the major concepts referred to above as well as with the related concepts of genocide, memory, human rights education and emotive and controversial issues.

Due to my lack of knowledge of other languages, this study only reviews literature written in English although it was evident from the bibliography of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) report (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a) that much has been written on all aspects of topic of the Holocaust in German and other European languages.

The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section relates to museums globally and investigates the rationale and purpose of museums today. The literature reviewed examined the relationship between memory and history; how memory is portrayed in museums; how people learn in museum settings and the controversies that exist in museum discourse. Understanding these phenomena provided an understanding of the context within which the museum educators work.

The second section reviewed literature and issues pertaining to the particular genre of museums pertinent to my study, Holocaust museums. The literature explored the rationale and purpose of Holocaust museums and looked at some of the controversies that have raged over their establishment. These institutions face many challenges and understanding what these challenges are helps museum educators to deal with situations that might arise during the course of their duties. The literature included research on how school educators view Holocaust museums, the phenomenon of dark tourism and how museum educators should present horrific information in a manner that would not traumatise visitors but enable them to draw connections between an event that occurred in a different time, place and context and their own lives.

In the third section, there is an exploration of the literature on museum educators in general and Holocaust museum educators in particular. The literature centred mainly on how museum educators acquire their knowledge and develop their expertise, with particular reference to the Contextual Model of Learning. It examined the kinds of people who become museum educators, and in the case of Holocaust museum educators, their current and future role in Holocaust education.

Holocaust education, the conceptual umbrella under which museum educators work, is explored in the fourth section of this literature review. This area of research investigated how and why the Holocaust is taught, the distinction between human rights education and Holocaust education as well as the current debate concerning the relevance of the lessons for humanity from the Holocaust. The literature also looked at methods museum educators can use to teach the Holocaust successfully as well as how effective or ineffective museum educational programmes might be. In addition, the literature covered the education programmes at Holocaust centres in South Africa, which was particularly relevant for my research.

Thus through the review of the literature and by examining what various researchers said, I was able to link the literature with the theoretical frameworks underpinning this study. Two main theories informed my study. The first related to how learning takes places in museums. The second was the idea discussed in Chapter 1 that the way in which the Holocaust is taught can be viewed from two quite different perspectives, historical or social, and that even if Holocaust museums are aware of both aspects of this education, they tend to favour one over the other.

## 2.2    An exploration of the literature on museums

Museums embody and reflect recollections of the past. Unlike personal memories that are reflected in books, diaries, memoirs and so on, memorials and museums mould and shape public memory (Young, 1993a). Public memory is also collective memory which according to Novick (1999) tends to simplify events, looking at them from a single perspective in order to eliminate any ambiguity and this in turn establishes and defines a fundamental identity for members of the group who form part of this collective memory (Novick, 1999). A challenge for museums is to portray public memory in a way that reflects the memories of the group that it represents. However, as human beings our memories are fallible, so inevitably where there is remembering, there is also forgetting which means that "whenever history becomes memory and is institutionalised, certain choices are made, certain forgetting sanctioned, certain remembering allowed" (Bremner, 2007, p. 94). The implication of this for museums

is that the depiction of memory becomes a matter of choice, be it the topic for exhibition panels or the choice of artefacts or even the placement of information. This choosing is reflected in the curatorial decisions made and according to Young (1993a), the motive for the use or exclusion of particular memories might not necessarily be pure.

In addition to the choices made regarding the content of museums, there might be a difference between how history is portrayed and how it is perceived, resulting in problems for both the visitor and the museum (Crane, 1997). In other words, the visitor's memory of the past might be in conflict with what is presented by a museum. This distortion might be reflected in the visitor's expectations based on his or her personal memories or life experiences. Despite these possible ruptures, museums such as the CTHC and District Six Museum in Cape Town, for example, have been described as places where visitors can safely explore their own traumatic memories (Geschier, 2005).

The literature draws a distinction between official and unofficial history. Official history is sanctioned by the state and is regarded, for example, as that which is taught in schools. In South Africa the Holocaust is taught in Grade 9 in response to the following questions posed in the NCS - History (Department of Education, 2002, p. 61)

> How did the Nazis construct an Aryan identity? How did the Nazis use this 'identity' to define and exclude others? How and why did the Holocaust happen? What choices did people have in Nazi Germany?

In official history, the answers to these questions are obtained from school textbooks, the knowledge of the educator, worksheets, workbooks and so on within the context of the school curriculum and according to educational policy. Unofficial history, on the other hand, relates to external sources of education such as the media, museums, families, communities and so on. Unofficially the answers to the questions posed above might be obtained from a relevant panel at a Holocaust museum or from a television documentary or from a discussion that a learner might have at home around the dinner table where the source of the information is not bound by school protocol.

Museums lie at the extremity of the boundary between official and unofficial history (Phillips, 1998) and it is within this blended realm of history education where official history is being taught in an unofficial environment, that the DHC, the site of my research, is located.

Museums, be they official or unofficial, serve many different purposes. They have a socialising function as, according to Phillips (1998, p. 40), "the powerful images gained outside the official environment have profound implications for the ways in which children are influenced and socialized". Museums are also an extension of intellectual life (Feldman, 1983) and are places of personal learning (Falk, 1999); they create and reflect mirrors for their visitors (Crane, 1997; Harris, 1995); they are sites of memory; they can be seen as a symbol of childhood whether this is a single visit or one which occurs with regularity (Crane, 1997) and they are regarded as "crucial educational sites" (Geschier, 2005, p. 45). Moreover museums have the potential to enable visitors to explore the importance of history, to learn why history matters and how to engage with it personally. They are places where reflections of the past and how this past has been interpreted by others are found (Castle, 2002).

Cohn, Ali and Horne (2009) argue that a good reason to visit a museum is that people can see and touch the exhibits and they leave with vivid memories and a desire to ask questions and express their own thoughts about what they have seen. This is borne out by a teacher who described the atmosphere in the school bus after a visit to the Cape Town Holocaust Centre as follows: "On the journey back to school the bus is quiet and subdued; the students return filled with a desire to know more" (Schrire, 2002, p. 8).

Castle (2002) described the work of educators at museums as generally involving two elements: the guided tour; and a programme designed to focus on the content of the exhibition which might be structured or semi-structured but which has "educational intent"(p. 1). Two examples of this work were described in the FRA report (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a). At The Holocaust Centre Beth Shalom in the UK the exhibitions were described as "a key feature of the educational

seminars, which generally last for several hours". At this centre it was considered important for the students to work "as independently as possible" and for the seminars to be varied so "very few lectures or standard tours" were offered (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 125). At the IWM in London, the museum educators also conducted an educational programme, which started with an orientation session to discover learners' prior knowledge and to draw parallels with their own lives. This was followed by an exhibition tour showing the chronological structure of Holocaust history from the political situation post World War I to the liberation of the labour and death camps and where the victims' perspective was highlighted using a range of survivor testimony (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 127). The tour concluded with a feedback session. Part of the work of museum educators was to help the learners interact with exhibition panels (Grenier, 2009).

The way in which people learn at museums was described in Falk and Dierking's (2000) research. They argue that if learning in a museum is to be successful then free-choice learning is essential. As the name implies, this is learning that involves freedom of choice by the learner:

> Free-choice learning tends to be non-linear, is personally motivated, and involves considerable choice on the part of the learner as to what to learn, as well as where and when to participate in learning (Falk & Dierking, 2000, p. 13).

They also report that "learning is at its peak when individuals can exercise choice over what and when they learn and feel that they have control over their own learning" (Falk & Dierking, 2000, p. 138). Although this kind of learning occurs in places other than museums, it is within the museum environment that it is currently best understood. This was supported by the FRA which reports that in the view of teachers taking part in their research, learners should participate voluntarily in visits to Holocaust sites (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a).

According to Falk and Dierking (2000) some of the most interesting research regarding how people learn in museums came from studying visiting groups where

the learning environment was highly structured, a situation contrary to their free-choice model within the Contextual Model of Learning. This model provided one of the components of the theoretical frameworks of my study. It addressed eight key factors within three key contexts that influenced learning in museums: personal (the prior motivations and expectations of visitors, their prior knowledge, beliefs and interests and the choices and control that they exhibit); socio-cultural (mediation within groups where collaborative learning occurs and mediation which is facilitated by other people such as museum educators); and physical (design, prior organisation and reinforcing events beyond the museum experience).

This model also gave suggestions as to how visitors can achieve better learning experiences at museums. This included the staff having a better understanding not only of the nature of learning but also of people's motivations for visiting the museum and how "contextual factors can be used to facilitate learning" (Falk & Dierking, 2000, p. 177).

A study with a different focus but still within the realm of learning in museums investigated how teachers can be trained to use museums as a resource to enhance their classroom teaching (Min Fui Chee, 2006). In this study, the author proposes that it is the teacher who decides how much will be gained from the museum experience by his or her learners. As many teachers are not museum-goers themselves, like most of their learners, their experience is also limited to the school visit. Instead of being actively involved in the teaching at museums, Min Fui Chee says teachers tend to adopt a passive role, simply handing their learners over to the museum's education officer. Some of the strategies she recommends for the training of teachers to enable them to get the most out of museum visits include learning how to work with artefacts; training to become more skilled at reading museum texts, including how to read them more critically; and becoming more understanding of how museums work.

Apart from being places of learning, museums can be places that generate controversy (Boyd, 1999; Harris, 1995). The controversial nature of museums has changed over time. According to Harris (1995), museums used to be regarded as

places of controversy due to the nature of their exhibits or how they were funded or if there was obscenity on display. Presently, however, controversy might arise from visitors' experiences or the message implied in an exhibition or even the question of what topics should be included or excluded. Other reasons for controversy erupting at museums might include questions about how the history is represented (Crane, 1997), the nature of the museum or even the fact that the exhibits might be emotionally and/or politically charged (Salmons, 2003). This political element was apparent in the creation of the USHMM where the issues were diverse. Controversy abounded with detractors wanting to know how a Holocaust museum could be built in America, a country that did not assist the Jews during the Holocaust. Questions were raised about the museum's location, its design, who would 'own' the interior space and about how various groups would be represented (Musser, 2008). Adding to this tension was the accusation that although the establishment of the museum was proposed by the then President, Jimmy Carter, it was in fact, an initiative of his Jewish aides (Novick, 2003).

Controversy with regard to museums is not confined to the physical environment or ideology and might extend beyond the museum to the broader community or mass media. In January 2011 a debate raged in the local media as to whether Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu should be removed as a patron of the CTHC and JHGC. Petitions both for and against the Archbishop were created on the internet with the subsequent discourse playing out in both the printed and electronic media, locally and internationally. The petition calling for his removal cited his criticism of Israel as antisemitic and anti-Israel and said that this made him unsuitable to hold the position of patron of a Holocaust museum (Hersch, Reuben, & Joffe, 2011). On the other hand, the petition defending him stated that he was a worthy defender of human rights (Gosling, 2011) and that "the legacy and lessons [of the Holocaust] belong to and must be guarded by all of humanity" (Kamen & Mndende, 2011). These petitions brought many different people from diverse communities, countries and walks of life into the debate which in turn, according to Kamen (2011), served as a tool to educate people about the Holocaust.

Museums might be regarded as places of controversy but controversial issues, which Stradling (1984) describes as those issues that generate dialogue or disagreement between learners and teachers, are an integral, inescapable part of the school history curriculum. As difficult as these discussions might be, they are valuable in developing critical thinking, improving interpersonal skills and in preparing learners to become productive citizens in societies where democracy is valued (Harwood & Hahn, 1990).

In the light of the above Boyd (1999) claims that it is important that museums challenge visitors and that visitors in turn challenge museums for it is through such an exchange that learning takes place and that a forum is created for differing ideas. The use of guest books can for example be used by museums to encourage and facilitate this kind of dialogue between visitors and the museum. Through them, comments have been recorded about the concept and design of the museum, visitors' educational and emotional experiences (Crane, 1997) and in South Africa, visitors mention their insight into the links between Nazi Germany and South Africa's apartheid past (M. Du Preez, 2008, p. 77). It is this dialogue that is "the lifeblood of teaching and learning in the humanities [for] only dialogue has the power to change" (Feldman, 1983, pp. 50-51).

The literature on museums thus provides the reader with an understanding of some of the complexities relating to contemporary museums. They are places where history and memory are brought together to create a learning environment but they are also places of contestation and controversy. This applies not only to museums in general but also to those with specialised content and context such as Holocaust museums.

## 2.3 Reviewing the literature on Holocaust museums

Holocaust museums are a relatively recent phenomenon only having sprung up around the world in only the last twenty years. This affirms Young's (1993a) observation that as the historical events recede in time Holocaust memorials and museums become more prominent. At the same time each country portrays its

Holocaust museums differently, reflecting its own political, cultural and national knowledge and this in turn determines how a country's future generations will understand this period of time (Young, 1993a).

Holocaust museums were originally intended primarily as places of memorial, honouring both those who died and those who survived, but today they are multi-purpose institutions. They are places of memorial, commemoration, documentation, contestation and education (Alba, 2005; Yad Vashem, 2010a). In defining the roles of history and memorial, Eckmann (2010) emphasises that knowledge and not commemoration should be paramount. For others Holocaust museums "structure, maintain and reinforce collective memory" and where, through an exploration of memory and our past, we learn about ourselves (Bourguignon, 2005, p. 65). Imboden and Hopeck (2008) suggest that Holocaust museums have a cultural function, defining the groups that they represent while for Stradling (1984) the way in which Holocaust museums educate, be it implicit or explicit, encourages visitors to connect to what the Holocaust tells people about humanity. Clark (2007), on the other hand, believes there is a need to shift the emphasis from European Holocaust museums being sites of memory to sites concerned with other issues such as tourism promotion and the promotion of multiculturalism. In general though, Holocaust museums encompass various elements and serve many functions simultaneously:

> Depending on where these memorials are built and by whom, they remember the past according to a variety of national myths, ideals and political needs. Some recall war dead, others resistance and still others mass murder. All reflect the past and present experiences of their communities, the state's memory of itself and, at a more specific level, an artist's vision ... The reasons for building memorials are as various as the sites themselves. Some obey the traditional Jewish injunctions to remember. Others respond to a government's need to explain a nation's past to itself. Some aim to educate the next generation; others are conceived as expiations of guilt or as self-aggrandizement. Still others are primarily tourist attractions (Young, 1993a, p. 36)

Holocaust museums face multiple challenges. Amongst these is the question of how to express the enormity of the event and at the same time make it understandable and accessible to visitors without concentrating on horrific images. Holocaust museums achieve this by focusing on the personal stories of individuals, including victims,

bystanders, resistors or upstanders and perpetrators (Fowler, 2004; E. T. Linenthal, 1994; Schrire, 2002) for it is these personal stories that create empathy by personalising and humanising others' experiences (Imber, 2009; E. T. Linenthal, 1994; Salmons, 2001). Considering this, Imber (2009) instructs educators to rescue the individual from the pile of bodies which, she says, can be done by teaching about Jewish life as it was before the Holocaust. This connects events to the life of the learner thus ensuring that the Holocaust is taught as a human story. In line with this thinking, many Holocaust museums display information on exhibition panels showing European Jewry prior to the Holocaust; use scaled models and artefacts showing what individuals experienced; show videos of survivor testimonies; use quotes by individuals; and display the personal photographs of victims. Personalisation is regarded as crucial at Holocaust museums as it is believed that it is almost impossible for most people to comprehend the scale of the systematic murder of six million people (Silbert & Petersen, 2008). Another way in which to personalise Holocaust museums is to have survivors talk about their experiences or lead visiting groups, as they are able to answer learners' questions with insider knowledge (Holocaust Education Development Programme, 2009).

Other challenges experienced by Holocaust museums relate to their interaction with schools. The problems include the lack of related materials such as textbooks; teachers' bias and their lack of expertise in the field; and their lack of understanding as to why the Holocaust was included in, for example, the national history curriculum in South Africa (Freedman, 2009). Also problematic is the short amount of time available for school visits and the issue of how Holocaust museums might measure the success of a school's visit. Salmons (2003), for example, stated that if any meaningful reflection was to be achieved it needed a reasonable amount of time to be set aside.

In addressing some of these challenges, Short and Reed (2004) report that in general Holocaust museums can play a valuable role in assisting those who lack expertise in the topic or have insufficient resources. In line with this thinking South African Holocaust museums provide resources and materials in the form of manuals, DVDs

and workshops for teachers who are under-resourced or lacking in Holocaust knowledge (M. Du Preez, 2008).

Another difficulty faced by Holocaust museums is how to teach the immense complexities of the Holocaust narrative (Fowler, 2004; Salmons, 2001, 2003). The vast scale of the event makes it difficult to present a completely logical, cohesive account (Kushner, 2001; Schrire, 2002). One of the suggested ways of dealing with this is to provide materials to the schools before their visit in order to create a link between the school and the museum (Salmons, 2001) thus enabling the teachers to become the interface between the two (Geschier, 2005).

Also challenging for Holocaust museums is how to deal with the emotional component of teaching Holocaust history for while emotions are seen as an important part of the educational process, there is a danger of "emotional overload or emotional resistance" when confronting the Holocaust (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 12; Holocaust Education Development Programme, 2009; Short & Reed, 2004). Educators, in both the classroom and the museum environment, are therefore cautioned to be sensitive to learners' emotions, avoid glibness, differentiate between teaching and preaching (Salmons, 2003) and generally follow the many guidelines available on how to teach the Holocaust (Cohn, Ali, & Horne, 2009; Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010b; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010f).

Contemporary museum visitors are part of the digital age and young people in particular interact with technology on a daily basis but some Holocaust museums are not fully embracing this as yet. To address this reticence, Imboden and Hopeck (2008) suggest ways in which museum educators can engage and communicate more effectively with their school visitors via technology. These include explanations about how different a modern city is from, say, the ghetto in Warsaw during World War II

where communication was lacking; discussions about Darfur[8] to show learners that genocide and human rights abuses still exist today; and the incorporation of new technologies such as touch screens into exhibitions.

An emerging phenomenon in the literature on Holocaust museums is dark or genocide tourism (Bourguignon, 2005; Crane, 1997; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a; Norden, 1993; Schaller, 2007; Stone, 2006). Holocaust museums are regarded as sites of dark tourism due to their content of persecution and death. According to the FRA report, Lennon and Foley (2000) conducted a study of people who visited both authentic sites and museums associated with suffering and death and ranked these destinations on a scale from light to dark (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a). On such excursions, visitors go to authentic Holocaust sites, museums or memorials where they stay in hotels, take tours and eat in restaurants thus attaching economic value to their visits and participating in the local tourism infrastructure. For example, there are tours to the sites of the death camps in Poland, which provides a lucrative business for local Poles (Schaller, 2007). In South Africa too Holocaust museums are part of the local tourism infrastructure. In Durban, for example, the DHC is advertised in tourist information pamphlets such as *Wuzu* (J. Du Preez, 2011*)* and in the official Durban City museum tourist guide of Ethekwini Municipality called *Museums* (Ethekwini Municipality, 2011).

Various issues arise in relation to dark tourism, one of which is the potential that exists for visitors to be emotionally exploited. For instance, visitors to authentic Holocaust sites might gain a distorted view of the country they are visiting. Or they might focus too narrowly on the purpose of their visit, that is, the sites of death and suffering, and therefore might not get a global perspective of that country's other

---

[8] The conflict in Darfur in western Sudan has resulted in the deaths of approximately 300,000 civilians, mainly from disease. The United States and some human rights groups believe that genocide is taking place although this contention has not been supported by a United Nations investigation. The Arab Janjaweed militia are accused by the current government of trying to drive out black Africans from large areas of the country (BBC News, 2010).

attributes (Schaller, 2007). In fact, if they are only concentrating on these features of their visit, the context of the Holocaust or the events leading up to it might be missing. Rather than going to the authentic site, Bourguignon (2005) suggests that visitors actually prefer visiting Steven Spielberg's reconstructed *Schindler's List* set depicting Auschwitz in Kazimierz, Poland, as this, she says, is in better condition than the original. The question then arises as to whether visits to Holocaust museums with their element of horror are, in fact, educational or just voyeuristic experiences (Schaller, 2007). However, it has also been suggested that the experience of horror, so long as it is devoid of the element of voyeurism, can be a powerful educational tool (Crane, 1997).

The emergence of Holocaust museums in South Africa is documented in the literature through the history of South African Jewry and the development of the CTHC, with an emphasis on the testimony of survivors (M. Du Preez, 2008; Schrire, 2002). The South African Holocaust centres, that is, the DHC, CTHC and JHGC, all fall under the umbrella of the South African Holocaust and Genocide Foundation (SAHGF). They state as their mission the desire to further Holocaust education in order to achieve the following aims: the memorialisation of the six million murdered Jews and others; the wish to address the issues of discrimination and racism in South African society by raising moral and ethical issues; support for the NCS History curriculum with its human rights emphasis (M. Du Preez, 2008; Freedman, 2009); dedication to "Holocaust and genocide education and memory" (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2009b) and the encouragement of social activism and individual responsibility (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2011a). It should be noted that most of the available literature regarding these museums comes from official SAHGF documentation such as commemorative books, pamphlets, newsletters and the official website. Researched scholarly work is scarce although there is currently some research being undertaken at the CTHC by Petersen (2010) on how human rights education is being taught through the teaching of the Holocaust at the CTHC's teacher training workshops. Some earlier research was also conducted by Geschier (2005) who interviewed museum educators on their role in mediating traumatic memories and Schrire (2002) on the societal impact of the

CTHC. Nates (2010) in turn wrote a journal article on how to teach the Holocaust in the South African context. Gaps remain in the research on the museums themselves, that is, how they function, the role of their educators, their pedagogy and the efficacy of the museums' educational programmes.

Despite the large number of Holocaust museums that continue to spring up worldwide, there are a number of cautionary and dissenting voices. Amongst these is Short and Reed (2004) who, whilst they recognise the educational value of Holocaust museums, caution that these museums also have the ability to mislead. They say, for instance, that Holocaust museums might give visitors the impression that all Germans were Nazis or that all Jews are victims or they might neglect to address other victims or even possibly fail to address their own country's views on antisemitism.

The motive and purpose of Holocaust museums is also called into question. When the extension to the Jewish Museum in Berlin was opened in 2002, it was described it as "a memorial destined to keep the wounds fresh" (Patterson, 2000, p. 70). In his review article Cole (2002) quotes Mintz (2002) as saying that "engagement with the Holocaust is always mixed up with ulterior motives" (p. 129) and "a concern with audience will influence curatorial choices, with the exhibit being intentionally shaped to meet the needs of a particular community within which the museum is located" (p. 130).

Questions are raised in the literature regarding content and structure. As previously noted, curators make choices about these crucial elements of Holocaust museums, such as decisions about how to portray the past, about what material is to be included or excluded and how this material is to be represented. For instance, one topic that is often excluded from Holocaust museums due to its controversial nature is that of the *Judenrate* or Jewish Councils which were castigated by Hannah Arendt and defended by Isaiah Trunk (Novick, 2003).

One of the intentions of Holocaust museums is to educate and prevent Holocaust denial, but Norden (1993) claims that despite this aim he believes that their existence

will not deter Holocaust deniers, although he concedes that they might inhibit the deniers' work to some degree.

However, the most controversial dissenting voice in the sea of Holocaust literature is that of Norman Finkelstein. Short and Reed (2004) call his book a "blistering polemic against the Holocaust industry" (p. vi). In *The Holocaust Industry* Finkelstein (2003) claims that Jewish suffering has been exploited for financial gain and he questions the place that the Holocaust occupies in American culture. Referring to Holocaust museums and memorials he says that in order to truly learn from the Nazi holocaust, its physical dimension must be reduced and its moral dimension expanded. According to him, the Holocaust, although it does not serve any political agenda, has become a tool used by the Israeli leadership. He believes that two dogmas underpin the Holocaust framework. Firstly, that the Holocaust was a unique event, although this is no longer asserted by some contemporary Holocaust authors such Silbert (2011), and secondly that the Holocaust marks what he terms, an irrational "eternal Gentile hatred of Jews" (p. 54) . He also claims that too many public and private resources have been invested in memorialising the Nazi genocide and that most of the output is worthless, a tribute not to Jewish suffering but to Jewish aggrandisement" (p. 8). He also addresses the reasons for the silence of survivors, saying that many did want to speak out, but that Americans did not want to listen and he believes that this lack of desire to engage with survivors was politically motivated. For Finkelstein, Yad Vashem, the Israeli Holocaust museum, does not represent education or memorial but instead corruption and greed. He tells of his father's friend, a Holocaust survivor who became a director there: "Reluctantly and with genuine disappointment, my father finally admitted that even this man had been corrupted by the Holocaust industry, tailoring his beliefs for power and profit" (p. 7).

In addition to exposing these dissenting voices, the literature on Holocaust museums documents the emergence of Holocaust museums around the world and their purpose, as well as the many challenges (both internal and external) that are faced by Holocaust museums and those who work in this particular museum environment in education. It is these people who are the focus of the next section – who they are,

what their function is at Holocaust museums, and what link they provide to Holocaust education.

## 2.4 Museum educators - the link between Holocaust museums and Holocaust education

Museum educators, be they staff members or volunteers, are the educational bedrock of museums. They are instrumental in presenting the school programmes at South African Holocaust museums (M. Du Preez, 2008) where they guide visitors through the exhibition, help learners interact with the various exhibition panels (Grenier, 2009), interpret the museum's content and provide support at Holocaust related functions or for visiting exhibitions (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2010). In many cases, in contrast to the ideas expressed by Falk and Dierking (2000) on their free-choice model, learners require interpretation of the displays as they are not accustomed to learning from museums (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010b). This is done by museum educators who interface with learners in their capacity as guides and facilitators. In addition, Geschier (2006, p. 2) exhorted researchers to pay attention to the subjectivity of museum educators in order to understand "how 'change' (as a historical 'event' but also as changing moral values, behaviour and thought) is taught" .

As museum educators' educational skills, expertise and motivation all contribute to a successful educational experience (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a) their continued development is regarded as an asset in their functioning at museums (Grenier, 2009). In fact, the museum educators play a key role in mediating visitors' experiences either enhancing or inhibiting it and hence "significantly facilitate visitor learning" (Falk & Dierking, 2000, p. 139). To do their work, the museum educators rely not only on the grounding provided by the museum but also on their own understanding of the past and history, an understanding which has inevitably been shaped by personal experience (Castle, 2002). In her research Castle (2002) reveals that the management at the Community History Museum in Canada

where her research was undertaken believes that museum educators implement their educational programme as instructed, but she found that they actually re-interpret what they have been taught through their own experiential lens and construct their own meaning.

Although this is significant, there does not appear to be any other research on the link between what museum educators are instructed to teach and what they actually teach. As museums become more popular, there is a growing body of literature on museum educators in general but there is a glaring gap in the literature on Holocaust museum educators. In one study Grenier (2009) examines the role of learning in the development of expertise in museum educators. Her research shows that formal learning is necessary in the training of museum educators but that this in itself is not sufficient to produce knowledgeable competent educators and that they need to engage in "purposeful informal learning" (p. 153). She identifies this informal learning as incidental learning, that is, where people continue to learn informally through their own reading; self-directed learning in which they learn through other media such as books, television or movies; and situated learning in which museum educators learn from other people and as well as through the experiences they have whilst guiding (Grenier, 2009).

How museum educators improve their learning was researched by Castle (2006) who examines the importance of curriculum studies in informing the training and development of education programmes for museum educators. Referring to Shulman's "model of reasoning and action" (Shulman 1987 in Castle 2006, p. 124) as well as Grenier's study, she researched how museum educators think they learn to teach. According to her, the growth in their learning is organic, rather than linear, in other words, they learn to teach by examining the content of the museum, by shadowing more experienced museum educators and through their own hands-on teaching - some of it through trial and error. But Castle (2006) concludes that there should be a more concerted approach taken by museums to develop their educators' knowledge and pedagogy and they should not to simply be used to fulfil the institution's mission. She does recognise however, that there could be restrictions on

training and development due to funding and other restraints such as time and energy of volunteers. Generally though, research on how museum educators learn is lacking.

There is also evidence of this in the FRA (2010) report. The report, which covers many other aspects of Holocaust museums extensively, fails to address how volunteers are integrated into the museums, their pre- or in-service training, or the role they play on educational teams. What is acknowledged in the report, however, is that "teachers and students in the focus groups attached a great deal of importance to the guides, who are frequently not employees of the institutions and who get, according to the findings of the on-site research, not always adequate support" (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 69). The report goes on to state that the museum educators are not well integrated into the theoretical work of museum educational departments. It does, however, emphasise the importance of museum educators' motivations and attitudes in determining how successful a school visit will be.

Descriptions of the kind of people who become museum educators are relatively consistent in the literature. They tend to be older, well-educated women possibly with prior teaching experience (M. Du Preez, 2008; Grenier, 2009). Most museum educators are volunteers and their motivations vary as to why they undertake this work at Holocaust museums. These may include having family members who were in the Holocaust; their desire to perpetuate the memory of the Jews who were murdered by the Nazis; they might be teachers who simply miss the classroom; they might doing it for the love of history or they might feel that they are contributing to transformation (M. Du Preez, 2008).

Whilst some literature about museum educators in general does exist, there is a dearth of information about Holocaust museum educators. One of the few studies which could be located in this field is that by Baum, Rotter and Reidler (2009) who suggest that educators who teach about the Holocaust at museums are becoming increasingly important. They contend that as Holocaust survivors diminish in number, Holocaust educators will have the task of telling the Holocaust story and part of their challenge

will be to build professional and personal resilience in order to cope adequately. In South Africa too, the importance of Holocaust museum educators is growing in the official educational sphere as they widen their sphere of influence by also conducting teacher training workshops for both the private and government sectors (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2010).

It is evident from the literature reviewed that more research needs to be undertaken with regard to Holocaust museum educators. The areas of current research include how museum educators learn their craft and the kind of people who become museum educators. From this point of view, the literature on museum educators in general is also applicable to Holocaust museum educators. However, the role that Holocaust museum educators play in shaping Holocaust education is under-researched. The next section of this literature review examines the available literature on Holocaust education.

## 2.5    Reviewing the literature on Holocaust education

The way in which the Holocaust is depicted and taught is distinctly different in each country and reflects not only each country's connection to the events of the Holocaust but also each country's experience of human rights abuses, genocide and antisemitism (Maitles, Cowan, & Butler, 2006). In South Africa for example, schools and museums use the Holocaust as a tool for teaching human rights in the aftermath of apartheid (Petersen, 2010). When new panels relating to South African history were developed for the travelling Anne Frank exhibition in 1993, it gave visitors the opportunity to learn about antisemitism and uniquely providing them with a South African perspective.

The reasons for teaching the Holocaust are well-documented, that is, to teach about the historical events of the Holocaust; to remember those who died at the hands of the Nazis; to honour those who survived; and to create a better world (Bauer, 2010; Cohn, et al., 2009; Freedman, 2009; Hirshfield, 1981; Short & Reed, 2004; Silbert & Petersen, 2007; The Historical Association, 2007). Also, implicit in Holocaust

education is the notion that we are unable to change the past but are certainly able to do something about the future (Fowler, 2004; Imber, 2009; Schrire, 2002) and that teaching about the Holocaust will help prevent future genocides (Bauer, 2009; Harff, 2003; Nates, 2010). There have been claims that the Holocaust was an unprecedented event (Bauer, 2009) although Melson (1996) asserts that the Armenian genocide sets a more accurate precedent of current mass disasters although he says this is not true, for genocides that go beyond nationalism. And Silbert (2011) advises that this claim of unprecedentedness is no longer supported by the SAHGF.

In the introduction to his book, Totten (2002) points out that educators have different rationales and motives for teaching the Holocaust. Some feel that as it was a watershed occurrence being the first time a group of people had been marked for total annihilation and that learners should know about this in order to better understand the world in which they live. For others, learning about the Holocaust will make learners more socially and personally responsible in society and for still others the Holocaust has the ability to help reduce incidents of intolerance and prejudice in order to create better citizens.

Different aspects of the Holocaust are highlighted by different museum educators. For example, at the Houston Holocaust Centre in the United States, where the educational programme centres on personal responsibility, museum educators teach learners how to be upstanders in their own lives (Berger, 2003). However, the director of the Houston Holocaust Centre is emphatic that the Centre teaches the history first and then the lessons believing that this is the way to achieve the necessary balance between teaching history and teaching tolerance.

The literature reviewed also addresses some of the educational programmes of Holocaust centres and museums around the world. For example, a typical visit to The Holocaust Centre for school groups would include: an introductory talk with a short film, a tour through the exhibition, hearing testimony from a Holocaust survivor, discussions about contemporary issues, time in the memorial gardens and finally personal reflection and feedback (The Holocaust Centre, 2010). Visiting learners

were provided with workbooks which the museum educators said helped the learners "to focus on important aspects of the exhibition and gardens and encourages them to consider the causes of persecution and genocide" (no page).

In fact, Eckmann (2010, p. 10) instructs that Holocaust education is "first and foremost a duty of history; the duty to transmit and to teach and to learn the history". She feels that too much emphasis has been placed on memory and commemoration and even on the lessons. These, according to her can result in too much moralising, not enough education about the knowledge of the history itself and she says, the lessons are not always correct. Salmons (2010) agrees that the Holocaust must be taught from an historical perspective warning that simply turning to the Holocaust to look for moral lessons can seriously distort the past. He believes that the inclusion of the Holocaust in school curricula ensures that education about it is grounded in history and is not simply used as a rhetorical device for the teaching of the lessons. The latter, he says, would lay the learners open to emotional manipulation or coercion from people who might want to push their own social agendas. This is supported by the FRA (2010b, p. 31):

> Holocaust education must first be about exploring and attempting to understand and explain the historical context of the Holocaust. To be meaningful, it is vital that the past is not shaped to serve the needs of any moral, political, social or ideological agenda.

Freedman (2010) agrees that the historical context is important, but goes on to say that it is from the knowledge of history, and particularly the narratives of survivors that we gain understanding about and inspiration for the present.

According the FRA (2010a) there is also another goal of Holocaust education. They believe it should help preserve the memory of the victims by recognising them as individuals and developing empathy in the learners for them. In their study, they therefore suggest that Holocaust education could be viewed as the relationship between three corners of a triangle which is made up of history education, commemoration and the raising of moral awareness (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a).

Notwithstanding the focus of different educators or educational institutions, the lessons (be they are implicit or explicit) are an intrinsic element of Holocaust educational programmes at museums and in school curricula. For many they are used as a tool to teach moral and human rights education and genocide prevention (M. Du Preez, 2008; Durban Holocaust Centre, 2009; Holocaust Memorial Center Zekelman Family Campus, 2010; Schrire, 2002; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010a). In fact, in the Institute of Education's Holocaust Education Development Programme (HEDP) research report, the aims stated most often by the participating teachers were "to develop an understanding of the roots and ramifications of prejudice, racism and stereotyping in any society" and " to learn the lessons of the Holocaust and to ensure that a similar human atrocity never happens again" (Pettigrew, 2010, p. 50). In this respect, the lessons from the Holocaust constitute remembrance with a purpose and that purpose is to change attitudes and create upstanders for social justice (Cohn, et al., 2009; Facing History and Ourselves, 2010; Petersen, 2011). However, according to the FRA (2010a, p. 29) the goal of "providing students with insights and lessons which could serve as a basis for future action" is "perhaps [the] most controversial" of Holocaust education. And Pettigrew argues that "insisting that there is a clear dichotomy between 'historical' and 'civic' or 'social' understandings is not always helpful" (Pettigrew, 2010, p. 52).

The question also remains as to whether or not the lessons are actually able to achieve the goal of creating upstanders and effect attitudinal change. Cowan & Maitles (2007) believe that they do. Their longitudinal study investigated if teaching about discrimination and prejudice using the Holocaust as a case study produces better citizens. According to them, the results suggest that Holocaust education has an "immediate and lasting impact" on values and that longer term benefits and improvements in attitude are generally maintained (p. 128). Seeking these attitudinal changes and establishing social activism in learners is also a key factor in Holocaust educational programmes in South Africa (Petersen, 2011). However, Ehmann (2001) warns that there is currently no support for the idea that what the victims of the Holocaust suffered will translate into desirable behaviour in those who learn about their fate. Thus the question of whether or not these educational programmes can

achieve and maintain their objectives in the long-term remains unanswered and this question requires further research.

This discourse on the usefulness of the lessons has generated vigorous debate in Holocaust education literature. Arguments both for and against abound. One of the criticisms of Holocaust education is that the Holocaust was such an extreme occurrence and so far removed from the daily life of ordinary people, that it can have little to teach us about life today (Novick, 1999). However, Short and Reed (2004) refute claims that there are no useful lessons to be gained from the Holocaust, particularly for very young learners, and that it should not be taught in British schools at all. Short and Reed (2004) state that we can take note of such cautionary advice but that whether or not it is taught, the Holocaust is in the public eye and part of history and that it is more responsible to teach it than to ignore it. They add that since Holocaust education is a fairly new phenomenon it may not yet have achieved the desired effect of changing attitudes but will over time. They go on to document the success of some of the lessons such as the warnings of the dangers of unrestricted free speech that have been achieved while at the same time admitting that the lessons relating to racism have yet to be learned.

Drawing on the field of conflict analysis, Harff (2003) poses the question of whether or not mankind has, in fact, learned anything from the Holocaust as genocides and mass murder continue, but through her study she concludes that some lessons have indeed been learned. She notes that despite genocides having occurred in Cambodia, Bosnia and Rwanda post the Holocaust, some politicians such as former United States President, Bill Clinton, have listened to genocide and Holocaust scholars who "joined to combat ignorance about the causes of these events, to engage politicians, and to mobilise public empathy" (Harff, 2003, p. 57). As a result, she says, they tried to implement early warning social systems to identify possible genocidal situations.

Kofi Annan (2010), former Secretary General of the UN and a Nobel Peace Prize winner, addressed the issue of the effectiveness of education in genocide prevention and education. He commented that when he was UN secretary general in 2005 he

believed that it was necessary to institute measures in education to help prevent genocide. However, in his *New York Times* article five years later he noted that "it is surprisingly hard to find education programmes that have clearly succeeded in linking the history of the Holocaust with the prevention of ethnic conflict and genocide in today's world" (Annan, 2010). Although he does not question the importance of Holocaust education he believes that how the Holocaust is taught needs to be addressed and better training for teachers implemented.

The path to prevention of genocide was believed by many teachers who took part in the Institute of Education's study to begin with teaching about prejudice, stereotyping and racism and to learn the lessons of the Holocaust in order to prevent it happening again and the more historical aims underplayed (Pettigrew, 2010). Some of the teachers in this study even went so far as to suggest that there was a slippery slope "from bullying to genocide" (Pettigrew, 2010, p. 53). However, Pettigrew stresses the fallacy of this claim adding that there is a very significant difference between the two and that simply employing concepts such as racism or prejudice cannot adequately explain the Holocaust.

Despite believing that the lessons are indeed useful, Short (2005) admits that their effectiveness as a tool for social change remains a debatable aspect of teaching the Holocaust. He suggests that the lessons are not from the Holocaust itself, but whether through them, researchers can discover how a relatively normal society transformed into a deadly one as a result of the racist ideology that it adopted. From his study he concludes, "*Some* students were able to distil meaningful lessons" (Short, 2005, p. 377). But Norden (1993) questions how long non-Jews will accept what he calls the "alleged lessons" (p. 31) without addressing their own issues or how long they will accept being taught that bystanders share the guilt of perpetrators. In fact, he believes that there is a sub-agendum to the lessons, which is keeping Jewish feeling alive.

That there are lessons to be learned from the Holocaust seems to be generally accepted but what these lessons are is not universally agreed upon, although there is general agreement in the discourse that a repetition of the Holocaust should be avoided. Yet again there is no concurrence by governments or educational institutions

as to how this prevention can be achieved. There is agreement, however, that the current dialogue should continue (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a) as it is believed that through the Holocaust learners are able to understand prejudice and racism more easily and thus begin to understand the consequences of silence, apathy and indifference.

However, it is also recognised that the Holocaust cannot be solely relied on to solve all the problems of the world with some researchers pointing out that using the Holocaust on its own is not a panacea for racism in general or antisemitism in particular nor is it a magic bullet that can put an end to all discrimination, prejudice and genocide (Annan, 2010; Cowan & Maitles, 2007; Norden, 1993). In fact, in the view of Clements (2006) grand outcomes in promoting anti-racism and genocide prevention are actually unlikely and she asserts that the main purpose of Holocaust education is to enable dialogue between learners and educators about society and humanity. This dialogue, she believes, is generated in the course of teaching and learning about the Holocaust in the school environment where a shared language and the fact that emotional barriers are lowered are significant contributors to anti-racism and citizenship issues.

In order to enable transformation and facilitate this dialogue, it is suggested that certain methodologies and materials be adopted when teaching about the Holocaust (Cohn, et al., 2009). Given this, Imber (2009) motivates for teaching the Holocaust from a human social science perspective whilst stimulating critical thinking. In addition, she says, the history itself should be taught in context and the lessons taught in the context of the history (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a; Salmons, 2001, 2003; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010f). Eckmann (2010, p. 9) agrees that context is important explaining that "the specific national context gives students the opportunity to reflect self-critically about the history of their own society". She also raises the question of comparative methodology in history, saying that it is risky to draw lessons without knowing the concrete historical elements, adding that comparison is only possible when the learners know what, how and why they want to make the comparison. This is relevant

in the South African situation, where comparisons are drawn between the laws of Nazi Germany and those of apartheid South Africa. There is much literature and many websites that provide educators with online resources for teaching methods (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010a; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010f). Various issues are discussed such as striving for accurate language; not giving simple answers to complex questions; avoiding comparisons of pain; and not romanticising the history. Advice is given on how to teach emotive and controversial issues (The Historical Association, 2007) and it is generally emphasised that role play should be avoided as it is impossible for learners to have insight into such an extreme and traumatic event (Short & Reed, 2004; Totten, 2002). How Holocaust educators, both at schools and in museums, choose to present the material in the most appropriate way and whether or not this is done effectively requires further research and these questions forms part of my research at the DHC.

As previously mentioned, emotive and controversial issues form an integral part of Holocaust studies. For Hirschfield (1981) the goal of Holocaust courses must be more than the simple transmission of historical data but should reflect "the multidimensional nature of the subject and the moral dilemmas that lie buried within the historical narrative" (p. 24). Teaching dilemmas is generally a highly complex task but especially when teaching the Holocaust where "the big historical questions" are generated through discussions about the moral dilemmas faced by people, such as how ordinary people became mass murderers or why more people did not help their Jewish friends and neighbours, standing by passively while they were beaten, tortured and dragged off to concentration and death camps (Hirshfield, 1981; Salmons, 2001, p. 3). Through the literature, educators are instructed to teach about these dilemmas in order to generate empathy and not judgment by explaining to learners that there were all kinds of people in the Holocaust and that people are able to change (Imber, 2009). But teaching these dilemmas is a hugely complex task and should not be treated lightly and, in fact, any confrontation with the Holocaust can be difficult emotionally for learners (Salmons, 2001). In order to alleviate this, educators can give a balanced perspective of the Holocaust narrative, presenting both sides of the story. They might,

for instance, give an account of what was suffered by the victims but then balance this with the stories of those who assisted Jews, so that learners should not to feel helpless or pessimistic or overwhelmed by the content (Salmons, 2001). Furthermore Gurewitsch (2009) believes that teachers should prepare learners as much as possible for a visit to a Holocaust museum as, she asserts, the shock of seeing some of the graphic images or detailed descriptions of horror can produce secondary trauma in learners or teachers. Being well prepared intellectually and emotionally prior to the visit can help to avoid this.

Despite the problems that can accompany a confrontation with the Holocaust, it has been included in the South African History curriculum for all Grade 9 learners. The emphasis of this inclusion is on human rights. According to the South African DoE's NCS - History (2002, 2008), the Grade 9 curriculum includes: human rights issues during and after World War II; the struggle for human rights; apartheid in South Africa; and various issues relating to this such as a comparison between the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Nuremberg trials, xenophobia and genocide.

Although these official documents are available, I could not find literature or official documents relating to the reasons for the inclusion of the Holocaust in the curriculum. What is known is that it was implemented after the former Minister of Education, Kader Asmal referred the subject of the Holocaust to the South African History Project, an initiative set up in 2001 to investigate history teaching in South Africa and instructed them to come up with recommendations for the new curriculum (Asmal, 2002). According to Andre Keet of the South African Human Rights Commission, the inclusion of the Holocaust in the new curriculum was never in dispute (Nates, 2010). One of the reasons for this was the synergy between the Holocaust and the history curriculum. For example, both the Holocaust and the history curriculum examine the notion of individual choice. According to the DoE (2008, p. 7):

> A study of history builds the capacity of people to make informed
> choices in order to contribute constructively to society and to
> advance democracy. History, as a vehicle of personal empowerment,
> engenders in learners an understanding of human agency, which
> brings with it the knowledge that, as human beings, they have

choices, and that they can make the choice to change the world for the better.

This notion of choice as well as other concepts such as xenophobia, crimes against humanity and genocide also point to questions of the similarities and differences that exist between Holocaust and human rights education (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a). Teaching about the discrimination, persecution and murder of the Jews by the Nazis is regarded by the FRA as Holocaust education while giving learners the skills to embrace and uphold human rights in their daily lives possibly using the Holocaust as a case study is regarded as human rights education. Human rights education should also embrace the history of human rights, including The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, along with various legal and philosophical dimensions (Eckmann, 2010). Thus human rights education is described as encompassing education both "*about* human rights as well as education *for* human rights" (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 37) as well as learning within the framework of human rights, that is, the inclusion of "active methods such as learning by experience" (Eckmann, 2010, p. 11). In Holocaust education, learning about human rights is possible. Learning for human rights is more difficult because of the moral complexity of the subject and the limited time frame. Therefore in general it appears that the distinction between human rights and Holocaust education is not clear-cut with much that is called Holocaust education embracing an implicit human rights focus. In fact, by 2003 the most common approach to teaching the Holocaust was from a human rights perspective (Cohn, et al., 2009) and at Yad Vashem's Seventh International Educators' Conference in June 2010, one of the recommendations was to encourage "educational systems to set clear goals for Holocaust education and to define the relevancy of Holocaust education to human rights" (Yad Vashem, 2010b, p. 5).

At the DHC, the site of my study, education about the Holocaust is centred on human rights and serves as support for the human rights component of the NCS - History curriculum for Grades 9 and 11 (Freedman, 2009; Nates, 2010; Silbert & Petersen, 2007). The SAHGF which is the umbrella body for the DHC states that "as the only national service provider of Holocaust education we can make a significant

contribution to a human rights culture in South Africa" (M. Du Preez, 2008, p. 144). This stands in contrast to the situation in Europe where the findings of the FRA indicate that in general human rights are not the focus of Holocaust museums in the European Union. However, both in South Africa and in Europe most educators at both schools and museums lack human rights training (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a) even though in South Africa, human rights education is a key concept underpinning both the curriculum (Keet & Carrim, 2005) and the educational programme at local Holocaust museums (Petersen, 2010).

At some Holocaust museums Holocaust education is not only informed by the exhibition panels, multimedia and/or artefacts but also by the architecture and structure of the buildings that reflect their content (Berger, 2003; M. Du Preez, 2008; E. T. Linenthal, 1994; Salmons, 2001). For instance, visitors enter the CTHC through specially designed doors and walls, ceilings and lighting reflect the mood of the exhibit with multimedia displays, artefacts, maps, newspapers, music, engravings and models enhancing the museum experience (M. Du Preez, 2008). This reflects what the research says about re-created spaces being an excellent way to help learners connect with the material in a museum (Falk, 1999). At the DHC, this idea is implemented with the Anne Frank Room.

Thus according to the literature reviewed, Holocaust education encompasses not only the history of the murder of six million Jews and the persecution and murder of other groups, but also the imperative to create a better society and prevent future crimes against humanity and genocide. This is done through the lessons of the Holocaust. Whether this is successful or not is a question that challenges Holocaust educators. For some the lessons are a crucial part of museum educational programmes but depending on the perspective of the researcher, the lessons are given a greater or lesser focus. This decision is informed by whether Holocaust education at a particular institution has a human rights focus. In terms of South African Holocaust education, human rights are stated as core concept for both school and museum Holocaust education programmes.

## 2.6    Conclusion

In conclusion it can be surmised that Holocaust education has become an integral part of both official and unofficial history in many parts of the world. The literature shows that it is taught both in schools and at Holocaust museums by teachers and museum educators who follow educational programmes that are created by education departments and/or museum educators. In addition the literature indicates that Holocaust centres are mushrooming around the world. What is unknown, however, is the process of interaction between the learners and museum educators and what role museum educators play in the long-term outcomes of Holocaust education, if any. Also requiring further investigation are the issues of museum educators' pedagogy and training and whether or not this impacts on attitudinal change in the learners.

The literature on the historical events of the Holocaust is plentiful (Elon, 2003; Frankl, 2004; Gilbert, 1987; Silbert & Petersen, 2007) and literature on Holocaust-related educational research internationally is also relatively abundant. In 2004, Short and Reed (p. 129) spoke of "the relative dearth of literature underpinned by research", but according to the FRA in 2010 the scope of literature is vast which is indicative of the rapidly expanding interest in and research worldwide into the value and implementation of Holocaust education and social transformation. In contrast, there are many gaps in the literature relating to museum educators' Holocaust educational practices in South Africa generally, and at South African Holocaust museums and museum educators in particular, despite their pivotal role in ensuring a successful educational visit for learners (Crane, 1997; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a). In addition, the link between South African schools and their use of museums as an educational tool is not explored.

In general the discourse on Holocaust education is relatively uncontroversial with most scholars seeming to agree that there is intrinsic value in it. The value that is ascribed to Holocaust education is in creating awareness of moral responsibility, human rights, civic education and the prevention of future genocides. However, the short or long term effects on civil society have not been sufficiently tested to draw

decisive conclusions as to its efficacy. There seems to have been more debate about this prior to 2000 but in more recent times there appears to be more general agreement in the literature about the value of the lessons. The evidence in the literature points to consensus that the function of education at Holocaust museums includes education about the historical facts; memorial for the six million Jews and others who were murdered by the Nazis; commemoration of those who died and those who survived and the promotion of their stories to illustrate the consequences of unbridled racism and discrimination; and the promotion of education that engenders values in learners in order to create a better, more humane world. There are some dissenting voices but this goes against the popular worldwide trend to teach the Holocaust as a case study in order to educate about human rights and to prevent genocide. This is true at South African Holocaust museums too where the story of the Holocaust is taught from a human rights perspective and placed within the South African context of our own apartheid background in order to make the story relevant to South African learners.

Against this background, the scope exists for more in-depth studies to be conducted on the role of museum educators in Holocaust education at Holocaust museums in South Africa, especially as they are increasingly part of mainstream education, not only guiding learner groups in the museums but also guiding adult groups such as nurses, the police and prison services and conducting teacher education workshops. Most of the research to date has been based on small samples in qualitative studies and the long terms effects of Holocaust museum visits have not been adequately researched.

As discussed in the literature review, research in South Africa has taken place or is currently taking place at the CTHC and JHGC but no original prior research has taken place at the DHC. It is within this context that a niche exists for my study, which is uniquely situated in KZN but the results of which have applications for the wider South African Holocaust museum community.

# CHAPTER 3
# RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

## 3.1    Introduction

Before I set out to design my study, I wanted to better understand the purpose of doing research. The most compelling reason came from Wellington, et al. (2005, p. 101) who stated that, "The reason for doing research is to acquire knowledge and to communicate that knowledge, often with the ultimate view of informing practice and/or policy and, thereby, improving things in some way". This rang true for me as I wanted to investigate and understand Holocaust education through the work of the museum educators at the DHC and how they were shaping it, hopefully being able, ultimately, to contribute to the body of knowledge on Holocaust museums and museum educators and to the best practices of the education there.

The research questions for this study were posed in Chapter 1 but before starting to collect data to answer them I first needed to define my theoretical standpoint. Wellington, et al. (2005) advise that the researcher investigate his or her philosophical position and basic assumptions concerning ontology, epistemology and human nature in order to choose the appropriate methodology and methods for the study. This they say enables the researcher to clarify his or her standpoint, which is relevant for the credibility of the findings. I therefore begin by clarifying my ontological and epistemological viewpoints.

## 3.2    Ontological and epistemological considerations

The world within which human beings function is socially constructed with each person subjectively experiencing his or her own reality and expressing these experiences through language (Wellington, et al., 2005). I agree with this and found that the research paradigm best suited to this way of thinking was the interpretivist paradigm which poses that reality is subjective, that it can only be imperfectly grasped and that people are social beings who constantly create meaning as they

attempt to make sense of their world (Voce, 2004). This ontological position allowed me to investigate the thoughts, feelings and perceptions of my participants through interviews and photo-elicitation which I undertook at a particular time in a particular context (Amin & Ramrathan, 2010). In my research interactions with the participants, we spoke about their feelings, experiences, beliefs and understanding of the educational programme at the DHC. Their perspectives on and interpretations of Holocaust education in turn provided the data for my research and enabled me to better understand the way in which the museum educators at the DHC shape Holocaust education through their work.

Whereas ontology is concerned with the nature of reality, epistemology is concerned with the nature of knowledge: where it comes from, what it is, whose knowledge it is, how it can be communicated to others and how this knowledge can be understood (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Knowledge is constructed by social beings who subjectively understand and make meaning of their lives (Voce, 2004) and that meaning is obtained through interaction and dialogue using other people's experiences as a way of understanding subjective human experience (Cohen, et al., 2007; Henning, Van Rensburg, & Smit, 2004). Thus with the purpose of research being to try and understand why people behave in a certain way, in my study, I set out to examine Holocaust education through the lens of the museum educators within the particular social, intellectual and cultural context of the DHC. I therefore investigated how the museum educators conducted their work at the DHC and how this work impacted not only on the Holocaust education programme but also on them. I was also curious to find out why they made certain choices, both personally and professionally, such as why those chose to engage with this complex and sometimes emotional subject, and how they believed they fitted into the educational programme at the DHC. I also wanted to know why museum educators teach the Holocaust, what impact their teaching has, if any, on learners' own lives, what the best practices arising from this teaching are and what they considered some of the issues or underlying problems to be. These questions underpinned my research.

In order to conduct this research, I made various ontological and research choices such as defining the questions I would use, choosing my participants based on what I knew about them and selecting appropriate photographs. I also wanted to understand the source of the museum educators' knowledge, what their perspectives were with regard to the subjects they taught and what they believed their role is in teaching Holocaust education to be - so these questions were included in my preparation for the interviews.

## 3.3     Theoretical framework

According to Henning (2004, p. 25), "A theoretical framework positions your research in the discipline or subject in which you are working. It enables you to theorise about your research". Thus in order to define my theoretical stance, I needed to locate my study within the relevant current theoretical body of work which Kaniki (1999) says is done within the context of the literature review. By examining current theories on Holocaust education, Holocaust museums, the work and expertise of museum educators and related subjects such as genocide and human rights, I was ideologically able to find a place for my own study and to frame my research questions. The theoretical framework also enabled me to identify my own biases and develop the conceptual framework for this study, which Henning (2004, p. 25) describes as "an alignment of the key concepts".

The literature provided me with various theories with which to frame my study. Based on the literature review, I chose to define two theoretical frameworks. The first was based on how learning takes place in museums both from the perspective of the museum educators and the visitors. On the topic of learning in museums, the theorists whose work influenced my ideas most directly were Falk and Dierking (2000). They developed the Contextual Model of Learning. Their theories provided me with insight into how visitors to museums learn and the key factors enabling them to have the best educational experience. They suggested that a free-choice model provides the optimum museum learning environment and that learning in a museum setting is "always highly personal". In other words, learning is most successful when learners

have freedom of choice and are able to "control their own learning" (Falk & Dierking, 2000, p. 139). This research therefore provided an important foundation for my theoretical framework. The Contextual Model of Learning also proposes the importance of "facilitated mediation by others" with Falk and Dierking stating that the work of museum educators provides "powerful socially mediated learning [which] can occur with strangers perceived to be knowledgeable" (Falk & Dierking, 2000, p. 139). This model therefore not only provided the benchmark for the way in which visitors to the DHC learn but also a strong motivation for the museum educators to be well trained and knowledgeable.

The learning undertaken by the museum educators provided the second part of the learning concept for my study. The theories for the ways in which museum educators learn and continue to develop their expertise was provided by the research of Castle (2002, 2006) and Grenier (2009). Through their work, I was able to better understand how the museum educators at the DHC might acquire their own knowledge and what the best practices for the museum management might be. I was thus able to formulate my first theoretical framework and base my interview questions on solid theoretical ground.

The second theoretical framework was based on the idea that in education the Holocaust is taught from two standpoints, one being the historical and the other social. Both can be present but the literature suggested that teaching the Holocaust today is not simply the teaching of the historical events, but rather relates to social elements, which are built on the historical core. The Holocaust is then used as a case study to encourage learners to make a personal connection to the issues raised by the history as well as encouraging them to develop good values in society, particularly with the aim of creating upstanders for social justice. This idea was based on distinctions suggested by various researchers: Finkelstein (2003); Pettigrew (2010) who refers to the tensions that exist between the various aims of teaching the Holocaust; and Salmons (2010) who emphasises the importance of the historical context in which he believes the Holocaust should be taught. I have framed these distinctions as the Historical Holocaust and the Social Holocaust.

Thus the theoretical frameworks for this study provided me with an ideological foundation based on a solid body of work. This framework was divided into two parts: firstly how learning that takes place in museums and secondly that the Holocaust can be viewed and taught from two diverse perspectives, that is, either simply as part of history or as an event that provides the foundation for the teaching of social values or perhaps even as some combination of these two points of view.

## 3.4 Methodological considerations

Having established my ontological and epistemological standpoints, the best way to implement these ideas methodologically was to work within a qualitative framework, which is concerned with words, ideas, feelings and dialogue (Henning, et al., 2004; Kelly & Terre Blanche, 1999). By using this I was able to investigate aspects of the lives of the museum educators at the DHC and then interpret their understanding of it (Henning, et al., 2004). Dialogue and interaction are defining aspects of qualitative research (Kelly & Terre Blanche, 1999; Nieuwenhuis, 2007a) so I used these to examine the museum educators' lived experiences. The interpretive paradigm relies heavily on naturalistic methods and typically uses qualitative methods such as interviewing, observation and analysis of existing texts to gather data. These were incorporated in my study, as I will show later. Qualitative research also ensures that there is adequate dialogue between the researcher and the interviewees "in order to construct a meaningful reality" and that out of the research process meaning evolves (Amin & Ramrathan, 2010).

I therefore met with my participants and on the basis of our discussions recorded their perceptions, impressions, emotions and subjective experiences of guiding learners in the museum environment in order to better understand Holocaust education through the work of the museum educators.

Qualitative research enables the researcher to find new ways of looking at problems, to understand how tasks, roles or policies are understood by the participants in the research and to build theories or generalisations based on the data collected (Merriam,

2010). I was able to develop a fresh perspective on the way in which Holocaust education is being taught by investigating how the museum educators themselves saw their work and what their insights into Holocaust education were. I was particularly intrigued by the way in which they operated within the local KZN context and how their beliefs shaped the very fabric of Holocaust education. Out of this data I was able to generate ideas on the nature and practice of Holocaust education and the role of the museum educators at the DHC in shaping it. For these reasons, a qualitative framework was well suited to my research.

## 3.5    Research design

Once I had established my methodology the next step on my research journey was to set up my research design. As a novice researcher, I needed to understand the purpose of the research design phase. I discovered that the term research design referred to how I should choose my sample; how my subjects would be selected, where the data collection would take place, and the procedures that would be put in place to collect it. I also needed to decide how best to collect and analyse the data; how to interpret it and write about the results; and finally how I would address issues of validity, reliability and ethics (Cohen, et al., 2007).

The first decision required was who would take part in my study. I needed to establish the nature of my participants and the role they would play in my research, something that I unpack fully later in this chapter. I considered if they were there voluntarily; whether or not they were enthusiastic about participating in this research; if there were there any factors affecting their participation on the day of our interviews; what their hierarchical position at the DHC was, and so on. Once I had identified possible participants based on what I knew about them, I used purposive sampling to choose them. This will be elaborated on later.

Next I decided where and how the data collection would take place. I chose to do individual interviews and to include photo-elicitation and a document analysis in my research design. This was done as qualitative data should be obtained through a

variety of sources (Henning, et al., 2004). The decision to exclude a focus group interview was made after I had conducted the one-on-one interviews and realised that I had enough thick, rich data to complete my research. The time factor and length required for the M Ed dissertation also influenced my decision.

The choice of location for the interviews followed. For some participants they took place at the DJC and for others at their homes, depending on what suited them best. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and was recorded on my Blackberry voice recorder before being transferred to my computer desktop files. Although I had intended taking field notes, I found this exercise to be too distracting. I maintained eye contact as much as possible throughout the interview and felt that scribbling notes interfered with this. I therefore recorded my feelings and impressions on my Blackberry voice recorder immediately post-interview. Once I had completed and transcribed the interviews, I analysed the resulting data in order to extract meaning that related to my research questions. I was looking for rich, thick data which has been described as "the most distinguishing factor in progressive qualitative research" (Henning, et al., 2004, p. 8).

Being present and involved in the one-on-one interviews, I was a co-creator of meaning and brought my own subjective experience and meaning to the research through my interpretations (Voce, 2004) bearing in mind that "observation is fallible" (Henning, et al., 2004, p. 19).

As part of the design phase, I also had to clarify my position as both an insider and an outsider at the DHC. I knew that as a trained museum educator myself, I was an insider. I had a thorough understanding of the educational processes and the training that the museum educators received. I had guided a few schools and had occasionally acted as a guide for adults, but in general did not have much experience in this work. In addition I am a member of the Jewish community and have engaged socially with some of the museum educators. However, I am also an outsider. Due to my inability to be involved in the day-to-day guiding of schools as noted in Chapter 1, I was not fully conversant with the school visits to the DHC, the interaction of individual

museum educators with the learners or what each museum educator's pedagogic practice was. These elements of my research will be fully unpacked later.

There were also some other implications regarding my position as both insider and outsider. As a researcher interacting with my peers, I realised that I would be adopting a new, different and unknown role. This meant that I might become an outsider in their eyes with the result that the dynamic that I currently had with them might change. I was aware of this during the interviews, as I knew that it could influence what they were willing or unwilling to disclose to me. However, I found that during the actual interviews there was no tension in this regard. In fact, I felt that they knew who I was and that I was knowledgeable about the content of Holocaust education, which enabled them to relax and to speak easily about what they were doing at the DHC. They sometimes made references to insider information or to other museum educators who would have been unknown to an outsider. They also used abbreviated references that might have required clarification for an outsider, thus making the interviews more informal and intimate.

There were pros and cons to my position as both insider and outsider. Being an insider made me ideally placed to conduct this research as it gave me a more global perspective of the phenomena I wanted to investigate (Kelly, 1999). It meant that I understood the learning process undertaken by the museum educators in their training. I also had some knowledge of the school visits and a relatively deep understanding of the Holocaust. Consequently I was also able to direct the conversations more easily. An advantage of being an insider was that I was knowledgeable enough to conduct the interviews in an informed manner, which meant that the conversation was able to flow. At the same time I was able to assess the veracity of the information being provided by the museum educators to me (Cohen, et al., 2007). However, as an outsider, the museum educators were initially somewhat wary of the fact that I was pursing my studies and conducting research although this issue had been dealt with adequately by the time the interviews took place and the museum educators were very happy to talk to me. I was mindful that they might have felt intimidated by the recordings so did my best to assure them that

they would be able to check the transcripts and veto anything that they felt uncomfortable with. After the transcriptions were complete I did this and they were all accepted.

As pointed out in the UKZN Faculty of Education's letter approving my proposal (Singh, 2010), my position as an insider could have influenced the results of my research. In order to avoid this I needed to be aware during the interviews that I did not propose or defend my own views too vigorously although I did engage in discussions with my participants. As Henning (2004, p. 67) advised the interviewee should not feel like she is being "examined" but "is giving her contribution in a two-way dialogue" so I allowed my participants enough space to say and expand on whatever each felt was important. As the interviews progressed, I realised that the less I said, the more the participants were able to freely express their own ideas. I also noted that nodding and prompting them to continue provided me with useful interview tools.

### 3.5.1   Method of investigation – bounded case study

The purpose of a case study is to develop an in-depth analysis of a single case or multiple cases (Cresswell, 1998) where the case is a bounded system (Henning, et al., 2004; Maree & Pietersen, 2007). The case study "provides a unique example of real people, in real situations, enabling readers to understand ideas more clearly than simply representing them with abstract theories or principles" (Cohen, et al., 2007, p. 253). The choice of the DHC as the case for my study was a simple one. It was an easily identifiable bounded system in which I could explore Holocaust education through the work of the museum educators.

According to Henning (2004, p. 32) "a case is studied because the researcher suspects that there is something waiting to be unravelled". Mine was not a methodological choice but rather a choice of what was to be studied, namely Holocaust education, and this work was being done by museum educators at the DHC (Stake, 2005).

There are three kinds of case studies: intrinsic (in which one simply wants an understanding of that particular case), instrumental (in which a specific case is studied "to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalisation" and multiple (where one studies a number of cases) (Stake, 2005, p. 445). The most appropriate description for my study was the intrinsic case study as I investigated the work of museum educators at the DHC and the fact that the study took place with the participants all belonging to a single organisation, the DHC, meant that this was a bounded system (Henning, et al., 2004).

A case study was also an appropriate research choice within the qualitative interpretivist framework as it allowed me to be integrally involved in the case. The case study as a method of research enabled me to focus on the individuals who were part of the group of DHC museum educators and to understand their views and practices of Holocaust education. According to Cohen, et al. (2007) a strength of case study research is that it allows the researcher to obtain rich and vivid descriptions from the participants on a topic with a narrow focus, that is, Holocaust education, which coincided with the needs of my study. And finally I was able to use multiple sources and data gathering techniques, as recommended by Maree & Pietersen (2007). A drawback of this type of study is that if it relies on a very small sample, as mine did, it might not be representative of the larger body of museum educators, and thus extrapolations to the larger population might be tenuous.

### 3.5.2  Selection of participants

I selected my sample of participants based on my understanding of the qualitative interpretivist paradigm. Using this foundation I sought to obtain rich, thick data from each participant. Although a small sample might be seen as a research design flaw, small samples are, in fact, necessary to gain rich, thick data as the larger the sample, the less in-depth knowledge can be gleaned (Amin & Ramrathan, 2010). In choosing my participants I sought to obtain the widest range of opinion from my small sample. Maree and Petersen (2007) point out that one can get away with a small sample provided it is representative of the population which I believe my sample was.

Thus, using my own judgement, I chose my participants in a specific, non-random way, that is, by purposive sampling, as described in the literature (De Vos, et al., 2005; Patton, 1990). For the one-on-one interviews, I chose six working museum educators of the DHC according to what I knew about them and what I suspected their educational focus might be. They included the three paid full-time and three part-time volunteer museum educators. The criteria for my selection included: young and old, Jewish and non-Jewish, black and white, male and female. Apart from these criteria I chose museum educators according to my prior knowledge of their areas of expertise. For example one of the museum educators had been involved with the DHC from its inception, one had taught history and others had prior teaching experience. The survivor museum educator who I had hoped to interview was unavailable. However, from the museum educators who agreed to participate, I was able to obtain rich and thick data with which to answer my questions and thereby obtain a real understanding of the case (Cohen, et al., 2007).

Knowing who my participants were going to be assisted me in planning my interview strategy more successfully (Henning, et al., 2004). As I had mentioned my upcoming research to some of the museum educators at the DHC many months before I identified my actual participants, they were sensitised to the fact that I was going to be conducting research. They were enthusiastic about taking part and encouraging about the research. This was advantageous as it allowed them enough time to become comfortable with the idea of sharing their stories with me. The downside of this, however, was that they might have developed preset ideas of what they wanted to say, possibly muddying the waters of my research. One participant had been quite anxious about whether or not she would be examined and wanted to know if she should brush up on her historical knowledge prior to being interviewed. But once I assured her that this would be a "soft" process in which she would be talking about her personal experiences, thoughts, views and feelings and that she was not going to be questioned on content, she visibly relaxed and became far more enthusiastic about taking part. She also felt much happier after she knew that she would be able to examine the transcript of the interview and change or omit anything that she felt uncomfortable with and that she could, in fact, deny me use of her interview if she chose to do so.

### 3.5.3 Data collection and preliminary analysis – documents, one-on-one interviews and photo-elicitation interviews

In essence, I began the management of my data prior to conducting the interviews or analysing the teachers' post-visit evaluation documents. I knew that the data needed to be generated and organised in some way and I anticipated using my computer, which I did, as I am fully computer literate. I had previously decided to use the software programme Nvivo, which I did from the outset. This proved to be very successful and enabled me to analyse my data thoroughly, resulting in a very comprehensive set of rich, thick data. This process is described below.

The research process followed by me can be summarised as follows. It began with a document analysis using the post-visit evaluations written by the accompanying teachers. This was followed by face-to-face, individual, semi-structured interviews with the museum educators, which generated the bulk of my data, and finally a photo-elicitation exercise. I also used observation, a research journal and memoing, as described by Henning, et al. (2004). The order in which I present the next section is a reflection of the order in which the actual research process unfolded.

#### 3.5.3.1 Document analysis

After the wrap-up session and prior to leaving the DHC, the teachers are asked to anonymously record their feelings and thoughts about what they have experienced during the museum visit. These post-visit evaluations were the subject of the first level of data analysis. From these documents, which De Vos, et al. (2005) classify as primary personal documents, I wanted to understand more about the visitors' perceptions of their experiences both educationally and personally. Documents are a rich source of information that can be neglected in qualitative research (Henning, et al., 2004, p. 99) and these provided me with useful information as well as adding to the triangulation of the data.

After I had collected the post-visit evaluation forms from the DHC, I began the process of data analysis. Although both teachers and learners write post-visit evaluations, I made the decision to use only the teachers' documents, as there were far too many learner documents to be analysed for a masters' degree, which has an expected length and depth. De Vos, et al. (2005, p. 333) describe data analysis as "the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data". In addition, they say, it is not a linear process, but a messy, time consuming and creative one, which it certainly proved to be.

As a novice researcher I used the conventional method of qualitative coding and means of categorisation to analyse the post-visit evaluations that is, open-coding. In open-coding the ideas inherent in the data are broken down into small units of meaning, categorised, analysed and the relevant categories then grouped together as a new concept in order to construct new meaning (Henning, et al., 2004). To me this was like creating a quilt, with the various fabrics chosen, cut into strips and squares, and then stitched back together to make something beautiful, functional and new. Open-coding was performed during a first pass of the collected data. After receiving the documents, I typed all the teachers' responses into a single Word document and printed this out for evaluation.

Various steps are undertaken in the categorisation process, namely, labelling the phenomena, discovering categories, naming the categories, investigating the properties and dimensions of categories and writing the coded notes (De Vos, et al., 2005, p. 342). I began by carefully reading through this data, searching for themes or general ideas that I first became aware of during my review of the literature after which I began to create categories by looking for recurrent themes. As I discovered each new category, I colour coded it. Using different coloured koki pens I highlighted different topics and was able to see where common ideas were emerging. This proved to be quite frustrating however, as there are only a few different colours available and I had to combine colours to give myself greater variety. I also made a list of the names of the categories by colour. In this way, I wrote down my preliminary ideas and emerging themes on paper, bringing "themes to the surface from deep inside the

data" (Neuman & Kreuger, 2003, pp. 321-322). The advantage of this manual open-coding was that it enabled me to gain some experience in coding. As a novice researcher I was unsure of the analytic process and this enabled me to obtain an initial understanding it.

However, I realised that this was not the most efficient way to record the numerous categories that if I was to be able to do my coding systematically and thoroughly, I had to use the software package Nvivo from the outset. I then imported the single Word document that I had already created into Nvivo as an internal source document. Having no previous knowledge of this software, I followed the online training and learnt through self-discovery.

Thereafter I began creating categories, or nodes as they are known in Nvivo, based on the coding I had already done manually. Tree nodes are compound hierarchical structures while free nodes have no affiliation to other nodes. I began by dragging the relevant data across from the document pane either into the free or tree nodes. As I progress I combined categories of free nodes into tree nodes, is a process known as axial coding. This is defined as "a set of procedures whereby data are put back together in new ways after coding by making connections between categories" (De Vos, et al., 2005, p. 340). In this way I was able to create a complete hierarchy of categories and sub-categories that reflected my understanding of the data.

One of the initial categories that I created were "positive" and "negative", to denote where the teachers commented on their learners' experiences as either positive or negative. I used descriptive names within each section to denote various categories, for example: educational (where something was learnt); emotional/psychological (how the learners and teachers felt – bored, happy, excited); long-term outcome (if I felt that learners were likely to act); physical (day was too long, learners were tired); and comments on the DHC itself (the panels, the environment). However, these categories broadened and changed over time and the final categories did not resemble the initial ones. This ability to easily update, change and expand categories is one of the strengths of Nvivo. The categories created at this point in the research process,

became the basis for the categories derived from the interviews. I also recorded quotes made by the museum educators that I thought were relevant or that might be useful later.

As I knew from which schools the documents were sourced, I was able to correlate what I thought the teachers' reactions might be with what was actually said. For example, when a rural school visited the DHC, the learners were required to travel long distances and make a very early start, so it was not surprising that the teachers reported that some of the learners felt that the tour was too long or that it was boring, as they were probably tired and their concentration was not at its peak. However, this prior knowledge did not influence the analysis in any way other than as a point of interest. The names of the schools and teachers were not included in my research in order to protect their anonymity.

The evaluation forms proved to be both advantageous and disadvantageous for my research. One of the advantages of using the personal reflections of the teachers was that the writers were not aware that what they had written would be used for research purposes. This meant that the contents were not affected by the knowledge that someone would be researching their answers and I did not need to make contact with the authors in order to access to their thoughts. However, I suspected prior to the document analysis that a limitation might exist, namely, the matter of language, and this proved to be accurate. Many of the visiting teachers spoke English only as a second language and some could not speak English at all. As they wrote their evaluations in English it appeared that they were not always did not always able to adequately express their thoughts or feelings.

However, I was conscious of the fact that these documents should be read in context. For example, I suspected that the teachers might have felt that they needed to speak positively about their experiences as this was a school outing or that they might have been aware that they were creating a public document that could be read by the museum staff, a situation that was brought to my attention by the research of De Vos, et al. (2005). From the tone and content of the documents, it was clear that some of

the visitors were overcome by emotion and when assessing these emotive comments, I needed to keep the context of their authorship in mind. These documents were written immediately after their tour when the museum educators' words were still fresh in their minds, as was evident from their words, and some teachers were in a highly emotional state. These factors could have clouded their writing, hampering more rational responses. This is also discussed again in the next chapter (Chapter 4, p. 137). If the comments had been written once the teachers had left the DHC, it is possible that their feelings about what they had seen and experienced might have subsided somewhat and their personal commitment to change might not have been as great. Thus in order to verify the longer term effect of the visit on the teachers' behaviour, a follow-up evaluation after a few weeks and then say again a year later, to assess the impact of the tour is recommended.

In conclusion, I believe that the document analysis gave me the valuable insight that I sought into the teachers' Holocaust education experiences. The documents provided a window into the thoughts of the teachers, revealing how they perceived the guides' and facilitators' presentations, both in terms of educational content and personal performance. Many primary themes emerged from analysis of them which reflected the teachers' thoughts and emotions and revealed what they had learnt both educationally and personally. At the same time they provided insight into their learners' responses to the education programme. I was also given some prior insight into the work of the museum educators which proved to be helpful for the individual interviews. In addition I was able to look for strengths and weaknesses inherent in the museum's educational programme and apply these thoughts when I began the interviews with the museum educators. This initial analysis also provided me with valuable Nvivo experience and proved to be helpful in creating the initial framework for the huge amount of data that was generated by the one-on-one interviews. And finally the documents enabled me to later triangulate my findings.

### 3.5.3.2  One-on-one interviews

Having completed the document analysis and prior to conducting the one-on-one interviews, I contacted the DHC to obtain the contact details of possible participants. I then wrote to the proposed participants and obtained written consent according to UKZN policy from those who were willing to participate, (Cohen, et al., 2007; Groenewald, 2004; Kelly & Terre Blanche, 1999).

I conducted the interviews, depending on each participant's preference, at the participants' homes or in one of the conference rooms at the DJC where the DHC is housed. I was flexible about the venue, as I believed that if they were in a familiar, convenient environment this would help to set them at ease. However, I did stipulate that the interviews should be conducted in a quiet environment where there would be little or no interruptions and I was able to achieve this goal successfully (Cohen, et al., 2007; Kelly & Terre Blanche, 1999).

Interviews are one of the main methods of data collection in qualitative research (Henning, et al., 2004). The aim of my face-to-face, individual and semi-structured interviews was to obtain data from the museum educators in order to understand their "construction of knowledge and social reality" (Maree & Pietersen, 2007, p. 87). In addition, I realised that I would be obtaining data from them that I could not collect in any other way as it represented each individual's own life experiences as a Holocaust educator. This data was gained through listening to their stories which in qualitative research is regarded as a way of knowing (De Vos, et al., 2005). I was also conscious of the fact that interviews are deeply personal experiences for the participants so I allowed them as much freedom as possible to articulate their points of view and deeply lived experiences and emotions (Henning, et al., 2004). I found that the participants were very open with me and I never felt that they were withholding information although at times I did feel as though they might be couching their language carefully to put what they were saying in the best light.

Interviews thus afforded me the best opportunity to gain in-depth data about the museum educators and their educational practices. I was aware that they would be time-consuming so the time factor was built into my research design (Nieuwenhuis, 2007b). I only conducted one interview per day and allowed one hour for each but did not schedule anything personal afterwards to give myself the freedom to continue where necessary. In most instances the interviews did last approximately an hour but I was flexible about the length of the interview so that participants would not feel under pressure to stop their thoughts in mid-stream and in one instance, it actually extended to one and a half hours. I used my Blackberry cell-phone voice recorder for the recordings, which proved to be very successful.

The main aim of the interviews, was to uncover the museum educators' thoughts and feelings regarding their work at the DHC; their motivations and intentions; their roles as educators and to reveal what educational practices they used to undertake their teaching-guiding in order to answer the research questions (Henning, et al., 2004; Nieuwenhuis, 2007b). I was an active participant in the interview process, both as an insider and as an outsider, as noted previously. I had prepared a few standard questions to begin the interview and to act as a guide during the discussions. During this process there was interaction between me and the interviewee that became part of my research report (Henning, et al., 2004).

During the interviews I observed the museum educators and tried to be aware of any non-verbal cues in order to establish if, for example, the person was feeling uncomfortable or excited (Maree & Pietersen, 2007). I believe that my own experiences as a museum educator helped me to establish a quick rapport with them as I was familiar with the participants and we had a common interest, that is, Holocaust education. It also reduced the risk of "stage fright" (Cohen, et al., 2007, p. 364). I was very aware that "the interview is a social, interpersonal encounter, not merely a data collection exercise" (Cohen, et al., 2007, p. 361) so set out to make each interview as personal, intimate and fun as possible both for the participant and myself so where possible tea and biscuits were part of the interview ritual. Prior to recording, in order to set them at ease, we discussed their participation being

voluntary and I explained that anything they said could be retracted later. All except one museum educator, who was initially a little tentative, were relaxed and chatty from the outset. Once the voice recorder was set and the participant and I were seated comfortably, I began with the first question.

To elicit and facilitate the discussions I used semi-structured, open-ended questions from a set of five pre-determined questions which were designed to answer the research questions (Nieuwenhuis, 2007b). I first asked the museum educators to describe their work at the DHC, a question that I knew was simple and straightforward but which contained information that I needed. Once they had outlined the general routine of a school visit and what role they played in it, I asked them to give me their thoughts on Holocaust education. The next questions related to their motivation to guide and the training they received and finally we discussed challenges they faced during the course of their guiding. I had also prepared sub-questions that I generally used to expand the discussion or push it in a certain direction and added additional spontaneous questions as the discussion evolved. I tried to follow the logical progression of the questions and not get caught up in my own responses, concentrating instead on drawing out the interviewee's knowledge. During the course of the interviews I also used probing techniques to help the museum educators expand and develop their thoughts (Maree & Pietersen, 2007).

This strategy gave participants the opportunity to answer fully, enabling me to collect rich, thick, descriptive data (Henning, et al., 2004) and to make our dialogue interesting and informal. Open-ended questions allowed for dialogue but as these were fairly specific they provided me with a structure to get to know my participants through their words and expressions which they were encouraged to express freely (Cohen, et al., 2007). As the participants were able to qualify their answers and there was no limited range for their answers - as there would be in multiple-choice questionnaires for instance - there was no inherent bias.

According to Henning (2004, p. 53) the data that emerges from these research dialogues is regarded as "credible and believable" provided that the interviewer

guides the interview but does not ask leading questions, prevents contamination of the data and does not force the participant to reveal things that he or she might not want to say. I therefore did my best not to ask leading questions but stuck quite closely to my question schedule, allowing the conversation to flow and responding by nodding and encouraging the participants to tell me about their experiences, work and any challenges that they might face. However, if a tangential discussion opened up, I allowed the conversation to flow. If I sensed that there was any reluctance during the interview I did not pursue that particular line of questioning but moved on. I also assured the participants that they would be able to edit their answers after the interview was transcribed. The questions that I asked were questions that arose from my literature review and document analysis as well as from my own knowledge of Holocaust education.

Although the interviews proved to be invaluable, there were both limitations and advantages to them. According to Cohen, et al. (2007) having a structured set of questions, as I did, makes the data more comprehensive and logical gaps can be closed. This was particularly evident from interview to interview when I was able to anticipate the possible direction of the discussions and insert more probing questions which I might have missed during the previous interview. Also, the interviews "remain fairly conversational and situational" (p. 353). One of the limitations of this type of interview, however, is that topics can fall through the cracks if the interviewer sticks too rigidly to the interview schedule. I experienced this frustration occasionally when I realised during the transcription that I could have taken a topic further if I had not gone on to the next question but allowed my participant to continue his or her train of thought. On the whole, though, this was not the case and the flexibility with which I treated the question schedule proved successful.

One of the challenges I faced in the interview process was that I was forced to conduct some of the interviews in the afternoons. As a result the participants might have been more fatigued that they have been during a morning interview. I mention this as I found that those interviews that were conducted in the morning sometimes

generated more animated discussions. However, this might have been due to my own tiredness, after concentrating deeply during the morning at work.

Apart from asking questions and probing, I also gave the participants visual cues such as nodding to encourage them to continue and expand their trains of thought in order to elicit the richest, most descriptive information possible. I found humour to be a valuable tool as it allowed the participants to relax which they visibly did after we shared a joke.

From my reading, I knew that there were some common pitfalls that I needed to avoid during the interviews. These included ensuring that there were no interruptions and limiting the number of interviews per day to one. I also knew that my participants should be confident that anything they said was in confidence (De Vos, et al., 2005) so I assured them of the confidentiality of the research process.

Once each interview was concluded I was ready to start transcribing it. According to Patton as referenced in de Vos (2005, p. 336) the process of analysis begins at the point at which ideas begin to emerge that make sense of the data. This can even take place in the field so I made both oral and written field notes, recording any thoughts that I had with regard to themes or categories that I felt might be relevant later. However, this was not done in a comprehensive manner and the first steps in really managing the data took place away from the site of the interviews. Kelly and Terre Blanche (1999) recommend transcribing the interview in its entirety rather than trying to ascribe meaning during the course of the transcription because the meaning can only be interpreted in the context of the entire interview. I found this technique helpful as simply transcribing accurately and verbatim required my full attention.

I also followed the advice of Merriam (2010) who stated that transcription should be undertaken as soon as possible on the same day as the interviews. Therefore as soon as possible after I got home, I began transcribing each interview in order to have my best recollection of how and why things were said and in what context (Henning, et al., 2004). However, although it had been my intention to complete the transcription

on the same day, this was not possible and proved to be a long arduous and time-consuming process. Also sometimes life intruded at home but generally the interview was simply too complex and lengthy to complete at a single sitting. Fortunately my working space was very quiet and conducive to work so I was always able to get started immediately after each interview. I found that, in general, the transcription took longer than I had anticipated. As I was aware that what the participants said might be open to misinterpretation I took care with this work, aiming for as much accuracy as possible. However, particularly as a novice researcher, I found this task rather challenging especially having to create a systematic method for recording the normal hesitations and so on in everyday speech. Thus each interview was transcribed verbatim with all the sighs, laughter and silences noted.

As advised by Merriam (2010), I numbered each line, typed my transcriptions in single spacing with double spacing between speakers and used margins wide enough to give me space to make meaningful notes, although as I used Nvivo, this was not really necessary. During the transcription I took note of and wrote down the procedures which I recorded in my research journal (De Vos, et al., 2005). This proved to be challenging but invaluable. And as part of the analysis, I used the annotation facility in Nvivo to make detailed notes about my own thoughts and feelings about what was being said.

Once this process was completed I read through the entire transcription in conjunction with the audio-recording, adding any further notes that I considered necessary (Henning, et al., 2004; Kelly & Terre Blanche, 1999). When I felt that the transcription was as complete as I could make it, I emailed it to the interviewee to read and comment on so that we could have a critical discussion about it, if necessary (Cohen, et al., 2007). Immediately after the interviews, a couple of the museum educators emailed some additional comments to me of what they thought that they had omitted to say but no interviewee made any further comments or wanted any changes to be made to the emailed transcribed interviews.

At this point I felt that I was ready to start coding the data and adopted the same open-coding approach as I did with the document analysis. According to Cohen (2007), there are various stages in analysis. These include generating natural units of meaning, which should then be classified, categorized and ordered; structuring narratives to describe the contents of the interview and then interpreting the data from the interview.

I printed out a copy of each interview and began by reading and re-reading the data to make sense of it, gradually becoming aware of various categories, themes and patterns pertaining to my research questions. I looked for repeated words and ideas, for links between what I knew about Holocaust education or what I had read and what the interviewee was saying, and searched for common themes. I then began to search for various explanations about what appeared to be emerging. (De Vos, et al., 2005). I was aware of the categories from my document analysis and was able to look for linking data in the interviews as well as keeping my research questions and the literature in mind. I made some notes in the margins to record my initial thoughts. From my reading I knew that coding the data from open-ended questions would be time-consuming and this was certainly the case.

At this point the real work of analysis began. I imported the interviews into the sources section of Nvivo and continued the process I had begun with the post-visit evaluation documents, of creating hierarchical tree nodes and dragging across bits of data from the document panel to the nodes so that common themes were gathered together. Nvivo enabled me to see who had said what within each category. The major categories that emerged were Holocaust education, museum educators, museums, photographs and teachers' post-visit evaluations. Each of these consisted of various sub-categories and then another level of sub-categorisation emerged too.

Once I had completed the coding to the best of my ability I began to write down the findings in Chapter 4 (De Vos, et al., 2005). This process was greatly facilitated by the structural hierarchy of the tree nodes that had been established and using this as the foundation for my findings I was able to add the necessary layers of first analysis.

### 3.5.3.3   Photo-elicitation interviews

Photographs are the dominant text and a critical element of the exhibition at the DHC. They are displayed extensively on all the panels as well as on video screens and are the primary source of information at the DHC and are supported by relevant text. They were also extremely important in documenting the Holocaust and, with almost all the documentation having been recorded by the perpetrators, create a powerful body of primary source evidence of the historical events. They were therefore an important part of the learners' experience in the museum and were used by the museum educators as the foundation of their discussions during the course of their guiding.

Once the structured questioning was complete, as a second part of the one-on-one interviews, I used photo-elicitation as an alternative method of data collection. The purpose of this was to elicit responses and generate further discussion regarding the interviewees' work or Holocaust education, to change the pace and to add interest (Harper, 2002). Currently, photo-elicitation is not often used as part of interviews to obtain information but I knew that it had the potential to enhance data from interviews (Harper, 2002; Van Auken, Frisvoll, & Stewart, 2010). Also as Holocaust museums are primarily visually-based institutions, where photographs constitute the bulk of the panel content and are the vehicle through which museum educators interact with visitors, the use of photographs as a research tool seemed to be particularly relevant (Alba, 2005).

According to Harper (2002, p. 13), people respond to images and verbal cues differently as the human brain uses evolutionary older parts to process visual information: "Images evoke deeper elements of human consciousness than do words; exchanges based on words alone utilize less of the brain's capacity than do exchanges in which the brain is processing images as well as words".

In photo-elicitation interviews, the photographs to be used can be either found or generated by the researcher (Prosser, 2006) or generated by the participants (Loeffler,

2005). I found the photographs that I wanted to use on the internet and printed them on my home printer. I chose images that represented various themes that I knew corresponded to those on the DHC exhibition panels: life before the Holocaust; Hitler's rise to power; propaganda; antisemitism; apartheid; the choices and dilemmas of people who experienced the Holocaust either as victims, bystanders, perpetrators or rescuers; children's experiences; what can be learned from photographs; justice; and retribution. In this case, my insider knowledge was advantageous. I was able to find copies of many of the photographs that appear in the permanent exhibition at the DHC, particularly on the internet. Most of the photographs that I included were familiar to the museum educators but I also chose some photographs that were similar to or represented areas of knowledge with which they would be familiar but which did not appear in the exhibition, such as the photograph of the Ringelblum Milk Cans that were recovered from the Warsaw Ghetto being opened (Appendix A, 9) (Shoah Memorial, 2011). I then asked the participants to choose three of ten photographs that were shown to them (Appendix A) that best represented the most important aspects of Holocaust education for them. As they selected each photograph, I asked them to identify and describe it and then I then asked them to answer two questions: "How do these photographs represent what you hope to achieve in terms of Holocaust education when you take learners through the centre?" and "Why have you chosen these particular photographs?" A discussion of the chosen photographs followed in order to explore their understanding of Holocaust education.

The museum educators' responses were recorded and then transcribed into a Word document. Like the post visit evaluation documents and one-on-one interviews, the photograph interviews were imported into the sources section of Nvivo and then analysed using tree and free nodes, being categorised into the main and sub-themes. Each of the photographs represented a tree node heading which was divided into two sections: the description of the photograph and the meaning attributed to it by the museum educators. For example, the photograph showing the bystanders (Appendix A, 1) was labelled "bystanders".

I had hoped for various outcomes in introducing photographs as a data collection method. Firstly, I hoped that their choice of photos would indicate museum educators' bias or educational focus. I wanted to discover whether the educators emphasised Jewish history or general historical facts or if they favoured human rights or Holocaust education and I hoped the photographs would stimulate their memories of encounters they had had with learners. In Loeffler's study (2005), photographs helped to trigger memories in his participants which increased their ability "to tell narratives of their experience and to reflect on them" with the photographs acting as "memory anchors" (Loeffler, 2005, p. 345). I was open to any outcome and discussion generated by the photographs. The resulting data was analysed and discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

### 3.5.3.4 Other data collection methods

During the interviews, I took only a few written field notes, also called memos, to contribute to my data. However, I did create verbal memos. Terre Blanche and Kelly (1999) describe two kinds of memoing. In the first, the researcher tries to describe as fully as possible what is being said or done. In the second, meticulous notes are kept about the actual research process such as ideas relating to the analysis of data or ethical issues that might arise (Kelly & Terre Blanche, 1999). I used the first types of memoing to record my interpretations or reflections of what I experienced as well as the decisions that I took during the analytic process (Henning, et al., 2004). As I did not want to distract my participants during the course of our discussions, I took few manual notes, but immediately after they had left, I voice-recorded memos describing in detail all my impressions both of the interview and the participants themselves, such as their demeanour. This meant that I had a comprehensive record of the interviews but was not distracted during the interviews. In fact, I was so caught up in the discussions with my participants that I actually forgot to take written notes. So afterwards, when I did my transcription, I also added my most vivid recollections to these observations.

In addition, I kept a research journal from the outset of my study and maintained it during the entire course of my research. The content of this journal included my thoughts, feelings and sometimes frustrations regarding the direction of my research, the problems I encountered during the course of it and my thoughts about the research process itself. I also included relevant events such as chance meetings or discussions that I had with my participants and other people that related to my study. For convenience and in order to be able to use it in conjunction with my other data, I it set up in the Nvivo software programme.

## 3.6 Other considerations - validity and reliability, ethical considerations and limitations

As mentioned previously, the diversity of my data collection methods contributed to the triangulation of the data. I obtained material from as many diverse sources as possible in order to gain different perspectives of the themes that emerged from the research (Kelly & Terre Blanche, 1999). In my case this was the documents, the one-on-one interviews and the photo-elicitation interviews. From these different perspectives, I was able to explain and explore my observations in greater depth and thus ensure greater validity and reliability (Cohen, et al., 2007; Harper, 2002; Nieuwenhuis, 2007b). I found that similar themes emerged in all three and these became the major findings of the study. For instance, the teachers and the museum educators in their one-on-one interviews all spoke about the concept of choice in the face of human rights violations, with the question of bystander behaviour being discussed often. This directly related to the dominant theme of the Social Holocaust and the fact that through this education, social activism was being encouraged. This was supported by the fact that the only photograph chosen by all six participants as being representative of the most important element of Holocaust education was the photograph of the Jews scrubbing the streets of Vienna with a large group of bystanders looking on (Appendix A, 1).

In order to conduct the research for this thesis, ethical clearance was required from the university and this was done (Appendix B). Prior to each interview I outlined my

research for the each of the interviewees, advised them of what procedures we would follow, obtained informed consent from those who were willing to participate in the research and gave them consent forms to sign, assuring them of their right to privacy, confidentiality and anonymity in accordance with UKZN policy (Henning, et al., 2004). Since I wished to audiotape my interviews, permission was required and obtained from the participants to use a voice recorder. I also needed to get consent from the DHC to use the name and location of the museum, which was done. I had anticipated that I might need to obtain permission from the director of the SAHGF to conduct my research and contacted him. However, he advised me that this was unnecessary and that the director of the DHC was the only person who needed to give me permission. I therefore contacted her and obtained the necessary permission not only to conduct my research and interview the museum educators but also to use the facilities of the DJC.

As the post-visit evaluations by school educators and learners were written anonymously, I did not require permission from them in order to be able to use them in my document analysis. I did, however, need to gain access to these documents from the gatekeeper of the DHC as per UKZN policy and once again this was done.

One of the limitations of this study was the fact that I was a novice researcher. I had therefore not previously conducted interviews, had no experience with photo-elicitation nor had I done a document analysis. Consequently I missed a few opportunities to ask probing questions. After the first interview, where I did quite a lot of interjecting, I realised that I needed to be more silent and simply allow the participants an opportunity to explore their own thoughts as fully as possible. I got better at this as I went along. I also used the experience I gained from each interview to try and improve aspects of the next one, such as how to bridge questions. As the interviews progressed, I realised that the most important determinant of the success of each interview was the willingness of the participants to speak freely to me on Holocaust education matters. Some of the museum educators were more forthcoming, even discussing their difficulties with me, while others were more reticent and I felt

that they were perhaps protecting the Centre and its practices and possibly telling me what they thought I wanted to hear.

## 3.7 Conclusion

The research process, although sometimes arduous was, in general, interesting and informative, providing me with large amounts of rich, thick data. I felt that the methodology adopted, that is use of documents, one-on-one interviews and photo-elicitation interviews, provided me with triangulated, valid data. The use of the Nvivo software programme proved to be a huge asset to my ability to record not only the data, but also my journal notes and models of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks. Through it I was able to easily categorise the qualitative data into categories and view it as a hierarchical structure. I found the open-coding method of coding the data was appropriate as was the use of case study methodology.

# CHAPTER 4
# ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

## 4.1     Introduction

This chapter is an analysis and presentation of the findings generated by the research methods employed, as described in the previous chapter. Using this introduction as the route map, I intend taking the reader on a metaphorical journey through the data with the museum educators, a journey that reflects the journey taken by learners and their teachers of their educational tour at the DHC. The purpose of this chapter is to answer the first research question: "What is the work of the museum educators at the DHC and what is their educational focus in terms of Holocaust education?" (Chapter 1, p. 25)

The learners and the teachers who accompanied them began their journey on their arrival when they were met by their facilitator for the visit. As a group, the learners attended an introductory session presented by this facilitator. My parallel metaphorical journey through the data therefore begins with an introduction to the museum educators learning about their roles at the DHC, investigating who they are as individuals and what their training was.

The next step on the learners' journey was to view the DVD presentation after which the learners wended their way through the exhibition, led by a guide or facilitator. Thus the next step on my parallel journey also deals with cognitive matters as the museum educators' thoughts on Holocaust education are unpacked. An intrinsic element of the learners and accompanying teachers' journey was the personal, intellectual and emotional challenges they faced during their tour so the various challenges faced by the museum educators, including how they dealt with emotional issues is revealed through analysis of the data.

Finally the learners' tour ended with the wrap-up session and the writing of post-visit evaluations so the final step on my parallel metaphorical journey is my own reflections on these two journeys.

## 4.2    Who are the DHC museum educators?

The first encounter that the teachers and learners had at the DHC was with the museum educators – the facilitator who led the educational programme and the guides who accompanied them through the exhibition. So who are the museum educators? The participants described themselves as a history teacher; a ballet teacher; a university lecturer and a judge but also a shop owner and a university graduate. Apart from these descriptions of their work, past and present, they also described themselves as Jewish, Catholic, black, white, female, male,[9] South African and having European roots.

Although this group was diverse in terms of work experience and religious and ethnic orientation with only a few being teachers by profession, most of the museum educators agreed that teaching experience, although not a prerequisite, gave them a distinct advantage in being able to deal with both the academic and the practical sides of their work. One museum educator commented, "I definitely think if you have had teaching experience it's an added benefit, it does help" - although she did not elaborate on how or why.

The practical advantages of teaching experience according to some museum educators were being able to discipline and control groups of learners as well as being better able to express themselves well and to communicate easily with the learners. However, in terms of knowledge, Emma commented, "I think a teacher, in whatever form, has learnt to sort the wheat from the chaff in the information that they're giving them". And it was evident from her interview that the museum educator who had been a history teacher had acquired the necessary skills to impart historical

---

[9] In order to protect the anonymity of the single male participant in this study, I refer to all participants as if they were female.

knowledge. Although not specifically highlighting these skills, she described how she was able to weave the lessons of the Holocaust into the historical account. In addition, she was aware of fundamental aspects of history education such as understanding sources and using appropriate writing skills. For those museum educators without teaching experience but who had worked with young people in another capacity, simply having the ability to connect with young people was important. In this regard Abigail said, "I think it's in you to be able to convey ideas to people". She also felt that she had gained valuable people skills from her work as a youth leader, and she felt this held her in good stead in her guiding. On the other hand, the museum educator who had no prior experience with teaching young people claimed, "If I'm a good guide then having studied teaching had nothing to do with it. If I'm a bad guide then that may be the reason".

Once they had committed themselves to the idea of guiding[10], the museum educators did not seem to harbour any pre-conceived notions of what that work would entail but were passionate about their commitment and happy to be involved. They found the work personally enriching with Abigail stating that her guiding sessions left her feeling "elated" while Grace said that "generally speaking I'm always bowled over", adding that guiding made her feel "like a million dollars afterwards". For Emma, guiding was fulfilling, leaving her feeling richer for the experience; Chloe "loved it" and for Sophia, it was "rewarding". However, these positive feelings were occasionally overshadowed by a sense of lack of achievement. As Sophia explained:

> And there's other days when you come back and think, that was flat, it didn't go well. I mean it's the same knowledge, but it's just ... sometimes there's a spark and sometimes there isn't and that's the challenge, to always provide that spark. As I say, it doesn't always happen, there really are days where I come back thinking, 'Oh my G-d that was awful!'

Even though they might not have initially been interested in education per se, most of the museum educators felt that being a museum educator was "a great opportunity"

---

[10] The museum educators sometimes used the words guiding and teaching interchangeably. However, for the purposes of this study I will refer to guiding as the work done by the guides who take the learners through the DHC exhibition and teaching as the act of passing on information. Thus teaching is one of the elements of guiding at the DHC.

and that they were "lucky to be involved". The museum educators' motivations to guide included learning more about themselves as human beings, wanting to contribute meaningfully to the Jewish community or society at large, and to ensure that the Holocaust was not forgotten. For one museum educator the link to South Africa was a motivating factor in her guiding. She explained, "You know there's so many connections that I see with South Africa's history that it's astounding and that's why I'm passionate, really, really passionate about Holocaust studies".

It was thus evident that the museum educators were a diverse group of people who encompassed a broad range of educational characteristics. As a group they were passionate and excited about guiding at the DHC. They wanted to be part of the Holocaust education educational team and believed that the work they were doing was worthwhile. Having committed themselves to participating, the next step on the museum educators' journey was to become fully-fledged guides and facilitators, so on my parallel journey I examine how they achieved this.

## 4.3    DHC museum educators' training and expertise

In order to more fully understand the work of the museum educators, it is necessary to understand how they acquired their knowledge because depending on when they joined the DHC, they underwent different types and levels of training - training that has changed significantly over time as the DHC grew and developed its own educational ethos. The initial training for the DHC educators was conducted by senior educators from the CTHC and Grace, Lee, Abigail and Sophia underwent all or part of it. Abigail said, "Well we had a very intensive I think it was a six- or eight-week course, where we went completely through the [Holocaust] history, through every facet that is displayed in the Centre itself. We studied that and we were made comfortable with it". However, according to Sophia, the decision was made by the DHC management to conduct their own in-house training. One of the elements of this in-house training was described by Emma as learning by shadowing more experienced guides, which she said gave the new museum educators "enough information" to be proficient in guiding. She added that this was supported by a

biennial group walk through the exhibition with a very experienced museum educator, the purpose of which was to add "more dimension" to their knowledge. However, one of the museum educators who underwent this initial in-house training method described it as being "self-taught":

> For me personally how I learnt was watching other people guiding otherwise I wouldn't have known how to guide … So I was given ... books, the Educator's Manual as well as the Learner's Manual, and I also had to basically learn from those books. I spent, I think it was a month, ploughing through, trying to get an understanding, more of an understanding of the Holocaust from those books.

The manuals to which she referred namely, *The Holocaust: Lessons for Humanity - Educator's Resource Manual & Guide for Introductory Film* and *The Holocaust: Lessons for Humanity - Learners' Interactive Resource Book*, were written by Marlene Silbert and Tracey Petersen of the CTHC. According to Grace, who was partially trained under the "new" system but who had also attended some of the workshops offered by the CTHC staff, believed that these educators had effectively established the fundamental points required to teach the Holocaust and, she added, these were all that was really required. She explained, "I honestly think that a person who just reads their body of information is much more than qualified to do the [guiding] … and everything else is just the icing on the cake". It should be noted, however, that the motivation to read these manuals and thus gain enough information to guide was internally driven, as no formal assessments were conducted. Also, those museum educators who had this type of training had no other yardstick against which to measure the training methods.

Thus the two distinct kinds of training were described by the museum educators. The "old" training was conducted by the senior museum educators of the CTHC in a group setting with all aspects of the educational programme being covered, from guiding tips to historical facts, while the "new" training was conducted in-house at the DHC. This involved the new museum educators reading the manuals and shadowing other more experienced DHC museum educators. Most of the museum educators who participated in this research received the CTHC training with only a few having done the DHC in-house training, supplemented by other workshops or

seminars. Books, films and DVDs added to the museum educators' historical knowledge.

Amongst the descriptions of their primary training were the assertions that it had brought the museum educators various levels of insight and had taught them about concepts like empathy, as well as giving them the ability to deal with various situations, both in their guiding and in social situations. Emma, who attended the CTHC training as well as various other workshops described it as "empowering" while Chloe, who did the DHC in-house training, also attended a Facing History and Ourselves workshop which she described as "amazing", adding that it had made her more insightful about herself. Only Lee "wasn't enthusiastic" about her CTHC training declaring, "Okay, you're asking me what training I've had - I was there!" However, Abigail, who completed the initial CTHC course, felt that that her training was "essential" and even spoke about wanting to repeat it.

Once their initial training had been completed, be it in-house or CTHC training, the museum educators said that they continued to learn and empower themselves, mostly by reading. In order to maintain their expertise, Chloe, for example, said, "So basically I read, read, read". What the museum educators reported that they read were the manuals, from which they gained information about both historical events and how to teach the Holocaust, as well as other independently sourced books such as *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*. On the whole, however, it appeared from the data that the museum educators read more for historical content knowledge than about education. The internet and survivors' personal stories were not widely cited as personal educational sources although those who did use them found them to be useful and informative. However, learning from films and DVDs was popular. A glaring omission in the museum educators' accounts of how they maintained their expertise was the inter-museum network. According to Emma, there was a "phenomenal relationship" between the DHC and the other South African Holocaust centres with "a wonderful network of information that circulates all the time". Yet none of the museum educators other than Emma spoke about this as a source of information.

The museum educators also continued to learn by occasionally shadowing their peers and from the exhibition panels, particularly if new permanent or temporary exhibits were introduced. They grew through a confrontation with their own issues as well as in their encounters with learners. Workshops and seminars, both locally and internationally, provided another valuable source of educational information with the added benefit of the museum educators getting together socially and being able to exchange ideas. Discussion groups also provided this opportunity although these were described, as few and far between, with one of the museum educators noting that there had, in fact, only been one meeting since the inception of the DHC.

At some stage during the research process, all the museum educators addressed their perceptions of their own levels of historical and educational Holocaust knowledge. Each one expressed the general opinion that they were confident enough in their knowledge to undertake the educational task of guiding, making comments such as "I'm at least as well read as most so I had a background" and "Really, you know I don't believe that I can learn much more about the history". And while some museum educators were initially overwhelmed by the vast amount of available information, as they became more familiar with the subject they were able, in their estimation, to interact more spontaneously with the exhibits.

Thus both the initial training and the ongoing development of museum educators' expertise was crucial in how they presented and disseminated information and ultimately to how they shaped Holocaust education at the DHC.

Once the museum educators had been trained, they were ready to begin guiding school groups and to implement their Holocaust education knowledge. The next step on my metaphorical journey was therefore to examine the museum educators' perspectives on Holocaust education: the manner in which they viewed the historical aspects of the Holocaust; what they regarded the purpose of teaching the Holocaust to be; how they envisaged the nature of Holocaust education; and how they set about passing this knowledge on to the learners and the accompanying teachers. The body

of knowledge and nature of the content used by the museum educators was then examined.

## 4.4    The museum educators' views on Holocaust education

The dominant view expressed by museum educators regarding the purpose of Holocaust education was that they taught the Holocaust because it was in the NCS - History and that the primary goal of both the exhibition and the educational programme was education. In fact, according to Emma, the inclusion of the Holocaust in the curriculum provided the rationale for the creation of the DHC. She explained that it had been created not out of sympathy for Jews, but for educational purposes, having been included in the Grade 9 and 11 History curricula (Department of Education, 2002, 2003). As a result, she said, "Every single school-going South African child will learn [about it]". She felt that this was felicitous for South Africans, being such a superb example of what not to do if you wanted to be counted as an upstanding person in the world. She stressed that the DHC did not include its own bias or sentiments but that "it had to be the facts as they were". She therefore felt, "We had to be sure to teach it right" and believed that the DHC should take some control over how schools taught the Holocaust, "They [the teachers] can't teach it their way". There was recognition by both Chloe and Abigail however, that the Holocaust comprised only a small section of the History curriculum at school, but Abigail felt that however small, it needed to be taught well. In fact, she felt that the DHC "would not be that important if it was not for the school education".

However, apart from their belief that Holocaust education at the DHC existed to support the school History curriculum, the museum educators believed that the DHC had other purposes too, such as engaging with the learners on issues such as remembrance and to try to bring about attitudinal change in them.

## 4.4.1   The Historical Holocaust

As expected, all the museum educators agreed that Holocaust education was fundamentally about teaching the historical events of the Holocaust, although different museum educators emphasised different facets of it. Like the kernel of a peach, the historical events constituted the core of Holocaust education. They agreed that they wanted to create an awareness of what happened, ensuring that the learners knew how and why the Holocaust occurred. I call this the Historical Holocaust.

The museum educators said they discussed various historical topics during the course of their guiding. These included: the implementation of the plan to kill the Jews during World War II in Europe; the Evian Conference; the story of Anne Frank; Auschwitz and the death camps; the Einsatzgruppen; and the resistors who stood up for the Jews, such as the White Rose Movement and Pastor Martin Niemöller. They also addressed the Nazis' use of propaganda against the Jews which was confirmed by a teacher who said that he had learnt about "the power of propaganda". However, some of the museum educators mentioned that they left out some elements of the history. For example, they said that they did not pay much attention to Hitler's rise to power as they presumed that this was covered by the teachers in the classroom. For the same reason, Sophia, said she did not spend much time talking about the Nazi concentration camps. This might account for the fact that none of the museum educators chose the photograph of Hitler, a central figure in the Holocaust, and his cohorts standing next to a train, during the photo-elicitation portion of their interviews (Appendix A, 8). Individual museum educators independently selected different historical events to highlight. This was supported by one of the teachers who said that on her tour, the museum educator highlighted "some of the SS staff and indicated their backgrounds". In general, the teachers felt that in terms of the historical events, the educational programme "covers in an extensive and graphic way, most of the aspects of World War II that affected the Jewish people" and that it showed "the reality of the horror, the sadness and the immense loss for the Jewish people of Europe". In fact, Grace said that although the Holocaust was specifically

"against the Jews of Europe", she felt, "It could have been against anyone. It happened to be the Jews of Europe and they were scapegoated".

Although some of the museum educators were well acquainted with the historical events, the data revealed that others were less knowledgeable. One museum educator admitted that she did not know much about Anne Frank even though there was a great deal of information on this topic in the exhibition whilst another explained that she was always trying to get more factual information "because sometimes you'll get asked certain questions, like for example I got a question on the SS". She revealed, "I had no clue about the SS. I had to go back and learn more". Clearly ongoing learning was necessary and this was undertaken by the museum educators.

It was therefore evident from the data that the historical events of the Holocaust were discussed. The museum educators spoke about how the Holocaust impacted on European Jewry and they highlighted selected events such as the Evian Conference and individual stories, like that of Anne Frank. But the historical events were clearly not the focus of the museum educators' work and they were fundamentally used to illustrate the other purpose of Holocaust education, bringing about social and personal transformation in the learners. While the Historical Holocaust was the foundation on which the DHC educational programme rested, investigating history itself was not the prime objective of the museum educators. Consequently, while some of them had great depth of knowledge about the historical events, particularly those who had a previous interest in Holocaust history, others came into the educational programme knowing very little about it and had to work hard to arm themselves with sufficient knowledge with which to guide.

### 4.4.2   The Social Holocaust

"We've taught them the facts, now we've got to teach them the lessons". This declaration by Emma summed up the intention of the educational programme and typified the focus of the museum educators. Apart from teaching the historical events, the museum educators made it clear that the purpose of Holocaust education was to

illustrate the enormity of the event and to give survivors a voice. But even more that this, they explained, it was about other things too - society facing up to the past; genocide and human rights; the connection between the Holocaust and apartheid in their parallel laws and ideologies; and most importantly the teaching of "the lessons" in order to bring about change in the learners and society. This societal element of what the museum educators taught, I call the Social Holocaust. The data revealed that this was the dominant view of the museum educators with regard to Holocaust education and the extent of its reach will be seen through analysis below.

### 4.4.2.1   The lessons

Without exception, the museum educators stated that they used the Holocaust to teach what they referred to as "life lessons", "lessons for humanity" or simply "the lessons". Grace said that these lessons were most evident not from other genocides, of which she was aware, but from the Holocaust. She explained, "It [the Holocaust] is the best one ... I've had a little look at Armenia and I've had a little look at Rwanda and Darfur ... but there's been other holocausts ... [but] this one to me just gives every lesson I need". Various lessons to be learnt from the Holocaust were highlighted by the museum educators. One of these was that the bystanders had a choice in the way they behaved. Another was that there were consequences to racism, discrimination and stereotyping and yet another was to show what human beings were capable of in their treatment of each other.

For Grace, the most important lesson concerned the behaviour and choices of the bystanders during the Holocaust:

> This would probably be number one in terms of a lesson ... And the lesson is that thoughts are fabulous … but actions are what count. And the bystanders no matter how sorry you feel, but by standing there you are empowering the perpetrator, that's it!

It was this assertion that the bystanders not only empowered the perpetrators but that they could have made different decisions that many of the museum educators believed was an important lesson in Holocaust education. The significance of this was clearly demonstrated in the photo-elicitation exercise when the only photograph

chosen by all the museum educators as best representing what they hoped to achieve through teaching the Holocaust was the photograph depicting Jews scrubbing the streets of Vienna, Austria surrounded by unarmed Hitler Youth and a large crowd of bystanders (Appendix A,1). From Emma's perspective this photograph, which also features in the DHC exhibition, "encompasses everything we're trying to teach them". She felt that more than learning about World War II and the Holocaust, it was the lessons to be learnt from it that drove Holocaust education and that the choices made by the bystanders were at the heart of these lessons. The fact that this was the only photograph chosen by all the museum educators was telling, as was the fact that none of the museum educators chose the photograph showing Hitler and his cohorts (Appendix A, 8) or the Nuremberg Trials (Appendix A, 10).

All the museum educators explained that through the photograph of the bystanders they could explore the various roles of those present, that is, the perpetrators, the victims and the bystanders and they used it to talk about bystander behaviour, choices and moral dilemmas and even about the power of the perpetrators. Grace, for instance, used it to generate what she believed were important discussions with the learners about the kind of choices that people made and what the "possibilities for action" might have been; discussions which she then extended to situations that might arise in the learners' own lives. She acknowledged that it was hard for people to know what to do in those situations but pointed out that it was through these discussions with the learners that the lessons of the Holocaust came to the fore.

Revealing the intellectual nature of Holocaust education, both Chloe and Grace made the point that although the viewer could observe the bystanders' behaviour in the photograph (Appendix A, 1) it was, in reality, impossible to know what they were really thinking. In addition to this, although most of the museum educators believed that the bystanders could have made different choices, one museum educator questioned the inevitability of this, "You and I know that people couldn't have done anything. You couldn't have gone up against these [Hitler Youth]. We can say it to them but there is nothing that anyone could have done there". This also revealed a possible disconnect between what she taught and what she really believed.

In their post-visit responses the teachers provided support for the views on Holocaust education expressed by the guides by agreeing that Holocaust education should include discussions about the moral implications of choice. One teacher noted, "I liked the way you impressed upon us the importance of independent and critical thinking - never to be a bystander" whilst another felt that the programme would, "definitely encourage learners to become more proactive about making positive changes in our country".

The second major lesson spoken about by the museum educators related to the warning contained in the Holocaust about the consequences of racism, discrimination, stereotyping and antisemitism in society, one of which, they said, was xenophobia. They all believed that they discussed one or more of these concepts with the learners in their teaching of the Holocaust. Sophia, for instance, explained that she spent a lot of time on antisemitism and its consequences while Chloe indicated that she concentrated on the fact that the Holocaust did not begin with murder but with discrimination, stereotyping and racism in an environment where there was no empathy or humanity.

Another lesson deemed to be important and taught by the museum educators was the ways that human beings treat each other, with one museum educator saying she wanted to teach the learners to "just [be] more humane to people who might not be the same as they are". They also indicated that they wanted to illustrate that human beings are all the same and that there is only one race, the human race, and "if you embrace each other's differences, accept that we all come from different backgrounds, we've got different faiths, we've got different skin colours, but we're all human beings with the same problems, we can help each other". Chloe felt that through such lessons, the Holocaust was able to generate "cultural understanding".

Grace was of the view that she wanted to teach about "the warning sign ... what would happen unless we look after each one another, unless we see the world as one little global oyster". And part of this education, from Emma's point of view, was putting a halt to bullying, a message picked up by one of the teachers in the post-visit

reflections who observed, "Let's hope they [the learners] all develop a sense of resistance to any form of bullying". This comment revealed that for at least one of the teachers, education about the Holocaust was about societal concerns and life lessons.

Ultimately though, Chloe believed that Holocaust education needed to be a personally enriching experience for learners and that this could be achieved through their encounter with the lessons. She explained:

> The main thing that I've gotten is that, at the end of the day, it must be as much as it's learning about something so terrible that happened, there must also be an upliftment at the end - as long as the learners leave feeling, 'Wow I've learnt something. I can do something. I can be a better person'.

According to her this could be achieved by engendering curiosity and sparking enquiry in the learners adding, "I hope that the experience gets them to reflect and to think about themselves first and foremost". This sentiment was echoed by Sophia who posited that the opportunity was created in the wrap-up session for the learners to reflect on their own lives, the way they behaved and the way they treated other people.

Thus it can be concluded that the museum educators placed an emphasis on teaching the moral and behavioural lessons when they were teaching about the Holocaust. The issue of bystander behaviour was regarded as one such core lesson. The museum educators taught this lesson by scrutinising the choices and dilemmas faced by the bystanders and also by getting the learners to examine their own behaviour, at the same time encouraging learners and teachers alike to become upstanders against social injustice. Other lessons that they taught by means of the Holocaust were the consequences of certain kinds of behaviour, illustrating that human beings were all the same, trying to prevent bullying and sounding the warning about what would happen if people did not look after each other. And at least one of the museum educators believed that the lessons should provide the learners with an uplifting experience, making them want to be better human beings. "The lessons" thus constituted both the purpose and nature of Holocaust education according to the DHC museum educators. They were the primary reason for teaching the Holocaust for

some of the museum educators and at the same time were one of the key elements of Holocaust education.

## 4.4.2.2 Racism - apartheid and antisemitism

An aspect agreed on by all the museum educators was that the Holocaust was included in the NCS - History for Grade 9 because of the link to South Africa's own apartheid past. According to Sophia, "You only have to look and see the laws that were promulgated, the Nuremberg laws and other laws that were promulgated by the Nazis and the parallels with South Africa. So there are parallels and I think it's crazy to even deny it". In the photo-elicited discussion, Lee likewise spoke about these parallels, highlighting the photograph of the woman on a bench (Appendix A, 2), which she said was important because it showed the origins of apartheid as a mirror of the Nazis' attitude to the Jews. Chloe, like Lee, reiterated the importance of this link. She said the photograph of the woman on a bench showed how, through enforced separate amenities, racist governments in Germany and South Africa had intended to dehumanise people, separate them, create suspicion between them and increase hostilities amongst them. Thus, she said, the photograph, which also appears in the DHC exhibition, taught the learners not only about the dangers of racism and discrimination but also showed how people who were oppressed in that kind of system actually felt.

When speaking about the links between Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa, the museum educators made it clear that they were careful to ensure that the learners understood that these parallels only existed in terms of the laws that were promulgated in Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1938 and the laws governing apartheid South Africa, after which there were no further parallels. Lee pointed out that there was, in fact, a "vast difference that, under Nazi Germany at the time of the Holocaust, there was an active policy of killing Jews - that's what the Holocaust was all about". Emma in turn made it clear that she told the learners that there was never such a policy in South Africa to kill black people and that apartheid "was never genocidal in intent, and it really wasn't, ever".

From the teachers' perspectives the link between the Holocaust and apartheid struck a chord. They said that they were appreciative of the museum educators' insights as well as how they wove the histories of Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa together.

Despite being a crucial element of the unfolding events of the Holocaust, the concept of antisemitism did not receive as much attention as apartheid. Only half of the museum educators spoke about it in relation to Holocaust education, with Chloe and Sophia giving it the most emphasis. Chloe felt that antisemitism was, together with racism and apartheid, one of the most important aspects of Holocaust education. She said that she spoke at the outset of the tour about antisemitism and its long history and in fact, she spoke about it quite often during her interview. It was also important to Sophia who said that she spent quite a lot of time "on antisemitism and the consequences", particularly during the introductory session. She explained, "There are certain scenes I like to pick out before we go into the Centre like ... questions of race, questions of antisemitism ... because a lot of them don't really know much about antisemitism and things like that there isn't really enough time to bring them up in the museum". Grace on the other hand, mentioned it only once during her interview, in the context of the continuity of antisemitism in history and the other museum educators did not address it at all.

It can therefore be concluded that racism and apartheid were key themes in the museum educators' views on Holocaust education at the DHC. They regarded Holocaust education was as being more than just about Jews with the museum educators drawing parallels between the laws promulgated in Nazi Germany and those implemented in apartheid South Africa. They did this in order to contextualize the Holocaust and make it relevant to a South African audience. However, it was clear from the data that antisemitism was not foregrounded in terms of teaching and learning as much as apartheid was by the museum educators - despite being a fundamental contributor towards the events of the Holocaust.

**4.4.2.3  Genocide**

An idea that surfaced quite frequently in the analysis of the data was the notion that Holocaust education was actually "a genocide education". The museum educators spoke about the connection between the Holocaust and other genocides around the world such as the Armenian genocide, which Lee pointed out, had taken place prior to the Holocaust. For Grace, however, the Holocaust was the most significant to her personally, being a clear warning sign, she said, of what could and did happen in society. She explained that she recognized the possibility that what happened in Nazi Germany could have happened in apartheid South Africa if there had been a war, under cover of which many atrocities could have been committed.

Generally there was consensus amongst the museum educators that teaching about the Holocaust and other genocides such as those in Rwanda and Darfur might help to prevent future genocides, which was another key theme in their perspective on Holocaust education. Lee felt that learners needed to be made conscious of the need to fight things like apartheid and genocide. She stressed, "In this day and age I think that what we've got to do is try and do our damndest to see that we don't have another Rwanda anywhere in the world" while Sophia and Chloe both quoted the saying by Santayana that those who did not remember the past were doomed to repeat it.

This concept of the Holocaust as a genocide with contemporary social relevance as taught by the museum educators was picked up by a teacher who affirmed its importance, "It also forces them [the learners] to look at genocide as a modern tragedy, not just something for the history books".

It can therefore be seen that Holocaust education for the museum educators encompassed genocide education, with a view to preventing future genocides worldwide. Teaching the Holocaust in this manner constituted part of the purpose of Holocaust education from the museum educators' perspective. It also contributed to the nature of Holocaust education as taught by the DHC museum educators.

### 4.4.2.4  Human rights and democracy

Another theme that surfaced from analysis of the data was the issue of human rights. Human rights, like genocide, is a contemporary concept that had not yet been defined during the Holocaust. According to Lee, discussions in this regard were raised in quite a simple manner, with the learners being asked to reflect on their own roles as perpetrators, victims or bystanders: "At this level of course it's very different from what was happening in the Holocaust but the simple question is, 'Do you bully your little brother ... or sister?'" This type of questioning, she added, "seems naive and almost irrelevant in trying to raise the human rights issues that are so deep and intense".

On a different level, Grace, for example, said that the Holocaust was a warning sign about what might happen if people's rights are ignored and Sophia described the Holocaust as "just a total abuse of all human rights". This sentiment was echoed by Abigail who pointed out that there are still human rights violations today. However, only Emma spoke about the connection between the Holocaust and the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights being signed in 1948, the same year that the National Party came to power. She added that the National Party government introduced the same discriminatory laws as Hitler did in 1933. In her view, the Holocaust was taught as "a case study for human rights".

In their post-visit feedback the teachers picked up the museum educators' connection between human rights issues and the Holocaust. Firstly, the teachers confirmed that the educational programme they were exposed to at the DHC was in line with the NCS – History Grade 9. One teacher wrote, "It really works well because the focus of the Grade 9 syllabus is the abuse of human rights". Teachers were also appreciative of the link drawn by the museum educators to human rights in South Africa with one teacher stating that he liked the "relevant and important link with human rights'/children's rights' issues in South Africa".

Thus the data showed that although all the museum educators mentioned human

rights or made mention of human rights violations in some way, there was very limited reference made to Holocaust education being used as human rights education or to addressing human rights issues more globally. In other word, the Holocaust was used by the museum educators to teach about, rather than for, human rights. Also, while the knowledge focus in the NCS – History Grade 9 was stated as being about human rights issues during and after World War II and also about the struggle for human rights after the war (Department of Education, 2002), at the DHC it was evident that the purpose of Holocaust education was not to teach human rights per se but to integrate the idea of human rights into Holocaust education. The museum educators' views on human rights were diverse, however, and it appeared that they did not buy into a single idea of how this should be done.

An issue related to the question of human rights was that of democracy. On this subject, only two voices were heard, those of Grace and Chloe. Chloe said she would ask the learners what democracy meant and then discuss the antisemitic policies of the Nazi regime and racist laws implemented by the National Party. Grace meanwhile, related democracy to dialogue and dialogue to a call to action:

> The more people that have a conversation, the more civilised they become and the more ... they start establishing values and ideas in their mind. So once we've understood that, we've got to have a look at what the possibilities for action could be and talk about them.

It was these discussions, she added, that were at the "heart of democracy". Thus Holocaust education was seen, in her view, as a way of promoting mutual cultural understanding and democracy and as a way to create social activists. Holocaust education thus included a range of views on human rights and democracy. The Holocaust was introduced to support to support the human rights focus of the NCS – History. However, the museum educators did not foreground human rights issues as much as they did apartheid issues and democracy emerged as a minor theme.

### 4.4.2.5  Memorial/Remembrance

According to the museum educators there were other reasons too for teaching the Holocaust. Grace, Abigail and Chloe all foregrounded the theme of remembrance.

Chloe believed that a function of the DHC was "to memorialise the Holocaust" whilst other museum educators explained, "The Holocaust has got to be remembered and it's not being remembered" and "I just think we dare not forget". For Lee the purpose of the DHC and Holocaust education could be summed up in two words, "Never forget" and she added, "People must remember what happened then, so that it won't happen again".

The DHC museum educators expressed the idea that the Holocaust was not simply an historical event that happened in the distant past on a different continent. Instead they felt that it had contemporary relevance for both South Africa and the world. Sophia explained, "Books and movies, I mean the number of books that are written, novels about Nazi Germany and so on. You know, so far from it being history to be forgotten, it's still very much alive". Other museum educators spoke about the fact that there had been a resurgence of Holocaust education around the world and that there were many places in the world where the Holocaust was being taught such as the United States, with its Klu Klux Klan history of racism, as well as Germany and South America. To illustrate this fact, Emma said that she had been on a Holocaust education seminar attended by 750 delegates from 52 countries around the world, all of whom were teaching the Holocaust. Thus to the museum educators, Holocaust education at the DHC was part of a global phenomenon of memory and remembrance, which was manifested in seminars and workshops, books, films and educational programmes as well as in museums worldwide.

However, Emma alone expressed the view that Holocaust education was able "to [give] the survivors a voice" for as she explained, "The survivors of today are the true testament to the Holocaust". For her, part of the purpose of Holocaust education was to enable survivors to be heard and in the process counter Holocaust denial. However, she also believed that centres such as the DHC would be even more important when the survivors were no longer able to speak for themselves. As she said, "When they die you'll see an upsurge in Holocaust denial because there will be nobody to defend it. That's why it's so important for the Holocaust Centres to be established, so that they [the deniers] can see for themselves".

However, at the core of Emma's views on Holocaust education was the belief that through it "the truth" would be laid bare. She mentioned several times that the "true facts" needed to be taught. When asked if this meant that the historical facts lay at the heart of Holocaust education, she simply replied, "It's the truth". For her at least, the nature of Holocaust museums and education included the idea that the DHC and the museum educators were keepers of the truth. Thus the DHC provided an environment that enabled expression of that truth through the voice of Holocaust survivors and the educational programme, simultaneously providing a means of countering Holocaust denial.

It can therefore be concluded that another objective of Holocaust education was memorialisation and remembrance but this emerged as a minor theme. The museum educators believed that the purpose of Holocaust education was to remember those who died, to honour those who lived and to keep and expose the truth.

### 4.4.2.6 Good vs. evil

Yet another theme revealed by analysis of the data was that of evil and its opposite, good. From Lee's perspective, the nature of Holocaust education was "just stressing the evils of what actually happened, telling them the history, explaining that there was opposition and we have got those people who've since been honoured in the Garden of Remembrance", (actually called the *Garden of the Righteous Amongst the Nations* at Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, Israel). For her, the concepts of good and evil were exposed through the actions of the perpetrators and the rescuers.

Grace went even further, raising the idea that in learning about the Holocaust, people's potential to become either good or evil can be investigated. This was evident when she chose the photograph showing the four little girls (Appendix A, 3):

> They have potential for so much good and so much evil ... in terms of the fact that I know these are Jewish children at the swimming pool, it could be anybody, ... it could be a group of Catholic girls, group of Scandinavians or a group of gypsies for all I know, but they are just people and that bad things can happen to people for absolutely no reason whatsoever.

Extending this thought she pointed out that this photograph, which for her represented how events might start, was diametrically opposed to the photograph of the Einsatzgruppen (Appendix A, 4), whom she described as the very worst group, and which she said, represented how events might end. Indeed, it seemed from the data that for Grace teaching the Holocaust also embodied an element of a personal mission relating to her child-rearing and life philosophies. It appeared that she was in pursuit of an answer as to what made people ultimately become either good or evil, a theme that she was able to interrogate through Holocaust education with the learners.

It can hence be concluded that the museum educators viewed good and evil as a minor theme of Holocaust education. The rationale behind this was to show how acts of evil were perpetrated alongside acts of good and how the extremes of people's natures could be explored. In addition, its purpose was to enable the learners to reflect on the choices made by different individuals in this extreme social situation and to investigate how people ultimately became either good or evil social beings.

### 4.4.2.7  Identity

As revealed by the data, a further theme exploring the psychology of human behaviour in Holocaust education was related to identity. The museum educators tackled this from two perspectives: Jewish identity and the learners' identities. In dealing with the question of Jewish identity, Lee pointed out that not all those whom the Nazis defined as Jews, actually considered themselves to be Jewish. She added that in South Africa, Jewish people comprised a very small minority and hence the museum educators, both Jewish and non-Jewish, were conscious of the fact that the many of the learners had probably not met a Jewish person or even knew what a Jew was, a fact borne out by some learners' comments to the museum educators during their tours. Jewish museum educators therefore revealed to the learners that they were Jewish and the non-Jewish museum educators spoke about what it meant to be Jewish in Nazi Germany, although one museum educator felt that despite all these explanations many of the learners might still not fully understand:

> You'll find a lot of learners may have a Jewish person in their classroom, like I did – there were two Jewish learners in my grade - but I still didn't know what it meant to be Jewish until, you know, until I actually worked in this environment so I think it's very, very important to understand what Judaism means.

Although almost all of the museum educators addressed the question of what a Jew was with the learners, only one museum educator spoke about a purpose of Holocaust education being the preservation of Jewishness:

> I mean being Jewish is what counts ... I mean they've got centres in Australia they've got all over the world ... I think it's just the Jewishness that's the important thing and our little shrinking community here. Eighteen hundred people that's all we've got here.

This museum educator even expressed the opinion that the Holocaust might not be as important to other people as to Jews themselves:

> Researcher: So a Holocaust Centre then has as its purpose … to connect with the syllabus and no other real meaning for anybody else other than Jewish people?

> Museum educator: Almost. People who may have been affected by the war might if they're not Jewish. But you can't imagine people who have no contact with it whatsoever to identify with what we are trying to do here.

This theme of Jewishness relates the earlier theme of antisemitism, as discussed earlier in this chapter (p. 103). There it was shown that the DHC museum educators did not place as much emphasis on antisemitism as they did on apartheid. So once again it appeared that Jewishness, although not entirely omitted, was nevertheless neglected.

In the process of this interrogation of Jewish identity, the learners were encouraged to reflect on their own identities. As Chloe said, "I hope that the experience gets them to reflect and to think about themselves first and foremost". This was explored most often in the wrap-up session after the learners and teachers had been guided through the DHC exhibition and when the learners' own behaviour was under the microscope, when, for example, they were asked to classify themselves as victims, perpetrators, bystanders or upstanders or to examine case studies of human rights abuses.

In conclusion, Holocaust education dealt with two forms of identity: Jewish identity and the learners' personal identities. Through an examination of this theme, the learners were encouraged to explore different social characteristics in order to gain a broader understanding and empathy of other people's experiences and their own behaviour and attitudes. This was done through an interrogation of the Jews' situation and by examining the moral dilemmas and choices faced by the victims, bystanders and even the perpetrators.

**4.4.2.8  Tourism**

In order to learn even more about the DHC museum educators' views on the nature and purpose of Holocaust education, I asked some of them if they thought that Holocaust education had a connection to tourism. Abigail felt that the DHC was not a tourist attraction as such because even though it remained open on Sundays it was poorly attended and she speculated that it was probably just a place to visit on a rainy day. Emma, on the other hand, felt that the opening of the gift/coffee shop was an important addition to the activities of the DHC. She said that gift shops were part of Holocaust museums worldwide and were necessary to enable people to buy trinkets and other goods to remember their visit and at the same time generate funds for operating costs. According to her, some visitors had asked to buy mementoes. With regard to the goods on sale at the gift shop, she explained, "Our teaching materials will be on sale. Holocaust material in as far as Anne Frank books, diaries, little pens, little things because that was a huge demand we found in the last few years". The gift/coffee shop would thus provide this facility and at the same time generate funds for the running expenses of the DHC. One question that arises is whether having a shop associated with the DHC will encourage more visitors to visit the exhibition and learn about the Holocaust.

In conclusion, tourism was not the current focus of the Holocaust educational programme at the DHC and as the data showed, tourism was not foregrounded by the museum educators. Their views regarding tourism were related to the function of the gift/coffee shop, that is, to provide the visitors with a place to reflect on what they had

experienced and to enable them to purchase mementoes of their visit. This reinforced the concept of the Social Holocaust in which education about the Holocaust was related to a social function.

**4.4.3   Conclusion**

The DHC museum educators' views on Holocaust education were diverse. Using the exhibition panels as a framework for their guiding, they agreed that they placed the Holocaust in the local context in order to make it more meaningful to the teachers and learners. In fact, analysis of the data revealed that they taught those elements of the Holocaust that were most meaningful, relevant or interesting to them personally. In addition, not all aspects of the Holocaust were viewed equally by them, nor were they generally accepted or subscribed to by everyone, with some themes being given greater prominence than others.

However, in terms of how the museum educators viewed Holocaust education, two main groups of themes emerged from the findings - the Historical Holocaust and the Social Holocaust. Within the Social Holocaust the various themes could almost be placed on a sliding scale of importance with "the lessons" at the top of the list. All the DHC museum educators emphasised their importance and they employed various educational vehicles to teach them. The most dominant of these was the theme of bystander behaviour and the consequences of the choices that people make. This was linked to more minor themes of good vs. evil and identity. Issues of racism and South Africa's link with the Holocaust were also regarded by many of them as important as was the issue of human rights. These were associated with the more minor themes of democracy, antisemitism and memorial.

From the group of themes discussed above, that is, the lessons, genocide, human rights, democracy, memorialisation and racism and apartheid, it was evident that a more global social theme was emerging. In addressing these issues, the museum educators were striving for a similar objective, namely to encourage the learners and teachers to become social activists and hence agents of social change through an

examination of their own behaviour. The data revealed that the museum educators agreed that the purpose of the educational programme at the DHC was primarily to support the NCS – History Grade 9 and but at the same time to encourage social activism in order to create a better society. They did this by promoting moral behaviour with the objective of changing learners' attitudes and creating upstanders in the face of social injustice. The data showed through the educational programme they hoped to encourage good citizenship, prevent future genocides and help achieve national unity. A minority view was that they could make the learners and teachers more aware of antisemitism and preserve Jewishness, which was necessary due to the diminishing numbers of Jewish people in Durban. On the whole, however, the historical events were underplayed and understated, despite the history being the bedrock of Holocaust education. Analysis of the data exposed the fact that the history was clearly not the DHC museum educators' key focus in their guiding. The Social Holocaust was foregrounded over the Historical Holocaust and in fact, was the driving force behind Holocaust education at the DHC. This was supported by the sheer volume of Social Holocaust data generated as opposed to Historical Holocaust data.

An examination of the data showed that while the museum educators were generally knowledgeable about the historical events of the Holocaust, there were some knowledge gaps and they did not always feel entirely comfortable with the range of their Holocaust knowledge, nor were they were fully conversant with all the historical events. In mitigation they explained that this was a vast, complex history and the data showed that they were generally willing to research areas of knowledge in which they felt they might be lacking.

In conclusion, the findings showed that although the museum educators viewed the historical events of the Holocaust as the core of Holocaust education, they viewed its aim as the social and personal transformation of the learners through the creation of upstanders for social justice and hence the improvement of society as a whole. They held diverse opinions as to how to achieve this aim but nevertheless shaped Holocaust education at the DHC as result of them.

## 4.5 The educational duties of the DHC museum educators

Proceeding on my metaphorical journey, having learnt who the DHC museum educators were and how they viewed Holocaust education, the next part of this chapter investigates the educational duties of the guides and facilitators and how they performed them as well as whether or not their educational philosophy met with their practical duties.

### 4.5.1 Meet and greet introductory session

After having met their facilitator for the visit, the next stop for teachers and learners on their tour was the introductory session. The museum educators were generally in agreement regarding the role they played at the DHC. They agreed that the museum educator's work was divided in terms of skills and labour, that is, they were either categorised as a facilitator or a guide depending on their function and responsibility. They explained that the work of the guides was to lead the learners and teachers through the exhibition, at the same time explaining the panels and concepts to the learners and controlling the groups. The facilitators had broader responsibilities. In addition to guiding visitors through the exhibition, they organised the group's activities for the day, greeted the learners and teachers and conducted the introduction and wrap-up. Thus the facilitators could be viewed as specialised guides.

During the introductory session, according to the DHC museum educators, the facilitator's work entailed assessing the group and ensuring that the learners were familiar with the relevant terminology and concepts to be used such as race, stereotyping, antisemitism and genocide. Grace described the introductory session as taking the learners on "a little journey of discovery" and Chloe said that it was "like a set-up to the main aspect of their visit which is going through the Holocaust Centre itself". For the Grade 11 learners Sophia said she might discuss Darwinism even though she suspected that very little of this was now being taught by the other facilitators, despite it being part of the NCS – History Grade 11. This was confirmed by Emma, who said that they no longer touched on "Nazism, Darwinism or anything

like that". This exclusion was instigated by those museum educators as part of the "new" introduction and clearly demonstrates how different museum educators shaped the educational visit differently. According to the museum educators, the guides who were going to accompany the group through the exhibition were requested to be present during the introduction so that they could hear any special instructions given by the facilitators and be aware of what was said so as not to repeat it. However, they were not expressly instructed to attend the wrap-up session and consequently some of the museum educators complained that they did not receive feedback about their guiding.

The interviews with the museum educators revealed that they had differing views on the duration and content of the introduction, a situation that provoked some controversy. One of them explained that the format had been changed considerably. In the original half hour introduction, she said that she tended to give the learners an overview of the Holocaust and then highlight various panels in the exhibition to draw attention to what she had explained earlier in the introduction. The panels were used to embroider what she had already been spoken about and she was able to weave the content of her introduction into the exhibition tour. According to her, the introduction had been "cut ruthlessly" and the new facilitators were "doing very little facilitating" and were, in fact, doing "more telling than picking up". However, she conceded that she had not actually seen the "new" introduction in action so she did not want to judge it, but added that she personally had fallen "hook, line and sinker" for the "old" way of doing things. In contrast, another museum educator was thrilled with the changes to the introduction.

According to one of the museum educators who had been instrumental in bringing about these changes, the reason for this was that the "old" introduction of half an hour was just too long. She explained:

> You see the thing is … me personally … I cannot do an interesting
> 30 minute introduction, I cannot, it's too long for me ... personally ...
> I can do an interesting 10-15 minutes, yes, but I cannot do 30 minutes
> but maybe another guide can.

She believed the introduction should be shortened because, she explained, "I don't need to sit there and speak, because I also take away from what the guides are going to say". She felt that the introduction was an opportunity to introduce herself and the guides to the learners, welcoming them and giving them a short background to the Holocaust.

In her discussion about the introduction, yet another museum educator explained that the management now considered the original method of guiding adopted by the museum educators as giving too many historical facts, an indication of how the Historical Holocaust was moved into the background. She added that the introduction had therefore been pared down to suit the target audience, which included many black Grade 9 learners from schools in rural areas. Revealing the DHC's desire for institutional educational autonomy, she clarified, "We've just ... taken out what we feel is a little of every one of the concepts, elaborate on it, work with the students. So it's Marlene's [CTHC] method, which we've streamlined to suit the children and the approach that we want to make. Not give them too many [historical] facts". Once again the focus was moved from the Historical to the Social Holocaust. This question of the introduction was clearly a divisive topic amongst the participants. However, the "new" approach was well received by one of the visiting teachers when she commented that the introduction had improved but it was unclear from the data what the teachers' reactions in general were to the "new" introduction as according to one museum educator there had been no prior complaints about the original introduction.

Another contentious issue with regard to the introduction was the perceived parameters for guiding. Although the management insisted that there were specific points to be covered during the introduction, according to Chloe there were no parameters that had to be adhered to:

> Researcher: So you haven't really been told, okay you must do this
> and then you must do this?
> Chloe: No, no!
> Researcher: So it's completely free, really, about what you choose to
> do and what you choose to emphasise?
> Chloe: Exactly.

Sophia's interpretation of the parameters was that there were guidelines that arose out of the training and discussions but according to her these were flexible. However, she pointed out that the exhibition itself dictated parameters, as there were certain basic themes to be covered in the exhibition, such as antisemitism and racism. But she reiterated, "There's a choice. And I think it's good that there isn't a stereotypical way of doing it, that everybody has to do it exactly the same way, because there is so much to be gained from it".

It was evident from this that the facilitators were free to shape the way the Holocaust was introduced to the learners at the DHC. This shaping was based on personal preference and the kind of training received, which resulted in some dissention amongst the facilitators. Some of those who were trained by the CTHC educators chose to include topics such as racism and Darwinism in their introduction whilst some of the self-taught group used this session as an introduction to themselves and the DHC and a short general background to the Holocaust. It appeared from the data that there was no uniformity in this regard.

**4.5.2   Watching the DVD**

After the introduction, the visiting learners embarked on the next stage of their journey and were split into smaller units with the groups rotating so that one group remained to watch a DVD while another began with the exhibition. The purpose of the DVD was to provide the learners deeper insight into some aspect of the Holocaust or to help them connect to individual stories such as that of Anne Frank or Hana Brady.[11] Without exception the museum educators commented on the fact that the learners loved the DVDs and this was reinforced by the teachers in their post-visit evaluations, with comments such as, "Video material gripping", "We loved the movies" and "The new introduction DVD was brilliant!" Many of the teachers mentioned *Hana's Suitcase* and *The Shoe,* an investigation into a single child's shoe from Auschwitz, describing them as "educational" and "moving". They agreed that

---

[11] Hana Brady was the protagonist of the movie *Hana's Suitcase*, which was based on the book of the same name. She died at Auschwitz, aged 13 years.

the DVDs personalised the Holocaust and felt that they provided "valuable perspectives" on the events.

While the DVD was in progress, the museum educators either took the opportunity to watch it again or left the room, only returning after it was over. Lee though, never missed watching with the learners. She explained, "Well I'll tell you. I don't avoid the DVDs. Some people say, 'I've seen it so often I'm not going to watch the DVD'. I watch - there's got to be a damn good reason for me not to watch the DVD and I tell you I get a lump in the throat every time I watch *Hana's Suitcase*".

After the DVD, Chloe said she discussed it with the learners, asking them what had stood out for them, what their feelings were and then she said she would "sort of try to connect it in a way with the experience that they're going to have in the Centre". This discussion was a choice made by her and was ultimately part of the decision making process of the facilitator in charge for the day. The other facilitators were silent on their treatment of the DVDs although as Silbert (2011) explained, the use of the DVD was an opportunity for the learners to have a break from the talking of the museum educators' and could also be used to engage with the learners.

### 4.5.3   The tour through the DHC exhibition

While one group watched the DVD, the remaining group or groups (depending on the number of learners) were concurrently accompanied through the exhibition by a guide. This, according to Grace, was the core of the museum educator's job, "I'm taking people through the setting ... [it] is exhausting and it's the hardest work and it's the real meat and potatoes of the job, honestly it's the real thing". For another museum educator too, the exhibition was the essence of the tour. She described it as follows: "The Centre itself is so amazing, it's so beautiful and resourceful and full of so much information, rich in source materials". This was, in fact, her justification for her earlier assertion that she did not want to do the 30-minute introduction, believing that the exhibition itself was the major source of information for the learners.

In terms of parameters to be followed in the exhibition there was a general consensus amongst the DHC museum educators that the exhibition itself dictated the progression of the tour. According to Abigail, "We pretty much follow a set of, I'd say, markers in the Centre. We're familiar with the Centre and we take kids through". Lee concurred and explained that there was "very little room for individual exploration" in the exhibition, meaning that the museum educators followed the fixed progression of the exhibition panels but at the same time were free to choose which ones best suited what they wanted to say. For example, when speaking about which panels in the exhibition she foregrounded, Chloe explained, "For me personally, racism, the first couple of panels, racism, discrimination, antisemitism are the most important panels because for me the whole experience is about locating it back in the context of South Africa". On the other hand, Abigail, Sophia and Chloe all said that they avoided some of the most gruesome panels such as the Einsatzgruppen murders and the liberation panel showing a cart piled high with bodies. Sophia and Abigail went so far as to deliberately stand in front of these panels in an attempt to hide the images from the learners. It is here that one of the many ways in which the museum educators shaped Holocaust education is evident.

For the learners, there was not much time for individual study or exploration of the exhibition although according to Emma, management had adjusted the educational programme to allow learners 15 minutes to return to the exhibition after a short break "to listen to the things that they couldn't listen to, to look in detail" prior to wrap-up session. Grace also believed that this time was important so that the learners could go back and investigate areas of the exhibition if they felt that their guided tour "wasn't quite enough".

In their post-visit evaluations the teachers were generally positive and enthusiastic about the exhibition with many describing it as "excellent" although some did find it "shocking". It was this kind of response that led a few of the museum educators to mention that in addition to highlighting the most important panels, it was their duty to filter out the horrors in the exhibition tour, especially for the younger visitors.

The work of the museum educators was assessed by the teachers in their post-visit feedback. On the whole, the teachers were full of praise for the museum educators, describing them as "knowledgeable", "enthusiastic", "eloquent" and "dedicated". However, despite their enthusiasm, there were also some criticisms levelled at the museum educators' performance in the exhibition. For example, some felt that there should be more interaction with the learners with one teacher suggesting that the museum educators "must try to engage learners into the exhibit e.g. get them to read out extracts as was done today" revealing that she thought that that particular museum educator had not fully connected with the learners and even suggesting a method to enable this connection.

After the exhibition the group either went to see the DVD or went out into the memorial garden, where the learners could reflect on what they had experienced, depending on how they started.

### 4.5.4   The wrap-up and debrief session

After watching the DVD and going through the exhibition, all the groups once again met up with the facilitator who conducted the wrap-up and debriefing session. For Grace the wrap-up was "the most important part". Here, depending on the learners' responses, she and other facilitators drew conclusions and related them to the learners' everyday lives, highlighting issues related to the Social Holocaust such as choice, bystander behaviour or other issues that arose not only in the classroom but also in a wider social context. Sophia described this as "an opportunity to let the kids reflect on their own life and they way they behave and they way they treat other people". In order to achieve this introspection, she and other museum educators spent a lot of time on the issues of victim, perpetrator, bystander, and upstander, using case studies to facilitate the discussion. The museum educators encouraged the learners to consider their own situations and feelings, particularly with regard to human rights. For example Grace said that a case study, "sometimes leads to very interesting discussions like with one school [where one of] the girls said, 'You know, it's funny

how we can say jokes about our own group of people but when we hear that same joke being said by someone else it's not so funny anymore'".

For groups where the discussion about bystanders, victims and so on might be too sophisticated, or for groups that did not understand the Holocaust very well, Chloe said that she would simply ask, "What have you learnt? What has stood out for you today? What is the most important lesson that has come out today?" She said that they would then discuss quotes such as that by Albert Einstein, "The world is too dangerous to live in not because of those who do evil but because of those who sit and let it happen" and what this meant in relation to the learners' current lives or what they might do if negative things were happening to people around them.

It was these exercises, using case studies or quotes, that constituted the main objectives of this session, which according to the facilitators, was to encourage the learners to become more proactive in society. They said that they wanted to encourage them to become upstanders or social activists, particularly when faced with human rights violations, such as bullying. The dialogue about choice was picked up by a few of the teachers, one of whom felt that the educational programme indeed encouraged critical thinking. Another said that the points relating to victim, perpetrator and bystander were well made and effective and yet another added, "I'm especially pleased that the learners were made aware of choices and consequences and the emphasis to speak or act against any atrocity that may affect anyone or any group". The wrap-up and debriefing was also an opportunity for the facilitators to tie up any loose ends such as dealing with unanswered exhibition questions or learners' questions.

The final step on the tour for the learners and their teachers was an inward private journey, reflecting on what they had learned. They wrote their thoughts and feelings in the post-visit evaluations and in so doing provided feedback for the DHC. This was a private journey for both parties.

It can therefore be concluded that the wrap-up session provided the museum educators with an opportunity to direct the learners' perceptions of and conclusions arising out of the events of the Holocaust. They provided the lens through which the learners were encouraged to examine their own lives and the actions of others thereby encouraging them to become upstanders and endeavouring to bring about changes in the learners. It was during this session that issues of social justice and human rights were explored, revealing the fact that it was the Social Holocaust and not the Historical Holocaust which was the focus of the educational programme.

On my parallel, metaphorical journey, the museum educators reflected on the tour during the research process. They generally agreed that their work included: teaching/guiding; creating a personal connection for learners with the Holocaust; getting the learners to identify with and relate to the experiences of people who experienced the Holocaust, particularly with regard to the victims and the bystanders; to encourage the learners to make meaning out of what they had seen; and to take away something meaningful from the tour. According to Grace and Abigail the museum educators' believed that the work they were doing was important and responsible – an idea supported by the teachers in their post-visit evaluations. However, although museum educators were the bedrock of the educational tours of the DHC, surprisingly they were seldom mentioned by visitors in the guest book. Entries showed that there was an emphasis on the tour, which was described as interesting or informative, but not on the museum educators who were seldom mentioned either in general terms or by name.

### 4.5.5   Conclusion

Holocaust education was regarded by the DHC museum educators as a vehicle for social justice and human agency and the work of the museum educators was to facilitate that learning. They did this by encouraging reflection in the learners, mediating and moderating difficult material and drawing parallels and links to South Africa's apartheid past and possibly to other genocides. However, the DHC museum educators were free to choose the manner in which they did this, which was

particularly evident with regard to the contested introduction. In other words, they supplemented classroom learning while putting their individual stamp on the way they taught the Holocaust, making educational decisions based on their personal interests, abilities and training. The next section investigates these educational decisions by analysing the museum educators' pedagogy.

## 4.6    The pedagogy informing the DHC educational programme

Underlying and infiltrating every aspect of the educational programme was the pedagogy employed by the museum educators. Some of it originated from their previous job knowledge, some from their Holocaust education training and some from their personal educational philosophies. Analysis of the data showed that the museum educators embraced various methodologies during the course of their guiding. I am going to examine the pedagogy used and through it show how the museum educators influenced education about the Holocaust at the DHC.

### 4.6.1    Selection and implementation of content

It emerged strongly during the museum educators' interviews that they were mediating the material for the learners. As discussed earlier, analysis of the data showed that the museum educators were almost unanimous in their belief that as the DHC laid down no formal agenda for them on how to proceed they were free, within the borders of Holocaust education, to decide which topics and exhibition panels they wanted to highlight. Emma explained that in terms of pedagogy, the museum educators were not required to address every facet of the Holocaust, rather what was required was to, "Give them the basic points ... now when we go through the exhibition with a guided tour we don't try and tell them about every picture, every panel. We have told our guides, 'Hone in on five panels through the exhibition'".

As there were no rules governing which panels the guides should choose, they based their choices on a range of personal criteria, including their training and personal interests. Not having a fixed agenda and after some soul searching at the outset about

what she should be teaching, Chloe explained that she came to the conclusion that she should teach what she wanted to learn and that it was important to teach the Holocaust to help the learners reflect on themselves in order to become better people. Using her own Holocaust learning experiences as a yardstick, Chloe drew conclusions about what she believed was important in Holocaust education and as a facilitator she was further able to integrate this into the educational programme.

Discussing her choice of panels, Lee explained that she always chose to emphasise the panel showing a photograph of the judges of the Berlin criminal court taking an oath, not only, she said, because she found them personally interesting but also because discussing it with the learners gave her the opportunity to talk about the importance of the South African Constitution. She also said that she always used the cartoon showing the crossroads of the Evian Conference to talk about xenophobia, both in Nazi Germany and in South Africa today. One of Chloe's choices was the panel with the image of the woman on the bench (Appendix A, 2) which she used to discuss how people felt when faced with racism and antisemitism whilst other museum educators used this photograph to speak about the dehumanisation of individuals, how the Nazis separated people according to race and to compare the Nuremberg laws to the apartheid laws experienced by South Africans. Sophia in turn explained that she chose the photograph of the Ringelblum cans (Appendix A, 9), a photograph that does not appear in the exhibition, to discuss the importance of historical sources and how learners could seek greater objectivity in their work by questioning sources. She believed that teaching about evidence and sources was a central part of teaching history. This photograph showed two of the three Ringelblum milk cans, which held documents written by inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto to document Jewish life there, being opened.

Although Chloe and Grace both spoke about the use of historical sources and evidence during their interviews, only Sophia chose the Ringelblum Can photograph as one of her three photographs in the photo-elicitation interview. She explained that this photograph raised the questions, "How do we know what we know?" and "What are the records that we have?" The answers, she said, came from two sources: "What

we know from the victims and what we know, the bulk of the material ... from the perpetrators". She added that this evidence, because most of it came from the perpetrators, also helped to refute Holocaust deniers' arguments. It was thus clear that the museum educators consciously chose certain content to illustrate points they wished to make.

Apart from deciding which panels to use to illustrate their educational focus, the museum educators also influenced content by moderating the material contained in the exhibition panels. One of the ways in which they did this was by "glossing over" the more horrific events of the Holocaust. Abigail, for instance, explained that she did not draw the learners' attention to the Einsatzgruppen panels as she felt that there was so much other material that the learners might not notice it if she ignored these panels. She added that if they did ask questions about these images as they passed she would "just gently explain to them what it's all about and involve the group". Sophia likewise mentioned that she too was conscious of not shocking the learners and she too tried not to dwell on the Einsatzgruppen photographs saying that they were "really harsh". But at the same time she was pragmatic about the fact that "you can't avoid it either". She said she would explain to the learners that there were lessons to be learnt from them so it was not all doom and gloom.

Selecting content was actually necessary due to the vast amount of complex material in the DHC exhibition. In order to help the learners make sense of it all, Grace edited and wove the information into what she thought was an understandable narrative. She felt this was part of the importance of having guides in the exhibition:

> It's much nicer for pupils that age to go with a guide than on their own … because a guide blends it. The guide weaves it through. It's too much otherwise and the guide keeps them at a pace so that they won't be completely exhausted by the end and give up. It's a lot of reading, there's a lot of pictures, visuals, but sometimes a little sentence is necessary with each visual.

In order to make this connection with the learners, the museum educators also adopted various questioning techniques. For example, they asked lower order questions such as, "What do you think of that? What does it mean to you? What do you feel?" They said that they were open to being asked questions and Grace, in

particular, was delighted when learners questioned her saying that it was her very best thing and that as far as she was concerned nothing was too sacred to be questioned. Only one guide said that she was more likely to use the "teacher-tell" method, after which she would find out from the learners if they understood what she had said. As a result of these questioning techniques the teachers reported that the learners were very involved and engaged in the entire process of the educational programme. They also liked the fact that the museum educators got the learners to read parts of the material out loud with one of the teachers saying that the "interactive nature" of the DHC had captivated his learners.

Thus analysis of the data showed that selection and implementation of content at the DHC constituted an important element of the museum educators' pedagogy. They based their decisions about which panels to highlight on their personal knowledge, interpretations and interests and not on pre-determined DHC parameters. In fact as a result of their pedagogy, which was structured and guide-centred, the museum educators made meaning for the learners rather than allowing the learners to do so themselves.

### 4.6.2   Personalisation

One of the tasks faced by the museum educators was, according to Abigail, how to convey the enormity, both geographically and numerically, of the Holocaust. For Chloe, it was necessary to keep complex concepts simple enough for everyone to understand. The museum educators dealt with the tension between simplicity and complexity in an affective rather than cognitive manner employing various techniques, one of which was personalisation. All the museum educators testified that they employed this technique during the course of their guiding although they adopted different approaches in doing so. For instance, some used personal anecdotal experiences, such as Abigail who told learners about her father's experience of the financial crisis in Germany prior to World War II when money was worthless:

> There is one panel of inflation and they have somebody with trunks
> of money. Now I remember my father telling me that it was cheaper
> to burn the money than to buy the wood and I tell them this story and

this gets through to them what the inflation meant; that the money wasn't worth anything.

Also telling her personal story was the only DHC guide who was also a Holocaust survivor. She was mentioned frequently by the museum educators and the teachers. In their post-visit evaluation forms, the teachers indicated that they were most appreciative of these personal accounts and wrote that their learners really enjoyed them. One teacher for example, stated, "Very inspiring and moving for us to hear the survivor's personal account of the Holocaust and her family's experiences at the time and [the time] afterwards". And according to another, "The girls love hearing personal stories - so thank you to the guides for including their personal stories or what they have heard outside of the museum".

Those museum educators who had no personal connection to the Holocaust selected other people's stories or materials such as books, poems or quotes to personalise the Holocaust. Sophia said that she chose topics that she felt were relevant and accessible to learners such as the story of Anne Frank and the antisemitic children's cartoon book, *The Poison Mushroom*. She claimed "things like that ... kids can relate to". Other museum educators also used the story of Anne Frank to make a connection, particularly with the younger learners. The Anne Frank room at the DHC was specifically dedicated to her and is, in fact, the only section of the museum suitable for and visited by primary school learners, as it is believed that young learners can relate to her diary.

One of Grace's methods for personalisation was to analyse primary source documents such as Mrs Elinor Gusenbauer's letter to the SS in which she complained about a concentration camp that was close to her home. Grace used this to raise the issue of choice with the learners and to help them to come to grips with a bystander's perspective of events. One of Chloe's strategies for personalising the Holocaust was to give the learners a worksheet with photographs of young people from Poland and other countries occupied by the Nazis accompanied by a quote about each of their experiences. She hoped that this would prompt learners to remember a phrase or face as they walked through the exhibition and in this way draw their own connections to

what they were seeing. She stressed, however, that this strategy was not suitable for all learners; for example, there was no time to conduct this exercise with learners who simply needed to be made familiar with the relevant concepts or even the history of the Holocaust.

For Sophia, guiding itself was a way to personalise the events: "I think at school they learn these are the events, this is what happened, but somehow guiding them it's a much more personal engagement and I think also you can personalise the whole approach much more".

Another way in which the museum educators personalised the Holocaust, particularly when dealing with a group that was not very well-versed in it, was to choose well known quotes in the wrap-up. Chloe explained that she discussed what these quotes meant in reference to their own daily lives in order to encourage them to be more proactive and not simply to "sit and watch while negative things are happening to people in their close environment, for example, in their school". Lee likewise used quotes to help connect to the learners because, "I think it's important to tell kids that it is important to oppose the evil and of course I tell them about Edmund Burke [who] said that for evil to succeed it is enough that good men do nothing". She explained that she used this quote to encourage the learners to stand up against evil in their own lives.

The idea of personalisation and giving the Holocaust a human face was reinforced during the photo-elicitation portion of the museum educators' interviews with the image chosen second most often being that of the four little girls in their swimming costumes (Appendix A, 3). All the museum educators who chose it agreed that they used this photograph as a connection point for young people who they believed could identify with a group of young girls sitting together next to a swimming pool. They said that this image illustrated various concepts for the learners, for instance life before the Holocaust, as it showed ordinary people "very much like we are" and it suggested that bad things could happen to good people. Another interpretation

proposed by a museum educator was that the photograph represented the innocence of the Jews.

Yet another educational technique used by museum educators to personalise the Holocaust and at the same time engage the learners and maintain their interest was to draw comparisons with familiar objects and ideas. To try and help the learners understand the numerical enormity of the Holocaust, Abigail explained that the learners needed something to relate to, be it a number or an idea. So to explain the concept of six million she related it to the number of people living in and around Durban, which she said was less than the number of Jews killed in the Holocaust, thereby drawing a more personal parallel to the numbers. She also physically pushed as many learners as possible into the confined space representing a gas chamber in the museum, a concept she called "an object lesson".

In conclusion, by using their personal anecdotes; drawing on the personal experiences of those who experienced the Holocaust through the use of primary source documents and evidence; and by connecting with the learners through questions and familiar concepts, the museum educators helped to draw a personal connection between the learners and the material. It was evident that the DHC museum educators regarded personalisation as a fundamental facet of their pedagogy, employing it throughout the educational programme from the introduction to the wrap-up.

### 4.6.3   Underlying educational philosophy of the DHC museum educators

Whilst it was clear that the museum educators had, through their guiding, adopted a teaching function, Chloe was insistent that she did not want to adopt the role of the teacher and that the museum was not a classroom. She claimed that re-creating a classroom experience was a "switch-off" for learners and that the more interactive, novel and different their experience at the museum was the more learning would take place. How learning took place in a museum setting was not directly addressed by any of the other museum educators leading me to believe that the museum educators

generally did not delve into this aspect of their work, rather concentrating on the content and outcome.

However, they were all very conscious of the emotional and psychological component of learning at the DHC. They felt that part of their pedagogical practice was to ensure that the learners left with a positive message and were not intellectually or emotionally overwhelmed. Chloe described the Holocaust as a "shocking" and "deeply disturbing" aspect of history, especially for a young person. She felt that it took a certain maturity in a person to be able to internalise and grasp what it was about and not be "wounded" by it and therefore felt that her role was to "facilitate that learning". She did this by, "taking them through the process of the learning that is appropriate to their understanding and their experience and the level of experience they're at right now and for them to leave with an understanding of 'Wow! This can actually happen'''.

As a result of the museum educators' educational philosophy in which they shielded the learners from trauma, the learners were not allowed to make meaning for themselves. Rather, the museum educators made meaning for them based on their personal educational philosophies. This was all done with the best of intentions. As described earlier, only Chloe addressed the issue of the role of the museum educator as teacher, saying that she did not want to be one, but it appeared from the data that other DHC museum educators fell into this role, possibly as they themselves might have been products of an education system which had adopted a "teacher-tell" philosophy. So whilst all the museum educators were conscious of the disturbing nature of Holocaust history and sought to ensure that the learners had a positive experience at the DHC, in general they did not address issues of how people learnt in a museum setting.

### 4.6.4   Conclusion

It was thus clear that through their pedagogy the museum educators had the power to shape the way in which the learners learnt about and experienced the Holocaust.

Through their explanations, avoidance, censorship, descriptions and by selecting, highlighting and personalising certain material, they were able to direct the learners' and teachers' attention, creating a lens through which the visitors viewed the Holocaust. They brought certain elements of the history into focus and the same time downplayed others. They also interpreted whatever they felt might be ambiguous for the learners and answered questions based on their own knowledge and personal interest. Based on their educational philosophy they made meaning for the learners, directing the learners towards what the museum educators perceived the intended pedagogical outcomes of Holocaust education to be. It should be noted that the museum educators nevertheless behaved in a highly professional manner. Based on their training and their internal moral compasses, they seemed to have a common goal in wanting to encourage the learners to reflect on their personal lives and social circumstances in order to become better people in society. They did this based on their passion for Holocaust education.

## 4.7    Dealing with challenges

Any educational context will have challenges and at the DHC this was no different. As part of their work the museum educators were faced with various educational, emotional, psychological, and logistical challenges. In the next section I examine how the museum educators dealt with the various pedagogical issues they faced in the course of their work – both personal and professional.

### 4.7.1   Pedagogical Challenges

#### 4.7.1.1   Contemporary issues and the Holocaust

The museum educators sometimes had to deal with contentious issues or questions that were difficult to answer during the course of their guiding. These related particularly to topics such as the Israeli/Palestinian conflict or whether or not apartheid was a genocide. There were even difficult religious questions posed such as, "G-d said the Jews were the chosen people, what happened to them in the

Holocaust?" Emma, to whom this question was directed, indicated that she felt this was beyond the scope of her expertise and redirected it to a more experienced person.

Questions such as these, border on contemporary politics and the museum educators were advised not to engage in political, social or religious discussions while guiding the learners and teachers through the exhibition as they were deemed to be distracting and time-consuming. Instead the museum educators said they were trained to avoid these topics, with standard answers and strategies provided by the DHC. One of these strategies was for guides to refer such questions to the facilitator who would then deal with it during the wrap-up session. As Abigail explained, "If we're asked a question we aren't qualified to answer, we refer back because it's impossible for us to know and also to spend the time". The DHC's administrator said she might even phone the CTHC for answers, or *Google* the question, or contact the local synagogue for answers and if this proved fruitless, she said, "We assure them that we will get back to them and I make a point of doing so".

A pedagogically sound question, but one that the museum educators sometimes found difficult to respond to, related to the subjectivity of the Holocaust material. There were periodic accusations by teachers and learners that the information presented was biased and showed only the victims' point of view. Emma described one such encounter:

> We had one educator [who] within twenty minutes of Marlene doing her introduction said, 'Ja, this is all very well, that's your side of the story. When are we going to hear the other side of the story?'

The response given, and which later became the stock response for this accusation, was:

> You must remember that every record we have was taken by the perpetrators, was recorded by the perpetrators. This is not us. Victims never went to their deaths with a camera in their hands.

This generally proved to be an adequate explanation for on one occasion a teacher even commented, "It's reassuring to know that the records you have were taken by the perpetrators". This answer enabled the museum educators not to become distracted or drawn into lengthy controversial debates. In fact, one of the museum educators

commented that this question also gave her an opportunity to discuss historical sources and to present the historical perspective of the DHC.

On the whole, the museum educators felt confident that they could handle most of the questions posed or had strategies in place to do so, although some admitted to not being a "font of knowledge" in every instance but were generally willing to acknowledge their shortcomings. Testimony from the teachers in their post-visit evaluations attested to the ability of the museum educators to deal with questions adequately, with one teacher thanking her guide "for answering all my girls' questions, and mine too".

Another challenge faced by some of the museum educators related to the veracity of the content that was taught as occasionally the truth was contested by one or other of the museum educators. For example, according to Abigail said that she overheard one of the other museum educators telling the learners things that according to her were "absolute nonsense". Emma concurred that there were occasions where the museum educators differed in some of their historical accounts and that sometimes some of the guides, particularly those who were less experienced, needed to be observed to ensure that they did their job accurately:

> I think somebody shadowed one of the guides and realised that she wasn't answering the questions. And you know, unfortunately it's something we've got to do because one tends to get into a groove and you hear them saying things which have gone a little bit off-track.

In conclusion some of the contemporary challenges faced by the museum educators included difficult question and topics and how museum educators dealt with contested historical truths. Generally though, they were prepared by the DHC to deal with these issues so that the guiding did not become derailed by questions that were off the topic or by the manner in which certain topics were handled.

**4.7.1.2   Dealing with emotion – theirs and ours**

By dint of the content of the Holocaust, the meaning ascribed to it and the affective strategies employed by the museum educators, one of the more difficult aspects of Holocaust education was its emotive nature. The impact of this was felt by the learners, the teachers and even the museum educators themselves. According to Sophia many of the learners had heard quite a lot about what happened during the Holocaust prior to coming to the DHC but, she observed, "Seeing it is very different". Apart from the exhibition, in which both audio and visual material was used, the educational programme itself was presented in a manner that focused greatly on the affective domain. This was recognised by the teachers who said that with its many audio and visual displays, the DHC was a learning environment where their learners were emotionally affected by what they saw and heard, revealing both the emotive and visual components of the tour.

Analysis of the data showed that amongst other reactions, the learners exhibited two extreme responses: On the one hand there were learners who were overcome by emotion and on the other, learners who were totally disinterested and who, for whatever reason, simply did not want to be present. Part of the museum educators' pedagogy was to deal with these two extremes.

Dealing with emotional learners was part of the museum educators' work. Both the learners and teachers were touched by the DHC panels and the museum educators' pedagogy. Emma pointed out that the history was "traumatic and you've got to deal with it" and according to Sophia, "We've had a few kids get quite teary". She added, "The kids will tell you at the end of a wrap-up session ... someone was upset or whatever". Emma explained that sometimes a learner felt that everything was just too overwhelming and in these instances she felt that there had usually been some kind of connected personal history on the part of the learner. In response to my questions as to how they dealt with emotional learners, the museum educators were generally in agreement. They said that they responded firstly by acknowledging the learners' feelings. Sophia, for instance, said that she would say, "That's upset you hasn't it? Yes

I can understand it" and then she would try to avoid "anything more horrific". By then censoring further panels and information, she protected the learners from further trauma but at the same time inevitably edited their experience. The learners were also asked if they wanted to continue or if they needed to sit down and were then offered tea and a sandwich as a comfort. Parents were immediately notified if a learner was completely overwhelmed, as had happened on occasion. Those learners who were emotional and who wished to continue on the tour were usually asked to stand next to the museum educator to be monitored for any further signs of distress.

The museum educators explained that they generally tried to avoid emotional overload in the learners and were aware of the emotional impact of the material. Abigail explained, "When you've got Grade 9s and Grade 11s, especially Grade 9s they just can't take it in ... so you have to be very careful that you don't overload". For example, in order to minimise the emotional impact of the material on the learners, Sophia said she warned them of upcoming panels that might deal with difficult issues such as the ghettos or death camps, explaining to the learners that what they were going to see might upset them and that they were not going to spend too much time on those panels but that those things did happen. As a result of these warnings it is possible that the learners were alerted to their feelings and their emotional reactions might have been brought on by the pedagogy itself. In addition to this, the learners were shown touching, albeit educational, informational DVDs and were reminded that they were in a memorial space. They were then guided through the exhibition, which was filled with powerful visual images and stirring music. The museum educators interpreted and explained these images to the learners, relating them to moral values and behavioural dilemmas and mediating their experience. This affective, visual approach sometimes resulted in distressed visitors but also positively touched others, with one teacher making the comment: "This programme has moved me in a way that I never thought I could be moved by history".

However, not all the learners felt the impact of the material so acutely, for as Abigail explained, "it builds up [in the exhibition], so you don't start with the horrors". And as Emma said, both adults and children needed time to absorb what they had seen, so

a break was included in the educational programme after the exhibition and prior to the wrap-up session to allow the learners to collect their thoughts and emotions.

At the other end of the emotional spectrum, were the learners who were completely disconnected from the experience. Emma was conscious of two different groups in this category: those who might be holding back from participating in the tour because they were emotionally upset and those who simply did not want to be there. The latter also posed a pedagogical challenge for the museum educators whose job it was to motivate and draw these learners into the experience. It was decided by the management that one of the ways to deal with disinterested groups was to ensure that their teachers were familiar with and had been taught the basic concepts and terminology of the Holocaust prior to their visit. The DHC museum educators achieved this by implementing teacher-training workshops or by providing the visiting schools with the SAHGF support material, that is educator and learner manuals and DVDs.

The emotional and moral impact of the educational programme was not lost on the teachers, with two of the most commonly used adjectives in the post-visit evaluations being "moving" and "emotional". In fact, one teacher wrote that after the tour she was "always encouraged to go out and be a better human". From the teachers' responses, it appeared that the experience of the tour changed people, generated empathy and created upstanders, including the teachers themselves as was evident from this comment, "Teachers also will stand up and do something in their communities, schools and government". It is relevant to note that these comments were made in the heat of the moment with teachers still experiencing raw, intense emotional reactions to both the material and the museum educators' pedagogy. Another point to be noted was that there was no indication in the feedback forms of the teachers' thoughts or feelings about the Holocaust prior to their visit or whether those with which they arrived were the same as those with which they left.

It was clear from the data that was analysed that the emotional impact of the Holocaust was not limited to the teachers and the learners, but impacted on the

museum educators too. This came about, they said, not only because they were dealing with emotional people but also because they regularly, if not on a daily basis, dealt with emotive and complex material. I asked them how they coped with this situation and if they became desensitised in the process. Their responses varied. Some museum educators were most insistent that they were definitely not desensitised. Lee for instance claimed, "Some might think you might become immune to the emotional thing the longer and the more you deal with it. I don't think that's true". This was reiterated by Emma who went so far as to assert that if she ever felt that she had become desensitised she would quit guiding. Abigail in turn stated that if anything, things got worse for her emotionally so the way that she dealt with it was to concentrate on her teaching practice and not on the content. Sophia, on the other hand seemed to be accepting of the fact that long-term exposure to this material could lead to emotional detachment. She noted that after dealing with the material for a long time a person did indeed become "in a sense detached", but added that one could not allow too much detachment to creep in otherwise this would be detrimental to the learners. She therefore believed that a balance was needed between being involved and being detached.

Thus, acknowledging the emotional aspect of their work, the museum educators adopted various coping mechanisms. Like Abigail, some directed their attention to the more cognitive elements of their guiding and were more pragmatic about it. For others, one of their coping strategies was avoidance. Chloe, for example, said that she simply did not watch any more videos. She explained, "I can't watch any more videos or movies or whatever. My heart can't take it. It's too too too much. It's just ... I just can't. I can do this on a daily basis because it's also my job. So you learn to sort of separate it out". She added that she did not like to go through the exhibition on her own, saying that for her it was like going to a cemetery. Another coping mechanism employed by some of the museum educators was to simply focus on the academic material rather than on their emotions or, as Emma described it, the "horrors of the experience". It was clear that the museum educators, despite having different responses and thoughts about the material, were nevertheless all affected in some way or another by it and all had to find their own coping mechanisms.

Most of the museum educators said they became emotional but only Abigail felt that she also occasionally became frustrated. She explained that this sometimes occurred when dealing with the younger children or if there had been many groups visiting on one day.

Pedagogically speaking, the museum educators were clearly aware of, affected by and prepared for the emotive element of their work. To deal with it, they employed crude coping strategies. They knew what emotions to look out for in the learners and teachers, having experienced many of the same emotions themselves, and they knew how to deal with emotive situations. However, it is possible that in addition to the Holocaust being a generally emotive topic, the museum educators themselves primed the learners and teachers for the emotive nature of the exhibition thereby sensitising them to the possibility that they might feel upset and hence generating emotive rather than cognitive responses in them.

In conclusion, the museum educators drew people in and created emotional connections for them using techniques that engaged them both emotionally and visually. The content was presented as an emotional, thought-provoking experience, with the learners being forewarned that what they were going to see might be upsetting. At the same time, the museum educators had to cope with their own emotions related to the content they were teaching.

### 4.7.1.3 Language issues

One of the greatest pedagogical challenges faced by the museum educators was language. As a museum educator who often facilitated for the black, rural school groups stated, "My hugest, hugest, hugest challenge is when I guide … Zulu-speaking learners through the Centre". The reason for this, she explained, was that when she did the introduction for a group whose mother tongue was Zulu, she spoke in both English and Zulu or a combination of the two languages. However, in the exhibition, English was used as the medium of instruction by her and the other guides. The problem that arose was not in the languages per se but because Zulu and English were

very different languages and words that were available to her in English simply did not exist in Zulu. She therefore needed to use three or four sentences in Zulu to explain a single English concept. "For example," she explained, "there's no word antisemitism in Zulu so I would directly have to translate that and say, 'It is the dislike or hatred of Jews'". In fact, only one word existed in Zulu to cover all of the English words used in relation to the Holocaust such as discrimination, stereotyping and prejudice. As a result, she found guiding and facilitating in English far more personally powerful than in Zulu as, according to her, speaking in Zulu virtually cut what she had to say in half. Consequently she felt that she was less able to communicate effectively with the learners from black disadvantaged schools, which resulted in pared down content. She said that she really struggled internally with this problem and even questioned herself, wondering if she was "doing the whole Bantu thing, education thing, where you're doing separate sort of things for different groups" but after much soul searching she eventually came to the conclusion, "You can't do the same thing". Her solution was therefore to adapt the programme to suit the needs and abilities of each group.

Another museum educator also experienced "a major challenge" with language. She explained that by virtue of her academic training, she did not always use the easiest terminology, resulting in some learners not being able to grasp what she was trying to say. Consequently she tried to use simple terminology, particularly when dealing with the Grade 9s but was not always successful. The teachers picked up on this problem too, with one teacher commenting, "My learners have a limited vocabulary. Simplify concepts [so they are] easier to understand" and another, "Sometimes language/vocabulary used was above the comprehension level of the children".

Language was therefore clearly a pedagogical challenge at the DHC. The museum educators generally left the guiding of Zulu-speaking groups to the Zulu-speaking museum educator but this did not entirely solve the problems, as most groups required at least two guides to take them through the exhibition. It therefore seemed that the DHC was best geared for first language English-speaking groups and that the large Zulu-speaking groups from disadvantaged schools that arrived with little or no

prior Holocaust knowledge were pedagogically compromised. Although having a single museum educator who was well versed in Zulu was preferable to not having one at all, this was not the most viable solution for teaching this programme to the many disadvantaged learners who visited the DHC.

### 4.7.1.4  Challenges related to time, distance and group size

Apart from language issues, there were also logistical and operational challenges faced by both the museum educators and the teachers, particularly with regard to time and distance. The museum educators explained that the learners from schools outside of Durban had to travel long distances to get to the DHC, which meant they had to leave very early in the morning to arrive by 10h00 and depart by 14h00 for the return journey. According to Chloe, the current maximum available time for the exhibition tour was one hour. As a result of this, Sophia felt that there was often not enough time to raise things she wanted to speak about in the exhibition. One of the consequences of this time crunch was that the museum educators made meaning for the learners as there was little time for them to draw their own conclusions.

Time was also one of the biggest problems for the accompanying teachers. They complained that it was difficult for the learners to absorb everything that the museum educators were telling them in the allotted time; that the learners had too little time to read the panels or watch the videos; and that there was limited time for the learners to complete their evaluation forms at the end of the tour. There were also some complaints about the pace of the presentation with one of the teachers commenting that due to time constraints it seemed "a little rushed" and another commenting that a quicker pace in the presentation was needed. These comments point to the fact that the visitors sometimes felt pressurized as they journeyed through the exhibition. From their side, the museum educators said that they were aware that part of their work was to manage both the available time and the pace of the presentation but that time constraints were an ongoing problem for them. It seemed though that neither the museum educators nor the teachers also had any real solutions to offer to solve this problem.

Whilst the museum educators were all very positive about the educational content of both the exhibition and the educational programme, most of them were realistic about what could be achieved in a time-restricted visit. Sophia remarked, "I think we can't judge from just our one morning with them".

Yet another pedagogical problem related to the issue of time was the length of the educational programme with the teachers expressing varying opinions about how to handle this conundrum. One suggested making the programme longer and another making the introduction shorter. Someone else commented that the programme was too long and that there was too much information to take in while at the other end of the opinion spectrum another wanted more information and more videos. Such conflicting assessments revealed the complexity of the time problem and might also have been a reflection of the different museum educators' guiding styles.

According to some of the museum educators, the optimal group size was 15 learners or less. Due to the interactive nature of guiding and with each group focusing on a single panel at a time, smaller more intimate groups were more easily accommodated and seemed to gain more from their experience. Smaller groups also enabled the museum educators to establish a more personal connection with the learners. From Grace's perspective, large numbers of learners were problematic as she felt that she did not have continuity with them. The teachers' comments showed that they too preferred smaller groups.

### 4.7.1.5 Conclusion

Thus time, group size and length of the programme all provided pedagogical challenges for the museum educators. They found that smaller, first language, English speaking groups provided them with a better opportunity to interact on a deeper level with the learners. And due to the immense of amount of material required to be covered during the course of the programme and the limited time available for this, the museum educators were constantly challenged to complete everything they had to say timeously.

## 4.7.2 Professional challenges

Apart from pedagogical challenges, the museum educators were also confronted with issues on a professional level. As professionals, they indicated that they endeavoured to provide a high level of academic content and they conducted the educational programme in a professional manner. In turn, they expected certain levels of behaviour from the visitors as well as certain input from management.

### 4.7.2.1 Maintaining Control

As part of their pedagogy, the museum educators were conscious of the need to monitor and control their groups. Maintaining discipline amongst the learners was cited by some of the museum educators as an important task. It was also necessary to manage the disinterested learners whose attention wandered or who behaved badly. Invariably the museum educators felt that they were able to deal with unruly learners based on their experience. However, one of the teachers observed that the museum educators "should feel free to reprimand learners" implying that there were perhaps some discipline problems in her group.

### 4.7.2.2 Dealing with disruptive behaviour

Learners and teachers who visited the DHC for reasons that the DHC management believed were not in line with their educational ideology provided a professional challenge for some of the museum educators. According to Emma, an issue arose when the management realised that "a lot of the schools from out-of-town were including DHC on their tourism excursions". She explained that some schools had added the it to an itinerary that included the Moses Mahbida Stadium, Ushaka and the beach, and the management felt that they were attending for the wrong reasons, that is, for recreational rather than educational purposes. She added that the management had clamped down on such school visits, ensuring that learners were, in fact, on educational excursions when they visited the DHC by requiring all teachers to indicate in some way that their groups were familiar with the content or to undergo

teacher education training prior to their groups participating in the educational programme.

The museum educators also had to deal with teachers' behaviour that was deemed to be inappropriate by the DHC management. According to the museum educators, some extreme cases included prejudiced teachers; a teacher who arrived drunk; teachers who abandoned their learners to the museum educators and then drank tea in the bar while chatting on their cell phones; and teachers who meandered in and out of the exhibition while chatting on their cell phones.

**4.7.2.3   Issues pertaining to the museum educators' working environment**

Apart from the professional challenges relating to external issues, during the course of their interviews, some of the museum educators aired their feelings and views about various internal administrative issues relating to how they were managed. These included how rosters were organised, lack of feedback from management and intermittent meetings. For example, with regard to the organisation of the rosters, one of the museum educators indicated that she was frustrated at the way they were organised although she freely admitted that she did not have any solutions to offer.

The issue of feedback on their performance also provided a professional headache for some of the museum educators. For instance, one of the guides who went home directly after the DHC exhibition tour felt that she did not get the benefit of direct feedback from the wrap-up session. She clarified that protocol dictated that the guides were not required to be present for this session and even if they were, they did not see the post-visit evaluation forms completed by the learners and teachers. This prompted her to say it was "no good" not actually knowing how she was doing. She wanted more direct feedback regarding her guiding, suggesting that if management took a more active role in monitoring and appraising her performance it might enable her to assess and possibly improve it.

Another element of the museum educators' working environment related to their interpersonal relationships. As revealed by the data, although the museum educators

worked well together most of the time, there were some underlying tensions. In fact, when I asked whether or not the museum educators were empowered to institute changes to the educational programme if need be, one replied, "It would definitely have to be a discussion - which is always a challenge". What this challenge was she did not make clear. Such tensions are understandable as the museum educators are, on the whole, individually powerful, successful, professional and dynamic people with minds of their own. They gave their opinions freely and were sometimes met with opposition but on the whole they presented a united, happy front and worked successfully as an integrated unit.

Another challenge faced by the museum educators was the lack of meetings. According to Sophia, they did not actually have meetings as such, which, she thought would probably be quite useful. This sentiment was shared by another museum educator who added, "All I would like is more contact with other guides. I feel that we should have [a meeting] at least every three months, even if it's for half an hour". She even suggested a newsletter to keep the museum educators in the loop. It seemed that the system within which they operated gave the museum educators few avenues to discuss their work with their peers or air their opinions, the result of which was that they felt a measure of isolation. This in turn translated into unilateral decision-making with regard to their pedagogy.

Also as a result of their professional isolation, it appeared that some of the museum educators used the opportunity of their interview to air some of their suggestions as well as grievances. Possibly my role as both researcher and insider enabled their openness. In fact, one person commented, "Well I quite enjoyed it actually. It's because no one really wants to listen to what I think ... So I quite [enjoyed] explaining it because no one else wants to know". This sentiment was echoed by another museum educator who felt that she had gained by being able to verbalise her concerns, saying she had no other way to do so. What became evident was that as a group, the museum educators had no formal platform on which to air their views - although whether or not they wanted or needed their voices to be heard was not clear.

It was thus evident that there were some administrative and interpersonal problems for the museum educators with regard to their working environment. The lack of interpersonal contact indicated that, professionally, guiding was in fact quite lonesome work. However, on the whole, the museum educators worked well together and whilst they felt that there could be some improvement, in say, the feedback they received regarding their guiding or in the way the rosters were organised, none of the museum educators felt that they were dealing with any insurmountable issues.

### 4.7.2.4 Contested professional status - part-time vs. full-time museum educators

The analysis of the data revealed that there was a contentious professional issue apropos the perceived power of the two new full-time facilitators. It appeared from the data that they were currently the primary shapers of the way the Holocaust was taught at the DHC as they wielded the greatest influence over the introduction and wrap-up, conducting these sessions most regularly, and they were also part of the management team, which some of the other facilitators were not. Abigail noted that these two did most of the facilitation and she felt that they were both doing a great job. Their influence was affirmed by the museum's administrator who outlined the freedom afforded to them with regard to the structure and implementation of the educational programme:

> Now that we've got [the two full-time facilitators] on board, they pretty much run the education side. They liaise with Cape Town and with Johannesburg as to what the system is that we're going to be implementing and that's also trial and error. It's not so much as intense as it was before.

And yet despite their position of educational authority, Emma, who had previously worked as the primary museum educator, adopted an overseeing role, said, "They're coming at it from a different angle. So I sit in very often to see what their grasp is". This begs the question of who really was in charge of Holocaust education at the DHC.

The employment of the two facilitators to run the education at the DHC was, according to Emma, part of the vision of the DHC "to nurture an education

department in our small little way", a reflection of the autonomy sought by the DHC. Whilst it liaised with the mother body, the SAHGF, on some educational issues and followed their direction in some respects, it also led the way in others. But it appeared from the analysis of the data that some professional tension existed between those museum educators who were who were employed full-time and the part-time volunteers. For instance, when I asked one of the museum educators if she was still involved in teacher training, she passed the comment that she was, but not to the same extent, as the two new facilitators were paid to do this job. She added that they now received more opportunities than she did, but felt that they should do so as they worked full-time and she only part-time. Comments regarding payment and the distinction between part-time and full-time museum educators were made on more than one occasion by several of the museum educators.

The question does arise as to whether being a paid or volunteer educator influenced the museum educators' work in any way as generally volunteers work solely for the passion of it whilst paid staff might have a different agenda, even though they might be equally passionate about the work.

Thus analysis of the data showed that the issue of full-time vs. part-time status at the DHC underlay some tensions into the organisation. Part-time volunteers spoke about the changes that had been instituted since the introduction of full-time facilitators and raised concerns about some of these changes. They also commented on these changes in relation to their own positions in the organisation.

### 4.7.2.5 Structural tensions

The analysis of the data also revealed that some structural tensions permeated the organisation. In terms of the DHC hierarchical structure, the ultimate educational authority with regard to the content of the exhibition was its director. However, as seen above, when it came to the structure and content of the educational programme, the authority officially lay with two new full-time museum educators although the educational authority actually appeared to be quite fluid with all the members of the

management team, consisting of the director, administrator and the two full-time museum educators all providing input into the decision-making process.

Other structural tensions at the DHC included the fact that was that the bulk of the museum educator body consisted of volunteer Jewish museum educators, so some of the museum educators were teaching a history that was their own. This implied that it was very personal for some, whereas for others the history was further removed. In addition to this some of the museum educators had been guiding since the inception of the DHC while others, who had joined more recently, held positions of greater power. The question of the Jewishness of the museum educators was never overtly addressed and yet it subtly permeated the interviews and who was ultimately in charge of the education at the DHC and who wielded the greatest power were questions that were not answered fully by this study.

These structural problems, while not creating huge challenges for the museum educators, nevertheless did provide some underlying pressures.

### 4.7.2.6  Conclusion

The professional challenges that faced the museum educators were both overt and covert. From overt situations such as maintaining control over the learner groups or dealing with disruptive behaviour during the course of the visits, the professionalism of the museum educators was always evident. These challenges were an unavoidable part of their guiding. They were also faced with more covert challenges such as those that existed in relation to their working environment. The lack of meetings, the drawing up of rosters and the lack of feedback apropos their performance provided challenges for them as museum educator professionals, as was their desire to have greater contact with the other museum educators. However, they also faced professional challenges where there was no platform to air their concerns. These included the issue of the part-time vs. full-time status of museum educators and who the ultimate educational authority was.

### 4.7.3   Personal challenges

As the data revealed, apart from the pedagogical and professional challenges, some of the museum educators were also faced with personal challenges.

### 4.7.3.1   Pedagogical doubt

On a personal level, the museum educators sometimes faced self-doubt regarding their pedagogy. Sophia, for instance, said she was conscious of getting the message across to the learners and always wanted to provide the spark to keep them interested:

> I think my biggest challenge is when I come out of a session, have I got through to the kids? I'm not satisfied to just speak a whole lot of stuff and hope they get it ... I really want to get through to them ... So I think that's my challenge. Do I get through to them?

This was also a challenge for Abigail and Lee. Abigail, who on more than one occasion said that she wanted to do things "right", was thrilled when she came across a group of girls whom she had guided who spent their tea break in a circle debating what they had seen in the exhibition. She described this as "an absolute revelation that we had got through to them on that level that they were actually using it for debate". Confirming the importance for the museum educators of feedback from the learners, Emma likewise spoke about the affirmations she received from them such as, "This has changed my life"; "This has made me think differently" and "I now know that I'm not going to bury my head in the sand anymore. I'm going to keep my eyes open and look for where I can help rather than where I can hide".

Despite the overwhelmingly positive comments from the visiting teachers, one of the museum educators continued to display elements of doubt and silently wondered, "Whether they [the learners] had actually have grasped the enormity of it". Chloe was also not entirely sure that the message that she planned for learners was the one with which they would leave. She said that she felt that the learners actually responded to things that interested them, which might not have been what she had anticipated, in which case their learning was incidental:

What interests them, what motivates them. There may be a panel that sticks out in the mind of one learner and everything that I have said the whole day or any of the guides have said the whole day pales in significance to that one panel and the message that has come out.

The question also arose for the museum educators about the real impact that the educational programme had on the learners. Abigail was objective in her assessment saying, "To us it's madly important and if we can get one in a hundred or two hundred that it might make an impact on we're doing well. But I have no illusions of what happens". In fact, once she began this train of thought she continued, "When you start pulling it apart like this, in the end you mustn't do it because it's so hard". However, this reflection was tempered by Chloe's positivity about the long-term outcome of the programme and her belief that the learners would gain enough to put them on a path that would last beyond their visit, "What I'm hoping the students get out of it is more of a lifelong process that can happen, rather than something in three or four hours … but hopefully the seeds are planted".

### 4.7.3.2 Personal doubt

The museum educators had personal doubts too. One even wondered if she was too old to be teaching young people with yet another initially questioning her right to teach the history based on her own self-perception, "Do you know what my first internal issues were? Is this my story to even tell? Do you know what I mean? Like why am I telling this story? You know ... this is so far removed from me". However, through self-examination and in coming to understand why teaching the Holocaust was important to her, she was able to justify her involvement to herself. In this way she was able to take ownership of her position as a museum educator and she came to terms with the idea that the Holocaust belonged not to an exclusive group but to everyone.

### 4.7.3.3  Personal commitments

For some part-time museum educators juggling their personal lives with their commitments to guiding was also problematical. For instance, one museum educator wanted to guide more often than she was currently able to do. She believed that it was important to guide regularly in order to maintain her skills, but working in her own business made this difficult. Another felt that she had lost out on in-house courses and workshops as she was often away visiting family in other cities in South Africa or overseas. And in order to make ends meet, yet another museum educator had to take a second job.

### 4.7.3.4  Conclusion

Despite personal challenges, such as getting their message across correctly, concerns about their ages and abilities, and whether they had the right to teach this history, and logistical problems which arose by volunteering, the museum educators wanted to guide and ensured that they were able to do so. They juggled their schedules and resolved their internal doubts and difficulties in order to guide as they all believed in the intrinsic value of their work.

Ultimately, although the museum educators faced various challenges they generally dealt confidently with them based on their practical experience, their acquired knowledge and the guidelines provided by the DHC. It must be said, however, that despite any contested issues faced by the museum educators and regardless of some of their uncertainties and reservations, what emerged from the data was that the museum educators were overwhelmingly positive in their feelings about the work that they undertook and seemed able to deal with challenges adequately. The various emotional, educational, linguistic, logistical and personal challenges that arose did not detract from their commitment and passion for both Holocaust education and the DHC itself.

**4.8    Journey's end**

The first research question in Chapter 1 asked, "What is the work of the museum educators at the DHC and what is their focus in terms of Holocaust education?" The data in this chapter provided answers to this question.

The two journeys that were undertaken in this chapter started with an introduction to the museum educators. All the museum educators began as volunteers with some going on to become full-time paid staff. They were a diverse group of people, some of whom had prior teaching experience. They had a broad range of motivations for wanting to guide at the DHC but all were passionate about the work that they did.

The museum educators were classified either as guides if they only conducted tours for the learners and teachers through the exhibition or facilitators if they also conducted the introductory and wrap-up sessions.

During the introductory session, the learners and teachers got their first taste of the educational programme. Since the museum educators' work played a pivotal role in the educational programme, it was vital to know how the museum educators gained their knowledge. Therefore the next step on my parallel journey was to explore the museum educators' training and expertise to discover how they were trained, how they maintained their expertise and what they believed the most important elements of their training to be.

Analysis of the data showed that there was no uniform training at the DHC. Some museum educators were trained by senior museum educators from the CTHC while others received in-house training from the DHC. The depth and breadth of this training differed. It depended on the method of training received but also on the personal motivation of each museum educator to continue to learn, thereby maintaining his or her expertise. The CTHC training involved many hours of lectures, as well as learning from the educator and teacher manuals. The DHC training also involved reading these manuals but the bulk of the training was from shadowing more

experienced DHC museum educators. It should be noted that one of the necessities for the original CTHC training was that the DHC had not yet opened and there were thus no museum educators to shadow.

The maintenance of their expertise was a matter for both the DHC and for the individual museum educators. The DHC provided many in-house training workshops and courses, but it was left to each museum educator to continue with his or her own education, through reading, watching DVDs or attending further courses. The inter-museum network only appeared to be available to some of the DHC museum educators.

The work of the DHC museum educators began with the introductory "meet and greet" session, where the learners were introduced to the various relevant Holocaust concepts. The depth of this session varied depending on the facilitator and it ranged from an introduction to the facilitator for the visit and an outline of the day's activities to in-depth discussions about racism, antisemitism, and for the Grade 11s, Darwinism. The museum educators differed in their perceptions of the guidelines regarding the parameters for their guiding and for this session in particular.

The next stage of the learners' journey was watching the DVD. It was unanimously agreed by all the parties, that the DVDs provided both information and insight, at the same time punctuating the visit with a much needed break from the vocal commentary. It was also used it to connect the learners to individual stories, to provide the historical background to the Holocaust and to personalise the Holocaust.

Depending on how they had started, the group of learners then progressed to the exhibition. This was believed by some of the museum educators to be the most important part of the visit as the panels provided rich information. Analysis of the data showed that these panels provided the framework for the guides and that there was therefore little room for "individual exploration". Due to the large amount of material however, both the museum educators and the learners and teachers felt that time was limited and that it was not possible to cover all the educational material

available. The museum educators were free to choose which panels to highlight, but according to the DHC administrator, they were advised to choose any five. They did this according to their personal knowledge and interests, thus each museum educator provided a unique perspective on the Holocaust for the learners.

After the exhibition tour, all the learners and teachers met up with the facilitator for the wrap-up, debriefing session. The purpose of this session was to draw connections for the learners with their everyday lives and to weave together the various conceptual thematic threads that had been exposed during the exhibition. The museum educators used discussions about bystanders, perpetrators, victims and upstanders to facilitate this learning and case studies to illustrate situations of human rights violations such as bullying. Learners were encouraged to think about how they could help to prevent such situations in their own social environments and become upstanders for social justice. The purpose of this session was clearly related to the Social Holocaust.

The final stage on the learners' journey and also the museum educators' journey was reflection and feedback. The learners and their teachers wrote post-visit evaluations regarding what they had seen, what they had learnt and how they felt. The DHC museum educators went home and reflected on their guiding and performance that day and also reflected on the tour and what it meant to them during the research process the museum educators.

Who the museum educators were, what their work entailed and their educational pedagogy and philosophy was revealed by an analysis of the data and enabled me to answer the first research question posed in Chapter 1.

The museum educators agreed that the Holocaust was taught at the DHC primarily as a result of its inclusion in the NCS – History for Grade 9. They also agreed that it also served as a memorial for the six million Jews and others who had died in the Holocaust and as a reminder that such an event should not happen again. But it was evident from the data that there were, in fact, two foci in the educational programme

– the Historical Holocaust and the Social Holocaust. In teaching the Historical Holocaust, the museum educators taught the historical events of the Holocaust, which they concurred, formed the foundation of the educational programme. But it was the aim of the programme that dictated its focus and this was to create upstanders and bring about social change for a better society with the goal preventing future genocides.

In order to reach this objective, the museum educators taught "the lessons" of the Holocaust foregrounding the dominant themes of racism, apartheid, genocide and human rights, as well as lesser ones of good vs. evil, democracy, memorial and identity. Antisemitism was important to some museum educators but not all. They did this by selecting content and by their use of personalisation to connect Holocaust history to the learners.

During the exhibition, the learners were faced with various challenges; personal, professional and intellectual. Apart from the challenging nature and complexity of the Holocaust narrative, they also had to contend with the emotional impact of this complex history as well as any personal issues that might have been exposed. They also had to deal with difficult questions and contested absolute truths and they grappled with the emotional nature of Holocaust education as it affected both the visitors and themselves. Language provided a major challenge for the museum educators, particularly with regard to the nature of the Zulu language and a common complaint was that there was not enough time.

In addition to overt professional challenges such as inappropriate teacher behaviour, the museum educators had to face more covert problems in their working environment. The question of the status and power of part-time vs. full-time museum educators arose as did some structural tensions. And to complicate matters, the museum educators had to juggle their personal lives with their commitments to the DHC.

During the interviews, the teachers' post-visit evaluations were examined for confirmation or denial of what the museum educators had said and how their thoughts and insights had impacted on the learners. Photo-elicitation was also used to clarify and bring the museum educators' educational insights into focus. These methods provided insight into how the museum educators shaped Holocaust education at the DHC. Analysis of the data revealed that their focus was clearly on the Social Holocaust.

The teachers' and learners' journeys, although having a beginning, middle and end, were not intended to be finite, for as Chloe saw it, the seeds of thought and personal development using the lessons from the Holocaust were intended to be sown. Education about the Holocaust was presented to the visitors by professional, committed museum educators who, despite their doubts and challenges, seemed to possess their own internal Holocaust education compass which directed them through both their personal learning and their guiding. Although the museum educators followed a fixed path through the educational programme, what they chose to highlight and how, was in essence a personal choice, based on their knowledge, training and experience and was not bound by fixed parameters.

The learners' and teachers' journey twisted and turned through the intellectual and emotional narrative of the Holocaust and finally ended with introspection and self-examination. This was indeed a personal journey for them. It was also a personal journey for the museum educators as was evident on my metaphorical, parallel journey which also took many twists and turns. Ultimately, however, the journey ended, providing a better understanding of the museum educators' role in Holocaust education and how they shaped it.

# CHAPTER 5
# DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS RELATING TO
# HOLOCAUST EDUCATION AT THE DHC

## 5.1 Introduction

The question inevitably raised by Chapter 4 is "So why are these findings relevant?" In this chapter I answer this question by providing a second level of analysis of the data. Through a synthesis of the data in Chapter 4 and a comparison with the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, I draw conclusions and in the process set out to answer the remaining research questions, "How are the museum educators shaping Holocaust education?" and "Why are they shaping Holocaust education in this manner?" I also establish synergies between my findings and the literature and look for new findings that go beyond the scope of the current literature.

My study was framed by two theoretical frameworks both of which were adapted from the available literature. The first was based on the idea that teaching about the Holocaust today generally has one of two aims. According to Pettigrew, a tension exists in the current literature between "exclusively 'historical' and otherwise 'social', 'moral' and/or 'civic' teaching aims" (Pettigrew, 2010, p. 50), The former, which I have termed the Historical Holocaust, posits that the aim of Holocaust education is to teach about the actual historical events of the Holocaust including how and why it happened, while the latter, the Social Holocaust, uses the Holocaust as a catalyst for social and moral transformation. These ideas are explored in Chapter 3 (p. 63) and Chapter 4 (p. 122). The second theoretical framework was based on the idea that two kinds of learning take place in relation to museums: learning by the visitors and learning by the museum educators. Falk and Dierking provided a theoretical model, the Contextual Model of Learning, for how learning takes place and how visitors making meaning in museums (Falk & Dierking, 2000). One of the conclusions they reached in their research was that free-choice learning in museums provides visitors with the best learning experience and I have used this as part of the theoretical framework underpinning this study. How museum educators learn and

maintain their expertise was researched by Castle (2002, 2006) and Grenier (2009) and their work informed and provided a basis for this study too.

Both these frameworks provided the platform for this study and from which to launch a second level of analysis of the data.

## 5.2 Focus on the Historical Holocaust as it relates to the theoretical framework

One of the most significant findings to emerge from this study and one that was aligned to the theoretical framework was that while the DHC museum educators taught both the Historical Holocaust and the Social Holocaust, they were pre-occupied with and biased towards the latter. The importance of teaching the historical events and the relevance of teaching the Holocaust in context was discussed extensively in the literature (Bauer, 2010; Cohn, et al., 2009; Freedman, 2009; Hirshfield, 1981; Short & Reed, 2004; Silbert & Petersen, 2007; The Historical Association, 2007). This study found that the museum educators discussed the historical events and used them as the foundation for the educational programme but they did not investigate history per se, rather concentrating their teaching on social objectives. An explanation for this was given by one of the museum educators who suggested that the historical events were not the focus of her guiding because they were covered in the classroom by the teachers which enabled her to provide a different focus in her guiding (Chapter 4, p. 97). Hence this study found that teaching about the consequences of history was given greater priority than teaching the actual historical events.

In order to understand how a focus on the consequences of the history translated into teaching about social concerns, it is necessary to address how historical matters were dealt with by the DHC museum educators. The DHC is located in the context of history museums which Castle (2002) described as places where visitors had the opportunity to explore why history matters and to see reflections of the past. At the DHC, the museum educators provided this reflection of the past but stopped short of

interrogating why history matters. Instead they turned their focus to the consequences of people's behaviour during the Holocaust emphasising its importance to what was happening in contemporary events. The findings showed that part of the reason for this was that the museum educators were generally not schooled in the field of history education. While some of the museum educators were very knowledgeable about history, as well as about the events and implications of the Holocaust, others knew very little prior to joining the DHC and had to work hard to gain sufficient knowledge to become proficient to guide. In fact, the findings revealed that only Grace had a university background in history education, which not unexpectedly placed her in a key position at the DHC. This finding was supported by Castle (2002) who said that museum educators generally did not have an understanding of history and hence lacked foundational aspects of their work.

Another possible reason for this absence of focus on the Historical Holocaust might have been the lack of time allocated for school visits, resulting in historical exploration and understanding being given lesser prominence than the social aspects. As Petersen (2011, p. 1) proclaimed, "The education programmes of the CTHC approach the memory of the Holocaust in order to nurture a culture of human rights in South Africa, encouraging social activism and challenging apathy". This phenomenon was not unique at the South African Holocaust centres nor at the DHC but was part of an international tendency to foreground social awareness. This situation also occurred at museums such as the Houston Holocaust Centre (Berger, 2003), USHMM (2010c), Yad Vashem (2010a), Sydney Jewish Museum (Alba, 2005) and The Holocaust Centre (2010). This statement made by Emma, "Holocaust education is obviously what happened during the Second World War and the Holocaust but it's more the lessons to be learnt from it, that they can adapt those lessons to contemporary society", typified the educational focus of the DHC museum educators. At the DHC, history was marginalised and underplayed in favour of more social objectives, such as creating upstanders for social justice and preventing future genocides. In fact, the literature showed that the lessons to be learned rather than the history itself were the key component of many Holocaust educational programmes (Holocaust Memorial Center Zekelman Family Campus, 2010; Schrire, 2002) and that the purpose of these

lessons was to encourage social activism in the learners. In fact Salmons (2010, p. 58) asked, "Why is the study of the Holocaust as history afforded a relatively low status, even among history teachers?" and went on to answer his own question as follows:

> It may be that the power of the Holocaust as a universal warning, as a rhetorical device to advocate a broad array of social aims, coupled with the challenge of conveying the complexity of this history in limited curriculum time has overwhelmed fundamental historical questions.

This might indeed be the situation at the DHC where the Historical Holocaust has been overwhelmed by the social aims, time constraints and a lack of history education training for the museum educators. This finding is supported by the literature and is part of an international trend (The Holocaust Centre, 2010; Totten, 2002; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010f; Yad Vashem, 2010b). Additionally it supports one of the theoretical frameworks of this study, which holds that there are two divergent aims for teaching the Holocaust today.

## 5.3    Focus on the Social Holocaust

As explained in Chapter 4, the findings showed that the Social Holocaust was the actual focus of the DHC educational programme. A number of social themes were explored by the DHC museum educators; the lessons for humanity; racism and apartheid; human rights abuses, genocide and antisemitism; moral dilemmas and choice; identity; and good vs. evil.

Various contextual factors drove this Social Holocaust focus. The first was the inclusion by the DoE of the Holocaust in the NCS – History for Grade 9 (Department of Education, 2002). In fact, this was cited by the DHC museum educators as one of the primary reasons for teaching the Holocaust. According to the NCS - History Grade 9, the Holocaust was used to address: issues of human rights during and after World War II; the struggle for human rights; apartheid in South Africa; and various topics relating to this such as a comparison between the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Nuremberg trials, xenophobia and genocide (Department of Education, 2002). In order to match this emphasis in the curriculum and to make it

relevant to the majority of South African learners, the museum educators married the Holocaust to the South African context. They therefore compared the laws promulgated in Nazi Germany with the South African apartheid laws. Thus the Holocaust, as per the institution that was behind its introduction into the NCS – History, was described as a tool for teaching human rights in the aftermath of apartheid (Petersen, 2010). This was supported by the structure of the exhibition where the panels on racism, apartheid and antisemitism were located at the beginning of the exhibition.

The museum educators also focused on the Social Holocaust because this was the policy of the SAHGF. The "old" introduction, as explained in Chapter 4 (p. 115) clearly pointed to concerns of racism, stereotyping, discrimination and antisemitism while the wrap-up session was used not to discuss historical matters, but how what they had seen related to the learners' own lives. This included incidents of bullying and how they saw themselves in terms of being a bystander, victim, perpetrator or upstander. The aim of this session was to provide the learners with social tools to enable them to become upstanders against social injustice.

Finally the DHC museum educators concentrated on the Social Holocaust because of their desire to do something good. Believing that they could make a difference in society, by either preventing future genocides or ensuring that issues such as stereotyping and discrimination, for example, were addressed, provided an important impetus for the DHC museum educators to highlight the Social Holocaust rather than the Historical Holocaust.

The Social Holocaust was therefore a key element of the educational focus of the DHC museum educators. Another highly significant theme that related to the Social Holocaust was apartheid. It was clear that racism and apartheid, with their South African focus, were treated as key concepts while antisemitism, with its Jewish focus, was not entirely ignored but was certainly downplayed. Locating the Holocaust in this context was relevant not only to the learners and teachers but also to the museum educators many of whom were older and had directly experienced the effects of

apartheid. They were therefore easily able to draw parallels for the learners and in the process shaped Holocaust education in a certain way. The fact that so few learners knew about or had even met a Jewish person in their daily social interactions, meant that they were naive about all things Jewish. The museum educators therefore concentrated more on placing the Holocaust in the local context, than in a European Jewish context, to make it more personally relevant to them. According to the literature reviewed this was an important task. Eckmann (2010), for example, stated that it was necessary for the learners to reflect critically on the history of their own society, an opinion echoed by Maitles, et al. (2006) who argued that education about the Holocaust should reflect each country's unique experience of human rights atrocities, genocide and antisemitism. In line with the theoretical framework, using contextual factors to facilitate learning was advised by Falk and Dierking (2000) in order to achieve successful museum learning.

In addition, Young (1993b, p. viii) claimed that there was a political element attached to Holocaust memorials and museums which, he said, were constructed to remember events "according to the hue of national ideals, the cast of political dicta". At the DHC, apartheid and xenophobia, both elements of South Africa's own current and past history were part of this discourse, revealing the geo-political nature of Holocaust education.

Yet one of the concerns of Short and Reed (2004) was that in teaching about the Holocaust greater emphasis would be placed on racism than on antisemitism, a situation that appeared to exist at the DHC. They believed that teaching about the Holocaust was useful in helping learners learn about racism but at the same time it was an ideal mechanism to teach about and combat antisemitism. The fact that the museum educators did not fully highlight this aspect of Holocaust education might be due to the fact that antisemitism is not a significant factor in the national consciousness as Jews make up a very small percentage of the South African population. Apartheid on the other hand was an integral and painful part of South African history and therefore provided the "way in" for the Holocaust to exist and be taught in an African context.

Despite the intensity of focus on human rights in the NCS – History for Grade 9 (Department of Education, 2002) and also in the political sphere worldwide, this study revealed that the DHC museum educators actually placed a greater emphasis on genocide than on human rights. The prevention of future genocides through Holocaust education was cited as a reason for teaching the Holocaust by all the DHC museum educators. This was a concept supported by the literature (Bauer, 2010; Cohn, et al., 2009; Harff, 2003; Hirshfield, 1981; Short & Reed, 2004) and, in fact, forms part of the mission statement of the DHC. The DHC museum educators also believed that the Holocaust contained a warning for the future in which a progression of human rights abuses might result in genocide. However, as Pettigrew (2010) pointed out, the psychological distance between bullying and other forms of social abuses of human rights is a far cry from genocide. Whilst the DHC museum educators in no way suggested to the learners and teachers that bullying would end in genocide, some of their comments did not fall far short of the assertions made by teachers in the HEDP study that there was a slippery slope between behaviour such bullying or xenophobia (Pettigrew, 2010).

It was also clear that the distinction between human rights education and Holocaust education was not as clear-cut as some of the literature suggested. The current literature showed that there is a difference between Holocaust education and human rights education and the question posed is whether or not they can be taught together and each be given due diligence (Eckmann, 2010; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a). What this study showed was that in spite of the human rights emphasis in the NCS – History Grade 9 (2002) and despite articles being written about how the teaching of the Holocaust contributed to the culture of human rights in South Africa (M. Du Preez, 2008; Nates, 2010, 2011; Petersen, 2010), the DHC museum educators were not conducting human rights education. They taught *about* human rights, teaching about what happened to the Jews, and to some extent they taught *for* human rights, discussing current issues of genocide and xenophobia and providing the learners with some social tools to use when coming across human rights violations, but they did not include the third element of human rights education, that is, teaching *within the framework* of human rights (Eckmann, 2010). In fact, only

one DHC museum educator even mentioned the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In addition, the DHC museum educators did not receive any human rights education training, a situation mirrored in the Holocaust museums in Europe (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a).

Other social Holocaust themes explored by the museum educators included memorial and remembrance; moral dilemmas; the nature of good vs. evil; and identity - both Jewish identity and the learners' identities.

The findings showed that Grace, Abigail and Chloe all foregrounded the theme of remembrance, a subject also highlighted in the literature (Alba, 2005; Yad Vashem, 2010a). The idea that Holocaust museums served as memorials to those who died in the Holocaust was expressed not only by the DHC museum educators but it was also part of the mission statement of the SAHGF. A related theme of Jewishness was given prominence by most of the DHC museum educators but only from the perspective that the Holocaust happened to Jewish people and was predominantly a Jewish event. One DHC museum educator even said that the Holocaust as a genocide could have happened to anyone, but it simply happened to be the Jews. The idea that Jewish feeling in Durban was being kept alive through Holocaust education was an idea mentioned by only one of the DHC museum educators but this also had resonance in the literature (Norden, 1993). However, in general the findings showed that issues of Jewishness, which resonated more closely with the historical Holocaust, were generally downplayed while other issues that had greater bearing on issues of the social Holocaust such as apartheid, genocide and xenophobia, were highlighted.

Moral dilemmas and self-reflection were two further Social Holocaust themes covered by the museum educators. They believed that through an investigation into the moral dilemmas faced by others, the learners could begin to think critically about themselves. In this regard, Chloe believed that encouraging critical thought was an integral part of Holocaust education. For Bourgignon (2005) this was an expected function of museums, but more significantly, Hirshfield (1981), Imber (2009) and Salmons (2001) all agreed that learning about these moral dilemmas constituted a

crucial element of Holocaust education. Also in exploring themselves through these moral dilemmas, the learners sometimes came across difficult or controversial questions, which for Stradling (1984) are an inescapable part of history. The kinds of discussions generated through an exploration of these issues, the thinking goes, inculcated critical thinking in the learners, improved their interpersonal skills and prepared them to become productive citizens (Harwood & Hahn, 1990). In fact, Clements (2006) believed that it was this dialogue about society and humanity that was the actual purpose of Holocaust education.

Themes identified in this study that could not be located elsewhere in the literature included good vs. evil and identity. Although the theme of identity in Holocaust education was also a key theme of the Facing History and Ourselves programme, which was attended by some of the DHC museum educators, it was not foregrounded in the literature. Another finding unexplored by the literature was that Holocaust education needed to be a personally enriching experience for the learners and that they should go away feeling encouraged to become better human beings as a result of their experience. This assertion by one of the DHC museum educators echoed the emotive nature of Holocaust education and was supported in the teachers' post-visit evaluation documents.

It can therefore be concluded that although the museum educators had diverse views on the nature of Holocaust education, they were unanimous in their belief that the purpose of Holocaust education at the DHC was both to provide support for the NCS – History and to bring about personal and social transformation in order to create a better society. This is in line with the Contextual Model of Learning in which mediation by museum educators is said to provide the appropriate socio-cultural context for the best learning experiences to occur (Falk & Dierking, 2000). The museum educators believed that they could accomplish this by encouraging social activism in the learners and show them how to become upstanders for social justice. Totten (2002) regarded this teaching to create upstanders for social justice and activism as an achievable aim, stating that it would reduce incidents of intolerance and prejudice and result in the creation of better citizens.

The research thus supported the contested nature of the two elements of Holocaust education (Pettigrew, 2010), revealing that far greater importance was attached by the museum educators to the Social Holocaust than the Historical Holocaust (Finkelstein, 2003). This support came not only from the literature that was reviewed but also from the sheer volume of the data generated by the museum educators' interviews and the teachers' evaluation documents.

## 5.4    The work of the DHC museum educators

Before discussing how the museum educators shaped Holocaust education it is necessary to refer to one of the theoretical frameworks underpinning this study and to discuss how learning takes place in museums. As discussed previously Falk and Dierking's (2000) Contextual Model of Learning claimed that the best way to learn in a museum environment was through free choice. Visitors to museums had the best learning experience when they able to choose what they wanted to learn as well as where and when they wanted to participate in this learning. This was practised at some museums where it was considered to be important for the learners to work "as independently as possible" and where there were "very few lectures or standard tours" (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 125). This gave learners the feeling that they had control over their own learning.

However, this was contrary to the way the learners and teachers acquired knowledge at the DHC, where there was a strict linear structure in the educational programme. In fact, learning at the DHC more closely resembled a highly structured classroom model rather than Falk and Dierking's free-choice museum model. Some museum educators were conscious of this, such as Chloe who insisted that she did not want to adopt a teacher role and Grace who tried to ensure that the learners had some free time afterwards to go through the exhibition on their own. However, the majority of the museum educators in this sample adopted the linear classroom model in their guiding. Indeed the findings showed that there was little opportunity for the learners to engage objectively with the core exhibition material as the programme was crammed with information and activity and they engaged with it according to the

museum educators' emphasis. The learners and teachers were therefore unable to critically assess what they saw and, as they were often caught up in the emotional and visual rather than the cognitive elements of the tour, were sometimes overcome with emotion. However, as explained by Grace and Emma (Chapter 4, p. 120), the educational programme had recently been adjusted to allow the learners to go back into the exhibition for 15 minutes on their own to watch videos or read text of their own choice. This was to enable them to watch videos or explore parts of the exhibition in greater depth.

Yet another component of the Contextual Model of Learning was the need for learners to be personally motivated. Clearly this was not the case at the DHC where, being part of an organised school group, the learners were not necessarily personally motivated to visit the DHC, and the only freedom of choice that they had in this regard was to refuse to participate.

The structure of the educational programme was reflected in the structure of the work day of the DHC museum educators. As the finding showed, each tour began with the introductory session (conducted by a facilitator) where they engaged with the learners and teachers, familiarising them with the relevant terminology and concepts. This was followed by the exhibition tour (conducted by a guide) and ended with the wrap-up session (once again conducted by the facilitator). During their guiding in the DHC exhibition, the museum educators facilitated learning, which according to the Falk and Dierking (2000) was beneficial for the learners, and made meaning for them. They mediated and moderated difficult material whilst simultaneously drawing parallels and links to South Africa's apartheid past. They also investigated the nature of genocide through discussions and encouraged contemplation and reflection in the learners. In the process they made pedagogical decisions regarding content and methodology based on their personal interests, perceptions, abilities and training.

In line with to the literature reviewed, a synergy exists between the structural elements of the work of DHC museum educators and those elsewhere in the world. Castle (2002) for instance described the two elements of the museum educators work

in her study, that is, the guided tour and the programme which she said had an educational purpose. The content and structure of the educational programmes for museums such as Yad Vashem (Yad Vashem, 2010a), the USHMM (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010c), the IWM (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a) and the Houston Holocaust Centre (The Holocaust Centre, 2010) are available on the internet and show that their programmes are similar to that offered by the DHC. Also, as described by Grenier (2009), the DHC museum educators interpreted panels for the learners. The parallel nature of these programmes points to a certain universality of Holocaust education where the focus is on history for a social purpose.

According to the teachers and the DHC museum educators themselves, the work of the museum educators was both valuable and necessary. This was supported by the literature. Crane (1997) for instance, observed museum educators played a key role in the visitors' experience. The ITF (2010c) described the museum educators' role as crucial to the success of visits to Holocaust museums, stating that learners require assistance from museum educators as they are not accustomed to learning from museums (2010b). In another study undertaken by the FRA (2010a), this assertion was supported with the teachers in their focus group reporting that the success of a visit was linked both to the quality of the educational approach and the competence of the staff who also interpreted the exhibitions and made meaning for the learners. The importance of the museum educators is supported by Falk and Dierking (2000), who agreed that museum educators exercised a positive influence over the experiences of visitors, especially if the staff were well trained. In fact, Baum, Rotter and Reidler (2009) believed that the role of museum educators would become increasingly important, beyond the current time where Holocaust survivors can tell their own stories, and museum educators would eventually be responsible for telling the whole Holocaust story. The literature therefore supported the findings in this study, which found that the museum educators played a valuable role at the DHC.

In summary, the museum educators and the work they do is regarded as a necessary part of the learning process (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Geschier, 2005) but at the same

time, free-choice learning provides the best learning experience for visits. However, the highly structured nature of the educational programme at the DHC and the desire of the museum educators to assist learners to understand the Holocaust and its implications meant that the learners were given little freedom to draw their own conclusions but were led to a guided outcome through the explanations and direction of the museum educators. Thus education at the DHC was museum educator- rather than learner-centred. In addition, Castle's (2002) research showed that the museum educators who taught history shaped it according to their own understanding and personal experiences, which was supported by the findings in this study. At the DHC, the museum educators based their teaching on their own understanding of the Holocaust, on their past teaching experiences, on their knowledge whether it was gained from personal experience or from their training and on their passion for their subject. In this way they shaped Holocaust education at the DHC.

According to the findings the museum educators faced both personal and professional challenges in the course of their work. Professionally, they dealt with difficult questions; issues of language, particularly in relation to non-English speaking learners from disadvantaged backgrounds as discussed above; and issues relating to time, distance and group size. Time posed a particular challenge for the museum educators at the DHC and they found support in the literature. Salmons (2003) for example, noted that enough time was required to address sensitive issues and enable meaningful reflection, while Andrews (2011) pointed out that many teachers in the HEDP study also complained about the lack of time. The museum educators faced various other issues too, such as the lack of contact between them and the fact that there were no meetings and or platforms from which to air their views. The DHC museum educators also faced more personal challenges. They had to cope with the intense emotions as well as concerns about their age and ability and some encountered logistical problems relating to their personal schedules and family commitments. The findings also uncovered some covert contested interpersonal issues that occasionally arose, particularly with regard to the introduction and the influence of the full-time paid facilitators. These issues might have arisen because the DHC museum educators were professionals who felt free to speak out when they felt

the need to contest issues and, being volunteers did not have anything to lose. On interpersonal and personal issues pertaining to Holocaust education and the museum educators, the literature seemed to be silent and there is scope for further investigation in this regard.

It can thus be concluded that the work of the museum educators greatly mirrored the work of museum educators at other Holocaust centres and museums around the world. The structure of the educational programme at the DHC was similar to those of other Holocaust education institutions and the museum educators faced many similar challenges. However, there was a wide departure in terms of the contextual problems faced. At the DHC problems and situations existed that were unique to the South Africa, such as language, geographical and temporal distance from the Holocaust and lack of knowledge about Jews. There was also a divergence from other museums, some of which had adopted the free-choice model of learning while at the DHC learning was linear and highly structured.

## 5.5    How did the DHC museum educators shape Holocaust education?

Responding to research question two, "How are the museum educators shaping Holocaust education at the DHC?" it was evident from analysis of the data that the DHC museum educators shaped Holocaust education in various ways. They did this through their pedagogy, through their content knowledge and in various other ways that I discuss below.

### 5.5.1   Shaping through pedagogy

The first way in which the museum educators shaped Holocaust education at the DHC was through the pedagogy they employed. They made meaning for the learners at the DHC through their explanations, avoidance, censorship, descriptions, and highlighting of material, based on their individual educational philosophies. The DHC museum educators were given a great deal of professional latitude, with few or no parameters imposed on them and no professional assessment. As a result, within

the framework of their acquired knowledge, they were free to decide what they wanted to teach. This gave them a broad canvas on which to construct meaning for the learners guided only by their implicit personal attitudes, internal moral compasses, integrity, individual historical interests and professionalism. As a group, they were passionate about the work they were doing and believed strongly in the moral imperative behind Holocaust education but as described earlier, this was highly individualised. This freedom was reflected by Castle (2002) who said that the museum educators in her study did not implement the programme as it was written but re-interpreted it according to their own understanding and this certainly appeared to be the case at the DHC too. Despite their individual choices, the DHC museum educators all shared a broad vision and pedagogy relating to Holocaust education.

The findings in this study also correlated with that of Min Fui Chee's (2006) study with regard to the amount of educational control exercised by the museum educators. She found that the accompanying teachers on school visits adopted a passive role at the museum, handing their learners over to the museum educators for the duration of their visit becoming part of the learner group themselves. The museum educators therefore exercised full educational authority, both managerial and pedagogical, over the visitors, with their consent and thus gave them the freedom to shape Holocaust education as they saw fit.

One of the ways in which the museum educators made meaning for the learners was through the technique of personalisation. According to the literature, this was the best way to make the enormity of the Holocaust understandable (Fowler, 2004; E. T. Linenthal, 1994; Schrire, 2002) as it created empathy and humanised others' experiences (Imber, 2009; E. T. Linenthal, 1994; Salmons, 2001). It was regarded as preferable to focusing on piles of bodies and other horrific images (Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010c), a situation that the museum educators also avoided. One of the ways that they achieved this personalisation was by focusing on individual stories, particularly of children like Anne Frank and Hana Brady, and of survivors even including stories about surviving family members. Regarding their pedagogy, only one of the DHC

museum educators felt that how the Holocaust was taught was just as important as what was taught, a thought also expressed by Petersen (2010).

This strong "teacher-centred" approach adopted was not problem-free and a tension existed between the museum educators' educational theory and practice, especially with regard to language issues. Although an effort was made to ensure that all language groups received the same quality of information and attention, they realised that in reality this was not possible. Chloe typified this realisation when she said that the programme needed to be adapted to the circumstances of the group. It was also found that groups with the most sophisticated grasp of the English language and the best background knowledge were able to reap the greatest benefits from the educational programme. This in itself was a new finding as I was unable to find support for language-related issues in the literature on Holocaust education.

Related to the issue of pedagogy and content was the question of the understanding of how people learn in museums. None of the participants spoke about this during their interviews, although it must be said that I did not ask them a direct question in this regard. Their lack of knowledge in this area meant that they were unaware of the current best practices described in the literature and consequently they simply followed the educational programme guidelines provided to them without question and even though the DHC museum educators explored the content of the NCS - History very well, the Outcomes Based Education philosophy of self-exploration was ignored. A possible explanation for this is that the DHC museum educators were socialised in an educational context where teacher-centredness was the underlying pedagogical philosophy and thus they sub-consciously adopted this role. Another explanation is that the programme was very limited in terms of time and the museum educators therefore tried to cram as much information into the shortest possible time. In fact, even though there were few parameters laid down by the DHC, the museum educators gravitated towards the same pedagogy with only a few of them questioning or trying to adapt the basic model. In fact, those who did try to be innovative tended to be the younger facilitators. In this respect, Falk and Dierking (2000) suggested that staff at museums be given training to enable them to better understand the nature of

learning in museums, why people visit them and how contextual factors can be used to facilitate learning. There is currently no such training at the DHC.

It can therefore be concluded that the DHC museum educators' pedagogy influenced the way in which they shaped Holocaust education. This pedagogy included the fact that they made meaning for the learners based on their own freedom to choose materials and methods, including the choices they made in personalising the Holocaust. In this respect, the DHC museum educators all adopted a similar pedagogy, thus revealing that they had pedagogical freedom but only within a generally understood framework. As the museum educators exercised full control over the learners, with no input from the accompanying teachers as they themselves became part of the learner group, the DHC museum educators were free to shape the way in which they taught the Holocaust as they pleased. They dealt with the language issues according to their abilities but generally did so according to the South African context in which the learning was taking place. The museum educators' understanding or lack of understanding of how people learn in museums also shaped how they taught the Holocaust.

## 5.5.2   Shaping through content knowledge

A significant finding that emerged from analysis of the data was that the DHC museum educators shaped Holocaust education through their own content knowledge. Particularly at the outset of their guiding, this depended on their training, which as the findings showed, was not uniform and later on, the extent to which they personally maintained and developed their expertise. When and how the DHC museum educators were trained influenced both their pedagogy and knowledge. For example, prior to the DHC opening in March 2008, the first group of museum educators were trained by educators from the CTHC. They were given in-depth methodological and content training with an active transfer of knowledge. However, more recent training, the findings showed, involved self-directed training which meant that the new DHC museum educators shadowed more experienced ones, and learned from literature, films, DVDs, the manuals provided by the SAHGF and the internet. Transfer of

knowledge was therefore more passive and depended on each museum educators' personal incentive to learn. According to the literature, shadowing or observation, also referred to as learning by analogy, was shown to produce fast results but also inaccuracies (Gentner, et al. 2003 in Grenier 2009). It was therefore effective but came at a price.

Also prior to their guiding work, many of the DHC museum educators had formal teacher training and experience, which provided them with some knowledge of teaching strategies and once again revealing certain uniformity in their socialisation. And yet in terms of history education, only Grace had studied it at university. In contrast, Grenier (2009) reported that the museum educators in her study "had little knowledge of teaching strategies", although they were "generally academically trained" and probably had extensive knowledge of their subject matter, (Grenier, 2009, p. 142). Mirroring this diversity of training, the literature showed that current museum educator training around the world ranged from very little to very intensive (Grenier, 2009). In fact, in EU countries, museums educators "often lack formal training" and sometimes received varying levels of internal training on historical subjects (Crane, 1997; European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a, p. 154).

All the museum educators indicated that they continued to learn and grow, primarily through reading, but also by shadowing, attending workshops, learning through their guiding experiences, learning from films, DVDs and use of the internet. The importance of these learning activities was supported by Grenier (2009) who explained that formal learning was indeed necessary but that "purposeful informal learning" (p. 153) was needed to produce competent museum educators. Based on Grenier's categories of learning, the DHC museum educators undertook incidental learning (reading); self-directed learning (watching films and DVDs and using the internet) and situated learning (shadowing and learning from other people) plus what I will call developmental learning (from their guiding experiences). What was also revealed was that over time training changed from being predominantly people-driven (trainers) to more object-driven (the educator and learner manuals and other material

such as books, DVDs and the internet) and unlike the situation at the USHMM (2010f), there was no formal evaluation of the museum educators at the DHC.

According to Castle (2006), the development of the museum educators' expertise was not linear, rather it grew organically by shadowing, hands-on teaching and examining content of museums In contrast, Grenier (2009) described museums where the training was far more intensive and structured, for example at the USHMM, where apart from training workshops, museum educators reported that they had people talking to them all the time, they watched film strips and they were provided with many support materials. Grenier also found that there were museums where the museum educators were taught people skills such as handling disabled visitors or foreigners. As the findings from this study showed, the development of expertise at the DHC more closely resembled Castle's findings than those of Grenier.

From this it can be concluded that the DHC provided different levels of training and preparation for the museum educators but it was museum educators own ongoing, self-directed learning that was the greatest determinant of how they shaped Holocaust education in terms of content. Those with prior teacher training regarded this as an asset but both their formal and informal training and professional development determined the depth and breadth of their knowledge. This in turn laid the groundwork for their educational decisions and pedagogy and ultimately the manner in which they shaped the content knowledge of Holocaust education at the DHC.

### 5.5.3 Other factors contributing to the shaping of Holocaust education at the DHC

Holocaust education is both an intellectual and an emotional event, with the cognitive and the affective standing side by side in the educational programme. Consequently, the findings showed that the DHC museum educators as well as the visiting teachers and learners were many a time affected emotionally and to different degrees. This emotional element of their teaching of the Holocaust provided the DHC museum educators with another opportunity to shape Holocaust education. One of the

manifestations of the emotional impact of the educational programme was visible in \the teachers' post-visit evaluations where it was clear that many were moved by their experiences, vowing to become better people as a result of their visit to the DHC. To Boyd (1999) this kind of emotional challenge was an integral part of the museum experience because he believed that this was how learning took place.

The amount of emotion displayed by both the teachers and the learners could be attributed to how the DHC museum educators presented their material. In this regard, the literature warned not to create emotional overload in learners (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a; Holocaust Education Development Programme, 2009; Short & Reed, 2004). The museum educators in this research were indeed conscious of this warning and were careful not to expose the learners to too many emotional challenges, which they did by moderating the material presented. For instance, they sometimes shielded the learners from upsetting material and sometimes warned them of upcoming possibly upsetting panels, in the process shaping the way in which they taught the Holocaust. A possible explanation cited in the literature as to why learners became emotional was expressed by Gurewitsch (2009) who proposed that this happened if the learners were unprepared for their visit by teachers, a situation which occurred with some schools that visited the DHC. It was evident that the DHC museum educators had the power to shape Holocaust education through the emotive element of their guiding and did so. As at other Holocaust museums and centres around the world, Holocaust education at the DHC had a highly emotive component. Due to the nature of the content even the museum educators were sometimes overcome with emotion and as part of their duties they had to cope with learners who were overwhelmed. I did not find mention of this in the literature although, as noted in the literature review (Chapter 2, p. 39) many researchers dealt with the methodological considerations of how to deal with emotive and controversial issues (Short & Reed, 2004; Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research, 2010a; The Historical Association, 2007; Totten, 2002; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010f). As the analysis of the data showed, the museum educators played an important role in ensuring that the

learners were able to cope adequately with the difficult emotive nature of Holocaust education and further research could be undertaken in this area.

In addition to their training and pedagogy, the findings showed that the museum educators shaped Holocaust education both personally and professionally and that their position in the organisation was significant in this shaping. From a purely descriptive point of the view, the museum educators at the DHC were demographically similar to those around the world and like their international counterparts, their motivations for volunteering varied (M. Du Preez, 2008). The DHC museum educators also believed that teaching about the Holocaust was personally fulfilling and a way to give something back to society.

However, this study veered from the international norm in two major respects. The first was that the museum educators foregrounded the local apartheid context, drawing parallels between South Africa's apartheid past and the discriminatory laws that led up to the Holocaust. The most obvious reason for this emphasis on apartheid was the connection between the DHC educational programme and the inclusion of the Holocaust in the curriculum. However, it could also possibly be attributed to place the Holocaust in the local context in order to close the geographical and temporal divide that exists between South Africa today and the Holocaust. There was a particular synergy between the Holocaust and apartheid too, which was picked up and used by the museum educators. This was the fact that other than South Africa, no other country in the world had national discriminatory laws written into the statute books in this manner. And for South African museum educators who were not Jewish and who were located in a different geographical and historical context, there was possibly a different motivation to teach this history.

The second way in which this study differed from others was that analysis of the data showed that no mention was made of interest in or connection to the local history being an important factor in the museum educators' pedagogy. As one DHC museum educator noted, she was passionate about Holocaust studies because of the many connections she saw to South African history.

The different organisational positions held by DHC museum educators also influenced their capacity to shape Holocaust education, with the full-time paid facilitators having the greatest authority. The full-time museum educators conducted the all-important introductory and wrap-up sessions which gave permanency as a factor for greater shaping.

Thus the findings showed that the DHC museum educators shaped Holocaust education in various ways. The emotive nature of Holocaust education gave the DHC museum educators an opportunity to shape how the learners and teachers dealt with various issues. In addition, the personal and professional identities of the DHC museum educators moulded Holocaust education, with each museum educator providing his or her own insights based on these identities. And finally, even the positions held by the museum educators influenced Holocaust education at the DHC. These factors all made up the lens through which the museum educators viewed the Holocaust and thus shaped the teaching of it.

Analysis of the data thus showed that the museum educators are indeed shaping Holocaust education, both collectively and individually. However, as a result of the structure provided both in the exhibition and educational programme, a shared vision and some educational socialisation, the DHC museum educators taught the Holocaust in a uniform way. They generally agreed on their pedagogy but varied in their choice of content. The lack of oversight and the immense liberties that they had with regard to their choice of content allowed them to choose their own ideologies and impose their own educational focus and ethos on their guiding. This in turn led to a diverse range of perspectives being offered, a situation from which Sophia felt there was much to be gained. Also, depending on the DHC museum educators' position in the organisation, their personal interests, past teaching and life experiences and pedagogy, they shaped Holocaust education in different ways and to different degrees but did not stray far from the core of the Social Holocaust focus.

### 5.5.4 The museum educators' perspectives on the DHC as a factor in shaping Holocaust education

The DHC, a museum/educational centre and the workplace of the museum educators, was viewed by them as both a place of memorial and of education, which aligned with the literature reviewed.

According to Young (1993a), museums and memorials, depending on who built them, remembered the past according to a variety of needs and even helped governments to explain the nation's own past. However, unlike in Europe, where the past was inextricably bound with Holocaust history, in South Africa the Holocaust was decontextualised which meant that a new paradigm needed to be established to make it relevant to South African learners and teachers. In general, the teachers and learners had no personal connection to Europe's traumatic Holocaust past and knew nothing about it other than by learning about it through the history books at school. Thus, in South Africa the reflection on the past was linked by the DoE to the history of apartheid and human rights abuses, as many South African families would have been aware of and experienced some aspect of this history. In turn, this was reflected in the exhibition and educational programme at the DHC and the museum educators used this aspect of the DHC to shape Holocaust education.

Another reason cited by some museum educators for the existence of the DHC was its role in responding to the Jewish injunction to never forget. Again, this tallied with the rationale for the existence of Holocaust museums around the world (Bauer, 2010; Cohn, et al., 2009; Freedman, 2009; Hirshfield, 1981; Short & Reed, 2004; Silbert & Petersen, 2007; The Historical Association, 2007). As such, the DHC as a memorial space was also used by the museum educators to shape Holocaust education.

Young (1993a) also addressed the issue of Holocaust museums as tourist attractions. However, this was not the case at the DHC where the primary focus was greatly educational and to a lesser extent memorial, although there were some inevitable tourist elements revealed in the findings. This was, however, minor in relation to the

overwhelming educational focus of the DHC with large numbers of learners and teachers, particularly Grade 9s, visited to augment their classroom education. In fact, some schools used this visit as their only confrontation with this history, as it represented a very small portion of the Grade 9 History curriculum. In doing so, the DHC as an educational institution shaped Holocaust education.

On more than one occasion, the museum educators spoke interchangeably about the role of the DHC and the purpose of Holocaust education. This phenomenon was echoed in the literature where it was found that there was a link between the structure of Holocaust buildings and their usage and content (Berger, 2003; M. Du Preez, 2008; E. T. Linenthal, 1994; Salmons, 2001). Thus it appeared that at the DHC as in other parts of the world, Holocaust museums have almost become a metaphor for Holocaust education and vice versa. The DHC museum educators agreed that one of the reasons they taught the Holocaust was so that people would not forget. However, while the buildings incorporated memorial and history, the museum itself did not foreground Jewishness and the educational programme focused primarily on the Social Holocaust.

Thus the DHC as a museum space helped the museum educators shape Holocaust education. This was not only their workplace but also a place where the structure of the exhibition reflected its educational content. Geographically far removed from the setting of its European content, the DHC reflected the local context thus providing the DHC museum educators with further shaping mechanisms.

### 5.5.5 Conclusion

The first major finding in this study was the influence of the DHC museum educators' training on their content knowledge and pedagogy, which in turn shaped Holocaust education at the DHC. Different levels of training and their personal commitment to ongoing maintenance and development of their expertise were determinants of how the museum educators shaped Holocaust education. They regarded prior teaching training as an asset and used it in their guiding but it was the

acquisition of their content knowledge that determined how the museum educators shaped Holocaust education at the DHC.

Another major finding was that the museum educators made meaning for the learners, using various techniques such as: mediation, which they did by choosing content and personalising the events of the Holocaust; moderation whereby they avoided topics or panels); facilitation; and dealing with challenges, such as issues with language and the emotive element of Holocaust education. They did this according to their individual abilities. They also made meaning for the learners and hence shaped Holocaust education simply because of who they were. Their personal and professional identities as well as how they dealt with various challenges influenced what they taught and how they taught it.

A third major finding was that the museum educators shaped Holocaust education through the educational programme. The way in which they influenced its content, such as the revision of the introduction, their selection of panels and their highlighting of the Social Holocaust in the wrap-up showed that the museum educators were shaping education at the DHC. These factors plus the lack of formal parameters for their guiding and the pedagogical freedom afforded to them enabled them shape Holocaust education according to their own interests and pedagogy albeit within a generally understood structure.

## 5.6    Why did the museum educators shape Holocaust education the way they did?

In response to research question three, The DHC museum educators shaped Holocaust education the way they did for various reasons. They did this both consciously and sub-consciously and were influenced by both internal and external factors. Individually they simply believed that they were presenting the information about the Holocaust in their own unique way and there was no intention to mould Holocaust education, and yet each museum educator imposed his or her own stamp of

individuality every time they guided, while still relying on the bigger template of Holocaust education. Thus shaping inevitably occurred.

This shaping was based on contextual and personal factors of which the museum educators were both aware and unaware. In addition, each strove to establish his or her own educational identity. As a result of these influences both the structure and focus of the educational programme have morphed over time.

One of the reasons why the museum educators shaped Holocaust education at the DHC was to match it to NCS - History Grade 9. As explained before, there is a human rights emphasis underpinning the curriculum with both the Holocaust and apartheid being taught in schools to support this goal. The museum educators in this study were conscious of this and shaped their instruction at the DHC to be in line with it. In this respect, Holocaust education was greatly shaped by "official history". Some of the accompanying teachers even mentioned that teaching about the Holocaust prior to teaching apartheid was beneficial, as the Holocaust was a step removed from apartheid, allowing greater objectivity as apartheid still resonated negatively with some of them. In addition to the distance afforded by teaching the Holocaust prior to apartheid, some of the teachers mentioned that many of the learners were bored with the topic of apartheid, having studied it in earlier grades. Apartheid and local concerns were seen as a focal point in education about the Holocaust at the DHC. However, as there are very few Jewish people in South Africa, the DHC museum educators did not overemphasise Jewishness or Jewish concerns, thus shaping Holocaust education.

Another factor influencing the shaping of Holocaust education at the DHC was the current global body of knowledge on the Holocaust and the global emphasis on genocide. Being part of a network of Holocaust museums worldwide, the DHC taught the Holocaust in line with international trends which meant that Social Holocaust education was at the fore rather than the Historical Holocaust which regarded as a vehicle to deliver a social message. Organisations such as the UN and other bodies with global influence placed an emphasis on the prevention of future genocides

through Holocaust education while organisations such as Facing History and Ourselves focused on reducing human rights abuses through their education programmes. This was the global lens through which the museum educators viewed Holocaust education and they shaped their teaching to be in line with it. There was a dominant and powerful discourse in the literature reviewed which gave the Holocaust the greatest agency. With curricula for school going learners emanating from powerful organisations such as Yad Vashem, USHMM and the ITF, organisations such as these promoted the Social Holocaust and this was reflected in the NCS – History.

Policy factors also played a part in why the museum educators shaped Holocaust education as they did. The policies of the organising body, the SAHGF (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2011a) determined the aims and focus of the educational programmes and the DHC fell in line with them. This focus is clear on the official SAHGF's website where of the three images portrayed in the header, one represents apartheid and two the Holocaust. Despite this official focus, on an individual level, the museum educators were given few if any parameters to direct their guiding and they felt free within the overall educational policies to shape Holocaust education according to their individual pedagogies and philosophies.

Yet another reason why the DHC museum educators shaped Holocaust education as they did was their desire to facilitate individual and social transformation. Driven by their passion for Holocaust education and their wish to contribute positively to society, many of them believed that they could bring about personal transformation in individual learners and on a broader canvas, societal change, particularly the prevention of genocide worldwide and the universal implementation of human rights. Typifying the museum educators' belief in their goal of creating upstanders in the face of social injustice, via Holocaust education, was Grace who claimed:

> This would probably be number one in terms of a lesson ... And the lesson is that thoughts are fabulous … but actions are what count. And the bystanders no matter how sorry you feel, but by standing there you are empowering the perpetrator, that's it!

Even the teachers supported this objective with one of them saying, "I liked the way you impressed upon us the importance of independent and critical thinking - never to be a bystander". In the South African literature, Petersen (2010, p. S28) stated that the NCS - History policy documents for Grade 9 reflected the "role of the history educator and history as an agent of change" and that people could make a difference in society if they saw themselves as "shapers of the world" (Petersen, 2011, p. 1). Freedman (2010) spoke about the inspirational, transformational effect of survivor testimony and Nates (2011) described how Holocaust education provided the platform for learners to connect the past and the present and to translate this into social activism through the choices that they made. However, the literature also generated questions about whether or not such transformation was achievable in the long term as the learners only had brief encounters with the Holocaust with Short (2005) questioning the effectiveness of the Holocaust as a tool for social transformation and concluding that only some learners gained meaningful lessons.

The findings therefore showed that the DHC museum educators shaped Holocaust education in order to teach within the bounds of the educational programme and global trends, that is, they foregrounded the Social Holocaust. They also wanted to make the Holocaust relevant in the local context so they matched their Holocaust teaching to the NCS – History Grade 9 by drawing links to the apartheid laws promulgated in South Africa. Also contributing to why they shaped Holocaust education as they did was their desire to do something good for society and therefore they hoped to bring about individual and social transformation by encouraging the learners to stand up for the rights of others.

## 5.7 So what? – The meaning of the findings and why they are important

The ultimate question then is, "So what? What do all these findings mean in the bigger picture?" The literature reviewed showed that there was very little about Holocaust education in the Third World and this study contributes to and begins to fill this knowledge gap. Another major finding of this study was that the DHC museum educators taught both the Historical Holocaust and the Social Holocaust

albeit with a mighty imbalance in favour of the latter. International trends confirmed that the focus in Holocaust education was on human rights, genocide, social injustice and so on, rather than on history or Jewishness. This discrepancy between history as a subject and history for a purpose was evident at the DHC too.

Also significant was the fact that the DHC museum educators viewed Holocaust education through their own experiential lens and shaped it as they did in order to encourage social activism in the learners. They wanted to help the learners to become aware of human rights abuses, racism and xenophobia and to stand up against these injustices. And in the greater context they wanted to help prevent future genocides, particularly on the African continent where more recent genocides had taken place, such as in Rwanda, in this respect almost Africanising Holocaust education. This made education about the Holocaust accessible to the learners who visited the Centre but in doing so almost reduced Jewish and historical matters.

Although this local emphasis reflected the knowledge focus and provided support for official history in NCS - History Grade 9 (Department of Education, 2002), it should be noted that this education took place in an unofficial environment. Nevertheless the educational programme had the power to shape learners' attitudes. It also provided uniqueness to Holocaust education in the KZN context.

The findings of this study did not show was whether or not there was any kind of follow-up of the programme once learners returned to their classrooms and further research should be undertaken in this regard. In fact, one of the areas of concern addressed by Short and Reed (2004, p. 129) was the how Holocaust education actually impacted on "adolescent's understanding of citizenship" and in South Africa, and in fact all of Africa, there has not been an examination of the effectiveness of the educational programmes on attitudinal change. Despite a multitude of educational programmes and Holocaust centres worldwide, the longer term benefits of Holocaust education for learners are unclear. Apart from one DHC museum educators' assertion that the learners' had undergone behavioural changes, no empirical evidence emerged

on this topic during the course of this study and there is room for a much larger scale study to investigate this.

This study highlighted the fact that the DHC museum educators were teaching a highly emotive and psychologically complex topic, which required all their sensitivity and understanding in addition to their factual knowledge. Analysis of the data also showed that the accompanying teachers could better prepare their learners, both mentally and emotionally, before bringing them to the DHC as the educational programme was geared for those learners who had deeper background knowledge and better language skills rather than those without this knowledge. However, once they arrived at the DHC, the learners generally benefitted from the experience and expertise of the museum educators.

One of the reasons why the findings are important is that they provide Holocaust centres in general and the DHC in particular with information about the people who work there. Through these findings, Holocaust centres in South Africa can better understand the motivations and needs of their museum educators as well as understanding more about their pedagogy, their thoughts and feelings about the work they do, the outcomes of their training and how they maintain their expertise in the field of Holocaust education. As the study showed, the training of the museum educators, or lack thereof, combined with the knowledge they brought to their guiding determined their understanding of the purpose and nature of Holocaust education and how well they were able to deal with the challenges posed by this education. This is important because it was clear that few if any parameters were perceived to be set by management. The DHC museum educators felt free to make decisions about what should be taught and how, although this was always done within the framework of the exhibition panels and a shared rigid pedagogy that was guide/facilitator-centred. It should be said that the museum educators might have been socialised themselves in such a pedagogy, for although they claimed to adhere to the spirit and intention of the NCS – History Grade 9 and they did so in relation to the content, at the same time they defeated its spirit by sticking to a pedagogy which did not allow the learners to develop their own historical skills or critical thinking. Ultimately though, it is clear

that Holocaust education at the DHC was taught by people who cared deeply about both the Holocaust and the way in which it was taught. They were passionate about their work and, in the case of the volunteers, devoted enormous amounts of their free time to educate the learners about the Holocaust. They wanted to give something back to society and therefore, through this education, they spread what they believed was a message that bettered society as a whole.

In addition the study showed that the monitoring of volunteers was as important as the selection of volunteers and staff. Meeting the needs of the museum educators ensures a happy team who will provide ongoing commitment to Holocaust education and the DHC. These findings are important because they could influence the training and support of the DHC's museum educators who are a crucial element of their education programme.

Apart from the framework provided by the exhibition and their shared pedagogy, the DHC museum educators based their guiding on the manuals as well as their own belief systems. For example, for Lee Judaism was an important aspect of how she saw herself. She spoke about being Jewish when she met the learners and therefore explained the events of the Holocaust in terms of her personal Jewish paradigm. Grace's guiding and facilitation on the other hand was influenced by her role as a parent and part of her pedagogy involved making meaning of the world in terms of good and evil. Similarly all the other museum educators had their own narratives too. This individuality was unavoidable and not undesirable and it can certainly be used as part of the forward planning of Holocaust museums/centres. It was unclear from this research whether or not the management of the DHC was aware of the individual biases of their museum educators or what these might be. In turn this knowledge could provide the planners of Holocaust education with a better idea of the kind of training required for museum educators.

The importance of this study therefore lies firstly in the fact that it contributes to a field of knowledge that has gaps. It shows the imbalance that exists between Historical Holocaust and Social Holocaust education and the reasons why this

imbalance exists. The findings also reveal that there is a gap between current knowledge and potential knowledge with regard to the long-term outcomes of Holocaust education. They highlight the complex emotive and psychological component of Holocaust education and contribute to the body of knowledge on how museum educators deal with these challenges. In addition, they reveal the tension that exists between the official curriculum and the DHC, where official history is being taught in an unofficial environment and provide guidance to teachers who in turn take what they have learned back into their classroom. In terms of knowledge about museum educators themselves, this research provides information on the pedagogy of museum educators as well as what is required to satisfy their needs, particularly as volunteers. And finally the study is important because it shows the important link to the South African context in which this European history is taught.

## 5.8 Conclusion

Thus all three research questions have been answered. In response to the first research question apropos the work and educational focus of the DHC museum educators, the findings revealed that Holocaust education was being taught according to the same basic outline and educational philosophy governing that of Holocaust education worldwide. The literature showed that Holocaust centres and museums engaged in educational programmes attached to their primary exhibitions so that learners were taught not only about the history of the Holocaust but also about the consequences of racism and bigotry in an effort to prevent future genocides. At the DHC too, museum educators taught the history and foregrounded the Social Holocaust. The themes that received the most attention at the DHC were apartheid, human rights, and genocide while antisemitism, Jewishness, identity and lesser themes such as good vs. evil were only highlighted by some of the museum educators. What was clear was that the educational focus of the DHC museum educators reflected the aims and objectives of the SAHGF and they all followed a similar pedagogy but placed their own individual stamp on it in the process. They made meaning for the learners, personalised the Holocaust and led the learners through a highly structured linear programme. As the literature showed, this was contrary to Falk and Dierking's (2000) Contextual Model

of Learning, which showed that free-choice learning offers the most effective learning environment in museums.

In response to the second research question, the museum educators shaped Holocaust education in various ways. In terms of the DHC museum educators' content knowledge, the findings showed that this was acquired during their training and subsequent personal learning and that their prior knowledge, particularly in the teaching environment, and that the lack of uniformity in training resulted in the museum educators shaping Holocaust education differently. Shaping was in many respects dependent on their content knowledge and educational philosophies. The DHC museum educators although following a strict pedagogy, were given almost complete freedom of choice when it came to content selection. Almost all of those interviewed spoke of the latitude afforded to them when it came to how to teach the Holocaust and what they chose to emphasise. They were basically allowed to do as they pleased, so long as they followed the structure of the programme. They received little direct guidance on educational matters and little communication took place either between them and management or between themselves. However, this independence provided diversity and individuality in their guiding which was commented on favourably by some of the teachers who accompanied the learners but at the same time created a sense of isolation for some of the museum educators.

Personal and pedagogical challenges are part of any organisation. Some Holocaust education challenges were universal, like finding a balance between the time available for school visits and the amount and depth of content to be covered, but others proved to be unique to the DHC, such as the issue of language. This was a very important finding. The problem lay in the local context and required a unique, local solution. Most of the visitors to the DHC from rural areas are Zulu speaking. This is a language with far fewer words available to describe the complex issues of antisemitism, stereotyping, discrimination and so on. Apart from this, the museum educators themselves were not all fluent in Zulu creating a schism between learners' understanding and the museum educators' abilities. It also meant that most of the facilitation of these schools fell on the shoulders of a single facilitator and this

advantage was lost when learners viewed the exhibition, the bulk of the tour, with a non-Zulu speaking guide. A third element of the language problem lay with museum educators who felt that their own language was too sophisticated for the learners and they battled to simplify it, leaving some learners baffled by some of the concepts.

So why did the DHC museum educators shape Holocaust education as they did? Three reasons emerged: internal, external and contextual. From a contextual perspective, the DHC museum educators shaped what they taught according to the dictates of the history curriculum and particularly its human rights focus. They did this within the confines of language, which restricted their level communication with those learners who only spoke Zulu and were therefore required to edit and contextualise the educational programme for these learners. Internal factors governing their shaping included the fact that the DHC museum educators wanted to change society. They also wanted to do something good, which they felt they were doing by encouraging the learners to become upstanders for social justice and giving back to society by passing on their expertise. Their passion for Holocaust education influenced the ongoing maintenance of their expertise, driving them to keep learning and thereby increasing their knowledge base. This in turn shaped the way they taught the Holocaust. Finally the DHC museum educators were influenced by external factors. They were part of a global body of knowledge and they stayed aligned both to this and to the aims and educational philosophy of the guiding body, the SAHGF. In an almost apparent contradiction, however, they shaped Holocaust education through their freedom of choice which came about due to the free rein they were given by the DHC with regard to their selection of content, simply being provided with the guideline that they should choose five panels to focus on during the exhibition tour. In this regard, many of the museum educators chose to emphasise apartheid issues and issues of bystander behaviour but underplayed Jewishness and history in order to contextualise their guiding. The findings showed that they did this in order to connect the learners to a European history and make it relevant to their target audience, in the process Africanising the Holocaust. This was clearly a situation unique to the South Africa.

The DHC museum educators who were part of the research were most co-operative and discussed their views freely with me resulting in rich thick data being generated in the findings. The findings revealed that the museum educators' work was regarded not only as personally worthwhile but also as an important, responsible job. This was supported by the literature. On the whole, the DHC museum educators revealed showed their humanitarian orientation with all of them wanting to improve the world. This supported the finding that the Social Holocaust is the primary educational goal of the DHC. The DHC educational programme and the DHC itself were created as a result of the Holocaust being included in the NCS - History which begs the question, what would happen to Holocaust education in South Africa if it were removed from the curriculum? Would the DHC revert to being a Jewish memorial or would it continue to be a part of the global initiative to teach the Holocaust with the goal of preventing future genocides and eliminating social problems such as xenophobia?

# CHAPTER 6

# CONCLUSIONS AND REFLECTIONS ON THE WORK OF THE DHC MUSEUM EDUCATORS

## 6.1    Focus and research questions

The focus of this study was the museum educators at the DHC. They are the driving force behind the implementation of the educational programme and as such shape Holocaust education in various ways. Although much has been written about Holocaust education itself, the work of the people who deliver the message at Holocaust centres has not been as widely researched. The research questions were therefore formulated to learn more about the work and pedagogy of the DHC museum educators in order to understand how they were shaping Holocaust education at the DHC.

Based on the interpretivist, qualitative paradigm and using open-coding to evaluate the interviews, document analysis and photo-elicitation which generated the data, the study posed three research questions: what was the work of the museum educators at the DHC and what is their educational focus in terms of Holocaust education; how were they shaping Holocaust education and why were they shaping Holocaust education in this manner?

The first research question raised the issues of how the educational programme unfolded during the course of a visit, but also the museum educators' underlying educational philosophy and pedagogy. It provided the impetus for me to learn more about how the museum educators viewed their role in Holocaust education and what they believed Holocaust education to be. It addressed the question as to why they volunteered to be a part of a team that teaches this complex, difficulty history, how they prepared academically and psychologically for this task and how they felt about the work they were doing. The answers provided insight into the pedagogy of the museum educators, the underlying principles of Holocaust education at the DHC and also about the museum educators themselves.

The second and third research questions asked how the museum educators shaped Holocaust education at the DHC and why they were shaping it in this way. They provided the focus for an investigation into the views of the museum educators on Holocaust education, and the way in which their pedagogy and individual personal philosophies and interests influenced the teaching of the Holocaust at the DHC.

## 6.2    Purpose and rationale, including the theoretical framework

The purpose of this study was to understand Holocaust education through the work, philosophy and pedagogy of the DHC museum educators. Holocaust education, as the findings showed, encompassed a broad range of topics in the views of the DHC museum educators. It ranged from education about purely historical events - the Historical Holocaust - to far more complex motivations and goals, particularly within the range of social, moral and civic responsibility - the Social Holocaust.

Another purpose for this study was to add to the general body of knowledge regarding museum educators, Holocaust education and Holocaust museum and in so doing, close some of the gaps that exist in the current literature, as highlighted in Chapter 2.

Although being Jewish meant that the Holocaust narrative was part of my personal history, it was my wish to be involved in education as well as a desire to give something back to my community that provided me with the impetus to become a museum educator. But it was my curiosity and insider knowledge in my role as a museum educator that piqued my interest in the bigger issues regarding Holocaust education and the role played by the museum educators. It seemed to me that the museum educators were doing more than simply teaching the historical events. The work they were doing went to the heart of education about social issues. Knowing that the Holocaust was being taught to all Grade 9s in South Africa in response to the NCS - History, I realised that the museum educators were teaching official history in an unofficial history environment and that their role was changing and unfolding over time. Holocaust education was increasingly evolving in mainstream education and yet

I knew that the training that was received by the museum educators did not address questions of pedagogy, the psychological impact of this subject, nor the question of human rights education. I wondered if other museum educators were also aware of these phenomena. I also wanted to know more about the educational programme and how the museum educators influenced its development. I wanted to know if they were teaching Holocaust education from a human rights perspective, as the DHC was created to support for the NCS – History with its human rights focus. I also wanted to know if they followed an established educational framework or they had any particular bias in what they taught. In short, the reason for my study was to investigate the work of the DHC museum educators within the Holocaust museum framework and at the same time to learn more about the museum educators and their pedagogy.

Turning to the available body of literature, I was able to establish two theoretical frameworks on which to base my research. As the DHC was a place of education, learning inevitably took place. Therefore the first theoretical framework was based on theories of learning; both the kinds of learning undertaken by museum educators and learners. The theory on which I based my understanding of how visitors should learn in museums was the Contextual Model of Learning (Falk & Dierking, 2000). In this model, key factors were identified as essential to visitors having a positive learning experience in museums. The dominant factors were: free choice, in which the learners chose when and how they learnt; prior knowledge of the subject (the personal context); and mediation and facilitation by museum educators (the socio-cultural context). This provided me with a foundation on which to develop the structure of my interview questions. I set out to investigate if the museum educators acted as facilitators in the museum educational programme and how they believed the learners gained their knowledge. I wanted to know what kind of educational environment underpinned the educational programme at the DHC. Also within the framework of learning was the learning undertaken by the museum educators, many of whom were volunteers. The research done by Castle (2002, 2006) and Grenier (2009) was particularly helpful in this regard. Through their research I was able to learn more about how museum educators in other museums acquired their skills, about the kinds

of training they received and how they maintained their expertise and I realised that this would be applicable to my own research. This literature also provided me with insight into how museum educators elsewhere continue to learn as part of their own-going personal and professional development. I knew that in preparation for guiding, the museum educators required training, but not having been a regular participant in guiding the schools, I wanted to investigate if the initial intensive training provided by the CTHC was still given to new museum educators and if not, what kind of training did they have to prepare them to become guides and, later, facilitators.

In contrast, the second theoretical framework arose out of the discourse surrounding Holocaust education and the rationale for teaching it in museums, particularly those in the First World. Through the literature, I became aware that tensions existed regarding the teaching of the Holocaust education in the global discourse. There was a clear distinction in the literature between Holocaust education that taught was purely for and about the history – the Historical Holocaust - and Holocaust education that existed to teach about social issues, such as choice and personal responsibility – the Social Holocaust. In fact, as the literature showed, for many educators, Holocaust education was equated with teaching the lessons of the Holocaust for a purpose; that purpose was creating upstanders for social justice and preventing further genocides. In fact, the literature clearly pointed to a preponderance of education about the Social Holocaust and thus, framing my study, was the question of whether or not this also occurred at the DHC. This distinction was borne out by Pettigrew (2010, p. 50) who wrote, "Regular readers [of the *Teaching History* journal] ... will recognise that previous contributions concerning the Holocaust have often been framed by an apparent tension between exclusively 'historical' and otherwise 'moral' and/or 'civic teaching aims". However, she believed that such a dichotomy in Holocaust discourse was not always helpful (Pettigrew, 2010) highlighting even further the controversial nature of the aims of Holocaust education today. Less obvious but equally disquieting was Finkelstein's (2003) framing of the distinction between the social and historical aspects of Holocaust education. His violent opposition to anything that he believed turned Holocaust trauma into an industry, provoked the idea in me that there was a distinction between the events of the Holocaust and the objectives envisioned by

scholars and others to achieve goals beyond the historical. However, on the whole, it seemed that most Holocaust education lay on the continuum between the Historical and Social Holocausts. Thrown into this mix, was the question of human rights education and where it lay in relation to Holocaust education.

Throughout this thesis I have endeavoured to actively engage with these theories and not treat them as either expected "add-ons" or as tubes to stare at the world of Holocaust education in a myopic manner.

## 6.3    Key findings and interpretation of results in terms of the literature

From the analysis of the data it emerged strongly that the purpose of Holocaust education at the DHC was personal transformation in the learners and social transformation in general. For the DHC museum educators, Social Holocaust education predominated over Historical Holocaust education. As noted earlier, Pettigrew (2010) and Finkelstein (2003) both alluded to the conceptual split between teaching history for sake of history teaching it with other motivations in mind. It emerged from the findings that at the DHC social concerns (moral, civic or social) primarily drove the Holocaust educational programme. Consequently the focus of the educational programme was also more on the affective than on the cognitive.

Before embarking on this programme, the goal and purpose of the educational programme needed to be defined by the management of the DHC, in collaboration with the umbrella body, the SAHGF. From the findings it was again clear that social concerns – the memorialisation and remembrance of those who died in the Holocaust; the prevention and future genocides; and the wish to create upstanders in the face of human rights violations - were reported by the museum educators as reasons for teaching the Holocaust. This was supported by the mission statement of the DHC (South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation, 2011b).

Other researchers were also embroiled in this discourse, although there were various different emphases by different researchers. Eckmann (2010), for instance,

emphasised that history and not memory should be the focus of Holocaust education while Salmons (2001, 2003) believed that an exhibition about the Holocaust could be devoted to history but at the same time address moral questions. From Short and Reed's (2004) perspective Holocaust education should be taught to prevent human rights violations, but more specifically to raise awareness about antisemitism. And Totten (2002) agreed that learning about the Holocaust would enable learners to better understand the world around them. These diverse points of view, nevertheless, all pointed to one conceptual focus – the Social Holocaust. The literature reviewed therefore supported the findings of this study that Holocaust education at the DHC was in line with the current world view and pedagogical practices where the Social Holocaust predominates over the Historical Holocaust. At the DHC, the historical events of the Holocaust provided the educational programme with a vehicle whereby education about the parallels with apartheid, xenophobia, stereotyping and genocide were able to be taught.

Another significant finding in this study related to the above was that racism rather than antisemitism was foregrounded by the DHC museum educators. It appeared that Jewish concerns were not entirely ignored, but were definitely not made the focus of the educational programme. Instead racism and apartheid, in particular, were the primary focus of the DHC museum educators' pedagogy. In order to make the Holocaust relevant to the majority of South African learners who attended the educational programme, it was linked to the local context. Together with personalisation, which was essentially a personal choice of the museum educators, this concern with locating the educational programme in a locally relevant context, was certainly supported by the literature and in particular, by the Contextual Model of Learning (Falk & Dierking, 2000). Eckmann (2010) and Maitles, et al. (2006) also proposed the idea that learners should reflect critically on their own society, which in South Africa meant a reflection on South Africa's apartheid past. This link between the laws of Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa was, in fact, a key element of the DHC museum educators' views on the purpose of Holocaust education. This was linked to the "official history" aspect of Holocaust education, where as shown above the educational programme supported the human rights emphasis in the NCS –

History of the DoE. At the same time it provided the teachers and learners with a "way in" to teaching the more emotionally complex subject of apartheid which was also taught in schools.

However, the question of human rights, which underpinned the NCS - History, also arose in relation to the findings with respect to Holocaust education at the DHC. Although I had anticipated that it would be a key focus, based not only on the fact that the DHC was created in response to the inclusion of the Holocaust in the NCS – History for Grade 9 but also because of the international emphasis through organisations such as the ITF and UN, this was not so. The findings revealed that the museum educators certainly discussed human rights in relation to the Holocaust narrative, thus teaching about human rights, and they encouraged the learners to stand up for others in the face of bullying and so on, thus teaching to some extent for human rights, they most definitely did not teach within the framework of human rights. Only one museum educator mentioned the UN Declaration of Human Rights and the museum educators were in no way trained as human rights educators. In fact, the literature posed the question as to whether or not human rights education and Holocaust education could be taught in the same educational programmes as their goal was different (Eckmann, 2010). Thus it appeared that in the same way that the Holocaust was used as a vehicle to teach about apartheid, so it was used as a vehicle to initiate discussions about the human rights abuses that occurred during the Holocaust and in society today. A key finding was therefore that a full programme of human rights education did not exist at the DHC.

Within the ambit of Holocaust education, the DHC museum educators faced various challenges: personal, professional and pedagogical. However, it was the pedagogical challenges that raised the most important issues and hence provided key information. Amongst these were the questions of language and the critical role played by emotion in teaching and learning this difficult, complex history. Language issues, which were not referred to anywhere else in the literature, arose as a huge challenge for some of the museum educators. For one museum educator, this was an immense pedagogical and professional challenge. As the primary facilitator for Zulu-speaking schools, she

used Zulu to teach the relevant concepts. However, she found that the language itself formed a barrier to communication about the Holocaust, as it did not have single words to describe some of the major Holocaust concepts and therefore required long explanations to teach a single idea. On a more personal level, a language issue arose for a museum educator who felt that she was unable to dilute her own language in order to make it understandable by the learners; her language structure and vocabulary was simply too complex.

Another key finding related to the professionalism of the museum educators, was that there were some underlying management issues that created tension within the museum educators' workspace. Underlying tensions arose with regard to the role and status of some of the facilitators, as well as issues of communication. Some museum educators complained that management was reticent in discussing their guiding performance with them, generating a feeling that they were unable to grow professionally. It also meant that they felt a measure of isolation, not being able to meet with or have educational discussions with their peers on a regular, structured basis. These issues were not prominent in the body of literature reviewed although there were some examples of institutions that did have museum educator assessments such as the USHMM (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010c).

This study also revealed that the museum educators at the DHC were given no parameters with which to guide. They relied on the layout of the exhibition as the framework for their guiding, constructed their knowledge framework based on their training and relied on their internal moral compasses to choose their pedagogical foci and as their motivations were usually socially driven, the Social Holocaust became the focus of their pedagogy.

The findings showed that the museum educators had the freedom of choice with regard to the content of their guiding, freedom of pedagogy to shape Holocaust education according to their own interests and personal philosophies and the freedom to choose whichever panels in the exhibition best suited their purposes. Hence an important finding related to how the museum educators acquired and maintained their

expertise. Analysis of the findings showed that the current training undertaken by the new museum educators was more internal, passive and object-focused than the earlier training given by the CTHC trainers. The current DHC in-house training involved the new museum educators reading the manuals provided by the SAHGF and shadowing more experienced museum educators. Shadowing was mentioned in the literature as having both good and bad attributes as this kind of learning by analogy enabled quick learning but often inaccuracies crept in (Gentner, et al. 2003 in Grenier 2009). Museum educator training did not include how visitors learn in museums (Falk & Dierking, 2000) or what the best teaching strategies were (Grenier, 2009) or even what general educational theories existed with regard to learning and teaching (Castle, 2006) so the museum educators taught what they thought was required, based on their past teaching and other experiences and on their personal self-learning. Thus their learning lay within the theoretical framework of free-choice learning being advantageous, whereas the learners did not. Their learning in turn influenced the way in which they shaped Holocaust education.

Training and the maintenance of museum educators' expertise was an important element of their work and as seen previously, the work by Castle and Grenier underpinned the theoretical framework for this study. The research at the DHC revealed that there were many synergies with the findings of Castle (2002, 2006). These included the fact that the foundations of the DHC museum educators' knowledge were based not only on their training but through their own continuing endeavours, particularly through reading, watching DVDs and by attending Holocaust education-related workshops and seminars. This self-directed learning was generally not within the field of education but tended to be more about the historical events of the Holocaust, so that they felt confident that they had all the "facts" at their fingertips. In addition the DHC museum educators expanded their knowledge and guiding expertise during the course of the guiding; as well as from other museum educators. Their understanding of Holocaust education and the growth of their expertise was organic, not linear and provided the core of their guiding proficiency. They were not totally on the DHC to provide the educational framework for their guiding, relying in many cases on their own resources, improving themselves through

self-directed learning. This in no way altered the prominence of the Social Holocaust or their pedagogy employed. Underlying factors determining the way in which the museum educators framed their pedagogy, included the fact that many were socialised in South Africa and thus were part of a "teacher-tell" system. In fact, the younger museum educators were more willing than older museum educators to break away from this way of teaching, as was described in Chapter 4. These findings contributed to answering the second research question.

One of the most significant findings in this study was the fact that the DHC museum educators made meaning for the learners rather than letting them draw their own conclusions and this finding also contributed to answering the second research question. Contrary to the Contextual Model of Learning's best practices advice, the learners who visited the DHC did not experience free-choice learning, which according to the theoretical framework provided the best learning experience for visitors to museums. Counter to the ideology of Outcomes Based Education, which the DHC supports in many other ways, for instance, support of the human rights focus and content of the NCS – History, it did not support the pedagogy. At the DHC, the museum educators facilitated almost all the learning for the teachers and learners through mediation, moderation, directed guiding, personalisation and through their affective presentation. This facilitation was based on their personal abilities, interests and pedagogy. Facilitated learning is certainly one of the key factors proposed by Falk and Dierking (2000) for effective museum learning but the extent of that facilitation and the limited amount of free-choice exercised by the visitors, enabled by the museum educators seems to be most important. This was not learning undertaken by choice as the learners were part of school outings, arranged by their schools. In addition, facilitation by the museum educators left little or no time for independent learning.

To recap, the findings answered the research questions and can be summarised as follows. The work of the DHC museum educators was shown to have two parts to it. Firstly, the museum educators outline their educational duties with respect to each school's visit. The tour began with an introductory session with a facilitator, watching

a DVD, the tour through the exhibition with a guide and the wrap-up session, after which the learners and teachers gave feedback to the DHC via post-visit evaluation forms. The second aspect of the work of the museum educators was their pedagogy. Various factors emerged to reveal their educational focus. The museum educators selected the content for the learners and personalised the Holocaust according to their own interests and philosophies.

Drawing the findings together, the museum educators views on Holocaust education emerged. The first major finding in this regard was that the DHC museum educators foregrounded the Social Holocaust over the Historical Holocaust. Whilst the history and events of the Holocaust were deemed to be important and were taught, this was nevertheless done as the foundation for a social goal that was generally understood but not made explicit by the management. As in Holocaust museums around the world, the Holocaust was being used at the DHC as a case study to show the learners the dangers of stereotyping and discrimination and to draw attention to the importance of standing up against human rights abuses in society. The ultimate aim of this education was to prevent future genocides around the world. The findings showed that despite the emphasis in the NCS – History on human rights and the creation of the DHC to support this curriculum, human rights was not the focus of the DHC museum educators' pedagogy; nor was antisemitism or Jewishness. One of the main themes adopted by the museum educators was genocide and another was apartheid. Almost all the museum educators discussed the parallels that existed between the racist laws that underpinned both Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa in order to make the Holocaust relevant to a South African audience that was far removed from the location and events of the Holocaust.

The second major finding was that the challenges that arose in Holocaust education at the DHC did so as a result of it being taught in an African context. Language proved to be a huge challenge for some of the museum educators and was clearly a headache for the management. In addition, learners had to travel long distances to reach the DHC and many had no knowledge of Jews at all. Hence to make the teaching relevant to these learners, parallels were drawn to enable them to empathise with the victims

of the Holocaust and make their decisions and choices more relevant to the learners' daily lives.

Another major finding was that the museum educators made meaning for the learners. Despite the inclusion of the Holocaust in an Outcomes Based Education system, the pedagogy of that system was ignored. The learners were not encouraged to come to their own conclusions regarding what they were experiencing at the DHC. With the education being museum educator rather than learner directed, the content was delivered by the museum educators in a highly structured learning environment. The DHC museum educators mediated and moderated the material. They protected the learners from the emotional impact of disturbing material as best they could and they interpreted the panels for them. They did this based on their own pedagogy, training and interests and led them to a definitive goal, which was the creation of upstanders in the face of social injustice. The learners were shown that the lessons of the Holocaust suggested that people should stand up in society for those who suffer human rights abuses, be it bullying or xenophobia. Thus the findings showed that a free-choice learning model was not adopted at the DHC.

And finally, the findings showed that the museum educators' training differed depending on when the training was done. Their learning was, in general, organic, self-driven and provided the basis for their pedagogy.

## 6.4    Evaluation and implication of the findings

According to Myers (2000), "The ultimate aim of qualitative research is to offer a perspective of a situation". Using qualitative research techniques, I was able, through analysis of this data, to offer my own perspective on Holocaust education as it was practised by the museum educators at the DHC. I was able to show how they foregrounded Social Holocaust concerns, how their training influenced their ability to shape Holocaust education, what their pedagogy was and where synergies and differences existed in relation to the body of literature reviewed.

In many respects this study acted as a confirmation of current theories about Holocaust education. For instance, the purpose of Holocaust education at Holocaust museums and the fundamental description of many museum educators tallied with current research findings in other studies. Moreover, as the findings showed, my study revealed that the educational philosophy of the DHC and the museum educators ran parallel to that in Holocaust museums in many parts of the world – the USA, UK, Australia, Japan, and European countries. From the one-on-one interviews conducted in this research and analysis of the teachers' post-visit evaluations and the photo-elicitation portion of the interviews, it was evident that the DHC museum educators taught the Historical Holocaust but foregrounded the Social Holocaust, in line with Holocaust education practices globally. Analysis of the data showed that the goal of Holocaust education at the DHC was more than simply teaching about the events of the Holocaust as history. The Holocaust was primarily used as a case study to make the learners aware of issues of apartheid and its consequences and racism that included xenophobic reactions that ignited violence and bullying. However, other common Social Holocaust global themes were discussed by the DHC museum educators too, such as antisemitism and how to prevent future genocides and human rights abuses, by making the learners and teachers aware of the consequences of their and others' choices and behaviour.

A tension existed in the methodology with regard to how the Holocaust was taught. In some respects, the DHC was out of sync with other Holocaust museums/educational centred elsewhere in the world, such as at The Holocaust Centre Beth Shalom, where learners were encouraged to undertake free-choice, self-directed learning and few standardized tours were provided (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2010a). In contrast, at the DHC, learners were restricted in what they were able to do. They had little or no opportunity to draw to their own conclusions about what they were seeing, undertake self-study or assess the programme objectively as the educational programme at the DHC was highly structured, museum-educator driven and highly visual, affective in its approach. This resulted in high levels of emotion being experienced during the tour by some learners and teachers and critical assessment being suspended.

New findings in this study were mostly related to the African context in which Holocaust education at the DHC took place. One of these findings related to how language issues affected the quality of teaching by the museum educators. They were described as a challenge by the museum educators at the DHC, but the implication of this finding extends beyond the borders of the DHC and to the greater community of Holocaust museums in South Africa.

The challenge of language raised the question of how and why this history is relevant to the vast majority of South African learners who have absolutely no connection to it. However, using the message embedded in this history, the findings showed that it can be made relevant to a South African audience, particularly as it has been included in the NCS – History. Despite being able to ascertain its relevance, the question of the medium of instruction remained problematic. The learners from rural schools in both KZN and the Easter Cape were faced on their visits to the DHC with concepts such as antisemitism, stereotyping and discrimination that had no simple equivalent in their native mother tongue. According as the one Zulu-speaking museum educator, explaining these concepts in Zulu was difficult enough, but she explained that she needed to construct many sentences in Zulu in order to teach the corresponding single English word. For English-speaking museum educators, in addition to trying to communicate foreign concepts, they were unable to communicate with their learners in their mother tongue. Trying to explain complex, emotional ideas and vast amounts of material in a foreign language proved to be a huge challenge to both for the individual museum educators and the organisers at the DHC. One of the strategies employed by the DHC to overcome this problem was to employ a full-time facilitator who was fluent in Zulu. The accompanying teachers were sometimes used as interpreters but this slowed the entire process of guiding, which already operated within strict time constraints. This is an area of research that definitely requires further research. This problem was not evident in Europe, the UK or USA but further investigation into how language affects instruction in other countries such as Japan and South America, where the events of the Holocaust did not take place and the primary language was not English, but where the Holocaust is taught could be undertaken to better understand the impact of indigenous languages on Holocaust

education and how Holocaust education is shaped within the local context by regional factors.

Another implication arising from this study concerned the museum educators themselves. In this area, information was gained that I could not find in the literature that I reviewed. There were some parallels between the research and this study such as the characteristics of people who became Holocaust museum educators, their needs, motivations and so on. But this study adds to the available knowledge and additionally shows more particularly how they shaped Holocaust education at the DHC through their own insights, perceptions and feelings. The findings in this study with regard to the impact of the museum educators' personal circumstances, their professional needs and their pedagogical challenges all generated new information. It was shown that on a personal level, the museum educators were introspective in their role as Holocaust museum educators. They considered their performance levels, the impact of their guiding on the learners, their own levels of Holocaust knowledge and their interpersonal relationships. The museum educators reiterated that they wanted to have greater connectedness both with the DHC and with their peers and it was revealed that not having a platform on which to air their views resulted in covert rumblings, rather than overt constructive discussions. On a professional level, the findings showed that the DHC museum educators were given complete freedom of choice with respect to their guiding decisions. They were free to choose the focus of their presentations as well as the content. This applied to both the facilitators and guides and resulted in each museum educator providing a unique presentation. This was not a bad situation, for as one museum educator noted, it gave the visitors a greater variety of opinions so if they visited on more than one occasion, there was something different to look forward to. However, the museum educators felt that they could have been given greater levels of performance assessment and professional support.

A further finding related to the museum educators showed that much of their ongoing learning relied on their own endeavours. There was synergy in this with Castle's (2006) study that showed a more concerted approach should be taken by museums to

develop their educators' knowledge and pedagogy and in her opinion, they should not to simply be used to fulfil the institution's mission. In addition, interpersonal relationships that existed between the DHC museum educators, particularly the volunteers, relied on them making their own connections with few meetings or other means of ongoing communication with other museum educators and only intermittent top-training sessions or educational seminars being provided. These findings have implications for training and management at the DHC as well as for the educational programme itself. They provide not only an examination of the focus of the educational programme but also of the needs of the museum educators. Future decisions at management level could be taken regarding the pedagogy of the museum educators, such as the weight received by the historical relative to the social aspects of the educational programme. These decisions could be made with more clarity if based on academic research. With regard the maintenance of a happy, cohesive team, various changes could be implemented such as more regular meetings, a greater flow of information between management and volunteers via a newsletter and a platform for museum educators to air their opinions could be created.

In evaluating the findings, answers to the question of how the museum educators shaped Holocaust education, were provided by an analysis of the data and in so doing answered the second research question. It showed how the museum educators selected the content for their guiding. The specific focus adopted by various museum educators at the DHC, pointed to the fact that there was a freedom and power underlying their choices. They shaped Holocaust education according to their own ideologies but within a generally understood framework which defined the goals of Holocaust education. A common educational focus adopted by the DHC museum educators was apartheid and its relation to the laws promulgated by the Nazis to create divisions between people on every possible level, for the good of the ruling regime. The findings were revealed that an imbalance that exists in education at the DHC between education about the Historical and Social Holocausts. Although this dichotomy was aligned to literature worldwide, this study verified that Holocaust education at the DHC is skewed in favour of a social objective.

In conclusion, these findings provided greater insight and information into the work of the DHC museum educators and how they were shaping Holocaust education and contributes to the body of knowledge on Holocaust education. Analysis of the data showed how the Holocaust was taught within the South African and particularly the KZN context where the museum educators have to deal with very specific problems. For example, they have had to find their way through, the maelstrom of language. This study provided some initial insight into the way that the DHC museum educators deal with the challenges of language, the vast distances needed to be covered by visiting schools and dealing with South Africa's own history of racism and discrimination.. In fact, very little has been written about Holocaust education in the Third World and this study begins to fill this knowledge gap.

The findings also filled a knowledge gap about Holocaust museum educators. Because Holocaust museums are mushrooming around the world to educate people in the field of human rights and genocide prevention, more needs to be learnt about them. In some countries, Holocaust education is part of the school curricula and thus a relationship exists between national goals and the aims of Holocaust museums. This certainly applies to South Africa and the UK. However, gaps remain in the research on the museums themselves: that is, how they function, the role of their educators, their pedagogy and the efficacy of the museums' educational programmes.

Finally, this research provided new knowledge on the pedagogy of Holocaust museum educators. The work of the museum educators was fundamental to this study and pointed to the ways in which the museum educators are shaping Holocaust education at the DHC. The DHC sought educational autonomy. In achieving this freedom, the DHC moulded its educational programme and hence Holocaust education, according to its own and local needs. It also gave a great deal of freedom of choice to its museum educators. Through this independence, the museum educators at the DHC were able to choose both the content and emphasis of their tours. In this way, the study showed, the DHC museum educators brought their own "flavour" to their work. This is new knowledge.

## 6.5     Evaluation of the methodology

My use of case study methodology was appropriate for a study of a bounded case like the DHC. It enabled me, as a first time researcher, to limit the scope of my investigation to a single case and to pull the threads of this particular setting apart, teasing out the data embedded there. All the participants were readily available and their educational focus was within the bounds of the DHC itself. The learners and teachers on the most part came to the DHC and the museum educators, with only a few of the facilitators moving out of the physical bounds of the museum to teach at teacher workshops in other parts of South Africa.

As I chose to conduct my research from a qualitative, interpretive ontological position, the one-on-one interviews with the museum educators, the foundation of my data, proved to be an appropriate and effective research tool. The interviews provided me with rich, thick data that gave me clarity and insight into both the thoughts and feelings of my participants regarding their participation in the DHC educational programme and about Holocaust education itself. As a museum educator myself, my position as an insider provided me with a valuable perspective on the work, training and philosophy of the DHC museum educators. However, I was also an outsider in this process, being the researcher, and I was conscious during the interviews of the balance that needed to be maintained between these two roles.

In addition to the one-on-one interviews, I also used a document analysis of the teachers' post-visit evaluations to triangulate and validate my findings. The use of photo-elicitation techniques and the document analysis verified the information obtained from the one-on-one interviews. The document, in addition to the insight I gained about the teachers' perspectives, also provided me with a window into the views of their learners.

Photo-elicitation added an interesting dimension to my study. I believe that it could have yielded even greater results but as it was done right at the end of the one-on-one interviews, the process was inevitably truncated. At this point, both the participant

and I were quite tired and had spoke for a long period of time. However, I still found the findings valuable and they supported what the museum educators had said previously, thereby triangulating my findings. I believe that more research can also be undertaken with regard to photo-elicitation in interviews. There is a gap in the available knowledge on how the use of photographs in Holocaust education can be used to trigger both thoughts and feelings and thus this study contributes to this relatively new field of study. Further research using this portion of the interviews can still be undertaken to establish how the photographs contributed to the museum educators' responses. The museum educators' views on the contribution made by the photographs would also provide valuable information.

One of the most valuable tools that I had as a qualitative researcher was the software programmes that I obtained from the UKZN online software library, that is, Nvivo and EndNote®. I found both to be invaluable. EndNote® enabled me to easily build a body of citations, both manually and by importing citations from online databases. I simultaneously created my bibliography, which was correctly formatted according the APA 5$^{th}$ convention required by UKZN. Nvivo on the other hand, provided me with a superb method of handling the very large amount of data generated by the one-on-one interviews, documents and photo-elicitation in a logical, constructive way. Being able to visualise the categories provided me with a means of ordering not only the material but also my thoughts. Even the conceptual and theoretical frameworks were given structure and form through the use of the modelling tools available in Nvivo. I would recommend this programme as a tool for qualitative research to any prospective researcher but with the added advice that it should be used from the outset of the coding process, as I did, in order to prevent future duplication. There are other qualitative research programmes available, such as MAXQDA. For me, the advantage of using Nvivo was that it was provided free of charge by UKZN as their software package of choice and thus provided technical support if it was required. In addition I found the self-learning tutorials to be very easy and intuitive. However, Kuş Saillard (2011) believes that MAXQDA provides better support for interpretive data.

Although I found that my research design was, in general, successful, there were design flaws that were evident at the end of the research process. These related particularly to the interviews. As a novice researcher, my questions might have been lacking in some respects. For example, the findings showed that during the one-on-one interviews, the museum educators spent less time discussing their methodology and more time on their educational philosophy and objectives. This might have been due to the fact that the latter were the focus of the questions directed to them and the museum educators were not asked specifically about their methodology; in other words, better questioning techniques might have better directed their thinking, generating richer results. Another instance of this was that the museum educators could have been questioned more directly about their understanding of how people learn in museums or what the current best practices are. However, although these could have been included as specific questions, in this instance, many of the answers were revealed through our discussions anyway.

Another possible addition to the design could have been a focus group as this might have given me greater insight into the volunteers and less experienced museum educators. All six of the participants were experienced museum educators and four of these had done the initial intensive CTHC training. To gain a broader perspective, I could have included less experienced, newer museum educators too. I chose experienced museum educators as I believed they knew the most about Holocaust education and would hence provide me with the richest data, but new museum educators would have given me a slightly different perspective as well as greater insight into the current training methods at the DHC.

## 6.6    Limitations of the study

Any study is burdened by limitations, particularly if the researcher is a novice, as I was, as it meant that everything that I undertook was done without prior experience or knowledge.

One of the limitations of this case study was that I only used a small sample and therefore it might not have been representative of the larger body of museum educators. Using only six participants who were interviewed for an hour each could have been seen as a limitation. However, I believe that I gleaned large amount of rich data from these interviews and within the limited time-frame of a masters' degree, including more participants would have been prohibitive. I also believe that my sample was, in fact, representative of the DHC museum educators, for, as Amin and Ramrathan (2010) pointed out, small samples are in fact necessary to provide rich, thick data. The use of larger samples, according to them, makes it is more difficult to gain in-depth knowledge. However, it should be noted that because of this small sample and the fact that this study was specific to the DHC, the findings could not be generalised. In addition it was conducted over a very short period of time with each museum educator having been interviewed for approximately one hour and with no follow-up assessments.

Another limitation of this study was that Holocaust education was only examined through the eyes of the museum educators. There was, nevertheless, a glimpse of other perspectives. The teachers' views were evident from the post-visit evaluation documents and their comments also provided some insight, albeit limited, into the learners' views. Of course the museum educators were the focus and purpose of this case study, but a one-sided view does not provide a global perspective of a phenomenon and hence there is scope for further investigation into Holocaust education from both the teachers' and learners' points of view.

What is missing are the longer term questions relating to the outcome of the educational programme, such as, what do the learners feel about the Holocaust a month or a year after visiting the DHC? Did it in any way change their attitudes to genocide or human rights abuses? Questions were raised in the literature about attitudinal change and whether or not teaching about the Holocaust could really prevent genocide with Annan (2010) advising that in order to achieve this end, educators would need to be better trained. One of the limitations of this study was that while it addressed the work of the DHC museum educators, the longer term

impact of this teaching did not form part of this study and there is room for this study to be done in this regard. As the literature showed, attitudinal change was indeed possible (Cowan & Maitles, 2007). Other researchers questioned whether learning about what others' suffered would indeed translate into desirable behaviour (Ehmann, 2001) and yet others did not believe that there would be grand outcomes of Holocaust education (Clements, 2006). Thus in order to verify the longer term effects of the visits on the learners to Holocaust educational centres, a follow-up evaluation after a few weeks and then say again a year later, to assess the impact of the tour is recommended.

My own standing as an insider could be regarded as a limitation too. As a museum educator myself, although I tried to be as objective as possible, my own experiences might have coloured the way in which I interpreted the answers of participants. Indeed the findings are an interpretation of the data through my own experiential lens. My position as an insider might also have influenced the amount of information that was given to me by the participants.

I only became aware of during the course of my analysis that the participants in this study were only drawn from the group of museum educators who had been trained either by the CHTC trainers or who had a combination of in-house and external training. The newest museum educators, who only had in-house training, were omitted from my sample and ideally I should have included one or two of these individuals in order to gain the perspective of a novice museum educators' pedagogy. Ideally I would also like to have included the only survivor museum educator, as her voice would have added to the body of information gathered on Holocaust education at the DHC.

## 6.7    Conclusion

The work of the museum educators at the DHC provides insight into their personal motivations for guiding, training and ongoing development of their expertise as well as their educational pedagogy and philosophy. Through their words, their pedagogy

and educational philosophy and how it shaped Holocaust education at the DHC was revealed. The study encompassed two journeys, that of the museum educators in their work and also a parallel, metaphorical journey through the data which revealed the way in which the museum educators shaped Holocaust education at the DHC. Based on two theoretical frameworks, learning in museums and the focus of educational programmes, the study revealed how museum educators learned, the best practices for learner education and the strong Social Holocaust education message that was foregrounded by the museum educators. However, overriding all considerations was the passion for Holocaust education that was revealed by the DHC museum educators who participated in this study.

# Bibliography

Alba, A. (2005). Integrity and relevance: shaping Holocaust memory at the Sydney Jewish Museum. [Article]. *Judaism, 54*(1/2), 108.

Amcha. (2010). About Us/Amcha's Mission.   Retrieved 18 June 2010, from http://www.amcha.org/aboutus/IntroductionEN.asp

Amin, N., & Ramrathan, L. (2010). Naturalistic, ethnographic and case study research. Unpublished Lecture - Research methodologies in education.

Andrews, K. (2011). Teaching and learning about the Holocaust, . Durban.

Annan, K. (2010). The myth of 'never again'. *Opinion*  Retrieved 20 June, 2010, from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/18/opinion/18iht-edannan.html?_r=1

Asmal, K. (2002). Asmal: South African Jewish Board of Deputies, *Address by the minister of education, Professor Kader Asmal, MP, to the South African Jewish Board of Deputies*: Ministry of Education.

Astourian, S. (1990). The Armenian Genocide: an interpretation. *The History Teacher, 23*(2), 111-160.

Bauer, Y. (2009). The unprecedentedness of the Holocaust. Unpublished Lecture, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem. Yad Vashem.

Bauer, Y. (2010, 3 May 2010). *Teaching about the Holocaust is crucial says leading scholar.* Paper presented at the Holocaust Memorial Day, Institute of Education, University of London.

Baum, N. L., Rotter, B., & Reidler, E. (2009). Building resilience for Holocaust educators. *Prism: an interdisciplinary journal for Holocaust educators, 1*(1), 81-88.

BBC News. (2010). Q&A: Sudan's Darfur conflict.   Retrieved 1 January 2012, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/africa/3496731.stm

Beer, L. (2009, October). Preserving their memories: survivor testimony over the years. *Yad Vashem Jerusalem, Volume 55*.

Berger, J. (2003). Review essay: teaching history, teaching tolerance. Holocaust education in Houston. *The Public Historian, 25*(4), 125-131.

Berman, J. E. (2001). Holocaust museums in Australia: The impact of Holocaust denial and the role of the survivors. [Article]. *Journal of Holocaust Education, 10*(1), 67.

Bourguignon, E. (2005). Bringing the past into the Present: Family Narratives of Holocaust, Exile, and Diaspora: Memory in an Amnesic World: Holocaust, Exile, and the Return of the Suppressed. *Anthropological Quarterly, 78*(1), 63-88.

Boyd, W. L. (1999). Museums as Centers of Controversy. *Daedalus, 128*(3), 185-228.

Bremner, L. J. (2007). Memory, nation-building and the post-apartheid city. In N. Murray, N. Shepherd & M. Hall (Eds.), *Desire lines: space, memory and identity in the post-apartheid city*: Routledge.

Cape Town Holocaust Centre. (1999). Cape Town Holocaust Centre Opens. In C. T. H. Centre (Ed.): Cape Town Holocaust Centre,.

Castle, M. C. (2002). Teaching History in Museums. *Ontario History, 94*(1).

Castle, M. C. (2006). Blending Pedagogy and Content: A New Curriculum for Museum Teachers. *Journal of Museum Education, 31*(2), 123-132.

Claims Conference. (2012). Artworks and Other Cultural Property Restitution and Compensation : Descriptive Catalogue of Looted Judaica.   Retrieved 25 March 2012, from http://forms.claimscon.org/Judaica/southafrica.pdf and http://forms.claimscon.org/Judaica/

Clark, D. (2007). Sites of memory or aids to multiculturalism? Conflicting uses of Jewish heritage sites. *Sociological Research Online, 12*(2). Retrieved from http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/2/clark.html

Clements, J. (2006). *A Very Neutral Voice: Teaching about the Holocaust*.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.): Routledge.

Cohn, S. N., Ali, S., & Horne, E. (2009). Holocaust educational practices, reviews and recommendations. from http://education.ucf.edu/holocaust/docs/HolocaustEducationalPracticesCohn.pdf

Cole, T. (2002). Review: Representing the Holocaust in America: Mixed Motives or Abuse? *The Public Historian, 24*(4), 127-131.

Cowan, P., & Maitles, H. (2007). Does addressing prejudice and discrimination through Holocaust education produce better citizens? [Article]. *Educational Review, 59*(2), 115-130.

Crane, S. A. (1997). Memory, Distortion, and History in the Museum. *History and Theory, 36*(4), 44-63.

Crespi, I. (1964). Public Reaction to the Eichmann Trial. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 28*(1), 91-103.

Cresswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing amoung five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Vos, A. S., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. B., & Delport, C. S. L. (2005). *Research at Grass Roots - For the social sciences and human service professions* (3rd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Department of Education. (2002). *Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R-9 (Schools) Social Sciences*. Retrieved from http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=QmptPBvaVUE%3d&tabid=266&mid=720.

Department of Education. (2003). National Curriculum Statement Grades 10 – 12 (General) History.   Retrieved 13 September 2011, from http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=KU%2fEDBh6z6Y%3d&tabid=246&mid=594

Department of Education. (2008). National Curriculum Statement Grades 10-12 - History- Learning programme guidelines Retrieved 15 April 2010, from http://www.education.gov.za/curriculum/LPGs2007/LPG%20HISTORY.pdf

Du Preez, J. (2011). Wuzu. Durban: Jenny du Preez.

Du Preez, M. (Ed.). (2008). *A Place of Memory A Place of Learning, The first ten years of the Cape Town Holocaust Centre*: Hands-on Media.

Durban Holocaust Centre. (2009). Durban Holocaust Centre March 2008 - 2009, The First Year. In D. H. Centre (Ed.).

Durban Holocaust Centre. (2010). Newsletter October 2010: Durban Holocaust Centre.

Durst, N. (2010). Holocaust survivors and trauma. Unpublished Lecture.

Eckmann, M. (2010). Exploring the Relevance of Holocaust Education for Human Rights Education. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education, 40*(1), 7-16.

Ehmann, A. (2001). Learning from history: Seminars on the Nazi era and the Holocaust for professionals. In J. K. Roth & E. Maxwell (Eds.), *Remembering for the future: the Holocaust in an age of genocides* (Vol. 3, pp. 2256). Hampshire: Palgrave McMillan.

Elon, A. (2003). *The Pity of It All: A Portrait of the German-Jewish Epoch, 1743-1933*: Picador.

Ethekwini Municipality. (2011). Museums. Durban: Ethekwini Municipality.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2010a). Discover the Past for the Future: A study on the role of historical sites and museums in Holocaust education and human rights education in the EU - Main Results Report January 2010.   Retrieved 13 November 2011, from http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/FRA-2011-Holocaust-Education-Main-report_EN.pdf

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2010b). Excursion to the past – teaching for the future: Handbook for teachers Available from http://www.fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/Handbook-teachers-holocaust-education_EN.pdf

Facing History and Ourselves. (2010). About Us.   Retrieved 18 August, 2010, from http://www.facing.org/aboutus

Falk, J. (1999). Museums as Institutions for Personal Learning. *Daedalus, 128*(3), 259-275.

Falk, J., & Dierking, L. (2000). *Learning from Museums: Visitor experiences and the making of meaning*: AltaMira Press.

Feldman, E. B. (1983). Objects and Images, Museums and Schools: Using Them to Teach. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 17*(3), 39-52.

Finkelstein, N. G. (2003). *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the exploitation of Jewish suffering* (2nd ed.): Verso Books.

Fowler, J. (2004). *Education about the Holocaust: how does it help build a better world?* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Holocaust Organisations. Retrieved from http://www.holocaust-trc.org/edu_holocaust.htm

Frankl, V. (2004). *Man's search for meaning: the classic tribute to hope from the Holocaust*: Rider.

Freedman, R. (2009). Teaching the Holocaust to non-traditional audiences: the South African experience. *Canadian Diversity, 7:2*(Summer 2009).

Freedman, R. (2010). Opening of the exhibition: Surviving History - Survivors of Vina. Durban.

Freeman, M. (1995). Genocide, Civilization and Modernity. *The British Journal of Sociology, 46*(2), 207-223.

Geschier, S. M. M. A. (2005). Beyond experience: the mediation of traumatic memories in South African history museums. *Transformation: An International Journal of Holistic Mission Studies*(59), 45-65.

Geschier, S. M. M. A. (2006). Narrating the Holocaust to younger generations: memory and postmemory in the Cape Town Holocaust Centre. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 6*(January).

Gilbert, M. (1987). *The Holocaust: a history of the Jews of Europe during the Second World War*: H. Holt.

Gosling, M. (2011, 14 January, 2011). Chief Rabbi slams anti-Tutu petition. *Independent Online (IOL)*. Retrieved from http://www.tios.co.za/chief-rabbi-slams-anti-tutu-petition-1.1012103

Grenier, R. S. (2009). The Role of Learning in the Development of Expertise in Museum Docents. [Feature]. *Adult Education Quarterly, 59*(2), 142-157.

Groenewald, T. (2004). A Phenomenological Research Design Illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods April 2004 3*(1).

Gurewitsch, B. (2009). The Holocaust museum as an extension of the classroom. *Prism: an interdisciplinary journal for Holocaust educators, 1*(1), 64-69.

Harff, B. (2003). No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955. *The American Political Science Review, 97*(1), 57-73.

Harper, D. (2002). Talking about pictures: a case for photo elicitation. [Article]. *Visual Studies, 17*(1), 13-26.

Harris, N. (1995). Museums and Controversy: Some Introductory Reflections. *The Journal of American History, 82*(3), 1102-1110.

Harwood, A. M., & Hahn, C. L. (1990). *Controversial issues in the classroom*.

Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W., & Smit, B. (2004). *Finding your way in qualitative research*: Van Schaik

Hersch, D., Reuben, J., & Joffe, H. (2011). Petition calling for the termination and/or resignation of Archbishop Tutu as a Patron of the Cape Town Holocaust Centre and the Johannesburg Holocaust and Genocide Centre., from www.petitionsite.com

Hirshfield, C. (1981). Teaching the Holocaust: A Conceptual Model. *Improving College and University Teaching, 29*(1), 24-27.

Holocaust Education Development Programme. (2009). *Teaching About the Holocaust in English Secondary Schools*.

Holocaust Education Development Programme. (2010). Why teach about the Holocaust?   Retrieved 31 May 2010, from http://www.hedp.org.uk/_files/Documents/why_teach_about_the_holocaust.pdf

Holocaust Memorial Center Zekelman Family Campus. (2010). About the previous location of the HMC.   Retrieved 31 May 2010, from http://www.holocaustcenter.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=62&Itemid=10014

Human Sciences Research Council and the High Commission of the United Kingdom. (2008). *Violence and Xenophobia in South Africa: Developing Consensus, Moving to Action*.

Imber, S. (2009). The educational philosophy of the International School for Holocaust Studies. Unpublished Lecture. Yad Vashem.

Imboden, K., & Hopeck, P. (2008). Never Again: Memory and Action in a Holocaust Museum. [Article]. *Conference Papers - National Communication Association*, 1.

Kamen, D., & Mndende, L. (2011). Petition in defence of Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu.   Retrieved 16 January, 2011, from http://www.thepetitionsite.com/1/defend-tutu/

Kaniki, A. (1999). Doing an information search. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in practice: applied methods for the social sciences*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Keet, A., & Carrim, N. (2005). Infusing Human Rights into the Curriculum: The Case of the South African Revised National Curriculum Statement. *Perspectives in Education, 23*(2), 99-110.

Kelly, K. (1999). Hermeneutics in action: empathy and interpretation in qualitative research. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in practice : applied methods for the social sciences* (1st ed.): University of Cape Town Press.

Kelly, K., & Terre Blanche, M. (1999). Interpretive methods. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in practice : applied methods for the social sciences* (1st ed.): University of Cape Town Press.

Kuş Saillard, E. (2011). Systematic Versus Interpretive Analysis with Two CAQDAS Packages: NVivo and MAXQDA. [Grounded theory methodology;

CAQDAS; NVivo; MAXQDA]. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 12*(1 (34)).

Kushner, T. (2001). Oral History at the Extremes of Human Experience: Holocaust Testimony in a Museum Setting. *Oral History, 29*(2), 83-94.

Levine, K. (2008). *Hana's suitcase*. Cape Town: New Africa Education.

Linenthal, E. (2001). *Preserving memory: the struggle to create America's Holocaust Museum*: Columbia University Press.

Linenthal, E. T. (1994). The Boundaries of Memory: The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *American Quarterly, 46*(3), 406-433.

Loeffler, T. A. (2005). Looking Deeply In: Using Photo-Elicitation to Explore the Meanings of Outdoor Education Experiences. [Article]. *Journal of Experiential Education, 27*(3), 343-346.

Maitles, H., Cowan, P., & Butler, E. (2006). *Never Again! Does Holocaust Education Have an Effect on Pupils' Citizenship Values and Attitudes?*

Maree, K., & Pietersen, J. (2007). Sampling. In K. Maree (Ed.), *First steps in research*: Van Schaik.

Melson, R. (1996). Paradigms of Genocide: The Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide, and Contemporary Mass Destructions. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 548*, 156-168.

Merriam, S. (2010). Qualitative Research and Data Analysis (Workshop at University of KwaZulu Natal ed.). Durban.

Min Fui Chee. (2006). Training teachers for the effective use of museums. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 6*.

Monteath, P. (1994). Buchenwald Revisited: Rewriting the History of a Concentration Camp. *The International History Review, 16*(2), 267-283.

Musser, C. (2008). Preserving Memory: national Holocaust memorial museum controversy. Retrieved 5 January, 2011, from http://www.suite101.com/content/preserving-memory-a75809

Myers, M. (2000). Qualitative research and the generalizability question: Standing firm with Proteus. *The Qualitative Report, Volume 4 (3/4)* from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR4-1/myers.html

Naidoo, S. (2010). Holocaust museum in Durban from http://www.timeslive.co.za/sundaytimes/article87531.ece

Nates, T. (2010). 'But, apartheid was also genocide … What about our suffering?' Teaching the Holocaust in South Africa - opportunities and challenges [Lecture]. *Intercultural Education, 21*(1), 17-26.

Nates, T. (2011). Holocaust Education in South Africa. *Holocaust and the United Nations - Discussion Paper Series* Retrieved 5 August 2011, from http://www.un.org/en/holocaustremembrance/docs/paper12.shtml

Nelson, E. (Writer). (2009). Hitler's Hidden Holocaust. In Creative Difference Productions for National Geographic Channel, E. Nelson, D. Harding, P. Hankoff & G. Hodge (Producer).

Neuman, W. L., & Kreuger, L. (2003). *Social work research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*: Allyn and Bacon.

Nieuwenhuis, J. (2007a). Introducing qualitative research. In K. Maree (Ed.), *First steps in research* (1st ed., pp. 334): Van Schaik.

Nieuwenhuis, J. (2007b). Qualitative research designs and data gathering techniques. In K. Maree (Ed.), *First steps in research* (1st ed., pp. 334): Van Schaik.

Niewyk, D., & Nicosia, F. (2000). *The Columbia guide to the Holocaust*: Columbia University Press.

Norden, E. (1993). Yes and No to the Holocaust Museums. *Commentary, 96,* 23-32.

Novick, P. (1999). *The Holocaust in American LIfe*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Novick, P. (2003). The American National Narrative of the Holocaust: There Isn't Any. *New German Critique*(90), 27-35.

Novick, P., & Baron, L. (2004). Letters to the Editor. [Article]. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies, 18*(2), 358-375.

Patterson, R. (2000). The Void that is Subject: Libeskind's Jewish Museum, Berlin. *Architectural Design, 70*(5).

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.): Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Petersen, T. (2010). Moving beyond the toolbox: teaching human rights through teaching the Holocaust in post-apartheid South Africa. *Intercultural Education, 21*(1 ), 27 - S31

Petersen, T. (2011). Holocaust education in post-apartheid South Africa - impetus for social activism or a short-lived catharsis? Unpublished journal article.

Petrie, J. (2000). The secular word HOLOCAUST: scholarly myths, history, and 20th century meanings. [Article]. *Journal of Genocide Research, 2*(1), 31-63.

Pettigrew, A. (2010). Limited lessons from the Holocaust? Critically considering the 'anti-racist' and citizenship potential. *Teaching History: The secondary education journal of The Historical Association*(141), 50-55.

Phillips, R. (1998). Contesting the past, Constructing the Future: History, Identity and Politics in Schools. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 46*(1), 40-53.

Prosser, J. (2006). Researching with visual methods: some guidance notes and a glossary for beginners. Retrieved 8 August, 2010, from http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/481/1/0606_researching_visual_images.pdf

Rosenberg, I. (2010, April ). The voice of the survivors. *Yad Vashem Jerusalem, Volume 57*.

Salmons, P. (2001). Moral dilemmas: history, teaching and the Holocaust. [Article]. *Teaching History*(104), 34.

Salmons, P. (2003). Teaching or Preaching? The Holocaust and intercultural education in the UK. [Article]. *Intercultural Education, 14*(2), 139.

Salmons, P. (2010). Universal meaning or historical understanding? The Holocaust in history and history in the curriculum. *Teaching History: The secondary education journal of The Historical Association*(141), 57-63.

Schaller, D. J. (2007). From the Editors: genocide tourism - educational value or voyeurism? [Article]. *Journal of Genocide Research, 9*(4), 513-515.

Schrire, G. (2002). To inform and to inspire : the impact of the Cape Town Holocaust Centre. *Jewish Affairs ( Johannesburg ), 57*(1), 6.

Schrire, G. (2007). Tolerance Education in post-apartheid South Africa Retrieved 3 June 2010, from http://www.jewishmag.co.il/119mag/holocaust-south-africa/holocaust-south-africa2.htm

Shoah Memorial. (2011). The secret archives of the Warsaw Ghetto. Retrieved 18 January 2012, from http://www.memorialdelashoah.org/upload/minisites/ringelblum/shoah/index-en.htm

Shoah Resource Center, T. I. S. f. H. S. (2011). Reinhard Heydrich. Retrieved 1 January 2012, from http://www1.yadvashem.org/odot_pdf/Microsoft%20Word%20-%206366.pdf

Short, G. (2005). Learning from genocide? A study in the failure of Holocaust education. [Article]. *Intercultural Education, 16*(4), 367-380.

Short, G., & Reed, C. A. (2004). *Issues in Holocaust Education*: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Silbert, M. (2011). Day long course for museum educators at the Durban Holocaust Centre. Durban.

Silbert, M., & Petersen, T. (2007). *The Holocaust: Lessons for humanity - educator's resource manual & guide for introductory film* (2nd ed.): The Cape Town Holocaust Centre.

Silbert, M., & Petersen, T. (2008). Guide Training for the Durban Holocaust Centre. Unpublished Lecture.

Silbert, M., & Wray, D. (2004). *The Holocaust: Lessons for humanity - learners' interactive resource book*: New Africa Books (Pty) Ltd & The Cape Town Holocaust Centre.

Singh, L. (2010). Letter of approval of the researcher's proposal. Durban.

South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation. (2009a). Johannesburg Holocaust & Genocide Centre - Education.   Retrieved 30 November, 2010, from http://www.ctholocaust.co.za/johannesburg/johannesburg-our_education.htm

South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation. (2009b). Johannesburg Holocaust & Genocide Centre - Our Centre Retrieved 16 July 2010, from http://www.ctholocaust.co.za/johannesburg/johannesburg-our_centre.htm

South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation. (2010). Annual Review 2010 South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation.

South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation. (2011a). About us - vision/mission.   Retrieved 6 December 2011, from http://www.holocaust.org.za/pages/about-the-foundation-vision_mission.htm

South African Holocaust & Genocide Foundation. (2011b). Durban Holocaust Centre - Our Centre Retrieved 18 January 2011, from http://www.holocaust.org.za/durban/durban-our_centre.htm

South African Museums Association. (2012). What is a museum? .   Retrieved 25 March 2012, from http://www.sama.za.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=47&Itemid=65

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed.).* (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Staub, E. (2006). Reconciliation after Genocide, Mass Killing, or Intractable Conflict: Understanding the Roots of Violence, Psychological Recovery, and Steps toward a General Theory. *Political Psychology, 27*(6), 867-894.

Sternin, M. (2010). Between two worlds - modern representations of the Holocaust: posters created by Israeli art students at Shenkar. Unpublished Seminar at the Durban Holocaust Centre

Stone, P. R. (2006). A dark tourism spectrum: Towards a typology of death and macabre related tourist sites, attractions and exhibitions. *Tourism An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 54*(2), 145-160.

Stradling, R. (1984). The Teaching of Controversial Issues: An Evaluation. *Educational Review, 36*(2), 121-129.

Swartz, S. (2006). A long walk to citizenship: morality, justice and faith in the aftermath of Apartheid. [Article]. *Journal of Moral Education, 35*(4), 551-570.

Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research. (2010a). Guidelines for teaching.  Retrieved 12 April 2010, from http://www.holocausttaskforce.org/education/guidelines-for-teaching.html

Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research. (2010b). Hand Book for teachers - guidelines for teaching about the Holocaust.  Retrieved 16 May 2010, from http://london.iwm.org.uk/upload/pdf/Holocaust_Ex_TeachHbook.pdf

Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research. (2010c). How to teach about the Holocaust in Schools. *Guidelines for teaching* Retrieved 8 November, 2010, from http://www.holocausttaskforce.org/education/guidelines-for-teaching/how-to-teach-about-the-holocaust.html

Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research. (2010d). Member States.  Retrieved 20 August, 2010, from http://www.holocausttaskforce.org/memberstates.html

The Historical Association. (2007). *Teaching Emotive And Controversial Issues*.

The History Place. (2010). Holocaust Timeline.  Retrieved 25 December, 2010, from http://www.historyplace.com/worldwar2/holocaust/timeline.html

The Holocaust Centre. (2010). The Holocaust Centre.  Retrieved 7 December 2011, from http://holocaustcentre.net/?page_id=3 & http://holocaustcentre.net/?page_id=8 & http://holocaustcentre.net/?page_id=94

Totten, S. (Ed.). (2002). *Remembering the Past, Educating for the Present and the Future: Personal and Pedagogical Stories of Holocaust Educators*: Praeger

United Nations. (2010). Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.   Retrieved 21 May 2010, from http://www.un.org/millennium/law/iv-1.htm

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010a). About the Museum.   Retrieved 13 May 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/museum/about/

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010b, 1 April 1 2010). Coining a Word and Championing a Cause: the story of Raphael Lemkin. *Holocaust Encyclopedia* Retrieved 12 May 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007050

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010c). Education.   Retrieved 25 August, 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/education/

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010d). Eichmann Trial. *Holocaust Encyclopedia*  Retrieved 19 November, 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005179

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010e). Frequently asked questions about the Holocaust. *Research*  Retrieved 5 December, 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/research/library/faq/details.php?topic=01#02

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010f). Guidelines for teaching about the Holocaust.   Retrieved 12 April 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/education/foreducators/guideline/

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010g). The Holocaust. *Holocaust Encyclopedia*  Retrieved 30 April 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005143

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2010h). Nazi Camps. *Holocaust Encyclopedia*  Retrieved 7 November, 2010, from http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005144

Van Auken, P. M., Frisvoll, S. J., & Stewart, S. I. (2010). Visualising community: using participant-driven photo-elicitation for research and application. [Article]. *Local Environment, 15*(4), 373-388.

Voce, A. (2004). Introduction to Research Paradigms, *Handout for the Qualitative Research Module*.

Wassermann, J. (2011a). Supervision Meeting 25 June 2011. Durban.

Wassermann, J. (2011b). Supervision Meeting 30 December 2011. Durban.

Wellington, J., Bathmaker, A.-M., Hunt, C., McCulloch, G., & Sikes, P. (2005). *Succeeding with Your Doctorate* (1 ed.): Sage Publications Ltd.

Wood, A. G. (2007). *Holocaust - the events and their impact on real people* (1st ed.). London: Dorling Kindersley Limited.

Yad Vashem. (2005). Address by Yehuda Bauer on the opening of the new Yad Vashem museum: Yad Vashem.

Yad Vashem. (2009). Preserving their memories: survivor testimony over the years. *Yad Vashem Jerusalem, 55*.

Yad Vashem. (2010a). About Us.   Retrieved 28 November 2011, from http://www1.yadvashem.org/yv/en/about/index.asp

Yad Vashem. (2010b, July). Hindsight and Foresight: The seventh international educators' conference. *Yad Vashem Jerusalem, 58*.

Yad Vashem. (2010c). The Holocaust - Overview : How vast was the crime. Retrieved 2 June 2010, from http://www1.yadvashem.org/yv/en/holocaust/about/index.asp

Yad Vashem. (2010d). The Holocaust - The ghettos.   Retrieved 22 August, 2010, from http://www1.yadvashem.org/yv/en/holocaust/about/03/introduction.asp

Yad Vashem. (2010e). The Holocaust - The Implementation of the Final Solution : The Death Camps.   Retrieved 21 November, 2010, from http://www1.yadvashem.org/yv/en/holocaust/about/05/death_camps.asp

Yad Vashem. (2010f). Kristallnacht. *Concise Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* Retrieved 10 June 2010, from http://www1.yadvashem.org/education/entries/english/36.asp

Young, J. E. (1990). *Writing and rewriting the Holocaust: narrative and the consequences of interpretation*: Indiana University Press.

Young, J. E. (1993a). A Holocaust Rorschach Test. *New York Times Magazine,* pp. 36-38. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1993/04/25/magazine/a-holocaust-rorschach-test.html

Young, J. E. (1993b). *The texture of memory: Holocaust memorials and meaning*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

**Photographs shown to the museum educators**

Description
(not provided for the museum educators)

Photograph
(provided for the museum educators)

1. Bystanders watch the Jews of Vienna, Austria, guarded by Hitler Youth, scrub the street



2. Woman on a bench marked "Only for Jews!"



3. Four little girls in their swimming costumes sitting next to a swimming pool

Appendix A

# Photographs shown to the museum educators

4.    The Einsatzgruppen



5.    Two women - one white, one black.



6.    Women doing hard labour at Plaszow
      Concentration Camp



7.    Selection taking place on the platform at
      Auschwitz

**Photographs shown to the museum educators**

8. Hitler and his cohorts



9. The Ringelblum Cans recovered from the Warsaw Ghetto



10. The Nuremberg Trials

# Sample of letter of request to conduct research at DHC

Research Project Title:      Investigating Holocaust Education through the work of the guides at the Durban Holocaust Centre: a case study

Researcher:      Brenda Gouws
University of KwaZulu Natal

Date:

Dear Mrs Kluk

As you are aware I am undertaking research as part of my Masters in History Education at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. My study is an investigation into the role of the guides at the Durban Holocaust Centre in Holocaust Education.

I would like to interview between five and eight people who participate in the Centre's educational programme for schools. As part of the ethical clearance required by the university, I need your permission as Director of the Durban Holocaust Centre to do this. I have identified a few possible participants to be interviewed on a purely voluntary basis.

I also need permission from you to use the name of the Durban Holocaust Centre in my study, some of which might be published and to use the post-visit evaluation forms completed by the teachers and learners after their visit through the museum for a document analysis.

I would like to conduct the interviews at the Durban Jewish Centre if possible.

Attached please find a copy of the letter requesting guides' consent to participate for your information.

If you agree to these requests, please fill in the consent form below.

Many thanks for your support.

Kind regards

Brenda Gouws

# Signed letter of consent to conduct research at DHC

## LETTER OF CONSENT

I, Mary Kluk, Director of the Durban Holocaust Centre, hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project.

I hereby consent to the participation of some of our guides in this study as well as the use of the post-visit evaluation forms for a document analysis.

I also consent to the researcher, Brenda Gouws, using one of the rooms at the Durban Jewish Centre to conduct the interviews and to using the name of the Durban Holocaust Centre in her research.

M Kluk                                          25 Oct 2010
.........................................          .........................................
SIGNATURE                                       DATE

## Sample of letter inviting museum educators to participate

Research Project Title:        Investigating Holocaust Education through the work of the guides at the Durban Holocaust Centre: a case study

Researcher:        Brenda Gouws, University of KwaZulu-Natal

Date:

Dear

This letter is an invitation to invite you to participate in a study I am conducting as part of my Master's degree in History Education at the University of KwaZulu Natal under the supervision of Professor Johan Wassermann. I would like to provide you with more information about this project and what your involvement would entail if you decide to take part.

As a guide at the Durban Holocaust Centre you will know that the Holocaust was introduced into the South African History curriculum for all grade 9 learners in 2007 and that the Durban Holocaust Centre conducts an educational programme in support of it. You provide a valuable educational role as an educator at the Centre but not much research has been done regarding Holocaust education as practiced by the guides at Holocaust Centres around the world. The purpose of this study is therefore, to add to this body of knowledge by interviewing you in your role as a guide and teacher of Holocaust education.

I would like to interview you to learn more about your work there. Our discussion will include your views on Holocaust education; how you perceive your role; and your views on how and why we teach the Holocaust in South Africa. During the interview I will ask you questions on these topics and also, as part of our discussion, show you 10 photographs, of which I would like you to choose 3, in order to identify what you consider to be the most important aspects of Holocaust education at the museum.

I hope that the results of my study will be of benefit to the Durban Holocaust Centre, other Holocaust Centres not directly involved in the study, other teachers of the Holocaust as well as to the broader research community.

Participation in this study is voluntary. It will involve an interview of approximately one hour in length to take place at the Durban Jewish Centre or somewhere else that suits you. You may decline to answer any of the interview questions if you so wish and we will move on to another question. Furthermore, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences by advising the researcher.

With your permission, the interview will be audio recorded to facilitate collection of information, and later transcribed for analysis. I will also take notes of some of the things that you say. Shortly after the interview has been completed, I will send you a copy of the transcript to give you an opportunity to confirm the accuracy of our conversation and to add or clarify any points that you wish to make. All information you provide is considered completely confidential.

Your real name will not appear in any thesis or report resulting from this study unless you wish it to be used; however, with your permission anonymous quotations may be used.

There are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

Data collected pertaining to this study will be retained for a period of 5 years in a locked office at the University of KwaZulu Natal and then destroyed.

If you have any questions regarding this study, or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please contact me on 082 822 0600 or by email at bgouws@iafrica.com.  You may also contact my supervisor, Professor Johan Wassermann on 0312603484 or email wassermannj@ukzn.ac.za.

I would like to assure you that this study has been reviewed and has received ethical clearance through the Faculty Research Committee at the University of KwaZulu Natal. However, the final decision about participation is yours.

I look forward to speaking with you and thank you in advance for your assistance in this project.

Yours sincerely,

Brenda Gouws

# Sample of participant consent form

By signing this consent form, you are not waiving your legal rights or releasing the investigator(s) or involved institution(s) from their legal and professional responsibilities.

_____

I, ……………………………………………………(full name of participant) hereby confirm that I have read the information presented in the information letter about a study being conducted by Brenda Gouws of the Department of History Education at the University of KwaZulu Natal. I have had the opportunity to ask any questions related to this study, to receive satisfactory answers to my questions, and any additional details I wanted.

I am aware that I have the option of allowing my interview to be audio-recorded to ensure an accurate recording of my responses.

I am also aware that excerpts from the interview may be included in the thesis and/or publications to come from this research, with the understanding that the quotations will be anonymous.

I was informed that I may withdraw my consent at any time without penalty by advising the researcher.

This project has been reviewed by and has received ethical clearance from the Faculty Research Committee at the University of KwaZulu Natal.

With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

☐YES   ☐NO

I agree to have my interview audio-recorded.

☐YES   ☐NO

I agree to the use of anonymous quotations in any thesis or publication that comes of this research.

☐YES  ☐NO

Participant Signature:   _____

Participant Name:   _____ (Please print)


Witness Signature:   _____

Witness Name:   _____ (Please print)

 Date:   _____