

Activating Built Pedagogy: A genealogical exploration of educational space at the University of Auckland Epsom Campus and Business School

Kirsten Locke

Critical Studies in Education Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland

ABSTRACT

Inspired by a new teaching initiative that involved a redesign of conventional classroom spaces at the University of Auckland's Epsom Campus, this article considers the relationship between architecture, the built environment and education. It characterises the teaching space of the Epsom Campus as the embodiment of educational policy following its inception in the early 1970s. Heralded as a modernist work of architecture juxtaposing material and textural combinations, the Epsom Campus emerged as a metaphorical vanguard of teaching pedagogy that stood as a symbol of a more progressive and culturally inclusive style of education. With consideration for a different kind of architectural space and pedagogy at the city-based business school, the article extends an understanding of spatiality and learning, and argues the structural architectonics of the teaching space and the built environment confer their own pedagogical value. By drawing on the critical stance of Nietzsche's genealogical methodology for reading history, strands of historical discourse and 'vibrant materialities' are considered so that the 'built pedagogy' of both contexts can be activated and explored.

KEYWORDS

built pedagogy, genealogy, vibrant matter, Nietzsche, Bennett, affect

ARTICLE HISTORY

First published in
Educational Philosophy and Theory, 2015, Vol. 47, No. 6,
596–607

Introduction

Classroom structures and the physicality of teaching spaces are not benign. The purpose of this article is to illustrate the way buildings convey their own messages, solidified and materialised through physical walls and demarcated spaces, about the purposes of education. This article focuses on these spatial sites of pedagogy as the ideological terrain on which competing ideas are played out and educational purpose made manifest. Particular attention is given to the idea that this spatial or *spatialized* site of pedagogy is the interrelation between the embodied actions of what we do as teachers, and the physical spaces *where* we do it. Embodiment in this context is considered 'a generative site of epistemological understanding' (Senior & Dixon, 2009, p. 21), where bodies, spaces, matter and immateriality intersect in education and have the potential to create new meanings. This interrelational dimension draws on a strain of architectural thought that conceives of architecture and space as not simply consisting of a dualism between designed object and social use, but instead as active constituents of social relations that intersect in dynamic and fluid ways. With reference to the philosopher Henri Lefebvre, Borden (2000) describes this architectural reconceptualization as a 'space of flows—not as an object in space, but as the product of, and interrelation between, things, spaces, individuals and ideas' (p. 224). As a socially constructed site of

interrelations, the embodiment of teaching and learning is defined and redefined within these borders and, in turn, demarcates the borders of the educational space.

This article was written in response to the introduction of interactive large class teaching at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland, New Zealand in 2012. This new teaching initiative required a restructuring of classrooms to accommodate groups of approximately 60 students in one space. A pressing problem was to make classes physically larger, and this usually involved knocking down a wall between two standard-sized classrooms to create larger spaces. The enlarged room then underwent a substantial technological refit with large screens positioned at various places on the classroom walls, usually with a main screen and projector at the front of the room. Instead of desks in rows or groups, the furniture was fitted with hexagonal tables that were formed by separate modular desks. Ipads were allocated to numbers of students to ensure interactivity, and lecturers' teaching in these rooms underwent a series of training programmes to help integrate the different technological interfaces into their teaching practice. While not universally rolled out in all Initial Teacher Education courses, many students and lecturers have now experienced the initiative.

This new teaching initiative ignited my curiosity. I was initially interested to find out that the Business School at the University of Auckland had also implemented these changes to the teaching delivery of the heavily prescribed first-year paper that fed into various commerce degree pathways. However, what interested me particularly were the different intended outcomes between the two initiatives, and then as I thought about this more, what the physical shifts of classroom spaces that both sites had to undertake meant in the context of education. The Business School had implemented these changes for reasons that would have been specific to the context of the discipline being taught, and the physical site where these teachers and students learnt this knowledge. The interactive large classes at the Faculty of Education would necessarily have different needs and, certainly, a different teaching context and purpose. The Business School would be readying its students for the world of commerce. The Faculty of Education, predominantly, serves the purpose of preparing future teachers. To a certain extent, the space of teaching at the faculty is where the theoretical and practical 'organs' of pedagogical methods, approaches and theories of learning and teaching are laid bare. While both the Business School and the Faculty of Education deal with engaging students with new technologies and teaching methods for the purpose of teaching and generating knowledge, the aims of the schools are necessarily different: at the Faculty of Education, the purpose is to teach students about, and how, to teach—an altogether different reason for being from that of the Business School.

There were other factors that fed my curiosity and growing interest in these changes. The Faculty of Education is located in the inner-city suburb of Auckland in Mount Eden, approximately four and a half kilometres away from the Business School that is located in the city centre where the University of Auckland has its main campus. This geographical distance is mirrored in the different ages and architectural styles of the buildings. The group of buildings at the Epsom Campus, as it stands today, were built between 1973 and 1978 (with further modifications that continued at various intervals and still continues to this day), while the Business School was built to great fanfare in 2007 and as yet has not undergone any significant reconstruction. The Epsom Campus buildings are a material and discursive outcome of the 1970s. In 2004, the Campus (which was then Auckland College of Education) amalgamated with the University of Auckland. The Business School, housed in the Owen G Glenn Building at the University of Auckland city campus, is a product of 2007, steeped in a confidence in the knowledge economy and the university's aim to claim a leading position in the 'knowledge wave'. Both the Business School and Epsom Campus exist in the present neoliberal and globalised world, and in both cases, the introduction of large class teaching needs to be read in this context. In order to do this, and to build on the notion of interrelationality between spaces, embodiment and educational discourses, I utilise the idea of *built pedagogy* that is infused within the form of the buildings, where educational intent is concretised into solid mass that physically shapes and defines the spaces and borders of the educational endeavour. The density of the solid block forms of the Epsom Campus and the fluid, floating, glassed transparency of the Owen

G Glenn Building ‘speak’ to us about pedagogy as the style and intent of what we do as teachers at the university; they activate a version of their own built pedagogy that we embody and are constituted by. This article maintains these educational spaces impact on the social; they not only ‘express social relationships but also react upon them’ (Rendell, 2006, p. 17), thus constituting a particular kind of pedagogy that has particular aims.

To complement the discussion, I use a genealogical perspective to explore the Epsom Campus and the Owen G Glenn Building that utilises the historic notions of descent and emergence to reveal what Foucault (1979), via Nietzsche, refers to as the ‘histories of the present’. To do this, I focus on the different histories that animate the present twilight of the perceived usefulness of the Epsom Campus as the home of the Faculty of Education, and the histories of the present that animate the current vitality of the Business School. The identified histories illustrate the rich interplay between buildings and people, space and mass, physical and spiritual environment, and educational policy and intent. While there are examples of historical and artistic explorations of university sites (see for instance Edquist & Grierson, 2008), this discussion is concerned with various archived narrative strands of a genealogical analysis that are woven into the history of the Epsom Campus and the Owen G Glenn Building, constituting what Bennett calls the vibrant matter of our lived environment (Bennett, 2010). The genealogy I present draws on the critical stance of Nietzsche’s methodological approach to history that allows the existence of vibrant materialities and matter in a critical history of the built pedagogy to emerge. It is to a closer examination of Nietzsche’s genealogy that I now turn.

Doubling the ‘Built’: Place/Time—Pedagogy/Architecture

Genealogy is gray, meticulous, and patiently documentary. It operates on a field of entangled and confused parchments, on documents that have been scratched over and recopied many times. (Foucault, 1991, p. 76)

Foucault’s opening statement to his essay ‘Nietzsche, Genealogy, History’ (Foucault, 1991) evocatively depicts the complex webbing of genealogical discourse. This one statement contains within it the active, temporal dimension to genealogical analysis with its reference to ‘scratching over’, rewriting and ‘re’-copying the threads of discourse that make up the conventional narratives of history so that a standard truth in the past may be questioned, rewritten and put to the test. For Foucault, ‘the past actively exists in the present’, as it ‘continues to secretly animate’ life in its contemporaneous, temporal and affective states (1991, p. 81). While Foucault famously utilises this approach as a guiding methodology throughout much of his mid-to-late thinking, the inspiration for looking at history differently so as to provide greater insight into the present, first emerges from Nietzsche. In the essay entitled ‘On the uses and disadvantages of history for life’ in the *Untimely Meditations* (1983), Nietzsche, writing in 1874, explores the way historical knowledge can enhance the present, but only if we can resist the urge to reify the past so that the present avoids stultification. Foucault picks up on Nietzsche’s questioning of the way history is accessed and utilised for its own sake, as was certainly Nietzsche’s argument in the time and place of his writing context in nineteenth century Germany. Nietzsche argued that history can only have a useful and therefore beneficial affect when it is brought in to the present ‘for the purposes of life’ as a critical history of the present (1983, p. 64).

Nietzsche’s meaning of the ‘purposes of life’ is where genealogy comes to the fore as an alternative lens with which to view and treat history, and where my approach to looking at the historical past becomes relevant. For Nietzsche, history is split into three versions: monumental, antiquarian and critical. While monumental and antiquarian views of history deal with models for living and existing in the world that draw on past events, and models of cultures which justify the existence of *man* as a constantly developing and improving creature of reason, critical history questions all absolutes and truths. For Nietzsche, to live fully in the present required a person to ‘employ the strength to break up and dissolve a part of the past: he does this by bringing it before

the tribunal, scrupulously examining it and finally condemning it' (Nietzsche, 1983, p. 76). To be critical of the past, in this context, is to be productively active in the present with an aim to move beyond and away from one's own culture and history, to a vital and rich engagement with the conditions of existence in order to activate these conditions in a 'present-ness' of the present. Being critical, in Nietzsche's view, requires a fine balance between knowing the past in a historical sense, yet having the facility to look beyond the past by living in the present in an *unhistorical* way. By *unhistorical*, Nietzsche is intimating a necessary 'ability to forget'. He goes on to explain, 'the *unhistorical* and the *historical* are necessary in equal measure for the health of an individual, of a people and of a culture' (1983, p. 63).

It is this genealogical view of history that inspired my analysis of the Epsom Campus in the context of newer institutional buildings such as the Owen G Glenn Building, and the ways they act on, create and maintain educational imperatives that

are products of their time and place in New Zealand's educational history. Foucault's use of genealogy and architecture is most famously encapsulated in the disciplining spatiality of the panopticon, an all-seeing, behaviour-regulating mechanism of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1979). However, it is Nietzsche's approach to the telling of history more critically, and the importance of the temporal *unhistoricity* and spontaneity of the present, that can also be helpful when applied alongside a spatial history of educational discourse. The genealogy in the following sections examines some historical evidence of the Epsom Campus and considers this alongside the emergence of the Owen G Glenn Building. The affective *unhistorical* dimension from Nietzsche is then woven into a discussion of vibrant matter and vital pedagogies.

Place/Time: Epsom Campus

Thanks to a large cohort of baby boomers entering higher education, it became increasingly apparent in the late 1960s that the existing brick building at the Auckland Teachers College in the inner-city Auckland suburb of Mt Eden was simply not big enough for the post-war baby boomers it needed to accommodate (Shaw, 2006). In 1967, the prominent Auckland architectural firm of Thorpe, Cutter, Pickmere and Douglas was approached, and in 1973, the first architectural plans were finalised. The intention was to incorporate both the primary and secondary teacher training colleges, previously housed separately in different buildings, on one unified site. A senior architect on the project, Jack Manning, described the brief as follows:

The decision was made to turn Auckland Teachers' College, which was a primary teaching college, into both a secondary and primary teaching college one on the same site. So there was a new primary building, a new secondary building, a teaching building, a gymnasium for each, a library to be shared between the two and common rooms for the students. I was the architect in charge of the project. David Mitchell had come to work at the firm and he was another senior architect on it, and there were a whole lot of graduates straight out of architecture school, people like Peter Sargisson, Neil Simmons and Peter Hill. (Manning, 2011)

The proposed replacement of the imposing brick building would need to take into consideration the population of the student body, the different forms of teaching qualification and the different functions of the teaching space. From the outset, the redevelopment of the site stood for the more progressive and inclusive approach to education for which the college positioned itself as a major leader. The buildings that materialised emerged as a metaphorical vanguard of teaching pedagogy that stood as a symbol for this newer style of education. Epsom Campus was shaping to be a radical redevelopment, from an imposing brick structure reminiscent of an austere style of education that mirrored very strongly the grammar school model, to one of progress, growth, innovation and the 'new' New Zealand of political activism, hard-won cultural independence and identity, and an education system that would be ready to tackle growing societal inequalities.

The redesigned site proposed housing the two colleges through the unifying thread of a meandering pathway that traversed the entire campus. Students would be able to walk freely into any space, up or down, in any direction, regardless of what they were studying. The pohutakawa and the many old trees that had been planted on the site were an important structural element to take into consideration. The genealogy of the trees, such an important contemporary testimony to the history of the campus, were first planted by the Grierson family whose homestead 'Longmead' occupied a portion of the land between 1908 and 1921 (Gray, 2011), and then by the first two decades of students beginning the first year the site opened as a college in 1926 (Trussell, 1981). Also of importance was the birdlife, the structural configurations of the volcanic slopes that provided the contours of the campus, and the surrounding suburban setting. Not only would the redesign of the campus infuse the progressive and innovative elements of education, but the designers themselves wanted to craft something different and cutting edge. The primary training section and the secondary training section each had different designers, accounting for the quite different stylistic characteristics between buildings. One of the other senior architects was David Mitchell. In the New Zealand architectural programme, 'The Elegant Shed' Mitchell discusses with Jack Manning the point of difference of the Epsom designs to the brutal concrete and glass boxes that were taking the cities of New Zealand by storm.

Well at that time, I think every architect working on an office block had the same attitude. They were all pretty much in love with glass boxes. It was an attitude that had started with Lever House and Seagram House in New York and was repeated thousands of times after that, getting gradually worse as time went on ... I don't know whether it was a conscious reaction against that ... we all had an attitude that was quite different. The main materials are fibrolite, which has got a spray coating on them and inside that there are just acres and acres of good old Kiwi timber framing. So the materials are basically very simple and very economical. I suppose you'd say this is probably New Zealand's first large, high-tech building and the use of steel and colour and fairly light, elegant materials was all part of the language architects were using at that time. (Manning in Mitchell, 1984)

Construction took place between 1973 and 1978, with the final dismantling of the old brick building in 1976 (Shaw, 2006, p. 170). Teaching continued throughout the construction, and there was a palpable feeling of an emerging brave new world in education, an excitement and sense of anticipation that seemed to run through the buildings themselves as their curved turrets and glassed enclosures started to take form. The political landscape, like that of the campus, was also changing during the 1970s, and the significance of the redeveloped campus at this time was heightened as it became a symbol of standing strong in defiance to wider societal challenges. Jack Manning commented on this liveliness:

It was a really lively team and the buildings that resulted from it were quite striking. They were fairly simply built. There was a fair amount of raw concrete and we used a lot of cement panels as cladding, pre-coated with polyurethane. This was often in dazzling whites and primary colours. There were some quite startling things about the buildings that were really quite vibrant and vital. (Manning, 2011)

The campus is not only vital, as Jack Manning describes, but also playful and whimsical in places. The classroom 'prefab' (that most New Zealand of school architectural icons), serves as a motif that the designers clearly riff on in the shapes of the teaching spaces and larger building structures. This is a campus that feels very much like the schools it was, and is, preparing its student population. There are many entry points to the campus; the porous boundaries of the site offer a clever counterpoint to the dense weightiness of some of the blocked shapes. The metaphor is that learning is contained within these blocks, but the space of education itself is pliable and change-able. The softness of the many curves complement and complicate the strong, mechanistic lines of the buildings, and the glassed stairwells and exposed pipes give a cheeky wink to the 'nuts and bolts' of the teaching profession. Couched in the humour, of course, is the notion that the exposure of the inner workings of the building to the outside elements, signals a darker hint of the exposed nature of the teaching profession to notions of surveillance and transparency. Education, if the buildings

we work in are anything to go by, in its essence, is not a straightforward journey. It meanders, it can be a little shambolic, there are many different perspectives on how we do things, and not everything is tied to a perfect and predictable outcome. Implicit within this exploration is the related notion that the translation between the architectural idea and architectural object is never a simple straight line, but that many affects, threads of discourse and conceptual meanings complicate and constitute the lived, embodied spaces that emerge (Ingraham, 1998). Epsom campus is in some important way the tangible manifestation of a built pedagogy that draws on the genealogy of many different dimensions such as trees, birds and volcanic ground that gives specificity to the local environment in which this built pedagogy is situated.

Pedagogy/Architecture: Owen G Glenn Building

The Owen G Glenn Building has its own version of built pedagogy with educational aims that converge and diverge with those of the Faculty of Education. Both educational spaces aim to engage learners and use technology in new large interactive teaching spaces, yet their differences when applying a Nietzschean genealogical lens can be identified beyond these similarities. The Owen G Glenn Building is a leaner, meaner beast of space and form transplanted directly from other renowned international business schools. This is no locally derived or sourced building in ideology or intent. Sturm and Turner (2011) trace the architectural lineage of the Owen G Glenn Building to the Hult International Business School, the Simmons School of Management and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management. They draw on the New Zealand Herald article that announced this triumphant addition to the University of Auckland in 2007 in the following:

The building cuts and thrusts. Its facade, in bands of shiny glass and aluminium, curves as a bay out to jutting headlands. Glass blades sweep past the building's ends, slicing the air. It means business. (cited in Sturm & Turner, 2011, p. 28)

Sturm and Turner offer an alternative response to the building, describing the style as 'transcendental university architecture', a form of 'neoliberal gothic where, like old Gothic a transcendental architecture comprised of space, light, line and geometry' (p. 12) reaches not for the God in the heavens, but boldly outwards. This is the temple to transcendental capitalism that Sturm and Turner identify as being the third stream to the purpose of the university that was added in to the strategic direction of the University of Auckland. This third stream, apart from the aims of teaching and research at the university, includes business partnerships and alliances. The Owen G Glenn Building is a template that is 'vectoral, its out-reaching arcs tracing the flight lines of transcendental capital that punctuate and striate, and so redistribute, local space' (ibid.). The transparency of the glass façade in the Owen G Glenn Building signals no building and empty space, or at least space 'filled' with nothing that, following Casey (1997), seems to present no sense of its unique *place* when contrasted with the humour and whimsy of the Epsom Campus.

The transparency of the glass gives the Owen G Glenn Building the appearance and feeling of other big, utilitarian structures such as an airport or conference centre. This is an indoor–outdoor flow taken to the extreme. Unlike the solid forms of the Epsom Campus, the Owen G Glenn Building suggests a free-floating timelessness, unburdened by historical and individual narratives. Enclosed under the fluid glass are the customers, travelling through the building to their destinations beyond the enclosure, using the facilities, refuelling on fast knowledge on their ways. Like the free-flowing transcendental capital it symbolises, the students move freely only on the first and second floors, while the floors above are left free to let intellectual capital flow and academic business happen.

But what of the built pedagogy in the Owen G Glenn Building? This space encourages clean transmission of information, easily tested nuggets of economic gold that turn into data quicksilver able to travel in an instant to the waiting receptacle of the university central nervous system of Cecil, the University of Auckland online interface that deals with course information, timetables and some forms of assessment. Like the instant flows of capital the Business School covets, information in this

context must flow unaided and without obstacles. Drawing on Nietzsche, the built pedagogy at play as a history of the present in this building is animated by transcendental neo-liberalism within which abstract forms of space, capital and commerce resonate. Like the Epsom Campus, the Owen G Glenn Building is currently produced through neo-liberal imperatives, and in the case of the Business School, it is situated in the Central Business District of Auckland where the focus can be closely aligned to the discourses and flows of commerce that constitute the business at the heart of the city. This focus on commerce is one of the interesting divergences between the two institutional sites, where as at Epsom Campus, a more 'pastoral' dimension is evoked in which the relational aspects of education can flourish.

Vibrant Materialities as Built Pedagogy: Bringing Histories to Life

The built pedagogy of Epsom Campus also includes the negative space, that is, the space that outlines the silhouette of the buildings and wider campus that forms the shape of the campus as a whole. It is here that Bennett's notion of vibrant matter can be linked to narrative threads that can be incorporated into an activation of the built pedagogy of the campus. It is also at this point that a genealogical lens is further applied to Bennett's application of a 'vital materiality' that follows Nietzsche's dictum of a critical history that *animates* the present. The intention of exploring Bennett's vibrant matter through the built environment is, following Nietzsche, to bring these historical threads to life for the purposes of enriching our present understandings of the built pedagogy of the Epsom Campus. Bennett defines vibrant matter as organic and inorganic matter that, taking inspiration from the philosopher Spinoza, is 'not inert matter, but lively intensities, vibrant materialities' (2010, p. viii). Bennett looks at the way Spinoza incorporated this sense of vibrant materiality of things into a drive within matter to seek alliances with other inorganic and organic forms to enhance vitality. Of importance to my Nietzschean application of vibrant matter, is the way Bennett deconstructs the primacy of the subject, over things, environment and inorganic matter. Instead for Bennett, *things* as objects and matter have as much 'agentic capacity' (2010, p. 9) as thinking beings, thus allowing the Epsom Campus and its 'built' environment a status other than merely passive and *un-affective*. It is at this point I am placing the Epsom Campus within a gravitational pull where suddenly the borders of its space become significant and alive, where things and histories become part of the vitality of the campus as a whole.

At the edge of the expansive playing field of the Epsom Campus is the first form of vibrant matter I identify as the normal school that borders the campus, Auckland Normal Intermediate. The expansive green lushness of the fields belies what was once part of a rough lava-field from the nearby volcano of Maungawhau, also known as Mt Eden, when the original building of the Campus was first populated with students (Shaw, 2006, p. 73). The grounds that surrounded the original brick building were covered in gorse and rocks that had to be levelled, and it would take another couple of years before the playing fields that join the two sites together were fit for purpose. From its inception in 1923, Epsom Campus was to include a purpose-built normal school, and by 1928 Mount Eden Normal School was built 'comprising eight classrooms and a large criticism room' (Shaw, 2006, p. 81). It is not by accident that the space of teacher training is next to a school. There are historic and pragmatic reasons for this that are significant to any ideas about pedagogy as something that must be learnt, that requires technical and theoretical knowledge, that has a distinct body of knowledge, and that contributes to the notion of teaching as a profession (Openshaw & Ball, 2006). Like the radical change of landscape from rocky, gorse-covered, unlevelled land to flat, grassed expanse, the close vicinity of a school to the Epsom Campus and the connecting land that joins it, serves as a constant reminder of the 'hewn' dimension to the craft of teaching as something that has the power to transform.

Also on the edges of the Epsom Campus stand the memorial gates dedicated to the Auckland teachers who fought and died in the First World War. Officially opened in 1932, the gates stood at the entrance to the original brick building providing a sense of grandeur and patriotic fervour to the

campus. Made from Portland stone left over from the Auckland War Memorial Museum, the gates were crafted by unemployed stonemasons during the Depression and were 'symbolically linked' to the campus with the continuing programme of planting native New Zealand trees such as manuka, kauri and pohutakawa (Shaw, 2006, p. 87). A further genealogical link is that the architectural firm of Grierson, Aimer and Draffin designed the Auckland War Memorial Museum. One of the architects was Hugh Grierson who lived as part of the Grierson family on the Epsom Campus site at Longmead, and the Portland stone that was left over from the War Memorial Museum provides another genealogical thread that animates the present history of this site. While Hugh Grierson survived Passchendaele, his brother Walter was killed in the First World War (Vail, 2011) and the stone that links these two memorial sites is imbued with individual loss even as it testifies to public trauma. Belich (2001) described the First World War as a mincing machine, where New Zealanders were sent to fight, even when there was knowledge of the futility of the situation, and were sentenced to death with no control over how this would happen. Belich also identifies the sustained ideological programme that emerged after the First World War that celebrated heroism and loyalty, of which education took a leading role. Now aged with moss and darkened with time and rust, the memorial gates no longer stand starkly as the main entrance of Epsom campus, and instead crouch into the shade provided by the grown trees as a side entrance that services the normal school. As an example of vibrant matter, these gates are an important narrative thread that symbolise the way education is always situated within a wider social, political and ideological fabric.

Another example of vibrant matter is a single tree that stands outside what is now the administrative block of the campus. In a small brown paper envelope in the Sylvia Ashton Warner Library archives, there is a photo that is slightly blurred and yellowed, of people planting a small tree. There is no date on the photo and no caption describing what this tree planting ceremony was in aid of. Yet that tree now stands tall and strong, like many other trees that provide so much of the built environment of the campus. This little tree was planted, and somehow, has endured. There is no plaque, just a yellowed photograph stored in the archives testifying to its significance. This piece of anonymous history, of one tree that was planted in a ceremony that bears no mark of time other than to show the 'new' buildings of the redevelopment is what acts as a vital materiality. As an example of placing history to the uses and advantage of life, this article is somehow testifying to this one tree's enduring significance. In this context, the tree signals growth, change and affect in the life of the present.

Not far from the tree is the campus marae, named 'Tutahi Tonu Wharenuī'. It seems a glaring omission, looking back from today's vantage point, that a marae was not part of the original plans of the redevelopment but this in itself also says something interesting about education in New Zealand at one particular point in time. In the decade of the 1970s when the campus was redeveloped, a growing international discourse of decolonisation, marked by a local strengthening and momentum of Maori activism and identity, was making its appearance felt. By the time of the opening of Tutahi Tonu where 1500 people took part in the opening ceremony in 1983, the Treaty of Waitangi negotiations were first beginning to be linked to educational policy aims. Since then, Tutahi Tonu now stands as a symbol of diversity and inclusivity that is part of the built pedagogy of this campus. The word marae refers to 'space' and the wharenuī is the building. The wharenuī at the Epsom Campus has a plaque that talks of enduring presence, continuity, standing steadfast in this place: 'We stand day and night, we stand as one'. According to a local legend, Māori tupuna brought some earth with them from their ancestral homeland Hawaiki and buried a handful of that earth into the volcanic crater on this site. Tutahi Tonu is the built manifestation that signifies *building* Maori identity and culture into prominence in New Zealand's educational discourse, and bears testimony through local legend and myth, to the spiritual dimension and connections of teaching and learning that help deconstruct colonised space.

Concluding Comments

This article took as its inspiration the implementation of a new teaching initiative and the significant shifts this initiative precipitated in physical classroom borders and spaces at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland. My intention has been to link an exploration of these material shifts with a genealogical analysis of affective spatialities that constitute and activate what I have termed the built pedagogy of the Epsom Campus and Owen G Glenn Building. Since its inception, the large class teaching spaces have provided an array of challenges and opportunities for innovative pedagogical approaches at the Faculty of Education. With a growing international literature on the effectiveness of these spaces (see for instance Brooks, 2012; Salter, Thomson, Fox, & Lam, 2013), and an increasingly receptive audience in the university academic sphere to teaching innovation, the initiative looks set to develop further both internationally and locally. However, my intention has been to broaden an exploration from the changing materialities of classroom spaces to the wider built environment, and to explore this built environment as part of a more expansive conversation on the metaphorical, symbolic and affective spatialities of learning and teaching. Presented as a genealogy of spatial and affective histories, I have drawn attention to the critical dimensions of the physical and historical shifts that have taken place between two educational sites at the University of Auckland in order to explore the built pedagogy that animates both teaching contexts. Finally, this article has offered an alternative lens with which to view these histories, following Nietzsche, for the advantage of *educational life*.

References

- Belich, J. (2001). *Paradise reformed: A history of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the year 2000*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Borden, I. (2000). Thick edge: Architectural boundaries in the postmodern metropolis. In I. Borden & J. Rendell (Eds.), *Intersections: Architectural histories and critical theories* (pp. 221–246). London: Routledge.
- Brooks, C. (2012). Space and consequences: The impact of different formal learning spaces on instructor and student behavior. *Journal of Learning Spaces*, 1(2). Retrieved from <http://libjournal.uncg.edu/index.php/jls/article/view/285/275>
- Casey, E. S. (1997). *The fate of place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edquist, H., & Grierson, E. (2008). *A skilled hand and cultivated mind: A guide to the architecture and art of RMIT University*. Melbourne: RMIT.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Nietzsche, genealogy, history (D. F. Bouchard & S. Simon, Trans.). In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader: An introduction to Foucault's thought* (pp. 76–100). London: Penguin.
- Gray, B. (2011). *An old kiwi reminiscence*. Retrieved April 4, 2014, from http://winsomegriffin.com/Newsham/Barbara_Grierson.html
- Ingraham, C. (1998). *Architecture and the burdens of linearity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Manning, J. (2011). *Interview with Jack Manning*. Retrieved October 5, 2012, from <http://www.nzia.co.nz/news-media/jack-manning-is-the-latest-recipient-of-nzia-gold-medal.aspx>
- Mitchell, D. (1984). *Kaleidoscope*. [Episodes 1–6] The elegant shed, March 9, 1984–April 4, 1984. Auckland: TVNZ Television Archive.
- Nietzsche, F. W. (1983). *Untimely meditations*. (R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Openshaw, R., & Ball, T. (2006). New Zealand teacher education: Progression or prescription. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 33, 102–123. Retrieved from <http://erjournal.net>
- Rendell, J. (2006). *Art and architecture: A place between*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Salter, D., Thomson, D. L., Fox, B., & Lam, J. (2013). Use and evaluation of a technology-rich experimental collaborative classroom. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32, 805–819.
- Senior, K., & Dixon, M. (2009). Reading with the ancients: Embodied learning and teaching to an embodied pedagogy? *Access: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies*, 28, 21–30.

- Shaw, L. (2006). *Making a difference: A history of the Auckland college of education 1881–2004*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Sturm, S., & Turner, S. (2011). 'Built Pedagogy': The university of Auckland business school as crystal palace. *Interstices: Journal of Architecture and Related Arts*, 12, 23–34.
- Trussell, B. (1981). *Auckland teachers college: Reflections on a hundred years of teacher education*. Auckland: Centennial Committee of Auckland Teachers College.
- Vail, H. (2011). *100 New Zealand world war one memorials 1914–2014*. Retrieved April 6, 2014, from <http://100nzmemorials.blogspot.co.nz/2011/03/walter-alexander-grierson-mt-eden.html>