ABSTRACT

Cultural and national examinations appears to have passed into the shadows of scholarly interests, supplanted by globalization and political economy as the new thousand years' special worries among left scholastics. However, social and public examinations' longstanding interest in the interrelationship of intensity, legislative issues, and culture remains basically significant. Matters of organization, awareness, instructional method, and way of talking are fundamental to any open talk about legislative issues, also schooling itself. Henceforth, this article contends that the guarantee of social examinations, particularly as a principal part of advanced education, dwells in a bigger groundbreaking and majority rule legislative issues in which matters of teaching method and office assume a focal job.
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INTRODUCTION

Pedagogy is an encompassing term concerned with what a teacher does to influence learning in others. As the importance of high quality early childhood education and care services for children has become more clearly understood, so has the teacher/educator's role in the provision of these services. This demands a clear understanding of the meaning of ‘pedagogy’ and how it plays out in individual educators and services. The definitions below
show a range of thinking around the term pedagogy, all of which have what a teacher does and how they do it at their core. For the purpose of this document the terms ‘teacher’ and ‘educator’ are used interchangeably. Pedagogy is about learning, teaching and development influenced by the cultural, social and political values we have for children…in Scotland, and underpinned by a strong theoretical and practical base. Quality teaching is defined as pedagogical practices that facilitate for diverse children their access to knowledge, activities and opportunities to advance their skills in ways that build on previous learning, assist in learning how to learn and provide a strong foundation for further learning in relation to the goals of the early childhood curriculum. Pedagogy develops from a range of factors including theories and research evidence, political drivers, evidence from practice, individual and group reflection, educators’ experiences and expertise, and community expectations and requirements. It informs both curriculum (all the interactions, experiences, activities, routines and events planned and unplanned) and teaching in a service. It reflects and supports the principles of and outcomes sought by a service.

Early years’ pedagogy is an extremely complex phenomenon comprising a wide variety of practices underpinned by principles acquired through training and as a result of professional experiences and personal understandings. Because of its complexity ‘effectiveness’ has to be viewed as a whole rather than as particular aspects taken in isolation. Early childhood education and care is concerned with ensuring children achieve positive outcomes. Research on teaching, learning and outcomes shows that quality pedagogy is identified as a key lever for improving children’s outcomes. Sound research evidence, discussed later, shows what educators can do to provide children with strong foundations for ongoing learning and development in all aspects of life. This evidence must be reflected in educators’ pedagogy if children’s learning and development is to be optimized.

METHODOLOGY

Pedagogy evolves through ongoing research and reflection at all levels, including service and educator level. This ensures continuous improvement in educators’ practice with the aim of supporting the best possible outcomes for all children and recognizes the importance of the educator in children’s learning and development.

RESEARCH WORKS

Within the last few decades, a number of critical and cultural and national studies have been provided to our understanding of how culture deploys power and is shaped and organized within diverse systems of representation, production, consumption, and distribution. Culture is recognized as the social field where goods and social practices are not only produced, distributed, and consumed but also invested with various meanings and ideologies implicated in the generation of political effects. Culture is partly defined as a circuit of power, ideologies, and values in which diverse images and sounds are produced and circulated, identities are constructed, inhabited, and discarded, agency is manifested in both individualized and social forms, and discourses are created, which make culture itself the object of inquiry and critical analyses. Rather than being viewed as a static force, the substance of culture and everyday life—knowledge, goods, social practices, and
contexts—repeatedly mutates and is subject to ongoing changes and interpretations. Within this discourse, cultural studies becomes available as a resource to educators. Cultural studies, pedagogy, and responsibility who can then teach students how to look at the media (industry and texts), analyze audience reception, challenge rigid disciplinary boundaries, critically engage popular culture, produce critical knowledge, or use cultural studies to reform the curricular and challenge disciplinary formations within public schools and higher education.

In spite of the importance of bringing matters of culture and power to the schools, I think too many cultural studies theorists are remiss in suggesting that pedagogy is primarily about schools and, by implication, that the intersection of cultural studies and pedagogy has little to do with theorizing the role that pedagogy might play in linking learning to social change outside of traditional sites of schooling.

Pedagogy is not simply about the social construction of knowledge, values, and experiences; it is also a performative practice embodied in the lived interactions among educators, audiences, texts, and institutional formations. Pedagogy, at its best, implies that learning takes place across a spectrum of social practices and settings. As Roger Simon observes, pedagogy points to the multiplicity of sites in which education takes place and offers the possibility for a variety of cultural workers to comprehend the full range of multiple, shifting and overlapping sites of learning that exist within the organized social relations of everyday life.

This means being able to grasp, for example, how workplaces, families, community and institutional health provision, film and television, the arts, groups organized for spiritual expression and worship, organized sport, the law and the provision of legal services, the prison system, voluntary social service organizations, and community based literacy programs. Moreover, it is precisely at the intersection at which diverse traditions in cultural studies and pedagogy mutually inform each other that the possibility exists of making the pedagogical more political for cultural studies theorists and the political more pedagogical for educators. An interest in cultural studies emerges from an ongoing project to theorize the regulatory and emancipatory relationship among culture, power, and politics as expressed through the dynamics of what I call public pedagogy. Culture, in this instance, is the ground of both contestation and accommodation, and it is increasingly characterized by the rise of mega-corporations and new technologies that are transforming the traditional spheres of the economy, industry, society, and everyday life.

Culture now plays a central role in producing narratives, metaphors, and images that exercise a powerful pedagogical force over how people think of themselves and their relationship to others. From my perspective, culture is the primary sphere in which individuals, groups, and institutions engage in the art of translating the diverse and multiple relations that mediate between private life and public concerns. It is also the sphere in which the translating possibilities of culture are under assault, particularly as the forces of neoliberalism dissolve public issues into utterly privatized and individualistic concerns. Central to my work in cultural studies is the assumption that the primacy of culture and power should be organized through an understanding of how the political becomes pedagogical, particularly in terms of how private issues are connected to larger social conditions and collective forces—that is, how the very processes of learning constitute the political
mechanisms through which identities are shaped and desires mobilized, and how experiences take on form and meaning.

RESULTS

Cultural studies, pedagogy, and responsibility within and through collective conditions and those larger forces that constitute the realm of the social. In this context, pedagogy is no longer restricted to what goes on in schools, but becomes a defining principle of a wide ranging set of cultural apparatuses engaged. The realm in the latter part of the twentieth century because the actuality of economic power and its attendant networks of control now exercised more influence than ever before in shaping how identities are produced, desires mobilized, and everyday social relations acquired the force of common sense. Pedagogy is a referent for understanding the conditions of critical learning and the often hidden dynamics of social and cultural reproduction. As a critical practice, pedagogy’s role lies not only in changing how people think about themselves and how they behave. But like any other body of knowledge that is continuously struggled over, pedagogy must constantly enter into dialogue with other fields, theoretical domains, and emerging theoretical discourses. As diverse as cultural studies is as a field, there area number of insights it provides that are crucial to educators who use critical pedagogy both inside and outside of their classrooms. First, in the face of contemporary forms of political and epistemological relativism, a more politicized version of cultural studies makes a claim for the use of highly disciplined, rigorously theoretical work. Not only does such a position reject the notion that intellectual authority can only be grounded in particular forms of social identity, but it also refuses to endorse an increasing anti-intellectualism that posits theory as too academic and complex to be of any use in addressing important political issues. While many cultural studies advocates refuse either to separate culture studies from politics or reject theory as too complex and abstract, they also reject theory as a sterile form of theoreticism and an academicized vocabulary that is self-consciously pedantic as it is politically irrelevant. Matters of language, experience, power, ideology, and representation cannot make a detour around theory, but that is no excuse for elevating theory to an ethereal realm that has no referent outside of its own obtuseness or rhetorical cleverness. While offering no guarantees, theory in a more critical perspective is seen as crucial for relating broader issues of politics and power to the problems that shape everyday life. Moreover, theory in this view is called upon as a resource for connecting cultural studies to those sites and spheres of contestation in which it becomes possible to open up rhetorical and pedagogical spaces between the actual conditions of dominant power and the promise of future space informed by a range of democratic alternatives. Underlying such a project is a firm commitment to intellectual rigor and a deep regard for matters of compassion and social responsibility aimed at deepening and extending the possibilities for critical agency, racial justice, economic democracy, and the just distribution of political power. Hence, cultural studies theorists often reject the anti-intellectualism, specialization, and methodological reification frequently found in other disciplines. Similarly, such theorists also reject both the universalizing dogmatism of some strands of radical theory and a postmodern epistemology that enshrines
difference, identity, and plurality at the expense of developing more inclusive notions of the social that bring together historically and politically differentiated forms of struggles. The more progressive strains of cultural studies do not define or value theory and knowledge within sectarian ideological or pedagogical interests. On the contrary, these approaches to cultural studies define theorizing as part of a more generalized notion of freedom, which combines democratic principles, values, and practices with the rights and discourses that build on the histories and struggles of those excluded because of class, race, gender, age, or disability. Theory emerges from the demands posed by particular contexts, and reflects critically upon ways both to better understand the world and to transform it when necessary. At the same time, it is crucial for educators to recognize that while they need to be attentive to the particular context in which they work, they cannot separate such contexts from larger matters and configurations of power, culture, ideology, politics, and domination.

CONCLUSION

One implication for such work is that future and existing teachers should be educated about the viability of developing context-dependent learning that takes account of student experiences and their relationships to popular culture and its terrain of pleasure, including those cultural industries that are often dismissed as producing mere entertainment. Despite the growing diversity of students in both public schools and higher education, there are few examples of curriculum sensitivity to the multiplicity of economic, social, and cultural factors bearing on students’ lives. Even where there is a proliferation of programs such as ethnic and black studies in higher education, these are often marginalized in small programs far removed from the high status courses such as business, computer science, and Western history. Cultural studies at least provides the theoretical tools for allowing teachers to recognize the important, though not unproblematic, cultural resources students bring to school and the willingness to affirm and engage them critically as forms of knowledge crucial to the production of the students’ sense of identity, place, and history. Equally important, the knowledge produced by students offers educators opportunities to learn from young people and to incorporate such knowledge as an integral part of their own teaching. Yet, there is an important caveat that cannot be stated too strongly.

Cultural studies, pedagogy, and responsibility approach is also important because such work often operates at the frontiers of knowledge, prompting teachers and students to raise new questions and develop models of analysis outside of the officially sanctioned boundaries of knowledge and the established disciplines that sanction them. Trans-disciplinarity in this discourse serves a dual function. On the one hand, it firmly posits the arbitrary conditions under which knowledge is produced and encoded, stressing its historically and socially constructed nature and deeply entrenched connection to power and ideological interests. On the other hand, it endorses the relational nature of knowledge, inveighing against any presupposition that knowledge, events, and issues are either fixed or should be studied in isolation. Trans-disciplinary approaches stress both historical relations and broader social formations, always attentive to new linkages, meanings, and possibilities.
Strategically and pedagogically, these modes of analysis suggest that while educators may be forced to work within academic disciplines, they can develop trans-disciplinary tools to make established disciplines the object of critique while also contesting the broader economic, political, and cultural conditions that reproduce unequal relations of power and inequities at various levels of academic work. This is a crucial turn theoretically and politically because transdisciplinary approaches foreground the necessity of bridging the work educators do within the academy to other academic fields as well as to public spheres outside of the university. Such approaches also suggest that educators function as public intellectuals by engaging in ongoing public conversations that cut across particular disciplines while attempting to get their ideas out to more than one type of audience. Under such circumstances, educators must address the task of learning the forms of knowledge and skills that enable them to speak critically and broadly on a number of issues to a wide range of publics.

Fourth, in a somewhat related way, the emphasis by many cultural studies theorists on studying the full range of cultural practices that circulate in society opens the possibility for understanding a wide variety of new cultural forms that have become the primary educational forces in advanced industrial societies. This seems especially important at a time when new electronic technologies and the emergence of visual culture as a primary educational force offer new opportunities to inhabit knowledge and ways of knowing that simply do not correspond to the longstanding traditions and officially sanctioned rules of disciplinary knowledge or the one-sided academic emphasis on print culture. The scope and power of new informational technologies, multimedia, and visual culture warrant educators to become more reflective about engaging the production, reception, and situated use of new technologies, popular texts, and diverse forms of visual culture, including how they structure social relations, values, particular notions of community, the future, and varied definitions of the self and others. Texts in this sense do not merely refer to the culture of print or the technology of the book, but refer to all those audio, visual, and electronically mediated forms of knowledge that have prompted a radical shift in the production of knowledge and the ways in which it is received and consumed.

Cultural studies, pedagogy, and responsibility as a process that never ends. Such a project is based on the realization that democracy open to exchange, question, and self-criticism never reaches the limits of justice; it is never just enough and never finished. It is precisely the open-ended and normative nature of such a project that provides a common ground for cultural studies theorists to share their differences and diverse range of intellectual pursuits. Second, cultural studies is still largely an academic discourse and as such is often too far removed from other cultural and political sites where the work of public pedagogy takes place. In order to become a public discourse of any importance, cultural studies theorists will have to focus their work on the immediacy of problems that are more public and that are relevant to important social issues. Such issues might include the destruction of the ecological biosphere, the current war against youth, the hegemony of neo-liberal globalization, the widespread attack by corporate culture on public schools, the ongoing attack on the welfare system, the increasing rates of incarceration of people of
color, the increasing gap between the rich and the poor, the increasing spread of war globally, or the dangerous growth of the prison-industrial complex. Moreover, cultural studies theorists need to write for a variety of public audiences, rather than for simply a narrow group of specialized intellectuals. Such writing needs to become public by crossing over into sites and avenues of expression that speak to more general audiences in a language that is clear but not theoretically simplistic. Intellectuals must combine their scholarship with commitment in a discourse that is not dull or obtuse but expands the reach of their audience. This suggests using opportunities offered by a host of public means of expression including the lecture circuit, radio, Internet, interview, alternative magazines, and the church pulpit, to name only a few. Third, cultural studies theorists need to be more specific about what it would mean to be both self-critical and attentive to learning how to work collectively through a vast array of networks across a number of public spheres.

Pedagogy in this instance can be addressed as a moral and political discourse in which students are able to connect learning to social change, scholarship to commitment, and classroom knowledge to public life. Such a pedagogical task suggests that educators and cultural theorists define intellectual practice as part of “an intricate web of morality, rigor and responsibility” that enables them to speak with conviction, enter the public sphere in order to address important social problems, and demonstrate alternative models for what it means to bridge the gap between higher education and the broader society. One useful approach is for educators to think through the distinction between a politicizing pedagogy, which insists wrongly that students think as we do, and a political pedagogy, which teaches students by example the importance of taking a stand (without standing still) while rigorously engaging the full range of ideas about an issue. Political pedagogy connects understanding with the issue of social responsibility and what it would mean to educate students not only to engage the world critically but also to be responsible enough to fight for those political and economic conditions that make its democratic possibilities viable. Such a pedagogy affirms the experience of the social and the obligations it evokes regarding questions of responsibility and social transformation by opening up for students important questions about power, knowledge, and what it might mean for them to critically engage the conditions under which life is presented to them and simultaneously work to overcome those social relations of oppression that make living unbearable for those who are poor, hungry, unemployed, deprived of adequate social services, and viewed under the aegis of neo-liberalism as largely disposable. What is important about this type of critical pedagogy is the issue of responsibility as both an normative issue and a strategic act. Responsibility highlights not only the performative nature of pedagogy by raising questions about the relationship that teachers have to students but also the relationship that students have to themselves and others. Central here is the importance for cultural studies educators to encourage students to reflect on what it would mean for them to connect knowledge and criticism to becoming an actor, buttressed by a profound desire to overcome injustice and aspired commitment to social agency. Political education teaches students to take risks, challenge those with power,
encourage them to be reflexive about how power is used in the classroom. Political education proposes that the role of the public intellectual is not to consolidate authority but to question and interrogate it, and that teachers and students should temper any reference for authority with a sense of critical awareness and an acute willingness to hold it accountable for its consequences. Moreover, political education foregrounds education not within the imperatives of specialization and professionalization, but within a project designed to expand the possibilities of democracy by linking education to modes of political agency that promote critical citizenship and engage the ethical imperative to alleviate human suffering. However, politicizing education silences in the name of orthodoxy and imposes itself on students while undermining dialogue, deliberation, and critical
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