



Cultural Studies and Education: From Birmingham Origin to Glocal Presence

Handel Kashope Wright & Karl Maton

To cite this article: Handel Kashope Wright & Karl Maton (2004) Cultural Studies and Education: From Birmingham Origin to Glocal Presence, *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 26:2-3, 73-89, DOI: [10.1080/10714410490480359](https://doi.org/10.1080/10714410490480359)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714410490480359>



Published online: 16 Aug 2010.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 221



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 11 View citing articles [↗](#)

Cultural Studies and Education: From Birmingham Origin to Glocal Presence

Handel Kashope Wright and Karl Maton

INTRODUCTION: THE EDUCATION ORIGIN OF CULTURAL STUDIES

[Education is] one of the most pressing, promising, and paradoxical sites of cultural studies. (Larry Grossberg 1997)

Cultural studies not only contributes enormously to the possibility of articulating a broad based definition of education but itself undergoes a particular—in my view—productive orientation in the institutional context of a school of education. (Roger Simon 1995)

The relationship between cultural studies and the traditional humanities and social science disciplines is a perennial problematic of the field of cultural studies. Wariness bordering on hostility characterized the traditional disciplines' (especially sociology and literature) reception of the inception of institutionalized cultural studies as an initially interdisciplinary, and soon strongly anti-disciplinary project at Birmingham University, England in the early 1960s. Since then, though its status has evolved, cultural studies has continued to wrestle with the issue of disciplinarity, scrambling to embrace any label (e.g., post-discipline, anti-discipline, etc.) rather than acknowledge that it may have indeed become a discipline (Maton 2002; Maton and Wright 2002a). The fact is that cultural studies has evolved, somewhat ironically, from being anti-disciplinary to becoming something of a discipline itself, albeit a "reluctant discipline" (Bennett 1998) or even a "hidden discipline" (McEwan 2002). The identification of cultural studies as a discipline does not in itself resolve the question of disciplinarity since what is important for cultural studies is not so much whether or not it is a discipline. As Alasuutari (1995, 15) has asserted, for cultural studies "what is important is the [ongoing]

politics of disciplinarity" (emphasis ours). While some mutual wariness remains between cultural studies and disciplines, the current post-mixed genres academic period, characterized by a general turn to interdisciplinarity appears to have fostered détente in some quarters and mutual appropriation and recognition in others. As evident from cultural studies enthusiastic reception of texts such as Nelson and Gaonkar's (1996) *Disciplinarity and Dissent in Cultural Studies*, the relationship between cultural studies and the disciplines continues to be a topic of considerable interest.

Part of and indeed an early contributory factor to the perennial interest in the relationship between cultural studies and the disciplines is the story that cultural studies emerged out of a series of crises (in parameters, in theory, in and of identity) in the traditional humanities and social science disciplines in the British academy in the 1950s and 1960s. This narrative, widely assumed in cultural studies circles and reiterated in numerous introductory texts (e.g., Brantlinger 1990; Gray and McGuigan, 1993), has passed from story to taken-for-granted fact.

While the "crises" narrative is indeed a viable one, it is only one of several stories of the origin of cultural studies. Indeed, the case could be made that cultural studies emerged in multiple locations around the world, at various other times and in various intellectual contexts including "culturology in Russia in the 1920s, the Harlem Renaissance in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, the Negritude Movement in France, francophone Africa, and the French West Indies in the 1930s . . . [and] the praxis of cultural studies developed at Kamiriithu [Kenya, in the 1970s]" (Wright 2004, 65). Given the singular Birmingham narrative of origin, the frequent assertions that Birmingham is not the only origin (often made, as Maureen McNeil, 1998, asserts, without pointing to other concrete examples) and the veritable plethora of viable alternatives to Birmingham, it could be concluded that "the development of cultural studies is a dangerous and confused topic in which authors have often lost their sense of direction" (Maton 2002, 34).

Even if one takes up the general notion that cultural studies originated in Britain (for example, it is indisputable that the CCCS lent cultural studies its name), there is a intellectually specific British narrative, one that firmly establishes the field of adult education rather than a series of crises in the humanities and social sciences generally thought of as the origin of cultural studies. For a variety of reasons, this adult education origin has been marginalized or simply eschewed in favor of the crises narrative. It therefore bears reiteration here as a starting point for discussing the central themes of this special issue of the *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, namely the contemporary relationship between

cultural studies and the field of education; the characteristics of cultural studies in/and education and the “glocal” presence of cultural studies in/and education.

Two central concepts in this discussion are “education” and “glocal presence.” Education is conceptualized here very “broadly” to include, as Simon (1995, 109) asserts, “the full range of multiple, shifting and overlapping of sites of learning that exist within organized social relations of everyday life [including] workplaces, families, community and institutional health provision, film and television, the arts, groups organized for spiritual expression and worship, organized sport . . .” While inclusive of schooling and teacher education, this cultural studies influenced, “broad” conception of education is clearly not synonymous with the study of schooling. The focus in this special issue is on a broad education studies as institutionalized in institutions of higher education — in colleges, faculties and departments and programs of education.

The notion of the “glocal” signals a focus on the dialectical and dialogical relationship between the global and the local (Appadurai 1993; Arnove and Torres 2003; Eriksen 2001; Luke 2003) as opposed to the dominant conceptualization of globalization as a virtually unidirectional process whereby global developments impact local sites. Thus the notion of the glocal presence of cultural studies in education suggests simultaneously that cultural studies is emerging in various sites around the world (both in academia generally and in the field of education); that this emergence could be seen as positive or tinged with the danger of cultural imperialism (a danger Appadurai, 1993, points out for the relationship between dominant and marginal polities, and which should be acknowledged as possible also for the relationship between progressive work of the dominant nations and that of much smaller nations); and that the process is two way, such that global developments affect the local praxis of cultural studies and/in education and local characteristics and developments affect and contribute to the global discourse of cultural studies and/in education.

In describing the precursive stages of the British version of the origin of cultural studies, Raymond Williams (1989, 154) observes that

In the late 40s, people were doing courses in the visual arts, in music, in town planning and the nature of the community, the nature of settlement, in film, in press, in advertising, in radio; courses which if they had not taken place in that notably underprivileged sector of education [namely, adult education] would have been acknowledged much earlier.

What Williams describes are some of the elements at work in the field of adult education which were to coalesce into what we

have come to identify as cultural studies. These include the study of radio, the press and advertising (that would become media studies), the idea and practice of studying the popular seriously, and the juxtaposition of various disparate discourses. In sum, what Williams' statement clearly reveals is that what we have come to call cultural studies had its origins in the field of education. Other figures who contributed to the early development of cultural studies in Britain, such as Stuart Hall, readily endorse Williams' assertion of an adult education and extramural origin of cultural studies while pointing out that cultural studies grew out of a search for approaches to literary texts in adult education classes that were more relevant to the histories, concerns and perspectives of working class students. In fact, as Larry Grossberg (1997, 375) has pointed out, "All the founding figures of cultural studies (including Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams, E. P. Thompson, and Stuart Hall) started their careers, and their intellectual projects, in the field of education, outside the university, in extramural departments and adult working-class courses." Thus it is not the case that what we have is a happenstance of one principal figure, Raymond Williams, working in and pointing to education as the context in which cultural studies originated. Rather, in the British case, adult education offered a conducive context for cultural studies to evolve, whether considered in opposition to or in collaboration with the academy.

CULTURAL STUDIES OF EDUCATION AS INTEGRAL CCCS WORK

It is important to note that the originators of British cultural studies did not work in education as an academic field but as an area outside of the academy. The following quote from Stuart Hall (1990, 12) is illustrative

We came from a tradition entirely marginal to the centres of English academic life, and our engagement in the questions of cultural change ... were first reckoned within the dirty outside world. The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies was the locus to which we retreated when that conversation in the open world could no longer be continued. ... Some of us — me, especially — had always planned never to return to the university, indeed, never to darken its doors again. But, then, one always had to make pragmatic adjustments to where real work, important work, can be done.

What we have in Hall's statement is a notion of the adult education/extramural program as a space outside of the stifling elitist world of academia, a space where one was free to push the borders

conceptually, theoretically and in praxis, and where one could do “real politics.” The CCCS was, in part, an attempt to recreate in the elitist, politically restrictive and restricted world of the academy, a semblance of the situation and the work that was being conducted and engaged outside. It was also an acknowledgement, a recognition of the differences in status and resources between adult education and the university itself.

It is also important to note that the field of education did not merely act as a principal point of origin after which cultural studies moved smoothly into the more urbane and prestigious world of the academy, leaving education behind. In other words, cultural studies was not born as pedagogy and then idealized into intellectual production. Once the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) was established at Birmingham University, education was engaged as a prominent part of early cultural studies work conducted at the Centre. The CCCS included at least two consecutive, formally constituted Education Groups and the Centre’s series of in-house paper publications in the 1970s and early 1980s included several publications on education. Of these, Paul Willis’s, (1977) *Learning to Labour*, is the most widely known. Less well known but quite important education texts include cultural studies of education contribution to the CCCS Working Papers series (e.g. Clare 1985; Doyle 1981; Moos 1979) and books by the first and second CCCS Education Groups (*Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies* 1981, 1991).

The identification of this sample of texts is intended to simultaneously mention a body of work to an audience that might be unaware of its existence, remind the audience that does know of its existence but has curiously neglected it and to reiterate the point that from the 1970s onwards, education was an integral though, now less known, aspect of CCCS work.

DENIAL: EDUCATION IS CULTURAL STUDIES’ INCONVENIENT OLD AUNT IN THE ATTIC

Given this background, it appears rather curious at first that despite its origins in adult education, and despite the prominence of education as an integral and prominent aspect of an early cultural studies project at Birmingham, contemporary cultural studies appears to be implicated in the marginalization of pedagogy and the field of education, especially in North America. There are numerous ways in which this occlusion is made manifest. For example, most introductory cultural studies texts put forward the “crises narrative” of origin and this more expansive historicization

of cultural studies effectively effaces (albeit inadvertently) the role of pedagogy and the field of education in the birth and development of cultural studies.

Also education is too often simply absent from contemporary discussions of the disciplines, fields and even topics which have contributed to, or been influenced by, cultural studies (e.g., Nelson and Gaonkar's, 1996, *Disciplinary and Dissent in Cultural Studies*). While anthropology, literature, sociology, history, communications, and rather improbably, even physics, have all been taken up in this vein, education continues to be distinctly absent in discussions about cultural studies and the disciplines. Similarly, in recent calls for papers for cultural studies conferences and publications, the wide range of disciplinary origins, from which papers are invited, all too often exclude the field of education.

Finally, topics on and figures working in education are usually not included in anthologies of cultural studies work. The inclusion of Henry Giroux's (1992) essay, "Resisting Difference: Cultural Studies and the Discourse of Critical Pedagogy" in the collection, *Cultural Studies* is the exception that proves the rule. Taken as a whole, cultural studies has not only developed somewhat of a blindspot for its own nature as education (Maton and Wright 2002), but also for education as an academic field of inquiry. Given the above observations, it would appear that education is cultural studies old aunt in the attic, an inconvenient relative that cultural studies is reluctant to acknowledge, especially when good company like cutting edge theory and form of postdisciplinary work come to visit.

On the other hand, education as a field has generally been wary of and has marginalized cultural studies. As Henry Giroux (1994, 279) once declared, "educational theorists demonstrate as little interest in cultural studies as cultural studies scholars do in the critical theories of schooling and pedagogy." This is the case for a number of reasons.

First, education appears to regard cultural studies as being of dubious value in addressing educational issues. With an emphasis on practice and on formally organized institutions (schools, colleges, universities) mainstream education (especially aspects like teacher education) would consider cultural studies as not dealing with its immediate sphere of interest.

Second, cultural studies is associated, even by some critical educators, with academic elitism and, therefore, is thought of as being at odds with the goals and approaches of education in general. Shirley Steinberg and Joe Kincheloe (1997, 6) for example, declare, "We are enthused by the benefits of cultural studies of childhood yet critical of expressions of elitism within the discourse of cultural studies

itself — a recognition made more disturbing by the field's claim to the moral high ground of a politics of inclusivity.”

Third is cultural studies' overt leftist politics. With its close, albeit complex and revisionist ties to Marxism, at least in the initial British tradition (Cary Nelson, 1996, has decried the fact that in America cultural studies has largely eschewed engagements with Marxism, a criticism which might well apply to contemporary cultural studies at many sites around the world) and to addressing issues of social difference and working for social justice, cultural studies does not have broad appeal for mainstream education which must regard it as being entirely too radical.

A fourth reason is that the concerns and approaches of early cultural studies coincided with marginal and much less prestigious aspects of the field of education. To revisit Williams' (1989, 154) statement, the courses in film, radio, etc. being designed and taught in the 1940s in England were “Courses which if they had not taken place in that notably underprivileged sector of education [adult education] would have been acknowledged much earlier.” Because precursive cultural studies work began in what is perceived as a less than prestigious area of education, it was doomed from the start to be considered marginal and less prestigious work in the field of education in general.

What we have in the relationship between cultural studies and education is a situation characterized originally by strong, productive links, and later, by mutual exclusion at worst and mutual wariness at best, and presently, by ferment and foment — a situation in such flux that Larry Grossberg (1997, 374) has described education as “one of the most pressing, promising, and paradoxical sites of cultural studies to have emerged recently.” This is particularly true of the relationship between education and cultural studies in the North American context.

CONVERGENCE: THE NORTH AMERICAN MOVE FROM FLIRTATION TO COMINGLING

There has been an interesting series of shifts as far as the relationship between cultural studies and education is concerned from the 1980s to the turn of the century in Canada and the United States. The 1980s could easily be described as a decade characterized by some flirtation between education and cultural studies with, for the most part, missed opportunities to make very direct links between the two, let alone to articulate them into a hybrid discourse. It is curious, for example, that even though cultural studies started in adult education, the field of adult education in the US and Canada does not appear to have embraced or drawn upon

cultural studies in the 1980s. Parallels such as the spread of Frierean approaches to adult education, and popular theater as an aspect of adult education, are tantalizing but remain, in the end, parallel rather than contributory.

What dominated radical leftist work in education in general in the 1980s was critical pedagogy. It is interesting that critical pedagogy developed not only from Frierean or liberatory pedagogy, but also from critical theory and the latter made for possible links with cultural studies which, nonetheless, were not realized in any sustained manner. The collection of essays in David Livingstone's (1987) *Critical Pedagogy and Cultural Power* are a most fascinating study in what, at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), was at once a loosely hybrid critical pedagogy/cultural studies educational discourse and a juxtaposition of some cultural studies of education with a more dominant critical pedagogy. In the end, however, what could have been articulated as a new hybrid discourse was, for the most part, considered an extension of radical pedagogy and thus claimed for critical pedagogy.

If the end of the 1980s saw the initial overt juxtaposition of critical pedagogy and cultural studies, the 1990s can be identified as the decade in which cultural studies in education began to come into its own as an explicitly named, influential discourse in progressive education. The late 1990s and turn of the century has witnessed the resurgence of cultural studies in education, this time in a much more assertive, self-confident and expansive form. All these characteristics are epitomized in the title, style, and arguments of Susan Huddleston-Edgerton (1996) in her book, *Translating the Curriculum: Multiculturalism into Cultural Studies*. (This North American text echoes the title, style and arguments of an earlier British text, Antony Easthope's, 1991, *Literary into Cultural Studies*.)

There are interesting developments in the relationship between cultural studies and critical pedagogy which have been initiated from within the field of critical education and which constitute the beginning of what promises to be the rapid development and institutionalization of cultural studies in education. As illustration, one could point to the recent establishment of programs, in and emphasis on, cultural studies in graduate studies in education (e.g., the Cultural Studies in Education in Canada, the cultural studies emphasis at the Ohio State University's Leadership Studies in Education program, a Cultural Studies focus within the Social Sciences and Comparative Education Division at UCLA, and the Cultural Studies in Education Program at the University of Tennessee). What is most significant about cultural studies in education at Ohio State and at the University of Tennessee is that cultural

studies has been officially recognized and institutionalized through the explicit naming of departments and programs of cultural studies in education (actually named Cultural Studies Section at OSU and the Cultural Studies in Education Program at UT). Also, papers have been published recently which directly and explicitly address the relationship between education, pedagogy and cultural studies and the productive possibilities that inhere in the intersection of education and cultural studies. Finally, there are now journals devoted to the cultural studies in education and cultural pedagogy, including *Taboo* and *The Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*.

THE DISCOURSE AND PRAXIS OF CULTURAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION AND ITS GLOCAL PRESENCE

From the cursory look at the relationship between cultural studies and education provided above, a number of characteristics and developments can be discerned, each of which already contributes to the evolution of both the fields of cultural studies and education or has the potential to do so. First, the education origin narrative, if taken up seriously in the field of cultural studies, would mean that education as a topic and educational concerns which are general academic concerns (e.g., pedagogy) would gain much more significance and prominence in cultural studies discourse and praxis. Second, early CCCS work on an education addressed policy and opened up the possibility that cultural studies analysis of educational policy could be a substantial aspect of the emerging cultural studies of education discourse, and could also contribute to cultural studies work on, even as, policy studies (as advocated by Tony Bennett 1922). Third, the institutionalization of cultural studies in the academy, initiated at Birmingham, and a topic of continued importance (Striphas 1998), could in and of itself be considered an educational issue (as in higher education meets cultural studies). Fourth, the relatively recent phenomenon of the institutionalization of cultural in colleges/faculties and departments of education is contributing to the examination of institutionalization and disciplinarity of cultural studies as well as new directions in critical education (indeed cultural studies has emerged as a successor regime to critical pedagogy and multicultural education, c.f., Wright 2000a). Fifth, the emerging discourses of what Larry Grossberg (in Wright 2000b) has described as “cultural studies of education” and what could be described as “cultural pedagogy as education” demand “making a space for education” in cultural studies (to amend Michael Green’s, 1998, call for “making a space for cultural studies” in academia).

While this account has focused so far on the dominant national traditions (British and American), the relationship between cultural studies and education in general and the more specific phenomena of the institutionalization of cultural studies in colleges/faculties, departments and programs of education; the emerging discourses of cultural studies of education and cultural pedagogy as education are present or emerging in other countries around the world. This special issue reflects this comprehensive view and the essays have been selected to illustrate that cultural studies in/and education could, and indeed should, be conceptualized and examined as a “glocal” phenomenon. The essays have been carefully selected to represent a broad variety of international sites of cultural studies and/in education as well as very specific issues being addressed at the local level at each of these sites. The overall purpose is to portray cultural studies and/in education as operating at once globally and locally. Taken together the essays give an indication of the globality of cultural studies and/in education, while the discussions of very specific issues at local sites from around the world indicate the local.

In what follows the essays are taken up though not so much in terms of their specific topics and contents, which are quite stimulating and make for very interesting reading. Rather, given the focus of this editorial, the essays are discussed in terms of how they are illustrative of, and contributory to, three selected characteristics of cultural studies and/in education mentioned earlier, namely the institutionalization of cultural studies in the national academy; the institutionalization of cultural studies in education; and literacy, reading and cultural pedagogy as aspects of the discourse and praxis of cultural studies and/in education.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CULTURAL STUDIES IN THE NATIONAL ACADEMY

Laurence Raw’s “The Practice of Cultural Studies in the Turkish Republic” and Gönül Pultar and Ayşe Lahur Kirtunç’s “Cultural Studies in Turkey: Education and Practice” depict and address issues involved in the institutionalization of cultural studies in the Turkish academy. These essays join other accounts of how cultural studies has emerged and become institutionalized in various countries and at specific institutions around the world. In other words, these essays contribute to the narrative of the globalization of the phenomenon of the institutionalization of cultural studies, a characteristic which makes them inherently significant.

Cultural studies ought not to be conceptualized and taken up merely as a body of knowledge or a number of given approaches

to be applied in new settings. Rather, ideally, cultural studies emerges at each new site in a form which reflects the problematics and characteristics and hence principal project of each site. This means that the global spread of cultural studies does not (or rather, should not) result in the duplication of an existing model, the taking up of established texts, the inheritance of a given history and the application of established approaches in new contexts. Rather, the specific characteristics of the new site determine, to a large extent, the characteristics of cultural studies at that site. Thus, the two essays illustrate that for cultural studies in Turkey some of the key problematics and characteristics include the politics of language (what Pultar and Kirtunç identify as the need for a shift from cultural studies in and as English discourse to cultural studies in Turkish); what the dominant Kemalist project and national cultural characteristics of secularity, modernity, westernization and the promotion of unity mean as a context for constructing a Turkish cultural studies; the politics of legitimation of cultural studies in a Turkish academy still dominated by a model of strong, discrete and powerful traditional disciplines (emphasized by Pultar and Kirtunç) and the related “interesting questions about interdisciplinarity” (explored by Raw); the pedagogy of cultural studies (both papers) and the emerging and future projects of Turkish cultural studies (Pultar and Kirtunç).

While the two papers overlap to some degree in some of the general points made, the different vantage points of Raw as a transplanted American and Pultar and Kirtunç as native Turks makes for interesting differences in emphasis. While Raw’s account concentrates on providing an overview of the history and institutionalization of cultural studies in Turkey, Pultar and Kirtunç tackle, in addition, the details of the politics of legitimation and what they describe as “the identity crisis” of the Turkish academy.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CULTURAL STUDIES IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

The problematic of institutionalization does not occur simply at the national level, but more concretely at the level of specific institutions and even specific departments and fields of study. The papers by Raw, and Pultar and Kirtunç reveal that in Turkey cultural studies has emerged out of the Humanities and more specifically was first taken up, according to Pultar and Kirtunç, by a group of Americanists via a two-day conference “co-organized by the Department of American Culture and Literature of Ege University and the American Studies Association of Turkey ... on April 10–11, 1995.”

It is not always possible to be quite as specific about the institutionalization of cultural studies. In other settings cultural studies has not been established in quite the same definite and concrete manner. Rather it has crept in through such means as the introduction of isolated courses or even sections of courses within a discipline or department at an institution or through the pedagogy and writing of individual or small groups of instructors. Sometimes cultural studies is established through a combination of definitive, bold measures (such as the establishment of the Cultural Studies in Education Program at the University of Tennessee) and smaller measures such as the construction of heuristic models for doing cultural studies work within a program, design and teaching of cultural studies courses and even the inclusion of cultural studies texts and approaches in existing traditional courses and programs of study.

Ronald Soetaert, Andre Mottart and Ive Verdoodt, in their essay "Culture and Pedagogy in Teacher Education," provide a sustained discussion of how they are introducing cultural studies into the teacher education program at a Belgian university. In their case, cultural studies has not been formally institutionalized through symbolic, large scale measures such as the formation of a department, program of study or even courses in cultural studies. Rather, cultural studies is being introduced by the authors into existing traditional courses in their Department of Teacher Education and Department of Pedagogy through the "small acts" (as in small but highly productive and meaningful; c.f., Gilroy 1993) of their pedagogical approach and praxis. They trouble traditional approaches and concepts (e.g., cultural literacy based on naïve conception of a homogenous national culture) and introduce cultural studies influenced reconceptions into, and through, their pedagogy (e.g., Henry Giroux's notion of "border pedagogy" to reconceptualize pedagogy and Mary Louise Pratt's notion of "contact zone" to reconceptualize the curriculum as contact zone).

Tatiana Ryba and Patrick Williams, essay, "Multiculturalism or Assimilation? An Examination of a University International House" is an example of cultural studies praxis made possible in part by the establishment of a heuristic model for undertaking cultural studies work in a college of education at an American institution, namely Handel Wright's model which, as they characterize it, "blends and hybridizes three distinct fields of scholarship: cultural studies theory, an activist form of service learning known as service learning for social justice, and qualitative research." They turn the focus of service learning (which usually involves reaching out from the university into the community) back to the university by undertaking service learning at one of the university's own set of

programs, namely those of the International House. Thus, their work is dual in terms of institutionalization — they undertake work that is made possible by the institutionalization of cultural studies and they undertake this work in a fashion that critiques the university as an institution and as community.

Although Ryba and Williams appropriate service learning as part of a hybrid model for examining the university as an institution, the introduction of service learning does raise the traditional service learning preoccupation, namely forging links between the university and the community. Michael Hoechsmann's "Reading Youth Writing: Grazing in the Pastures of Cultural Studies and Education" reflects an effort in the opposite direction of the essays discussed so far, that is, moving cultural studies as education out into the community. Hoechsmann spent years outside academia and has recently returned to take up a teaching position at a faculty of education at a Canadian university. This history has heightened his inside/outside perspective as reflected in the fact that he raises questions of praxis, of how well we, as academics practice being "cultural workers," of whether academics, even those who champion youth culture, work closely with youth. In other words, while the emphasis in both this editorial and the other essays discussed thus far have concentrated on bringing cultural studies into education, Hoechsmann's concern is with how cultural studies as education operates outside of the formal institution. He discusses the work produced by youth involved in Young People's Press, a project for which he served as director for four years, as well as some 300 articles to a newspaper. His focus is on teasing out, from the diversity of voices and speaking positions of the youth, the hybrid voice and the central common concerns expressed about issues of identity and culture.

READING (AND) CULTURAL PEDAGOGY

Literacy in general and critical literacy in particular is a principal topic in several of the essays (Costa; Higgins; Hoechsmann; Soetaert, Mottart, and Verdoodt). However, some of the essays go beyond addressing literacy to undertaking reading as their primary concern. Robert Helfenbein's "New Times, New Stakes: Moments of Transit, Accountability, and Classroom Practice" could be said to be a sustained reading of the simple phrase, "No Child Left Behind." Of course, the phrase is quite significant as it is the backbone of current school (kindergarten through grade 12) education policy in the United States. Based on rigid notions of testing of students, accountability of schools, a system of rewards and punishment and an inordinate emphasis on "the

basics" of reading, writing and arithmetic (at the expense of creativity, critical thinking, etc.), this very conservative doctrine has as its foundation and rationale, Helfenbein points out, a manufactured crisis supposedly in need of being policed. Helfenbein's essay is both something of a response to Grossberg's (in Wright 2000b) call for new work from education that examines educational issues from a cultural studies perspective and an essay that is reminiscent of the Birmingham CCCS Education Groups (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies 1981, 1991) with its close analysis of educational policy issues utilizing a cultural studies approach.

Marisa Vorraber Costa's essay, "Teaching to Divide the World: The Perverse Curriculum of a Television Program," is also based on reading. However, while Helfenbein's topic is traditional educational policy, Costa's essay is about education more broadly defined, namely the cultural pedagogy of a Brazilian television program. As Costa points out, the mass media sets itself up as a true, if not the ultimate pedagogue, "claiming to tell and show us what was 'really' happening, teaching us about the world, about life, inventing epics and tragedies, shaping opinions . . ." The essay is a close reading of *Bamulua*, a children's television program that portrays a moral universe in starkly binary terms (portraying two communities, one moral and full of light and goodness and the other morally bankrupt and full of darkness and evil). She teases out the moral lessons the program attempts to teach and some its rather surprising portrayals (e.g. the disabled and modern technology as part of the world of evil and darkness). If Hoechsmann shifted the focus from inside education to inside/outside, Costa brings the focus outside formal education and its institutions to the cultural pedagogy of the media. Drawing principally on Foucault for her theoretical framework and playing on the title of a book by the Canadian education theorist, John Willinsky, for her own title, Costa's work, like that of many of the essays in the collection, illustrates the local use of theorists and concepts that have gained global circulation. As a reading of a television program's pedagogy, Costa's essay is a good example of what we identify as cultural pedagogy as education.

The South African, John Higgins contributes, "Superseding Williams: Critical Literacy in Williams and Said," which is simultaneously the most specific and most comprehensive in scope. In terms of its characteristic of being principally a reading, it is the most specific of the essays. What Higgins provides is a both a personal reading of the work of Edward Said and Raymond Williams and a critical personal reading of earlier readings of the points of divergence and convergence between the works of these two intellectuals. He points to the pedagogy of Williams and Said's

intellectual work. He observes that the comparison he undertakes and the re-reading of earlier comparisons is necessary because "in my view...the existing frame tends to misrepresent the force of William's work, the deeper significance it had for Said, and it works to inhibit an adequate understanding of the larger or long-term significance of both bodies of work." Reading as an aspect of the pedagogical encounter with intellectual work is part of how we could view Higgins' essay. While this makes it a very personal individual exercise, the international status of the intellectuals and the comprehensive scope of the work engaged pushes us to consider the essay in terms of the international scope of the pedagogy of intellectual work (and both the personal and the universal make Higgins' location in South Africa virtually incidental).

CONCLUSION: TURNING GLOCAL CRITICAL EDUCATION TOWARD CULTURAL STUDIES

In one sense, this special issue of the *The Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies* can be seen as a freestanding text in which the essays make individual, unique arguments in and of themselves. However, this editorial has been used to relate the essays to one another and to the more general theme of the glocal emergence of cultural studies and/in education, with the editorial serving to outline some of the history and contemporary status of cultural studies and/in education and to indicate in brief, broad strokes a few of the ways in which some of the characteristics are reflected in the essays.

While this conception serves to unite the papers and the editorial as part of a discussion about the phenomenon of cultural studies and/in education, it should be recognized that this present discussion is in fact part of a larger discussion, one which the editors had made their initial comprehensive contribution to an earlier special issue of the *International Journal of Cultural Studies* IJCS; (Maton and Wright 2002b). The two special issues are conceptualized as complimentary. The IJCS special issue had the theme of "returning cultural studies to education," with an emphasis on highlighting the ways in which cultural studies was, in part, a form of education and issuing a call for cultural studies to return to its education roots and seriously consider education as a contributory discourse. The present special issue could be said to highlight the opposite side of that argument, that is, the need for a cultural studies approach to education to be acknowledged and highlighted in the field of education, an argument for (re)turning critical education to cultural studies. With both issues the attempt has been to indicate that cultural studies

and/in education is a global phenomenon, one deserving of higher profile in both education and cultural studies circles, even as such already multidisciplinary circles give way around the world to what is, hopefully, an increasingly interdisciplinary, indeed postdisciplinary and more praxis-oriented academic world.

REFERENCES

- Alasuutari, P. 1995. *Researching culture: Qualitative method and cultural studies*. London: Sage.
- Appadurai, A. 1993. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In *Colonial discourse and postcolonial culture*, edited by P. Williams and L. Chrisman. New York: Harvester.
- Arnove, R. and C. A. Torres, eds. 2003. *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Bennett, T. 1992. Putting policy into cultural studies. In *Cultural studies*, edited by L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, and P. Treichler. New York and London: Routledge.
- . 1998. Cultural studies: A reluctant discipline. *Cultural studies* 12(4):528–545.
- Brantlinger, P. 1990. *Crusoe's footprints: Cultural studies in Britain and America*. New York: Routledge.
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Education Group 2. 1991. *Education limited: Schooling, training and the new right in England since 1979*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies Education group. 1981. *Unpopular education: Schooling and social democracy in England since 1944*. London: Hutchinson.
- Clare, M. 1985. *Ideologies of adult literacy: Politics and practice*. Vol. 80.
- Doyle, B. 1981. *Some uses of English: Denys Thompson and the development of English in secondary schools*. Vol. 64.
- Easthope, A. 1991. *Literary into cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Eriksen, T. 2001. *Small places, large issues: An introduction to social and cultural anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.
- Gilroy, P. 1993. *Small acts: Thoughts on the politics of black cultures*. New York: Serpent's Tail.
- Giroux, H. 1992. Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy. In *Cultural studies*, edited by L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, and P. Treichler. New York and London: Routledge.
- . 1994. Doing cultural studies: Youth and the challenge of pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review* 64(3):278–308.
- Gray, A. and J. McGuigan, eds. 1993. *Studying culture: An introductory reader*. London: Arnold.
- Green, M. 1998. Making space for cultural studies. In *Cultural studies, interdisciplinarity, and the university*, edited by M. Dahbi, M. Ezroua, and L. Hadded. Rabat, Morocco: Mohammed V University.
- Grossberg, L. 1997. *Bringing it all back home: Essays on cultural studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hall, S. 1990. The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis of the humanities. *October* 53:11–23.
- Huddleston-Edgerton, S. 1996. *Translating the curriculum: Multiculturalism into cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Livingstone, D. ed. 1987. *Critical pedagogy & cultural power*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

- Luke, C. 2003. Glocal mobilities: Crafting identities in interracial families. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*. 6(4):379–401.
- Maton, K. 2002. Popes, Kings and cultural studies: Placing the commitment to non-disciplinarity in historical context. In *Cultural studies: Interdisciplinarity and translation*, edited by S. Herbrechter. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Maton, K. and H. K. Wright. 2002a. Editorial: Returning cultural studies to education. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 5(4):379–392.
- Maton, K. and H. K. Wright. (Editors). 2002b. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 5(4).
- McEwan, P. 2002. Cultural studies as a hidden discipline. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 5(4):433–444.
- McNeil, M. 1998. De-centering or re-focusing cultural studies: A response to Handel K. Wright. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1(1):57–64.
- Moos, M. 1979. *Government youth training policy and its impact on further education*. Vol. 57.
- Nelson, C. 1996. Always Already Cultural Studies: Academic Conferences and a Manifesto. In *What is cultural studies? A reader*, edited by J. Storey. London: Arnold.
- Nelson, C. and D. P. Gaonkar, eds. 1996. *Disciplinary and dissent in cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Simon, R. 1995. Broadening the vision of university-based study of education: The contribution of cultural studies. *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies* 17(1):107–114.
- Steinberg, S. and J. Kincheloe, eds. 1997. *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Striphas, T., ed. 1998. *Cultural studies*. 12(4).
- Williams, R. 1989. The future of cultural studies. *The politics of modernism: Against the new conformists*. London: Verso.
- Willis, P. 1977. *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Aldershot: Saxon House.
- Wright, H. K. 2000a. Nailing Jell-O to the Wall: Pinpointing aspects of state-of-the-art curriculum theorizing on the threshold of the 21st century. *Educational Researcher* 29(5):4–13.
- . 2000b. “Pressing, promising, and paradoxical: Larry Grossberg on education as a site of cultural studies.” *The Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies* 22(1):1–25.
- . 2004. *A prescience of African cultural studies: The future of literature in Africa is not what it was*. New York: Peter Lang.