

Cultural pedagogies and the logics of culture: learning to be a ‘community type of person’

Andrew Hickey

Author Bio

Andrew Hickey, PhD. is Senior Lecturer in Cultural Studies and Social Theory in the School of Linguistics, Adult and Specialist Education at the University of Southern Queensland, and President of the Cultural Studies Association of Australasia. His most recent book *Cities of Signs: learning the logic of urban spaces* (Peter Lang), offers an exploration of the role of cultural pedagogy in the formation of community.

Abstract

In the excitement and dynamism that marks current scholarship on cultural pedagogy it is perhaps easy to forget that culture has always ‘taught’. It is with the formation of *cultural logics*—the core bases upon which we come to *know* and *be*—that the pedagogical implications of culture materialise. This *cultural* knowledge, of how to be cultured, is deployed pedagogically and presented with intent, so much so that to wander a street, engage in conversation, view television, or simply negotiate a life as a member of a community become deeply educative acts.

The knowledge that is of the most worth may not be the kind of knowledge that can be transmitted in a school context (Kliebard 1997)

The metonymy of schooling and cultural pedagogy

In its most basic sense we might take pedagogy to be the process of transmitting ideas in a codified and intentioned manner. As Bernstein (1996) suggests, pedagogy is ‘a fundamental social context through which cultural reproduction-production takes place’ (3), and in this broad designation pedagogy is concerned with the intent to shape ideas and convey meaning. For the argument contained in this chapter, pedagogy determines how culture comes to be known; *a cultural pedagogy shapes how culture is experienced and understood*. This latter point is significant as it is with how pedagogy provides a sense of *context* that the consequence of cultural pedagogy becomes particularly evident.

As will be suggested throughout this chapter, the real significance of a cultural pedagogy is in how it *informs*—in how the foundations of being and experience articulated by this pedagogical exchange find meaning as cultured acts. This isn’t to suggest that certain, *intended* pedagogical outcomes are always met. Counter effects and resistant outcomes might too surface, and it is with these that this chapter will spend some time to illustrate the workings of cultural pedagogy. But it is with how the prevailing *logics* of culture set the rules of the game and define the way things *are*, culturally, that an insight into cultural pedagogies might be made.

By cultural logics, I refer to those ways of knowing and being that are core to a culture. The way certain knowledges are ordained, certain practices are deployed, and in general, the way a culture comes to be known and understood are the result of certain formulations of logic as carriers of understanding. This isn’t to suggest that these logics are fixed, or absolute—culture is never static—but that a culture, in coming to be identified and known carries certain logics that define its shape and meaning. It may well be that multiple logics are in circulation, and that while some just happen to be dominant, there are simultaneously competing claims over what culture *is* and what it means. This is the ‘messiness’ of culture. But it is in how these logics are contained in what I will roughly refer to as the *curriculum* of culture and then translate into practice through individuals that the pedagogic is realised¹.

The significance of a cultural pedagogy hence lays in the exchange between culture and the individual and what it is that can be made of the logics of culture. A prominent theme conveyed here is that although the pedagogical effects—that is, the outcome of the pedagogical exchange—of a cultural pedagogy may never be *total*, and that counter-effects will exist, it is with how the message comes to be framed, conceptualised and ultimately experienced that the logic of culture finds articulation. In this regard, the central contention of this chapter is twofold; firstly, that because pedagogy (as a notoriously slippery term) is generally understood to happen in sites of *formal* education—namely schools—the pedagogical implications of culture are thus often missed and secondly, that the pedagogical aspects of culture are evident in processes of *learning-to-be* a cultured being and are positioned at the point of exchange between the individual and those wider cultural logics that frame how things come to be *done*.

In making the case that cultural pedagogies are significant and offer conceptual scope for charting the experience of being human, I will draw on the experiences gained during a long-term ethnography that explored the construction of identities around the concept of ‘community’ within a large, master-planned urban development situated in south-east Queensland, Australia. From the lessons learnt during this project, I will propose a way of understanding culture according to its implicit pedagogical intentions and argue for a cultural pedagogy that draws attention to the logics of culture as its concomitant curriculum.

Definitional considerations: cultural pedagogies and the logics of learning culturally

So what might it mean to talk about a ‘cultural pedagogy’? Where does this take place and, by extension, what does it mean to culturally learn? In other words, *what is the nature of this pedagogical address and how is a cultural pedagogy actually deployed?*

An inference within current discussion around public and cultural pedagogies draws on the locations in which these pedagogies might occur. A problematic distinction is commonly made between ‘formal’, as in commonly recognised and primarily institutionalised pedagogies that happen in locations such as schools, universities and colleges and other less-recognisable ‘informal’ pedagogies that occur away from institutional settings. Sandlin, Schultz and Burdick (2010) note this point specifically when suggesting that:

Increasing numbers of educational scholars, from a wide range of contexts, are interested in the learning and education happening **outside of formal schooling systems** and position **informal spaces of learning** ... as sites of pedagogy containing possibilities for both reproduction and resistance (2, emphasis added).

In this sense, the location in which pedagogy occurs features as the identifier of the type of pedagogy it might be. So, for example, in a *formal* educational setting (say, a classroom), it is according to such markers as those readily identifiable features of the space (the centrality of the archetypal blackboard, or the teacher’s desk), the division of roles amongst those actors taking part in this exchange (for instance, between students and teachers), the specialised practices and rituals deployed within this site as *techne* (such as ‘lining up’, ‘sitting quietly’ and so on), and those particular modes of address and forms of behaviour that become identifiers of this type of pedagogy. The space of the school is thus easily recognised as a space of pedagogical exchange; a place of learning that is understood according to its formal structure and by assumptions concerning what these structures mean.

If the current literature offers any indication, defining a *cultural* pedagogy is a far more fluid affair. Without explicit and immediately identifiable institutional locations in which this pedagogy is practised, a sense of what type of pedagogy this *is* becomes a much harder thing to pin down. A cursory glance at the focal points of recent work in public and cultural pedagogy highlights this point: Rich (2011) focuses on reality television and obesity, Hayes and Gee (2010) explore video games, Sandlin and Milam (2008) discuss culture-jamming and activism, Giroux (2002) surveys Hollywood film, Kincheloe (2002) critiques the McDonald’s Corporation, Bennett (1995) reads the museum, while my own (Hickey 2012, 2010, 2006) work has accounted

for the city-space as pedagogue. These examples highlight the divergent sites within which cultural pedagogies (and their commensurate critiques) are understood to happen. These are of course 'cultural' spaces (as all spaces become when invested with human meaning) and in them 'cultural' practices find expression according to various exchanges that can be considered to be pedagogical with regard to the intent these have to convey something about culture.

A twofold problem inheres in these conceptualisations of pedagogy, however. When defined against *locatedness* and the sites of activation in which these pedagogies are practised, the limits of spatiality as the point-of-definition quickly become apparent. Firstly, this distinction neglects the fact that formal sites of pedagogy such as 'the school' (as a monolithic and metaphoric construct) as cultured (and *cultural*)² space may actually support a range of cultural pedagogies in conjunction with recognisably *formal* pedagogies in complex and intertwined ways. The current debate in Australia over the formation of a national curriculum stands as a case in point in this instance. Considerable bargaining and public comment over what should be included within this curriculum—over what should be formally addressed pedagogically in Australian schools—has focused on what matters enough to be included in the curriculum, and concomitantly how this curriculum will go about adequately shaping young Australians as 'good' Australians (an age old concern of curriculum design). Questions around what should be represented in the curriculum and how these representations might frame Australian identities and histories suggests something larger than the formal codification of knowledge that curriculum alone is thought to assert. It shows that wider cultural 'lessons' are at stake in what students are expected to take on as good citizens and how these come to infiltrate the cultural construct that is the *formal* curriculum.

The so-called *formal* curriculum, in this instance at the least, has been shaped by wider concerns about what should be known. Defining exactly what is *formal* and by extension what is (culturally) *informal* hence becomes a problematic endeavour. As a site that draws on cultural pedagogies as the point of transmission for wider cultural beliefs about what is important, the school itself functions as an important host of a range of informal cultural pedagogies. When recognised solely against those locations within which the pedagogical address occurs, the distinction between formal and informal quickly dissipates as a slippery point of differentiation. Something more is needed to make sense of the cultural pedagogy.

Reconceptualising cultural pedagogy as a mode of address

The provisions of the locatedness of the pedagogy, whether considered according to its placement within formal-institutional or informal-cultural settings, ultimately run short in providing a useful cue for charting the dimensions of cultural pedagogy. Instead, I want to suggest that a more useful way to understand cultural pedagogy might involve a focus on the *mode of address* by which the pedagogy is mobilised. When considered not according to the site of its activation, but the mode of address deployed, a more concrete sense of cultural pedagogy emerges. It is in the act of transmission—the specific intent to socialise—that the cultural pedagogy is realised and the operations of the concomitant *content* of the pedagogical exchange appear. This content—what might again be referred to as a *cultural curriculum*—is an important point of orientation for the pedagogical act and one that signifies the nature of the cultural pedagogical address. It is in the way this cultural curriculum is deployed, how its meanings find explication

and how its ideas are forged and normalised according to specific modes of address that the pedagogic is evidenced. A cultural pedagogy hence is best understood in terms of how it deploys the messages of culture.

Of course, human beings make culture as much as they are made by it, and so it is with individuals that cultural pedagogy rests. As learners and pedagogues at once, it is according to how relationships of power function between individuals in the formation of culture that the pedagogical intent of culture is positioned. To push the school analogy even further, within the formal classroom it is with such things as the identity positions assumed by student and teacher and affirmed by gender, sexuality, race and ethnicity, dis/ability and class (amongst manifold other axes of identity), how concerns around learning and acquisition shape and define the structure of the classroom, the role that the explicit and ‘hidden’ (Giroux and Purpel 1983) aspects of the curriculum perform and the rules and codes of conduct by which the school ‘works’ that mediations of certain behaviours and determination of the learners’ (and teachers’) scholastic fate will be realised (Freire 1977; Willis 1977; Apple 1979). So, too, do dynamics of power and positionality alter the way that culture is taught.

As in the formal classroom, it is also the case with cultural pedagogies that actual, real-live human beings are responsible for *teaching*. These are the cultural pedagogues, and although they might be part of a larger institution, are still informed by sets of orientations and epistemic logics that are decidedly *human*; logics that find airing via the cultural pedagogy and within the constructs of a cultural curriculum.

A case in point: the mobilisation of a cultural pedagogy in Greater Springfield.

Between 2005 and 2009 I undertook an extended study of the master-planned edge-city *Greater Springfield*, located in south-east Queensland’s expansion corridor to the south-west of the state capital Brisbane. This ethnography started with an interest in the way that competing visions of ‘community’ as both an ideal and physical expression of human interaction were framed by the development companies charged with building this place and those residents who were drawn to buy-into this instant city. One aspect of Greater Springfield emerged fairly soon after I started my exploration. Significant expressions about what this place *was* were beamed across the landscape via, amongst other components of a highly organised marketing strategy, *billboards* (see *Figures 1, 2 and 3*). All manner of theme and ideal was presented via these visual information disseminators; they covered it all from paleo-symbolic ideals of community, belonging, family, and choice (amongst many others) to banal calls for consumption and excess (Hickey 2012). These billboards quickly became the focus of my study given the significance they held as ‘pedagogical artefacts’. This terminology was applied due to the influence I saw these things wielding not only as manifestations of a corporate image for the area, but also according to the way that they were consumed and negotiated by the residents themselves. Of course, it should be noted that these artefacts weren’t the pedagogues per se. It wasn’t the billboard itself that conjured the communications it held—that was the job of the development firms, or more specifically the staff of various marketing departments—but they were intrinsic to the pedagogical address being presented. To apply a crude analogy, these were the *blackboards*

of the cultural pedagogical exchange proffered in Greater Springfield, and carried with them the sort of codified lessons that any good teacher would want her or his students to know.

[INSERT FIGURES HERE]

In conjunction with an extensive visual ethnographic and semiotic analysis of the billboards, banners, posters, roadside signage, flyers, brochures and a number of other similar pedagogical artefacts deployed in Greater Springfield, I conducted ethnographic interviews with residents and representatives of the various development companies in the area. I spoke with people who, perhaps unsurprisingly, loved the area and everything about it, just as I encountered those who found the place isolating and despairing. While extended analysis of the semiotics and visual ethnography of the various billboards and marketing materials attached to the development of Greater Springfield are detailed elsewhere (see Hickey 2012, 2010, 2006) I want to focus here on how it was that the residents encountered the cultural logic of Greater Springfield via the paleo-symbolic ideals these pedagogical artefacts deployed as the cultural curriculum of the development.

What the residents saw

I was amazed with how the lofty idealism presented in the billboards, brochures and other artefacts of Greater Springfield compared to the everyday functions of living I witnessed. It wasn't that the ideals presented by the billboards were wrong, or worse, intentionally misleading, but that they captured a very specific view of what life *could* be like, and not what life *was* like for everyone. This after all was a community of several thousand people, with perhaps as many interpretations of 'the vision' of community as there were people resident in this place. While the images and suggestions for living presented on the billboards and other artefacts of Greater Springfield represented an imagined (Anderson 1983) form of community connectedness and self-identification, the ideals the images contained were something that I found the residents didn't automatically accept nor reject in their 'real' day-to-day lives. There was a complex interpellation of subjects through these ideals into everyday living.

Naturally, the point of advertising media such as those billboards and brochures I encountered in Greater Springfield is to sell an image of what something could be; as Hebdige (1988) notes 'advertising provides an endless succession of vacatable positions for the "desiring machines"' (211). The billboards and brochures showed what could be done—or perhaps more correctly, what *should* be done by the 'desiring machines' of Greater Springfield as envisaged by its developers. But living in Greater Springfield wasn't simply a process of residents seeing, wanting and becoming. The 'desiring machines' of Greater Springfield—its residents—had their own agency and ideas about what life should be like and didn't always fall for the imagery to blandly recreate what they saw. In fact, disregard and active criticism of the images was presented by several of my informants; one in particular noted that the idealism of the imagery was 'a load of rubbish, to be quite honest' (Jane).

The imagery of Greater Springfield didn't function along a basis of a simple dialectic; a dualism where the image sat in one corner, and the ideas of the residents in the other. The imagery did

exert a certain influence. It did set a logic for the place. It did define the boundary and how things came to be known in Greater Springfield. But the residents also presented their own views—alternative views in many cases—and actively critiqued how ideals of community and collective living were premised in the imagery of the billboards and brochures distributed by the developers. But while certain residents may have been critical of the idealistic imagery of the billboards and brochures, their criticisms were simultaneously bound-up by the very logic of the imagery itself. A complex relationship to the place emerged here, where Greater Springfieldians, whether for or against the ideals suggested in this place came to see themselves *as* or *not as* ‘the sort of person who lives in Greater Springfield’ (Jane)³.

This was striking, because it suggested that my informants had a clear idea of what sort of person lived in Greater Springfield, and perhaps more implicitly, whether that was the sort of person they were. Jane, in particular, seemed to battle the most with this—she was deeply critical of what Greater Springfield had become, how Delfin, the developers, had constructed the place as a contrived form of community. Jane was largely typical of the demographic that Greater Springfield sought to attract; she was affluent, a mum with a young family and a partner who worked locally at a nearby military base. She had purchased in the area with a view to establishing roots and connections, as per the imagery she saw and initially had connected with. But she also became impassioned and angry as she told me about her experiences—of what she had encountered in contrast to the image. Jane noted how she felt isolated within this ‘community’ and had recently made the decision to move away:

- Jane: ...I just don’t like the whole community, kind of thing—imposed community. And I feel that it is an imposed community.
- Andrew: And you find that you feel pressured to be part of the community when you might just want to be on your own?
- Jane: Sometimes.... Where we’re living at the moment, we’re kind of all piled on top of one another. I’m not really a community... kind of person, really.

Jane was critical of the way that the ideals of Greater Springfield, presented via its pedagogical artefacts, transcended the realm of the image alone to be representative of the underlying logic of the place. Even in disagreement with these ideals, the logic of Greater Springfield was still conjured.

Another informant, Rebecca, noted that while she could see what Delfin and the Springfield Land Corporation were attempting to achieve with the imagery of life in Greater Springfield, she questioned the intent behind the application of it:

- Rebecca: I think when Delfin discuss community it’s certainly a marketing spin, absolutely. But then on the other hand they have put up community groups that don’t make a profit for them—but I suppose the fringe benefit of that would be that it might attract people to move into the community and keep it vibrant and so forth. So yeah, I don’t buy into their version of community whatsoever.
- However, ... Springfield is a community—it’s a community because people live there and people work there and play there and their children are there.

So I think even despite some cheesy commercials and cheesy marketing, a community will develop anyway, yeah. Because people are people I think and they want to have interactions with other humans.

These views were largely representative of the *sense* many of the informants had of Greater Springfield. Even though the imagery presented by the billboards and brochures suggested an idealised view of how life in Greater Springfield functioned, the residents exerted and lived their own views of things within the structural constraints of the development. But, all the while, the underpinning logic of the development, as mediated by the developers, was ever-present; via the way the built environment was structured, the nature of the type of housing available, the services provided and the expectations for maintaining the financial investment of owning a part of Greater Springfield. These were undeniable and suggested something more than just what the physicality of the place superficially presented.

As Schutzman (1999) suggests, flows of advertising as information dissemination devices present a peculiar dilemma in the late-capitalist world:

We desiring machines roam haphazardly in ad-inspired fugue states, ever shopping, seeking self-improvement and satisfaction. When we fail, as we always do, we try again... But in our search for happiness, commodities deliver us to the pearly gates short-sighted and impotent. Our ephemeral dreams were masterfully packaged in things that leave us only smoke and mirrors, just as the profiteers intended it. (118)

In Jane's case, the 'self-improvement and satisfaction' presented by Greater Springfield didn't respond to her desire, to the point that she felt pathologised in the 'claustrophobic' and 'imposed community' of Greater Springfield:

Andrew: So what is the moral of the story if you're moving to Springfield...
Jane: Don't move to a community if you don't want to be a community person.
 As much as they try to be inclusive, it can be exclusive.

The glossy images of belonging, community, lifestyle and connectedness didn't quite translate for Jane. Greater Springfield for her had become a very isolating experience—an experience that fitted a certain type of person; as she noted, a 'community type of person'. While choices could be made within the preformed environments of Greater Springfield and appropriations of its logic deployed to some extent, it remained that a boundary of agency functioned to authorise specific identity claims and modes of living. As Rebecca noted, while it may well have been possible for residents to deride the imagery of Greater Springfield as marketing spin, it still did maintain a benchmark upon which ways-of-living and lifestyle were measured and upon which the entire physicality of Greater Springfield—its buildings, parklands and shopping centres—was constructed. To live in Greater Springfield meant, at least in part, accepting a certain understanding about *who you were*, with this identity measured against how the ideal Greater Springfield resident was framed. The cultural pedagogical artefacts of Greater Springfield provided clear visual cues as to who this was. The built environment, configuration of public space and nature of the services available in the place further mediated the style of living and type of person the Greater Springfield resident *could* and *should* be.

The cultural pedagogies of Greater Springfield

The way that the residents of Greater Springfield came to understand their ‘community’ identity drew on a number of sources. While Rebecca suggested that a middle class aesthetic that presented ideals of style, distinction and affluence came into Greater Springfield with its residents, it remained that there was a concerted effort on behalf of the developers and their marketing agencies to attract this demographic segment in the first place.

What I was interested in was how the residents viewed this process of class concentration. When I met with Nicole and Debbie, two people actively involved in developing the identity of Greater Springfield through their work as public relations staff with development firm Delfin, they noted that what they were trying to do was connect ‘likeminded people’. Particularly in their role in community liaison, Nicole and Debbie were actively involved in supporting and providing assistance for the various community groups that operated in Greater Springfield. As they noted, their role was to assist in getting these groups off the ground:

Nicole: So that’s the first thing and then from there it is a matter of sort of through our job is trying to establish more community groups and trying to connect likeminded people for the social side of things or for the educational side of things. So it’s all within the – in the hub.

While it made perfect sense to get similar people involved in activities and community events, it also suggests that this sort of involvement by the developers in crafting social networks could potentially result in the creation of insularity that Rebecca had noted, or the outright isolation that Jane mentioned. It all seemed to hinge on what sort of groups and activities the developers were happy to support, as this would give an indication as to what types of people they considered to be Greater Springfieldians. While Nicole and Debbie both suggested during the couple of occasions we met that they would be happy to support any group that residents suggested would be useful, I asked them whether, for example, an Islamic Literature Reading Group would be possible to form. The response was that they suspected there wouldn’t be enough interest to sustain such a group, which left me to conclude that between the normatively ‘white’, middle class aesthetic that residents brought with them into the area and the initial marketing towards a specific demographic of people by the developers, a very clear sense of what was ‘normal’ was established in Greater Springfield. If you didn’t fit this set of characteristics, as Jane had found, the experience of Greater Springfield could become a very isolated one indeed.

The role of the pedagogical artefacts within this process of identity formation and identity consolidation cannot be understated. It was the imagery and text these contained and the presentation of certain types of lifestyle and people that carried the logic of Greater Springfield. This cultural curriculum celebrated certain ways of being and certain ways of knowing, and when I asked my informants what they thought about this process, and whether or not they felt the billboards, brochures and other artefacts exerted a pressure on the identity of Greater Springfield and its people I received replies such as the following from Brett:

- Brett: I think when people come to Springfield they're buying into the idea of the community.
- Andrew: You mentioned advertising; do you think it's solely advertising that's doing this? That perhaps it's advertising that's constructed an image that people have seen and said; 'yes that's me'?
- Brett: I think the advertising attracts the type of people who want to be in a part of a community so *it perpetuates a community because you're attracting people who want to participate in the community.* (emphasis added)

Building on this theme, Rebecca highlighted a fascinating aspect of the marketing approach deployed in Greater Springfield; the use of actual residents within the pedagogical artefacts. The way the billboards and brochures came to present actual residents was a significant extension of the intra-supporting nature of the marketing used in Greater Springfield:

- Andrew: [Nicole and Debbie] mentioned that the people represented in the ads are actual residents?
- Rebecca: Yes, that's true. Yeah definitely because you see them around—I mean you see them walking around or might know them because you've taught their kids or whatever. But yeah they are definitely residents... but they're carefully selected.
- Andrew: OK, so how are they selected?
- Rebecca: You know like they know—they're selected because they know someone at Delfin by and large. Like I've never seen an ad in the paper that says we're trying out for a—auditioning for a commercial; they know the people.

Rebecca was sceptical of the hand-selected use of certain residents within these artefacts. These 'real people' as Nicole and Debbie labelled them, may well have been residents, but for Rebecca the hand-selected nature of their inclusion said something about the desire the developers had to show a certain type of individual as resident in Greater Springfield. For Rebecca, the very white, middle class, heterosexual and nuclear family arrangements displayed in the billboards and brochures didn't capture a genuine image of what *her* Greater Springfield was. As she noted:

- Rebecca: I mean on the ads it's really promoted—I have never seen anyone except for a white person who looks like they ascribe to middle class values. I mean just looking at my own street that I live in, I live in a small cul-de-sac, there's probably about 10 houses in my whole street. So we've got a retired couple, we've got a mixed family—mixed by that I mean step family like mum and dad have remarried but have combined their children. There's an old couple and a young couple as well. There's another young family. There's a Samoan family that live on the end of our street. Then there's another family with two kids and then there's another couple with a dog. A family from New Zealand.
- Andrew: Well that's an interesting mix isn't it? It doesn't necessarily add up with what the advertising image says.
- Rebecca: No it doesn't, no.

While a concerted effort appears to have been made by the developers to present ‘real people’, for Rebecca those real people only represented a small sub-set of the residents of Greater Springfield. As I saw it during my time in Greater Springfield, this was a clear expression of the privileging of certain identity characteristics. More so, what the pedagogical artefacts were doing included not only the selling of an image, but more explicitly, the suggestion that the image being sold was in fact ‘real’. And to a certain extent it was; but after looking closely, it was apparent that it was real for only a small sub-set of those people who called Greater Springfield home. This was a privileging of a specific lifestyle and identity; one that people like Rebecca and Brett couldn’t relate to, and in the case of Jane specifically, felt isolated because of. For Jane it was via the lessons conveyed on the fronts of billboards and circulated according to a cultural curriculum that privileged certain ways of living, knowing and being, that she had learnt that she didn’t belong.

Criticality in cultural pedagogy

So what is left after these applications of cultural pedagogy do their work? I draw on Schaul’s (2007) call for a *critical* pedagogy to posit how cultural pedagogies such as those deployed in Greater Springfield might be problematized and opened for critique:

Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (34)

Of course, Schaul was referring to formal incarnations of pedagogy, but the same applies for cultural pedagogies.

It is with the way that things come to make sense via culture that the implications of cultural pedagogy are most apparent. In *making sense*—in conveying the logic of culture as the point of reference by which meaning and experience are derived—the pedagogy of culture does its work. In Greater Springfield this was achieved by presenting a specific vision of what the place meant via (of all things) billboards and similar other advertising. As became evident in Greater Springfield, this image was restrictive and excluded as much as it included; as was the case with Jane who realised that she could no longer live in the area, and Brett’s conflation of class and a certain aesthetic toward living. The logic of Greater Springfield was apparent to these residents via the cultural pedagogical exchanges they had with the billboards they passed each day. Here the intentions of those (its developers primarily) who had decided on how Greater Springfield would be codified established this cultural curriculum as a ‘vision’ for the development and set about transmitting these ideals within sets of paleo-symbolic prompts; *community, belonging, family, learning* and so on. Embedded in this pedagogical act were the ideals that the Greater Springfield resident should live up to. But as with Jane, the effects of this cultural pedagogy were messy and complex. Although she ultimately didn’t buy into the imagery, she did engage with it to make sense of the place and herself. In this regard, the pedagogy was effective, albeit by identifying to Jane that she really wasn’t the sort of person who should live in Greater Springfield.

In closing, the significance of a cultural pedagogy must be read against the intentions its commensurate cultural curriculum suggests. As the carrier of the logics of a culture and the point from which meanings are plied, this cultural curriculum signifies what is important and what *should* be understood and experienced within culture. The messages implied within this are the stuff of the cultural pedagogical address, with the cultural pedagogy powered by what meanings it is harnessed to convey. But in considering this curriculum of culture, attention should be given to the nature of the address deployed. The cultural pedagogy as bound by the relationships of power that demarcate how certain logics come to prevail and, most significantly, who is enacting these messages is writ-large in something bigger—something behind the scenes, all the while functioning as the arbiter of what comes to be known and how the experiences of coming-to-know are framed. Any investigation of a cultural pedagogy should seek to decode how things come to mean, and the effects these prevailing meanings, framed as codified cultural logics, come to exert on those individuals implicated in the learning of its curriculum. Decoding the cultural pedagogy is one thing; understanding the logics this cultural pedagogy is mobilised to convey from the cultural curriculum, and how actual people respond to and ‘learn’ from them, is quite another.

List of References

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. New York, Verso.
- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York, Routledge and Keegan Paul.
- Bennett, T. (1995). *The birth of the museum: history, theory, politics*. London, Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: theory, research, critique*, London, Rowman and Littlefield.
- Cohen, A. P. (2004). *The symbolic construction of community*. London, Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1977). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, Penguin.
- Giroux, H.A. 2002, *Breaking into the movies: film and the culture of politics*. Malden, Blackwell.
- Giroux, H. A., and D.E. Purpel, (1983). *The hidden curriculum and moral education: deception or discovery?* New York, McCutchan.
- Hayes, E.R. and J.P. Gee, (2010). ‘Public pedagogy through video games: design, resources, and affinity spaces’. In J.A. Sandlin, B.D. Schultz and J. Burdick, (eds.), *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: education and learning beyond schooling*. New York, Routledge.
- Hebdige, D. (1988). *Subculture: the meaning of style*. New York: Routledge.

- Hickey, A. 2006. 'Street smarts/smart streets: public pedagogies and the streetscape'. *M/C Journal*, 9(3).
- 2010, 'When the street becomes a pedagogue'. In J.A. Sandlin, B.D. Schultz and J. Burdick, (eds.), *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: education and learning beyond schooling*. New York, Routledge.
- 2012. *Cities of signs: learning the logic of urban spaces*. New York, Peter Lang.
- Kincheloe, J.L. (2002). *The sign of the burger: McDonald's and the culture of power*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Kliebard, H.M. (1997). 'The rise of scientific curriculum making and its aftermath', in D.J. Flinders and S.J. Thornton (eds), *The Curriculum Studies Reader*. New York, Routledge: 27-38.
- Rich, E. (2011). 'I see her being obese!: public pedagogy, reality media and the obesity crisis'. *Health: An interdisciplinary journal for the social study of health, illness and medicine*, 15(1): 3-21.
- Sandlin, J.A. and J.L. Milam, (2008). 'Mixing pop (culture) and politics: cultural resistance, culture jamming, and anti-consumption activism as critical public pedagogy'. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 38(3): 323-350.
- Sandlin, J.A., B.D. Schultz and J. Burdick (eds.). (2010). *Handbook of Public Pedagogy: education and learning beyond schooling*. New York, Routledge.
- Schaull, R. Foreword. (2007). In P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, Penguin.
- Schutzman, M. (1999). *The real thing: performance, hysteria and advertising*. Hanover, New Hampshire, Wesleyan University Press.
- Willis, P. E. (1977). *Learning to labour: how working class kids gets working class jobs*. Aldershot, Gower.

¹ An immediate observation of this construct might draw parallels to Bourdieu's conceptualisation of habitus, or even Foucault's suggestion of *dispositif*. While I do intend to suggest a sense of comparison between these concepts and the ideas that mobilise them as constructs, I use 'cultural logic' according to derivations of Anthony Cohen's notion of 'boundary', as derived from his ethnographic encounters in the Hebrides. Cohen explains certain ways of knowing and being present as a set of logics that depict the shape of a culture. Bourdieusian scholars might see this as the formation of the habitus determined by the field and its actors. However I prefer Cohen's theorisation of the boundary, as it provides a more pragmatic sense of how culture is made by people, but more importantly also, how the exchange between culture and individuals in coming to learn and know culture functions. This sense of 'logics' is furthered throughout the chapter as 'cultural logics'.

² I make this distinction accordingly; by 'cultured' I mean that schools (in this instance) are products of culture. By 'cultural' I suggest that they are simultaneously also responsible for the production and maintenance of culture.

³ Several of my other informants (Mike, Pete and Maree) also alluded to there being such a thing as the 'Springfield person', as if some sort of archetypal Springfield resident did exist.