IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)
e-ISSN: 2320–7388, p- ISSN: 2320-737x Volume 11, Issue 1 Ser. II (Jan. – Feb. 2021), PP 06-29
www.iosrjournals.org

Conceptualizing and Defining Pedagogy

Dr. Rajendra Kumar Shah
Associate Professor

Sanothimi Campus
Tribhuvan University
Sanothimi, Bhaktapur, Bagamaati Province 3, Nepal

Abstract
The Greek word for child (usually a boy) is pais (the stem of this is paid), and leader is agogus-so a paid-agogus or pedagogue was literally a leader of children. And yet this confines us to a very limited understanding of what pedagogy is, or has the potential to become. Although the terminology pedagogy is not a recent invention, it has been a major concern of the educationist in the twentieth century. Later, the word pedagogue became synonymous with the teaching of our young. Taken in this context, we would probably all agree that pedagogy is about children's education. Pedagogy, literally translated, is the art or science of teaching to children. The major aim of the present article is to conceptualize and define pedagogy from different perspectives. For this purpose, I have made in-depth study of the related literature during the course of the study.This paper offers a thematic analysis of the ten topics such as etymological meaning of pedagogy and pedagogue; difference between pedagogues and teachers; defining pedagogy; revisiting the definition of the pedagogy; changing concept of pedagogy; the thinness of Anglophoneconceptions of pedagogy; pedagogy as arts, science and applied science and types of pedagogy; sub-fields of pedagogy; methods of pedagogical research;and models of pedagogy. Models of pedagogy section includes pedagogy of teacher centred teaching and pedagogy of learner centredteaching.On the basis of these topics, I have analyzed the nature, characteristics, and types of the pedagogy and derived the conclusion.

Keywords:Pedagogy, teaching, learning, teacher centred teaching, learner centred teaching,

---

Date of Submission: 28-11-2020 Date of acceptance: 09-01-2021

Etymological Meaning of Pedagogy and Pedagogue

In the Western world, the term pedagogy has a long history. The etymological meaning of the term pedagogy is derived from the Greek word ‘paidagōgeō’ in which ‘país, genitive, paidos’ means child and ágō means lead; so it literally means ‘to lead the child’. The Latin-derived word for pedagogy means ‘child instruction’ which is in modern use in English to refer to the whole context of instruction, learning, and the actual operation involved therein. In English the term pedagogy is used to refer to instructive theory; trainee teachers learn their subject and also the pedagogy appropriate for teaching that subject. The word *pedagogy* has its roots in Ancient Greece. Rich families in Ancient Greece would have many servants, often slaves, one of whom would be specifically tasked to look after the children. Often these slaves would lead or escort the children to the place of education. The Greek word for child (usually a boy) is *pais* (the stem of this is 'paid'), and leader is *agogus*-so a *paid-agogus* or pedagogue was literally a leader of children. Later, the word *pedagogue* became synonymous with the teaching of our young. Taken in this context, we would probably all agree that pedagogy is about children's education. And yet this confines us to a very limited understanding of what pedagogy is, or has the potential to become.

Pedagogy, derived from French and Latin adaptations of the Greek ‘boy’ + ‘leader’, literally means a man having oversight of a child, or an attendant leading a boy to school. This meaning is now obsolete. Moreover, the gendering, appropriate in ancient Greece-where the formal education of girls was unusual-is inappropriate for modern times. The limitations of the literal meaning of the term have encouraged leading contemporary writers to invent broader terms, such as andragogy, for adult education.The first pedagogues were slaves-often foreigners and the ‘spoils of war’ ***(Young 1987).*** They were trusted and sometimes learned members of rich households who accompanied the sons of their ‘masters’ in the street, oversaw their meals etc., and sat beside them when being schooled. These pedagogues were generally seen as representatives of their wards’ fathers and literally ‘tenders’ of children (pais plus agögos, a ‘child-tender’). Children were often put in

their charge at around seven years and remained with them until late adolescence.Plato talks about pedagogues as 'men who by age and experience are qualified to serve as both leaders (hëgemonas) and custodians (paidagögous)' of children ***(Longenecker 1982: 53)***. Their role varied but two elements were common ***(Smith 2006)***. The first was to be an accompanist or companion-carrying books and bags, and ensuring their wards were safe. The second and more fundamental task concerning boys was to help them learn what it was to be men. This they did by a combination of example, conversation and disciplining. Pedagogues were moral guides who were to be obeyed ***(Young 1987: 156).***The pedagogue was responsible for every aspect of the child's upbringing from correcting grammar and diction to controlling his or her sexual morals. Reciting a pedagogue's advice, Seneca said, "Walk thus and so; eat thus and so, this is the proper conduct for a man and that for a woman; this for a married man and that for a bachelor'***(Smith 2006: 201)***.Employing a pedagogue was a custom that went far beyond Greek society. Well-to-do Romans and some Jews placed their children in the care and oversight of trusted slaves. As ***Young (1987)*** notes, it was a continuous (and ever-widening) practice from the fifth century BC until late into imperial times ***(quoted in Smith 2006).*** He further reports that brothers sometimes shared one pedagogue in Greek society. In contrast, in Roman society, there were often several pedagogues in each family, including female overseers for girls. This tradition of accompanying and bag carrying could still be found in more recent systems of slavery such as that found in the United States-as Booker T Washington recounted in his autobiography Up from Slavery ***(Washington, 1963)***.The relation of the pedagogue to the child is a fascinating one. It brings new meaning to ***Friere's (1972)*** notion of the 'pedagogy of the oppressed'-this was the education of the privileged by the oppressed. It was a matter that, according to Plato, did not go unnoticed by Socrates. In a conversation between Socrates and a young boy Lysis, Socrates asked, 'Someone controls you?' Lysis replied, 'Yes, he is my tutor or pedagogue here.' 'Is he a slave?' Socrates queried. 'Why, certainly; he belongs to us,' responded Lysis, to which Socrates mused, 'What a strange thing, I exclaimed; a free person controlled by a slave!' ***(Plato 1925, quoted by Smith 2006).***

Pedagogy is also associated with the Greek tradition of philosophical dialogue, particularly the Socratic method of inquiry. A more general account of its development holds that it emerged from the active concept of man as distinct from a fatalistic one and that history and human destiny are results of human actions. This idea germinated in ancient Greece and was further developed during the renaissance, the reformation and the age of enlightenment. In the context, first of all, I want to analyze the etymological meaning of pedagogy.

In the modern context, pedagogy entered the Oxford English Dictionary in 1571. Pedagogy is the term that describes the relationships and "interactions between teachers, students and the learning environment and the learning tasks." ***(Murphy, 2008. p 35)***. The Latin word 'paidagogi' was used to describe the slave who accompanied the young Roman boy to school. Plato described these pedagogues as both leaders and custodians of children ***(Smith, 2006: 200)***. From this etymology, has developed the term of pedagogy to describe the methods and approaches used by teachers to lead students in their learning. ***Alexander (2008, p 6)*** outlines the difference between teaching and pedagogy by emphasising that "teaching is an act while pedagogy is both act and discourse…Pedagogy connects the apparently self-contained act of teaching with culture, structure and mechanisms of social control." Pedagogy is not therefore simply describing the activity of teaching, but reflects the production of broader social and cultural values within the learning relationship.Concepts of pedagogy reflect societal values and beliefs about learning, and usually draw from two main paradigms: traditional notions of learning as a biological, cognitive acquisition of uncontested knowledge, or alternatively notions of learning as a cultural and social construction within communities of practice. The traditional learning paradigm that emerged in the early 1900s and dominated the 20th century was based on beliefs of social efficiency, social Darwinist theories of innate ability through individual heredity, and behaviorist learning theories ***(Shephard 2000)***. Principles drawn from efficiency of industrialisation and factories were applied to education and educational building design. Fundamental building blocks of curriculum were taught in sequence so skills could be mastered and measured by frequent testing, with motivation provided by reward and positive reinforcement.

A new paradigm of learning emerged in the 1970's about the time when Vygotsky's work was rediscovered when translated into English. Within this emerging paradigm, "fixed, largely hereditarian theories of intelligence have been replaced with a new understanding that cognitive abilities are developed through socially supported interactions" ***(Shephard, 2000 p.7)***. ***Friere (1970)*** also challenged the notion of a banking model of education, in which the teacher "owns" knowledge and "deposits" it in students. Instead, he promoted what is now known as critical pedagogy in which teachers and students learn together through dialogue, posing problems and investigating their own worlds, leading to a "dialogical theory of praxis and knowledge and a revised relationship between teacher and student" ***(Bartlett, 2005)***. The active role of the learner within cultural communities created a greater focus on how learning occurs, and appreciating the diversity of learners and their preferred learning styles and modes. ***Sfard (1998)*** has noted that both "acquisition" and "participation"

approaches to learning are needed. Learner centered principles from both paradigms such as flexibility, differentiation, adaptation, individualised and active learning are principles of pedagogy that have significant implications for learning space design.

In modern day usage pedagogy stands for: A place of instruction; a school, a college; a university; Instruction, discipline, training; a system of introductory training; a means of guidance; The art, occupation, or practice of teaching. Also: the theory or principles of education; a method of teaching based on such a theory' ***(Oxford English Dictionary, 2018)***. Pedagogy may be commonly defined as the art and science and may be even craft of teaching. However, viewing pedagogy in this way fails to honour the historical experience and connect crucial areas of theory and practice. To understand the term fully, it needs to be explored through the thinking and practice of those educators who look to accompany learners, care for and about them, and bring learning into life ***(Encyclopedia Britannica 2015)***. Teaching is just one aspect of their practice. In recent years, there has been more intense and wider discussions on this term perceived from different directions. Freire has been seeking a pedagogy of the oppressed or critical pedagogy and has proposed a pedagogy with a new relationship between teacher, student and society. As a result of the broader debates on pedagogy, practitioners have been wanting to rework the boundaries of care and education via the idea of social pedagogy; and perhaps most significantly, governments wanting to constrain the activities of teachers by requiring adherence to preferred pedagogies ***(Smith 2012)***.

Difference between Pedagogues and Teachers

Within ancient Greek society, there was a strong distinction between the activities of pedagogues (*paidagögus*) and subject teachers (*didáskalos*). Moral supervision by the pedagogue (*paidagogos*) was significant in terms of status. He was more important than the schoolmaster because the latter only taught a boy his letters, but the *paidagogos* taught him how to behave, a much more important matter in the eyes of his parents. He was, moreover, even if a slave, a member of the household, in touch with its ways and with the father's authority and views. The schoolmaster had no such close contact with his pupils ***(Castle 1961:63)***. However, because both pedagogues and teachers were of relatively low status they were could be disrespected by the boys. There was a catch here. As the authority and position of pedagogues flowed from the head of the household, and their focus was more on life than 'letters', they had advantages over teachers (*didáskalos*).

The distinction between teachers and pedagogues, instruction and guidance, and education for school or life was a feature of discussions around education for many centuries. It was still around when Kant explored education. In *On Pedagogy* (*Über Pädagogik*) first published in 1803, he talked as follows:

> *Education includes the nurture of the child and, as it grows, its culture. The latter is firstly negative, consisting of discipline; that is, merely the correcting of faults. Secondly, culture is positive, consisting of instruction and guidance (and thus forming part of education). Guidance means directing the pupil in putting into practice what he has been taught. Hence the difference between a private teacher who merely instructs, and a tutor or governor who guides and directs his pupil. The one trains for school only, the other for life.* ***(Kant 1900: 23-4)***

Defining Pedagogy

Pedagogy, literally translated, is the art or science of teaching children. In modern day usage, it is a synonym for teaching or education, particularly in scholarly writings. Throughout history, educators and philosophers have discussed different pedagogical approaches to education, and numerous theories and techniques have been proposed. Educators use a variety of research and discussion about learning theories to create their personal pedagogy, and are often faced with the challenge of incorporating new technology into their teaching style. Successful education for all depends on teachers being able to embrace both the art and science of pedagogy, acting as parents who understand the needs, abilities, and experiences of their students while also being trained in the best methods of communication and presentation of appropriate materials.

Pedagogue was originally a term for a slave who was responsible for the care of children in the household. Later, the meaning of the word expanded to mean educator and teacher. A pedagogic theory deals with the nature and structure of educational action, teaching, and upbringing. Pedagogic theories are connected with belief and value systems, concepts of man and society, and philosophies of knowledge and political interests. Thus, it is rather difficult to define a pedagogic theory exactly. In general, the concept of pedagogy refers to a systematic view of organizing education. It discusses the issues of how to educate and what it means to be educated. In this sense, a pedagogic theory is a theory of educational action, or a systematic view and reflection of pedagogic practice. Pedagogic theory is a systematic conceptualization of the process of education

and conditions of human development in both the individual and the societal life sphere. It deals with processes of upbringing, teaching, learning, and social and cultural development. Aims and means, values and norms, and objectives and methods of education are systematically reflected therein. Pedagogic theory building starts with two fundamental anthropologic questions: What is a human being, and what should he or she be? Combining these questions, pedagogic theory examines educational aims and means of helping human beings to develop toward what they should be. Pedagogic reflection and theory building are based on the idea that-in the words of Immanuel Kant-a human being can become human only through education. Studying childhood from the vantage point of pedagogic theories focuses on the development of a pedagogic way of thinking over the course of time***(DEEWR, 2009C)***.

Modern day usage of the term pedagogy is more common in otherEuropean countries, in particular, in French, German and Russian-speaking academic communities, than in English-speaking ones. In continental Europe,pedagogical institutes are to be found alongside, and within, universitydepartments***(DEEWR, 2009b)***. Academic awards in pedagogy are also common. A scan ofa European journal seemingly addressing this areaof work, shows, however, that few articles actually do focus on what to manyBritish readers would be central: classroom teaching. The boundaries of pedagogyin mainland Europe, it appears, are defined very broadly. As one Swedish academic notes: 'Pedagogy as a discipline extends to the consideration of the development of health and bodily fitness, social and moral welfare,ethics and aesthetics, as well as to the institutional forms that serve tofacilitate society's and the individual's pedagogic aims' ***(Marton and Booth, 1997: 178)***. Even in France, a country which has taught pedagogy since 1883, the director of its Institute National de RecherchePedagogique hasdescribed how the term is subject to changing connotations and pressures***(Best, 1988)***.Pedagogical commonly understood as the approach to teaching, is the theory and practice of learning, and how this process influences, and is influenced by, the social, political and psychological development of learners. Pedagogy, taken as an academic discipline, is the study of how knowledge and skills are imparted in an educational context, and it considers the interactions that take place during learning. Both the theory and practice of pedagogy vary greatly, as they reflect different social, political, and cultural contexts. Pedagogy means the method of teaching in the widest sense ***(Winch and Gingell, 2004)*** which might include the philosophy, sociology, psychology and methodology involved in teaching children as well as the curriculum, school organization and management ***(Lohithakshan, 2004)***. ***Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2003)*** gives the meaning of pedagogy as 'the study of methods and activities of teaching'. Thus the term generally refers to strategies of instruction, or a style of instruction. Pedagogy is also occasionally referred to as the correct use of instructive strategies.

Definitions of pedagogy are offered from time to time. A commonexample is 'the science of teaching'. However, the brevity of this phrase maycreate its own difficulty, since such a definition depends on the reader'sassumptions about 'science' and their conceptions of 'teaching'. ***Arends (2001)*** defines pedagogy as 'the study of the art and science of teaching'. Teacher as an artist need to be innovative, flexible and imaginative so that he/she is not locked into any single teaching style. A survey of the literature indicates that the term 'pedagogy' is contested, defining it is complicated because of its complex nature so often the term is vague or broadly defined ***(Gipps and MacGilchrist, 1999; Ireson et al., 1999; Watkins and Mortimore, 1999; Westbrook et al., 2013)***. Pedagogy is sometimes used synonymously with teaching. As ***Loughran (2006, p.2)*** puts it, pedagogy is used as "a catch-all term" to talk about teaching procedures, teaching practice, and instruction. However, ***Watkins and Mortimore (1999)*** and ***Murphy (2008)*** point out that there have been changing perceptions of pedagogy over time in a complex way, besides having a fluctuating status in different cultures. Therefore, understanding the definitions of pedagogy is important. ***Watkins and Mortimore (1999)*** note that using the term pedagogy is less popular in English-speaking academic communities than in other academic European communities such as the French, German and Russian. ***Alexander (2004)*** analyses the reasons for the limited use of the term in England and points out that pedagogy has been narrowly defined in England to connote with the practice of teaching. Therefore, due to cultural differences, England has been criticised for ignoring pedagogical studies ***(Watkins and Mortimore, 1999; Alexander, 2009)***.

Pedagogy is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as 'the science of teaching'. ***Alexander (2000: 540)*** states: 'Pedagogy encompasses the performance of teaching together with the theories, beliefs, policies and controversies that inforn1 and shape it'. However, not many teachers use the term. ***Hayes (2000)*** discusses those experienced teacher who maintain that teaching is a practical activity and that the theoretical study of teaching in higher education is irrelevant once one enters the classroom. Pedagogy was defined as 'the science of teaching' or as only referring to teaching techniques and strategies in schools which ***Watkins and Mortimore (1999)*** and ***Hall et al., (2008)***criticise as a narrow definition of pedagogy which relies on readers' interpretations of 'science' and 'teaching'. ***Watkins and Mortimore (1999, p. 3)*** provide a definition of pedagogy which

identifies pedagogy as 'any conscious activity by one person designed to enhance learning in another'. From ***Watkins and Mortimore's (1999)*** perspective, this definition takes the learner into consideration while drawing attention to teaching. In another definition of pedagogy, ***Alexander (2000)*** highlights the relationship between culture and pedagogy arguing that culture is a strong shaper of education. According to ***Alexander (2000)***, culture influences everything that happens in classrooms whether it was noticeable on the walls for example or invisible in children's heads. In line with Alexander (2000), there is lots of emphasis in the literature on the importance of understanding pedagogy within the specific cultural and historical context where it happens ***(Tabulawa, 2003, 2013; Sternberg, 2007; Vavrus, 2009; Guthrie, 2011; Schweisfurth, 2013, 2015; Guthrie, 2015; Schweisfurth and Elliott, 2019)***. Based on ***Alexander (2000, 2008b, 2009)***, there are many components which constitute pedagogy such as teachers' knowledge, skills and values, the purposes of education, the learning processes as well as the interaction between teachers, students, the learning environment and the world outside. ***Alexander (2000, p. 551)*** argues that 'pedagogy contains both teaching as defined there and its contingent discourses about the character of culture, the purposes of education, the nature of childhood and learning and the structure of knowledge.' Therefore, ***Alexander (2000)*** redefines pedagogy in a more comprehensive way which I adopt in this research. This is reflected in my methodology which embraces teachers' beliefs, the learning context, and wider understanding of positive practice. ***Alexander (2008b, p.3)*** argues that teaching is 'an act' whereas pedagogy is "both act and discourse". In this perspective, pedagogy is a broad term which includes the performance of teaching, the theories, beliefs, policies and controversies that underlay, influence and explain teaching. Furthermore, pedagogy relates the act of teaching which is seemingly self-contained to the culture, structure and means of social control. Consequently, based on ***Alexander (2008b)***, pedagogy is not only a technique as it reflects the values of teachers and the values of their culture.

Pedagogy is an encompassing term concerned with what a teacher does to influencelearning in others. As the importance of high quality school education and care services for learner 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 havewhat a teacher does and how they do it at their core.***DEEWR(2009a: 42)*** defines pedagogy as 'the function or work of teaching: the art or science of teaching, education instructional methods'.

Alexander (2008b)criticises***Watkins and Mortimore's (1999)*** definition of pedagogy. According to ***Alexander (2008b)***, Watkins and Mortimore's perception of pedagogy which focuses on the learner is part of his definition of 'teaching' which excludes the theories, beliefs, policies and controversies from pedagogy. ***Alexander (2009)*** points out that as a field of practice, theory and research, pedagogy is multidimensional. ***Alexander (2009)*** stresses that pedagogy is related to the act of teaching, its policies, supporting theories, and encompasses the knowledge, skills, and values that teachers have and need to be equipped with to make and explain their different teaching decisions which makes pedagogy and teaching interdependent:

> *I distinguish pedagogy as discourse from teaching as act, yet I make them inseparable. Pedagogy, then, encompasses both the act of teaching and its contingent theories and debates. Pedagogy is the discourse with which one needs to engage in order both to teach intelligently and make sense of teaching - for discourse and act are interdependent, and there can be no teaching without pedagogy or pedagogy without teaching* ***(Alexander, 2009, p. 4)***.

In ***Alexander's (2009)*** definition, pedagogy is not restricted to understanding what happens inside the classroom only because it requires an awareness of the interaction between teachers, students, the learning environment and the world outside. Along similar lines, ***Hall et al., (2008)*** define pedagogy from a sociocultural perspective to broaden the definition of pedagogy to include the relationship between methods and the cultural, institutional, and historical contexts in which the methods are used. This deeper and broader view of pedagogy as ***Hall et al., (2008)*** indicate, emphasises the identities which are valued, reproduced, and transformed in different ways as people participate in activity. The implications that arise from the broader definition of pedagogy as suggested by ***Alexander (2000, 2008b, 2009)*** and ***Hall et al., (2008)***, which are relevant to the purposes of this research, are regarding the ways different models of pedagogy are perceived and promoted in different contexts. At the heart of the encompassing definition of pedagogy is that what works in one context may not simply work in another context. Therefore, ***Alexander (2004)***, ***O'Sullivan (2004)***, ***Sternberg (2007), Vavrus (2009), Guthrie (2015)*** and ***Schweisfurth and Elliott (2019)*** argue that pedagogy is a complex enterprise which cannot be uncritically limited to forms of 'best practice' based on what is considered as effective methods in certain contexts. Similarly, ***Siraj-Blatchford, Sylva, Muttock, Gilden& Bell, (2002***) defines pedagogy in the following terms:

> *...the instructional techniques and strategies that allow learning to take place. It refers to the interactive process between teacher/practitioner and learner and it is also applied to include the provision of some aspects of the learning environment (including the concrete learning environment, and the actions of the family and community.* ***(p.10)***

Education Scotland (2005) also defined pedagogy emphasizing on the cultural, social, and political values. They further says, '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'***(p.9)***.In the same context,***Farquhar (2003)*** defines pedagogy as:

> *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 …and cultural, community and family values.****(p. 5)***

Revisiting the Definition of the Pedagogy

Didactics was a term introduced to bring coherence to the debate about pedagogy: it describes the study of the relationship between learners, teachers and educational subject knowledge. Didactics placed an emphasis on the uniqueness of school subjects and accorded them equal status with the process of presentation. Didactics is concerned with the processes of the person learning and the particular content to be learned (the knowledge and the know-how). However, the practical element of pedagogy, the putting into practice, was seen to be absent from such a description. ***Tochon and Munby (1993)***, in developing a wider definition of pedagogy, distinguish didactics from pedagogy in the following way:

> *Pedagogy is concerned with our immediate image of the teaching situation. It is live processing developed in a practical and idiosyncratic situation. Didactic goals can be written down, but pedagogical experience cannot be easily theorised, owing to its unique interactive aspects. Though action research and reflection reveals the existence of basic principles underlying practical classroom experience, no matter what rules might be inferred, pedagogy still remains an adventure.* ***(p. 207)***

This move away from conceptions of pedagogy as the science of teaching, reflects a new epistemology of practice-an epistemology in which the notion of praxis is central. Praxis is a term used to describe the dialectical relationship between theory and practice in teaching-a form of reasoning informed by action. ***Schon (1987)*** describes this new epistemology of practice in the following way:

> *… one that would stand the question of professional knowledge on its head by taking as its point of departure the competence and artistry already embedded in skilful practice-especially the reflection-in-action …that practitioners sometimes bring to situations of uncertainty, uniqueness and conflict.*

The reconceptualizing of pedagogy as art is not a small matter. The way professional knowledge is perceived as ambiguous and incomplete, a 'tacit knowledge that is hard to put into words, at the core of the practice of every highly regarded professional' ***(Schon, 1987)***, has led to a crisis of confidence in the profession of education.It is for these reasons that reformists such as Shulman are currently attempting to articulate the knowledge base of teachers. He defines *pedagogical content knowledge* as 'that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of professional understanding' ***(1987, p. 8)***. He argues, as others do, that it is the *wisdom of practice* that is the 'least codified source of teacher knowledge'. What is challenged by those educationists examining Shulman's concept of pedagogical content knowledge is that it presumes subject knowledge is absolute, uncontestable, unidimensional and static ***(Meredith, 1995)***. Others argue the need to see the transposition of content knowledge to school knowledge as a didactic rather than pedagogic process. The didactic process involves change, alteration and restructuring if the knowledge is to be teachable ***(Banks, Bourdillon, Leach, Manning, Moon and Swarbrick, 1995)***. Hence, a split between school knowledge and pedagogical school knowledge is envisioned to 'create a dynamic which leaves open to question curriculum constructs such as subjects' ***(Banks et al., 1995, p. 8).***

To reflect on this new epistemology of practice requires a discourse that Alexander refers to as 'dilemma-language' ***(Alexander, 1992)***. Dilemma-language is the articulation of 'doubts, qualification, dilemma, consciousness of nuance, alertness to the affective dimension … which can indicate true insight… and inner strength rather than mere professional machismo.' Such a discourse, according to Alexander, has not yet been legitimized because of the imbalance in power between practitioners and others in the educational

hierarchy. The dilemmas teachers face also need to be examined in the political, social and cultural contexts in which teachers practise. ***Osborn and Broadfoot (1992)*** observed in their study of French and English primary teachers that:

> *…for English teachers the critical issue…is how to resolve the practical problems inherent in delivering an individualised pedagogy in the context of a range of external pressures and large class sizes. For French teachers the dilemma is providing equal justice under law with the assumption of a common cultural base.…given growing differentiation in the social context and individual values.* ***(p.12)***

The redefinition of pedagogy as an art follows from the view that pedagogy is about the interactions between teachers, students and the learning environment and learning tasks-our working definition given in the introduction. However, we have argued that pedagogy cannot be disembodied from the wider educational system. So, in order to address what is an effective pedagogy, we must be agreed on the goals of education. In the context of the equity debate, it is Freire's view that has been influential. In his liberatory pedagogy, ***Freire (1971)*** argues that education must help students develop an increasingly critical view of their reality. It is appropriate now to examine the feminist contribution to the debate about pedagogy. It was feminist research which first drew attention to inadequacies in pedagogy in relation to groups and individuals. Through feminist interventions and evaluations of these, we now have a much richer understanding of the nature of pedagogy.

Changing Concept of Pedagogy

Within International Development and Comparative Education, two broad conceptualizations of pedagogy circulate. On the one hand is the technical perspective, reflected in the first quote below from the World Bank study, Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa ***(Bashir, et. al., 2018)***, which views pedagogy as subject-matter knowledge and strategies that lead to measurable outcomes in learners' knowledge. I will call this the technicist notion of pedagogy. On the other hand, there is the much broader understanding of pedagogy portrayed in the ***Alexander (2008)*** quote, which I will refer to as sociocultural. These two definitions are as follows:

> *Pedagogical knowledge pertains to a teacher's mastery of a particular subject as well as the most effective ways to teach it*. ***(Bashir et.al. 2018: 280)***

> *Pedagogy is not a mere matter of teaching technique. It is a purposive cultural intervention in individual human development which is deeply saturated with the values and history of the society and community in which it is located*. ***(Alexander, 2008:92)***

Technicist Conception. In the technicist view, pedagogy is a technical matter, involving neutral subject knowledge and strategies for imparting it to students-as noted above-'*mastery of subject matter* and "*effective ways to teach it*." Teachers' role, in this conceptualization of pedagogy, is merely "delivering and assessing knowledge" ***(Kuzich, 2011, p. 4)***, or that of "specialized technicians … who manage and implement curricula programs" ***(Giroux, 1985, p. 36)***. A focus on technicism privileges efficiency and economy in what is perceived to be the value-free and objective function of schooling ***(Welch, 2003)***. ***Halliday (1998, p.597)*** emphasizes that this conception removes questions of the purpose of education from view, as the goal is simply to achieve curricular goals which can be achieved through "mechanistic" practices:

> *Technicism may be defined as the notion that good teaching is equivalent to efficient performance which achieves ends that are prescribed for teachers… For technicists, general theories can be set out to guideparticular practices. Practical development is amoral and describable in a mechanistic way …*

Because pedagogy is seen as value-free and mechanistic, those with a technicist conception tend to see good teaching practices as universally applicable. ***Bermeo, et.al. (2013),*** have observed this in Tanzania. They assert, "[there is a] tendency in some education policy and teacher education discourses to understand teaching knowledge as technical, scientific, and universal, and as a set of skills that can be delivered and managed…" ***(p. 41)***. The proliferation of "what works" and "best practices" that are transported from one country to another attests to the assumed universality of teaching strategies ***(Vavrus, 2016)***. An example of this assumption can be found in a "rigorous literature review" on "Pedagogy, Curriculum and Teaching Practices in Developing Countries" prepared for DFID ***(Westbrook, et.al., 2013)***. Though the importance of "context and conditions" is acknowledged as part of the research question, the conclusions still recommend a single "pedagogical practice" (communicative or interactive pedagogy), which is to be supported by three "teaching strategies" and six

"effective teaching practices." ***(pp. 2-3)***. These "strategies" and "practices" are taken to be so universal that they apply to all developing countries. A similar sentiment seems to drive the USAID literacy programs in Africa, as the same intervention has been replicated in Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and Malawi, sometimes with the same name and program components, as in TusomePamoja Kenya.

In addition to being seen as value-free and universal, much of the technical assistance provided in IDE projects are "behaviorist" interventions aimed to alter what are viewed as deficient practices ***(Tao, 2013a)***. For example, in the 3Rs programsmentioned earlier, one focus area has been training teachers to introduce single letter sounds (as opposed to the traditional, syllabic way of teaching Swahili) and to regularly use decodable class readers in instruction. While *TusomePamoja*and Education quality Improvement Programme-Tanzania (EQUIP-T) programs are not focused on single variables (for example, they include diverse strategies to increase parent involvement in reading and school attendance, school leadership training, sometimes school feeding or economic-generation projects), their instructional component for teachers takes a technical and content-based approach to increasing teachers' knowledge and use of materials, which is believed to correct deficits in the ways teachers had been teaching. As ***Alexander (2008)*** notes, this narrowed, technical approach makes pedagogy "a controllable input rather than … a process whose dynamic reflects the unique circumstances of each classroom and which is therefore variable and unpredictable" ***(pp 7-8)***. Viewing pedagogy as a series technical steps that lead to set learning outcomes is a tidy process, assuming fairly linear causality between the teachers' actions and the learning outcomes. This "controllable" type of input is much more attractive than "variable and unpredictable" processes for development partners who emphasize "value for money" in their investments in education programs ***(Atkinson, et.al., 2019)***.

This technicist, universal and controlled-input view of pedagogy is influenced by movements in education in many of the development partner's home countries. ***Mason, et.al. (2019)*** highlight this in their recent reflection on "conceptual and ethical issues" in the modalities of international development and research. They particularly highlight theneoliberal underpinnings of this movement, and the related urge for universal generalizations:

> *Policy-makers and planners, and many of the most influential international development agencies, may acknowledge … postmodern scepticism and the postcolonial critique, but in practice the overall trajectory of ongoing policy and action continues to draw more directly on the neo-liberal perspectives, values and principles that have shaped international development modalities since the latter decades of the twentieth century… The calls in the USA and UK for educational research to be more cumulative, authoritative and accessible.…has, in turn, influenced international development agencies…and reinforced their commitment to research that can 'deliver' 'evidenced-based' policy that is 'statistically robust' and generalizable across contexts*.

This commitment to generalizable, statistical evidence narrows the indicators used to measure the quality or effectiveness of teaching. An example can be found in the Service Delivery Indicators developed by the World Bank to measure progress in education in African countries. "Teacher effort" is measured by spot-checking teachers' presence or absence in school and an English and Math test is used to rate teachers academic and pedagogical skills. The notions that teaching effort is reflected in being physically present and written tests measure teaching ability reflect a highly mechanistic view of pedagogy. The problem with technicist conceptions of pedagogy is not only that they lean toward simplification of the teaching and learning process, but they also ignore the social-embeddedness of schooling, and of pedagogy in particular.

The curtailed and narrow technicist conception of pedagogy has serious implications for education. As ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** asserts, "to isolate teaching techniques and classroom practices from relationships, motivations and constructions of knowledge is reductionist" (p. 12). ***Tabulawa (1997)*** points out that not only does thisview deny the historical and social context of teaching, but it also treats "pedagogical styles as value-neutral" ***(p.192)***. As a result, students and even teachers themselves, as well as other members of society, do not question or take part in determining what are desired and useful knowledge or desired and useful ways of being. Instead, they accept and adapt themselves (to use Freire's 1970/2000 terms) to the ways of being (and teaching/learning) that are inherited or passed down from the small cadre of experts (local and international) writing educational policy, which may or may not ultimately serve their own wellbeing. An alternative to the technicist view lies in sociocultural conceptions of pedagogy.

Sociocultural Conception. The basis of a sociocultural approach in examining any aspect of education is to recognize the "essential relationship between [the processes under study] and their cultural, historical and

institutional settings" ***(Wertsch, 1991, p. 6 as quoted in O'Loughlin, 1992)***. In considering pedagogy, a sociocultural conception requires investigation of the material, institutional, discursive, and axiological norms and negotiations that both shape and are shaped by pedagogical encounters. As noted by ***Osaki and Agu (2002)*** "The community, the district and the nation surround the classroom and limit, as well as influence, what takes place within it … yet [these influences] can be translated into reality only through the actions and choices of children and teachers."(p. 104). Therefore, pedagogy and teaching knowledge are "culturally and socially shaped by shared meanings derived from social interaction and practice….tacit as well as explicit knowledge, including values, attitudes and feelings" ***(Bermeo, et.al., 2013, p. 41)***. Not only do the parameters of knowledge (in the form of the official curriculum) and the social and moral norms of the community shape pedagogy, but so too, do the material (including physical and financial) conditions ***(Vavrus& Bartlett, 2012; Vavrus&Salema, 2013)***. Thus, pedagogy in schools is "not only a sustained process of instruction whereby people acquire particular knowledge, skills and values, but also [as] a 'cultural relay: a uniquely human device for both the reproduction and the production of culture"***(Watkins, et.al., 2015, p.4 drawing on Bernstein, 2003)***. A sociocultural approach to pedagogy, therefore, encompasses not only the technical, but also the non-technical influences on classroom interactions and practices. Drawing upon both anthropology and sociology of education, I will emphasize the dialectical nature ***(O'Loughlin, 1992; Willis, 1981)*** of the interaction between pedagogical setting and actions. The setting influences teachers' pedagogical choices while at the same time, teachers' pedagogical actions influence the setting and participants.

Within the field of Comparative and International Education (CIE) Alexander has championed the need for a nuanced understanding and comparative study of pedagogy. In the voluminous study of teaching in five cultures he undertook with a team of comparative researchers, ***Alexander (2000)*** noted that the exploration of every element, even those seemingly [or often perceived-to-be] objective or cognitive aspects of teaching, such as analysis of task and activity, "raised questions of value, priority and purpose." Thus, "pedagogy connects the apparently self-contained act of teaching with culture, structure and mechanisms of social control" ***(p. 540)***. Further, Alexander articulated that, "pedagogy encompasses the performance of teaching together with thetheories, beliefs, policies and controversies that inform and shape it." ***(p. 540)***. He later synthesized these many aspects of culture, structure, values, policies, beliefs, and control in the more succinct and oft quoted definition: "Pedagogy is the act of teaching together with its attendant discourse." ***(Alexander, 2004, p. 11)***. Crucially for my discussion of technicist and sociocultural conceptions of pedagogy, ***Alexander (2000)*** further differentiates pedagogy from teaching, the latter of which he defines as: "the act of using method *x* to enable pupils to learn *y*" ***(p. 535)***. In these terms, the technicist approach focuses on *teaching only* rather than *pedagogy.*

The Thinness of Anglophone Conceptions of Pedagogy

Alexander (2000) and ***Hamilton (1999)*** argue that curriculum, rather than pedagogy, has formed the organizational basis of education studies and theorization in Anglophone countries. They further posit that this has led to under-theorization of pedagogy. This stands in contrast to a long tradition of wider conceptualizations of pedagogy in continental European studies of education. Over the past two decades, several comparative education scholars have noted the "thinness" of the theorization of pedagogy in Anglophone academic traditions, compared to the European traditions of "didactics" and *Pädagogik****(Biesta, 2011; Elliott, 2014; Hamilton, 1999; Payne, 2019)***. ***Biesta (2011)*** notes that while in the United States and United Kingdom, the education field uses other disciplines and their perspectives "*on* education," in Central and Eastern Europe, education has always been taken as an academic field in its own right, with attendant theoretical development in the areas ofdidactics, *pädagogik*and the concepts of *Bildung*and *Erziehung.* The latter is particularly akin to the sociocultural understanding of pedagogy I employ in this dissertation. The notion of *Erziehung*encompasses much more than cognitive learning: "the term implies teacher's intentional guidance of a child in his or her moral, aesthetical, personal, social, physical, and spiritual advancement" ***(Ermenc, 2015, p. 42)***. Yet the English language lacks even terms equivalent to *Erziehung*and *Bildung*, and theorization of teaching and learning correspondingly focuses on cognitive/behavioral (more technicist) aspects or on socioeconomic influences on teaching and learning processes.

Another (initially non-Anglophone) source of theorization on pedagogy comes from Freirean critical pedagogy ***(Freire 1970/2000; 2004)***. Critical pedagogy contributes to understandings of power in the relations between teacher and students and between the knower and the known, that is, the dialectical relations between subject and knowledge, whose knowledge is valued and what structural purposes knowledge serves. While critical pedagogy has helped to fuel a movement of social justice education in the US, and has been taken up by some non-governmental organization promoting small programs in low-income countries (for example, Karibu Tanzania Organization, or Questscope in Jordan), it has not been seriously taken up by development partners or

government officials in Tanzania. ***Freire's (1970/2000)*** critique of what he called the "banking" conception of education has been used by those who promote more constructivist, learner-centered approaches to teaching (see, for example, Hamilton, 1999;), but the IDE Discourse of 'evidence-based' practice in general tends to reinforce the hidden power relations between knowledge, education and political/economic oppression which Freire sought to challenge. In contrast, the political aspects of Freire's concept of pedagogy and the moral aspects of *Erziehung*are an important part of my own definition of pedagogy, which I situate in a sociocultural perspective.

Pedagogy as Arts, Science and Applied Science and Types of Pedagogy

In order to trace the history of pedagogy, it's important to first define the concept of pedagogy itself, whose meaning has undergone numerous iterations over the centuries. The concept has always been associated with the history of the development of thought, instructional institutions and the advancement of knowledge, on which thinkers-educators-have always relied. Right from the beginning, education was assigned the status of an art-the art of teaching, of leading children to knowledge. This concept reminds us that the profession of educator first emerged in Ancient Greece. Back then, the role of educator was performed by slaves, who were given the noble task of walking the master's children to school, taking care of their physical appearance, and accompanying them during their chores and play.

At the end of the 19th century, the development of such scientific fields as sociology and psychology is accompanied by the emergence of pedagogy as an applied science, that is, it starts to be viewed as a true science. Pedagogy is now treated as a science with the understanding that its ultimate objective, as in the other cases, is not so much to describe or explain but instead to guide the process of teaching and learning. That is, it's a field of science that just might to teach us how to teach. It's no coincidence that we've used the subjunctive mood here, since pedagogy-as the science of teaching and learning-is not a fully-formed discipline, thereby leaving room for other educational sciences, a plural science. It became clear over time that the exotic science known as Pedagogy could not be soluble there.Table 1 provides definitions of pedagogy presented in the four textbooks. All the definitions view pedagogy as a science that aims to uncover objective laws pertinent to the development of personality.

Table 1
Definition of pedagogy

Fitsula (2009)	Volkova (2012)	Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013)	Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)
• Pedagogy is a complex of theoretical and applied sciences that study processes of upbringing, teaching/learning, and development of personality (p. 9). • Pedagogy studies upbringing activities which take place in education establishments by professionals trusted by the society/teachers (p. 10).	• Pedagogy is 'a self-contained/integral multidisciplinary science, which studies the laws [sic] of learning and upbringing, and the development of a child's personality (p. 11). • Pedagogy (Greek paidos- child, and ago-leading) is a science that studies the processes of upbringing, teaching andlearning, and the development of personality (p. 12).	• Not provided	• Pedagogy is a science about upbringing a person. By upbringing we mean education, teaching/learning and personality development (p. 13).

In the definitions in Table 1, ***Fitsula (2009)*** and ***Volkova (2012)***emphasise that pedagogy is a science, which is limited mainly to formal education ***(Fitsula 2009)***. Adult education is not acknowledged as part of pedagogy, to the extent that some sources imply that there is a separation between adult education and pedagogy. ***Volkova (2012)*** states that 'Pedagogical science emerged as a theory of upbringing for the young generation' ***(p.13)*** and continues to discuss the importance of this age for the development of personality.

Today, we no longer debate whether pedagogy is an art or a science. We live at a time when pedagogy-just as medicine or politics-is viewed as an "applied science," that is, as a discipline geared towards the practical application of acquired knowledge. Thus, the history of pedagogy is the history of pedagogues or of the practitioners and theorists of the instructional process. At issue are the men and women "engaged in the actual educational process, using both theoretical concepts and practical skills combined in such a way as to obscure the extent to which the practical skills employed in the educational process are more important than theoretical concepts, and vice versa. And, as the pedagogy specialist points out, this particular side of the issue has frequently remained hidden and unknown. Has this been intentional? No, but for some reason, preference has often been given to the loftier element of the equation-that is, to the theoretical. For this reason, many

pedagogues were relegated to the ranks of philosophers, educational theorists and thinkers-that is to say, it was commonplace not to refer to them as pedagogues at all. Nevertheless, in other instances, people entirely ignored the other aspect of pedagogy-its theoretical side, thereby assigning pedagogues a purely practical role. In such cases, pedagogues were viewed as teachers and instructors. Such a classification only took the practical aspect of their occupation into consideration, ignoring the theory behind teaching and instruction.

Today, it's extremely important to provide a precise definition of pedagogy. It's vital to establish the rightful place education should occupy in today's structure of modern science. Defining pedagogy as an applied science should help calm the polemic by demonstrating that the specific knowledge acquired through educational practice is actually fundamental knowledge. This knowledge, however, cannot replace theoretical, scientific knowledge in the given discipline, but may only serve as a complement thereto. Both the theoretical fundamentals and the practical skills are essential.

Sub-fields of Pedagogy

Various scholars described a numbers of sub-branches of pedagogy. Some sub-field of pedagogy are presented in the table 2.

Table 2
Branches of pedagogy

Fitsula (2009)	Volkova (2012)	Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk(2013)	Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)
• General pedagogy • Age-specific pedagogy • Pedagogy for correction (special needs pedagogy) (surdo-pedagogy (for the deaf-mute), speech therapy, pedagogy for the blind, pedagogy for oligophrenia) • Branch pedagogies (avia pedagogy, army pedagogy) • History of pedagogy and school • Methodologies of teaching specific subjects • Social pedagogy (p. 18).	• General pedagogy (foundations of pedagogy, theory of teaching and education (didactics), theory of upbringing, theory ofmanaging the teaching-upbringing process (school studies)) • Age-specific pedagogy (pre-school pedagogy, pedagogy of secondary education) • Professional pedagogy (pedagogy of vocational education, pedagogy of HE) • Pedagogy for correction [special needs pedagogy] (surdo-pedagogy (for the deaf-mute), speech therapy, pedagogy for the blind, pedagogy for oligophrenia) • History of pedagogy • Methodologies of teaching specific subjects • School hygiene • Comparative pedagogy • Branch pedagogies (avia pedagogy, army pedagogy) • Folk pedagogy • Pedagogy of ethnography. • Family pedagogy • Kozak pedagogy • Spiritual pedagogy • Pedagogical deontology (about the code of conduct for teachers) • Social pedagogy (pp. 12-18).	• Methodology of education • History of education • Pedagogy in different subject areas • Special needs pedagogy (p. 15).	• Pedagogies of different famous people (p. 16) • Kozak pedagogy is the highest peak of Ukrainian national pedagogy' (p. 17).

What is striking in Table 2 is the all-encompassing nature of pedagogy, which stretches across time and different fields of human activity. Pedagogy embraces the ideas of prominent educational thinkers and certain historical periods, which are significant in modern Ukraine (e.g. Kozak pedagogy). Table 2 gives an impression that all aspects of human activity can potentially come under the banner of pedagogy, and that everything is becoming a pedagogy.

All the textbooks except for ***Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013)*** discuss the interdisciplinary nature of pedagogy. ***Fitsula (2009)*** maintains that pedagogy has links with philosophy, sociology, psychology, and people's anatomy and physiology. ***Volkova (2012)*** provides the same list, supplementing it with economics and ethnology. ***Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)*** discuss the links between Ukrainian pedagogy and foreign pedagogies. ***Fitsula (2009)*** expresses similar views about a distinct nature of the Ukrainian pedagogy. ***Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)*** go even further by stating that the personalities of Ukrainian students develop differently from the personalities of foreign students.

In an attempt to situate Ukrainian pedagogy in relation to foreign pedagogy, ***Fitsula (2009, pp. 20-23)*** list the following most important directions of foreign pedagogy: philosophical, psychological-pedagogical and social. He maintains that the philosophical direction emerged from the philosophy of neo-positivism, existentialism, neo-Thomism, and others. The psychological-pedagogical direction was developed in the theories of German theorists such as Wilhelm Leah (1862-1926) and Ernst Meyman (1862-1916) in the early

20th century. The social direction is concerned with the substantiation of the doctrine of a so-called 'noosphere' (the interaction between nature and society), and the development of 'the noosphere pedagogy' in the early 20th century.

Methods of Pedagogical Research

According to ***Fitsula (2009),*** 'Method of scientific-pedagogical research is a way of researching the formation of personality, identification of the objective law/tendency in upbringing and teaching/learning by complex psychological-pedagogical methods' (p.27). ***Volkova (2012)*** maintains that: 'Method of scientific-pedagogical research is a means of researching psychological-pedagogical processes of personality formation'. Table 3 provides an overview the methods of pedagogical research presented in the four textbooks under analysis. It is worth noting that ***Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk's (2013)*** textbook provides the most detailed account of methods. However, despite this abundance of classifications no examples or references to completed research are provided in all textbooks under analysis. As a result, students learn about research not by reading about or designing the studies, but by memorising the classifications shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Methods of pedagogical research

Fitsula (2009)	Volkova (2012)	Sysoyeva and Krystopchuk (2013)	Pashchenko and Krasnoshtan (2014)
*Empirical:*observation, discussion (interview), survey, experiment, studying school documents and students' work, ranking, summarising independent characteristics, psychological-pedagogical testing, sociometry, analysis of students' academic performance results. *Theoretical:*(analysis, synthesis, induction, deduction, comparison, classification, summarising, abstracting, specification). *Mathematical and statistical*: (registering, ranking, modelling, measuring) (p. 27).	*Methods:*pedagogical observation, discussion, interview, experiment, studying the results of activities, sociological methods (surveys, ranking, summary of independent characteristics), science methods (p. 21). *Stages of research:* research problem identification, studying scientific facts, studying school practice, hypothesis formation, experimental work, comparison of the results with mass practice, summarising research results, writing up of research results. (p. 33-5)	*Theoretical methods:*analysis and synthesis; induction and deduction; analogy and abstraction; concretisation and modelling; idealisation and formalisation; summary and comparison; thinking experiment. *Empirical methods:*pedagogical observation; pedagogical experiment; rating; testing; study, analysis and summary of pedagogical experience; scientific and pedagogical expedition; literature review. *Sociological methods:*questionnaires; interview and pedagogical talk; sociometrics/network analysis; expert analysis; pedagogical council. *Mathematical methods:*ranging; scales; synthesis; correlation; regression; cluster analysis; factor analysis; latent-structural analysis (pp. 85-323).	The presence of scientific worldview allows a person to perceive the environment adequately and evaluate it objectively (p. 20).

Models of Pedagogy

I have just analyzed various branch or sub-branches of pedagogy. During the course of study, I have found two major traditions of pedagogical practices. TCTtradition and LCT traditions are commonly found in the existing literature of the education. These two pedagogical practices are described below:

Pedagogy of Teacher Centred Teaching (PTCT)

Surveying the literature reveals that there have been several terms associated with these models such as teacher-controlled, traditional, objectivist, or to use ***Bernstein's (2000)*** term "performance" models. As the term suggests, in a teacher-controlled class, the teacher is at the centre of the learning process. ***Bernstein (2000)***, who categorises the models as dichotomous, refers to these models as the performance or visible model because teachers' pedagogic control is clearly visible to the students as the teachers tell their students the content of learning and how they learn in a strongly structured lesson. Moreover, the focus of learning is on the specific output, the particular text students are expected to construct and the skills they need to produce the expected output or text ***(Bernstein, 2000)***.

TCT models are heavily influenced by the behaviorist learning theory which enhances teacher's authoritative role in class and whole-class didactic teaching, while it minimises students' choice and interaction ***(Tabulawa, 2013; Westbrook et al., 2013; Carroll, 2014)***. As a theory of learning, behaviourism originated from the work of ***Thorndike (1911), Pavlov (1927) and Skinner (1957)*** and prevailed in the 1960s and 1970s ***(Westbrook et al., 2013; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***. The behaviourist model of learning is influenced by the scientific laws of stimulus response and the use of trial and error ***(Westbrook et al., 2013; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***. Success in learning, ***Zhou and Brown (2015)*** clarify, relies on the stimulus and response as well as on the associations that students make. Hence, teachers' role is to encourage the intended behaviour by creating a stimulating environment which places the attention in the learning process on teachers. Therefore, ***Liu et al.,***

(2006) and Hattie and Zierer (2018) indicate that the assumption in these models is that students are passive, and teachers are required to look for incentives so that students react to stimuli and learning happens. However, in their study of life in Botswana classrooms, ***Fuller and Snyder (1991)*** argue that although Botswana classrooms were predominantly teacher-centred, pupils were not always passive and silent. Teachers may try to motivate their pupils and encourage their participation even if that means they depend on asking factual questions ***(Fuller and Snyder, 1991)***.

In TCT, ***Zhou and Brown (2015)*** point out that rewarding the desired response is essential for learning to happen. ***Carroll (2014)*** explains that models influenced by behaviourism reward students' appropriate responses by using various praise systems such as verbal praise, awards and ticks in jotters due to the belief that this is how students learn best. Punishments are also used to discourage inappropriate behaviours. However, in ***Guthrie's (2011)*** teaching styles model, domineering teachers who enforce obedience using physical sanctions such as corporal punishments are called authoritarian. Authoritarian teachers are different from 'formalistic' teachers as ***Guthrie (2011)*** explains in that formalistic teachers control learning and use negative sanctions as low marks, but they may occasionally offer students an active role and may be flexible in their methods. ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** provide examples of practices which models shaped by behaviourism usually adopt including lecturing, demonstration, rote learning, memorisation, choral repetition, and imitation or copying. In TCT classrooms, the goals of learning are selected and knowledge is transferred from teachers to students accompanied by a strict control of classroom behaviour***(Elen et al., 2007; Carroll, 2014).*** In addition, there might be some limited teacher-student and student-student interactions which are controlled by teachers ***(Guthrie, 1990, 2011)***. In formalistic teaching, ***Guthrie (2011)*** points out that teachers ask closed-ended questions in whole-class settings. ***Westbrook et al., (2013) and Carroll (2014)*** indicate that students' minds are viewed as empty vessels to be filled with knowledge. Therefore, direct instruction is the most common method teachers' use in TCT ***(Brown, 2003)***.

However, ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** differentiate between direct instruction which is teacher-led from teacher-centred practices in that direct instruction often follows a certain scripted and even prescriptive sequence, but later in the lesson they may develop into more learner-centred activities. According to ***Mendenhall et al., (2015)***, direct instruction is one of the most important teacher-centred strategies in education. In a study which was primarily motivated by the prevalence of recitation, ***Clark et al., (1979)***analyse the impact of teacher behaviour in classroom recitations. Based on ***Clark et al., (1979)***, using direct instruction is effective when used with an appropriate balance of questions. The study suggests that low soliciting which involves asking students only about 15% higher order or reasoningquestions can be effective in inducing achievement on both lower order and higher order achievement test questions for which only the teacher is the main provider of information. Due to the influence of the behaviorist theory of leaning, in TCT models, the teacher is in control of learning and what actually happens in class ***(Kain, 2003; Schweisfurth, 2013; Westbrook et al., 2013)***. In these models, teachers show their expertise in content knowledge ***(Brown, 2003)***. The teacher is the thinker and controller of what and how students learn, while students' role is to memorise information ***(Brown, 2003)***. The relationship between teachers and students is hierarchical ***(Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010)***. However, ***Guthrie (2011)*** argues that the hierarchical relationships may not be authoritarian as most of teachers are not violent or otherwise enforcing of their control. In addition, ***Carroll (2014)*** points out, these models promote the view of knowledge as something external and in their most extreme form the curriculum is developed as containing a fixed body of knowledge which students must learn. Because TCT models usually follow a fixed curriculum and depend on transferring knowledge from teachers to students, these models are associated with knowledge transmission through teacher-talk, worksheets and textbooks ***(Brown, 2003; Schweisfurth, 2013; Carroll, 2014)***.

In TCT curriculum, students' achievements are prioritised over meeting their needs ***(Brown, 2003)***. Assessment is exam-oriented, so objective tests are used to measure students' achievements ***(Brown, 2003; Westbrook et al., 2013)***. According to ***Cornelius-White and Harbaugh (2010)***, learning is characterised by competition and individualism. There is a heavy reliance on teaching content rather than focusing on the learning process ***(Brown, 2003; Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010)***. The outcome of covering content then is teachers' limited use of open questioning or work on problem-solving tasks ***(Brown, 2003)***. Therefore, it is argued that teacher-centred models limit students' active engagement in the process of learning ***(Kaufman, 1996; Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010)***. Furthermore, it is argued that teacher-centred models do not support deep learning ***(Elen, et al., 2007)***.

The main criticisms of behaviourism include disregarding students' individual differences and experiences and adopting the "one-size-fits-all" approach ***(Westbrook et al., 2013, p.9)***.In addition, ***Zhou and***

Brown (2015) and Hattie and Zierer (2018) point out that behaviourism has been criticised for its oversimplification of the complexity of human behaviour and disregarding the internal psychological or mental process in learning. Therefore, one of the limitations of behaviourism is viewing learning as a passive process ***(Hattie and Zierer, 2018)***. Several authors such as ***Sinclair (2002), Sommers (2002) and Dryden-Peterson (2016)*** point out that most of the teaching learning process is mostly TCT. Because of the many challenges facing teachers such as the increasingly growing needs of students, variations in learning styles, and advances in technology, ***Brown (2003)*** indicates that the use of the universal approach may no longer be effective. Along similar lines, ***Williams (2001)*** argues that based on research teacher-centered models are less effective in supporting children's learning. Limiting teaching to drilling, reciting and/or imparting knowledge only may not possibly provide children with the cognitive challenge they need ***(Alexander, 2017)***.

Nevertheless, surveying the literature reveals that TCT models still predominate in classrooms particularly in low-income countries and refugee contexts ***(Kaufman, 1996; Vavrus, 2009; Mtika and Gates, 2010; Dryden-Peterson, 2016; Alexander, 2017)***. The behaviourist learning theory can be used in different contexts ***(Westbrook et al., 2013)***. Moreover, the literature reports some benefits of these models for students and teachers. For instance, authors including ***Bennett (1976), Clark et al., (1979), Guthrie (1990, 2011), Bernstein (2000), Brown (2003), Zhou and Brown (2015) and Alexander (2017)*** have shown some of the positive sides of these models. While examining teaching styles using survey methods, ***Bennett (1976)*** suggests that learning in a structured environment may make students feel more secure. ***Alexander (2017)*** also indicates that drilling, recitation and teacher explanation provide teachers with security as they can control both the content of the lesson and classroom events. Moreover, giving power in class to teachers minimises the risk to teachers of exposing and testing their own knowledge ***(Alexander, 2017)***. Similarly, ***Guthrie (1990)*** argues that teachers and students may be comfortable with using formalistic teaching as a starting point in many situations.

Using teachers' expertise in the learning context is one of the strengths of these models which can be valued as ***Brown (2003)*** points out because of teachers' ability to understand the fuller picture and mastery of the content. Furthermore, teacher-centred models are considered time and cost-effective as the training of teachers does not require much theoretical base compared to the other models ***(Bernstein, 2000; Westbrook et al., 2013)***. Teaching in a TCT class, ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** indicate, requires having fewer resources including less skills and teaching experiences. Therefore, ***Guthrie (1990)*** suggests that these pedagogic models may be used in schools where teachers have to teach large classes, teachers do not have time to innovate and they lack good resources or facilities. ***Guthrie (1990)*** adds, traditional styles may also be more appropriate in many developing countries whose educational systems cannot deal with revolutionary change. ***Guthrie (1990, 2011)*** provides some explanation for the predominance of formalistic teaching styles in some societies. ***Guthrie (1990, 2011)*** argues that in many educational and cultural contexts, formalistic teaching is considered effective and appealing although many modern educationists disagree with it. Therefore, the use of this model is appropriate in societies which consider respect for knowledge and authority as valuable and ritual as meaningful. In addition, ***Guthrie (1990, 2011)*** explains that implementing this model is compatible with formalistic teacher training, inspections, and examination systems so it provides coherence in many educational systems. Particularly with lower cognitive levels, ***Guthrie (1990)*** argues that traditional teaching is useful at promoting learning in primary and secondary schools. Moreover, according to ***Guthrie (2011)***, this type of teaching can support student engagement and lead to high academic standards that go beyond memorisation. To support his arguments, ***Guthrie (2011)*** reports the high educational achievements of Chinese students on international tests. Although Chinese students are taught in large formalistic classes, the teachers who control the classes are able to mentally engage students in an active way to understand the underlying meaning in depth ***(Guthrie, 2011)***. According to ***Zhou and Brown (2015)***, some students may be motivated to learn in classes influenced by the behaviourist learning theory which can be satisfying for both teachers and students. Change in behaviour may be the result of students' work to satisfy their desire to get things which provide them with positive feelings and support from people they admire.Repeated behaviours may help some students develop habitual behaviours which helps keep them away from behaviors they associate with unpleasantness ***(Zhou and Brown, 2015)***.

Pedagogy of Learner Centred Teaching (PLCT)

Like the TCT models, lots of varying terms have been associated with LCT models and sometimes used interchangeably despite the differences between them such as progressive, constructivist, humanistic, participatory, or democratic education, problem-based or enquiry-based learning, and child-centred learning ***(Tabulawa, 2003; Schweisfurth, 2013; Sriprakash, 2012; Lattimer, 2015)***. ***Tabulawa (2003)*** illustrates that the common themes uniting these terms are focusing on activity, the significant role of learners in the learning process, and being developed upon the social constructivist learning theory. The difference; however, might be related to emphasising different degrees of learner autonomy ***(Tabulawa, 2003)***. As one manifestation of

learner-centredness, another example of these differences is that child-centred education, ***Schweisfurth (2013, 2015)*** explains, is specifically about children and particular understandings of childhood and adult-child relations, while LCT extends beyond childhood. Furthermore, ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** point out that child-centred education is informed by constructivist learning theory, whereas LCT is underpinned by the social constructivist learning theory. ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** relate LCT models to ***Bernstein's (2000)*** competence or invisible models in which teachers respond to students' individual needs and there is a lack of clear structure in the learning process as well as hidden learning outcomes.

As a theory of learning, constructivism originated mainly from the work of Dewey and Piaget ***(Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010)***. The difference between constructivism and behaviourism as ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** explain is about the nature of knowledge. Therefore, they indicate that in constructivism, the mind is inherently structured to develop concepts and learn language. Based on the constructivist theory of learning, learning is an active and interactive process ***(Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010)***. ***Weimer (2002)*** indicates that students need opportunities to discover and relate information to their own experience regardless of their level of expertise. Therefore, students are actively responsiblefor learning, making sense of input, organising information and adapting it to their existing knowledge or schemas ***(Gipps and MacGilchrist, 1999; Murphy, 2008; Westbrook et al., 2013)***. In constructivism, progress in thinking happens through two processes: assimilation and accommodation of knowledge. When existing knowledge or schema is ready to deal with a new object, situation or problem, learning happens by a process of assimilation which means incorporating new information to pre-existing knowledge ***(Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010; Westbrook et al., 2013)***. However, when existing knowledge does not work, ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** illustrate, learners modify their existing schema to fit new information through a process of accommodation. Therefore, models influenced by constructivism provide activities which suit students' developmental stage to develop their existing knowledge and challenge them to make progress using the process of accommodation ***(Westbrook et al., 2013)***. As ***Zhou and Brown (2015)*** indicate, instruction is adapted to suit learners' development level and teachers facilitate learning through the provision of different experiences. To develop new knowledge, discovery learning is encouraged in constructivist classes as it offers learners opportunities for exploration and experimentation with knowledge ***(Struyven et al., 2010; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***.

The constructivist view of learning emphasises less teacher telling and more student exploration of knowledge ***(Weimer, 2002)***. Unlike behaviourism which suggests that learning occurs by directly transferring knowledge from teachers' heads to students', in constructivism, ***Gipps and MacGilchrist (1999)*** point out that learning is a continuous process of knowledge construction. Learning is no longer a process of transmission. It is an active process of adapting and constructing knowledge which happens through interacting with students and teachers ***(Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010; Carroll, 2014). Murphy (2008)*** indicates that students' existing knowledge, how they acquire knowledge and feel about it are all important in learning. Nevertheless, ***Weimer (2002)*** argues that in this theory of learning less knowledgeable and experienced learners approach content in less intellectually powerful ways of thinking. ***Carroll (2014)*** indicates that models influenced by constructivism offer students opportunities to engage in learning actively with their peers. Therefore, ***Westbrook et al.,(2013)*** suggest that individual and group work activities focused on problem solving are considered suitable in these models. In addition, constructivist teachers nurture learning in a stimulating environment through providing hands-on and minds-on learning experiences ***(Carroll, 2014; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***. Constructivist teachers also develop new understanding through using concrete props and visual aids and providing relevant examples to facilitate understanding more complex ideas ***(Struyven et al., 2010; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***. The provision of relevant and real-life activities is favoured for younger students, whereas activities offered for older students include symbolic and abstract thought ***(Westbrook et al., 2013)***. In these models, ***Carroll (2014)*** adds, acquiring knowledge and skills is more important than covering curriculum.

It is important to mention that the constructivist view of learning is in line with social constructivism. The difference between these theories; however, is that social constructivists emphasise the social aspect in learning ***(Gipps and MacGilchrist, 1999; Cornelius-White and Harbaugh, 2010)***. For social constructivists learning is primarily a social process and knowledge is socially constructed by using language and cultural tools***(Westbrook et al., 2013, p.10).*** Knowledge is not only discovered nor handed on, but also it is part of a process of co-construction as ***Carroll (2014)*** clarifies. The social constructivist theory of learning has been developed from the work of Vygotsky. Based on the Vygotskian perspective of learning, students' development is influenced by culture and the social environment where they live ***(Carroll, 2014; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***. According to ***Zhou and Brown (2015)***, the cultural and social influences may be inherent or direct and they affect students' beliefs towards learning, schooling, and the education philosophy. As a result, the social constructivist models emphasise that culture does not only teach students what to think, but also how to think

(Carroll, 2014). In addition, ***Zhou and Brown (2015)*** point out that student-teacher relationships have a significant role in learning. Therefore, based on ***Carroll, (2014)***, discussion with others is central for learning as understanding knowledge happens through students' collaborative social engagement rather than transmission.

The teachers' role in social constructivist models is to design suitable activities and experiences which generate discussion and offer students chances to express theirunderstanding ***(Carroll, 2014; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***. Classrooms may often be noisy because of the importance of discussion in the learning process ***(Carroll, 2014)***. Moreover, ***Cornelius-White and Harbaugh (2010)*** and ***Carroll (2014)*** illustrate, in social constructivism all students can learn when they are supported within a zone of proximal development (ZPD). According to ***Vygotsky (1978)***, ZPD is the distance between what students can do supported by the guidance of a more capable peer or adult and what they cannot do yet by themselves. To construct students' knowledge in the ZPD, Vygotsky indicated that students needed guided support in learning. In social constructivist classes, learning happens through engaging students in problem-solving activities supported by knowledgeable others as teachers ***(Carroll, 2014)***. The temporary support which students get when they need assistance is called scaffolding which may include a skilful mix of teacher explanation, demonstration, praise, asking focused questions, using prompts, hints, minimisation of error, practice and direct instruction ***(Westbrook et al., 2013; Carroll, 2014; Zhou and Brown, 2015)***. According to ***Cornelius-White and Harbaugh (2010)***, in scaffolding teachers purposefully provide activities which students can do without help and others which they require some support to be able to do. Examples of class activities which social constructivism encourage include small groups, pair and whole class interactive work, higher order questioning, teacher modelling, reciprocal teaching and co-operative learning ***(Westbrook et al., 2013)***. Therefore, ***Cornelius-White and Harbaugh (2010)*** and ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** point out that LCT has been developed from the constructivist and social constructivist ideas of adaptation, ZPD, and scaffolding. Like behaviourism, however, Vygotsky's social constructivist theory of learning has not gone without criticism. ***Zhou and Brown (2015)*** indicate that Vygotsky based his findings on observation and testing without doing empirical work to confirm them. Although social interaction is significant to Vygotsky, he did not specify the types of social interaction which best support learning. Moreover, some critics argue that learning can happen gradually or passively and not necessarily because of active engagement in knowledge construction:

> *Some children, regardless of how much help is given by others, may still develop at a slower rate cognitively. This suggests that there are other factors involved such as genetics.***(Zhou and Brown 2015, p. 36)**

Another critique of Vygotsky's learning theory which ***Zhou and Brown (2015)*** point out is regarding the assumption that it can be applicable universally in all cultures. ***Rogoff (1990, cited in Zhou and Brown, 2015)*** argues that scaffolding may not be equally effective universally for all types of learning because learning certain skills effectively may be better achieved through observation and practice rather than relying heavily on verbal instruction. It is important to note that I will extensively explore the critiques and challenges of implementing learner-centred pedagogy which is informed by social constructivism in a separate section below. Nevertheless, in the literature, learner-centred environments are presented positively more than teacher-centred environments because of the promising advantages the pedagogy claims to offer ***(McCombs and Whisler, 1997; Brown, 2003; Kain, 2003; Elen et al., 2007; Mtika and Gates, 2010; Struyven et al., 2010)***. According to ***Liu et al., (2006)***, the assumption in learner-centred models is that students are active and they have an unlimited capacity for individual development. Through inquiry and discovery, students are involved with the curriculum which is based on their interests ***(Mendenhall et al., 2015)***.

In LCT, ***McCombs and Whisler (1997)*** indicate that the different perspectives of learners are encouraged and respected. Therefore, ***McCombs and Whisler (1997)*** and ***Brown (2003)*** argue that these models respect learners' cultures, abilities, needs and styles as well as place them at the centre of the learning process. ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** indicate that in LCT teachers respond to students' emerging needs in class. In addition, students work on tasks individually or in pairs and groups to meet their needs ***(Brown, 2003)***. The organisation of lessons and learning depend much on teachers' ability to take advantage of what learners bring to class and their language use, which makes this pedagogy more complex and challenging as ***Shepherd (2012)*** highlights. ***Murphy (2008)*** and ***Carroll (2014)*** indicate that the LCT and their underpinning theories of learning have changed teacher's dominant role into a guide who facilitates students' learning. Therefore, the relationships between teachers and students are re-examined in LCT classes ***(Liu et al., 2006)***. The usage of teachers' directions and instructions is minimised, and interactive work in pairs, groups or in whole class activities is more encouraged ***(Westbrook et al., 2013)***. Learners do not only decide what tolearn, but also the way they learn ***(Schweisfurth, 2013)***. In addition, ***Carroll (2014)*** points out that in these models, curriculum is developed as a

process rather than a fixed body of knowledge. The primary focus of teachers is on learning and outcomes ***(Mtika and Gates, 2010)***. Furthermore, ***Mtika and Gates (2010)*** add, teachers promote critical learning environments and aim to challenge their learners and encourage their creativity. Because learning is based on dialogue, learner-centred pedagogy has been regarded democratic and has often been affiliated to participatory, democratic, inquiry-based, and discovery methods ***(Tabulawa, 2003, p. 9)***. The common belief in these models is that children are capable of taking charge of their learning if their learning environment is supportive ***(Murphy, 2008)***. Directing attention on students' own potential, ***Murphy (2008, p. 30)*** argues, has brought in the idea of individualized pedagogy instead of whole-class pedagogy. In learner-centred pedagogy, ***McCombs and Whisler (1997)*** stress that decision-making in class is both informed and developed by the dual focus on individual learners and learning:

> *learner-centered perspective is one that couples a focus on individual learners-their heredity, experiences, perspectives, backgrounds, talents, interests, capacities, and needs-with a focus on learning-the best available knowledge about learning and how it occurs and about teaching practices that are most effective in promoting the highest levels of motivation, learning, and achievement for all learners* ***(McCombs and Whisler, 1997: 9)***.

In LCT, ***Westbrook et al., (2013)*** indicate that teachers are expected to share the same language and culture of their students, accept a more democratic and less authoritative role, and be skilled to organise effective group work and tasks and to provide skilful supported instruction when needed. Moreover, the arrangement of flexible grouping requires space and respect of students' right to talk and participate in the learning of their peers ***(Westbrook et al., 2013)***.For all of the above, the literature indicates that LCT is considered a complex and challenging pedagogy for several reasons. Firstly, as several studies show, LCT requires teachers and learners' efforts, commitment and motivation for its success; secondly, it depends on coming up with learning opportunities in class and teachers and learners' immediate response to them; finally, the increased expectations from teachers require more time for teachers to plan their teaching approaches, create resources and know their learners'individual needs and interests as well as the provision of adequate teacher training ***(Brown, 2003; Shepherd, 2012; Sriprakash, 2012; Schweisfurth, 2013)***.

Modern LCT is derived from European philosophy and the recent advancements in countries such as the UK and USA ***(Schweisfurth, 2013)***. However, according to ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** because of his ideas on the liberating concept of education, Freire is believed to be one of the leading educationists who promoted the practice of LCT in different contexts. In his book Pedagogy of the Oppressed, ***Freire (1972)*** uses the terms 'banking education' and 'problem-posing' or 'liberating education' to refer to the two main models of pedagogy. Freire, who is a critical theorist and an adult educator, analyses teacher-student relationship and criticises narrative education in which teachers depend on filling students' heads with the contents of their narration instead of communication and encourage students to memorise and repeat information. Consequently, education becomes merely "an act of depositing" which is why Freire calls this method banking education ***(Freire, 1972, pp. 45-46)***. In banking education, it is assumed that teachers are very knowledgeable whereas students are completely ignorant:

> *Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. The teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence. The students, alienated like the slave in the Hegelian dialectic, accept their ignorance as justifying the teachers' existence-but, unlike the slave, they never discover that they educate the teacher* ***(Freire, 1972, p. 46)***.

Freireemphasises that education is used as a means of social control and which can be used as a means of social change as well. For example, traditional forms of education encourage students to receive information and store it without challenging it. This makes them accept their passive role in school and society as a whole ***(Freire, 1972)***. Disempowering students and minimising their creativity are in the service of their oppressors as ***Freire (1972)*** believes. For education to promote social change and be the practice of freedom, ***Freire (1972)*** argues that the contradictory relationship between teachers and students should be reconciled. Incontrast to the banking method, liberating education views teachers and students as equals who engage in dialogue to make sense of the world around them ***(Freire, 1972)***. According to ***Freire (1972)***, true education is based on dialogue and communication which stimulate critical thinking. In the liberating concept of education, teachers are always 'cognitive' rather than narrative, and they are always encouraged to update their reflections in the light of their students' reflections ***(Freire, 1972)***. As for students, they are no longer passive listeners. They are critical thinkers who through dialogue with their teachers co-investigate reality***(Freire, 1972)***. Liberating education, as

Freire (1972) points out, is based on creativity, continuous reflection and action which correspond to the true nature of human beings. Unlike banking education which stresses permanence and the fatalistic perception of reality, liberating education considers these a problem as it rejects having a pre-planned future. Hence, ***Freire (1972, p. 57)*** considers this method as "revolutionary futurity" and "prophetic" in a way that it is agreement with the historical nature of human beings. It is a humanist and liberating method based on dialogue and it advocates overcoming authoritarianism all of which are against the interests of the oppressors ***(Freire, 1972)***. The reasons for supporting the use of LCT in peacetimes and emergencies will be examined in the next section.

LCT has a number of weakness and drawbacks. One of the main critiques of LCT which several authors have raised is the problem of its definition ***(Bennett and Jordan, 1975; Kain, 2003; Schweisfurth, 2013; Thompson, 2013; Lattimer, 2015). Schweisfurth (2013)*** argues that LCT is a vague and loosely used term, which has affected understanding and using this model of education. Along a similar line, ***Thompson (2013) and Lattimer (2015)*** indicate that the literature suggests different interpretations of LCT and the term has been associated with various related terms. As a result, ***Schweisfurth (2015)*** cautions that to explain policy or practice anything might be calledLCT which may make the meaning of the comprehensive term unclear.In addition to the lack of a clear definition of LCT, critics of this pedagogic model argue that there are many complex issues which affect LCT implementation; therefore, numerous studies question its appropriateness globally in all situations as the 'best practice' particularly in developing countries and refugee contexts ***(Brown, 2001; Tabulawa, 2003, 2013; O'Sullivan, 2004; Alexander, 2008b, 2009; Vavrus, 2009; Mtika and Gates, 2010; Guthrie, 2011; Schweisfurth, 2013; Mendenhall et al., 2015; Stott, 2018; Brinkmann, 2019; Schweisfurth and Elliott, 2019)***.

Many authors including ***Alexander (2000), Sternberg (2007), Vavrus (2009) and Guthrie (2011, 2015)*** argue that culture is a powerful shaper of education. Therefore, ***Sternberg (2007)*** highlights that understanding pedagogy and the goals of education should be only within their cultural contexts. Examples of other factors which comprise pedagogy and affect LCT implementation whether in developing countries or refugee contexts include the availability of resources, having enough support and monitoring strategies, having time to innovate, class size, teacher-learner relationship, the quality of teacher education and training, teachers andlearners' beliefs about teaching and learning, teachers and learners' motivation and experiences, curriculum and assessment and government policies ***(Gipps and MacGilchrist, 1999; Williams, 2001; Kain, 2003; Kagawa, 2005; Vavrus, 2009; Mtika and Gates, 2010; Guthrie, 2011; Schweisfurth, 2013, 2015; Westbrook et al., 2013; Lattimer, 2015; Mendenhall et al., 2015; Brinkmann, 2019)***.

According to ***Sternberg (2007)***, when students learn in a way which is in harmony with their culture, this positively affects their school performance. ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** explains that as part of their cultural beliefs, learners in some contexts do not question their teachers as a sign of respect and showing loyalty. Therefore, introducing pedagogy which challenges teachers, learners and parents' cultural beliefs may be met with resistance ***(Schweisfurth, 2013; Westbrook et al., 2013)***. Applying a new pedagogy in any context requires considering its relevance in the existing national, institutional and professional culture and adapting it to suit the local context otherwise there will be implementation difficulties ***(Sternberg, 2007; Schweisfurth, 2013, 2015)***. Based on ***Schweisfurth (2013)***, the local context affects LCE interpretation and implementation. For example, in different contexts, LCT might be represented differently or it might take different shapes which may result in tensions upon transferring ideas or materials uncritically from one context to another. As evidenced by various studies, the history of LCT suggests that there have been lots of challenges in implementing LCT internationally because of cultural factors ***(Guthrie, 1990, 2011; Brown, 2001; Tabulawa, 2003, 2013; O'Sullivan, 2004; Vavrus, 2009; Schweisfurth, 2011, 2013; Lattimer, 2015; Stott, 2018; Brinkmann, 2019; Schweisfurth and Elliott, 2019)***.

As ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** illustrates, LCT reduces teacher control in class and gives students more control over their learning affecting consequently adult-child power relationships which are profoundly shaped by cultural expectations. In addition, ***O'Sullivan (2004)*** indicates that LCT encourages questioning and exploration as it aims to promote children's critical skills. However, in some contexts, for cultural reasons, there might be reservations about reducing and questioning teacher authority because they are not accepted by teachers, learners, parents and their community as a whole ***(Schweisfurth, 2013)***. For example, ***Brown (2001)*** points out the difficulty of applying LCT in Bhutan's refugee schools since cultureand religion strongly impact people's lives. Education has religious significance, learning is respected, teachers are revered as religious leaders and schools are respected as temples by the community. Therefore, ***Brown (2001)*** explains that the Bhutanese culture fosters traditional forms of teaching by which students do not question teachers and listen to them respectfully which made it difficult for teachers to implement LCT in refugee classes. Along similar lines,

Westbrook et al., (2013) report LCE implementation difficulties in studies from East Africa, India and Burma due to challenging cultural beliefs about teacher's role in class. ***O'Sullivan (2004)*** also indicates that the Namibian culture does not encourage children to question adults. Therefore, ***O'Sullivan (2004)*** argues that the LCT is not appropriate in the Namibian culture. Several authors such as ***Tabulawa (2003, 2013), O'Sullivan (2004)*** and ***Guthrie (2011)*** argue that LCT is a Western approach which may not be appropriate in all contexts. Therefore, these authors doubt the relevance of LCT across the world particularly in developing countries.

According to ***O'Sullivan (2004)***, LCT has been developed in the West and it better suits the Western focus on the individual. The progressive values that LCT promote may have culturally unacceptable influences ***(Guthrie, 2011)***. Individual differences in learning which vary between cultures and the way teachers manage them in class can be barriers to applying LCT in some contexts ***(Schweisfurth, 2013)***. As a result, several authors including ***Alexander (2000, 2008a:b, 2009), Tabulawa (2003, 2013), O'Sullivan (2004), Sternberg (2007) and Vavrus (2009)*** warn against transferring what is considered a successful pedagogy in one context to another without determining its appropriateness in the target context. Similarly, ***Brinkmann (2019)*** argues that implementing the western model of LCT requires an alignment with teachers' underlying beliefs otherwise it will be met with resistance. Based on ***Brinkmann (2019)***, the principles of LCT are incompatible with teachers' cultural beliefs in India which is one of the main challenges to LCT implementation. ***Williams (2001)*** argues that bringing about changes to teaching and learning demands that teachers teach in different ways which are not well understood and difficult to achieve even in resource-rich countries. ***O'Sullivan (2004)*** explains that LCT implementation demands having well-qualified and experienced teachers. In addition, to become aware of and attendto various learning needs, styles and preferences, LCT expects teachers to develop rich teaching repertoires which enable them to guide learners and requires having certain classroom arrangements, enough time, several resources, some materials, guides, equipment and small class sizes as well as training for teachers all of which may make this pedagogy an expensive option in developing countries whose classes are usually under-sourced, have a big number of students and teachers are poorly trained ***(Guthrie, 1990; O'Sullivan, 2004; Kagawa, 2005; Schweisfurth, 2011; Sriprakash, 2012)***. ***O'Sullivan (2004)*** reports the challenges to implementing LCT in Namibia because of contextual constraints such as the unavailability of the demands that LCT require. ***Sriprakash (2012)*** also points out the difficulties of training teachers and the lack of resources in the global south upon analysing pedagogical change towards LCT there.

Brinkmann (2019) indicates that implementing LCT requires having a systematic alignment between pedagogy, curriculum and assessment and the provision of high quality teacher education programmes which are unavailable in the Indian context. Besides having contextual constraints such as the lack of resources and large class sizes, ***Brinkmann (2019)*** argues that the curricula, textbooks, examinations and teacher supervision systems are often in conflict with LCT prospects. According to ***Schweisfurth (2013),*** having a fixed curriculum which is framed in behaviorist ways challenges applying LCT since LCT is based on learning through negotiating information which is not static. Therefore, the nature of curriculum and how flexible it is taught and described affect the success of LCT implementation. Furthermore, even when teachers have some freedom in teaching the prescribed curriculum, pressures from content-driven assessment can inhibit the successful implementation of LCT as ***Vavrus (2009)*** and ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** indicate. ***Mtika and Gates (2010)*** also show that teachers in Malawi face similar challenges when implementing LCT because the education system is exam-oriented. Despite offering training for teachers in using LCT, in ***Brinkmann's (2019)*** study of 60 government primary teachers in India, the quality was poor which affected teachers' understanding and implementation of LCT. Therefore, the provision of training in using LCT does not necessarily result in its successful implementation. As ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** points out, teacher training might be theoretical and teachers might fail to apply what they have been trained to because of poor teacher motivation, lack of administrative support or because of contextual constraints. In developing countries and conflict situations, ***Schweisfurth(2013)*** explains that teachers may lose motivation because they are badly-paid or they have to teach in bad working conditions. Moreover, lots of teachers choose teaching only because of their qualifications which affects their motivation. If teachers are not competent or feel comfortable while teaching using a certain language, they might resort to asking closed questions and controlling the content and discourse in the classroom to hide their linguistic incompetence ***(Schweisfurth, 2013)***.

Pedagogical change towards LCT can be more problematic due to the complexity of teaching traumatised children, the unavailability of well-trained teachers, the lack of resources and materials, having social and cultural conditions, and the difficulty of managing education and monitoring policy implementation ***(Williams, 2001; Kagawa, 2005; Mendenhall et al., 2015; Tomlinson and Benefield, 2005; INEE, 2010a; Schweisfurth, 2013; Mendenhall et al., 2015)***. Educating refugee children outside their country of origin means having to deal with the troubles of trauma, reintegration and other accompanying challenges caused by the

impact of conflict ***(Williams, 2001; Davies, 2004; Kagawa, 2005)***. Teachers and students' views of teaching and learning which are affected by multiple complex factors such as culture, experience and education all influence LCT implementation as numerous studies suggest ***(Gipps and MacGilchrist, 1999; Kain, 2003; Vavrus, 2009; Mtika and Gates, 2010; Schweisfurth, 2011; Dryden-Peterson, 2016)***. Exploring teachers' views of learning and their beliefs about how children learn has become highly important asthese can provide information on classroom decisions and pedagogic approaches as well as foretell teachers' readiness to try new approaches ***(Gipps and MacGilchrist, 1999; Alexander, 2008b)***. Teachers usually get their views from their previous experiences as school students and from the approaches encouraged in their teacher education, school curriculum and their colleagues' classrooms ***(Westbrook et al., 2013)***. Sometimes the proposed change in pedagogy contradicts teachers' beliefs about effective teaching which makes implementing the required change more difficult in practice ***(Wedell, 2009)***.

According to ***Tabulawa (2003)*** and ***Schweisfurth (2013)***, LCT challenges teacher authority and depends on learners' active participation in learning through dialogue and collaboration with teachers and peers. The assumption is then in learner-centred classes, learners are intrinsically motivated to collaborate with peers in groups, work independently, and respect the rules of the democratic class ***(Schweisfurth, 2013)***. However, ***Kain (2003)*** indicates that learners may not be equally motivated to use learner-centred methods. In their study of trainee teachers' ability to implement LCT, ***Mtika and Gates (2010)*** suggest that students did not show enthusiasm for the adoption of LCT which made it difficult for teachers to use LCT strategies such as group work and role play. The students were used to TCT which made them resist its implementation in the Malawi context. As another example of the discrepancy between teachers and students' views of teaching and learning in refugee contexts, ***Dryden-Peterson (2016)*** indicates that Somali refugee students in school classroom did not have experience with LCT such as group work, initiating questions and self-directed exploration in their home country. As students were behaving in what may have been considered appropriate classroom behaviour in their home country, the teachers supposed that refugee children were silent and unable to ask questions because they did not have much contributions to make in class. In this way, refugee children resist learner-centred methods because of their views which are influenced by their home culture. According to ***Schweisfurth (2013)***, a teacher's own need for security and the cultural expectations about their roles as authorities play a major role in the success of LCT implementation. As ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** explains, implementing LCT may create challenges for teachers as they try to keep order and control of classroom time whilerespecting the ideals of learner freedom. The fear is confusing democracy with permissiveness. Therefore, ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** indicates that teachers need to negotiate classroom rules and discipline with their learners to learn in a democratic class, which requires teachers to be competent to avoid learners' abuse of power. Having enough administrative capacity and continuing support from school management and ministries of education may also affect LCT implantation otherwise teachers may get back to the traditional ways of teaching as ***Guthrie (1990)***, ***Schweisfurth (2013)*** and ***Lattimer (2015)*** note. ***Lattimer (2015)*** points out that although national policy makers and NGOs' representatives make promising statements about LCT reforms, they provide very little specific guidance for applying LCT in classrooms. For all of the aforementioned challenges, ***Guthrie (1990, 2011)***, ***Tabulawa (2003)***, and ***Vavrus (2009)*** doubt the appropriateness of LCT in developing countries. Given the cultural values of teachers and students and the realities of classroom conditions, ***Guthrie (1990)***argues that TCT may be more appropriate in developing countries contexts. ***Tabulawa (2003)*** and ***Vavrus (2009)*** question the reasons for promoting LCT by international aid agencies in developing countries arguing that they have hidden agendas.

Nevertheless, it is important to mention that questioning the appropriateness of LCT in developing countries has not gone unchallenged ***(O'Sullivan, 2004; Barrett, 2007; Schweisfurth, 2011, 2013; Thompson, 2013)***. ***Barrett (2007)*** illustrates the use of a combination of teaching methods to improve the quality of education in under-resourced systems based on the findings of her fieldwork. According to ***Barrett (2007)***, the national assessment and curriculum were performance-based, the classes were overcrowded, and some teachers' views of knowledge were compatible with TCT. Despite mainly relying on TCT, ***Barrett (2007)*** argues that teachers were mixing pedagogies and there was a significant variation in the quality of pupil-teacher interactions. As a result, ***Barrett (2007)***emphasises that implementing constructivist principles in whole-class teaching as in Tanzanian classes challenges the polarised views of TCT and LCT pedagogies in low-income countries.***Thompson (2013)*** similarly challenges the arguments which claim that LCT is a Western model through encouraging the cultural translation of LCT. To facilitate successful implementation of LCT, several authors including ***Alexander (2000, 2015)***, ***O'Sullivan (2004), Vavrus (2009), Mtika and Gates (2010)***, and ***Schweisfurth (2011, 2013, 2015)*** recommend analysing the context as a whole and adapting LCT selectively to fit the local context and meet teachers and learners' views, needs and aspirations. Numerous studies recommend mixing pedagogies to improve the quality of education while being attentive to the contextual constraints rather

than promoting one model of pedagogy as exemplified by the 'mixed-mode approach to teaching' ***Gipps and MacGilchrist (1999)*** suggest depending on the purposes of teaching, ***O'Sullivan's (2004)*** learning-centred rather than learner-centred approach which encourages teachers to use the methods which best support students' learning within the realities of their classrooms, ***Vavrus's (2009)*** call for adopting 'contingent constructivism' which considers the cultural, economic, and political conditions in the teaching context and ***Schweisfurth's (2013)*** 'minimum standards' for LCT.

Conclusion

It is very difficult to mention single definition of the pedagogy. Different scholars defined pedagogy from their own as perspectives. Because their background of the study is different. At the same time, their socio-cultural and family background is also different. The etymological meaning of the term pedagogy is derived from the Greek word 'paidagōgeō' in which 'país, genitive, paidos' means child and ágō means lead; so it literally means 'to lead the child'. In English the term pedagogy is used to refer to instructive theory; trainee teachers learn their subject and also the pedagogy appropriate for teaching that subject. The word pedagogy has its roots in Ancient Greece. Rich families in Ancient Greece would have many servants, often slaves, one of whom would be specifically tasked to look after the children. Often these slaves would lead or escort the children to the place of education. Later, the word pedagogue became synonymous with the teaching of our young. Taken in this context, we would probably all agree that pedagogy is about children's education. And yet this confines us to a very limited understanding of what pedagogy is, or has the potential to become. In the modern context, pedagogy refers to a verities teaching learning activities.There are two pedagogical models which are teachers centred and learner centred pedagogical models. Most of the educationists laid emphasis on the learner centred teaching pedagogy.

Reference

[1]. Alexander, R. (1992). The problem of good primary practice. In Alexander, R. (Ed.) *Policy and Practice in the Primary Curriculum*, London, Routledge.
[2]. Alexander, R. (2000).*Culture and Pedagogy: International Comparisons in Primary Education*. UK: Blackwell.
[3]. Alexander, R. (2004). Still no pedagogy? Principle, pragmatism and compliance in primary education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 34*(1), 7-33.
[4]. Alexander, R. (2008). *Essays on pedagogy*. Routledge.
[5]. Alexander R. (2008a).Education for all, the quality imperative and the problem of pedagogy: create pathways to access.Research Monograph No. 20, *Consortium for Educational Access, Transitions and Equity*. London: Institute of Education.
[6]. Alexander, R. (2008b). Pedagogy, Curriculum and Culture. In K. Hall, P. Murphy and J. Soler (eds), *Pedagogy and Practice: Culture and Identities* (pp. 3-27). UK: The Open University and SAGE. Alexander,
[7]. Alexander, R. (2008c).*Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk (4th Ed.)*. York: Dialogos.
[8]. Alexander, R. (2009). Towards a Comparative Pedagogy. In R. Cowen and A.M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International Handbook of Comparative Education*(pp. 923-942). New York: Springer.
[9]. Alexander, R. (2015). Teaching and learning for all? The quality imperative revisited. *International Journal of Educational Development, 40*, 250-258.
[10]. Alexander, R. (2017).*Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk* (Fifth Ed.). York: Dialogos.
[11]. Arends, R. I. (2001). *Learning to teach (5th Ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
[12]. Atkinson, J., Soman, K., Walls, E.,& Harris van Keuren, C. (2019). *What does value for money mean when it comes to educating a child?* (Paper presentation). Comparative and International Education Society, San Francisco, CA, United States.
[13]. Banks, F., Bourdillon, H., Leach, J., Manning, P., Moon, B. and Swarbrick, A. (1995). *Knowledge, school knowledge and pedagogy: Defining an agenda for teacher education*. Paper presented at the first meeting of the European Educational Research Association, Bath.
[14]. Barrett, A. M. (2007). Beyond the Polarization of Pedagogy: Models of Classroom Practice in Tanzanian Primary Schools.*Comparative Education, 43*(2), 273-294.
[15]. Bashir, S. Lockheed, M., Ninan, E., & Tan, J-P. (2018). *Facing forward: Schooling for learning in Africa*. AFDB/World Bank Group.
[16]. Bartlett, L. (2005). Dialogue, knowledge and teacher-student relations: Freirean pedagogy in theory and practice. *Comparative Education Review, 49*(3).
[17]. Bennett, N. (1976).*Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*. London: Open Books.
[18]. Bennett, N. and Jordan, J. (1975). A Typology of Teaching Styles in Primary Schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 45*(1): 20-28.
[19]. Bernstein, B. (2000).*Pedagogy, Symbolic and Identity: Theory, Research and Critique*. London: Rowan and Littlefield.
[20]. Bermeo, M.J., Kaunda, Z. &Ngarina, D. (2013). Learning to teach in Tanzania: Teacher perceptions and experiences. In F. Vavrus& L. Bartlett (Eds.), *Teaching in tension: International pedagogies, national policies, and teachers' practices in Tanzania* (pp. 39-60). Sense Publishers.
[21]. Best, F. (1988). The metamorphoses of the term pedagogy: Prospects. *Quarterly review of education, Vol. XVIII, No 2*, 157-66.
[22]. Biesta, G. (2011). Disciplines and theory in the academic study of education: a comparative analysis of the Anglo-American and continental construction of the field. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 19*(2), 175-192.
[23]. Brinkmann, S. (2019). Teachers' beliefs and educational reform in India: from learner-centred to learning-centred education. *Comparative Education, 55*(1): 9-29.
[24]. Brown, J. S., Collins, A. and Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), pp. 32-42.
[25]. Brown, K. (2003). From teacher-centered to learner-centered curriculum: Improving learning in diverse classrooms. *Education, 124*(1), 49-54.

[26]. Brown, T. (2001). Improving Quality and Attainment in Refugee Schools: The Case of the Bhutanese Refugees in Nepal. In J. Crisp, C. Talbot and D. B. Cipollone (Eds), *Learning for a Future: Refugee Education in Developing Countries*(pp. 109-162).Geneva: UNHCR.
[27]. Bruner, J. S. (1985). Vygotsky: A historical and conceptual perspective. In Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
[28]. Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
[29]. Burton, L. (1996). A socially just pedagogy for the teaching of mathematics. In Murphy, P. and Gipps, C. (Eds.),*Equity in the Classroom: Towards Effective Pedagogy for Girls and Boys*. London: Falmer Press, Unesco Publishing.
[30]. Cambridge University Press. (2003). *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
[31]. Carroll, M. (2014). Models of Teaching and Learning. In M. Carroll and M. McCulloch (Eds.), *Understanding Teaching and Learning in Primary Education*(pp. 40-55).London: Sage.
[32]. Castle, E. B. (1961). *Ancient Education and Today*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.
[33]. Clark, C.M., Gage, N.L., Marx, R.W., Peterson, P.L., Stayrook, N.G. and Winne, P.H. (1979). A Factorial Experiment on Teacher-structuring, soliciting and Reacting.*Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(4): 534-552.
[34]. Cornelius-White, J. and Harbaugh, A. (2010).*Learner-centered instruction: Building relationships for student success*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
[35]. Davies, L. (2004). *Education and conflict: Complexity and chaos*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
[36]. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). (2009a). *Belonging, Being and Becoming: The Early Years Learning Framework for Australia*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
[37]. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (2009b). *My time, our place: Framework for School Age Care.* Commonwealth of Australia.
[38]. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (2009c). *Belonging Being & Becoming: The Early Years Learning Framework for Australia.* Commonwealth ofAustralia.
[39]. Dryden-Peterson, S. (2011). Refugee Children Aspiring Toward the Future: Linking Education and Livelihood. In K. Mundy and S. Dryden-Peterson (Eds.), *Educating children in conflict zones: Research, policy, and practice for systematic change-A tribute to Jackie Kirk* (pp. 85-99). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
[40]. Education Scotland (2005). *Let's talk about pedagogy*. Retrieved 23 November 2014 from www.educationscotland.gov.uk/images/talkpedagogy_tcm4-193218.pdf
[41]. Elen, J., Clarebout, G., Leonard, R. and Lowyck, J. (2007). Student-centred and teacher-centred learning environments: what studentsthink.*Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(1), 105-117.
[42]. Elliott, J.G. (2014) 'Lessons from abroad: Whatever happened to pedagogy?'.*Comparative Education, 50*(1). 27-44.
[43]. Ermenc, K.S. (2015). The role of comparative pedagogy in comparative educational research. *Comparative sciences: Interdisciplinary Approaches International Perspectives on Education and Society, 26*, 37–56.
[44]. Encyclopaedia Britannica (2015).*School and Library Subscribers*, https://www.britannica.com/ topic/education (Accessed 26 October 2016).
[45]. Farquhar, S. E. (2003). *Quality Teaching Early Foundations: Best Evidence Synthesis*. New Zealand Ministry of Education.
[46]. Fitsula, M. (2009). *Pedagog (3rd Ed.).* Kyiv: Academic Press.
[47]. Freire, P. (1970).*Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
[48]. Freire, P. (1971).*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York, Herden and Herden.
[49]. Freire, P. (1972).*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
[50]. Freire, P. (1985). *The Politics of Education.* London: Macmillan.
[51]. Fuller, B. and Snyder, C.W. (1991). Vocal Teachers, Silent Pupils? Life in Botswana Classrooms. *Comparative Education Review, 35*(2), 274-294.
[52]. Gipps, C. and MacGilchrist, B. (1999). Primary School Learners. In P. Mortimore (Eds.), *Understanding Pedagogy and Its Impact on Learning*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
[53]. Giroux, H. A. (1985). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. *Social Education, 49*(5), 376-79.
[54]. Guthrie, G., (1990). To the defense of traditional teaching in lesser-developed countries. In V. Rust and P. Dalin (Eds.), *Teachers and Teaching in the Developing World* (pp. 219-232). New York and London: Garland Publishing.
[55]. Guthrie, G. (2011). *The Progressive education fallacy in developing countries: In favour of formalism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
[56]. Guthrie, G. (2015). Culturally grounded pedagogy and research methodology.*Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 45*(1): 163-168.
[57]. Harding, J. (1996). Girls' achievement in science and technology: Implications for pedagogy. In Murphy, P. and Gipps, C. (Eds.) *Equity in the Classroom: Towards Effective Pedagogy for Girls andBoys.*London, Falmer Press, Unesco Publishing.
[58]. Hall, K., Murphy, P. and Soler, J. (Eds.) (2008).*Pedagogy and Practice: Culture and Identities*. UK: The Open University and SAGE.
[59]. Halliday, J. (1998). Technicism, reflective practice and authenticity in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(6), 597-605.
[60]. Hamilton, D. (1999). The pedagogic paradox (or why no didactics in England?). *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 7*(1), 135–152.
[61]. Hattie, J. and Zierer, K. (2018).*10 Mindframes for Visible Learning: Teaching for Success*. New York: Routledge.
[62]. INEE (2010).*Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*. New York: the Author.
[63]. Ireson, J. and Mortimore, P. and Hallam, S. (1999). The common strands of pedagogy and their implications. In: P. Mortimore (Ed.), *Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning* (pp. 212-232). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
[64]. Kagawa, F. (2005). Emergency education: a critical review of the field.*Comparative Education, 41*(4): 487-503.
[65]. Kain, D. J. (2003). Teacher-Centered versus Student-Centered: Balancing Constraint and Theory in the Composition Classroom.*Pedagogy, 3*(1): 104-108.
[66]. Kant, I. (1900). *Kant on education*. (Translated by A. Churton). Boston: D.C. Heath.
[67]. Kaufman, D. (1996). Constructivist based experiential learning in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 18*(2), 40-50.
[68]. Kenway, J. (1996). The emotional dimensions of feminist pedagogy in schools. In Murphy, P. and Gipps, C. (Eds.), *Equity in the Classroom: Towards Effective Pedagogy for Girls and Boys*. London:Falmer Press, Unesco Publishing.
[69]. Kruse, A. M. (1996). Single-sex settings: Pedagogies for girls and boys in Danish schools. In Murphy, P. and Gipps, C. (Eds), *Equity in the classroom: Towards effective pedagogy for girlsandboys*, London, Falmer Press/UNESCO Publishing.
[70]. Kuzich, S. (2011). Education for sustainability: Implications for curriculum and pedagogy. *Development, 4*(2), 203-211.
[71]. Lattimer, H. (2015). Translating theory into practice: Making meaning of learner centered education frameworks for classroom-based practitioners.*International Journal of Educational Development*, 45, 65-76.

[72]. Lerman, S. (1993). *The problem of intersubjectivity in Mathematics learning: Extension or rejection of the constructivist paradigm*. London: South Bank University Technical Report, SBU-CISM.
[73]. Lohithakshan, P. M. (2004). *Dictionary of Education: A Practical Approach.* New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers.
[74]. Longenecker, R. N. (1982). The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians.*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, Vol.25*, pp.53-61.
[75]. Loughran, J. (2006).*Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.
[76]. Lui, R., Qiao X. and Liu, Y. (2006). A paradigm shift of learner-centered teaching style: Reality or illusion?' *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT, 13*: 77-91.
[77]. Marton, F. and Booth, S. (1997).*Learning and awareness*.New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
[78]. Mason, M., Crossley, M., & Bond, T. (2019). Changing modalities in international development and research in education: Conceptual and ethical issues. *International Journal of Educational Development, 70*, 1-10.
[79]. McCombs, B. (1997). Self-assessment and reflection: Tools for promoting teacher changes toward learner-centered practices.*NASSP Bulletin, 81*(587): 1-14.
[80]. Mendenhall, M., Dryden-Peterson, S., Bartlett, L., Ndirangu, C., Imonje, R., Gakunga, D., Gichuhi, L., Nyagah, G., Okoth, U. and Tangelder, M. (2015). Quality education for refugees in Kenya: Pedagogy in urban Nairobi and Kakuma refugee camp settings. *Journal on Education in Emergencies, 1*(1): 92-130.
[81]. Meredith, A. (1995). Terry's learning: Some limitations of Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 25*(2), pp. 175–87.
[82]. Mtika, P. and Gates, P. (2010). Developing learner-centred education among secondary trainee teachers in Malawi: The dilemma of appropriation and application.' *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30: 396-404.
[83]. Murphy, P. (1996). Assessment practices and gender in science. In Parker, L. H., Rennie, L. J. and Fraser, B. J. (Eds.) *Gender, Science and Mathematics: Shortening the Shadow* (pp.105-17).Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
[84]. Murphy, P. (2008). Defining Pedagogy. In K. Hall, P. Murphy and J. Soler (Eds.), *Pedagogy and Practice: Culture and Identities* (pp. 28-39). UK: The Open University and SAGE.
[85]. Moyles, J., Adams, S. & Musgrove, A. (2002). *Study of pedagogical effectiveness in early learning.* Anglia Polytechnic University.
[86]. O'Loughlin, M. (1992). Rethinking science education: Beyond Piagetian constructivism toward a sociocultural model of teaching and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29*, 791–820. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660290805
[87]. Osaki, K. M. &Agu, A.O. (2002). A study of classroom interaction in primary schools in the United Republic of Tanzania. *Prospects, 32*(1), 103–116.
[88]. Osborn, M. and Broadfoot, P. (1992). A lesson in progress? Primary classrooms observed in England and France.*Oxford Review of Education, 18*(1), pp. 3-15.
[89]. O'Sullivan, M., (2004). The reconceptualisation of learner-centred approaches: a Namibian case study. *International Journal of Educational Development, 24*(6): 585-602.
[90]. Oxford English Dictionary (2018). Available at http://www.oed.com/ (accessed 6 May 2019).
[91]. Payne, L. (2019). *Panel on Effective pedagogy in cultural context* [Discussant]. Comparative & International Education Society, San Francisco, CA, United States.
[92]. Paschenko, M. and Krasnoshtan, I. (2014). *Pedagogy: Textbook.* Kyiv: Academic Literature Centre.
[93]. Pavlov, I. (1927). *Conditioned reflexes: An investigation of the physiological activity of the cerebral cortex*. New York: Dover.
[94]. Rogoff, B. (1990).*Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
[95]. Schon, D. (1987).*Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
[96]. Schweisfurth, M. (2011). Learner-centred education in developing country contexts: From solution to problem?*International Journal of Educational Development, 31*: 425-432.
[97]. Schweisfurth, M. (2013).*Learner-centered Education in International Perspective: Whose Pedagogy for Whose Development*? London and New York: Routledge.
[98]. Schweisfurth, M. (2015). Learner-centred Pedagogy: Towards a post-2015 agenda for teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Development, 40*(1): 259-66.
[99]. Schweisfurth, M. and Elliott, J. (2019). When best practice meets the pedagogical nexus: recontextualisation, reframing and resilience.*Comparative Education, 55*(1), 1-8.
[100]. Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher, 27*(2), 4-13.
[101]. Shepard, L. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher, 29*(7), 4- 14.
[102]. Shepherd, S. (2012). Responsive teaching and learner centredness. In D. Mallows (Ed.), *Innovations in Englishlanguage teaching for migrants and refugees*. London: British Council. pp. 166-175.
[103]. Sinclair, M. (2002).*Planning education in and after emergencies*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
[104]. Siraj-Blatchford, I., Sylva, K., Muttock, S., Gilden, R. & Bell, D. (2002). Brief No: 356 *researchingeffective pedagogy in the early years.* Retrieved 22 November 2014 from www.ioe.ac.uk/REPEY_research_brief.pdf.
[105]. Skinner, B. (1957).*Verbal behaviour*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
[106]. Smith, M. J. (2006). The Role of the Pedagogue in Galatians. *Faculty Publications and Presentations*. Paper 115. Liberty University.
[107]. Smith, M. K. (2012). What is pedagogy? *The Encyclopaedia of Informal Education*, http://infed. org/mobi/what-is-pedagogy/ (Accessed 26 October 2016)
[108]. Sriprakash, A. (2012).*Pedagogies for development: The politics and practice of child-centrededucation in India*. London, New York: Springer.
[109]. Sommers, M. (2004).*Coordinating education during emergencies and reconstruction: Challenges and possibilities*. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.
[110]. Sternberg, R. (2007). Culture, instruction, and assessment.*Comparative Education, 43*(1), 5-22.
[111]. Stott, A. (2018). Are instructivist pedagogies more appropriate for learning the sciences in South African low-quintile schools than western literature suggests?*Journal of Education, 71*: 39-57.
[112]. Struyven, K., Dochy, F. and Janssens, S. (2010). Teach as you preach: the effects of student-centred versus lecture-based teaching on student teachers' approaches to teaching.*European Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(1), 43-64.
[113]. Sysoyeva, S. and Krystopchuk, T. (2013). *Methodology of scientific-pedagogical research: textbook.* Rivne: VydavnytstvoOberehy.
[114]. Tabulawa, R. (2003). International Aid Agencies, Learner-Centred Pedagogy and Political Democratisation: A critique.*Comparative Education, 39* (1), 7-26.

[115]. Tabulawa, R. (2013).*Teaching and learning in context: Why pedagogical reforms fail in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Senegal: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.
[116]. Tao, S. (2013a). Why are teachers absent? Utilising the Capability Approach and Critical Realism to explain teacher performance in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *33*(1), 2-14.
[117]. Thorndike, E. (1911).*Animal intelligence: Experimental studies*. New York: Macmillan.
[118]. Thompson, P. (2013). Learner-centred education and 'cultural translation. *International Journal of Educational Development, 33*, 48-58.
[119]. Tochon, F. and Munby, H. (1993). Novice and expert teachers' time epistemology: A wave function from didactics to pedagogy.*Teacher and Teacher Education, 9*(2), pp. 205-18.
[120]. Tomlinson, K. and Benefield, P. (2005) *Education and Conflict: Research and Research Possibilities*. Slough: NFER.
[121]. Vavrus, F. (2009). The cultural politics of constructivist pedagogies: Teacher education reform in the United Republic of Tanzania.*International Journal of Educational Development*, *29*: 303-311.
[122]. Vavrus, F. (2016, November). Dean's lecture on *When 'What Works' Doesn't: Comparative Pedagogies and Epistemological Diversity in Education*. University of Sydney, Sydney.
[123]. Vavrus, F. and Bartlett, L. (2012). Comparative Pedagogies and Epistemological Diversity: Social and Materials Contexts of Teaching in Tanzania. *Comparative Education Review*, *56*(4), 634-658.
[124]. Vavrus, F. &Salema, V. (2013). Working lives of teachers: Social and material constraints. In F. Vavrus& L. Bartlett (Eds.), *Teaching in tension: International pedagogies, national policies, and teachers' practices in Tanzania* (pp. 75–92). Sense Publishers.
[125]. Volkova, M. (2012). *Pedagogy (4rd Ed.).* Academic press: Kyiv.
[126]. Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Gauvain and M. Coles (Eds.), *Reading on the development of children*. New York: Scientific American Books. pp. 34-40.
[127]. Washington, B. T. (1963). *Up from slavery: An autobiography*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday.
[128]. Watkins, C. and Mortimore, P. (1999). Pedagogy: What do we know. In P. Motrimore (ed.) *Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning*, London: SAGE, pp. 1-19.
[129]. Wedell, M. (2009).*Planning for educational change: Putting people and their contexts first*. London: Continuum.
[130]. Weimer, M. (2002) *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francesco: Jossey-Bass.
[131]. Welch, A. (2003). Technocracy, Uncertainty, and Ethics: Comparative Education in an Era of Postmodernity and Globalization. In R. F. Arnove, C.A. Torres, & S. Franz (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local*. Rowman& Littlefield.
[132]. Westbrook J., Durrani N., Brown R., Orr D., Pryor J., Boddy J. and Salvi F. (2013).*Pedagogy, curriculum, teaching practices and teacher education in developing countries: Education Rigorous Literature Review*. UK: Department for International Development.
[133]. Williams, J. H. (2001). On School Quality and Attainment. In J. Crisp, C. Talbot and D. B. Cipollone (Eds.), *Learning for a future: Refugee education in developing countries* (pp. 85-108). Geneva: UNHCR.
[134]. Winch, C. and Gingell, J. G. (2004). *Key Concepts in the Philosophy of Education.* London and New York: Routledge.
[135]. Young, N. H. (1987). Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor. *NovumTestamentum* 29: 150.
[136]. Zhou, M. and Brown, D. (2015) *Educational Learning Theories (2nd Ed.)*. Education Open Textbooks, available at: https://oer.galileo.usg.edu/education-textbooks/1/ (Accessed 14 February 2019).

The end