Marquette University
e-Publications@Marquette

College of Education Faculty Research and Publications | Education, College of

2007

Socially Just Teaching and the Complementarity of Ignatian Pedagogy and Critical Pedagogy

Sharon Chubbuck
Marquette University, sharon.chubbuck@marquette.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/edu_fac

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Chubbuck, Sharon, "Socially Just Teaching and the Complementarity of Ignatian Pedagogy and Critical Pedagogy" (2007). *College of Education Faculty Research and Publications*. 327.
https://epublications.marquette.edu/edu_fac/327

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Education Faculty Research and Publications/College of Education

***This paper is NOT THE PUBLISHED VERSION*.**
Access the published version via the link in the citation below.

Christian Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 3 (2007): 239-265. DOI. This article is © Routledge and permission has been granted for this version to appear in e-Publications@Marquette. Routledge does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Routledge.

Socially Just Teaching and the Complementarity of Ignatian Pedagogy and Critical Pedagogy

Sharon M. Chubbuck
Department of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI

Abstract

“This qualitative research, conducted in a teacher education course at an urban Jesuit university, examines the concerns voiced by preservice teachers when they are challenged to define and embrace a vision of "teaching for social justice" in a methods course utilizing instructional methods based on theories of critical pedagogy and Ignatian pedagogy. The reflective journals and focus group interviews of a cohort of 15 preservice teachers revealed concerns about the curriculum, the pedagogy, and the rationale for socially just teaching. Those concerns, when juxtaposed with Ignatian pedagogy and critical pedagogy, reveal that each theory is both helpful and limited in its ability to address those concerns. In tandem, the two theories provide valuable support for the development of preservice teachers attempting to become socially just teachers.

> As the year continues, I'm really beginning to realize that a social justice classroom is one of those things in life that's a heck of a lot easier said than done.” - Valerie, preservice teacher

Educating teachers to embrace a vision of social justice in their profession recently has produced considerable controversy. Editorials in the popular press (e.g., [26]; [48]) have accused teacher education programs of using dispositions towards "social justice" as a means of screening out teachers who don't hold an appropriate politically "left agenda" ([26]) and of rendering the goals of education a series of "self-actualization" and "social adjustment" activities ([48]), rather than rigorous learning and sound acquisition of knowledge. One editorialist claimed that "social justice teaching is a frivolous waste of precious school hours, especially for poor children, who start out with a disadvantage" ([42]).

This controversy reflects a significant misunderstanding of the goals of socially just teaching, however—goals that are much too important to be dismissed because of confusion and partisan dissension. Simply defined, social justice means justice at a societal level, that is, equitable and fair access to commonly accepted rights and opportunities as experienced by distinct societal groups, such as those defined by race, class, or gender, rather than as experienced by individuals alone. Teaching for social justice, correspondingly, means equitable access to learning and achievement for all groups of students. The present-day level of injustice in education is seen in the continuing gap in academic achievement between students of color and their white counterparts, numbers frequently confounded by socioeconomic differences ([35]), with all the ramifications for future life opportunities that academic disparity predicts.

While the choices of individual students and their families significantly shape academic success or failure, classroom practices, school policies, and structural inequities in society also have a major effect on student learning. Both individual choice and institutional/societal structures are implicated ([47]); however, individual choice remains largely outside the control of educators. To be socially just, educators must attend to practices and policies within our control. Educators and educational researchers ([4]; [5]; Christensen, 2000; [8]; Darling-Hammond, 2004; Edelsky, 1999; Nieto, 2000; [44]; [45]) describe a cluster of outcomes that comprise socially just teaching: teacher knowledge of their own and their students' cultural and racial identity; equitable access to learning for all students based on sound, culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy; teacher activism around the formation of policy at both school and societal levels; and empowerment of students as critical, engaged citizens.

What teachers teach and how they teach it, and the varied policies that shape schooling, both serve as either channels of just and equitable or unjust and inequitable access to learning. The larger injustices of society limit students' access to equitable learning and life opportunities. Teachers who embrace a socially just practice are engaged in analyzing and transforming all those levels—classroom practice, institutional policy, and societal injustice—and their students gain the skills and knowledge needed by successful citizens who engage in critical analysis and activism to transform the inequities of their world.

The goals of social justice and its corollary of socially just teaching are woven into the fabric of most major religions of the world; for millennia, Judeo-Christian doctrine has embraced a goal of social justice to address societal inequities. This goal is particularly clear and constant in the social teaching of the Catholic tradition ([1]; [16]; [23]; [36]; [39]; Spohn, 2001). The current polarizing wrangling over the term "social justice" and the ongoing confusion over the content and implementation of socially just teaching should not dissuade teacher educators from training preservice teachers to embrace socially just teaching. The challenge, rather, is to find greater theoretical and practical clarity about the content of socially just teaching, the best methods for accomplishing such teaching, and, perhaps most fundamentally, a sound rationale for both.

The voices of preservice teachers can help provide this needed clarity. This research, conducted in a teacher education program housed in an urban Jesuit university, foregrounds those voices by exploring this question: What concerns are expressed by preservice teachers as they explore socially just teaching and their role in enacting it? As those concerns emerged, one subset of themes raised a second, primarily theoretical question:

To what extent can the components of critical pedagogy and Ignatian pedagogy, both of which have fundamental connections to the goals of social justice, address those concerns?

The paper presents an overview, critique, and comparison of Ignatian pedagogy and critical pedagogy, followed by a description of the research context and methodology. Findings of the salient subset of themes raised by preservice teachers regarding socially just teaching are then described. The paper then presents a theoretical interpretation of how Ignatian pedagogy and critical pedagogy each relate to those concerns, with implications for teacher education.

Ignatian Pedagogy and Critical Pedagogy: Overview, Critique, and Comparison

Ignatian Pedagogy

Ignatian pedagogy is a method of teaching grounded in long-standing Jesuit commitment to education based on the vision of St. Ignatius of Loyola, sixteenth−century founder of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). The aim of Jesuit education, to prepare leaders who will exercise responsible citizenship in a global world (Kolvenbach, 1989) calls for a transformative learning experience—at spiritual, intellectual, affective, and behavioral levels—that leads to "full growth of the person which leads to action ... that is suffused with the spirit and presence of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Man-for-Others" (The International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education [ICAJE], 1994b, p. 241). That transformative learning in secondary and post-secondary Jesuit education includes a range of characteristics, including attention to the formation of the whole person; an affirmation of the world; dialogue across cultures; a lifelong openness to growth and reflectivity; a willingness to analyze institutional structures; an education that is value-oriented; and the formation of "men and women for others" ([1]) who will adopt an action-oriented solidarity with the poor (ICAJE, 1994a).

Ignatian pedagogy was developed in the 1990s to support teachers at secondary Jesuit schools nurturing these characteristics in their students in "a manner that is academically sound and at the same time, formative of persons for others" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 239). Learning is built around the interplay of five elements: context, experience, reflection, action, and evaluation. Closely related to St. Ignatius' work on spiritual formation, these five elements of Ignatian pedagogy can be applied to any content area since the primary focus is a "particular style and process of teaching" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 239) that leads students to enact the characteristics of a Jesuit education in their lives.

Context encompasses the circumstances that influence the learning experience: the students' cultural identity, prior experiences, family, and community; the institutional setting; and the socioeconomic, political, and cultural context of the school. Teachers know their students, establish communities with "authentic relationship[s] of trust and friendship" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 248), and develop instructional strategies and learning activities that build on the various contextual elements represented by the students, the school, and the community. Through experience, students acquire a lived understanding of content through actual experience. Experience ideally is direct, but it can also occur vicariously through readings (ICAJE, 1994b). Knowledge is not to be acquired with abstract, objective detachment; rather students are asked to engage their learning as whole persons—in heart, mind, and will—by feeling the world's "gritty reality" ([23]) while searching for its beauty ([15]).

In reflection, the teacher invites students to use memory, imagination, and emotion to grasp the value of their learning, its relationship to other aspects of life, and any implications for future study. Students revisit content as they consider their own reactions, contemplate alternative responses, and deepen their own self-understanding. Prompted through teachers' open-ended questions, this ongoing student reflection is a formative and liberating process that shapes the "conscience of learners (their beliefs, values, attitudes and

entire way of thinking) in such a manner that they are led to move beyond knowing, to undertake action" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 250), the fourth element of Ignation pedagogy. Based on the Ignatian principle that "love is shown in deeds, not words" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 251), action is an outgrowth of students' experience and reflection. Beginning in the will as an internal reordering of priorities, action becomes an external expression of those new priorities, including everything from a student actively engaging in a sport because of experiences in a physical education class to volunteering in a soup kitchen as a result of what is experienced and reflected on in a social studies class (ICAJE, 1994b). And finally, Ignatian pedagogy includes regular evaluation of both students' academic growth and, equally, their growth in attitudes, priorities and actions. While academic growth can frequently be measured objectively, evaluation of the student's "well-rounded growth as a person for others" (ICAJE, 1994a, p. 252) depends on more subjective, formative means such as journaling, mentoring, and self-evaluation.

The components of Ignatian pedagogy parallel many theories of good teaching (e.g., [22]; [24]; [34]; [49]). Ignatian pedagogy is distinctive, however, in its clear grounding in faith. The mission of Jesuit education, as described by Father Hans Peter Kolvenbach, SJ, Superior General of the Society of Jesus, includes a commitment to "faith that does justice" (2000), where justice is integrally linked to faith, since a claim to love God without also pursuing justice for men and women is seen as a farce ([1]), a teaching found in biblical writings (see I John 4). Jesuit education in conjunction with Ignatian pedagogy produces students of "competence, conscience, and compassion" who will work as "effective advocates, agents, and models of God's justice, love, and peace" for the good of all people and "the reform of society and its structures" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 242).

Maintaining a balance between faith and justice, however, has proven challenging. Faith is clearly encouraged in both secondary and postsecondary institutions of Jesuit education. At the same time, a free marketplace of ideas is practiced. Faith is honored, but it is not prescribed; a wide-ranging critique of society is encouraged, but it is based on moral values often drawn from faith. While service activities of students at Catholic colleges range from working in soup kitchens to protesting against the School of the Americas, Fr. [23] clarification of the integral connection between "the service of faith and the promotion of justice" resists any explicit recommendation of either "a disincarnate spiritualism or a secular social activism" ([23], p. 6).

In light of this tension, some members of the Jesuit community have raised concerns that Catholic university students are not sufficiently challenged to engage in the societal critique and reform that justice work requires. The emphasis on quality of education and formation of character promoted in Ignatian pedagogy without equal attention to critical analysis and reform may result in graduates who, though rich in acts of mercy, may be deficit in the acts of critical analysis, political advocacy, and societal reform required to address injustice at its root. The late William Spohn, SJ (2001), past director of Santa Clara University's Bannan Institute for Jesuit Education and Christian Values, acknowledged the importance of Catholic university students' service and volunteerism, but he recognized that personal involvement with the poor "does not often transfer into political interest or lead to serious examination of the factors that lead to unemployment, poverty and family distress" (p. 2) and "while students usually see a connection between their faith and helping others, they often cannot see the religious significance of working to change government policies and business practices that contribute to injustice" (p. 4).

Citing Catholic historian David O'Brien, who stated that Jesuit universities excel at volunteerism and service learning but have "only scratched the surface on actual education for justice" (cited in Spohn, 2001, p. 1), Spohn agreed that the greatest challenge for Catholic universities is in "education for justice" (p. 2) particularly as grounded in the Catholic Social Tradition ([39]). [16], director of the Jesuit Center of Concern, a Catholic organization focusing on global institutional reform to serve the ideals of justice, stated that "U.S. Catholic higher education will be faithful to its deeper mission when it helps us to envision ways to live in solidarity with all peoples and with the earth in a single holistic community, one in which the law of justice and love regulates the social, cultural, economic and political development of everyone on the planet" (p. 22). Though based in a

rich tradition of faith and in rich pedagogical potential, the practice of Ignatian pedagogy in Jesuit institutions clearly raises important concerns over the level of attention to social justice at a structural level.

Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy, emerging in the 1970s from earlier thinking of Dewey, Gramsci, Foucault, and Bourdieau, among others ([28]; [31]), is a philosophy of teaching that critically analyzes the existence of inequitable material effects growing out of hierarchies of power in American society. Three sources of thought were particularly significant in its formation.

First, critical pedagogy is grounded in the philosophy of critical theory, developed by the pre-World War II Frankfurt School of Critical Social Theory, which used a class-based analytical model as the primary lens for understanding human experience ([21]), with race and gender considerations later included. Society is seen as the site of "iniquitous relations of power" ([12], p. 313) where institutions, including schools, reproduce highly stratified, class-based divisions marked by significant material inequities. These inequities often seem "normal, natural, and inevitable" ([7], p. xiii) when embedded in hegemonic patterns of institutional/structural discourse and policy. Breaking this reproduction of inequities requires recognizing asymmetrical power relations, contesting the social institutions and structures that sustain them, and acting to transform society. Critical pedagogy, then, leads students to respond to societal institutions in that cycle of recognition, contestation, and activism. Since all aspects of educational practice are seen as "politically contested spaces" ([20], p. 2) that socially and politically characterize the dominant society, both historically and currently ([30]), critical teachers actively analyze and contest those spaces in order to restructure the entire schooling system and to empower their students to effect similar change in their own lives.

The second major influence on the development of critical pedagogy is based on the theory and pedagogical practice of Paulo Freire, literacy educator for the adult peasant population of Brazil in the 1970s. An active participant in Catholic liberation theology ([12]; [36]), including the tenet that Christian love cannot be reconciled with human exploitation ([12]), [10] developed a pedagogical approach to address exploitation. Freire held that all education is political, either perpetuating hierarchies of power or contesting them. He claimed that the traditional "banking" method of instruction, where educators deposit the approved knowledge of the dominant class into passive students, simply replicated social control by perpetuating the dominant ideology and positioning students as receptive objects of others' will rather than as active agents who can effect change in their own life circumstances. In Freire's reciprocal pedagogy, instructors taught literacy using themes generated from students' lives to help them acquire a "critical awareness" that would then produce understanding of oneself and one's world with a view towards change ([36]). By participating in a dialogic process of problem-posing, that is, naming their experience and challenging its taken-for-granted nature, Freire's students, rather than being passive objects, critiqued their experience in light of their sociopolitical context and became agents to transform those experiences ([10]).

Though Freire's method of building instruction around problem-posing offers excellent pedagogical practice aligned with the goals of critical pedagogy, a definitive description of classroom practice is intentionally absent in most critical pedagogy literature. [31] refused to provide a "blueprint for doing critical pedagogy," saying it would fundamentally oppose the goals of critical pedagogy by "reduc[ing] teaching to a tool box of prepackaged lessons" (p. 26). [29] similarly commented on "pseudocritical educators [who], in the name of liberation pedagogy ... reduce Freire's leading ideas to a method (p. 2) ... [and] blindly advocate for the dialogical model, creating, in turn, a new form of methodological rigidity laced with benevolent oppression" (p. 3). Educators more attuned to the needs of classroom teachers have expressed concern about this lack of pedagogical support (Ayers, Michie, & Rome, 2000; [27]; Torres, 2005), claiming that overuse of rhetoric and under presentation of practical methods only frustrate teachers.

Finally, postmodern theory has influenced critical pedagogy. Through deconstructing dominant meta-narratives, postmodernism unmasks how invisible, taken-for-granted dominant ideologies can reproduce inequitable power relations ([32]). When applied to the meta-narratives of the culturally, economically, and politically powerful who control the production of knowledge, the postmodern critique supports critical pedagogy's goal of recognizing, contesting, and unmasking hegemonic power and, simultaneously, validates multiple perspectives ([9]; [11]; [20]).

The wedding of critical pedagogy and postmodernism is uneasy, however, and has produced critique from some proponents of critical pedagogy. Valuable as postmodernism's unmasking of taken-for-granted hierarchies of power might be, a radical postmodernist approach actually weakens critical pedagogy's ability to critically analyze and transform society ([9]; [13]; [30], [32]; [20]; [21]; [38]). Radical postmodernism's wholesale rejection of meta-narratives logically includes a rejection of critical theory's class-based analytical lens, itself a meta-narrative, leaving little room for substantive challenge to class-based hierarchies ([38]). In addition, the attack on meta-narrative with a resulting rise in identity politics produces a fragmentation of collective identity and knowledge, weakening unified efforts to accomplish critical pedagogy's goal of transforming schooling ([9]).

Further, in its deconstruction of textual authority, radical postmodernism can allow "some of the most unwelcome of guests: nihilism, relativism ... to name but a few—which makes thinking about human emancipation futile" ([38], p. 161). A position of extreme relativity leaves little room for declaring practices and policies unjust. [21] acknowledged the danger of nihilism and inaction, suggesting that the "normatively ungrounded postmodern critique is incapable of providing an ethically challenging and politically transformative program of action" (1994, p. 144). They proposed a resistance postmodernism including a "normative foundation" drawn from critical theory "for distinguishing between oppressive and libratory social relations" ([21], p. 144). Critical pedagogy, then, struggles to preserve postmodernism's ability to unmask power while resisting the paralysis of relativism and fragmentation.

Methodology

Context

This qualitative research took place in a teacher education program, housed in a midsized urban Jesuit university where the faculty, influenced by the call for "faith in the service of justice" ([23]), are committed to foregrounding social justice in preservice teachers' preparation. Participants in the research are enrolled in a required policy course taught by the author, a white female.

In the course, preservice teachers critique educational policy using lenses of culture, race, class, and gender, paying attention to both institutional structures and specific classroom practices that develop around each policy. For example, bilingual education, high–stakes testing, ability grouping and tracking, and inclusive education are studied and analyzed. Throughout the semester, aspects of critical pedagogy and Freirean instruction are named and modeled. Together the students and I problem-pose the "taken-for-granted" policies and practices that benefit some and disadvantage others, engage in extensive dialogue exploring issues of power and differential access, generate possible actions available to socially just teachers, and read examples of Freirean teaching methods that foreground social justice issues ([4], [5]; [40]). Elements of Ignatian pedagogy, though not explicitly taught, are also modeled. For example, course readings and field experiences (from other courses) immerse preservice teachers in the urban educational context. Through role playing, simulations, fishbowl debates, group presentations, and debate, preservice teachers engage in extensive discussion. They then write regular, ungraded reflections on their responses to the issues, their personal understanding of socially just teaching, and their concerns about enacting it.

Participants

Participants were drawn from three separate sections of the course over two semesters. Out of 80 possible participants enrolled in the three sections, 15 students agreed via written consent to allow their written reflections to be included as data and to participate in focus group interviews, both occurring after the course ended and grades were finalized, to reduce any sense of coercion. Those 15 participants represented the following demographics: 8 were female and 7 were male, a higher−than−typical ratio that reflected the random enrollment demographics during those two semesters; 13 self-identified as white, one as Latina, and one female as Asian American. All were traditional college age (18–21) except for one 50-year-old nontraditional Latina student.

Data Collection and Analysis

The first set of data derived from the preservice teachers' five nongraded reflective journals based on the following prompts.

- What is your definition of teaching for social justice?
- How is this course content affecting you intellectually, affectively, behaviorally, and ethically/spiritually?
- Can you see yourself being a teacher for social justice? Why or why not?
- Where do you see yourself on a continuum with individual acts of mercy on one end and collective political acts of justice on the other?
- How has your definition of teaching for social justice changed over the course of this semester?

The journals of all students enrolled in the class were read during the semester as course assignments. The journals of participants were then accessed as data after the semester ended and course grades had been finalized. Further data derived from focus group interviews of two to four members, 75–90 minutes in length, audiotaped and transcribed, which were conducted by research assistants after the completion of the semesters. Interview questions further probed the journal topics to elicit more depth and nuance.

Data were initially coded for broad themes, independently by the author and a research assistant, using open-coding techniques outlined by [43]. A second iteration of analysis consisted of multiple examinations of texts to code for preservice teachers' specific concerns about socially just teaching and their future role in enacting it. Several themes emerged which serve as findings for a larger study. The three major themes relevant to this paper were the following: appropriate curricular content, effective pedagogical strategies, and rationale for socially just teaching. Finally, this set of major themes was juxtaposed with critical pedagogy and Ignatian pedagogy to see how each theory addressed the preservice teachers' identified concerns.

Findings and Discussion

In the three themes identified, six participants (Dennis, Josh, Karen, Kyle, Michael, and Valerie) expressed a cautious response to a justice-oriented curriculum, a limited description of pedagogy, and almost no mention of a rationale for socially just teaching, thus appearing less aligned with the outcomes of socially just teaching described earlier. Another six (Andy, Ariel, Caitlyn, Marta, Rebecca, and Victor) reflected many of the outcomes of socially just teaching, expressing enthusiastic willingness to teach justice issues and a somewhat sophisticated pedagogical expertise, citing a moderate-to-strong, faith-based rationale for their thinking. The remaining three (David, Laura, and Susan) vacillated between the positions of the other two groups, with Laura and Susan closer to the first, more cautious, limited response and David closer to the second group. Though nuances existed within all the themes, the participants tended to fall along these groupings.

The Curriculum of Socially Just Teaching

The preservice teachers' first area of concern was a basic definitional question of what curricula constituted socially just teaching, with responses ranging from mastery of basic skills and knowledge to activist-oriented exposure to societal issues of injustice. Virtually all participants were adamant that the curricula in their classrooms give full attention to all students' individual mastery of both basic and high-level knowledge and skills. They understood that teaching students to read, write, and do math is a profoundly just act, providing a means to a better personal life for individual students. One wanted to give all his students "the ability to read, write, think, present projects at an equal level" (Josh, white male, age 18), and another stated that "[It is] important for all students to understand basic principles in math" (Kyle, white male, 20). The preservice teachers' thinking of how this goal connected to justice varied, however, with all seeing individual personal benefit but only some recognizing these skills as tools to address collective societal issues of injustice by providing "the tools to change their own live and others" (Susan, white female, 18) and "the tools they need to succeed ... to become politically active" (David, white male, 20).

All students also mentioned the possibility of including social justice issues in the curriculum, again, with a complex range of variations this time related to caution. On one hand, all participants acknowledged the value of generic "hands-on, real life" (Susan, white female, 18) curriculum to enhance student engagement and, as a result, student learning. Others cautiously suggested real-life curricula that included social justice topics as a way to increase their future students' awareness of inequities in society, and improve human relations; however, this was approached cautiously and not integrated into the curriculum, such as [if] "something works, it can be added on" (Karen, white female, 18). Some participants were particularly cautious about potential teacher bias and undue influence, becoming adamant that the teacher's presentation of issues be completely neutral, presenting both sides of issues and allowing their students to formulate their own opinions. One preservice teacher stated the value of "showing advantages and disadvantages ... exposing bias ... so the students can come together and be comfortable" while maintaining the importance of being "careful about crossing boundaries ... [or] being offensive to anyone ... [and] still keeping control of the situation" (Kyle, white male, 20). Another stated that his job as a teacher would be "to educate, not indoctrinate ... to educate about the issues ... in an unbiased manner" (David, white male, 20), while still another stated that "I will push my students to think critically about history ... but pushing social justice issues coincides with pushing political issues ... [and] I certainly do not want to myself be the one pushing one way or the other" (Josh, white male, 18).

Some, however, enthusiastically embraced the inclusion of social issues with few caveats. These preservice teachers valued a curriculum of content and skills coupled with seamlessly integrated justice related topics in order to empower students to work for change. "Social justice needs to be incorporated into the lessons whenever possible. It shouldn't just be a once-and-a-while focus. Social justice needs to be a way of teaching" (Rebecca, Asian-American female, 18). These preservice teachers claimed that the teacher's job was to lead students in "questioning everything" (Victor, white male, 21). One participant stated, "I see endless possibilities with instilling social justice into a curriculum. ... Social justice requires both reflection and action. ... I will instill these notions into my students in hopes that they will not only question why but they will look to see what they can do" (Ariel, white female, 21). While not actively advocating one-sided presentation of issues, these participants were much less cautious about protecting alleged neutrality, encouraging challenge and even an activist response among students. "I think it's much easier to teach the status quo ... like don't rock the boat, don't ask why. ... I think that teaching for social justice is exactly the opposite of not asking why ... I think it's important to ask why and not just ask why but to do something about it" (Rachel, Asian-American female, 18). Another echoed the danger of protecting the status quo and allowing denial of injustice to continue, claiming that

> "[T]he classroom must be the frontline in the battle against social injustice ... If there is unanimous agreement amongst parents, administrators, and students regarding curriculum, a teacher is not doing enough. They are teaching the status quo ... Nothing is more dangerous to a student's ability to recognize injustice than the status quo ... It's not me preaching at my students, but actually leading by example and not being partisan because this goes far beyond politics ... Things like racism are so engrained in our society that we don't even realize it." (Andy, white male, 21)

All students, then, acknowledged the justice of a curriculum that provides students with content and skill mastery; they also valued relating learning to real life. A smaller group also embraced the inclusion of justice−related topics in their curriculum, some with caution concerning teacher bias, others with a stronger commitment to a curriculum that definitively challenged the status quo and encouraged student activism.

The Pedagogy of Socially Just Teaching

The policy course in which the participants were enrolled did not focus on pedagogy; however, discussions of teachers' practice consistently filtered in to course content, and the second finding focused on effective pedagogical strategies to implement a socially just curriculum. The group of participants favoring a curriculum focusing primarily on content and skill mastery and expressing more caution about critical exploration of societal issues of inequity mentioned pedagogy the least; those participants who were most willing to engage a critical curriculum expressed the most sophisticated ideas about what sort of pedagogy would be effective.

The most common, closest reference to pedagogy provided by the first group was a teacher's fairness, in treatment of students, in covering content, and in not offending anyone regarding issues of injustice. Several embraced "treating everyone equally no matter what their background is" (Susan, white female, 18), "a fair opportunity to all students in the classroom" (Michael, white male, 21), and "I think everyone should be treated fairly" (Dennis, white male, 18). Moving beyond basic fairness, one participant claimed that he would probably be a "drill and skill" kind of teacher so that students could gain mastery of math skills (Kyle, white male, 21). Another expressed concern that including justice issues might interfere with effective instruction of some subjects. "Social justice is something that is a very touchy school subject because it is hard to incorporate it into high school classrooms dealing with math and science" (Karen, white female, 18). As with curriculum, this group of preservice teachers was cautious that pedagogies to support socially just teaching could possibly offend students, parents, or administration. "I want to make my students aware of these differences [inequities in society], but I don't yet know how to do this without offending someone on one side of the spectrum or another" (Susan, white female, 18), a sentiment echoed by another's concession that "a controlled debate every now and then is fine" (Josh, white male, 18).

Those participants in the second group, who were enthusiastic about using a critical curriculum, understood the difficulty of the pedagogical task—"My cooperating teacher let me do a couple of history lessons ... and I kinda realized that, man, this is really hard to implement, teaching for social justice" (Andy, white male, 21)—yet as a group, they expressed a fairly sophisticated vision of pedagogy that would support this goal. They called for culturally relevant pedagogy that welcomed the multiple perspectives of multiculturalism—"Teaching for social justice is to me multiculturalism" (Marta, Latina, 50) and "making sure lessons are taught from multiple perspectives. Also, "multiculturalism and social justice teaching go hand-in-hand" (Rebecca, Asian-American female, 18)—using pedagogy grounded in the lives of the students—"I am a big promoter of holistic teaching and I want my classroom to connect to the lives of my students" (Caitlyn, white female, 19).

In addition to the importance of culturally relevant pedagogy, these preservice teachers valued methods that would engage students in deep exploration of the topics. Extensive dialogue and debate were suggested as methods. "In a social justice classroom, students are able to discuss their feelings, disagreements, agreements in

a safe environment" (Marta, Latina, 50). One preservice teacher specifically mentioned "problem-posing" as a valuable pedagogical tool.

> “[P]roblem-posing ... [is] a teaching method which requires students to critically analyze and discuss, debating over answers and ideas that cannot be expressed in scantron form ... It does not promise a result and it does not advertise any paths as "easy," but it does insist on the inherent goodness and value [of the process].” (Andy, white male, 21).

The goal of the pedagogy these participants envisioned was a complex exploration of issues in deeply personal, sometimes frustrating ways, as one participant described:

> “[In my classroom, I want them to] delve deeper into the issues, attempting to examine the endless possibilities of what was really going on, why it was happening, what we could do about it ... I do not want students to simply know that there are problems, but I want them to think about them, examine them, get frustrated that they cannot solve them yet hope that one day they can, because one day it will get better.” (Ariel, white female, 21)

The participants also expressed a desire for pedagogy that moved from theory to activism related to their students' communities. "I will also need to tap into the resources of the community I am teaching in. I want the kids to get out into their community and apply what they learn in my classroom" (Rebecca, Asian-American female, 18). Simply leading students in discussions and activities to increase their understanding without active response seemed insufficient to these preservice teachers. "For example if I were teaching a unit on the Great Depression ... I could have them go to a soup kitchen or food pantry to see how some of the same things are occurring in their own/neighboring communities" (Ariel, white female, 21).

Once again, all participants acknowledged that pedagogy needed to treat all students fairly. Beyond that, however, those who were more cautious about including justice issues or appearing partisan in their classrooms were also less forthcoming about possible pedagogical strategies. The smaller group, which held a more bold curricular vision for social justice, valued pedagogies that support depth of exploration such as problem-posing, debate, and extensive discussion. They also embraced pedagogy that extended into student engagement in the community.

The Rationale for Socially Just Teaching

As the preservice teachers considered embracing socially just teaching for themselves, those who were most cautious about teaching a critical, activist-oriented curriculum for fear of appearing political or fomenting controversy were, not surprisingly, virtually silent about any rationale to support socially just teaching. Those preservice teachers who expressed creative interest in teaching a critical, activist curriculum based their decisions on rationales grounded in faith and ethics.

Some participants identified an ethical, moral rationale, linked to an informed citizenry capable of working for the common good of society. One preservice teacher stated, "It would be shameful and completely irresponsible not to make students aware of social justice issues" (Andy, white male, 21). Another voiced a similar moral concern, linking her rationale to the future roles of leadership her own students might hold. "A big part of social justice is the willingness to stand up and say, 'This isn't right' ... You have to build a sense of right and wrong so these students can become productive leaders in the future" (Caitlyn, white female, 19).

Several others identified their personal religious faith as their rational for pursuing socially just teaching, a finding not surprising in a Catholic university. "Catholicism has that philosophy: you treat the other person the way you want to be treated, your brothers and sisters ... If I don't take a stand now, who's going to do it?" (Marta, Latina, 50). Similarly, another stated:

> "This class has reinforced my faith and sense of ethics. Now I am much more willing to make connections between my faith and social issues. I've always known that social justice is a huge part of my faith. [Now] seeing how certain issues directly affect education makes me want to respond more to these issues ... it has made me more willing to live my life courageously" (Rebecca, Asian American female, 18).

For some, a faith-based rationale for socially just teaching also included a somewhat postmodern stance that welcomed a more universal rationale, while still maintaining the validity of their own perspectives. One identified her convictions as similar to "what most religious teachings say about treating others" (Ariel, white female, 21). Another clearly based her thinking in her faith, but recognized that the ethics prescribed by her faith could also be part of a more universal, humanistic rationale.

> "What I learned about social justice has corresponded with my religious beliefs. But I would say it's both religious faith and ethics, because though I am a religious person, I like to try and communicate with people on a completely nonreligious level when it comes to things like social justice, because I do believe that it's not just the beliefs of one religion that rule the world. It's people being moral and ethical and human." (Caitlyn, white female, 18).

One particularly interesting faith-based rationale came from a preservice teacher who identified himself as not practicing the Catholic faith in which he had been raised, with no intention of returning to it. His study of justice issues, however, had prompted him to reconsider the role of faith—separate from organized religion, part humanism, part spiritual pluralism—as an increasingly necessary part of his rationale for doing the work of justice.

> "I found myself thinking about how much faith one must really have in order to believe that a difference can be made. The task to change things is so daunting that it would seem almost crazy to think that one person could implement change without having some type of faith in his or her fellow man. Whether you call it God, Jehovah, Buddha, or Allah, a faith in a supreme being makes it that much easier." (Andy, white male, 21)

As with the theme of pedagogy, then, those preservice teachers most cautious about including justice issues in their curriculum provided the least description of rationale, and, not surprisingly, those preservice teachers who more willingly embraced a curriculum including explicit issues of injustice articulated fairly strong rationales. These were based on moral and ethical stances, typically grounded in their faith, but for some, their thinking included a more universal understanding of ethics related to faith.

Implications: Critical Pedagogy, Ignatian Pedagogy and Socially Just Teaching

These three areas of concerns about socially just teaching— curricular content, effective pedagogical strategies, and rationale—indicate the areas of clarity needed to make teaching for social justice a less confusing and more likely occurrence. Juxtaposing the range of preservice teachers' responses against the elements of critical pedagogy and Ignatian pedagogy showed that while both theories can provide valuable clarification, neither is sufficient. Their greatest value is found in their complementarity.

Curriculum of Socially Just Teaching

Preservice teachers clearly saw teaching academic content and skills as just; some also recognized that a socially just teacher extends the curriculum to include real−life issues related to justice and activism, as well, even to the point of possible controversy. Both critical pedagogy and Ignatian pedagogy favor a curriculum that includes justice issues at a societal level, but they differ significantly in practice. Ignatian pedagogy never claims to

include a specific curriculum, being, instead, a "particular style and process of teaching" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 239); indeed, part of its strength is that the methods—attending to context, experience, reflection, action, and evaluation—can be applied to any content (ICAJE, 1994b). As a result, Ignatian pedagogy advocates methods that are "academically sound" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 239), leading to student mastery of content and skill, a fundamentally just and important goal.

The corollary goal of Ignation pedagogy, to be "formative of persons for others" (ICAJE, 1994b, p. 239) by infusing in students the characteristics of Jesuit education, provides a real-life curriculum to potentially address injustice, but without more explicit curricular focus, critical content may too easily be omitted (O'Brien, cited in [41]; [41]). As a result, the acts of service and volunteerism that frequently accompany Ignatian pedagogy, though much needed in society, can mask the need for more controversial critical analysis and activism needed to transform unjust structures and institutions. Without an accompanying analysis and reform of the societal conditions that reproduce inequity, such merciful actions only partially serve the goal of justice, and Ignatian pedagogy is in danger of ignoring the critical content demanded by socially just teaching. Given some preservice teachers' caution about broaching the more controversial topics, Ignatian pedagogy's implied permission to omit a more critical curricular stand on curriculum can be a significant problem.

Critical pedagogy, on the other hand, has a curriculum heavy on issues of justice in order to empower students to address inequity. The theory's analysis of how power, ideology, and culture are intimately interconnected with societal inequities ([25]) offers preservice teachers insight into a curriculum of critical social analysis, advocacy, and transformation in the promotion of justice. This critical curricular component, replete with challenge of status quo and encouragement to act, is the strongest element of critical pedagogy. Yet, this strong emphasis on critical curriculum can at times leave mastery of academic skills as merely serving that critical goal rather than receiving explicit attention in itself. In tandem, the two theories suggest a curriculum that is equally focused on developing the necessary academic content and skills while including strong attention to issues of justice and equity throughout the curriculum. Preservice teachers need expertise in teaching both aspects of the socially just curriculum, especially in those content areas that seem less amenable to justice topics (e.g., [14]).

Pedagogy for Socially Just Teaching

Both Ignatian pedagogy and critical pedagogy offer rich methodological resources to teacher educators and future classroom teachers. In fact, both pedagogical approaches are quite similar: instruction centered on the experiences and context of both student and society; reflection and dialogue drawn from personal engagement in the learning process; and learning expressed in reordered priorities and action. All teachers would benefit from using these pedagogical strategies; they are especially important for those who embrace socially just teaching. This is seen in how often those preservice teachers mentioned the types of culturally relevant, dialogic, activist pedagogy they envisioned using.

The resistance of some of the major theorists of critical pedagogy to definitively formulate these pedagogical steps ([29]; [31]) has left practicing educators somewhat abandoned, perhaps even undermining the efforts of practitioners who stepped in to fill that void by focusing explicitly on the work of Freire (1970/1955) (e.g. [2]; [4], [5]; and [40]). While critical pedagogy is strong in critical curricular content, Ignatian pedagogy's great strength is its clearly articulated pedagogical process, applicable to any curriculum. Materials that provide explicit examples of Ignatian pedagogy in practice are available for teachers (e.g., [33]). Theoretical proponents of critical pedagogy would do well to back the efforts of practitioners to bring similar explicit examples of Freire's pedagogies to the hands of teachers. Preservice teachers especially need explicit instruction in practices fluid enough to resist formulaic adoption but detailed enough to help them imagine the sorts of dialogic, reflective, action-oriented teaching required of socially just teachers. Ignatian pedagogy offers this. In the work of Freire, critical pedagogy does, as well.

Rationale for Socially Just Teaching

While curriculum and pedagogy are vitally important, the fact that those preservice teachers who appeared willing to embrace a social justice curriculum voiced the strongest rationale for doing so indicates that this concern, finding a solid rationale to support the difficult work of socially just teaching, is fundamental. The participants articulated rationales based on ethical, moral, and faith-centered convictions. They also expressed a concern for a more inclusive base. Both critical pedagogy and Ignatian pedagogy have conceptual roots in Christian faith, though Ignatian pedagogy remains closely aligned to faith while critical pedagogy only slightly references those origins in favor of postmodernism's resistance to any meta-narrative of belief. Both aspects are needed —the normative moral and ethical foundation provided by faith and the multiple perspectives of postmodernism—though they may seem to be contradictory.

Critical pedagogy's contribution to this sort of rationale for socially just teaching is complex. The postmodernism critique integral to critical pedagogy offers a valuable service in unmasking the power hidden in text and discourse, problematizing the dominance of one meta-narrative over others, and thus, opening up multiple perspectives. This process is valuable for two reasons. First, a postmodern deconstruction is needed to identify hegemony and to clarify issues of injustice because much of the world's inequity is reproduced in structures sustained by unexamined, taken-for-granted discourses of dominant ideology ([7]; [12]). Second, the increasingly pluralistic nature of the United States as well as the volatile political realities of globalization require leaders who can engage in civil dialogue and negotiation with people representing a variety of faiths or no faith, establishing common ethical, humanistic grounds upon which to determine policy for the benefit of all. Clearly, training teachers of conviction who can also negotiate these pluralistic waters and teach their students to do the same is of critical importance in these times. Critical pedagogy offers that perspective.

On the other hand, the relativism produced by this postmodern rejection of a normative position can produce nihilism and inaction, undermining the foundation for conviction ([21]) and fragmenting collective, unified coalitions, leaving the struggle for a more equitable, just society floundering ([9]; [13]). Ignatian pedagogy, with its clear roots in Christian faith, provides a solid rationale upon which to base a commitment to social justice. Given the reality of pluralism, Catholic and other Christian institutions of higher education must not take faith for granted ([6]); rather, we must explicitly challenge our preservice teachers to see the clear link between faith and a pursuit of justice in their teaching practice and to embrace the solid rationale that faith provides. The task is to offer this challenge in a way that allows for inclusive dialogue and collaborative efforts across faiths. Kammer, SJ (2003) expressed the need for a normative stance that encompasses a wide variety of sources when he called for dialogue among the various religions that shape cultures in order to denounce unjust structures. Without such a normative foundation, students are left with a void of motivation and meaning ([37]) and little foundation for conviction; without an ability to dialogue across beliefs, students are limited in their ability to unite in collective action to create a more equitable, just, and caring world. Together, critical pedagogy and Ignatian pedagogy offer the sort of tension needed to keep the necessary balance.

Preparing teachers who will enact a vision of socially just teaching is critical. The United States and the world need educators who understand and present knowledge, not as disconnected abstractions, but as the essential elements used to shape the realities of both human joy and suffering. We need teachers who can engage their students around justice-related topics in the level of dialogue and reflection that produces compassionate wisdom and, out of that wisdom, transformative action to alleviate human suffering. And we need teachers who are sufficiently grounded in an ethic of faith to support this work, and at the same time, willing and able to engage in the productive dialogue needed to bring together the nations of the world to produce and sustain human dignity and social justice. Ignatian pedagogy and critical pedagogy, working in tandem, can inform, critique, and complement each other and begin to meet these needs. The stakes are too high not to consider the value of each.

References

Arrupe, P.SJ.1973. "Men for others. Section 4". In *Foundations*. Edited by: Meirose, C.E.31–40. Washington, DCSJ (Compiler) (1994). Jesuit Secondary Education Association.

Ayers, W., Hunt, J.A. and Quinn, T.1998. *Teaching for social justice*, New York: The New Press.

Ayers, W., Michie, G. and Rome, A.2004. "Embers of Hope: In Search of a Meaningful Critical Pedagogy". *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1): 123–131.

Bigelow, B., Christensen, L., Karp, S., Miner, B. and Peterson, B.1994. *Rethinking our classrooms* (Vol. 1), Milwaukee, WI: A Rethinking Schools Publication.

Bigelow, B., Harvey, B., Karp, S. and Miller, L. 2001. *Rethinking our classrooms* (Vol. 2), Milwaukee, WI: A Rethinking Schools Publication.

Brackley, D.SJ.2006. "Higher standards". Vol. 194(4), 9–13. *America*

Brookfield, S.D.2005. *The power of critical theory for adult learning and teaching,* New York: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill.

Cochran-Smith, M.2004. *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M. and Torres, R.D.2003. *The critical pedagogy reader*, New York: Falmer Press.

Freire, P.1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.), New York: Continuum. (Original work published in 1955).

Giroux, H.A.1988. Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning, Westport, CO: Bergin and Garvey.

Giroux, H.A.1997. Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(2): 285–320.

Giroux, H.A.2004. Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/modern divide: Towards a pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1): 132–153.

Gutstein, E. and Peterson, P.2005. *Rethinking mathematics: Teaching social justice by the numbers*, Milwaukee, WI: A Rethinking Schools Publication.

Hendrickson, D.SJ. October2005. "Facilitating conversion in Jesuit higher education". In Paper presented at October, Washington, DC Social Justice in Jesuit Higher Education Conference. Cleveland, OH: John Carroll University

Hug, J.Eẋ, SJ. 2000, May 20. Educating for justice. *America*, 16–19: 22

International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education. 1994a. "Go forth and teach: The characteristics of Jesuit education, Section 10. In C. E. Meirose, SJ (Compiler)". In *Foundations*. 129–153. Washington, DCJesuit Secondary Education Association

International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education. 1994b. "Ignatian pedagogy: A practical approach, Section 14. In C. E. Meirose, SJ (Compiler)". In *Foundations* 237–269. Washington, DC. Jesuit Secondary Education Association

Kammer, F.SJ.2003. *Ignatian vision and contemporary realities*. Washington, DC. Loyola Week Ignatian Lecture. Loyola University in New Orleans

Kincheloe, J.L.2005. *Critical pedagogy*., New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J.L. and McLaren, P.L.1994. "Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research". In *Handbook of qualitative research*, Edited by: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S.138–157. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kirshner, D and Whitson, J.A.1997. Editors' introduction to Situated cognition: Social, semiotic, and psychological perspectives, 1–16. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kolvenbach, P.SJ.2000. "The service of faith and the promotion of justice in American Jesuit higher education. Address presented at the Commitment to Justice in Jesuit Higher Education Conference, Santa Clara

University". Santa Clara, DCRetrieved June 22, 2006, from http://www.sjweb.info/documents/phk/2000santa%5fclara%5fen.doc.

Ladson-Billings, G.1995. But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3): 159–165.

Leistyna, P. and Woodrum, A.1995. "Context and culture: What is critical pedagogy?". In *Breaking free: The transformative power of critical pedagogy*, Edited by: Leistyna, P., Woodrum, A. and Sherblom, S.1–7. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Leo, J. October 242005. October 24, Washington, DC. Class(room) warriors. U.S. News and World Report

Lowe, R. and Kantor, H.1991. [Review of the book *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle*.]. Educational Studies, 22: 123–129.

Luke, A.1997. "Critical approaches to literacy". Edited by: Corson, D. and Edwards, V.Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishers. *The encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 2. Literacy*

Macedo, D.1997. "An anti-method pedagogy". In *Mentoring the mentor: A critical dialogue with Paulo Freire*, Edited by: Freire, P., Fraser, J.W., Macedo, D., McKinnon, T. and Stokes, W.T.1–9. New York: Lang Publishing.

McLaren, P.1995. Critical pedagogy in the age of global capitalism: Some challenges for the educational left. *Australian Journal of Education*, 39: 5–21.

McLaren, P.2003a. *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*, 4th, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McLaren, P.2003b. "Revolutionary pedagogy in post-revolutionary times: Rethinking the political economy of critical education". In *The critical pedagogy reader*, Edited by: Darder, A., Baltodano, M. and Torres, R.D.151–186. New York: Routledge-Falmer.

Meirose, C.Eẋ, SJ. 1994. "(Compiler)". In *Foundations*, 237–269. Washington, DC: Jesuit Secondary Education Association.

Moll, L.C.1994. "Literacy research in community and classrooms: A sociocultural approach". In *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, Edited by: Ruddell, R.B., Ruddell, M.R. and Singer, H.179–207. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2005. *The nation's report card.* Retrieved January 16, 2006, from http://www.nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard.

Oldenski, T.1997*. Liberation theology and critical pedagogy in today's Catholic schools: Social justice in action*, Hamden, CT: Garland Publishing.

Oldenski, T. and Carlson, D.2002. "Introduction. Yearnings of the heart: Education, postmodernism, and spirituality". In *Educational yearnings: The journey of the spirit and democratic education*, Edited by: Oldenski, T. and Carlson, D.1–9. New York: Peter Lang.

Rikowski, G.1996. Left alone: End time for Marxist educational theory. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 17(4): 415–451.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. 2005. *Compendium of the social doctrine of the church*. Washington, DC United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Shor, I.1987*. Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for libratory teaching*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Spohn, W.SJ.Spring1998. "Catholic higher education. Paper presented at the Joint Consultation: Commonweal Foundation Faith & Reason Institute". Spring, Washington, DCRetrieved July 1, 2006 from http://www.catholicsinpublicsquare.org/papers/spring2001joint/spohnpaper/spohnpaper1.htm.

Stern, S.July 212006. "When activism masquerades as education". In New York Daily NewsJuly 21, Washington, DCRetrieved August 15, 2006, from http://www.nydailynews.com/news/ideas%5fopinions/story/436703p-367945c.html.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J.1994. "Grounded theory methodology: An overview". In *Handbook of qualitative research*, Edited by: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S.273–285. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tatum, B.1992. Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1: 1–24.

Taylor, S.V. and Sobel, D.M.2003. Rich contexts to emphasize social justice in teacher education: Curriculum and pedagogy in professional development schools. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 34: 249–258.

Torres, M.2004. "The role of participatory democracy in the critical praxis of social justice". In *Social justice in these times*, Edited by: O'Donnell, J., Pruyn, M. and Chávez Chavez, R.15–32. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

West, C.1994. *Race matters*, New York: Vintage Books.

Will, G.January 162006. January 16, Ed schools vs. education. Newsweek

Zeichner, K. and Liston, D.P.1996. "Historical roots of reflective teaching". In *Reflective teaching: An introduction*, 8–22. Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.