Boston College

Lynch School of Education and Human Development

Department of Teaching, Curriculum, and Society

Curriculum and Instruction

REAPPROACHING THE CROSSROADS:
A NEW PEDAGOGICAL THEORY FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Dissertation
by

KRISTIN BARSTOW MELLEY

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

May 2021

Abstract

REAPPROACHING THE CROSSROADS:
A NEW PEDAGOGICAL THEORY FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Kristin Barstow Melley, Author

Dennis Shirley, Chair

This dissertation is a conceptual study of Catholic education as a distinctive approach for learning in elementary and secondary Catholic schools. It draws upon the academic disciplines of philosophy, theology, and education to construct a theory of pedagogy that attends to and faithfully reflects the particular beliefs and aspirations of Catholic education.

The opening historical analysis describes significant changes to the US Catholic school landscape, including the ways in which Catholic education is defined and accounted for in the life of the school. This analysis is widened to explore the claim that there is no adequate definition of Catholic education today. Together, these observations reveal an urgent need for new theories to realize the core mission of Catholic education.

Toward this end, I develop a conceptual framework for Catholic education interbraiding Christian anthropology—emphasizing the themes of *imago Dei,* relationship, and grace—relevant Church documents authored by the Congregation of Catholic Education, and the pedagogical theory of Bernstein (1990, 2000). I employ this framework to construct a new pedagogical theory for Catholic education.

The theory explores the identity of the person as both a knower and a learner. Bernstein's (2000) concepts of classification and framing are used to articulate the

distinctively Catholic qualities of the pedagogy. The pedagogical discourse features three dynamic movements: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. Each movement consists of practical and spiritual considerations that, over time, foster learning and strengthen relationships. These outcomes, or text (Bernstein, 2000), create the conditions for deepening the dispositions of discipleship while allowing persons an essential way to participate in the flourishing and fullness of each other's lives in the realm of God's grace.

The final segment of the dissertation explores the ways in which the instructional model, tutoría, appropriates the new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. I trace the evolution of tutoría and highlight the experiences of students and educators who are implementing the model in four schools in Chile. The dissertation concludes with a discussion on the value of the new pedagogical theory for Catholic schools globally.

Acknowledgements

This project is, in many ways, the summation of the many "tutorials" of my life-- profound moments when learning has been both a gift of knowledge and a gift of self. The tutorials I have received have inspired me, challenged me, and shaped me into the person I am and continue to guide me toward the person I hope to be.

I would like to thank those who have guided my scholarship on this dissertation. First, are my "tutors" at Boston College. I wish to thank Dennis Shirley for his steady encouragement and thoughtful critique that has helped me become a better scholar. You recognized and supported the uniqueness of my research project and emboldened me to take the road less traveled. And yes, it has made all the difference. I am thankful for Patrick McQuillan and his openness to this project. Your guidance has helped me articulate the essential questions of my research which have, in turn, created meaningful data for this project. I am deeply grateful to Thomas Groome whose own pioneering work as a religious educator has provided the scaffolding and inspiration for my own path. I am grateful for your support, in all its forms, these many years and for your contributions to my scholarship.

My work has been blessed by "tutors" living in faraway places. Gabriel Cámara, thank you for opening yourself up to my project, for our scholarly conversations, and for being my tutor in so many ways. I wish to thank Santiago Rincón-Gallardo for introducing me to tutoría, for his support of my research, for his partnership with the Nigeria project, and for showing us what it means to be a disrupter for justice in education. I am grateful for Juan García-Huidobro, SJ for being an invaluable conversation partner, helping me clarify my research and navigate my program of study.

I wish to give a special thanks to Educación 2020 and the Chilean educators, parents, and students who welcomed me into their learning communities to study tutoría. Your experiences have changed my understanding of what learning is all about. Thank you for sharing your stories and your dreams with me.

I am thankful for Fr. Gilbert Ezeugwu for inviting me to be part of his dream for the children of the diocese of Nsukka, Nigeria. You are a tutor of determination, compassion, and selflessness. Thank you for your friendship and partnership. I look forward to seeing tutoría continue to unfold for the children and teachers of the diocese.

I am grateful to Zainabu Mohamed, a force for love and educational change in the lives of the children of Anyiko Village, Yala, Kenya. You and the children you serve inspire me and much of this project. Thank you for tutoring me in the many ways we can say yes to God.

I am deeply grateful to family and friends, whose faith and encouragement have carried me through the moments of uncertainty and change. I wish to thank my parents and siblings, my in-laws, and dear friends: Catherine, Mickey, Ronny, Patty, Remy, Adam, Susannah, Annemarie, Dan, Bill, Hosffman, Sr. Augustina, Fr. Anthony, Betty, Sr. Angie, and Fr. Bob.

I wish to thank my children. Erin and Thomas, thank you for the countless ways you have supported me through this work: for picking up extra chores, surprising me with treats and cups of tea, and always understanding when I needed to retreat to write. Every encouraging word and joyful smile from you fueled me to keep going.

I thank my husband. Paul, you were my first Catholic educator. Your loving witness and artful expression of God's abundant love helps me realize God's activity in

my life and makes me a better person. Thank you for believing in me, for helping me find the words and see the path before me. Truly, I could not have done this without you and your love.

Lastly, I thank God, who has blessed my life abundantly and continues to make all things new.

Table of Contents

PREFACE

Reapproaching the Crossroads

Before proceeding, I wish to offer some thoughts on my project's title, *Reapproaching the Crossroads*. First, crossroads are liminal places. They are the place where two roads intersect. Each direction offers varied possibilities, alternate journeys, and different horizons. The traveler, arriving at the crossroads, encounters a threshold of existential decision.

Second, I believe contemporary Catholic education operates in the shadow of Jacques Maritain's *Education at the Crossroads*. In 1943, Maritain prophetically argued that education in the U.S. had indeed come to a crossroads. He asked: would American education continue on a path defined by "an instrumentalist and pragmatist philosophy" (p. 118) or would it reorient itself toward a Christian *telos* and the nature of the human person? Nearly eighty years later, I'm convinced that Catholic educators are still (or should be) grappling with this question.

How does this dissertation relate to these crossroads? I am not interested in *returning* to the crossroads, nor do I believe the way forward is by a return to the past. However, I believe there are valuable lessons for us at these crossroads that can help us navigate our current reality. This project is, therefore, interested in carrying forward Tradition, and *reapproaching* the crossroads. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines *approach* in three ways: "a.) to draw near; b.) to come very near to [resemble]; and, c.) to make advances to." This project aspires to accomplish each one in turn: to demonstrate our own proximity to the conflict presented by Maritain's crossroads, to align the meaning of my project with Maritain's, and to clarify in new ways the decision that lies

before us. And, while many others have arrived at the crossroads, I humbly submit my project to be a *re*-approach.

One final note concerning our image of the crossroad. Catholic educators are called to be disciples. It is apprenticeship to the One who invites and in fact obliges us to pick up our cross and to follow Him along the way: truly a cross road if ever there was one.

CHAPTER ONE

In Search of Catholic Education

This dissertation is a conceptual study of Catholic education as pedagogy. In this first chapter I introduce the central research questions and their relevance for Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the US. Included in this is a description of the challenges facing US Catholic schools and an analysis of how Catholic education has changed over the past 70 years. This is followed by an overview of the dissertation's chapters and their purposes. These are organized to develop a new pedagogical theory for Catholic education that is relevant and responsive to current circumstances in Catholic schools. The first chapter concludes with a brief statement explaining just why theory-building in regard to pedagogy is so essential for Catholic schools today.

Searching for Catholic Education

In early June of 2020, I joined a webinar on systemic racism in Catholic schools. As I listened to the eight Black conversation leaders tell their stories of attending and teaching in Catholic schools, I was moved by one young man's experience. He attended Catholic elementary and secondary schools and spoke passionately about the absence of identity-relevant experiences, such as conversations with teachers and any study of Black history, literature, and art. He described a school culture indifferent to racially charged incidents making headlines and unfolding in the vicinity of his school. While his Catholic school helped him form a relationship with God, he said, it did not help him understand or confront the oppression he faced as a Black youth in America. He went on to say that, for these reasons, his identity was formed outside of his Catholic school experience.

This student was deprived of a valid Catholic education. No doubt he was given a rigorous academic program, taught the tenants of Catholicism in religion class, and

showed the importance of caring for others. I am confident he was surrounded by thoughtful and supportive educators, some with whom he had an especially close relationship. He was given help to navigate successfully the systems and stages of his education and was accepted with a generous scholarship to a prestigious university. Despite this incredible, noteworthy success, I maintain his education, as a Catholic education, was truncated.

In recent years, I have been searching for Catholic education. I have encountered it in a few places. However, in the majority of my professional work and research I have discovered it far less often than the number of schools that bear the designation "Catholic." I have been joined by other educators who tell me they too are searching for Catholic education. I have been somewhat surprised to find that their searches include things such as new governance models, funding structures, high tech innovations, and enrollment incentives. These approaches certainly provide important, and in some cases, enticing updates to the schools. However, how they bring us closer to realizing the core mission of Catholic education has not been demonstrated.

A Concise Definition of Catholic Education

The greater part of this dissertation involves defining Catholic education for elementary and secondary schools. I believe Catholic education is learning who we are (our Christian anthropology), exploring what our life means (God's desire to be in relationship with us), and discovering what to do with our life moving forward (how to carry out our responsibility as agents of God's reign). I do not assume the designation "Catholic school" insures Catholic education. Nor do I believe it to be reducible to the religious education curriculum or campus ministry programs, both of which are

commonly expected to affect, and even solely carry, the objectives of "Catholic education." Rather, this vision is about a form of learning that arises from all aspects of school life and is in dialogue with these foundational truths and desires. Learning how to see, sense, and be in the world with an uncompromising responsibility to the dignity of all persons comprises an education that is genuinely Catholic. This is the Catholic education I am searching for.

Searching the Past

My search for Catholic education is complicated by its recent history. Catholic education has changed significantly in a relatively short period of time, making it difficult to assess and comprehend. Catholic schools constitute the world's largest system of establishment of schools, educating nearly 55 million students in 150,087 schools (CARA, 2020). Despite their global significance, a mere 4.2 percent of them are located in the US. Behind this data point is a dramatic story of decline. Since 1960, over 51% (6,604) of US Catholic schools have closed and student enrollment has dropped by 66% (a difference of 3,463,637 students) (McDonald and Schultz, 2019). The National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA) predicted another 100 schools did not reopen for the 2020-21 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Crary, 2020).

Accompanying this staggering narrative of decline is a more subtle tale that reveals changes in the Catholic education of the schools. Looking across a 70-year timespan, we can perceive these changes unfolding in three distinct moments, or epochs[1]: the *Heyday* epoch of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s; the *Catholic Effect* epoch that began in the mid 1980s and peaked in the early 1990s; and the *Catholic Identity* epoch that started at

---

[1] I use the word *epoch* to mean a particular period of time that had certain unique characteristics.

the turn of the century and continues into 2020s. The following analysis provides a brief snapshot of each epoch. I rely on historical school data and prominent research and publications from the era to capture some of the salient points and challenges in the given period of time. While each epoch is worthy of its own in depth, scholarly discussion, that is not possible here. I am only able to provide the broad brushstrokes most relevant to understanding the changes in Catholic education.

The Heyday: 1950s to 1970s

The pre-Vatican II years of the 1950s and early 60's are often referred to as the "heyday" of Catholic schooling in the United States (Cieslak, 2006; O'Donoghue & Potts, 2004; Staysniak, 2012). Student enrollments peaked at 5.2 million and nearly 74% of the personnel were religious women and men (McDonald and Schultz, 2019). The religious to student ratio can be calculated as 1:47. Students paid little to no tuition and many schools were unable to meet the demands of enrollment.

Parishes hosted schools and children moved seamlessly from classroom to church to home. Children living in the neighborhood of their parish school could grow up without knowing the world outside of the Catholic tradition (O'Toole, 2009). In school, the primary educators were religious women, formed in faith, dressed in habit.

Catholic education came in many forms. Lessons in Catholic education were given directly, sometimes spontaneously as part of a disciplinary action and often thematically woven into any topic of study. Lessons were offered indirectly, too. The school calendar, the daily prayer, the acts of charity, the code of conduct--each part of the school day reflected a commitment to the Catholic tradition (Bless, 1957). Catholic education was embodied within the student experience and in the work of the religious,

particularly in their management of the curriculum and the students. The *Heyday* was a triumph of steeping Catholic youth almost entirely in the Catholic worldview of its time.

Major research of this period attempts to describe the religious attitudes of students and faculty (Neuwien, 1966) and demonstrate lasting effects of a Catholic education on adult religious behavior (Greeley and Rossi, 1966). In addition to these projects, which tended to promote a favorable view of Catholic education, other publications suggest a growing dissension surrounding the schools' future relevance. There was a growing sentiment that the Catholic school project had fulfilled its original purpose--providing Catholic youth, many the descendants of recent waves of immigrants, an education free from the anti-Catholic sentiment found in the Protestant-run public schools. A central voice in this debate was Mary Perkins Ryan, whose 1962 publication, *Are Parochial Schools the Answer?,* called for a reversal of the Church's priorities. Ryan argued that Catholic schooling had weakened (perhaps even excused) parents' participation in forming children in the faith. She called for a new "emphasis on adult education, the liturgy, and instructing parents that the task of educating children is theirs, not the parochial school's" (as cited in Grant and Hunt, 1992, p. 134-35).

Three years later, the Second Vatican Council (1965) produced *Gravissimum Educationis* (Declaration on Education). This landmark document affirmed the Church's participation in the "progress and development of education" and called upon schools, school teachers, parents, and universities to support one another in the wider work of Catholic education. The document offered special attention to the role of parents, reminding them that they are the primary educators of their children (1965, sec. 6). The relevancy of Ryan's (1962) argument continues to this day.

The Church entered the post-Vatican II era with a new openness to the modern world. It invited members of religious orders to do the same, producing unimaginable consequences. Many orders shifted priorities and moved away from school ministry. Some orders ended as too few members were left to guide internal reforms.

Over the next 16 years, between 32,000 and 39,000 religious women left their orders (Neal, 1984). Their exodus placed the mantle of Catholic education on the shoulders of lay leaders and educators. In less than a decade, lay educators constituted 51.6% of the school staff. Between 1960 and 1970, student enrollments fell nearly 17% (McDonald and Schultz, 2019). The impact of these swift changes is reflected in the publications of the time. Articles on Catholic education used the word "crisis" in their titles and addressed new topics such as, how to sustain a school's religious education program (Koob, 1971), how to close a school (Maher, 1970), and how to instill sound business practices into school administration (Seidel, 1968).

In the concurrent Civil Rights era, Catholic schools struggled with racial integration. The schools constructed in the suburbs in the 1950s and early 1960s served affluent white Catholics who fled urban schools attended by minority students. Church leaders called for integration and increased resources to support inner-city school students, many of whom were Black and non-Catholic. Glock and Stark (1969) reported that "lay people were not only prejudiced, they also denied 'the right of the churches [to which they belonged] to challenge their prejudice'" (cited in Grant and Hunt, 1992, p. 167).

From today's perspective, it is clear that the "heyday" had a problematic side. The rapid expansion and robust enrollment came at a cost. Studies on school operations

during this time describe difficult learning environments, crowded classrooms, and teachers (religious and lay) who were poorly prepared (Buetow, 1985; Fichter, 1959). The experience was abusive for many students. Catholic schools' use of corporal punishment very nearly defined the approach and seeped into the popular culture in both caricature and, sadly, accurate portrayals. Between 1970 and 1979, at least 6,540 children were sexually abused by clergy (CARA, 2020).[2] This number, which only includes reported cases of abuse, is the equivalent of one in every 273 students enrolled in the 2018-19 school year. Alternately, the number amounts to one student from each Catholic school.

This time period is recognized for its tremendous achievement as well as its suffocating clericalism and the failure of far too many Church leaders. Grant and Hunt (1992) refer to this moment as a "disintegration of the sense of mission" that resulted from a "loss of a widely shared sense of purpose and agreement about the importance, indeed indispensability, of Catholic schools on the part of Catholics, clerical as well as lay" (p. 2). As the Church tried to understand the meaning of these changes, thousands of schools, built with hope and haste, would soon become the great burden of countless lay school leaders.

The "Catholic Effect": 1980s to 2000

This period saw a continuation of decline. Catholic school enrollments fell by 40.2%. The number of religious women educators decreased by 74%. The religious to student ratio was 1:73. As student enrollment dropped, nearly 1500 schools closed

---

[2] Another 3,792 allegations of clergy sex abuse of minors have been reported for the years 1980-1989 (CARA, 2020).

(McDonald and Schultz, 2019). Lay personnel outnumbered religious by 42%. Rising costs elevated student tuitions; secondary school tuition was an average of $2240 (Guerra, 1993). Many factors contributed to the decline: improvements to public school systems, the beginning of the charter school movement, an increase in private school choices, and an overall declining population of Catholics as a result of Catholic couples raising smaller families--a trend that began in the 1970s and continued (Westoff & Ryder, 2008).

As educational leaders struggled with the challenges that accompanied these trends, they were perhaps buoyed by the findings of new research on Catholic school effectiveness.[3] In a study comparing public and private schools' abilities to develop student academic achievement, Coleman et al. (1982) found that Catholic schools were more successful with students from disadvantaged backgrounds (defined in this study as Hispanic and Black students): "The result, very simply, is that achievement difference between students from advantaged backgrounds and those from disadvantaged backgrounds are considerably less in Catholic schools than in public schools" (pp. 194-5).

These findings fueled a great debate. The central criticism was selectivity bias. Opponents of the study argued that students enrolled in Catholic schools were screened and admitted based on academic performance and parental involvement. The two populations were not on equal footing to validate the claim.

---

[3] The question of "effectiveness" had been raised earlier by Greeley and Rossi (1966). Their interest in "effectiveness" explored the influence Catholic education had on adult "success." While their findings portrayed Catholic schools in a favorable light, their methodology drew criticism and the study lost credibility (Convey, 1992).

The researchers responded and in 1987 published their findings from an expanded, longitudinal study titled, *Public and Private High Schools: The Impact of Communities* (Coleman and Hoffer, 1987). According to Convey (1992), the Coleman et al. (1987) study was helped by Greeley's (1982) study of minority students' success in Catholic schools. Using Coleman's et al. 1982 data set, Greeley (1982) identified key factors to help explain how Black and Hispanic students were more academically successful in Catholic schools than their counterparts in public schools: increased commitment to studying, a higher caliber of academic instruction, and a heightened sense of community. The second Coleman et al. (1987) study echoed Greeley's (1982) findings and confirmed their 1982 claim that Catholic school students, regardless of family background, managed greater academic achievement than public school students. Moreover, Coleman et al. (1987) demonstrated that "the achievement benefits for Catholic schools were considerably greater for Black and Hispanic students than for non-Hispanic white students" (Convey, 1992, p. 20).

This and other positive results were accredited to the distinct quality of the Catholic school community. Coleman et al. (1987) concluded:

> The results have a number of implications for the functioning of schools, implications which are very much related to the social context of the school: the kinds of families whose children are in the school, and the kinds of social structures in which family and school are embedded. These relations constitute a set of resources that can be usefully described as "social capital." (pp. 220-21)

According to Coleman et al. (1987), particular forms of social capital are possible within a religious community due to shared norms or common values (p. 222). The quality of

the Catholic schools' social capital became known as the *Catholic Effect*. Catholic schools now had convincing evidence to support their superior academics and unique capability for fostering achievement with minority students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

While the debate on Coleman's et al. (1987) research continued, another *Catholic Effect* study was published. In this highly acclaimed study, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Bryk et al. (1993) set out to understand the ways in which the "Catholic school effects might accrue" (p. 59). Through extensive field work and data collection in seven secondary Catholic schools, Bryk et al. (1993) uncovered the ways in which Catholic schools foster social capital that produces higher academic achievement. Impressed with these outcomes, the authors encouraged Catholic schools to embrace this success as their central purpose. Parting ways from the "Church's...demands on its members," Catholic education should "represent an invitation to students both to reflect on a systematic body of thought and to immerse themselves in a communal life that seeks to live out its basic principles" (p. 335). The Bryk et al. (1993) study was the climax of the *Catholic Effect* epoch. Overall, these studies signaled a new identity for the Catholic schools, one of academic excellence and community empowerment.

The Catholic Identity Epoch: 2000 to 2020s

As the Church entered the third millennium, it was faced with the breaking scandal of decades-long, systemic sexual abuse of minors by clergy. Faithful Catholics were forced to manage their outrage and disgust toward the hierarchy with their love of the faith. It is difficult to assess the full impact of this horror on Catholic schools. We can imagine, however, the situation it created for families. How did the church expect parents

to enroll their children in Catholic schools, the majority of which were led by members of the clergy? Schools scrambled to implement new child protection policies and safety measures, but the recovery of trust and legitimacy has been slow.

The fallout of the scandal has become yet another major challenge facing Catholic schools. Catholic school enrollments dropped 32.6% and nearly 1500 more schools closed.[4] As of 2019, 1.8 million students attend 6,289 schools. Religious educators constitute just 2.8% of school personnel, making the religious to student ratio 1:422. Similar to the previous time period, many schools struggle to manage the impossible tension of enrollment decline and cost increase. The average tuition for elementary school is $4,903 and for secondary school $10,864 which is different from the average per pupil cost of $6,513 and $14,825 respectively. The difference is made up through tireless fundraising efforts (McDonald and Schultz, 2019).

The impressive narrative of the earlier *Catholic Effect* epoch, featuring evidence of academic success and empowering relationships, proved inadequate to reverse the fate of many urban Catholic schools. According to O'Keefe and Scheopner (2007), between 2000 and 2005, a total of 667 Catholic schools closed. In 2006 alone, an additional 220 schools closed. O'Keefe and Scheopner (2007) reported, "many of the school closures are in the urban areas with high poverty rates and large numbers of minority students" (p. 27). The authors conclude their grim findings with a call for more research, particularly in the area of Catholic education effectiveness.

In the midst of this decline, a new focus for schools emerges: *Catholic identity*. The phrase, *Catholic identity,* has been in use for decades. Nascent research on this

---

[4] To my knowledge, there is no study that has determined a causal correlation between the clergy sex scandal and the drop in student enrollment and school closures.

reveals that one of the earliest instances of this phrase can be found in a newspaper article published in 1923.[5] The term gained some frequency of use in the 1980s. In the first two decades of the 21st century, however, *Catholic identity* became ubiquitous in conversations on Catholic schools. A 40-year analysis of doctoral dissertations on Catholic education shows a total of 30 dissertations written on the topic of Catholic identity in US Catholic schools; six of them were written during the 1980-90s and 24 between 2000-2018 (CHESCS, 2020).

The *Catholic identity* epoch features a call to increase, strengthen, renew, and evaluate the Catholic character of the many dimensions of a Catholic school. In *The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium* (1997)*,* the Congregation for Catholic Education emphasized the importance of the schools' Catholic identity, writing: "It is from its Catholic identity that the school derives its original characteristics and its 'structure' as a genuine instrument of the Church, a place of real and specific pastoral ministry" (1997). Pope John Paul II continued this message in his 2004 address to US bishops, stating: "It is of utmost importance, therefore, that the Church's institutions be genuinely Catholic: Catholic in their self-understanding and Catholic in their identity" (cited in Miller, 2006, p. 18). Later that same year, the president of the National Catholic Educational Association, Michael Guerra, echoed the Pope's words, claiming: "The first and most important task for Catholic schools is to maintain and continually strengthen their Catholic identity" (2004, p. 105). While there seems to have been no objection to

---

[5] "*from certain churches without espiscopal ordination and yet did not thereby lose its **catholic identity**, then it could and can, so far as a principle goes…*" The Manchester Guardian (1901-1959), Sep 21, 1923.

embracing Catholic identity as a priority, many were left wondering what it actually was (Convey, 2012; Cook, 2007; Schuttloffel, 2012).

John Convey, a leading quantitative researcher of US Catholic schools, was one among those who recognized the need for clarity. Convey (2012) administered a three-part survey to over 3,300 Catholic school principals and teachers, asking them to define and prioritize twelve features, or "components" of Catholic identity. The study's core findings are presented in the table below.

Table 2: Average Ratings of Components of Catholic Identity

Component	Mean	S.D.	Essential
School Day Begins with Prayer	3.90	.375	92%
Strong Faith Community	3.90	.343	91%
Religion Course Presents Catholic Teachings	3.88	.403	90%
Periodic Schoolwide Liturgies	3.87	.417	89%
Students Participate in Service	3.85	.433	87%
Teacher of Religion is Catholic	3.77	.555	82%
Crucifix in Every Classroom	3.66	.702	77%
Principal is Catholic	3.66	.649	74%
Class Begins with Prayer	3.46	.815	63%
Catholic Teachings Integrated in Curriculum	3.48	.755	61%
Vast Majority of Teachers are Catholic	3.19	.800	39%
Vast Majority of Students are Catholic	2.82	.762	15%

The findings from Convey's (2012) study strongly influence the ways in which Catholic educators understand and evaluate the Catholic identity of their schools.

The same year, Ozar and Weitzel-O'Neill (2012) released the *National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools* (NSBECS). This landmark document identified 13 standards and 70 accompanying benchmarks to improve the overall quality of Catholic schools. The Mission and Catholic identity domain consists of four standards and 16 benchmarks. Although the document does not

define Catholic identity, it suggests several ways a school can amplify its Catholic values and commitment to its mission.

Not all schools have embraced their Catholic identity. In 2017, board members of the San Domenico Catholic School in San Anselmo, California voted unanimously to remove nearly all religious statuary in an effort to make the school less "alienating" to members of other faith traditions. According to the *Washington Times*, the school's principal said the decision to remove the statues was intended to send a message to the wider community that the school was not just Catholic, but independent, and open to people of other faiths (Chasmar, 2017). The article concluded by quoting parents and students who did not support the board's decision, and who expressed their frustration with the visible erosion of the school's Catholic identity.

The *Catholic Identity* epoch reflects the aspirations of the schools to create an *ethos* that transmits Catholic values and meaning and inspires the young to embrace the Catholic faith. It emphasizes the observable, visible characteristics commonly associated with the Catholic tradition. Guidelines and benchmarks were developed to encourage all members of the school community to value and promote Catholic identity.

The Shifting Forms of Catholic Education

The three epochs highlight significant changes within US Catholic schools over the past 70 years. Each moment heralds great achievement for the thousands of religious women and men and Catholic communities who have and continue to overcome tremendous obstacles to build and sustain Catholic schools. The epochs also reveal a concerning pattern. There is a gradual *thinning* of Catholic education. The learner's experience of, and encounter with, Catholic education is slowly reduced or weakened. It

is valuable to take a critical view of this pattern, which reflects trends towards secularization of faith in the broader society, beginning with the *Heyday*.

Catholic education during the *Heyday* took a traditional form reflecting the orthodoxies of the pre-Vatican II era. In the classrooms, students received instruction *thick* in Catholic sentiment and surrounded by religious symbolism. Not all students had a positive experience of this approach. Hastings, (1996) a Catholic school student in the pre-Vatican II era, used strong language to convey his critique:

> Catholic schools, through compulsory worship and buildings decorated with Crucifixes and statues, appeared to be 'worshipping communities of faith' composed of believing, practicing Catholic staff and pupils. Their task was the transmission of a package of beliefs, 'faith,' a gift of God and rejected at peril, and of rules, 'morals,' imprinted by God on each soul. (p. 272)

Hastings' account describes Catholic education as the implicit messages of physical objects, the explicit "packaged" content, and those responsible for transmitting belief to the students. Other studies capture similar experiences. In an effort to provide a balanced view of these accounts, Grace (2002) reminds his readers that "... the discouragement of independent questioning was ... a feature of the culture of many categories of schooling in this historic period," not just Catholic schools (p. 60).

What was unique to Catholic schools was "the nature of the knowledge that had to be learned and the assumption that Catholics could be 'made' by the learning of the catechism" (Grace, 2002, p. 60-61). These historical accounts, while "fitting" for the time period, depict a Catholic education limited to contemporaneous educational practices of lecture and drilling, while unable (with rare exception) to explore the experiential,

dialogical, and reflective modes of learning emerging in the work of theorists like Dewey and Montessori. Thus, the approaches of the *Heyday* reduce Catholic education to the level of indoctrination and obligation.

The Catholic education of the *Catholic Effect* epoch differs significantly from the previous era. Catholic schools embraced the research that suggested there was something special about Catholic education that engendered greater student success, especially for minority students in urban settings. Their findings depict Catholic education as increased academic "time on task" and a close, caring community.

I entered the field of Catholic education professionally in 2004 during the Catholic identity epoch. While Catholic identity has the potential to facilitate Catholic meaning, its interpretation and application is difficult to achieve (Fuller and Johnson, 2014; Grace, 2010; Maney et al., 2017; Pollefeyt and Bouwens, 2010). Catholic identity is reduced to mostly empty trappings hung on classroom walls, mounted in courtyards, and heard over loudspeakers. This kind of identity can easily be dismantled, relocated, and dismissed. The effect, over time, produces a school which mimics its secular counterpart.

The Catholic identity components promoted by Convey (2012) are based mostly on observable data and present the same limitations as the *Catholic Effect* research. Additionally, the components have the effect of a check-list. Schools can easily become faithful to this list and feel they are satisfying all that is required of them as a Catholic organization. However convenient for overburdened educators, Catholic identity-- understood as outward signs of a school's commitment to the Church--is inadequate for providing students with a Catholic education.

These forms of Catholic education reflect a gradual *thinning*, where the *depth* structures of the Catholic faith become *shallow* and less present to the community. They too easily evaporate under the heat of secularism and rampant materialism. This *thinning*, I believe, has made Catholic education difficult to find, and subsequently, difficult for learners to receive. Catholic education is meant to provide learners with the knowledge and experience of the deep rivers of the faith (Groome, 1998, p. 45). The opportunity before us is to find new ways to bring learners out into the deep waters of the Catholic tradition.

Research Questions

Catholic education is part of a living tradition, the Catholic tradition, and as such, is sensitive to the changes of time. It is meant to prepare learners to engage and transform the challenges that surround them. As we have seen, there has never been a single, static understanding of Catholic education and this is a sign of health and underlying vitality. Catholic education maintains its value by engaging the particular challenges, dangers, and opportunities of every era. It retains this valuable quality by allowing the wisdom of the tradition to engage contemporary issues.

In recent years, as I have searched for Catholic education, I have become concerned for the *thinness* of what I see. Certainly, there are many ways we might understand or explain why this is. We have already considered a few. My greater concern is the implicit compromise inherent in this unintentional neglect. What becomes of Catholic education if its relationship with the tradition continues to *thin*? What becomes of young people who are formed with a *shallow* experience of Catholic education? What becomes of the Catholic Church if its education programs provide young Catholics with a

barely knee-deep experience of Catholic education? How can we re-immerse ourselves in the essence of Catholic education in schools?

This dissertation pursues these concerns by asking two central questions. The first question is: *What makes Catholic school education Catholic?* The focus here is on education, the primary activity of a school. My interest is to develop a *thick* experience of Catholic education located in the educative moments of the school, that should benefit all learners in the community. This is accomplished by thinking in new ways not about *what* we teach but *how* we teach, in other words, by turning our attention to pedagogy.

This leads to the second question, which establishes the direction of the dissertation: *How should Catholic education be expressed through pedagogy in particular?* This question contains subsidiary questions. How does pedagogy, meaningfully designed, incarnate the essence of Catholic education? How can learners participate in a *thick* experience of Catholic education through pedagogical methods? The dissertation answers these questions with a new pedagogical theory for Catholic education.

The theory is rooted in the philosophical tradition of Catholic education and Christian religious educational scholarship. At the same time, the theory creates a new conversation between the literature of contemporary secular education and religious education and theology. Surprisingly, this is a rare occurrence. Sullivan (2001) observed, "Theological and educational literature are often studied quite separately and without reference to one another" (p. 198). Bringing together the sacred and the secular generates new possibilities for Catholic education with relationship to pedagogy. It allows the principles of Catholic education to be informed by recent educational theory on

pedagogies. This dissertation shows that this dialectic between secular theory and the Catholic intellectual heritage can fortify rather than dilute its rich and endlessly unfolding theology.

Overview of the Dissertation's Structure

This project is born out of a desire to rekindle Catholic schools with Catholic education. To address the research questions, I have developed a conceptual study to inform and design a new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. The following is an overview of the substance and purpose of each chapter.

Chapter Two presents the central discourse on my topic from the field of Catholic education, organized in three sections. The first traces the meaning of Catholic education in the years leading up to the Second Vatican Council, the Council's interpretation of the meaning of Catholic education, and the widening and disunity within the field on the meaning of Catholic education at the start of the third millennium. The second section presents four distinct approaches used by Catholic schools to embody the principles of Catholic education: religious education programming, curriculum integration across all subject areas, non-confessional education programming, and pedagogy. Of these, the pedagogical approach accomplishes the principles of Catholic education in ways the other approaches do not. The review's third section illustrates the field's lost relationship with its philosophical and theological roots and makes the case for how a theory of pedagogy, drawn intentionally from the philosophy and theology of Catholic teaching, may help schools rekindle the lost principles of Catholic education.

Chapter Three introduces the study's conceptual methodology. The methodology is informed by three sources: the Church's teaching on the purpose of Catholic schools;

the theology of Christian anthropology; and Bernstein's (2000) sociological theory of pedagogy. The sources anchor the theory as both "Catholic" and "pedagogical." The theological aspirations of the Catholic education articulated in Bernstein's pedagogical language is presented in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four is the centerpiece of the dissertation. I describe the central elements of my pedagogical theory starting with the identity of the person as both knower and learner. This identity arises from a Christian anthropology of the person and acknowledges the dynamic interplay between what we know and what we are learning. Next, I utilize Bernstein (2000) to define and describe the conditions of *classification* and *framing* that help to promote the distinctive characteristics of Catholic education within the pedagogy. I then elaborate on these characteristics as they inform the design of the pedagogy's three movements: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. In the final section of the chapter, I describe the outcomes, or the *text,* of the pedagogy.

Chapter Five appropriates tutoría as a pedagogy for Catholic education (Cámara, personal interview, April 2019; Ng, 2019; Rincón-Gallardo and Elmore, 2012). Tutoría is analyzed according to the framework of the new theory, with particular attention to the identity of the learner and the qualities of the pedagogical discourse described in Chapter Four. The analysis is strengthened by my research with the scholars who developed the model and my observations and conversations during my visit to four Chilean schools that have implemented the model.

Chapter Six, as the concluding chapter, reviews the scope and central features of the dissertation. I reiterate the contribution of the project while at the same time, recognize its limitations and the questions that remain. I invite debate and welcome the

development of other theories to promote the principles of Catholic education. Lastly, the discussion engages Pope Francis' *Global Compact on Education: Together to Look Beyond.* I consider how my proposed pedagogical theory for Catholic education can work in support of the Pope's vision.

Conclusion

I return to my opening claim, that the former Catholic school student leading the webinar on systemic racism in Catholic schools did not receive a Catholic education. This dissertation attempts to challenge and disrupt the ways in which we think about and approach Catholic education in schools. The pedagogical theory for Catholic education elevates the voice of students by relying on their identity and wisdom expressed as curiosity, creativity, and empathy. This is accomplished by reorganizing the structures and relationships of the learning experience to more fully reflect the principles of Catholic education.

CHAPTER TWO

Reviewing Catholic Education: Philosophy, Theology

and Contemporary Theories of Practice

This chapter is a review of the literature on Catholic education theory in the context of Catholic elementary and secondary schools. The majority of resources included here were published between 1993 and 2018, capturing twenty-five years of scholarship and commentary on the aims of Catholic education in schools. Some of the sources used to define Catholic education, however, come from an earlier time period. This is to include the influential work of Jacques Maritain (1882-1973) and relevant documents from the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). Both sources, as will be demonstrated, hold contemporary significance for Catholic education. Also, the literature is limited to Western scholars as their work has historically dominated this topic.

The chapter is organized into three sections. The first section asks: What is the meaning of Catholic education? The essential philosophical and theological principles of Catholic education are presented along with central tensions and enduring questions. This discussion underpins the second section which explores the question: How is the meaning of Catholic education expressed as an educational theory? I present four models of Catholic education; each takes a different approach to achieving the purpose of Catholic education in the school context. The first depends on the religious education program and the second involves the entire school curriculum through a model of integration. The third theory, introduced in 2015, offers a challenging non-confessional approach to Catholic education while the fourth theory centers on pedagogy. The theories are

critiqued for the ways in which they represent and actualize the principles of Catholic education introduced in the first section.

The third section explores the frequent claim that there is no adequate theory of Catholic education today (D'Souza, 2016; Garcia-Huidobro, 2017; Grace, 2002; McKinney, 2013; McLaughlin, 1996; Whittle, 2015). Scholars from within the field of Catholic education have expressed this paucity as a central challenge for advancing the goals of Catholic education. This claim will be reframed to introduce a new opportunity to support contemporary Catholic schools, discussed in Chapter Three.

Before proceeding, I wish to offer a few notes of clarification. First, conversations on this topic have frequently used the terms "Catholic education" and "Catholic schools" interchangeably (Haldane, 1996). This approach is problematic. The Catholic Church maintains an educational mission broadly, realized in a variety of contexts: the home, the parish, the seminary, the university, and the school. The particular social, political, and structural dynamics of the school necessitates a form of Catholic education that is distinct from, though ideally compatible with, these other contexts. Second, Catholic education is a particular expression of education, with its own principles and commitments, regardless of the school model (e.g. private, diocesan, parish, etc.). A third distinction, models of schooling, is a separate topic, not included here. Given these clarifications, what is offered is an exploration of the aims of Catholic education in the context of Catholic schools without regard to the model of schooling that may be operative in any particular school. In keeping with this priority, we must first comprehend the aspirations of Catholic education and then consider which theory or theories of Catholic education are most suitable for achieving these aims in schools.

Defining Catholic Education

What is Catholic education? Over the centuries, scholars have engaged this question as a matter of philosophy and theology. Some scholars have utilized both the philosophical and theological, demonstrating a natural overlap between these two approaches. While Catholic education has benefited from the attention of numerous philosophers and theologians through the centuries, it is not possible to describe the full scope of their contributions here.

Instead, I have chosen to present the work of Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain (1882-1973) whose writings were and continue to be widely embraced by scholars of Catholic education (Boland, 2013; Bryk et al., 1993; Carr et al., 1995; D'Souza, 2016; Elias, 1999; Groome, 1998; Haldane, 1996; Joseph, 2001; Sullivan, 2001; Whittle, 2015). Maritain (1943) provided a compelling vision of Catholic education in the years leading up to the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Before turning to this historical moment in the Church, we must first consider and appreciate Maritain's philosophy of Catholic education.

Maritain's Philosophy of Catholic Education

Maritain was a Neo-Thomist, following in the tradition of thirteenth century Saint Thomas Aquinas (Boland, 2013; D'Souza, 2016; Elias, 1999). He engaged many of Aquinas' ideas, updating them for modern audiences, in order to promote Christian thought in the twentieth century (Sweet, 2019). Though his interests span a wide range of topics, Maritain's work in the area of education is highly regarded (Boland, 2013; D'Souza, 2016; Sweet, 2019). His most cited work originates from four lectures he

presented at Yale University in 1943 titled, *Education at the Crossroads*. Here, Maritain articulates the essential elements of education.

First, education must reflect the nature of the human person. From the Christian perspective, the human person is created by God, in the image and likeness of God. This belief is the Catholic doctrine of *imago Dei.* Created this way, the human person "possesses absolute dignity because [s]/he is in direct relationship with the realm of being, truth, goodness, and beauty, and with God" (Maritain, 1943, p. 8). The human person exists as both a spiritual being and a physical being, and education has a responsibility to both. The spiritual self, the indwelling of God and harbor of one's personality, requires an education which Maritain describes as "an awakening."

The physical self is supported with an education of practical aims, a pragmatic education that prepares the student for his/her future job and livelihood. These two dimensions are not isolated from each other. On the contrary, they are a dynamic unit, together guiding persons in their total learning of knowledge, judgement and morality (p. 10). In this way, Maritain validates a pragmatic theory of education. However, he warns against its overemphasis in contemporary school environments for its potential to dismantle the inner unity between the spiritual self and physical self.

A second principle of Maritain's educational philosophy is that the student, not the teacher, is the main agent in the learning process (D'Souza, 2016, p. 56). In Maritain's view, the human mind at birth is a *tabula rasa*, Latin for "blank slate," and holds a strong capacity to learn. It is this capacity that must be strengthened and nourished by educational activities. In the student-teacher dynamic, it is the teacher's role, not to insert knowledge, but to help build up this capacity for knowledge. The teacher does not create

knowledge. Knowledge exists all around the student. Instead, the teacher "communicates knowledge to the student whose soul has not previously contemplated the divine ideas" (Maritain, 1943, p. 30).

Maritain compares the role of the teacher to a medical professional whose craft it is to understand the particular inner vitality that contributes to the health of the patient. The patient has her/his own unique dynamism of health that the medical doctor must interpret and support to promote the patient's flourishment. In this way, the doctor is subservient to the patient. Maritain argues the same is true for the teacher and student relationship, where the "primary dynamic factor...is the internal vital principle in the one to be educated; the educator or teacher is only the secondary--though a genuinely effective--dynamic factor and a ministerial agent" (p. 31). This relationship is vital to the success of Maritain's first principle.

In terms of epistemology, Maritain promotes a Thomist philosophy "that distinguishes between the senses and... the intellect" (D'Souza, 2016, p. 59). Acquiring knowledge involves both the senses and the intellect. The intellect transforms what the body senses. In this way, the intellect assists the senses, transforming what is perceived into knowledge.

There is more, however. Maritain speaks of a second dynamic of knowing. The act of thinking generates insights which allow the learner to transform knowledge into "meaning and understanding beyond the sensory" into "something that is intelligible" (D'Souza, 2016, p. 59). This view of epistemology is consistent with Maritain's understanding of the student as the central agent in acquiring knowledge. Knowledge

exists all around the learner. It is the learner's active engagement and reflection on this engagement that encourages thinking and makes something knowable.

Certainly, Maritain's work on education is much more expansive. However, given the parameters of this study, I have limited my presentation to its essential features. Maritain's philosophy of education insists on a Christian understanding of the person, the learner, who is both human and divine. This learner is the primary agent in the acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge arises from sensory perceptions transformed by the intellect and from insights the learner develops through active thinking. The teacher, sensitive to the particular learning dynamics of each student, nurtures the learner's capacity for knowledge. Overall, the purpose of education is personal awakening, as in the learner's "liberation through knowledge and wisdom, good will, and love" (1943, p. 11). These essential elements of Maritain's philosophy formed a comprehensive philosophical view of Catholic education that was widely accepted in the years leading up to the Second Vatican Council. The Council would introduce new understandings of Catholic education that would slowly disrupt this view.

The Second Vatican Council and the Theological Turn

As the Church pivoted to engage the modern world, the comprehensive philosophy of Catholic education championed by Maritain dissolved (D'Souza, 2016; Elias, 1999; Kelty, 1999). What slowly emerged was a series of theological explanations of Catholic education, representing a critical shift from philosophical to theological approaches. According to D'Souza (2016), "The mantle of leadership was moving from philosophy to theology, a leadership of theology and theological method, rather than the more circuitous route of philosophy, classically understood and exclusively Western in its

approach and focus" (p. 42). The Church sought to understand itself on its own terms, departing from earlier philosophical traditions to give new primacy to Scripture and the work of theologians.

As the updating Church prioritized diversity and encouraged change, it needed new approaches to Catholic education. Over the next six decades, the Vatican's Council on Catholic Education produced eight documents to inspire and guide change. The documents signaled a departure from prior commitments. According to Kelty (1999), "The old agenda for Catholic education rapidly unraveled in the years following the Second Vatican Council" (p. 12). While scholars worked to study and interpret the new agenda set out by the Council, many Catholic schools throughout the English-speaking world were falling into temporal chaos, as described in Chapter One. These challenges created a separate--and urgent--research agenda on topics such as legitimacy, governance, finance, and enrollment (Conroy, 1999; Grace, 2002; Grace and O'Keefe, 2007). Catholic education thinkers engaged these struggles and generated a groundswell of literature attempting to comprehend the significance of the moment. Included in nearly every conversation is the question: What is the meaning of Catholic education? (Conroy, 1999; Duminuco, 1999; Elias, 1999; Hunt et al., 2001; Kelty, 1999; McLaughlin, 1996; Youniss & Convey, 2000; Youniss, et al., 2000).

Capturing the mood of the period, one scholar stated: "The demand for a more explicit definition of the identity and distinctiveness of Catholic education is one of the most pressing concerns today among Catholic educators and parents as well as among many members of the Church hierarchy" (Duminuco, 1999, p. 136). The effort to define

Catholic education produced more variety than unity. What follows is a review of central themes used by writers in their myriad efforts to define Catholic education.

The Theology and Philosophy of Catholic Education

The scholarly debate on the meaning of Catholic education that emerges in the 1990s produces an array of interpretations. Of interest are the sources they use to define Catholic education and the principles they emphasize, and in some cases, exclude. I have grouped the interpretations into four categories to indicate overlap, yet highlight distinctiveness.

The first category features scholars whose interpretations are based on post-Vatican II theological articulations of Catholic education which "begin with scripture, the teaching tradition of the Magisterium, and the Catholic moral and theological tradition" (D'Souza, 2016, p. 14). Morris (2012) claims the goals of Catholic education are "rooted in Christ, and his teachings as recorded in the Gospels" and schools are therefore committed to "transmitting the essential doctrines, devotions and corporate religious vision of Catholicism" (p. 17). Haldane (1996) argues that Catholic education depends upon "forms of education through which the essential doctrines and devotions of Catholicism are transmitted" (p. 133). Joseph (2001) supports the primacy of theology in defining Catholic education: "What makes Catholic schools Catholic are the theological truths which govern and give guidance to both philosophy and to persons of Christian faith" (p. 32). These scholars share an understanding of Catholic education that emphasizes Christian scripture and the doctrine of the Church. In this view, the teachings of the Church are given priority over the person, or in the context of school, the student.

In the second category are scholars who are less certain about the primacy of a theological approach for defining Catholic education (Elias, 1999; Kelty, 1999; McLaughlin, 1996). Elias (1999) believes the Church's theological documents are insufficient for defining Catholic education and calls for a return to philosophical approaches:

> What appears to have emerged within the Catholic education community may better be called a theology of education based on principles drawn from Vatican documents and Catholic theologians. No sustained effort has been made in these documents to ground an approach to education in a specific philosophy of education. (p. 94)

Elias suggests a new philosophy of Catholic education based on the philosophies of Lonergan and Freire, not Vatican documents. Like Elias, McLaughlin (1996) recognizes limitations to the theological, stating "...there are dangers in basing discussion of Catholic educational principles drawn from documents of this kind" (p. 139). Unlike Elias, McLaughlin does not dismiss the documents; instead, he uses them to construct a new philosophy of Catholic education. His approach centers on the nature of the person. It provides a holistic and integrated method of studying and supports religious and moral formation.

Kelty (1999) shares Elias' (1999) and McLaughlin's (1996) views on the limitations of the Vatican documents to provide a "fully developed educational philosophy" (p. 14). Like McLaughlin (1996), he unites philosophical traditions with the theology of post-Vatican II documents. Kelty features Neo-Thomist principles of pre-Vatican II developed with theological content from Vatican documents. He names this

fusion a *theology of Catholic education* "which claims the Second Vatican Council as the source for its educational rationale" (p. 14). In this way, Kelty offers an understanding of Catholic education that integrates pre and post Vatican II traditions.

The third category features an integrated approach of theological and philosophical themes with social and historical dynamics. Sullivan (2000) defines Catholic education as "the integral development of the human person, the autonomy of the disciplines, and the synthesis between faith, culture, and life" (p. 199). It is worth noting that Sullivan, while concerned for Catholic education globally, is writing to defend the legitimacy of Catholic schools in England and Wales. He writes, "Catholic schools need to make their story attractive, credible and even compelling." He adds, "If they do not preserve their distinctive identity, there will be no special reason for their separate existence" (p. 198). Given this concern, we might wonder at the lack of Catholic distinctiveness present in Sullivan's interpretation of Catholic education.

McKinney (2013) offers a definition of Catholic education in two parts. The first is drawn from the Vatican's *General Directory for Catechesis* (1997)*,* highlighting the centrality of Jesus and the importance of "Christian formation and growth in faith" (p. 17). The second consists of "key issues of what it is to be human, the realization of human potential, the nature of interpersonal relationships, and the nature of a good society" (p. 17). McKinney describes how the aims of Catholic education are aligned to the aims of the United Nations: "Catholic education shares the ideals of the UN declaration and focuses on the key issues of what it is to be human" (p. 17). McKinney's motivations for making this connection highlight an important tension. Certainly, Catholic education benefits from broader perspectives and partnerships with other global

organizations like the UN. However, it is important to recognize that Catholicism has its own understanding of the "key issues" that are distinct from the UN's. On the whole, Sullivan's (2000) and McKinney's interpretations of Catholic education lack a distinctive Catholic quality. They can easily serve the educational mission of any faith-based school, Christian or non-Christian. They represent a challenging departure from the principle aims of Catholic education.

The fourth category features the work of preeminent religious education scholar Thomas Groome (1996), who also participates in the conversations of this time. Unlike his contemporaries, he promotes an understanding of Catholic education that is neither bound by doctrinal teachings nor a concern to reconcile the Church's philosophical and theological traditions. Instead, Groome advances an interpretation of Catholic education that "is prompted by the distinctive characteristics of Catholicism itself" (p. 107). He highlights five characteristics: "positive anthropology, sacramentality for life, a communal emphasis, commitment to tradition, and appreciation of rationality" (p. 108).

Positive anthropology is a recognition of humanity's essential goodness, created with equal dignity, in the image of God, capable of receiving God's grace. (This is discussed in detail in Chapter Three as part of the notion of *imago Dei.) Sacramentality* is the principle that all created things are potential bearers and mediators of God's divine presence. It is a way of seeing and interacting with the world, welcoming us to apply the gifts of human imagination and creativity in order to experience God in the world. *Community* plays a tremendous role in our ability to live in the Christian story and vision. It facilitates our learning, our self-discovery, and our encounter with God, shaping us into "an instrument of God's saving grace" (Groome, p. 114). *Faith and reason* are

Catholicism's enduring commitment to make sense of 'the story' of Christianity in the context of the contemporary world. It insists on learning and critical thinking that encourages personal awareness and ethical relationships with others. In this way, faith is strengthened, not overcome, by an expanding knowledge of the natural world. Lastly, *tradition* is the choice to live in the story and vision of Christian faith. When we situate our lives in the story, and align ourselves to the future of the Christian vision, we become part of the tradition.

Groome's interpretation of Catholic education is markedly distinct from his peers'. Braiding the principle of sacramentality, the work of the community, and the value of reason (in relationship with faith), Groome emphasizes themes pervasive to Catholicism, not just Catholic education. Additionally, Groome seems to engage the *spirit* of the Second Vatican Council and the wider Christian story and vision (Groome, 1991) instead of the documents of the Vatican, which have been criticized for their limitations (Elias, 1999; McLaughlin, 1996). This spirit included new understandings of community, the role of Scripture, and a wider sense of tradition that "actively engages" the faithful (D'Souza, 2016, pp. 39-41). By attending to the "deep waters" of the tradition (Groome, 1998), Groome presents an understanding of Catholic education that promotes qualities essential to live with Christian faith. The distinctive approach offered by Groome is significant for this project and influences the pedagogical theory for Catholic education described in Chapter Four.

In summary, what emerges from the 1990s and onward is a disunity and expansion of the meaning of Catholic education. Before the Second Vatican Council, Catholic education was strongly influenced by neo-Thomist Maritain. In this view,

Catholic education begins with the Christian understanding of the nature of the person, created by and in relationship with God. Knowledge, obtained through education and carefully guided by the teacher, leads to personal awakening and freedom. The central principles of Catholic education are concerned with the nature of the person, the nature of knowledge, the role of the teacher and the goal of freedom.

Thirty years after the Second Vatican council, debates on the meaning of Catholic education demonstrate that few of the earlier principles have been maintained. What is more, new priorities are introduced, widening and potentially revising the meaning of Catholic education. Beyond the nature of the person, the contemporary debate demonstrates few points of consensus. Some promote doctrinal teaching and the devotional activities of the Catholic tradition. Others emphasize principles related to practices of study and the synthesis of the content. Others, still, include the role of the community, religious learning, and formation. This challenges Catholic schools responsible for maintaining the tradition, meaning, and vitality of Catholic education. To proceed, I explore the extent to which the principles of Catholic education, outlined above, are present in current practical theories of Catholic education used by Catholic schools today.

Theories of Catholic Education

Thus far, I have briefly outlined several central philosophical and theological interpretations of Catholic education. Prior to the Second Vatican Council, scholars shared a philosophical approach inspired by Maritain's Neo-Thomist writings. This view emphasizes the nature of the person, the student-teacher relationship, and the dynamic process of acquiring knowledge. The advent of the Second Vatican Council, with its

aspirations of *aggiornamento* (updating) invited a range of new theological approaches for defining Catholic education. Beginning in the mid-1990s, there is a surge in scholarly debates on the matter. While some neo-Thomistic elements endure this transition, others are lost. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, in the midst of school closings, financial crises, and Church scandal, the field of Catholic education widens further and buckles, and becomes increasingly diffuse while trying to respond to a growing number of worldly concerns. What emerges from this moment are multiple theoretical models of Catholic education.

In the following, I highlight four theoretical models that have evolved and are, at present, used in Catholic schools. These models are prevalent in the literature on Catholic education from the 1990s to 2018. These are:

1. Religious education models

2. Curriculum integration models

3. A Non-confessional model

4. Pedagogical models

I present the benefits and limitations of each approach based on my analysis of the relevant literature. This review introduces important themes for the construction of my own theory for Catholic education. My analysis begins with models that seek to achieve the aims of Catholic education through religious education programming.

Religious Education Programs

The religious education program is considered to be the "defining characteristic" of Catholic education in Catholic schools (Dooley, 2000; Engebreston, 2014; Franchi, 2018; Whittle, 2018). Globally, Catholic schools share this as the most common

characteristic. Here, students study and reflect upon the teachings of the Church as they would any other subject presented in the course of a school day. Engebreston (2014) described the religious education program as one that engages students directly in the challenges of being religious in the twenty-first century. Religious education functions as an explicit curriculum on Catholicism, with the intention of deepening students' faith.

D'Orsa's (2013) investigation of Catholic schools in Australia revealed important challenges with this model of Catholic education. Most schools maintained their commitment to Catholic education with their religious education program. D'Orsa stated that schools view themselves as Catholic "when religious education has a central and honored place, and is regarded as a rigorous intellectual discipline alongside other disciplines" (p. 73). However, within this approach, D'Orsa found an intentional effort among the educators to remove curricular elements which were seen as having the potential to influence faith formation. The content that was viewed as "formative" was offered separately as electives, contained in the activities of the campus ministry department. These efforts came about as a way to accommodate the religiously diverse student populations of the Catholic schools participating in the study (D'Orsa, 2013).

D'Orsa criticized this approach for "objectifying" the religious education program, suggesting that Catholic education is more than the study of doctrine and history. The study raises questions about the effectiveness of the religious education programs, broadly, and their commitment to the principles of Catholic education. What is its purpose, if it is designed not to form students in Catholic faith? Parceled religious education programs increase other concerns, such as the effectiveness of the curriculum

integration model (discussed next), which runs on the "engine" of the religious education program.

Engebreston (2014) found alternative challenges to religious education programs, specifically related to their implementation. Her study revealed how some religious knowledge was untaught because it was unpalatable to teachers who were insufficiently trained. Engebreston (2014) stated:

> The lay teachers who struggled to hold the Catholic education system together were largely untrained in [religious education] and no doubt found it easier, with a more and more resentful captive audience in their classes, to focus on life experience rather than unpalatable religious knowledge. (p. 11)

Poorly prepared religious education teachers have struggled to teach the curriculum.

Curriculum Integration

Most scholars of Catholic education agree that religious education programs alone do not achieve the goals of Catholic education (Davis, 1999; Grace, 2002, 2010; Maney, et al., 2017; Miller, 2006; Porath, 2000). Instead, religious education programs are fortified by the Catholic worldview woven throughout the entire school curriculum (Miller, 2006). This is commonly referred to as *curriculum integration*. Curriculum integration is urged by the Church's Conference on Catholic education (CCE, 1977) and suggests that the aims of Catholic education are achieved by integrating Catholic concepts and teachings within traditional (secular) courses of study. Miller (2006) argues: "All instruction...must be authentically Catholic in content and methodology across the entire program of studies" (p. 44).

Catholic education scholars, while promoting a Catholic school curriculum, have voiced significant concerns about its success in practice, and in some cases, its existence. In a review of US Catholic schools, O'Keefe and O'Connor (2014) report no evidence of a Catholic curriculum: "By and large, the distinctiveness of faith related schools is not to be found in the curriculum, with the exception of religious studies" (p. 128). D'Orsa (2013) claimed curriculum integration takes two forms in her study's participating schools. The first is "values integration" which highlights the specific "Catholic or Gospel values into various aspects of the curriculum" (p. 73). This approach raises criticism from Lovat and Clement (2014) who claim that a values-based curriculum no longer makes a Catholic school distinct. Values integration curricula are "being implemented and arguably perfected more widely outside [faith-based schools]" (p. 567).

The other form of curriculum integration noted by D'Orsa is termed 'teachable moments' and relies on teachers to identify and make "connections with Catholic faith and values" in the context of the standard curriculum. D'Orsa concludes that each of these approaches falls short of curricular aims of Catholic education. Despite a sincere and extended commitment to develop a Catholic curriculum, "local understanding of the principles on which these were based has often been inadequate" (p. 68).

Krebbs, (2000) who worked with faculty at 11 schools in the Archdiocese of New York, discovered significant deficiencies in the teachers' knowledge about the Catholic tradition which impeded their ability to support the integration approach: "This infusion presumes a fairly sophisticated knowledge of Catholic theology, history, and culture, as well as knowledge of the academic disciplines and an extensive repertoire of pedagogical

strategies. Few teachers possess these prerequisites for infusing Catholic truths and values into the curriculum" (p. 308).

Davis (1999) offers strong commentary on the failings of schools to produce and provide a Catholic curriculum. He criticizes the efforts of assimilation, a term he prefers over integration, claiming:

> The assimilationist movement blurred the distinctiveness of Catholic identity, to project an image of the Catholic school as progressive, caring, academically respectable and wedded to the secular goals of material progress...Assimilation meant doing the same things as secular schools, only better. (p. 223)

Davis calls for a renewal of the curriculum which draws from the tradition, "exhibiting all that is best and most open from the deposits of Catholic learning and from the recovery of the rich humanistic pedagogy" (p. 226). He seeks a "restoration of the bond between the subject areas and the integrated mission of the Catholic school" (p. 226) and notes the paucity of scholarship in this area (p. 229).

Davis and Franchi (2013) returned to Davis' 1999 essay to seize upon a moment of new humanism within the Church (p. 40). They claimed the field of Catholic education has concentrated its attention on religious education programs to the detriment of the wider curriculum and its "potential receptivity or resistance to an authentically Catholic intellectual witness" (2013, p. 39). Davis and Franchi called for new approaches to Catholic education that signal "to the world that the Catholic community desires broader human flourishing and authentic well-being for all" (p. 49). The authors encouraged a Catholic education curriculum that is not just for Catholics, but for those wanting to benefit from the Church's "universal search for a better and more human civilization" (p.

49). Davis and Franchi articulated a theory of Catholic education with humanistic and universal priorities.

Garcia-Huidobro (2017) stated that a compelling vision of Catholic education as a curriculum has yet to form coherently into a rigorous totality. Reviewing the literature on the Catholic curriculum from 1993 to 2015, Garcia-Huidobro (2017) concluded that there continues to be serious challenges for the educational programs of Catholic schools, citing the need to deepen educators' understanding of the dynamics influencing curricular integration and the formulation of a new theory. This should achieve the foundational principles of Catholic education and engage the religious diversity found in most Catholic school populations.

The literature on efforts to accomplish the aims of Catholic education in the curriculum content of Catholic schools reveals an ongoing struggle. If the principles of Catholic education are to be achieved in the curriculum, that is the content taught to students, then it seems the schools are significantly underachieving at this goal.

Non-confessional theory of Catholic education

Whittle (2014) developed a non-confessional theory of Catholic education as a way to legitimize the Catholic school project in today's education market. Though he does not define non-confessional, it is generally understood as an approach to learning about a religion without professing that religion. The lack of scholarly response to Whittle's (2014) theory of Catholic education makes it difficult to assess its acceptance. However, as the most recent theory that has been succinctly offered to the field, its presuppositions and conclusions deserve analysis.

Whittle's (2014) theory attempts to address internal and external "threats" to the tradition of Catholic education. Among the external threats he identified are the schools' perceived threat to social cohesion, their burden to non-Catholic tax-payers, and accusations of indoctrination that undermine children's rights. Some of these issues are unique to the school system in the UK. However, the internal threats align to Catholic schools universally: a lingering ambiguity on the meaning of Catholic education, wide uncertainty on the purpose of Catholic education, and decline in Catholic practice (pp. 11-22).

Whittle attempts to resolve these challenges by promoting a non-confessional theory of Catholic education, that is teaching in a manner that excludes evangelizing students to believe in the Catholic faith. This is accomplished, according to Whittle, by removing formative efforts and expectations from the curriculum and reassigning theology the role of "guidelines for the aims and content of the curriculum as a whole" (p. 94). Whittle argues that this arrangement is already at work in Catholic schools, suggesting that teachers have forfeited their role as catechists--a term he uses to distinguish between an educator and a teacher who gives a "positive defense of the Catholic faith" (p. 89).

Whittle defended his theory by demonstrating its likeness to the scholarship of leading Jesuit theologian Karl Rahner, whose work was foundational in influencing Vatican II. According to Whittle, Rahner used theology to engage with, and respond to, the unsolvable mysteries of the world. In the context of a Catholic school, this approach would allow educators to teach nuanced theological concepts, such as mystery, instead of inculcating students to take on positions of faith.

Through the presence of these kinds of mysteries pupils would be brought to a

point of threshold. This is different to the confessional account of Catholic

education, where pupils are nurtured into adopting certain theological beliefs.

Rather than being involved in a confessional activity Catholic education could,

using Rahner, be described as a non-confessional activity of bringing pupils not to

theological beliefs but rather to the threshold of theology. (p. 129)

In other words, the "threshold" is the point where mature students may freely determine

if they wish to embrace a theological, in this case, Catholic, understanding of truth, or

not.

Whittle's theory is problematic in several ways; here, I highlight three. First,

Whittle narrowly conceives of Catholic education as an isolated dimension of curriculum.

While the curriculum is one of the spaces this project explores to assess the vitality of

Catholic education, it is not the only space within Catholic schools. As the renowned

sociologist of Catholic education Gerald Grace (2002) argues: "...there has not been, and

in human society, cannot be, a school or an educational experience which is entirely

autonomous, objective, neutral and ideologically free" (p. 14). Students attending

Catholic schools are exposed to a Catholic ideology in many ways, not only in the

explicit curriculum. That is, "confession" takes many forms, expressed in the culture of

the school. Rooting "confession" out of the theology curriculum will not (and should not)

undo a Catholic school's religious ideology/orientation.

Second, Whittle's approach to the theology curriculum is inconsistent with the

aims of Catholic education, discussed in the first section of this chapter. Whittle seems to

support curriculum integration, that is weaving theological concepts throughout all

subjects. However, his version of curricular integration is significantly at odds with much Catholic theology. Instead of helping to realize God's activity in all subject areas, Whittle suggests something more clandestine. Theological claims are not to be presented explicitly in the content but are to be concealed insofar as they are to serve as one guide amongst others in the development of the curricula. In this way, the Catholic worldview becomes submersed and passive. It is given little to no direct influence over students' efforts to make meaning of their coursework or their lives. Here, the connection between learning and faith is intentionally masked.

Third, Whittle's theory is a troubling example of too much compromise with a secular age (Taylor, 2007). Clearly, the survival of Catholic schooling is a concern Whittle is trying to address. He wrote: "In order to survive there have had to be compromises and accommodations" (p. 23). Whittle's theory promotes a response to the challenges of contemporary Catholic schooling in the UK that diminishes the overt presence and influence of Catholicism in education. If Catholic education is going to endure, surely it must retain, not reduce, its specifically Catholic nature. This need not involve indoctrination; it can be invitational. Schools can welcome students into the vast theological architecture of Church history and the kinds of "dialectical hermeneutics" proposed by Groome (1991) without requiring them to take up residence.

Whittle's theory of Catholic education, it could be argued, is a misnomer. Whittle's theory offers a narrow approach that is not wide enough, deep enough, or exciting enough to engage students with the aims of Catholic education.

Catholic Education as Pedagogical Accompaniment

The analysis thus far has featured three different approaches to Catholic education: religious education programming, curriculum integration, and non-confessional schooling. These examples have shown the ways in which Catholic educators have interpreted and implemented the principles of Catholic education in the context of a Catholic school.

A fourth approach looks beyond the content and into instruction, where the principles of Catholic education are conceptualized in pedagogy--that is, the manner in which learning happens. Shimabukuro (2013) argues for a pedagogy that nurtures student spirituality. She develops her argument with reference to Church documents and established Christian writers who recognize the value of a pedagogy that "include[s] the nurturance of the spirit of Christ in students in conjunction with their interior and integral formation" (p. 506). However, the pedagogical model she constructs is drawn from the wider field of education, such as new science models (Senge, 2000) and "best practice principles of effective teaching learning" in America's public school standards (Zemelman et al., 2005).

Shimabukuro's thoughtful article highlights an important tension within the field of Catholic education. She identified the need for learning processes that promote the particular aims of Catholic education yet she moves outside the tradition in search of ways to achieve these aims. What is the cause of this? Perhaps, in her view, there is a lack of sufficient resources within the tradition to support the needs of Catholic schooling. Or perhaps there are resources but they are not accessible or known to Catholic school educators. Shimabukuro recognizes the opportunity in pedagogy to

promote the principles of Catholic education yet looks outside the Catholic tradition for direction.

A different example of pedagogy comes from the Society of Jesus, also known as the Jesuits. The Society, founded in 1543 by Saint Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), became deeply involved in the educational mission of Europe's counter reformation (Topping, 2015). Guiding this practice was the *Ratio Studiorum*--"a tiered educational system that sought to develop the intellect and religious spirit of the scholastics" (Lorenz, 2017, p. 15). First published in 1599, the *Ratio Studiorum* served as a teaching manual, articulating both general expectations and practical instructions for teaching. "From suggestions on drills, to recitations, to the place of public lectures, to the distribution of awards, all is to be ordered with a view to instilling mental and moral discipline in a manner both efficient and pleasing" (Topping, 2015, p. 209). For centuries, the *Ratio Studiorum* has informed the Jesuit educational system and contemporary notions of Ignatian pedagogy. Understanding this tradition and the pedagogy it has produced is helpful to this project.

Duminuco (1993, 1999), former Secretary of Education for the Society of Jesus, defined Ignatian pedagogy as: "the way in which teachers accompany learners in their growth and development" (1999, p. 155). It consists of a dynamic learning process with three stages: experience, reflection, and action. Experience is the starting point. The teacher invites students to draw on their prior knowledge and *experiences* to form a personal understanding of a given topic of study. The teacher then advances the students' understanding with new knowledge and experience. This leads to *reflection*. Reflection facilitates integration, allowing the new knowledge and experiences to inform and change

students' dispositions, "—their habitual attitudes, values and beliefs as well as ways of thinking" (Duminuco, 1993, p. 10). The awareness that arises from reflection leads students to new *action*, that is to new commitments and behaviors attuned to the learning they have received. The students' experience, reflection, and action form the central dynamic of Ignatian pedagogy. It is a paradigm for engaging students in all topics of study.

Unlike the other theories (presented above) which view Catholic education as curriculum content to be learned, Ignatian pedagogy as defined by Duminuco promotes the principles of Catholic education through a dynamic method of learning. Duminuco explains how the model promotes the principles of Catholic education: "A Catholic pedagogy...must assume the worldview of Christ and suggest more explicit ways in which gospel values can be incarnated in the teaching-learning process" (1999, p. 155). In this way, the pedagogy depends on the work of the learner and the teacher: "The teacher creates the conditions, lays the foundations and provides the opportunities for the continual interplay of the student's experience, reflection and action to occur" (1993, p. 9). Unlike the other theoretical models, Ignatian pedagogy emphasizes the dynamic interaction between the student and the teacher and, in this way, resembles the priorities of Maritain's philosophy of Catholic education.

Each of the four theoretical models I have reviewed attempts to promote the principles of Catholic education. They each fall short, in some way, of the richest possibilities available to Catholic education. The non-confessional and religious education theories seem to be the most limited forms of Catholic education. The former conceals Catholic principles from students. The latter, while exposing students to the

central teachings of the Church, lacks key principles of Catholic education, among them being holistic study and religious formation. Curriculum integration models, while promising and widely endorsed, are poorly executed and require a theological knowledge base for all faculty that is very difficult to cultivate. Lastly, the pedagogical theory encompasses several principles of Catholic education. As suggested by Shimabukuro (2008), there is a need for more pedagogical models that animate the principles of Catholic education.

An Awareness of What is Missing

Thus far, this chapter has described the ambiguity of meanings pertaining to Catholic education and the limitations and possibilities in four theoretical models of Catholic education. Related to these challenges, I believe, is a missing activity in the field that connects the two—theory-building. This striking absence of theory-building has been observed by many. Elias (1999) notes, "Catholic educators have continued to write on education, but not from a specific philosophical position" (p. 94). Sullivan (2013) writes:

> There is evidence within our culture of an erosion of confidence among some
> Christians, an undermining of tradition, an awkwardness in the face of pluralism,
> a loss of the sense of transcendence, a breakdown of community, a lack of
> attention to stewardship of the soul and disruption of the transmission of culture.
> (p. 33)

Joseph's (2001) analysis of the 1996 edition of the *Encyclopedia on the Philosophy of Education* proposes a possible cause for the lack of theory-building: a decline of Catholic philosophers in the field of education:

A total of 184 authors contributed sections [to the 1996 *Encyclopedia on the Philosophy of Education*]. Not one contributor addressed either the Catholic philosophy of education or philosophy as it relates to Catholic schooling. Eleven of the contributors resided in Catholic institutions of higher learning. None discussed philosophy as it relates to Catholic education. (p. 32)

The encyclopedia is not the only publication that reveals this silence. O'Keefe and Grace's (2007) expansive handbook on the state of Catholic education in 35 societies around the world covers secularization, globalization, political contexts, the preferential option for the poor, student experiences, faith formation, Catholic schooling for girls, the staffing of teachers and leaders of Catholic schools, moral and social formation, finance, and Church-State partnerships. The authors provide no understanding of Catholic education that has guided their project and omit any discussion of its significance as a challenge for Catholic schools in the twenty-first century.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence of this concern comes from Youniss and Convey's (2000) edited collection titled, *Catholic Schools at the Crossroads*. Given the importance of Maritain's (1943), *Education at the Crossroads*, one might expect the 2000 publication to be an allusion to Maritain's legacy, however, it is just an odd coincidence. The text makes no reference to Maritain's scholarship or publication. Conroy (1999) argues that this lack of attention and debate on the philosophy of Catholic education will leave the field unable to articulate its distinctiveness, and subsequently its value.

Conclusion

The previous discussion presented three co-existing challenges facing Catholic education. First, the field struggles with ambiguous interpretations of the meaning of

Catholic education. As we have seen in Chapter One, Catholic education belongs to a living tradition and should evolve in response to history. Yet, as seen in the interpretations of the past 25 years, we find the essence of Catholic education "give in" to the challenges of time. Second, there is compelling evidence that current methods used by Catholic schools are insufficient for generating a Catholic education. Teachers struggle to implement the curriculum models and students experience Catholic education as concepts, featured in a few moments of the school day. Alternatively, the pedagogical models seem to provide a way to engage students in the principles of Catholic education, signaling its potential for rekindling the greater enterprise of Catholic education. Third, there is a paucity of theory-building in the field of Catholic education. One probable cause of this is the decline of Catholic education philosophers. However, it also seems possible that the operative structures of school and the steady decrease in resources have established the *terms* of Catholic education. In other words, Catholic educators no longer feel they have the means to shift the school from a *thin* to a *thick* experience of Catholic education. This project attempts to respond to these three challenges by: establishing a clear definition of Catholic education; engaging the dynamics of pedagogy to develop learning inclusive of the person; and demonstrating the importance of theory-building to meaningfully unite the principles of the Catholic tradition and effective pedagogy.

Chapter Three

Theology and Pedagogical Theory as Conceptual Methodology

This chapter introduces a framework for a new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. The framework is designed to intentionally respond to the challenges and possibilities outlined in Chapter Two, namely, Catholic education, in the context of Catholic schools, is in need of new theories to clarify its purpose and new approaches to accomplish its purpose.

The proposed conceptual framework features three domains: the *purpose* of Catholic education in the context of school, the *theology* of Christian anthropology as it relates to education, and the *sociology of pedagogy* as it pertains to relationships in learning. While these three domains have been differentiated for the purposes of definition and clarification, they are mutually informing, and therefore meant ultimately to be taken as a whole. In addition, every pedagogical theory requires an essential understanding of the learner. Toward this end, the proposed framework purposefully draws on Christian theology in order to develop a theory is "faithful" to a Catholic understanding of the human person. Proceeding this way, I wish to demonstrate how an understanding of the personhood of the student informs the ways in which Catholic schools define and facilitate learning.

This chapter presents each of the three domains beginning with the Church's teaching on the educative purpose of Catholic schools and its meaning for today's school communities. This discussion is grounded in select Church documents: *Gravissimum Educationis* (translation: Declaration on Christian Education) (1965), *The Catholic School* (1977), and *The Catholic school on the threshold of the third millennium* (1997).

I then explore the theology of Catholic anthropology with a particular focus on *imago Dei,* the image of God. This is followed by the sociology of pedagogy by which I mean the interpretation of learning methods in terms of the learner's relationships to others and to knowledge. I describe each domain separately but then describe how they form an effective hermeneutic to support a pedagogical theory for Catholic education, which is the focus of Chapter Four.

Recalling the Challenges: A Brief Summary of Chapter Two

Chapter Two described the ways in which the philosophy and theology of Catholic education have become disconnected from common approaches used by Catholic schools to fulfill their mission. Neo-Thomist Catholic philosophers who preceded the Second Vatican Council promoted a cohesive understanding of Catholic education. Their interpretations, championed by Maritain and others, characterized learning as an experience of awakening. The teacher served as a guide to the learner's interpretation of experience and strengthened the learner's capacity for knowledge. The purpose of education was "liberation through knowledge and wisdom, good will, and love" (Maritain, 1943, p. 11). The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) departed from the previous era of a narrow Thomism, introducing new expressions of Catholic education which emphasized the broader theological tradition of the Church. Over the next half century, the spirit of Vatican II inspired at least eight other significant documents on Catholic Education redefining Catholic education in terms of scripture and doctrine.

By the end of the twentieth century, the literature and Church documents on Catholic education featured a variety of theoretical definitions. I presented four

theoretical models of Catholic education with emphases on religious education programming, curriculum integration, non-confessional schooling, and engaged pedagogy. The first three models were shown to be deficient in their ability to convey the principles of Catholic education. Only Ignatian pedagogy, which prioritized the learning processes over curriculum content, embodied these principles. This suggests that the principles of Catholic education are more effectively expressed in pedagogy than curriculum content. What is needed to actualize Catholic education are pedagogies designed to engage and promote the Catholic understanding of the person. These pedagogies, however, must also respond to the goals of Catholic education within the context of Catholic schools. For this, we turn to the relevant contemporary literature of the Church's teaching on the Catholic school.

Purpose of Catholic Education

The purpose of Catholic education is rooted in the Church's overall educational mission to form persons of faith capable of intelligently engaging with the world committed to live as disciples of Jesus and his teaching of the reign of God; in particular this includes to work for justice on behalf of those without voices, without power, and without opportunity. As we have seen, the Vatican's Conference on Catholic Education (CCE) has published eight documents over the past 60 years defining the purpose and possibilities of Catholic schools. Each document advances the discussion and furnishes valuable insight.

"Gravissimum Educationis" (1965)

Foundational to the Church's teaching on Catholic education is *Gravissimum Educationis* (trans. Declaration on Christian Education, 1965). Published in the final year

of the Second Vatican Council and proclaimed by Pope Paul VI, *Gravissimum Educationis* outlines the Church's educational vision, broadly. Catholic schools are identified as one of many "educational instruments" (para. 19) of Christian education. Here the Church declares purpose of the Catholic school is "to create for the school community a special atmosphere animated by the Gospel spirit of freedom and charity" (para. 25).

Of particular importance is the manner in which this is accomplished: "Intimately linked in charity to one another and to their students and endowed with an apostolic spirit, may teachers by their life as much as by their instruction bear witness to Christ, the unique Teacher" (para. 28). The aims of Catholic education, in the context of the schools, is achieved through meaningful relationships and approaches to learning. Meaningful relationships arise from *charity*, that is generous self-gift, caring for the other without concern for reciprocation. The approaches to learning are to *witness* the unique Teacher. This suggests that the method of teaching, that is the pedagogy, reflects the priorities of Jesus. The school community engenders the aims of Catholic education with its equal concern for meaningful relationships and methods of learning.

"The Catholic School" (1977)

Twelve years after *Gravissimum Educationis* (1965), the Congregation on Catholic Education published *The Catholic School* (1977). The document fleshes out many of the more general statements of *Gravissimum Educationis* (1965) and argues for the unique contribution of Catholic schools in an era when many questioned their legitimacy.

How does the document define the purpose of Catholic schools? Let's consider the following statement on the particular educational work of the Catholic school:

> Mindful of the fact that [humanity] has been redeemed by Christ, the Catholic school aims at forming in the Christian those particular virtues which will enable [the person] to live a new life in Christ and help [the person] to play faithfully [his/her] part in building up the Kingdom of God. (para. 36)

To appreciate the meaning of this statement, let us analyze it in segments. The first segment establishes the school's foundational commitment rooted in the central confession of Christian faith. The school should honor and espouse this commitment. *Aims at forming in the Christian* identifies the primary recipient of Christian education, the baptized Christian. While rather straightforward, this phrase calls for a new sensitivity to the 18.7% of the student and faculty populations in today's Catholic schools (McDonald & Schultz, 2019, p. 22). As Pope Francis repeatedly insists, Catholic schools must welcome all, with those from non-Catholic traditions being enriched by and encouraged to learn from the spiritual wisdom of Catholic faith. This is a recent challenge: Is the Catholic school responsible for forming non-Christians? If Catholic schools commit to forming Christians, is it neglecting other commitments of welcome and inclusion?[6] This concern will be considered in the proposed theory explored in Chapter Four.

Returning to the language of the statement, the word *forming* is significant. It suggests that the outcomes are not immediate but gradual, involving a process of shaping

---

[6] Catholic schools can address this tension with culturally responsive pedagogy, one by which all can *learn from* the faith foundation of the Catholic school while Catholic students are encouraged to *learn into* their identity in faith.

the person. In addition, the phrase *aims at* signifies that this effort is aspirational and that we are on our way.

The next segment, *those particular virtues which will enable [the person] to live a new life in Christ,* indicates that there are distinctive qualities and dispositions (virtues) that must be cultivated systemically to contribute to the person's holistic faith formation. Moreover, these qualities empower persons to understand the meaning of their lives as disciples of Jesus and to embrace the universal values reflected in his life mission – making them accessible to all, regardless of their faith identities. The final phrase, *and help [the person] play faithfully his/her part in building up the Kingdom of God*, gives purpose and direction to the formation. A person needs assistance and guidance to understand his/her role. And there is clearly a role to play. The phrase infers activity and participation in something outside of the person that calls upon their full engagement. The activity is directed at building up something that is incomplete, that is underway, and that requires uncompromising devotion: building up what the New Testament refers to as the "Kingdom of God."

The word *Kingdom* creates some objection among contemporary theologians. Groome (1991) suggests *reign* because it is gender neutral and a more accurate translation of the Hebrew and Greek sources. However, even *reign* comes with challenges, namely "it has inexhaustible meaning that can never be fully stated" (p. 15). This requires educators to engage in their own hermeneutics of the scriptural sources to raise up the potential contemporary richness of this biblical symbol for Catholic education, which is one of the tasks that I undertake in this dissertation.

Proceeding with Groome's suggestion, the phrase *reign of God,* signifies the core of Jesus' message. Jesus represented God's *reign* as the defining purpose of his life; it thus should be likewise for Catholic education if it is to honor its faith foundations. *Building up the [reign of] God* implicates the Christian people "to effect in history the values of God's reign, love and justice, peace and freedom, wholeness and fullness of life for all" (p. 13). Groome develops this notion of history as the Christian Story and Vision. The concept of the Christian Story and Vision is essential to the theory of Catholic pedagogy that I will be developing in the following pages and requires deeper analysis.

Christian Story and Vision

The Christian Story and Vision is the foundation of Catholic education. It situates the person in what has passed and what is happening now. Groome (1991) explains:

> [Story is] a metaphor for the whole faith life and practical wisdom of the Christian community that is congealed in its Scriptures, symbols, myths, rituals, liturgies, creeds, dogmas, doctrines, theologies, practices, spiritualities, expected life-styles, values, art, artifacts, structures, and so on. It is a comprehensive metaphor for all that realizes or reflects the faith of Christian people over time and in our time.
> (pp. 113-14)

The Story opens up the Vision of what is demanded of people's lives, which is future oriented. According to Groome (1991) Vision is a metaphor for "the possibilities and responsibilities, the promises and demands, that are prompted by the Christian community's story" (p. 115). Groome is careful to point out that Vision is not dictated nor prescribed by a select few. Rather, it emerges from people's "imaginative reflection" which is interpreted through the lens of the Story by the person as well as within the

community. The Story/Vision dimension for Christian religious education provides a necessary faith foundation and direction to the educative work of Catholic schools.

Returning to the earlier discussion of the CCE's statement on the Catholic school, the analysis can be summarized as: *The education of a Catholic school aims to form the person with the values and dispositions necessary to engage in and promote the fullness of the Christian Story and Vision whose ultimate horizon is the realizing of the reign of God*. There is one final observation worth highlighting. The document does not define precisely this *aim* in terms of students and teachers, learners and learned, child and adult. In other words, the school's central educative activity is one without clearly defined roles. It is with this universal view of the person in the school community that I turn to the third document on the teaching of the Catholic school.

"The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium" (1997)

Twenty years after *The Catholic School* (1977), the Congregation on Catholic Education published *The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium* (1997). Significantly shorter in length, this document reviews the state of Catholic education, restating the purpose of schools, highlighting new tensions and its enduring value. Included are rising concerns over increased attention to the "technical and practical elements of education" (para. 10) and the decline of scholarly debate on the essence of education.[7]

> In the Catholic school's educational project, there is no separation between time for learning and time for formation, between acquiring notions and growing in

---

[7] This shift was noted in the debates of the academic community featured in Chapter Two.

wisdom. The various school subjects do not present only knowledge to be

attained, but also values to be acquired and truths to be discovered. (para. 14)

Here, we find an articulation of Catholic school's necessarily unique educational

approach. The preparation of persons to *engage in and promote the fullness of the*

Christian Story and Vision in the world, requires an integrated educational experience.

The manner of the integration is significant. There is no learning without formation, nor

knowledge without the discovery of truth. These commitments require special

considerations not only of what persons are taught, but how persons are taught.

The preceding discussion has explored the Church's teaching on Catholic schools,

in particular their purpose as a central educational instrument of the Church in current

times. This body of knowledge informs the first of three domains of my conceptual

framework for the new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. In the framework, this

teaching, with its emphasis on the purpose and approach of Catholic education, is paired

with an equal emphasis on the nature of the person, understood as Christian

anthropology.

Christian Anthropology for Education

Despite the multiple interpretations of Catholic education (noted in Chapter Two),

a distinctive principle of Catholic education continues to be the nature of the person

(McLaughlin, 1995; Miller, 2006; Sullivan, 2001). Maritain (1943) voiced concern for

the educational programs of the twentieth century that showed little commitment to the

nature of students as human beings. However, how this anthropology is realized in the

educational programming of Catholic schools remains unclear and, in some cases,

disregarded. While Catholic anthropology has a rich and long heritage, consisting of

numerous theological themes, for the purposes of my project, I focus on three. First is the theme of the *imago Dei*--meaning the image of God--a Judeo-Christian teaching that each person is created in the image and likeness of God. This understanding informs the second and third themes: because we are created in the image and likeness of God, we have a responsibility to care for one another, and these efforts are aided by God's grace. These themes of Catholic anthropology provide a foundation for understanding the Church's doctrine on the nature of the person and thus the implications for Catholic education.

Imago Dei

Etymological Considerations

Central to Catholic anthropology is the Judeo-Christian concept and theological doctrine of *imago Dei* which affirms the essential goodness and dignity of each human person. *Imago Dei* is Latin for "image of God," and appears in the creation accounts of the Hebrew scripture, beginning with the first Chapter of Genesis and repeated throughout the Bible: "Then God said, 'Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness'…So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them" (Genesis 1:26-27). Historically, the word "image" has taken on many meanings, easily affected by historical and social change. In our time, the word possesses a digital quality, referring to data files ("imaging data") or photos ("upload image"). These meanings are far removed from the notion of "image" intended by the authors of the Genesis narratives.

To arrive at a historically accurate understanding, we turn to the Septuagint and the Hebrew Bible. The Septuagint is the oldest known Greek translation of the Hebrew

bible, dating to the third century BCE. This translation uses the word, εικονα, transliterated as *eikon* which is a cognate of the English word "icon." The Greek lexicon defines *eikon* as "one in whom the likeness of any one is seen" (Thayer and Smith, 1999). This definition proposes "image" as a living representation of another, suggesting that the essence of one being is revealed by one to another.

This interpretation resonates deeply with the "visual theology" of iconography commonly practiced in Eastern (Greek, Russian, Coptic) Christianity. In these cases, the physical painting, or icon, becomes a sacred portal which mediates a visual encounter between heavenly and earthly beings. To pray in front of a sacred icon is not to worship the two-dimensional image. Rather, it is to place oneself in spiritual communion with the one whose likeness is depicted, to see and be seen by a living representation, not embodied in the icon, but through it. In this way, iconography helps to communicate the Greek notion of "image" which plays in the same register as the Hebrew words "*selem*" *and* "*děmût,*" the meanings of which we explore next.

Sachs (1991) offers an insightful analysis of the Hebrew etymology of "*selem*" and *"děmût"* found in the book of Genesis: "[*Selem* refers] to a concrete, external form of a representation, like a carved statue" (p. 16). Sachs interprets this as humanity being "established as God's *representatives* on earth in a unique way" (italics original, p. 16) and not a reference to idolatry, that depicts God as embodied in a statue. *Děmût*, or likeness, "refers more specifically to an internal relationship and similarity," but not sameness. According to Sachs, this similarity mediates humans' relationship with God. "Human beings are radically different from God but uniquely and intimately related to God, capable of personal relationship with God" (p. 16). "Likeness" indicates both a

distinction and relationship between humankind and God. With this layered understanding of *imago Dei*, we turn to the scriptural passages and their doctrinal interpretations.

Biblical Passages on the Image of God

The doctrine of *imago Dei* centers on two accounts of the creation of humankind in the opening of the Book of Genesis, Chapters 1 and 2. The first account appears in Chapter 1 as part of God's seven-day creation sequence. On the sixth day, God created "living creatures of every kind: cattle and creeping things and wild animals of the earth of every kind...Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness" (Gen. 1:24, 26-27). The other account appears in the second chapter of Genesis: "Then the Lord God formed ['*adam*] from the dust of the ground, and breathed into [its] nostrils the breath of life; and the ['*adam*] became a living being" (Gen. 2:7).

It may be important here to present a brief excursus regarding some controverted biblical exegesis related to the second passage. Some interpretations of the "Adam and Eve" story have proven problematic for feminist theologians (Clifford, 2004; Griffin, 2002; Johnson, 2009) who claim that there is an implicit hierarchical ordering of the creation of "man" first, and "woman" second – and taken from the man's "rib."

However, feminist biblical scholars maintain that, at this point in the story, the *'adam*, or earthling, is a genderless term, best translated as "person of the earth." (Clifford, 2004; Johnson, 2009). Once God determines that the other living creatures are not suitable partners for the '*adam*, God separates it into two parts, male and female (Clifford, 2004). Johnson (2009) describes this event as simultaneous, not sequential (p. 70), thereby emphasizing an equality between the two that previously had been one.

Though the author of the second account does not use the Hebrew equivalent of the Latin phrase *imago Dei,* the passage can be understood to depict the equality with which God created the first humans, each formed from exactly the same valuable, in-breathed lump of clay, and is therefore included in the Church's doctrine on *imago Dei*.

Doctrinal Interpretations

It is clear that *imago Dei* is a fundamental orientation toward the goodness and dignity of the human person, asserting that humankind is created in the image and likeness of God. For centuries, biblical scholars have debated the exact meaning of this phrase, with some interpretations justifying gender inequality and some even leading to ecological abuse. Fortunately, contemporary scholarship has dismantled harmful ideological interpretations and given rise to new understandings of the *imago Dei*. (Clifford, A., 2001; Clifford, R., 1988; Groome, 1998; Groppe, 2004; Johnson, 2002). In broad brushstrokes, let us consider some of the original meanings offered by the Church's first theologians and then note the contemporary interpretations.

The earliest writings locating the *imago Dei* in the intellect are traced to Clement of Alexandria (150-215). Clement explored the idea of *imago Dei* in a Platonic register by affirming the reality of the human person as body and soul while prioritizing the spirit and intellect to the exclusion of body and matter. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) expanded upon Clement's notion of the soul and substance dualism. According to Matthews (Ed., 2002), Augustine reasons that the plural syntax of Genesis 1:27 represents the Holy Trinity, which leads him to connect the internal activities of the mind with the figures of the Holy Trinity. "The mind's capacity for remembering, knowing, and

loving affirms the presence of God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit within the soul" (Clifford, 2004, pp. 224-25).

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) both broadened and deepened Augustine's interpretation of *imago Dei*, believing certain human activities and dispositions image God (Clifford, 2004). Furthermore, Aquinas asserted that it is each creature, both the person *and* the unified whole, which is made in the image of God:

> And because one single creature was not enough, he produced many and diverse [creatures], so that what was wanting to one expression of the divine goodness, which in God is single and uniform, in creatures is multiple and scattered. Hence the whole universe less completely than one [creature] alone shares in and represents the divine goodness. (*Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 47, a. 1, as cited in Clifford, 2004, p. 226)

The goodness of God, while dwelling within each individual creature, cannot be contained by any one on its own. This interpretation proposes an understanding of the *imago Dei* as divine goodness that dwells beyond individual creaturehood, and is a reality that all living beings share, in relationship with each other and with God.

Relationship with Responsibility

Contemporary interpretations of *imago Dei* carry forward and maintain the importance of *relationship* introduced by Aquinas. However, contemporary theological scholarship emphasizes the responsibility inherent in relationship, namely, a responsibility for the care of all living things (Clifford, 1988; McFague, 1987; Sachs, 1991) and for the equal dignity of all human beings (*Catechism*, 1994; Groome, 1998; Groppe, 2004; Johnson, 2009). Yves Congar (1904-1995), a French Dominican friar and

influential member of the Second Vatican Council, understood the divine image as the common nature of humankind, and the empowering source of our unity as human family. Congar scholar Groppe (2004) explains: "We are created with the capacity to speak to another, to strive to know another, to love one another, and to receive one another in love...To live in the *imago Dei* is to live in relation to others" (p. 88). We access our relationship with God by being in relationship with others. This radical relationality is a primordial identity of the human person—we cannot escape our relatedness. It is a vocation which comes with personhood and its relational responsibility.

How do we develop this responsibility? Tanner (1994) forms an understanding of *imago Dei* by emphasizing its relationality and by contrasting it with a capacity we hold as individuals. For Tanner, to be made in the image of God is to share in the life of God. By choosing to live in partnership with God: "Human beings gain their unique dignity not by virtue of anything they possess...but by being in God's image--by reflecting, corresponding to...making an appropriate response to, the God who has created them for such a relationship" (p. 573). In other words, being in relationship with God comes with responsibility to live according to God's ways, to see the world as God sees it, and work to correct reality in places it falls short. Groome (1998) states that humans grow into this responsibility: "...the emphasis must be on *becoming;* human nature is never 'given' as a finished product, but comes as a lifelong journey that unfolds with the help of God's grace, partnership with others, and our own best efforts" (p. 83). While we are created in the image of God, our nature is shaped over time as a result of our good work, our relationships with others, with our efforts prompted, sustained and perfected by God's grace.

Responsibility Bestowed with God's Grace

Thus far, I have presented an anthropological framework of the person, centered on *imago Dei.* The human person is created in the image and likeness of God, born into a partnership with God, that develops, deepens over time, and matures into a relationship with responsibilities. This development is nurtured through God's grace—which is God's effective love at work within creation and people's lives – prompting and sustaining their response. Grace, then, is gift, abundantly and perpetually available to humankind to empower humanity's good in the world. Before attempting to define grace for today's Christians, let us first consider the term's etymological roots.

According to Sachs (1991), the word "grace" appears throughout the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament. In Hebrew, "grace" is written as *ḥēn* and *ḥesed*. Sachs wrote that "*Hen* expresses the gracious approach of the person to someone who is weaker, poorer and in need of help. It refers both to the graciousness of the benefactor and to the favor or gift bestowed" (p. 67). There is an interesting dynamic captured in Sach's description between two figures, one with means and one with less. In this relationship, instead of the needier one seeking the one with means, the reverse is true: the one with means reaches out to the one who is more needful. This teaches us something about grace as God's love at work. It moves outward, desiring to give from its abundance to those who need. It seeks and fills the emptiness of others with loving generosity.

Ḥesed, by contrast, carries a different nuance. Sachs explains: "*Ḥesed* is often rendered as 'loving-kindness' or 'goodness.' It is more than an act of help or mercy. It implies an on-going relationship of concern, even friendship" (p. 67), or what the Bible

describes as a covenant. Where *ḥēn* connotes a sense of generous *direction*, *ḥesed* signals a generous *duration* and partnership. The emphasis is on a sustained, familiar relationship that responds meaningfully to personal human need. In Ignatian pedagogy and theology, this theme will be taken up under the guiding premise of accompaniment. Together, the two terms convey a giving response, based in a relationship that is open and just.

In the New Testament, the word for "grace" appears mostly in the writings of Apostle Paul as Χάρις, transliterated as *charis*. Paul employs *charis* to characterize the saving power of God at work in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Sachs, p. 68). Sachs explains:

> It is the *gratuity* of God's saving action which is central for Paul. Grace is
>
> unearned. It is not based on worthiness (Rom. 3:24), human merit (Rom. 4:4), or
>
> religious observance (Rom. 3:27f), but on God's fidelity (1 Cor. 1:4-9) and faith
>
> (Rom. 4:16). (p. 68)

Grace is given in total freedom and without condition. But God's grace—the theological gloss for the whole of God's orientation toward creation—is much more than a mere concept. In fact, Haight (2004) writes: "The Jewish-Christian Scriptures as a whole are depictions of God's grace... An integral approach to grace in the Scriptures can never be reduced to a word study of the Greek and Hebrew terms…" (p. 405).

God's Generous Love

Karl Rahner, arguably the most prominent Catholic theologian of the twentieth century, defines grace as God's "self-communication and presence to human existence" (Haight, 2004, p. 403). Grace is a gift of divine goodness and love, abundantly available and freely accessible to the human. It is unlimited and universal, able to extend beyond

the realm of the Church and into what many characterize as the "profane" dimensions of life (Haight, 2004). This last point is of great importance. Unlike the binary categories of "sacred" and "profane" Durkheim (1971) used to classify sociological phenomena, grace makes no distinction. Grace breaks into any context and St. Paul constantly claims that grace does so "in abundance."

God's Activity

How does humankind experience grace? Grace is the sharing of God's effective love in our lives, enhancing our efforts, while promoting our freedom. The entire orientation of our lives, experiences, and our world is suffused and held by the totally gratuitous offer of God's self to us, and all of creation (Melley, 2021). We participate in God's grace when we respond to God's invitation to live into the fullness of our created nature. As 1 John 4:19 attests, God takes the initiative–"God first loves us" – and by grace enables us to freely respond.

Another way to think about this encounter or interaction is a dialogue. According to Haight (2004), God created us with the desire to be in dialogue with us: "God creates human beings because God intends an interpersonal dialogue with creatures who can respond. This dialogue is genuine...It is into this milieu into which every human being is born" (p. 408). When we respond to God's loving outreach, we receive God's grace and participate in God's loving dialogue with us and the world.

Grace is an essential gift for human flourishing, forging our capacity to move closer in intimacy with God, and with those whom God loves—all of humanity. It allows us to embrace the responsibilities of our relationship with God which is never simply a matter of God and the person, but with outreach to the whole human family. Groome

(1998) writes, "God's grace, rather than lessening our responsibility or freedom, heightens both; it empowers us to respond and to do so freely" (p. 80). Here we begin to understand this theme of grace in Christian anthropology. We are created in the image and likeness of God, with goodness and responsibility, that is learned, guided, and lived in dialogue with God. According to Groppe (2004), "the human person is structured to be open, receptive, and responsive to a divine call" (p. 94).

Summary of Anthropology: *Imago Dei,* Responsible Relationship, Grace

Christian anthropology establishes the human person as a reflection of God, who is created to be in relationship with God, and to respond, with God, to the world's needs. We have considered three themes of this anthropology: the doctrine of *imago Dei,* responsible relationship, and grace. The doctrine of *imago Dei* constitutes the elemental aspect of this anthropology. The human person is created in God's image and likeness, and is capable of reflecting God's love and goodness to the world. Our ability to image God begins from our creation and develops through our participation in, and choosing a life that reflects the love and vision God has for the cosmos, as reflected in Jesus' central theme of, and movement towards, the reign of God.

Likewise, the human relationship with God implicates all people in a shared responsibility for all God's creation. Humans should participate in God's activity by responding to the world with love and goodness. Grace is the unmerited gift, always on offer, that energizes and renews humanity, guiding its efforts to acknowledge and respond to God's loving kindness for the world. These anthropological themes--*imago Dei,* responsible relationship, and grace--together establish the Catholic Christian

hermeneutic that is needed to inform a new pedagogy for Catholic education. It suggests the potential of the person that is to be developed by Catholic education.

This positive anthropology constitutes the second part of the conceptual framework for a new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. Catholic education has the potential and responsibility to promote this anthropology in its educational designs. Such an approach, though grounded in a positive anthropology, is neither naive nor indifferent to human sin. On the contrary, precisely because we are created in God's image and open to relationship and grace, we must work to overcome any and all elements of the human condition--from the personal to the systemic--that seek to mar or destroy that which God has so generously given. How does this anthropology inform a pedagogy of Catholic education? How do models of learning cooperate with human nature? The third part of the conceptual framework explores these questions through the possibilities of pedagogy.

Pedagogy

The proposed theory of Catholic education entails a pedagogy in which learning is intentionally promoted with others. My primary interest is the experience of learning, not the explicit content that is featured. Certainly, it is possible to discuss pedagogy as curriculum. Further, it is reasonable to consider curriculum as essential to pedagogy. However, as proposed in Chapter Two, much attention has been given to the notion of Catholic education as content. I wish to focus now on the concept of pedagogy in order to prioritize *how* we educate.

Defining Pedagogy

Pedagogy is a term with much ambiguity and requires definition and exposition. The origin of the word παιδαγωγός, transliterated as *paidagōgós,* is a Greek compound of the words *paîs*, which means a slave or a servant, and *ágō,* a verb meaning to lead, carry, bring forth, or to lead by accompanying. *Paidagōgós* originally referred to a trusted family slave or servant who was responsible for overseeing a young boy, specifically for safely leading him to and from school.

In more recent times, "pedagogy" has been used to denote processes of instruction, or skills, strategies, and techniques for teaching. "Critical pedagogy" has emerged as the necessary investigation, critique, and reform of politics, values, equity, and cultural identity dynamics embedded in structures of learning (Freire, 2012; Giroux, 2020; Oldenski, 1997; Rincón-Gallardo, 2019). My work is greatly influenced by the potency of critical pedagogy which teaches us ways to bring new awareness to the invisible and powerful systems of our human institutions. However, instead of bringing a critical lens to existing pedagogical forms in Catholic schools, for the time being, my intention is to bring the resources of this discipline to construct a theory of pedagogy that attends to and faithfully reflects the particular beliefs and aspirations of Catholic education.

Despite the valuable contributions being made in the name of "pedagogy," there remains the challenge of understanding its nature. According to Max van Manen (1982, 2016), pedagogy has an ineffable quality and suffers from a lack of understanding it in the context of our daily lives. He asks:

Where should we attempt to find the location or the space where pedagogy may be seen to reside? In the educator's acting? In the educational intention? In the

theory or knowledge forms that teachers or parents use? In the effects that

teachers have on children? Can pedagogy be observed? Can it be experienced?

What does it mean to ask for the nature of pedagogy in this way? (2016, pp. 142-

3)

Van Manen's questions, though intended to show the indescribability of pedagogy, reveal

its essential sensitivity and spirituality, especially in its intent to engage the learner *qua*

person. In this regard van Manen's questions provide a link to the same questions that

have animated Catholic educators. In this framing of pedagogy, it is susceptible to its

context, is inherently dialogical, and requires profound thoughtfulness and an intention

similar to Catholic notions of formation with regard to the educative act.

Van Manen's questions suggest that there is something spiritual about the nature

of pedagogy. This is something that is not contained, or fixed, but rather is something that

exists between persons, like a dialogue, influencing the way we encounter one another.

These qualities affirm the potential value of pedagogy as a meaningful focus for faith-

based education. The depth of van Manen's questions, however, do not identify the

means to construct a pedagogical theory in and of themselves. Where van Manen is at a

loss for words to elaborate a theory of pedagogy appropriate to our current time and

challenges, Basil Bernstein identifies a way forward.

Basil Bernstein

The conceptual framework of my proposed pedagogy draws upon the work of

twentieth century sociologist of education, Basil Bernstein (1924-2000). The value of

Bernstein's scholarship for Catholic education has been acknowledged by other

contemporary researchers in the field (Byrne and Devine, 2017; Garcia-Huidobro, 2017; Grace, 2002). I have chosen Bernstein for two particular reasons.

The first reason is that the sociological nature of his educational theory is a good fit for Catholic education. As shown in the earlier discussion on Christian anthropology, the human person depends on others to fulfill his/her nature. Our ability to respond to God's activity in our lives depends upon our being in relationship with others. Therefore, a sociological interpretation of pedagogy such as Bernstein's has the potential to provide an appropriate view of a Catholic pedagogy.

Second, Bernstein's analysis provides a particular system of viewing and coding the constitutive elements of pedagogy. This approach allows me to consider each element's distinctiveness independently and to examine how it interacts with the other elements in his fully elaborated educational system. I have found that I am able to appropriate Bernstein's language codes in particular to describe the key aspects of a Catholic pedagogy. Moreover, it provides for a necessary level of awareness and intention of social dynamics, which are in and of themselves value-laden and thereby educative. The following overview of Bernstein's (2000; 2009) work introduces the concepts which structure my new theory of Catholic pedagogy and explain why it is especially generative, even though Bernstein himself was not particularly attentive to issues of theology in general or Catholicism in particular when it came to the elaboration of his theory of education.

Classification and Framing

The concepts of *classification* and *framing* anchor Bernstein's (2000; 1990) theory of pedagogy. Classification (C) refers to the nature of the space between two

categories. Classification is sometimes confused with categories by readers of Bernstein. For example, in Bernstein's terminology, a student and a teacher are categories. Classification considers the relationship between them. The principles of classification include interpersonal power dynamics and "establish social division of labour...identities…[and] voice" (p. 11). When classification in an organization or setting is strong, the division between the student and teacher is clearly defined and can grow wider. In other words, the two categories are "insulated" from one another.

When classification is weak, on the other hand, the categories are less distinct. Weak classification pertains to categories that are permeable and ambiguous. The formula of this concept is shown as:

$$\pm C$$

According to Bernstein, classification carries *internal* and *external* values, each of which can be expressed in various ways. Internal classification includes the structuring of space and the organization of objects within a space. In a school this can denote matters such as the arrangement of furniture within a classroom or the images that are present (or absent) on the walls. Even one's posture and dress reveal internal values of classification (p. 14). The external value, on the other hand is the continuous influence of other social relations on another classification, as classification is always understood in relation to other classifications and categories. Bernstein summarizes the rules of classification by stating: "Where we have strong classification, the rule is: things must be kept apart. Where we have weak classification, the rule is: things must be brought together" (p. 11).

Framing (F) is a separate dynamic from classification. Where classification establishes the social dynamic between persons/positions, framing establishes the

message of what is communicated. Bernstein writes there is a regional and local dimension to framing. That is, there is an "official," widely accepted message which is regional and the "specific" or personal message which is local. Where framing is strong, the "official" message dominates communication. In the context of schools, strong framing can lead to the silencing of persons whose identities are not reflected in the "official" message (p. 14). Where framing is weak, the local message (represented in the individual voices of the community) is more prominent than the regional message. Strong and weak framing is written as:

$$\pm F$$

Framing has two sub-dynamics which Bernstein terms *social order rules* and *discursive order rules*. The rules generate two types of discourse: *regulative* and *instructional*. I will say a bit about these discourses as they help to shape the theory for Catholic pedagogy.

Regulative and Instructional Discourses

Regulative discourse (RD) establishes expectations of "conduct, character and manner" of the student (Bernstein, 2000, p. 13). It is not often spoken aloud. Its nature is more implicit and is used to create order and social relations, as well as influence moral formation. Regulative discourse is always the dominant discourse. Alternatively, instructional discourse (ID) pertains to the "selection, sequencing, pacing, and criteria of the knowledge" that is to be acquired (p. 13). It represents the explicit tactics used by the teacher to further students' studies. The instructional discourse is always embedded in the regulative discourse. Bernstein represents these relationships as:

$$F = ID/RD$$

It is important to note that RD and ID are influenced by the framing strength. Strong framing (+F) produces learning environments with highly visible and highly explicit regulative and instructional discourses. Alternately, weak framing (-F) produces environments where learning is less visible and more implicit. This continuum of strong to weak framing produces a variety of configurations which result in different pedagogical models. Before we discuss two of these models, we must review three more elements of Bernstein's theory: the concept of *text* and the rules of *recognition* and *realization*.

Text and the Rules of Recognition and Realization

Text is the expected student output, or as Bernstein (2000) writes, "anything that attracts evaluation" (p. 18). Its form can range from the reproduction of a geometry proof to "how one sits or how one moves" (p. 17). A student's ability to construct the required *text* depends on the rules of *recognition* and *realization*. These two rules go hand-in-hand. The *recognition rule* refers to a student's ability to identify the particular signposts of a given context. The *realization rule* is the ability to construct meaning within that context.

In order for the student to engage with a given text, the student needs both rules: to recognize meaning and to realize that meaning by producing the expected text (p. 17). Recognition works to locate the student in the educative moment; realization enables the student to communicate the meaning of it. Research (Holland, 1981; Whitty et al., 1994) shows that students' socioeconomic status influences their success with these rules. These findings encourage educators to treat them openly and explicitly so that students do not

suffer from the school's "hidden curriculum," but rather come to understand how schools work as distinctive social systems.

Models of Interactional Practice

Having reviewed the key components of Bernstein's theory, I want to consider how they form into systems of interactive practice. Two models, with diametrically opposed classification and framing procedures, help to illustrate the effects of the different approaches.

The Performative Model (+C+F).

The first model features strong classification (+C) and strong framing (+F). Here, the role of teacher is clearly distinguishable from the role of student. The learning space is organized to designate the teacher's space as separate from the students' and to elevate various objects which verify the teacher's authority and expertise. Because the framing is strong, the purpose for being in the space has been decided by individuals who are not present. These individuals are policy makers, curriculum writers, and teacher educators who have scripted the instructional discourse (ID), that is the content, sequencing, and assessments that are to be used. Further, they have prescribed the regulative discourse (RD), which is the manner in which the ID is to be accomplished.

In this scenario, the students are to produce evidence, that is *text*, that satisfies the standards established by those in charge of the framing. All students, regardless of their locations, are to utilize the rules of recognition and realization to create the required text. Their results will be compared with other students' in schools across the region. The school whose students produce the strongest text will be praised and prized. This model is arguably the dominant model in schools around the world, both in Bernstein's time and

today. Its uniformity produces a certain predictability and consistency that allows for standardization across systems. At the same time, it ultimately generates a pedagogy that prioritizes conformity and performance.

The Competence Model (-C-F).

Unlike the performance model, the competence model features weak classification and weak framing. The roles of teacher and student are less defined. At times, students hold some of the functions of the teacher. Additionally, the teacher positions herself as a learner, making it obvious to her students that they are teaching her something she did not know before. It is difficult to determine if the teacher has her own desk in the classroom. Here, the walls are covered, not with evidence of the teacher's accomplishments, but with whiteboards adjusted to the students' height. Because the framing is weak, the local education professionals have determined school-wide learning goals and identified the regulative discourse (RD) and the instructional discourse (ID) they require. Students and parents work with teachers to develop students' personal learning goals.

In the competence model, students are expected to produce *texts* that satisfy these learning goals based on local rules of recognition and realization. Students' texts will be evaluated for the competency they reveal. Ideally, students will discover deep satisfaction and joy in the opportunity to grow in learning. Educators from different schools from across the region will gather to share the strategies they are using to develop student competency and discuss what their students are teaching them about being an educator. Participants of the gathering will experience the pride and joy of being an educator.

The two models' differences in classification and framing procedures affect pedagogy. Varying degrees of classification and framing create different conditions, roles, responsibilities, meanings, and opportunities for those engaged in the interactive practice. Certainly, we can begin to imagine the forms of pedagogy that would emerge by combining weak classification and strong framing. There are many possibilities, especially when other dynamics are introduced. The models described above are set to produce pedagogies of performance and competence. The question we can now consider is, how might the features of the model be configured to articulate a pedagogy that promotes the particular aims of Catholic education?

An Integrated Framework

The proposed conceptual framework for the pedagogical theory for Catholic education is informed by the Church's teaching on Catholic education in the context of a Catholic school, a Christian anthropology, and the sociological theory of pedagogy. Each domain represents an essential wisdom that helps anchor the theory as Catholic and pedagogical. First, the Church's teaching on school-based Catholic education provides the theory its objective: *form the person with the values and dispositions necessary to engage in and promote the fullness of the Christian Story and Vision*. Second, Christian anthropology, emphasizing the doctrine of *imago Dei,* responsibility, and grace, designates the human person, who is created with such wondrous complexity, as the focal point of the theory. Last, Bernstein's sociological theory of pedagogy, backed by rigorous academic scholarship and research, contributes the conceptual building blocks that make it possible to articulate the structures, relationships, and priorities of a theory of Catholic

pedagogy. Each domain, on its own, is valuable for the particular tradition and perspective it provides the theory.

However, there is an additional value to be found with these domains. Their integration reflects an important reality. Theology needs an educational theory if it is to be enacted in the social space of a school. Among many things, the theological concepts at work in this project are extraordinarily immense, complex, and amorphous. They require a form that allows them to participate in the "ordinary" interactive human experiences of school. Bernstein's sociological theory of pedagogy provides a structure that is sturdy enough to hold the theological concepts while at the same time flexible enough to allow for their expansive and metaphysical nature. Together, the domains form a conceptual framework that can be developed and adapted to enact the aims of Catholic education.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented the conceptual methodology for a theory of Catholic pedagogy. Earlier chapters surveyed some of the many challenges facing Catholic schools in western society. Principal among them is a diminished philosophical awareness within the debates on Catholic education. Schools are struggling to actualize the principles of Catholic education in their educational programming. Ignatian pedagogy, which prioritizes the processes of learning, seems to incarnate the qualities of Catholic education in ways the curriculum content does not. The proposed theory attempts to espouse the philosophy of Catholic education and to articulate a pedagogical theory for Catholic education that can support contemporary Catholic school practice.

The conceptual methodology features three, mutually reinforcing domains, intended to inform a theory that is consistent with Church teaching and the sociology of education. The first domain, developed from relevant Church documents, establishes the purpose of the proposed theory as the formation of persons who recognize God's activity in their lives and to respond with love and kindness. The second domain promotes the concept of Christian anthropology with a focus on the doctrine of *imago Dei,* responsible relationships, and grace.

The final domain is Bernstein's social theory of pedagogy. Bernstein's theory provides the framework that is adjustable for Catholic education. The structures and systems help make visible the often invisible yet powerful interactions which influence pedagogy. This applies not only to the individual persons involved in the interactive practice, but to the interaction itself. In this way, Bernstein's framework allows me to account for the factors contributing to the individual's experience as well as the factors between the individuals. The synthesis of the three domains help to promote and animate the essential qualities of the theory of Catholic pedagogy, explicated in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

A Pedagogical Theory for Catholic Education

The Church does not *have* an educational program; it *is* an educational program.

--M. Harris, 1989, p. 47, italics original

This chapter claims that Catholic education is a specific kind of education. I am not concerned with "Catholic education" as a type of school, different from a district or charter school. Nor am I concerned with the religious education programming within a Catholic school. My purpose here is to articulate "Catholic education" as a form of education that is deeper than these constructs, and that needs to be understood to achieve the mission of Catholic schools.

As discussed in Chapter Three, I am distinguishing *pedagogy* from *curriculum*. Certainly, pedagogy is tightly interconnected with curriculum. However, I wish to emphasize the methodology over the explicit content in order to show how the method of instruction teaches the essential qualities of a Christian education. In addition, the theory is designed to support learning across the whole school, not just for religion class or the theology department.

I contend that pedagogy is an essential vehicle for transmitting the meaning of Catholic education. Pedagogy, naturally, has its own educative narrative that transmits meaning (Freire, 2000; Gadotti, 1996; Grace, 2002; Lovat & Clement, 2014; Rincón-Gallardo, 2019). The pedagogical theory for Catholic education is one that recognizes this phenomenon and attunes the meaning and messages embedded in the learning process to the meaning and purpose of Catholic education. In other words, the

pedagogical theory presented here aspires to Maria Harris' claim (shown above): the pedagogy is "an educational program" of the Catholic school. How pedagogy accomplishes this is revealed in the theory itself.

Why Pedagogy?

Catholic education belongs to the Christian Story and Vision (Groome, 1991) and it is this story and vision to which students and educators belong. The story has not ended; it is very unresolved. However, the story and its people are struggling. In this current moment of decline in Christian faith in the US (Pew, 2019), the story needs more actors, characters, agents, people who engage with the storyline, question and debate, challenge, steward, and evolve the meaning of the story.

The story does not need more spectators. There are spectators in the story, but without sufficient actors, the story becomes obscure, leaving little to observe. Reflecting on the rapid decline of Christian communities, Groome (2011) writes: "We know we can rely on God's grace to encourage *faith on earth*, but...grace always comes to us as a responsibility--a response-ability" (p. 5). The story needs agents--those with response-ability for the origins, history, and perpetuation of the story and vision (Groome, 1991). While agents can come from many places, they should certainly come from Catholic schools. Catholic schools are responsible for preparing *response-able* students as agents of the Christian story and vision.

Pedagogy is the educative dynamic best suited to this task. Fundamentally, pedagogy is learning *responsibly*. It is the practice of responses and responding in a learning moment. It is the knower in relationship with the learner engaged in an experience of interaction, persons who are open and capable of responding meaningfully

to one another (van Manen, 2016). An engaging pedagogy not only enables a learner to arrive at new understandings, it also encourages a person's ability as a response-maker, allowing the learner to develop the skills and dispositions to become, increasingly, response-*able*. A pedagogy of Catholic education cultivates response-able learners who are prepared to be actors/agents of the Christian story and vision.

Overview of the Chapter

The pedagogical theory for Catholic education is presented in three sections. The first section reviews the building blocks of the theory. I introduce the teacher and the learner, both central actors in the pedagogical exchange, and define the identity of each in ways that go beyond their traditional meanings. This is followed by an overview of Bernstein's (2000) sociological framework. I use his notions of classification and framing to develop the qualities which contribute to the priorities of Catholic education and give the pedagogy its uniquely Catholic value.

The second section introduces pedagogical discourse. It features three movements: a.) composition, a process of preparation; b.) juxtaposition, an experience of discovery and accompaniment, and c.) transposition, an act of realizing learning. Each movement has one layer which relates to the acquisition of practical knowledge and a second layer which pertains to the formation of the participants' spiritual development.

The third and final section presents the pedagogy's text, or outcome. I suggest that the pedagogy produces two interconnected texts: discipleship and an openness to grace. The pedagogical discourse encourages participants to develop dispositions of discipleship while at the same time, actualizes an understanding between them that is enriched by God's grace. The layers of the pedagogical movements yield subtle yet

significant experiences for the participants that foster their sense of discipleship and that nurture their awareness of God's grace in their lives.

A final note: In the explanation of the theory, I have assigned female pronouns to the teacher and male pronouns to the learner. This is done to help distinguish the central actors and their activities in the pedagogical exchange.

Engaging Bernstein's Theory of Pedagogy

The pedagogical theory for Catholic education centers on two or more persons who are engaged in the act of learning. In this way, it resembles the ordinary. Its uniqueness and its meaning dwell within the identities of the persons, the roles they occupy, the responsibilities they hold, the value they are given, and the priorities they reflect. I use Bernstein's (2000) sociological theory of pedagogy to articulate the central features of a theory for Catholic education and the ways in which these features interact with one another. Bernstein's work expresses pedagogy as a system of variables. Each variable holds a value which can be increased or decreased depending on the commitments of those responsible for the pedagogy. This is a critical point. The sociological concepts of Bernstein's theory allow me to shape the variables of this pedagogy in a way that they espouse the particular values of the Catholic tradition.

 I begin with the person and use Bernstein's concept of *classification* to detail who the person is in relationship with others in the act of learning. Next, I describe how the classification is upheld by the *framing*, that is the way in which the message of the education is established. This message is then communicated through the *instructional discourse* and the *regulative discourse.* The latter unfolds through a series of movements: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. The last segment of the theory features the

pedagogy's *text*, as in the outcomes the pedagogy is expected to produce in the person. The pattern of the pedagogy is designed to form the person and the Catholic school community with a thick experience of Catholic education. It centers on the heart of the school's primary activity, learning. On the whole, I follow Bernstein's structure of pedagogical interaction. In an effort to express the elements which make the pedagogy distinctively Catholic, I occasionally depart from Bernstein's terms and explore aspects of the interaction not present in his work.

The Knower/Learner Identity

The two main actors in the theory of Catholic education are the student, or learner, and the teacher. Traditionally, these roles are viewed as separate, with the teacher facilitating the learning and the student receiving the learning. The professional preparation and wisdom represented by the teacher makes the teacher more responsible for the dynamics of learning than the student. Yet the identities of the teacher and student must also account for more than this, for each role contains within itself a portion of both: the teacher is at once a knower and learner, and so is the student. While the pedagogical theory for Catholic education utilizes the terms *teacher* and *learner*, it maintains an interpretation of these roles that is informed by Catholic thought and recognizes each as a learner and a knower. This important distinction requires further discussion.

The Person as Learner

Who is the person in the context of Catholic education? What term captures this person's identity? The common term is *student,* which means, one who studies. By itself, the term is one-dimensional. It reveals little about the person, his nature, his motivation. *Student* takes on meaning when used to distinguish between the one who studies from the

one who has studied and knows, as in the *teacher*. The identity of the person as *student*, non-teacher, is insufficient for the proposed pedagogical theory. It represents a division between the activities of studying and teaching and suggests one cannot occupy both roles simultaneously.

Bernstein (2000) uses the term *acquirer,* which suggests one who is a "collector of knowledge." More than *student*, the term *acquirer* connotes a separation between the person and an external form that is to be obtained. This understanding negates learning that can come from within a learner in the form of internal reflection, traditionally a significant source of wisdom for learning to live a life of faith. Therefore, *acquirer*, like *student*, does not adequately represent the person in the context of Catholic education.

Preferably, I have chosen the term *learner*. Unlike *student* and *acquirer, learner* suggests the development of a whole person through a process and continuous unfolding of understanding. It connotes an openness to discovery, discovery within and beyond oneself. Unlike acquirers who bring external knowledge inward, learners pursue wisdom from inside and outside of the self.

The term *learner* is more akin to a Christian anthropological understanding of the person. This was evident in the educational philosophy of Maritain (1943), who attributed persons with unique "inner learning vitality" that influences their development. Each person is born with this active learning disposition, which is to be identified and nurtured by the educator. More so than the term *students*, learners explore meaning, interpret experience, develop knowledge, and seek relationship with God. Learners wonder, probe, feel, question, reflect and develop knowledge. Learners' minds are naturally active and curious, wired for growth (Maritain, 1943).

The learner identity in Catholic education is the person seeking to know God, to be in relationship with God, and, by God's grace, to learn to respond to the world's great needs and to build the reign of God. Learning is a primary activity and duty of the person, living out her human vocation in light of reason and grace. Yet, even if it is preferable to the term student and acquirer, *learner* still falls short. It neglects a dimension of the person that has to do with his identity and prior knowledge, knowledge that guides and refines learning. In this way, the person is also a knower, an important dimension that can be eclipsed when excessive emphasis is placed upon the role of a learner.

The Person as Knower

A person is born a knower, with instinctual knowledge that informs and can teach others from the moment of birth (Keeping, 2007). This is exemplified in the ways in which an infant's instincts teach her parents how to respond to her needs by parenting. Knowers possess what Maritain (1943) described as "internal resources" (p. 9) which, in time, allows the knower to "proceed from what it already knows to what it does not yet know" (p. 31). A person does not abandon what has already been understood. On the contrary, our knowing, however limited or incomplete, is a crucial aspect of our educative experience and our identity in a learning community.

In a pedagogical context, the knower identity needs regular acknowledgement, voice, and status.[8] This is different from an assessment which emphasizes demonstration or performance of learned skills, once a lesson has been concluded. Acknowledging the

---

[8] Friere's (2000) work acknowledges the knower identity. He recognizes that all persons bring with them what they have already learned from their prior experiences of the world. Describing the characteristics of the oppressed, Freire writes, "Almost never do they realize that they, too, 'know things' they have learned in their relations with the world and with other women and men" (p. 63). The pedagogical model of tutoría, presented in Chapter 5, is in part influenced by Freire and draws on this view of the student.

knower identity is to create space and meaning in the pedagogical discourse for the experiences and wisdom of those participating in learning.

For Catholic education, the knower identity provides both the person and the community with essential knowledge of God's activity and allows the participants of the pedagogy to find themselves reflected in what is being taught. The fullness of creation is revealed and engaged with in Catholic education, which includes the dialogical interaction of the individual with the world. This notion is explained in greater detail in my presentation of the three movements of the pedagogical theory.

The Knower/Learner Identity

The knower/learner identity is the union of the learner dynamic and the knower dynamic of the person. The person is both a knower and a learner and both aspects must be encouraged in Catholic education. Our capacity for curiosity and knowledge, as well as our desire to love and be loved, most clearly and radiantly reflects God's image in us. Learning is a way of discovering God in ourselves and others. As learners, we seek meaning, knowledge, understanding, guidance, and direction with the aim to come to know God. At the same time, we are guided in part by our knowing. As knowers, we use our internal vitality, curiosity, dispositions, experiences and desires to affirm our choices and lead us in our relationship with God.

Freire (2000) also recognized this two-part dynamic with his *teacher-student with students-teachers* concept, fundamental to his liberation pedagogy. Freire argues a teacher's authority and narration of the educative content undermines the students' dignity and ability to gain the essential critical perspective for change. This is undone when "the teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself

taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach" (p. 80). The knower/learner identity is similar to the student-teacher role.

However, I wish to highlight an important distinction between this and the knower/learner identity: Freire's approach perpetuates the categories of teacher and student as two separate actors and their political, or hierarchical, relationship. In this arrangement, each person maintains a primary role while stepping into a secondary role. This is different from the knower/learner concept which affirms each person's primary identity is knower/learner. The knower/learner identity pertains to all actors, in an egalitarian way, emphasizing that each person is always, and at the same time, a knower and a learner.

The Knower/Learner Dynamic: K/l; L/k

In the person, the *knower* and the *learner* maintain a dynamic, mutually reinforcing relationship. The knower cannot advance without the learner, and vice versa. As the learner strengthens, so does the knower. Neither is ever absent, as both are always necessary in the act of learning.

The two dynamics of this identity continuously negotiate the roles of leading and following. This negotiation happens on a personal and social level (discussed in a later next section). On the personal level, the *knower* dynamic leads when one is affirming, validating, and considering one's experiences and understandings. At the same time, the *learner* dynamic accompanies the *knower* dynamic, helping to shape and grow from these experiences.

Borrowing from Bernstein's (2000) pedagogical language, we can code this as *K/l*, upper case "*K*" and lower-case "*l.*" That is, *K/l* symbolizes the knower/learner who is

operating primary as a knower. The reverse expression, *L/k,* reflects the person who is operating primarily as a learner. As one learns (*L*), one continues to be guided and influenced by one's prior knowledge and experience (*k*). The knower/learner dynamic is reinforced by the conditions of the learning environment, in particular by relationships with other knower/learners, but also through the natural world or the build environment.

The designations of *knower* and *learner* are not limited to teacher and student, respectively. A student can assume the role of knower and a teacher can assume the role of learner. This versatility does not diminish the expertise of the teacher, but rather supports a way of participation in the pedagogy that is consistent with the aims of Catholic education.

The coding of this identity has the potential to confuse readers. To mitigate this, I will use "teacher (K/l)" when referring to the Knower-learner and "learner (L/k)" when referring to the Learner-knower. To understand how these distinctive identities come to work themselves out in the social context of pedagogy, we turn to the concept of *classification* (Bernstein, 2000).

Classification and the Knower/Learner Identity

Bernstein's concept of *classification* helps to describe the knower/learner identity in relationship with other knower/learners. Bernstein uses classification as a way to analyze the relationship between the categories of transmitter and acquirer. In his model, the transmitter is separate from the acquirer. The stronger the classification, the greater the distinction between them. Strong classification (+C) pulls authority toward the transmitter and away from the acquirer, creating a "top-down" power structure. Weaker classification (-C) between the transmitter and acquirer distributes authority differently.

The roles become more fluid. Weak classification is necessary for a community of knower/learners. It creates the conditions which allow the knower and the learner identities of each person to be recognized and validated.

Weak classification (-C) is consistent with the pedagogical theory for Catholic education. Chapter Three presented a summary of the Conference of Catholic Education's (1977) document, *The Catholic School.* The brief statement highlights the aims of Catholic education, which include forming in the person the virtues which "will enable [the person] to live a new life in Christ and help [the person] to play faithfully [his/her] part in building up the Kingdom of God" (para. 36). Given that the passage does not explicitly define the person as the teacher or the learner, we can broadly apply the statement to the overarching goal for all people who belong to the school community and that the learning conditions must allow for all people to take part. Weak classification is consistent with these conditions.

Weak classification (-C) encourages the members of a learning community to look beyond conventional categories of who is a teacher and who is a student. The roles become permeable and allow all persons, at various moments, to demonstrate their identities as knowers and learners. It recognizes wisdom in many forms. It fosters the knower/learner identity by allowing all members of the learning community to give who they are to the community and benefit openly from others' knowing. Weak classification creates the conditions necessary to encourage meaningful relationships between all knower/learners. It affirms that each person, inherently, has something to give or teach another person and establishes a fundamental identity of belonging to the entire learning community. Recognizing and realizing both identities becomes the work of framing.

Framing and The Knower/Learner Identity

The knower/learner identity is supported by the pedagogy's *framing. Framing* is Bernstein's (2000) term for the message that shapes the educational program. It is concerned with *who* and *what* controls the message or narrative of the education. It deals with the notion of content and what is taught. However, more than this, its central concern is "how meanings are to be put together" (p. 12). Framing establishes who controls the message and whose perspectives are favored. When framing is strong (+F), the message is determined by "officials" who are remote to the learning environment, such as state-level policy makers and affiliated agencies who establish the curriculum standards for different disciplines (i.e. College Board's Advanced Placement courses). When framing is weak (-F), and the standards allow some flexibility in interpretation by educators or their students, then the message is defined by those who are participating directly in its enactment in the learning environment of a given school.

The message, framed strongly or weakly, influences two systems: the instructional discourse (ID) and the regulative discourse (RD). According to Bernstein, (2000), instructional discourse (ID) consists of the various settings one might use to manage instruction: "selection, sequence, pacing and criteria of the knowledge" (p. 13). The instructional discourse is always "embedded" in the regulative discourse (RD). Regulative discourse establishes the "conduct, character, and manner" of the interactive activity (p. 13). Together, these systems form the pedagogic discourse. We can begin to understand how this unfolds by describing two opposite scenarios of the knower/learner in the pedagogic discourse, one with strong framing, the other with weak.

What happens to the knower/learner identity when framing is strong (+F)? At a fundamental level, strong framing diminishes the role of the knower in the knower/learner identity. Strong framing emphasizes the authority and validity of the official message system and consequently, is not especially interested in the message of those participating in the pedagogy. Their understandings and experiences in the educative activity may even be seen as disruptive, intrusive, or distracting. As the knower identity diminishes, the learner identity increases, and a person's value becomes increasing associated with her responsibility and ability to learn the official message.

The official message comes with expectations for the instructional discourse (ID) and the regulative discourse (RD). ID decisions pertaining to pacing, sequencing and selection of content are made in order to satisfy the requirements of the official message. The RD that pertains to classroom culture and personal behavior are enacted to support the learners' ability to acquire the official message.

The second scenario features weak framing (-F). When framing is weak, the official message of the education, while present to the community, is diminished. It does not control the narrative of the community's education. In its place is the local message which emphasizes and validates the identities of those belonging to the learning community. The narrative is local, particular, unscripted, and relevant. The work of the pedagogical discourse, consisting of the instructional and regulative discourses, belongs to the knower/learners and is adjusted to support their development (as opposed to meeting the expectations of the official message).

Realizing the knower/learner identity requires weak framing (-F). Weak framing creates the conditions necessary for the persons participating in the learning environment

to influence the message and meaning of the educative activities of a school. Instead of the official message dominating the learning experience, weak framing allows a different message to take shape, one that prioritizes the particular questions, ideas, curiosities, ambitions, and desires of those present to the learning activities. Moreover, weak framing can provide the participants with more control over the ID and RD. They can determine how best to engage one another in the learning objectives.

Summary of Key Concepts: Knower/Learner, Classification, and Framing

Before turning to the finer points of the theory, summarizing the components which have been presented thus far will be helpful. The pedagogical theory for Catholic education features the person as knower/learner. This identity is consistent with the Christian anthropological understanding of the person. It emphasizes our human nature that is under-way, in formation and common to all human persons. Unlike the terms teacher/student and acquirer/transmitter, knower/learner operates outside these dichotomies to realize these cooperating aspects in the act of learning.

The theory depends upon weak classification and weak framing. Weak classification allows for greater ambiguity between the categories of knower and learner than does strong classification. Weak classification creates a learning environment with the potential for all persons to contribute to the knowing and learning activities of the community. Weak framing creates the conditions necessary for the members of the community to shape the meaning of the education programing. It increases the opportunities and responsibilities of the knower/learner in the learning process. We shall see how these opportunities and responsibilities align with Christian anthropology and foster the aims of Catholic education.

Pedagogical Discourse

Pedagogical discourse is a dimension of framing. According to Bernstein (2000), the weaker the framing the greater the potential for the pedagogical discourse to be determined by those gathered for the interactive activity. The pedagogical theory for Catholic education features weak framing, holding all knower/learners responsible for the pedagogical discourse. This approach creates a qualitatively different experience for the learner/knower and helps to reveal the Catholic nature of the pedagogical theory.

As we can recall, pedagogical discourse consists of two complementary discourses: instructional (ID) and regulative (RD). The former determines instructional practices such as pace, sequence, duration, and the terms for assessing learning. The latter pertains to the manner in which the instruction unfolds, attending to the conventions of the learning: who speaks, who listens, who sits in the front, who sits in the back, who sits with whom, and how order is maintained. The participants of the activity agree upon the terms of the instructional discourse (ID) and work together to develop the regulative discourse (RD). The RD plays a critical role in conveying the Catholic qualities of the pedagogy and therefore requires careful analysis.

The Movements of the Pedagogical Discourse

Groome's Shared Christian Praxis

Before proceeding with the movements of the proposed pedagogical theory for Catholic education, it is necessary to consider the contributions of Thomas Groome and his theory of "shared Christian praxis." He defines shared Christian praxis as:

A participative and dialogical pedagogy in which people reflect critically on their own historical agency in time and place and on the sociocultural reality, have

access together to Christian Story/Vision, and personally appropriate it in community with the creative intent of renewed praxis in Christian faith toward God's reign for all creation. (p. 135)

Groome's (1991) shared Christian praxis is a pedagogical methodology that invites Christians to bring the experiences of their life to bear on their faith and vice versa. The focusing activity calls participants into personal praxis, a "consciousness" or "awareness," in order to call their attention to something that is about to happen and help them gain an awareness of God's active presence and desire to be with them through the movements that follow. It can take the form of an artifact or a symbol as well as an event such as a nature walk. Overall, the focusing activity recognizes God's activity in the present moment, ignites personal and shared praxis, and engages and validates reflective and communal participation. These reflections provide the substance for Movement 1.

Movement 1, *Naming/Expressing "Present Praxis"* asks participants to voice their current understandings or experiences of the focusing activity. This step allows participants to "share and test our representation of our historical consciousness and to have it further enlightened in a faith community if it is to be a reliable source of God's self-disclosure and if our faith is to be a communal one" (p. 179). The participants' expressions of historical consciousness provide the entry point for deeper reflection in Movement 2.

Movement 2, *Critical Reflection on Present Praxis*, helps participants arrive at their own "critical appropriation of present praxis" in terms of his/her "place, and time...to share in dialogue their own stories and visions" (p. 147). Through dialogue, participants articulate what is happening in their lives as it relates to the focusing activity.

This stage engages the Christian conviction that "God's word is always for a people, and its interpretation is best discerned and tested in the midst of a community of faith" (p. 198). Questions from a facilitator guide the dialogue and cultivate a shared expression of God's presence in the participants' lives. This awareness is explored in the wider Christian Story/Vision in Movement 3.

The purpose of Movement 3, *Making Accessible Christian Story and Vision,* is to situate the expressions of the opening movements in both the Story and Vision of Christian faith. Participants acknowledge that God's continuous self-disclosure has real meaning in their lives. Participants are led by a "designated educator" who "interprets and explains the aspects of Christian community Story/Vision as appropriate to the generative theme(s)...in dialogue with the stories/visions of participants" (p. 223). Participants interpret their critical reflections from the previous movements in light of the Christian Story and the challenges of the Christian vision.

Movement 4, *Dialectical Hermeneutic to Appropriate Christian Story/Vision to Participants' Stories and Visions,* invites participants to consider how their critical reflection relates to the Christian Story/Vision. It is a process that encourages them to "judge and come to see for themselves how their lives are shared by it and how they are to be reshapers of its historical realization in their place and time" (p. 250). This movement is marked by freedom and personal agency that invites participants to grapple with the Christian Story/Vision in order to come to know for themselves what their experiences mean. Their synthesis or "appropriation" leads to decision making in Movement 5.

At this moment, participants consider what has emerged from the shared Christian praxis and what difference it makes in their lives. Movement 5, *Decision/Response for Lived Christian Faith,* returns participants to praxis with "the added conviction that people's renewed choice and effort to live their faith in place and time is a heightened source of God's ongoing revelation in their lives and community" (p. 272). Decision-making activities help form the participants' "identity and character as agents of God's reign" and "encourage ongoing Christian conversion that is intellectual, moral, religious, and social" (p. 292). Movement 5 affirms the participants' role as agent-subjects to bring about the Vision in the world.

Groome's (1991) Shared Christian Praxis is a powerful approach for handing on faith and has deeply influenced my own understanding of pedagogy and faith formation. Its design is intended for Christian religious education, though it has been applied to other disciplines (Meehan, 2007). Catholic schools, with their broader educational charge, require a more general theory of pedagogy. In this dissertation, I propose a new pedagogical theory with three movements that are relevant for every subject area and grade level.

I borrow the term *movement* from Groome (1991) to promote some similarity between the stages of his model of shared Christian praxis and my proposed pedagogy for Catholic education: "[Movement]," Groome writes, "implies that shared praxis is a free-flowing process to be orchestrated, much like the movements of a symphony or a dance" (p. 146). Similarly, the pedagogy for Catholic education requires a degree of freedom and a degree of design. Moreover, like Shared Christian Praxis, there is movement, or momentum, to the proposed pedagogy. Leading the person and the community from one

manner of being to another is the intention of the model. More specifically, it is designed to move the members of a Catholic school from a *thin* awareness to a *thick* experience of God's activity and empower them as actors in the Christian Story and Vision (Groome, 1991).

The Three Movements of the Discourse

The movements of my proposed pedagogy for Catholic education are *composition, juxtaposition,* and *transposition.* Each represents an essential moment for those participating in any interactive educational activity. My alignment with Groome (1991) over the use of the term *movement* is a departure from Bernstein (2000), whose comparatively static work does not acknowledge the movements or stages of an interactive and historically unfolding activity such as pedagogy.

Bernstein's discussion of regulative discourse (RD), as described previously, introduces the rules of *recognition* and *realization*. These rules describe the degree to which the learning is understood (recognized) by the participants and their ability to demonstrate (realize) this learning. Both rules are included in the new pedagogical theory for Catholic education, appearing in the second and third movements. In what follows, I describe the meaning of each movement along with the responsibilities and opportunities of the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k).

Composition.

The word *composition* comes from the Latin word *componere*, meaning "to put together, to collect a whole from several parts" (*Composition | Search Online Etymology Dictionary*, n.d.). Composition, then, is creative, developing wholeness out of separate things. It is not a replication of something that already exists; rather it is the creation of

something original, the coming together of different parts, intentionally combined, and unified in a manner to produce a new idea or expression. Compositions need composers who create the new ideas, who arrange and sequence meaning, and who anticipate and influence the manner in which they are to be experienced by others.

Composition of Lesson.

Composition is the first movement of any interactive educational activity. It features the creative work done by educators and learners in preparation for learning together. There are two goals to this movement. The first is to compose a learning experience to share with others. A learning experience is a carefully arranged, or composed, lesson that utilizes a teacher's (K/l) knowledge. There are both personal and social aspects to composing the lesson. Beginning with the personal, the teacher (K/l) turns inward to uncover the story (L/k) of how she learned the particular concept that is to be featured in her lesson. She considers what she knows about it and how she has come to this knowledge. She reflects on the stages of her own progress in learning the concept. She recalls the ways in which she uses the concept, what other understandings are necessarily related to it, what intrigues her about the concept, and what its essential elements are.

Having recovered this story from memory, she envisions how she can best share her knowledge with others (L/k $\rightarrow$ K/l). Her composition then takes into account the terms of the instructional discourse (ID) as well as her past experiences teaching and learning with others. From this she arranges her composition in a manner that honors the L/k identity of those with whom she will share the lesson. She designs her composition with intentional spaces to invite the learner (L/k) to influence the lesson. The teacher

(K/l) considers the learners (L/ks), the potential knowledge they bring to the interaction, and their particular style of learning and communicating. These qualities refer to the "inner vitality" (Maritain, 1943) of the persons to be taught. The lesson is composed with the story of the teacher (K/l) and her vision of sharing the lesson with learners (L/ks). The teacher (K/l) partners with learners (L/ks) to bring full expression to the lesson. Her composition remains incomplete, unresolved until the next movement, when it is animated by her juxtaposition with the learners (L/ks).

Composition of Self.

The second goal of *Composition* is to compose the self. This applies to both the teacher (K/l) who will lead the lesson and the learner (L/k) who will receive the lesson. Each person must prepare for learning with another. There is a personal and social aspect to this composition. The personal requires each participant to prepare to receive and respond to the interactive learning that is to unfold. From a theological point of view, participants are invited to a spiritual act of personal preparation, similar to how one might begin prayer. It is an intentional moment that summons one's awareness of the sacredness waiting to be encountered in another. In academic disciplines less inclined to this language, I am describing a moment of consciousness raising in order to create an openness in the ways in which one responds to another.

Saint Ignatius of Loyola, founder of the Jesuits, encouraged a similar discipline, which he termed *compositio loci*, or composition of place. Ignatius believed the imaginative technique helped retreatants situate themselves in an historical moment of the Scriptures, which prepared them to encounter Jesus (Standaert, 2007). According to Juliano Ribeiro Almeida (2019), composition of place allows the practitioner to "be

focused on the mystery that is about to be contemplated…." (p. 48). For not only is this an exchange among teachers and learners, it is an encounter among those created in the image and likeness of God. And as each person is a potential mediator of God, each person must recognize how the encounter can provide an experience of God. Standaert (2007) writes, "the composition of place...is a special occasion for facilitating this encounter" (p. 7).

In a similar way, teachers and learners must engage in a suitable form of active reflection to prepare a place within themselves for this encounter. Being with others to learn is the opportunity to deepen and enrich our personal composition. To do so, each participant must compose him/herself with humility, openness, curiosity, and attentiveness.

The social aspect of the composition of self is perhaps more trying. In order to participate meaningfully in the pedagogical discourse, the person must be in right relationship with those around him or her. In the context of a Catholic school community, teachers and learners are more than colleagues and classmates. They are, in the Gospel sense, neighbors with which one enters into communion with God. In Luke Chapter 10, Jesus commands his disciples to "love your neighbor as yourself." He then illustrates the meaning of this relationship with the parable of the Good Samaritan. The lesson is powerful; to be in relationship with God, our response to one another must be merciful, compassionate, patient, loving, and generous. This is something those in the parable who pass by the injured man fail to see as they believe it might compromise their ability to worship at Temple.

The lessons of the Good Samaritan are consistent with the earlier discussion of Christian anthropology and the responsibility we are granted as persons created in the image and likeness of God. The neighborly relationship, then, must be realized among the gathering of teachers and learners, which includes the teacher. Conflicts must be quelled and forgiveness must be sought and given. A spirit of understanding and peace must exist among the participants, in order to engage fully in the next movements of the pedagogical discourse.

Composition is a critical movement of preparation for Catholic pedagogy. It creates the necessary preconditions to promote learning that is reflective, creative, aware, and sacred. During this movement, teachers and learners compose lessons, as well as themselves. They fulfil the purpose of this movement when they have determined meaningful ways to share their knowledge with others, designed opportunities for listening and interaction, and resolved any lingering conflicts and persistent misunderstandings. This movement concludes as the participants organize into distinct groups made up of those who will guide the interactive activity, the teachers (K/l), and those who will be guided, the learners (L/k). They are then ready for the second movement: juxtaposition.

Juxtaposition.

Juxtaposition is an occurrence of meaning making. In the context of the pedagogical discourse, the meaning is a result of the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k) joining together, being juxtaposed, to engage the composition. The word *juxtaposition* comes from the Latin word *ixtua* meaning ""beside, very near, close to, near at hand" and the French word *posicion* meaning "position" (*Juxtaposition | Search Online Etymology*

Dictionary, n.d.). Contemporary uses emphasize the creative effect of placing two or more things side by side.

In this line of thinking, each on its own, carries its own meaning, or essence. When juxtaposed, they form something new together, something that each is not on its own. Additionally, regardless of the physical arrangement of elements being juxtaposed, one is not more important than the other. Their presence shares equal value--in a manner similar to the Socratic dialect--even if one exists in a relationship of contradiction or tension with the other. Before getting to specific juxtapositions in a school environment-- such as the interaction between the teacher and the learner--I want to explore the way in which parables and worship are forms of juxtaposition in the Christian story and vision. Both of these intertwined notions are required to explain the nature of the juxtaposition movement of the pedagogical discourse and merit closer consideration.

Parables as Juxtaposition.

Linguistically the word *juxtaposition* is related to *parable*. Parable comes from the Greek word, *parabolē* meaning a throwing (*bolē*) alongside (*para*) (*Parable | Origin and Meaning of Parable by Online Etymology Dictionary*, n.d.). Each term shares the notion of putting separate things in proximity to one another. In a parable, these separate things are put together to create a short story. The purpose of this, Kilgallen (2008) suggests, "is to make clearer one of those two things" (p. 12).

As a pedagogical device used by Jesus with his followers, *parable* resonates deeply within the Christian tradition of learning (Crossan, 1992; Meier, 2013; Pagola, 2013). Interpreting and authenticating the parables associated with Jesus has long consumed biblical scholars (Eck, 2016). However, according to Pagola (2013), most

agree that Jesus' parables were a powerful yet simple form of teaching for his day (p. 135).

Jesus was a master teacher and storyteller (Groome, 2011; Kilgallen, 2008; Pagola, 2013). He created parables with images and comparisons to captivate his listeners and help them understand the reign of God. He told many stories although less than 40 have been preserved (Pagola, 2013). The parables related to the everyday lives of Jesus' listeners to help them experience the nearness of God. Consider the parable of the woman who lost a coin:

> Or what woman, if she has ten silver coins and loses one coin, does not light a lamp and sweep the house and search carefully until she finds it? When she has found it, she calls together her friends and neighbors, saying, 'Rejoice with me, for I have found the coin which I had lost!' (Luke 15:8-9, NASB)

Though brief, this parable conveys a great deal. Jesus' listeners would easily classify the woman as poor, possessing so little money. Yet, they would also understand the effort she makes to reclaim the fraction of what she has lost. This small amount of little value, for the woman, is of great worth. So much so that when she finds the coin, she deems it an occasion to celebrate and shares the moment with friends and neighbors.

Jesus concludes the parable with, "In the same way, I tell you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner who repents" (Luke 15:10, NASB). Biblical scholar, José Pagola's (2013) reflective commentary on the parable helps us to imagine this moment for Jesus's followers:

> That's what God does! He is like that poor woman who searches for her coin and is overcome by joy when she finds it. What might have little value for us, is a

treasure for her...the listeners are surprised. A few women are moved to tears. Is

God like that? Are...the lost souls and sinners who mean so little to certain

religious leaders, so much loved by God? (p. 150)

While we do not know for certain the full effect of the parable on Jesus' listeners,

Pagola's analysis highlights a key element of parable. Teaching with parables

communicates meaning and understanding in ways that other teaching methods cannot.

Jesus could have simply told the crowd that day, "God cares about everyone." What

difference would this statement have made in their lives? Instead, he teaches them with a

parable, crafted in a way that respects the conditions of their lives, their anxieties, their

hopes. As they listen, they realize the story is for them; they see themselves in it. They

recognize themselves in the experience of the woman. It triggers their imagination and

speaks to them: *A woman's poverty is also her treasure. Even the smallest fraction of*

one's poverty has great worth. Yes, of course we would make every effort to restore what

has been lost. What relief and joy we would feel. God feels this way for us? Their

experience of the parable speaks to their lives. It produces meaning that is unique and

personal to each listener. And still, there are things that emerge in this experience that

cannot be expressed.

The occasion of juxtaposition in the second movement of the pedagogical

discourse operates in a way similar to parable. As participants of the interactive activity

engage in learning, they encounter new stories of familiar things. The teacher (K/l) makes

fresh what the learner (L/k) has some familiarity with, what he has experienced, not to

introduce new ideas or concepts (that comes in the third movement), but to rekindle a

connection between the learner (L/k) and what he already knows and has experienced. In

this way, the teacher (K/l) is putting the learner (L/k) in touch with his knower identity. Before turning to the ways in which the interactive activity unfolds, we consider the notion of worship as another form of juxtaposition.

Worship as Juxtaposition.

The concept of juxtaposition has been used to interpret the ways in which the very structure of worship creates meaning for Christians (Bradshaw, 1992; Lathrop, 1998; Schmemann, 1975). The work of Lutheran theologian, Gordon Lathrop (1998) is particularly compelling. Lathrop draws on the effects of juxtaposition as he seeks to renew the Christian worship experience. While there are important differences between a Catholic school classroom and a Christian house of worship, Lathrop's scholarship demonstrates the creative, spiritual value of juxtaposition for rekindling worship and experiencing God. Given the aims of my new pedagogical theory, to rekindle Catholic education and increase knower/learners' awareness of God, Lathrop is a helpful resource for the second movement of the pedagogical discourse. His work centers on the structure of the *ordo*, that is the "way meaning occurs in Christian worship" (p. 33). He argues that in a Christian assembly, meaning is created through juxtaposition, "by one thing set next to another" (p. 33). The creative effect of this juxtaposition, Lathrop states, is transcendence:

> When the liturgy is at its best, with strong signs set in the strong juxtaposition of the *ordo*, it roots us in a place, a limited, local, real place. Its 'away from here,' its movement toward transcendence, calls us toward God's promised grace for the world we know, not toward escape. (p. 214)

Lathrop's aspirations for the liturgy are applicable to Catholic education. When Catholic education is at its best, it creates an experience that simultaneously meets us where we are and draws us closer to God, it strengthens us to live joyfully and not hide from the challenges of the world. In the interactive experience of pedagogy, the juxtaposition of knower/learners creates this meaning. It is created at two levels, the practical and the spiritual.

The Teacher:Learner Interaction.

Having described the concept of juxtaposition, we now turn to the particulars of this movement demonstrated in the interactive practice between the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k). According to Bernstein (2000), the interactive practice is characterized by classification and framing procedures (p. 17). In the context of the Catholic pedagogy, the weak classification (-C) between teacher and learner is highly visible. We may not be able to readily distinguish between who is guiding and who is being guided in the learning interaction. We also will observe weak framing (-F) as the identities and personalities of the participants are highly visible in the exchange and all voices support the interactive practice.

Interactive practice is the juxtaposition of the teacher (K/l) with the learner (L/k). They are placed alongside one another. Both parties have prepared for the juxtaposition. Stemming from the first movement, they greet one another, composed with an openness and awareness of what the interaction might yield. The ratio of teacher (K/l) to learner (L/k) may be as small as one to one (and should remain small in order to facilitate a sense of togetherness--juxtaposition-- between the actors of the pedagogical discourse). They come to the interaction, carrying their own stories, their own identities. The teacher (K/l)

commences to share her composition with the learner (L/k). Together they form a learning relationship. As they enter into dialogue, one leads and the others follow. One role is not more powerful than the other. Rather, they interact as equals, partners, co-creators. Who is the Knower/learner without a Learner/knower? What is a leader without a follower? They depend on each other to fulfill the purpose of the pedagogy.

Recognition Rule.

The primary goal of the juxtaposition movement is *recognition*. Bernstein (2000) uses the term *recognition rule* to describe the "means by which individuals are able to recognize the speciality of the context that they are in" (p. 16). Recognition, for Bernstein, is an essential orientation of sorts that occurs only at the level of the acquirer, attempting to familiarize the acquirer with the concepts being taught by the transmitter. It is the responsibility of the acquirer to develop this field of reference in the given lesson.

For Catholic pedagogy, the *recognition rule* differs from Bernstein's interpretation in two ways. First, it applies to all participants in the interactive activity, not just the learner (L/k) (Bernstein's *acquirer*). Stronger classification decreases the extent to which the teacher (K/l) is responsible for the learner's (L/k's) ability to recognize the content being shared. Weaker classification, as is the case with the pedagogy for Catholic education, increases the role and responsibility of the teacher (K/l) for empowering the learner's (L/k's) field of reference.

Second, the recognition rule has two dimensions: the practical and the spiritual. Because both participants are responsible for establishing the recognition rule, they rely on each other to create this context of learning. As the teacher (K/l) shares her composition with her partnering learner (L/k), he probes, questions, and ponders,

marking common and familiar territory. Additionally, the teacher (K/l) is noting important gaps in the learner's (L/k's) understanding. She asks, *Do you recognize what this is? Can you explain why this is? How have you experienced something like this before?* This approach validates the knower identity of the learner (L/k), directly inviting him into the interactive practice. As the learner (L/k) responds, the teacher (K/l) listens, reflects, and asks new questions that incorporate what the learner (L/k) has just shared. The learner (L/k) answers, signaling where he is in response to this question and gives the teacher (K/l) more information on the learner's (L/ks') location.

Through this dialogical interaction, the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k) establish the *recognition rule*. With the learner's (L/k's) field of reference now in view, the teacher (K/l) commences her composition, proceeding from the learner's (L/k's) location. She presents new knowledge and invites the learner (L/k) to move toward it and scrutinize it. Throughout the interaction, the teacher (K/l) remains skillfully attuned to the manner of thinking and gaps in the learner's (L/k's) understanding and offers him opportunities to make personal comparisons with the knowledge she is sharing. Together, they guide the learner (L/k) toward new awareness, new meanings, and new connections with what he already knows.

In this way, the practical dimension of the recognition rule operates like Jesus' use of parable. The master storyteller juxtaposed what the audience already knew (field of reference), with what Jesus knew (composition) of the reign of God. Putting their understanding next to his understanding, Jesus created deeply personal and profound, challenging and joyful, experiences of learning. So far, we have considered the ways in which the juxtaposition of the teacher (K/l) with the learner (L/k) produces the

recognition rule, sharing knowledge and generating learning together. This type of recognition helps facilitate pragmatic learning. Catholic education, however, is also spiritual learning that invites us to discover our nature, our divine anthropology, and helps us learn how to be in relationship with God.

The spiritual dimension of the recognition rule is more difficult to perceive, yet no less present, than the practical dimension. The spiritual recognition rule is recognizing and affirming the sacredness of the other in the pedagogic discourse. Like the juxtaposition created in the *ordo* of worship described above (Lathrop, 1998), the interaction roots each person in the moment, forming a sense of here and now. Notions of individuality, personal control, and distinctiveness are overcome by a sense of unity, vulnerability, and connection. Participants lose track of time as they become more and more present to one another in the moment. As they probe and explore the educative terrain of the teacher's (K/l's) composition together, they slowly and imperceptibly establish the spiritual dimension of recognition rule. Internally, this can be experienced by participants through interspiritual encounters of mutual dialogue. *I see you. I care about you. Your understanding depends upon my understanding. My knowing is bound up in your knowing. My learning is bound up in your learning. My joy in knowing is complete in your joy of learning. My joy in learning is complete in your joy of knowing.* The juxtaposition provides participants with a profound recognition of their shared human dignity. Moreover, it allows each one to participate in an experience of God's grace, described in the Chapter's final section.

The primary purpose of the juxtaposition movement is for the participants of the interactive practice to establish the recognition rule. The recognition rule, as applied to

the pedagogical theory for Catholic education, establishes two understandings. First, it clarifies the learner's (L/k's) field of reference of the topic presented in the composition. This is the practical dimension of the recognition rule, which operates similarly to Jesus' use of parable. Jesus conveyed his understanding of God to his followers by creating stories with experiences and challenges which were familiar and common.

Second, it reveals a profound yet common connection between the participants, their shared human nature and divine relationship. Like the ordering of certain elements of worship, the placing together of these persons, their unique juxtaposition, in the effort to communicate meaning and understanding, creates the conditions for each person to recognize the sacredness within the other. This is the spiritual dimension of the recognition rule. The recognition rule, according to Bernstein (2000), is necessarily followed by the *realization rule*, the central purpose of the third movement, *transposition.*

Transposition.

Transposition is the third and final movement of the new pedagogical discourse. It centers on the changes produced by the interactive practice of the pedagogy. These changes involve both the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k), with minor distinctions.

Before describing these changes, I want first to define transposition and explain how it functions in the pedagogical discourse. Transposition comes from the Latin word for transpose, *trans*--meaning "beyond, over" and *ponere*--which means "to put or to place" (*Online Etymology Dictionary*, n.d.). It is a change in position, involving the movement of something from one place to another, beyond the original place. This is

done not in a superficial way, but rather in a way that the thing is established in a new place or holds a new position.

The word *transposition* is used in a wide variety of fields and contexts. In mathematics, transposition involves transferring quantities from one side of an equation to the other, while maintaining balance or equality between both sides. Transposition in the field of electricity deals with the reorganization of power lines to maintain proper levels of electrical charge while minimizing the potential danger of multiple lines in proximity to each other. These examples illustrate the notion of transposition as transfer, which is especially evident in the field of music.

Transposition and Music.

Music offers a highly useful example of transposition for the pedagogical theory for Catholic education. It describes the act of placing a piece of music, a composition, in a different key. This is commonly done to make the piece more accessible to a musician. For instance, a composition is transposed to reflect the vocal range of the singer who is performing the piece. Alternately, because some keys are more difficult to play than others, a musician might transcribe a composition to make the piece easier to play. Transposition provides musicians with ways to express a composition that is suitable to their instrument and skill. It places something that was out of reach within reach in a way that allows the performer to sing or play along. Transposition then, is intended to:

> maintain the relationship between notation and execution (fingering etc.) among instruments of a similar kind but of different pitch. The music is therefore written in a transposition whereby a player may read it in the same manner for each instrument in the group. (Baines & Page, 2001)

Transposition does not change the nature of a composition; it is the same melody in a different key. The two compositions--one original the other transposed--correspond as the same song. One final note on music transposition: while compositions can be transposed by any trained musician, it is generally understood to be the responsibility of the performers to make the necessary adjustments based on their instrument and skill. In this way, the performers engage the composition thoroughly, adjusting each note according to the new key. The performers' success is revealed audibly in their performance of the composition, when they demonstrate how well the transposition corresponds to the original composition.

Transposition as Correspondence Between Systems.

The notion of correspondence is important to shaping our understanding of transposition. Here, the writing of British author and theologian C. S. Lewis (1898-1963) is illuminating. In a sermon entitled *Transposition* given on Pentecost Sunday, 1944, Lewis (2015) explored the ways in which the spiritual and divine realm correspond to the natural and human experience. He wrote, "Our problem was that in what claims to be our spiritual life all the elements of our natural life recur: and, what is worse, it looks at first glance as if no other elements were present" (p. 10). If we proceed in a way that ignores the spiritual dimension of our existence, we settle for an inferior analysis and understanding of our lived experiences. Lewis referred to this inferior approach as a lower medium or poorer system.

Transposition, however, offers us a different understanding of our lowly experiences; it gives us access to a higher system, richer and fuller. Lewis illustrated his idea by pointing to the ways in which the two systems of communication correspond,

such as a full orchestral score transposed into a piano score and a three-dimensional sculpture rendered with ink and pen on a two-dimensional sheet of paper. Here, the richer systems of the orchestral score and sculpture are recast into the poorer systems of the piano score and ink drawing. Lewis (2015) explains, "Transposition occurs whenever the higher reproduces itself in the lower" (p. 9).

While Lewis maintains that transposition is generally a movement of the higher system to the lower system, he acknowledges the opposite is possible:

> I said before that in your drawing you had only plain white paper for sun and cloud, snow, water, and human flesh. In one sense, how miserably inadequate! Yet in another, how perfect. If the shadows are properly done that patch of white paper will, in some curious way, be very like blazing sunshine: we shall almost feel cold while we look at the paper snow and almost warm our hands at the paper fire. (pp. 12-13)

In this example, the lower system consisting of simple lines sketched on white paper corresponds powerfully, *realistically*, with its higher system, to that which is drawn. When our limited use of the lower system corresponds with the higher system, as described in the above examples, we move toward the higher system, narrowing the gap between the two systems. What was vague becomes bold; what was thin becomes thick. Our efforts to live with Christian faith, according to Lewis, is the effort to use our lower, poorer system with a desire to participate in the higher, richer system, continuously hoping that these two systems are never too far apart and can be overcome through divine grace.

As this discussion has shown, the concept of transposition is layered and dynamic. As a mathematical concept, transposition is the re-positioning of a quantity from one side of an equation to the other while maintaining equality between the two sides. Transposition of power lines helps maintain safe levels of electrically charged cables running parallel to one another. In music, transposition is changing the key, or voice, of a composition while maintaining the original melody. Transposing is done by the musician and enables her to play the composition according to her instrument and skill. The fourth example, provided by Lewis (2015), explores transposition as the correspondence between the spiritual and divine, on the one hand, and the natural and human, on the other. Lewis argues for the existence of both systems and our ability to realize the spiritual and divine "system" through our limited efforts available to us in the natural and human "system." These various expressions of transformation are essential for an incarnational religion such as Catholicism and they contribute to our understanding of the third movement of the pedagogical discourse.

The Teacher:Learner Interaction.

The transposition movement relies on the two prior movements of composition and juxtaposition. As we can recall, the composition movement involves preparation for the learning that is to be shared and the preparation of the persons who will engage in the pedagogy. The latter preparation involves both a personal composing the self and a social composing or reconciling of right relationships with one's community of fellow knower/learners. Juxtaposition, the second movement, initiates with putting teachers (K/ls) alongside learners (L/ks) to engage the composition and establish the recognition rule. Through their interaction, they come to recognize not only the learner's (L/k's) field

of reference and relationship to the material featured in the composition, but also recognize their common dignity and connection. As the juxtaposition movement progresses, the participants of the interaction reach the third movement of transposition.

Realization Rule.

Recognition leads to the discovery of new ideas and concepts that require appropriation. Thus, the primary goal of the transposition movement is establishing the *realization rule*. According to Bernstein (2000), the realization rule stems from the recognition rule: "The recognition rule, essentially, enables appropriate realisations to be put together. The realisation rule determines how we put meanings together and how we make them public" (p. 17). Once they establish the recognition rule, the teacher (K/l) invites the learner (L/k) to look beyond what is known (the field of reference) and guides him toward new ideas. For these ideas to be of use, they need to be realized, intentionally, in the learner's (L/k's) widening field of reference and shared with the world.

The realization rule is a critical aspect of the learning process. Persons who possess the recognition rule but lack the realization rule are able to memorize, recite, or describe the elements of a literary theory or geometric proof, but are unable to evaluate the ideas they represent. They can only replicate or mimic that which is given. They recognize the concepts but are missing critical agency in regard to any independent interpretation of the ideas they have been taught. Moreover, they do not know how to bring their knowledge into the public space; it remains encapsulated in the school.

The absence of the realization rule, Bernstein (2000) claims, reinforces strong classification and strong framing in learning environments:

Many children of the marginal classes may indeed have a recognition rule, that is, they can recognise the power relations in which they are involved, and their position in them, but they may not possess the *realisation rule...* For these children, the experience of school is essentially an experience of the classificatory system and their place in it. (p. 17)

Without the realization rule, classification is strengthened and the division between those with power and those without power widens. Moreover, framing strengthens as the perspective of those with power in the pedagogical encounter dominates the meaning and messaging of what is taught. In order to accomplish the goals of Catholic education and its attendant aspirations of maintaining weak classification and weak framing, pedagogical discourse must enable the participants of the interaction to establish the realization rule. Without this, knowledge remains static and privatized, which violates the dynamic and dialogic concept of personhood essential to Catholicism.

My proposal is that this can be done through transposition, which designates the process of developing and strengthening the realization rule for both the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k). Like the recognition rule, it occurs both practically and spiritually. We begin with the practical. As the teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) progress through the composition, the teacher (K/l) presents the building blocks of what she knows to the (learner) L/k.[9] The interaction takes on a new purpose. No longer is the teacher (K/l) trying to establish the learner's (L/k's) field of reference. She is introducing something new. She presents an idea that belongs to the field of reference of which the learner (L/k)

---

[9] The L-k encounters these building blocks and he too presents some of his understanding and meanings to the K-l in return. Because the L-k is in the dominant learner role, these are typically less substantive than the K-l's understandings and meanings.

is unaware, something that he did not know existed or that he had a vague notion of. She draws his attention to this idea. She asks him if he can explain it: *Can you demonstrate that you recognize what I am showing you*?

Most classroom learning contexts end here with an assessment of recognition. Students are given a test to prove that they have paid attention and studied the information provided by their teacher. This demonstration is followed by the introduction of new information: the next chapter of the textbook, the next element on the periodic table or a new set of irregular verbs. Absent is the opportunity for students to appropriate or *transpose* the knowledge with their own critical thought, curiosities, and experiences. Nor is there any effort made to transpose this new knowledge into the world beyond the school, which is essential to the trajectory in Catholic faith towards the manifestation of the reign of God.

In the pedagogical theory for Catholic education, the recognition rule is followed by the realization rule. Here the teacher asks numerous questions that move dialogue beyond recapitulation. *Can you demonstrate that you recognize what I am showing you*? is followed by, *What do you think about this? How do you make sense of it in terms of what you already know?* Here, the interaction begins to transition from recognition to realization. And instead of the teacher (K/l) explaining why the idea is important or how it relates to the field of knowledge, she expects the learner (L/k) to do so. In response, the learner (L/k) begins to transpose the building blocks of the knowledge into his own voice, his own register. In this way, his effort to realize the knowledge operates in a manner similar to music transposition.

The transposition of the practical knowledge resembles the transposition of music in three ways. First, the learner (L/k) transposes the knowledge, that is the melody, in a manner consistent with the original composition. He must analyze, interpret, and express the values of the notes in a way that is true to the composition. Second, his transposition is both consistent with and unique to the original composition. The process of transposing requires both faithfulness and innovation. The musician must demonstrate a loyalty to the original composition yet he cannot help doing so without expressing his unique sound, ability, skill, and vitality. The ideas contained in the composition are appropriated by his identity and create a unique expression of the melody. Third, the musician's transposition does not diminish the original composition. On the contrary, he animates the composition and gives it meaning and relevance in the present moment. In a similar way, the learner (L/k) not only develops a new understanding of what he has been given to learn, he also develops his own relationship with it.

The teacher (K/l) supports the learner (L/k) as he engages new ideas and appropriates them into his prior ways of knowing. As a result, the knowledge of the teacher (K/l) is quite literally *transposed*--placed beyond herself and with the learner (L/k). In time, the learner (L/k) will attain an understanding of the composition strong enough for him to become a teacher (K/l) of the knowledge. As a result, his identity is *transposed* from Learner/knower to Knower/learner.[10] In return, the learner's (L/k's) realization of the composition provides the teacher (K/l) with additional practical knowledge: the learner's (L/k's) transposition is didactic, reflecting back to the teacher

---

[10] This notion is explored in more detail in the following section.

(K/l) a unique interpretation of her composition and with it the opportunity to appreciate the composition in a new way.

Once again, there is more being transposed than the practical knowledge of the composition. There is the spiritual dimension of the realization rule. We return to Lewis' theory of transposition, which helps to illustrate this. Lewis acknowledges two systems: a lower, poorer system and a higher, richer system. When sculpture, belonging to one system, is meaningfully rendered with ink on a flat piece of paper, a different system, a correspondence is realized between them. When the two systems correspond, we find that we can participate in both; we know the sculpture from the sketch and vice versa and we comprehend the relationship between them. It is important, however, to approach Lewis' insistence on hierarchy of the systems with due circumspection. The danger, of course, with hierarchical ordering is the components to be "ranked," and thus what is lower in the order is more easily objectified. That being said however, what is more significant is a horizontal relationship of correspondence--differing systems sharing meaning, enriching one another.

It is in this manner, through the pedagogical interaction, that the teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) can come to realize spiritual correspondence. The steps they have taken toward recognition and realization can foster an alignment between them, a relationship that reveals their common humanity. In other words, they can come to realize that they each correspond in his and her own way to a common source. Metaphorically, they are unique musical transpositions of a larger melody, or they are each a pen and ink sketch of a greater being. This realization can reveal how, as unique transpositions, they are meant for each other, have responsibilities to one another, and also common responsibilities for

the care of earth, our common home. Recalling the words of Ives Congar (2004) highlighted in Chapter Three, they realize they "are created with the capacity to speak to another, to strive to know another, to love one another, and to receive one another in love" (p. 88).

In realizing they are transpositions of God, they image who God is for each other. *Who you are, your uniqueness, reveals something of who God is. Together, we image God's relationship with us.* A profoundly theological concept is at work here. The realization that unfolds is sacramental; a mediated encounter with the divine. It is a verification of the being of "personhood-in-relation," created as *imago Dei*. The teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) realize this relationship and in so doing, participate in God's grace. As corresponding transpositions, actively accompanying one another in the discovery of truth, the teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) can come to realize God's effective love into their lives, enhancing each other's efforts to know God, to promote their freedom, and to build the reign of God.[11]

Transposition is the third and final movement of the pedagogical theory for Catholic education. Its primary purpose is the realization rule, the effective appropriation of what has been taught and shared between the participants of the interactive practice. Transposition, meaning to put into a new position, resembles the practice of musical transposition. The original score is put into a different key or register that is best suited for the instrument or the instrumentalist. In the pedagogical interaction, the learner (L/k) must transpose the knowledge he is receiving from the teacher (K/l) in his own voice,

---

[11] There are several things happening in this moment as the K/l and L/k realize an encounter with the divine. To describe them would lead us into complex philosophical and theological discussions that fall beyond the scope of this project. Though, I welcome the theological scholar willing to navigate and develop this dimension of my theory.

according to his own skills and sensibilities. The transposition must resemble the original score, yet is in and of itself a unique articulation of it. The third movement also facilitates a spiritual transposition, one that emphasizes the corresponding relationship between persons and with God. As the teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) realize their common humanity and encourage each other in the discovery of truth, they mediate an encounter with the divine. And in so doing, they participate in God's gratuitous grace.

Pedagogical Dissonance

Good pedagogical theory must anticipate variance, obstacles, and misunderstandings that naturally accompany learning. Anyone who has taught can attest to this classroom phenomenon. How does the pedagogical theory for Catholic education support and navigate dissonance? The answer is found in the pedagogical movements.

Composition.

As we can recall, the composition movement involves both the practical exercise of developing a lesson to share and the spiritual dimension that prepares participants for the pedagogical encounter. On the practical side, composing a lesson can present various challenges, such as difficulty recalling important details, including too much or too little content, or arranging ideas out of sequence. In response, a teacher (K/l) should seek the guidance of others in the learning community who can be resources to help resolve these concerns. In addition, the teacher (K/l) should practice her composition (in part or entirely) with others outside the classroom or learning community to become aware of tensions or issues that might be unintentionally part of her lesson design. Only when the teacher (K/l) has had a chance to verify a degree of readiness should the composition be

shared. (The movement of juxtaposition also creates opportunities for the teacher (K/l) to make other adjustments to the composition as needed, described below).

Naturally, there are obstacles to preparing oneself spiritually, or becoming open, to engage another. Some persons require less preparation and others require more. And even then, some will not be ready. In these cases, persons should be invited to be quiet observers of the other two movements. In this role, they can witness others' learning and deepen their understanding of the pedagogy's methodology, and even offer constructive feedback to the participants of the pedagogical discourse. Participating in this way keeps the person engaged and provides an opportunity for reflective conversation on the importance of composing the self when we seek to learn with and from others.

Juxtaposition.

Bringing persons together to learn through dialogue and reflection naturally produces challenges. Let's consider those in the practical dimension first. One potential issue is the proximity (and intimacy) of the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k). The methodology of the juxtaposition movement might make the learner (L/k) feel vulnerable or exposed. Proper training for the teacher (K/l) will mitigate against this and provide her with the skills to comfort and encourage the learner (L/k) each step of the way. She accomplishes this by asking the learner (L/k) what he knows about a given topic, validates it, and joins him where he is.

If there are conceptual inaccuracies or weaknesses to the composition, it will be exposed in the juxtaposition movement. The learner (L/k) should be engaged critically with the composition and provide thoughtful feedback to the teacher (K/l). In keeping

with the values of weak classification and framing, the teacher (K/l) welcomes this feedback from her learner (L/k) who in this instance reveals some of his knower identity.

The natural curiosities of the learner (L/k) might lead the lesson into uncharted territory. This is to be applauded and the learner (L/k) should be encouraged to explore the curiosities he discovers. The teacher (K/l) should demonstrate enthusiasm for the learner's (L/k) curiosity, widening her lesson and asking him to articulate these curiosities as questions for him to pursue further.

Certain difficulties can also interfere with the spiritual dimension of the juxtaposition movement. The teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k) can struggle to establish a sense of connection and subsequently a sense of joy and meaning in the experience. Confusion and misunderstanding can disrupt efforts to form a connection. The movement loses its sense of encounter and interaction becomes transactional. These instances should be met with patience and choice. Patience provides the participants with extra time to become more familiar with each other and to establish a rapport together. Choice provides the participants with freedom to step away from the interaction to reflect and determine what adjustments are needed to improve the juxtaposition.

Transposition.

Another challenge facing the pedagogical theory for Catholic education is academic integrity. When multiple teachers (K/l) engage multiple learners (L/k) in pedagogical discourse simultaneously on a variety of topics, how do we make certain that the learning is sound? Here, the movement of transposition is particularly helpful. The transposition movement is concerned with the realization rule (Bernstein, 2000) which invites learners (L/k) to appropriate the ideas they have been given through the discourse

as their own. This realization must be voiced, publicly. Here the analogy of musical transposition is helpful. When a French horn player begins to play notes transposed from a trumpet score, she knows immediately if she is correct. The notes either are or are not in agreement with the score. Correspondence between the original score and the transposition exists or does not. As the learner (L/k) voices the ideas he has gathered from the lesson, his teacher (K/l) and other members of the learning community play an essential role in confirming correspondence. In this way, the movement of transposition plays a critical role in supporting the integrity of the content and the learners' (L/k) grasp of it.

While the movements of the pedagogical discourse are not immune to the challenges of education and a shared learning environment, they can be used to help resolve discord and improve the encounter between participants.

Summary of Three Movements

The pedagogical theory for Catholic education features a discourse of three movements: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. In the first movement, composition takes two forms: composing a lesson and composing the self in order to actively participate in learning with others in the community. The composition of the self, which involves readying oneself to participate in an educative exchange, is not commonly practiced in schooling but is an essential part of Catholic theology and especially the Ignatian examen. To do this fully, participants must prepare themselves to be open to what is about to unfold and create the internal psychological conditions among each other as a learning community to participate positively in the pedagogical discourse.

The second movement, juxtaposition, places two or more persons alongside one another to establish together the recognition rule. Juxtaposition operates like parable in that it places the learner (L/k) in a particular context that allows him to become newly aware of his understandings and assumptions. Juxtaposition also operates like *ordo,* the putting together of new and familiar things to develop a sense of belonging and relevance. The teacher (k/l) and the learner (L/k) hold enough in common to make a connection and establish a relationship. At the same time, they participate in something that has not happened before, something unique that can only come about by their activity. As they engage the composition, their juxtaposition fosters a discussion that reveals the boundaries of the learner's (L/k's) knowledge and gives birth to a fresh and original understanding of the given concept featured in the composition.

The final movement of transposition moves the learner (L/k) from recognition to realization. Embedded in this experience is the learner's (L/k's) appropriation of the knowledge presented in the composition, demonstrated in his independent, internalized ability to express the new ideas or concepts in his own voice, using all of the symbols available in his own register, as well as those new symbols that he has acquired through critical dialogue with others. Moreover, through this process, both the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k) can come to realize a correspondence between themselves and with something holy.

Text: An Overview

In Bernstein's theory (2000), the pedagogical discourse results in a *text*. He defines text as "anything which attracts evaluation" (p. 18). We are to think of text as the product of the interactional practice and the result of the system of pedagogy, with its

particular configurations of classification and framing values. A text invites an always novel approach to instructional and regulative discourse, and its processes of establishing the recognition and realization rules.

The word text comes from the Latin word *textus* meaning a woven thing. The past participle is *texere* meaning "to weave, to join, fit together, braid, interweave, construct, fabricate, build" resulting in the notion of textile (*text | Search Online Etymology Dictionary*, n.d.). Here, individual threads are woven, looped, or tied together to create something purposeful, a blanket or a tapestry. Different patterns of weaving give the textile distinctive characteristics. In some cases, these patterns are handed down from generation to generation, linking the characteristics to particular peoples or regions of peoples. In other words, the textile, the manner in which it comes together, reveals a history, a story, a place, an identity, a tradition, a particular weaving wisdom shared by a community.

It is this principle of weaving that informs the notion of *text* in the new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. While Bernstein's (2000) definition remains broad and less descript, my interpretation is one that depends upon text as a "woven thing." The pedagogy, quite intentionally, takes the various threads of the learning community and weaves them in a particular way to reveal the distinctive characteristics and identity of the faith community, of the commitments of Catholic education. What is rendered in the weaving? What are the unique patterns and notions embedded in the text?

In Chapter Three, I summarized the Congregation on Catholic Education's (CCE) understanding of the purpose of Catholic schools: *The education of a Catholic school aims to form the person with the values and dispositions necessary to engage in and*

promote the fullness of the Christian Story and Vision whose ultimate horizon is the realizing of the reign of God. This is the aim of Catholic education. The new pedagogical theory for Catholic education promotes within teachers and learners two texts, essential to this aim: the realization of discipleship and grace. Discipleship emerges from the practical, visible experiences of the composition, juxtaposition, and transposition movements of the pedagogy. Grace results from the generous and gratuitous nature of the teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) relationship. I rely on the concept of symbolic exchange (Chauvet, 1995) to help define and articulate this dimension of the pedagogy. In these final two sections, I describe how the participants of the pedagogy become woven with these distinctive texts.

The Text of Discipleship

The etymology of disciple is *discere*, meaning "to learn," to" take apart" and "to grasp" (*Disciple | Search Online Etymology Dictionary*, n.d.). These terms carry a certain degree of action, suggesting that discipleship is not passive. Groome (2011) pointed out that "The New Testament word *mathetes* is usually translated as disciple" which, at the time, also meant apprentice (p. 29). An apprentice engages in a form of learning that intends more than practicing skills. The person apprentices in order to develop the wisdom and experience for succeeding in life.

Discipleship is a concept long associated with Jesus and his first followers (Bonhoeffer, 1963; Gittins, 2008; Groome, 2011; Sawicki, 1988). The disciples were a small group of people who were drawn to the person of Jesus, so much so that they abandoned the lives they had been living to be near him, to be in relationship with him. The relationship was predominantly one of learning and evangelizing. Jesus was

preparing the disciples to carry on his ministry, to bring it forth into the world after his death. As he taught them, he challenged their traditions and practices and slowly unraveled their thinking about the nature of God and how to be devoted to God.

As weeks and months passed, the disciples were strongly influenced by Jesus, not only about what he preached, but how he lived: who he spoke to, who he dined with, who he touched, and who he healed. The disciples witnessed these daily interactions and engaged the master teacher in thoughtful discussions and transformative practices. The disciples developed new understandings of God and God's activity in their lives. In time, they practiced the patterns of Jesus' life and became woven into the story, the narrative, the commitments, and the wisdom of his message and ministry. He prepared them to carry out his mission to bring about the reign of God.

In its own way, the new pedagogy for Catholic education attempts to engage young persons as disciples, to prepare them to bring about the reign of God. In Chapter Three, I highlighted Groome's (1991) definition of the reign of God: for the Christian people "to effect in history the values of God's reign, love and justice, peace and freedom, wholeness and fullness of life for all" (p. 13). The pedagogical discourse emphasizes these values in each movement, attempting to weave within the personhood of the knower-learner essential dispositions for discipleship.

The first movement, composition, invites the knower-learner to review her understanding of certain concepts, of truths she has received or discovered. She considers how she came to know these truths and composes learning methods to share them meaningfully with others. She determines that despite the knowledge she can claim, there is always more to know. This is also the moment she composes herself spiritually,

considers her relationships with those in her immediate learning community. She takes

steps to resolve tensions or misunderstandings and prepares to be open to the ideas,

thinking, and experiences of those around her. Like a disciple, the knower-learner values

and practices these activities and is committed to sharing and discovering truth in many

forms and to fostering peace within her community.

The second movement, juxtaposition, creates its own important experiences for

the text of discipleship. In this setting, the teacher (K/l) and the learner (L/k) are "thrown

together" to discover new ideas and share meaning. Though their roles are different, they

work together toward a common goal: recognition. The teacher (K/l) guides the learner

(L/k) toward his existing knowledge of the topic being taught. The learner (L/k) signals

back to the teacher (K/l) that he understands. Together they move toward deepening and

refining the learner's (L/k's) knowledge. Here, the teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) act out

a critical aspect of discipleship: responsibility, that is, "response-ability." Each

demonstrates care and trust for the other, carefully speaking for meaning to be received

and trustfully listening for meaning to guide learning. Each is responsible for the goals of

the other. Juxtaposition allows knower-learners to practice a unique partnership and

strengthen certain skills of communication that promote the needs common to the other

and beyond the self.

In the third movement of transposition, the learner (L/k) receives new knowledge

from the teacher's (K/l's) interactive composition. The learner (L/k) is invited to interpret

the new information in his own voice, his own register, according to his identity and in

harmony with the values of the community. This is done in a manner similar to music

transposition, when an instrumentalist places the notes of a score into a different key,

either to make it more suitable for the musician or for the instrument being played. As the teacher (K/l) listens, she confirms the transposition's alignment with the original information and affirms the L/k in his realization of the information in his own voice. This movement emphasizes an expectation of the participants: the information that passes between the teacher (K/l) and learner (L/k) is meant to validate, strengthen, and amplify their voices in the learning community.

The three movements of the pedagogical discourse, with its weak classification and weak framing, result in a text that promotes important qualities of discipleship, a central commitment of being Christian. Corso (1999) wrote "Christian faith fundamentally involves being a disciple of Jesus Christ...It is an apprenticeship to a pattern of living that involves self-sacrifice. As such, the decision to follow Jesus is an act of charity, of love, of self-donation" (p. 103). Through these movements, teachers (K/ls) and learners (L/ks) become woven in the values of composition-- reflection, peace-making, truth-seeking--by the experiences of juxtaposition--accompaniment, clear speech, attentive listening, meaning-making, recognition--and by the activities of transposition--interpretation, affirmation, identity, and voice. This discussion has highlighted the ways in which the knower-learner integrates these three movements and becomes woven in the attributes of discipleship. There is a second layer to consider, a layer that is woven simultaneously with discipleship. Let us now consider the ways in which the participants of the pedagogy are woven spiritually in the gift of grace.

The Text of Grace

The pedagogical theory for Catholic education aims to influence much more than the knower-learners' awakening and realization of knowledge: it seeks to amplify their

awareness of God's grace in their lives. In Chapter Three, we explored the meaning of grace as a central dynamic of Catholic anthropology. Grace is God's effective love at work within creation and people's lives. We participate in God's grace when we respond to God's invitation to live into fullness of our created nature.

This requires life-long formation, a gradual process that strengthens our ability to recognize God's activity in our lives and to realize an effective response with our own activity. This formation can take place through our interactions or exchanges with others. Pedagogy, with its countless exchanges--both spoken and unspoken--is uniquely suited to foster a "text of grace." To explain how, I rely on the work of Louis-Marie Chauvet (1995) and his theory of symbolic exchange.

Symbolic Exchange.

Symbolic exchange comes to us from French theologian Louis-Marie Chauvet (b. 1942) whose work is recognized for renewing contemporary scholarship in sacramental theology--a dimension of Catholic theology which explores sacrament as a vehicle for human participation in God's grace. Chauvet (1995) offers "symbolic exchange" as a model "for understanding the distinctive way in which the subject comes to be in its relations with other subjects...*outside the order of value*" (pp. 99-100, italics original). He believes symbolic exchange provides "a possible path by which to theologically conceive this 'marvelous exchange' (*admirable commercium)* between God and humankind which we call grace" (p. 100). To appreciate the distinction he is making, we must familiarize ourselves with Chauvet's key concepts and how they function together. Chauvet offers a highly nuanced theory with countless notions, each worthy of exploration. However, for the purposes of this discussion, I draw on the most salient parts of symbolic exchange to

explain the theological text of the pedagogy: sign and symbol, and return-gift. After describing these concepts, I present how Chauvet uses them to shape an understanding of grace and our participation in it.

Sign, Symbol and the Notion of Non-Value.

Chauvet (1995) recognizes how sign and symbol overlap: "In the concrete world, sign and symbol are always mixed together" (p. 111). However, he distinguishes them by how they function in the act of exchange. *Sign* belongs to exchange systems of value, what Chauvet designates as business exchange: economic, convenience, or status (p. 103). For instance, cars signify economic value, convenience, status. We may assess the value of a car according to its price, the convenience it provides our lifestyle, or the status it suggests. In a business exchange, what matters is the thing that is being obtained--a car.

Symbol, on the other hand, operates outside of business systems of value, as non-value. Its importance is ambiguous and can only be established through it use and ascribed value by subjects engaged in the exchange, not by economic systems. What matters in the exchange of a symbol are the persons participating in the exchange and an object or commodity that mediates their relationship. Durheim (2010) summarizes Chauvet on this point: "Both the sign and they symbol are given from someone to someone else, but in exchange a sign it is the *what* that matters; in giving a symbol what matters is the *who* is given to whom" (p. 42, italics original). Let us simplify this idea with an example.

A "flower" can be a sign and a symbol. As a sign, "flower" references a specific thing, a word that allows us to recognize it in different contexts. Consider the following. My husband stops at the flower market to select a bouquet of roses for our dining room

table. He has chosen this particular flower market because it is a convenient stop on his drive home from work. Entering the market, he considers his options, evaluates the flowers' appearance, and compares their value to their price. He makes a selection, waits in line spaced six feet from the person in front of him, and pays the florist. Choosing and obtaining the bouquet is driven by value principles: convenience, quality, and cost. In this exchange, what matters are the flowers, not the seller nor the buyer. My husband drives home with his purchase.

As he carries the bouquet from the car to the house, he notices that the purple wild clover near the side of the road has bloomed. It reminds him of the farm lane I grew up on, where I lived when we first met. He picks the flower and enters the house, finds a small glass jar, fills it with water, places the flower in the jar and sets it on my desk before me. I see it, look up, and smile.

These two examples highlight the difference between value and non-value systems of exchange. In the first example, featuring a value-based exchange, what matters is the object obtained. The flower bouquet is the primary focus of the exchange. It is a thing set up by the seller to be admired and ultimately obtained by the buyer. The florist and my husband are players in an exchange of priced goods.

In the second exchange, what matters are the subjects and their relationship. Chauvet explains, "The true objects being exchanged are the subjects themselves" (p. 106). The exchange is not about the object (the clover) nor its value, rather it is about my husband and me, who we are and what we mean to one another. It is illogical to prescribe an economic value to the clover; its significance lies beyond the aforementioned value systems. The clover symbolizes the relationship between us in a way that the bouquet of

flowers does not. This non-value symbol represents the substance of the exchange. The other quality of symbolic exchange is action between the subjects. Chauvet refers to this function as *return-gift.*

Return-Gift.

Embedded in the process of symbolic exchange is the return-gift. It is the response of the subject who is receiving and functions as an acknowledgement of sorts. The return-gift occurs in the moment of the exchange as a "sign of gratitude, at the very least a 'thank you' or some facial expression" (Chauvet, p. 108). It symbolizes that the gift has been received. Reception and return-gift are not separate actions; they are encased within the response of the receiver.

Consider again the example of the clover given to me by my husband. Receiving the clover and smiling at him are simultaneous actions. What's more, because the exchange is about us and our relationship, symbolized by the clover, a sentiment of gratitude is attached to the gift, prior to my receiving it. Chauvet claims, "by the very structure of the exchange, the gratuitousness of the gift *carries the obligation of the return-gift of a response*" (p. 108, italics original). Because of the truth of my relationship with my husband, any exchange that affirms this naturally produces from me a return-gift response of love. Now that we have explored these features of symbolic exchange, we can now consider how it pertains to Christian understanding of grace and gratuitousness.

Grace and Gratuitousness of Symbolic Exchange.

According to Chauvet, the structure of symbolic exchange, with its emphasis on non-value giving and return-gift response, provides a model for the way in which humans participate in God's grace. In this system, grace is non-value. "[It] is essentially that

which cannot be calculated and cannot be stocked" (p. 108). Grace is God's effective love at work in our lives. It is a gift, freely given to us, out of God's desire to be in relationship with us. However, for the gift to be received, there must be the gratuitous return-gift. And because we are limited in our ability to respond to God the giver, our return-gift response is necessarily directed to others. We give ourselves to others, with the hope of mediating God's grace in the world. Durheim's (2010) summary is useful here:

> Humans cannot repay that which is outside of value. They cannot give back in either want or excess—they can only *respond* in kind or out of kind. Receiving grace as the act of God (or, as Godself) is inseparable from giving oneself back as a subject through whom grace can continue to be given...God's grace in this way has been successfully mediated to Christians only when they respond with graciousness toward others. (p. 43)

The obligatory return-gift to God's grace is a response of kindness and love to others. When we respond in this way, we affirm our relationship with God and with our brothers and sisters.

This is the sacred text of the pedagogy for Catholic education. The subjects engaged in the pedagogical interaction exchange knowledge as well as the gift of God's grace. Participating in one another's development and growth, the subjects give of themselves at these two levels. As a result, "the subjects weave or reweave *alliances*, they *recognize* themselves as full members of the tribe, where they find their *identity* in showing themselves in their proper place, and in putting others in their proper place" (p. 106, italics original). How fitting that Chauvet uses the words "weave" and "reweave" to

describe the human activity at the center of symbolic exchange. As we may recall, *text*--Bernstein's (2000) word for the outcome of a pedagogical interaction--means a woven thing. The pedagogy, designed to prioritize relationships within a learning community, develops knower-learners with a keen awareness of belonging to one another and of being woven together. Knower-learners' ability to give and receive loving kindness is, in this sense, the preeminent text of the pedagogy of Catholic education.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented the central aspects of a new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. The theory invites a new analysis of the identity of the teacher and learner and the conditions influencing the learner's experience and relationship with others in the learning process. I have pursued an ambitious agenda, drawing together a wide range of sources to renew the ways in which practitioners in the field of Catholic education think about and organize learning. The intention here is to realize the proper objective of Catholic education. This is that the educative experiences of a Catholic school incarnate and promote essential Catholic teachings on the nature of the person, openness to divine Grace, and spiritual guidance on how we are to live together.

Bernstein (2000) provided the building blocks of the new pedagogical framework. Beginning with the Knower/Learning identity, we develop a deeper understanding of who is taking part in the learning activities. All persons come to an educative moment with prior knowledge and assumptions that shape their thinking and their identity. For authentic Catholic education to take place, the pedagogical interaction must acknowledge and embrace all persons as knowers and learners who belong to the community and to the Christian Story and Vision (Groome, 1991). Weak conditions of classification and

framing generate an openness in the pedagogy, creating powerful opportunities for the Knower/learner and the Learner/knower to engage.

The pedagogical discourse of the theory features three movements: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. Each movement contains different layers and fosters personal reflection, social (or community) connection, and growth. As teachers (K/ls) lead learners (L/k) through the stages of the prepared lesson, they work together to establish the rules of recognition and realization. Certainly, this approach advances each participants' academic growth. Yet more importantly, for the aims of Catholic education, their collaboration strengthens their sense of discipleship and carries the potential of mediating God's grace. The new pedagogical theory for Catholic education, seen in this way, is sacred. As Congar (2004) so poignantly wrote, there is within us "an overture to other persons and [the human being] only realizes himself [or herself] in communion with them. The human being is made to live in relations of exchange with others, in a situation and an exercise of 'co-humanity'" (Groppe, p. 88). The pedagogical theory for Catholic education offers knower-learners both a situation and exercise to exchange meaningfully with others in the hope of realizing genuine 'co-humanity.'

CHAPTER FIVE

Tutoría: A Pedagogy for Catholic Education

To learn is to be different from who you were before, it is to grow. If in school there isn't

space for this deep interest that transforms a person, then there is no learning.

--Gabriel Cámara

This chapter describes how an instructional model, tutoría, provides a pedagogical theory for Catholic education. I trace the model's development through the lens of its founder, Gabriel Cámara, and review its rapid expansion in Mexico, Chile, and Nigeria. Following a summary of the central elements of tutoría for Catholic education, I discuss the ways in which the model affirms a pedagogy for Catholic education. I evaluate the identity of the learner, the conditions of *classification* and *framing*, the movements of the pedagogical interaction, and the *text* that results from the learning experience of tutoría. I conclude by discussing the implications of tutoría for Catholic education, as it is not an explicitly Catholic pedagogy.

My sources for this chapter come from published work on tutoría, the documentary *Maravillas* (2013) filmed in Zacatecas, Mexico, my interviews and exchanges with Gabriel Cámara, and conversations with teachers and students and observations of the model I made while visiting four schools implementing tutoría in Chile in the fall of 2019. I also have collaborated with leading experts of the model to establish tutoría in Nsukka, Nigeria. Finally, I also have had three experiences as a tutee of Gabriel Cámara, Santiago Rincón-Gallardo, and Manuel, a 15-year-old boy from Temuco, Chile. These sources provide me the perspective of a learner to inform my

understanding of the pedagogical model of tutoría and the ways in which it exemplifies a pedagogical theory for Catholic education.

Scholarly Interest in Tutoría

Tutoría has intrigued researchers in the field of educational change for over a decade (Elox, 2019; Ng, 2019; Rincón-Gallardo, 2011, 2015, 2016, 2019; Rincón-Gallardo & Elmore, 2012; Shirley, 2017). In his most recent book, Shirley (2017) identified tutoría as an educational model that accomplishes both achievement and integrity. Rincón-Gallardo and Elmore (2012) value the model for its ability to disrupt a "default culture" in education and bring about large-scale social movement. Rincón-Gallardo (2015, 2016, 2019) has continued to endorse tutoría as a blueprint to help educational systems "liberate learning." Ng (2019) considered the ways in which tutoría transforms power dynamics in the instructional core that influence student-teacher relationships with learning. These few examples represent a much larger body of research on tutoría, most of which center on the important topic of changing educational priorities. My interest in tutoría is somewhat different. I have been studying tutoría since the spring of 2016 and have come to view the model as a pedagogy that corresponds with the goals for Catholic education.

What is Tutoría?

Tutoría is an instructional methodology featuring a one-to-one dialogic interaction between a tutor, who has demonstrated mastery of a given topic, and a tutee, who has expressed freely an interest in learning that topic (*Redes de Tutoría,* 2017). Elox (2019) describes tutoría as "a pedagogy aimed at making students into self-directed learners" (p. 1). The model is applicable to every content area and has been used with learners from

primary school through higher education. Tutoría is perhaps best understood when viewed through the act of tutoring. The following narrative is based on an observation I conducted in the fall of 2019 in Santiago, Chile.

A Geometry Lesson

It's a cold and damp September morning in Santiago, Chile (comparable to mid-March in Boston, Massachusetts). Two students sit across from one another at a small white table in the middle of a crammed teacher's office. The students keep their coats on because their school, which is constructed out of interlocking shipping containers, is not heated. José is a fifth grader and Maria is a sixth grader. The two students have not met before, but for the next hour and a half, José will be Maria's geometry teacher. Moments ago, Maria selected José's geometry topic from a series of choices offered by other students at the school.

As they get settled, I take in the setting and note that there is no adult engaged in the lesson. The younger student will be the teacher; the older student will be the learner. The teacher-student ratio is 1:1. There are no textbooks; there is no front or back to the room; both the "teacher" and the "student" are seated; and both have notebooks and pens at the ready.

The session begins with light refreshments of juice and cookies and friendly conversation. José asks Maria, "How has your day been so far?" and "Do you have any big tests today?" Maria responds with a smile and says, "I'm okay. I had a test earlier, but it was okay. How about you?" José offers that he is fine and says "thanks." He then asks Maria to say why she chose his topic of the Pythagorean theorem. Maria shares that she recognized the concept from last year but remembered she didn't understand it well. She

says, "it seems important and I think it would be good to understand." José is interested to know more about her experience with the theorem. He pushes her to recall her experience from last year. "What parts do you remember?" José writes down everything Maria shares. He uses this information to get to know Maria as a geometry student and to begin to think of ways to personalize the tutorial to help her overcome obstacles from last year and strengthen her understanding of the theorem.

Next José presents Maria with a series of challenges--or *desafíos*--which he has carefully prepared. Each challenge consists of a task that is accompanied with reflective, analytical questions. The tasks and questions become more challenging as the tutorial progresses.

José presents Maria with a diagram with geometric shapes, including a right triangle. He asks, "What can you tell me about these shapes?" Maria studies the diagram and begins to share her observations. José records her statements. After a very long pause, José asks her to defend one of her claims: "How do you know that is the longest side of the triangle?" Another long pause. José asks Maria to share what she is thinking. She responds by saying, "Well, compared to the other sides, it looks longest."

With this information, José shifts her focus to the other sides of the triangle. Over the next 40 minutes, José asks, listens, and challenges Maria to articulate how she is thinking and why. José procures colored markers, scissors, a ruler, and extra copies of the diagram with which Maria cuts, colors, measures and explores various ways in which she might respond to José's questions. José waits patiently, noting how Maria is thinking about and working each challenge. He offers an encouraging smile from time to time. She pushes on. Eventually, she has a breakthrough. José beams.

The tutoring session is not complete, however. Maria must create an artifact that represents her learning and present it before the other members of the school who are taking part in the day's learning festival. Maria prepares a small poster featuring a right triangle and three squares. Each square shape uses one of the triangle sides as its own. She explains the diagram to José who offers affirmation. They thank each other and head off together to join the full assembly of students.

José and Maria have just participated in an innovative learning model. Their school is one of nearly 80 across the country participating in *Redes de Tutoría,* tutoring networks. Little do they know, the moment they just shared was inspired by one man's childhood experience of school 75 years earlier. This man's name is Gabriel Cámara and he is the founder and inspiration of the pedagogical model, tutoría. I interviewed Gabriel on April 5, 2019 via zoom. In the following section, I share highlights of my conversation with Gabriel which bring into focus the early experiences of his life which informed and continues to inform his aspirations for educational change. Unless otherwise noted, all quoted content is taken from this interview.

Gabriel Camara

Gabriel Cámara was born in Mexico City, Mexico in 1930. The fourth of five children, and the only boy, Cámara had a qualitatively different childhood from his sisters. "My father worked most of the time but my mother stayed home. My mother took care of my four sisters but in our culture, a man could do whatever he wanted. The attention was focused on my sisters. It was not ideal, but we were a loving family and, though they reprimanded me sometimes, I basically did what I wanted to do." Cámara

enjoyed the good and the bad that usually comes with too much independence at a young age, getting into trouble from time to time.

Bored and impatient, his middle school experience was a struggle. "I played hooky, I didn't go to school. I was not interested. I started flunking." Despite this, he kept trying because the headmaster, a Jesuit, demonstrated faith in Gabriel, "so I kept going." He fought to overcome his teachers' negative views of him as a student. "Teachers were kind, but they didn't take care of me. I mean, I didn't feel attended to. They knew that I was lazy but they let me do it. They flunked me and I had to react by cheating on exams and doing that. My school experience was basically loneliness."

Gabriel nuanced the loneliness he experienced at school from not having friends. He had friends, he was well liked by other kids, he was good at sports, and yet school was lonely. "As a young person growing up, I could relate to my friends and my family, but academically, it was a waste land."

Gabriel's academic trajectory changed at the age of 14 when his friend offered to teach him math. His name was Jorge Elizalde and he was Gabriel's neighbor. "At the end of the second year of middle school, I had flunked three subjects. So, things were not going very well. But then that summer a friend of mine, who was a year ahead of me, a companion of my 'mischievings' and all that, asked me if I wanted to learn geometry because next year, the third year, it was the subject we were going to study."

Gabriel's experience that summer, learning geometry with Jorge, changed his life. "For the first time, I had an experience of a subject freely offered from a friend I trusted and from somebody who really knew it [well] because he had already finished third year.

That is how I met an intellectual challenge in the most favorable of circumstances, with affection, with truth and honesty, commitment."

At the end of the summer, when Gabriel returned to school for his third year, his teacher expected very little from him.

> The Jesuit in charge of the class, Professor Silva, knew who I was, a disaster…[He] used to bring students up to the front of the classroom without warning to provide a demonstration of what we had been studying. So, one day it happened to me and I went up [Gabriel chuckles] and he asked me to demonstrate a simple theorem that the sum of the inner angles of a triangle add up to 180 degrees. So, I did it without formalities as I had been doing with my friend: dut-dat-da-da-da [Gabriel makes quick rhythmic sounds with his tongue and swift gestures with this hand, writing on an imaginary blackboard with ease and confidence].

> There was silence, and then he told me to go back to my seat. As I was walking to my seat, he told the class, 'This person might be good at math.' I hadn't heard anything like that my whole life. I share this to show you how it changed me innerly, how my change was really existential. From then on, I became one of the best students. People came to me to ask for help.

This was a turning point. Gabriel discovered a part of himself that he had not known was there and that he suspected his teachers were not willing to see. Through guided instruction, he realized a new relationship with math. The classroom provided him the opportunity to realize this relationship publicly with his classmates and his teacher. No

longer "a disaster," his new identity put him in new relationships within his school community.

Becoming a Jesuit

Gabriel enjoyed his new status, but more, the opportunity to help others learn. He began to consider joining the Jesuits. From his limited knowledge of the Society of Jesus, Gabriel equated Jesuits with educators--he learned afterward that they were priests too! By joining the order, he believed he could expand the ways in which he helped others learn. "The Jesuits started to pay attention to me and I realized I wanted, in time, to become like one of them. So, I joined the Jesuits. I wanted to be a teacher because for me that had been a watershed moment, [when school was] almost a deadly activity to a very lively activity."

After joining the Jesuits, he attended Harvard Graduate School of Education and became familiar with the writings of Ivan Illich and Paulo Freire, "the usual suspects, those highly critical of education." As his formation as an educational scholar progressed, he became critical of Jesuit education itself. "In fact, at Harvard, I wrote a qualifying paper, a criticism, trying to describe the process of [updating] Catholic teaching practices to be more open to the way of relating intellectually [with students]." Gabriel's dissertation, published in 1972, is entitled *How to Update Jesuit Schools in Mexico: A Planning Project Focusing on the City of Chihuahua*.

Gabriel described how his views on education were being shaped by his affiliation with Ivan Illich in Cuernavaca, Mexico. "Ivan Illich didn't bother teaching young people to get degrees and become lawyers or whatever. He concentrated on criticizing [universities'] major faults to modern society...making [young people] subservient to a

bureaucracy." These views were in conflict with the educational practices of Iberoamericana University, the major Jesuit university in Mexico. According to Gabriel, professors at the university were "taking for granted that the way they were teaching was the right way to teach people, and so I became convinced that the problem is not you or me, or the students, or the teachers, but the structures in which we present the opportunities to learn."

In time, after 22 years, he determined it was necessary to leave the Jesuit order. Gabriel was determined to develop a model of education that engendered the qualities of his learning experience so many years before with Jorge. For Gabriel, the experience with Jorge encapsulated everything that learning should be. He spent the next few decades working with historically marginalized communities in Mexico, "developing grassroots educational projects to help youth and communities take control over their learning" (Rincón-Gallardo & Elmore, 2012, p. 475). These projects would become tutoría.

Tutoría: Humble Beginnings, Rapid Success

In 1996, Gabriel and a group of close colleagues were charged with reimagining rural education in parts of Mexico for the Post-Primary Project managed by the National Council for the Promotion of Education (CONAFE--acronym in Spanish). Under the name, Convivencia Educativa, A.C. (CEAC), Gabriel and his team supported "350 rural communities in 27 Mexican states and were praised in national and international evaluations" (Rincón-Gallardo & Elmore, 2012, p. 475).

In 2003 the project came under new leadership that introduced a different focus. Separate funding became available in 2004 and CEAC launched a new project for a small number of middle schools in rural communities. The schools were united under the name,

Learning Community Project (LCP). With Gabriel at their side, the small yet dedicated team worked tirelessly to support teachers in multiple locations to develop their skills with the new instructional model.

By 2008, the work paid off and the LCP expanded to support 60 schools. Around this time, Dalila Lopez, a senior administrator for LCP was promoted to the Department of Innovation at the Ministry of Education. This was a strategic move for the LCP. With Lopez's guidance, the Mexican Ministry of Education strengthened its support of the LCP and expanded the model to another 400 schools. The following year, the Department of Ministry, under the direction of Lopez, initiated a program to bring the pedagogy of the LCP to 9000 schools across Mexico.

The positive results of this reform were captured in the ENLACE data, Mexico's national standardized test. Rincón-Gallardo (2016) summarized the results for *telesecundaria* (middle school) students, from 2009 to 2013:

> The percentage of *Telesecundaria* students scoring at good and excellent levels in Mathematics and Literacy moved from the bottom among the three modalities of public schools in Mexico to the top. In the case of Mathematics, by 2013 performance of students in *Telesecundaria* was similar to that of students in Mexican private middle-schools. (p. 417)

These results were highly significant. Historically, public middle schools had the worst performance on the national standardized test. Using the new model of instruction, *tutoría,* middle school students outperformed students enrolled in other public schools and matched those in elite private schools. In four short years, *tutoría* seemed to level the playing field between elite private schools and under resourced public middle schools.

According to Rincón-Garalldo and Elmore (2012), the LCP measured other indicators of success as well. These included:

> Increased student engagement, as indicated by students voluntarily spending more time in school; increased percentages of graduates from LCP schools enrolling in high school; increased student confidence presenting their learning in public and acting as tutors; improved classroom discipline; and better and more frequent use of materials in school libraries. (p. 476)

Despite this visible effectiveness, the department within the Ministry of Education responsible for the rollout and operation of the LCP, was dismissed in 2012 with the election of a new president (Rincón-Gallardo, 2016). Fortunately for tutoría, the model had already achieved international attention. Conferences, publications, and white papers developed by Gabriel and others had entered international educational networks. Researchers, foundations, and scholars had already been visiting LCP sites in Mexico prior to the shutdown to study, theorize, adopt, and adapt tutoría for educational initiatives in various parts of the world.

Today, tutoría continues to influence classroom learning. The pedagogy is utilized in many parts of Mexico. It has been transferred successfully in Chile, and initial trials are underway in Thailand, Singapore, and Nigeria. Further, the passing of eight years has introduced a new president to Mexico and an effort is underway to restore the educational programs that have been proven to make a difference for the country's youth. Perhaps the most promising sign for the future of tutoría in Mexico is that Gabriel, at the age of 91, has just been announced as Mexico's General Director of the National Institute of the Promotion of Education. (Truly, a life-long learner!)

For more than 75 years, Gabriel has been working to offer young people an experience of learning reminiscent of his own experience with Jorge--to meet an intellectual challenge with "the most favorable of circumstances: with affection, with truth and honesty, and commitment." Many elements of Gabriel's story contribute to the forthcoming analysis of tutoría as a pedagogy for Catholic education. Before taking this step, however, reviewing the central elements of the theory, presented in Chapter Four, may be helpful.

The Pedagogical Theory for Catholic Education: A Review

The pedagogical theory for Catholic education unites the theology and philosophy of Christian anthropology to develop a new approach for achieving the goals of Catholic schools. This approach is intended for all courses, not just theology class. These next sections reintroduce the concepts of the *knower/learner* identity, *classification*, *framing*, the three movements of the pedagogical discourse--*composition, juxtaposition* and *transposition*--followed by *text*. These concepts guide the analysis of tutoría further on in the chapter.

The Knower/Learner Identity

The first concept pertains to the identity of the learner. The new theory of Catholic education promotes an understanding of the person in the educative context as a learner and knower, simultaneously. Both dynamics--learning and knowing--contribute to our understanding of the whole person and reflect the ways in which a person participates in and receives learning. We are learners, seeking meaning, knowledge, understanding, guidance, and direction with a desire to know God. At the same time, we depend, in part,

on our knowing. As knowers, we use our internal vitality, curiosity, dispositions, experiences and desires to affirm our choices and lead us in our relationship with God.

The presentation of the new theory in Chapter Four emphasized the dual identity of teachers and students with the coding K/l--to signify the one who is predominantly teaching--and L/k--to signify the one who is predominately learning. Tutoría uses the concepts *tutee* and *tutor* to distinguish between the one who is receiving and the one who is guiding, respectively. These terms are suitable for the pedagogical theory. While there are still elements of power associated with the terms (i.e. a tutor leads and tutee follows) they are less pronounced than teacher and student; it is easier to imagine a tutor and tutee stepping into each other's roles than a teacher and a student.

Classification

Bernstein (2000) used the concept of classification to understand the dynamics of power and authority in an educational setting. Classification is concerned with the "relationships between categories" of people, such as the teacher and the student (p. 5). Certain factors can increase or decrease the strength of classification. In the context of an academic lecture, the categories are lecturer (the one presenting) and lectured (the ones receiving). The arrangement of seating, the distance between the podium and the seating, the lighting, the presence and location of microphones, and style of presenting all contribute to the strength or weakness of the relationship between the lecturer and the lectured.

The pedagogical theory for Catholic education articulated in Chapter Four features weak classification. It emphasizes a horizontal relationship between the participants in the pedagogical interaction and it creates the conditions for the

knower/learner identity to be realized in learning. It gives students a voice in their learning and growth. They are not passive recipients of knowledge, but rather share in the responsibility for learning. Weak classification is fortified with weak framing.

Framing

According to Bernstein (2000), framing is concerned with who controls the message, establishing, as it were, the rules of engagement for the learning organization. Framing determines what is significant and what is not, what is included and what is excluded, who is heard and who is not. An illustration of strong framing is when schools rely on curricula and assessment standards that have been developed in a manner disconnected from the population of students served by the school. Here, outside experts and testing companies establish what is important, what is knowledge. The effect minimizes the voices of experts and the wisdom naturally present within a learning community. In addition, weak framing cooperates with the knower/learner identity, allowing the ideas and voices from within the community to influence the educational priorities of the school. Weak classification and weak framing create the conditions for the commitments of Catholic education to emerge, broadly in a learning community, and particularly in the pedagogical interaction between knower/learners.

Movements of the Pedagogical Interaction

The pedagogical theory for Catholic education identifies three movements in the discourse between participants: *composition*, *juxtaposition*, and *transposition*. Each movement promotes commitments that are both practical and spiritual for those engaged in the pedagogical discourse. These movements are not part of Bernstein's (2000)

pedagogical framework. I have identified them based on my own critique of the current state of Catholic theology and pedagogy and in particular their need for a thorough-going reformulation and revitalization in the everyday practices of Catholic schools. The movements contain many elements that I presented at length in Chapter Four and provide the foundation for an identification of tutoría as a new manifestation of Catholic pedagogy.

Tutoría: A Pedagogy for Catholic Education

In this section, I analyze tutoría with the framework of the new pedagogy for Catholic education. This includes the identity of the learner, the values attributed to classification and framing, the three movements of the pedagogical interaction, and the intended outcomes, or the text. My analysis emerges from various sources on tutoría, some formal and others less so, which seems somewhat fitting, as tutoría itself utilizes both formal and informal strategies to support transformative learning (Cámara, 2008; Elmore, 2016).

Identity of the Learner

The pedagogy for Catholic education views the person as both a learner and a knower. Both the student and the teacher occupy these roles. At times, the teacher will be a learner and a student will be a knower, capable of teaching others. Further, the pedagogy recognizes that both dynamics are actively working in the exchange of knowledge. That is, in the act of teaching, the teacher is both a knower and learner-- guided by what she knows while also taking in information about those she is teaching. The same is to be said about the learner. That is, in the act of learning, the learner is both

a learner and a knower--actively receiving information while reconciling it with what he knows.

Tutoría affirms this view of the student as both learner and knower. It is not difficult to consider the ways in which a student is invited to the role of learner. Students' primary purpose in attending school is to learn. In a pedagogy for Catholic education, we are concerned with the *telos* of this learning. The learning is intended to change us and our community. Learning in order to teach others changes the terms of the student identity. They are learners on their way to become knowers with a purpose. In tutoría, as students engage in learning, they are aware that what they are learning is intended to help others and to make their community stronger.

An example of this comes from a story Gabriel shared with me. He was encouraging me in my research of tutoría and the ways in which the students' learning was changing their lives.

> I don't know if you have had a chance to look at those videos of kids teaching their parents. There are cases which are really moving. Like this kid whose mother was being abused by the man with whom she was living. He studied the rights of women, the legal rights of women, what the law said. He taught his mother and so the mother learned and sent the man away. The learning is real. It isn't just to pass an exam. You're transformed, that's absolutely true. (G. Cámara, personal communication, April 5, 2019)

This student who was tutored in women's legal rights engaged in the issue as a learner in order to become a knower and transform his mother's life.

In a learning community, tutoría presupposes everyone can learn and can teach, even students with moderate learning differences. At a school in the Araucanía region of Chile, I met with teachers and students to learn about their experiences of tutoría. In recent years, the Ministry of Education in Chile implemented new policies for the way schools support students with learning differences. Many teachers felt unprepared to serve these students as they joined mainstream classrooms. However, at this particular school, the teachers and students alike were eager to introduce me to Juan, a 13-year-old autistic student. His teachers shared the struggle they experienced to carry him with the rest of the class and the sadness they felt from their inability to make a connection with him.

One day, one of his classmates, Veronica, offered to tutor him in the writing assignment the class was working on--and she reached him. Juan connected with Veronica and was able to communicate his understanding of the lesson that she provided. This was a turning point. From this moment on, Juan's classmates enthusiastically embraced the opportunity to be his tutor (in fact, they fought a bit about it, too). The teacher saw it as a win-win situation. "He loves to learn from his classmates and they love to demonstrate their knowledge and their compassion for him" (C. Lopez, personal communication, October 3, 2019).

Students receive tutoring with the understanding that, if they so choose, they will have the opportunity to master the content more deeply and become a tutor of the topic. Recall the tutoring session between José and Maria. José is a master tutor on the topic of the Pythagorean theorem and will continue to be a tutor of it as long as he desires. Maria,

having received this tutoring, may choose to deepen her knowledge of the Pythagorean theorem in order to teach others or she may adopt a different focus for mastery.

Tutoría affirms the teacher as a learner and knower. Again, it is not difficult to recognize the teacher identity as knower. Yet, how often do teachers model themselves as learners? Some benefits of this perspective are that students can develop a healthy view of their teachers as life-long learners and one can never know enough on a given topic. (Here, I'm thinking of all the J.R.R. Tolkien aficionados in my life.) What may be less obvious about the teacher-as-learner identity is that, in tutoría, the teacher's teacher may be a student. When the teacher becomes the student of a student, she signifies her openness to learning as well as a desire to learn from her student. In this act, she affirms her student as a knower, one who has the capacity to transform others' lives.

In 2010, Harvard University professor Richard Elmore visited Zacatecas, Mexico to learn about tutoría. During his visit, he was invited by a student to take part in a tutoring session. "The professor became a student" is the heading of an article he later wrote based on his experience:

> As a learner, with Maricruz as my tutor, I found myself in an unusual situation. It was clear that I was engaged with someone who had mastered a practice. She was not bashful about stopping me when I moved from one step of the problem to another to ask for a clarification of why I made the decision I had made ... I felt that I was in the hands of an expert. (Rincón-Gallardo & Elmore, 2012, p. 472).

Elmore's experience highlights the importance of affirming students and educators as knowers and learners. When this dual identity is recognized and realized in pedagogy it has the potential to empower young people to engage the challenges of their communities

and the world. How we invite students and teachers to occupy these roles is accomplished through classification and framing.

Classification

A pedagogy for Catholic education should be one with weak classification. The boundaries between the participants should be ambiguous, flexible, and fluid. As a result, teachers and students should find themselves in new relationships with each other and with the content of their learning.

Tutoría presents strong evidence for the effectiveness of weak classification. This quality of tutoría has been observed consistently by researchers of the model (Cámara, 2008; Elmore, 2016; Ng, 2019; Shirley, 2017; Rincón-Gallardo, 2015, 2019). Ng (2019) wrote, "The way teachers and students related...was transformed, as top-down learning relationships were now horizontal ones. Students were actors and reformers of instructional practice and grew to be experts in the practice as they lived it every day" (p. 9). Elmore (2016) suggested "the essence of the tutorial relationship is to give as much control as possible to the learner" (p. 8).

Shirley (2017) described how the model's egalitarian power dynamics provide a new understanding of academic expertise:

> The model…demonstrates the power of peer learning networks to transform the teaching and learning that is at the heart of education. This is a new form of professionalism. It is not based upon teachers' power over their students. It is based on a common pursuit of understanding. (p. 90)

With tutoría, persons are recognized for their mastery of an idea regardless of their age or position. Reflecting on the Post-Primary Project sponsored by Mexico's National Council

for the Promotion of Education (CONAFE--acronym in Spanish) between 1996 and

2003, Rincón-Gallardo (2015) wrote,

> The Post-Primary [Project] tells a story of the boundaries of teaching and learning
>
> becoming blurred, in such a way that anyone can teach and everyone is expected
>
> to learn, provided that the student is interested in a particular topic and the tutor
>
> has the capacity to help him master it. In the Post-Primary Project, everyone was
>
> expected to develop the skill to learn independently and to serve as tutor to others,
>
> not only teachers and students, but also the leaders of the Post-Primary at the
>
> national and State-levels. Who was to be a tutor was determined by the
>
> demonstrated mastery of a given topic, not by formal position within the
>
> classroom or the institutional structure of CONAFE. (p. 168)

Unfortunately, evidence of tutoría's weak classification is found in the government's

actions in 2012 to cut the funding of the Post-Primary Project, despite its proven success

(Rincón-Gallardo, 2016). Shirley (2017) wrote, "The LCP's [Learning Community

Project] egalitarian message challenged the traditional culture of school with their clear

definitions of control and hierarchy" (p. 89).

Evidence of weak classification can also be found in the testimonies of the

members of the learning communities. Here, highlighted in interviews conducted by Elox

(2019), a student comments on the relationships brought about by tutoría:

> For me, *tutoría* is a learning method that has helped me a lot because it's about
>
> students working among them and building a connection, a dialogue. It's not just
>
> the teacher who lectures, but everyone helps and supports each other in some
>
> way. (p. 4)

Relationships evolve as members of the classroom and school develop trust among themselves. Students and teachers together foster the community of their practice. The pedagogy of tutoría demonstrates the principle of weak classification. The relationships between students and teachers are ductile and based on a common desire to learn together, not to reinforce divisions of authority and power.

Framing

A pedagogy for Catholic education is one with weak framing. The weak classification is a prerequisite in many ways for weak framing. When the teacher transfers some of her authority to the students, the students are able to exercise some control over how learning happens as well as what is taught.

Tutoría depends upon weak framing. The decisions that determine what is taught, what is considered a worthwhile topic to study and master, and the sources used for learning are made at the local level. This is not to say that schools using the tutoría model are autonomous in every way. Students still take national standardized exams. This, however, is not the essential objective. Tutoría's weak framing allows the members of the community to be responsible for their curriculum and how it is taught. The schools that join tutorial networks evolve from strong to weak framing.

Tutoría Reframes Framing

Between 2003 and 2012, the Learning Community Project (LCP) introduced tutoría to nearly 9,000 of Mexico's poorest performing schools (Rincón-Gallardo, 2016). The new model was a significant shift to existing instructional practices. Most of these schools were located in rural, under-resourced communities and relied on government

televised presentations of the national curriculum. Rincón-Gallardo (2016) described the context of learning pre-tutoría:

> The general structure of classroom practice in *Telesecundaria*, at least until 2009, consisted of 50-minute sessions for each subject matter. For the first 15 minutes, students watched a lesson on satellite TV, and in the remaining 35 minutes they completed textbook exercises...Teachers functioned mainly as administrators of time and prescribed textbook activities. (pp. 414-15)

When schools joined the LCP, small groups of teachers and students took part in regional professional development sessions with Gabriel and his dedicated team of educators to learn the tutoría pedagogy. As part of their training, teachers and students would be tutored, one-on-one, on topics of their choosing. The experience introduced them to the structure, techniques, and educational philosophy of the model. But this was not all they were learning. They were developing and deepening their knowledge in the fields of mathematics, literature, history, science, art, engineering, and more. Each small group would return to their school community with a new way to teach and deeper knowledge to teach with.

From time to time, members of the community of practice visited with other nearby LCP schools where they had the opportunity to learn more topics and strengthened their tutoring skills. In time, teachers and students discovered that much of that knowledge was embedded inside of themselves, replacing the government televised broadcasts of the curriculum. Rincón-Gallardo and Elmore (2012) explained:

> The knowledge generated through this process becomes the common property of all the parties to the work and is made available to tutors and students in other

[nearby] schools. Over time, students and tutors participate in the construction of a broad fund of knowledge that is made available, through networked relationships, to everyone who participates. This model disrupts the familiar pattern of school; knowledge ceases to be the sole preserve of teachers, learning becomes a collaborative practice among tutors and students and students become active agents not only in deciding what they will learn but also in bringing their learning into their relationships with adults and other students. Students become creators of knowledge as well as consumers of it. (p. 474)

Here we see the effects of weak framing on tutoría. Schools develop a depth of knowledge to bring to bear on the learning experience of its students. Diminished is the schools' reliance on external systems of what is communicated as learning. Further, because the value of classification has become weak, students and teachers together actively participate in cultivating and disseminating knowledge. In his evaluation of the LCP, Shirley (2017) noted the impact of tutoría on both the program of study and its community of learners:

Many of the newly participating schools were remote rural and severely underfunded middle schools with pedagogies that relied excessively on unimaginative frontal instruction on government-sponsored television programs for instruction. Tutorial relations in these schools transformed learning from passive listening to active engagement. Students and teachers responded with enthusiasm. (p. 89)

Tutoría is empowered by weak framing.

My own interactions with teachers and students in Chile in 2019, tell a similar story. For example, a twelve-year-old middle school student, who described herself as someone who struggles in mathematics, described her most recent experience of being tutored:

> Well, recently I was tutored about the bisector rays in mathematics and now I'm implementing that tutorial. I'm going to put more challenges on it and I'm going to tutor it. At first it was difficult for me to do it, but later I could take the form and I could achieve it.

As evident from this student's statement, decisions on matters of learning are local and students play a role. The weak framing conditions of tutoría allow members of the learning community, including the students, to come to the foreground and participate authentically.

Thus far, we have discussed the ways in which tutoría is consistent with weak classification and weak framing. These conditions are necessary for a pedagogy for Catholic education. We now look to examine the pedagogical discourse of tutoría and the way it engages the participants in learning.

Pedagogical Discourse

In this section, my analysis relies on resources provided by *Redes de Tutoría,* the operational hub of tutoría today. Located in Mexico City, Mexico, *Redes de Tutoría* coordinates, develops, and disseminates information and resources to support the expansion and success of tutorial networks around the globe. The pedagogical discourse of a pedagogy for Catholic education features three movements: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. The movements, separately and together as a whole,

invite the participants to encounter learning within themselves and with others. In what ways does the tutorial relationship model foster these three movements? What can they contribute to our quest for a renewed vision of a pedagogy for Catholic education?

Composition

The interactive practice of a pedagogy for Catholic education begins with *composition*. Participants develop a learning experience for another, while they inwardly compose themselves to participate fully in the act of learning from one another. Self-composition consists of personal reflection, as well as being in good relationship with the learning community.

Tutoría relies upon the personal mastery and tutoring skills of many members of the community. Rigorous preparation for interactive practice of one-to-one tutoring is essential for the development of others and contributes to the overall resiliency of the learning community. Therefore, before a tutor offers learning to another, she must dedicate herself to careful preparation. *Redes de Tutoría* (2020) provides these guidelines for composing a tutorial:

> We advise the tutor to begin with some short material--whether it be a short story, a single mathematical problem, a historical essay, an experiment, etc., depending on the subject matter--and learn it for mastery. The budding tutor writes down his motivation to learn that material, his previous experiences with the field, the difficulties he encounters, the discoveries he makes along the process, and the questions that remain open for him. Once he is satisfied with this learning and feels like he can facilitate a similar process to someone else, he can add that material--the story, problem, or experiment--to his "offering catalogue." (p. 7)

The process includes some fairly obvious steps of how one might prepare to teach. What is less obvious, but nonetheless important, is reflecting upon one's motivations and past experiences with students' engagement with the material. Including these elements in the tutor's preparation should enable her to access them as sources of wisdom to inform her tutoring and to enhance the learning experience.

Successful tutoring depends upon healthy relationships within the community of practice. Trust, kindness, and a spirit of cooperation contribute significantly to the quality of the tutoring experience. At each of the learning events I attended in Chile, I observed tutors and tutees engaged in simple acts of kindness and social bonding. The two-hour tutoring session began with singing, dancing, holding hands, and playing games, which consistently resulted in much laughter and joy. Light snacks of juice and cookies were distributed to each workspace, creating a sense of hospitality and communion. As tutors and tutees took their seats, they paused, looked each other in the eyes, smiled, and asked, "How are you today?" If they had not met before, they would spend a few moments getting acquainted.

The intentional steps of preparation, along with the gestures of kindness and community-building, help tutors and tutees recognize that the tutorial is not just about the transfer of information. It is also about getting to know oneself as a learner better and connecting more deeply with the community. Tutoría manifests the elements of the composition movement, and does so in a way that is completely compatible with the premises of Catholic education and its affiliated pedagogies.

Juxtaposition

The second movement in the new pedagogy for Catholic education is *juxtaposition*. It consists of the somewhat random grouping of two or more persons who work together to learn and discover new meaning. A primary objective of this movement is the *recognition rule* (Bernstein, 2000) which establishes understanding between the participants of the interactive discourse. Through dialogue, the one who teaches strives to improve the learner's comprehension by means of confronting pre-existing gaps and misconceptions, pushing the learner past what he already knows.

Tutoría brings together a tutor and a tutee to engage in a loosely scripted, dynamic process of learning. The tutor comes to the tutorial with a strategy that features her learning journey as well as a series of challenges, or *desafíos,* to guide the tutee's learning. The tutee has chosen the tutor's topic from a catalogue of options she's presented to him. The tutee has no knowledge of the tutor's strategy. The tutor knows little of tutee's aptitude on the topic. In this way, the pair unites around the topic in a somewhat random, uninformed fashion. They are juxtaposed--thrown together--with the purpose of creating meaning and form.

As the exchange unfolds, the tutor engages the tutee in a series of challenges. She carefully listens and monitors his thinking and actions. She is careful not to reveal what she is hoping he will discover. According to *Redes de Tutoría* (2020) this is an important part of the tutorial process:

> During the dialogue, the tutor does not strive to convey his own solution to the
> learning challenge, but to engage the learner in the process of discovering his own
> solution. This means the tutor does not give explanations, as does a teacher in

traditional schooling, but listens to the tutee's out-loud thinking and poses focused questions that allow the tutee to clarify and refine her ideas. (p. 9)

Through dialogue, the tutor and tutee work together to establish the recognition rule. The tutor uses the feedback from the tutee as he engages with the challenge to develop additional questions and prompts. The feedback from the tutee demonstrates the boundaries of his current understanding of the topic. The tutor continues to probe. Sample questions are: "What do you notice about X? What happens to X when you add Y? Can you make a diagram to express your question?"

There is a deeper process taking place within the interaction. The tutor is both guiding the tutee toward new knowledge, and she is trying to make sure he knows how he's getting there. In this way the tutee doesn't just learn content, but also learns about learning itself.

Elmore's (Rincón-Gallardo and Elmore, 2012) tutoring experience with Maricruz is illustrative. He wrote,

Her questions were clear and highly focused...She was more interested in what I didn't know, or couldn't readily recover from my prior knowledge...she coached me through a process of thinking about the problem, and diagnosed a critical weakness in my background knowledge. I felt that I was in the hands of an expert. (p. 472)[12]

Maricruz found the holes in her tutee's understanding and scaffolded them in such a way that he himself was able to fill them.

---

[12] Elmore's language is strongly reminiscent of Maritain's (1943) analogy of the educator as medical expert, testing and probing the inner vitality of each learner, diagnosing and guiding the learner toward wholeness.

How should we understand not just the knowledge won, but also the meaning-making that results from the juxtaposition? In a practical way, a learning community that relies on its members (and not the government-televised curriculum) as the primary source of knowledge must strive for this level of comprehension in its tutors and mastery in its tutees. I would also suggest that the tutor has become a meaningful part of the tutee's story, the guide who showed him the way to new understandings. From here, however, the tutee will reflect on the new knowledge he has been given. He will consider how he made it his own, and how he will undertake making a public demonstration to the school community of his intellectual achievement. Finally, he himself will evolve to become a tutor of other students so that the roles he plays continually adapt themselves to new circumstances and needs.

Transposition

The third movement of a pedagogy for Catholic education is *transposition*. It relates to the notion of correspondence, in which the learner demonstrates he has received the lesson and has appropriated the new knowledge. Bernstein (2000) refers to this as the realization rule. The learner moves beyond recognizing the ideas being presented to comprehending and applying them in his own way.

Tutoría promotes the goals of the transposition movement in concrete, visible ways. Throughout the tutorial, the tutor probes the tutee. She is looking for evidence of the tutee's comprehension. She will not accept a response that mimics her own approach to the challenge. The tutee hesitates and understands that in order to move forward, he will have to demonstrate, in his own way, that he comprehends the idea being discussed. For example, the tutor might ask the tutee to devise an alternate explanation for the

challenge he solved. The documentary, *Miravillas* (2013) captures one teacher's first experience with tutoría and his reaction when confronted with this request. He was attending a three-day professional development program provided by the LCP to learn how to become a tutor:

My tutor said to me, "What do you want to work on?"

And I said, "What do you mean, what do I want to work on? You tell me what you want me to work on and I'll do it."

He said, "I'm going to give you a math problem. What do you think?"

I solved it [and said], "Here it is."

[Looking it over, he said,] "Hmmm. Is there another way to solve it?"

"Is it not done correctly?"

"Yes, yes. It's solved correctly. But why don't you see if you can find another way to solve it, another solution."

"But why? If it's already solved?"

The answer to this question, according to Gabriel, is that autonomous thinking is vital to the learning process. Jorge taught him this, the importance of taking responsibility for his own learning.

If I was willing to meet a challenge and find somebody who would accompany me along in my efforts to solve it, not to give me the answers, or to pass on to me the same competency that he had, I knew I could learn. In a few words, it's the experience of being capable of learning by yourself. (G. Cámara, personal communication, April 5, 2019)

Transposition is one of the defining characteristics of tutoría (Ng, 2019; *Redes de Tutoría*, 2017; Rincón-Gallardo, 2015; Rincón-Gallardo & Elmore, 2012). The tutor guides the tutee through the challenge, encouraging him to discover other strategies to demonstrate his grasp of the idea.

In the final stage of the tutorial, the tutee creates an artifact and presents it to the assembled community of practice, often at the close of a learning festival (*Redes de Tutoría*, 2017; Rincón-Gallardo & Elmore, 2012). During my visit to Chilean schools, I observed three learning festivals. Learning festivals bring tutors and tutees together from within a single school or between two or more schools in the network to facilitate multiple tutorials and celebrate the shared practice of learning. As the tutorials conclude, each pair of tutor and tutee is called forward to present to the assembly. The tutor remains silent as the tutee presents a summary of his experience. He highlights the challenge his tutor gave him, and what he discovered about the topic. He synthesizes the things that were difficult, and the questions that he still has. He concludes his brief remarks with a simple statement of thanks to his tutor for helping him learn.

The learning process of tutoría supports the learner's realization of his own knowledge and his role in the construction of it. The tutor is a guide, working alongside the tutee, encouraging him to take up the ideas that have been presented, to work through them, and put them in his own voice. The transposition takes place first during the tutorial between the tutee and tutor, and is then made public, before the members of the learning community. In these ways, tutoría brings to life the transposition movement of the new theory of pedagogy for Catholic education.

Text

The pedagogy for Catholic education aims to increase students' abilities to engage the world, to respond meaningfully and confidently to the challenges they confront, and to do so with compassion for others. We may recall that the etymology of *text* is related to the idea of "weaving" and "to be woven." A cloth is formed by countless threads closely and thoughtfully woven together. The experiences of tutors and tutees evidence such weaving in the ways that they learn together. In the discussion that follows, members of the tutoring networks describe how they themselves have become "woven" and "bonded" by the characteristics of a caring community.

Tutoría produces many texts, or outcomes, all of which deserve thoughtful consideration. Fundamentally, tutoría forms relationships. These relationships help manifest the texts of discipleship and grace. Because relationships are an essential prerequisite to the texts of discipleship and grace, we first familiarize ourselves with the relationships the participants experience. These relationships, which develop over time, form at three levels: between the person and her self-knowledge, between persons engaged in tutorials, and within the wider community using tutoría . We begin with the relationship between the person and self-knowledge.

The Person in Relationship with Self-knowledge

We may recall Gabriel describing his childhood experience of school as "loneliness." This was, he insisted, different from the presence of friends in his life. He was very social, always busy with sports and "mischievings." Regardless, he felt isolated from the primary activity of school: learning. Given the way that his schooling was organized, he had no relationship with learning.

In time, Gabriel began to wonder if his teachers' view of him was correct, that perhaps he was "a disaster." Yet when learning was offered to him by Jorge, with "affection, with truth and honesty, and commitment," he discovered he was capable, in fact, more than capable. With Jorge's tutoring, Gabriel could detect new mathematical patterns and manipulate ideas. He focused on learning how to learn, and discovered a depth to himself he did not know existed before. He could use his imagination to put new ideas together, and this transformed him, and his understanding of who he was. He embraced this new identity and, with joy, reached out to help others.

During my time in Chile, I met dozens of young people whose stories resembled Gabriel's. Manuel, the 15-year-old student in Temuco who was my tutor, is one such case. Enrolled in 7th grade, he was noticeably the oldest in the class by a couple of years. He knew more hardship than most adults I know. He was the oldest of 4 children. His family lived in a slum. His education was regularly disrupted by the need to earn money to help support his family.

A recent change in Manuel's living arrangements with his parents afforded him the opportunity to attend this school, which is implementing tutoría. His teachers told me that when he first arrived he "carried many wounds and would not receive instruction" from them. He sat in the back of the class, disconnected from instruction and from the curriculum.

Then a classmate offered to help and it transformed him. Manuel shared:

This way of teaching has changed me, academically, and in how I behave. I love to learn now and help others. I used to be shy, and nervous to try new things. Now I am more open to learning, and I like to participate in more things. I have

discovered that I am a good dancer. I am learning the dances of my ancestors and I really love it.

Tutoría creates the conditions for the person to be in a new kind of relationship with the self, to learn who she is and what matters to her.

The principal of a Chilean school described how the students' lack of self-confidence was a barrier to the initial implementation of tutoría:

It was a very emotional time, very rocky. The students thought that they were not capable of reading and computation. They resisted the idea of being tutors. We went ahead and saw an awakening. They became very emotional, realizing what they could do. (Personal communication, October 2, 2019)

Tutoría challenges students and teachers to confront their identities as learners. It invites them into a new relationship with understanding who they are, what they know, and what they want to learn.

The Person in Relationship with Other Persons (Tutor with Tutee)

Tutoría invites and sustains delicate, interconnected relationships between tutor and tutee. It is no small thing to have two people, sometimes strangers, draw near to one another to participate in a learning process that is intentionally designed to expose the gaps, misconceptions, and weaknesses of one of the participants. In this vulnerable space, one guides and probes, the other wonders and searches. The tutor leads the tutee to new terrain. The tutor offers encouragement as the tutee manages the uncertainty entailed in learning new material. Trust begins to form as they open themselves up to each other to share their thoughts, observations, and ideas.

Tutoría normalizes this vulnerable exchange with notetaking, or logging, which is expected of both the tutor and the tutee. Each of these activities and affiliated artifacts documents the way in which the tutorial unfolds over time. Notes address the initial thoughts of the presented challenge, questions used to clarify meanings and terms, turning points, setbacks, and breakthroughs. These are all written down, processed, and validated as an important part of the learning experience. They notate more than their own experience of the tutorial; they capture the movements of each other's thinking. They record the questions and responses to the knowledge at the core of the tutorial. In this way, the log is a narrative of the dyad's unfolding encounter. It documents the moves they make together toward recognition and realization. In many ways, the log demonstrates the responsibility they hold for the other's experience.

For genuine learning to happen, the tutor and tutee must work together--closely, attentively, and respectfully. As a result, they discover certain details about each other that had not been known before. They learn about each other's ways of thinking, problem solving, and manners of communication. One fifth grade teacher commented about the changes she saw in her students' relationships: "We can say that they are much closer, because their learning is being personalized and, facing each other, they feel more confident." The benefits of the tutoring model improved her connection with students: "We as teachers can get to know our students even more, if they have a lot of difficulties or what is going on for them [personally]."

Through the partnership they form, the tutor and tutee become, in a sense, "woven" together. The partnership becomes a relationship. As a teacher stated, "One

takes into account the person in tutoría and this allows you to create a bond together"
(Middle school teacher, Temuco, Chile, personal communication, September 30, 2019).

The Person in Relationship with the Community (Beyond Tutors and Tutees)

The bonds students and teachers form through the act of tutoría change the nature of the learning community. During one of my visits, I spent time with middle school faculty to learn about their impressions of tutoría. A teacher of 18 years stated, "I'm beyond happy with the change in my students. I have learned who my students are unlike before. We have established trust and I know them more deeply. I get emotional thinking about the changes I see in them."

Another teacher added, "The students are developing more positive behavior together. Also [with tutoría] you discover new things in your students that you miss in a whole classroom model. This creates bonds. And students are learning to express themselves, express themselves with their learning and also improve their emotional expression. (Middle school teachers, Temuco, Chile, personal communication, October 3, 2019).

The special education (SPED) coordinator at one of the schools noted the positive effects of the model from the perspective of inclusion and the opportunity it provides SPED students to be both tutors and tutees: "With tutoría, the SPED students have managed to become part of one classroom, a classroom of respect, respectful of the different paces and rhythms of each student."

These teacher testimonies capture changes in student and teacher relationships. They pertain to the challenges of fostering community in the classroom and school. In their view, tutoría has facilitated much more than the explicit curriculum. It has moved

the students and teachers away from division and toward understanding, compassion, and inclusion.

The students noted the difference. They preferred to learn with the tutoría model because of the relationships it created. When asked about her experience, one twelve-year-old said,

It has changed things. We now share more and there are no more fights. [We now understand] that we can all learn as we are, all the same, although we have many ways of understanding, that we have differences in learning, we can all be equal. (Personal correspondence, October 4, 2019).

One principal credited tutoría for his students' kind actions when one of their classmates experienced a personal crisis. He explained how a boy with great economic need was taken from his mother and put into a foster home. The boy had attempted suicide.

His classmates heard about this. These kids--who were already trained in the methodology of tutoría—took the lead to organize a response. They found him new housing [with a family in the community], collected materials to make him a new bed, cooked and delivered food and wrote him letters. And it wasn't just a couple of kids helping, it was his whole class. I share this because I believe tutoría played a role in shaping my students' empathy.

For the communities implementing tutoría, the pedagogical methodology has become both a way of sharing knowledge and a way of building a caring, compassionate community. By participating in this form of instruction, the community becomes

involved in each other's learning and, by extension, invested in each other's lives in and out of school.

Tutoría fosters three primary relationships within the learning community: the personal relationship of the tutor and the tutee with knowledge; the partnership relationship between the tutor and the tutee; and the community relationship between tutors and tutees beyond the pedagogical discourse. These relationships are a necessary condition for the texts of discipleship and grace, to which we now turn.

Text of Discipleship

In Chapter Four, I explored discipleship as a text of the pedagogical theory. Through and because of the relationships manifested in tutoría, the pedagogical interaction encourages the dispositions of discipleship. These dispositions develop as the tutorial unfolds.

Composition: Reflection, Peace-Making, and Truth-Seeking.

Beginning with the composition movement, the tutor and tutee practice the qualities of *reflection*, *peace-making*, and *truth-seeking*. The tutorial commences with the contemplation and reflection of an idea. This develops into a lesson as the tutor recalls how she obtained the knowledge she has and *reflects* on the processes she will use to guide the tutee toward the knowledge. Before initiating the lesson, she spends time singing or playing soccer with classmates. She may feel the need to make peace with her peers, apologizing or asking forgiveness for any wrongdoing she has caused. She knows the importance of these actions and the ways in which *being a good friend* impacts her ability to teach and to learn.

As she stands before her classmates and teachers, ready to announce the theme of her tutorial, she does so out of a desire to share her *truth* with another. Her objective is to make a genuine connection with someone else who freely chooses to learn with and from her. Her tutee, who has joined in the singing and ball-playing, accepts the opportunity to learn. He brings his whole self to the tutorial—his identity, history, ambition, struggles and style of learning. He should not disguise what he already knows or endeavor to fake his way through the tutorial in anticipation of an extrinsic reward such as a grade. He presents himself to his tutor with openness and truth.

Juxtaposition: Accompaniment, Clear Speech, Attentive Listening, Meaning Making.

The juxtaposition movement centers on the qualities of accompaniment, clear speech, attentive listening, and meaning making. As the tutorial gets underway, the tutor and the tutee draw near to each other and begin to open themselves up to one another. Simple expressions of introduction lead to the initial challenge and more complex conversation.

The tutor has planned her questions ahead of time but knows these will be adapted as the tutorial unfolds to meet the particular thought patterns of her tutee. She chooses her words intentionally as she scaffolds the posing of new questions. *Speaking* and *listening* are skills that allow her to *accompany* her tutee towards unknown concepts and procedures embedded in the curriculum.

In a similar way, the tutee carefully composes his answers and questions. He attempts to communicate the extent or limitation of his understanding of the given topic. Together, they create *meaning*, an understanding and a narrative of learning and

exploration. The tutorial relationship establishes the recognition rule through effective accompaniment, speech, listening, and meaning making.

Transposition: Interpretation, Affirmation, Identity, and Voice.

As new understandings are formed, the tutorial shifts toward helping the tutee deepen his knowledge and demonstrate his learning. This stage requires the tutee to *interpret* the content of the lesson in his own way. As he searches for the right words and expressions, the tutor listens attentively to *affirm* the tutee's interpretation and if necessary, provide correction. The tutorial has changed the tutee, his *identity*. He is not the same person he was when he selected the topic of study. To demonstrate this change, he creates a unique artifact that represents what he now knows. He is invited before his learning community to *voice* the highlights of his experience, his struggles and his strides to comprehend something he had not understood before.

Tutoría depends upon and reinforces the dispositions of discipleship for both the tutor and tutee. It is the simple yet committed practice of these elements that, over time, shapes the person and the community and forms the disciple. Tutoría facilitates this formation from within the educative practice, prioritizing the dispositions that contribute to discipleship.

Text of Grace

People's everyday lived experience offers an encounter with the effective love of God's grace. We participate in grace when we respond to God's invitation to live into the fullness of our created nature. Tutoría creates an opening for such grace.

We have considered the ways in which knowledge (e.g., the Pythagorean theorem) is composed, juxtaposed, and transposed between the participants of the

pedagogical interaction. We have analyzed this interaction and understood it as an exchange of information and knowledge prepared and given to another. We have also recognized how the regular practice of tutoría is capable of developing the particular dispositions of discipleship. What remains is a discussion on the ways in which tutoría has the potential to facilitate grace.

Tutoría is not simply a transactional exchange of learning; it is also an existential exchange of the self with others. It manifests the ways in which the person is always already embedded in relationship. It is an exchange that operates in the realm of non-value (Chauvet, 1995)[13].

The tutor and tutee, each created in the image and likeness of God, stand open to each other and exchange the very gifts of their selves within the realm of non-value. As the tutee receives the self-gift of the tutor, he will respond by giving himself to others. This pattern of generosity and gratuitousness can be viewed as participation or communion in the realm of God's grace. The acceptance of another's gift of self, obligates us to respond likewise, setting up a covenantal sequence of flourishing and fullness for all. In doing so, the members of the learning community can affirm their relationship with God and with each other as sisters and brothers.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have drawn together the testimonies of those directly involved in tutoría and research on the model. I have shown the ways in which the new theory of pedagogy for Catholic education that I am advancing in this dissertation are manifested in tutoría. Gabriel's reflections on his school-year experiences gave insight to the original

---

[13] For the previous discussion on symbolic exchange as gift of self may be found in Chapter Four.

commitments and aspirations of this transformative model for learning. The geometry tutorial between José and Maria, and Maria's growth in confidence and mastery of the curriculum, conveyed how the model works in action to improve learning.

My analysis of tutoría demonstrates how it embodies the central aspects of the new pedagogy for Catholic education. Beginning with the identity of the person, tutoría affirms tutors and tutees as knower-learners. This happens in two ways. First, each member of the community is recognized as one who will be a tutor and be a tutee. This promotes an egalitarian view that everyone can teach, and everyone can learn. Second, the model's process of learning requires the tutor and the tutee to bring their whole selves--what they know (the knower identity) and what they wonder (the learner identity)--to the interactive activity.

The weak values of classification and framing scaffold the knower-learner identity. Weak classification allows any person who has demonstrated a level of mastery of content with tutoring skills to teach, such as José and his geometry lesson. Weak framing empowers the members of the tutorial networks to define and develop the learning that is deemed necessary.

The learning process of tutoría facilitates three movements of the pedagogical discourse. In the movement of *composition*, students and teachers alike take explicit steps to prepare a program of learning complete with challenges and divergent questions. Prior to the tutorials, they sing, dance, and enjoy each other's company, to create an atmosphere of joy and welcome. Tutees then choose a topic to study and are introduced to their tutors. The *juxtaposition* between the tutor and the tutee creates a new unique encounter for learning. Following the structure (or *ordo*) of the learning process, they

find themselves on unfamiliar ground. The tutor probes and the tutee searches. They

establish the *recognition rule.* As the tutorial progresses, the tutee must find his own way

of expressing the concepts he has learned to establish the *realization rule.* This is the

movement of *transposition*, inviting the tutee to first put the ideas in his own voice, often

in the form of an artifact, and then share this publicly with others gathered at the learning

festival.

The final stage of the analysis was on *text.* I presented the ways in which the

person participating in tutoría becomes woven in the particular values and commitments

of the model. Of particular significance are the relationships. I described how the model

engenders three forms of relationships: between the person and self-knowledge; between

the tutor and the tutee; and between the person and the community. These relationships

create the conditions for the text of discipleship and grace.

At this point, it is important to address a potential point of tension between the

pedagogical theory for Catholic education and tutoría. It is important to note that while

tutoría is not overtly a Catholic pedagogy, it does emerge from a Catholic and Jesuit

formation and sensibility. Certainly, it is possible to identify particular themes and

experiences in Gabriel's life that are the influence of Catholic thought. Being a Jesuit for

22 years is no casual experience! Nevertheless, it remains true that tutoría empowers the

culture in which it is practiced. I suspect tutoría would be just as effective in Buddhist,

Hindu, Muslim cultures due to the nature of its profoundly personal pedagogy.

In the new theory for Catholic education, I describe how the pedagogy encourages

a *text* of discipleship and grace. These are not the priorities of *Redes de Tutoría* and so it

is unreasonable to analyze the *text* of tutoría for these elements. Yet, discipleship and

grace are still attainable. The model develops the dispositions of discipleship, allowing the tutor and tutee to apprentice to these ways of being. The relationships that develop between self and knowledge, others, and community, are also spaces where the person encounters God and participates in God's grace. The work of Catholic schools is to orient the community to this horizon, to help its members to listen for and be open to grace. Tutoría need not inhibit these goals of a Catholic education. Rather, tutoría makes them possible.

CHAPTER SIX

Transforming Learning with Understanding and Relationships

The pandemic has led us to realize that what is really in crisis is our way of understanding reality and relating to one another. --Pope Francis, October 15, 2020

This conceptual study set out to develop a new theory for Catholic education. It responds to a paucity of theory-building in the field and continued concern regarding Catholic schools' ability to form students in and with their faith. My approach has been to draw together the philosophical, theological, and educational disciplines in building this new theory. The premise has been that any authentic contemporary approach to Catholic education must be informed by, and engage with, these three fields of study. It must engage with all three of them simultaneously and critically.

In Chapter One I provided an historic overview of Catholic schooling in the United States and the notable changes in the ways in which the schools identified themselves as Catholic. In the years leading up to and immediately following the Second Vatican Council in 1962, Catholic schools were part of the cultural and religious architecture of the Catholic parish. The school was populated by the children of parishioners and staffed by religiously vowed women and men. Students had fairly consistent exposure to Catholic ways of thinking and seeing, in the formal settings of the classroom, and the informal contexts of everyday conversations and shared reflections. Students were immersed in a culture of sign, symbol, routine, ritual, in their schools and churches, that was held together by women and men whose faith was manifested in highly visible forms.

As this structure started to slowly come apart in the years following the Second Vatican Council, Catholic schools remained resilient, maintaining high standards of academics with a commitment to community. Students thrived in Catholic schools in spite of the social turmoil of the 1960s. Researchers took notice and wanted to understand the factors that were contributing to Catholic school students' success. The strength of relationships existing within the school community became known as the "Catholic school effect." This positive recognition, however, was not enough to reverse the financial hardship that continued to plague schools for decades and contributed to their decline.

Today, many Catholic schools find themselves in a highly competitive education market. They need to articulate their distinctiveness while appealing to a broad population of families who can afford their tuition. Schools, in large part, have adopted secular curricula and marginalized their religious roots as a way to appeal to the market base. The presence of a Catholic culture has become more difficult to perceive in many of these schools. Many schools work to maintain their Catholic identity as an outward sign of their commitment to the Church, but others appear to go so far in mimicking secular schools that their Catholicity appears more residual than vital.

Catholic schools need other approaches to realize a Catholic education with today's students. Opportunities exist in the history and theology of Catholic education, but these need updating and renewal to be effective with today's population of young people and with the challenges we face. The new pedagogical theory for Catholic education is designed as one such approach. It is proposed as one component of a broader approach to transform learning in Catholic schools.

In Chapter Two I presented three essential challenges in Catholic education. The first was defining Catholic education. After tracing this history, I recognized elements to help guide this project. The second challenge was understanding how current approaches used in Catholic schools form students in Catholic education. The pedagogical models were determined to engage students in the principles of Catholic education in a manner the others did not. Lastly, I illustrated how recent discussions on Catholic education have lost touch with their philosophical roots. I suggested the need for more theory-building within the field to spark new debate about the philosophy and theology of elementary and secondary school Catholic education.

Chapter Three introduced a new conceptual framework for Catholic education. The framework responds to the challenges highlighted in the previous chapter by weaving together the foundations of Catholic anthropology with the pedagogical sociological theory of Bernstein (2000) and the aim of Catholic schools as defined by the Church. This framework was used to develop and define the new pedagogical theory for Catholic education presented in Chapter Four.

The pedagogical theory centers on the relationship between learners and educators in the presence of knowledge. The learner is defined as a person who brings one's whole self to learning. Bernstein's (2000) concepts of *classification* and *framing* are used to demonstrate how this identity is supported throughout the learning process. Three movements shape the pedagogical discourse: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. Metaphors bring definition to these movements and explain both their practical and spiritual dimensions. The theory concluded with *text*, the pedagogy's

outcomes. It described the ways in which participants become woven, or formed, with dispositions of discipleship, and the potential to mediate God's grace.

In Chapter Five, I demonstrated the ways in which tutoría embodies the new pedagogical theory for Catholic education. Drawing on research, interviews, and personal correspondence with Gabriel Cámara, who developed the pedagogy, I analyzed the principles and characteristics of tutoría according to the central features of the new pedagogical theory. The identity of the person was shown as both learner and knower, realized in the responsibility each member of the community had to learn-in-order-to-teach and in the ways in which the learning process of the tutorial intentionally engages the unique wisdom of each participant. Examples reflecting non-hierarchical relationships between learners and educators evidenced weak classification and opportunities for the community of learners to influence and develop the focus of the learning signified weak framing.

Next, I demonstrated how the learning process of the tutorial facilitates the triple movements of the theory's pedagogical discourse: composition, juxtaposition, and transposition. These work together in the model to produce a text consisting of relationships with the self, with the other, and with the community. Combined, the three movements and the resultant text create the conditions for discipleship and mediating God's grace.

This new theory of Catholic pedagogy can work in any Catholic school at any grade level and in any academic content area. The effort here is to provide an overarching theory that does not delegate Catholicity to classes on religion or services that are offered in schools. Even though tutoría is not explicitly Catholic, it appears clear that there are

numerous residues of the training that Gabriel Cámara received as a Jesuit to delineate numerous affinities to Catholic approaches to the person, the community, and the larger order of creation in which we all are embedded. This new pedagogy of Catholic education as enacted in tutoría thus in some sense is a work of recovery.

Limitations

One of the limitations of Chapter Five on "Tutoría: A Pedagogy for Catholic Education," is that I was unable to benefit from some of the research literature on tutoría. This is because it is written in Spanish, a language in which I lack fluency. More time and added resources would have allowed me to include this literature and subsequently deepen my study of tutoría.

Another limitation is the incomplete nature of my conversations and work with Gabriel Cámara. Each encounter creates the hope for more conversation. Gabriel is an inspiring and generous wisdom figure in high demand. Our several interactions have been transformative and divergent. The juxtaposition of his life's work with my project has allowed me to transpose the aims of Catholic education into a powerful theory of learning. I remain eager for our next conversation.

Lastly, a conceptual study is naturally limited by the extent to which one comprehends the concept. In this study, I drew on multiple disciplines to develop a theory that was partially *from* the field of Catholic education *for* the field of Catholic education. The introduction of the secular sociological theory of pedagogy advanced by Basil Bernstein required a theoretical synthesis of disparate bodies of knowledge commonly kept distinct from one another. Likewise, tutoría itself has not been theorized as a pedagogy for Catholic education, although I trust this dissertation has revealed a natural

affinity between tutoría and such a pedagogy. I realize that the theory itself is limited by the extent of my own knowledge in the theology, philosophy, and sociology of education. While I believe the pedagogical theory is strong as it now stands, I am convinced it can be made more so from future collaboration with each discipline--an opportunity I fully welcome.

Contributions to the Field

The new pedagogical theory for Catholic education makes several important contributions to the field. Concerning higher education, this project highlights the need for the field of Catholic education to be more intentionally structured and informed by the disciplines of theology, philosophy, and education. The deep knowledge that undergirds Catholic education exists in a fragmented way in higher education, making it more challenging to develop scholarship that integrates these disciplines. As a result, projects that look to improve Catholic education are not being developed in conversation, either within the tradition itself, or in dialogue with others sympathetic to the aims of Catholic schools. While inchoate, the approach used to develop the new theory is one I hope will inspire others in the field of Catholic education.

The second contribution is linked to the first. The field of Catholic education needs more theory, ideas that are informed and articulated by the commitments of the Catholic tradition. Catholic schools need support for the countless challenges they face. Without theories for Catholic education, Catholic schools will continue to rely on educational theories that have emerged from secular projects. Even if some of the theories for Catholic education are inferior to those produced for secular education, the

field will benefit and grow stronger from the effort and the debate that comes with theory-building.

The new theory also creates a different conversation about the meaning of Catholic education. As demonstrated in Chapter Two, many schools conceptualize Catholic education as a curriculum, as informational content to teach to students. The new theory implicates *how* we teach as part of *what* we teach. How would schools articulate their Catholic identity if Catholic education was reimagined as a *how* and not a *what*?

In addition, the theory for Catholic education has the potential to support current efforts to reform diversity, equity, and inclusion in Catholic schools. In the opening chapter, I highlighted a young Black man's experience of Catholic school and critiqued it for the ways in which it excluded him, his story, his voice, and his aspirations. Catholic schools, in their efforts to recognize the identities of their students, will find the pedagogy for Catholic education highly useful. As exemplified by tutoría, the conditions of classification and framing create a necessary space for each person to bring his/her whole self to contribute to and help form the learning community. This approach centers on the members of the community and allows for this change to evolve organically from within the routine and ordinary, common and daily experiences of learning.

Lastly, and most importantly, the new theory, imagined in tutoría, provides schools with a powerful program for change. As the world's largest educational system, Catholic schools are well positioned to respond to the current education crisis articulated in the Pope's (2020) recent encyclical, *Fratelli Tutti*, (translation: On Fraternity and

Social Friendship). On October 15, 2020, less than two weeks after the release of *Fratelli tutti*, Pope Francis addressed the Congregation for Catholic Education in Rome, saying:

> The pandemic has led us to realize that what is really in crisis is our way of understanding reality and relating to one another...Education is above all a matter of love and responsibility handed down from one generation to another...What is called for is an integral process that responds to those situations of loneliness and uncertainty about the future that affect young people...This entails a shared journey…(pp. 2-3)

The Pope's words offer a harsh critique of the education landscape. The systems have failed to accomplish understanding and the ability to relate to others.

Pope Francis remains hopeful, though, emphasizing love and responsibility as the essence of education. What is needed? An "integral process that responds to those situations of loneliness and uncertainty." Analyzing the Pope's message, we see the virtues of understanding, relationship, love, and responsibility being called upon to respond to the endemic loneliness and uncertainty caused by the pandemic. We also see him pointing towards promising new pedagogies for Catholic education, of which tutoría could be one example. As an antidote to the current educational crisis for millions of young people, the contribution of tutoría is just beginning to show its promise.

Future Directions

It's a hot and humid January morning. Desert sands from the Sahara float in the air, creating an orange hue across the landscape. It's Harmattan season in Nigeria.

I'm in the back seat of a small Toyota pickup truck. On my left is Nkadi Onyegegbu, Professor of Science Education at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Affectionately called, "Prof." Nkadi is a wisdom figure and force for change. Mrs. Nelly Omeke, Diocesan School Supervisor, is on my right. She has helped coordinate today's visit. Up front are Francis, our driver, and Samson, our defender--a local police officer, armed with a rifle. The car in front of us carries my dear colleague, Fr. Gilbert Ezeugwu, former Chair of the Educational Commission for the Diocese of Nsukka and doctoral student at Boston College, and Officer Sunday, the other half of our police detail. We are on our way to Saint Boniface Okpaligbo-Ogu Catholic school to meet students and reconnect with the pastor and one of his teachers who both participated in last week's conference on Catholic education. The school serves 144 students with a faculty of nine teachers. We are travelling to St. Boniface because it has requested to pilot tutoría.

The pastor sees us driving up and warmly welcomes us. He is very happy we have made the difficult and dangerous journey. He is excited to show us what is taking place at his school. The school is a basic structure with a boarded roof and walls constructed out of hardened earth. There is no electricity or running water.

I enter the classrooms and meet with students. Their teacher, who first experienced tutoría at the conference days before, has just introduced her class to some of the model's principles. Within the last hour, the students have rearranged their desks and chairs from a front-facing orientation to face each other. Two students from the next grade level have been invited to the class by the teacher to work with her students on algebra. In these small ways, the teacher has begun to make tremendous change. She has reconfigured her students' relationship with learning, with each other, and with her. Their enthusiasm is unmistakable.

This is the Catholic education I am searching for. As I said in the opening chapter, I believe Catholic education is learning who we are (our Christian anthropology), exploring what our life means (God's desire to be in relationship with us), and discovering what to do with our life moving forward (how to carry out our responsibility as agents of God's reign). The new pedagogy for Catholic education offers a unique learning experience, inviting teachers and learners to engage in and respond to our past, present and future. The pedagogy is surely an element of the antidote Pope Francis is seeking. It is the favorable circumstances of "affection...truth and honesty, and commitment" that Gabriel Cámara and *Redes de Tutoría* are disseminating. The educational project before us *is* the education project begun centuries ago by a carpenter from Nazareth.

References

Augustine. (2002). *On the Trinity: Books 8-15* (G. B. Matthews, Ed.; S. McKenna, Trans.).

Cambridge University Press.

Baines, A. C. (2021). Transposing instruments. In *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University

Press.

https://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001

.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000028272

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. Rowman & Littlefield

Publishers.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse (class, codes and control)*.

Routledge.

Beutow, H. A. (1985). *A history of United States Catholic schooling*. National Catholic

Educational Association.

Bible Gateway passage: Genesis 1 - New Revised Standard Version. (2020a, May 31). Bible

Gateway. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+1&version=NRSV

Bible Gateway passage: Luke 15 - New American Standard Bible. (2020b, July 19). Bible

Gateway. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke%2015&version=NASB

Bless, W. (1957). Role of the school in the religious formation of youth. *Lumen Vitae*, *12*, 99–

112.

Boland, OP, V. (2013). Thomas Aquinas, Catholic education and the transcendental properties

of truth, goodness, beauty and integrity. In S. McKinney & J. Sullivan (Eds.), *Education

in a Catholic perspective* (pp. 49–64). Ashgate Publishing Company.

Bonhoeffer, D. (1963). *The cost of discipleship*. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Bradshaw, P. (1992). *The search for the origins of Christian worship*. Oxford University Press.

Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Harvard University Press.

Byrne, R., & Devine, D. (2017). Theorising Catholic education: The relevance of Bourdieu and Bernstein for empirical research. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, *9*(1), 29–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/19422539.2017.1286908

Cámara, G. (2008). *Otra educación básica es posible*. Siglo XXI.

CARA. (2017). *Frequently requested church statistics: World data over time*. Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate. http://cara.georgetown.edu/frequently-requested-church-statistics/

Carr, D., Haldane, J., McLaughlin, T., & Pring, R. (1995). Return to the crossroads: Maritain fifty years on. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *43*(2), 162–178.

Catholic Higher Education Supporting Catholic Schools (CHESCS). (2020). *Dissertations pertaining to Catholic education: 1980-*.

Chasmar, J. (2017, August 25). California Catholic school removes Jesus and Mary statues: "Alienating." *The Washington Times*.

Chauvet, L.-M. (1995). *Symbol and sacrament: A sacramental reinterpretation of Christian existence* (P. Madigan, SJ & M. Beaumont, Trans.). The Liturgical Press.

Cieslak, M. J. (2006). The lack of consensus among Catholics for establishing new elementary schools. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *10*(2), 139–157.

Clifford, A. M. (2004). Creation. In F. S. Fiorenza & J. P. Galvin (Eds.), *Systematic theology: Roman Catholic perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 201–251). Fortress Press.

Clifford, R. J. (1988). Genesis 1-3: Permission to exploit nature? *Bible Today*, *26*, 133–135.

Coleman, J. S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1982). *High school achievement: Public, Catholic, & private schools compared*. Basic Books.

Coleman, James S., & Hoffer, T. (1987). *Public and private high schools: The impact of communities*. Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Composition | Search Online Etymology Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved December 27, 2020, from https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=composition

Congregation for Catholic Education. (1977). *The Catholic school*. Vatican. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_19770319_catholic-school_en.html

Congregation for Catholic Education. (1997). *The Catholic school on the threshold of the third millennium*. Vatican. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_27041998_school2000_en.html

Congregation for the clergy. (1997). *General directory for catechesis*. Vatican.

Conroy, J. C. (Ed.). (1999). *Catholic education: Inside out*. Veritas Publishers.

Convey, J. J. (1992). *Catholic schools make a difference: Twenty-five years of research*. National Catholic Educational Association.

Convey, J. J. (2012). Perceptions of Catholic identity: Views of Catholic school administrators and teachers. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice*, *16*(1), 187–214.

Cook, T. J. (2008). *Catholic Identity Today*. 8.

Córdova Lucas, J. L. (2013). *Maravillas*.

Corso, M. J. (1999). The parish and family as catechist. In T. H. Groome & M. J. Corso (Eds.), *Empowering catechetical leaders* (pp. 83–112). National Catholic Educational Association.

Crary, D. (2020, June 11). *Amid pandemic, scores of US Catholic schools face closure*. AP NEWS. https://apnews.com/4fe7bd56c238888d9842760236502453

Crossan, J. D. (1992). *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (2nd ed. edition). Polebridge Press.

Davis, R. A. (1999). Can there be a Catholic curriculum? In J. C. Conroy (Ed.), *Catholic education: Inside out, outside in* (pp. 207–229). Veritas Publishers.

Davis, R. A., & Franchi, L. (2013). A Catholic curriculum for the twenty-first century. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, *5*(1), 36–52.

Disciple | Search Online Etymology Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved February 2, 2021, from https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=disciple

Dooley, OP, C. (2000). The religious education curriculum in Catholic schools. In J. Youniss, J. J. Convey, & J. A. McLellan (Eds.), *The Catholic character of Catholic schools* (pp. 156–175). University of Notre Dame.

D'Orsa, T. (2013). Catholic curriculum: Re-framing the conversation. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, *5*(1), 68–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/19422539.2012.754589

D'Souza, M. (2016). *A Catholic philosophy of education: The church and two philosophers*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Duminuco, SJ, V. J. (1993). *Ignatian pedagogy: A practical approach*. International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education.

Duminuco, SJ, V. J. (1999). *Towards the millennium—Catholic Education: Identity, context, pedagogy* (J. C. Conroy, Ed.; pp. 135–162). Veritas Publishers.

Durheim, B. (2010). *Symbolic Exchange and the Gift: Louis-Marie Chauvet and Jacques Derrida in Dialogue*. 9.

Durkheim, E. (1971). *The elementary forms of religious life: A study in religious sociology*. Allen and Unwin.

EarMaster—Music Theory & Ear Training on PC, Mac and iPad. (2020, August 19). https://www.earmaster.com

Eck, E. van. (2016). *The Parables of Jesus the Galilean: Stories of a Social Prophet*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Elias, J. L. (1999). Whatever happened to Catholic philosophy of education? *Religious Education*, *94*(1), 92–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408990940108

Elmore, R. (2016). *Reflections on the role of Tutoría in the future of learning*. Redes de Tutoría.

Elox, M. M. (2019). *Freedom to learn in Mexican rural middle schools*. A talk for the 50th Carl Rogers annual conference, San Diego, California.

Engebretson, K. (2014). *Catholic schools and the future of the church*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Fichter, J. H. (1959). Are parochial schools worthwhile? *The Catholic World*, *188*, 362–367.

Franchi, L. (2018). Religious education and Catholic education: A Scottish perspective. In *Researching Catholic Education* (pp. 219–230). Springer Nature.

Freire, P. (2012). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Fuller, C., & Johnson, L. (2014). Tensions between Catholic identity and academic achievement in an urban Catholic high school. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *17*(2), 95–123.

Gadotti, M. (1996). *Pedagogy of praxis* (J. Milton, Trans.). State University of New York Press.

Garcia-Huidobro, J. (2017). What are Catholic schools teaching to make a difference? A literature review of curriculum studies in Catholic schools in the United States and the United Kingdom since 1993. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *20*(2), 64–97. https://doi.org/10.15365/joce.2002032017

Giroux, H. A. (2020). *On critical pedagogy*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Gittins, A. J. (2008). *Called to be sent: Co-missioned as disciples today*. Liguori Publishers.

Glock, C., & Stark, R. (1969). (N.T.). *The Wisconsin State Journal*, 10.

Grace, G. (2002). *Catholic schools: Mission, markets & morality*. RoutledgeFalmer.

Grace, G. (2010). Renewing spiritual capital: An urgent priority for the future of Catholic education internationally. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, *2*(2), 117–128.

Grace, G., & O'Keefe, S. J., J. M. (Eds.). (2007). *International handbook of Catholic education: Challenges for school systems in the 21st century* (Vol. 1–2). Springer.

Grant, M. A., & Hunt, T. C. (1992). *Catholic School Education in the United States: Development and current concerns*. Garland Publishing, Inc.

Greeley, A. M. (1982). *Catholic high schools and minority students*. Transaction Books.

Greeley, A. M., & Rossi, P. H. (1966). *The education of Catholic Americans*. Aldine Publishing Company.

Griffith, C. M. (2002). Human bodiliness: Sameness as starting point. In E. Johnson (Ed.), *The church women want: Catholic women in dialogue* (pp. 60–67). The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Groome, T. (1998). *Educating for Life: A spiritual vision for every teacher and parent*. Thomas More.

Groome, T. (2011). *Will there be faith? A new vision for educating and growing disciples*. HarperCollins.

Groome, T. H. (1991). *Sharing faith: A comprehensive approach to religious education and pastoral ministry*. Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Groome, T. H. (1996). What makes a school Catholic? In T. McLaughlin & J. O'Keefe (Eds.), *The contemporary Catholic school* (pp. 107–125). RoutledgeFalmer.

Groppe, E. T. (2004). *Yves Congar's theology of the Holy Spirit*. Oxford University Press.

Guerra, M. J. (1993). *Dollars and sense: Catholic high schools and their finances*.

Guerra, M. J. (2004). Catholic schools in the United States: A gift to the church and a gift to the nation. *Seminarium*, *1*(2), Article 2.

Haight, R. (2004). Sin and grace. In F. S. Fiorenza & J. P. Galvin (Eds.), *Systematic theology: Roman Catholic perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 375–429). Fortress Press.

Haldane, J. (1996). Catholic education and Catholic identity. In T. McLaughlin, J. O'Keefe, & B. O'Keeffe (Eds.), *The contemporary Catholic school: Context, identity and diversity* (pp. 126–135). The Falmer Press.

Harris, M. (1989). *Fashion Me a People: Curriculum in the Church*. Westminster/John Knox Press.

Hastings, P. (1996). Openness and intellectual challenge in Catholic schools. In T. McLaughlin, J. O'Keefe, & B. O'Keeffe (Eds.), *The contemporary Catholic school: Context, identity, and diversity* (pp. 272–283). Falmer Press.

Holland, J. (1981). Social class and changes in the orientations to meanings. *Sociology*, *15*(1), 1–18.

Hunt, T., Joseph, E., & Nuzzi, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of research on Catholic education*. Greenwood Press.

Johnson, E. (2009). *She who is* (10th ed.). The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Joseph, E. A. (2001). The philosophy of Catholic education. In T. C. Hunt, E. A. Joseph, & R. J. Nuzzi (Eds.), *Handbook of research on Catholic education* (pp. 27–63). Greenwood Press.

Juxtaposition | Search Online Etymology Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved December 27, 2020, from https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=juxtaposition&ref=searchbar_searchhint

Kelty, B. J. (1999). Toward a theology of Catholic education. *Religious Education*, *94*(1), 6–23.

Kilgallen, J. J. (2008). *Twenty parables of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*. Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico.

Koob, A. C. (1971). Catholic education: Today and tomorrow. *Notre Dame Journal of Education*, *2*(Spring), 30–35.

Krebbs, M. J. (2000). Values infusion: A systematic response to Catholic identity. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *3*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.15365/joce.0303042013

Lathrop, G. (1998). *Holy things: A liturgical theology*. Augsburg Fortress.

Lewis, C. S. (1949). *Transposition, and other addresses.* London. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b3932648

Lorenz, K. (2017). *Introduction to the content and context of the Ratio studiorum: Notes, quotes, and commentaries on the Jesuit educational ideal*.

Lovat, T., & Clement, N. (2014). So who has the values? Challenges for faith-based schools in an era of values pedagogy. In *International handbook of learning, teaching and leading in faith-based schools* (pp. 567–581). Springer.

Maher, J. A. (1970). Close a school? *Catholic School Journal*, *70*, 30–32.

Maney, J. S., Carrie, K., & Kiely, T. J. (2017). Who do you say you are: Relationships and faith in Catholic schools. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *21*(1), Article 1. http://dx.doi.org/10.15365/joce.2101032017

Maritain, J. (1943). *Education at the crossroads*. Yale University Press.

Matthews, G. B. (Ed.). (2002). Introduction. In *On the Trinity: Books 8-15* (pp. ix–xxix). Cambridge University Press.

McDonald, PBVM, D., & Schultz, M. (2019). *United States Catholic elementary and secondary schools 2018-2019: The annual statistical report on schools, enrollment and staffing*. National Catholic Education Association.

McFague, S. (1987). *Models of God: Theology for an ecological, nuclear age*. Fortress Press.

McKinney, S. (2013). Catholic education. In S. McKinney & J. Sullivan (Eds.), *Education in a Catholic perspective* (pp. 13–30). Ashgate Publishing Company.

McLaughlin, T. (1996). The distinctiveness of Catholic education. In T. McLaughlin, J. O'Keefe, & B. O'Keeffe (Eds.), *The contemporary Catholic school: Context, identity and diversity* (pp. 136–154). The Falmer Press.

Meehan, A. (2007). Paradise regained: Teaching science from a Christian standpoint in a postmodern age. *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*, *59*(4), 275–282.

Meier, J. P. (2013). The historical Jesus and his historical parables. In *The Gospels: History and Christology* (Vol. 1, pp. 237–260). Editrice Vaticana.

Melley, P. D. (2021). Roots and branches: The origins and potential of mystagogy in religious education today. *Journal of Religious Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40839-021-00132-y

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Approach. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved February 2, 2021, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/approach

Miller, CSB, M. J. (2006). *The Holy See's Teaching on Catholic Schools*. Sophia Institute Press.

Morris, A. (Ed.). (2012). *Catholic education: Universal principles, locally applied*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Neal, SNDdeN, M. A. (1990). *From nuns to sisters: An expanding vocation*. Twenty Third Publications.

Neuwien, R. (1966). *Catholic schools in action: A report*. University of Notre Dame.

Ng, M. (2019). The program for the improvement of academic achievement in México: Tutorial relationships as an imposition of freedom to transform the instructional core. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, *18*(3), 394–411.

O'Donoghue, T., & Potts, A. (2004). Researching the lives of Catholic teachers who were members of religious orders: Histographical consideration. *History of Education*, *33*(4), 469–481.

O'Keefe, J., & O'Connor, M. T. (2014). Faith related schools in the United States: The current reality. In J. D. Chapman, S. McNamara, M. Reiss, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *International handbook of learning, teaching and leading in faith-based schools* (pp. 115–138). Springer.

O'Keefe, J., & Scheopner, A. (2007). No margin, no mission: Challenges for Catholic urban schools in the USA. In G. Grace & J. O'Keefe (Eds.), *International handbook of Catholic education* (pp. 15–36). Springer.

Oldenski, T. (1997). *Liberation theology and critical pedagogy in today's Catholic schools: Social justice in action*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315051017

O'Toole, J. (2009). *The Faithful*. Harvard University Press.

Ozar, L., & Weitzel-O'Neill, P. (Eds.). (2012). *National standards and benchmarks for effective Catholic elementary and secondary schools*. Loyola University Chicago, Center for Catholic School Effectiveness. https://www.catholicschoolstandards.org/

Pagola, J. A. (2013). *Jesus: An historical approximation* (M. Wilde, Trans.; 4th ed.). Convivium Press.

Parable | Origin and meaning of parable by Online Etymology Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved December 27, 2020, from https://www.etymonline.com/word/parable

Pew Research Center. (2019). *In U.S., decline of Christianity continues at rapid pace*.

Pollefeyt, D., & Bouwens, J. (2010). Framing the identity of Catholic schools: Empirical methodology for quantitative research on the Catholic identity of an education institute. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, *2*(2), 193–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/19422539.2010.504034

Pope Francis. (2020a). *Fratelli Tutti*. Vatican.

   http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-

   francesco_20201003_enciclica-fratelli-tutti.html

Pope Francis. (2020b, October 15). *Global compact on education*. Congregation for Catholic

   Education, Rome.

Pope Paul VI. (1965). *Gravissimum Educationis (Declaration on Christian education_*.

   Vatican. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-

   ii_decl_19651028_gravissimum-educationis_lt.html

Porath, J. (2000). Not just religious education: The academic character of Catholic schools. In

   J. Youniss, J. J. Convey, & J. A. McLellan (Eds.), *The Catholic character of Catholic

   schools* (pp. 219–240). University of Notre Dame.

Redes de Tutoría. (n.d.). *Tutoría Toolkit* (pp. 1-17).

Redes de Tutoría. (2017). *Redes de tutoría: Impact report* (pp. 1- 39).

Ribeiro Almeida, J. (2019). "Application of the senses" in Ignatian prayer. *The Downside

   Review*, *137*(2), 47–58.

Rincón-Gallardo, S. (2011). *Educational change as experienced by nine teachers in

   marginalized Mexican public schools: Challenges and possibilities of transforming

   schools from the inside-out*. Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Rincón-Gallardo, S. (2015). Los Talleres: A CONAFE post-primary center (Mexico 1996-

   2003). In E. Rodríguez (Ed.), *Pedagogies and curriculums to (re)imagine public

   education: Transnational tales of hope and resistance* (Vol. 3, pp. 157–170). Springer.

Rincón-Gallardo, S. (2016). Large scale pedagogical transformation as widespread cultural

   change in Mexican public schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, *17*, 411–436.

Rincón-Gallardo, S. (2019). *Liberating learning: Educational change as social movement*. Routledge.

Rincón-Gallardo, S., & Elmore, R. (2012). Transforming teaching and learning through social movement in Mexican public middle schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, *82*(4), 471–490. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.82.4.46751717307t4j90

Ryan, M. P. (1963). *Are parochial schools the answer?* The Guild Press.

Sachs, J. R. (1991). *The Christian vision of humanity: Basic Christian anthropology*. The Liturgical Press.

Sawicki, M. (1988). *The Gospel in history: Portrait of a teaching church: The origins of Christian education*. Paulist Press.

Schmemann, A. (1975). *Introduction to liturgical theology*. Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Schuttloffel, M. (2012). Catholic identity: The heart of Catholic education. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice*, *16*(1), 148–154.

Seidl, A. A. (1968). *Focus on change: Management of resources in Catholic schools*. Joseph F. Wagner, Inc.

Senge, P. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline field book for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. Doubleday.

Shimabukuro, G. (2008). Toward a pedagogy grounded in Christian spirituality. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *11*(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.15365/joce.1104082013

Shirley, D. (2017). *The new imperatives of educational change: Achievement with integrity*. Routledge.

Standaert, N. (2007). The composition of place: Creating space for an encounter. *The Way*, *46*(1), 7–20.

Staysniak, C. (2012). "We are definitely the pioneers of this movement": The Regis lay

    apostolate and the origins of postgraduate volunteerism, 1949-1972. *American Catholic*

    Studies, *123*(4), 46–65.

Sullivan, J. (2001). *Catholic education: Distinctive and inclusive*. Kluwer Academic

    Publishers.

Sweet, W. (2019). Jacques Maritain. In E. Zalta (Ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

    Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2019/entries/maritain/

Tanner, K. (1994). The difference theological anthropology makes. *Theology Today*, *50*(4),

    567–579.

Taylor, C. (2007). *A secular age*. Belknap Press.

Text | Search Online Etymology Dictionary. (2020, August 23).

    https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=text

Thayer & Smith. (1999). Greek lexicon entry for eikon. In *The NAS New Testament Greek*

    Lexicon—New American Standard.

    https://www.biblestudytools.com/lexicons/greek/nas/eikon.html

Topping, R. N. S. (Ed.). (2015). *Renewing the mind: A reader in the philosophy of Catholic*

    education. The Catholic University of America Press.

Transpose | Origin and meaning of transpose by Online Etymology Dictionary. (2020, August

    19). https://www.etymonline.com/word/transpose

van Manen, M. (1982). Phenomenological pedagogy. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *12*(3), 283–299.

van Manen, M. (2016). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive*

    pedagogy (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Westoff, C., & Ryder, N. B. (2008). National fertility survey, 1970. *Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research*. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR20003.v1

Whittle, S. (2015). *A theory of Catholic education*. Bloomsbury.

Whitty, G., Rowe, G., & Aggleton, P. (1994). Discourse in cross-curricular contexts: Limits to empowerment. *International Studies in the Sociology of Education*, *4*(1), 25–41.

Youniss, J., & Convey, J. J. (Eds.). (2000). *Catholic schools at the crossroads*. Teachers College.

Youniss, J., Convey, J. J., & McLellan, J. A. (Eds.). (2000). *The Catholic character of Catholic schools*. University of Notre Dame.

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2005). *Best practice: Today's standards for teaching and learning in America's schools*. Heinemann.