
Advances in
**Social Science,
Education
and Humanities
Research**

Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Psychology and Pedagogy - "Diversity in Education" (ICEPP 2019)

Bibliographic information:

Title	Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Psychology and Pedagogy - "Diversity in Education" (ICEPP 2019)
Editors	Tina Hayati Dahlan (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia) Hani Yulindrasari (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia) Yeni Rachmawati (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia) Vina Adriany (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia) Tutin Aryanti (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia) Kiyomi Banda (SANNŌ University, Japan) Fonny Dameaty Hutagalung (University of Malaya) Bambang Sumintono (University of Malaya)
Part of series	ASSEHR
Volume	399
ISSN	2352-5398
ISBN	978-94-6252-896-3

Indexing

All articles in these proceedings are submitted for indexation in **CPCI**, **CNKI** and **Google Scholar**. Optionally, we also submit to **Compendex** and **Scopus**. Note that in case you need information about the indexation of these proceedings, please check with the organizers of the conference as we cannot reply to messages received from participants.

Free Access

In order to increase the visibility of this conference and of the papers from its participants, this conference has chosen to sponsor the online publication of the conference papers. Therefore, all conference papers can be read and downloaded **for free**; no subscription or other payment is required.

Copyright

The copyright of all articles published in these proceedings remains with the **Authors**, i.e. Authors retain full ownership of their article. Permitted third-party reuse of the open access articles is defined by the applicable **Creative Commons (CC)** end-user license which is accepted by the Authors upon submission of their paper. All articles in these proceedings are published under the **CC BY-NC 4.0** license, meaning that end users can freely **share** an article (i.e. copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and **adapt** it (i.e. remix, transform and build upon the material) on the condition that proper **attribution** is given (i.e. appropriate credit, a link to the applicable license and an indication if any changes were made; all in such a way that does not suggest that the licensor endorses the user or the use) and the material is only used for **non-commercial** purposes. For more information, please refer to the [Open Access and User Licenses](#) section in the [Atlantis Press Open Access & Article Sharing policy](#).

Lecturers' Perspectives on Ignatian Pedagogy

Brigitta Erlita Tri Anggadewi, Timotius Maria Raditya Hernawa, Marcellinus Andy Rudhito, Danang Satria Nugraha, Maria Josepha Retno Priyani

Universitas Sanata Dharma
brigitta.erlita@gmail.com

Abstract

Ignatian Pedagogy (IP) is signature pedagogy in Jesuit education. It is an approach through which lecturers help students to be a whole-person. This pedagogy consists of elements, which form a cycle: Context, Experience, Reflection, Action and Evaluation. Since the lecturers become the keys in the implementation, it is pivotal to understand their perspectives on the pedagogy. Based on the background, this research aims at investigating how much the lecturers are informed about IP, how the lecturers implement IP in the learning, as well as the effects after implementing IP. The participants were 72 lecturers in a private Jesuit university in Yogyakarta. The data were gathered through open-ended questionnaires. The data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. The results showed that 79% of the lecturers understood and have implemented IP in learning. With regards to Context, the lecturers made efforts in understanding the students' context through direct interactions, both orally and in written forms. Experiences are given both inside and outside the classroom. Reflection was done in a flexible manner based on the dynamics of each class. Evaluation is done orally and in written forms and would result in Action after the learning is done. The effects of IP implementation are improvement in intrapersonal skills, development of more contextualized learning experiences, and improvement in interpersonal skills.

Keywords: Ignatian Pedagogy, lectures, context, experience, reflection, action, evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

Education places educators as the key to implemented a science. Lecturer as facilitators to help students to find the meaning of knowledge. In the context of education in Indonesia, tertiary institutions have a goal to play a strategic role in educating the nation's life, advancing science and technology by applying the values of humanity and civilizing and empowering a sustainable Indonesian.

Learning in college is learning for adults. Knowles (1998) calls adult learning is andragogy. According to Knowles, adult learning depends on life needs and experiences. Knowles argues that motivation to learn is a life motivation or problem centered. One of the paradigms of adult learning that can be used is the Ignatian Pedagogy paradigm.

Pedagogy is a way in which lecturer accompany students in their growth and development. Ignatian pedagogy was published in 1993 in response to questions for lecturers in the Jesuit school about whether there was a difference in the Jesuit approach to teaching itself. Ignatian Pedagogy is inspired by Saint Ignatius who emphasizes the humanist spirit and is universal. Attention to students as individuals, or known by the Jesuit with the term *curapersonalis*, makes the first Jesuitlecturers really care about what really helps learning and human growth. How educators relate to students,

how educators understand learning, how educators engage students in finding the truth, what educators expect from educators, integrity and idealism of educators, all have a significant impact on the growth of learners.

Ignatian Pedagogical principles in learning include; (a) lecturers have a role in serving students, are sensitive to the talents and difficulties of students, are personally involved, and help develop the internal abilities of each student; (b) students need to be actively involved in study, discovery and creativity personal; (c) the relationship between lecturers and students is personal and sustainable; (d) syllabus and teaching are adjusted to the level of ability of students; (e) content and materials (education) are arranged in logical order; (f) repetition and improvement (preview and review) really strives for better mastery, better assimilation, and a deeper view; (g) the depth of the material takes precedence over the breadth of coverage (*non multa, sedmultum*).

According to Korth (2008), there are five elements in the Ignatian Pedagogy paradigm, namely; (a) Context, where educators need to understand the world of students, including family life, friends, culture, politics, economics, religion, media, art, music, and reality another world that affects the lives of students; (b) experience, where educators must create conditions in which students collect together material from their experience to filter out what students have understood in the form of facts, feelings, values, insights, and intuition and brought in lecture material; (c) Reflection, where memory,

understanding, imagination and feeling are used to find meaning and value that is the essence of what is learned, to find its relationship with human knowledge and activities, and appreciate its implications in continuing the search truth; (d) Action, educators provide opportunities that will challenge imagination and train the willingness of learners to choose probably the best of an action from what students learn; (e) Evaluation which is an activity to measure the development of students in aspects of mind, feeling (heart), and enthusiasm. The ongoing process of experience, reflection and action is at the core of Ignatian Pedagogy.

Basen on some previous researches (Hayes, 2006; DeFeo, 2009; Fager, 2010; Van Hise & Massey, 2010; Callahan, 2013; Mountin & Nowacek, 2012; McAvoy, 2013; Van Hise, 2013; Schiller, 2013; Mesa, 2013; Pennington, Crewell, Snedden, Mulhall, & Ellison, 2013; Font-Guzmán, 2014; Rigby, 2005; Lu & Rosen, 2015) it was an evidence that Ignatian Pedagogy can be embedded on the education process itself. The implementation is depending on at least two actors, namely educators and learners or students. As an illustration, consider the figure 1 in appendix section.

If the paradigm is done well, students can truly have the habit of thinking and acting and understanding where they live in the world as people who are competent (competence), listen to conscience, and be compassionate, to seek greater goodness. While the key to learning also lies with educators. Then the relationship of trust and friendship between educators and students is a condition to be able to increase growth with a commitment to values.

Although it has strong and clear learning principles, there are no empirical reports on how to internalize it with every educator. The description of the importance of the role of the lecturer in the learning process includes how they internalize the values of learning, making this research necessary. For this reason, the objective of this study is the views of the lecturer on (a) the Ignatian Pedagogy Paradigm (PPI); (b) the way the lecturer knows the context of the student; and (c) the way the lecturer presents aspects of learning experience. This research aims at investigating how much the lecturers are informed about IP, how the lecturers implement IP in the learning, as well as the effects after implementing IP.

2. METHOD

This research uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative designs (mixed methods). The type of research used is exploratory design, namely research that uses qualitative methods to find important aspects that underlie the phenomena that will be examined and supported by quantitative data (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012).

In this study, qualitative design was used at the beginning of the study to uncover aspects that wanted to be explored, namely aspects of perceptions, values, and attitudes of lecturers according to the purpose of this study. Twelve lecturers were selected from different study program to represents each of it. They were separated into two focused

group discussion (FGD). Content analysis was used to analyzed result of FGD to discover their perceptions, values and attitudes which later was used to develop questionnaire. According to Sieh and Sannon (Supratiknya, 2015) content analysis is to interpret subjectively the contents of data in the form of text through a process of systematic classification in the form of coding or coding and identification of various themes or patterns.

The questionnaire is divided into several sub-sections, namely identity, understanding and implementation of Ignatian Pedagogy. It consisted of 18 opened question items, 8 closed question items provided with answer choices, and one likert scale type item. Questionnaires were distributed to 33 study programmes through online using the Google form.

Research subjects were 72 lecturers (N:587) from 27 study programmes. The subjects were 55% male and 45% are female. They were 26 to 75 years old with varied tenure from 1 year to 49 years.

Data from opened question questionnaire were analyzed with content analysis. The analysis was conducted by coding lecturers' answers, classifying them into categories and themes, then interpreting the meaning of the findings. Whereas the data from closed questionnaires and scale were arranged in the frequency distribution table to determine the percentage according to the categories in closed questions.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Ignatian pedagogy has been widely socialized internally in the hope that the lecturers can know, understand and implement Ignatian Pedagogy so that it can be useful in developing learning. Based on the data obtained, 79% of 72 lecturer respondents stated from the quantitative responses, they had implemented Ignatian Pedagogy in learning. While as many as 21% stated that they had not implemented Ignatian Pedagogy in learning.

Of the 21% who stated that they had not implemented Ignatian Pedagogy, there were as many as 55% giving reasons that they did not fully understand the procedures, steps, and how the Ignatian Pedagogy implementation pattern should be done in learning. There is the statement from the result that they not fully understand about the procedures detail:

“Saya hanya mengerti secara singkat alur PI tetapi belum bisa menerapkan PI dalam proses pengajaran di kelas” (I only understand briefly the PI pathway but I have not been able to apply PI in the teaching process in the classroom).

The other responses are similar:

“Sudah pernah ikut lokakarya PI, paham secara teoritis namun kadang masih bingung mengimplementasikan” (I have participated in PI workshops, understood theoretically, but sometimes they are still confused about implementing).

Then as many as 45% of the 21% who stated that they had not implemented Ignatian Pedagogy argued that they had difficulty implementing Ignatian Pedagogy like this statement:

“Konsep-konsep mendasar dari PI sangatlah filosofis sehingga tidak mudah dicerna dalam waktu yang singkat dan butuh banyak pengalaman untuk memaknainya” (The basic concepts of PI are so philosophical that they are not easily digested in a short time and require a lot of experience to interpret them).

Similar response that shows about the reason they felt difficult to implement PI:

“Diantara 5 tahap dalam proses PI, bagi saya tahap Refleksi tidak mudah bahkan ketika sudah dilakukan latihan rutin, juga tahap Evaluasi yang benar dan komprehensif bukan perkara mudah.” (Among the 5 stages in the PI process, for me the Reflection stage is not easy even when routine exercises have been carried out, also the correct and comprehensive evaluation stage is not an easy matter).

Difficulties that arise are mentioned, among others: difficulties in combining with the material, not yet confident and confident so that they feel doubtful, and feel the material presented is felt to be inappropriate if done in accordance with the path of Ignatian Pedagogy.

Based on the response given, respondents tried to get to know students in a variety of ways. These methods can be divided into three categories, namely ways that are carried out without direct interaction with students, the way that is done by involving interactions between respondents and students verbally, and which involves interaction in writing. In general, respondents involve interaction with students to get to know them better. How to do it orally is to do question and answer, discussion, sharing, and games. Whereas the method that is carried out through written interactions is through surveys, writing works, pre-tests (to measure the level of recognition, stages of learning topics), and reflections produced by students. The way to do without direct interaction with students is by looking at data from the SIA (Academic Information System). From the SIA, respondents can know the background of the students, for example where they came from, the number of siblings to the work of parents. In addition, respondents also made observations, both inside and outside of learning. Duminuco (in Mauri, Figueiredo & Rashford, 2015) states that individualization and personalization of instruction are the main keys of Ignatian education. Then the context becomes one of the first doors of lecturers in understanding students to be able to design learning according to their needs.

In the learning done, respondents have tried to provide diverse experiences. The learning experience can be categorized into learning experiences in the classroom and outside the classroom. In the classroom, many respondents use discussions, both discussions between teachers and students, as well as group discussions of students. Respondents also wrote that they also encourage learning

outside the classroom by providing group assignments and projects and field practice. Subagya (2010) states that with experience, students can be encouraged to seek further understanding by analyzing, comparing, and evaluating so that they can form knowledgeable students as a whole, while also being able to generate friendship and concern for related material. So through the experience given, respondents expect understanding of the material experienced by students as integral and intact.

Subagya (2010) states that reflection can be interpreted as listening carefully to learning materials, experiences, ideas, suggestions, or spontaneous reactions in order to get meaning deeply. There are various ways that can be done to process a reflection on students. In this study it is known that reflection is done flexibly based on the dynamics of each class both oral and written. Written reflection is usually done online or offline with or without question guidance. Reflections in the form of responses to reading, videos, learning experiences or experiences of everyday life. Some reflections are done with different methods, one of them is drawing method and then sharing the meaning of pictures in groups as well as reflection by making inspirational stories.

The action plan is a potential action that is written and concrete both personally and in groups. The action plan can be a commitment to improve or respond to situations outside of yourself. Real actions that relate directly to learning material by making products such as textbooks, learning videos, question banks, computer programs and more. Other actions are carried out in a wider scope such as actions to help other people, namely fellow students, local residents and the general public.

Actions can be a concrete activity, but might also take the form of an understanding, a disposition, a decision, a belief, a commitment, or to try something else that would build on the previous knowledge (Mountin, S. & Nowacek, R., 2012). The type of knowledge-in-action that encourage by the Ignatian pedagogical paradigm is the type of deep understanding that enables learners to do more than memorize formulas; learners can do something to show the knowledge that they know. So through this action, learners gain the growth from the their knowledge that is realized in real terms.

Evaluation in the learning process is carried out with various methods and objectives. Respondents stated that the process of evaluating students was carried out so far through oral and written examinations in the form of quizzes, giving individual assignments, presentations, group discussions, observations and reflection assignments. Evaluation is carried out to determine the ability of students including knowledge and skills in a material. Another form of evaluation carried out by respondents is by inviting students to evaluate the lecture process. Teachers and students together see the inhibiting and supporting factors during the lecture process. The instructor also evaluates the models, methods, learning strategies, and the progress of each student for the purpose of improvement. Evaluations are carried out in each chapter, midterm evaluation or evaluation at the end of the semester. Subagya (2010) states that evaluations will be effective and can assess how far the development of students is if done

regularly. In addition, the evaluation carried out covers the Conscience and Compassion side of the students.

Based on Ignatian Pedagogy-based learning activities, there are impacts that arise on lecturers and students in terms of the perceptions of lecturers as respondents. The impact that appears is divided into 3 parts, namely the impact on intrapersonal development, the impact on interpersonal development, and the impact on the development of learning itself. In terms of respondents as lecturers, intrapersonal development in the form of increasing values of empathy, ability to reflect on themselves, awareness of the importance of self-development, more sensitive and serious but on the other hand still able to enjoy work. Besides that the response that arises is that through the implementation of Ignatian Pedagogy, respondents have adequate learning experience. Interpersonally, the response that arises is the existence of closer, better, and more positive relationships between lecturers and students (curapersonalis), the emergence of mutual mutual learning, and more communicative understanding. In addition, the response that arises is that respondents become more familiar with the context of learners so that the understanding of students becomes increased and is able to provide the best in learning. In terms of the development of science, the respondents wrote the impact of the implementation of Ignatian Pedagogy is that respondents become more able to implement knowledge in daily life, able to develop material creatively, develop effective and conducive learning (both in preparation, appreciation, and evaluation) . In addition, in terms of competence, lecturers and students feel that the knowledge learned is more contextual in their daily lives, so that the class becomes more alive and the achievements become more optimal and satisfying.

Moreover, the development of learning carried out by respondents also includes three domains (3C), namely competence (conscience), conscience (compassion), and compassion (compassion). As stated in the Ignatian Pedagogy Paradigm, that the purpose of all education is so that students can become human beings for and with others (people for and with others) (Arrupe in Subagya, 2012). These objectives are expressed in more detail in 3C: competence, conscience, and compassion (Kolvenbach & Hans, nd). In the future, graduates will not only have academic abilities but also be able to integrate cognitive abilities, attitudes and human values, and care for others.

4. CONCLUSION

Lecturers have done a variety of ways that are very varied in knowing the context of students, both by interacting directly, indirectly or through data about students who have been recorded. Information about students who want to know is also quite diverse and profound. Furthermore, the experience given by lecturers to students has also been carried out through ways that are quite creative and encourage students to understand a material. Reflection activities in

learning have also been carried out in a very flexible way, form and time, both online and offline. Likewise in the Evaluation of Learning that has been carried out through various forms and includes aspects of Conscience and Compassion besides of course competence. The lecturer has also encouraged and facilitated the implementation of a lecture action. This form of action is very diverse and flexible. Action in the form of an action plan or commitment is also quite a lot. Even though real actions in the form of concern for the surrounding residents have also been carried out.

In general, the number of lecturers participating in filling out the questionnaire is still relatively small. However, the lecturers who fill in are quite varied, both from the study program origin, age and those who have implemented the Ignatian Pedagogy or not. All of those who filled out the questionnaire, from the content given, showed great concern for efforts to improve learning. The responses given also showed a good view of the Ignatian Pedagogy paradigm which was proven in the optimal implementation of learning. Lecturers have a good perspective on learning based on Ignatian Pedagogy. This paradigm is felt to be able to encourage students as well as increase knowledge for lecturers in the learning process. Not only students, the lecturers are also increasingly directed to achieve the full educational goals which are also specified in competence, conscience, and compassion (3C). The lecturers integrate the 3C into learning, where not only emphasizes knowledge, but also attitudes and values of life, instilling that what students learn will affect human life, sharpen student care for friends, encourage students to be able to collaborate and collaborate, train student sensitivity and conscience through reflection.

Based on the discussion and conclusions that have been conveyed, there are several recommendations given to be able to deepen research on the Ignatian Pedagogy paradigm, including: (a) in-depth follow-up on responses or survey responses; (b) need to take into account the different characteristics of each program study, it is necessary to specify the implementation of Ignatian Pedagogy in each study program so that the specificities of each unit can be found.

5. REFERENCES

- Callahan, R. F. (2013). Professional reflections: The alignment of Ignatian pedagogy principles with Jesuit business school education and business practices. *Journal of Jesuit Business Education*, 4(1).
- DeFeo, J. A. (2009). *Old wine in new skin: Ignatian pedagogy, compatible with and contributing to Jesuit higher education*. Fordham University.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.

- Fager, J.J. (2010). The principles of Ignatian pedagogy, standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students, and a promise for portable professional development. In *Teaching to the Mission: A Compendium of the Ignatian Mentoring Program*. Ohio: Center for Mission and Identity, Center for Mission.
- Font-Guzmán, J. N. (2014). Using Ignatian pedagogy in a mediation course. *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*, 3(1), 48-63.
- Hayes, C. X. (2006). *Paradoxes, parallels and pedagogy: a case study of Ignatian pedagogy and teachers' perceptions of implementation in Australian Jesuit schools* (Doctoral Dissertation. Australia: School of Religious Education, Faculty of Education, Australian Catholic University).
- Knowles, M. S., Holton, E., & Swanson, R. (1998). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (5th). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Kolvenbach, S. J., & Hans, P. n.d. Pedagogi Ignatian masa kini. *Konteks: Humanisme kristiani zaman sekarang. Terjemahan J. Drost, SJ*.
- Korth, S. J. (2008). Precis of Ignatian pedagogy: A practical approach. *A Jesuit education reader*, 280-284.
- Lu, Z.J. & Rosen, V. (2015). Practicing Ignatian pedagogy: A digital collection of resources. *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*, 4(2), 135-152.
- Mauri, A. J., Figueiredo, J. N., & Rashford, N. S. (2015). Ignatian pedagogy in the strategy classroom: Experience, reflection and action towards better managerial decisions. *Journal of Jesuit Business Education*, 6(1), 77-100.
- McAvoy, M. (2013). Training faculty to adopt the Ignatian pedagogical paradigm, IPP and its influence on teaching and learning: Process and outcomes. *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*, 2(2), 62-109.
- Mesa, J. (2013). The international apostolate of Jesuit education: Recent developments and contemporary challenges. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 5(2), 176-189.
- Mountin, S. & Nowacek, R. (2012). *Reflection in action: A signature ignatian pedagogy for the 21st century. exploring more signature pedagogies: approaches to teaching disciplinary habits of mind*. Nancy L. Chick, Aeron Haynie, Regan AR Garung (Eds.). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Pennington, K., Creswell, J., Snedden, T., Mulhall, M., & Ellison, N. (2013). Ignatian pedagogy: Transforming nursing education. *Jesuit Higher Education*, 2(1), 34-40.
- Rigby, P. (2005). Spiritual directions in teacher induction: An Ignatian approach. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 2(2), 90-92.
- Schiller, J. (2013, April). School shootings and critical pedagogy. In *The Educational Forum* (Vol. 77, No. 2, pp. 100-110). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Subagya, J. (2010). *Paradigma pedagogi reflektif: Mendampingi peserta didik menjadi cerdas dan berkarakter*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Subagya, J. (2012). Paradigma pedagogi reflektif-mendampingi peserta didik menjadi cerdas dan berkarakter, edisi revisi. *terjemahan Ignatian Pedagogy, A Practical Approach, GS Prakash, India*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Supratiknya, A. (2015). *Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif & kualitatif dalam psikologi*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Van Hise, J., & Massey, D. W. (2010). Applying the Ignatian pedagogical paradigm to the creation of an accounting ethics course. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(3), 453-465.
- Van Hise, J. (2013). Transformative education: Using Ignatian pedagogy to teach business ethics. *Jesuit Higher Education*, 2(2), 110-126.