

RECONSTRUCTION OF HUMANISTIC EDUCATION IN THE ERA OF SOCIETY 5.0

M. Firman Maulana, Rosmidar, Risky Ayu Permata, Chaliza Anshary

Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Universitas Dharmawangsa
Jl. Sisingamangaradjadja, Teladan-Medan, Jl. Yos Sudarso, Medan, Sumatera Utara
Email: mfirman.maulana@fai.uisu.ac.id, rosmidar@dharmawangsa.ac.id,
riskyayupermata@dharmawangsa.ac.id, chalaza_anshary@dharmawangsa.ac.id

Abstract: The era of Society 5.0 has brought fundamental transformations to education through the integration of intelligent technologies oriented toward human well-being. However, in practice, this development also generates serious challenges, particularly the potential dehumanization of education due to the dominance of technology and instrumentalistic approaches to learning. This article aims to examine the urgency and direction of reconstructing humanistic education in responding to the era of Society 5.0 through dialogue and synthesis of humanistic and critical educational thought. This study employs a qualitative-conceptual literature review method, utilizing critical analysis of educational, humanities, and Society 5.0-related literature. The findings indicate that humanistic education plays a strategic role as a value-based foundation in maintaining a balance between technological advancement and the strengthening of human dimensions in education. The reconstruction of humanistic education in the era of Society 5.0 involves reorienting educational goals, transforming the role of educators, developing dialogical and reflective learning processes, and internalizing ethical values, empathy, and social responsibility. This article is expected to provide a conceptual foundation for the development of future educational paradigms that are adaptive to technological change while remaining firmly oriented toward human values.

Keywords: Humanistic, Human-Centered, Reconstruction, Society 5.0

Abstrak: Era Society 5.0 telah membawa transformasi mendasar dalam pendidikan melalui integrasi teknologi cerdas yang berorientasi pada kesejahteraan manusia. Namun, dalam praktiknya, perkembangan ini juga menimbulkan tantangan serius, terutama potensi dehumanisasi pendidikan akibat dominasi teknologi dan pendekatan pembelajaran yang bersifat instrumentalis. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji urgensi dan arah rekonstruksi pendidikan humanistik dalam merespons era Society 5.0 melalui dialog dan sintesis pemikiran pendidikan humanistik dan kritis. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kajian pustaka kualitatif-konseptual dengan analisis kritis terhadap literatur di bidang pendidikan, humaniora, dan kajian Society 5.0. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa pendidikan humanistik memiliki peran strategis sebagai landasan berbasis nilai dalam menjaga keseimbangan antara kemajuan teknologi dan penguatan dimensi kemanusiaan. Rekonstruksi pendidikan humanistik di era Society 5.0 mencakup reorientasi tujuan pendidikan, transformasi peran pendidik, pengembangan proses pembelajaran yang dialogis dan reflektif, serta internalisasi nilai-nilai etika, empati, dan tanggung jawab sosial. Artikel ini diharapkan dapat memberikan landasan konseptual bagi pengembangan paradigma pendidikan masa depan yang adaptif terhadap perubahan teknologi sekaligus tetap berorientasi kuat pada nilai-nilai kemanusiaan.

Kata Kunci: Berpusat pada manusia; humanistik; rekonstruksi, society 5.0

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of digital technology has led the world into a new phase known as the era of Society 5.0. This concept was first introduced by the Japanese government as a response to the challenges of technological disruption that potentially erode human values and social cohesion (Fukuyama, 2018). Society 5.0 emphasizes the integration of advanced technologies into social life while positioning human beings as the central focus of development. In this context, education becomes a critical sector in navigating technological change while safeguarding the essence of humanity.

The era of Society 5.0 presents both opportunities and challenges for education. On the one hand, technology enables innovative learning models that are more flexible, personalized, and adaptive. On the other hand, the dominance of technology risks shifting the essence of education from a process of humanization toward mechanization and instrumentalization of learning. Education may be reduced to a technologically driven transfer of knowledge, while values, ethics, empathy, and character formation receive less attention. Moreover, the extensive use of artificial intelligence, big data, and the Internet of Things in education raises concerns about the potential dehumanization of learning processes amid accelerating digitalization.

In this context, education is not merely required to adapt to technological developments, but also to play a strategic role in preserving and strengthening human values. This situation highlights the importance of educational approaches that are not only technologically responsive but also deeply rooted in humanistic principles. Humanistic education emerges as a fundamental framework for addressing these challenges, as it places learners at the center of the educational process and emphasizes holistic human development—intellectual, emotional, social, and moral—while promoting meaningful learning oriented toward emancipation and self-actualization.

However, numerous studies indicate that the integration of technology in

education is often accompanied by tendencies toward instrumentalization and technocratization of learning processes (Biesta, 2015; Selwyn, 2019). Education increasingly prioritizes measurable competencies and standardized outcomes, while dimensions of meaning, pedagogical relationships, and character formation are marginalized. This condition intensifies concerns about the dehumanization of education, particularly when technological systems overshadow humane relationships between educators and learners (Freire, 2005).

Historically, education in Indonesia has been grounded in strong humanistic foundations. Ki Hadjar Dewantara emphasized that education aims to guide the natural potential of children so that they may achieve the highest levels of well-being and happiness as human beings and members of society (Dewantara, 1967). This educational philosophy aligns closely with humanistic education, which positions humans as the primary subjects of education rather than mere objects within instructional systems.

Religion, particularly Islam, has also played a significant role in shaping the humanistic orientation of education in Indonesia. Islamic education conceptually emphasizes the balance between intellectual development (*al-aql*), spiritual growth (*al-rūh*), and moral formation (*al-akhlāq*), viewing education as a process of cultivating the complete human being (*insān kāmil*) (Al-Attas, 1993; Nata, 2012). Islamic educational institutions such as pesantren and madrasahs traditionally prioritize moral values, exemplarity, and ethical relationships, reflecting humanistic educational practices within an Islamic framework.

Beyond religion, local culture has contributed substantially to the character of education in Indonesia. Indigenous values such as mutual cooperation (*gotong royong*), deliberation (*musyawarah*), and social solidarity have long been embedded in community-based educational practices (Tilaar, 2009). At the policy level, the Indonesian state normatively affirms that education aims to develop learners who are faithful, morally upright, intellectually

capable, and socially responsible citizens (Law No. 20 of 2003). Nevertheless, in practice, education increasingly faces global pressures related to standardization, competition, and market-oriented demands, which may displace long-standing humanistic values (Giroux, 2011).

Rapid social and technological transformations in the era of Society 5.0 therefore necessitate a reorientation of humanistic education to ensure its continued relevance and contextual applicability. This condition calls for a reconstruction of humanistic education that remains grounded in religious, cultural, and national values while critically and ethically responding to technological challenges. This study seeks to address this gap by proposing a conceptual framework for reconstructing humanistic education in the context of Society 5.0.

Such reconstruction extends beyond redefining educational goals to encompass the transformation of educators' roles, the redesign of learning processes, and the internalization of ethical and human values within technology-based educational environments. Accordingly, this article aims to examine the urgency and direction of reconstructing humanistic education in the era of Society 5.0 and to offer a conceptual contribution as a foundation for developing future educational paradigms that balance technological advancement with the strengthening of human values.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach using a library research design. The qualitative approach is selected because this research aims to understand, interpret, and reconstruct the concept of humanistic education in the context of the Society 5.0 era in a deep and holistic manner, rather than measuring variables statistically (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Denzin & Lincoln, 2018).

Library research is adopted as the primary method because the study focuses on the analysis of ideas, theories, and academic discourses developed in contemporary literature on humanistic education and Society 5.0. In educational research, literature-based studies are

considered particularly relevant for constructing new conceptual frameworks, especially in contexts characterized by rapid social and technological change (Snyder, 2019; Xiao & Watson, 2019).

Theoretically, this research is grounded in a critical-conceptual approach, which aims to re-examine key concepts, identify underlying assumptions, and reconstruct conceptual frameworks to ensure their relevance within new contexts (Tight, 2019). This approach is widely applied in humanities-oriented educational research to address contemporary issues such as digitalization, humanism, and educational ethics (Biesta, 2020; Giroux, 2020).

Within the context of Society 5.0, a critical-conceptual approach is particularly important because education is not merely understood as a technical practice, but as a domain of values, ideologies, and power relations that require reflective and critical examination (Selwyn, 2019; Williamson, 2021). Accordingly, this study does not merely describe educational phenomena, but also engages in critical reflection on the direction and implications of education in the era of intelligent technology.

The data sources for this study consist of: a). National and international journal articles, particularly those indexed in Scopus and SINTA, b). Academic books in the fields of education, humanities, and Society 5.0 studies, c). Relevant policy documents and educational research reports. The literature analyzed is prioritized from publications within the last seven years to ensure relevance to recent developments, particularly since the intensification of discourse on Society 5.0 and human-centered education (Fukuyama, 2018; Shiroishi et al., 2018; Biesta, 2020; Selwyn, 2019).

Data analysis is conducted using thematic analysis and conceptual synthesis, as recommended in qualitative literature-based research (Braun & Clarke, 2021; Snyder, 2019). The stages of analysis include:

1. Identification of key concepts, such as humanistic education, human-centered education, and Society 5.0;

2. Thematic categorization, including educational goals, the role of educators, learning processes, and human values;
3. Critical synthesis, integrating diverse theoretical perspectives to formulate directions for reconstructing humanistic education that are contextual and relevant.

This methodological approach enables the study to produce a systematic and argumentative conceptual understanding, serving as a foundation for the development of future educational paradigms (Tight, 2019; Biesta, 2020).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Contemporary education faces increasingly complex challenges due to rapid technological advancement, social change, and dynamic cultural transformations. The era of Society 5.0 demands the integration of intelligent technologies into everyday life, including education, without neglecting human values that form the foundation of humanistic education. In this context, the study of humanistic education becomes highly relevant, as education is not merely a process of knowledge transmission or technical skill development, but also a means of shaping character, morality, and social awareness among learners.

Furthermore, globalization and digitalization have intensified the risk of educational dehumanization, in which technology becomes more prominent than social interaction, empathy, and value reflection. This condition highlights the need for the reconstruction of humanistic education—an effort to realign and strengthen educational directions to remain responsive to contemporary challenges while upholding human and social values. Accordingly, this discussion addresses five key aspects: the concept of humanistic education, the characteristics of the Society 5.0 era and its implications for education, the urgency of reconstructing humanistic education, the direction of such reconstruction in the era of Society 5.0, and the conceptual implications for future education.

Humanistic Education: Conceptual Foundations

Humanistic education is an approach that positions the whole human being as the central focus of the educational process. Carl Rogers (1969) emphasizes *learner-centered education*, in which learners are active subjects and learning is oriented toward self-actualization. Meanwhile, Paulo Freire (2005) critiques traditional education through the concept of the *banking system*, advocating dialogical learning that fosters critical consciousness (*conscientization*). Complementing these perspectives, Biesta (2020) introduces a social dimension, arguing that humanistic education should not only focus on individual development but also on cultivating responsible citizenship and social morality.

From this perspective, education is not limited to the transmission of knowledge but involves the cultivation of human values such as empathy, respect for human dignity, and the capacity for critical and reflective thinking. In humanistic learning models, learners are regarded as active subjects with unique potentials who require meaningful and contextual learning experiences connected to real-life situations.

Humanistic approaches in education are closely associated with moral, ethical, and social values that support the formation of responsible and character-driven individuals. In the digital era, humanism functions as a crucial safeguard to ensure that technological integration does not erode human relationships in teaching and learning processes. Particularly in the era of Society 5.0, where technology plays a dominant role, humanistic values serve as a buffer against educational dehumanization that prioritizes technical outcomes over human meaning.

Moreover, humanistic education is highly relevant to principles of pluralism and respect for diversity within society. Humanistic learning provides space for intercultural dialogue, diverse perspectives, and varied social backgrounds, enabling learners to develop not only cognitive intelligence but also social sensitivity. This concept aligns with character education and multicultural education approaches that

view learners as social beings who must coexist harmoniously in pluralistic societies.

Thus, humanistic education should not be understood merely as a classical educational theory, but rather as a philosophical and practical framework that remains relevant in contemporary contexts for shaping generations that are adaptive to change while firmly grounded in universal human values. In the Indonesian context, this humanistic orientation resonates with Ki Hadjar Dewantara's educational philosophy, which emphasizes guiding children's inherent potential toward achieving well-being and happiness as human beings and members of society (Dewantara, 1967).

However, classical humanistic approaches must be synthesized with modern challenges, as learners today are required to think critically, creatively, and adaptively within technological and global societal contexts. Consequently, contemporary humanistic education extends beyond "human values" to include social, ethical, and digital readiness, consistent with recent studies emphasizing the integration of *human-centered pedagogy* with digital literacy and ethics (Williamson, 2021; Biesta, 2020).

The Era of Society 5.0 and Its Implications for Education

The era of Society 5.0 represents a model of societal development initiated in Japan that integrates advanced technologies—such as artificial intelligence (AI), big data, the Internet of Things (IoT), and widespread digitalization—into all aspects of life with the aim of enhancing human well-being. This model emphasizes harmony between humans and technology, ensuring that future generations are not only digitally competent but also socially oriented and committed to sustainable societal development.

Society 5.0 positions intelligent technology as a means to improve human welfare. Fukuyama (2018) and Shiroishi et al. (2018) conceptualize this era as a *human-centered society*, where technology serves to enhance, rather than replace, human life. However, Selwyn (2019) warns of the risk of educational dehumanization when

technology dominates learning processes without adequate consideration of human values. Similarly, Williamson (2021) underscores the importance of ethical digital literacy so that learners not only acquire technological skills but also understand the social and moral implications of technological use.

In educational contexts, Society 5.0 significantly influences learning models, pedagogical methods, and the role of technology in educational processes. Digital technologies can expand access to learning, enrich educational resources, and support more personalized and adaptive learning experiences. Nevertheless, problems arise when technology is viewed merely as a tool for efficiency optimization without regard for the quality of educational relationships and foundational human values.

Learning processes that focus excessively on technological sophistication risk neglecting essential elements such as collaboration, empathy, and value reflection, which are central to humanistic education. Such imbalances may weaken interpersonal relationships between educators and learners and diminish sensitivity to social and cultural contexts. Therefore, technological integration in education must be accompanied by the internalization of humanistic values to ensure that education in the era of Society 5.0 retains its humanistic and ethical significance.

In Indonesia's multicultural and diverse context, the challenges of Society 5.0 in education are not merely technical but also socio-cultural. Technology should enhance social interaction and support inclusivity across diverse learner backgrounds. Consequently, educational technology implementation must align with plural social realities. Technology should function not only as a tool for efficiency but also as a means to strengthen collaboration, empathy, and social responsibility among learners. From this perspective, Society 5.0 is not merely a process of digital transformation, but also an opportunity to reinforce humanistic education by expanding meaningful and contextual learning experiences.

Finally, educational values and ethics must be systematically internalized across

curricula and learning practices, including the development of responsible digital competencies, media literacy, and social awareness. These values form the foundation that shapes how learners employ technology for humanistic purposes rather than purely personal or competitive interests.

The Urgency of Reconstructing Humanistic Education

The urgency of reconstructing humanistic education in the era of Society 5.0 arises from the gap between technological advancement and education values grounded in humanity. Although technology opens opportunities for more efficient and flexible learning innovations, without an emphasis on humanism education risks turning into a mechanical process that merely pursues competitive outputs. This aligns with research findings that emphasize the importance of balancing digital literacy with human values as the moral compass of education.

This means that the need for reconstruction stems from an imbalance between technological progress and humanistic educational values. Freire (2005) stresses the importance of education that is liberating rather than merely transferring knowledge, while Biesta (2015, 2020) asserts that education must return to its social and moral purposes, not be limited to technical competencies. In the Indonesian context, Tilaar (2009) shows how education often loses its humanistic values due to overly technocratic curricula.

The argument is that humanistic reconstruction is not simply a repetition of classical theories, but a synthesis of classical ideas and contemporary needs: learners must develop cognitively, emotionally, socially, and ethically. This reconstruction also emphasizes the importance of internalizing ethical values in the use of technology, so that education in the era of Society 5.0 can produce individuals who are critical, creative, and socially and morally responsible (conference.bicone.id, 2023).

The reconstruction of humanistic education is also necessary to address the challenges of moral and social pluralism in increasingly complex societies. Education that focuses on

humanism requires a moral approach capable of accommodating diverse cultural, religious, and social identities, enabling learners to participate actively in inclusive societies. Research shows that moral pluralism is a crucial aspect of humanistic education in the era of Society 5.0 to cultivate tolerant and open-minded learners.

Moreover, the urgency of reconstruction also includes the need to safeguard ethical considerations in the use of technology, such as digital norms, AI ethics, and social responsibility in digital communication. This is essential to ensure that education does not merely produce technology experts, but also ethical and socially responsible generations. Therefore, the reconstruction of humanistic education becomes a critical imperative to redefine educational goals, processes, and values so that education in the era of Society 5.0 can unite technological sophistication with the intrinsic strength of human beings as social and moral agents.

Direction of Reconstructing Humanistic Education in the Era of Society 5.0

The direction of reconstructing humanistic education in the era of Society 5.0 needs to begin with a reorientation of educational goals that are not solely focused on achieving digital technical competencies, but also on developing students' character, ethics, and empathy. The goals of humanistic education should encourage learners to become creative, critical, and integrity-driven individuals, while also being able to use technology wisely for the common good.

Furthermore, the role of educators needs to be reconstructed into that of facilitators who are capable of integrating technology with values, ethics, humanism, and digital literacy in the learning process, rather than merely acting as transmitters of information (Biesta, 2020; Rogers, 1969). This approach combines learner-centered education with critical pedagogy and ethical digital literacy (Freire, 2005; Williamson, 2021). Educators are no longer seen only as sources of knowledge, but as role models of values and reflective guides who help students understand the social and ethical

impacts of technology use in real life.

The reconstructed learning process must prioritize participatory, dialogical, and student-centered learning, in which technology is used to enrich learning experiences rather than replace human interaction. The integration of technologies such as AI and digital literacy can be combined with cooperative and contextual learning approaches to strengthen relationships between students and educators. Humanistic educational values such as empathy, collaboration, and critical reflection must become the core of the curriculum (jurnalhafasy.com, 2023; kurniajurnal.com, 2022). With this direction, reconstruction is not merely a restoration of old values, but an adaptation of humanistic values to ethically and critically navigate the challenges of Society 5.0.

Finally, educational values and ethics must be embedded throughout the curriculum and learning practices, including the development of responsible digital competencies, media literacy, and social awareness. These values serve as the foundation that determines how students use technology for humanitarian purposes, rather than solely for personal or competitive interests.

Conceptual Implications for Future Education

The reconstruction of humanistic education in the era of Society 5.0 has broad implications for the future of education. First, education must be able to produce generations that are adaptive to technological change while remaining firmly grounded in moral and social values. The synergy of ideas from Rogers, Freire, Biesta, and Williamson shows that learners are not only subjects of learning, but also agents of social transformation who are capable of using technology for the common good. This requires educational systems to design holistic curricula that strengthen digital literacy alongside character education.

Second, education constructed on a humanistic foundation will foster inclusive learning environments that are responsive to cultural and social diversity. In plural societies, learning approaches are needed that not only respect differences but also

teach dialogue and tolerance as essential capital for shared life in a global era. Therefore, the integration of digital literacy, ethics, and human values makes humanistic education not merely a theoretical concept, but a practical framework for producing global citizens who are principled, critical, creative, and socially concerned, ready to face the dynamics of Society 5.0 and beyond (conference.bicone.id, 2023; jurnalhafasy.com, 2023).

Third, the integration of technology in future education must always be accompanied by ethical and humanistic considerations, so that technology does not become a source of domination or social control, but rather a tool to expand meaningful learning opportunities that contribute to society at large. Ultimately, this reconstruction positions education as an arena of social transformation that not only produces technically competent workers, but also responsible citizens who are socially aware and capable of collaborating across technological and cultural boundaries—a vision of education that is relevant to the challenges of the 21st century and beyond.

CONCLUSION

The emergence of the Society 5.0 era marks a new phase in the relationship between humans and technology, exerting a significant influence on the direction and practice of education. Although Society 5.0 conceptually positions humans at the center of technological development, educational practices increasingly exhibit tendencies toward technocratization and the instrumentalization of learning. This condition risks shifting the essence of education from a process of humanization toward the mere attainment of technical competencies. In this context, humanistic education becomes increasingly relevant as a philosophical and pedagogical framework for maintaining a balance between technological advancement and human values.

This study demonstrates that humanistic education cannot be understood statically as a classical educational approach, but must be reconstructed to remain contextual and responsive to the

challenges of the Society 5.0 era. The theoretical dialogue between humanistic psychology (Rogers), critical pedagogy (Freire), and contemporary educational thought (Biesta and Selwyn) underscores that contemporary humanistic education must integrate self-actualization, critical consciousness, and social as well as ethical responsibility. Within the Indonesian context, these humanistic values have long been rooted in religious, cultural, and national educational traditions; however, they require critical adaptation to prevent erosion under the pressures of globalization and educational digitalization.

The reconstruction of humanistic education in the era of Society 5.0 necessitates a reorientation of educational goals, the role of educators, and learning processes toward holistic human development. Technology should be positioned as a pedagogical tool that strengthens meaningful, dialogical, and reflective learning, rather than as the ultimate objective of education itself. Through this orientation, education is expected to produce not only digitally competent individuals, but also ethical, empathetic, and socially responsible human beings capable of contributing constructively to increasingly complex societies.

The conceptual implications of this study emphasize that future education must be directed toward strengthening a critical and technology-adaptive human-centered education paradigm. A reconstructed humanistic education holds strategic potential as a foundational framework for developing educational systems that are not only responsive to technological change but also committed to the formation of whole persons. This study is expected to serve as an initial conceptual reference for further research, particularly in the development of Islamic education, educational policy, and technology ethics within the context of Society 5.0.

REFERENCES

Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1993). *Islam and secularism*. International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization (ISTAC).

Biesta, G. (2015). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635861>

Biesta, G. (2020). *Educational research: An unorthodox introduction*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dewantara, K. H. (1967). *Bagian pertama: Pendidikan*. Majelis Luhur Persatuan Taman Siswa.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum.

Fukuyama, M. (2018). Society 5.0: Aiming for a new human-centered society. *Japan Spotlight*, 27(5), 47–50.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Continuum.

Giroux, H. A. (2020). *On critical pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.

Nata, A. (2012). *Ilmu pendidikan Islam*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Charles E. Merrill Publishing.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.

Shiroishi, Y., Uchiyama, K., & Suzuki, N.

(2018). Society 5.0: For human security and well-being. *Computer*, 51(7), 91–95. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2018.3011041>

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>

Tight, M. (2019). *Theory and method in higher education research* (Vol. 5). Emerald Publishing.

Tilaar, H. A. R. (2009). *Kekuasaan dan pendidikan: Kajian manajemen pendidikan nasional dalam pusaran kekuasaan*. Rineka Cipta.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.

Williamson, B. (2021). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on conducting a systematic literature review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 39(1), 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17723971>