The current issue of *InterActions* brings together senior and emerging scholars whose work covers a variety of formats – scholarly article, interview, literature review, and commentary – each making critical interventions into the fields of education and information studies. The authors link their research to larger social and political contexts to address a range of interdisciplinary concerns, including classification systems, linguistics, cultural studies, science studies, political economy, higher education, pedagogy, and institutional discipline. In line with the aims and scope of the journal, these authors challenge traditional approaches by suggesting new directions for research into the purposes, practices, and organization of education and information institutions.

In her article "Polyphony in Social Classification: Exploring Hybrid Forms of Speech, Practice, and Text in Digital Settings," Lilly Nguyen presents a study of a social classification system, del.icio.us, from an ethnographic approach. Nguyen reveals the way people participate within these systems by introducing concepts of monologue and dialogue as a way to understand new forms of sociability online.

Peter McLaren's featured commentary, entitled "Revolutionary Critical Pedagogy," outlines a pedagogy of critique based on "revolutionary love," which exists between free and equal people who have the same ideals and commitments to serving the poor and oppressed. In doing so, he offers a critique of a pedagogy of desire, which, according to McLaren, mirrors the condition of alienated capital by teaching adjustment to existing social relations in the guise of radical politics.

In a second featured commentary, entitled "The Self-Imposed Limits of Library and Information Science: Remarks On the Discipline, On the Profession, On the University, and On the State of 'Information' in the U.S. at Large Today," Ron Day discusses the hazards of neglecting critical inquiry and interdisciplinary work within library and information science. Day challenges traditional domains of inquiry by suggesting new directions for the field and broadening a definition of "information seeking." Additionally, he critiques what he sees as the dominant positivistic methods within information science and argues for the importance of questions of subjectivity in an "information age."

In an interview with Professor Mike Rose, Tina Arora illuminates the process of academic writing, touching on concerns such as meaning, productivity, time, interdisciplinarity, and professional advancement. Additionally, Arora explores the way academic writing can effectively participate in broader public conversations about educational issues.

Heather Metcalf investigates scholarship around science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce in her literature review, "Stuck in the Pipeline: A Critical Review of STEM Workforce Literature." Metcalf challenges the way in which identity, recruitment and retention, and scientific work are represented, measured, and understood. She argues that the pipeline

model has a limited view of retention that is based upon socially constructed ideas about what constitutes "valid" scientific and engineering work and who counts as "real" scientists and engineers.

Melissa L. Millora's literature review, entitled "Market Values in Higher Education: A Review of the For-Profit Sector," examines for-profit higher education within the context of an increasingly marketized system of higher education in the United States. Millora describes how market values have influenced important aspects of higher education, including federal student aid policy, accountability standards, and the rise of the private for-profit sector.

These timely and reasoned contributions reveal transformative possibilities within education and information studies by challenging traditional approaches and suggesting new directions in both method and practice. *InterActions* is pleased once again to provide a forum for such interdisciplinary and critical encounters.