UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.14 (3);
https://unijerps.org
2021 Impact Factor: 5.641; 2020 Impact Factor: 5.355.
July-December, 2022
Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363

FREIRE'S CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND PROFESSIONAL TEACHING IN THETWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Patrick O. Akinsanya, Ph.D,
&
Anthony Ojoka Ojotule
pakinsanya@unilag.edu.ng; fr.anthonyojotule@gmail.com
Department of Educational FoundationsUniversity of Lagos, Nigeria

ABSTRACT
This paper examined the contributions of Paulo Freire who was unarguably considered as an influential philosopher and one of the most significant educators in the twentieth century; he was indeed one of the most cited and iconic figures in the last century's education literature. He was seen as a special kind of intellectual, and his influence was noticed in many areas such as social studies, curriculum studies, adult education, secondary education, higher education, educational planning, inter alia. Using the philosophical research methods, viz: analysis and speculation, the study exposed the significant influence of Freire's pedagogical model on twentieth century education and established the positive changes which the twenty first century's pedagogy would envision given the infusion of Freiran educational philosophy into teaching profession. Freire wanted teachers to treat learners as co-creators of knowledge. In the light of the problem-posing approach, particular attention was drawn to dialogue, in the course of which everyone could ask questions or express his or her own views freely. Thus, education would be seen as the practice of freedom, and in the practice of freedom, through dialogue, teachers and students would raise their awareness. Freire argued that teaching required questioning at the core of the dialogue, and the possibility of questioning was included in dialectical structure. As revolutionary as the philosophy of Freire was, however, the twenty first century seems to have docked it in the dustbin. This may not be unconnected with criticisms from some scholars, who considered Freiran pedagogy as being parochial and limited in use. This paper thus resurrects the good elements in Freiran critical pedagogy which could be very beneficial to the present century's practice of teaching. The researchers concluded that despite the loopholes found in Freire's postulations, which are reflections of human imperfections, Freiere's critical pedagogy has overwhelming comparative advantages which are highly consequential to teachers and learners in the present age.

Keywords: Freire, Teaching, Critical pedagogy, Twentieth century, Twenty first century

Introduction
The twentieth century brilliant Brazilian-born philosopher and seasoned critical educator, Paulo Freire isunarguably one of the major advocates of critical pedagogy in the world. Intellectually equipped from a Brazilian University, the lawyer-turned critical educator, Freire, developed an unquenchable desire for critical education as expressed in his adult literacy campaign. Having studied the relationship between teaching and learning and discovered that each student has a way of thinking critically and is not just a passive recipient of knowledge or education from a teacher, Freire endorsed and championed the idea that every teacher should helpstudents develop freedom of thought which

would enable them use their knowledge to take constructive actions. Gradually and progressively, Freire's conviction and practice gained international recognition.

As shown in his most famous 1970 book, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* his motivation for critical pedagogy was inextricably linked to his background and the socio-political climate of his days which was characteristically predominated by capitalist ideology. Influenced by his poor middle-class upbringing, working experience with multitudes of illiterate Brazilians, Marxist leanings and imprisonment in Brazil, amidst hunger and poverty during the Great Economic Depressions of 1930s, Freire set agenda to address the needs of the poor, particularly their lack of critical education, which he saw as inhibiting the development of Brazil and the wider humanity **(**Stevens, 2002**;** Shor, 2018). Undoubtedly, his works and ideas in this regard accorded him not only the Latin America's foremost educationist, thinker and writer, but also deemed him the father of critical pedagogy (Kolb & Kolb 2005, Rodriguez-Mojica, Muñoz-Muñoz & Briceño, 2020). Ultimately, Freire considered education as part of a wider project of cultural and political liberation, humanization and transformation of society through critical consciousness. Given this prelude, this paper sets out to explore and analyse Freirean concepts of critical pedagogy, banking system of education**,** alternative education model and relevance of Freire's philosophy to professional teaching in the twenty first century.

Statement of Problem

Teaching in the twenty first century seems to be relapsing into the conventional mode, wherein there is a divide between the teacher and the student, and the former is considered as a reservoir of knowledge, whereas the latter is taken to be an empty container. This traditional conception of pedagogy was brought to a halt towards the end of the last century with the enigmatic philosophical contributions of Paulo Freire, who had created a paradigm turn from traditional method of teaching to a new method labelled as critical pedagogy. This new turn, with its pragmatic promises, was highly celebrated across the globe. However, in the new dispensation, Freiran model of pedagogy seems to have taken the back seat due to some criticisms which had greeted the educational philosophy. Sadly, the present century, with its characteristic elements, tilting more towards criticality and creativity, is consequentially in need of nothing but critical and creative pedagogy, which Freire readily offers. This paper thus attempted an exhumation of Freire, by extrapolating the practical merits in engaging the scholar's pedagogical model in teaching, in the present century.

Research Method

This study adopted traditional methods of research in philosophy, viz; analysis and speculation. Analysis is adopted so as to clarify and break down the philosophy of Freire; philosophical speculation to adumbrate the impact of Freire's critical pedagogy on twenty first century education, and forecast the possible critical consciousness which would be developed when Freirean critical pedagogy is fully infused into the teaching profession.

Freire's Critical Pedagogy: Conceptual Clarifications

It was Aristotle who once posited that a good philosophical discourse must begin with clarification of terms (Aristotle in Nkokelonye, 2005). The term "critical" as employed renders itself to many synonyms such as evaluative, analytic, explicative, expository, and dialogic,

among others. According to Shor, critical pedagogy is:

> the habit of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning, first impressions, dominant myths, official pronouncements, traditional clichés, received wisdom, and mere opinions, to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, object, process, organization, experience,text, subject matter, policy, mass media, or discourse (Shor,1992:129).

The idea expressed above presupposes critical pedagogy as being inquiry-based, questioning in character, analytically oriented and evaluative in nature. This analysis aligns well with Giroux's (1988) who considered critical pedagogy as a method of imparting on students the concept of learning as an unfolding process of inquiring, analysing, and evaluating in a genuinely critical way.

Alexander (2021) also considered critical pedagogy as a theory and practice of teaching in which the teacher and students (interlocutors) critically interrogate the topic of study, express and listen to multiple voices and points of view, and create respectful and equitable classroom relations. In contrast to traditional or conventional method, this method of teaching is by nature, student-centered, collaborative, democratic and critical. While conventional method relies heavily on recitation and memorization and positions students as remembers (Nystrand, 1997), critical teaching on the other hand, values critical thinking. It harnesses the power of talk to engage interest, stimulates thinking, advances understanding, expands ideas, evaluates arguments and empowers students for lifelong learning and democratic engagement. Actually, its proponents claim that it is a continuous process of what they called unlearning, learning, and relearning, reflection, evaluation, and the effect that these actions and processes have on students-particularly students who have been historicallydisenfranchised by what traditional schooling *(*Malott, 2016). Typically, learner-centered methods, as Ahmad and Aziz (2009) noted, are generally associated with capacity to infuse imaginative, critical and creative skills. They involve active participation of both teachers and students in learning process through dialogic inquiry and reflective and metacognitive engagement which leads to higher academic efficiency and human effectiveness in addressing problems of humanity. Thus, like other student-centered pedagogies, the standard features of critical pedagogy in addition to the ones stated include collaborative learning, connecting new information to previous knowledge and critical thinking (Froyd, 2007, Ahmad & Aziz, 2009).

As an academic field of discipline, critical pedagogy is a philosophy of education and social movement which developed from application of critical theories and related traditions to the field of education in response to capitalists' oppressive ideology. Being antithetical to capitalism and all forms of dehumanizing practices in human society, it is mostly described by scholars as a humanistic and liberating crusade championed by critical thinkers and socialist activist educators. In fact,

critical pedagogy is embraced by scholars as Shor, Kincheloe, Illich, Giroux, Hooks and Mclaren whom Freire called his "intellectual cousin", among others (Kincheloe, 2008, Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008*)*. These crops of critical theorists viewed teaching as an inherently political act. Thus, they rejected the neutrality of knowledge and insisted that issues of social justice and even democracy itself are not distinct from acts of teaching and learning. Although Freire popularized the idea of critical pedagogy which is almost synonymous with his name, surprising, it is worth stating that he himself seldom used the term "critical pedagogy" in his discourse on philosophy of education. Actually, the term critical pedagogy was a creation of Henry Giroux, a very close associate of Freire, in his 1983 book entitled *Theory and Resistance in Education*. Giroux personally encountered and experienced Freire as one could infer from the following words of his "I had a close personal and working relationship with Paulo Freire for over fifteen years"(Giroux, 2010).

Historically, the ideas and principles underlying critical pedagogy are attributed to educational thoughts of Frankfurt's school which started in Europe around 1923. This epoch in history witnessed the wake and rise of Fascism and Stalinism, oppression of labour class by capitalist ideology, and government's domination over economy, among others. According to Mahmoudi, Khoshnoo and Babaei (2014), as at 1960s and 1970s, the situation above lapsed and aggravated into a complete triumph of racial inequities, lack of equal social opportunities for all, gender inequality, *inter alia*, in Europe and America. It was this dawn and reign of oppression and injustice in the land which was both the bane and basis for critical thinkers to challenge the *status quo.* It is then not unexpected that Paulo Freire's, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, came out at this time in history. Given this and in fact in connection with others, Freire's vision for critical pedagogy, otherwise, the pedagogy of critical thinkers which is wrought by critical inquiry and critical consciousness, emerged from his experiences in the three stages of his life: The first period concerned work in Brazil. He worked in several organizations; public and private, making connections between culture and adult literacy; the second period began with his exile in Bolivia, Chile, in USA and, finally with his work in the World Council of Churches in Geneva (Switzerland). This period is, possibly, the moment of a wider application of his philosophy and practice and the establishment of his international reputation. The third step in his life was his return to Brazil. This last period was characterized by his work as a teacher in several universities and, finally, as Secretary of Education in Sao Paulo (Brazil) between 1989-1991 (Lucio-Villegas, 2009).

Arising from above context in which the notion of critical pedagogy originated, was Freire's transposition of thenotion of power domination and subjugation of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat under capitalist system to teacher-student relationship in education system under conventional pedagogy. Specifically, for educators like Paulo Freire, and critical theorists in general, critical pedagogy, to this effect, was desirously tailored to awaken and foster critical thinking and attempts social reformation. By implication, this pedagogy sought the twin objectives of decolonization and rehabilitation of pedagogues and students from what Giroux (2003) called false consciousness of traditional education to true awakening light of critical teaching method. Interestingly, critical pedagogy has evolved

considerably since the 1960s and 1970s when Freire developed this idea. It has been interpreted and developed in different ways by different scholars and thinkers, drawing upon the divergent views of critical theorists and radical educators. Currently, critical pedagogy describes a range of practices that have different names and interpretations: ranging from liberatory teaching, pedagogy of possibility, empowering education, pedagogy of resistance, emancipatory pedagogy to postmodern pedagogy (Giroux, 2010). Despite differing terms, at the heart of all these versions of critical pedagogy is the intent for critical consciousness. Primarily, it aims at stimulating teachers' and students' thoughts and reflection to go beyond the world they know and feel comfortable in, to expanding their understanding of a range of social possibilities and achieving a more equal and just future.

From the sequences of Freire's educational thoughts and its socio-political emergence, one discovers that critical pedagogy is primarily targeted at raising human critical consciousness as opposed to conventional pedagogy. In fact, McLaren (2005) concurred that critical pedagogy is intended to raise critical consciousness since ignorance, understood by Freire as lack of knowledge and lack of critical thinking skills, is a key tool in the maintenance of oppression. Critical pedagogy is targeted so as to say to give humans some dose of criticality in order to develop the habit of critical questioning and boosts human interrogative, analytical, inquisitive, speculative and probing capacity. Contrary to conventional pedagogy, critical pedagogy is expected to humanize both teachers and students. Its tenets, as shown from the foregoing, characteristically positions critical pedagogy as self-evaluating, itself- analyzing, and self-probing. Conversely, it is an educational approach which is founded on and also purposed to develop and enthrone critical consciousness, critical literacyor awareness in both teachers and learners. Given these design and desire, therefore, the first social organizationthat should undergo modification and change, according to Freire is educational system. Why? because schoolis the factory of human society where societal man-powers are produced. Educational system is intended to constitute teachers and students as informed subject and social agents to do their best to modify and change the situations they feel discriminatory and unjust within school system and the larger society thereafter. Following this line of thought, the main notion of classroom, in Freire's understanding is to invite students to think critically about the nature of the subject under discussion, the society's prevalent ideas and the process of information transfer in the society, instead of the mere impartation of skills, knowledge and truths. It is from this perspective that Freire (1972) defined critical pedagogy as an educational methodology which seeks to increase students' awareness of the hidden curriculum's inequalities and multiple form of oppression which exist in the society, and encourage them to take steps towards creating a more democratic and equitable society. Characteristically, it provides learners with the tools to critically analyse how, why and on whose benefits knowledge is constructed.

Freire and Conventional Method of Teaching (Banking System of Education)

Banking system of education was Freirean coinage for conventional pedagogy based on his perception of its mode of operation. Freire (1970) referred metaphorically to the traditional view of education as banking model of

education in which the teacher makes 'deposits' into the supposedly 'empty' heads of learners. Likening teachers and students to depositors and depositories respectively in this depiction, Freire conceived banking system of education as depositing information and knowledge into an empty account of students in a similar manner one operates a bank account. The pedagogical description as purported chiefly emphasises students' passivity in the manner that is akin to mere robotic reception of knowledge without the power of reflection, contribution, analysis and questioning. Being a monologic teaching approach that is apparently devoid of communication, the teacher more or less issues communiqués and makes deposits into students' heads in which they patiently receive, memorize and repeat. Education becomes in this condition, an act of deposition instead of drawing out knowledge from students or arousing intellectual capacity for critical dialogue and exploration and stimulates thirst for knowledge. In this distortion of learning, the measure that is deposited is almost the measure withdrawn. Consequently, the scope of action allows students extend only as far as receiving, filingand storing the deposits. The following summarises Freire's impression:

> In the banking system of education, teachers are pillars of knowledge; they know everything and students know nothing. Teachers deposit knowledge in students and never ask them to question that knowledge. The teacher thinks, the students do not; the teacher chooses the content, students comply with it. Teacher is authority and students are obedient to authority. Students in this model are receivers of knowledge. They receive, memorize and repeat. They are not asked to relate this knowledge to the current problems and injustices in society with the aim of improving the society (Freire, 1970:47)

As pictured above, banking model of education is monologic. Like conventional education, it is hierarchical, domineering and unilateral. These characteristics separate the teacher and students, and provide rare opportunities for creating meaningful dialogue among them. Matusov (2009) expressed similar view that while banking system of education might increase test scores, it cannot lead to genuine reflective (critical) mastery and understanding of what is learned**.** Freire observed that banking system views students as object of assistance. It does not give them the opportunity to dialogue with their teachers because teachers are often seen as transmitters of knowledge, and students, simply as the object in which knowledge is transmitted or deposited into. So purported, learning is more or less conformity, if not deformity. It advocates for an indoctrination of a set knowledge, without allowing the learner to critically assess the kind of knowledge being deposited in them. In this act of conformity extolled in banking education model, knowledge/education is seen as a gift offered to student by teacher who considers learners as marginal, ignorant and resource-less. Freire saw this as false generosity from the dominant group (oppressors) and a way of dominating and controlling the people (the oppressed) for their selfish benefits. This, according to Freire, makes the banking system a very dangerous model of education. It only makes the student a tool in the hands of the teacher. Naiditch (2010) noted that Freire had hit a nerve when he elaborated on the dichotomy of students as subjects as opposed to objects of theirown learning process. Traditional or conservative approaches to education like this, which essentially constitute students as objects, discourage development of critical thinking skills or creativity in the classroom as they deny learners opportunity to become engaged in their own learning. Operationally, teachers silence any other voice but theirs, and reading becomes an activity of finding the meanings the teacher expects students to find; theright answers, the one accepted interpretation.

Joldersma (1999) argued strongly that this pedagogical model mirrors the structure of an oppressive society in which the oppressed and the oppressors are divided. By inference, it excludes teachers and students as co- learners and co -creators of knowledge in what Matusov (2009) called meaning-making-venture. The scholar lambasted this teaching model on the ground that knowledge is packaged, completed and objective and transferred into passive students, depicting the world as static and unchangeable. Students are conditioned to believe that power, authority and activity are held by the teachers who often view them as objects rather than reflective and creative beings. This claim is legitimated by teacher's perceptions of students as 'ignorant' and devoid of knowledge, and students' own acceptance of their alienated status and 'ignorance' as justifying the teacher's existence. So perceived, the idea that teacher and students can learn together is an absolute contradiction in banking education. It advocates fixation of reality as teachers do not offer students opportunity to critically reflect and act on the nature of knowledge acquired. Like conventional pedagogy, this model is dehumanizing as it creates oppressive passivity in students. According to Freire (1970), it is this educational contradiction as upheld in banking education that mirrors oppressive society as a whole. This approach has a disempowering effect on learners and can create misuse of power.

While still contending with the challenges of banking education already, the issue of its ineptitude to raise a higher consciousness needed to outwit and break the force of colonialism surfaces. The problematic question is: Can one really escape ideological frameworks and put oneself in a position that enables one sees the world in a different way? An attempt to

respond to the latest question indicates that one needs to employ another pedagogical form, but this would entail getting detached. Instead, banking system of education has been found as a veritable tool in the maintenance of the *status quo.* Through transmission of existing cultural and lived ideologies, the received views which make up the history of any people are kept safe. Banking system of education is therefore history preserving and identity securing. Again, by perpetuating the *status quo*, revolutions are tactically avoided. Lived ideologies that are beneficial are not just jettisoned for the mere hungeror quest for the novel.

The maintenance of people in a certain range of lived ideological matrices as banking system of education does is an important factor in stabilizing and continuing a given mode of world view. Though it may be considered a supportive rhetoric, but history has always proved that people more often than not, fulfill themselves only when there is a strong but just authority structure in society. Without a defined educational curriculum with its methods of impartation of knowledge, everything will pass as knowledge; hence, it may be increasingly difficult to differentiate sense from nonsense. This is a respected view which has strong philosophical tradition supporting it and goes back, yet banking system of education embraces the principle that it is better to have knowledge than to be ignorant; but as it is always said, it is better to be Socrates-dissatisfied than a pig-satisfied. Of what value is mere accumulation of knowledge without ability for its application to solve human problems? This is the crux of the matter (Ihejirika, 2017). Harris (1979) substantiated Freire's claims by emphasizing that the two major mistakes that have been made within the educational purview are first, the thinking that every teacher is always right, and so, whatever he or she says should be accepted. The second mistake is the belief that everything written in books must be treated with sanctity, and must be accepted as right. So, instead of allowing the students to critically access and raise arguments on vital issues, the banking system practiced by most societies constrict the students to only fill their essays with quotations without independently advancing their thoughts. They prefer to adopt quotations from famous authorities without analysis because it is believed to be right and perfect.

Inspired by Marxian disgust for the continual rift between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in capitalist system, Freire was critical of teachers who applied the banking' concept in their teaching. In his opinion, 'the more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world (Freire, 1970). Based on Freirean opinion, it goes well to say that banking education deadens and inhibits critical and creative powers both in teachers and students. No one who engages in the process of banking education seen as an attempt to maintain the submersion of critical consciousness, he said, can be truly human while preventing others from being so (Freire, 1972). Thus, he views banking' approach as helping to undermine the development of a critical and questioning habits in students. In this respect, the prevalence of banking approach in schools is viewed by Freire as serving the interests of the ruling class (whom he termed the 'oppressors') who for him are agitating to maintain the *status quo* as it numbs the threat of student critical consciousness. Indeed, 'the more the oppressed can

be led to adapt to the situation, the more easily they can be dominated. The same justification for the denial of education to slaves and those freed, following the abolition of slavery. In other words, by filling working class pupils/students with knowledge dictated by the ruling/middle classes, they become educated not only to understand but to accept their place/role in society without question/challenge. Based on the dangerous nature of the banking system, Freire believed that the best model is the *problem posing model*. In this new model, there is a mutual interaction between the teacher and the learner, in which their experiences are thoroughly discussed and consequently evaluated. The teacher is always cognitive; she regards objects as reflecting upon by students and herself and not as her private property. Students are no longer passive listeners, but critical individuals (Sisimwo, Rop & Osman, 2014).

Freire's Pedagogical Model: Problem Posing

As an alternative to banking model of education, Freire (1970) proposed a problem-posing. The term problem- posing was a Freirean coinage in his book: *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Descriptively, it is a method of teachingin which emphasis on critical consciousness engages learning community in dialogue and reflective inquiry in order to infuse critical and creative powers for the purpose of human liberation and humanization. Problem posing is an active learning strategy where a teacher or student poses a problem and the class collaborates to find answers (Freire, 1970). Aimed to activate critical and creative mindedness, this alternative education modelresists transfer of knowledge and insists on empowering learners by involving them (not as objects or observers) in knowledge creation which is engendered by dialogue, interaction, and critical questioning of what is taught and its application to real life.

Specifically, dialogue is crucial to problem-posing education. Freire considered dialogue as the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world. Dialogue is consequently an existential necessity, and since dialogue is the encounter in which the united reflection and action of the dialoguers are addressed to the world which is to be transformed and humanized, this dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person's "depositing" ideas in another, nor can it become a simple exchange of ideas to be "consumed" by the discussants. Education, Freire argued, is a collective, communal and social act and cognitive engagement among dialoguers. It therefore becomes a contradiction for one to begin to prescribe, transfer and deposit knowledge to learners as a consumable commodity as it is often the case of a typical conventional teacher. Dialogue, as it is referred to here, is a kind that is meaningful and intelligible. For this reason, Freire (1973) contended that true dialogue cannot exist unless the dialoguers engage in critical thinking – thinking which perceives reality as a process, as transformation, rather than as a static entity – thinking which does not separate itself from action, but constantly immerses itself in temporality without fear of the risks involved. Through critical dialogue, problem solving creates among learners, the perpetual habit of looking at problems critically since the outcome of this meaningful dialogue is generation of critical consciousness. Informed by this belief, Freire argued that teachers should be concerned to make students 'more fully human' by which he meant 'conscious beings', subjects and creators of knowledge. To attain holistic development of the human person, dialogue among community of learners is at the heart of problem-posing education, that is, dialogue between teachers and students, and students with teachers. The point here is that in problem-posing education, the

inconceivable idea of "the all-powerful teacher" engaging students in knowledge creation which is upheld in banking education is demystified. Problem-posing solves the student–teacher contradiction by recognizing that knowledge is not deposited from one (the teacher) to another (the student), but is instead formulated through dialogue between the two (Freire, 1970).

From Freire to subsequent authors, problem-posing education is pedagogically procedural. Nixon-Ponder (1995) maintained that the learner undergoes five steps of problem posing respectively describing the content of discussion, defining the problem, personalizing the problem, discussing the problem, and discussing the alternatives of the problem. In different terms, Elias (1976) confirmed that in problem -posing model, students are closely equal to their teachers, regarding the problem under analysis and the developing knowledge. They exercise freedom and together with the teacher control the educational process. To Freire (1970), both students and the teachers are subjects in this process. The teacher uncovers reality and creates knowledge of the world. Students in this view develop power to critically reflect on the way they exist in the world and then come to see the world not as a static reality, but as reality in process, in transformation. In that respect, problem-posing education is considered 'revolutionary' and by nature antithetical to conventional pedagogy's institutionalized ignorance and false consciousness. Here, one observes Freire's marxist beliefs coming to fore. Problem posing seeks to make a change, a difference to the education of the masses. Posing as a coach to humanists and liberating praxis, Freire posited as fundamental that the people subjected to domination must fight for their emancipation. To that end, problem posing enables teachers and students to become subjects of the educational process by overcoming authoritarianism and an alienating intellectualism; it also enables people to overcome their false perception of reality. The important thing, from the point of view of libertarian education, is for the people to come to feel like masters of their thinking by discussing the thinking and the views of the world explicitly or implicitly.

In Freirean understanding, there exists a kind of chasm, if not a conflict of interest between banking model of education and problem-solving education. The following inferable comparison usefully brings the point home.

Banking education (for obvious political reasons) attempts, by mythicizing reality, to conceal certain factswhich explains the way human beings exist in the world; problem-solving education sets itself the task of demythologizing. Banking education resists dialogue; problem-posing education regards dialogue as inseparable to the act of cognition which unveils reality. Banking education treats students as objects of assistance and teacher, the sole knowledge givers; problem-posing education makes them critical thinkers and co-inquirers and generators of knowledge. Banking education inhibits creativity and domesticates (though it completely destroy) the intentionality of consciousness by isolating critical consciousness from the world, thereby denying people their ontological and historical vocation of becoming full humans. Problem-solving bases itself on creativity and stimulates true reflection and action upon reality, thereby responding to the vocation of persons as beings who are authentic only when engaged in inquiry and creative transformation (Freire, 1970).

In sum, banking theory and practice, as

immobilizing and fixating forces, fail to acknowledge men and women as historical beings; problem-solving theory and practice take people's historicity as their starting point.

Major Criticisms against Freire's Pedagogical Model

No thinker existed in human history whose ideology is completely without a circumstantial influence. Accordingly, human ideologies are either informed by or developed in response to experiences of ones' family background or the socio- political and possibly, religious climate that predominantly rule one's epoch. The indubitability of the above fact, demands as it were, constant consciousness of the possibility of either human subjectivism or fallacy of hasty generalization in reportage. Such is the case with Freire's critical pedagogy and its perspective which evidently renders it either amenable to some criticisms or disputes among scholars. One of such debates borders on the ideal moment or level of education that is suitable for critical pedagogy. Among critics and even theorists of critical pedagogy, opinion varies regarding the developmental stage or school level and even the subjects or academic discipline that are most appropriate for application of critical pedagogy in order to ensure maximum learning. Majorly considerations are premised on its metacognitive demands since by its operationalization, critical pedagogy is actively and dialogically participatory, reflectively and analytically learning and inquiry based. Ennis (2015) for instance stated that critical pedagogy can be possibly applied by teachers' right from childhood in primary school so as to initiate critical thinking skills and consciousness from outset. Although it is considered that such skills can be previously widened (Bailin, 1999), however, Halpern (1999) on the other hand, asserted that for the sake of intellectual maturation and social experiences required for teaching and learning of this sort to blossom, critical pedagogy is better employed more intentionally during higher education regardless of subjects and discipline. Although many scholars seem to align more with the later opinion than the former, nonetheless, the expertise of critical pedagogue has a great role to play in this kind of teaching and learning episode. Thinking of its mental task and time involvement, critics have also noted that it takes almost an immeasurable energy to be a critical pedagogue. Freire (1970) had admitted that critical pedagogy entails what he called "epistemological curiosity", that is, endless questioning due to awareness of our "unfinishedness," which is realised by the capacity of the mind. This epistemological curiosity is undoubtedly one of the striking ingredients that simultaneously fuels and drains a critical pedagogue's energy. Further, the tension between teaching, research, and service may be heightened for the critical pedagogue. As stated earlier, long hours in labour-intensive preparation and teaching combined with obligations to attend to and support students' social action projects outside of class may heavily impinged on teachers' effectiveness. One difficulty added to this is institutional challenges and bureaucratized practices**.** Situations abound where support facilities for teaching activities are based on institutional policies and practice and rarely on teacher demands or teacher's influence. Also, some instructors may have texts and curricula chosen for them, especially part-timers or in departments where, for example, an introductory text is chosen for all sections. All of these institutional impediments added to lack of academic freedom may constrain teachers' capability to implement a critical pedagogical framework.

The hallmark of Freire's critical pedagogy is critical consciousness which itself thrives basically on twofundamental assumptions; first, critical reflection always begets critical action which in turn brings a positive change. The second one which is linked to the first is that the

relationship between critical reflection and critical action is both reciprocal and circular. Consequently, growth in critical reflection implies a simultaneous growth in critical action and positive change. Given human complexity, reflective power and unpredictability sometimes, this sounds and equally seems too utopic, if it is not mechanistic. According to Watts, Diemer and Voight (2011), times are when critical action does not meet its purpose. In this situation, it could lead to frustration rather than an awareness of societal inequities. Besides, with the constructive and destructive potentials of human intelligence, critical consciousness considered as an antidote to injustices can be abused or negatively skewed in response to and in favour of human selfishness. Admittedly, these aforementioned loopholes are possible challenges and reflections of human imperfection. However, other things being equal, critical pedagogy has overwhelming comparative advantages that are relevant to man and today's society.

Twenty First Century and Freire's Model

Towards the end of the last century, the influence of Freire's critical pedagogy was vividly noticeable in various ways, in different countries, all over the world. For instance, in Japan, Freire's works became the focus of attention from the late 1970s to the beginning of the 1980s among sociologists and educators concerned with the problem of minorities' illiteracy and discrimination, as well as education in third world countries. Freire's philosophical and theoretical principles have however been reduced in the present dispensation, to either a method of literacy for adult education or to an educational theory applicable only in third world countries. As a consequence of this limited view, there are few works which thoroughly analyze Freirean original thoughts as a theory of education. Moreover, there are almost no works or papers that analyze or refer to Freire's latest works, such as the 'talking books' published in the 1980s and the books published in the 1990s, which are important to have a complete view of the development of his philosophical and theoretical principles (Yamaguchi, 2000). In a North American context, similar to Japan, Freire's thoughts are now reduced to methods, which tendency, according to Aronowitz, is one of the main problems of American educators: their tendency to reduce pedagogical theories to mere methods, to mere "aspirin practices," which are expected to solve their "headache as quickly as possible."

Recently, however, Freirean works have begun to gain renewed attention and this time not only among adult educators, but also among school teachers. It can be argued that this increase in interest is a consequence of two main factors: his pedagogy is being rediscovered as an alternative to solving the problems schooling is facing nowadays, such as the high rate of drop-outs among minorities. Freirean works, published in the 1990s, focus on the necessity to redefine the role of schools in the society by questioning the conventional educational system. Now, all Freirean works written in the 1990s have already been translated into English and, books and dissertations analyzing his latest tendencies and experiences in public schools are being published (Burbules, & Berk, 1999). In Brazil, the rebirth of the progressive educational movement has brought the revival of Freirean works that had been labelled 'subversive' during the military dictatorship period (1964-1985). The economic crisis caused the power of the military to weaken and allowed the redemocratization process to start. In addition, this process was accelerated by the subsequent political opening and strengthening of popular movements that until then had been suppressed.

Freire critical pedagogy, which was influenced by

Frankfort School, has introduced a new approach to teaching in the last century, and the twenty first century cannot afford to go back to the bin. Freire laid emphasis on the role of critical understanding to remove deprivation and injustices from societies. He postulated an educational plan, which is in line with the redeemer education, to pave the way for a basic evolution in education. With his model of education, students' lives are enriched. Via this approach, students are given the chance to challenge accepted hypotheses and also to explore the relationship between their society and the content of their educational environment. Through these opportunities, learners can comprehend their positions in the society and they can take positive steps to amend the society, and ultimately eliminate problems, inequities and oppressions in their lives. Synoptically, critical pedagogy helps learners to become empowered, and capable of achieving self-awareness and self-actualization to transform inappropriate conditions into a better one. For this purpose, conventional methods of education are challenged and should not be resorted to, in the twenty first century; critical thinking-based education via critical pedagogy should take over the stage.

Conclusion

This paper attempted a resurrection of the use of critical pedagogy in the present century, as opposed toattempts by critics who condemned critical pedagogy outrightly, and consequently pushed for the conventional approach to teaching. Numerous researches, as indicated in the body of this paper, have shown that the twenty first century is highly in need of critical pedagogues who would make students/learners cope with the enormity of challenges confronting the present century. Critical pedagogy is the pathway to critical consciousness for both teachers and students, as it precipitates a kind of reflective and critical approach which is not only necessary for, but generates creativities and inventions.

Recommendations

Based on the challenges discussed in this work, the researchers thus recommend the following:

- Given the present century's characteristic elements which tilt more towards criticality and creativity, the process of teaching the young minds must be critical and creative, that is, critical and creative pedagogy which Freire readily offers, should be adhered to.

- Problem posing method of teaching, which is an active teaching/learning strategy wherein a teacher or student poses a problem and the class collaborates to find answers with the aim of activating critical and creative mindedness, is a better approach to teaching in contemporary times, and every teacher should adopt this mode.

- The idea of "all-powerful teacher" who engages students in knowledge creation which is upheld in banking education should be demystified. Freireran pedagogy solves the student–teacher contradiction by recognizing that knowledge is not deposited from one to another, but is instead formulated through dialogue between the teacher and the student. This makes the pedagogy 'revolutionary' and thus in contradistinction to conventional pedagogy's institutionalized ignorance.

- By and large, Freire critical pedagogy has introduced a new approach to teaching and the present century cannot afford to backslide. His

particular brand of pedagogy helps learners to become empowered, and capable of achieving self-awareness and self-actualization. The present age is highly in need of critical and creative pedagogues who would make learners cope with the daunting challenges confronting it. Critical pedagogy is the sure guide to critical and creative consciousness for both teachers and students; it generates reflective mood which in turn leads to creativities and inventions.

References

Ahmad, F. & Aziz, J. (2009). Students' perception of teachers teaching of literature communication and understanding through the eyes of the audience. *European Journal of Social Science, 7*(3), 17-39.

Alexander, R. (2021). *A dialogic teaching companion.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Bailin, S. (1999). Common misconceptions of critical thinking. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31*(4), 285-302.

Burbules, N.C. & Berk, R.C. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: relation, differences and limits. In Popkewitz, T. & Fendler, L. (eds). *Critical Theories in Education.* New York: Routledge

Elias, J. L . (1976). *Conscientization and deschooling: Freire's and Illich's proposal for reshaping society.* Philadelphia: Westminster press.

Ennis, R. H. (2015). *Critical thinking: The palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education.* PalgraveMacmillan.

Freire, P. (1972). Research methods. Paper presented at a seminar on Studies in Adult Education, Dares Salaam,Tanzania.

Freire, P. (1973) Education as the Practice of Freedom. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Froyd, J. E. (2007). Evidence for the efficacy of student-active learning pedagogies (Retrieved September 22, 2021) from http://cte.tamu. edu/program/flc.php.

Giroux H (2010). Rethinking education as the practice of freedom: Paulo Freire and the promise of critical pedagogy. Policy Futures in Education, 8(6), 715–721.

Giroux, H. A . (2005). Literacy and the pedagogy of political empowerment. Literacy: reading the word and theWorld, Taylor and Francis e-library.

Giroux, H.A. (2003). Lessons from Paulo Freire, the chronicle of higher education. *The Chronicle Review*, 1-8.

Halpern, D. F. (1999). Teaching for critical thinking: Helping college students develop the

Ihejirika, C. I. C. (2020). The state of education in Nigeria: Problems and prospects. https://www.researchgate,net/publications. Assessed 13th November, 2021.

Joldersma, C. (1999). The tension between justice and freedom in Paulo Freire's epistemology. *Journal ofEducational Thought*, 35*(2)*, 129-148.

Kincheloe, J. L. & Steinberg, S.R. (2008). *Indigenous knowledges in education: complexities, dangers, and profound benefits* in Denzin, N., Lincoln, S., & Linda. T (Eds). Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies, Sage Publications.Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer*. New York: Peter Lang

Kolb A. & Kolb D A (2005) Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in highereducation. Academy of Management Learning &

Nixon-Ponder, S. (1995). Using problem-

skills and dispositions of a critical thinker, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *80,* 69-79.

Harris, K. (1979). *Education and knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Education, 4(2), 193-212

Lucio-Villegas, E. (2009). Paulo Freire: A beginner's guide. *Concept*, *1* (1), 1-5.

Mahmoudi, A., Khoshnood, A. & Babaei, A. (2014). Paulo Freire critical pedagogy and its implications in curriculum planning. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *5* (14), 86-92.

Malott, C. (2016). *History and education: engaging the global class war.* New York: Macmillan Matosov, E. (2009). *Journey into dialogue pedagogy:* New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Mclaren, P. (2005). Freirean pedagogy, praxis and possibilities, Taylor and Francis e-library.

Naiditch, F. (2010). Critical pedagogy and the teaching of reading for social action. *Critical Questions in Education*, 1 (2), 94-107.

posing dialogue: in adult literacy education.

htt://www.researchgate,net/publ ication.

Nkokelonye, C.U. (2005). *History of education: ancient and modern.* Nsukka: University Trust Publishers.

Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Rodriguez-Mojica. C., Muñoz-Muñoz, E.R & Briceño, A. (2020). Preparing bilingual teachers to enact culturally sustaining pedagogy. *Handbook of Research on Diversity and Social Justice in Higher Education*, 202-221. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-5268-1

Shor, R. (2018) Brazil's unintended gift to the world: Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed, fifty years later. Revista E-Curriculum, 16(4), 1334–1340.

Shor, R. (1992). *Empowering education*, Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Sisimwo, J. S, Rop, C.J, and Osman A.A, (2014). A reflection on the works of Paulo Freire and its relevance toclassroom teaching in middle eastern. *African Journal of Educational Research*, 13, 21-26

Stevens, C. (2002). *Critical pedagogy*, Chicago*:* University of Chicago press.

Watts, R. J., Diemer, M.A. & Voight, A.M. (2011). Critical consciousness: current status and future directions. In Flanagan, C. A. & Christens, B.D. (Eds.). Youth Civic development: work at the cutting edge.New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, *134*, 43-57.

Yamaguchi, A. M. (2000). Paulo Freire's theory of education in the 1990s: from a political struggle to a social struggle. *Summary of the Faculty of Education, Hokkaido University*, 80, 133-149.