

## フレイレのクリティカル・ペダゴジー(FCP)を構成する用語と パラメーターを定義する

ウルック・アンドリュウ  
岐阜聖徳学園大学外国語学部

### Defining the terms and parameters of what constitutes Freirean Critical Pedagogy (FCP)

A.R. WOOLLOCK

#### Abstract

クリティカル・ペダゴジーの理論的枠組みはしばしば教育の様々な状況において議論され適用される。多くの場合、クリティカル・ペダゴジーはクリティカル・ペダゴジーの ‘inaugural philosopher(開始者)’ (McLaren 2000:1)、創始者であるPaulo Freire (1921-1997)の研究と同じであるという仮説が適用される。しかしながら、それは文学と専門的な実践の両方の中で成立したものであり、簡潔にまとめられた定義に欠いている。それゆえ、論文の用語は曖昧なままである。それは、W.B Gallie(1956)が言及したように、少々 ‘essentially contested concept(本質的に論争的な概念)’ といったものであるがゆえ、構成要素は混同したままである。この論文はFreireの著書で、特に影響力の強い分析である ‘Pedagogy of the Oppressed(被抑圧者の教育学)’ (1970)への回帰を試み、クリティカル・ペダゴジーを構成するもの(しないもの)に関して、正確で基礎的な定義を引き出し提供しようとするものである。

Key Words : critical pedagogy, Paulo Freire, educational theory

#### I. Critical Pedagogy: An overview

In the popular lexicon Critical Pedagogy (CP) is undoubtedly seen as a singular unified theory or practice by numerous pedagogues who have each carved out small niches within the overarching and largely uniform paradigm. In academic parlance, however, this is not the case and despite the fact that the primary objective of critical pedagogies should be ‘to create the basis for transforming that system into a more equitable one’ (Auerbach, 1993: 544) there is a great deal of semantic and historical jostling for position and prominence. Whether wishing to be called: ‘critical education’ (Apple, 1999), ‘pedagogies of resistance’ (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1993; Bajaj, 2015), ‘participatory education’ (Auerbach, 1992, 1993), ‘post-modern pedagogy’ (Giroux, 1992), ‘border pedagogy’ (Giroux & McLaren, 1994), ‘radical pedagogy’ (hooks, 1989), ‘emancipatory pedagogy’ (Nouri & Sajjadi, 2014), ‘transformative pedagogy’ (Pennycook, 1999), ‘pedagogies of possibility’ (Giroux & Simon, 1988, 1992; Simon, 1987, 1992) or ‘liberatory teaching’ (Shor, 1987), the critical pedagogues share one common goal, ‘to fight against imperialism and social and political injustices through education’ (Santana-Williamson, 2000: 7), and to use education as a means to bring about a more socially just world; Kanpol (1999), Kessing-Styles (2003), and Kincheloe (2004).

It is perhaps this idea which takes CP back to where some (e.g. Gur-Ze’ev; Kincheloe; Lather, 1998; McLaren, 2003) concur it arose; from the Frankfurt School’s Critical Theory influenced by Marx & Engels’ view of labour (Breuing, 2011:4). It is clear, therefore, that

from an academic perspective, CP might be thought of as a somewhat messily cut pie made up of different ingredients which yield different flavours depending upon where the knife falls. Another metaphor might be Lather’s ‘big tent’ (1998: 184) which consists of ‘differently engaged but nevertheless affiliated critical moves (ibid). Feminist scholar and historical revisionist Mary Breuing offers us the following table as a way of attempting to answer the quandary of why there are so many positions or forms of CP within the academic lexicon.

Pre-Frankfurt School.	Critical Social Theorists. Social and economic equality	Liberatory Education. Emancipation from oppression	Pedagogical Project of Possibility. Disrupting the dominant (socioeconomic) discourse	Feminist Pedagogy. Disrupting the dominant (male privileged) discourse	Post-structuralism. Multiple ways of knowing that are situated, contextual, and partial	The Possibility of Pedagogical practice. Employing the theory of critical pedagogy in praxis
Rene Descartes	Max Horkheimer	Paulo Freire	Henri Giroux	bell hooks	Patti Lather	Paulo Freire
Immanuel Kant	Theodor Adorno	John Dewey	Peter McLaren (cultural studies)	Caroline Shrewsbury	Donna Haraway	Ira Shor
Hegel	Herbert Marcuse	Antonio Gramsci	Michael Apple (curriculum studies)	Kathleen Weiler	Deborah Britzman	Joe Kincheloe
Marx & Engels		Franz Fanon	Roger Simon			

☒ (Table)1 Overview of Historical Roots – Critical Pedagogy adapted from Breuing (2009: 249)

Although Breuing’s self-confessed ‘oversimplified’ table is not complete and is open to debate and discussion, I have elected to refer to it as it demonstrates quite clearly, not so much the development of CP per se, rather, in academic parlance, CP not as a single phrase i.e. ‘critical-pedagogy’ but two separate words. Through this table Breuing demonstrates that the keyword under discussion here is in fact ‘pedagogy’ and *critical* is a kind of sub-clause attached to it. And in her view, it is the nature of the word *critical*, which is of primary importance. It is *critical* she argues, with its particular focus on: education, gender, class, race &c. which defines the *pedagogy*. Extending the nomenclature laid out in the above table, she explains that: critical pedagogical discourse emphasises: *democracy* (Dewey, 1916; 1938; Freire, 1998), *cultural literacy* (Kellner, 1998; Macedo, 1994), *poststructuralism* (Lather, 1991, 1998; Pillow; 2000), and the *politics of identity* and difference embodied in the discourse of *class* (Apple, 1996; Giroux, 1997; McLaren, 2003), *gender* (Shrewsbury, 1987; Weiler, 2001), *race* (hooks, 1994, 2003), and *sexuality* (de Castell & Bryson, 1997) (2011: 14). In this way ‘critical pedagogy will allow educators to realize the possibilities of democratic and social values within their classroom’ (Kincheloe, 2004 quoted in Breuing, 2011: 4). It

could be stated therefore that, despite their differing focus or objectives, they share similar outcomes. There is, however, a further divide between the purely academic or theoretical, and the practical, as Gore (1993) notes when taking aim at Giroux and McLaren, who she deems, should not call their project ‘critical *pedagogy*, but critical *education theory*’ (1993: 42).

## II. Freire’s Critical Pedagogy (FCP)

As was stated in the previous section, although there are many scholars associated with CP e.g. Apple, Freire, Giroux, hooks, McLaren, and Shore et al and many theorists or revolutionaries whose influence is undoubtedly felt in its development, such as: Marcuse, Fanon, Du Bois, Guevara et al, and those like Gur-Ze’ev (1998) who denounce that there is one true definition of CP. The focus of this paper is, however, not to debate methods of these practitioners, nor even to critically examine differences and shortcomings; the above section is provided to present the discussion in some further context and note the semantic underpinning to the debate about terms and tenets. One of the purposes of this research is to address not the definitions or history of CP per se, rather to contribute to the debate about exploration and use. As Breuing states:

While there is a body of literature that considers the theory of critical pedagogy, there is significantly less literature that specifically addresses the ways in which professors attempt to apply this theory in practice. (Breuing, 2009: 247)

At the centre of this research lies not only a practical exploration of the most widely read and disseminated proponent of CP, its ‘inaugural philosopher’ (McLaren, 2000: 1), Paulo Freire, but also a further adaptation of Freire’s theory branching off into what Britzman (2003) describes as ‘methods as a means for a larger educational purpose’ (2003: 62). I use the phrase *FCP* rather than *CP*, in the same way a theologian or social scientist might wish to return to the primary canon to perform a close reading rather than focus on secondary interpretations, so following Brookfield’s (2001) lead, ‘[r]ather than locating this article (research) in secondary literature [...] I have returned to the source and tried to retrace [...] as much as possible using his (the author’s) own words’ (2001: 3), wishing to re-connect with Freire’s own words and teachings as a point of departure for this research.

For Freire, the key tenets of CP coalesce around the core theme of democracy or democratic values (e.g. 1970, 2013: 47, 53, 75) which is viewed from a Marxist perspective. The term democracy, therefore, as an essentially contested concept (Gallie, 1956) *must* be viewed from a Marxist standpoint and must be seen not as an inert action, like casting a ballot, but should be viewed as a means of progression towards social change and betterment for the working-class; something perhaps better expressed as *democratic values* or *democratic practice*. Besides these it must be imbued with an inherent sense of social-justice too. As Dewey (1916) notes on the subject, ‘democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience.’ (1916: 87). It might also help to view Freire’s democracy as a micro construct at the grass-roots, working towards incremental shifts in consciousness, rather than being a macro construct headed solely for large-scale change. It is also useful to consider democracy as much as an internal process is an external one – something which is, of course pertinent to other key constructs such as praxis and conscientização. Social justice therefore with its outer ring of democratic practice forms the central core to which all other tenets thread backwards, and is the

keystone, which essentially informs all of Freire's teachings. In addition to the central core of democratic values and social justice, there are a further seven constructs identified as being key to the theory; tenets which I posit need to be engaged with and explored if the theory is considered to be truly Freirean in nature. Whilst I have neglected to include certain specific constructs that others might have chosen such as societal change (Freire, 1994: 37) I have included elements of this in my headings *transformation*, and *social justice*. Likewise strategies such as the move from dehumanising to humanising – for educands to *become fully human* (Ibid: 27, 38); the *oppressed freeing the oppressor* (Ibid: 26); the *struggle for liberation and redemption* - class struggle (Ibid: 36, 107); or the *culture of silence* (Ibid: 15), have all been either indirectly alluded to or refracted through reference to other tenets. If they were omitted it was not because they were unimportant, rather that they either have an inherent historical or cultural locus which makes them less applicable to the current context of this enquiry.

### III. The Nine Tenets

Practice which purports to be Freirean in nature should adhere to 9 key tenets. These are separated into two core tenets; *democracy* and *social justice*, and 7 secondary tenets; *Dialogue*, *Disruption*, *Praxis*, *Conscientização*, *Countering the banking model of education*, *Problem-posing model of education*, and *Transformation*. These seven secondary tenets are outlined below. As stated above, there is an understanding that as a Marxist, Freire's primary concern is situated within *democratic practice* and *social justice* arenas which encapsulate the wider teachings of Marx. These core elements then extend outwards from this political stance to further inform the secondary tenets. Marxist theory implies that firstly education (in its top-down form) is a key construct in maintaining the social strata of a feudal society which divides the workers - the proletariat from the ruling class and the bourgeois. Secondly it maintains that each person must be free to determine the rate of exchange for their labour, and it could be argued that only by understanding this true rate, through emancipatory education and liberation, can (wo)men get a fair exchange. Finally it seeks a more just society with a more equal distribution not just of wealth, but also of power, culture, and knowledge, engaging with what Habermas (1972) might call *emancipatory knowledge*. Furthermore, common ownership, which is an oft cited construct of Marxism, should be seen as extending beyond the material into the cultural, pedagogical, legal, and social.

#### (1) Dialogue

Firstly, in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (chapter three), Freire takes a whole chapter to discuss the importance of dialogue, and just why it is a foundational for FCP. As a holistic construct, dialogue occupies a locus of importance for a number of reasons. To engage in dialogue there is a need for two or more interlocutors; without these a dialogue cannot occur. It can be seen that dialogue, by its etymological roots *dialogos* (conversation) – *dialegethal* (to discuss) indicates that such an occurrence cannot be despotic in nature. Clearly, for any process, (research, or otherwise) to be considered democratic, it must contain genuine dialogue, what Giddens (1994) calls 'dialogic democracy,' because only through a dialogical exchange can opinions be shared and critically examined which may then lead further. As Cornel West notes on the subject: 'Freire's project of democratic dialogue is attuned to the concrete operations of power (in and out of the classroom) and grounded in the painful yet

empowering process of conscientization.’ (West, 2002: XIII, in Leonard & McLaren, 2002). It should be stressed however, that as a postmodern pedagogical paradigm, FCP is not about reaching consensus, rather, it is about embracing plurality and multiplicity and the agency of the individual.

## (2) Disruption

Disruption of the pre-established metanarrative, which in itself is representant of homogeneity and uniformity, is a key construct of Freire’s teaching. Partly due to its quest for democratic engagement through dialogue, there is a sense that FCP from its postmodern perspective has as much to do with uncertainty as it does with certainty, something which Dewey (1938) notes as being, ‘the organic connection between education and personal experience.’ (1938: 25). Conscientização, which will be discussed below is, in pedagogical terms also perceived as disruptive for it encourages the educand to question notions of Truth and power. Disruption of the metanarrative occurs in many ways but is essentially brought forth by the introduction of plurality and heterogeneity; in the absence of defining authority and Truth, the individual is free to interpret the world as s/he wishes and blanket constructs become harder to maintain.

The idea of disruption also has associations with the Hegelian ideas of contradiction embodied in dialectics, to which Freire subscribes, and which undoubtedly influence his idea of ‘problem posing’ (Freire, 1970: 51, 57, 65 &c.). As Ritzer (2008) notes, ‘Hegel believed contradictions were necessary within society as they provide a method for defining and understanding our world.’ (2008: 150) – and of course an addendum might be; understanding ourselves.

## (3) Praxis

‘Genuine participation is not represented through its external and hence inevitably co-opted guise, but instead by inner creativity and spiritual qualities,, through an awakening of self-realization, step-by-step transformation, or praxis.’ (Rahnema, 1992 quoted in Jones, 1995: 588)

From the entire lexicon which PO brought us, it is perhaps best known for placing the word praxis into popular parlance. Well known, but perhaps the least understood of the key tenets, Freire (1994: 33) defines praxis as, ‘reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it.’ He goes on to state, ‘the praxis which, as the reflection and action which truly transforms reality, is the source of knowledge and creation’ (ibid: 81-82). Praxis therefore, is not only a key term which, like so many others, in part replicates similar sentiments expressed in the other CP corpus, but is the point of departure towards cyclicity and the concept of action research. For in Freire’s model, there has to be an element of *doing* as well as the time for reflection. The act of doing, of movement, of physicality is undoubtedly a legacy of Freire’s adult education programme in Recife and is an important introduction to working with a wide variety of ‘non-standard’ educands. This quasi-Zen approach to doing, followed by reflection, not only empowers the educand to seek answers from within, but also places the locus of power closer to home and renders them less passive and less dependent.

## (4) Conscientização

Whilst praxis concerns itself with the cyclical or non-linear nature of enquiry feeding back into itself, it does not, however, offer us any endpoint, rather it provides a leaping-off

point. Conscientização, or the raising of critical consciousness, on the other hand takes us towards the endpoint of cognitive emancipation and a revelation in that we ‘learn to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality.’ (ibid: 17). ‘Conscientização threatens to place the status quo in question; it thereby seems to constitute a threat to freedom itself (1996: 18). Conscientização, is therefore, the strongest indicator of Freire’s Marxist, or revolutionary credentials and the strongest indicator that the purpose of process of education was subservient to an endpoint of emancipation, which itself was only the point of departure towards different endgoals such as societal change, equality, reform, and social justice. Conscientização indicates that education is not an end but the means to achieve the end. For the purpose of raising the critical consciousness of the participant. ‘Here, no one teaches another, nor is anyone self-taught. People teach each other, mediated by the world, by the cognizable objects which in banking education are “owned” by the teacher’ (Freire, 1994: 61).

#### (5) Countering the banking model of education

Freire’s last lexical gift to the world was to take the dominant model for primary and secondary education worldwide and to create the metaphor of information being deposited into minds like coins in a piggy-bank, which he called the banking model of education. Freire was not the first to posit such an idea, Dewey, for example in *Experience and Education* (1938) states that ‘the chief business of the school is to transmit them (bodies of knowledge) to the new generation.’ (1938: 17). Prior even to this, Marcy (1922) noted from a class perspective, ‘revolutionary pedagogues should not treat workers as capitalists did, as ‘empty vessels into which we pour our preconceived ideas.’ (Marcy, 1922: 295). The metaphor is therefore a potent one with a lengthy history; plainly, whenever information is to be transmitted from one authority to a recipient, be it in the school system towards examinations or standardised testing or in an apprenticeship to a trade where component skills must be internalised in order that a *master-piece* can be produced. The Banking Model of education, however, is not merely a stand-alone concept, but like the other tenets mentioned above, it encompasses a number of other elemental parts too; insofar as it intimates a power diametric between the giver and the receiver, the locus of power and those to whom it is disseminated. It also denotes a demarcation point in terms of what is to be included in the deposit and what is not, and again, who gets to determine this and decide? Furthermore, from a pedagogical perspective it gives us a reference point against which to locate other, more progressive paradigms which see the educand not as a *tabula rasa*, but as a co-constructor of knowledge and signifies the shift towards skill sharing and facilitation.

#### (6) Problem-posing model of education

Antithetical to the above cited ‘Banking Model’ of education, or what might be called the problem solving model, is its counterpart, the problem *posing* model. This tenet can be viewed as a lens through which all of the other key constructs can be seen, and again, optimises the holistic nature of Freire’s theory. Clearly if the facilitator wishes to practise democratic values in the pedagogical context, then they need to be mindful that they are actually doing so. Insofar as prescribing a solution which is in actuality undemocratic would be both oxymoronic and untenable. Likewise by engaging in genuine and respectful dialogue, they offer the potential to critically discuss notions of Truth and power. By interjecting the dialogical exchange with democratic values, the plurality and heterogeneity which arises has

the potential to bring forth a different *weltanschauung* for the educand which may disrupt the metanarrative of Truth proffered by sources of authority. Praxis, like conscientização, require the educand to engage in reflective action which ultimately leads towards self-realisation, or self-actualisation, both states of being which place the individual as the central locus of authority and change and not an external force which would be necessary if the banking model were to be enacted i.e. the depositor, something which may lead towards what might be described as ‘active citizenship’ (Kallen, 1996; Canário, 2003; Borg & Mayo, 2005; Jarvis, 2007).

#### (7) Transformation

Transformation is intended to occur in 2 loci, either within the individual (as per Conscientização noted prior) or within society, although in reality these two theoretical notions become inter-dependent. The ultimate aim being that through individual growth and change, societal change too will occur. That if individuals are emancipated and encouraged to be active, thoughtful, and passionate citizens, that the end result will be society too will be transformed into a more egalitarian or just model. Within the discipline of CP, two North American scholars, Canadian, Peter McLaren (1948-) and American-Canadian, Henri Giroux (1943-), are considered at the forefront of extending this tenet. Giroux (2011) notes that:

‘critical pedagogy, unlike dominant modes of teaching, insists that one of the fundamental tasks of educators is to make sure that the future points the way to a more socially just world, a world in which the discourses of critique and possibility, in conjunction with the values of reason, freedom, and equality function to alter, as part of a broader democratic project.’ (2011: 10)

In the Japanese sense, transformation is closely related to the etymology of the word education: *kyou-iku* (教育), which is linked with the idea of raising up or bringing up an individual (Japanese: *soda tsu* - 育つ) - that education, in its idealised form (at least) is ultimately transformatory, being about raising individuals up and fostering intrinsic change.

#### IV. Conclusion

Currently, the terms and parameters as to what constitutes CP are confused and inconsistent. This inconsistency leads to not only a confusion in practice, but also to a confusion in academic discourse. In order to establish a common lexicon for further discourse and practice, this paper has attempted to demonstrate what can reasonably be called a Freirean Critical Pedagogy, and in contrast, what can *not*. By returning to the source of FCP, the author and has attempted to demonstrate not only the parameters which define FCP, but also the origins too. By conducting a close reading of Freire’s most influential works, notable Pedagogy of the Oppressed, the author has attempted to build a frame for constructing a primary and authentic definition of FCP. It is hoped that by presenting this to academia not only can practitioners and theorists alike find a common ground on which to articulate and argue CP (or FCP), but also that a renewed interest may spring forth in the work of Paulo Freire; work which is arguably as fresh and relevant now as it was when written nearly 5 decades ago.

## 注・文献

(Selected references)

Freire, P. (1970) *The pedagogy of the oppressed*, 1993 edition. New York, USA: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P. (1970) *The pedagogy of the oppressed*, 2010, 40th Anniversary edition. New York, USA: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P. (1974) *Education for critical consciousness*, 2013 edition. London: Bloomsbury.

Freire, P. (1994) *Pedagogy of hope: reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*, 2014 edition. London, Bloomsbury Publishing.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York, USA: Rowman and Littlefield.