International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research
Vol. 23, No. 8, pp. 513-531, August 2024
https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.8.26
Received Apr 9, 2024; Revised Aug 18, 2024; Accepted Aug 25, 2024

Proselytising Ideologues: The Stifling Vectors of Metacognition in Andragogy

Davison Zireva
Morgenster College of Education
Associate College of the University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe

Alfred Henry Makura*
Central University of Technology
Free State, South Africa

Abstract. In andragogy, one of the all-embracing goals is the provision of quality education which is realized in metacognition. The andragogic learners are expected to embody the knowledge which they acquired by participating in metacognitive activities such as innovative, critical, creative, reflective and analytical thinking as well as open-mindedness and problem solving. Qualitative research was carried out with some teacher educators and some graduating teachers who had attained distinctions in all the teacher education curricular disciplines. The research findings revealed that the extent of metacognition in teacher education learners is obfuscated by fallacious criteria considered by some 'teacher educators' who have lapsed into proselytising ideologues. These 'teacher educators' employ the banking concept of education and resort to idiosyncratic awarding of 'distinctions' which they consider as the measure for provision of quality education. These 'teacher educators' stifle the development of metacognition. The distinctions awarded tend to be a camouflaging strategy of concealing some deficiencies in their provision of quality education. Distinctiveness in teacher education is only conspicuous by showcasing one's metacognitive activities.

Keywords: Proselytising ideologues; stifling vectors; metacognition; andragogy

1. Introduction

The provision of quality education is the goal of every education system world-wide. The United Nations (UN) emphasizes that quality education ensures the transformation of the world by 2030. The implication of quality education is that it guarantees lifelong learning which is manifested in the urge to create new knowledge for sustainable global development (United Nations, 2023). At

*Corresponding author: *Alfred Henry Makura; amakura@cut.ac.za*

tertiary education level, metacognition is requisite for quality education. When metacognition is not being attained there are some detracting-compensatory measures for 'quality' that are adopted. Some teacher education institutions in Zimbabwe have of late clinched to a frivolous measure of quality education.

We argue that there appears to be an obsessed thrust on the quantity of 'distinctions' that are obtained by teacher education students at the expense of the quality of the so-called distinctive students. At most graduation ceremonies the host heads of institutions brag about the provision of 'quality' education which they measure by the number of 'distinctions produced' at their institutions. Some teacher educators even brag about 'producing' up to seventy-five per cent distinctions in the departments they work in. Such a situation begets scepticism about the criteria for being distinctive.

There seems to be some stasis in the criteria for distinctiveness in these institutions. Instead, there should be thrust on progressive education which focuses on problem solving and critical thinking (Yamasaki, 2010). The stasis in the criteria of distinctiveness is not responsive to global trends and seems to be biased towards some arbitrary criteria set by some domineering 'educators'. We view these 'educators' as proselytizing ideologues who have the criteria of distinctiveness based on idiosyncratic criteria. Thus, these teacher educators harbour a misconception that most of the so-called distinctive students they 'produce' are a measure of the provision of quality education. They have idiosyncrasy credits which warrant them to make arbitrary decisions which are believed to be in favour of organizational expectancies (Hollander, 2006). The idiosyncratic criteria could have stifling effects on being proactive and reactive to global-quality educational criteria and nomenclature. The proselytising ideologues are, therefore, not responsive to the global education dynamics. One who is distinctive in the contemporary technological era has outstanding ingenuity and should not be ferreted out desperately among other students of the same level of performance. The basic criterion for the provision of quality education in tertiary education institutions is metacognition.

2. Background

The promotion of metacognition within the realm of educative practice has been the norm through the ages though it was explicitly presented by Dewey in 1938. Its implicit traces date back to the times of Plato and Aristotle. The greatest promoter of metacognition was Plato since he was able to nurture the adverse thinking of Aristotle. Thus, Aristotle's philosophy of materialism was hinged on the contradistinctive thinking of his educator's philosophy, idealism. Plato was far from being a proselytizing ideologue and thus promoted metacognitive thinking in his student Aristotle. The extent of metacognition within a given context is an essential characteristic of quality education. Without involvement in metacognitive activities, there is no quality in education. The quantification of quality education in terms of the number of distinctions that are awarded at an institution is fallacious. Distinctiveness is a very rare attribute among the students of mediocrity who are almost always the 'images' or copycats of the proselytizing ideologues who stifle metacognition.

The proselytising ideologues are megalomaniac since they consider themselves as omnipotent and omniscient. They think that they are all-knowing in the education phenomenon and have all the standards that ought to be. They are after sustaining the status quo in education. The proselytizing ideologues are in an epistemic-closed system. They think that they are in possession of the criteria of requisite knowledge. They have become epistemic despots who uphold monological strategies in education. The dialogical interactions are desiderata to the proselytising ideologues in the academic discourses.

3. Motivation

The realization of authentic quality education in the andragogic situations becomes a pipe dream when proselytizing ideologues are allowed to impose their idiosyncratic criteria. The proselytizing ideologues employ monological strategies which seem to be the modus operandi in andragogy.

The strategies embrace a closed epistemic pedagogy which employs cultural literacy to sustain the status quo which is influenced by idiosyncratic decision making. Cultural literacy "educators" are tyrannical since they offer communiqués about their idiosyncratic standards of education which that propagate injustice (Bishop, 2014). Cultural literacy stifles authentic assessment of the provision of quality education. Thus, the proselytising ideologue assumes the prerogative of setting arbitrary standards which fortify the status quo. The situation reinforces the regurgitation of the 'incontrovertible' knowledge of the "educators ". However, the effective teaching-learning situations in andragogy are far more engaging than being mere appendages of the educator (Levesque, 2023). The "educator" who is a proselytising ideologue employs monological strategies and stifles metacognition in the learners. When idiosyncrasy is given a chance then the teacher 'produced' is an aware pawn in the technological era which demands that teacher education graduates become metacognitive thinkers. Instead, there should be nurtured a didactic culture anchored on metacognition (Tanner, 2012). The assessment criterion for quality andragogy which is hitched on the number of distinctions is fallacious and should be exposed.

4. Conceptual explications

Andragogy

Andragogy is adult education (Kearsley & Knowles, 2023). It has particular education methods and principles that are opposite for adult learners. The term andragogy is derived from two Greek words 'andr-' meaning 'man' and 'agogos' meaning 'leader of' (Knowles, 2009). Thus, andragogy literally means 'leading men'. The current definition is that it is the art and science of facilitating adult learning. The term andragogy was originally coined by Alexander Kapp in 1833 (Akyildiz, 2019). A renowned theorist of andragogy is Malcolm Knowles who came up with six assumptions of adult learning. The assumptions are that; adults are motivated to learn anything when they know the reasons for learning, , adults are motivated to learn when they are accorded the responsibility to make decisions in planning and evaluation of their learning, adults are motivated to learn content which has instantaneous applicability to their livelihoods, adult learning is more motivating when problem-centred than

content-oriented and adults are more responsive to intrinsic than extrinsic motivation (Purwati, 2022).

Andragogy precisely refers to formal adult education which focuses on academic learning activities such as reflecting, critiquing and analysing (Rachel, 2002). Thus, the andragogic situation requires that the learner be involved in metacognition. There should never be any room for rote learning in andragogic situations. The engagement of the andragogic learners in metacognition makes them self-directed. The emphasis on the self-directedness of the learner has caused the inception of the term heutagogy which is a system where learners learn on their own being guided by the educator (Akyildiz, 2019).

Metacognition

The term metacognition is derived from the Greek word 'meta' which means 'beyond' and the Latin word 'cognoscere' which means 'getting to know' (Colman, 2015). Thus, metacognition is a mental activity which focuses on thinking beyond knowing, understanding and learning. In other words, metacognition is the conscious reflective thinking which emphases on the critical interpretation of experiences. Succinctly, metacognition is about the thoughts surrounding the experiences (Colman, 2015). Metacognition calls for rigor in thinking and can also be referred to as thinking about thinking (Chick, 2013) or in other words it is meta-thinking. Metacognition happens when there is higher order thinking and reflection on experiences in specific learning contexts (Zohar & David, 2009). The educator who promotes metacognitive thinking focuses on **how** the learners learn and not merely on **what** they learn (Weimer, 2012 & Chick et.al, 2009). If metacognition is to be realized, the educator should focus on *mathetics* (a term coined by (Brookfield, 1985) which means learning how to learn.

Metacognition is the thinking one is involved in which is beyond cognition. Thus, all the meta-thinking activities need to be considered for a comprehensive understanding of metacognition. The meta-thinking activities are: innovative thinking, analytical thinking, open-mindedness, problem solving, critical thinking, reflective thinking and creative thinking (Baron, 2000; Saputro, Mahfud, Sari & Sukatiman, 2023).

Proselytising ideologues and the banking concept of education

The proselytising ideologues are developing from the banking concept of education which is a term used by Paulo Freire (2000) in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. The banking concept of education is a philosophical concept that was used to explicate and critique the oppressive, epistemic-closed education system, which is basically a standardized, closed education system. Freire argued that this system denies the learners critical and dialectical thinking which are requisites for knowledge development (Smith, 2002). The thinking skills are indispensable facets of metacognition. The banking concept of education metaphorically considers the learners as receptacles into which 'educators' must fill with knowledge (Freire, 2000). There is malleability of learners which culminates into passivity and docility in didactic situations that occur in a closed education system. The learners become inactive intellectually since they are required to absorb the 'educator's' perceptions of reality that are regarded as

knowledge which is static and absolute (Nola & Irzik, 2005). Thus, the banking concept of education oppresses both students and educators since it develops a paternalistic attitude which thwarts criticality and creativity. The predominance of the banking concept of education educational systems stifles the development of fair-minded critical thinkers in andragogy (Rose, 2017).

When students embrace docility which is enforced onto them, they simply become adaptive to the rhythms of world as they are (Freire, 2000). The banking concept of education thus promotes the oppressive, standardised, technicist education which views an "educated" person as one who readily accepts the vicariously interpreted world and does not question the injustices around him or her. The inception of the banking concept of education was in education system of the 1600s which had the aim of moulding learners into 'obedient' employees in the factories (Davis, Sumara & Luke-Kapler, 2015).

Proselytising ideologues have a background of banking education and are thus oppressive in didactic situations since they have become omnipotent from their fallacious convictions of omniscience. They take the learners as malleable beings who should fit in idiosyncratically created moulds.

Research question and objective

One of the criteria for judging the quality of andragogy is the extent to which learners are involved in metacognition. Thus, in the realm of teacher education, the lecturers have an uncompromisable mandate of promoting metacognition. However, there is a dearth of the metacognitive aptitude in the teacher education learners and the lecturers cannot be exonerated from this miseducative phenomenon. The research question which the article endeavours to answer is concerned with the extent to which lecturers stifle the development of metacognition in the learners. Thus, the objective of the article is to assess the extent to which lecturers are stifling vectors of metacognition in andragogy.

5. Empirical investigation

The research methodology which was employed in the empirical investigation was qualitative which implied the consideration of the interpretive paradigm. A paradigm is a philosophical viewpoint or world view which consists of a basic set of views which influence actions (Cresswell, 2018). Interpretivism as a paradigm develops meanings of phenomena from the informants' experiences (Cresswell, 2007). Thus, the empirical investigation sought to explicate the situations which the informants experienced. The research design which was considered was phenomenology. The thrust of the phenomenological design is to explicate the lived experiences of the informants. The lived experiences of the informants were expressed empirically (that is free from the researchers' biases), in the informants' own words (O'Leary & Devos et al., 2011).

Phenomenology penetrates illusions of the lived experiences of the informants and explains the realities underlying the illusions (Higgs & Smith, 2002). Thus, in phenomenology, the researcher is advised to use interviews in the generation of data about the lived experiences. There are two types of explanations of the lived experiences of informants. There are the explanations by the informants

and the explanations by the researcher. The informants' explanations of their lived experiences are known as the *emic* explanations. The explanations by the researcher are known as the *etic* explanations and are the result of the analysis of data in the *emic* explanations (Hoberg, 2001). The Johnson-Christensen method was used for the analysis of the interview data. The method was considered as ideal since it enables the critical analysis of the *emic* (informants') explanations of experiences which facilitate more trustworthy *etic* (researchers') interpretations (Johnson & Christensen, 2008 and Salvin, 2007).

The data were generated by interviewing ten teachers who were conferred with diplomas at graduation ceremonies which were held at three teacher education colleges in a developing country. The graduates were purposively selected on the criterion that they were awarded distinctions in all the four areas of the national teacher education curriculum. The pseudonyms of the graduates were G1, G2, G3 … and G10.

The other category of informants comprised six lecturers, two from each college. The lecturers were conveniently selected, and they agreed to be interviewed while having lunch at the graduation ceremonies. The pseudonyms of the lectures are: L1, L2, L3, … and L6. The pseudonyms were used for observance of the ethical consideration of confidentiality. The researcher is obligated not disclose unauthorized information of the informant (Hecker & Kalpokaps, 2022).

The interviewer captured all the data that were generated from interviews by audiotaping them. The audiotaping of the interviews ensures that all verbal data are captured (Kidd & Parshall, 2000) and that the transcriptions are verbatim (Vemuri et.al, 2004). Prior to holding the full-scale interviews, the interview questions were pilot tested and refined in order to generate credible data. The attribute of credibility was also enhanced by triangulation of data sources. The graduates who were awarded the distinctions and the lecturers who awarded distinctions were the informants.

The analysis of the data was done thematically. Thus, data were condensed into identified patterns which were considered as themes (Johnson & Christensen, 2008 and Salvin, 2007). The *emic* perceptions were the basis of the *etic* interpretations (Horberg, 2001). Basing the etic perceptions on emic perceptions ensured confirmability. Some audit trails were considered to ward off some biases in coming up with the themes. Transparency and traceability in the generation of themes were ensured by considering inter-coder consistency. The researchers coded the data separately, compared the codes they came up with and then discussed them to ensure authentic codes.

6. Facets of metacognition

6.1 Innovative thinking

The creation of new knowledge and innovative thinking are closely intertwined. Knowledge is created from invention and reinvention (Freire, 2000). One of the strategies for creation of knowledge is employing the problem-posing approach which emphasizes authentic reflections on reality. The novel solutions to the problematic situations are hinged on innovative thinking from the perspectives of both the educator and the learners. After reflecting on different experiences, the educator and the learners gain insights which improve on their abilities to generate innovative ideas. Thus, dialogue is facilitated and a situation which leads to mutual scaffolding is presented when involved in innovative thinking. However, this is not the case since some teacher educators despise the learners. Informant L2 postulated,

> *"Innovative thinking is really difficult to stress on when teaching the calibre of our students who are mediocre. You could be wasting time waiting for innovative thinking which will never come."*

Thus, Informant L2 was not patient in developing innovative thinking in the learners since she despised their intellectual ability. The lecturer is not aware of essence of dialogic andragogy which requires both the lecturer and the learner to collaborate in innovative thinking (Phillipson & Wegerif, 2017). According to her, no one deserves to be awarded a distinction but, in her department, distinctions were awarded. Corroborative contemptuous remarks were given by Informant L1;

> *"These graduates when they were students, they could not challenge my ideas in any way. They could not bring better ideas to be considered as innovative."*

Innovative thinking is the thinking which enables the creation of something new, or the thinking which transforms the *modus operandi* of certain operations (Collins, 2018). He further alludes that innovative thinking would be, to think up something new, or to think about something old in a new way. Thus, the educators could have old great ideas which should be scrutinized in the wake of the contemporary situation. However, some teacher educators stifle the development of innovative thinking. Informant L4 asserted:

> *"The old things that are substantial may not need any new ways. The so-called new ways that are unorthodox are almost always really confusing."*

Innovative thinking brings about the unorthodox ways of doing things. The learners who are innovative think outside the box and the closed education system should not format them to do things in age-old ways.

Innovative thinking is indispensable in the problem-posing education strategy since no problematic situation in the world is a replica of already experienced situations. Educators who are obsessed by the banking concept of education and have become proselytizing ideologues are venomous to learners' innovative thinking since they vicariously present lived experiences. Informant L4 posited:

> *"You cannot do anything other than telling them what they are supposed to know. Those who pay attention always smile at the end when they get distinctions."*

The remarks that were given by L4 reflect on some of the vices that are crippling innovative thinking in teacher education. The telling method at tertiary education level is used by the proselytising ideologues whose predominant approach is monologic rather than dialogic (Alexander, 2020). Confirmatory remarks of what happens in teacher education were given by in the graduate teacher, G1 who explained:

> *"Challenging a lecturer's age-old ways of doing things is a taboo, how would I dare to do such a thing. Those who thought themselves as being wiser than the lecturers always had re-writes. Those who respected the lecturers' thinking have got distinctions. I am happy with everything which happened to me as a student."*

According to the remarks, very little or no innovative thinking was promoted but subservience and docility. These vices promote monologic situations in andragogy which stifle innovative thinking (Kim, 2019). Thus, quality education was compromised since a lot of intellectual development that is inherent in innovative thinking was adversely affected.

6.2 Analytical thinking

Analytical thinking is the conscious use of the mind to deconstruct information into finer nuances to understand the composition of complex phenomena. So, the analytical thinker can split complex problems into simpler problems and detect the relationships of the simpler problems and how they mutually influence each other (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Analytical thinking is thus one of the critical constituent parts of metacognitive thinking. It is closely intertwined with logical reasoning and critical thinking. The proselytising ideologues thwart analytical thinking insidiously. Informant L5 remarked:

> *"I presented the constituent parts of whatever phenomenon that was dealt with. I then explained how the constituent parts were related to the whole. I engaged my students into focus group discussions for the analysis of the complex phenomenon."*

The remarks do not point to any active intellectual involvement of the learners in analytic thinking. Analytical thinking requires that the learner dissects intricate problems and explicates some synergies of the constituent parts of a composite whole. The goal of analytical thinking is meaning making (Coursera, 2023). The learners were no called upon to decipher anything from the synergistic relationships. They were expected to merely consolidate what the lecturer had explained. The situation was confirmed by informant G5 who explained:

> *"The lecturers presented some diagrams about the complex phenomena on chalkboard or interactive board then there were some explanations on the constituent parts of the phenomena and how the parts were inter-related."*

The teacher educators did not involve the then learners more actively in analytical thinking. Thus, the teacher educators were involved in the mis-educative practice of the banking concept of education. The learners were deprived of an indispensable intellectual skill which is requisite to metacognitive thinking. The analytical thinkers are systematic in their thinking when seeking the truth in order to solve some complex problems (Coursera, 2024).

6.3 Open-mindedness

Open-mindedness is a mental disposition of receptiveness to new ideas that could be either for or against one's cherished convictions. The open-minded person reflects on the contribution of the new ideas to shaping his or her philosophy of life (Riggs, 2010). The new ideas are not refuted cursorily before being reflected on. Some teacher educators are not open-minded and seem to have very strong foot holds in being close-minded. Informant L1 proclaimed:

> *"How can students who are novices in the teaching profession shape my philosophy of life? I have been shaping their philosophies of life. Tertiary education is all about enlightenment of the would-be professionals. It is in line with the analogy of the allegory of the cave by Socrates the Great Philosopher."*

The mentioning of 'shaping' a philosophy of life is tantamount to saying that the teacher educator is a proselytizing ideology who has a metaphorical 'intellectual mould' for the learners. Hence, the teacher educator is not open-minded. Being open-minded is a virtue and is requisite for critical and rational thinking (Cherry, 2020). The disposition of open-mindedness develops from an intrinsic consciousness that one's convictions are not infallible and can be strengthened by other people's viewpoints on realities of life. Some teacher educators fall short of developing the disposition of open-mindedness. Informant L6 corroborated:

> *"The students are still learning the ropes of the profession. They have not yet developed firm foot holds. As such they cannot profess to know to the extent of having contradistinctive ideas. Most of the diverse thinking is naive."*

The proselytizing ideologues are on the contradistinctive side of being open-minded and are thus closed-minded. They have a pervasive tendency which makes them be selective of ideas that are inclined towards their convictions. Such people have what is referred to as my-side bias (Kwong, 2015). Some teacher educators go to extremes with the bias. Informant G4 posited:

> *"One time I argued against the lecturer's convictions in the lecture hall, and I was called to the lecturer's office and cautioned. Since then, I stopped raising contradistinctive ideas and I became a gentleman who later on, got four distinctions."*

Confirmatory remarks were given by Informant G5 who explained:

> *"At a church institution, the lecturers' philosophies of life with respect to religion are cast in iron. Following the convictions of the lecturers is sometimes rewarding. That has earned me the distinctions which I am now proud of."*

The 'educators' who have this bias are parochial with regards to the scope of the content and they are afraid of being pushed into a zone of incompetence (Baehr, 2011). The lecturers' experiences which are defined by the number of years of doing routine teaching makes them to become closed- minded. Closed-minded 'educators' are prone to indoctrinating the learners.

6.4 Problem-solving

The problem-solving skill cannot be developed without the presentation of a problem which is the state of incapacitation to reach a specific outcome or goal (Ntiko, 2001). Whoever is confronted by a problem needs problem-solving skills. So, problem-solving is closely intertwined with problem-posing, which is a highly esteemed strategy of education (Freire, 2000). Some teacher educators are aware of the intertwinement of problem posing and problem-solving, but they are not conscious of how to go about it. Informant L3 postulated that:

> *"I posed problems which the learners grappled with for some time before I intervened with the solutions to the problems."*

The teacher educator had some ready-made solutions to the problems which she posed. The problem could be structured the same, year after year but insights to the possible solutions could vary according to learners' experiences. Confirmatory explanations were posited by informant G10:

> *"The lecturers used to pose some problems to us and then asked us how we were supposed to solve the problems. They would then intervene with their tried and tested solutions."*

Problem-solving is a complex skill which involves various activities which are: defining and delimiting the problem, determining the causal factors, identifying the possible solutions and prioritizing them and then implementing the most efficacious solution (Novick & Bassok, 2005). Essentially, problem-solving requires higher order thinking which has similar activities in trying to come up with solutions to a problem (Rubin, Watt & Ramelli, 2012). Higher-order thinking refers to a complex process about understanding a problematic situation. There is firstly the analysis of the situation to find out the constituent elements. Secondly there is synthesis of the constituent elements discussing their mutual influencing. Lastly there is evaluation of the generated solutions to the problem (O'Tuel & Bullard, 2003). The teacher educators seem not to have a systematic way of developing the problem-solving skill. Informant L3 explained:

> *"When there is a problem, it has to be solved. Following processes of problem-solving is no guarantee that a solution would be got."*

So, according to Informant L3, the problem-solving skill was not developed systematically. Informant G8 confirmed that there was no systematic way of solving problems by explaining:

> *"I am not aware of any process of solving problems. When a problem was presented to me, I reflected on my experiences to find out if any of my experiences were going to provide me with the insights."*

In the education situation, the ideal problem-solving technique which involves both the educator, and the learners is collaborative. The collaborative problem-

solving technique involves people with a common concern working together to solve a real-world problem (Margrett & Marsiske, 2002). There is a dialogical interaction between the educator and the learners, and everyone has the freedom to ask about anything with regards to finding solutions to the problem. As a group with a common goal, they share their expertise and experiences. Both the educator and the learner create and exchange knowledge. Thus, collaborative problem-solving requires joint intellectual involvement which is referred to as dialogical dialectics (Shih, 2018; Freire, 2000). In andragogy, dialogical dialectics requires mutual interrogations of thoughts. However, the proselytizing ideologues despise the contributions of the learners. Informant L1 asserted:
"In most cases there would not be collaboration at all. The students are just onlookers in the work which is supposed to be collaborative. Some contributions are not rational at all."

When they were students, the graduates were not exposed to meaningful collaborative problem-solving. Informant G7 surmised:
"It seemed like the problem-solving technique was a ritual that had to be done. Our contributions were considered with some semblances of contempt. The lecturers did not seek the rationale behind our contributions."

The proselytizing ideologues do not expose the learners to situations which require them to solve some problems. They think that the learners do not have the experiences and reflective intelligence to solve real world problems meaningfully. In essence, the proselytising ideologues think that they have solutions to all the problems. They think that what they should do is to tell the learners the ready-made solutions to any problem that they encounter. So, the learning situations cease to be realistic but theatrical.

6.5 Critical thinking
Critical thinking is conceptualized as "thinking about thinking". One of the comprehensive definitions of critical thinking is reasonable reflective thinking focused on making decisions about convictions and actions (Ennis, 1996). Critical thinking transcends 'mere ability to think' (Smith, 2002). Despite having various definitions, critical thinking is primarily focused on forming reasoned judgements (Doyle, 2024). A critical thinker makes a judgement of the presented situations before making convictions and actions (Bailin et al., 1999). Critical thinking is rarely promoted by the proselytizing ideologues. Informant L4 asserted:
"I sometimes involved the learners in critical thinking but that depended on the complexity of the problem and the sensitivity of the problem."

In this case, the proselytizing ideologue largely thwarted critical thinking. The so-called complex and sensitive issues are almost always not looked at critically. Informant L5 corroborated by explaining:
"The involvement of the learners in criticality depended on how dignified the critiquing was done. I didn't like situations where a student critiqued my convictions as if we were equals. These students of nowadays do not have the mental agility to challenge the

lecturers' convictions. After all whatever we are presenting to them is aimed at equipping them with the requisite knowledge to be good practitioners in education."

According to the teacher educator, critical thinking is not a requisite skill to the education practitioners. Critical thinking is consciously atrophied [in order] to maintain an epistemic–closed comfort-niche. The teacher educator falls far short of Plato's educative practice, that of accommodating and nurturing diverse-critical thinking. The proselytizing ideologue abhors the learners who challenge the age-old convictions. The learners who have a disposition of critical thinking are stifled. Informant G2 postulated:
"I was not free to exercise critical thinking. If one tried to be critical that was tantamount to trying to outwit the lecturers and that always ended up with some reprimands."

The graduate informants confirmed that they were denied the opportunity of exercising critical thinking. Informant G6 asserted:
"That depended on the nature of the situation. Our judgements were over-shadowed by the judgements of the lecturers."

Informant G3 corroborated:
"In very rare cases were the lecturers appreciative of the value of our reflections. In most cases one could read a tone of contempt in the comments that the lectures passed on the presented reflections."

Critical thinking is indispensable to metacognitive learning. In andragogy, the learners should be afforded the opportunity to think about their thinking. A denial of such an opportunity is a mis-educative practice which makes learners follow some routines laid down by the proselytizing ideologues. Being critical about routine thinking is sanctioned negatively. The proselytising ideologue considers criticality as insubordination. In that way, critical thinking which is requisite to metacognitive learning is stifled.

6.6 Reflective thinking

In the education realm, reflective thinking is a critical facet of metacognition (Hartman, 2010). Reflective thinking is closely intertwined with critical thinking. These two mental engagements can only be distinguished but not separable. Reflective thinking is a conscious mental engagement of critically interpreting experiences. In other words, reflective thinking is a mental activity which requires that experiences are recollected, ruminated, and given contextual meanings. During reflective thinking, there is evaluation of experiences which culminates into the generation of new theories and the transformation of existing theories. The novel experiences are interpreted with reference to some prior events either personally or vicariously experienced. Notwithstanding the mode of reference, reflective thinking is idiosyncratic and should never be vicarious.

Reflective thinking requires the learners to rethink their experiences, interrogate the meanings and essences of experiences [in order] to refine the interpretations of the experiences. So, reflective thinking is a requisite for continuous learning which capacitates the learners in making sound decisions in problem-solving (Finlay, 2008). Reflective thinking enables the learners to process experiences.

Through reflective thinking, the past and current experiences are reconfigured and subsequently improved interactions with the environment realised (Dunlock & Metcalfe, 2009 and Fisher & Wells, 2009).

Reflective thinking is not promoted by some teacher educators. Informant L2 postulated:

> *"At times it was a sheer waste of time to ask the learners to reflect on their teaching practice experiences when interpreting some theories. These graduates were quite incapable of making sound reflections."*

The lecturer despised the extent of reflective thinking of the so-called all-round distinctive graduates. Informant G1 confirmed the thwarting of reflective thinking by the lecturers by explaining:

> *"When I tried to explain some theories using my teaching practice experiences, my explanations were considered as ridiculous."*

The derision had implications that the lecturer had some predetermined explanations of the theories. L3 posited,

> *"In some situations, I had to explain some theories using some examples from my vast experiences."*

Some corroborative remarks were given by L1,

> *"With my experience of over twenty years in teacher education, I can give the learner refined reflections of some situations."*

The learners were not given the opportunities to do reflective thinking to give meaning to their experiences. There were vicarious interpretations of experiences. Confirmatory remarks were given by G2,

> *"The lecturer interpreted some theories using his experiences. The adoption of his experiences made me look smarter according to his judgement."*

The implication is that the graduates when they were learners, earned appraisals from being copycats of the lecturers' interpretations of experiences. Some lecturers think that reflective thinking should not be done for the teacher-education diploma students. L4 posited,

> *"Engaging teacher education learners at diploma level in reflective thinking is asking for too much from them. They will be engaged in such thinking when they do higher studies."*

Reflective thinking is indispensable to quality education provision in andragogy. One who is oriented in reflective thinking is poised for making transformations in education. The reflective thinking done; in-action, on-action and for-action motivates transformative interactions.

6.7 Creative thinking

Creative thinking is the thinking which is concerned with considering problematic situations in unconventional ways trying to discover new ways of solving the problems. The learners who are creative thinkers have a disposition

of applying their ingenuity in unique ways when presented with problems. So, creative thinkers generate unique ideas which they interrogate before they try to actualize them and subsequently evaluate the outcomes (Kampylis & Berki, 2014). Some teacher educators implore the learners to be creative. Informant L6 posited:

> *"I always challenged them to employ their creativity to solve some problems but there were hardly plausible contributions."*

Corroborative remarks were given by Informant L2:

> *"You could hardly find learners who could come up with unique ideas. When I asked them to be creative, they could just stare at me and I always felt that I was wasting time waiting for something that would never come."*

The controversial issue is that though the teacher educators did not realize any distinctive thinking in the learners, they contributed to awarding the same learners some distinctions. However, one of the graduate respondents, Informant G9 saw otherwise:

> *"The unconventional ways were not readily accepted by most of the lecturers. There was a lot of scepticism and at times you would feel that you were being humiliated by the interrogations that were made by the lecturers."*

Some confirmatory remarks about what transpired were given by Informant L6 who had some conditions for what constituted creative thinking. She postulated that:

> *"I like the unorthodox ways of solving problems as long as they are substantiated rationally."*

At the inception stage, the ideas are not readily accepted since they would be seen as threats to the orthodox ways of solving the problems (Kaufman & Beghetto). Also, the newness evokes scepticism from some close-minded educators who fear to be thrown into the zones of incompetence.

Creative thinking brings out ideas that transcend the already known strategies of doing things. So, creative thinking is a critical preliminary aspect of metacognition. Hence, metacognitive thinking could be stifled by proselytising ideologues if they do not afford the learners situations that develop creative thinking. The learners should be granted the opportunity to brainstorm their ideas and actualize them (Career Services, 2022).

7. Discussion

The provision of quality education is one of the Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs) (United Nations, 2023). Thus, the standards for the provision of quality education are globally defined. The indulgence in idiosyncratic standards as the criteria for quality education is pseudo-quality since the criteria which are responsive to global trends were not considered. One of the manifestations of the globally accepted criteria for the provision of quality education is the engagement of learners in metacognition. Dye and Stanton (2017) found out that the learners who are metacognitive are disposed to evaluating their approaches

to learn and are flexible in adjusting these approaches to fit in the prevailing situations. Metacognitive learners have a propensity to interrogating their thinking which is one of the criteria for quality education. With reference to the findings of this research study, the andragogic learners were fallaciously considered to have been exposed to quality education since they were not intellectually capacitated to be engaged in metacognition. The learners were not educated to become lifelong learners who can intervene efficiently into global problems. According to the findings by Stanton, Dye and Johnson (2019) metacognitive learners are introspective, evaluating their capabilities for effective interventions into problems at their disposal. The teacher educators were not cognisant of the fact that they have a significant role to play in intellectually capacitating interveners into contextual and subsequently global problems. The teacher educators have lapsed into being proselytizing ideologues who stifled the development of metacognitive thinking. These 'educators' have been focusing on what the learners learn and not on **how** they learn (Weimer, 2012 and Chick et.al, 2009). According to the findings of Stylianou-Georgiou and Papanastasiou (2017) the metacognitive learners regulate their thinking and become successful in their courses. Contrarily, the 'teacher educators' in this study have 'produced' malleable teachers (Freire, 2000) who can only read the word but not the world.

The teacher education learners were not developed to be innovative, critical, reflective, analytical, and creative thinkers who are open-minded problem solvers. In other words, the learners had not; developed critical thoughts surrounding experiences (Colman, 2015), rigor in thinking which involves thinking about thinking (Purwati, 2022), higher order thinking and reflection on experiences in particular learning contexts (Colman, 2015). In succinct the learners had not acquired skills of making sense of life experiences (Price-Mitchell, 2015). The teacher educators were aware that they had not developed the andragogic learners to become metacognitive thinkers, but they implicitly claimed to have provided quality education by awarding pseudo distinctions.

If a teacher education learner who has not yet acquired the metacognitive thinking skill is awarded a distinction, he or she would become complacent in acquiring this requisite. There would not be motivation to introspect to find intellectual deficits and remedies thereof. The situation begets a non-progressive education experience which is a 'miseducative' experience. Thus, some teacher educators who award distinctions to undeserving learners stifle the development of metacognition and subsequently the provision of quality education.

8. Conclusion

Metacognition is multifaceted since it involves various meta-thinking skills which are: innovative thinking, analytical thinking, open-mindedness, problem solving, critical thinking, reflective thinking and creative thinking. In andragogy, the meta-thinking skills are the determinants of the provision of quality education. The provision of quality education should not be measured quantitatively by the number of distinctive candidates that are 'produced' but

should be explained with respect to the extent of metacognitive thinking that the candidate would have attained. The awarding of distinctions should be influenced by clear exhibition of exceptional thinking modes that are developed consciously. Quality education is determined by the extent of metacognitive thinking that is nurtured in the andragogic learners. Some teacher educators are not aware of the criteria to be considered for a candidate to be awarded a distinction thus they 'produce' distinctive candidates. The criteria that they consider are idiosyncratic and hinged on the banking concept of education. The candidates who regurgitate the content presented to them by the 'teacher educator' are perceived as distinctive. The banking concept of education thus promotes the oppressive, standardised, technicist education which views an "educated" person as one who readily accepts the vicariously interpreted world. Thus the 'teacher educator' has abdicated from the noble role of facilitating the development of metacognition and has become a proselytizing ideologue in a closed education system.

The study had a temporal limitation. The time for interaction with the informants was limited and could have impacted on high level credibility of data. The researchers probed the informants to explicate issues which seemed to compromise on credibility.

The study exposes some knowledge gaps with regards to metacognition and hence gives insights into areas for further study. Firstly, since the study explored only one exogenous variable which adversely influences the constituent parts of metacognition, there could be further research on other exogenous factors like gender. Secondly, further research can be carried out on the extent to which an endogenous factor like self-concept influences metacognition.

7. References

Akyildiz, S.T. (2019). Do 21st Century Teachers Know about Heutagogy or Do They Still Adhere to Traditional Pedagogy and Andragogy? I*nternational Journal of Progressive Education, 15*(6), 151–169.

Alexander, R. (2020). *A Dialogic Teaching Companion*, Routledge.

Baehr, J. (2011). The Structure of Open-Mindedness. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy, 41*(2), 191–213.

Bailin, S., Case, R., Combs, J.R. & Daniels, L.B. (1999). Conceptualising critical thinking. *Journal of curriculum studies, 31*(3), 285–302.

Baron, J. (2000). *Thinking and deciding* (3rd ed). Cambridge University Press.

Bishop, E. (2014). Critical literacy: Bringing theory into praxis. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *30*(1), 47-62.

Brookfield, S.D. (1985). *Understanding facilitating adult learning*. Penguin.

Cherry, K. (2020). The Benefits of Being Open-Minded. www.verywellmind.com>Self-improvement>HolisticHealth.

Chick N., Karis T., & Kernahan, C. (2009). Learning from their own learning: how metacognitive and meta-affective reflections enhance learning in race-related courses. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 3*(1), 1-28.

Chick, N. (2013). Metacognition. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/metacognition/

Collins, B. (2018). Innovative thinking. 2018. http://www.forbes.com/sites/bryancollinseurope

Colman, A.M. (2015). *Metacognition: A Dictionary of Psychology.* Oxford Paperback Reference (4 ed.). Oxford University Press.

Coursera (2023). *Analytical thinking: what it is and why it matters more than ever.* https://www.coursera.org. [Accessed June 28, 2024].

Coursera Staff. (2024). *What Is Analytical Thinking and How Can You Improve It?* https://www.coursera.org. [Accessed June 28, 2024].

Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE.

Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2015). *Engaging minds: cultures of education and practices of teaching.* Routledge.

De Vos, AS., Strydom, H., Fouche, C.B., & Delport, C.L.S. (2011). *Research at grassroots; for the social sciences and human service professions*. Van Schaik.

Doyle, A. (2024). *Critical thinking definition, skills and examples*. https://www.thoughtsco.com>critical-thinking-definition. [Accessed June 28, 2024]

Dunlosky, J. (2009). Metcalfe J. Metacognition. SAGE.

Dye, K. M., Stanton, J. D. (2017). Metacognition in upper-division biology students: Awareness does not always lead to control. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *16*(2), ar31.

Ennis, R.H. (1996). Critical thinking dispositions: their nature and accessibility. *Informal Logic, 18* (2&3): 165-182.

Finlay, L. (2008). *Reflecting on 'reflective practice (Technical report)*. Practice-based Professional Learning Centre. The Open University.

Fisher, P., & Wells, A. (2009). *Metacognitive Therapy: Distinctive Features*. Routledge.

Freire, P. (2020). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Sage Publications.

Hartman, H. J. (2010). *A guide to reflective practice.* McGraw Hill.

Hecker, J., & Kalpokas, N. (2022). *The ultimate guide to qualitative research- part 1: The basics* https://atlasti.com>qualitative-research-guide-part-1 [Accessed June 28, 2024]

Higgs, P., & Smith, E. (2020). *Rethinking truth.* Juta.

Hoberg, S. M. (2001). *Research methodology: Education management study guide 2 MEDEM 2-R*, UNISA.

Hollander, E. (2006). I*nfluence processes in leadership–followership: inclusion and the idiosyncrasy credit model*. In Donald A. Hantula (ed.). Advances in Social and Organizational Psychology: A Tribute to Ralph Rosnow. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational: Quantitative, qualitative and Mixed Approaches*. SAGE.

Kampylis., P., & Berki E. (2014). *Nurturing creative thinking*. International Academy of Education. http://www.chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/http://staging.iaoed.org/downloads/edu-practices_25_eng.pdf

Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R.A. (2009). Beyond Big and Little: The Four C Model of Creativity. *Review of General Psychology*, *13*(1), 1–12.

Kearsley, G. (2010). *Andragogy: The theory into practice database*. http://tip.psychology.org

Kidd, P.S., & Parshall, M.B. (2000). Getting the focus group: enhancing analytical rigor in focus group research. *Qualitative health research, 10* (3): 293-308.

Kim, M.Y. (2019) What is dialogic teaching? Constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing a pedagogy of classroom talk. *Learning, culture and social interaction* (21), 70-86.

Knowles, M. (2009). The making of an adult educator: An autobiographical journey (Ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Kwong, J. (2015). Open-Mindedness as a Critical Virtue. *Topio, 35* (2), 403–411.

Levesque, S. (2010). Canadian issues: Promoting historical thinking and critical literacy. http://www.virtualhistorian.ca/historian_literacy

Margrett, J. A., & Marsiske, M. (2002). Gender differences in older adults' everyday cognitive collaboration. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26*(1), 45–59

Nitko, A. J. (2001). *Educational assessment of students.* Prentice Hall.

Nola, R., & Irzık, G. (2005). *Philosophy, science, education and culture*. Dordrecht: Springer-Verlag.

Novick, L. R., & Bassok, M. (2005). *Problem solving*. In K.J. Holyoak, RG. Morrison (Eds.), Cambridge handbook of thinking and reasoning (Ch. 14, pp. 321-349). Cambridge University Press. O'Leary, Z. (2010). The essential guide to doing your research project. SAGE.

O'Tuel, F. S., & Bullard, R. K. (2003). *Developing higher-order thinking in the content areas K-12*. Critical Thinking Press & Software.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (Eds.). (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification.* Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, N. and Wegerif, R. (2017). *Dialogic Education: Mastering core concepts through thinking together*. Routledge.

Price-Mitchell,M. (2015). Metacognition: Nurturing self-awareness in the classroom. https://www.edutopia.org>blog>8-pathways-metacognition

Purwati, D. (2022). The Six Characteristics of Andragogy and Future Research Directions in EFL: A Literature Review. Elsya: *Journal of English Language Studies, 4*(1), 86-95. http://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v4i1.7473. S2CID 245995831

Rachel, J. R. (2002). Andragogy's detectives: A critique of the present and a proposal for the future. *Adult Education Quarterly, 52*(3), 216-228.

Riggs, W. (2010). Open-mindedness. *Metaphilosophy*, *41*(2), 172–188.

Rose, M. (2017). The idea of the "banking concept in education". http//www.ourpolitics.net.philosophy.

Rubin., M., Watt, S. E., & Ramelli, M. (2012). Immigrants' social integration as a function of approach- avoidance orientation and problem-solving style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36*(4), 498–505.

Saputro, I. N., Mahfud, T., & Sari, A. I. (2023). Promoting Creative Professional Behavior of Future Educators: The Role of Social Capital, Motivation and Self-Efficacy. *Интеграция образования*, *27*(3(112)), 390-402. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/promoting-creative-professional-behavior-of-future-educators-the-role-of-social-capital-motivation-and-self-efficacy

Shih, Y.H. (2018). Rethinking Paulo Freire's dialogic. Pedagogy and its implications for teachers' teaching. *Journal of education and learning* 7(4), 230-235.

Slavin, R. E. (2007). Educational Research: In Age of Accountability. SAGE.

Smith, M. K. (2002). Paulo Freire and informal education'. The encyclopaedia of pedagogy and informal education. https://infed.org/mobi/paulo-freire-dialogue-praxis-and-education/

Stanton, J. D., Dye, K. M., & Johnson, M. S. (2019). Knowledge of learning makes a difference: A comparison of metacognition in introductory and senior-level biology students. *CBE – Life Sciences Education*, *18*(2), ar24.

Stylianou-Georgiou, A., Papanastasiou, E. C. (2017). Answer changing in testing situations: The role of metacognition in deciding which answers to review. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *23*(3–4), 102–118.

Tanner, K.D. (2012). *Promoting student metacognition. CBE – Life Sciences Education, 11,* 113-120.

UNESCO. (2014). Available from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002276/227680e. [Accessed: June 20, 2023]

United Nations (2018). Quality education. https://www.un.org>upload>2018/09>Goal-4

Vemuri, S., Schmandt, C., Bender, W., Tellex. S., & Lassey, B. (2004). *An audio-based personal memory aid*. In Proceedings of Ubiquitous computing. Springer.

Weimer, M. (2012). *Deep learning vs. surface learning: Getting students to understand the difference.* Available from: www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-professor-blog/deep-learning-vs-surface-learning-getting-students-to-understand-the-difference/. [Accessed: June 25, 2023].

Yamasaki, Y. (2010). The impact of Western progressive educational ideas in Japan: 1868–1940. *History of Education, 39*(5), 575–588.

Zohar, A., & David, A.B. (2009). Paving a clear path in a thick forest: a conceptual analysis of a metacognitive component. *Metacognition Learning, 4,* 177-195.