



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_13455
Title of the Manuscript:	A Philosophical Examination of Liberative Pedagogy from the Perspectives of Solarin and other Liberative Thinkers
Type of the Article	Short communications

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Generally, and as I stated in my first review, if the article is about developing Tai Solarin's thoughts around liberative education, then that is what the article should do. Though the abstract focuses on "liberative education" and selected thinkers, the piece really centers around Solarin. This is but one example as to why this piece is not yet scholarly or ready for publication. The reader does not come away from this article more informed about Tai Solarin's educational philosophy as it pertains to liberative education. I see that the author tries to do this by juxtaposing Solarin with others, but it is still not done in a scholarly and/or nuanced way that really provides the reader or the entire discourse with something to think about. The submission reads as a biographical sketch that is comprised of other biographical sketches which in turn are comprised of key words or phrases. That's not scholarship. If this piece is more of a biography around a person and their idea, then shape the article like that. On my view, a scholarly piece does not include "etc." (line 13), does not include descriptors such as "gem" (line 29), does not rely on "vis a vis" (line 72) to extend a thought, does not rely on Wikipedia (line 59) as a reference though I agree Wikipedia has come a long way in terms of being a reference, and does not rely on key words to carry the piece as is the case from page 5 to page 6, and then to an inordinate extent on pages 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 with very little referencing. My concerns about attributing words to Freire, even through juxtaposition, such as "exclusive nihilistic anthropology" is untenable (line180); or sadism (line 186); or anaclitic anthropology (line 202). All done without any kind of reference. The reader can easily come away from this piece with the understanding that Freire, in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, used these terms. The author should also make mention that Freire discusses liberatory pedagogy, and that the authors are making the connection with "liberative." These distinctions are important for people who have read the people being discussed in the article. Again, if Freire does and I've missed those exact references, then provide the actual page numbers. I asked for this earlier and this change has not been made. Again, my hope is than any reviewer would see that this needs to be made. Tai Solarin, again, the person who this piece revolves around receives only 3 pages of coverage, and it is not coherently organized or elaborated. For example, in Section 3.4 the author could introduce what will happen in the following sections, this would go a long way in terms of helping the reader understand what is happening and what the author is going to do. The paper just isn't well organized, and I think it's not well organized because the author is still unclear as to its conceptualization. This is evidenced by how the abstract and the paper don't actually agree with each other. I think "phenomenology" is used incorrectly (line 74). I had asked that the more discursively-laden and obfuscatory language be either removed or rewritten (lines 87-94; lines 107-111; lines 134-139; lines 153-156). This has not been done.	This work has attempted to elaborate the pedagogy of liberation as conceived by chosen thinkers. The inclusion of a section on Sloarin's biographical background was meant to enhance the knowledge of the audience about the thinker and not to serve as the major subject matter of the work. The work is therefore not centered on biographical sketches. The observations on (lines 13 and 29) are noted and shall be corrected. We do not discountenance the authority of Wikipedia as one of such credible sources of information in this century. We have also provided cited references for most of the ideas and some of the ideas of the thinkers. However, we wish to register that some of the ideas discussed under Freire are paraphrases of some themes in his work. Most of those ideas are paraphrases of some of the themes in Freire's work. We have stated so in the piece. Aside this, we have provided due references (page numbers) for all the themes discussed under Freire. We perceive our arrangement as adequate. This has been modified accordingly. The language used may be value-laden but descriptive of the thinker's perception of reality. The thinker's perception is what we expose using the said language.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

I commented earlier about the use of the latin *a fortiori* in that sense seems incorrect. This has not been addressed.

This rewrite is very similar to the original paper.

This is noted and correction shall be effected.