



Convergence or divergence of ideas on andragogy in different countries

Dusan Savicevic

To cite this article: Dusan Savicevic (2008) Convergence or divergence of ideas on andragogy in different countries, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 27:4, 361-378, DOI: [10.1080/02601370802051504](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370802051504)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02601370802051504>



Published online: 23 Jun 2008.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 493



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 6 View citing articles [↗](#)

Convergence or divergence of ideas on andragogy in different countries

DUSAN SAVICEVIC
University of Belgrade, Serbia

Historical and comparative research shows that the roots of andragogy are deeper than certain contemporary authors mean. The learning and education of adults have always been integral parts of human activity and of human aspirations to learn. Theoretical discourses on pedagogy vs andragogy were common during the second half of the twentieth century in the former Yugoslavia. Two schools of thought were formed: pedagogical and andragogical. The first considered pedagogy as an 'integral' science of upbringing; the second one considered andragogy to be a relatively independent science dealing with distinctions of learning and education of adults. There were interesting discussions on andragogy in other countries. The greatest numbers of supporters of the concept of andragogy as a social scientific discipline (or under another name) come from Central and Eastern Europe and from the USA.

1. Introduction

The interest of science in the learning and education of adults is a relatively new phenomenon. This scientific interest was intensified during the second half of the twentieth century. A few sciences are interested in the learning of adults. The main subject of andragogy is studying the learning and education of adults. The traditional research paradigm was predominately oriented toward studying the phenomena of learning of children and young people. The economical, political and scientific resources were also oriented in this direction. We call this scientific orientation traditional because of the lack of interest in the human development after the period of adolescence. And above all, the ignorance of the studying of lifelong human *potentialities* in this scientific orientation has a negative impact on economic, social, cultural and individual development. Human skills are not used for further development. Emphasizing the needs for learning and education of adults does not mean *ignoring* the needs for studying learning in childhood and youth. Rather, it is a conditional approach for studying the phenomena of lifelong learning and education of adults. This approach represents the philosophy of lifelong learning and lifelong education, which became a dominant thought of education in the second half of the twentieth century. By ignoring of a whole field of adult learning and education, and by excluding the adult population from the learning efforts, one could not gain vividly in the philosophy of lifelong learning and lifelong education. This especially applies to educational policy shaped by government and governmental agencies. It

Dusan Savicevic is Professor Emeritus at Department of Pedagogy and Andragogy, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Serbia, Email: c/o_kovesni@gmail.com

is important to free such a policy from an 'infantile' perspective in the material, financial and spatial sense. Democratic policy of education must be integral (holistic) and equally attentive to the learning and education of children, young people and adults. Such philosophy requires a shift in traditional education policy, reorganization of the educational institutions, and especially requires a shift in professional education of teachers, associates and tutors. However, there are some shortages in andragogical preparation of future teacher candidates.

Traditional pedagogical thought simplifies the solving of this problem. There is a confusion, in some sense (intentionally or unintentionally). This confusion is captured in the following: after the acceptance of the philosophy of lifelong education (i.e. learning during the whole life) there is no need to emphasize distinctively the learning of children, youth and adults. ***It is all the same!*** Historically, this perspective is not authentic! It ***ignores*** (intentionally or unintentionally) the scientific outcome in the field of the learning and education of adults produced in the second half of the twentieth century. And more than that! Such a perspective is intended to transfer experience from education of children and youth to the field of learning and education of adults. An 'infantile' perspective of the learning and education of adults, the approach intended to transfer norms and experience from education of children and youth to the field of the learning and education of adults, is manifested in such a way.

Because of a lack of fruitful results, it is necessary to 'de-school' such an educational policy. Generally, contemporary pedagogical thoughts are directed toward elementary and partly toward secondary education. Even didactic is 'contracted' and integrated in 'school pedagogy'. In our cultural and scientific circles, the explained perspectives lead to ***tensions*** between the two educational segments: the education of children and youth and the education of adults. These tensions and creative discourses will continue in the future. But, these tensions will not be brought closer by doctrinary 'proclamations' about pedagogy as an 'integral science of upbringing'; the only way is in fundamental research and critical theoretical considerations.

These tensions can be found on a few levels. The first one is in a domain of terminology. As well as all other scientific disciplines, andragogy tends to form its own terminology, too. The second level encompasses disagreement and ***misunderstandings*** of the meaning of used terms, resulting in some consequences for educational policy in the field. The third level is a practice. The practice in the learning of children and youth differs from the practice in the learning of adults by needs, forms and activities of learning, by design of learning material, by planning and establishing the learning results, etc. Public (governmental) educational policy completely ignores that a lot of learning is going on outside formally organized educational institutions. Here we come face to face with the question of legitimacy of education and learning. What educational experience should be a legitimate one? Is it just the case for learning carried on in educational institutions? Who makes the decisions? What criteria should be applied? In the future we should find the answers to these questions through the research.

In spite of that, one should take into account that in the future the learning of adults will strive (develop) in different directions because it is and will be interconnected with multiple unsolved social and personal problems. The transformation of culture and social relations needs the learning. This is a very complex process, and setting the priorities is controversial. One could mention some of them: work;

employment; income distribution; social position; environmental degradation and harmed ecological balance; urban disintegration; the influence of science and technology on every aspect of life and society; and the need to choose between plenty of scientifically-technological interventions regarding environment and human beings in entirety (genetics, chemical, neuro-physiological, psychological). Here, we mention *contradictions* with social dimensions and impacts on adult education. New social groups, which could not be ignored from the standpoint of learning, appeared: women, ethnic and racial groups, elderly, migrants, displaced persons, the poor.

From the standpoint of learning of adults the mass-media is a special problem; the mass-media have a special role in adult education, too. Mass-media showed power and dispositions for the manipulation of information. Clearly, all of these problems are *reflecting* on adult learning and education. This problem overlaps the contents of learning. The selection of contents is interconnected with philosophical questions: What to learn? Who makes decisions about it? Neither pedagogy, nor the traditional (inflexible) system of education offer satisfying answers. Supporting sustainability and expansion of *open*, various, self-directed learning of adults should make progress. It is impossible to build a free and democratic society without accomplished issues for adult education. Creating different possibilities enables adults to manage their own learning according to their needs and interests. Learning aim formulation, making decisions on place for learning and on learning resources are of special importance for carrying out the integral educational policy.

Until now, most of these decisions were regulated by educational institutions and this generates rejection of adults to participate in formally organized learning activities. The increased demands for adults created the need to develop a complex set of *competencies* for self-direction in learning such as, for example: defining the learning goals with possibility for *evaluating* attained scope, planning of learning activities, predicting of consequences of (un)attained scopes and of fulfilling of educational obligations, defining of criteria for self-evaluation in learning and reconsidering and reflection of the learning experience. The whole organization of learning should *encourage* and stimulate continued learning of individuals after they finish an educational activity, not only in the field of personal and public interests, but wider than the educational institution promises. The *promotion* of continuing education among others, for the sake of learning outside educational institutions is expected from the individuals who accepted this philosophy. Because of that the learning and education of adults should be *heterogeneous*, differentiated, and decentralized to the level of a local community. The local community should become an *andragogical center*. Public (governmental) educational policy should identify and support all of the opportunities for learning of the least included, the least competent in planning, organization and evaluation in their own learning.

The new andragogical personnel and the continuing education of the existing ones will be necessary for this accomplishment, especially for designing the learning *competencies* between adults. Because the concern for learning is not transferable to these categories of citizens, for this accomplishment fair allocation of financial resources of society will be necessary. There are doubts that average educational institutions could fulfill these criteria, and that one could apply the market concept to this category of citizens (the poor, underprivileged, uneducated). The result is that public (governmental) educational policy should not be neutral and non-intervened. Raising the average level of education and of culture is one of the *conditions* for

complete realization of the philosophy of lifelong education. The gap in education is larger than the gap in appropriate distribution of wealth.

Adult education has *vertical* dimensions. Learning activities are interconnecting at local, regional and global levels. Andragogical and sociological literature develops the *global* learning paradigm. This paradigm means that we should learn on other cultures' and other civilizations' springs, too. The learning could help man and mankind in complete understanding of other cultures and other civilizations, in meaningful management of the increased number of problems, in respecting the elements of global views and in respecting the elements of global systems. The new learning is necessary for the struggle with new challenges, new tensions and with new dangers; new learning is necessary for effective usage of new technology, for overcoming new production technologies, for a better understanding of the new concepts of the world, humanity as a planetary problem. Adults decide on it, so, in the first place, the learning activities should be intended for them. The learning could help us to accomplish our *duties* on different levels aimed at well-being of current and future generations (protecting the environment, struggle with modern diseases, drugs, terrorism etc.).

We emphasized world interconnections. In these interconnections the *vulnerability* of man is more intense than in any other historical period. The changes in the world are networked; one leads to another in chain reactions, even the others do not provoke them. We should learn how to struggle with changes, painful for both societies and man. We should learn how to *struggle* with overcoming lack of confidence, uncertainty, and unpredictability. Solutions are many, but learning to *unite them* from the local to the global level is a priority.

It is necessary to reconsider on a scientific basis and to study the elements of learning distinctive for adult learning and education. Most importantly, we have in mind the social and psychological framework of adult learning. These two phenomena of adult learning (social and individual) are of great importance for its understanding. The concept of development of adults is *a key element* of andragogy. The research in psychology and in andragogy shows that more or less intensive, this development, as well as learning, *happens* during the whole life. The developmental tasks are different for each phase of the development, but people encounter them and try to solve them.

A few theories of adult learning, all of them in the essence of andragogy, originated in the last decades of the twentieth century. It is necessary to be acquainted with them, in order to analyze and critically evaluate them. The abundant science production on *differences* between the education of children and the education of adults could be found in the last decades of the twentieth century. The research shows the complexity of these two scientific phenomena; but differences exist not only between the education of children and the education of adults but also within the conception of adult learning. A lot of external factors affect the learning of adults; especially the *convergence* of work and education, motivation and learning, teaching concepts in andragogy, the distinctive role of andragogical practitioners, the phenomenon of self-directed learning, as well as the future of adult learning. We will not explain in detail nor reconsider them due to the lack of space; rather, we have done it in our study *Distinctions of the Learning of Adults (Osobenosti učenja odraslih)*, Savicevic, 2006). Our research on the past, present and future tightened our convictions of the twenty-first century as a century of adult learning. This will be a challenge for andragogy as a science and for the andragogical profession as well.

2. What do historical and comparative researches tell us?

Each science which cares about its own scientific identity searches for the leading ideas in shaping concepts and in constituting the science. It means that every science should consider its own history. There are no good reasons for a different behavior of andragogy. We are conscious of threats of mechanical transfer of contemporary thoughts to a more distant or to a closer history of learning and education of adults. On the other hand, it should be harmful to *overlook* that the learning and education of adults are as old as mankind. The learning and education of adults have always been an integral part of human activity and of the human aspirations to learn. Due to the lack of space we will not explain the roots and development of andragogical ideas. We will try to draw a historical line of andragogical ideas, which has been overlooked or disregarded, and eventually was marked as a history of pedagogical ideas in the traditional history of pedagogy textbooks.

For studying andragogical ideas, time is an important category. Perhaps it is so because of the importance regarding the appearance of andragogical ideas understood as the concepts of learning and education, and as the practice of learning and education; regarding ongoing development on these ideas, their acceptance or rejection in the particular historical epochs and in certain social milieux. The thesis that the learning and education of adults as a particular social activity emanated from pedagogical activities, can not be accepted without critical considerations. Careful and strengthened reconstruction of andragogical ideas reveals that such practice has deep roots in the development of human society and culture. Less acceptable is the thesis that andragogical practice in slaveholding ancient Greece was a part of common pedagogical practice. The history of andragogical ideas (understood as a conception, institutions and practice) shows that in Hellenistic and ancient Jewish cultural circles andragogical institutions were the first to be founded. It was three centuries later that schools for children education were founded, because the family provided the frame for the children's upbringing.

The Hellenistic civilization delivered plenty of andragogical ideas understood as practice, institutions and concepts. A developed philosophical thought, fruitful and dynamic cultural activity, was mainly oriented toward adults. Hellenistic philosophical thoughts affirmed the idea of lifelong learning. The system of lifelong learning and education, which encompassed all periods of human life, was based on this idea. The ideas of the learning and education of adults in Hellenism are not homogeneous, but they have their own developmental phases (periods). Homer influenced significantly the learning and education of all generations of Greeks. Even if the forms differ, adults in ancient Athens learned and educated themselves through the spoken word. The sophists were the first important andragogical practitioners. They claimed that they could teach people any kind of knowledge. They made a profession of their educational work; popularized science and culture, and they developed and improved rhetoric. The spoken word dominated; it was both, 'the sword and the shield'. Through his own ideas and through his practical activity, Socrates had a great influence on Hellenistic adult education. Some authors (Grattan 1955), who were engaged in the reconstruction of andragogical ideas named Socrates the most important teacher of all time. Socrates' special contribution to andragogical ideas was through his own methods which he used in practical educational work. Through his own ideas and through practical activity, Socrates had great influence on Hellenistic adult education. Plato and Aristotle gave personal contributions to the ideas

of adult education. Plato's Academy and Aristotle's Lyceum were adult education institutions. The roots of a many contemporary problems can be found in the main opus of these great philosophers: lifelong education, educational needs, choosing the contents, methods, etc.

The Hellenistic culture and civilization influenced the development of the Roman civilization. In andragogical practice in ancient Rome the schools for preparing the rhetoric had a dominant position. These schools were professional schools on a higher level. Education and learning in ancient Rome should be observed from a wider cultural context. If we neglect rhetoric schools, Roman adult education was oriented toward informal forms: libraries, reading rooms, public bathhouses, dramas, comedies, forums etc. Cicero, Seneca, and Quintillian had great impact on the improvement of Roman education and culture.

In ancient Jewish civilization a system of both formal and informal institutions and the forms of the adult learning and education appeared. This system existed for a few centuries before the forming of a formal system of education of youth, with appearance of homes of gathering, homes of meetings, temples named synagogues. The synagogues were the centers for learning, private meetings, forums, even houses (homes). The learning of adults was a life style and a kind of prayer. It was not only an intellectual activity, but also a religious experience. Over time different adult education institutions appeared: communities of learning, schools, academies; also, there evolved part time learning which enabled the combination of learning and work. Learning and scholars (teachers, Rabbis, and wise men) were appreciated in Jewish culture. People respected learning. In Jewish cultural heritage one could find valuable didactic and methodical solutions, actually even today. Well known didactic rules—from simple to complex, from known to unknown, from closer to distant—were formulated in ancient Jewish andragogical practice in the centuries before the new era. Learning was not only a respected but even a mandatory activity. Jewish people used to underestimate and to *scorn* the ignorant and uneducated.

Spiritual development was slow and decelerated in the Middle Ages as a long period of the European history. It was marked by Christianity as an ideology and religion. Taking roots and tightening of Christianity lasted a few centuries. Education and learning were strong factors in converting adults to Christianity. The churches and monasteries became centers for education, culture and science. The first schools founded by Christians were aimed at adults. The schools for children were founded later. As a new phase in the development of European civilization, the church influenced the appearance of universities. The universities were andragogical institutions as well. In the field of education and culture in general, new influences and movements emerged, among which Humanism and Renaissance dominated. In the late Middle Ages the secular forms of adult education spread, both formal and informal ones. Mandatory elementary education was introduced. The final disappearance of the Middle Ages epoch was marked by a new way of production, development of mercantilism, exploration of new roads and the discovery of new geographical places.

The New Era is a long-lasting period of human civilization. It did not begin at the same time in different countries. This depended on the economical and scientific changes, on the stage of technical development, and on appearance of a new social force (middle class), which initiated, stimulated and accelerated changes. The changes were unavoidably interconnected with learning and education. The elementary marks of the New Era are scientific discoveries, inventions and the

dynamical development of science. A 'fertile soil' for development of andragogical practice in the New Era were traced by economical and social development, the development of science, philosophy and art. Such practice had different intensity in different European countries. The two most developed countries in the epoch named the New Era, Great Britain and France, best represent the forms of this practice. Due to the lack of space we will not describe or analyze this practice (details in: Savicevic 2000). Here we mention that the andragogical ideas stated by Comenius are the constitutive *foundation* of andragogy as a science. The nature and the importance of his thoughts about the possibilities, needs and organization of education and learning of adults are a basis to consider him as a founder of modern andragogy. He explained these thoughts in Pampedia, the paper found by a Czech Slavist in 1934. In Pampedia, Comenius developed the philosophy of life-long education, and proclaimed equal frames for living and for learning. According to Comenius, it is not enough to say that is never too late for learning; he emphasized that 'every period is dedicated for a life and for learning' (Vybrane Spisy 1966). Comenius requires special institutions, forms, means, methods, and teachers for learning and education of adults.

The process of dissolving of feudal society affected the learning and education of adults. The migration of populations occurred and urban poverty multiplied. Absolute and functional illiterates could not be efficient workers. The industrial revolution led to the needs for vocational adult education. The more educated workers participated in the *accumulation of the capital*. New andragogical institutions appeared: mechanical institutes, peoples' and workers' colleges, university extensions, folk high schools, associations for workers' education, educational settlements etc. The whole eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries were marked by foundation and tightening of institutions for learning and education of adults. Adult education evolved in a worldwide educational movement. In this period the ideas about scientific thought and discipline capable of studying these processes and practice appeared. One could not ignore this historical development.

3. Changes of paradigm from education to learning

The concepts and terms which appeared in andragogy are influenced by *changes*, modifications and development. These changes are not only the result of scientific consolidation; they have significantly broader dimensions, economical and technological ones. The terminology in the field of learning and education is predominately influenced by developed European and North American countries. Because of these influences it is necessary to reconsider and to critically assess the global usage of these concepts and terms. Comparatively, the last decades of the twentieth century were marked by paradigmatic changes in the field of learning and education of adults. These changes had broader dimensions and were directed from education toward learning. These changes were led by the developed, industrialized countries; the leading initiator was OECD. UNESCO followed this development. These changes were most visible in the 1990s, when developed countries based their strategies and the directions of change on learning instead of on education. Andragogical journals changed their names, by including the term 'learning' instead of the term 'education' in their titles. This was especially the case in the United Kingdom and North America. OECD especially forced the paradigm of learning.

These paradigmatic changes were most expressed at the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education, organized by UNESCO in Hamburg in 1997. The main topic of the conference was 'adult learning—a key for the 21st century'. At this Conference *the Hamburg Declaration* was adopted. By its nature, this is a socio-political and educational manifesto which tries to give a direction for the road of adult education in the twenty-first century. It was established that mankind could attain a better future by learning (see UNESCO 1997).

The transfer of the emphasis from education to learning was preceded by the discourses in the andragogical literature published from the 1950s. These discourses had the most extended base in North America. These discourses significantly influenced intellectual andragogical movements in Europe, as well as in other parts of the world, and especially in Japan. Lifelong learning as philosophy is a main aim of the reconstruction of education and of acceptance of new strategies of its reform. Some countries adopted strategies based on the philosophy of lifelong learning: Great Britain, Sweden, and the Netherlands. There was a similar trend in Germany, too. 1996 was declared the European Year of Lifelong Learning. How did these paradigmatic changes influence traditional pedagogical thoughts? This influence was minimal. In some countries there was even some confusion, expressed in a statement that when the philosophy of lifelong education was adopted, the differences between the education of children and the education of adults 'disappeared'.

4. Critical consideration of pedagogy vs. andragogy relationship

In the nature of every science there is an existence of *creative* tensions, different conceptions and scientific controversy. Universal agreement in science leads to dogmatism. It is true for sciences, especially for the social sciences. In the twentieth century the unity of a science is withdrawing after its huge specialization, and new scientific disciplines start to emerge. Some sciences were created on the borders of other disciplines. A few sciences studied numerous problems of the social and individual life. Such is the case in learning and education. This phenomenon is known in science as interdisciplinarity; it means that a few sciences unite their own forces in studying the phenomena of learning and education.

The theoretical discourses on the pedagogy vs. andragogy relationship during the second half of the twentieth century were common in my country (the former Yugoslavia). There were formed two schools of thought: pedagogical and andragogical. The first one considered pedagogy as an 'integral' science of upbringing; the second one considered andragogy as a relatively independent science dealing with distinctions of learning and education of adults.

In their historical development until the 1960s, pedagogical ideas were connected to upbringing and education in the period of childhood and youth. Historical and comparative researches show that such concepts were common in many countries. Since the 1960s the evolved unfounded spreading of the subject of pedagogy as an 'integral', 'general', 'complete', 'united' science of upbringing started by rejecting andragogy or by labeling it as a 'branch' of pedagogy, in the best case. The very essence of this concept is that because upbringing and education are lifelong processes, considering upbringing in whole as a subject of pedagogy—there is no need for the existence of andragogy.

This is a long time since we rejected the definition of pedagogy as a science of upbringing of the children. It is science of upbringing in general, of upbringing of man from his birth until the end of his life. Forming the adult pedagogy or the andragogy as a particular discipline or as a totally independent science has only a scholastic character (Simlesa 1980: 132–133).

Such a position represents an *unconditional claim* and was not based on the historical and comparative facts. It ignores the scientific andragogical production of the twentieth century. The claim that some authors in pedagogy ‘rejected definition of pedagogy’ is not a *valid reason* for negation of andragogy. Such thoughts may be marked as a reflection of the circumstances, as an episode in a scientific concept, but such thoughts are persisting to this day as if no changes in the late 1990s had occurred. Such a concept was abandoned in Russia, where it evolved. Although in the theoretical sense it is not so harmful, insisting on the unfounded spreading of the subject of pedagogy has a great *negative* impact on practice. These impacts are manifesting in the reduction of andragogical knowledge produced by the research of the phenomena of learning and education of adults aimed for future teacher candidates. In order to be convinced, it is enough to have a cursory look at pedagogical textbooks for students of education: there one can find half of a single page dedicated to adult education. For God’s sake, it is the ‘same’, because some authors in pedagogy ‘abandoned an earlier definition of pedagogy’! However, the tendency of implementation of distinctive elementary school experiences on the learning and education of adults is not rejected yet!

Comparatively, this thesis has no scientific foundation. It overlooks the research based theoretical foundation of learning and education of adults; it overlooks social factors, theories of adult learning, motivation, convergence of work and education, different social roles of adults on which depend the present and future position of society and of individuals, differences in the learning of children and adults, the role of andragogues practicing in this process, etc. The andragogues are asked to present the demarcation criteria between pedagogy and andragogy. These criteria lie in a huge historical and comparative material on the education and learning of adults. The researchers who search for the demarcation criteria should find them in this material, if they do not ignore these contributions.

The belief that andragogy ‘evolved’ from pedagogy, andragogical practice from pedagogical practice, lasted for decades in my country. The known historical facts show the opposite. Why does then ignorance or inexcusable ‘pilfer’ persist? The historical materials demonstrate that andragogy does not evolve from pedagogy, but from intellectual ‘conflicts’ with pedagogy. As a term, pedagogy was used from the period of introduction of mandatory elementary education. Comenius, in the seventeenth century, was the first to draw the demarcation line between pedagogical and andragogical ideas; but he drew this line in the Pampedia, written at the end of his life, not in the Great Didactic. In the Pampedia Comenius urged for distinctive ‘schools’ for adults, for distinctive contents, textbooks and teachers as we mentioned above. Why was this thought ignored in pedagogical textbooks? Andragogical ideas and practice (understood as a conception, institutions and new forms) were created in the period of social, scientific and technological changes brought on by the industrial revolution; they were created under the wing of the workers’ movement, constituted in England.

It was Germany's philosophers who founded the development of pedagogical thoughts, especially Kant who introduced pedagogy as a subject of university studies. According to him, there is no possibility for upbringing adults:

Until when should one continue upbringing? Until the nature as such arranges that human being guide itself alone—until the development of the sexual instinct—until young man could become a father and could upbringing others—approximately up to sixteen years of age. After that period one could use supportive means of culture and steadily discipline but, frankly speaking, there are no continued upbringing' (in Buchner 1904: 4).

As we could see, Kant posed one *criterion*: that 'human being guides himself alone...' He precisely defined the term 'upbringing'.

Such considerations influenced Kant's followers, especially Herbart; these considerations had a key role in defining the subject of pedagogy as a science of upbringing of younger generations. These definitions have not significantly changed to this day. Herbart strongly opposed the idea of forming andragogy. When Kapp (1833) posed the idea of urgent foundation of andragogy, Herbart pit against him, emphasizing that it would mean an extension of upbringing to adults, that 'would lead to general state of juvenility' (Herbart 1864). According to Herbart, pedagogy ends with the end of upbringing and education of young people. In this sense, Herbart followed his predecessor Kant. Such an understanding of pedagogy clarifies why Kapp considered Herbart as an opponent. Compared to Kapp, Herbart had an indisputable authority in the philosophy and pedagogy of this time in Germany. Although Kapp's ideas were not accepted, the search for the name of the discipline of studying all of education evolved outside school institutions attended by children continued. Thus Diesterweg (1835) posed the thesis about 'social pedagogy' (Socialpädagogik) as a discipline studying all of educational activity taking place outside of school, including the education of adults who missed their first chance in education, and marginalized social groups, as well. As one can see, Kapp's attempts echoed.

These efforts were stimulated by institutionalization of adult education, from elementary to the forms of university education. The practice experiences were collected and the distinctions of adult learning were pointed out. Educational and cultural functions of the worker's movement strengthened. A number of authors dealing with and interested in the problems of adult education appeared, especially in the first decades of the twentieth century. After the First World War a number of German authors tried to shape the theoretical thoughts on the learning and education of adults, emphasizing the role of experience of adults in learning and education. Rosenstock (1924) for example, considered that for 'the one who cannot derive a knowledge from the experience' there is no place in adult education. He made a clear demarcation between the education of the young and the learning and education of adults. According to Rosenstock, the differences could not be exclusively attributed only to the discrepancy between the contents and the roots of learning:

The difference is permanently connected with the life as such: between a child and an adult there is a field of action, adult came into history and became a link on a chain of sin, entangle, wishes and pains. This experience is strange for children, so the education should not anticipate the nature. The children

education should be consistent with the nature and in striving to self-improvement. The adult comes from the public life and brings the world of incomparable and unchecked terms, concepts and elements of the education. The conflict is a basic principle of a superior intelligence. In adulthood, this conflict ends in confrontations, criticisms and discussions. An adult accepts only when eliminated by himself; the education of an adult is a vivid intellectual exchange of the essence of the thought' (Rosenstock 1924: 4).

Working at the Academy of Work at Frankfurt University, in rejection of the pedagogical methods, Rosenstock reached the concept of andragogy. According to him, a different philosophy, different methods and different teachers are needed for worker's education. He asked for a professional teacher, capable of direct contact with participants. He considered that such teachers could only be andragogues. This was the period when universities opened their gates to the learning and education of adults.

All these activities made a solid foundation for the shaping of the theory of adult learning. A German experience influenced other continental European countries. Due to the lack of space, we could not analyze these experiences. Not to 'hush up', not to ignore it, but to study the history which testifies the differences between the learning and education of children and adults, between the pedagogy and andragogy is what we could recommend to the school of 'integral pedagogy' followers. The study of this process should provide the distinctive 'criteria' between pedagogy and andragogy.

The Russian language literature from the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century gives us an important historical experience based on the perspective of differentiation of pedagogy and andragogy, upon differentiation of the learning of children and adults. As far as we know, the first person who used the term andragogy in the Russian literature was Olesnickij (1885), professor at Kiev University. Olesnickij developed the concept of education, important even today in the sciences of education. Olesnickij had an optimistic approach to human development and believed it can continue not only until the young period, but *later*, even in the mature and third age. He assumed that changes happen throughout the whole life. In the mature period the ideals of the young period are replaced by *sober*, practical expressions. The physical strength decreases, while spiritual life could be compared with the energy of youth. Every period of life has its own psychological and physiological distinctions; the nature of children is different to that of adults.

The applications of different upbringing means is a reason why it should be desirable to know a human nature. Emphasizing that not children but adults, capable of reasonable and independent activities, are the ones who move the culture, Olesnickij argues for their preparation for these activities: 'The science is developed by adults, the art is improved by adults' (Olesnickij 1885: 27). In the experimental research on adult learning and education in the twentieth century, some ideas of Olesnickij were confirmed. We should have in mind that the period of posing these ideas was the same one when pedagogical psychologists rejected the possibility of learning and education in adulthood. If the followers of the school of 'integral pedagogy' did not ignore the historical facts, then they would not deny the criteria of the age as a distinctive one for drawing the demarcation line between pedagogy and andragogy. In the very essence of this demarcation line there is a concept of adulthood, which

encompasses the roles of adults, the nature of adult learning, the contents, forms, processes and results of learning. Olesnickij comprehended this by the end of the nineteenth century.

In the Russian pedagogical literature there are no references to the concept of andragogy which evolved in the first decades of the twentieth century. During and immediately after the October Revolution the institutions for education of adults were enlarged. The theoretical foundation of andragogy is attributed to Medinskii (1923) who connected it to *anthropogogy*. He wrote that 'Pedagogy is a science of upbringing the children, and not of a man in general; as such pedagogy is just a discipline of the anthropogogy, the science of upbringing the people' (Medinskii 1923: 10). According Medinskii, the second part of anthropogogy is the theory of informal education—*andragogy*. The contribution of Medinskii to the constituting of *andragogy* is of great importance. With his ideas, Medinskii was ahead of the time he belonged to. Lunacarskij also used both the terms 'anthropogogy' and 'andragogy'.

The turn from this standpoint happened suddenly, in the 1930s. According to the decisions of the ruling party, education of adults was understood as a sphere of ideological work, for which there was neither space nor need for scientific research. Ideology and politics had priority over science. Such a condition in scientific research of adult education lasted until the 1960s, when discourses about pedagogy as a general science of upbringing were restored due to Kairov's statement at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of USSR, when he asked for the enlargement of the subject of pedagogy on the problems of upbringing and education as a whole. In the *Pedagogical Encyclopedia* (Kairov and Petrov, 1966) there is a new definition of pedagogy, as follows: 'The pedagogy developed as a theory of upbringing children; contemporary pedagogy involves educational-upbringing, cultural-enlightening, agitation-propagandist problems of the work with the adults, too'. Thus, 'socialistic pedagogy serves the whole of the society'. However, only declarations remain from this service orientation of pedagogy. But, the declaration on enlargement of the subject of pedagogy influenced the definitions of the subject of pedagogy in other socialistic countries, where the enlargement of the subject of pedagogy also occurred.

During the last decades of the twentieth century the researches in the field of learning and education were intensified, but in the theoretical sense, andragogical thoughts did not leave the field of 'pedagogy of adults'. However, such authorities in pedagogical science as Goncharev, the president of the Soviet Union Academy of the Pedagogical Sciences, recognized andragogy as a synonym of the pedagogy of adults. He does it in his own way:

Nowadays, the pedagogy of adults is developed in a whole world under the name 'andragogika'. Andragogika studied the problems of upbringing and education of adults in a given context of their life activities. It is a theory, scientific base for adult education, without which it is impossible to found a practice of education, without theory the practice would become sorcery' (Goncharev 1976: 3).

Due to the lack of space, we will not analyze other authors' contributions to foundation of the andragogy and of its disciplines. Social, political and economic changes in the Russian Federation made a new space for the development of andragogy as a science. New university departments for andragogy, new research centers for studying learning and education of adults appeared, and andragogy was

considered as one of the sciences in the system of educational sciences. The Academy of the Pedagogical Sciences became the Academy of Education; new studies dedicated to andragogy emerged (Andragogika 2001, Verslovskij 1998, Zmeyov 1999, Kolesnikov 2003, Gromkova 2005). In the Russian Federation, andragogy became a major subject in the professional preparation and in continuous teacher development; the utilization of the literature on learning and education of adults developed in the western cultural circle became widespread. Similar changes happened in the countries dominated by the former Soviet pedagogic idea: Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Czech Republic, Poland, and Bulgaria. So, should we 'hush up', suppress or ignore these changes? Doing this would mean a violation of the scientific facts.

In the United Kingdom the spreading of the concept of andragogy was slow. The first researcher who pointed out the concept of andragogy was J. A. Simpson in the 1960s. He emphasized that the concept of andragogy is common in continental Europe (Simpson 1964: 186). Writing on andragogy, Simpson tends to point out the need for researching the distinctions of learning and education of adults by those competent. Simpson's tendencies to dissuade attention from the techniques and to concentrate on the synthesis and on the values applicable in the whole field of the learning and education of adults, were justified.

At the end of the 1970s at the University of Nottingham a group evolved which aimed to shape the concept of andragogy (Nottingham Andragogy Group 1983). Due to the base founded in the ideas of Knowles, an American scholar, the group continued it, by redefining andragogy; by essentially leaning on and connecting andragogy with the philosophy of Freire. The Group comprehended it as a temptation to help adults to become initiators of their own thinking and their own feelings. The Nottingham Andragogy Group views adults as social beings, the products of history and culture. By integrating the affective dimensions in the group and in the individual context, individuals in adulthood acquire capabilities for creative and critical thinking. More than accepting other people's ideas, in the andragogical process adults are urged for the critical thinking. This group comprehended the andragogical process in a much broader sense (Nottingham Andragogy Group 1983: 45).

At the beginning of the 1980s, in the United Kingdom, the number of papers about andragogy multiplied. Thoughts were divergent, from understanding andragogy as a theory of practice to understanding andragogy (Jarvis 1984) as an *incomplete* theory of adult education, drawing knowledge from different disciplines.

At the beginning of the 1980s, a renowned Oxford publisher, The Pergamon Press, initiated publishing of the international journal *Andragogy: An International Journal of Research and Studies* with research orientation aimed to help experts in the field of learning and education of adults. The Pergamon Press asked me for an opinion on the validity of this project. I answered and pointed out that:

...the idea is great. In the last 25 years my wish is a foundation of such a journal in English. It should be a new step in development of theory of adult education. The Pergamon Press is excellent choice for publishing such a journal because of international circulation of its publications. The statement on the goals and on the scope of the proposed journal is very good. We need a good theory of the education and learning of adults in every place of the world. A new journal could contribute in advancement of andragogical ideas, terms and research findings. (Savicevic 2006: 56)

In the concept of the proposal of the journal, andragogical theory of learning, application of andragogical models of learning are described, and ambitions for dissemination concept of andragogy in the whole world are explained (Pergamon Press 1985). This project testifies that some authors from the United Kingdom seriously considered the concept of andragogy and its international dimensions.

The next opportunity I had to participate in the discussion on andragogy with British and other scholars was in 1990, at the Standing Conference on University Teaching and Research in the Education of Adults (SCUTREA). I was invited to the conference to present a contribution on the concept of andragogy. A new discussion on andragogy was taking place. The British scholar W. M. Robb especially supported a concept of andragogy. He emphasized the problems with explanations of meaning of andragogy which practitioners have, emerging because of two main reasons: first, the term 'andragogy' is not included in prominent dictionaries of English; and second the term is used with different meanings (Wellings 1990).

In the USA, the concept of andragogy is tightly connected to the name of Professor M. S. Knowles. But, the process of development of the concept of andragogy is usually ignored. Knowles emphasized in some of his books that he 'stole' the term andragogy from a young Yugoslav adult educator. There was no 'stealing', but Knowles formulated his approach after our longstanding discussion on andragogy, after our mutual correspondence and after our exchange of andragogical sources (Savicevic 2006). I was aware of the importance of attracting Knowles to the concept of andragogy. He was the first university professor who stood for the idea of considering the need to form andragogy as scientific discipline, at the National Convention of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, held in the fall of 1966, in Chicago. I have explained this process in detail in my latest study (Savicevic 2006: 54–67).

The correspondence between Professor Knowles and myself continued after my return to Yugoslavia in July 1967. We had discussions about writing the term 'andragogy' and arranged to write a book on andragogy together. Agreement on writing that book was attained in 1987 at the international conference 'Learning how to learn'. We agreed on the title *Andragogy in Historical and Comparative Perspective*, and on the details about who should write which part of the book. Unfortunately this project was not brought to fruition. Over the course of two decades Knowles changed his opinion on andragogy. He claims that andragogy is a 'model' of learning applicable even to a preschool institution. In the 1980s, Knowles defined andragogy as a 'technology of learning', and as a 'technology of helping adults to learn'. In this way he reduced andragogy to a prescription, recipes for teachers' behavior in the process of education and learning. Not in a single case can andragogy 'help adults to learn'. It could do it indirectly, if practitioners use some findings. With such claims, Knowles estranged himself from the basic concept of andragogy he formulated in the 1960s. Knowles did not consider enough the historical roots of evolution and of development of andragogy in American and European literature. Such a relation to the historical roots led him to the conclusion that he was the 'first' to use the term andragogy in the American literature.

Historical data show that such a conclusion is not justified. It is well known that the concept of andragogy evolved in German cultural circles, and that some American scholars used the term andragogy in the 1930s (Lindeman 1926, Anderson and Lindeman, 1927, Hansome 1931). They 'borrowed' the term from the German andragogical practice. It is worth mentioning that Lindeman and Hansome were

Danish, and that they became interested in the European andragogical experience on their study trips.

The concept of andragogy explained by Knowles, initiated new discussions in the professional literature. It should be useful to make a deeper analysis of andragogical ideas expressed in these discussions. Due to the lack of space, we can not do it here. However, in spite of different approaches to andragogy, no serious scientific study on adult education since the 1980s has ignored andragogical problems. Since we initiated the discussion on andragogy with Knowles in 1966, contemporary resources show that more than 170 doctoral theses on this topic have been defended in the USA (Cooper and Henschke 2001: 5–14).

Forty years in development of a science is not a long nor ignorable period. I met Professor Knowles four decades ago and argued on terms and on concept of andragogy. Since then, the term and the concept of andragogy have enlarged and become rooted in the American professional literature. There is no doubt that Knowles contributed to it, not only by his texts, but with his spoken word and lectures. He was a 'masovik', i.e. a lecturer at mass events. He told me that he lectured at 10,000-visitor stadiums. As if he was inspired by an ancient agonistic spirituality! His contribution to dissemination of andragogical ideas throughout the USA is huge. The history of andragogy will put him on a meritorious place in the development of this scientific discipline.

Latin America is the place where the radical philosophy of adult education was nurtured first. The most distinguished exponent of such a philosophy was the Brazilian philosopher and andragogical practitioner Paulo Freire. He gave a special contribution to the development of andragogical thoughts. His influence is also evident in other Latin American countries, especially in Chile, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela.

In the early 1970s, the Organization of American States, which encompasses all Latin American states, started a project called Integrative Education of Adults. The goal of this project was to prepare experts for the field of education of adults, and to start pilot researches of education and learning of adults. The main focus of these activities was in the Center for Polyvalent Education of Adults in Santiago, Chile.

At the end of November 1971 in Santiago a seminar for experts from Latin America engaged in the field of adult education was held and lasted for three weeks. I was invited to the seminar as a lecturer. I accepted the invitation and gave a few lectures during the seminar. I had conversations with responsible people on the problems of andragogy, on the need for professional preparation of personnel in the field, and on starting researches and appropriate journals for diffusion of research results. Shortly afterward, the Center started a new library, the Biblioteca Andragogika which published my papers (lectures at the aforementioned seminar) in the first three issues. That is how the andragogical library in Chile started. The most enthusiastic supporter of andragogy in Venezuela was Dr. Felix Adam. His book *Andragogy—The Science of Adult Education* had an evident impact on the field in Spanish-speaking countries. I was invited by the Simon Rodrigues University to be a visiting professor for andragogy in postgraduate studies in 1977. Apart from the lectures, I was active in the consultation on the problems of development of the Simon Rodrigues University.

My activities in Latin America consisted of lecturing on the field of adult education, dissemination of andragogical ideas, influence on starting andragogical publications, supporting international cooperation in the field of adult education and

introduction of new personnel in postgraduate studies such as, for example, a course on comparative andragogy. The contribution to developing andragogy is connected to the name of Felix Adam, the first general secretary of the Pan-American association for adult education, and later the rector of the Simon Rodrigues University and the director of the International Institute for Andragogy in Caracas.

Interesting discussions on andragogy were held in other European countries including Hungary, Czech Republic, Poland, Austria, Switzerland and Finland. Due to lack of space we can not give a detailed description of the essence of these discussions. I have done this in my two books (whose text is in Serbian with summary in English) *Contemporary Conceptions of Andragogy (Savremena Shvatanja Andragogije)* (1991) and *Andragogical Ideas in International Framework (Andragoske Ideje u Medunarodnim Okvirima)* (2006). The comparative research shows that in the East European countries since the 1990s the interest in andragogy as a science of learning and education of adults has suddenly increased. If learning of adults becomes the key for life in the twenty-first century, one could presume that andragogy as a science with such a subject will become more important.

5. Convergence and divergence in the contemporary concepts of andragogy

In the second half of the twentieth century the process of professionalization in the field of education and learning of adults accelerated; this was evident especially in Europe and in North America. The new infusion of knowledge to a new profession for its dynamical and responsible acting was necessary. It was a time when the discussions on andragogy as a scientific discipline emerged. In the period between the First and Second World Wars the main attention was oriented toward the proving of the possibility of adult learning. Since the 1960s the main research efforts have been aimed at proving the differences and distinctions in education and learning of adults in comparison to education and learning of children. This was the common and visible tendency in the most countries.

The comparative research shows that in the period after the Second World War due to andragogy several schools of thought (concepts) in Europe and North America emerged: pedagogical conception, agological conception, prescriptive conception, andragogical conception and conception of ignoring andragogy as a scientific discipline.

The pedagogical concept evolved in a few countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Essentially, this school regarded andragogy as one of the pedagogical disciplines. Such a concept does not ignore andragogy as a scientific discipline, but places it under the umbrella of the global science of pedagogy. The weakness of this concept is concentrated in the fact that it assumes that andragogy originates from pedagogy and that the field of andragogy for research and for theorizing is limited. Establishing pedagogy as an integral science of upbringing belongs to a domain of abstractions, without a scientific basis.

The second concept is set apart by its integrity and is named agological and evolved in the Netherlands. This concept exceeded education of adults and relates to all guiding activities: social work, health protection, human relations, and life in groups. The trends in the Netherlands moved from agology toward andragogy.

The prescriptive concept in andragogy was deeply rooted by some scholars in North America. Prescribing teachers' and students' ways of behavior in the processes of education and learning are in its essence. Sometimes, its concept is described as 'helping adults in learning', and sometimes, considering the situation, as a wide applicable 'model' of learning.

The largest number of supporters of the concept of andragogy as a scientific discipline (or under the other name) comes from Central and Eastern Europe, and from the USA, especially among younger researchers and university professors. The claims of the existence of constituted discipline, with studying of the learning and education of adults in both formal and informal forms of work as a main subject, is its essence. The supporters are encountered in Germany (see Pöggeler 1957, 1981, 1998 and Reischmann, 2004, 2005), Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, former Yugoslavia and the Russian Federation, with a growing number of followers in the USA and in Canada, especially at Montreal University. They tend to establish andragogy as an integral science of learning and education of adults. Andragogy possesses its own scientific structure, its own system of subdisciplines whose subjects are studying of particular, mutually differentiated sub fields of learning and education of adults.

The concept of ignoring andragogy as a scientific discipline is a distinctive school of thought, whose supporters usually ask questions regarding the existence of andragogy as a scientific discipline. The supporters of this concept claim that learning and education of adults is a field for research realized by the previously constituted disciplines such as anthropology, psychology and sociology. Historical development of andragogy and the growing body of scientific knowledge produced in different social contexts, giving on opportunity to andragogy as a subject of study, show that there is no future for these claims. We consider that the skepticism about constituting discipline studying learning and education of adults declared by some authors is unjustified. Deeper reconsideration of the terminology evolved in the field is needed. A necessary condition for constituting a science is a founding of a precise terminology. This also applies to andragogy. But both the terms and the scientific structure are in the very essence of every discipline.

References

- ANDERSON, M. and LINDEMAN, E. C. (1927) *Education Through Experience* (New York: The Workers Education Bureau Press).
- BUCHNER, E. F. (Ed.) (1904) *Kant's Educational Theory* (Philadelphia: Lippincott).
- COMENIUS, J. A. (1910) *The Great Didactic* 2nd edn. (M. Keating trans) (London: A&C Black).
- COOPER, M. K. and HENSCHKE, J. H. (2001) Andragogija: Osnovi teorije, istra'zivanja i praktičnog povezivanja. *Andragoske studije*, 1(2), 5–14.
- DIESTERWEG, F. A. W. (1835) *Wegweiser zur Bildung für deutsche lehrer*, (Berlin: Vortage form des Erscheinungsvermerks).
- GRATTAN, C. H. (1955) *In Quest of Knowledge* (New York: Association Press).
- GRONKOVA, M. T. (2005) *Andragogika*. (Moskva: Ioniti).
- HANSOME, M. (1931) *World Workers' Educational Movement—Their Social Significance* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- HERBART, F. (1864) *Pädagogische Schriften*. Bearbeitet von K. Richter. 2 dln.
- JARVIS, P. (1984) Andragogy—A sign of the time. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 4(16), 32–38.
- KAIROV, I. A. and PETROV, F. N. (Eds) (1966) *Pedagogičeskaya entsiklopediya* (Moscow: Academy of Pedagogical Sciences).
- KAPP, A. (1833) *Platons Erziehungslere* (Minden).
- KOLESNIKOV, V. I. (2003) Novooiskol'tsyi Novooskol'e: izbrannye ocherkii rasskazy iz arkhiva uchitelia. (Belgosod, Otchii krai).

- LINDEMAN, E. C. (1926) *The Meaning of Adult Education* (New York: New Republic).
- MEDINSKII, E. N. (1923) *Encihlopedii Vnesikolnogobrazovanii* (Tom I, Obscai teorii vneshiolnogo obrazovanii) (Moskva-Petrovgrad: Gosidarstvennoe izdatelstvo).
- NOTTINGHAM ANDRAGOGY GROUP (1983) *Nottingham Andragogy Group mimeo* (Nottingham: Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham).
- OLESNICKIJ, M. A. (1885) *Polskii Kurs Pedagogiki—Teorija Vaspitanija* (Kiev: Korcak-Novicki).
- PÖGGELER, F. (1957) *Einführung in die Andragogik* (Düsseldorf: Ratingen).
- PÖGGELER, F. (1981) *Erwachsenenbildung—Einführung in die Andragogik* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).
- PÖGGELER, F. (1998) History of adult education as a history of adult educators: Biographical aspects of andragogical historiography. In M. Friedenthal-Haase (ed.) *Personality and Biography in the History of Adult Education*, vol. I. (Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main) Available online at: <http://www.andragogy.net>.
- REISCHMANN, J. (2004) *Andragogy. History, Meaning, Context, Function*. Available online at www.Andragogy.net (accessed 10 January 2004).
- REISCHMANN, J. (2005) Andragogy. In L. M. ENGLISH (ed.) *International Encyclopedia at Adult Education* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 58–63.
- ROSENSTOCK, E. (1924) *Andragogik* (Berlin: Verlag der Arbeitgemeinschaft).
- SAVICEVIC, D. (1985) A letter from Pergamon Press. *The Scope and Purpose of Andragogy: An International Journal of Research and Studies*.
- SAVICEVIC, D. M. (2000) *Koreni i Razvoj Andragoskih Ideja* (Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju).
- SAVICEVIC, D. M. (2006) *Andragoske Ideje u Medjunarodnim Okvirima* (Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju).
- SAVICEVIC, D. M. (2006) *Osobnosti ueenja odraslih* (Beograd: Zavod za ud`benike).
- SIMPSON, J. A. (1964) Andragogy. *Adult Education*, 37(4).
- SIMLESA, P. (1980) *Odabrana djela I* (Osijek: Pedagoski Fakultet).
- UNESCO (1997) *Declaration of the Fifth Conference on Adult Education* (Paris: UNESCO).
- VERSOVSKIJ, S. G. (1998) Schule als Sozialisationsinstanz—Über die Orientierung von Sankt Petersburger Schulabsolventen.
- VYBRANÉE SPISY (1966) *Jana Amosa Komenského* (Praha: Statni Pedagogicke Nakladtelstvi).
- WELLINGS, A. (Ed.) (1990) *Towards 1992, Education of Adults in New Europe* (Sheffield: SCUTREA).
- ZMEYOV, S. I. (1998) Andragogy: Origins, development and trends. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 44(1), 103–108.