

Svein Loeng

PEDAGOGY AND ANDRAGOGY IN COMPARISON – CONCEPTIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

ABSTRACT

This article draws attention to the comparison of pedagogy and andragogy. It is based on well-known writers within the field of adult education and learning. The selected literature is considered to give a representative picture of how comparing pedagogy and andragogy is generally approached, serving as my basis for critical consideration. In general, the comparisons are based on the traditional understanding of pedagogy and the understanding of andragogy in line with Knowles's theory. This does not give a true picture of the circumstances. Pedagogy is much more than traditional pedagogy, and andragogy is much more than Knowles's andragogy. The conclusion is that a reliable comparison demands a clarification of the terms included. Attention is also drawn to three perspectives on the pedagogy–andragogy relationship, namely, dichotomous, continuum, and relational perspectives. Here, too, a traditional understanding of pedagogy is the basis.

Keywords: *pedagogy, andragogy, adult education, adult learning, progressivism*

PEDAGOGIKA IN ANDRAGOGIKA V PRIMERJAVI – POJMOVANJA IN PERSPEKTIVE – POVZETEK

Članek opozarja na primerjave med pedagogiko in andragogiko. Temelji na idejah uveljavljenih avtorjev na področju izobraževanja in učenja odraslih. Izbrana literatura podaja reprezentativno sliko splošnega pristopa do primerjave pedagogike in andragogike. Na splošno so primerjave osnovane na tradicionalnem razumevanju pedagogike in razumevanju andragogike v skladu s teorijo, ki jo je razvil Malcolm Knowles. Zaključki kažejo, da je zanesljiva primerjava možna le na podlagi razjasnitve pojmov. Članek se posveti tudi trem perspektivam na odnos med pedagogiko in andragogiko: perspektivam dihonomije, kontinuuma in odnosov. Tudi tukaj osnovo predstavlja tradicionalno razumevanje pedagogike.

Ključne besede: *pedagogika, andragogika, izobraževanje odraslih, učenje odraslih, progresivizem*

INTRODUCTION

Since the concept of andragogy entered the scene in the English-speaking world around 1970, andragogical literature has contained quite a number of comparisons of pedagogy and andragogy. Finger and Asún (2001) state that “it has become standard practice in adult education to oppose – or at least compare – pedagogy and andragogy” (p. 70). These comparisons are mostly based on a traditional “schoolmaster-like” description of pedagogy. Andragogy, on the other hand, is generally perceived as synonymous to Knowles’s andragogy. “Schoolmaster-like” pedagogy is a traditional pedagogical approach, with characteristics such as transmission, content- and teacher-orientation, and a view of the learner as dependent. Beyond this, the term “schoolmaster” is often assigned a derogatory meaning, referring to a person who is magisterial and admonishing. Some of the literature in the field of adult education and learning seems to tend towards this view without expressing it directly. Such a basis for comparison further increases the difference between pedagogy and andragogy.

To make a reliable comparison, the two concepts must be clarified. Neither pedagogy nor andragogy is an unambiguous concept. Pedagogy is much more than “schoolmaster-pedagogy”, while andragogy is much more than Knowles’s andragogy.

To give a truthful picture of the relation between these two concepts, all nuances should be expressed, and the comparison should clarify which understanding of the concepts it is based on. To compare pedagogy and andragogy without taking different conceptions into account is inappropriate. To declare that pedagogy should be replaced by andragogy is almost empty of meaning if the basis of the understanding of the concepts is not specified.

DISCREPANCY BETWEEN PEDAGOGY AND ADULT EDUCATION

When adult education began to be organised systematically in the early 1920s, the pedagogical model was the only one adult educators could refer to, which meant the traditional understanding of pedagogy. Soon discontent arose among adult educators and adult learners with respect to this traditional pedagogical model. Many of the learner characteristics set forth in the pedagogical model did not fit the characteristics of adult learners. Pedagogy was based on the transmission of knowledge. Adult learners seemed to be dissatisfied with pedagogical teaching strategies, such as lectures, assigned readings, drills, quizzes, note memorising and examinations (Holmes & Abington-Cooper, 2000; Knowles, 1980). This dissatisfaction resulted in high dropout rates.

The first signs of the traditional model of pedagogy being inappropriate for adults appeared in Eduard Lindeman’s *The Meaning of Adult Education* (1926). He claimed that adults learn best when actively involved in determining what, how, and when to learn. Lindeman (1926, pp. 4–7) introduced these four assumptions dedicated to “those who need to be learners”:

- 1) Education is life, not a mere preparation for an unknown kind of future living.
- 2) Education revolves around non-vocational ideals.
- 3) The approach to adult education will be via the route of situations, not subjects.
- 4) The resource of highest value in adult education is the learner’s experience.

In Lindeman's opinion, the purpose of learning is to make life meaningful and it must be about discovering the meaning of our experiences. His book makes an important contribution to a new perspective on adult learning. He puts what characterises adult learners into words. It must be mentioned that Lindeman did not use the term andragogy to signify his approach to adult learning.

Conaway (2009, p. 32) refers to Gehring (2000) and Ozuah (2005) when she brings up five major points emphasised in pedagogical theory: children's lack of experience, their dependency in the learning situation, their external motivation, their readiness to learn and content-oriented learning. A consequence of this understanding is that children are externally motivated because they are closely linked to content- or subject-oriented learning, maintaining the child's natural dependency on the teacher. Because of their status in the societal hierarchy, children are dependent on adults directing and guiding them: "It should be noted that pedagogy is fundamentally a teacher-centred model, where the teacher determines what will be learned, how it will be learned, when it will be learned, and if it has been learned" (Ozuah, 2005, p. 83).

This is commonly considered to be in contrast to andragogy, referred to as the education of adults. Adults bring valuable experiential knowledge with them and have community-oriented aspirations (Gehring, 2000). Andragogy is usually described as learner-centred; the learner is responsible for achieving his or her own learning goals through self-direction and evaluation (Marshak, 1983). The teacher is not a transmitter of knowledge and skills, but a facilitator or helper in the learning process.

DIFFERENT CONCEPTIONS OF ANDRAGOGY

The concept of andragogy is ambiguous. It deals with adult education and learning in some way or another, but apart from this, various understandings of the concept exist (Loeng, 2018). The generally accepted view of andragogy in the English-speaking world is in line with Knowles's andragogy from the 1970s.

Knowles (1980) formulated the following assumptions about adult learners: as individuals mature,

- 1) their self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality towards one of being a self-directed human being;
- 2) they accumulate a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich source for learning;
- 3) their readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of their social roles; and
- 4) their time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly, their orientation towards learning shifts from one of subject-centredness to one of performance-centredness (in the 1970 edition, he used "problem-centredness").

In 1984, Knowles added a fifth assumption: As a person matures, the motivation to learn is internal. These assumptions formed the basis of the common understanding of andragogy in the English-speaking world.

Many authors have declared andragogy to be a unique perspective on adult education and learning, different from or sometimes incompatible with pedagogy, according to Finger and Asún (2001, p. 70).

The already-mentioned Eduard Lindeman was one of Knowles's greatest inspirations. Knowles (1989, p. 8) stated that Lindeman's book, *The Meaning of Adult Education*, was his main source of inspiration and ideas for a quarter of a century.

Still, there is at least one essential difference between these two central figures within adult education. Knowles has an individualistic focus and valued ideals such as individualism, self-realisation, independence and self-direction. Lindeman focused on social commitment and social change. He wanted to use adult education as a means to social change.

What is less known is that Lindeman was inspired by Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy (Loeng, 2013). Rosenstock-Huussy was a leading force in the first theoretical and academic reflections on the field of adult education in the 1920s. His ideas led to a new practice and he became a source of inspiration for adult educators in the interwar and post-war period. Andragogy is, according to Rosenstock-Huussy (1924), a turning away from mere pedagogy and demagogy. To him, andragogy is a term for all school-like education of adults. These schools should not be characterised by the transmission of information and teacher-centredness but should contribute to a new understanding of consciousness-raising. Like Lindeman, he had a social focus. Andragogy is a new kind of teaching that aims to solve social problems and move towards a better future (Rosenstock-Huussy, 1925).

To draw an even more complex picture of the different conceptions of andragogy, Alexander Kapp should be mentioned. He was, as far as we know, the first one to use the concept of andragogy (Kapp, 1833; Loeng, 2017). His approach was different from the already-mentioned representatives of andragogy. Kapp introduced his andragogy in 1833 based on Plato's educational theory (Loeng, 2017).

The different perceptions of andragogy illustrate a multifaceted term. Additionally, further confusion arises because some consider andragogy to be synonymous with adult learning, while others use it to denote a specific sort of adult learning, particularly Knowles's andragogy.

Differentiating between North American and European andragogy is also appropriate. The latter arose long before Knowles's andragogy and had a different basis. In European andragogy, the social perspective is more prominent (Höghielm, 1985). In particular, Eastern European andragogy attaches importance to the socialisation function of andragogy, in addition to self-realisation. Knowles, as a representative of North American andragogy, stands out with a more individualistic focus. According to Sandlin (2005), Knowles seemed to ignore the relationship between the individual and society. Lindeman

is also a North American, but he is closest to European andragogy with his emphasis on adult learning as a means to achieving social change. Andragogy in Great Britain is more similar to North American than to German andragogy (Savićević, 1999b). The above shows that the picture is not entirely clear.

When it comes to the perception of andragogy as a scientific discipline, the situation is varied (Savićević, 1999b). On one side, some theorists rejected the possibility of establishing an independent andragogical science. The opposite extreme argued in favour of andragogy as an integrative science, with disciplines such as sociology, psychology and others to be integrated into a common andragogical science (the Dutch variant). Somewhere in between, andragogy was subordinate to or belonging to pedagogy or other established sciences such as sociology, psychology, anthropology and others. There were also proponents of andragogy as a fairly independent scientific discipline, with andragogy as an integral science of adult education and learning. Supporters of this understanding were particularly to be found in Germany, Poland, Hungary, former Czechoslovakia, former Yugoslavia, and the Netherlands.

The first attempts to give andragogy a scientific basis were made in the 1950s. In this context, Franz Pöggeler (1957) was considered a pioneer with his book *Einführung in die Andragogik (Introduction to andragogy)*. In the decades that followed, several theoretical standpoints have crystallized into different perceptions of andragogy.

An institution that has contributed significantly to the development of andragogy as a scientific discipline is the University of Bamberg in Germany. An andragogical chair (Lehrstuhl für Andragogik) was established in 1994, focusing on the scientific side of adult education. Andragogy became the term for the scientific discipline studying adult education and learning (Reischmann, 1996).

ANDRAGOGY AND PROGRESSIVISM

Throughout the 1900s, the traditional conception of pedagogy was challenged by progressivism, introducing new ways of seeking knowledge. A chief exponent of progressive education was John Dewey. In short, progressive education was learner-centred and the teaching methods were focused on active inquiry, problem-solving and investigation. Disagreement was encouraged and the classroom was a place where differences could be articulated and analysed. Learners were treated as participants, not objects, and the goals were both individual and social. “In liberating the learner, a potential was released for the improvement of society and culture” (Elias & Merriam, 1995, p. 47).

The progressives’ view of education was to a great extent adopted by adult educators (Elias & Merriam, 1995). This meant increased focus on factors like socialisation, the centrality of experience in the sense of the learners’ experiences, in addition to the practical and pragmatic. Reason, experience, and feeling began to replace tradition and authority as the chief ways of arriving at truth (Elias & Merriam, 1995, p. 46).

Dewey's progressive pedagogy was especially influential in North American andragogy, which was represented by Malcolm Knowles. Elias and Merriam (1995) write that "Knowles's description of the adult educator as andragogue rather than pedagogue is in reality a contrast between the view of the teacher of traditional education and that proposed by the progressives" (p. 65).

As previously mentioned, Eduard Lindeman was one of Knowles's greatest inspirations. Lindeman is generally considered a link between progressivism and adult education (Fischer & Podeschi, 1989). According to Elias and Merriam (1995), "there is scarcely an adult educator whose ideas cannot be traced at least in some indirect form to the seminal ideas of Dewey and Lindeman" (pp. 68–69). "Lindeman goes on to give a definition of adult education that is truly Deweyan and progressive and that underlies the theoretical and practical thinking of many adult educators today" (Elias & Merriam, 1995, p. 64). In their opinion, "all adult educators accept the basic progressive premise that education is a process of reflective inquiry" (p. 74). So it is valid to say that there is a line from Dewey, via Lindeman, to Knowles. This relationship resulted in an andragogy with great similarities to progressive pedagogy.

ANDRAGOLOGY – PEDAGOGY-DISTANT OR PEDAGOGY-CLOSE?

If we compare traditional pedagogy to Knowles's andragogy, andragogy is without a doubt pedagogy-distant. However, if progressive pedagogy is the basis of comparison, andragogy is pedagogy-close. Which of these comparisons is the most truthful depends on, among other things, basic educational views. It is unreasonable to say that the most correct way is to compare traditional pedagogy with an understanding of andragogy in line with Knowles. There are so many other possible comparisons.

Traditional pedagogy includes characteristics such as learner dependency, content- and teacher-oriented learning, external motivation, and considering learner experience to be of little importance. In comparison with andragogy, these characteristics of traditional pedagogy will be strongly misleading, not least when it comes to learner experience. Malcolm Knowles, Eduard Lindeman and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy are prominent representatives of twentieth-century andragogy, and they all attach importance to learner experience. Knowles (1970) stated that the learning process is related to and makes use of the learner's experience; experiences increasingly become a source of learning. Lindeman, who was one of Knowles' greatest inspirations, claimed that in adult education, the learner's experience is the resource of the highest value and that learning must be about discovering the meaning of our experiences (Lindeman, 1926). Although Lindeman never developed an independent theory in the name of andragogy, Davenport (1987, p. 17) called him the spiritual father of andragogy.

What is less known is that Lindeman was inspired by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, who was a pioneer in the use of the concept of andragogy. To Rosenstock-Huessy (1925), teaching should be based on the experiences and ideas of the learners. The participants should be made conscious of their own experiences and aware of the need for social

integration (Loeng, 2013). He also called attention to the importance of dialogue and communication. As opposed to Descartes' "*cogito ergo sum*" ("I think, therefore I am"), he introduced the formula "*Audi, ne moriamur*" ("Listen, otherwise we die") (Tate, 1986).

In terms of learner experience, Alexander Kapp's (1833) andragogy differs from the three above mentioned representatives of andragogy. Kapp's andragogy has a rationalistic focus, with Plato's educational theory as a starting point. The importance of learner experience is toned down; the emphasis is on inner qualities such as character forming and self-knowledge (Loeng, 2017).

To understand the relationship between pedagogy and andragogy, you must understand the historical origin, writes Savićević (1999a). He is a representative of Eastern European andragogy, where andragogy is explicitly considered to be one of the pedagogical disciplines, with pedagogy as the superior discipline. Savićević (1999b) points out that this does not necessarily mean that andragogy belongs to pedagogy. Neither does it mean that andragogy is derived from pedagogy. In his opinion, German philosophy and pedagogy form a fruitful basis for andragogy, but they have two different starting points. Pedagogy has developed from philosophy and has a deductive structure. According to Savićević (1999a), andragogy has an inductive starting point and is a product of the labour movement and workers' education in the 1800s and the first decades of the 1900s.

THE PEDAGOGY–ANDRAGOGY RELATIONSHIP – THREE DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

The last part of this article looks more closely at three different perspectives concerning the pedagogy–andragogy relationship. All three perspectives are based on a traditional understanding of pedagogy and an understanding of andragogy in line with Knowles's andragogy. Consequently, these perspectives are pedagogy-distant.

A Dichotomous Perspective

A dichotomy is expressed by using the words "either" and "or". The assumption is that there are only two positions. When expressing it this way, you may be forced into one of these extreme positions.

In the 1970 edition of *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*, Knowles expresses a dichotomous perspective on the relation between pedagogy and andragogy. He describes the differences this way:

Pedagogy

- The pupil's role is dependency.
- The teacher is responsible for learning taking place.
- The pupil's experience is of little importance.
- The school/society decides what is to be learnt.
- The subject matter knowledge is not useful until later in life.
- The curriculum is organised in logical subject areas.

Andragogy

- The learner moves towards increasing self-directedness.
- The teacher encourages increasing self-directedness.
- Experiences become an increasing source for learning.
- Learn what you need to learn.
- Provides knowledge and abilities to cope with everyday life in a better way.
- Learning is organised around categories that enable learner competence development.

If you present two concepts as dichotomous, this is a false dichotomy if there are evident overlapping alternatives or if the two positions are not mutually exclusive. A false dichotomy can be used to force someone into an extreme position. Rothwell (2013) states that false dichotomies denote the tendency to view the world in terms of only two opposing possibilities when other possibilities are available and to describe this dichotomy in an extreme mode of expression. This gives people a predisposition to see problems and solutions only in extremes. Rothwell (2013) claims that such either-or descriptions lock us into a mindset of narrow vision. Most problems or events are somewhere in between, not black or white. Most likely, this also applies to the relation between pedagogy and andragogy. The either-or perspective may be too restrictive, thereby representing a false dichotomy.

Bright (2018) comes to the conclusion that Knowles's characteristics of adult learners, including self-directedness, rich experience, specific learning needs, competence and learning orientation, can all in different ways be applied to children as well. He also refers to Knowles's criteria to justify the distinctive and fundamentally different nature of adults as opposed to children. Bright (2018) claims that humanistic psychology does not make this distinction and would consider the criteria relevant to all humans. He asserts that the criteria were formulated to establish a specific field of adult learning and development. In this way, a false dichotomy is established by creating two subgroups within the population.

A Continuum Perspective

A continuum is a continuous sequence between two ends or extremes that are very different from each other. In this case, pedagogy and andragogy are the extremes of this continuum. To make the extremes different from one another, a traditional understanding of pedagogy is appropriate to use in this case. Between these extremes, there are lots of positions representing degrees on this unbroken line between pedagogy and andragogy. The elements change in character gradually without any clear dividing points.

In the 1970 edition of *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*, Knowles suggested a dichotomy in the subtitle, *Andragogy versus Pedagogy*. This dichotomisation of the relation to pedagogy was criticised, and in the 1980 edition, the subtitle was changed to *From Pedagogy to Andragogy*. This indicates a continuum rather than a dichotomy, suggesting that the difference between children and adults is a question of degree, not kind (Hartree, 1984).

Ozuah (2005) concludes that andragogy and pedagogy are opposed to each other but are not necessarily mutually exclusive paradigms:

It is true that the assumptions of pedagogy do not acknowledge the principles of andragogy (or adult learning theory), but rather focus on the dependent personality, subject-centeredness, extrinsic motivation, and irrelevant prior experiences. However, it should be noted that andragogy contains an appreciation and acceptance of pedagogy in many instances. For example, adult learning practitioners believe that pedagogy is an appropriate approach in situations where adult learners are truly dependent and have no relevant prior experiences. (p. 84)

However, he believes that practitioners of andragogy will gradually steer the learner away from the dependency of pedagogy towards increasing autonomy and self-direction (Ozuah, 2005).

Cross (1981) classifies Knowles's assumptions in personal and situational characteristics. Personal characteristics such as learning readiness and self-concept must be viewed on a continuum. They represent a gradual growth or development and do not belong to either childhood or adulthood. Situational characteristics, such as part-time versus full-time learning and voluntary versus compulsory, are dichotomous (Cross, 1981).

Humanagogy

An example of a continuum perspective is Knudson's (1979, 1980) approach that he calls humanagogy. His starting point is to consider human learning more by degree than by kind. Knudson states that it is the degree that separates adults from children in the learning situation, not the fact that they are adults and children. On this basis, he claims that adult educators can exclude neither pedagogy nor andragogy. By excluding pedagogy, you also exclude the adult who still acts and thinks like a child (Knudson, 1979, 1980).

Knudson's humanagogy takes into consideration that the adult has been a child. When a human develops, previous experiences will shape later experiences, which, in turn, will play a part in shaping later experiences and so on. Consequently, no experiences from earlier life will be lost; they are more or less integrated in later experiences. So experiences are very central to this approach: "To exclude principles of pedagogy from adult education is in essence to ignore the fact that as humans we retain a certain amount of childhood experiences which prevent us from operating differently at later ages" (Knudson, 1979, p. 262).

So the influence of previous experiences in learning situations is a central focus in humanagogy. If, for example, traumatic school experiences from childhood are dominating, the adult will act and react according to these experiences (that means acting like a "child"). If you "overcome" these experiences, they will not dominate the learning situation. Then the adult will be able to act like an "adult". According to humanagogy, andragogical principles

can be used in the latter case. Then the adult is able to cope with his/her “fear of learning” rooted in negative learning experiences. In Knudson’s (1979, 1980) opinion, andragogy is the proper approach for adults who are less psychologically caught up in their childhood experiences.

Unlike the separate terms of pedagogy and andragogy, humanagogy represents the differences and the similarities that exist between both adults and children as learning human beings. It approaches human learning as a matter of degree, not kind. Jarvis (2010) describes humanagogy as a *human* theory of learning and not a theory of “child learning”, “adult learning” or “elderly learning”. He states that it is a theory of learning that combines pedagogy, andragogy and gerogogy and considers every aspect of the presently accepted psychological theory (Jarvis 2001, p. 152). However, Jarvis characterises humanagogy as a clumsy word that has gained a great deal of currency since it was introduced, and he asks himself what makes humanagogy a concept different from that of human learning. In his opinion, Knudson’s term is probably unnecessary, even though his emphasis on human learning is very important (Jarvis, 2001, pp. 152–153).

Grow’s Staged Self-Directed Learning Model

Grow’s (1991) Staged Self-Directed Learning Model also represents a continuum perspective; it accounts for varying degrees along a continuum where teacher-centred learning and self-directed learning are the extremes. The move from the teacher-centred extreme to the self-directed one implies a move from a traditional pedagogical approach to an increasing emphasis on andragogical principles.

According to Grow (1991), self-direction is both a personal attribute that develops in stages and a situational response. The degree of self-direction can be a response to a specific learning situation, but it is also an ability that it is possible to learn. Therefore, the goal of the educational process must be to produce self-directed learners.

Students have varying abilities to relate to teaching that requires self-direction. Learners in stage 1 have little self-direction. They are dependent learners and learning is teacher-centred. Learners in stage 2 are moderately self-directed. They are interested and interestable, as Grow (1991) puts it, and the teacher should be a motivator and guide. Stage 3 is a transitional stage towards self-direction. The teacher is a facilitator, and the learners are involved in discussions facilitated by the teacher, who participates as an equal. Stage 4 learners are highly self-directed, and the teacher is a consultant and delegator. The learners can set their own goals and standards with or without help from experts (Grow, 1991).

There may be a bad coherence between the teacher’s role and style and the students’ stage of self-direction. The teacher must adapt to the students’ stage of self-direction and allow them to be more self-directed in their learning. Therefore, good teaching is situational by nature and this must be an integrated part of teaching. It must be individualised to fit the learners’ degree of self-direction and allow them to become more self-directed. Problems arise when the teaching style does not match the learner’s degree of self-direction.

An Orthogonal Perspective

Research carried out by Delahaye (1987) indicates that the relationship between pedagogy and andragogy is not necessarily linear or on a continuum; they are independent variables and consequently not subject to covariation.

The study was carried out among 205 students at the undergraduate level, who were taking a one-semester course in either psychology, human resource management or general management. The students were asked to respond to 25 andragogical and 25 pedagogical questions.

The study was based on the following assumptions underlying pedagogy and andragogy (Delahaye, 1987, p. 4; Marshak, 1983, p. 80):

Pedagogy

- It is teacher-centred.
- The teacher sets the goals.
- The teacher leads the learning process.
- The teacher evaluates the results.
- It is subject/topic oriented.
- It is the transmission of knowledge.
- The teacher encourages learning.
- The teacher has a central role in imparting new knowledge and skills.

Andragogy

- It is learner-centred.
- Learning is self-directed.
- The teacher is the facilitator.
- It is problem/project oriented.
- It uses experience-based techniques.
- Self-motivation is needed to encourage learning.
- The learners have a central role in acquiring new knowledge and skills.

If pedagogy and andragogy were on a continuum, a high score for pedagogy would cause a corresponding low score for andragogy and vice versa. This was not the result. The majority of the students had a high score on both pedagogy and andragogy focused questions. This reveals that the use of pedagogical principles does not simultaneously exclude the use of andragogical principles. The study also shows that the use of “many” pedagogical principles does not exclude the simultaneous use of “many” andragogical ones. One set of principles must not necessarily be reduced correspondingly when the use of the other set is increased. A relationship based on a continuum would imply that a lower degree of pedagogical orientation leads to a higher degree of andragogical orientation and vice versa.

Delahaye (1987) conceived of learner maturity as moving through the following four stages:

Stage 1: Low andragogy/high pedagogy

Stage 2: High andragogy/high pedagogy

Stage 3: High andragogy/low pedagogy

Stage 4: Low andragogy/low pedagogy

He used the term “learner maturity” to give reasons for the amount of pedagogical and andragogical principles in the learning situation. Learner maturity consists of the learner’s past experiences, expectations, attitudes to the coming learning event and the amount of present knowledge in the subject area (Delahaye, 1987).

A natural starting point is Stage 1, “high pedagogy” and “low andragogy”. Delahaye (1987) states that this stage represents the Knowlesian interpretation of pedagogy. Here, we find the learners with low “learner maturity”. The learner needs the support of pedagogical structure. As learner maturity increases, the learner may be interested in some andragogical “liberties”, but is simultaneously not confident enough to leave the support provided by the pedagogical structure. This is a learner at Stage 2. As the process proceeds, the learner increasingly dares to free himself from the structure of pedagogy and indulge in the principles of andragogy. This is a learner at Stage 3. At Stage 4, the learner participates in learning without the assistance of a teacher or a facilitator. He or she needs neither the structure of pedagogy nor the mutual support and guidance of andragogy (Delahaye, 1987).

CONCLUSION

This article highlights some distinguishing features of the pedagogy–andragogy debate:

- When pedagogy and andragogy are compared, the idea that pedagogy equals traditional pedagogy/“schoolmaster-pedagogy” is generally taken for granted.
- Andragogy is generally conceived of in line with Knowles’s andragogy; different notions of andragogy are rarely accounted for.
- The fact that progressive pedagogy has influenced andragogy to a great extent is rarely mentioned.

Neither pedagogy nor andragogy is an unambiguous term. A reliable comparison implies a clarification of the terms included. The fact that pedagogy today is different from the one in the 1920s is hardly ever made an issue. When the comparison is carried out on the basis of traditional pedagogy or “schoolmaster-pedagogy”, the difference between pedagogy and andragogy is found to be great. Traditional pedagogy possesses characteristics such as learner dependency, content- and teacher-oriented learning, and external motivation, while learner experience has little importance. The above characteristics of traditional pedagogy will be highly misleading when it comes to establishing the characteristics of andragogy, not least when it comes to learner experience. As already commented in the introduction, “schoolmaster-pedagogy” might be considered a more extreme variant of traditional pedagogy, leading to an even greater difference between pedagogy and andragogy.

On the other hand, the basis for comparison is completely different if it incorporates progressive pedagogy, which has obviously contributed to a different view of education. Moreover, if we also take into consideration that North American and parts of European andragogy are largely influenced by progressivism, the basis of comparison is further changed.

The article also discusses the relationship between pedagogy and andragogy from a dichotomous, continuum, and orthogonal perspectives. Here, too, the basis is a traditional view of pedagogy and a view of andragogy that is in line with Knowles's andragogy.

In certain contexts, the conclusion is that pedagogy should be replaced by andragogy. Based on what has been previously discussed in this article, it is necessary to know what understanding of pedagogy and andragogy is used.

REFERENCES

- Bright, B. P. (2018). Epistemological vandalism: Psychology in the study of adult education. In B. P. Bright (Ed.), *Theory and practice in the study of adult education: The epistemological debate*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429436758>
- Conaway, W. (2009). *Andragogy: Does one size fit all? A study to determine the applicability of andragogical principles to adult learners of all ages* [Doctoral dissertation]. Walden University.
- Cross, K. P. (1981). *Adults as learners*. Jossey-Bass.
- Davenport, J. (1987). Is there any way out of the andragogy morass? *Lifelong Learning*, 11(3), 17–20.
- Delahaye, B. (1987). The orthogonal relationship between pedagogy and andragogy: Some initial findings. *Australian Journal of Adult Education*, 27(3), 4–8.
- Elias, J. L., & Merriam, S. B. (1995). *Philosophical foundations of adult education* (2nd ed.). Krieger Publishing Company.
- Finger, M., & Asún, J. M. (2001). *Adult education at the crossroads: Learning our way out*. Zed Books.
- Fischer, J. C., & Podeschi, R. L. (1989). From Lindeman to Knowles: A change in vision. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 8(4), 345–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260137890080405>
- Gehring, T. (2000). A compendium of material on the pedagogy-andragogy issue. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 51(1), 151–163.
- Grow, G. O. (1991). Teaching learners to be self-directed. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 41(3), 125–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001848191041003001>
- Hartree, A. (1984). Malcolm Knowles' theory of andragogy: A critique. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 3(3), 203–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260137840030304>
- Höghielm, R. (1985). *Undervisning I KomVux: Ideal och verklighet i grundskolekurser* [Instruction in KomVux: Ideal and reality in primary school courses; Studies in Education and Psychology 18]. Stockholm University.
- Holmes, G., & Abington-Cooper, M. (2000). Pedagogy vs. andragogy: A false dichotomy? *The Journal of Technology Studies*, 26(2), 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.21061/jots.v26i2.a.8>
- Jarvis, P. (2001). Malcolm S. Knowles. In P. Jarvis (Ed.), *Twentieth century thinkers in adult & continuing education* (2nd ed). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203819708>
- Jarvis, P. (2010). *Adult education and lifelong learning: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Kapp, A. (1833). *Platon's Erziehungslehre als Pädagogik für die Einzelnen und als Staatspädagogik, oder dessen praktische Philosophie* [Plato's educational theory as a pedagogy for the individual and as state pedagogy, or its practical philosophy]. Essmann.

- Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy*. Association Press.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Association Press.
- Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Knowles, M. S. (1989). *The making of an adult educator. An autobiographical journey*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knudson, R. S. (1979). Humanagogy anyone? *Adult Education Quarterly*, 29(4), 261–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074171367902900406>
- Knudson, R. S. (1980). An alternative approach to the andragogy/pedagogy issue. *Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years*, 3(8), 8–10.
- Lindeman, E. C. (1926). *The meaning of adult education*. Harvest House.
- Loeng, S. (2013). Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy – an andragogical pioneer. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 35(2), 241–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2012.749850>
- Loeng, S. (2017). Alexander Kapp – the first known user of the andragogy concept. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 36(6), 629–643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2017.1363826>
- Loeng, S. (2018). Various ways of understanding the concept of andragogy. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1496643>
- Marshak, R. J. (1983). What's between pedagogy and andragogy? *Training & Development Journal*, 37(10), 80–81.
- Ozuah, P. O. (2005). First, there was pedagogy and then came andragogy. *The Einstein Journal of Biology and Medicine*, 21, 83–87.
- Pöggeler, F. (1957). *Einführung in die Andragogik: Grundfragen der Erwachsenenbildung* [Introduction to andragogy: Fundamental issues on adult education]. A. Henn Verlag.
- Reischmann, J. (1996). Andragogik: Wissenschaft von der Bildung Erwachsener [Andragogy: Science of the education of adults]. In K. Derichs-Kunstmann, P. Faulstich, & R. Tippelt (Eds.), *Qualifizierung des Personals in der Erwachsenenbildung* (pp. 14–20). Deutsches Institut für Erwachsenenbildung.
- Rosenstock, E. (1924). *Andragogik*. Pass & Garleb.
- Rosenstock-Huussy, E. (1925). *Andragogy – 1925*. <http://www.argobooks.org/feringer-notes/t24.html>
- Rothwell, J. D. (2013). In *mixed company: Communicating in small groups and teams* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Sandlin, J. A. (2005). Andragogy and its discontents: An analysis of andragogy from three critical perspectives. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 14, 25–42.
- Savičević, D. M. (1999a). *Adult education: From practice to theory building*. Peter Lang.
- Savičević, D. M. (1999b). Understanding andragogy in Europe and America: Comparing and contrasting. In J. Reischmann & J. Z. Michal (Eds.), *Comparative adult education 1998: The contribution of ISCAE to an emerging field of study* (pp. 97–119). Slovenian Institute for Adult Education.
- Tate, E. D. (1986). Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy: Revolutionizing communication theory. In M. Darrol Bryant & H. R. Huussy (Eds.), *Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy: Studies in his life and thought* (pp. 89–108). The Edwin Mellen Press.