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Abstract

This updated History and Philosophy of Andragogy is mainly limited [with a few exceptions] to a chronological history and the accompanying philosophy of andragogy, in line with when the English language documents were published and personal descriptions of events were recorded. Some of these documents, however, present aspects of the events and ideas which recount the years and contexts prior to the time in which they appeared in published form. To date, nearly 400 documents have been discovered, but space limitations in this paper allowed the inclusion of only a fraction of that number. Each of 14 time periods are articulated with selected works.

Early Appearances of Andragogy, 1833-1927

The term ‘andragogy’, as far as we know, was first authored by Alexander Kapp (1833), a German high school teacher. In the book entitled ‘Platon’s Erziehungslehre’ (Plato’s Educational Ideas) he describes the lifelong necessity to learn. He turns his attention to adulthood – Andragogy or Education in the man’s age [a replica of this may be viewed at the following website] [http://www.andragogy.net]. The term andragogy lay fallow for many decades. Nonetheless, in the 1920s Germany became a place for building theory and another German resurrected the term (Reischmann, 2004).

Rosenstock-Huessy (1925) posed andragogy as the only method for the German people and Germany, dispirited and degenerated in 1918 after World War I, to regenerate themselves and their country. He suggested that all adult education (andragogy), if it is to achieve anything original that shapes man, which arises from the depths of time, would have to proceed from the suffering which the lost war brought them.

About the same time, Lindeman (1926) from the USA traveled to Germany and became acquainted with the Workers Education Movement. He was the first to bring the concept to America that andragogy is the method for teaching adults. The term was published in English only a few times in the first 100 years it existed. However, the use of andragogy increased in the almost eighty years that followed, which brings us up to the writing of this article.

Andragogy’s Second American Appearance and its Foundation Being Established, 1964-1970

Another extensive period of time elapsed until the term andragogy was published in English. This time, it appeared in Great Britain. Simpson (1964) proposed and issued a call that andragogy could serve as a title for an attempt to identify a body of knowledge relevant to the training of those concerned with Adult Education.
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Knowles (1970) indicated that he acquired the term in 1967 from Dusan Savicevic. [It was actually in 1966 (Sopher, 2003)]. However, after becoming acquainted with the term, Knowles infused it with much of his own meaning garnered from his already extensive experience in adult education.

**Movement Toward Applying Andragogy To Human Resource Development, 1971-1973**

Furter (1971), from France, proposed that universities recognize a science for the training of man to be called andragogy. The purpose would be to focus not on children and adolescents, but on man throughout his life.

Ingalls (1972) provided the first handbook guide to using andragogy in helping adult educators [they called them ‘trainers’ in those days] become more systematic and consistent in their engaging learners in the learning process. This was developed and tested in a branch of the US Government.

Knowles (1973) focused a full application of his conception of andragogy toward the Human Resource Development (HRD) Movement. He worked vigorously in the corporate sector and thus saw the importance of testing and relating andragogy within it.

**Emergence of Self-Directed Learning Skills As A Major Way To Implement Andragogy, 1975-1981**

Knowles (1975) published his guidebook for learners and teachers on the topic of Self-Directed Learning relating it to Andragogy. For him, andragogy was the underlying philosophy, and self-directed learning was a means to implement andragogy.

Hadley (1975) in his Doctoral Dissertation at Boston University developed and validated an instrument for assessing an adult educator’s andragogy and pedagogy orientation. The instrument was labeled as the Education Orientation Questionnaire (EOQ).

Kabuga (1977), an adult educator from Africa, advocated using highly participative teaching/learning techniques with children. He was quite committed to and convinced of the value of the andragogical idea in all education.

Mezirow (1981), developed a critical theory of adult learning and education, and laid the groundwork for what he called a charter for andragogy. This included the core concepts that would enhance adults’ capability to function as self-directed learners.

Suanmali (1981), a doctoral student of Mezirow, focused his dissertation research on Mezirow’s charter for andragogy. He found support and agreement among 174 adult education professors and practitioners for andragogy.

**Strengthening the Numerous Uses of Andragogy Along With Growing Controversy and Resistance Toward It, 1981-1984**

Christian (1982) provided the andragogical perspective of assessing the Student’s Orientation Questionnaire (SOQ). This instrument was based upon Hadley’s (1975) Educational Orientation Questionnaire (EOQ).

Allman (1983), who was associated with the Nottingham [UK] Andragogy Group, considered the strong connection between brain plasticity (fluid intelligence) and adult development. She asserted that Mezirow’s (1981) and Knowles’ (1970, 1980) understanding of andragogy could be linked and merged with her idea.
Nonetheless, some lack of enthusiasm about Knowles’ andragogy concept was reflected by Hartree (1984). She expressed the feeling that Knowles’ andragogy did not live up to what she interpreted as his desire for its becoming a comprehensive learning theory for adult education.

Jarvis (1984) wrote that the theory of andragogy had moved into the status of an established doctrine in adult education. However, he thought it did not have the grounding in sufficient empirical research to justify its dominant position.

Not to be deterred at this point, Knowles (1984) presented the first book in which he cites thirty-six extensive case examples of applying andragogy in practice. In it he revealed what worked and what did not.

**Identifying the Stronger European Base of Andragogy in Comparing it with the American Base, 1985-1988**

Young (1985) perceived the European concept of andragogy as being more comprehensive than the American conception. He considered that most Europeans do not use the terms andragogy and adult education synonymously.

Taylor (1986) offered a very strong and articulate research based model for the andragogical process of transition into learning for self-direction within the classroom. This is from the learners’ point of view and has various phases on a cycle of what may be characterized as a cultural journey.

Ross (1988) connected the concept of andragogy and its value with some of the research on teacher effectiveness. He believed that teachers’ behavior relates to student achievement.

Davenport (1987) questioned the theoretical and practical efficacy of Knowles’ theory of andragogy. He suggested that adult education would simply be better off to drop the word from its lexicon.

**The Foundation of Trust Undergirds Andragogical Learning Despite The Andragogy Debate 1989-1991**

Henschke (1989) developed an andragogical assessment instrument entitled, Instructional Perspectives Inventory (IPI). The central and strongest major core of this instrument was originally and still is a focus on the teacher trust of learners.

Nadler (1989) stated that Human Resource Development (HRD) is based in learning, and every HRD practitioner should have an understanding of the theories of Adult Learning. This was a crucial observation, because many in HRD have overlooked that consideration.

Krajinc (1989) perhaps provides the most beneficial definition of andragogy. She states, “Andragogy has been defined as…’the art and science of helping adults learn and the study of adult education theory, processes, and technology to that end’ ” (p. 19).

Long (1991) speculated that although Knowles’ form of andragogy is weak in empirical confirmation, it has survived the criticism leveled against it. Two reasons are that Knowles is a leader in the field and is widely respected for other contributions.

**Scientific Foundation Of Andragogy Being Established Amid Skepticism and Misunderstanding: 1991-1995**

Savicevic (1991) provided a critical consideration of andragogical concepts in five western European Countries, and five eastern European Countries. He also drew on sources from ancient times. This comparison showed common roots and indicated endeavors toward
andragogy as a fairly independent scientific discipline. Additionally, he credited J. A. Comenius in the seventeenth century with being regarded the founder of andragogy.

At this time, there was again strong criticism of American andragogy, and that coming from Candy (1991) in Australia. At the time Knowles articulated andragogy, self-expression and personal development were in vogue. Thus, self-directed learning and andragogy were gaining some prominence in becoming known as autonomous learning.

Houle (1992) in contrast, emphasized the impact of Knowles on American andragogy, and how he worked this out in practice especially in non-school settings and the workplace. He went on to indicate that scholars and theorists may find great value in Knowles’ discussion of the development of learning theories in the educational literature, and his exploration of the roots of his own thinking about theorizing.

Kaminsky (1993) suggested that whether we have knowledge for naming something academically or not, we may still be practicing pedagogy, andragogy, or any other ‘gogy’ or ‘ism’. This is the reason she selected that idea from hooks (1994). Kaminsky finds Mr. Ferro’s remarks snobbish and exclusionary sounding as it appears that he does not want anyone, other than ‘linguists’, to try and name the world, or even to make up new ways of naming things. She argues that he wants that job to belong to the expert name-makers, who, it seems, can never be adult educators, let alone people who have never seen the inside of a college or high school.

hooks (1994) said “the possession of a term does not bring a process or practice into being: concurrently one may practice theorizing without ever knowing/possessing the term…” (p. 61). It is sometimes later that this kind of practice is given a label that comes into common use.

Poggeler (1994) listed trends which he hopes will be helpful for future development of European andragogical research. These include at least: International knowledge, “development-andragogy” of the Third World, and understanding the “lifeworlds” of the participants.

Zmeyov (1994) clearly supported andragogy. He stated that the most important trend in adult education in Russia is the application and further development of Knowles’ (1970, 1980) theory of adult learning, or andragogy.

Milligan (1995) scientifically investigated andragogy. He conceptualizes his summary of it as the facilitation of adult learning, most notably used in nursing education, has elements of andragogy within it.

Henschke (1995) focused on describing a dozen different episodes with groups in various settings. He successfully applied his understanding and adaptation of Knowles’ theory of andragogy.

**Momentum Gained Against Andragogy While Counter Arguments Assert Its Value, 1995-1998**

Welton (1995) asserts that “the ‘andragogical consensus’…formulated by the custodians of orthodoxy in the American Commission of Professors in the 1950s and solidified by Malcolm Knowles and others in the 1960s and 1970s, has unraveled at the seams” (p. 5). He articulated that the fundamental accusations expressed are because this perspective inadequately serves the interests of the disenfranchised in North American society.

Van Gent (1996) asserted that andragogy has been used to designate the education of adults. He considered that its future lies only as a generic term for adult education.

Hanson (1996), from the other side of the discussion, called for adult educators not to search for a separate theory of adult learning [andragogy]. He suggests that we remove many of
the unsubstantiated assumptions based on almost utopian beliefs about the education and training of adults linked to un-contextualized views of learning and empowerment.

Houle (1996) talks about Knowles’ work in andragogy. He said that it remains the most learner centered of all patterns of adult educational programming around the globe.

Rostad (1998) outlined the library of the Nordic Folk Academy as a meeting place and an information center specialized in non-formal adult education, adult learning and andragogy. It applies andragogy to avoid any adults being marginalized.

**Antecedents To An Historical Foundation of Andragogy Being Extended And Broadened 1998-2000**

Henschke (1998a) asserted that long before the term andragogy appeared in published form in 1833, ancient Greek and Hebrew educators used words that were antecedents to andragogy. His definition of andragogy moved in the direction of calling it a scientific discipline of study.

Zmeyov (1998) aptly defined andragogy differently from others. He said that andragogy is “the theory of adult learning that sets out the fundamentals of the activities of learners and teachers in planning, realizing, evaluating and correcting adult learning” (p. 106).

Draper (1998) presented an overview of the historical forces influencing the origin and use of the term andragogy. He concluded, “Tracing the metamorphoses of andragogy/adult education is important to the field’s search for identity.” (p. 24).

Henschke (1998b) also emphasized that, in preparing educators of adults, andragogy becomes a way of being or an attitude of mind, and needs to be modeled/exemplified by the professor. Otherwise, if we are not modeling what we are teaching, we are teaching something else.

Further, Hoods Woods (1998) perceived andragogy, as related to wilderness teaching, being based on four environmental influences interacting in every being. They are: External (Physical); Internal (Physical); External (Spiritual); and, Internal (Spiritual).

The most comprehensive of all the publications on andragogy is a book that includes thirty of Savicevic’s (1999) publications within a twenty-six year period. His work has addressed how andragogy has and will shape all aspects of adult education.

Boucouvalas (1999) insisted that refined methodological or epistemological tools and indicators are critical for sound research in comparative andragogy. However, the role and influence of the ‘self’ of the researcher in the research process, is an equally critical element to be considered.

Savicevic (1999) indicated that Knowles was inconsistent in determining andragogy and thus had caused much confusion and misunderstanding. The most glaring mistake of Knowles was that he declared andragogy as a ‘model’ for teaching even in pre-school, thus moving it away from just applying to adults.

It has been suggested by Savicevic (1999) that andragogy is defined as a scientific discipline. Thus, it deals with problems relating to HRD, Adult Education, and learning in all parts of a person’s life.

Osborn (1999) declared that andragogy has the potential to play an important role in distance learning. However, she found that students need to be coached to understand the teacher’s expectations.

Henschke (1999) explored the gap between ‘learning’ and ‘performance’ within the andragogy concept relating to Adult Education and Human Resource Development [HRD]. He
concluded that the two distinct terms together are different sides of the ‘same coin’; and their close relationship is the key to HRD.

Savicevic (2000) also explored various antecedents to and backgrounds of andragogy before the term came into publication. In this he added another component to the scientific foundation of andragogy.

Ovesni (2000) proposed three research concepts and models of andragogues’ professional preparation. They are modeling: Andragogical personnel; viable tendency toward distinction; and, diversification within the process of education.

Reischmann (2000) indicated that in 1994 he changed the Otto Freiderick University, Bamberg, Germany, ‘Chair of Adult Education’ to ‘Chair of Andragogy’. His understanding differentiates ‘andragogy as the research’ and ‘adult education as the practice’ in the education and learning of adults.

Johnson (2000) applied and tested andragogy as an approach to learning that includes a focus primarily on the needs of the learner in every aspect of his/her life. He also asserted that given most, if not all definitions in the social science literature, andragogy could qualify as a theory or at least an emergent theory.


Billington (2000) found that with sixty men and women, there were a number of key factors relating to implementing andragogy. If they were present, it helped them grow, or if they were absent, it made them regress and not grow.

To the arguments questioning the value of Knowles’ approach to andragogy, Maehl (2000) addresses the philosophical orientations of a number of adult educators. He suggests that Knowles led in the direction of making andragogy quite humanistic that gained wide adoption in the field.

Grace (2001) considered that Knowles’ andragogy as a theory of how adults learn was losing much of its punch by 1990 as a result of the discussion and controversy surrounding it. He felt that Knowles’ perspective is too much caught up with extraneous matters.

Mason, et al. (2001) indicated that air carrier check airmen could benefit greatly from Henschke’s (1987) andragogical model in their preparation for becoming instructors in the pilot learning program. Most especially, they considered implementation of the plan will help pilot instructors display flexibility in their approach.

Merriam (2001) also posited that the scholarship on andragogy since 1990 has taken two directions. One stream seeks the establishment of a scientific discipline. The other stream critiques andragogy as being de-contextualized. She emphasized that andragogy is one of the major ‘pillars’ of adult learning theory.

Cooper and Henschke (2001) showed the continuing discovery and expansion of a much broader conception of andragogy than Knowles’. It was then published in the Serbian Language, in the Andragogy Journal in Yugoslavia to an audience largely acquainted with andragogy in one of its most pure forms, as it is credible in the University of Belgrade.

Rachal (2002) clearly identified seven criteria suitable for implementation in future empirical studies of andragogy. Those criteria are: Voluntary participation, adult status, collaboratively-determined objectives, performance-based assessment of achievement, measuring satisfaction, appropriate adult learning environment, and technical issues.
Kajee (2003) reported on the impact of using andragogy with English as a Second Language (ESL) in a South African university. This approach had a positive bearing learner autonomy and self-directedness.

Haugoy (2003) identified andragogy closely with various models of flexible open classrooms for the independent students in many countries. These models go back more than a century to Bishop Grundtvig’s life path.

**Bringing European and American Andragogy Closer Together As Distance Education Emerges, 2003-2004**

By this time a connection was emerging between andragogy and distance education. Simonson, et al. (2003) identified a number of characteristics needed in distance education systems designed for adults that are derived from Knowles’ concept of andragogy.

Andragogy showed the strength through its long history in Europe (Savicevic, 2003). He indicates that comparative andragogy has numerous elements that are essential in addressing this scientific research topic.

Sopher (2003) asserted that Knowles’ work is best understood by practitioners and researchers only if certain rules are observed. They are: It is accurate, humanistic, contextual, and recognizing of the role that adult education movements, he influenced and influenced him in the USA, plays in Knowles’ theory of andragogy.

Nevins (n.d., circa, 2003) asserts that successful business leaders are masters of andragogy. They need to quickly gather the facts and make decisions.

Wie (2003) articulated the aims, needs, motivation, skills, self-confidence, learning conditions and responsibility of learners in andragogy. These andragogical principles guarantee learning success and quality of adult learning.

Drinkard and Henschke (2004) found contrasts in nurse educators. Those who have a doctoral degree in other than nursing (andragogy to be specific) are more trusting of their learners in the classroom than nurse educators who have a doctoral degree in nursing.

Reischmann (2004) added some historical perspective to the scientific basis of andragogy. This related to whether a term such as “andragogy” was necessary, or that the field of adult education has been or will be able to flourish and do its work without a unique term.

Illeeris, (2004) is not an andragogue, but a pedagogue. He indicated that he is quite in line with Knowles’ agitation for andragogy as a discipline, which is different from the pedagogy of children’s schooling and upbringing.

Merriam (2004) has questions about whether andragogy is a theory. Nonetheless, she asserted that certainly andragogy is here to stay as one of the major landmarks in the development of adult learning theory.

Birzer (2004) presented an ‘andragogical guide’ which may be useful for criminal justice educators who desire to experiment with innovative approaches to foster a more effective teaching-learning transaction in various classes. Complexity of this guide related to the level of planning that one must perform in order to apply Knowles’ (1973) andragogical principles regarding: Structure of material, student level of maturity, student objectives, class size, and classroom schedule.

**The Hesitation Concerning Andragogy Continues While Many Still Stand By Andragogy 2005-2006**
Sandlin (2005) admitted that andragogy was a cornerstone of adult education for many decades. Notwithstanding, she has serious reservations about its prominence, and critiques it within the areocentric, feminist, and critical adult education perspectives.

Stanton (2005) related the andragogical concept to the concept of readiness for self-directed learning. There was not only congruence between the two, but also the Henschke (1989) Instructional Perspectives Inventory [IPI] was validated as an almost perfect ‘bell-shaped’ measurement of an andragogical facilitator.

Reischmann (2005) made a clear distinction in his definition between andragogy and adult education. He defined andragogy as the science of the lifelong and lifewide education/learning of adults. Adult education is focused on the practice of the education/learning of adults.

Another use of the principles of andragogy is in the public school setting. The purpose of Stricker’s (2006) research was to determine the attitudes of principals toward teachers as learners. He found a gap between how the principals viewed themselves and how the teachers viewed them.

Wilson’s (2006) research had turned into a book that was published. This was regarding the historical emergence and increasing value of brain research and andragogy in Germany and the USA.

**Knowles’ Prominent Long Range Contribution to Andragogy’s Continuance Into The Future 2006-2009**

Savicevic (2006a) has been working in andragogy for a half-century. He observed that since his first visit to the USA in 1966, up through 2006, the identifiable trace of andragogy on USA universities is that there had not been a single serious study on adult education and learning that did not refer to andragogy as a conception.

Isac (2006) analyzed that in their efforts in Romania to innovate, adult education/andragogy was completely neglected during the Communist Regime from 1945 to 1989. He recognized that it would now take much to renew these valuable andragogical traditions according to contemporary imperatives of the European Union.

As if seeking to culminate and bring together all these valiant efforts, Savicevic (2006b) does a thorough historical tracing of the converging and diverging of ideas on andragogy in various countries. He seeks to help lay a scientific research foundation for andragogy being the studying of the learning and education of adults. Savicevic also reflected about his perception of Knowles’ position in sustaining andragogy over the long range of its history into the future.

Forty years in development of a science is not a long or ignorable period. I met professor Knowles four decades ago and argued on term and on concept of andragogy. Since then, the term and the concept of andragogy enlarged and 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 on mass events. He told me that he lectured on 10,000 visitor stadiums. As if he was inspired by an ancient agonistic spirituality! His contribution to the 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. (p. 20)

Although Newman (2007) declared he was not a fan of andragogy, he said that in his estimation Knowles had contributed something to adult education and andragogy that was quite
unique. As he thought it through, he came to the conclusion that Knowles provided a means to assess the needs of adult learners, and he could not detect that any other adult educators provided such. They only had talked about assessing adult learner needs.

Isenberg, (2007), provides a break-through framework for bringing together the interaction of andragogy and Internet learning. She presents a dynamic design to meet the goal of the International Commission on Adult Education for the Twenty-first Century, focusing on five pillars of lifelong learning: To know, to do, to live together, to be, and to change.

Cooper and Henschke (2007) present a fully documented perspective on andragogy which has been absent from all previous author’s published discussions. This has been an open and up-front facing of a topic (andragogy) that by many has been considered unimportant to the adult education field.

Boucouvalas (2008) highlighted the emphasis that Knowles gave to group / community / society in his treatment of andragogy. Earlier perspectives on the purpose of adult learning included its serving a higher purpose than just the individual.

Vodde (2008) found that while a traditional, pedagogical, military model of training may have at one time served the needs and interests of police and society, its applicability and efficacy has been called into question. It was theorized that an andragogical (adult based) instructional methodology will serve as a more effective means for training police recruits.

Pleskot-Makulska (2009) presented a paper on andragogy at the Commission on International Adult Education (CIAE) Pre-Conference of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE) Conference, November, 2009, in Cleveland, Ohio. Her excellent paper also appeared in the Proceedings of that Conference. To make certain her paper is represented accurately, following is a quote from the abstract she provided of that paper.

In recent times steps are being taken to strengthen the position of andragogues in the job market in Poland. The presentation is centered around the system for their training in that country, with focus on education undertaken as part of the andragogical specialization at the Faculty of Education at the University of Warsaw. (p. 143)

**Conclusions on The History and Philosophy of Andragogy**

This is a History and Philosophy of Andragogy around the world, based on numerous English language documents. There are a total of nearly 400 English Language documents identified for the broad research on andragogy through 14 time periods. Only a fraction of these documents are included in this work. Two Hundred more are waiting to be included in further iterations of this research. Nonetheless, andragogy is not just the work of one or a few persons, but is the result of efforts by multiple people from numerous nations around the globe. The reader is invited to join that effort. Please contact the author at the e-mail address provided on bottom of the first page of this article.
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