

THE CONCEPT “EDUCATING”: A RECONSIDERATION*

W. A. Landman
University of Pretoria

Rethinking the concept “education”. When faculties of education occupied themselves with educating a child, equating education with the pedagogical created no problems. However, extending their activities to include the field of andragogics necessitates the extension of the concept education to also include the andragogical. Arguments for and against this are discussed by referring to the viewpoints of several educationists.

Introduction

Many educationists view educating as an event occurring from the cradle to the grave. In this case, a distinction must be made between educating a child (the pedagogical) and educating an adult (the andragogical). Educating, then, is the intervention of an educator as pedagogue or as andragogue with a person as helping (supporting) that person on his way to proper adulthood or to a still more proper adulthood. The educative aim, as pedagogical aim, is proper adulthood, while the educative aim, as andragogic aim, is still more proper adulthood. The educative situation, as pedagogic situation, gradually becomes an educative situation as an andragogic one. Pedagogical structures become andragogical structures. The pedagogical aim structure becomes an andragogic aim structure—a person is never complete, but remains a person-on-the-way (Homo Viator). Consequently, a Faculty of Education has both a pedagogical and an andragogical task.

The problem with which Faculties of Education today are increasingly confronted is that the andragogical task which comes to the fore so clearly in activities such as non-formal educating, educational administration, tertiary didactics, educational research

Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Opvoedkunde, 1989, Vol. 9, No. 3*
From web site: http://www.landmanwa.co.za/art89.02a_eng.htm

and curriculum studies cannot be accommodated by a definition which equates educating with the pedagogical.

Educating as the pedagogical

Educating, which can be equated with the pedagogical, is defined as the intervention of an educator/pedagogue with a child, as helping him on his way to adulthood. Educating, then, is the intervention of an adult with a non-adult to make the latter independent. It must always be kept in mind that educating is the intentional influencing of a non-adult (educand) by an adult (educator) with the specific aim of bringing about change which is valued. It is an intentional acting which gives a particular direction to the child's becoming adult. Also, this requires acceptance and, thus, cooperation from the educand. There is no mention of lawful (predictable) results. Educating is not an activity which lasts indefinitely, because to the extent that the educand is able to make independent choices and accept responsibility for them, the educator steps into the background and leaves the youth's forming to himself.

Educating, as the andragogical

Educating which is equivalent to the andragogical is defined as an event where support giving adults and support-receiving adults come together so the latter can be helped to become more proper adults. This has to do with that reality where the being together of adults can be seen as andragogic situations, i.e., the reality of educating is the total of all andragogic situations.

If the reasoning thus far is accepted, this means that the science of educating can be known as Education with its pedagogic and andragogic components.

EDUCATION = PEDAGOGICS + ANDRAGOGICS

Pedagogics and andragogics

Pedagogics, as the science of educating, is derived from the Greek: *pais* = child; *paido* = boy + *agien* = to lead; *agogos* = leader.

Andragogics, as the science of educating, is derived from the Greek: *aner* = man, adult + *agogos* = leader, guider: accompanying an adult. It is the science of the mutual guidance (accompaniment) of adults.

Thus, Faculties of Education practice the science of education in the form of pedagogics and andragogics. Hence, the unity of human forming, from the cradle to the grave, is preserved.

The Faculty of Education prepares pedagogues to take accountable pedagogic actions. The pedagogue (in the pedagogic situation) takes accountable pedagogic action when he actualizes pedagogical structures. The teacher, as pedagogue, does this especially during his giving a lesson, but also as part of his helping guidance to a child so the latter can learn in the most effective way possible or improve his relations with reality—he must be able to do this in proper and adult ways. The andragogue takes accountable andragogic action when he sees and actualizes pedagogical structures as andragogical structures. He does this also in the form of helping guidance to support-seeking adults to improve their relations with a particular reality (e.g., particularly, vocational reality)—there is always mention of becoming, of adulthood-in-becoming.

In both parts (aspects) of education, i/e., the pedagogic and the andragogic, the primordial fact of being a person is expressed, i.e., the agogic, as persons accompanying each other; the guidance is from one to the other, there is dependence on the commitment of the one to the other.

Comentary of Professor C. G. DE VRIES (University of Stellenbosch)

The use of the name education for the period of youth as well as adulthood, indeed, succeeds in solving a difficulty but, at the same time, it creates another knotty one.

The use of the name **child** education, **adult** education, and **elderly** education make it possible to refer to the entire event of accompaniment as follows:

EDUCATION (Science of Education, Agogic Science) = PEDAGOGICS + ANDRAGOGICS + GERONTAGOGICS.

The use of the term Education as an agogic science (i.e., science of accompaniment) solves a particular difficulty. However, a problem which is created is that the names **child**, **adult** and **aged** refer to WHO is accompanied, and not to WHAT the NATURE of that

accompaniment is. If, indeed, they refer to the nature, this means that educating is assumed to be the same in each of the three situations. For this reason, preference is given to the concept **educating** for the period of youth, **forming** for the period of adulthood, and **caring** for the period of old age. These indicate the **nature** of the accompaniment or activities and, thus, indicate the type of situation they are. This holds in all situations, e.g., medical, social, and juridical. The nature of the activity is the distinctive and defining factor regarding what the name ought to be.

Where adults are with each other, educating (educative guidance/accompaniment) does not occur, but rather the accompaniment is **formative** in nature. The same holds for the Gerontagogic. Here the conspicuous accompaniment is aimed at caring (bodily and spiritually), hence, caring accompaniment.

Considering the previous paragraph, it also is possible to refer to educating as follows: educating with children, formative educating with adults, and caring educating with the aged. Now the emphasis falls on the **nature** of the **activity** (accompaniment, educating) and not on the components conceived to be in the situation of accompaniment.

Despite the above possibilities, preference is given to educating in the period of youth, forming in the period of adulthood, and caring in the period of old age. The activities are as follows: educative intervention (accompaniment), formative intervention (accompaniment) and caring intervention (accompaniment).
EDUCATION = PEDAGOGICS + ANDRAGOGICS + GERONTAGOGICS.

The objection to the use of the concept education for the accompaniment of a person from the cradle to the grave is that education, in my opinion, is a pedagogical category which stems from the child anthropological categories of dependency, needing, and seeking help. The dependency, need, and seeking help of the adult calls forth the andragogic category of forming, and not educative accompaniment/guidance.

“More complete adulthood” is more satisfactory than “proper adulthood”. In my opinion, adulthood refers to the fact that “more

complete wisdom” is attained to the extent that it concerns attaining the demands of a particular culture. After further forming, as well as self-forming, “more complete wisdom” is attained. Adulthood refers to a dynamic way of being a person which must be conquered by and through educating, and perpetuated through continued forming and self-forming to attain a continually higher degree of adulthood. The child is becoming adult, while the adult is an adult who is becoming. The use of education for the adult, i.e., adult education, creates problems regarding adulthood as the total aim of education. Education, as well as self-education (the child’s part in digesting the intervention with him), is viewed as concluding with adulthood. This problem is found in the appropriate reference in English to “child education” and “adult education”.

Considering the above, the following pedagogical perspectives on the education phenomenon are distinguished:

Comentary of Professor W. J. LOUW (University of Pretoria)

The questions from practice are often directed to technology, and sometimes to academicians for consideration. Questions of this nature and type do not always fit easily into existing academic structures, i.e., into existing academic faculties and departments. On the one hand, this explains the growing need for a multi-disciplinary approach and, on the other hand, to the need to expand or reorganize existing academic structures.

The growing questions from practice regarding matters such as non-formal education, educational administration, and research methodology are examples of aspects of the lifeworld which appear as problems which qualify for academic reflection and clarification, but which do not simply fit into the existing departmental structures of Faculties of Education. The fact that these problems do not fit easily into academic structures does not mean that they are academically unworthy or that they are excluded from the original structure of reality by the phenomenological reduction and reflection and cannot be addressed. This simply means that the nature of human relationships with reality are more complex, more nuanced, and more sophisticated, and that these modifications require greater and even more intense academic accountability.

In this connection, Landman asks if the traditional concept “education” and the traditional names of Faculties of Education, and clusters of academic departments can address these changes accountably. As an investigator of educative interventions, and as knower of contemporary thinking about the phenomenon education, it is not strange that he asks this radical question. The way the question is framed suggests that everyone concerned with it is invited to critically re-investigate related standpoints. With this, I follow with a few of my personal opinions:

The proposition of many educationists who view educating as “an event occurring from the cradle to the grave,” is to open up and reduce the appearance of the phenomenon education to such a degree that important distinctions and nuances are going to be lost. Also, such a view leads to a semantic snare, because in one place it is stated that the pedagogue and andragogue provide help leading to proper adulthood (pedagogue) and still more proper adulthood (andragogue), and in another place that

“educating is not an activity which continues indefinitely because, to the degree that the educand is able to make independent choices and accept responsibility for them, the educator steps into the background and leaves his forming to the young person himself” [self-forming].

A second problem arises when educationists interpret the phenomenon education so “openly”, i.e., that a convenient leveling of the structures which underlie the pedagogic phenomenon are merely taken as an acceptable explanation of the andragogic; for example, “The pedagogic aim structure becomes an andragogic aim structure”. When the educand can make independent choices and accept responsibility for them, he is an adult. An adult who reaches a further state of proper adulthood with the guidance of another adult is not something other than an adult—he represents in the quality of his activities only a refining or perfecting of the **idea** adulthood. In this sense, the aim structure is elevated to a “first” or “primary” structure which itself is oblivious of the phenomenological demand which structures are in coordination. In this respect, it can be asked if the authority structure is the same in a pedagogic and an andragogic situation.

Regarding this last aspect, it is interesting to notice that juridical agogic intervention with a child and an adult are differentiated into “compulsory education” and “life obligation”. The qualification of the “obligation” in the two concepts distinguishes the nature of the authority structure—the one can be compelled, while for the other there is an ethical expectation which is not necessarily always actualized properly. No child can reach the state of adulthood without the educative intervention of an adult. In contrast to this, adults can reach a state of more proper adulthood without the agogic intervention of another adult.

The conclusion that EDUCATION = PEDAGOGICS + ANDRAGOGICS, indeed, can be drawn, if it is accepted that the educative reality is the totality of all andragogic situations. However, it is not the educative activity (pedagogic activity – “pais” + “agogos”) which is central, but rather the “agogos” in pedagogics and the “agogos” in andragogics. For this reason, the conclusion is that AGOGICS = PEDAGOGICS + ANDRAGOGICS. Should one want to change the name of a faculty of Education to reflect guiding a child and adult then there should be mention of a Faculty of Agogics. Such a name change perhaps will be difficult to accept—even some educationists find it difficult to use the term Pedagogics in place of Education.

The agogical situation (both pedagogical and andragogical) is an ordinary everyday life phenomenon. However, the scientific interpretation and explanation of it is complex because the great variety of nuances between a child’s and an adult’s relations with reality differentiate the area of the pedagogical and the andragogical. It is only when the pedagogue and andragogue notice these nuances and implement them in guiding the child and adult that the educative-effect and becoming-effect can be guaranteed as far as possible; for example, the nuances of the didactic structures in designing the guidance in the preschool and in distance teaching for adults are quite different. One sees the same nuances of fundamental structures as a rationale for differentiation in other scientific areas: a Pediatrician and Internist depart from the same fundamental anatomical and physiological structures, but a pediatrician is not necessarily an internist and the reverse.

Landman's concern about subject names to house the different problems from practice in an academic structure is scientifically accountable. Subject naming is not merely an academic affectation, but it lays the foundation for the scientific act because it delimits the area of scientific intervention, i.e., the terrain or scientific area for which the academician must hold himself accountable. Certainty about the terrain is a precondition for scientific focus, as well as the touchstone in terms of which the validity of scientific pronouncements are decided.

Refined subject naming is primarily a matter for academics. The community served by the academy is not primarily interested in the refined subject naming but in the solution of problems which are experienced in the community. It is the academic's task to inventory the problems and needs of the community, and to canalize the attention of the subject specialist.

If the subject specialist does not have a name, he also does not have an area of responsibility, and it is in this spirit that the above is stated, i.e., to interpret and name the changed and changing questions from the community for a thorough and responsible academic accounting.

Comentary of Professor A. K. MOLLER (University of Pretoria)

Introduction

Whether education is viewed as a lifelong event or, on the other hand, as an event which is concerned with becoming adult, i.e., limited to childhood, is a question of taking a personal standpoint, or side with pronouncements in terms of paradigms which are held by a group/body/faculty.

The English, "upbringing," certainly can be limited to childhood, but "education" is a lifelong event (so also can this be reasoned about the concept "pedagogic").

Viewed from Afrikaans terminology, the continuous activity of forming is paired with "feeding," with knowledge, concepts, insights, proficiencies, and skills which are meaningfully assimilated. This activity should show a continuous progression which curves "upward". When the two concepts are brought together, then it can

be asked if the adult is continually “educated” to further adulthood. (“Further” does not mean “more” because adulthood is an achievement; thus, “further” means that there is a higher level of adulthood actualized, in the same sense, e.g., in which a full-fledged physician or engineer allows that someone who is professionally his equal, becomes better at problem solving because of his knowledge and skills).

With this, Landman’s further reasoning about the task of the Faculty of Education is endorsed. Indeed, one should not be tied down by terminology, and pay the price of the autonomy of thinking. It is not words which determine reality, but it is reality as such, which determines what words one uses to describe it, i.e., the terminology must follow the trail of reality.

Education as the pedagogical and education as the andragogical
Viewed in the light of the above commentary, one can do nothing other than subscribe to Landman’s argument. Perhaps a third dimension, the gerontagogical can be added to this because there is agreement that education is a lifelong event.

A question now arises naturally whether one must distinguish between educating adults and older persons. Are not the latter also adults?

One must be careful that many words or terms do not obscure the matter as such.

Pedagogic and andragogic

Once again, Landman’s argument is subscribed to. The only modification this writer would affect is to not state that the andragogue “sees and actualizes pedagogical structures as andragogical ones”, but that he “nuances and actualizes pedagogical structures into andragogical ones, and the nature of and the ways in which reality directs an appeal to the learners.”

Comentary of Professor D. P. J. SMITH (Rand Afrikaans University)
Basic points of departure in my reply

It is with hesitation Because of measureless respect, it is with great hesitation that I offer commentary on Landman’s deserving

thoughts, which again initiate a discourse on the concept of education. Out of regard for a valued colleague, I probably should refrain from critical commentary. But then I would neglect satisfying the appeal of the phenomenological step of thinking of intersubjective verification, and would make myself guilty of detachment from the growth of education as a science. Furthermore, many scientific writings by Landman are confirmation of his openness and willingness to enter a discourse. The *basic thesis* in my reply is that education does not need to imply an adult-not yet adult relationship; second, that there is too much pressure to define education away, and for it to be classified as forming, or mis-forming, for the sake of convenience; third, that the idea of adulthood, as educative aim, does not represent a conclusively fixed value; and last, that there can be only one perspective on education, i.e., an agogic perspective.

Education as an agogic activity

Education is not necessarily an adult-not yet adult relationship

In his reconsideration, Landman defines education in pedagogical terms, as the intervention of an adult with a non-adult to make the latter independent. In andragogical terms, education is defined as an event where support giving and support needing adults come together so those adults can be helped to become more proper adults. Landman presents the etymological meaning of the *peda-* and *andra-gogical*, and it is conspicuous that the common denominator is the *agogos* (leader or guider), the *agien* (to lead) and the *agogic* (guidance). In this regard, it also is important to indicate that the Latin *educare* means leading out, as well as the German “*erziehen*,” which means “to pull up”. It is used, then, in the sense of pulling someone up to where he is not yet, and to which he cannot arrive without help.

What is troubling is that educationists have traditionally accepted, in my opinion without a logical basis, that educative guidance,

in pedagogical terms, can only occur between an adult (grown-up person) and a non-adult (child); and,
in andragogic terms, can only occur between a (support giving) adult and another (support needing) adult.

For one or another inexplicable reason, it is suggested

that, e.g., a child cannot guide another child (indeed, if this is called forming); and
that a child, who already has attained wisdom or skill in a certain area of life, cannot guide an adult.

My objection to the narrowing of the phenomenon of guiding/accompanying, as presented by traditional educationists, is that they make the adult accompanier a structural precondition, and that this is a co-determinant of what is accepted as valid educating. Thence, forms of influencing which do not fit into this closed framework of guidance are typified as forming, or something other than educating. One important and most valid reason for the adult guided directedness is that the guider must be ready and able to accept responsibility for his guiding activity. The argument is that a child cannot yet accept responsibility for his guiding help to another child, or even to an adult in need of help.

On the question of accepting responsibility for guiding help, I have doubts. We dare not make too much of this. No primary or secondary educator can really determine the results of his educating and accept responsibility for it. For this reason, we distinguish between the task (process) concept and the product concept of educating. By the task concept of educating is meant the educative *activity* of the educator, irrespective of its result, for example, the *teaching* activity of the teacher. In contrast to this is the product concept of educating, which is only applicable if the child, indeed, has learned something meaningful.

Thus, what is important is that no primary or secondary educator ultimately really is accountable for the adult who appears on the other side (of his educating). Educating is a deed of faith and confidence, and certainly not a determined process of necessity. The parent of a child who unfolds into a magnificent young adult, wipes away a silent tear of thankfulness for the fortunateness of his educative stakes.

Forming is not the dumping ground for non-educative influences

To return to the argument of whether the guiding activity as such, of the guider as a person, must be a critical factor in the definition of education, the following also must be kept in mind: no educationist will deny the important, and even determining influence of the peer group. Especially from socio-education, voices are increasingly arising that, because of empirical data, view the peer group or social influences as even stronger than those of parent or teacher. This will not make sense if that influence is typified as forming, or even mis-forming, as if it occurs indirectly. Then we would, as in the past with the andragogic, narrow educative influences, and we would ignore other powers which potentially can have a decisive influence on the becoming of persons, and they are put away in the outside room to only be taken out when it suits us. Whether we typify the ways of intervening as educating, forming, mis-forming, drilling, forming habits, indoctrinating, teaching, socializing, giving therapy, etc. makes little difference. The fact is that each has an influence on the person's becoming which is important for the educationist to take note of. With this I do not suggest that it is erroneous to distinguish among these concepts; indeed, I think it is necessary. However, I object that so many of the ways of intervening are removed as non-educating, merely because they ostensibly do not satisfy the structural preconditions of a pedagogical or andragogical situation. However, we must remember that any structure does not exist alone but is merely instrumental to its effect. Because of the so-called pedagogical structure (adults, adults becoming, aim, content, etc.), we cannot eliminate actions, e.g., by classifying a peer group as non-educative. This should amount to a clarifying of the phenomenological method, which also can be described as a method by which there is an attempt to describe a phenomenon as it would describe itself if only it could.

What my argument amounts to, thus far, is that the emphasis must fall on the agogic activity itself, as well as on its (potential) effect. and that we must not assume the presence of either an adult or co-adults as a condition for such an agogic (educative) event. In this, my standpoint probably differs from that of Landman. Indeed, it also differs from his requirement that a support giving adult and a support-receiving adult must come together. For example, a good book can also have educative force. Consequently, I will let the emphasis fall on the influencing and not on the guider. Regarding

this, I believe Landman would be able to indicate that the co-adult or the one who gives guiding support is present in the book, as an instrument, and even is assumed in the word. I would not have a problem with this. Indeed, a naughty little boy can, in his naughtiness, suddenly develop a guilty conscience the moment he thinks of his father. His father has educative force, even in his absence. I have only tried to indicate that the idea of “being with” must not be taken literally.

If I now must venture to describe education, I state the following: Education finds its actualization and expression in situations of slight inequality (in knowledge, skills, perspective on propriety, etc.) between those involved, and which results in an agogic action directed to eliminating this slight inequality in terms of the demands of propriety. Thus, it is important that education be characterized by a particular type of relationship, i.e., an asymmetrical one, which finds its actualization there where the relationship is actualized in an activity of guiding.

This view of education confirms the view that it does not so much involve differences in age or social position, as differences in knowledge and skills, in independence, and in being of age. For me, with education, this has to do with differences in level of ability, in social formedness, and in the moral quality of those involved. The differences in age, bodily size, or adulthood status are of secondary importance.

Adulthood does not represent a conclusively fixed value

The idea of adulthood, as the aim of education, is somewhat problematic. The impression is easily given that adulthood is a conclusive point, or a fixed value, in mathematical terms, to be reached. Then, the impression given is that we educate a child to a particular fixed point. This then would be comparable to acquiring a diploma after a student has completed his studies with success. The only difference would be that we do not issue a diploma that certifies the child as an adult.

In his reconsideration, Landman concludes his definition of education in pedagogical terms “as providing help on his (the child’s) way to adulthood.” Where education is defined in

andragogical terms, Landman concludes “so that these adults can become more proper adults.”

What is immediately striking about the above is Landman’s implicit confirmation of the relativity or the incompleteness of the idea of adulthood. Without falling into unnecessary technical details and hair-splitting, all of us realize that, in everyday language, adulthood dawns when a person is in a position to accept responsibility for his own deeds, and when he can walk further on his path of life independently in terms of taking a personal position and financial self-sufficiency.

However, the problem is that both independence and responsibility, to mention only these two aspects of adulthood, are very relative and diffuse. In a society where one often is deprived of one’s readiness to accept responsibility by system- and power-structures, these dimensions of adulthood do not always enter the foreground. Just so, the prolonged cultural puberty, which correlatively can involve longer training and consequently dependence, delays a youth from standing on his own legs. Usually, we see the problem as not that a youth can or will carry responsibility, but rather as one of hindering carrying responsibility. I say part of the reason for this is that the limits of overstepping adulthood are vague and diffuse. Many youth might, e.g., already satisfy physical or psychic norms of adulthood yet, in societal terms (e.g., occupational engagement), not be accepted as adults. The opposite might also be true. Hence, what I try to show is that, to state adulthood as an aim of education, in many respects, is difficult to operationalize and to measure. Educating to adulthood, thus, in a certain sense is almost meaningless.

Landman’s reference to “becoming more proper adults” necessarily suggests a relative (not absolute) coming of age. Andragogic intervention can mean a reinforcing of what is already attained, i.e., adulthood, or it can mean educating (or is this forming?) in the direction of total (as completed) adulthood, or it can mean both.

What I bear down on is to highlight the dilemma which we, as educationists, cannot always show precisely when (child) education ends and (adult) forming begins. Thus, our reference to education,

in the one case, and forming, in the other, might appear to be superficial. However, I am a supporter of clearly distinguishing pedagogic and andragogic situations. Especially, in my opinion, the content, which can give structure to the pedagogic, cannot merely be projected onto the andragogic structure. Indeed, even in childhood, there is a shifting noticeable, e.g., in the nature of the relationship of authority. However, this is a matter which has not yet been examined decisively.

To link up with Landman where he deems the andragogical to be a field of study in addition to the pedagogical, I am in full agreement with him on this. A pedagogical perspective alone filters out too many relevant objects. Therefore, it would be preferable to talk of an agogical perspective by which the pedagogical as well as the andragogical can be accommodated as areas of study.

Comentary of Professor R. P. van ROOYEN (University of Fort Hare)

The following discussion is in terms of Landman's section of this work where he has described the present theme.

Introduction

Certainly, it can be accepted that the broad comprehensiveness of the concept (as interpreted via its definition) of education has contributed to the fact that this constituted pedagogic-phenomenon has been described ontologically-phenomenologically, contradictorily, dialectically, and hermeutically and, in doing so, has given rise to the Pedagogical as an autonomous science. In the same way, as Landman states directly, the concept education, as an event from birth to the grave, has a clear contribution to make to the constitution of the andragogical phenomenon. In Education Faculties, activities such as non-formal education, educational management, tertiary teaching, educational research, and curriculum studies can be described as andragogical matters with the aim, on the one hand, of a better forming of himself as an adult and, on the other hand, the improvement of providing help to children with whom such adults might intervene. With the constitution of an andragogical phenomenon, and the ontologicalphenomenological description of it, as Landman states

implicitly, excluded is the possibility that such a phenomenological description is towed along by a definition.

Educating as the pedagogical

In the context of the event described as “education”, the pedagogic phenomenon, indeed, can be discerned because it is clear that adults guide children on their existential way to becoming adult.

Education as the andragogical

It can be discerned that the andragogic phenomenon also can lay claim to a distinctive constituting within the comprehensiveness of “education”. In the same way, similar and differing phenomena are particularized within the education framework such as, e.g., gerontagogics; child guiding, where children can be partially responsible for guiding other children, and where “children” can even guide “adults”, i.e., didactically.

Pedagogical and andragogical

Here, what is particularly striking is the scientific quality of Landman’s statement when he writes:

“In ... the pedagogical and the andragogical, the primordial fact of being a person is expressed, i.e., the agogic as persons accompanying each other; the guidance is from one to the other, there is dependence on the commitment of the one to the other.”

This means that the agogic phenomenon is constitutive of the anthropological-ontological phenomena of guiding, as mentioned above. This also rightly means, as Landman has explicitly stated in other words, that the agogic phenomenon, in all cases, e.g., in terms of the pedagogical and the andragogical, is presupposed as continually being the same phenomenon, the same categorical structures. The agogic phenomenon alone does not assume the total object of knowing when there is mention, e.g., of the pedagogical and andragogical. It is precisely the prefixes ped (agogic) and andr- (agogic) which qualitatively distinguishes these two ways of being, as agogic phenomena, from each other. In the absence of this qualitative difference, there would only be one phenomenon constitutable. However, a phenomenon is equivalent to its

categorical constituent, and the reverse. Hence, each phenomenon must possess its own categorical structures. But, as already stated, the concept agogic, in both connections (pedagogical and andragogical) presupposes a single phenomenon where the prefix ped- and andr- qualitatively distinguish the two phenomena. Because the prefixes ped- (*paid* = child) and andr(a)- (*ander* = man, adult) both are *anthropos* and, therefore, presuppose the same anthropological categories, the two “stated” anthropological categories are qualitatively distinguished because of the experiential differences between child and adult. The constitution of the two distinct phenomena of the pedagogical and andragogical are grounded in this qualitative distinction. This means the pedagogical and andragogical categorical structures are the same, although their hermetics differ from each other.

Commentary of Professor J. J. PIENAAR (University of South Africa)

Statement of the problem

One of the enduring problems in Education is the difference between educationists who view the educative event as beginning with birth and continuing until death, and those who limit educative action to the period between birth and the attainment of adulthood.

If this matter is not expressed and described with clearly distinguishable concepts, even greater confusion and obfuscation will arise. Concepts such as child education and adult education are examples of terms which are more confusing than clarifying because they obscure the educative event, as is soon indicated.

This dilemma, which sometimes leads to great confusion can only be illuminated if the activities within an agogic context are clearly and meaningfully delimited. In an interesting commentary titled, “The concept ‘education’: a reconsideration”, once again, Landman opens the agogic conversation. What follows is an attempt to join in thinking about this.

Education as a pedagogic-agogic matter

What is very clear is that a person has a need for support and guidance from birth to death. However, what must continually be kept in mind is that the nature of this guidance differs according to

the various ways of human existence. A child is guided differently than an adult, or an aged person.

Thus, education is a term reserved for the particular intervention an adult takes with a child to bring that child(ren) to adulthood. Hence, education is a regional, agogic activity. Only children can be educated and, for this reason, adult education is a misnomer, while child education is a tautological concept, and both of these concepts preferably must be avoided.

Accompanying/guiding as an andragogic-agogic matter

The above is an attempt to indicate that educating implies a specific activity, while the help given to adults and the aged, if need be, must be distinguished from the term accompanying.

Accompanying/guiding, which normally can be described with the German “Bildung” (forming), ihus, in this one respect is an andragogic-agogic regionality.

This reduction of the problem of educating and accompanying, as two regional perspectives on the agogic, however, does not tell the whole story, because the matter of accompanying is much more involved than what is contended so far.

However, the space needed to thoroughly go into the variety and multidimensional nature of agogic accompaniment, such as, e.g., the mutual existential corrective is lacking. For the aim of this discussion, this matter is not gone into any deeper because now the agogic position of the Faculty of Education is going to be examined.

Pedagogic-andragogic task of the Faculty of Education

The earlier mentioned overview by Landman brings to the fore a variety of interesting perspectives. Among other things, he refers to the new problems confronted by faculties of Education. Considering the previous discussion, some of these aspects are examined.

To an increasing degree, the task of the Faculty of Education has broadened, and is summarized under the following different headings: the accompaniment of adults (prospective teachers) to educate children (formal education); the accompaniment of adults to guide young people and adults further (non-formal education);

and the accompaniment of parents, as adults, to educate children (informal education).

The task of the Faculty of Education regarding formal education
Faculties of Education in the Republic of South Africa, over the years, have had the task of preparing especially secondary teachers. In the past, this task was viewed particularly narrow, because it purely and simply had to do with the pedagogical, while here there is clear mention of an agogic matter.

The academician, as lecturer, is involved with adults (students) to reflect on the reality of educating, among other things, and to do research. Thus, these activities in Faculties of Education have two valences, i.e., an andragogical one, where the lecturer converses with students, as adults, about the reality of educating, and a pedagogical one, where this has to do with educating itself. The academician, as lecturer, not only must have knowledge of the reality of educating because, indeed, he is himself engaged also in an andragogic conversation.

Thus, in the case of formal education, the task of the lecturer is to unlock the reality of educating for his students. The task of the academician extends wider than the pedagogical because he also must have knowledge of the andragogical situation in which he finds himself.

The task of the Faculty of Education regarding non-formal education
Until recently, non-formal education was a neglected chapter in teacher preparation in this country, which is acquiring increasing prominence, and Faculties of Education have the task of trainers of trainees. It must not be allowed that trainers from any sector are involved with training where the agogical is misjudged. The aim must never be to provide the labor market with trained barbarians. It must be kept in mind that compulsory education can only last for six years. Thus, a 12-year-old child can land in a non-formal teaching situation where only three years of compulsory learning hold (White Paper on Teacher Preparation in the RSA, 1983:32). Thus, trainers who are involved in the three-year compulsory learning ought to have an agogic knowledge base at their disposal to

guide authentically. In this regard, Faculties of Education can make a particular contribution.

The task of the Faculty of Education regarding informal education
Strictly speaking, in the past, Faculties of Education had not much to do with informal education. Just as with non-formal education, here there also are important shifts and changes underway.

The modern parent is often at his or her wits end with educational ignorance in a precocious and changing scheme of things. Several educational problems, such as the need for authority, drug abuse, youth suicide, symptoms such as anorexia nervosa force the parent to seek information. Add the fact that the most important task of a right-minded parent has in life is to educate (bring up) his or her child(ren) effectively. In a polyvalent world with the correlated enormous demands, more expert help is often indispensable for the parent. The origin of the Afrikaans Parent Association across the country, in part, is evidence of this. Now, for the first time, in the history of education in the Republic of South Africa, the parent, as the primary partner in teaching and educating, are organized in a distinct body. The Faculty of Education ought to clarify and explore this area within the agogic field because it may not be omitted.

Commentary of Professor M. C. H. SONNEKUS (Emeritus professor, University of Pretoria)

Introductory remarks

It is with interest and great appreciation to acknowledge the above reconsideration, by Landman, of the concept “education,” as well as the commentary of various colleagues.

To complement the commentary, some questions are posed, which also can be viewed as criteria in terms of which the present problem, i.e., the “concept education: a reconsideration”, can be examined.

What is the essence of educating?

When educating is defined as “the intervention of an educator/pedagogue with a child, as providing help on his way to adulthood ... to make him independent” and, in addition, that it “requires acceptance and cooperation of the educand,” the question

arises regarding what this two-fold intervention (educator + child) includes?

From the side of the educator/adult, such intervention means a three fold acting or guiding.

1. Affective or emotional guiding, by which educating, in the first place, means an emotional addressing and educating. This springs from the child's emotional distress, known as helplessness or insecurity which, according to Langeveld, is the primary foundation for educating (See commentary of De Vries).
2. Cognitive or knowing guiding, which includes elucidating and explaining educating to a child. The best example, perhaps, is the explanation or elucidation of discipline or punishment, as well as the educator answering child questions. Thus, the child also must understand educating, and the guider must make it understandable.
3. Normative guiding, also known as the exemplification and emulation of values and norms to the child by the educator.

Commentary:

When this three-fold way of educating is "extended" to include the "andragogical", several questions arise about the essence of affective or emotional guiding, as applicable to the child in comparison with the situation of an adult. The idea of more proper adulthood alone is not sufficient justification for extending the concept "education". The child's educating is an entirely different situation, especially viewed emotionally, than that of an adult who must be guided.

The mentioned "acceptance" of educating by the child occurs through the child's own three-fold way of attributing sense and meaning:

1. Affective or emotional attribution of sense and meaning
2. cognitive or knowing attribution of sense and meaning, and
3. normative attribution of sense and meaning.

This three-fold way of attributing meaning is essentially the child's participation in his education and implies a complex totality event

known as the child's actualization of his psychic life. This cannot be gone into in greater detail, except to mention that this includes the child's experiencing of education, his willful choices, his knowledge of education, and especially his lived experiences of education.

Commentary:

This giving of sense and meaning by a child, indeed, is unique because of the fact that he is not yet adult and, thus, finds himself in a phase of becoming, as well as because the guiding (affective, cognitive, and normative) directly influences his attribution of sense and meaning. Such an attribution of sense and meaning is going to differ radically from that of an adult, who receives guidance from another adult, and cannot be equated with education.

The nature of the pedagogical educative relationships known as

the pedagogical relationship of trust,
the pedagogical relationship of understanding, and
the pedagogical relationship of authority,

can be questioned regarding the child and the adult who are guided in the different pedagogic and andragogic situations (also see the commentary of Louw, Pienaar, and Smith). Briefly, the question is how these relationships exist in the andragogic situation and how they differ (from a pedagogic one). It is obvious that the relationship of authority will appear entirely differently in the andragogic situation, and the fact that authority is accepted as a precondition for educating a child casts great doubt on whether, in the case of the andragogic, there can be mention of educating.

Educating must come to an end to qualify as a phenomenon for Pedagogics

This statement has special meaning and has become familiar through the well-known thought of Langeveld. Educating comes to an end with the attainment of adulthood.

To add the andragogic to the pedagogic, and then to label both as "education" does an injustice to the essence of education and, therefore, also 'pedagogics'.

Education can only be equated with Pedagogics, otherwise one runs the risk of falling into the English speaking “Education”, which is used with many meanings. EDUCATION = PEDAGOGICS + ANDRAGOGICS, thus is unacceptable.

If andragogics should be viewed as part of education, one can ask what would be the reaction of Continental European pedagogicians to such a point of view?

Conclusion

There cannot be agreement with the idea of extending the concept “education” to include andragogic guidance. The latter rather must be known as “forming”.

The activities such as non-formal education, tertiary didactics, educational research, and curriculum study are important matters of teaching and must be viewed as such. If Faculties of Education will perform these tasks, they are matters of teaching, but they cannot therefore be known as “educating”. Such “teaching” then is carried out and falls outside education.

Commentary of J. L. van der WALT (Potchefstroom University of Christian Higher Education)

Introductory comments

Landman’s thoughts on broadening the concept of “education” and on the possible changed task of Faculties of Education was stimulating. The commentaries of the other educationists, on the one hand, was exciting but, on the other hand, needlessly a complete reaction to Landman’s views. On close examination, however, it will appear as if a perspective ought to be taken on the following matters mentioned by Landman and the other colleagues:

- *the problem of terminology in education
- *the question of whether education is a lifelong event
- *the question of whether education progresses through a number of phases
- *the question of the broader task of Faculties of Education.

Viewpoints which address each of these problems by far do not do justice to the views of Landman and other colleagues, but time and space do not allow for much more.

Problem of terminology in Education

Many of the terminological difficulties which educationists experience can be blamed on the inability to authoritatively standardize, once and for all, concepts, such as “education”, “pedagogics”, “andragogics”, etc. for the entire community of educationists. One cannot find fault with the ways in which Landman wants to standardize the concepts, providing the laws of logic are not violated (such as some colleagues have shown). A term must have an unambiguous meaning within the context it is used; therefore, it is of the greatest importance that, at the beginning of any exposition, the author define his terminology in such a way that the reader can accept the terms as unambiguous within the frameworks of the author’s own exposition. This does not have to do with whether the reader necessarily agrees with the author’s definition. From the commentaries, examples can be given where Landman’s colleagues differ, not as a consequence of logical problems, but because of their own standardized terminology. The latter, then, works “paradigmatically”, and makes it extremely difficult to understand or to accept the other person’s terms.

The question of whether education is a lifelong event

In reformative educationist circles, Landman’s ideas of broadening the term “education” do not make a stir. Many of these educationist’s view education in every case as an event which continues for as long as a person lives. The problem lies in the term “adulthood”. Some colleagues have indicted that the term is context-structurally defined (church, state, etc.). “Adulthood” is an extremely diffuse concept to be used as the final aim of educating. Given their view of persons, it is understandable that not one reformative educationist accepts the principle that complete religious adulthood can be attained in this life. Considering this, educating then can be viewed as a continual lifelong task. There also is nothing in the word “education” per se which says it must necessarily be an activity with children. Educating literally means “feeding from above”, and the word can be understood in a religious sense as “feeding” persons of God (which all persons in

every case are, if they are aware of or recognize this or not) “to” their true Origin (God) or their supposed origin (an idol).

Also, in other languages, there is nothing in the term (word) as such, which implies that the word refers only to children. “Educate” is derived from the Latin *duco, educatum*, merely meaning “to lead forth or out”. “Erziehen,” in German, has, in its stem, the idea of “pulling”, “drawing”, as does the word “*tug*” (discipline), which goes back to the Old Dutch word “*tiegen*”, and which also means “*tug*”. It appears that the Zulu word “*imfundiso*” originally meant something such as “enculturation” or “socialization”, and makes no reference to intervention with children, per se. In addition, the Greek root word “*agoo*” (as in pedagogy) also only means. “I lead”, in this simple form.

Thus, there is nothing in the words/terms, used for the activity of leading a person, which even says that they refer only to intervening with children. The words “educate” (not taken as teaching), “erziehen”, “agogy”, thus, all can be viewed as correlatives which refer to “leading”. Even the addition “of persons,” such as “leading persons” is not inherently implied, and is a broadening of the range of meanings of the terms educationists have made. To say the words only refer to leading children, again, is to narrow the range of meanings. Those who choose to broaden and/or narrow the words’ range of meanings are free to do so with the risk that terminological confusion in Education can be the result:

1. educating as merely leading
2. educating as leading a person (broadening of 1)
3. educating as leading children (narrowing of 2).

Yet another way of broadening the concept is to view educating as “equipping” or as “unlocking”, which is current under reformative educationists. Another way of broadening the concept is to divide educating into “agogic phases”, such as the ped-agogic, andr-agogic, neani-agogic, geront-agogic, such as what Landman has done, partially in his proposal. To do so is in order, **providing** that a person defines the dividing principles, and the terms of the phases, with respect to natural work frameworks. Incidentally, Landman’s

proposal tallies with the long held view of reformative educationists, that education is a lifelong event—as noted above.

There is a particular rationale behind this view of education as a lifelong event or activity. The rationale lies in the anthropological given of a continuous asymmetry between persons. No two persons ever are completely alike; there exists a degree of difference between, and two persons who contact each other, and the one who possesses more of the talent for which the other has a need, takes a position of leading (equipping) the other. In this relationship, age has nothing to do with the matter; only more versus less talent, as well as the need or desire to eliminate the asymmetry is of significance. This situation shows itself lifelong to each person. Authority also plays a role in the elimination of the degree of difference (asymmetry) but not as what often is meant. The authority which arises in educating is normative authority (for a Christian, the latter is theonomous in nature: *theos* = God; *nomos* = law). As long as one person has the authority of the norm “on his side”, he has at his disposal a form of educative power. This explains why a ten-year-old child can admonish and reprimand his father, if the latter curses crudely, as soon as he hits his thumb with a hammer.

One colleague indicates directly that the term “education” historically is so loaded that only with difficulty can one work with it scientifically. Because, in the past, it was applied so inaccurately and unscientifically that educationists have given preference to terms which can only be applied in scientific (pedagogical) circles. This use, however, leads to the situation in which Landman, in his contribution, is checkmated. There are only two possible ways to handle the dilemma of confusion. The one is to use educating consistently with “agogic”, and to replace Education with “Agogical”. The second is to continue with the terms “educate” and “education” and, each time, to say clearly what is meant by them. The English have an even greater problem with “education”, which can mean educating and teaching, and also “education”, but one gives no indication of creating a number of new terms. They avoid confusion merely by clearly operationalizing their meanings.

The question of whether education progresses through several phases

In the previous section, it was indicated that it is possible to broaden the concept education by indicating the target person to whom the leading is directed, thus:

pais (child)

neanias (youth)

aner (adult)

gerontos (oldster, aged), each plus *agoo* ("I lead").

The idea of educating as leading is continually maintained, but the person to whom the leading is directed changes. It also will seem as if there is no absolute boundary between these phases, and that a person gradually proceeds from one to another. The boundary is established and maintained by agreement in a particular community. The age or date of retirement can be viewed as the boundary of the andragogic and the gerontagogic.

To give expression to the qualitative differences which appear in each phase, colleagues in their commentaries proposed that different words must be used, such as child: educate; adult: form; aged: care. In this line of argument followed here, such a step is problematic because the term "educate" then is only reserved for leading children, while it is indicated that this is not necessarily the meaning enclosed in the word.

"Educate" is a word or term chosen as the name or designation for an entire phenomenon which appears among persons, and which has a structure (a divine plan). It is important to indicate that this entire phenomenon or structure is not enclosed in the word (term) "educate", but that the word "educate" only is the label for a phenomenon with a structure which appears among persons. If one analyzes the phenomenon—and educationists are rather in agreement with this—one finds that the structure possesses characteristics (features, categories, a nature; essence, aim, content, core element, limitations, possibilities, etc). What it is that each of these things implies shows a parting of the ways.

Reformative educationists, e.g., view educating in its essence as

forming, in its function as unlocking, and in its destination (aim) as pliable.

So viewed, education in all the phases proposed by Landman (and others before him), in each case, is essentially forming, the function of which, in each case, is unlocking, and the aim, in each case, is pliable. “Forming”, thus, is not reserved only for the child phase and unlocking also is not reserved only for the adult phase. The person to whom the intervention is directed, in each phase, does not determine the essence of the phase, let alone its nature, i.e., the way in which the essence of the leading comes to expression or embodiment.

The question of the broader task of Faculties of Education

Fortunately, all universities have retained their Faculty of Education even though some of the departments within them, in the past, narrowed their won task to “Such-and-such a pedagogics”. Thus, the faculties continually have maintained the broader perspective on the phenomenon among persons which we call “educating”, i.e., as a lifelong event. The lifeworld outside it, and the demands placed on the faculties make the narrow approach (only “pedagogics”) unacceptable. Whoever will continue on this path, will reach irrelevancy, and will miss the boat. Landman’s reconsideration, thus, is timely and is to be treated seriously.

Concluding comments by Landman

From the above commentary, it can be concluded that, with respect to the *uppermost boundary* of education, two clearly distinguishable schools of thought exist:

1. Educationists who see the uppermost boundary as that time when the threshold to adulthood is crossed, but who continually deal with the problem that “adulthood” is not a closed, fixed, completed representation of values and that certain andragogical activities cannot be accommodated in Faculties of Education;
2. educationists who see education as an event without boundaries, which occurs from the cradle to the grave, but who continually deal with the problem that the lack of

boundaries possibly can lead to obstructing the appearance of the pedagogical.

It is common to both schools of thought that the emphasis must fall on the agogical activity itself. The agogical is decisive and overarching, and it also makes it possible for pedagogical structures to be nuanced into andragogical structures, and to notice the pedagogical and andragogical as regional agogics.

The following are *general* comments:

1. It can be argued that educating must be equated with the pedagogical as the primary field of a Faculty of Education. Andragogical activities with which Faculties of Education involve themselves are placed there only for organizational reasons. Such a view will not be satisfying to thinkers focused, e.g., on an epistemological foundation.
2. The pedagogical has an uppermost boundary which coincides with the lowermost boundary of the andragogical. In the “gray area” between the pedagogical and the andragogical, pedagogical structure become andragogical ones which indicate that here one has to do with the same reality or phenomenon (the agogic reality), with qualitative differences.
3. When this has to do with an agogical perspective on pedagogical and andragogical structures, as two sides of the same reality (both are ontic), and the activity is emphasized, the structural preconditions for this activity, and who is involved in the activity, cannot be ignored, otherwise there is mention of ignoring essential matters.
4. The pedagogician must not ignore child-child guidance, and child-adult guidance because both have significance for becoming adult: the former for promoting proper adulthood, and the latter for being on the way to more proper (fuller, additional) adulthood. The pedagogician must notice that there is a difference between task responsibility (responsibility for adequate educating) and outcome responsibility (responsibility for what someone has made of his educating).
5. The pedagogical and the andragogical have to do with the same anthropos and, therefore, their understanding occurs in

the light of the same anthropological categories. If it can be shown that education is an anthropological category, then educating embraces the pedagogical and the andragogical.

6. A child is guided differently than an adult, and with this guiding, his effective knowing and sensing experiences become unique and different, but still they remain valid as the same structural preconditions for guiding: the agogic, in the form of the pedagogical and the andragogical still are one reality.

Summary (Landman's English summary)

Introduction

Many educationists view education as an occurrence extending from the cradle to the grave. In this respect, one must distinguish between child education (the pedagogical) and adult education (the andragogical). Education, then, is the intervention of an educator, being either a pedagogue or an andragogue, with another person to assist (support) the other person on his or her way to proper or even more complete adulthood. The pedagogical aim of education, thus, is proper adulthood, while the andragogical aim is more complete adulthood. The educational situation, as a pedagogic situation gradually becomes an andragogic situation. Pedagogical structures become andragogical structures. The pedagogic aim structure becomes the andragogic aim structure—a person is never complete, but remains en route (*homo viator*). Therefore, a Faculty of Education's task is both pedagogical and andragogical.

Nowadays, some Faculties of Education are increasingly faced with the problem of a definition, which equates education with the pedagogical and, in doing so, makes no allowance for the faculties' andragogic function, which includes activities such as nonformal education, educational management, tertiary education, educational research and curriculum studies.

Education as the pedagogical

Education equated with the pedagogical can still be defined as the intervention of an educator/pedagogue with a child, with a view to assisting (supporting) the child on his or her way to adulthood. As such, education is described as an adult's intervention with a not-yet adult person for the latter to become independent. It must

always be kept in mind that education is the intentional influencing of a not-yet adult person (educand) by an adult (educator), with the particular aim of bringing about worthwhile changes. It is an intentional act which guides the growing up of the child. It must be accepted by the child and requires his or her cooperation. Results are not of the nature of cause and effect. Education, as the pedagogical, does not continue indefinitely because, as the capability of the educand to make choices independently and to accept responsibility for decisions made, increases, so the educator's intervention with the educand decreases.

Education as the andragogical

Education equated with the andragogical can be defined as an occurrence where supporting adults and adults in need of support are (come) together so that those in need can be assisted to become more complete adults. It has to do with a reality where the being together of adults can be seen as andragogic situations, in other words, the education reality is the total of all andragogic situations.

If the argument, thus far, is accepted, the science of Education can be known as Education, with its components of pedagogics and andragogics. EDUCATION = PEDAGOGICS + ANDRAGOGICS

Pedagogics and andragogics

Pedagogics denotes the science of education, and the word pedagogics is derived from Greek *pais* - child; *paido* - boy + *agein* - to lead; *agogos* - leader.

Andragogics also denotes the science of education, while the word andragogics has its origin in Greek *aner* - man, adult + *agogos* - leader, attendant; andragogy (-ics): the science of the leading of adults by adults.

The science of Education, in the form of pedagogics and andragogics is practiced by Faculties of Education. Thus, the unity of human development, which extends from birth to death, is maintained.

The Faculty of Education trains pedagogues to act in a pedagogically responsible way. The pedagogue (in the pedagogic situation) acts in a pedagogically responsible way, and the adult as a pedagogue does

this especially during a lesson, but also as part of his assistance to the child so that the child can learn, in the most efficient way, to improve his relationships with reality. The andragogue acts in an andragogically responsible way when he recognizes and realizes andragogic structures. He does this in the form of assistance to adults who need support to improve their relationship with a particular reality (e.g., the vocational reality).

In both modes of education, i.e., pedagogics and andragogics, the essence of being a person is expressed, i.e., the agogical, as the going together/accompanying of each other as human beings, the guidance of one person by another, the dependence of the one on the other.

English speaking educationists do not have this problem, because “education” is a broad concept. In fact, the broadness of the concept could be a problem to English speaking educationists.