

THE CONCEPT “EDUCATING”: A RECONSIDERATION*

W. A. Landman
University of Pretoria

Rethinking the concept “education”. As long as faculties of education occupied themselves with child education, equating education with the pedagogical created no problems. The extension of activities to the field of andragogics has, however, necessitated the extension of the concept education to also include the andragogical. Arguments for and against this are discussed by referring to the viewpoints of a number of educationists.

Introduction

Many educationists view education 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 pedagogic 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. Pedagogic structures become andragogic structures. The pedagogic 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 pedagogic and an andragogic task.

The problem with which Faculties of Education today are increasingly confronted is that the andragogic task that comes to the fore so clearly in activities such as non-formal educating, educational administration, tertiary didactics, educational research and curriculum studies cannot be accommodated by a definition that equates educating with the pedagogical.

Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Opvoedkunde, 1989, Vol. 9, No. 2
From web site: http://www.landmanwa.co.za/art89.02a_eng.htm

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 in order to make the latter independent. It always must 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 that is valued. It is an intentional acting that 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 that 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 that 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 in order to 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 in order to improve their relations with a particular reality (e.g., and in particular, vocational reality)—there is always mention of becoming, of adulthood-in-becoming.

In both parts (aspects) of education, namely, the pedagogic and the andragogic, the primordial fact of being a person is expressed, namely, 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 that 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.

In light of 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.

In spite of 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 that 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 that must be conquered by and through educating and perpetuated through continued forming and self-forming in order 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”.

In light of the above the following pedagogic perspectives on the education phenomenon are distinguished:

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

The actual questions from practice often are 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 life world that appear as problems that qualify for academic reflection and clarification but that 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 that 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”, namely, that a convenient leveling of the structures that underlie the pedagogic phenomenon merely are taken as an acceptable explanation of the andragogic; for example, “The pedagogic aim structure becomes an andragogic aim structure”. When the educand is in a position to 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 that in itself is oblivious of the phenomenological demand that structures are in coordinateion. 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 that 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”) that 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 in order 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 primarily is 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 that 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 was stated, i.e., in order 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 that 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 particular paradigms that 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 that are meaningfully assimilated. This activity should show a continuous progression that 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 that determine reality but it is reality as such that 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 effect 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 also 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 on the basis of measureless respect that I offer commentary on Landman’s deserving thoughts that 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 control and would make myself guilty of detachment from the growth of education as a science. Furthermore, a number of 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 misforming 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, namely, 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*” that 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 traditionally have accepted, in my opinion without a logical basis, that educative guidance

in pedagogic terms only can occur between an adult (grown-up person) and a non-adult (child); and
in andragogic terms only can 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 that 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 in a position 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 that only is 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 that 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 on the basis 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 that 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 that 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 pedagogic or andragogic situation. However, we must remember that any structure does not exist in itself but merely is instrumental to its effect. On the basis of the so-called pedagogic 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 that 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 either of 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 be (come) together. For example, a good book also can 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 that 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, namely an asymmetrical one that 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 easily given is 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 andragogic terms Landman concludes “so that these adults can become more proper adults.”

What immediately is 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 more or less 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 operationalized and to measure. Educating to adulthood, thus, in a certain sense almost is 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 already is attained, namely 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 that 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

between pedagogic and andragogic situations. Especially, in my opinion, the content that 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 that 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, dialectially and hermeutically and in doing so has given rise to the Pedagogic 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 andragogic-phenomenon. In Education Faculties activities such as non-formal education, educational management, tertiary teaching, educational research and curriculum studies can be described as andragogic 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 andragogic-phenomenon and the ontological-phenomenological 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 pedagogic

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 andragogic

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” even can guide “adults”, mainly didactically.

Pedagogical and andragogical

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

“In ... the pedagogic and the andragogic, the primordial fact of being a person is expressed, namely, 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 pedagogic and the andragogic, 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 pedagogic and andragogic. It is precisely the prefixes ped-(agogic) and andr-(agogic) that 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 constituents and the reverse. On this basis each phenomenon must possess its own categorical structures. But as already stated, the concept agogic in both connections (pedagogic

and andragogic) 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 pedagogic and andragogic are grounded in this qualitative distinction. This means the pedagogic and andragogic 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 that are more confusing than clarifying because they obscure the educative event, as soon will be indicated.

This dilemma that sometimes leads to great confusion only can be illuminated if the activities within an agogic context are clearly and meaningfully delimited. In an interesting commentary titled “The concept ‘education’: a reconsideration”, Landman once again 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 that an adult takes with a child in order 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 that normally can be described with the German “Bildung” (forming) is thus in this one respect 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 more 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 will not be 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. In light of the previous discussion, some of these aspects will be 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) in order 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 in order 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 narrowly because it purely and simply had to do with the pedagogic while here there is clear mention of an agogic matter.

The academician as lecturer is involved with adults (students) in order to reflect on the reality of educating, among other things, and to do research. Thus, these activities in Faculties of Education have two valences, namely 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 andragogical 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 that 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 only can 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 in order 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 often is at his or her wits end with educational ignorance in a precocious and changing scheme of things. A number of 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 often is 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 also great appreciation to acknowledge the above reconsideration by Landman of the concept “education” as well as the commentary of the various colleagues.

To complement the commentary some questions are posed that also can be viewed as criteria in terms of which the present problem, namely 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 ... in order 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 that, according to Langeveld, is the primary foundation for educating (See commentary of De Vries).
2. Cognitive or knowing guiding that also 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 essentially is 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 also finds himself in one or another phase of becoming as well as because the guiding (affective, cognitive and normative) directly influence 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” that 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 also 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 of 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 that 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 that 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 on the basis 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 educationists view education in every case as an event that 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. In light of this educating then can be viewed as a continual lifelong task. There also is nothing in the word “education” per se that says it necessarily must 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 (that 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, that 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) that goes back to the Old Dutch word “*tiegen*” and that also means “tug”. It appears that the Zulu word “*imfundiso*” originally meant something such as “enculturation” or “socialization” and also 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, that 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 that refer to “leading”. Even the addition “of persons” such as “leading persons” is not inherently implied and is a broadening of the range of meaning of the terms educationists have made. To say the words refer only to leading children again is to narrow the range of meaning. Those who choose to broaden and/or narrow the words’ range of meaning 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 reformatory 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 longheld view of reformative educationists that education is a lifelong event—as noted above.

There is a particular rational behind this view of education as a lifelong event or activity. The rational 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 enters into 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 that 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 that only can be applied in scientific (pedagogical) circles. This use, however, leads to the situation in which Landman in his contribution is checkmated. There only are 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 a number of 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 also 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 the andragogic and the gerontagogic.

To give expression to the qualitative differences that appear in each phase, colleagues in their commentaries proposed that different words must be used such as child: educate; adult: form; aged: care. In light of this line of argument followed here such a step is problematic because the term "educate" then is reserved only 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 that appears among persons and that 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 that 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 of the phases proposed by Landman (and others before him) in each case essentially is 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 in spite of the fact that 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 that we call “educating”, namely, as a lifelong event. The life world outside of 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 that 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 also 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 that coincides with the lowermost boundary of the andragogical. In the “gray area” between the pedagogical and the andragogical, pedagogical structure become andragogical ones that 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 agogic 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 also 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

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 in order to assist (support) the other person on his or her way to proper or even more complete adulthood. The pedagogic aim of education is thus proper adulthood while the andragogic 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 in order 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 has to 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 G. pais – child; paido – boy + agein – to lead; agogos – leader.

Andragogics also denotes the science of education while the word andragogics has its origin in G. 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 are in need of support, in order to improve their relationship with a particular reality (e.g., the vocational reality).

In both modes of education, namely pedagogics and andragogics, the essence of being a person is expressed, namely, the agological as the going together/accompanying of each other of 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.