

CHAPTER 1:

The Concepts of Andragogy and Pedagogy Contextualised and Explained

This chapter presents an introductory background to the study as follows; statement of the problem, purpose of the study and research questions. It also looks at the assumptions underlying the study, significance of the study, scope of the study, definition of terms, and chapter summary.

The word andragogy comes from the Greek word *andra* which means 'man' or 'adult' and *agogas* which means 'leader' (Deveci, 2007). In short andragogy is a model of learning that was coined by Alexander Kapp in Europe in 1833, later introduced in America by Edward Linderman in 1927 and popularized in Europe by Malcom Knowles. It is a set of assumptions and principles guiding the planning, management, implementation, and evaluation of teaching and learning involving adults (Ekoto & Gaikwad, 2015; Knowles, 2011; Reischmann, 2004). Andragogy is premised on five principles which are the self-concept, readiness to learn, orientation to learning, learner experience and learner motivation (Reischmann, 2004; McGrath, 2009; Knowles *et al.*, 2012).

Pedagogy is derived from the Greek words, *paidos* which means 'child' and *ago* which means 'to lead a child', thus it has been defined as the art and science of instructing children so that they become functional in society (Ekoto & Gaikwad, 2015). In contrast to andragogy, the underlying assumptions in pedagogy are that; the experience that the learner brings to the learning environment is of little relevance to the design and delivery of instruction. The learning is teacher centred and subject oriented. The learner is extrinsically motivated through tests, punishments and rewards. The philosophical underpinnings of pedagogy are that learner needs are derived from the Minimum Bodies of Knowledge (MBK) as directed by the national curriculum. However, in andragogical philosophy, the learner is involved in the design of instruction and is a participant learner up to the process of evaluation. In short, pedagogy and andragogy are learning models whose difference centre on the role of the facilitator, the learner, the administrator, agencies, and society from the process of needs analysis up to evaluation and feedback (Deveci, 2007).

The concepts of andragogy and pedagogy have been in existence since time immemorial. This is because man has been learning since birth, thus at one point or the other, the two concepts characterised the learning process knowingly or unknowingly (Raymond, 2008). Whilst theories, concepts and assumptions have been developed for institutional programmes involving adult learners, none have been

robust as to assert themselves as the connoisseurship of higher education teaching and learning. To this end, the impact of different learning models in institutional programmes has remained highly contested.

Usman (2015) and Tight (1996) agree that though seen dichotomously, the models have got functional overlaps but one could be having more impact on the teaching learning process depending on the context. The effectiveness of the models would depend on the degree to which administrators, the professoriate and students adopt and adapt to the multiformity of higher learning among other situations. Therefore, higher education institutional learning in most countries has been defined as progressively regressive (Garuth, 2014). This is because when learning models applicable to nursery and kindergarten are continuously applied up the ladder, learning would become regressive. To this end, some universities have continued to produce dysfunctional graduates, products of Silencing Education who are mere conformist of the industrial discourse (Mahmoudi *et al.*, 2014). This is supported by Bryson (2013) who argues that despite the diverse and multiplicity nature of adult learners in universities, the emphasis on design and delivery has basically remained on uniformity and conformity rather than multiformity. It is this current practice of dumping down content, poor needs analysis and poor methodological approaches that has led to ineffective education outcomes in Zimbabwean universities and colleges. This has negated the industrial processes and developmentalism. This therefore shows that the institutional model of learning is not holistic in addressing the learner and societal needs.

The Nziramasanga Commission, introduction of the New Curriculum and recently Education 5.0 are a justification to show that the government is in search of a more impacting model of learning. It shows serious concern with regards the effectiveness, efficiency and efficacy of the teaching-learning process in the tertiary institutions to perpetuate industrialization and sustainable development. Mohammed *et al.* (2018) in the Nigerian context and Addae (2016) in the context of South Africa and Ghana argue that developmentalism of a nation hinge on an effective education system whose curriculum is reflective of the national and societal aspirations. They argue that the curriculum should be reflective of the students' learning gaps complimented by varied and effective methodologies. In this vein, the Zimbabwean colleges and universities need to address the problem of lack of a holistic and impacting model of learning.

It should be appreciated that the teaching-learning process existed in the pre-colonial epoch, thus pedagogy and andragogy existed in the context of indigenous African education systems (Mutunhu, 2011). The society determined what the youths would learn, and the elders would teach the youths which is typical of pedagogy. However, on the andragogical perspective, the learning was to socialize them into

being functional men and women in the society through immediate application of learnt roles and skills. The philosophical underpinnings that include ethno-philosophy, philosophic sagacity, and nationalist-ideological philosophy resonate well with the concept of andragogy (Chukwu, 2002; Nafukho *et al.*, 2005). It can therefore be seen that there was a combinational use of the two models implying a lack of an absolute model between the two. Therefore, the lack of knowledge on what then constitutes the connoisseurship of institutional learning can be traced from the pre-colonial epoch and was further exacerbated by the adoption of perennialism in the colonial epoch to the post-colonial epoch. The varying perceptions and arguments with regard to the two models show that there is no absolute model for institutional programmes in higher education. There is need to determine the absolute model between pedagogy and andragogy or combine them in a continuum of Pedagogy-Andragogy-Heutagogy (PAH). It therefore calls for the need to scrutinize the educational philosophy that influences the strategic curriculum design. This is because the tertiary institutions would be guided by the strategic (national) curriculum as influenced by the national philosophy.

The debate on the impact of pedagogy or andragogy is further made complex by arguments that whilst underlying assumptions are different, education and learning are fundamentally the same wherever and whenever they occur (Kemppainen, 2017). In agreement, Chan (2010) argues that children, youths and adults can learn effectively under the same philosophy and principles. University of Zimbabwe is one institution in which some academics and students have argued that the concept of pedagogy should not be treated as a preserve of children but university adults as well. Contrary to the assertion of learning being universally the same, Allen (1979) cited in Christian (1982) observes that andragogical and pedagogical learning cannot have the same impact in university learning. This is because the university learning society has got students whose physiological and psychological orientations have seen the test of time, thus may have developed different learning styles due to problems of retention among others. These variations have led to other lecturers being labelled bad teachers depending on what students perceive to be the most efficient and effective instructional design and delivery model. This therefore necessitates an investigation as to what then constitutes the connoisseurship of institutional higher learning.

Whilst Knowles *et al.* (2012) acknowledge that the learning of children and youths is different from the learning of adults, it remains unclear which model has got the greatest impact for institutional programmes involving adult learners. Raymond (2008) from her studies at the University of Exeter argues that there still exist some inconsistencies with regards the approaches or models that constitute the connoisseurship of higher education teaching-learning. The argument has been that andragogy is uniquely ideal for the learning of adults and produces better

competences when employed in higher education than pedagogy (Southard, 2017). To this end, there are administrators, educators and students in Zimbabwean higher education institutional programmes who subscribe to the pedagogical practices while others contend that andragogy is the best model for adult learning. This has created a situation whereby students at various tertiary institutions have complained of not being taught when andragogical principles are implemented. Others have complained of reliving the primary and secondary type of learning of prescription when pedagogy of adults is implemented.

In line with moving the national education strategy from Education 3.0 to Education 5.0, some educational administrators have argued that the effectiveness of pedagogy or andragogy should not be assessed from the academic success standpoint alone. It should also be based on whether the graduates are meeting the demands of the fast-changing global job market in what has been termed heutagogy (Blaschke, 2012; Halupa, 2015). The chronicled variations in higher learning institutional programmes show a discord in what really is the best model of teaching learning or the connoisseurship of higher education teaching-learning. This therefore necessitates a comparative analysis on the impact of the two models to determine an ideal model for higher education institutional programmes.

The purpose of the study was to make a comparative analysis on the impact or the efficiency, effectiveness and efficacy of andragogy versus pedagogy as means of teaching-learning in higher education institutional programmes. The study sought to provide a perspective in to what constituted effective and efficient practices of university teaching-learning. It also extrapolated the nexus that existed between the system factors, school factors and classroom factors for both andragogy and pedagogy which brought to the fore the basis for comparison. By and large, the study sought to determine if either pedagogy or andragogy does exert the greatest impact on the design and delivery of institutional programmes in higher education so that it could be adopted as a model of higher education learning. It sought to expose the weaknesses of both models, their functional overlaps and paved way for the development of a more holistic and comprehensive model of higher education. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the tenets of teaching-learning that must be achieved or addressed for an education model to be considered effective in higher education institutional programmes?
2. Can higher education institutional programmes have impact on learners and the national development discourse based on learner centred needs alone without the national directive to address Minimum Bodies of Knowledge (MBK)?

3. To what extent does the professoriate, administrators and students perceive the impact of pedagogy and andragogy in the teaching learning in institutional programmes?
4. Is there an absolute model from the two that can be considered to have more impact in higher education institutional programmes, or they have got functional overlaps?
5. How do Strategic Educational Directives (SED) such as the national curriculum, Education 5.0 etc. influence and impact on models to be adopted in higher education institutional programmes?

In the context of Leedey & Ormrod (2010), assumptions are a basic tenet of research, the absence of which means that the research problem itself does not exist. They are somehow out of the researcher's control and their absence affects the credibility of the study (Simon, 2011). The paradigmatic assumptions underlying the Mixed Paradigm Approach are that positivism and post-positivism when integrated within the same research would achieve complementarity. This was necessary especially when the efficiency, effectiveness and efficacy of pedagogy and andragogy were to be determined. This assumption is supported by Greene & Caracelli (2003) in Simon (2011) who posit that to determine the value of a social programme or its efficacy, the researcher should employ all the methods at their disposal to generate sufficient and supportive evidence to arrive at conclusions and decisions. The principal assumption underlying this research is that the ontological and epistemological orientations of qualitative and quantitative research differ and thus reality and knowledge are perceived and generated differently. Therefore, the researcher sought to unearth reality and construct knowledge about the phenomenon from different paradigms.

The researcher assumed that the participants would constitute a representative sample to justify the research's credibility, dependability, transferability and generalizability. One of the assumptions was that all the lecturers have their own teaching styles that they developed and perfected overtime and being driven by different philosophical thoughts. These styles have led them to be regarded as best or bad professors depending on the pedagogical or andragogical orientations of students. The other assumption was that the pedagogical orientations to which university students got subjected to during their primary and secondary education would to a certain extent determine their feeling over what they thought would be the most effective teaching-learning model. The researcher assumed that the National or Strategic Orientation of education would to a greater extent influence the orientations of institutions and what they perceive to be the connoisseurship of teaching-learning. It was the researcher's assumption that overtime; university

lecturers and students have developed a way of teaching and learning that may be far more than the pedagogy-andragogy continuum. In as much as the theories of andragogy and pedagogy are understood, it was also assumed that their application and subsequent impact in the design and delivery of instruction in different contexts and programmes may not be understood. The researcher then based his study on the assumption that the University of Zimbabwe being the oldest in the country is home to academic expertise and excellence and would represent the other institutions since they are also off-shoots from it.

The significance of the study is that it sought to provide answers to what constituted the connoisseurship of institutional programme teaching-learning in universities and colleges. It also extrapolated the strengths and weaknesses of pedagogical and andragogical practices, thereby exposing areas of complementarity and confliction. It sought to expose weaknesses along the system, the school and classroom factors with an ultimate view to provide remedial action for the best impact. It sought to strengthen or demystify the perceptions that administrators, educators and facilitators have on the learning of adults in higher education institutional programmes. Over and above, the study sought to bring to the fore the constituents of positive or negative impact on educational effectiveness in institutional programmes. To an extent it reflected on the educational effectiveness of Education 5.0. It also sought to inform future policies on the necessary considerations to ensure the greatest positive impact on the teaching-learning in institutional programmes in universities and colleges. By and large, the study sought to produce a comprehensive and holistic learning model from the various adult learning models, thereby adding much to the existing body of knowledge on adult learning in universities and colleges.

The scope of the study is discussed under limitations and delimitations. Limitations are the weaknesses, influences, shortcomings or conditions that the researcher cannot control from the methodology up to data collection, presentation and analysis which would then impact one's conclusions. Efforts must be made to circumvent the effects of limitations on the validity and reliability of the study (Simon, 2011). Self-reported data which is data from interviews has got a very high chance of bias depending on whether one is pedagogical or andragogically oriented (Hermam & Edwards, 2014). This is one limitation that the research faced but was however reduced through methodological triangulation, participant, data collection, and analysis. One limitation that characterised the research was the sample size which gave the constraint of generalizability (Stephane *et al.*, 2013; Emmanuel, 2013). However, the researcher gathered data from data rich respondents and gained insights into the phenomenon through in-depth interviews thereby circumventing the effects. The researcher disseminated several questionnaires to randomly selected respondents to cater for the qualitative weakness.

Selective plausibility in the context of Ithantola & Kihn (2011) is one limitation that faced the research. This is because whilst the current research findings could have arrived at certain conclusions, there are many studies on pedagogy and andragogy and reconciling the present findings with all these researches was difficult. To circumvent this effect, the researcher conducted an extensive review of related literature. The socio-political and economic environment in which the research was conducted where UZ churns out graduates without being employed definitely negated on the responses of other respondents and participants. In short, the above limitations impacted on the trustworthiness of the research process. To uphold the quality of the research, the researcher adopted the Integrative Framework of Mixed Methods by Tashakkori & Teddlie (2008) and Onwuegbuzie & Johnson (2006)'s Legitimation Framework.

The comparative analysis on the impact of pedagogy and andragogy in institutional programmes was a cumbersome study that required the interrogation of all higher education institutions. It would have required the researcher to deal with a very large population from colleges to universities. In this regard, it would have required an extensive survey in the research design and would have taken more time. To start with, the researcher delimited the study to University of Zimbabwe which he assumed to represent all the tertiary institutions most of which are off-shoots from the former. To this end, the administrators, the professoriate and students assumed a repository of valuable information to be generalised to other higher institutions of learning. However, UZ is made up of many Faculties and Departments, thus it was impossible to interrogate the phenomenon in all the faculties. The study therefore centred on the Faculty of Education because it has got everything to do with the teaching-learning process from the development of curriculum to the production of teachers. It is also home to a significant number of non-traditional and traditional students. The extensive experience of the Faculty of Education professoriate and the non-traditional students in the process of teaching and learning meant the results of the study would address the research phenomenon.

Chapter 1 defined contextualised the definitions of andragogy and pedagogy, provided a background of the study, research questions, purpose of the study and significance. It laid out the research assumptions, as well as the limitations and delimitations of the study. The next chapter focuses on the review of related literature.