Dušan M. Savićević –
World’s Best Andragogy Researcher:
Inspiration for My Andragogical Perspective

Abstract: Dušan M. Savićević has been a towering figure working, researching and publishing in andragogy for more than a half-century. Dušan’s prism of world-wide experience has been connected very vitally with helping establish it as a science, self-directed learning, work, and has inspired others to develop their own andragogical perspective, including, but not limited to, learning contracts. He linked andragogy with mass media, various countries, ancient leaders, other learning theories, and a panoramic overview of it around the world. In this article, I seek to bring together aspects of his presence and work in andragogy, self-directed learning, learning contracts, that have inspired me to invest myself in this fertile field which encompasses adult education. After Dušan passed from this earthly world in June 2015, I was requested to bring some of my perspective on andragogy inspired by his prolific world-wide efforts in this regard. This task I humbly accepted and trust it will do him honor in some small way. Thanks, Dušan, for being who you are.
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Overview

My first personal contact with Dušan Savićević was in Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA, during the 1988 American Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE) Conference. I had a very positive experience in meeting face-to-face with the man from whom my mentor (Malcolm S. Knowles – my major adult education Professor at Boston University (BU) from 1967–1969) had received the term and concept of andragogy. Malcolm had talked about Dušan and an-
dragogy; and had developed his own brand and adaptation of andragogy in the Doctoral Program at BU. I have adapted my own version and application of andragogy in scholarship and practice over the years since my studies with Knowles. Nonetheless, it was not until 1993, when I was presenting a conference paper (Henschke, 1993) at Wadham College, Oxford University, United Kingdom, on some aspects of my practice of andragogy, that a man by the name of H. Hinnemint from Belgium, attending that same conference at Oxford, called my attention to Savićević’s (1991a) article on some extensive andragogical research Dušan had conducted and published. I went to the Oxford University Library, found the paper and made a photocopy of it.

The fact of Savićević (1991a) asserting that the history of considerably older sciences than andragogy bears witness that much time is needed for a science to come into existence, (thus also for andragogy to become a full-fledged field of scientific study) piqued my interest in terms of wanting to contribute in a small way to the already more than 150 years of history concerning andragogy, about which I knew very little. As I studied Savićević’s (1991a) work on the history of andragogy in ten different countries in Eastern and Western Europe, I put into capsule form what I garnered from his paper. This became my initial inspiration for beginning to investigate Dušan’s prolific work in andragogy. I describe his work in the following paragraphs.

Savićević (1991a) provided a critical consideration of andragogical concepts in ten European Countries – five western (Germany, France, the Netherlands, Britain, Finland), and five eastern (the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia). This comparison showed common roots but results in five varying schools of thought: (a) whether andragogy was parallel to or subsumed under pedagogy in the general science of education; (b) whether agology (instead of andragogy) was understood as a sort of integrative science which not only studied the process of education and learning but also other forms of guidance and orientation; (c) whether andragogy prescribed how teachers and students should behave in educational and learning situations; (d) whether the possibility of founding andragogy as a science was refuted; and, (e) whether endeavors had been made to found andragogy as a fairly independent scientific discipline. Moreover, he clearly aligned himself with the fifth school of thought in that the kind of research he was conducting aimed toward establishing the origin and development of andragogy as a discipline, the subject of which was the study of education and learning of adults in all its forms of expression.

In addition, I found that Savićević (1991a) also suggested that Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, the Sophists, Ancient Rome, the epochs of humanism and the
Renaissance, all reflect thoughts and views about the need for learning throughout life, about the particularities and manners of acquiring knowledge in different phases of life, and about the moral and aesthetic impact. He also credited J. A. Comenius in the seventeenth century with being regarded as the founder of andragogy in his primary wish to provide comprehensive education and learning for one and all to the full degree of humaneness, and urging the establishment of special institutions, forms, means, methods and teachers for work with adults. In addition, he theorized that the institutional basis for adult education was actually laid in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Britain and other countries with the emergence of Mechanics’ Institutes, workers’ colleges & educational associations, university extensions, board schools for adult instruction, correspondence education, and people’s universities.

Savićević (2006) expressed his realization that almost 50 years of experience with andragogical ideas acquired in different social, cultural and educational environments, were reflected through the prism of his personal experience. Very importantly, he also observed that since his first visit to the USA in 1966, up through 2006, the identifiable trace of andragogy in USA universities could be seen in the fact that there had not been a single serious study on adult education and learning that did not refer to andragogy as a concept. Savićević addressed the diversity of andragogical ideas in an international framework, which also became obvious in the expanding depth, breadth and worldwide nature of this research in andragogy. Savićević (2007) also affirmed that links between work and learning/education, in addition to combining the creation of theory with the advancement of practice, would only be improved through serious research that reduced what was unknown or less well known in andragogy.

Early connections between self-directed learning and andragogy

An early attempt at this comparison between andragogy and self-directed learning needs to include a historical look at the work of Dušan Savićević (2008) in his panoramic articulation of ideas on the convergence and divergence of andragogy in various contexts. He goes back in this historical document into ancient times and brings the discussion to the present time. In this work he mentions ‘self-directed learning’ (SDL) three times; each time it is within the context of other aspects of andragogy: mass media, a set of self-directed learning competencies, and the complex of different theories relating to various aspects of the education of children and various aspects of the education of adults.
SDL and Mass-Media

Savićević (2008) indicates that from the standpoint of adult learning the mass-media is a special problem; the mass-media have a special role in adult education. They show the power and disposition for the manipulation of information. Clearly, all of these problems are reflections on adult learning and education. This problem overlaps the contents of learning. The selection of contents is interconnected with philosophical questions: What to learn? Who makes decisions about it? Neither pedagogy, nor the traditional (inflexible) system of education offer satisfying answers. Supporting sustainability and the expansion of open, varied, self-directed learning of adults needs to make progress. It is impossible to build a free and democratic society without addressing the issues of adult education. Creating different possibilities enables adults to manage their own learning according to their needs and interests. Learning aim formulation, making decisions on place for learning and on learning resources are of special importance for carrying out the integral educational policy.

SDL – A set of competencies

Savićević (2008) asserted that until 2008, most of the education and learning decisions on the mass-media were regulated by educational institutions which created resistance in adults towards participating in formally organized learning activities. The increased demands of adults created the need to develop a complex set of competencies for self-direction in learning such as: defining the learning goals with the possibility of evaluating the attained scope, planning learning activities, predicting the consequences of (un)attained scopes and fulfilling educational obligations, defining criteria for self-evaluation in learning and reconsidering and reflecting on the learning experience. The whole organization of learning should encourage and stimulate the continued learning of adults after they finish an educational activity, not only in the field of personal and public interests, but in a sense broader than the educational institution promises. The promotion of continuing education among others, for the sake of learning outside educational institutions is expected from individuals who have accepted this philosophy. Because of that the learning and education of adults should be heterogeneous, differentiated, and decentralized to the level of a local community. The local community should become an andragogical center. Public (governmental) educational policy should identify and support all of the opportunities for learning down to the least included and the least competent in planning, organization and evaluation in their own learning.
SDL and a complex of theories of child and adult education

Savićević (2008) makes some observations concerning a few theories of adult learning, all of them in the essence of andragogy, originated in the last decades of the twentieth century. It is necessary to be acquainted with them, in order to analyze and critically evaluate them. Abundant academic production on the differences between the education of children and the education of adults can be found in the last decades of the twentieth century. The research shows the complexity of these two phenomena; but differences exist not only between the education of children and the education of adults, but also within the conception of adult learning. Many external factors affect the learning of adults; especially the convergence of work and education, motivation and learning, teaching concepts in andragogy, the distinctive role of andragogical practitioners, the phenomenon of self-directed learning, as well as the future of adult learning.

Adult learner characteristics served by various adult learning theories

Savićević’s arguments stated above, are buttressed by the historical and contextual emergence of SDL coming into the wider educational discussions. Furthermore, regarding the section above on the issue of mass-media and online learning, Cercone (2008) adds to that part of Savićević’s (1991b) discussion that the development of andragogy in the future will depart from differentiation of scientific integration towards the creation of theoretical models and the scientific synthesis of knowledge. This has a very a startling comparison to make regarding the strength of a number of learning theories related to adult learning or ‘andragogy’ as Cercone indicates. She focuses on the four most popular adult learning theories: Experiential Learning, Transformative Learning, Self-Directed Learning, and Andragogy. She makes the case for each of the four and their support of adult learner characteristics, but asserts that there is no one theory that explains all of how adults learn, just as there is no one theory that explains all human learning.

Existing theories provide frameworks or models which contribute something to our understanding of adults as learners. In light of the fact that learning is an internal process of the learner, the focus of theory is on what happens when real learning takes place. Adult learning theory helps a faculty to understand their students and to design more meaningful learning experiences for them. There is not one adult learning theory that successfully applies to all adult learning en-
environments. Learning is about change, and adult learning is also about change. Cercone (2008) developed a framework in which all four theories need to include the physical/bodily elements and learning style elements in the development and support of learning experiences, but they are givens of all human beings (or learners), not just unique to adult learners. However, there are 11 adult learner characteristics which Cercone (2008) recommends that need to be taken into account for mass-media and online adult learning course development.

1. Adults need to be actively involved in the learning process.
2. Adults need scaffolding to be provided by the instructor. Scaffolding should promote self-reliance, and it should allow learners to perform activities they would be unable to perform without this support.
3. Adults have a pre-existing learning history and will need support to work in the new online learner-centered paradigm.
4. Adults need the instructor to act as a facilitator.
5. Adults need consideration of their prior experience. The instructor should acknowledge this prior experience. Adults need to connect new knowledge to past events.
6. Adults need to see the link between what they are learning and how it will apply to their lives.
7. Adults need to feel that learning focuses on issues that directly concern them and want to know what they are going to learn, how the learning will be conducted, and why it is important. The course should be learner-centered vs. teacher-centered.
8. Adults need to test their learning as they go along, rather than receive background theory.
9. Adult learning requires a climate that is collaborative, respectful, mutual and informal.
10. Adults need to self-reflect on the learning process and be given support for transformational learning.
11. Adults need dialog and social interaction must be provided. They need to collaborate with other learners.

For each of the Adult Learner Characteristics listed above, Cercone includes numerous strategies and recommendations for implementing them (which I will not list here because of space limitations). She identifies each theory with characteristics addressed along with the number of strategies/recommendations (SR) for implementing and supporting each. Experiential Learning (EL) – #s 5, 9, 10, 11 for a total of 4 characteristics with 24 SRs; Transformative Learning (TL) – #s 1, 2, 10 for a total of 3 characteristics with 32 SRs; Self-Directed Learning (SDL) – #s 1, 2, 5 for a total of 3 characteristics with 34 SRs; and,
Andragogy (A) #s 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 for a total of 10 characteristics with 68 SRs. Consequently, all of this shows Andragogy to be the most comprehensive theory of adult learning and education, by comparison with Self-Directed Learning, Transformative Learning, and Experiential Learning. In fact, Cercone declares that the theories of Self-Directed Learning, Transformative Learning, and Experiential Learning are all encompassed within the theory of Andragogy.

Moreover, within this study, I am only including the calculation for Self-Directed learning which has 3 characteristics and 34 SRs; and, the calculation of Andragogy which has 10 characteristics and 68 SRs. In light of this finding, all three adult learner characteristics and 34 SRs included in the theory of SDL are included in the ten adult learner characteristics and 68 SRs of andragogy. This means that the theory of Andragogy includes seven additional adult learner characteristics and 34 additional SRs that the theory of SDL does not include. This appears to support the contention that Andragogy would be foundational to both andragogy and SDL as well as Andragogy providing additional support for implementing adult learning.

Eras, themes and other backgrounds of andragogy

During the 16 years that I have been researching, writing and publishing in andragogy, there are 17 major eras and six themes that I have discovered and articulated. These eras include more than 500 articles in the English language, thus covering a span of 183 years, from 1833 to 2016. Other backgrounds have been included.

Major eras in the history and philosophy of andragogy around the globe

1. Early appearances of andragogy 1833–1927;
4. Emergence of self-directed learning skills as a major way to implement andragogy 1975–1981;
5. Strengthening the numerous uses of andragogy along with growing controversy and resistance toward it 1981–1984;
6. Identifying the stronger European base of andragogy in comparing it with the American base 1985–1988;
9. Momentum gained against andragogy while counter arguments assert its value 1996–1997;
10. Antecedents to an historical foundation of andragogy being extended and broadened 1998–1999;
11. Empirical research being pressed to investigate andragogy’s value while objection remains 2000–2002;
13. The Hesitation concerning andragogy continues while many still stand by andragogy 2005–2006;
15. Applying andragogy ideas and learning techniques successfully in the USA, foreign countries and with cutting-edge technology 2009–2011;
16. Clearer emphasis on congruence between scholarship and practice accompanied by contribution to the shaking world economy 2012–2015; and,
17. On the cutting edge of additional developments in 2016 and beyond into the future (Henschke, 2015c).

**Major themes of andragogy**

I have also discovered in these more than 500 English language documents, when they are arranged in a different way within this 183 year span, that there are six themes of andragogy encompassed as follows: 1. evolution of the term andragogy; 2. historical antecedents shaping the concept of andragogy; 3. comparison of the American and European understanding of andragogy; 4. popularizing and sustaining the American and world-wide concept of andragogy; 5. practical applications of andragogy; and, 6. theory, research, and definition of andragogy (Henschke, 2015b). Although the eras and themes of andragogy date back to 1833, there are implications that andragogy predates this back into the 17th century, and perhaps as far back as ancient times.
Comenius’ ideas declared as a basis to consider him the founder of modern andragogy

According to Savićević (2008), Comenius, in the 17th century (antecedent to the 1833 first published appearance of the term and description of ‘Andragogy’), was the first to draw the demarcation line between pedagogical and andragogical ideas; but he drew this line in the Panpedia, (Comenius, 1910 – Translation of his Panpedia by M. Keating) written at the end of his life, not in his earlier writings. He urged for distinctive ‘schools’ for adults, for distinctive contents, textbooks and teachers for learning and education of adults, who are prepared to function in these schools for adults. Andragogical ideas and practice (understood as a conception, institutions, new forms, means, methods) were created in the period of social, scientific and technological changes brought about by the industrial revolution; they were created under the wing of the workers’ movement, constituted in England. Here he mentions that the andragogical ideas stated by Comenius are the constitutive foundation of andragogy as a science. The nature and importance of his thoughts about the possibilities, needs and organization of education and learning of adults are a basis for considering him as a founder of modern andragogy. In Panpedia, Comenius developed the philosophy of lifelong education, and proclaimed equal frames for living and for learning; that it is not enough to say that it is never too late for learning; he emphasized that ‘every period is dedicated for a life and for learning’.

Savićević explores antique antecedents as sources of andragogy

Digging back into ancient times, Savićević (2000) also explored various antecedents to and backgrounds of andragogy before the term came into publication in 1833. In this he added another component to the scientific foundation and design of andragogy in this book (which is in the Serbian language, but he has provided a summary in English). The summary indicates that this study is dedicated to searching for the roots of andragogical ideas, beginning with ancient civilizations, up to the present time. We understand the term andragogical ideas as thoughts and concepts of persons about education and learning of adults, the system of andragogical institutions that appeared in certain civilizations, as well as andragogical practice in which such ideas were realized. The structure of the study is made of several chapters that are interconnected and logically linked, and is divided into the following five parts: (a) conceptual and methodological frameworks of research, which includes: the nature and characteristics of research
of andragogical ideas and the methodological framework for research. (b) searching for the roots of the andragogical ideas of some authors, which includes: adult learning before literacy; ancient Greek civilization; the activities of the sophists; Socrates; Plato; Aristotle; the diffusion of Greek culture and science; Ancient Rome; Jewish cultural heritage; the Middle Ages; and the reversal brought by the New Century. (c) andragogical ideas in the international context, which includes: the work of Jan Amos Komensky; the ideas of Grundtvig and their practical realization; the thoughts of E. N. Medinsky; the views of E. C. Lindemann; Thorndike’s comprehension; and, thoughts of Freire. (d) andragogical ideas in the Yugoslav frame and context includes: practical realization in the Yugoslav cultural space; the social philosophy of Svetozar Marković; Radovan Dragović; Dimitrije Tucović; Dušan Popović; Filip Filipović; activities of the Serbian social democrats in practice; and, thoughts of Vićentije Rakić (e) andragogical comparisons and conclusions, including a final general discussion.

Henschke cites ancient hebrew and greek languages as sources and other items

Henschke (1998) asserted that long before the term andragogy appeared in published form in 1833, ancient Greek and Hebrew educators, if not others, used words that although they were antecedents to andragogy, included elements of the concept that has come to be understood within some of the various meanings and definitions of andragogy. He attempted a descriptive definition of andragogy that moved in the direction of calling it a scientific discipline of study. This he posed in contrast to what others considered to be the fading influence of andragogy. He went back earlier in history and claimed that the language of the Hebrew prophets, before and concurrent with the time of Jesus Christ, along with the meaning of various Hebrew words and their Greek counterparts – learn, teach, instruct, guide, lead, and example/way/model – provide an especially rich and fertile resource to interpret andragogy. He expected that by combining a probe of these words and elements with other writings, a more comprehensive definition of andragogy might evolve. So, he attempted a definition of andragogy, as follows: “Andragogy is a scientific discipline for the study of the theory, processes, technology and anything else of value and benefit including learning, teaching, instructing, guiding, leading and modeling/exemplifying a way of life, which would bring adults to their full degree of humaneness.”

The Hebrews/Jews in ancient times received the Ten Commandments, which were considered to be the most important text in the Hebrew Bible, or
as some call it, the Old Testament. From the book of Deuteronomy, chapter six, verses four through seven, these words of instruction are included: “Hear, O Israel; the Lord your God is one Lord. You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might. These words, which I command you this day shall be in your heart: And you shall teach, or sharpen them diligently to your children and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down, and when you rise up.” This is an illustration of their mode of teaching and learning – quite andragogical, long before (about 1423 BCE, or before Christ – BC) prior to when the word andragogy was invented or published in 1833 by Kapp.

When Jesus Christ of Nazareth was 12 years of age (about the year 8 CE – Common Era, or 8 AD, as some call it, anno Domini – the Year of the Lord), he was taken by his parents to the annual Feast of the Passover in Jerusalem (Luke 2:41–52). In an exchange conducted as he sat with the teachers in the Temple, he both listened to them and asked them questions – quite andragogical, about 1825 years before the word andragogy was first published by Kapp.

Henschke (2004) was inspired to adapt a poem that depicts how andragogy caught hold of him and has maintained its grip. He also found deep involvement in andragogy, when he paraphrased Robert Frost’s poem, Our Gift Outright, delivered at the USA 1961 Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. The paraphrase follows:

Andragogy belonged to me before I belonged to Andragogy.
Andragogy was my longing desire in living, teaching and learning for a few decades
Before I was her educator. Andragogy was mine
In undergraduate school, in graduate school, in theological seminary, in clinical training, in parish ministry, in doctoral studies, in university faculty, in consulting with various organizations throughout society,
But I belonged to Pedagogy, still captive,
Possessing what I still was unpossessed by,
Possessed by what I now no more possessed.
Something I was withholding made me weak
Until I found it was myself
I was withholding from the dynamic, vibrant idea of Andragogy,
And forthwith found new educational and living possibilities in surrender.
Such as I was I gave myself outright
(The deed of gift was many deeds of dialoguing with others about Andragogy)
To Andragogy vaguely realizing a new idea embodying teaching, learning, and living,
But still unstoried, artless, unenhanced,
Such as Andragogy was, such as she will become.
Knowles’ structure for andragogy and changes toward SDL

The main structure of Knowles’ (1970, 1980, 1990) andragogical expression took the form of a process design instead of a content design, with assumptions and processes. The assumptions about adult learners at that time were: 1. they need to know a reason that makes sense to them as to why they should learn any particular subject matter content; 2. they are inclined toward and have a strong desire to be self-directing in their learning; 3. their experience is a learning resource for themselves and others; 4. their learning needs are focused on the developmental tasks of their social roles; 5. their time perspective is a need for one of immediate application; and, 6. their motivation is much more intrinsic (internal) rather than extrinsic (external). The learning processes adults want to be actively and interactively involved in are: a. Preparation of the learners for what is coming in the andragogical learning experience; b. establishing a climate conducive to learning; c. cooperative and mutual planning; d. needing help in self-diagnosing their learning needs; e. setting objectives; f. designing the sequence of learning activities; g. mutually conducting the learning activities; and h. learners evaluating their own learner progress.

Transition from andragogical orientation toward including self-directed learning.

Knowles (1975) published his guidebook for learners and teachers on the topic of Self-Directed Learning. This was the first time that he labeled pedagogy as ‘teacher-directed’ learning and andragogy as ‘self-directed’ learning. Previously, pedagogy was for children and andragogy was for adults. Now his perspective was that where new, unfamiliar content was involved with children and adults, pedagogy was appropriate; and, where adults or children had some background in the content, andragogy was appropriate. He attached the term ‘self-directed learning’ to his six andragogical assumptions and his eight andragogical processes. Andragogy was the underlying and overarching philosophy, and self-directed learning was the major way andragogy was to be implemented. Beyond giving equal footing to andragogy and SDL, it was the first time that he illustrated and implemented the Learning Contract (LC). He did this by having the LC focus on the idea of becoming and/or improving competence as a Self-Directed Learner, while using the contents and processes throughout the book to assist the learner to become self-directed and improve in this. In the book, Knowles also presented
a set of nine Competencies of self-directed learning, which may be considered the essence of a LC in and of itself, as follows:

1. An understanding of the differences in assumptions about learners and the skills required for learning under teacher-directed learning and self-directed learning, and the ability to explain these differences to others.
2. A concept of myself as being a non-dependent and a self-directing person.
3. The ability to relate to peers collaboratively, to see them as resources for diagnosing needs, planning my learning, and learning; and to give help to them and receive help from them.
4. The ability to diagnose my own learning needs realistically, with help from teachers and peers.
5. The ability to translate learning needs into learning objectives in a form that makes it possible for their accomplishment to be assessed.
6. The ability to relate to teachers as facilitators, helpers, or consultants, and to take the initiative in making use of their resources.
7. The ability to identify human and material resources appropriate to different kinds of learning objectives.
8. The ability to select effective strategies for making use of learning resources and to perform these strategies skillfully and with initiative.
9. The ability to collect and validate evidence of the accomplishment of various kinds of learning objectives (p. 61).

Three major instances of implementing the use of andragogical LCs with enhancing SDL

First. As a continuing education specialist in the University of Missouri Extension, a Professor of Adult Education with the University of Missouri-St. Louis College of Education, and a Professor and Chair of the Doctoral Emphasis Specialty in Andragogy at Lindenwood University School of Education, St. Charles, Missouri, I applied and used learning contracts in numerous ways (Fedeli, et al., 2012). I began using them in 1975 and continue using them until the present time of this writing and will continue during the remainder of my educational career. The structure I most regularly used was Knowles’ (1986) five columns as follows: what are you going to learn (objectives); how are you going to learn it (resources and strategies); time span of when you will learn (schedule); how will you know that you learned what your objectives specified (evidence of accomplish-
ment), and, what standard will be used and who will validate that you learned what you indicated (proving that you learned what you said you would learn)?

Second. I used the Learning Contract (LC) with a small convent of 50 Roman Catholic sisters who had not had a new novitiate enter the Order in more than a decade. The average age of the sisters was increasing one year each year this continued. They expressed concern that if this pattern continued, their Order would soon ‘die out’. The Superior General and Council worked together with me for 75 days over a period of almost three years, during which each member of the Order developed and used an LC for herself, and the total group developed and implemented a LC for their future. In the process they looked at their past and considered options for their future. The happy result was that they initiated a merger with another Order and successfully came together to form a new Order. They are alive and vibrant today – 32 years later – looking toward a bright future and are receiving new members along with carrying on active contributive ministries (Fedeli, et al, 2012).

Third. I engaged the participants in Learning Contracts (LC) as part of an adult education program I conducted with the manager and 15 members of the educational and human resource division of a major corporation serving two US states (Fedeli, et al, 2012). They had not received an update on their education in about 16 years and requested my university to provide the update. I was selected to address this issue. We worked together for two-and-a-half years on this project. Each one of the participants became engaged in developing, writing and implementing a learning contract that served their learning needs throughout the duration of the project. The group as a whole, along with their manager, developed and implemented a learning contract that would help to guide them in assuring that they received and internalized the updating goal. As time progressed, each person and the team gained the competence that helped them become the most effective team in the corporation. They were involved in changing the function of the corporation’s education division toward performance support. They used to conduct the education of the workers the traditional way of taking them off the line for a week or two and then sending them back to their job with the workers saying “I am glad that is over with; now we can get back to our work and forget all this stuff.” As they received and internalized the educational update, they made some changes. They were expressing themselves in a way that showed they were delighted to be contributing to their organization and to their community.

The manager of the above group decided to take a Master’s Degree in Andragogy to learn how to do what I had been doing with them during the update. At the end of his degree program he designed and implemented what he
wanted to do for his ‘capstone / internship’ experience. He elected to do the re-
search within his corporation, to analyze all of the current training / educational
programs being conducted and determine the time, costs, etc., for them. Then,
he used that data, redesigned and recalculated the cost in time, costs, etc., for
all of them so that they would be conducted with an andragogical, self-directed,
learning contract approach. Then, he compared the two. His conclusion was that
if the new approach were actually implemented in the corporation, in a five year
period of time, they would save $5 million US dollars. Since he had the data from
inside the corporation, he was able to do a thorough analysis (Fedeli, et al, 2012).

Research combining a charter for andragogy with
ten elements of SDL

Mezirow (1981), adding to the discussion on andragogy, developed a critical the-
ory of adult learning and education, and laid the groundwork for what he called
a charter for andragogy that included twelve core concepts that would help with
an organized and sustained effort to assist adults to learn in a way that enhanced
their capability to function as self-directed learners. Suanmali (1981), a doctoral
student of Mezirow, focused his dissertation research on the agreement he found
that 174 adult educators, including professors and practitioners, had on ten of
those twelve core concepts of Mezirow (1981) that all related to self-direction in
learning. All items except numbers eight and twelve were included. The major
theme that came out of his research was that to assist adults to enhance their
capability to function as self-directed learners, the educator must: 1. decrease
learner dependency; 2. help learners use learning resources; 3. help learners define
their learning needs; 4. help learners take responsibility for learning; 5. organ-
ize learning that is relevant; 6. foster learner decision-making and choices; 7.
encourage learner judgment and integration; 8. facilitate problem-posing and
problem-solving; 9. provide a supportive learning climate; and, 10. emphasize
experimental methods.

Developing phases and phase transitions for learning SDL
in the classroom

Taylor (1986) discovered the sequential and circular process of learning for self-
direction in the classroom and used Knowles’ (1975) book on self-directed learn-
ing as a foundation to her outline and implementation of learning for self-direc-
tion in the classroom. The results came as follows: the study reveals four different seasons or phases of the experience in learning. The phases occur in a consistent order and eventually display a thematic problem being worked on. For six of the eight participants the problem was how to behave and understand oneself as a self-directed learner in a professional educational setting where one expects to be directed and evaluated. For two of the learners it was the problem of how to be a helper to others’ learning without having to be the infallible and only source of direction. In all cases, learners were challenged to make a major reorientation in their assumptions and expectations about learning and teaching.

The four phases and the phase transition points through which this change of perspective occurred are briefly summarized as follows.

**Disconformation (Phase transition).** A major discrepancy between expectations and experience.

**Disorientation.** A period of intensive disorientation and confusion accompanied by a crisis of confidence and withdrawal from other persons who are associated with the source of confusion.

**Naming the problem (Phase transition).** Naming the problem without blaming self and others.

**Exploration.** Beginning with relaxation with an unresolved issue, an intuitively-guided, collaborative, and open-minded exploration with a gathering of insights, confidence and satisfaction.

**Reflection (Phase transition).** A private reflective review.

**Reorientation.** A major insight or synthesis experience simultaneous with a new approach to the learning (or teaching) task.

**Sharing the discovery (Phase transition).** Testing out the new understanding with others.

**Equilibrium.** A period of equilibrium in which the new perspective and approach is elaborated, refined and applied.

The sequence is most adequately represented as a cycle since the disorientation phase arises out of an experience of equilibrium similar to the final phase described here.

**Experiences in SDL early in life and combining with andragogy in later times**

My two early experiences of Self-Directed Learning (SDL) took place before I knew there was such a thing as SDL. First, at three years of age, I refused to say my piece during the church Christmas program, although I had it definitely memorized to deliver. Second, I convinced a theological seminary professor to allow me to take
an Old Testament Book study course in place of taking an additional required semester course in Hebrew. I didn't realize until a few months ago that these two anecdotes exemplified SDL. However, our research instrumentation on this is based on more than just a couple of anecdotes. Guglielmino’s (1978) study out of which was developed the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS – later renamed “Learning Preference Assessment”); and, Henschke’s (1989) andragogical Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI) are examples of our having researched in the respective areas of Self-Directed Learning and Andragogy. I believe that the SDLRS or LPA has been used in well into the hundreds of completed doctoral dissertations. The MIPI to the present in 2016 has been validated three times and used in 20 completed doctoral dissertations, as well as being used in at least 12 doctoral dissertations that are in the process of being completed. Copies of each may be considered for use in various research projects by contacting the author of each.

Reciprocity among empathy, trust,
and sensitivity between andragogues and learners

Reciprocity of empathy, trust and sensitivity. To be effective, an andragogue needs to combine the reciprocity of empathy, trust, and sensitivity in concert with the ability and potential of learners for the same, to understand the learning process and interact with facilitators effectively in making the right choices. This reciprocity takes the form of the facilitator initiating and maintaining the combination of three elements. Insensitivity may get in the way/ block the process of modeling reciprocity of the three.

Two crucial elements of Organizational Learning (Chiva and Algre, 2009) that strengthens this process are Dialogue and Risk-Taking. Dialogue is defined as sustained collective inquiry and interaction conducted among the participants – andragogues and learners – into the processes, assumptions, and certainties that make up everyday experience, which creates an understanding of communication. Risk-Taking is defined as tolerance of ambiguity, uncertainty and possible errors – effective organizations accept and learn from failure and mistakes. The ‘D’ and / or ‘R’ letter(s) is/are added to each item below where Dialogue and / or Risk-Taking strengthens it.

Empathy – The andragogue:
- Feels fully prepared to teach; D
- Notices and acknowledges to learners positive changes in them; D
- Balances her/his efforts between learner content acquisition and motivation; R
• Expresses appreciation to learners who actively participate; \textit{D}
• Promotes positive self-esteem in learners. \textit{D R}

\textit{Trust} – The andragogue:
• Purposefully communicates to learners that they are each uniquely im-
  portant; \textit{D}
• Believes learners know what their goals, dreams and realities are like;
• Expresses confidence that learners will develop the skills they need;
• Encourages the learners to learn what is needed; \textit{R}
• Feels the learners’ need to be aware of and communicate their thoughts
  and feelings; \textit{D}
• Enables learners to evaluate their own progress in learning;
• Hears learners indicate what their learning needs are; \textit{D}
• Engages learners in clarifying their own aspirations; \textit{D}
• Develops a supportive relationship with learners; \textit{D R}
• Experiences conditional positive regard for learners; \textit{D R}
• Respects the dignity and integrity of learners. \textit{D}

\textit{Sensitivity} – The andragogue (with reciprocity, leans much more toward sensitivity):
• Makes certain to understand the learner’s point of view; \textit{D}
• Takes pains and time to get her/his point across to learners; \textit{D}
• Exercises patience in helping all learners progress; \textit{R}
• Overcomes any frustration with learner apathy; \textit{D R}
• Will use whatever time learners need to grasp various concepts; \textit{R}
• Thoroughly allows learners to ask all questions they need addressed; \textit{R}
• Resists in her/himself any irritation at learner inattentiveness in the
  learning setting. \textit{R}

\textit{Insensitivity} – The insensitive educator (without reciprocity, leans toward insen-
  sensitivity):
• Has difficulty understanding the learner’s point of view;
• Has difficulty getting her/his point across to learners;
• Feels impatient with learner’s progress;
• Experiences frustration with learner apathy;
• Has difficulty with the amount of time learners need to grasp various
  concepts;
• Gets bored with the many questions learners ask; and,
• Feels irritation at learner inattentiveness in the learning setting.

(Henschke, 1989; Henschke, 2014 b; Henschke, et al., 2015 b, c, d, & e).
**Dimensions of maturing in life**

Henschke (2014a), at 83 years of age, includes both andragogy and SDL in developing his story on living a long, healthy life. He has used the following growth process in a self-directed way for a number of years. It follows a plan that Knowles developed for systematically functioning in life for adults and children at any stage of their maturing. Knowles (1959, 1970, 1980) contrasts what happens with learners in the early stages and what happens with learners in the more maturing stages of life. The idea of maturity as a goal of healthy living within adult and community education and learning, needs to be divided into various dimensions, if it is to serve as a guide for facilitating continuous learning. Out of the psychological literature Knowles identified the notion that there are several dimensions of the maturing process in healthy living, each with its own unique cycle of development and growth. If the really critical dimensions of the maturing process could be listed, then adult and community education could have some yardsticks against which to measure the accomplishment of its mission which is to be found in helping bring about healthy living. As a starting point, Knowles found the following fifteen dimensions of maturing provided in the list below which are nominated for consideration. (Note that these dimensions describe directions of growth, not absolute states of being to be achieved.). The movement of the learners on these dimensions would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Toward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance</td>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small abilities</td>
<td>Large abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few responsibilities</td>
<td>Many responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow interests</td>
<td>Broad interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfishness</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rejection</td>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorphous self-identity</td>
<td>Integrated self-identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on particulars</td>
<td>Focus on principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficial concerns</td>
<td>Deep Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for certainly</td>
<td>Tolerance for ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsiveness</td>
<td>Rationality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although no stage is completely fulfilled at any point in life, one would seek to move along the path of each dimension through SDL. Some educators would be more inclined to control and direct the person seeking a healthy and long life, thus seeking to maintain them in the earlier stage of each dimension. The andragogue (the adult educator who practices the art and science of facilitating adults in their learning for a healthy and long life) would be more inclined to support and encourage the person seeking to become more self-directed and creative in the solutions they are willing to experiment with and implement. Thus, they would be seeking to help each adult, and even each child, move forward through SDL toward the expanded enactment of an individual dimension or combination of dimensions in her/his maturing and developing healthy living. Of all the dimensions, most important with the author at this time centers in developing deep concerns within himself and doing it in a SDL way.

On becoming and continuing to be a winner in life

From my background, I have had a tendency in my life to be a bit pessimistic. So, to overcome this inclination, I have developed the Self-Directed Learning habit to practice consistently some of what Waitley (circa, 1988) suggests, a system for living which he calls qualities of a total winner – he has ten of them. It all has to do with the ‘self’ of the person who would be a winner in life. These qualities are all involved with growth/learning, which when combined with the self, could be aspects of self-direction in learning, or ‘self-directed learning’. In adopting attitudes and implementing actions, there is learning that takes place on the part of the person adopting or implementing. Since Knowles (1970) suggests that learning is an internal process, it is and has to be chosen by the person internally and not dictated or governed by someone other than the self – the person. So, Waitley’s ten qualities are paired with five personal attitudes, which lead into five personal actions. First, the attitude of self-expectancy is expressed as: ‘I was good today; I’ll be better tomorrow’. Second, this attitude leads to the action of self-motivation and is expressed as: ‘I want to… and I can!’ Third, the attitude of self-image is expressed as: ‘I see myself changing, growing, achieving, and winning’. Fourth, this attitude leads to the action of self-direction and is expressed as: ‘I have a plan to make it happen; and, I’ll do what is necessary to get what I want’. Fifth, the attitude of self-control is expressed as: ‘I’ll take the credit or the blame for my performance’. Sixth, this attitude leads to the action of self-discipline and is expressed as: ‘of course I can do it; I’ve practiced it mentally a thousand times’. Seventh, the attitude of self-esteem is expressed as: ‘I do things well because I’m
that kind of person’. Eighth, this attitude leads to the action of self-dimension and is expressed as: ‘I live every moment, enjoying as much, relating as much, doing as much, giving as much as I possibly can’. Ninth, the attitude of self-awareness is expressed as ‘I know who I am, where I am coming from and where I am going’. Tenth, this attitude leads to the action of self-projection and is expressed as: ‘tell me what you want, maybe we can work on it together’. This frame takes constant concentration and attention. One reason is that as human beings, it is too easy to slip into the negative side and think we can’t do anything correctly. Nonetheless, as this frame becomes habitual, we move ourselves forward quite positively. Besides, the connection of attitudes leading to actions, serves to strengthen self-directed learning. It is not only surprising, but also encouraging to experience the positive results of speaking winning ideas into one’s life.

Using an andragogical self-directed learning model with medical education

Ramnarayan and Hande (2005) indicate that SDL has been identified as an important skill for medical graduates. To meet the challenges in today’s healthcare environment, self-directed learning is most essential. Several health care institutions have made SDLs a part of the curriculum. In self-directed learning, learners take the initiative in making use of resources rather than simply react to transmissions from resources, thus helping learners to learn more and learn better. The main purpose of education must now be to develop the skills of inquiry, and more importantly to go on acquiring new knowledge easily and skillfully the rest of his or her life.

The concept of self-directedness in learning was first discussed in educational literature as early as 1926 (Lindenman). From this writing, a preliminary description of self-directed learning emerged. Self-directed learning, in its broadest meaning, describes a process in which individuals take the initiative with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying resources for learning, choosing and implementing learning strategies and evaluating learning outcomes (Knowles, 1975). It is no longer practical to define the purpose of education as transmitting what is known. In a world in which the half-life of many facts and skills may be ten years or less, half of what a person has acquired at the age of twenty may be obsolete by the time the person is thirty.

One may ask a question such as: why Self-Directed Learning? One reason is that there is convincing evidence that people who take the initiative in
learning learn more things and learn better than people who sit at the feet of teachers passively waiting to be taught. The second reason is that self-directed learning is more in tune with our natural processes of psychological development; an essential aspect of maturing is developing the ability to take increasing responsibility over our own lives to become increasingly self-directed. The third reason is that many of the new developments in education put a heavy responsibility on the learners to take a good deal of initiative in their own learning. To meet the challenges in today’s healthcare environment, self-directed learning is most essential.

Thus it is important to attain new knowledge easily and skillfully for the rest of one’s life. Lifelong, These folks use the andragogical approach for Self-Directed Learning originally designed by Knowles (1975), which carries with it the six assumptions and eight processes originally formulated in Knowles’ conception of andragogy. SDL has been identified as an important ability for medical graduates (Harvey, 2003).

Providing the foreword to the Italian translation of Malcolm’s Self-Directed Learning book

It is a high honor and privilege to be asked to provide the foreword to the Italian translation of Malcolm’s Self-Directed Learning book. It took extensive thought to make certain I would do it justice. Here is a part of it (Henschke, 2014).

Self-Directed Learning: A Guide For Learners and Teachers
By Malcolm S. Knowles

Introduction to the Italian translation of the book to be published by John A. Henschke

Malcolm S. Knowles stands as a giant catalyst at the juncture – past, present, and future – of andragogy (the art and science of helping adults learn) and self-directed learning (taking increased responsibility for one’s learning) within the field of Adult Education and Human Resource Development. *Note: Malcolm considered andragogy to be his overarching concept of adult learning, and self-directed learning to be the strategy for implementing andragogy. I began learning with Malcolm more than 47 years ago as of this writing in 2014, and in many ways have continued even to the present day. I anticipate that my learning with him will continue for many years to come. Though decades have passed, I can recall my first learning experiences with Malcolm S. Knowles as if it occurred yesterday. (He always liked everyone to call him
Malcolm.) I remain captivated by each of my experiences of learning with Malcolm for a variety of compelling reasons.

For more than 50 years until his death in 1997, Malcolm devoted his personal and professional life to exemplifying the theory and practice of andragogy and self-directed learning: as a speaker to audiences of 10,000 or less; as a university professor with a multiplicity of adult learners (his students); as a consultant to numerous institutions and corporations in countries around the world; as a writer of 19 books and 225 articles; and as a human being that showed great care for any person with whom he happened to be meeting. I observed him being sought out at national conferences, studied with him in my doctoral program, and worked with him in various educational settings. Malcolm was just Malcolm through and through. Eight successfully defended doctoral dissertations have been written about various aspects of Malcolm’s work in andragogy. I believe Dušan Savićević, a University Professor from Belgrade (from whom Malcolm received the concept of andragogy) was right when he said that the world-wide history of andragogy will give Knowles a meritorious place in the development of this scientific discipline.

My personal experience of learning andragogy and Self-Directed Learning with Malcolm

My personal and professional learning relationship with Malcolm, that blossomed and came to flower over the years, started in 1967. During the summer of that year I made preparations to move in September, halfway across the USA from Jacksonville, Illinois, to Boston, Massachusetts with my pregnant wife, Carol, and two daughters in our automobile pulling a U-haul trailer. Also during the summer of 1967, Malcolm convened an impromptu doctoral admittance committee meeting and approved my application to officially start on the program that fall semester. From that beginning, I was the beneficiary of a series of actions by Malcolm, who consistently expressed a caring attitude toward students. Such caring was a miracle to me and I was deeply touched. I was learning in the core of my being.

The second night after my arrival at Boston University (BU), Malcolm invited all the Adult Education students to an informal gathering to talk and share. He asked each of the approximately 25 people present to talk about his/her background, how he/she came to BU, what each hoped to gain from the program and anything else each wished to share. When it came my turn to share, one aspect of myself I indicated was that I was taught in my Christian upbringing that the days of miracles had passed immediately after the generation in which Jesus
Christ and the Apostles lived on earth. Nevertheless, I had already experienced the miraculous when Malcolm’s efforts led to my becoming a doctoral student at BU. Here I was, not as yet in a formal class with Malcolm, and I had already experienced learning with him. Katz and Lazerson (1955) explained this in their research suggesting that it is the personal relationship that teaches.

*Three anecdotes show more work needed for strengthening both andragogy and SDL*

There is still much work needed in strengthening both andragogy and SDL. In addition, it is my opinion that improving the cooperation between them could be beneficial to both of them. Moreover, the constituencies each and/or both serve may greatly enhance the long range interests of both. Three dated but clearly visionary and descriptive statements appear quite ‘up-to-date’ in terms of what is proposed and worth considering for the future of andragogy and SDL: Combs (1966); Niebuhr (1981); and, Savićević (1991b).

Combs (1966) fosters a movement toward self-direction in learners by outlining four things that are needed: 1. we need to believe this is important, 2. we need to trust the human organism to be able and willing to self-direct, 3. we need to adopt an experimental attitude toward supporting them as they learn (and make some mistakes as well as successes) to and grow in self-directing, and, 4. we need to provide the opportunity to practice and become very competent in self-direction.

Niebuhr’s (1981) paradigm shift leans very much toward what he asserts, that coherence – a balanced way of life – is a species requirement. However, he cautions that the agencies that once provided it have been disintegrating. Nonetheless, he identifies some promising strategies and ventures: *two constructs, and three tasks are necessary in order to improve the human learning system paradigm.*

First, the two constructs: 1. it is time to conceptualize, comprehend, and make the human learning system an object of policy and program. 2. it is also time to conceptualize, comprehend, and specify in broader yet more explicit terms the individual’s role and responsibility within the human learning system. He proposes that *self-directed development* be used to describe the individual’s learning tasks in achieving a coherent and balanced strategy or theory of living. To this he adds that the construct of the human learning system is a useful reminder to: a. all the institutions and professions in the system that they are part of a larger societal process; and, b. individuals of their personal responsibility in the process of constructing and living their lives. Second, the three tasks which flow from the two
constructs: 1. educating the citizenry on self-directed development; 2. adjusting institutional processes to support self-directed development; and, 3. developing institutional coalitions to synergize the process locally.

Savićević (1991b) proposes that the chief pre-conditions for the future development of andragogy are the intensification of research and the further professionalization of educating and learning of adults. The study of education and adult learning is becoming more and more frequent in all countries and will, no doubt, result in andragogy being more comprehensively established. Currently we still see inadequate and incomplete preparedness on the part of researchers enrolled in graduate studies, especially in terms of sufficient theoretical deliberation in the studied phenomena – andragogy, both the subject and the preparation of andragogical professionals, which are interdependent processes. He declares that the significant task of andragogical research is the creation of a fundamental theoretical basis which would be valid in all fields of adult education and learning. Andragogy needs to form its philosophical basis. It would be best if, in research, efforts were invested in achieving a merging of epistemological, historical, theoretical and empirical research. Such methodological orientation necessitates solid methodological competence and calls for systematic andragogical studies.

Conclusions

Savićević (2008) puts forward a sweeping, panoramic view of the foundation and history of andragogy, which he traces back to ancient times before the common era (BCE), or as some call it, times before Christ (BC). Henschke (2014b, and 2015b) extensively addresses 17 eras of history, philosophy and six major themes of andragogy, going back to ancient times. Other things have been included in this review and analysis. Savićević’s publishing work in andragogy also addresses (2006) international perspectives in andragogy over a 50 year period of his international involvement around the world in Denmark and Sweden, North America, Canada, Great Britain, the International Council of Adult Education, UNESCO, European Society for Research on the Education of Adults, Open University, Council of Europe, Yugoslavia, India, China, Africa, Tanzania, Latin America, Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, the Workers’ Education Association, OCED, and, England and Wales National Institute of Adult Continuing Education. Moreover, I could continue on extensively by bringing in various aspects of Dušan Savićević’s published works on conceptions of andragogy, and the fact that he emphasizes the 21st century as being the century of adult learning. This article in its main purpose seeks to honor Savićević in his
immensely broad scope of contribution to the research and practice of andragogy around the world.

This article also highlighted some of the comparisons and complementary relationship between general research and publishing on andragogy and Self-Directed Learning. I could go on and on in presenting much more about Savićević’s contribution to andragogy and the comparisons and complementary relationship between andragogy and SDL. It also illustrated how andragogy, SDL, and Learning Contracts are combined to further advance the learning process in adults, which supports Savićević’s (2007) notion that the 21st century will be the century of adult learning. Nevertheless, time and space will not permit us to go on here. Moreover, I will continue these ventures for some time to come. This is my first attempt; but it will not be my last. I am firmly planted in both andragogy, SDL, and Learning Contracts. For that I am extremely grateful and privileged to do this work and to present some of my work in studying Savićević’s and Knowles’ work in andragogy, SDL, and Contract Learning.

Savićević (2012) asserts that research in andragogy cannot be reduced to research techniques. He suggests, rather almost insists, that the theoretical and philosophical need to undergird research techniques, methods and procedures – such as spiritual values, aims of education, learning, conceptions of an adult person, andragogical ethical reflection of theory and practice. My research on andragogy exemplifies this. I am not aware if SDL has proposed such a point of view as has Savićević regarding andragogy. I offer that as someone who has worked in andragogy, self-directed learning (at times with LCs), and Malcolm S. Knowles, one of the major movers and shakers in both, I agree with Malcolm’s proposition that andragogy is the overarching concept related to adult learning; and, that SDL is the most important way of enacting andragogy – a complementary relationship between the two – Self-Directed Learning and andragogy.
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Inspiracija za moju perspektivu andragogije – Dušan M. Savićević, najbolji svetski istraživač u oblasti andragogije

Apstrakt: Dušan M. Savićević je više od pola veka bio impozantna ličnost u svom radu, istraživanju i izdavaštvu u oblasti andragogije. Dušanova prizma iskustava iz celog sveta je ključno uticala na to da se andragogija utvrdi kao nauka, na samousmereno učenje i rad, a nadahnula je i druge da razviju sopstveni pogled na andragogiju, uključujući tu i ugovore o učenju, ali i više od toga. Povezivao je andragogiju sa mas-medijima, raznim zemljama, drevnim vodama, ostalim teorijama učenja i njenim panoramskim pregledom celog sveta. U ovom članku sam pokušao da povežem aspekte njegovog prisustva i rada u andragogiji, samousmerenom učenju i ugovorima o učenju, koji su me inspirisali da se posvetim ovom plodnom polju obrazovanja odraslih. Nakon što je Dušan zauvek napustio ovaj svet u junu 2015, zamoljen sam da iznesem neke svoje stavove o andragogiji nadahnute njegovim plodonosnim radom u ovoj oblasti. Ponizno sam prihvatio taj zadatak i verujem da će mu na neki način odati počast. Hvala, Dušane, za to što jeste.

Ključne reči: andragogija, samousmereno učenje, ugovori o učenju, preteče, teorije učenja.