

Kansas State University Libraries

New Prairie Press

Adult Education Research Conference

2013 Conference Proceedings (St. Louis, MO)

Andragogically Building a Doctor of Andragogy Program

Susan K. Isenberg
Lindenwood University

John A. Henschke
Lindenwood University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/aerc>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](#)

Recommended Citation

Isenberg, Susan K. and Henschke, John A. (2013). "Andragogically Building a Doctor of Andragogy Program," *Adult Education Research Conference*. <https://newprairiepress.org/aerc/2013/roundtables/18>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences at New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Adult Education Research Conference by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

Andragogically Building a Doctor of Andragogy Program

Susan K. Isenberg, Lindenwood University, USA

John A. Henschke, Lindenwood University, USA

Abstract: Developing and implementing a Doctor of Andragogy Program andragogically provides an opportunity to ‘think outside the box’. It requires congruency between talking and action. Is this possible to accomplish? Stay tuned.

Developing and implementing new accredited certificate and degree programs at an established university is a difficult undertaking. Faculty members who are expert in the content area usually create new university degree programs. The programs fill a need for a population that requires a degree in a field of study in order to be employable in that field. However, the traditional need for initial employment in the field is not perceived by students or faculty of andragogy. Instead, they appear to seek improvement in their current employment practice. This difference is fundamental and unique to andragogy degrees; therefore, these degrees attract those who are focused on self-improvement rather than employment. Students exemplify and speak of their eagerness for the journey (learning) as well as the destination (degree). In an effort to model the practice – theory connection, students currently taking andragogy courses at a Midwest university within the Instructional Leadership Ed. D. – Andragogy Emphasis Specialty program, are participating in the journey of enhancing the evolution of an independent andragogy doctor of education degree. In addition, since this all began, an online master’s degree and a graduate certificate, guided by the two professors of andragogy, are being developed. This helps to exemplify ‘in word and deed’ that students have a stake in and become very much invested in shaping their andragogy academic study and application.

Typically, the practice of actively involving participants in planning the adult learning process is included in the component parts of a workshop, conference, symposium, or other kinds of adult education programs. However, involving participants/students has not been attempted (as far as we know) in the development of doctoral and master’s degrees and a certificate in andragogy. Vigorously engaging participants in each step of the process of developing academic programs may be tested as an example for possibly helping to improve the field of adult and continuing education. This also will provide an opportunity to analyze how this process is being accomplished in a university setting. Changes may be implemented along the way that will help refine andragogy as it is applied to new territory. In this program, participants are invited to be involved in the process each step of the way with andragogy professors providing guidance and oversight in the overall process. This, in essence, blends the actual research, theory, and practice as an inseparable unit.

Foundational theory, research, practice and the two andragogy professors’ years of experience are blended to inform the scope of this process (Rachal, 2002; Savicevic, 2008; Glancy & Isenberg, 2011; Isenberg & Titus, 1999; Isenberg & Henschke, 2012; and Knowles, 1990). Table 1 below depicts the connections between the eight processes of andragogy and how these programs are being developed within the framework of each process step. Each item demonstrates the engagement of students, but is not complete as to the things included.

Table 1 *Aligning the Eight Process Elements of Andragogy with the Process Elements of*

Building an Andragogy Ed.D. Program to Demonstrate Theory Application

Preparing the learners for what is to come	Professors communicated vision and weekly mutual planning meeting approach to all andragogy students through email and during andragogy courses.
Setting a climate conducive to adult learning	Voluntary participation, sitting at round table in cheery office, drinking coffee, open invitation, open discussion, and respect for all voices and viewpoints. Creating a sense of place.
Involving learners and facilitators in mutual planning to foster pro-active learning	Timeline sequence of events working backward from "go live" deadlines, i.e., planning/co-creating international University partnerships, and planning/creating cultural experiences.
Engaging participants in a process of diagnosing their own learning needs	Developed Master's and Doctoral Assessment Instrument completed by all students in the program. Sent out survey on Survey Monkey to all andragogy students to see what courses they would like offered and in what sequence.
Facilitating the learners in translating their learning needs into learning objectives	Contract doctoral degrees as short-term goal, master's online degree, certificate, and free standing doctoral degree as long term goals.
Designing a mutually beneficial pattern of learning experiences	Weekly meetings, development of program and course proposals, market analysis, marketing plan, webpage planning, conference presentation planning, research planning, planning and executing lectures/discussions with "international" partners.
Collaborating with and allowing adult learners to manage and carry out their learning plans	Advocacy and seeking ways around barriers, providing face-to-face experience for interns, graduate assistants, independent study students, and international students.
Learners and facilitators assessing participant satisfaction and the extent to which participants have achieved their learning objectives	Weekly meeting, participant assessment biannually, program standards assessment at start and finish of program.

Note. Adapted From (Knowles, 1990; Isenberg & Henschke, 2012)

References

Glancy, F. & Isenberg, S. (2011). A conceptual e-learning framework. *Proceedings of the European Mediterranean and Middle Eastern Conference on Information Systems*, Athens, Greece, ELKM2 retrieved from <http://www.iseing.org/emcis/EMCISWebsite/EMCISProceedings2011.html>

Isenberg, S. & Henschke, J. (2012). Using andragogy to build a doctor of education program. *Proceedings of the 31st annual Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Extension Education*, Edmond, Oklahoma, 83-88.

Isenberg, S. & Titus, T. (1999). The impact of the Internet on research-to-practice in adult, continuing, extension, and community education. In A. Austin, G. Hynes, & R. Mill (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in adult, continuing, and community education: 9/22-24*, St. Louis, MO, 141-148.

Knowles, M. (1990). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. 4th Ed. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Rachal, J. (2002, May). Andragogy detectives: A critique of the present and a proposal for the future. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 52(3), 210-227.

Savicevic, D. (2008). Convergence or divergence of ideas on andragogy in different countries. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 27(4), 361-378.

The Motivation and Transformation of White Culturally Responsive Higher Education Professors

China Carter Jenkins, Texas A&M University, USA

Abstract: The purpose of this round table is to discuss the motivation, transformation and pedagogy of eight White culturally responsive professors featured in the author's dissertation. This dialogue will highlight the participants' perspectives on culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) and compare it with the discourse of CRP in higher education.

Introduction

Institutions of higher learning have become much more racially, culturally and linguistically diverse. Rising enrollments by students of color as well as students from nonwestern nations into predominately White institutions (PWIs) have significantly affected the population demographics of those schools. Haviland and Rodriguez-Kiino (2008) noted that, as student populations in these colleges and universities become more diverse, the challenges associated with teaching a diversity of students tend to rise. Scholars have argued that, because people have different racial identity development processes, epistemologies, and cultural belief systems, professors must know and understand their students' cultural differences and how those differences impact their learning (Richards, Brown, & Forde, 2007, Gollnick and Chinn, 2002). Much has been written about White professors being out of sync with many of the needs of their students of color and are, therefore, not culturally sensitive with their pedagogy. However, some White educators have taken on the challenge of creating inclusive classrooms and environments that exemplify culturally responsive pedagogy. This round table will discuss the author's dissertation research that focuses on the journey that eight White culturally responsive professors took to become culturally responsive educators.

Background

In the past, educators were trained to view adult learners as a homogenous group. Therefore, they expected learners of color to learn in the same manner as those in the mainstream culture. As a result, learners of non-dominant cultures often find that their personal experiences do not coincide with what is being taught in higher education. Consequently, education practitioners who instruct adults of various social, cultural, racial and linguist backgrounds are often unprepared to serve them. Gloria Ladson-Billings coined the phrase "culturally relevant teaching" to explain a method of teaching that uses the learners' cultural referents to empower them academically, socially, psychologically, and politically (1992). Canniff (2008), Gay (2000) and Sealey-Ruiz, (2007) suggest that educators who practice culturally responsive pedagogy can have a positive influence on the lives of their students, especially students of color, because they develop alternate pedagogies to compliment the educational experiences of their students.

A substantial amount of literature has been written on defining culturally responsive pedagogy and theoretical and practical approaches to reaching students of varying backgrounds. However, there is a void of the lived experiences of education scholars, which may inform others about significant issues concerning culturally responsive teaching in higher education.