How transformative are community education projects? Meta-analysis of two case studies

ANDREA MATTIA MARCELLI

Docente a contratto Discipline demoetnoantropologiche
Unicusano

VINCENZO SALERNO
Ricercatore di Pedagogia Generale e Sociale
Unicusano

Riassunto
Questo contributo è una metanalisi di due casi di educazione comunitaria: una mostra riguardante gli Eelam Tamil (Londra); una passeggiata di attraversamento di una comunità svantaggiata (Sud Africa). L'analisi ha lo scopo valutare questi interventi alla luce di sei categorie fondate sull'apprendimento trasformativo. Il risultato qualitativo più saliente di questo studio riguarda il complesso rapporto tra costruzione di ruoli sociali stabili e raggiungimento dei fini trasformativi comunitari.

Abstract
This paper is a meta-analysis of two community education projects: an exhibition on the Eelam Tamil (London); a transect walk in a vulnerable community (South Africa). The analysis aims to assess such interventions through the lenses of six categories drawn on transformative learning. The most relevant qualitative result obtained by this study deals with the complex relation between construction of stable social roles and the achievement of community transformative goals.

Parole chiave: Apprendimento trasformativo, Educazione comunitaria, Meta-analisi.

Keywords: Community education, Meta-analysis, Transformative learning.

1. Notes for the assessment of community education projects in terms of transformative learning[1]

According to Mycroft (2020), "community education" grasps an element of adult education, which often blurs into "further education": it is the act of re-skilling adults and prepare them for unprecedented and unpredictable tasks, with emphasis on the intergenerational character of such type of learning. If Mycroft's ontological approach is taken for granted, three analytic parameters emerge, which could be used to situate educational practices: an intergenerational dimension, and a communal or transformative dimension.

Whereas the former is descriptively established in terms of generational access to resources and the ability to pass them (or their products) over to other generational cohorts, the latter calls into question a qualitative dimension that requires presence and sharing (compare with Mycroft, 2020, pp. 53–57). "Presence" is a notion of Heideggerian reminiscence, which plays a pivotal role in De Martino's interpretation of community crises (Farnetti & Stewart, 2012; Saunders, 1993). Sharing requires the creation of a sense of community that fosters mutual understanding and is a pivotal notion in Mezirow's theory of transformative learning (Mezirow, 2018/2006).

As anticipated by Mezirow, when transformative learning takes place, some constraints are waived, chains are broken, and inclusivity is achieved. A first epistemological step towards this was achieved in Italy by the *scienze della formazione* (brief: *formazione*) paradigm, which rethinks education with privileged reference to non-formal and informal frameworks. As such, it advocates the emancipation of pedagogies by both overcoming the top-down perspective of curricular studies and by embracing the praxeological side of science. The latter means acknowledging education is part of the *Greater Humanities* and one of its roles is that of changing the ethical-political

[1] **Authorship:** Andrea Mattia Marcelli (*section 1*, *section 3*); Vincenzo Salerno (*section 2*, *section 4*, *section 5*).

reality—that is, to transform the social world we live in (Clifford, 2013; for an epistemological analysis, see Author1, 2020). Hence, "community education" (in Mycroft's intergenerational understanding) and Mezirow's transformative learning are faces of the same phenomenal reality.

As it happens with other educational models, its paradigm is grounded on convictions that, on the one hand, play the role of facts, whereas, on the other hand, they play the role of instruction. Such distinction between the descriptive—or empirical—level of foundational statements and the normative—or ideological—one is warranted by the assumption that the core of paradigms (and research programmes) is partly composed of unfalsifiable tenets that blur the border between *is* and *ought* (Kuhn, 1962; Lakatos, 1976). It is then better to address such paradigmatic elements as a *discourse*, which rests on its own rule to establish what *counts as* a fact and what *counts* as a direction, instruction, or duty (Foucault, 1969). This way, we could analyse epistemological constellations such as that of transformative community education without engaging in aprioristic ontological considerations inasmuch, as far as the paradigm is concerned, it could be treated as the grounding element of a discursive practice. Hence, concerning transformative community education, how does the interplay unfold between empirical statements and normative ones?

A first point is that transformative community education believes change is possible, and *feasible*. The latter specification is paramount, since theoretical possibilities could backfire and convince agents (e.g., learners) of options that are not even on the table. For example, the member of a community *could* purchase a lottery ticket and get rich tomorrow, but the rarity of such occurrence prompts more poignant concerns about the structural reality that constrains her freedom of action: through what means is she *currently able to* realistically improve her living conditions? The answer is a daunting one for oppressed communities since the hegemonic ties of long-established social realities such as colonialism are far-reaching (Alemazung, 2010). Thus,

theoretical considerations should make room for practical ones, which stem from an appreciation of the empirical reality that surrounds subjects and the communities they live in. Transformative community education appropriates such pragmatic tenets and focuses on *proximal* change rather than the theoretical one.[2]

Transformation requires action, and action is theory-laden and ideologically driven. Although this paper does not hinge on the assumption that action research methodology is the only way to enact change in a community, the author believes that critiques to action research could be extended to transformative approaches *in general*. In her doctoral dissertation Felix (2016) outlines many such critiques: transformative research is hardly transferable, often prescriptive, and even patronizing when it is not critically engaged. That is why, as Felix acknowledges, sound action research methodologies are *critical* in Habermas' sense of the expression (see Fraser, 1995), which lays the ground for Mezirow's notion of transformation (Mezirow 2018/2006). But transformation is not just epistemologically dangerous because it could channel change through crystallized prescription. In fact, it could also constitute another way to exercise hegemony in seemingly post-colonial contexts. This latter concern was partly addressed by Gill et al. (2012): even when action research (hence, transformation) is participatory, it might suffer from "modernism, monolingualism, eurocentrism and colonialism". For example: "multiculturalism" could often be "a discourse of tokenistic colonial benevolence"; additionally, "internationalization" practices work as a reinforcement of a pro-Atlantic towards work and education: the more you pay, the better the educational outputs, and the higher social status is gained—all in a formal Westernized scenario. Other risks entail an excessive detachment between researchers and communities (with researchers been seen as "different"), a lack of proper

[2] For the Vygotsky-inspired terminology, see (Fleer, 2016).

appreciation of the voices of learners—which are the most relevant stakeholders of education—and underappreciation of the limits of action and the rationality behind it. Unfortunately, Gill et al.'s solution is unilateral: participatory action research appears to be the only viable approach, yet some questions are left unanswered.

These views could be supplemented through the work of Absolon (2019). Absolon recognizes "institutions are either set up to support people, police or control them, or in the case of Indigenous peoples, eradicate or assimilate"; for this reason, she thinks of "educational structures as sites of change". This means that the educational issue faced by fragile communities does not stem from the change vs. *status quo* dichotomy; in fact, even the *status quo*—that is, surviving colonial structures—are indeed devices of change, except they act towards a reinforcement of the pre-existing lines of hegemony, rather than dismantling them. This means that transformative education is ethically successful whenever it can demonstrate it goes against hegemonic trends. Not just pioneering action research, then, but also policy change and curriculum reform—e.g., through "indigenization" or "*Indigegogy*".

Following the review Absolon's experience as an Indigenous trainer of social workers, a first remark could be made concerning ecosystemic change as a requirement for transformative education practices. Ecosystemic change is challenging, because it needs an adequate appreciation of the existing learning ecosystem in order to deconstruct and substitute parts of such device through targeted action. For instance, ecosystemic thought in education was advanced by Toutain et al. (2019). Their focus is on entrepreneurship competence rather than decolonization, but the effectiveness of their results demonstrates that educational issues should be tackled with a multi-level approach—let alone some room for localized experimentation. A state-of-the-art ecosystemic study requires a description of at least three societal layers: that of policies, that of organizational intentions and commitments, and that of the learners' experience. The goal of the ecosystemic assessment is to

control for alignment between the three elements and for causal links. By doing so Toutain at al. end up systematizing what Absolon (2019) would call "*wholism*", which she believes to be an essential approach to transformative education and learning.

Another intriguing point of Absolon concerns the need to "unlearn" colonial beliefs and attitudes. Such claim challenges the core of most educational paradigms, which rely on some (Westernized) assumptions that regard learning as a process of growth. Rather, if we understand learning as a process of adaptation (and self-adaptation), the tables are turned: learning is not a matter of knowledge accruement; rather, it is a matter of shaping [Italian: *formare*] the self (and the community). Knowledge accumulation assumes a linear development, and it is said to belong to an evolutionary stage in which agricultural societies emerged and developed their quasi-pyramidal hegemonic systems, including statehood and appropriation of the land—a system that is ultimately overcome by distributed networks of scientific leadership (see Björk, 2018).

Consistently with this—even though Absolon stresses the subversive element of *unlearning* embedded in her *Indigeogy*—we maintain *unlearning* is not the same thing as "*miseducation*". In fact, *unlearning* could be regarded as one of the ultimate steps of competence development. Take the SOLO taxonomy, for example (Biggs & Collis, 1982): the apex of competence acquisition entails reflection and the ability to step aside and almost look at the developed skills and practices from afar. Such Wittgenstenian act of "kicking the ladder" (Wittgenstein, 1922) is what projects the learner beyond the constraints of mere expertise and transforms her into a "leader" of that competence domain (Seemiller & Whitney, 2020). Namely, an expert technician could indeed adapt earlier solutions to new problems; but a leading technician is also able to situate herself at the helm of the broader market, understand needs of the community, and eventually steer the vessel towards unknown directions. Interestingly, then, the act of *unlearning* is possibly the chain ring that links

the last step of *education* with the first step of situated *leadership*. This does not overlook the fact that leadership could count as a competence in its own right but shows that "informed leadership" (that is, leadership stemming from the understanding of competences and processes, not sheer manipulation of one's peers) is one of the almost-natural developments of well-ingrained expertise.

2. Methodology

This paper gathers the former theoretical remarks into a framework for the evaluation of two studies in transformative education and learning. At this stage, the frame does not work as a ranking tool, but as a toolkit to identify critical elements and to control for the interaction of the different dimensions that have been highlighted through the literature review. Conclusions will then be drawn to guide transformative practices in prospective community education projects.

Thus, six key dimensions will be employed to critically analyse each study: *presence*, *intergenerational impact*, *feasibility* (and related challenges), *ecosystemic dimensions*, *emergence of new sustained leadership roles*, *unlearning*.

At this stage, the validity and significance of such items needs to be tested. Therefore, the authors set themselves to the task of carrying out the concurrent evaluation of two studies and to retain only the appraisals that reflected a 100% agreement between the two evaluators. Assuming that the exploration of the above six dimensions of transformativity does not yet account for a systematic qualitative ranking scale, the task had to be undertaken as an open-ended qualitative study (see Church & Rogers, 2006, p. 58) that proceeds by means of a Boyatzis-inspired thematic analysis (1998). This means that data were interpreted and rendered in a discursive way that could contribute to the appropriate framing of the above items. The resulting

assessments will serve as a guide for future appraisals, as well as an instructional tool for prospective inquirers and collaborators.

The sampling of appropriate case studies to assess presented its own challenges. Initially, 43 articles from 2006 to 2022 were identified that constituted viable candidates for these initial validating appraisals (convenience sampling). However, the lack of previous validity studies on the above analytical items called for a detailed examination of each sampled unit. Such course of action greatly increased the time length dedicated by each author to each appraisal.

Therefore, the authors elected to focus extensively on two of the most suitable and most recent examples of community education research: this accounts for about 5% of the previously agreed total, but is in line with the hermeneutical and discursive approach adopted to ensure the external validity of the results—close-quarter validity being more important, at this pioneering stage, than massive transferability.

Another reason to greatly reduce the sample of the meta-analysis is that sampled articles had to be sufficiently analogous to the guiding scenario that prompted the sketching of the analytical items. This means the appraised studies had to be reasonably similar to what described by Absolon (2019). Articles that tackled community education in a mostly theoretical way were promptly excluded—an example being the paper of Oneț (2021). Finally, the works of Lorenzo and Motau (2014) and of Seoighe (2021) were identified as those that could be foundational to the testing of the qualitative analytical tool based on the above six key dimensions.

3. Appraisal A: working with Eelam Tamil identity in London (UK)

Seoighe (2021) worked with Eelam Tamil (Sri Lankan Tamils) expats in London and her investigation report focuses on an exhibition about Eelam Tamil heritage that was held in 2019 at the Tamil Information Centre of the

city. The organization of the exhibition is viewed under the lenses of "memory work", which is instrumental to the construction of a counter-narrative to that of the winning side of the Sri Lanka civil war (ended in 2009). Collected data included: interviews with Eelam Tamil volunteers, documents and materials produced for and by the exhibition, and participant observation on behalf of the inquirer, who was an organizer herself.

Item	Achievements	Challenges
Presence	The exhibition was attended, over a two-days period, by about 2,000 visitors, which is an astounding figure giving the relative small size of the exhibition and it being concurrent with the political Eelam Tamil protests.	Although located in a city inhabited by the Tamil diaspora, the exhibition is detached from ordinary community life. This is intentional, given the exhibition was conceived as an interruption of ordinary life.
Intergenerational impact	Possibly, a gap was bridged between the first-generation Tamil refugees and the youngest ones who were still processing the 2009 defeat.	Volunteers cooperated but kept their goals distinct from each other: some sought advocacy, others pursued historical documentation, other ones expected community building, etc. A critical issue emerged concerning the representation of "Tamil mistakes"
Feasibility	The exhibition was not effortless but benefitted from broad participation and volunteering. Resources were appropriate to the task.	No specific organizational obstacles were encountered.
Ecosystemic dimensions	The leader of the British opposition was involved. Additionally, instances of *memory activism* entailed the creation of an interactive exhibition. Attendants to the exhibition reported ability to address their past with a renewed and more hopeful emotional stance.	A conflict emerged because of the overlapping of the exhibition with the protests that regularly take place on the anniversary of the 2009 defeat. This was addressed by extending the hours of the exhibition.
Leadership	A centralizing, tolerant leader that bridges intergenerational and political gaps.	Volunteerism on behalf of a single individual; over-reliance on personality traits.
Unlearning	The exhibition tackled and challenged the dominant Sinhalese narrative on the Sri Lankan civil conflict	Concurrently, participating volunteers had to come to term with the accounts of human rights violations on behalf of some Eelam Tamil fighters

Table 1 – Thematic analysis of the "Tamils of Lanka: a Timeless Heritage" exhibition as reported by Seoighe (2021).

Table 1 illustrates the analysis carried out by the authors of this paper after gathering inputs published by Seoighe in her report (2021). Across all dimensions, the relevant nodes concern: the ability of the exhibition to exert its presence among the Tamil community (and Eelam Tamil, in particular); ability to create shared goals; absence of further sustained ecosystemic

interactions at the policy level; over-reliance on the personality of a single, outstanding director. Emphasis on such aspects does not entail disapproval or behalf of the authors of this paper. Rather, it reflects the need to identify areas of proximal development for community actions.

For example, concerning the three-layered notion of *learning ecosystem* hereby adopted, the Eelam Tamil exhibition of 2019 appears to be very effective in triggering emotional responses in its participants. This means that at least two out of the three levels of the ecosystem were being touched upon. Difficulties in obtaining a political follow-up at the level of British lawmakers is possibly the result of contingent events, such as the invited opposition MP's failure to gain the majority vote in the subsequent year—that is, a requirement that is well beyond the scope of the Eelam Tamil initiative of 2019.

An *intergenerational challenge* faced by the exhibition was the different timing in the arrival of the members of the Eelam Tamil diaspora. Long-term London residents of Eelam Tamil origin did not share the same degree of politicization as the most recent refugees, whose lives had been transformed by the end of the war. Thus, it was the latter, the younger ones, who set out to organize events that could put the Eelam Tamil diaspora on the limelight with the hope of an intervention into Sri Lankan affairs by the International Court of Justice. In such an activist context—Seoighe explains—memory is made, shaped, and crafted to create a dissident perspective on historical and current events. The advantage of the action research intervention addressed by her was that it eventually brought together different generations by creating a shared space where memories could be processed and made available to others.

Other challenges were readily overcome through the action of *a cohesive leader* who managed to entertain a dialogue with diaspora Eelam Tamils from all political sides. However—as Seoighe remarks—the effectiveness of such action was diminished by the fact that it heavily depended upon the personality of such leader. This meant that the processes he had set up might

not survive his eventual demise—which occurred in March 2019, that is, before the exhibition was ready.

The *presence* indicator was very positive and could be assessed in the following way. The 2011 census put the Tamil-speaking population in London at 70,565 units, the greatest part of which is made up of Eelam Tamils (Jones, 2020, p. 59). By taking Seoighe's exhibition attendance datum at face value, it follows the action research intervention reached out to about 2.83% of the London Tamils. The British Government "Ethnicity facts and figures" service reports that, in the 2018–2019, 43.7% of interviewed people of Asian descent had visited a museum or a gallery (Government of the United Kingdom, 2021); however, other sources have a lower figure for individuals of low socioeconomic backgrounds (Statista, 2021)—that is, a likely occurrence for Eelam Tamils. Considering the exhibition was open only for two days in a solar year (0.55%) and given the above 43.7% yearly figure, the initiative might have reasonably expected an absolute attendance of about 169 visitors; instead, it welcomed about 2,000—almost 12 times more.[3]

4. Appraisal B: transect walks and community education in South Africa

Whereas Soeighe's memory work with Eelam Tamils took place in the relatively tranquil landscape of a Western European metropolis, the second subject of this paper's appraisal is located in a more challenging landscapes, which is better described through the words of the action researchers that worked there:

> "Public schooling in post-apartheid South Africa is in perpetual and deepening crisis, characterized by poor throughput and high dropout rates;

[3] This calculation is a 'thumb-rule', does not account for holidays, weather, and social events—thus assuming an invariant likelihood of attendance throughout the year. Notwithstanding the overall scientific unsoundness of this thumb-rule, the resulting figure of 169 expected visitors in a two-days period appears reasonable for such a minor event. For comparison, consider the well-established Geffrye Museum, which ranks among the "small museums" (Woollard, 2018): it received 38,463 visitors in the 2018–2019 accounting year—that is, about 105 visitors per day of the solar year (The Geffrye Museum Trust, 2020).

large student-to-teacher ratio; an increase in race and gender violence; a decline in teacher morale; weakened teacher unions; and conflict and protests. In addition to the above, privatization of education is rising while our public schools are stripped of resources, aligning them to the whims of the market, which furthers inequality as reflected in a national quintile system" (Geduld et al., 2020, p. 15).

Item	Achievements	Challenges
Presence	The transect walk technique enabled the embedding of investigators (who had also a role in the management of rehabilitation services) in the fabric of the community. Moreover, the community was surveyed with a passer-by perspective.	Transect walk run the risk of overlooking the existence of hidden issues.
Intergenerational impact	No data available (although encountered participants belonged to all age groups)	
Feasibility	The transect walk was not effortless but achieved most of its preliminary goals. Resources were appropriate to the task.	No specific organizational obstacles were encountered.
Ecosystemic dimensions	Transect walks are great ways to identify the outcome of specific policies. Moreover, during this specific transect walk, a bridge was thrown across the gap between community members and providers of rehabilitation services.	This intervention is still two-sided, whereas a three-sided ecosystemic outlook could have helped making sustained change to the types of services the community has access to.
Leadership	There is a reworking of leadership roles in the transect walk project. This entails the destitution of "ivory tower" attitudes on behalf of academic researcher and attain public-driven data gathering.	Although the community was empowered as a result of the transect walk data gathering, no specific arrangement was made to modify the leadership structure of the rehabilitation services (and it was not a state goal of the critical research activity).
Unlearning	The transect walk appeared appropriate to overcome the constraints imposed on humane education and rehabilitation by neoconservative and neoliberal structures acting upon South African society. Moreover, transect walks could make for a teaching opportunity within teacher preparation programmes.	The thematic analysis resulting from the transect walk preserves the analytical categories drawn on previous decisions by the Community-Based Rehabilitation service. Nonetheless, such decisions were fully informed.

Table 2 – Thematic analysis of the Winterveldt's "Transect Walk" as reported by Lorenzo and Motau (2014).

Lorenzo and Motau (2014) report on the outcomes of a transect walk project, which took place in Winterveldt. Winterveldt is an urbanized area of about 800,000–1,000,000 inhabitants located at the fringes of a greater metropolitan area in South Africa. It developed in the 1960s and 1970s as an informal hub of refugees coming from nearby States. The greatest turn in Winterveldt

history was determined by the 1996 Mandela provisions, which determined the development of local infrastructures, up to 11 newly built schools, as well as fresh water and sewage systems.

Winterveldt scenario proved challenging because of the punctuated nature of services and infrastructures for children with disabilities—whose needs were the focus of the transect walk. An early difficulty encountered by previous investigators was making facilitators come together and work under a shared vision: originally, after training, they would work "alone" (Lorenzo & Motau, 2014, p. 47). However, in the following years, a more structured service came into existence: university lecturers would supervise facilitators and graduating students, who in turn manned day-care centres and set out to train other adults for the purpose of managing and rehabilitating children with disabilities (Shipham and Meyer, 2002).

The project undertaken by Lorenzo and Motau (2014) followed a Community Participatory Action Research (CPAR). Again, as in Seoighe (2021), *presence* was crucial in attaining learning goals for prospective educators. This was achieved through "transect walks": walking activities in which a group of people crosses (transects) a certain area, either urban or rural. During transect walks, observation could take place, as well as questions and interviews concerning the situation of a town or an area. This is expected to help educators get in touch with the needs of a given community. Notwithstanding this, the downside of transect walks is their convenience sampling has a masking effect on individuals that do not partake in public space activities: this means that many potential participants could remain hidden from the eyes of the investigators.

In particular, participatory rural appraisals enabled them to touch on different ecosystemic dimensions and verify the successfulness of existing policies. The result of such transect walks could be the drafting of community maps, which help educators engage with the *ecosystemic* nature of their professional activities. However, the ecosystemic outreach of the project still operates at

only two of the three levels envisaged in *section 1* of this paper: policy outcomes are assessed through interviews with encountered community members, but no specific policy change was effected as a consequence of the project. Additionally, the project did not address critically the main tenets of the pre-existing Community-Based Rehabilitation (CBR) programme.

Notwithstanding the above limitations, Lorenzo and Motau's project resulted in enhanced information that proved functional to the work of facilitators and educators. Although the distinction between the inquirers and the respondents was preserved during the CPAR-driven questioning of passers-by, the thematization, rearrangement, and delivery of community-produced data created a bridge between the two poles of the CBR programme: facilitators and the community itself. This acts as a reworking of *leadership* hierarchies: CBR managers become investigators and listeners to the community's needs. The community, in turn, exerts a newfound power over the delivery of essential services. Concurrently, the community is also empowered through the creation of a thread of awareness—which is physically mirrored by the path of the transect walk.

These results are echoed by Geduld et al. (2020). These scholars outline the main aspects that ought to be challenged through critical pedagogy in order to attain an educational outlook that is better tailored to the needs of marginalized communities. Drawing on their narrative, it follows the main challenge of educator training in South Africa is represented by repeated neoliberal attempts to transform education (and tertiary education in particular) into an élite sector that is detached from the rest of the citizenry. Furthermore, a widespread cult of efficiency tends to transform education into an assembly line process, which overlooks the most human (and humane) aspects of learning. This goes in line with a culture of practical education, whose focus is on skills rather than competences.

Hence, educator training is faced with a double task: on the one hand, educators are expected by critical pedagogues to *unlearn* the economically

neoliberal and culturally neoconservative tenets imbued in their lot by some structural elements of the current South African society. Additionally, once educators achieve emancipation, they should become critical activists and contribute to the same changes in their pupils' mindsets through teaching. In this sense, it is more apt to talk of "teacher preparation" rather than "teacher training" (Geduld et al., 2020, p. 21)—and the same could be said for Lorenzo and Motau's facilitators. As anticipated in *section 1*, this is in line with the *formazione* paradigm that guides the theoretical framework of this paper.

5. Conclusions

This paper aimed to contribute to the validation of six analytical dimensions—each corresponding to a relevant item—by using them to assess the transformative significance of two community education projects.

Both demonstrated improved presence of the investigators on the territory, which is consistent with the tenet of both ethnographic and participatory action research. Additionally, the meta-analysis showed that, when the roles of inquirers and organizers overlap, at least two ecosystemic dimensions are always stressed. Finally, the element of unlearning is very significant, meaning that both studies adopted critical views that could be translated into practices community members could partake with.

On the downside, both projects did not engage systematically with the upper echelons of the ecosystem they related to. This does not entail the failure of said projects but casts a shadow on their ability to sustain change once change is achieved. Hence, it follows full transformative learning, especially at the community level, is unattainable in the long run unless changes acquire some sort of formal status. This is evident in the difficulties encountered when dealing with leadership roles: when leadership was acknowledged as part of the community education project, it was taken at face value and not as a process that could produce leadership effects notwithstanding the absence of gifted individuals; conversely, when leadership was not directly targeted, a

disadvantage was registered by the authors of this paper with regards to the most delicate item of the lot: that is, the unlearning of structurally ingrained hierarchies and stereotypes.

The above results lead the authors to an intriguing conclusion: the outreach of community education projects, when understood in terms of transformative learning, is not dependent upon the size of a specific intervention but on its ability to articulate itself through the multiple indicators of transformativity. This was already assumed by transformative learning theory (featured in *section 1*) but the meta-analysis of two cases proves the point: the magnitude of educational interventions is indeed relative to the size of the involved communities, but it could be boosted via a multiplication of its layers of interaction. This is both good news and bad news for community education projects: on the plus side, it means allocated economic resources could stay in the small scale and there is no need to escalate community-level projects in terms of available funding; however, on the downside, it means that unless appropriate the actors unlock self-sustaining leadership-enhancement processes and reach out to policymakers in order to modify their visions and decisions, community education projects run the risk of remaining a *unicum* with only contingent rather than permanent effects.

References

Absolon, K. (2019). Decolonizing Education and Educators' Decolonizing. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Polity, and Practice*, *7*(1), 9–28. Retrieved on May 10, 2022 from https://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/IJ/article/view/2073

Alemazung, J. A. (2010). Post-colonial colonialism: An analysis of international factors and actors marring African socio-economic and political development. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, *3*(10), 62–84. Retrived on May 10, 2022 from

https://www.jpanafrican.org/archive_issues/vol3no10.htm

Biggs, J., & Collis, K. (1982). *Evaluating the Quality of Learning: The SOLO Taxonomy*. New York: Academic Press.

Björk, L. E. (2018). *Education and the Cybernetic Hypothesis: A Synoptic View* [Master's thesis]. Faculty of Education.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming Qalitative Infromation: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*. Sage.

Church, C., & Rogers, M. M. (2006). *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. Washington, DC: Search for Common Ground, Alliance for Peacebuilding, United States Institute of Peace. Retrieved on May 10, 2022 from https://www.sfcg.org/Documents/manualpart1.pdf

Clifford, J. (2013). The Greater Humanities. *Occasion: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities*, 5, 1–5. Retrieved May 10, 2022 from http://arcade.stanford.edu/occasion/greater-humanities

Farnetti, T., & Stewart, C. (2012). An introduction to "Crisis of presence and religious reintegration" by Ernesto de Martino. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, *2*(2), 431–433. https://doi.org/10.14318/hau2.2.024

Felix, S. M. C. (2016). *Fostering Criticality within Neoliberal Higher Education: A Critical Action Research Study with First Year Students in Kazakhstan* [Doctoral thesis]. The University of Sussex: School of Education and Social Work. http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/61301

Fleer, M. (2016). The Vygotsky Project in Education – The Theoretical Foundations for Analysing the Relations between the Personal, Institutional and Societal Conditions for Studying Development. In D. S. P. Gedera, & P. J. Williams (eds.), *Activity Theory in Education: Research and Practice* (pp. 1-18). Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Fraser, N. (1995). What's Critical about Critical Theory?. In J. Meehan (ed.), *Feminists Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse* (pp. 21–55). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203094006

Foucault, M. (1969). *L'Archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.

Geduld, D., Baatjes, I., & Sathorar, H. (2020). Preparing Foundational Phase Educators: Reading the Word and the World through Transect Walks. In J. D. Kirylo (ed.), *Reinventing Pedagogy of the Oppresssed* (pp. 15–25). London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic. http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350117211.ch-002

Gill, H., Purru, K., & Lin, G. (2012). In the Midst of Participatory Action Research Practices: Moving towards Decolonizing and Decolonial Praxis.

Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology, *3*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.7577/rerm.357

Government of the United Kingdom. (2021). Visits to museums and galleries. *Ethnicity Facts and Figures*. Retrieved on May 10, 2022 from https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/culture-and-community/culture-and-heritage/adults-visiting-museums-and-galleries/latest

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jones, D. (2020). *Superdiverse Diaspora: Everyday Identifications of Tamil Migrants in Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Lakatos, I. (1976). Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. In S. G. Harding (ed.) *Can Theories be Refuted? Essays on the Duhem-Quine Thesis* (pp. 205–259). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1863-0_14

Lorenzo, T. & Motau, J. (2014). A Transect Walk to Establish Opportunities and Challenges for Youth with Disabilities in Winterveldt, South Africa. *Disability, CBR & Inclusive Development*, *25*(3), 45–63. http://doi.org/10.5463/dcid.v25i3.232

Mezirow, J. (2018/2006). Transformative learning theory. In K. Illeris, *Contemporary Theories of Learning: Learning Theorists... In Their Own Words* (pp. 114–128). London and New York: Routledge.

Mycroft, H. L. (2020). *Strange Times: The creation of a nomadic community education imaginary* [Doctoral thesis]. University of Huddersfield. http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/35563/

Oneț, M.-G. C. (2021). Towards a Transdiciplinary Systemic Approach to National Heritage-Based Learning. Curricular Insights into the Romanian Art Education Reform in the Glocal Transformative Age. *Educatia 21 Journal*, *20*(14), 111–119. https://doi.org/10.24193/ed21.2021.20.14

Saunders, G. R. (1993). "Critical Ethnocentrism" and the Ethnology of Ernesto De Martino. *American Anthropologist*, *95*(4), 875–893. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1993.95.4.02a00060

Seemiller, C., & Whitney, R. (2020). Creating a Taxonomy of Leadership Competency Development. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *19*(1), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.12806/V19/I1/R5

Seoighe, R. (2021). Reimagining Narratives of Resistance: Memory Work in the London Tamil Diaspora. *State Crime Journal*, *9*(2), 169–195. https://doi.org/10.13169/statecrime.9.2.0169

Shipham, E., Meyer, C. M. H. (2002). The value of community-based rehabilitation to mothers with disabled children in Winterveldt. *South African Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *32*(2), 6–11.

Statista. (2021). Share of adults who visited a museum or gallery in the last year in England from 2012/13 to 2018/19, by socio-economic group. Statista Research Department. Retrieved on May 10, 2022 from https://www.statista.com/statistics/418326/museum-galery-attendance-uk-england-by-socio-economic-group/

The Geffrye Museum Trust. (2020). *Annual Report and Accounts: Year Ended 31 March 2020*. Government of the United Kingdom.

Toutain, O., Mueller, S., & Bornard, F. (2019). Decoding Entrepreneurship Education Ecosystems (EEE): A Cross-European Study in Primary, Secondary Schools and Vocational Training. *Management international / International Management / Gestiòn Internacional*, *23*(5), 47–65. https://doi.org/10.7202/1066711ar

Wittgenstein, L. J. J. (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus / Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung*. London: Kegan Paul.

Woollard, V. (2018) The view from within: a curatorial account of the rise and fall of visits to London museums from 1851–2016: A research note. *Cultural Trends*, *27*(4), 251–269.

https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2018.1503790