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This paper explores ways in which pedagogy for an elaborated form of transformative learning can be a useful catalyst for the development of social capital in community and workplace groups and networks. I begin with an example and then explore ideas of learning challenges embedded in building and maintaining social capital. I consider the usefulness of a four-dimensional approach to transformative learning as a suitable pedagogy for its development and maintenance. The paper concludes with brief profiles of four educators whose work, in different ways, could be said to have promoted forms of social capital, directly or indirectly: Desmond Tutu, Anne Sullivan, Jesus and Socrates. Each of these educators, without excluding other approaches, tended to emphasise one of the four transformative pedagogies.
Introduction: social capital at the Otherway centre

Early in the new century, Aboriginal people linked to Adelaide’s Otherway centre, a Catholic meeting place and religious centre designated for Aboriginal people, discovered that a number of Afghan refugees had arrived in Australia and had been detained at the Baxter detention centre near Port Augusta. In earlier eras, many Aboriginal people had links with Afghani migrants, whose camel teams had carried supplies to outback Australia when there were few roads (cf. Nolan 2005).

Some of the Aboriginal people from the Otherway centre began visiting the detainees and established friendships which were maintained when the Afghanis eventually received temporary protection visas and came to stay in Adelaide with few resources and no certain future. The Aboriginal people offered the refugees the use of the Otherway centre for their religious practices – effectively designating it as a temporary Mosque on their day of worship.

From the perspective of social capital, the trust and social stability of the Otherway centre has been a useful resource to support the transition of the Afghan asylum seekers into a new life of education and employment in Australia. The source of such social capital seems to have been linked to compassion and inclusivity – values which are obliquely fostered by the educational and religious exchanges of the Otherway centre. It is this kind of learning implicit in the notion of social capital and its promotion that is the main concern of the rest of this paper.

Social capital and its learning challenges

Social capital tends to be a shorthand expression used to describe a particular kind of capability that develops in groups and networks with strong and trusting connections insofar as they have increased and deepened their connectedness to each other and participated in what Putnam (2000: 19) called civic engagement or civic virtue:

social capital refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. In that sense social capital is closely related to what some have called ‘civic virtue’. The difference is that ‘social capital’ calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a sense network of reciprocal social relations.

According to Field (2005: 2), Putnam saw active citizenship

as an important source of social capital because it is the main way in which people – particularly those who are strangers to one another – experience reciprocity through their pursuit of shared objectives. This in turn helps to create a dense web of networks underpinned by shared values and producing high levels of social trust, which in turn foster further cooperation between people and reduce the chances of malfeasance.

What can be discerned in this and similar writing about social capital (cf. Bourdieu 1983 and Coleman 1988) is that if people interact in a trusting and friendly way and share ideas and information, their location becomes a catalytic place of encouragement for all kinds of cooperative activities, including of course different kinds of learning. It is the links between social capital and forms of learning that is of interest here, where social capital can be seen as having come about as a result of forms of cooperative learning and, once in position, can become the catalytic site for more and different learning.

The learning embedded in group activities is not necessarily inherently valuable or enriching, since human coming together cannot be presumed to be always for moral and useful purposes. Criminal gangs, fraudulent business associations, unscrupulous get-rich-quick assemblies, proselytising political and religious groups using questionable forms of persuasion all depend upon a degree
of social connectedness. The notion of social capital is presumed to refer to cooperative qualities of a community and to rule out anti-social forms of selective collaboration. As such, it carries with it to a greater or lesser extent a presumption of an inclusive and egalitarian morality. The social cohesion that is a feature of social capital cannot be presumed to occur easily and naturally over time among groups of people. It needs rather to be seen as a learned state achieved by people living companionably together in a region or neighbourhood who have found ways to protect and enrich the inclusive and trusting qualities that enrich their life together.

The question which rises immediately, in the light of the interests of this paper, is whether and in what ways the learning processes for social capital could be enriched by transformative pedagogies which, while concerned about matters of interest to the connected group or network, can be shaped to minimise negative processes and outcomes and promote human betterment.

Learning in community interactions

The strong sense of enrichment in the idea of social capital discussed above tends to draw, to a greater or lesser extent, on a sense of homogeneity and belonging so that people will tend to feel accepted by those they feel they can understand and like and presume that understanding and affection will flow reciprocally. The easy exchanges that characterise this homogeneity can come under challenge when circumstances change. Newcomers to the group and different internal and external circumstances – income, employment, health, community status – can also pose a challenge to the easy solidarity and warmth of the group. Groups and communities can experience considerable tensions depending on different interests, cultures and languages, or interactive style. Kushner and Sterk (2005) show how close-knit communities with apparent strong bonds can have high rates of suicide. Personal and personality differences and various clashes between group members can raise the question of whether benefits of remaining in the group are outweighed by its costs. Attending group meetings and events may begin to be perceived as a chore rather than an enrichment; there can even be a sense of risk and discomfort, particularly if a unresolved clashes and conflicts become part of the collective ‘memory’ of the group.

An early classic definition by Thomas (1976: 891) highlights the significant foundation of conflict as based on clashes of interests: ‘conflict is the process which begins when one party perceives that the other has frustrated, or is about to frustrate, some concern of his [sic]’. For conflict in a group to be minimised and recovered from, participants must assess the value of group coherence and friendly interactions as high enough for them to ameliorate their concerns and interests to win at all costs.

There is thus a lot riding on the quality of the groups and networks that people belong to and in which they seek to make some investment. People who feel they are enriched by their membership in a group can seek to serve it in different ways on the grounds that good relations in groups and communities are easily damaged as circumstances change. Group integrity needs to be monitored and nurtured, and that can often involve learning to make sense of change, and to work out how best to respond to it. Since this represents in many cases a serious departure from commonly held discourses of competition and individualism, the ‘sharing’ attitudes of people in situations of high social capital points to a significant learning process. The group may experience serious learning challenges to find ways to accept and react creatively to change or face the possibility of imminent collapse.

There is of course a very real sense that for groups, as well as for individuals, moments of risk and challenge can also become opportunities for learning and growth. As Gary (2007) expresses it in his ‘managing conflict’ web-site:
Conflict gives rise to expanded information exchange, surfaced rationales, more options, and better group decisions that enable change. Managed poorly, conflict destroys. The dominant motive involved is control.

This is particularly the case if such challenges can be ‘named’ as learning challenges by the group and if the group can find the learning resources and flexibility to make necessary changes and adapt to them. These processes are the pedagogic work of community development educators when they have access to communities and groups and some kind of mandate for their care. Their action needs to be based on comprehensive ideas of learning and its facilitation.

Three dimensions of learning

In *The three dimensions of learning*, Illeris (2002: 19) writes that ‘learning simultaneously comprises a cognitive, an emotional and psychodynamic, and a social and societal dimension’. When examining the learning linked to the development of social capital, one needs to look for its cognitive, emotional and social dimensions.

The cognitive learning dimension of social capital can be understood as validating the rational logic underpinning social cohesion and co-operation, which of course involves perceptions of enrichment and betterment from social co-operation coupled with the deleterious effects of the breakdown of social trust and co-operation. Such a logical conclusion needs a transition to action via an emotional perception of desirability.

The emotional and psychodynamic part of human knowing and learning in the development and safeguarding of social capital is evoked particularly through the power of the human imagination, shaped by previous significant experiences, to create desirable and undesirable future scenarios. These scenarios, which could be called ‘imaginal’ following Hillman (1981), can have a powerful effect when people are lead or invited to ‘dwell on’ them, and for their hearts to be moved to choose and implement appropriate action towards identified desirable goals.

These intertwined cognitive and emotional processes are further shaped by the essentially social dimension of human learning. Thus, the cognitive naming and emotional appraising of events in human life is socially and interactively performed and forms the foundation of personal choices for the actions which people make, individually and in groups.

It is useful to reflect on ways in which learning to protect and enhance social capital – the qualities of social connectedness, resilience and trust – can be the subject of educational action. In exploring curriculum possibilities for social capital, the desired learning needs to be located within its three dimensions.

Cognitive learning

The cognitive learning processes that are required for the continuance and development of social capital can be explained using Piaget’s ideas of the learning process. Child psychologist Piaget (1896 – 1980) suggested that human learning is a process of adaptation in which learners seek equilibrium by assimilating new information into existing thought structures, or accommodating their thought structures to make a space for new information which does not fit into existing thought structures.

Extrapolating from Piaget (Inhelder & Piaget 1958, 1964), community members can be challenged to turn changes in their circumstances into learning challenges through which they come to understand and, if necessary, to change. Through processes of assimilation and/or accommodation to change, the social capital of a group can be maintained and enriched. Assimilation means that the group discovers a way to accept change without too much modification of existing thoughts and practices – integrating new members, occupying new premises, gaining access to new resources.
Accommodation is of course more explosive as group members confront and work to accept changes in themselves – composition, customs and rules. At this point, the social capital of a group can be in jeopardy but, as will be explored further in the next section, its difficult transition can be transformative and lead to better and more realistic circumstances as an alternative to social breakdown.

One of the major protagonists of accommodation learning of this kind is Mezirow (1991, 1995) with his work on perspective transformation. While Mezirow focuses on individuals, it is suggested here that forms of perspective transformation can occur in a group (cf. Illeris 2004). This was the view of Freire (1970, 1972, 1973), whose educational work with communities in South America combined literacy learning with political and social critique.

Accommodation also refers to quite radical change, aspects of which are almost always experienced as a loss. Kübler-Ross’ (1969) five stages in the grief process – denial, anger, bargaining, depression and acceptance – are a useful analogy for the kinds of experiences that members can encounter around an accommodation change in their community.

Group members can talk about coming changes in their world and their reactions to them. Since many groups are composed of members who choose to belong and can just as easily choose to disaffiliate, grief and loss from an accommodation process needs to be acknowledged and different levels of grief respected.

Emotional learning

The previous paragraph pointed to the emotional dimensions of social change, particularly where accommodation is concerned. Indeed, for groups, the emotional dimension of change goes to the very heart of social capital itself, insofar as it is a strongly affective process involving a positive emotional orientation to strangers, offering friendship and inclusion, co-operation and flexibility in collaborative projects, tolerance and even forgiveness in the case of disagreements and conflict.

Such emotional learning works with the imagination and the heart. It uses stories and symbols of co-operation to create ideals of inclusivity. Community groups tend to have implicit or explicit value statements and ideals around the service offered. Most churches, for example, stress kindness and inclusivity particularly to their members, but often more widely. Other community service groups stress practical service to community members and, at least implicitly, support inclusivity and networking. Community service clubs incorporate service and inclusivity values into their mission statements.

Social learning

Since social capital can be described as a socially embedded set of inclusive and co-operative attitudes and values developed over time and put into action to such an extent that some expectation of conviviality and welcome can become a characteristic of certain communities, the social dimensions of learning in this context are strongly relevant. The idea of communities of practice developed by Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998), which were derived from ideas of the social dimension of learning, point to the importance of this dimension of learning in the development of social capital.

Transformative learning and social capital

So much of the learning underpinning rich social capital involves communities and groups in serious and searching challenges in order to enrich existing relationships, break down barriers, foster reconciliation and the like. It seems almost inevitable that learning that fosters social capital often needs to be transformative in one way or another. A transformative approach to learning as it relates to personal and social change has been developed by Mezirow (1991, 1995), Boyd and Myers (1988), Dirkx (2000) and
Cranton (2006). Cranton (2006: 36) sums up transformative learning in these words:

Transformative learning is defined as the process by which people examine problematic frames of reference to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change. It can be provoked by a single event – a disorientating dilemma – or it can take place gradually and cumulatively over time. Discourse is central to the process. We need to engage in conversation with others in order to better consider alternative perspectives and determine their validity.

Frames of reference are made up of habits of mind (the broad predispositions we use to interpret experience) and points of view (clusters of meaning schemes, or habitual, implicit rules we use to interpret experience). A habit of mind is expressed as a point of view.

This definition tends to place the ‘transformative’ element of transformative learning in the rational rather than the emotional or social dimensions of learning. However in practice, learners reporting forms of transformation tend to refer to the experience as becoming different, which often involves emotional overtones and collaborative validation (cf. Karpia 2000).

As educators, these writers and their colleagues are interested in how transformative learning can be fostered. I have sought to expand the notion of transformative learning so that it refers to four kinds of learning occurring separately or together to differing degrees, and I explore their part in fostering the reciprocal community links and respectful and friendly interactions which are considered key contributors to social capital.

The question that immediately arises is how such educational action can be pursued in the aggregations, groups and networks that make up a community. Institutions with an overt value agenda, such as churches, continue their educational program in sermons and small group meetings around specific issues and practices. Other community groups may not have structured education programs but may have educational events from time to time, plus the daily interaction between members in which the ideal and practices of the group are constantly being refined and modified in response to changing circumstances. Apart from the practicalities by which learning activities can be organised in communities, there is the question of the curriculum for such activities – ways in which desirable kinds of transformative learning can be promoted, and that is the theme of the next section.

**Fostering transformative learning and its contribution to social capital**

The theory of transformative learning has developed over nearly three decades into a comprehensive and complex description of how learners construe the meaning of experiences of radical change often in the light of a democratic and humanistic ideology. In the spirit of a working theory, what follows is an attempt to take the idea further by suggesting that transformative learning can have four recognisable dimensions which, although in real life are often blurred, contribute to a more comprehensive and true to life understanding.

**Four dimensions of transformative learning and their pedagogies**

The foundations of this four dimensional view are the kinds of transformation meant and the assumed stance of the people or groups thought to be engaged in such learning. One form of transformative learning in this context can refer to a healing process through which wounded people or groups learn to discover a way to a state of personal or community healing, peace and well-being. Another meaning of transformative learning, referred to here as organic, refers to the transformation of coming to fullness of capacity in personal, social and workplace arenas. This form of transformative learning is linked to the ripening and maturation commonly
encountered in the organic world. The third form of transformative learning referred to as unitary (Willis 2004) involves the processes by which a person or group sheds that which is perceived to be inauthentic and seeks to come to a oneness. A fourth form of transformative learning, which was largely its original meaning in adult learning literature, refers to critical processes through which a person or people come to an awareness of and become resistant to oppressive and unequal power relations in various life situations they encounter.

What follows is a brief exploration of ways in which an educator, seeking to promote social capital in a group, may develop a broad-based curriculum by promoting the three dimensions of learning (rational, emotional and social) in the four forms of transformative pedagogy.

**Healing transformative learning and its pedagogy**

Healing transformative learning refers to the learning that takes place in individual and social healing. Stories of individual healing transformation have been referred to by Frank (1995: 75ss) as ‘narratives of restitution’ and are similar to the paths that sick people traverse as they become transformed from illness to some kind of wellness or rehabilitation. For groups, healing transformation tends to involve processes of conflict resolution and reconciliation (du Boulay 1989).

To promote the rational, emotional and social dimensions of healing transformation, the educator may begin with a factual or historical exploration of the situation in which people and groups find themselves. Promoting this rational learning dimension may mean the strategic use of factual information (what does this mean exactly?) of the personal and social wounds, the benefits of healing and useful ways by which such healing could be attempted. Combined with this is the need for the educator to look for ways to evoke emotional learning around healing, particularly by the use of images and stories of the pathos of wounding and illness and the benefits and infectious joy of healing. The educator can then promote the social dimensions of learning by prompting individuals and groups, hopefully now possessing some emotional energy towards healing, to see themselves as a healing community of practice. The informal welcome and conversations of the Aboriginal people reaching out to the Afghan asylum seekers, described at the beginning of this paper, seems to be a case where healing is a major element in their de facto transformative pedagogy.

**Organic transformative learning and its pedagogy**

Organic transformative learning refers to the learning people and groups can undertake to facilitate their natural ripening and growing to maturity. The rational dimension of organic transformative learning refers to processes by which people are assisted to become aware of their needs and capabilities and engage in active learning to gain appropriate knowledge and skills to optimise their personal, social and work life. Groups with an informed and empirical approach to their learning needs are laying one of the solid foundations for their social capital. The emotional dimension of organic transformative learning for social capital refers to ways in which groups and their members are encouraged to imagine their best futures and to see them as realisable. The social dimension of organic transformative learning involves group support and encouragement for the planned development of knowledge and skills for members, both individually and as a group. Social capital is enriched as group members hone the skills required for the continuance of the group. Learners who achieve a potential they may not have previously imagined can energize and deepen the social capital of a group significantly and joyfully.

**Unitary transformative learning and its pedagogy**

Unitary transformative learning refers to the ‘imaginal’ processes (Hillman 1981) centred on and drawing from the human powers of image making and desire (cf. Boyd & Myers 1988; Dirkx 2000;
Nelson 1997). These imaging processes are linked to the human need and capacity to make choices according to a chosen set of values and related generative images. Jung (1957) coined the term ‘archetypes’ for similar although more elaborated processes. Imaginal processes do not replace the more rational and logical parts of the human psyche but complement and enrich them. The religious and cultural historian Armstrong (2005), referring to this complementarity, speaks of an ancient nexus between mythos and logos:

In the pre-modern world, particularly for the Greeks, it was generally understood that there were two largely complementary ways of pursuing thought in order to come to truth. These were called mythos and logos. Logos (reason; science) was exact, practical and essential to human life. It was validated by its so-called testable correspondence to external reality. Myth expressed the more mysterious aspects of human experience and corresponded to the human desire to make sense of a world in which humans are often out of control. (p. 43)

The generative images or ‘visualised ideals’ of the mythos way of thinking and feeling are seen to appear implicitly in the inchoate or elaborated ‘self stories’ or personal myths of individuals and groups. It is through these that a person or group works to define and enrich an authentic ‘inner self’, often not without struggle through choices made, rejecting as far as possible alternative, less acceptable ideals and options. It is suggested here that the social capital of groups can have a strong need for unitary transformative learning when they are invited to re-configure their foundational ideals and attitudes and dwell on them, welcoming their ideals and visions into their hearts and minds.

For social capital educators, the rational dimension of unitary transformative learning has a critical role to play in interrogating the ideal and generative images of the group and keeping watch against the infiltration of the group ideals by alternative ideas provided by advertising and other forms of ‘spin’. When groups are under pressure from internal or external forces, the discerning function has an important role in unitary transformative learning.

Educators conscious of the emotional dimensions of unitary transformative learning need to be aware of the ‘storied’ nature of the identity of people and groups (cf. Day 2002) in which key foundational elements of their social capital can be contained. The largely unspoken yet accepted values and priorities of a group are often held together by key narratives and symbols underlying its informal conversations and gossip.

The educator looking to cater for the social dimension of unitary transformative learning needs to see in what ways the community can generate local images and stories of their history, identity and future dreams. For example, it can be suggested that one of the reasons behind the astonishing success of a Minnesota community radio program called The Prairie Home Companion is that its leader and raconteur, Garrison Keeler, in his weekly News from Lake Wobegone (Keilor 1985), gently and not a little ironically reveals, dwells on and validates the values and ideals that hold the rural northern Midwestern American communities together. More locally and in less dramatic ways, community newspapers and newsletters, local radio shows and various public addresses, sermons for the church groups, visiting speakers at meetings of sporting and service groups, can all contribute to the unitary transformation of a group and its members and significantly enrich and deepen the emotional learning underpinning its social capital. Likewise, annual community parades or festivals (cf. Hawkes 2005) affirm the existence, ideals and contributions of the constitutive associations and services of a community. Speaking of such celebrations, Hilbers (2007) writes:

Celebrations and the storytelling, play, ceremony, ritual, music, dance, food and feasting they encompass, are all pathways for exploring the creative and the mythopoetic depths of our lives and communities – both in the moment and over time. (p. 84)
Community educators seeking to promote social capital through unitary transformative learning can prompt community members to engage with and draw from such festivals an enrichment and confirmation of their ideals, visions and self stories.

**Critical transformative learning and its pedagogy**

The fourth and final form of transformative learning is the critical dimension. Using the term ‘perspective transformation’, Mezirow (1991, 1995) draws on Habermas’ (1972, 1984) idea of three kinds of ‘knowledge-constitutive interests’, each of which is linked to different kinds of learning: technical/instrumental, communicative and critical. With instrumental learning, we learn to control and manipulate the environment, while communicative learning involves learning to understand others and the social world in which we live. For Mezirow, Habermas’ critical and emancipatory learning occurs when individuals reformulate their structures of meaning, making them more attuned and resistant to social injustice, particularly when these inequities are hidden or unacknowledged. The educator concerned with critical transformative learning needs to promote its rational, emotional and social dimensions.

A pedagogy to promote the rational dimension of critical reflection needs to avoid being complicit in undetected forms of domination. Its logical and rational pedagogy needs to be pursued obliquely without persuasive lecturing or preaching. To protect the freedom and agency of learners, the educator can prompt dialogic reflective processes by which problems and contradictions are identified, discussed and assessed. The emotional dimension of critical transformative learning can be seen in the telling of evocative stories and images of resistance, such as the Eureka Stockade in the Australian goldfields (cf. Jones 2005), Dorothy Day with her houses of hospitality in New York (Forest 1986, Day 1952) and Paulo Freire’s (1970, 1972, 1973) emancipatory adult literacy programs in Brazil. Finally, the educator can promote the social dimensions of learning for critical transformation by prompting individuals and groups to choose to make concerns for justice and emancipation part of the culture of their group.

Fostering social capital through critical transformative pedagogy seeks to protect a democratic community’s foundational ideals and practices so that members can learn to free themselves from acts or dispositions which condone or actually promote injustice and exclusion. Educators promoting critical transformative learning can outline a reflective curriculum where community members are invited to confront challenges to the integrity and inclusivity of their community and/or group in order to safeguard its social capital under challenge from internal or external forces. One example of internal challenge is when oppressed minorities in a community threaten its social capital by resisting the subjugant place they have been allocated economically and socially. Examples of this have been the struggles of women for equality and later similar struggles for acceptance by Aboriginal and immigrant people. Challenges from outside the group can occur when people from different cultures and racial groups seek to join a community where the existing members resist such change.

The educator needs to be aware that critical awareness learning tends to be a form of accommodation in Piaget’s sense rather than assimilation to changed circumstances. Deep changes to the ways in which the values and activities of groups are pursued can be risky and painful, and one of the only appropriate educational approaches is to invite critical reflection and avoid preaching or proselytising. Different forms of facilitated transformative learning of the four kinds mentioned, some quite radical and painful, can well be experienced by various groups at different times. The social capital of such groups during these learning times may well be at a major turning point – emerging renewed or diminished but hardly untouched.
Four community educators with different transformative pedagogies and their links to social capital

The final section of this paper looks at the pedagogic practices of four outstanding transformative educators whose work can be said to have contributed in different ways or with different emphases to the building of social capital. These educators have each been chosen to exemplify one of the four transformative pedagogies: the healing transformative process of Desmond Tutu, Annie Sullivan’s organic pedagogy, the unitary approach of Jesus, and the critical approach of Socrates.

Desmond Tutu and the learning work of healing transformation

Tutu’s transformative pedagogy is an outstanding example of healing transformation, particularly in relation to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) which he was appointed to chair by President Nelson Mandela in 1994. In his overview of the TRC for the British Broadcasting Commission, South African journalist Greg Barrow (1998) wrote:

Much of the criticism of the commission stems from a basic misunderstanding about its mandate. It was never meant to punish people, just to expose their role in crimes committed under apartheid. It is in this respect that the achievements of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission stand out. Only by revisiting the trauma of the past can people look to a better future – but with the truth comes pain and a reminder that reconciliation may still be a distant goal in the new South Africa.

Tutu’s healing and uplifting agenda could be seen as a major contribution to the building of social capital in post-apartheid South Africa. Reporting on one of the sessions involving Winnie Mandela, Zia Jaffrey (1998) wrote:

During the course of the hearing, which lasted twelve days, Archbishop Tutu played the role of a healer, confessor, comedian, politician, proctor—even grammarian ... He warned listeners and participants that this hearing was not a trial, and that he did not wish to conduct a “witch hunt,” arguing that abuses committed by those suffering under apartheid were not morally equivalent to those perpetrated by the apartheid government. (p. 1)

Although Tutu promoted the healing process as one inspired by Christianity, his pedagogy drew on pragmatic humanistic ideals. One commentator, Robbins, was aware that many South Africans were sceptical of the Christian language of forgiveness and reconciliation and preferred the secular term ‘amnesty’ with its strong pragmatic connotation. Nevertheless, he felt that some kind of amnesty was absolutely necessary and that the commission was still valuable. As he writes:

Despite such challenges to the TRC’s rhetoric of forgiveness and healing, however, there is widespread recognition amongst South Africans that amnesty was perhaps an appropriate and politically necessary compromise. (1998: 9)

Tutu’s reconciliation pedagogy (1994, 1999) unashamedly claimed validation from the general Christian ideology that the vast majority of white and black South Africans espoused at least nominally. Following that rubric, he invited people who had committed human rights abuses under the apartheid regime to take the first steps on the path to reconciliation by confessing to these abuses, begging forgiveness of the families of victims with the largely unspoken suggestion that their brutality had been generated by the brutal and inhumane regime that had shaped their consciousness and excused or even demanded their abusive activities. His own charisma as the ‘wounded healer’ gave great weight to his invitation.

From the perspective of the three dimensions of learning, Tutu evoked the rational logical dimensions of the healing agenda by pointing out the absolute necessity of reconciliation between racial
groups as a preliminary to any kind of nation building that included them as one people under one government. He argued rationally and logically that the process of reconciliation would not be served by bringing to justice all the perpetrators of the many human rights abuses that had been committed. Many of these abuses were perpetrated through forms of exclusion from goods and services whereby the people implementing the exclusions were largely unaware of the injustices of a regime they had grown up with and accepted as a given.

Tutu invited these perpetrators of injustice by neglect as well as people involved in acts of direct brutality to confess their crimes and beg forgiveness from the victims and their families. Calling for an amnesty against prosecution, he advocated a form of general restitution, the energy of which could go into nation building. The claims of the oppressed had to be heard, and the confessing malefactors had to acknowledge their crimes perhaps with lessened culpability, and beg pardon for the sufferings they had inflicted.

The emotional dimension of the healing learning was powerful. Tutu’s use of vivid stories, and his invitation to sufferers and oppressors to do the same, charged the learning environment with dread and fear and anger on the one hand, and a huge outpouring of forgiveness and pardon on the other. Covering the sittings of the TLC, Jaffrey (1998: 2) reported that when the commission came to deal with Winnie Mandela, who allegedly ordered the murder of her medical doctor to prevent him from giving evidence against her, the confessed murderer Cyril Zakhale Mbatha

broke down and wept, begging forgiveness from the [doctor’s] family. He said he deserved to remain in prison, convicted of the crime he committed, but was misled by “a very clever woman.

Winnie Mandela in her turn was to express contrition for her part in some of the atrocities that came before the commission.

The social dimension of this healing transformation is critical. Under Tutu’s pedagogy, the TRC is held to its work of being a community of practice of listening, forgiveness and pardon. The healing transformative learning agenda of this senior and respected group was to create a kind of reconciliation ferment among the community which could allow some of the wounds to heal and for people to let go of their grief. Frank (2002), a scholar of transformative healing learning, suggests that forms of such learning often amount to the capacity to hear and attend to the stories that others tell, and to feel confident to share one’s own. He says ‘the dialogic task – and the profoundly ethical task – is for people to see themselves as characters in other’s stories’ (p. 21).

Ralston Saul (2002) talks of Baba Sikwepere, beaten and blinded during the apartheid regime, who said that he felt he got his sight back by being able to tell his story in this formally constituted arena and being heard. He writes that Baba

is still blind. What is the sight he has regained? The ability to imagine himself and his experience as a public part of a society’s experience; its self-declared reality. His sight is that he can now be seen by others through his story. (p. 126)

This form of democratic imagining involves people consciously listening, consciously giving space to allow the imagination of another to enter one’s own, and to allow a merging of stories. This could be seen as an extension of Tutu’s healing and transformative pedagogy.

Annie Sullivan and the learning work of organic transformation

Annie Sullivan, a promising partly sighted former student at the Perkins Institute and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind (HLN 2001), was nominated by its director to work with seven year old Helen Keller, who at the age of 18 months had contracted a disease that left her blind and deaf. Anne moved into the Keller’s home as a tutor in 1887 and worked to discover and release the emotional power
that she could feel in the angry almost uncontrollable child. In her role as tutor, Anne had to engage Keller’s learning agenda in many areas. She insisted on good table manners, courtesy and self-control while at the same time working constantly with the so-called manual alphabet in which each letter is signed on to the hand of the deaf blind person. One specific and notable moment of organic transformative learning is described in a brief biography of Keller (RNIB 2007):

Helen had until now not yet fully understood the meaning of words. When Anne led her to the water pump on 5 April 1887, all that was about to change.

As Anne pumped the water over Helen’s hand, Anne spelled out the word ‘water’ in the girl’s free hand. Something about this explained the meaning of words within Helen, and Anne could immediately see in her face that she finally understood.

In her autobiography, Keller’s (1903/1951) description of that incident shows evidence of her continued development, an inner unfolding of dormant parts of her psyche and the releasing of her skill to learn:

We walked down the path to the well-house, attracted by the fragrance of the honey-suckle with which it was covered. Someone was drawing water and my teacher placed my hand under the spout. As the cool stream gushed over one hand she spelled into the other the word water, first slowly, then rapidly. I stood still, my whole attention fixed upon the motions of her fingers. Suddenly I felt a misty consciousness as of something forgotten, a thrill of returning thought, and somehow the mystery of language was revealed to me. (cited in the RNIB biography mentioned above, no page number given)

The Royal National Institute of Blind People profile of Keller mentions that having ‘understood’ how the signing language worked, she learnt the names of many things and people, then a little later was introduced to Braille and typing, and from them to the world of communication and higher forms of education.

The organic transformative pedagogy of Sullivan fostered Keller’s transformative learning along its three dimensions. The rational logical dimension of her organic transformation is beautifully done as Sullivan holds her hand under the pump and signs the letters for water again and again waiting for the resonating spark which of course happens. The emotional dimension of the fragile beginnings of this kind of learning is provided by Sullivan’s constant supportive presence. There is no doubt of the warmth and commitment in the many touches and hugs that constituted and went on constituting the learning facilitative process. The social dimension is evident in the community of practice that builds around Annie and Helen. The spark of different kinds of learning is brought to flame in the warmth of their mini community which is not totally exclusive and included other educationalists at different times.

Jesus and the learning work of unitary transformation

Jesus, the founder of the Christian religion, was an itinerant prophetic figure in Israel. He was an educator whose teachings can be said to have been built around a strong, almost driven awareness that trust and inclusive friendship (which are central to ideas of social capital), generated from the interactions of people in community, was a fragile entity. Community inclusiveness and trust needed constant correctional practices to maintain and deepen the supportive relations between community members. A lot of Christian teaching from Jesus and from the apostle Paul concerned forgiveness and ways of working to regain equanimity in community. The foundational notion was ‘caring love’ which all members were encouraged to practice.

Although most of Jesus’ education for unitary transformation put strong emphasis on the imaginal and emotional, he did not ignore the cognitive and social dimensions of learning. Jesus used rational logical learning to separate authentic from inauthentic imaginal forms. He attacked hypocrites as wolves in sheep’s clothing. Many of his parables, with their strong imaginal messages, also carry rational
logical challenges to guide his learners to discriminate between false and true ideals, and to verify the validity of high ideals in the practices that should flow from these. The parable of the good Samaritan and Jesus’ remarks that ‘by their fruits you shall know them’ (Matt 7:16) are clear examples of his ideas and ideals.

Jesus’ use of imaginal pedagogy in his unitary transformative agenda is particularly linked to his ways of teaching which tended to be filled with images and stories designed to capture the imagination and move the heart. The responses that Jesus sought to his teaching were rarely concerned with logical, rational knowledge alone but with calls for repentance and conversion to a new way of life. The act of conversion can be construed as essentially letting go of inauthentic life stances and activities to adopt the new position. As such, it is particularly linked to unitary transformation. Jesus’ teaching tended to be invitational and choice-laden. His teaching does not browbeat but calls strongly to choice. He reminds his followers that deeds of acceptance must follow words of conversion.

The desired learning in Jesus’ unitary transformative pedagogy also had a social dimension. His disciples formed a loose community of practice characterised by a desire to please and be with ‘the master’ for a range of noble and less noble reasons. Most of his teaching was not done one to one but to the group, and ‘the last supper’ which carried the burden of his transformative teaching involved symbolic acts of community-building, such as the washing of the feet and the sharing of bread and wine.

Community educators following this model tend to be embedded in the life of a community and to teach and carry out works of mercy and forgiveness. Outstanding examples of such educators include musician and medic Albert Schweitzer, civil rights campaigner Martin Luther King, pacifist community worker Dorothy Day, and Yami Lester, a Yangutjatjarra civil rights activist working at the Institute for Aboriginal Development in Alice Springs.

Socrates and the learning work of critical transformation

Socrates is introduced as an early adult educator who challenged the beliefs held by the citizens of Athens. Many of his students were young and grew to idolise him and his teachings, so much so that parents complained and he was charged with corrupting the youth of Athens and bringing religion into disrepute. He was condemned to death in 399 BC.

Garth Kemerling (2006), in his web text on philosophy, comments on Socrates’ educational exchanges in Athens:

Socrates devoted himself to free-wheeling discussion with the aristocratic young citizens of Athens, insistently questioning their unwarranted confidence in the truth of popular opinions, even though he often offered them no clear alternative teaching.

Even though Socrates’ transformative pedagogy focused particularly on the logical rational dimension of human knowledge, he had some room for the imaginal in his spirited pursuit and espousal of the ideals of critical thinking and judgment. His personal charisma that so enchanted the youth of Athens cannot immediately be linked purely to logical rational pedagogy. Socrates had style and charisma accompanying his dialectic activities. Finally, Socrates was not unlike Jesus, with a group of followers seeking to form a community of practice with him, and to amplify his teaching amongst others. Ironically, it was the group pedagogy that finally lead to Socrates’ condemnation as one who ‘corrupted the youth of Athens’.
Conclusion

At least to some extent, social capital has tended to be an after-the-fact idea based on the experiences of contented and enriched members of functioning, inclusive and flexible communities. The questions posed and pursued here have been whether and in what ways such social enrichment can be fostered and what underpinning human processes are embedded in its pursuit and achievement. The more one reflects on social capital, the more a kind of utopian dimension emerges and with it a significant prerequisite level of courtesy and unselfishness underpinning it. The presence of social capital seems to be a strong indicator of refined and humane social relationships generated from the ongoing learning of fairly constant reflection, critique and consequent choice for action.

What can be described as ‘social capital learning’ has been explored in this paper with the suggestion that it can contain four kinds of transformation: healing, organic, unitary and critical. Following this, and seeking to ground these approaches, has been a final section describing the transformative pedagogic work of four outstanding practitioners, Desmond Tutu, Annie Sullivan, Jesus and Socrates. Each of these in turn has been shown to manifest, without totally excluding other approaches, outstanding ways of fostering one of the four forms of transformative learning.

A study of this kind seeks to bring the holistic nature of human learning to the fore and highlights the more tacit elements that can be found in human learning enterprises where action and collaboration are required. It can never be enough to focus purely on the technical skills and knowledge required for the specific functions of an enterprise without attention to the way participants create, critique and maintain the values that underpin their judgements and choices for action. For that, different forms of transformative learning, with the struggle and the illumination that can involve, are always required.

References


Willis, P. (2004). 'Mentorship, transformative learning and nurture: adult education challenges in research supervision', paper at the 34th Annual Conference of the Standing Committee for University Teaching and research in the Education of Adults (SCUTREA), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, 6–8 July.

About the author

Dr Peter Willis is senior lecturer in education, adult, vocational and workplace learning at the University of South Australia. He has been active in the adult education movement in Australia for many years. His research areas concern transformative and 'second chance' learning among adults and the relationship between religion, spirituality, aesthetic life and civil society. He pioneered the use of phenomenological approaches in arts-based adult educational research in his publications: Inviting learning: an exhibition of risk and enrichment in adult education practice (NIACE 2002) and Pedagogies of the imagination: mythopoetic curriculum in educational practice (Springer, in press).

Contact details

School of Education, University of South Australia, Mawson Lakes Boulevard, Mawson Lakes, South Australia 5095
Tel: (08) 8302 6553 Fax: (08) 8302 6832
Email: peter.willis@unisa.edu.au

After the doctorate? Personal and professional outcomes of the doctoral learning journey

Barry Elsey
International Graduate School of Business
University of South Australia
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