

Hardacre, Charlotte and Kinkead-Clark, Zoyah (2019) Authentic family learning: reconceptualising intergenerational education initiatives, in Jamaica and England, through cross-cultural conversation. *Journal of Childhood Studies*, 44 (5). pp. 85-102.

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/5119/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
- a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Authentic Family Learning: Reconceptualising Intergenerational Education Initiatives, in Jamaica and England, through Cross-Cultural Conversation

Abstract

This paper shares a set of cross-cultural conversations (Kinkead-Clark and Hardacre, 2017) between two family learning practitioner-researchers, one from Jamaica and one from England. Our concern that global education policies reflect and reproduce a social investment perspective, positioning family learning as a way to generate productive citizens, drives this paper. Using Hardacre's (2017) Authentic Family Learning as a conceptual framework we re-examine our ongoing work with families. An analysis of these cross-cultural conversations reveals that along with valuing the existing agency and identity of participants there is also a need to balance the role of power enacted by practitioners; ultimately reconceptualising power as a positive force that does not require inversion, minimisation or removal.

Keywords: Social Investment; Family Learning; Power; Authentic Learning

Introduction

Intergenerational learning has gained steady global acceptance as a tool to minimise dissonance between home, school and community (Moriarty, 2001; Wainwright and Marandet, 2011; Timmons and Pelletier, 2014; Cartmel *et al.*, 2018) Whilst the range of experiences covered in these family learning programmes may differ, the overarching goals have often been to provide robust opportunities for collaboration, knowledge building and strengthening of skills. In Jamaica and the UK, family learning programmes have had a long history. The Jamaican Movement for the Advancement of Literacy (JAMAL) – a family literacy programme started in the mid 1970's to address the low levels of literacy across the island and Families and Schools together (FAST) in the UK, both serve as examples of two programmes that have been very successful in yielding plethoric positive results (NIACE, 2013). This study analyses, a series of cross-cultural conversations between two researchers, who are also practitioners who have been intimately involved in family learning programmes. These conversations are structured around the Six Key Practices of Authentic Family Learning proposed intuitively by Hardacre (2017). The process involved critical discourse to explore how intergenerational programming is constructed and how it may be reconstructed within our individual contexts.

Context

As noted above, both practitioner-researchers are currently involved with intergenerational learning activities. One of the authors (Zoyah) is the programme manager for XXXXXX in Jamaica, an intervention which supports families in replacing harsh disciplinary practices with more responsive approaches. The other author (Charlotte) facilitates family learning courses in the UK, currently as an independent practitioner and previously, between 2009 and 2017,

on behalf of a local council as a Family English, Language and Maths (FEML) tutor. Through prior cross-cultural conversations about our practice (Kinkead-Clark and Hardacre, 2017), we have uncovered clear differences between our contexts, including funding levels, social norms and learning environments whilst also discovering rich seams of similarity. Such as, the emphasis placed on intergenerational education in the early years as a way to ameliorate social issues including unemployment, adult literacy and anti-social behaviour (Wainwright and Marandet, 2017). To provide context for the analysis of our cross-cultural conversations, an outline of each of the Intergenerational programmes we are involved with is set out below.

Insights in Jamaica

Insights, in Jamaica, is a tripartite temperament-based programme working with parents, teachers and children. To date Insights has been in 38 schools and has impacted 4923 children, 327 adults family members and 232 teachers in Kingston, St. Andrew, Manchester, St. Ann and St. Catherine. Though the programme predominantly targets children ages four to five, within the past year, the reach has been extended to children in Grade One in primary school. The programme has been in existence in Jamaica since 2013 and has the overarching goal to provide parents and teachers with behaviour management strategies and conflict resolution skills. Over the course of eight weeks, the programme uses intergenerational sessions to help parents develop strategies that can be used to resolve challenging situations they encounter in the home environment. This provides them with an alternative which helps minimise their dependence on harsh disciplinary practices (beating, shouting or cursing) which is a tremendous social issue in Jamaica (Bailey, Robinson and Coore-Desai, 2014).

FEML in the UK

Family English, Maths and Language (FEML), in the UK, is Government funded adult learning provision which is delivered by local authorities alongside a suite of other programmes including Personal and Community Development and Skills for Jobs (LCC, 2017). The Family English courses delivered by Charlotte take place during the school day, in primary schools located in areas of high deprivation. The courses are between 8 and 10 weeks long and are attended by nursery or reception-age children and one or two of their adult family members. FEML courses are intended to reduce ‘the cost of supporting vulnerable families, through improved health and well-being, increased engagement with society, positive attitudes to learning, greater confidence and employability’ (Learning and Work Institute, 2018, online). FEML is therefore discretely political, as it addresses the needs of the

employment market by ‘upskilling’ adults. This functional approach to learning, which takes a narrow, vocational focus (Hamilton & Burgess, 2011), sits in opposition to emancipatory ideals of education as liberatory and self-directed (Friedman, Kremer, Miguel and Thornton, 2011; Herz and Sperling 2004; Levine, Lloyd, Greene and Grown, 2008) and it is the tension between these opposing perspectives that led to an interest in Authentic Family Learning (Hardacre, 2017) as an alternative approach. It is this approach that provides the conceptual framework for the cross-cultural conversations that were analysed for this paper.

Literature Review

As noted above, a working theory of Authentic Family Learning is a touchstone for this paper. Thus to deepen our understanding, we conducted a literature review which considers how an authentic approach to learning is characterised by socially-contextual approaches, threatened by deficit perceptions of participants and bolstered by creating a sense of belonging.

Socio-contextual Learning

Timmons and Petellier (2014, p.513) relate rigid and uncompromising approaches, which privilege the needs of schools and marginalise the needs of families, to deficit models of family support that maintain ‘a one-way transfer of knowledge, which often excludes parents’ own knowledge and experiences’. They argue, in line with Dixon and Lewis (2008) and Rocha-Smidt (2008) that programmes would meet the real life needs more effectively if they took the diverse perspectives and practices of families into account more fully. Suggestions for addressing this deficit approach to intergenerational learning point to the benefits of developing a socio-contextual approach which is family-relevant, as well as school-relevant (Brown, 1998) and thus authentic and meaningful to all stakeholders.

Specific steps for moving towards a socio-contextual approach are articulated with much less frequency and detail in the extant literature, although some guiding principles are evidenced. For example, Goodall and Montgomery (2014) suggest that immediate relationships and personalised knowledge of the participants are a way to move toward more socially-situated practice with families. This corresponds to dialogic approaches which are characterised by an interchange of values, ideas and experiences in a two-way flow between stakeholders. Lawrence-Lightfoot (2004) places this sort of parental engagement, that is fluid, informal and dialogue-based, in contrast with the potentially superficial nature of highly-ritualised school activities such as parents’ evenings.

A cautionary note, about adopting a consultative approach, is raised by Elish-Piper's (2000) study, which analyses the social-contextual nature of adult education in urban family literacy programs, is to avoid tokenism. Whereby, programmes use a dialogic approach to collect information about family strengths, needs, and goals but do not use these details to inform the content or structure of courses. This point is developed by Simpson and Cieslik (2002), whose research outlines how optimistic initiatives to include participant voice in the development of programmes can collapse in practice because of assumptions about parents' level of skill and confidence and the amount of trust they have in practitioners and programmes.

This perspective is advanced by Argent (2007) who discusses how the role of parents in collaborative projects is unintentionally diminished by practitioners who privilege professional knowledge through repeated reference to official processes that lack relevance to parents. A similar point is described by Black (2007) who underscores the importance of conversing with parents without using jargon because of its potential to push them away. Correspondingly, Bryan and Henry (2012, p. 410) call on practitioners who are working with families to:

'purposefully diminish their roles as the 'experts', respect families' knowledge and insight, regard each other as valuable resources and assets, involve family members in mutual and equitable decisions about partnerships goals, activities and outcomes, refuse to blame each other and encourage families and communities to define issues'

This approach has the potential to build what Bryk and Schneider (2002) call "relational trust" which may be lacking between educators and parents who have had poor prior experiences of education. Meaning it is hard for either party to understand the motivation or actions of the other. Arguably, emphasising the importance of learning the differences and similarities between each other's values and beliefs is a practical form of critical pedagogy. Which has the potential to prompt practitioners to 'consider their own identities and contexts, not just those of the community members' (Ashworth and Bourelle, 2014, p.64), eventually moving both parties towards more authentic forms of interaction.

Deficit Perceptions

Several sources in the literature under review here describe how a return to learning in a primary school setting can be a barrier for participants in Family Learning (Brasset-Grundy, 2001; West, 2005; Moriarty, 2001; Wainwright and Marandet, 2017; Lexmond, Bazalgette and Margo, 2011; Kwan and Wong, 2016). Brasset-Grundy (2001) surveyed non-participating parents to find out why they chose not to engage in an intergenerational learning programme

and found a common reason was a previous unhappy experience of learning at school and concern about entering a formal educational space. Similarly, a survey by Hannon and Bird (2004) found that low levels of confidence and comfort in educational settings were powerful barriers to engaging in Family Learning.

Additionally, unease is evident in the literature about recruiting parents to intergenerational programmes of learning, solely to apply normative ideals about appropriate ways of supporting children's needs (Argent, 2007; Wainwright and Marendet, 2013). The consequences of this are apparent in Bryan and Henry's (2012, p.414) point that 'educator attitudes about families and partnerships determine how they treat families and partnerships'. Suggesting that programmes that seek to identify and then improve particular 'types' of parents, may be rooted in patronising, pessimistic or disapproving attitudes which are unlikely to be explicit but will shape interactions between participant and practitioner. This makes the argument for consciously working to understand differences as opposed to assumptively labelling practices and perceptions that differ from our own as deficient.

Wainwright and Maradet (2017, p. 214) argue that judgemental attitudes about the way families function reflects and reinforces the 'professionalization of parenting as a set of skills to be taught, understood and practised'. Additionally, the use of schools, as a space for enacting public policy is a matter of concern for scholars who suggest that because schools are arguably a middle-class institution (Kwan and Wong, 2016), with norms that may differ from other socio-economic groupings, it becomes a foregone conclusion that disadvantage and negative parenting practices are inextricably linked. A claim addressed by Lexmond, Bazalgette and Margo (2011, p.87) who undertook qualitative research in an area with high levels of deprivation, unemployment and crime in Glasgow. They found a key feature of daily life 'was the presence of familiar and trusted family friends and neighbours, and open communication and trust between parents and children'. Disrupting the idea that parenting problems are wide-spread in areas experiencing poverty, a stagnant labour market and criminality.

There was extensive recognition, across the literature of the idea that Family Learning is often rooted in pathologised or deficit perceptions of families (Elish-Piper, 2000; Heydon and Reilly, 2007; Moriarty, 2001; Timmons and Pelletier, 2014; Harris and Goodall, 2008; Luguetti and Oliver, 2017). In fact, Elish-Piper (2000) called for a move from deficit models of family literacy programmes aimed at perceived weaknesses towards strengths-based

approaches, nearly two decades ago, and this call is still echoing in more recent work by Wainwright and Marandet in 2013 and 2017. In the latter, concerns are raised about practitioners casting ‘a web of inspection and judgement’ (Wainwright and Marandet, 2013, p.20) in order to recruit parents, who are unemployed or have low levels of education, to Family Learning courses so that the social and economic policy interests of the Government can be served as opposed to the authentic interests of parents.

Sense of Belonging

Developing a distinct space for intergenerational learning was raised in a number of sources as a way to tackle a disconnect between parents and settings where Family Learning classes take place. An important solution because, as noted by Loughrey and Woods (2010, p.82), such divides can lead families to ‘view schools with mistrust and suspicion and...not see education as having much to do with their everyday lives’. Creating a welcoming and comfortable environment is a facet of building trust and demonstrating the value a school places on the role of parents. Lamb (2009, p.8) documents a concerning disregard for the way Family Learning courses are delivered in primary schools in the UK noting:

‘examples include classes taking place in corners of the staff room with constant interruptions; inappropriate furniture to meet the needs of adults; and courses cancelled because schools require children to be involved in an activity that is seen as a greater priority.’

Pahl and Kelly (2005) suggests that the place created by Family Learning groups can be understood as a ‘third space between home and school offering parents and children discursive opportunities drawing on both domains’. Heydon and Reilly (2007, p.157) also use third space thinking to describe how Family Learning might increase ‘the value attributed to home activity at school and school activity at home’. A suggestion reminiscent of Epstein’s (2010) widely cited call for family-like schools and school-like families. Creating a bridging space between home and school where schools take on a nurturing and inclusive nature and families reinforce the value of homework, classroom norms and high engagement with learning.

However, a challenge an authentic practitioner would face is developing truly meaningful activities as opposed to those mandated by the school (Barillas, 2000; Sangster, Stone and Anderson, 2013). Barillas (2000) tackled this by setting out the characteristics of meaningful activities prior to embarking on her intervention. These included the activity being reflective of the families’ cultural practices, having a personal element and being relevant beyond the classroom. Another useful definition appears in Auerbach (1989, p. 166) and draws on

Freire's (1970) work by arguing that an activity is meaningful 'to the extent that it relates to daily realities and helps [people] to act on them'. This definition links meaning with context and indicates that acting authentically requires practitioners to engage with the everyday life of parents and avoid imposing the school norms upon them. This sort of guidance is useful, but somewhat limited across the literature reviewed here and thus a gap has been identified wherein a wide range of scholars describe the nature and benefits of authenticity in learning but far fewer delineate specific steps for developing authentic practice. This study will go some way to addressing this gap by interrogating, as part of a wider set of aims, a specific set of practices that could be followed in order to achieve an authentic approach to family learning.

A Journey to Authentic Family Learning

The Authentic Family Learning approach emerged from a tension between Charlotte's personal values and the professional and political expectations that acted upon her in the role of Family English, Maths and Language (FEML) tutor. For example, the mandatory requirement by the local authority to improve parents' employability, literacy and numeracy levels whether they had expressed an interest in this goal or not when they were recruited to attend a course of family learning in their child's school. The marketing of these courses emphasised spending time with children over the employability and literacy activities. This drive, part of the Skills for Life strategy launched in 2001, also encompassed the mandatory use of decontextualized, mass produced learning materials which lacked relevance to adult participants everyday lives. Parents found the experience of completing cloze exercises based on working in a call centre or adding punctuation to paragraphs of text about country fayres disheartening and demotivating; particularly when time devoted to these activities detracted from the amount of time the children would spend in the classroom (Hardacre, 2011).

The term Authentic Family Learning was chosen because Hardacre has developed practice, within the FEML context, which involves using materials and activities that are not solely designed for use in school. There are real-life purposes for the practices and these are arrived at through dialogue and consultation with the parents and children involved in the course. For example, in one setting this involved planning, raising funds for, executing and celebrating an educational visit to an indoor ski slope. The vast range of discrete literacy tasks within this shared activity were all real. This task included the parents' interests, a considerable number of meaningful choices and the parents carrying out the actions, with purpose, in order to complete the task. This type of approach has been referred to as authentic learning by a wide

range of scholars including Jacobson, Degener and Purcell-Gates (2003), Maina (20004), Lombardi and Hui and Koplín. (2011).

Thus, it was as a result of concerns about homogenous and decontextualized approaches to FEML, that Authentic Family Learning emerged as an approximated and best fit approach wherein Hardacre worked to meet the disparate agendas of funder, practitioner, participant and setting. Consequently, the use of unorthodox and un-sanctioned methods of working with families who had not volunteered to be ‘upskilled’, were conceptualised as Six Key Practices (Figure 1.) which encapsulate Hardacre’s approach to setting up and delivering family learning in a way that is congruent with critical pedagogical values and authentic learning practices. These practices, outlined below (Table 1), shape Hardacre’s concept of intergenerational learning and have been selected as the basis for a cross-cultural conversation. The conversations will explore areas of resonance and dissonance with these practices in order to reconceptualise our understanding of intergenerational learning,



Figure 1. The Six Key Practices of Authentic Family Learning

The Six Key Practices of Authentic Family Learning

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Authentic Lifeworlds</p> | <p>The lifeworld (Habermas, 1987) encompasses a wide range of different conventions and suppositions about ‘who we are as people and what we value about ourselves: what we believe, what shocks and offends us, what we aspire to, what we desire and what we are willing to sacrifice.’ (Frank, 2000, online). In Authentic Family Learning none of these lifeworlds is privileged above another although power is disproportionately allocated and therefore always relevant and impactful.</p> |
| <p>Authentic Place</p> | <p>The authentic practitioner recognises the potential for parents feeling that they are in a hostile environment and seeks to create a ‘third space’ that is distinct from home and school (Pahl and Kelly, 2005). Seemingly small actions, such as insisting on appropriate rooms with adult-size furniture, disrupt the conventions of family learning courses and set an authentic tone that prioritises the immediate experiences of the people involved.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Authentic Agendas</p> | <p>Establishing shared goals focused on real tasks is therefore the most fundamental aspect of Authentic Family Learning. Especially as many families have experienced deficit-based interventions where they are told what is wrong with them. The authentic practitioner will need to establish trust and build constructive relationships with families in order to agree a shared goal that works for everyone.</p> |
| <p>Authentic Actions</p> | <p>Activities in FEML programmes are often abstract, decontextualized and prescribed in advance. In contrast, authentic activities are grounded in the lives of the families and involve practitioners and parents co-planning meaningful activities. This can only happen when agendas are explicit and authentic as these create the boundaries for the choice of actions available to the whole group.</p> |
| <p>Authentic Relating</p> | <p>The roles of trust and reciprocity are significant in this practice. The lack of hierarchy and imposed activity can create suspicion and confusion whilst the accepted role of teacher and student are not being taken up. Creating a period of negotiation and in some cases boundary testing. It is during this phase that the practitioner should maintain a focus on the shared goal and the enjoyment and engagement with the children.</p> |
| <p>Authentic Reflection</p> | <p>Authentic Family Learning will never take a static form, it will require constant negotiation and adjustment. A form of steering and control by the practitioner which some may feel belies authenticity, but is in fact the hallmark of AFL. Adults and children participating in AFL are invited to acknowledge and critique power structure through reflection on the impact of these on their own agency.</p> |

Table 1: The Six Key Practices of Authentic Family Learning

Methodology

This study is part of a wider set of research in which, as two researchers from different contexts we have engaged in a series of cross cultural conversations to discuss critical issues relating to intergenerational learning in our respective countries. As suggested by Suhonen, Saarikoski and Leino-Kilpi (2009), cross cultural research provides a robust opportunity to advance knowledge by taking a global perspective on critical issues. Likewise, as proposed by Ilesanmi (2009), cross cultural research ultimately seeks to remove barriers and bias in research by acknowledging cultural differences while simultaneously reaffirming global similarities.

Cross-cultural approaches are a useful response to ethnocentric discourses (Beiser, 2003; Sullivan and Cottone, 2010) because of their potential to contextualise researcher interpretations and situate knowledge within local communities. This possibility is demonstrated in a study by Widenfelt *et al.* (2005) which found that ethnocentric definitions of "social competence" for children resulted in bias and inaccurate conclusions because of the differing, culturally-situated meanings attached to the term. This finding indicates one way in which a cross-cultural approach may help researchers 'to reconsider conceptualisations that appear to be universal yet are actually based in Western standards and perspective' (Sullivan and Cottone, 2010, p.360).

Guided by this aim, we employ naturalistic collaborative enquiry as our methodology (Burnard *et al.* 2006), specifically in the form of a series of cross-cultural conversations in which we seek to reappraise our initial understandings of the purposes and practices of intergenerational learning. As Haigh (2005, p. 3) explains because 'conversation is a constant in our personal and professional lives, we are not necessarily inclined to think about it as a research tool'. However, in line with Senge (1994), Baker, Kolb & Jensen (2002) and Burnard *et al.* (2006) we position conversation as a valuable context for learning. In doing so, we acknowledge the distinct nature of conversation and the competencies and sensitivities that are required if conversation is to become an occasion for learning. Specifically, we contend that our cross-cultural conversations, as expressed by both Haigh (2005) and Senge (1994) should balance inquiry and advocacy. Meaning that participants should both state and justify their initial position whilst also engaging in an exploration and 'critique of the reasons and assumptions associated with their positions' (Haigh, 2005, p. 8).

Thus, conversation has the potential to be a purposeful yet intuitive exploration of extant positions in a dialogue enhanced by distinct features such as ‘immediacy, personal relevance, rich stories, serendipity, improvisation, an open agenda, permissiveness, and risk-taking’ (Haigh, 2005, p. 14) which may be found less often in other interactions for research such as structured interviews or oral surveys. Therefore, we sought to use conversation to identify and document our concepts of intergenerational learning by utilising Hardacre’s (2017) Six Key Practices of Authentic Family Learning as categories to discuss one by one.

Researcher Positionality

| Jamaican Practitioner Researcher: Zoyah | British Practitioner Researcher: Charlotte |
|---|---|
| Project manager | Facilitator |
| Programme caters to parents, teachers and children | Programme caters to parents and children |
| Predominantly involves inner-city schools in Kingston, St. Andrew and St. Catherine | Predominantly involves schools high on deprivation index in North-West England |
| Programme caters to children 5-6 years | Caters to children 0 - 5 |
| Responsibilities in the programme include tracking parent outcomes, teachers’ classroom practices | Responsibilities in the programme include; supporting employability of parents and improving children’s literacy skills |

Data collection

The data gathered for this research was garnered through comparative cross-cultural methodology. This method was purposefully selected because it provides an opportunity to remove boundaries and other limitations on how “knowing” is constructed. Likewise, as suggested by Tanaka-Matsumi (2001), cross cultural research provides an opportunity for researchers to interrogate the similarities and differences across and between cultures. By presenting an emic perspective on our individual experiences with family learning programmes we engaged in a series of cross cultural conversations. We were able to examine each other’s: contexts, life experiences and perspectives in order to interrogate and compare our individual concept of family learning within our own contexts.

To gather these data, we engaged in approximately 12 hours of conversations via Skype over the course of ten meetings. As previously stated, our conversations about family learning were explored in relation to the Six Key Practices proposed by Hardacre (2017). We selected

this as a framework to find resonance or dissonance with our respective concepts of intergenerational learning. Throughout each conversation, we each took notes of statements, points or topics which we felt were particularly important or significant (Wolfinger, 2002; Hermanowicz, 2002). At the end of each conversation, we each undertook a general overview of the notes taken. This practice served two purposes. It first provided us with the opportunity to appraise each other of the points we individually felt were important and secondly, it allowed to clarify issues which we individually felt needed to be elaborated or expanded on.

To analyse the data, we used deductive thematic analysis because, as suggested by Braun and Clark (2006), this method provides a basis for using previously developed theory to determine how resonant or dissonant the findings from previous research are. In this case, we used Hardacre's (2017) six key practices. In order to do this, we perused the data collected throughout our conversations and then sought to assess how well they aligned with the categories proposed by Hardacre (2017). The suitability and the alignment are discussed below.

Findings: Reconceptualising through Resonance and Dissonance

Following the analysis of our cross-cultural conversations a range of resonant and dissonant factors emerged. In relation to Authentic Lifeworlds, both practitioner-researchers acknowledged that parents attending their intergenerational learning programmes come from diverse circumstances and bring their experience and worldview into the learning space. With Zoyah noting 'these experiences should be valued even if they counter the philosophical underpinnings of the course'. This shared perspective was shaped by the fact that both interlocutors facilitate programmes which take a social investment perspective which may connote normative ideas about appropriate or good parenting that do not align with the beliefs or understandings of participants. The conversations reveal the mutual perspective that effective practice can only begin once participants and facilitators have developed a reciprocal respect for each other and the learning process. We both expressed the ways that this could be challenging because of the disproportionate allocation of power between facilitator and families. As a result, we both expressed a desire to convey equal value to all participants and make efforts to tackle difficulties up front. Charlotte noted the need to be cognisant of her power to legitimise the beliefs, values, actions and judgements of the group. Zoyah echoed this point whilst also point out the challenge of training other facilitators to understand the implicit ways in which they might impose their power upon the groups they are leading.

A particularly rich area of resonance was evident in relation to the concept of Authentic Place. This was revealed when the practitioner-researchers referred to the physical space allocated to family learning in a school or setting, connoting a level of value and respect to families. Zoyah explained: ‘in many instances, schools provide a space that reflects little consideration of the parents’ comfort..it is not uncommon for programmes to be held in rooms primarily used for storage’. Both practitioners related the common experience, of their courses being located in inappropriate spaces - despite lengthy negotiations to set up the course - to some schools perceiving intergenerational learning as an afterthought or bolt-on to the central activities of the school day. Mitigating factors such as availability of space within the school, timetabling issues and availability of staff cannot be dismissed but do not wholly account for the seemingly low status attributed to families attending classes in box rooms, storage areas or thoroughfares. This reinforcement of the hierarchical relationship between school and family is power-laden as the parent has limited recourse to make changes to the situation. This positions the family learning facilitator in a unique position to redress this power imbalance but raises questions about when this is the appropriate stance to take.

In terms of Authentic Agendas, resonance was found between the interlocutors in terms of developing a shared understanding about the nature and purpose of the course. This was particularly important to the practitioner-researchers because of the instructive and corrective nature of intergenerational learning that comes from a social-investment perspective. Insights helps parents reduce their reliance on harsh disciplinary practices and FEML aims to improve literacy and employability, thus both practitioner-researchers felt a strong drive to ensure parents were fully aware of these aims and both rejected well-intended but ultimately deceptive approaches, such as suggesting the sessions are simply an opportunity to work alongside their child at school. Again, our conversation turned to the role of power with Zoyah pointing out the structural factors that may have led parents to be enrolled on her programme in the first place, such as being compelled by the state to undertake parenting classes with their child.

In terms of Authentic Actions, an analysis of the conversations revealed some dissonance within this practice. When discussing the use of authentic materials in sessions Zoyah noted that because Insights is a programme that has been adapted from the US many of the ‘resources used throughout the programme reflect a context quite dissimilar to Jamaica’. Redesigning these resources would be too costly and time-consuming so the Jamaican

facilitators of the programme actively highlight the similarities and difference to stimulate discussion germane to the lived experiences of the participants. This best-fit approach was a common experience for Zoyah who noted that an expectation to use techniques and resources based on imported, Euro-American ideas of best-practice was part of her daily reality.

Thus, practical and material factors which clearly shape the degree to which a practitioner can be guided by the concept of authentic actions. Charlotte also noted that ‘using authentic materials can be challenging on short courses as there is limited time to get to know parents and design activities around their interests’. On these occasions, Charlotte explained that she would focus on a shared project that could be personalised, such as making ‘story sacks’. Thus, each family group could select their own book to base their ‘story sack’ upon but the activities each week could be planned without parent-input and contextualised week to week. For example, week two would involve the families creating a puppet based on their personally chosen story. In both instances, the practitioner-researchers did not eschew the idea of authenticity- which we define here in line with Jacobson, Degener and Purcell-Gates (2003) as approaches that are relevant, meaningful and personal - but they did have to adapt in line with financial and temporal realities. This indicates that Six Key Practices of Authentic Family Learning are best understood as guiding principles to be led by rather than prescriptive rules to apply in a wholesale and rigid manner.

The conversations also revealed that an adaptive approach resonated with the concept of Authentic Relating. For example, Zoyah explained that families were more likely to engage with and complete the course when there is a shared understanding about the purpose of the programme. Developing this shared understanding, is of course heavily reliant on a responsive relationship between stakeholders. Both researcher-practitioners emphasised the importance of honest and open communication between participant, practitioner and setting. This was not seen as a straightforward task, as the differing interests of, for example schools and families, can put pressure on facilitators to act as an intermediary. Both speakers agreed that rejecting this role was the most effective strategy as invariably both experienced what Hardacre referred to as ‘trying to please everyone and ultimately pleasing no-one...it’s not effective to advocate for both groups at the same time, you have to get them to talk to each other’. Again, we observed in our conversation, our function in shifting and redistributing the power operating between the stakeholders with Zoyah questioning whether this role should be more explicitly acknowledged in the design of intergenerational learning programmes and in the courses which train the facilitators of such programmes.

Resonance also emerged in relation to the last of the Six Key Practices of Authentic Family Learning; Authentic Reflection. Both practitioners, could see how this process aligns with the pursuit of critical consciousness, in which power structures are revealed. Charlotte recounted the ways in which she might invite participants to acknowledge and critique these structures and reflect on the impact of these on their own agency. However, as Zoyah pointed out, whilst this may involve parents questioning the legitimacy of authority figures in the school, it should not devolve into a generalised and circular airing of grievances. Charlotte concurred, agreeing that mindful and focused facilitation of these types of discussions is essential. This revealed the power-laden, steering role practitioners may have within intergenerational learning programmes including those with emancipatory aims.

Additionally, our analysis revealed resonance with authentic reflection when Zoyah brought up how ‘subtle biases and discourses surrounding the participants of such programmes..may be shared by stakeholders within the school walls’ and suggested the need to allow time to recognise and seek ways to address these through critical reflection. Charlotte agreed by noting how family learning tutors are often accepted as a natural peer by teaching staff and thus included in staff room gossip or well-intentioned but denigrating narratives about the challenging lives of parents and children in the school. The conversation turned to how, taking a buffering role between the competing interests and agendas of staff and parents can have merit, but what the practitioner may face is the temptation to placate both sides. Whilst, at face value this could appear to simply be abiding by social norms of empathy and polite agreement, our conversation revealed a feeling that it would in fact a form of collusion which maintains the status quo between the two groups. Therefore, actively choosing to challenge deficit discourses about parents and to reframe criticisms of the teachers and school towards solutions and action was seen as the best use of the unique and powerful position the intergenerational educators can will find themselves in.

Discussion: Reconceptualising Power in Intergenerational Learning

By engaging in cross-cultural conversations, using Authentic Family Learning as a conceptual framework, we found much common ground between the UK and Jamaican contexts. This can be attributed partly to the fact that we both deliver intergenerational programming that is underpinned by a social investment approach. The corrective and instructive nature of such programmes is hierarchical and power-laden and this power operates at various levels

(McDowell, 2004; Raco, 2009; Holloway, Brown & Pimlott-Wilson, 2011). The negotiation and management of power in our different contexts, shaped our entire set of cross-cultural conversations and leads us to now reconceptualise our understanding of the role of power in relation to practitioners and participants. As a result of this reconceptualisation we argue for a need to balance rather than subvert, invert or remove existing power positions in intergenerational programmes.

We were both aware of the influence of global policies on driving implementation and uptake of intergenerational programming in both our contexts. For example, the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, emphasise education as 'intrinsically an intergenerational process' (Bengtsson and Barakat, 2016, p.5) and call for an increase in family learning programmes as a way to minimise the intergenerational transmission of poverty. We also recognised that as a consequence of these global priorities, local authorities target families who are 'considered most deviant in terms of economic and social norms' (Wainwright & Marandet, 2017, p. 215) for recruitment onto intergenerational learning programmes with social investment aims. However, our conversations revealed concern about governmentality and the more 'coercive and regulatory dimensions' of intergenerational programmes (Wainwright & Marandet, 2013, p. 3), but lacked any insight into how to address such concerns practically.

Following the analysis of our conversations we considered how, in the everyday life of our classrooms, we accounted for this corralling of specific types of families onto programmes of intergenerational learning which seek to 'upskill' them and build aspirations that fit with 'highly normative forms of identity' (Wainwright and Marandet, 2017, p.226). In particular those with low levels of education, who are not in employment and live in areas of high deprivation. We identified that a key approach we already utilised intuitively was to actively discuss the purpose of the course with the families involved in such programmes. We see this as a practical way to balance power as it moves a previously hidden agenda into the light. Entering into dialogue with participants about what drives the funding and framing of intergenerational programmes, is in line with Freire's (1970, p. 45) argument that it is 'in speaking their word that people, by naming the world, transform it'.

This form of transformative dialogue, in which the nature and purpose of the course is actively acknowledged and engaged with by participants, is a way to ensure that the learning is grounded in participants existing 'agency, identities and literacies' (Brown, 2011, p. 3). Allowing them to make sense of their experiences and to raise their critical consciousness

about the interests and agendas being enacted through the intergenerational programme of which they are a part. This dialogue can infuse and shape the course, but it is not the central focus of the programme and thus takes the form of informal and spontaneous conversations about the families' reasons for attending or the purpose of activities. Allowing questioning to be an acceptable and welcome form of dialogue is a practical way to balance the distribution of power in intergenerational learning.

Prior to the cross-cultural conversations, we both characterised our practice as learner-centred, but the process of unpacking the lived experience of delivering intergenerational programming revealed that achieving learner-centred practice often requires significant intervention from practitioners in order to draw out the interests, beliefs and values of the families. This may well take place whilst working to externally set timescales, using de-contextualised materials and located in spaces not designed for learning. When the practitioner is necessarily expending control, in order to create a learner-centred experience, it would be disingenuous to claim that power structures are equalised or flattened. This is in line with Schweisfurth's (2014) call for the discourse on learner-centred pedagogy to account for the role of the practitioner more fully. Acknowledging that learner-centred approaches in practice, often feature teacher authority or curricula prescription because programmes are always 'deeply embedded in the cultural, resource, institutional and policy contexts in which they take place' (Schweisfurth, 2014, p.259).

This insight has much in common with the work Wainwright and Marandet (2013, p.22) who explicitly tackle power in family learning by suggesting that the relational dimensions of family learning, such as the broadening of social networks or the rapport between tutor and parent, are not simply an outcome of participation but also 'an important strategy through which family learning is effectively mobilised'. This Foucauldian (1991) reading conceptualises the power that operates through family learning as positive, or 'supportive' and acknowledges that 'relationships of empowerment are both voluntary and coercive, simultaneously controlling and liberating' (Wainwright and Marandet, 2013, p.28) in ways that neutral articulations of the interactions between participants and practitioners taking part in intergenerational learning obscure.

This characterisation of 'supportive power' aligns with our experience of the benefits of a relational approach to family learning. Such as improved retention rates and the continuation of family learning groups beyond the duration of the course itself. It also allows issues of

control, influence and authority to be recognised and held in tension with a more positive reading of the role of power. This is in line with Vincent and Warren's (1998, p. 191) point that intergenerational learning programmes that have a social investment focus are never entirely oppressive or entirely liberatory and 'it is only by recognising and holding these opposing readings in tension, that an analysis can be formed which appreciates both'.

Knowledge Democracy

It should be noted that, our dialogue is grounded in our positional contexts; one from a context which reflects the Euro-centric models of 'best-practice'; and the other from a context which frequently measures itself against these Euro-centric models (Rao *et al.*, 2014). Thus, the use of a conceptual framework rooted in British practice should be noted for its dominant-hegemonic perspective. Our awareness of the importance and value of knowledge democracy (Hall and Tandon, 2014) meant we acknowledged this perspective through our cross-cultural conversations with the hope of destabilising commonly assumed 'positions of power'.

This is resonant with the work of Levermore and Beacom (2009, p.158) who point to 'vertical partnerships' in which 'northern experts speak on behalf of the south' (Mwaanga and Adeosun, 2017). This phenomena, Giulianotti (2004, p. 22) is characterised as the "cultural legacy of colonialism" wherein the presumption of expertise is analogous with the assumption of a 'dominant and colonising position...which fails to recognise the expertise and worldview of colonised societies' (Brannelly, 2016, p.4). Cross-cultural approaches are a useful response to ethnocentric discourses on knowledge production (Beiser, 2003; Sullivan and Cottone, 2010) because of their potential to contextualise researcher interpretations and situate knowledge within local communities. However, whilst cross-cultural approach may help researchers 'to reconsider conceptualizations that appear to be universal yet are actually based in Western standards and perspective' (Sullivan and Cottone, 2010, p.360) we are keen in future work to use the Jamaican context as a starting point for cross-cultural conversation.

Conclusion

Intergenerational programmes of learning that are rooted in a social investment perspective are driven by a dynamic set of overlapping interests that are both complementary and conflicting. Particularly for programmes in school settings, where there are usually four types of participants- the practitioner, school staff, parents and children. Similar to Habermas (1987), our findings suggest all partners involved in the experience are equally important and should be treated as such. They each tacitly create, exchange and embody ideas, beliefs and

perceptions about right ways of being, learning and interacting and these must be carefully negotiated prior to and during the programme implementation. We also acknowledge that rather than viewing discordant lifeworlds as deficient, the practitioners ought to see an opportunity to build and support rich, authentic learning experiences which all participants can benefit from. We refer to this as the need to balance power. By eschewing a top-down transmission of knowledge to one that is more open and democratic, all partners are empowered to learn from each other while simultaneously increasing knowledge and strengthening skills. At the same time, we caution against discourses which minimise the role of facilitators and instead reconceptualise their role as a form of supportive power that, in line with Wainwright and Marandet (2013), should be acknowledged as a potentially positive force that does not require removal, dismissal or minimisation.

References

- Argent, K. (2007) Every child matters: Change for parents/carers and families? Can schools work with families to promote knowledge and understanding of government expectations?, *Education 3-13*, 35(3), 295–303.
- Ashworth, E. and Bourelle, T. (2014) Utilizing Critical Service-Learning Pedagogy in the Online Classroom: Promoting Social Justice and Effecting Change?, *Currents in Teaching & Learning*, 7(1), 64-79.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1989) 'Toward a Social-Contextual Approach to Family Literacy', *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(2), pp. 165-81
- Bailey, C., Robinson, T. and Coore-Desai, C. (2014) Corporal Punishment in the Caribbean: Attitudes and Practices. *Social & Economic Studies*, 63(3/4), 207-234.
- Baker, A., Kolb, D. and Jensen, P. (2002) *Conversational learning: an experiential approach to knowledge creation*. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Barillas, M. (2000) 'Literacy at home: honoring parent voices through writing', *The Reading Teacher*, 54 (3), pp.302-308.
- Beiser, M. (2003) Why should researchers care about culture? *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 48, 154-160.
- Bengtsson, S. and Barakat, B. (2016) *Education & the Sustainable Development Goals* Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002455/245580E.pdf>
- Black, M. C. (2007) Family literacy. *Education Today*, 19, 21-23.
- Brannelly, T. (2016). Decolonising research practices with the ethics of care. *Nursing Ethics*, 23(1), 4-6.
- Brassett-Grundy, A. J. (2001) Parental perspectives of Family Learning - Research Summary.
- British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Leeds, 13-15 September. Available at <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001917.html>
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Bryan, J. and Henry, L. (2012). A model for building school-family-community partnerships: Principles and process, *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 90(4), 408-420.
- Bryk, A. and Schneider, B. (2002) *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Brown, A. (2011) Consciousness-Raising or Eyebrow-Raising? Reading Urban Fiction with High School Students in Freirean Cultural Circles', *Perspectives on Urban Education*, 9(1), 1-12.
- Brown, B. L. (1998). *Family literacy: Respecting family ways*. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.
- Burnard, P., Craft, A., Cremin, T., Duffy, B., Hanson, R., Keene, J., Haynes, L. and Burns, D. (2006). Documenting 'possibility thinking': A journey of collaborative enquiry. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 14(3), 243-262. doi: 10.1080/09669760600880001
- Cartmel, J., Radford, K., Dawson, C., Fitzgerald, A., and Vecchio, N. (2018) Developing an Evidenced Based Intergenerational Pedagogy in Australia. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 16(1-2), 64-85.
- Dixon, K. and Lewis, K. (2008) Parents, teachers and early literacy: The perceptions of parents and teachers of the roles they should play in developing children's early literacy. In: Desmond, S. and Elfert, M. (eds) *Family Literacy Experiences from Africa and around the world*. Cape Town, South Africa: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.
- Elish-Piper, L (2000) An analysis of the social-contextual responsiveness of adult education in urban family literacy programs: Trends, obstacles and solutions, *Reading Research and Instruction*, 184-200.
- Epstein, J. (2010) School/Family/Community Partnerships: Caring for the Children We Share, *Phi Delta Kappan Magazine*, 92(3), 81-96.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2002) *Why we need a new welfare state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006) Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80-92. doi: 10.1177/160940690600500107
- Foucault, M. (1991) Governmentality, in: G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & Peter Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (87-104), Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Frank, A. W. (2000) *Notes on Habermas: Lifeworld and System* Retrieved from <http://people.ucalgary.ca/~frank/habermas.html>
- Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herter and Herter
- Friedman, W., Kremer, M., Miguel, E., and Thornton, R. (2011) *Education as Liberation*, NBER Working Paper, No. 16939. Retrieved from www.nber.org/papers/w16939
- Giulianotti, R. (2004). Human rights, globalisation and sentimental education: The case of sport, *Sport in Society*, 7(3), 355-369.
- Goodall, J. and Montgomery, C. (2014). Parental involvement to parental engagement: a continuum, *Educational Review*, 66(4), 399-410.

- Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Heinemann: London
- Haigh, N. (2005) Everyday conversation as a context for professional learning and development, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 10(1), 3-16.
- Hall, B. and Tandon, R. (2014). *No more enclosures: knowledge democracy and social transformation*. Retrieved from: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/transformation/budd-hall-rajesh-tandon/no-more-enclosures-knowledge-democracy-and-social-transformat>.
- Hamilton, M. and Burgess, A. (2011) *Back to the future? Functional literacy and the new skills agenda*. Retrieved from: <http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/66608/>
- Hannon, P., and Bird, V. (2004). Family Literacy in England: Theory, Practice, Research, and Policy. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of family literacy* (pp. 23-39). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Hardacre, C. (2011) Pay no attention to that man behind the curtain. An action research project considering the use of task-based learning in the adult literacy classroom. *Through the Looking Glass: Reflective Research in Post Compulsory Education*. Preston: UCLAN.
- Hardacre, C. (2017) 'An Authentic Approach to Family Learning' in Stuart, K. and Maynard, L. (eds.) *Empowerment and Agency*. London: Routledge.
- Harris, A. and Goodall, J. (2008) Do parents know they matter? Engaging all parents in learning, *Educational Research*, 50(3), 277-289.
- Herz, B. and Sperling, G. B. (2004) *What Works in Girls' Education: Evidence and Policies from the Developing World*. New York: Council on Foreign Relation.
- Hermanowicz, J. C. (2002). The great interview: 25 strategies for studying people in bed. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(4), 479-499.
- Heydon, L. and Reilly, J. (2007) Professional development for Family Learning programmes: a rationale and outline curriculum, *Literacy*, 41(3), 155-160.
- Holloway, S., Brown, G. and Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2011) Editorial introduction: Geographies of education and aspiration, *Children's Geographies*, 9, 1-5.doi: 10.1080/14733285.2011.540434
- Hovious, A. (2018) Toward a socio-contextual understanding of transliteracy, *Reference Services Review*, 46(2), 178-188.
- Hui, F. and Koplín, M. (2011) The implementation of authentic activities for learning: a case study in finance education, *Business Education and Scholarship of Teaching*, 5 (1), 59-72.
- Ilesanmi, O. O. (2009) What is cross-cultural research? *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 1(2), 82.
- Jacobson, E. Degener, S. and Purcell-Gates, V (2003) *Creating authentic materials for the adult literacy classroom: A handbook for practitioners*. Cambridge, MA: World Education.

- Kinkead-Clark, Z. and Hardacre, C. (2017) Using cross-cultural conversations to contextualize understandings of play: a multinational study, *Early Child Development and Care*, 187(5-6), 935-945.
- Kwan, P. and Wong, Y.L. (2016) Parental involvement in schools and class inequality in education: Some recent findings from Hong Kong, *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 11(2), 91–102.
- Lamb, P. (2009) *The impact of learning as a family: a model for the 21st century*. Leicester: NIACE.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2004) *The Essential Conversation: What Parents and Teachers Can Learn from Each Other*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- LCC (2017) *Employment and Skills Adult Learning Provision 2017/18 Project Brief*. Retrieved from <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/docs/Adult%20Learning%202017-18%20Project%20Brief.pdf>
- Learning and Work Institute (2018) *Family Learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.learningandwork.org.uk/our-work/life-and-society/family-learning/>
- Levermore, R., and Beacom, A., (2009) *Sport and international development*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Levine, R., Lloyd, C., Greene, M. and Grown, C. (2008) *Girls Count: A Global Investment and Action Agenda*. Washington: Center for Global Development.
- Lexmond, J., Bazalgette, L. and Margo, J. (2011) *The Home Front*. London: Demos.
- Lombardi, M. M. (2007) *Authentic Learning for the 21st Century: An Overview*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220040581_Authentic_Learning_for_the_21st_Century_An_Overview
- Loughrey, D. and Woods, C. (2010) Sparking the imagination: creative experts working collaboratively with children, teachers and parents to enhance educational opportunities, *Support for Learning*, 25 (2), 81-90.
- Lugueti, C. and Oliver, K.L. (2017) “Getting more comfortable in an uncomfortable space”: Learning to become an activist researcher in a socially vulnerable sport context, *Sport, Education and Society*, 1–13.
- Maina, F. W. (2004) Authentic learning: Perspectives from contemporary educators, *Journal of Authentic Learning*, 1(1), 1-8.
- McDowell, L. (2004) Work, workfare, work/life balance and an ethic of care, *Progress in Human Geography*, 28, 145–165.
- Mezirow, J. (1991) *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. doi: 10.1177/074171369204200309

- Moriarty, V. (2001) Family Learning Programmes: an investigation of parental perceptions, social capital and social inclusion. *Educate*, 1(1), 85 – 103.
- Mwaanga, O. and Adeosun, K. (2017). Decolonisation in practice: A case study of the Kicking AIDS Out programme in Jamaica. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 5(9), 58-69.
- NIACE (2013) *Family Learning Works: The Inquiry into Family Learning in England and Wales*. Leicester: NIACE.
- Pahl, K. and Kelly, S. (2005) Family literacy as a third space between home and school: some case studies of practice, *Literacy*, 91-96.
- Rao, N., Sun, J., Wong, J.M.S., Weekes, B., Ip, P., Shaeffer, S. Young, M., Bray, M. Chen, E. and Lee, D. (2014) *Early childhood development and cognitive development in developing countries: A rigorous literature review*. Hong Kong: Department for International Development.
- Raco, M. (2009) From expectations to aspirations: State modernisation, urban policy and the existential politics of welfare in the UK, *Political Geography*, 28, 436–444. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2009.10.009
- Rocha-Schmid, E (2010) Participatory pedagogy for empowerment: A critical discourse analysis of teacher parents’ interactions in a family literacy course in London. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 29, 343–358.
- Sangster, P., Stone, K., and Anderson, C. (2013) ‘Transformative professional learning: Embedding critical literacies in the classroom. Professional Development in Education’, 39(5), pp. 615- 637.
- Schweisfurth, M. (2011) Learner-centred education in developing country contexts: From solution to problem?, *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(5), 419-426. doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.03.005
- Schweisfurth, M. (2014) Learner-centred pedagogy: Towards a post-2015 agenda for teaching and learning, *International Journal of Educational Development*, 40, 259-266. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2014.10.01
- Senge, P. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing
- Simpson, D. and Cieslik, M. (2002) Education action zones, empowerment and parents, *Educational Research*, 44(2), 111–128
- Suhonen, R., Saarikoski, M. and Leino-Kilpi, H. (2009) Cross-cultural nursing research. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46(4), 593-602.
- Sullivan, C., and Cottone, R. (2010) Emergent characteristics of effective cross-cultural research: a review of the literature. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 88(3), 357-362.
- Tanaka-Matsumi, J. (2001). Abnormal Psychology and Culture. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 265-286). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

- Timmons, K. and Pelletier, J. (2014) Understanding the importance of parent learning in a school-based family literacy programme, *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 15(4), 510–532.
- Vincent, C. & Warren, S. (1998) Becoming a ‘better’ parent? Motherhood, education and transition, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19, 177–193.
doi:10.1080/0142569980190202
- Wainwright, E., & Marandet, E. (2011) Geographies of family learning and aspirations of belonging. *Children's Geographies*, 9(1), 95-109.
- Wainwright, E. & Marandet, E. (2013) Family learning and the socio-spatial practice of ‘supportive’ power, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3, 504–524.
doi:10.1080/01425692.2012.723870
- Wainwright, E. and Marandet, E. (2017) *Education, Parenting and Family: The social geographies of family learning*, *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 213–229. doi: 10.1002/berj.3262
- West, L. (2005) 'The radical challenge of Family Learning', *Adults Learning*, 16(6), pp. 11-13.
- Widenfelt, B., Treffers, M., Beurs, P., Siebelink, D., and Koudijs, A. (2005). Translation and cross-cultural adaptation of assessment instruments used in psychological research with children and families. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 8(2), 135-147.
- Wolfinger, N. H. (2002) On writing field-notes: Collection Strategies And Background Expectancies, *Qualitative Research*, 2, 85-95.