



Moving toward Praxis: Disrupting the Banking Model in English Teacher Education

Shea N. Kerkhoff, Nadia Behizadeh & Elsie Lindy Olan

To cite this article: Shea N. Kerkhoff, Nadia Behizadeh & Elsie Lindy Olan (2022) Moving toward Praxis: Disrupting the Banking Model in English Teacher Education, *The New Educator*, 18:3, 240-255, DOI: [10.1080/1547688X.2022.2096948](https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2022.2096948)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2022.2096948>



Published online: 26 Jul 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 14




View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Moving toward Praxis: Disrupting the Banking Model in English Teacher Education

Shea N. Kerkhoff ^a, Nadia Behizadeh^b, and Elsie Lindy Olan^c

^aUniversity of Missouri – St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, USA; ^bGeorgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA; ^cUniversity of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, USA

ABSTRACT

In this article, we reflect on pedagogy we implemented to help teachers enact praxis in their classrooms. We explore how our own classroom spaces inadvertently reified banking education and ways we can disrupt the “schoolishness of school” in teacher preparation. We share a series of reflective vignettes from each author followed by a collaboratively written discussion with hope that readers will also explore their culturally relevant instruction and guide teachers to go beyond awareness of students’ ethnic and cultural diversity to achieve authentic commitment to educational equity and justice.

Introduction

Praxis is taking action based on critical theory for the purpose of transformation and social justice, and then reflecting on action (Freire, 1970). As English educators, we are meta in our praxis. We are applying theories at the same time that we are teaching theories (and teaching others to apply theories), and we are continually reflecting on our teaching. Praxis for English educators includes supporting our teacher candidates (TCs) in taking critical and culturally relevant theory and applying it in instructional planning, and also supporting our TCs in providing their students opportunities to engage in praxis focused on social change.

The seeds for this dialogic commentary article were planted at an English Language Arts Teacher Educators (ELATE) conference session on social justice. During Bieler and Golden’s (2019) workshop on interrupting whiteness, the presenters asked participants to turn and talk to a neighbor, and we three authors serendipitously squeezed side-by-side in the last row of chairs. We shared our struggles and joys in helping TCs in our programs actualize socially just teaching. Through our conversation, we discovered how even though we teach in three seemingly disparate settings, we are constantly negotiating pedagogical moves where we guide our TCs to align newfound theory with praxis.

CONTACT Shea N. Kerkhoff  kerkhoffs@umsl.edu  University of Missouri – St. Louis, 1 University Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63121, USA.

© 2022 ATE and CCNY

In this article, we reflect on pedagogy we implemented to help teachers enact pedagogical praxis of critical and culturally relevant pedagogy in their classrooms. Teacher educators studying their own classroom spaces have identified course elements such as syllabi, grading expectations, and assessment methods contrasting with critical and culturally relevant pedagogies they espouse (Berchini, 2014; Rodriguez, Bohn-Gettler, & Israelson, 2020). When reflecting on our teaching with a Freirean lens, we realized the ways in which our own classroom spaces inadvertently reified banking education (Freire, 1970). We imagined new ways we could disrupt the “schoolishness of school” in teacher preparation (Whitney, 2011, p. 51). In other words, we consider how we might redesign our courses to help TCs apply critical and culturally relevant pedagogy in their classrooms, instead of seeing these theories as concepts to learn in the university and then leave behind when they are in the “real” world. We share a series of reflective vignettes from each author followed by a collaboratively written discussion with hope that readers will also explore their culturally relevant instruction and guide teachers toward enacting humanizing pedagogies.

Theoretical framework

Our theoretical framework of humanizing pedagogies includes culturally relevant pedagogy and critical literacy, which complement each other and overlap in many places. According to Ladson-Billing (1995), culturally relevant pedagogy connects the curriculum to students’ cultures, enhances students’ sense of cultural identity, increases critical consciousness, and is academically rigorous. However, Paris and Alim (2014) warn that the way the theory has been taken up often stops at the first tenet of connecting curriculum to students. They call for culturally sustaining pedagogy to go beyond awareness of students’ cultural diversity and require commitment to educational equity and justice. Importantly, this commitment illuminates necessary action, what Freire called *praxis*. Through implementation of humanizing pedagogies, learners reflect on their own lived experiences, explore conflicting perspectives and real-world issues, and then take action. Because we are in English education, we layer in critical literacy practices (Morrell, 2008), including learners reading, speaking, listening and writing through critical lenses.

Drawing on these theories, we ground our study in five practices: 1) sustaining linguistic, ethnic, and cultural diversity; 2) developing critical consciousness through analysis and reflection on real-world artifacts; 3) integrating multiple viewpoints and worldviews, including those of the learners; 4) using sociopolitical issues and topics related to race, gender, class, (dis)ability, sexual orientation, and intersectionality as curricula; and 5) engaging in praxis through a cycle of reflection, action, and then reflection on action. These practices resonate with Carter Andrews, Brown, Castillo, Jackson, and

Vellanki (2019) framework for humanizing teacher education in which they advocate for resisting binaries and integrating multiple ways of being and knowing. Further, they also emphasize reciprocal critical reflection by teacher educators and TCs as essential to humanizing teacher education.

Shea's vignette

The course I am reflecting on is the very first course I taught as a tenure track professor at a large urban university, an online class called Improving Teaching and Learning. Many of my students were practicing teachers working on alternative certification. These students were in their second year of teaching in high needs K-12 schools and completing the necessary graduate work for teacher certification simultaneously. A few of my students were not yet placed in schools and a few others were experienced teachers who took this course as a master's degree elective. As I learned through the introductory discussion board, my students had diverse lived experiences, including being first generation college students, BIPOC, queer, and refugees.

Originally, the course was based on cognitive theory and covered 20 instructional models. I redesigned the course using culturally relevant/sustaining pedagogy as the frame (CRP; Ladson-Billing, 1995; Paris & Alim, 2014). In my own teacher preparation program in the early 2000s, I had not been given access to these theoretical tools, which I needed as a white woman teaching in urban, predominately Black schools. Luckily, I was able to learn about critical and culturally relevant pedagogies through my engagement with professional organizations. Now, as a teacher educator, I wanted to provide for my students what I had not received in my own preparation. I strove to infuse discussions about culture and criticality throughout the course as well as elevate CRP as the focus for one of the eight modules. We began the course with an opportunity to become acquainted through our discussion board. In order to model bringing one's whole self to our classroom community, I provided the prompt shown in [Figure 1](#). I then asked students to find two classmates that they had something in common with and respond.

The second assignment asked for students to write about a problem of practice they witnessed in their classrooms. This assignment was designed based on Freire's concept of problem-posing and was a way to begin thinking about the final project. The final project asked students to conduct a classroom inquiry and synthesize multiple sources to propose and then carry out a possible solution. Course goals included:

- Problem-pose issues of quality, equity, diversity, inclusion, and access in our classrooms.
- Consider diverse perspectives of teaching and learning to problem-solve issues.

One of the questions teachers often ask each other when they meet is *What do you teach?* And, of course, I'm very interested in hearing about your present teaching assignment. But being a teacher is only one part of our identity, and I am also very interested in getting to know your whole self better. In the U.S., another question that we often ask each other is *Where are you from?* But as Taiye Selasi explains in her TED Talk, where we are from isn't an easy question for many of us to answer. She suggests we ask each other about our cultures rather than places. For others, place is a special part of their identities.

To get to know each other, I would like for everyone to share about the places, cultures, people, or other concepts that make you who you are. How we identify provides a lens through which we see the world and sharing with each other our multiple identities and cultural backgrounds can help us understand the different lenses of others and the lenses that we bring to the class readings, discussions, and activities. One way to think about who we are is by thinking about concentric circles. Nussbaum (2002) and Banks (2004) offer ways of thinking about who we are using the ideas of concentric circles.

For this post, please write or video your introduction. Please include your teaching assignment and major for your Bachelor's degree as part of your introduction about yourself, tell us about your family and your school context as part of your community description. Also, tell us about any national or global identifications or experiences that are important to you.

After this, I will use what you shared to be intentional in creating groups that will include diverse lenses as well as groups based on grade level and subject discipline when appropriate.

Figure 1. Getting to know each other discussion prompt.

As I read the problem of practice papers, I found myself feeling very disappointed. I bristled at the deficit language about children and lack of critique of systems. At the same time, I was projecting deficit thoughts onto my own students. What had I done to build background knowledge on systems of oppression? What had I done to foreground criticality? Nothing yet; this was their first assignment. To address some of these issues, I revised and extended opportunities for reflective learning in the upcoming CRP module. For the CRP module, we read Ladson-Billings and Delpit (See [Table 1](#)), with the option to also read Paris and Alim (2014). Resources were chosen for accessibility: all were available for free and via multiple modalities (i.e., print, digital, and audio). I asked students in my class to use these CRP lenses to think about their students' cultural community assets. My students were able to start surfacing their deficit views and identify how school structures and systemic bias were to blame for many of the problems occurring at their school sites, not the students themselves. For example, a white teacher in an urban school responded to a particular quote in Ladson-Billings' article,

The culture in the classroom is a microcosm of the greater community . . . The quote is a strong message to many "well-intentioned" white educators in majority black communities that their impact is more important than intentions. Are they letting implicit biases and stereotypes of Black underachievement lower their standards or are they maintaining high standards while still being trauma-informed and supportive?

This response notices and names how stereotypes in larger society can play out in their classes if teachers do not critically reflect on their biases.

Table 1. Selected texts and resources studied in the authors' courses.

Course	Readings	Online Resources
Shea's Learning through Inquiry	Delpit's (2006) <i>Other People's Children</i> , available in print, ebook, and audiobook. Ladson-Billings' (1995) "But That's Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy."	Teaching Tolerance's <i>Introduction to Culturally Responsive Pedagogy</i> (youtube.com/watch?v = nGTVjJuRaZ8) and Hunter's Tedx Talk <i>Lucky Zip Codes</i> about our local context (youtube.com/watch?v = gdX8uN6VbUE)
Nadia's Middle Level ELA Methods, focused on writing	Christensen's (2017) <i>Reading, Writing, and Rising Up</i> and excerpts from Nancie Atwell's <i>In the Middle</i> (1998; 2014), portions of Graham et al. (2016) report on teaching writing in grades 6–12, multiple resources from <i>Teaching Tolerance</i> , and many articles on authentic and critical writing, including Behrman (2006), Powell et al., (2001), and Wiggins (2009).	Peter Smagorinsky's online unit plans (petersmagorinsky.net), NCTE and ILA (read.write.think.org), the ELATE Commission on Social Justice teaching (justice.education), a TED talk on intersectionality by Kimberlé Crenshaw, and a video on critical literacy by Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope.
Elsie's Research in Teaching English	Asao B. Inoue's (2015) "Antiracist Writing Assessment," Geneva Gay's (2010) "Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice," Neuman & Celano's (2012) "Giving our children a fighting chance: Poverty, literacy, and the development of information capital," and Paris & Alim's (2017) "Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world."	Position statements from CPalms (cpalms.org/Public), NCTE (ncte.org/resources/position-statements), ReadWriteThink.org (readwritethink.org), and international literacy position statements (literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/position-statements)

Gloria Ladson-Billings describes CRP not as a teaching strategy but rather a lens through which to view our teaching. It was clear through asynchronous discussion boards that teachers desired to adopt a CRP lens and were open to including social and cultural issues in their classes. However, when they turned in lesson plans for the module's summative assessment, they were not necessarily applying theoretical tenets to their practice in meaningful ways. Specifically, their lessons were academically rigorous and provided opportunities for students to relate their community and cultural knowledge, meeting two of Ladson-Billings' tenets. However, there was a lack of considering differing perspectives, asking students to collaborate, and raising students' critical consciousness—three shortcomings I had initiated. I provided written instructions and a video which stated that students were to plan lessons where students worked together to analyze power structures in order to make empowered decisions about themselves, communities, and world. But, I had not modeled these pedagogies by asking teachers to collaborate or analyze how power structures in society are recreated in classrooms. In other words, my own pedagogy did not align with the pedagogy I expected teachers to take up in their lesson plans.

For example, high school English teacher Mia (pseudonym) described her CRP lesson plan for *Macbeth* as follows:

In this activity students are working in groups to choose from several prominent figures according to students' culture and provide rationales. This array of figures was chosen to mimic the faces in my classrooms, ranging from musicians, artists, historic idols, actors, politicians, etc. During this activity students get to take Shakespeare's universal work and paint it in a way that the characters are familiar, relevant, and culturally defining for them.

This activity provided opportunities for students to collaborate and see people that looked like them represented through the curriculum. However, the lesson fell short as far as critically analyzing power structures present in the text and the world. I had hoped that Mia might connect the theme of thirst for power in the play to corruption and violence in modern society.

Discussing the CRP literature through a discussion board and then asking students to individually apply the readings in a lesson plan design were not enough to move from theory to praxis, even when they desired to. I had unintentionally propagated the banking model, filling my students' heads with the knowledge of CRP and asking them to conform to Ladson Billings' model. I did not provide space for students to move from understanding CRP to applying CRP to their teaching practices. Reflecting on this missed opportunity, I wish I had provided more time for students to reflect on their own experiences as leaders and teachers and then name and define dimensions of CRP in ways that connected to their practices. I had also asked for all of this work to be completed within the two-week module structure, and even though I saw that we needed more time, I moved on.

During the module that followed, I included collaboration by asking students to work in small groups to design a lesson plan and provided feedback on their CRP lessons through asking probing questions in strategic places. I noticed that students incorporated more diverse perspectives and collaboration in their next lesson plan, but still missed the mark when it came to asking their students to critique society and seek ways to mitigate issues. Upon reflection, my course also did not include critique of society in our whole group spaces. The problem-posing and inquiry projects were individual projects only shared with me, not the larger class. I was afraid to open the door of critique, let negativity preside if even for a moment, and air our schools' dirty laundry in this digital space. Without seeing me engage in critique, students may not have known if I was a safe person with whom to share their social and political views related to schooling. Additionally, although I provided an opportunity to introduce ourselves at the beginning of the course, acquaintance does not equal relationship. Perhaps teachers did not know me well enough to be vulnerable with me or to know that criticality would be welcomed.

Nadia's vignette

One goal in my English language arts (ELA) methods course focused on middle level education is to help TCs integrate critical writing practices into teaching. I redesigned my course around my framework for powerful writing

pedagogy (PWP; Behizadeh, 2019a) that integrates critical composition pedagogy (Lewison, Flint, & Van Sluys, 2002; Morrell, 2003, 2008), evidence-based practices for writing (Graham et al., 2016), and authentic writing tenets (Behizadeh, 2019b). Recognizing the complexity of PWP, I selected one required text aligned with my framework, Christensen's (2017) *Reading, Writing, and Rising Up*, and supplemented with many additional texts (see Table 1). In the year of this study, I co-taught this class with a graduate teaching assistant who had over 20 years of experience teaching high school ELA, and I was a tenured associate professor of adolescent literacy with almost 20 years of teaching experience in middle school and college. Regarding some of my identities, I am middle class, white-presenting, queer, neurotypical, a cisgender woman, and a native speaker of English.

In my teaching, I strived to model PWP. For example, in one class we explored common gender stereotypes, discussed possible essential questions, and analyzed multiple texts to examine gender representations and narrative techniques. Then, after my graduate teaching assistant modeled writing a short narrative about how societal gender norms acted as barriers, TCs drafted, engaged in mini-conferences, and shared work with the class for feedback. We ended with TCs identifying themes across writing and a debrief of the lesson through the lens of PWP. During class sessions and in reflections, many TCs talked about translating PWP into classroom practice, yet the majority also voiced concerns about enacting critical elements in schools.

Applying our framework of critical and culturally relevant pedagogy, I reflected on the extent to which I was enacting these principles. By discussing gender norms and stereotypes, I was seeking to help TCs develop critical consciousness around their own gender identity and surface and reflect upon their experiences and perspectives. However, I designed the lesson without TCs' input, and my co-instructor and I facilitated the entire class session. TCs were seated at tables while instructors stood at the front of the room, modeling writing and giving instructions. This traditional set-up for the classroom may have unintentionally communicated to TCs that their knowledge and perspectives were less important than knowledge of the instructors. Furthermore, after the course ended, I read more about queer pedagogy (Britzman, 1995; Cohen, 2005) and realized I may have inadvertently reified a gender binary of woman or man by examining gender stereotypes based on this binary without further analysis and interrogation of the binary gender system itself. Was this "one-off" lesson on gender stereotypes actually dangerous? I fear I may have modeled a decontextualized approach to criticality, representing gender as a topic that could be skimmed over and still meet tenets of critical and culturally sustaining pedagogy. Instead of TCs sharing their stories of gender norms as barriers to make sense of their lives and how to engage in the world in more humanizing ways, they may have been engaging in order to see how the checklist of critical literacy components required in the

critical literacy unit plan could be achieved in a lesson plan. Also, as a queer-identified instructor, I noticed upon reflection that I did not bring myself fully into this conversation, even though I had complex, painful, and triumphant stories regarding my own gender and sexuality negotiations to share.

When assessing the summative project, a critical literacy unit plan, I discovered the included lessons did not fully incorporate critical literacy. I analyze one representative example here: Casey (a pseudonym) developed a unit on immigration, drawing on Christensen's (2017) chapter on linguistic diversity and designing a multimodal, multi-genre text set. Essential questions were: "What influences our behavior towards different cultures and diverse people? What factors help shape identity and how does understanding identity help people gain empathy for others?" In the rationale for her unit, Casey cited Powell, Cantrell, and Adams, (2001), claiming her goal was to help students take transformative action. Casey wrote, "Students will use the provided texts to identify social inequalities in our society and refer to inequalities and misinterpretations as factors that shape identity."

However, her lesson plans did not include students identifying social inequalities, exploring identity, or taking action. In one lesson on analyzing dialogue, students watched a video, answered questions about characterization, and then read a story about two recent immigrants to the United States. During reading, Casey modeled how to record examples of dialogue and what these examples revealed about the characters in a graphic organizer. After modeling, students worked in small groups to analyze a portion of the story. The lesson ended with students returning to a chart they had started in a previous class and adding ideas, questions, or comments, but this chart was focused on the standard, not essential questions around identity. Although this lesson included a text that could have been used for students to reflect on their own identity and experience related to national origin, language/dialect, and potentially injustices experienced based on cultural and linguistic difference, the focus was on standards and evidence-based practices.

Casey's lack of praxis may have reflected my own failing to engage TCs as co-learners in authentic inquiry. As Freire (2000) said of liberatory education, "Authentic liberation – the process of humanization – is not another deposit to be made" (p. 79). By treating critical literacy as an outcome, rather than a humanizing and ongoing learning process, I may have undermined attempts to support TCs in enacting their own praxis of criticality.

Elsie's vignette

The course I am reflecting on is a Master's level ELA course that I redesigned to emphasize CRP and antiracist writing assessment theory (Gay, 2010; Inoue, 2015; Paris & Alim, 2014). As a tenured associate professor at the largest public

university of the United States of America, I taught a research in writing instruction course. In this course we sought to recognize social and cultural experiences implicit in all instructional objectives of writing assessments and evaluate traditional and non-traditional assessment techniques used in their classes and in American schooling more broadly while acquiring knowledge of measurement and evaluation.

Students enrolled in this course were either teacher candidates in a teaching practicum setting or novice teachers. As they discussed course content and assignments, I thought about my more than twenty years of teaching in the K through 12 setting and I grappled with thoughts about writing assessments that were not inclusive of students' experiences and writing activities about literature that seemed based on a one-dimensional perspective where the narrative of deficit reigned.

We conversed about whether the assignments for this course and their current assessments in the classes they taught met the needs of diverse students. I became an avid listener, taking notes about how my students were challenged by state-mandated standardized tests, scripted lesson plans and very little time assigned for creative or analytical writing beyond assessments that did not meet their students' needs. Teachers too often spoke about assessments designed by their professional learning communities that did not "fit" or were not "right" for students and would set students up for failure. For example, high school teacher Marie (pseudonym) shared her experiences with dehumanizing writing assessments as follows:

My role as a teacher that is expected to assess learners' writing became evident when data was being thrown in my face during pre-planning before I even met my learners. My philosophy of teaching writing has been to make a good student even better, even though I felt I would have to put forth extra effort in creating assessments so that I would not discount the lower level writers.

Marie's experience (above) was a troubling idea that related to how my students felt disenfranchised in their own schools. After listening, I led the class in unpacking and situating CRP and antiracist writing assessment theory in relation to the troubling ideas they had discussed. I identified how teachers' beliefs that placement test results did not reflect the job they were doing as writing instructors was mentioned in Inoue's (2015) writing assessment ecology.

I assigned Inoue's (2015) writing assessment ecology and followed the reading with teacher candidates' newfound knowledge. Marie shared the following in response to reading:

Although I did not think of my race as a main attribute to my writing abilities in the past, my culminating experiences have both consciously and subconsciously shaped my current teaching philosophy on writing and how I think I should assess writing.

I have always been “reading the world,” as Paulo Friere wrote and for my students I get a bit disheartened when they have not been using their world in the ways that I have been. I do not believe that we can go through the world without noticing these pieces but whereas these pieces for me are pretty shells that pass by my feet in a sandy beach stroll that I stop and pick up, my pockets full, for my students they walk by pushing them down into the waves under foot, forgotten. This attitude is one that I project on my students and I know that it is likely a lack of encouragement and opportunity that do not allow my students to take advantage of these images in their writing.

After reading, my students talked about how taking into consideration race, social justice and culture could further inform how teachers raise their expectations, change their teaching practices and modify testing materials and writing instruction to draw on cultural strengths. As teachers continued sharing their experiences, they made connections to the seven elements (power, ecologies, purpose, people, processes, products and places) explored in Inoue’s (2015) writing assessment ecology. These seven elements were revisited in two key assignments. The first was a position paper on what constitutes effective writing instruction. For the second assignment, teacher candidates and teachers identified and analyzed writing assignments from websites (see Table 1). TCs and teachers shared how they struggled with power, processes, and ecologies embedded in the assessments used for their classes. For example, Marie began questioning the bias present in the writing assessment rubrics at her school:

In Inoue’s (2015) questioning of writing rubrics used for high stakes testing, he raises the notion that “What the guide does promote is a particular ideal text, one that values only abstract ideas, with no sensitivity to the way particular racial formations might respond differently, respond from their own social conditions” (p. 42). This white dominant discourse is apparent in the rubrics I have to use several times a year. A student wanting to score the highest points possible cannot have any loosely related material and must demonstrate basic grammar conventions. Who am I to hold students who are not explicitly taught grammar conventions to this rubric? How much of my subconscious bias deems loosely related material when it may be a connection I just simply do not have a connection with?

After teachers shared and talked about their position papers and their stances on effective writing instruction, we agreed the discussions were richer in problematizing and disrupting notions about ideal and effective writing instruction practices than what teachers had written in their initial position papers. We all had a sense of urgency to revisit our writing instruction and incorporate Inoue’s writing assessment ecology in order to dismantle assessments that perpetuate a deficit narrative of the achievement of our students of color. As other classmates revisited and revised their writing assessments. Marie drew from her teaching experiences, classroom inquiry and understanding of the seven elements of writing assessment ecology: power, parts, purposes, people,

processes, products, and places to develop writing assessments that pay obvious and explicit attention to her diverse students' needs. When reassessing writing assignments assessment, Marie shared the following:

There have been several writing assignments I have implemented with my students that prioritized and integrated student choice and interest. Theme is taught early on in my district's curriculum map. To provide students with everyday examples of theme, students complete a theme song writing assignment. For this assignment, students are allowed to choose a song they like that demonstrates a deeper meaning and life message. To encourage more authentic writing, I try to guide students to think of music genres that express how they relate to the songs they interact with and make them question how are they represented in their genre choice. I also encourage students to identify items that could be assessed for the theme song writing rubric.

A common theme that surfaced from TCs and teachers sharing of new assessments that represented Inoue's seven powers was a common goal to help students gain access to relevant literature and open opportunities for them to write about themselves and the world around them. As conversations moved on, we (TCs, teachers and I) revealed the need for us to provide relevant literature and for us to share our own authentic writing.

Teachers questioned the implementation of Inoue's seven powers within curricula. I encouraged them to engage in conversations with their peers and share some of the strategies and assignments we had worked with during our discussions. Nevertheless, teachers struggled to "convince" their teacher colleagues to revisit their assessments. The pushback they received was real. My students asked me to help them produce rationales for the implementation of CRP and assessments beyond theory. In the production of rationales, I acknowledged the complexity of trying to individually and collectively generate visions of the incorporation of CRP for our own teaching and for teachers' learning communities. We felt disempowered as we tried to shine light on hidden messages and curriculum embedded in the standardized curriculum. I wondered what could I have done to empower my students to design sound antiracist writing assessments while advocating for its implementation in their schools that were resistant to change. Along with my fellow teachers, I too questioned assessments that ignored our students of colors' experiences, background and knowledge they bring into the classroom. I also questioned how my assessment practices and processes could serve as a model representative of what I wanted my students to embody and enact. Through our constant critical interrogations, we encountered conflicting views in the "cultural, intellectual, and social dimensions of self" that informed our pedagogy (Freire, 1970). As I reflect on this experience and how my students (teachers) made me see their realities, I know that the process of humanizing our pedagogies was our individual and collective journey.

Authors' critical reflection

Upon reflection, we all felt our respective readings and multimodal texts contributed to teachers' knowledge of critical and culturally relevant pedagogy but perhaps did not offer teachers support for navigating the complex realities in schools where criticality is not generally emphasized. Take-aways of our past coursework include unpacking with teachers the notion of effective instruction, their understanding of criticality, and connecting this knowledge to their experience. We strived to create nonthreatening spaces to engage in dialogism where students could express their lived experiences in schools and the world. We had rich conversations about race, gender, position, power, cultural systems, and curriculum content.

Yet the end products we envisioned being tools for future praxis in their classroom did not fully represent understandings they expressed during dialogic interactions. We wondered: are we *doing* critical pedagogy and CRP in our own classrooms? Maybe we had not interrupted the "schoolishness of school" (Whitney, 2011) in the university. We realized that by grading students' criticality we were engaging in banking education (Berchini, 2014; Rodriguez et al., 2020). Thinking about CRP, we have to remember that there cannot be a summative assessment that represents attaining full criticality, but that they (and we) are on a continuum, that this is a messy, complicated process of discovery, and that criticality requires constant reflection on self and systems.

Additionally, we wondered if our TCs and ourselves saw the conversation about praxis as "over" at the end of the class session. How do we keep the conversation going through the assignments, and even more so, when the course is over? This led to us wondering if teacher education in the university is not built for truly dialogic and longitudinal relationships where we could continue the conversation with our students and with other educators authentically—not just for participation points or at biennial conferences. To dismantle the banking model, we must disrupt classroom power structures, disrupt false boundaries of time, and embrace a continuous process of becoming for ourselves and our teacher candidates.

To disrupt the power structures in our own classrooms, we hope to include more collaborative and dialogic learning experiences in our courses. One shift will be making the course activities and assessments more collaborative. We think engaging in critical collaborative reflection, like writing this piece together, is one way to push the field toward humanizing teacher education. We see collaborative experiences as culturally responsive because the pedagogical practices include building community and engaging in meaningful course work characterized by "inquiry, discourse, personal involvement, novelty, and reciprocity" (Gay, 2010, p. 253). Although class sessions utilized small groups where TCs consistently discussed topics, shared thinking and

writing, and presented work, our assessments were independent projects. Next year, we intend to develop groups organized by grade level, genre, and a social justice topic of interest, such as a group focused on upper elementary grades, argumentative writing, and climate change or a group focused on grades 6–8, narrative writing, and gender representations in the media. Instead of requiring individual instructional plans from each person, TCs will be able to collaboratively work on tasks: co-developing text sets and essential questions, working together to map out weekly objectives and activities, co-designing formative and summative assessments, and co-constructing lesson plans. Not only do we think this will be a more fruitful learning process, but it also better matches the social and collaborative planning they will ideally engage in when working with a team of teachers.

As opposed to a detached banking model, dialogic learning is deliberate in facilitating community and sharing of lived experiences (Olan & Richmond, 2017; Stewart, 2010). In order to include more authentic conversations, we plan to include more of ourselves into our courses. We are committed to draw on our personal experiences of developing reflexivity, building relationships with our students, and providing time for the process of becoming critically conscious. By better integrating our own life experiences into our teaching, making our curricula more resonant with who we are, we can also invite teacher candidates to bring their own stories and experiences into the space with reciprocity.

For us, this analysis has surfaced the detached nature of the banking model. If the banking model is even implicitly undergirding our teacher education courses, understanding of our students as people with unique experiences must ground our teaching. When we examine the epistemological and ontological stance of our pedagogy, we have to ask: where is there a recognition of the individual? Where, when, and how do we invite a multiplicity of views into the teacher education class?

For example, in the first vignette, Shea could have invited students to engage in conversation about social critique as soon as she noticed she had missed the mark when teaching about it the first time, asking them to draw from their own experiences of stereotypes around adolescents or gender to build new understanding about systems of power. In order to include more peer-to-peer conversations, we hope to include a feedback cycle for the instructional plans, where TCs will self-reflect and peer review with a chance to revise before turning it in as a summative assessment. We plan to ask our TCs how they are crafting their instructional plans and listen to where students are feeling the tension between what teachers do and why they are doing it, and addressing those particular places by theorizing, situating, and contextualizing.

A major next step for us is to ensure learning continues after the course, thus disrupting the false boundary of time ending in the classroom. Elsie has asked her doctoral students who were in the Master's program to come

back and share their current pedagogies—and how culturally relevant theory continues to shape practice. Nadia has developed a critical collaborative where she follows her TCs the semester after the ELA methods course, observes their teaching, and gives feedback with no stakes attached. Additionally, she has asked TCs from past semesters if they might be willing to give her advance feedback on syllabi and course assignments. Shea has developed an “Inquiry Initiative” group on Facebook to provide a dialogic space not bound by time or place and to connect teachers from her courses to teachers and teacher educators all over the world. These three efforts provide a chance to celebrate teachers enacting critical and culturally relevant/sustaining pedagogy and thus encourage sustaining praxis for our teacher candidates, for us, and future generations of teachers. By reflecting on our pedagogy and taking action to problematize and disrupt the Banking Model in our own teaching, we move toward praxis and dialogism that encourages our TCs and ourselves to be intentional as we aim to realize educational equity and justice in the university and K-12 spaces.

Through being honest with ourselves, being vulnerable with our students, and being open with our peers, we can reflect and strengthen where foundations of our humanizing pedagogies have become weak. Without our own critical reflection, we risk being hypocritical when asking our students to embrace praxis. Our work supports the need for teacher educators to engage in critical reflection with other teacher educators, particularly teacher educators committed to social justice, to support our continuous becoming (Carter Andrews et al., 2019). Embracing praxis is about transformation, not once, but always.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Shea N. Kerkhoff  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0052-4923>

References

- Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Atwell, N. (2014). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum*, 68(4), 296–305. doi:10.1080/00131720408984645

- Behizadeh, N. (2019a). Aiming for authenticity: Successes and struggles of an attempt to increase authenticity in writing. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 62(4), 411–419. doi:10.1002/jaal.911
- Behizadeh, N. (2019b). Realizing powerful writing pedagogy in US public schools. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 14(4), 261–279. doi:10.1080/1554480X.2019.1671847
- Behrman, E. H. (2006). Teaching about language, power, and text: A review of classroom practices that support critical literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(6), 490–498. doi:10.1598/jaal.49.6.4
- Berchini, C. N. (2014). Learning to teach and critical pedagogy: Struggling with a “Do as I say, not as I do” pedagogy. *English Education*, 46(3), 247–267.
- Bieler, D., & Golden, N. A. (2019). *Interrupting whiteness in and from English teacher preparation programs*. English Language Arts Teacher Educators (ELATE) Biannual Summer Conference, Fayetteville, AR.
- Britzman, D. (1995). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. *Educational Theory*, 45(2), 151–165. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.1995.00151.x
- Carter Andrews, D. J., Brown, T., Castillo, B. M., Jackson, D., & Vellanki, V. (2019). Beyond damage-centered teacher education: Humanizing pedagogy for teacher educators and preservice teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 121(6), 1–28. doi:10.1177/016146811912100605
- Christensen, L. (2017). *Reading, writing, and rising up: Teaching about social justice and the power of the written word* (2nd ed.). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Cohen, C. J. (2005). Punks, bulldaggers, and welfare queens: The radical potential of queer politics? In E. P. Johnson & M. G. Henderson (Eds.), *Black queer studies: A critical anthology* (pp. 21–51). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L. D., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., . . . Smither Wulsin, C. (2016). *Teaching secondary students to write effectively* (NCEE 2017-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <http://whatworks.ed.gov>
- Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse.
- Ladson-Billing, G. (1995). But that’s just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 159–165. doi:10.1080/00405849509543675
- Lewisohn, M., Flint, A. S., & Van Sluys, K. (2002). Taking on critical literacy: The journey of newcomers and novices. *Language Arts*, 79(5), 382–392.
- Morrell, E. (2003, March). *Writing the word and the world: Critical literacy as critical textual production*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED475208.pdf>
- Morrell, E. (2008). *Critical literacy and urban youth: Pedagogies of access, dissent, and liberation*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Neuman, S. B., & Celano, D. (2012). *Giving our children a fighting chance: Poverty, literacy, and the development of information capital*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country* (pp. 2–17). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Olan, E. L., & Richmond, K. J. (2017). Disrupting the dominant narrative: Beginning English teachers' use of young adult literature and culturally responsive pedagogy. *The Journal of Language & Literacy Education*, 13(2), 1-31. Retrieved from http://jolle.coe.uga.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Olan_JoLLE2017.pdf
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Education Review*, 84(1), 85-100. doi:10.17763/haer.84.1.982l873k2ht16m77
- Powell, R., Cantrell, S. C., & Adams, S. . (2001). Saving Black Mountain: The promise of critical literacy in a multicultural democracy. *The Reading Teacher*, 54(8), 772-781.
- Rodriguez, T., Bohn-Gettler, C., & Israelson, M. (2020). Missed opportunities: Troubling the waters of social justice teaching in an English methods course. *English Education*, 52(2), 114-134.
- Stewart, T. T. (2010). A dialogic pedagogy: Looking to Mikhail Bakhtin for alternatives to standards period teaching practices. *Critical Education*, 1(6), 1-20. Retrieved from <http://m1.cust.educ.ubc.ca/journal/index.php/criticaled/issue/view/59>
- Whitney, A. E. (2011). In search of the authentic English classroom: Facing the schoolishness of school. *English Education*, 44(1), 51-62.
- Wiggins, G. (2009). Real-world writing: Making purpose and audience matter. *English Journal*, 98(5), 29-37.