



## UNCOMMON PEDAGOGIES: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CURRICULUM DESIGN AND TEACHER PREPARATION IN STRUCTURALLY MARGINALISED CONTEXTS FOR SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION

Christabel Kanayo ANUMENECHI

*Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Curriculum Studies, Purdue University, USA.*

---

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

#### *Article history*

Received: 12 September, 2025

Revised: 24 November 2025

Accepted: 14 December 2025

#### *Keywords:*

*Uncommon Pedagogy, Curriculum design, Marginalized Learning Spaces, Public pedagogy, Teacher preparation, Sustainable Education*

### ABSTRACT

Curriculum theory and teacher education have traditionally privileged stable, formal schooling contexts, limiting their application to unconventional learning environments. While studies have examined teaching in contexts such as prisons and refugee education programs, a coherent curriculum-theoretical framework spanning these contexts remains underdeveloped. This paper introduces uncommon pedagogies as a conceptual framework for curriculum design and teacher preparation within marginalised learning spaces. Drawing on curriculum studies, critical pedagogy, and public pedagogy, it reconceptualizes curriculum as a lived, relational, and ethically grounded practice responsive to contextual constraint. By articulating key principles, the framework positions these spaces as central sites of curriculum-theoretical inquiry and provides conceptual tools for rethinking teacher education beyond conventional assumptions

---

© 2023 by the authors. Licensee GEN-MJSD, East London, South Africa. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license. (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

---

---

## 1. Introduction

The study of curriculum is a complex and multifaceted field, deeply engaged with foundational questions around the theory and practice of teaching and learning. (Coşkun & Aslan, 2021). It is also a domain that examines the intersections in the formation of teacher educators and the educational objectives they aim to achieve, as understood in internationalised, equity-focused frameworks (Rahatzad et al., 2016). Critical philosophies and pedagogies in education have challenged the disciplinary legacy of formal schooling, advocating for emancipatory practices that facilitate the holistic development of both teachers and learners (Freire, 1968/2000). It can be inferred that the persistent stratification of educational outcomes on a global scale necessitates a rigorous interrogation of dominant pedagogical paradigms, particularly those used in marginalised spaces (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025). Such patterns suggest that curriculum studies and teacher education have historically been shaped by assumptions of institutional stability and pedagogical predictability, often tethering instructional effectiveness to a narrow set of standardized, "evidence-based" practices. This underscores the importance of critically examining the most dominant curriculum models, including technocratic,

outcome-driven frameworks and conventional constructivist modes that prioritise standardized objectives and cognitive processes – often resting on assumptions of stability, regulatory coherence, and clarity, which are defined roles that align with conventional schooling environments. Contemporary curriculum scholarships critique these paradigms for narrowing, constraining curricular purposes, and reinforcing dominant knowledge systems that perpetuate inequities by overlooking the social and political conditions that shape curriculum enactment, especially in structurally marginalized contexts where school-centered assumptions fail to hold. (Riddle, Mills & McGregor, 2023; Coker, 2023; Mapuya, 2023). Critical voices in curriculum studies also highlight how traditional models often obscure social and cultural dimensions of curriculum enactment. From this critical perspective, conventional models risk obscuring how power, social structures, and institutional constraints shape learning, especially in contexts marked by marginalisation, disruption, and structural precarity. reinforcing dominant norms rather than addressing structural marginalization.

Empirical evidence indicates that across national and global contexts, teaching and learning now take place in marginalized spaces such as prisons and refugee education programs where educational access is shaped by displacement, confinement, interrupted schooling, and systemic exclusion (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 2023; UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning, 2021), to cultural erasure produced through systemic oppression, and inequities – shape access and learning outcomes ( Barajas-López,& Ishimaru, 2020). In these contexts, curriculum cannot be reduced to content coverage or instructional sequencing; rather, it emerges through relational negotiation, ethical judgment, and responsiveness to lived conditions (Pinar, 2012; Slattery, 2013).

From the reconceptualist and postmodern perspectives, education is socially situated, interpretive, and responsive to context rather than a technical or universal process that rejects singular truth claims and advocates instead for multiplicity (Pinar, 1975; Freire, 1970). These perspectives highlight the inadequacy of conventional schooling structures and standardized curriculum models for addressing equity, justice, and pedagogical growth in uncommon spaces. Thus, central to this framework is the exploration of how education unfolds beyond formal classrooms in "uncommon spaces"(refugee, carceral, displaced, constrained contexts) that foster critical consciousness and pedagogical growth among preservice teachers (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025; Akin-Sabuncu et al, 2023). Yet, despite the growing prominence of such contexts, teacher education preparations frequently fail to resonate within these spaces, and curriculum theory has been slow to engage them as legitimate sites of theoretical knowledge production. Accordingly, this paper argues that these uncommon spaces, including prisons, refugee learning centers, freedom schools, community hubs, etc., are legitimate sites of pedagogical development in an era of globalization, rendering conventional schooling structures inadequate, which

disrupts technocratic logic and exposes the inadequacy of standardized curriculum models (Apple, 2019; Pinar, 2012).

In response to these persistent failures, this paper advances uncommon pedagogies (pedagogical practices emerging because of constraint) as a conceptual framework for curriculum design and pre-service teacher preparation in marginalised and structurally constrained learning spaces. This framework calls for a decisive departure from scripted, one-size-fits-all approaches and what I term "common pedagogies" (school-centered, stability-assuming practices) that rely on standardised lessons that often lead to "curriculum narrowing" (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025). Such reliance reinforces deficit views of learners from disadvantaged backgrounds, positioning them as though they lack linguistic or cognitive capabilities rather than as agents of knowledge and meaning making (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1992).

Framed within global commitments to equitable and sustainable education, the framework aligns with broader efforts to advance long-term educational capacity in contexts shaped by structural constraints. Therefore, integrating these spaces into preservice teacher preparation is imperative, given that preservice teachers demand pedagogical orientations grounded in critical theory, cultural responsiveness, and ethical praxis rather than universalist prescriptions or managerial approaches (Slattery, 2013; Doll, 1993). Through the lens of reflective practice theory, it is clear that many teacher preparation programmes remain White-centric, failing to prepare would-be teachers to dismantle systemic inequalities, a critique powerfully articulated in Subini Ancy Annamma's *Pedagogy of Pathologisation* (2018), which exposes how schools criminalise and pathologise Dis/abled Girls of Colour within the school-prison nexus.

The purpose of this paper is to develop uncommon pedagogies as a curriculum – theoretical framework for understanding curriculum design and teacher preparation in unconventional learning spaces. To do so, the paper adopts a conceptual and theoretical approach, drawing on literature from curriculum studies, critical pedagogy, and public pedagogy. Through theoretical synthesis and critical analysis of existing scholarship, it advances a framework for teacher preparation beyond conventional school contexts, emphasizing concept-building and integrating insights from diverse contexts to articulate a coherent framework of uncommon pedagogies. This approach ensures that education becomes a site for sustaining the cultural practices of communities, rather than erasing them (Paris & Alim, 2017). Ultimately, this paper positions "uncommon spaces not as peripheral anomalies but as central to reimagining curriculum theory and critical sites for reimagining pedagogical theory and practice. By

foregrounding these spaces, the argument challenges normative models that privilege standardisation over responsiveness and justice (Apple, 2019).

While this paper develops uncommon pedagogies as a conceptual framework for curriculum design and teacher preparation, related work applies this framework to preservice teacher education in refugee and correctional contexts, justice-oriented pedagogical practices, and adult public learning spaces. As a curriculum scholar and teacher educator whose work examines teaching and learning beyond conventional schooling, I advance this as a theoretical intervention that exposes or responds to the limits of normative curriculum thinking and contributes new conceptual language to the field. This intervention also opens new possibilities for preservice teacher preparation, including pedagogies attuned to complexity and pedagogical approaches responsive to precarity in contemporary educational landscapes.

## **2. Theoretical Context: Curriculum Theory and Marginalized Learning Spaces**

### ***2.1 Situating the Problem: The Limits of Normative Curriculum Theory:***

Traditional curriculum models have long structured educational discourse and practice, yet they often fail to account for learning in marginalized or structurally constrained spaces. Dominant frameworks, whether the cognitivist and constructionist approaches concerned with mental processes, the social efficacy models designed to prepare learners for work, or the classical essentialist traditional frameworks that privilege canonical knowledge- assume stability, regulatory coherence, and clearly defined roles for teachers and learners (Tyler, 1949; Taba, 1962; Apple, 2004). While foundational, these paradigms are increasingly inadequate for understanding education in spaces characterized by displacement and confinement as they continue to structure discourse in ways that may produce inequity and marginalisation.

Classical curriculum theory has long prioritized order, coherence, and rational planning as indicators of educational quality. Early linear models, especially Tyler's (1949) objectives-based principles and Taba's (1962) structured curriculum process, conceptualized the curriculum as a systematically organized process where objectives, content, instruction, and evaluation could be deliberately aligned and controlled. Both models assumed that curricular intentions could be designed, articulated in advance, and implemented with a high degree of predictability, thereby framing curriculum as a stable and controllable enterprise (Tyler, 1949; Taba, 1962). Subsequent reform efforts sought to improve flexibility away from rigid linearity while preserving an overarching idea of institutional coherence, reflecting an ongoing tension between technical rationality and adaptive responsiveness in curriculum

design. Tyler, 1949; Wraga, 2017). J.F. Kerr's (1968) model introduced interaction among objectives, knowledge learning experiences, and evaluation, highlighting interdependence and strict sequencing. Still, the framework remains rooted in contexts where evaluation is within relatively stable educational systems. Similarly, Denis Lawton's (1975) located curriculum within broader social and cultural processes, the political and value-laden nature of curricular knowledge; however, Lawton's work represented a significant shift from technicist neutrality by placing curriculum within broader social and cultural processes. Nonetheless, reconceptualist scholarship critiques these linear frameworks for their rigidity and failure to account for curriculum as interpretive, context-specific practice (Pinar, 1978; Wraga, 2017).

Despite reforms driven by the critical turns, traditional frameworks largely presume conventional schooling environments, treating formal education as the stable site of curricular decision making (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Ball, 2008; Apple, 2019). This logic of predictability marginalises dynamic, context-responsive approaches to curriculum design, offering limited conceptual resources for understanding curriculum formation in spaces marked by social marginalization, institutional constraints, and structural precarity (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Singer & Verity, 2020). It is precisely these assumptions that become strained when curriculum is enacted in these learning spaces, where educational processes are shaped not by orderly planning but by constraint, uncertainty, and ethical negotiation. (Pinar, 2012; Slattery, 2013).

In response, many systems have defaulted to "common pedagogies", which are essentially the tightly scripted standardised lessons that frequently result in curriculum narrowing (Au, 2007; Ravitch, 2016). This narrowing often reduces literacy by learning to rote competencies detached from social relevance, thereby weakening teacher autonomy and limiting engagement with complex social issues (Anumenechi et al., 2025; Ball & Forzani, 2009). Reconceptualist perspectives, however, emphasize curriculum as an interpretive context-specific, and socially situated, insisting that education should not be merely a technical enterprise. In support, as situated within learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995), offer conceptual resources for reimagining curriculum as participatory, relational, and context-responsive, an orientation urgently needed in spaces where learners' identities and lived realities challenge universalist prescriptions (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1992; Doll, 1993).

## ***2.2 Inclusive Education and Social Justice in Uncommon Learning Spaces***

Culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP) extends beyond mere responsiveness to actively sustain, affirm, and expand learners' linguistic and cultural practices, as a conceptual orientation within curriculum theory, CSP is central to advancing inclusive and social justice, particularly in marginalized learning contexts such as adult immigrants and refugee education and justice-involved populations in prisons (Journal of Refugee Studies, 2023). Inclusive education and social justice demand that curriculum theory interrogate intersecting oppressions related to disability, race, and structural marginalisation, while expanding beyond conventional schooling to address multiple, overlapping forms of marginalities and exclusion (Slee, 2019; Waitoller & Artiles, 2013; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012).

Traditional approaches to inclusion have often relied on deficit-oriented frameworks. Just as disability has historically been framed through a "medical model" (viewing disability as a biological impairment), inclusive education must be reconceptualized by moving towards a social model that foregrounds institutional practices, structural barriers, and systemic inequities rather than individual impairment or deficit (Oliver, 1990; Slee, 2018). Subini Ancy Annamma's *Pedagogy of Pathologisation* (2018) deepens this critique by exposing how schools criminalise, marginalize and pathologise Dis/abled Girls of Colour within the school-prison nexus, revealing how deficit discourses reproduce exclusion rather than equity. From a curriculum-theoretical perspective, Response to Intervention (RTI) can function as a preventive, accessibility-oriented framework when enacted or implemented through a justice lens, rather than as a technocratic fix (CAST, 2023). Extending this logic to uncommon spaces, such as community-based adult learning hubs and educational programs for unhoused populations, further amplifies and complicates curriculum design and implementation. Community hubs require relational and asset-based curricula that draw on local knowledge and social networks (Belete et al., 2022; Wentworth, 2023). Similarly, programs for unhoused learners must navigate instability, trauma, and institutional bias while resisting standardized and deficit framings (Waller & Rascoe, 2023; Hashmi et al., 2020). These contexts demand curriculum practices that are adaptive, relational, and ethically grounded rather than standardised or prescriptive.

Ultimately, curriculum theory in these spaces necessitates a shift toward democratic professionalism, positioning educators as advocates who collaborate with learners, families, and communities to secure resources and enact justice both inside and beyond classrooms (Zeichner, 2024; Freire, 1970; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Such an orientation aligns with the broader argument of this paper by foregrounding uncommon pedagogies as essential for cultivating dignity, agency, and equity in structurally constrained learning environments.

### ***2.3. From Applied Work to Conceptual Intervention***

Recently applied scholarship has begun to illuminate how non-traditional learning spaces disrupt dominant assumptions about teaching and curriculum by shifting the "centre of gravity" from university-driven theory toward community-based practice (Zeichner, 2024). Over the years, traditional teacher preparation has been operational in a fixed framework designed primarily for teaching practice and mastery in elementary, middle, or senior high school contexts, largely oriented towards white, people of colour, middle-class, and monolingual populations, which inadvertently reproduces power dynamics and perpetuates certain standards as the norm.

Ardently, applied work in marginalised spaces does intervene conceptually by challenging this rigid, fixed white and or standardised normativity, arguing that the lived experiences and "cultural wealth" of marginalised communities are not deficits to be remedied but essential instructional assets (Chávez-Moreno, 2022; Yosso, 2005). Notwithstanding, the transition from applied practice to conceptual intervention is evidenced by the move toward hybrid teacher preparation models, as these models, such as teacher residencies and community-based "grow your own" programs, disrupt traditional hierarchies by establishing a "rightful presence" for school and community partners (Zeichner, 2024).

In prior work presented and published with Maria Regina Jaga at ISIT (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025), we examined how preservice teacher engagement with community-based adult learning environments unsettled normative pedagogical expectations and informed curriculum design in teacher education. That study demonstrated how uncommon educational spaces function not merely as sites of practice but as generative contexts for rethinking curriculum and teacher preparation. This intervention redefines the teacher educator to include not just university faculty, but also community mentors and families who possess unique expertise in the sociopolitical contexts of the students (Pastor, M. et al., 2019; Zeichner, 2022, 2024). As Ramsey (2021) suggests, it does require a systems leadership approach, where educational leaders act as "architects" who redesign systems to be inextricably connected to their local communities, ensuring that the curriculum responds directly to the lived realities of the learners. Furthermore, applied interventions in underserved regions, such as the use of complementary schools and participatory planning, illustrate that curriculum is most effective when designed to be flexible and stakeholder-driven (Day et al., 2011). Viewing curriculum through this lens shifts it from a static, state-mandated document toward a locally modified and adapted framework capable of integrating up to 20% of local knowledge, traditions, and life skills (Day et al., 2011).

In reality, while such applied analyses are essential and have significantly enriched understandings of teaching in marginalised settings, much of the existing scholarship remains context-specific. Many studies have looked at teaching in marginalised settings, but most of them focus on describing what happens or solving practical problems. What is less developed is a coherent curriculum-theoretical framework capable of accounting for education across marginalised and structurally constrained contexts. The present paper responds to this gap by moving from examples and experiences of applied insight to conceptual intervention, offering uncommon pedagogies as a framework that synthesises and extends existing theoretical traditions while centring constraint as a defining curricular condition.

### **3. Conceptual Framework: Uncommon Pedagogies**

#### ***3.1 Defining Uncommon Pedagogies***

The conceptual framework of uncommon pedagogies represents a radical departure from the "common" or dominant pedagogical models that define the current accountability era (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025). Whereas common pedagogies are often tethered to tightly scripted, standardised curriculum documents, manifesting in teaching practice preparation, as curriculum guides, syllabi, schemes of work, units of work, lesson notes, and lesson plans, aimed at fidelity and testable micro teaching skills, scoring sheets, and all forms of evaluation rubrics. Uncommon pedagogies are deeply situated, context-responsive, and relational (Anumenechi, 2025). Unlike dominant pedagogical models that presume continuity, predictability, and standardisation, uncommon pedagogies are conceptualized here as curricular and pedagogical orientations that emerge in response to educational contexts marked by institutional constraint, social marginalisation, and structural instability. Moving on, the framework is built upon three interrelated theoretical pillars: Curriculum Studies, Critical Pedagogy, and Public Pedagogy.

Firmly grounded in curriculum studies and shaped by reconceptualist scholarship, this framework positions curriculum as lived, interpretive, and contextually enacted practice, rather than as a static, prescribed plan (Pinar, 2012). From critical pedagogy, they inherit an understanding of education as a moral and political practice shaped by power relations and social struggle following the Freirean legacy, his approach seeks to foster critical consciousness (*conscientização*), enabling both educators and learners to analyze and disrupt the systemic inequities that define marginalized spaces (Anumenechi et al., 2025; Freire, 2000) (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2011; hooks, 1994). Within teacher preparation, this requires preservice teachers (PSTs) to interrogate their own social positionality and the power dynamics inherent in the classroom (Anumenechi et al., 2025).

Furthermore, uncommon pedagogies draw heavily on public pedagogy. Public pedagogy draws attention to learning that occurs beyond formal institutions and to the contested nature of educational meaning-making in public and semi-public spaces (Biesta, 2012; Sandlin et al., 2010; Burdick, 2013). It situates learning within civic and communal life; in practice, this entails cross-sector partnerships (departments of corrections, NGOs, libraries, faith and community organizations) and the recognition that curriculum unfolds in non-school ecologies with heterogeneous governance and accountability logics (UNICEF, 2024; U.S. State/PRM, 2025; Hunt, Rasor, & Patterson, 2019), social justice orientations, and cultural discourse in any space beyond formal traditional school.

By engaging with "uncommon spaces" –such as refugee camps, literacy programs, and grassroots organisations –PSTs interact with a "living curriculum" that is inherently responsive to local realities (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025; his pillar prioritises an asset-based view of marginalised communities by recognising their "Funds of Knowledge" (FoK) (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025; Anumenechi et al., 2025; Day et al., 2011). FoK represents the historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household functioning. Uncommon pedagogies position community members as competent individuals with rich cultural wealth, rather than viewing them through a lens of deficiency

What distinguishes uncommon pedagogies is their explicit engagement with constraint as a central curricular condition. In prisons and refugee education contexts, constraints are not peripheral obstacles but structuring forces that shape what can be taught, how teaching unfolds, and how learners participate. Curriculum design in such spaces, therefore, demands pedagogical orientations attuned to uncertainty, ethical complexity, and relational negotiation.

As a whole, uncommon pedagogies serve as a conceptual lens for rethinking how curriculum and teacher preparation operate under constraints. Rather than offering a perspective model, the framework provides an interpretive orientation that foregrounds relational judgment, ethical responsiveness, and contextual negotiation as central curricular capacities. In this sense, uncommon pedagogies do not replace existing theory but reconfigure how curriculum is understood, designed, and enacted when conventional assumptions of stability, standardization, and institutional coherence no longer hold.

### **3.2 Principles of Uncommon Pedagogies**

This section outlines four interrelated principles that operationalise and characterise uncommon pedagogies, each grounded in scholarly literature, as these principles help articulate how

1. **Relationality:** At its core, uncommon pedagogy places or foregrounds relational encounter as the foundation of teaching and learning, emphasizing the dynamic interaction between teacher, learner, and knowledge. Learning is enacted through dialogic spaces grounded in mutuality, democratic exchange, and co-construction of meaning (Hickey & Riddle, 2023). In contexts shaped by social marginalization and precarity, where learners' prior engagements with institutions may have involved exclusion or harm, relational pedagogy prioritises trust, recognition, and ethical engagement as conditions for learning. (Noddings, 2005; hooks, 1994).

2. **Contextual Responsiveness:** Uncommon pedagogies require curriculum to be responsive not only to learners but also to the broader conditions that shape educational possibilities. Effective practice in unconventional spaces requires deep responsiveness and attentiveness to learners' lived experiences, community realities, and sociocultural histories. famously argues that embedding curriculum within authentic, real-world contexts enhances meaning and student engagement (Johnson, 2002), while positioning teachers as curricular interpreters rather than mere deliverers of content. (Schwab, 1978; Doll, 1993). Curriculum in this sense remains open, provisional, and responsive to context.

3. **Ethical grounding:** Uncommon pedagogies are anchored in explicit moral commitments to care, justice, and professional responsibility. Pedagogical decisions in structurally constrained environments carry heightened ethical weight, requiring teachers to cultivate moral reflexivity and navigate complex ethical tensions in complex learning environments. (Orchard, 2024). On the other hand, Curriculum design must therefore foreground questions of dignity, agency, and responsibility, aligning with Biesta's (2010) emphasis on education as an ethical and subject-forming practice rather than a purely technical enterprise.

4. **Adaptability:** Uncommon pedagogies emphasize adaptability as a professional disposition rather than ad hoc improvisation. Curriculum design must remain flexible enough to pivot in response to learners' evolving needs and contextual unpredictability, while resisting deficit framings of difference. Adaptability here reflects professional dispositions and pedagogical judgment in teaching grounded in theory and moral virtue, not mere improvisation (Socket, 2012). Through formative assessment and

sustained expectations, adaptive teaching supports flexible, context-sensitive instructional adjustments without sacrificing rigor or purpose (Noon, 2025; Third Space Learning, 2024).

#### **4. Implications for Curriculum Design and Teacher Preparation**

Conceptualizing uncommon pedagogies carries significant implications for curriculum studies and teacher education. Teacher preparation programs that privilege conventional classroom contexts as the default site of practice risk limiting educators' capacity to engage meaningfully with diverse educational landscapes. Preparing teachers for marginalised spaces requires curriculum designs that cultivate ethical judgment, contextual analysis, and relational engagement as core professional competencies. The implementation of uncommon pedagogies necessitates a fundamental shift in how educational systems are structured, moving from a hierarchical, university-led model to a democratic and hybridized approach (Zeichner, 2024; Anumenechi et al., 2025). This transformation has deep implications for both the architecture of curriculum and the professional journey of preservice teachers (PSTs). It is expedient to say that teacher education must expand its scope to include "uncommon spaces" such as refugee camps, literacy centres, and grassroots organisations as legitimate sites for practicum (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025; Anumenechi et al., 2025).

For curriculum scholars, uncommon pedagogies challenge the field to reconsider where theory is generated and whose educational experiences are deemed worthy of sustained theoretical attention. Marginalised learning spaces should not be treated as sites of application for pre-existing frameworks but as productive contexts for theorizing curriculum itself. This shift expands the intellectual boundaries of curriculum studies and affirms its responsibility to engage education in all its social and institutional complexities. Curriculum design in marginalised spaces must reject the "accountability era" focus on scripted, "common" pedagogies that lead to curriculum narrowing (Anumenechi et al., 2025; Zeichner, 2024). Instead, the curriculum should be viewed as a teacher's "oeuvre," a body of work that is continuously refined to meet the specific conditions of the classroom (Anumenechi et al., 2025).

Teacher preparation must also address the structural inequities that prevent marginalised candidates from entering the profession. This includes mitigating financial constraints -- such as hidden costs for assessments, travel, and licensure-- and hiring academic advisors who reflect the diverse identities of the student body (Hall et al., 2025).

Sustainability in marginalised spaces requires Systems Leadership, where educational leaders act as architects who redesign systems to remove obstacles and engineer opportunities for success (Ramsey, 2021). This involves a shift toward community accountability, where TPPs engage in face-to-face

dialogue with community members to evaluate the quality of teacher preparation and respond to local needs (Zeichner, 2024). By aligning teacher education with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), programs can foster lifelong learning that is truly inclusive and equitable (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025; Anumenechi et al., 2025).

## **5. Conclusion**

The framework of uncommon pedagogies promotes a reimagining of curriculum design and teacher preparation in marginalized and structurally limited learning environments. By emphasizing relationality, contextual relevance, ethical principles, and flexibility, the framework directly addresses the shortcomings of dominant curriculum theories that assume stability, institutional coherence, and standardized teaching conditions. Ultimately, uncommon pedagogies shift the focus of curriculum from purely technical delivery to a lived, ethical, and contextually enacted practice shaped by constraints and social complexities. The aim is to make schooling a space for maintaining and even revitalizing other educational and cultural practices rather than erasing them (Paris & Alim, 2017; Anumenechi et al., 2025). Instead of viewing prisons, refugee education programs, community centers, and literacy hubs as peripheral or exceptional, this paper argues that such spaces are central to curriculum theory and are legitimate sites essential for integrating teaching practice. These contexts reveal the flaws of school-centered preparation models and highlight the need for pedagogical approaches capable of working across differences, uncertainty, and institutional limitations. Including field experiences in unconventional spaces helps pre-service teachers develop intercultural competence, ethical judgment, and critical awareness necessary for teaching in marginalized communities (Anumenechi & Jaga, 2025).

Lastly, uncommon pedagogies provide a theoretical framework that repositions curriculum as a space for supporting, rather than erasing, diverse educational and cultural practices (Paris & Alim, 2017; Anumenechi et al., 2025). In doing so, the framework also offers conceptual resources for engaging in teaching and learning amid instability, exclusion, and constraint, while aligning with the goals of Sustainable Development Goal 4 by promoting education as an inclusive, equitable, and lifelong endeavor grounded in the dignity and potential of every learner.

## 6. Reference

- Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. Teachers College Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2019). *Curriculum and ideology: Critical perspectives*. Routledge.
- Akin-Sabuncu, S., Chen Lee, C., & Knight-Manuel, M. (2023). Opening Pandora's box: A culturally relevant perspective on elementary teachers' approaches to educating immigrant and refugee students in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(3), 418–436.
- Au, W. (2007). "High Stakes Testing and Curricular Control: A Qualitative Metasynthesis." *Educational Researcher*, 36(5), 258–267.
- Annamma, S. A. (2018). *The pedagogy of pathologization: Dis/abled girls of color in the school–prison nexus*. Routledge.
- Anumenechi, C. K., & Jaga, M. R. (2025). Uncommon spaces, uncommon pedagogies: Preparing preservice teachers and informing curriculum through community-based adult learning. *TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 32(S7), 2618–2626.
- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497–511.
- Ball, S. J. (2008). *The education debate* (4th ed.). The Policy Press.
- Belete, S., Duke, C., Hinzen, H., Owusu-Boampong, A., & Khau, H. P. (2022). Community learning centres for adult learning and education: Development in and by communities. *International Review of Education*, 68, 259–290.
- Biesta, G. (2012). The future of teacher education: Evidence, competence or wisdom? *Research on Steiner Education*, 3(1), 8–21.
- Burdick, J., Sandlin, J. A., & O'Malley, M. P. (Eds.). (2013). *Problematizing public pedagogy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203113059>
- CAST. (2023). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 3.0*. <https://udlguidelines.cast.org>
- Chávez-Moreno, L. C. (2022). Critiquing racial literacy: Presenting a continuum of racial literacies. *Educational Researcher*, 51(7), 481–488.
- Coker, H. (2023). Teachers' use of knowledge in curriculum making. *Education Sciences*, 14(1), 3.
- Coşkun Yaşar, G., & Aslan, B. (2021). Curriculum theory: A review study. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 11(2), 237–260.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. Teachers College Press.
- Davis, E. A. (2003). Knowledge integration in science teaching. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(8), 797–828. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.10105>
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Leithwood, K., Hopkins, D., Gu, Q., Brown, E., & Ahtaridou, E. (2011). *Successful school leadership: Linking learning and achievement*. Open University Press
- Doll, W. E. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. Teachers College Press.
- Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016). Refugee education: The crossroads of globalization. *Educational Researcher*, 45(9), 473–482.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.; M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Herder and Herder. (Original work published 1968)
- Grumet, M. R. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (2004). *Failed states, war, and education*. *Critical Pedagogy in Uncertain Times: Hope and Possibilities*, 122–148.
- Giroux, H. A. (2000). Public pedagogy as cultural politics: Stuart Hall and the crisis of culture. *Cultural Studies*, 14(2), 341–360.

- Hashmi, S. S., Saad, A., Leps, C., Gillies-Podgorecki, J., Feeney, B., Hardy, C., Falzone, N., Archibald, D., Hoang, T., Bond, A., Wang, J., Alkhateeb, Q., Penney, D., DiFalco, A., & Pottie, K. (2020). A student-led curriculum framework for homeless and vulnerably housed populations. *BMC Medical Education*, 20, Article 232.
- Hickey, A., & Riddle, S. (2023). *Proposing a conceptual framework for relational pedagogy: Pedagogical informality, interface, exchange, and enactment*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(13), 3271–3285.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.
- Hub for Education for Refugees in Europe. (2020). *Refugee education in Europe: Mapping policies, practices, and challenges*.
- Hunt, T., Rasor, A., & Patterson, M. B. (2019). “We are the voice to speak up”: Cultivating adult learner voice through leadership. *COABE Journal: The Resource for Adult Education*, 8(2), 22–32.
- Johnson, E. B. (2002). *Contextual Teaching and Learning: What It Is and Why It’s Here to Stay*. Corwin Press.
- Kerr, J. F. (1968). *Changing the curriculum*. University of London Press
- Ladson Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lawton, D. (1975). *Class, culture, and the curriculum*. Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Lembke, E. S., Cook, B. G., Thorius, K. K., & Hunt, P. (2024). *Universal design for learning in inclusive classrooms: Practices that work*. Guilford Press.
- Mapuya, M. (2023). *Exploring social justice issues that inform the 21st-century curriculum in higher education*. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, 5(3), 108–127.
- Mendenhall, M., Bartlett, L., & Ghaffar-Kucher, A. (2017). “If you need help, they are always there for us”: Education for refugees in an international high school in NYC. *Urban Review*, 49(1), 1–25.
- Midgette, E., & González, J. (2023). Trauma-informed teaching of literature to multilingual learner refugees: Balancing cultural responsiveness and curriculum sensitivity. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 12 Article 11.
- Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education (2nd ed.)*. Teachers College Press.
- Noon, M. (2025). *Adaptive Teaching: A Practical Step-by-Step Guide for Teachers*. Third Space Learning.
- Oliver, M. (1990). *The politics of disablement: A sociological approach*. Macmillan Education.
- Orchard, J. (2024). *Philosophical Reflections on Ethics in Teaching and Teacher Education*. In S. Fraser-Burgess, J. Heybach, & D. Metro-Roland (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Ethics and Education* (pp. 544–570). Cambridge University Press.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Pastor, M., et al. (2019). Teacher education for inclusion across contexts: Preparing teachers for global mobility. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(5), 486–502.
- Pinson, H., & Arnot, M. (2007). Sociology of education and the wasteland of refugee education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(3), 399–413.
- Pinar, W. F. (1978). The reconceptualization of curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 10(3), 205–214.
- Pinar, W. F. (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* Routledge.

- Qiu, X. (2020). Education of migrant and refugee youth: Continuities and disruptions. *Comparative Education Review*, 64(2), 233–252.
- Ramsey, H. (2021). A theoretical framework for effective education in rural high-poverty schools (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University).
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. Basic Books. (Rev. & exp. ed., 2016)
- Rahatzad, J., Dockrill, H., Sharma, S., & Phillion, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Internationalizing teaching and teacher education for equity: Engaging alternative knowledge across ideological borders*. Information Age Publishing
- Riddle, S., & Hickey, A. (2023). Reclaiming relationality in education policy: Towards a more authentic relational pedagogy. *Critical Studies in Education*, 64(3), 267–282.
- Riddle, S., Mills, M., & McGregor, G. (2023). *Curricular justice and contemporary schooling: Towards a rich, common curriculum for all students*. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 43(2), 137–144.
- Sandlin, J. A., Schultz, B. D., & Burdick, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*. Routledge.
- Schwab, J. J. (1978). *The practical: A language for the curriculum*. In I. Westbury & N. J. Wilkof (Eds.), *Science, curriculum, and liberal education: Selected essays of Joseph J. Schwab* (pp. 287–321). University of Chicago Press.
- Slattery, P. (2013). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era: Teaching and learning in an age of accountability* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Slee, R. (2019). *Inclusive education isn't dead; it just smells funny*. Routledge
- Singer, J. B., & Verity, J. L. (2020). Curriculum as practice: Teacher agency and enacted meaning in classroom contexts. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 50(3), 265–283.
- Sockett, H. (2012). *Knowledge and virtue in teaching and learning: The primacy of dispositions*. Routledge
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Taylor, S., & Sidhu, R. K. (2012). Supporting refugee students in schools: What constitutes inclusive education? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(1), 39–49.
- Third Space Learning. (2025). *Impact: 2024/25 impact report (US/UK tutoring data)*. <https://thirdspacelearning.com/us/impact/>
- Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public-school reform*. Harvard University Press.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2023, September 8). *Unlocking potential: The right to education and opportunity – UNHCR refugee education report 2023* [Report]. UNHCR. <https://www.unhcr.org/media/unhcr-education-report-2023-unlocking-potential-right-education-and-opportunity>
- UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. (2021). *Reimagining the future of lifelong learning*. UNESCO.
- UNICEF. (2024). *Evaluation of “All Children in Education”: Ensuring a pathway to education for refugee and migrant children in Greece (Final report)*. UNICEF Greece
- U.S. Department of State. (2024). *Proposed refugee admissions for Fiscal Year 2025: Report to Congress*. <https://www.state.gov/.../Report-Proposed-Refugee-Admissions-for-FY25.pdf>
- Warner, L. (2007). Education in fragile states: Building resilience in contexts of displacement. *Comparative Education*, 43(2), 171–186
- Waller, A. C., & Rascoe, E. S. (2023). Challenges and culturally responsive practices of school counselors supporting students experiencing homelessness: A qualitative study. *Professional School Counseling*, 27(1), 1–9.

- Waitoller, F. R., & Artiles, A. J. (2013). *A decade of professional development research for inclusive education: A critical review and notes for a research program*. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 319–356. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483905>
- Wraga, W. G. (2017). Understanding the Tyler rationale: Basic principles of curriculum and instruction in a historical context. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49(4), 473–494.
- Wright, J. (2014). Participation in the classroom: Classification and assessment techniques. *Teaching Innovation Projects*, 4(1), 1–11.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91.
- Zeichner, K. (2019). Preparing teachers as democratic professionals. *Action in Teacher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1700847>