**Annotated Bibliography – culturally relevant pedagogies**

**Esposito, J., & Swain, A. N. (2009). Pathways to Social Justice: Urban Teachersʼ Uses of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy as a Conduit for Teaching for Social Justice. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, 38–48.**

 This article explores the connection between culturally relevant pedagogies and social justice pedagogies within the urban context. The authors saw that both pedagogies aimed to expose and eradicate the hegemony that permeates almost every aspect of society, including schools. Thus, there are three main goals with this intersection: sociopolitical consciousness, sense of agency, and positive social and cultural identities. The first point expands upon the needed notion to critically question whose narratives our curriculums are in and to argue the ideals that the larger society instills in classrooms. The second point builds off the first to help students sustain a mentality of “what can I do about my situation?” vs. a deficit view of their own situation without action. The third point talks about how students need to learn and have their own cultures included in curriculum to reinforce the positive notions of their people. However, there were several constraints including school reform models, risks to their career, time involvement, and lack of resources that presented them with challenges.

**Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Ingredients for Critical Teacher Reflection. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(3), 195–202.**

 This article analyzes how the outcomes of a truly culturally relevant pedagogy depends on the reflections of the instructor of themselves and their teaching styles. To execute it successfully, the instructor must analyze how race affects their students, how it affects their own decision making, and see the overlap. The instructor must constantly reflect and work collaboratively with their students to ensure their students’ success. As well, instructors must work to ensure that they work to be a part of their students’ cultures and lives. There are three teacher characteristics that were most important to students, such as possessing a caring attitude, the ability to build community within the classroom, and the ability to engage the students in the learning process.

**Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.**

 This article covers the foundations and the history of culturally relevant pedagogies. Studying the cases of eight teachers, analyzing their classrooms, teaching philosophies, and student outcomes, Ladson-Billings comes to the conclusions that awareness of race and culture, by teachers, working alongside students in the classrooms, leads to increased success as well as student connectivity to class content. As well, she looks to see that instructors must not look at their students in the deficit lens, but see the students for their strengths and highlighting those strengths.

**Ladson-Billings, G. (2018). But That’s Just Good Teaching! *Thinking About Schools*, 107–116.**

 Teachers often assume that CRP is just good teaching but it goes beyond that. It goes beyond just incorporating language and speech in the classroom. CRP promotes the individual to be academically successful and to be an active participate in our democracy and having students “choose” academic success. Teachers also needed to connect their students’ lives with the curriculum. Beyond individualism, students need to be able to connect their experiences with the sociopolitical culture of the world outside of the classroom. Furthermore, educators needed to feel like they were a part of the community and giving back to the community and perpetuated these notions to their students. They had to believe that their students could and had to succeed. There was also an emphasis on the switch and movement between teacher and learner.

**Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the Remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, *84*(1), 74–84.**

 Ladson-Billings covers the questions works on the expansiveness that her study has reached. She covers areas such as learning from African American students versus “about”, to learn about the intergenerational identities that other students may have like Hmong folks, and to engage all identities under this umbrella of CRP. This text also expands to rename CRP to “culturally sustaining pedagogies”. This remix also covers the evolution from a primary school setting, to a post-secondary setting. This alternative setting centers the voices of first-wave students who utilize hip hop to shape and form the ways they want to contribute to the communities that they are a part of. She looked at how the culturally relevant pedagogies helped inform the collaboration of non-First Wave students and the First Wave students in the classroom and saw both sides succeed and grow.

**Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: A Synthesis of Classroom-Based Research. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41(4), 433–452.**

 This article analyzes multiple articles across journals that cover culturally relevant pedagogies and looks to find salient themes across educators who execute CRP successfully. These are:

* High academic expectations
* Modeling, scaffolding and clarification of challenging curriculum
* Using students’ strengths as instructional starting points
* Investing and taking personal responsibility for students’ successes
* Creating and nurturing cooperative environments
* High behavioral expectations
* Cultural competence
* Reshaping prescribed curriculum
* Building on student’s funds of knowledge
* Encouraging relationships between schools and communities
* Critical consciousness
* Critical literacy (using texts as a springboard for critique)
* Engaging students in social justice work
* Making explicit the power dynamics of mainstream society
* And Sharing power in the classroom

In order to fully carry out the multiple dimensions of culturally relevant pedagogy as described here, teachers need more time with colleagues to create curriculum, to forge relationships with their students’ families, and to get involved in their students’ communities. Also, schools tend to gear towards a standardized systems and due to the restrictions put on teachers, classroom collaboration is less emphasized and is lost.

**Mane, J. (2009). Kaupapa Maori: A community approach. *MAI Review*. VOl. 9.** [**http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/mrindex/MR/article/download/243/243-1710-1-PB.pdf**](http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/mrindex/MR/article/download/243/243-1710-1-PB.pdf)**.**

This article looks at the Kaupapa Maori population in New Zealand and how community based practices need to be put at the forefront when working with this group as well as other indigenous populations. These practices center community needs without the input of the colonial lens and prevent power dynamics from being inflicted on the community. When conducting research, those who are directly in the community should contribute their knowledge to ensure that their communities are being helped in a manner that is conducive to their needs.

**Paris, D. (2012). Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93–97**

 This article touches upon the needed transition of culturally relevant pedagogies to culturally sustaining pedagogies. Detailing history, the author establishes that prior to the 80s, classrooms worked from a deficit lens, trying to eliminate any signs of culture or language from the classroom and working to establish White Middle class norms. There then was a shift post 80s sharing that teachers started to be more aware of the ways that culture and language could support students of color. The work needed to be more than bridge building – the work needed to be inclusive and extend the lives of the students into their academic lives. Therefore, Ladson-Billings’s work came into the limelight. Through much boom and reverence, the author saw its evolution through time and saw that maybe the terms did not quite encompass what they were trying to accomplish. The author argues that relevance reaches a certain threshold of cultural maintenance and does nothing beyond to continue the work – to really include the cultural dynamics of the students. Culturally sustaining pedagogies requires the support of young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence as well as offering access to dominant cultural competence.

**Young, E. (2010). Challenges to Conceptualizing and Actualizing Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: How Viable Is the Theory in Classroom Practice? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), 248–260**.

 This study analyzed theories of culturally relevant pedagogies and worked with the participants to transform the theories into viable pedagogical tools. The study assumed a high level of racism leading the institution’s practices. Culturally relevant pedagogies were measured under academic success, cultural competence, and sociopolitical consciousness. For academic success, educators regarded the students’ cultural capital as the means to build learning on their personal experiences and to make the curriculum meaningful to them, but not necessarily as a way to promote rigorous learning. For cultural competency, teachers described 3 themes: know your students, build relationships with students, and affirm cultural identities. In term of sociopolitical consciousness, there was an overall underdeveloped understanding of sociopolitical dilemmas. Cultural relevance to Ladson-Billings was more about establishing a culture of high expectations, creating a community of learners, and critiquing knowledge as a socially constructed concept. On the other hand, the participants’ concept of cultural relevance centered largely on the students themselves: their background, needs, family, and experiential knowledge. Everything else stemmed from a deep knowledge of the children, including how to push them toward higher level thinking skills, how to allow them to acquire and demonstrate knowledge in multiple ways, and how to make learning meaningful to them. Participants found CRP to be impossible to implement. They relied to much on traditional modes of teaching, held with cultural biases they had about the students or their knowledge. They also listed restraints due to the No Child Left Behind Act saying it restricted the time they had to cover certain curriculum.