# Democracy & Education

## Is Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Enough?
## Toward Culturally "Real"-evant Curriculum.

*James A. Gambrell (Kennesaw State University)*

### Article

In this response to Lingley's (2016) article "Democratic Foundations of Spiritually Responsive Pedagogy," the author invites the framework of (a)spiritually responsive curriculum to include a more direct engagement with a culturally relevant curriculum as well. The author agrees with Lingley's postulation that (a)spirituality is deeply embedded within the worldview of many students in K–12 classrooms, whether educators include this important aspect of their epistemology or not. Similar to the problems that come when we ignore identities of race, gender, (a)sexuality, (dis)ability, and social class, ignoring these important characteristics of students' lived experiences is detrimental to learning outcomes and reinforces dominating narratives. Synthesizing literature from the broader educational justice movement, the author engages Lingley's culturally responsive (a)spiritual *pedagogy* and invites her to more directly engage students in a culturally relevant *curriculum*, as well.

### This article is in response to

I AM WRITING TO respond to Lingley's (2016) article "Democratic Foundations of Spiritually Responsive Pedagogy," wherein the author disrupted educator silence around spirituality within the field of culturally responsive pedagogy. By invoking scholars that are typically celebrated among critical scholars (Freire, Noddings, Dewey, and hooks)—yet simultaneously illuminating the unspoken taboo regarding their writings on spirituality—Lingley piqued my interest immediately. The author maintained that a complex blend of fear, racism, and Western philosophy undergird

DR. JAMES GAMBRELL is an assistant professor of TESOL in the Inclusive Education department at Kennesaw State University. With a background in Spanish teaching and translation, he focuses on how intersections of race, language, and culture impact teaching and learning. From theoretical and practical perspectives, Dr. Gambrell prepares educators to think critically about how culture (including educators') intersects with curricula, pedagogy, and educational policy to reify or dismantle societal inequities.

educators' reluctance to acknowledge spirituality, while fear of offending religious parents/students, ignorance of the First Amendment, and educator unawareness of varied spiritual epistemologies result in educator discomfort discussing (a)spirituality[1] with students. These fears and ignorance result in silencing students' (a)spiritual ways of knowing.

Lingley (2016) problematized the assumed neutrality of spirituality's absence from public schools in the United States, often to the detriment of already marginalized youth (see also Mezirow, 2000). In response to this epistemicide, Lingley argued that educators must become comfortable embracing the role public schools play in cultural meaning-making systems within which they operate. Indeed, to discount that our current system is deeply rooted in Christianity and/or the Western binary of secular vs. religious paradigms would be disingenuous. Consequently, Lingley maintained that the same students who understand from African, Latinx, or Indigenous ways of knowing often have overlapping racial, economic, cultural, and linguistic identities that are dismissed, triggering them to "tuck away their spiritual aspects before crossing the threshold of a classroom" (p. 8).

Lingley's (2016) concept of spirituality, in the way she has framed it, is an important aspect of critical multicultural education. Therefore, I refer to literature from the greater educational justice movement to engage her culturally responsive (a)spiritual *pedagogy* and invite her to more directly engage students in a culturally relevant *curriculum*, as well. However, my purpose in this article is not to discount specifically addressing (a)spirituality in education. Certainly, this underpinning is a significant aspect of many students' worldviews. Lingley's appeal to directly engage (a)spirituality parallels Crenshaw's (2009) argument that although race and gender are social, not biological, constructs, they nevertheless must be acknowledged in educational discourse: "But to say that a category such as race or gender is socially constructed is not to say that category has no significance in our world" (p. 244). Therefore, although I refer to literature from the greater educational justice movement, it is simply due to the scarcity of literature regarding (a)spiritual relevant curriculum.

After reading Lingley's (2016) article about a culturally responsive pedagogy that is often dismissed or overlooked, I realized that the *pedagogy* (or the "how") of teaching historically underserved students is often addressed. However, the *curriculum* (or the "what") piece is often underconceptualized. Even if the teaching is implemented in a culturally responsive way, what message is transmitted to students from overlooked (a)spiritual identities when the texts, resources, websites, tests, and other assessments that are used in teaching promote a singular White Protestant master narrative (Ladson-Billings, 2009b)? Following reading Lingley's article, I did a Google Scholar search of the term *culturally relevant curriculum*. About 80% of the resulting articles were more about the "how" than the "what." I am not indicating

that literature regarding culturally relevant curriculum is missing. Rather, I posit that *both* a culturally responsive pedagogy *and* a culturally relevant curriculum are necessary to create interest, stimulate, represent, and include culturally diverse students, in this case students whose (a)spiritual ways of knowing are often dismissed, silenced, overlooked, and ignored (Gay, 2002).

Using culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy (CRP) as a framework, I explore what constitutes a culturally relevant curriculum. First, I address the key components of CRP, incorporating student outcomes, teacher characteristics, and teacher practices of a culturally relevant classroom. Next, I explain why CRP is not enough and why educators need to implement culturally relevant curriculum as well. Subsequently, I describe key characteristics of a culturally relevant curriculum, including formal, symbolic, and procedural curricula. I conclude with how the use of both a culturally responsive pedagogy and a culturally relevant curriculum could positively impact the same (a)spiritually marginalized students Lingley (2016) addressed in the article.

## CRP Key Components: "But That's Just Good Teaching!"

Ladson-Billings (1995b; 2009a) defined culturally relevant pedagogy as being specifically committed to both individual and collective empowerment. She maintained that CRP requires three components: (a) students must experience academic success (or at least more success than they would have had without CRP), (b) students must develop or maintain cultural competence, and, (c) students must develop a consciousness to critically challenge the society in which they live (see also Ladson-Billings, 1992). Thus, Ladson-Billings focused on learning *outcomes* in order to assess a culturally responsive teacher. Often at seminars, she stated, she is told that CRP is "just good teaching," to which Ladson-Billings (1995a) questions why so many African American youth are not taught in this manner. It is important to note that almost every article referenced in this paper either cites or uses Ladson-Billings's three criteria as a framework for their articles or studies. Therefore, although Ladson-Billings's framework is specifically designed for racially underserved students, the concepts transfer to Lingley's (a)spiritual responsive pedagogy.

### CRP Teacher Attributes

Whereas Ladson-Billings did research to articulate what attributes good teachers possess to achieve the three learning outcomes articulated above, Villegas and Lucas (2002) specifically have addressed CRP characteristics that are necessary for preparing preservice teachers to educate diverse student populations. They maintained that culturally responsive teachers:

> (a) are socioculturally conscious, (b) have affirming views of students from diverse backgrounds, (c) see themselves as responsible for and capable of bringing about change to make schools more equitable, (d) understand how learners construct knowledge and are capable of promoting knowledge construction, (e) know about the lives of their students, and (f) design instruction that builds on what their students already know while stretching them beyond the familiar. (p. 20)

Culturally relevant teachers are not necessarily from the same ethnic group as the students they teach (Osborne, 1996). Similarly, being a person from a particular religious, spiritual, or aspiritual group does not necessarily make one a culturally relevant teacher for that student group. What is important for a culturally relevant teacher is to exhibit an ethic of caring that extends to the students, the curriculum, their views of underprivileged groups, and their belief in the capacity that all students can be taught (Gay, 2002). However, most educators are not taught how to teach students coming from underserved and overlooked backgrounds (hooks, 1994). Before preservice educators can be effective at reaching out to marginalized students, they must be taught to look at their own subjectivities about race, gender, class, and sexual orientation (Ettling, 2006). Likewise, for an effectively implemented (a)spiritual responsive pedagogy, preservice teachers must confront their biases about underrepresented (a)spiritual narratives and ways of knowing the students bring with them to the classroom. For example, I have discussed with preservice teachers the term *creation myth* and invited them to think about which students' beliefs get the term *myth* attached and which do not.

### CRP Instructional Practices

Another important piece in a CRP framework is what *teachers must do* within classrooms to effectively reach (a)spiritually silenced, marginalized, and minoritized students. Howard (2003) maintained that teachers should teach students to critically analyze complicated subjects like race, ethnicity, class, and culture. Furthermore, students should be taught to recognize how these concepts shape the learning experience and meet the academic and social needs of culturally diverse students. Consequently, educators must observe and respond to the myriad ways in which students' (a)spiritual ways of constructing knowledge impact their learning process. Moreover, Gay (2002) stated that educators must create caring classroom environments that are conducive to learning for ethnically diverse students (see also, hooks, 1994). She also argued that building community through cross-cultural communication utilizing cooperative learning strategies accommodates the communal cultural systems of African, Asian, Native, and Latinx American groups. This acknowledgement of the social impact of learning aligns with Lingley's (2016) position that (a)spiritual ways of knowing often intersect with racial epistemologies, which, in turn, increases the need for educator inclusion of these often-silenced religio-cultural narratives.

### Why CRP Is Not Enough

Students who are silenced, undervalued, or left out of the learning process, tend to suffer from poor learning outcomes, resulting in either poor test results or being pushed out of school altogether (Darling-Hammond, 2007). In the United States, student academic success often comes at the expense of religio-culturally minoritized students' cultural and psychosocial well-being, as they are forced to assimilate into mainstream culture. Academic achievement, however, often results in students experiencing marginalization from their own culture of origin, forcing students into a dilemma of negotiating between approbation of peers or teachers

(Ladson-Billings, 1995b). Furthermore, because few teachers have been prepared to teach ethnically diverse students (hooks, 1994), (a)spiritually marginalized students have to master academic tasks using North American Protestant cultural norms that are often unnatural and unfamiliar to them (Gay, 2002). Osborne (1996) called this failure to reach marginalized youth a "tragedy" (p. 286) of teacher preparation programs.

Howard (2003) has maintained that the most important goal of culturally relevant pedagogy is to increase the academic achievement of historically underserved students. However, if outcomes are to be considered, CRP is not creating effective results (Ladson-Billings, 1995b). Osbourne (1996) clearly articulated this concept: "Statistics clearly indicate that the vast majority of students from non-Anglo cultural/social groups in Western nations are not receiving quality education and that inequality continues to expand rather than contract" (p. 286). Following are several problematic outcomes that must be considered that show the capacity of the United States public school system to reach historically disenfranchised student populations:

- Black students score, on average, 15 points lower than Whites on IQ tests (Gillborn, 2009). Because race is a social, not biological, construct this statistic indicates that the tests are culturally biased.
- Black, Latinx, and Native American children are underrepresented in gifted and talented programs, while overrepresented in special needs programs (Gillborn, 2009; Howard, 2003).
- "Freedom of choice," charter, and magnet schools have effectively reinforced a new wave of segregation, resulting in many Black and Latinx children attending public schools that are more racially isolated and inferior than before the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision (Bell, Jr., 2009).
- Black and Latinx students are further behind their White counterparts than they were before the educational reform movements of the 1980s to present (Gillborn, 2009).
- The racial "achievement gap" is double at high school graduation than what it was when the same students entered kindergarten (Taylor, 2006).
- There are more African American adults under correctional control today than were enslaved in 1850 (Smiley & West, 2012).

These tragic examples stem from poor testing models and teaching methods, not poor genetics (Bell, 2009; Gillborn, 2009). Moreover, cultural deficit models that are prevalent in American society cannot explain the disparities in educational and societal outcomes for children living in poverty or for children of color (Solórzano, 1997; Steele, 2009). Underprivileged students find "historically derived images, textual constructions, and explanations of 'their failure' in our system of schooling continue today" (Osborne, 1996, p. 288). The focus of these cultural deficit models is the acculturation of values and traditions of culturally underrepresented students toward dominant group values while downplaying, criticizing, or ignoring the underserved group's cultural values

(Solórzano, 1997). Additionally, good-intentioned, yet misinformed, teachers have attempted culturally responsive education solely through "ethnic" songs, foods, and dances, which has led to "superficial and trivial 'celebrations of diversity,'" rather than increasing the achievement of students of color (Ladson-Billings, 2009b, p. 33). However, when teaching strategies (read, pedagogy) fail to achieve desired results, it is the student—not the strategy—that is found to be lacking (Ladson-Billings, 2009b). Furthermore, according to Osborne (1996), "tinkering at the edges of content, classroom processes, assessment, or wider social practices will have no substantive influence on social justice" (p. 287) unless a substantial reframing of curricula on all fronts takes place. What I had never deeply considered before reading Lingley's article was the impact of educators' deficit viewpoints about (a)spiritual ways of knowing on educational outcomes. Thus, we need to examine and revise *curricula* in order realize the outcomes desired, but not achieved, by implementing (a)spiritually responsive pedagogy in a vacuum of culturally relevant narratives (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

## Our Culture Is Changing, But Are We Changing Our Curricula?

In 2003, students of color composed about one-third of U.S. public school students, yet by 2050 will constitute an estimated 57% of all students (Howard, 2003). Within education, curricula, instructional techniques, deficit models, assessment methods, school funding, and even desegregation promote a "White supremacist [Protestant] master script" (Ladson-Billings, 2009b, p. 29; see also Bell, 2009; Gillborn, 2009). Therefore, preservice teachers must be taught to reframe *curricula* in order to prepare for growing diversity in U.S. schools.

Despite the growing diversity in U.S. public schools, many textbooks reinforce White privilege and a White Protestant narratives. Texts "conjure up images of domination happening behind the backs of whites, rather than on the backs of people of color," which allows both White educators and White students to not acknowledge that European American, middle-class, and Protestant values are normalized (Leonardo, 2009, p. 262). Additionally, sanitizing (whitewashing) of history reimagines civil rights history as a rational, linear, incremental march toward equality (Gillborn, 2009). These comforting myths for dominant populations do not express the real struggles, conflicts, and experiences of racially or (a)spiritually underserved student groups and provide a mono-cultural view of present policy. One of the reasons that teachers do not promote accomplishments by the varied religio-cultural identities represented among students in their classrooms stems "from the fact that many teachers do not know enough about the contributions that different ethnic groups have made to their subject areas and are unfamiliar with multicultural education" (Gay, 2002, p. 107).

For example, as I write this article, several thousand Native Americans from several tribes are protesting an oil pipeline that will cross their land and possibly endanger water to the Missouri River, which provides drinking water to over 10 million people. Both the peaceful protest and the sacred nature of the land to Lakota spiritual narratives are being underplayed in the media

(Woolf, 2016). The inclusion of examples such as this one could highlight the injustices toward spiritual ways of knowing of students whose (a)spirituality is sidelined by the normalization of White Protestant curricula.

One paradigmatic weakness in literature specifically addressing CRP/CRC that needs to be addressed more fully is the assumption that these studies are solely for "diverse" populations of students. Students who are at primarily White Protestant schools must be taught the same critical text examination skills, so they do not perpetuate the inequities existing in current educational, governmental, and financial institutions. White Protestant students should also be taught that just because an (a)spiritually marginalized person is not present, does not mean that it is acceptable to use intolerant speech or actions toward people of other cultures (hooks, 1994). Furthermore, students should be taught that the stories of White allies of marginalized groups are hard to locate within majoritarian texts, as well. Indeed, Tatum (2009) stated, "As with other marginalized groups, the stories of peacemakers, or white allies, are not readily accessed" (p. 286).

## Culturally Relevant Curriculum Key Components: "Keepin' It Real"

In the subsequent paragraphs, I describe changes that can be made to foster better student learning outcomes in curricula. First, I describe how the formal curriculum should include, highlight, and challenge students from minoritized cultural groups. Next, I explain how the symbolic curricula of images, media, symbols, and other hypertextual objects can be used to recognize and promote the various languages, traditions, values, and cultures represented in a class. Finally, I discuss the impact of the procedural curriculum, which explains classroom procedures, rules, roles, and whose voices are highlighted or marginalized on a daily basis. Once again, I use literature from the greater educational justice movement because literature regarding (a)spiritually relevant curricula is limited.

### *Formal Curricula*

The only way to fully legitimize narratives from historically silenced groups is to include their narratives in the "official" or "formal" curriculum (Ladson-Billings, 2009a). In order to improve learning outcomes for poor students, students of color, and underrepresented (a)spiritual students, curricula must be changed to rely more heavily on the experiences, traditions, religions, languages, and demographics of students when selecting texts to use in class (Slattery, 2012). Culturally responsive teachers determine the multicultural strengths and weaknesses of curricula and make the changes necessary to improve their overall quality (Gay, 2002). Most important, effective multicultural educators help their students become aware of, critique, and challenge the power of ableistic, classist, racist, heterosexist, sexist, and cisgenderist scripts, and recognize silenced narratives through the CRP instructional strategies described earlier in this paper.

Gay (2002) listed several recurrent formal curriculum issues extant in majoritarian texts that negatively impact marginalized students, among them are:

*avoiding controversial issues such as racism; historical atrocities, powerlessness, and hegemony; focusing on the accomplishments of the same few high-profile individuals repeatedly and ignoring the actions of groups; giving proportionally more attention to African Americans than other groups of color; decontextualizing women, their issues, and their actions from their race and ethnicity; ignoring poverty; and emphasizing factual information while minimizing other kinds of knowledge (such as values, attitudes, feelings, experiences, and ethics.) (p. 108)*

Gay argued that culturally responsive teaching reverses these curricular trends by by not shying away from controversy by including a wide range of ways of knowing, doing deep cultural analysis of race, class, ethnicity, and gender, and including multiple kinds of knowledge and perspectives in curricula, assessments, and other instructional materials. Formal curricula are selected to represent the students' experiences and traditions, while still empowering them to participate in mainstream society (Osborne, 1996).

This proactive approach to selecting formal curricula that highlights marginalized (a)spiritual narratives avoids the religio-cultural epistemicide against which Lingley (2016) warned. For example, a music preservice teacher I taught during a class on multicultural education decided that rather than secularizing the winter concert, as other music teachers in his district were doing, he would teach a unit on how spirituality often informed music. He began the unit with a brief history lesson of how religion informed much of the Western music that students had been exposed to and encouraged to see as "classical" music. Next, he assigned students to discuss with their families and bring in a one-minute clip of music that would represent their family's (a)spiritual ways of knowing along with a brief explanation of how the music represented the family's life philosophy. Students brought in music and narratives that represented a myriad of religio-ethnic and nonreligious identities. In addition, some of the irreligious families chose music with themes that their families felt represented their sociopolitical philosophies. Guided by the teacher, the students selected music to represent a diversity of (a)spiritual ways of knowing for their winter performance. Moreover, the teacher was pleasantly surprised at the degree of parental involvement in the assignment and lack of controversy surrounding the music performed. Rather than silencing the (a)spiritual funds of knowledge in the music the class played, he highlighted their family narratives. The preservice teacher and I discussed ways of extending this unit to represent voices not present in the class by assigning the students to research lesser-known belief systems the following year.

### Symbolic Curricula
Often the structure—or the way a class/school is organized— indicates who is invited/not invited to participate in the learning process (hooks, 1994). In this section, I focus on how culturally relevant curriculum (CRC) incorporates the symbolic curriculum to augment the formal curriculum to include systemically excluded students. Symbolic curriculum includes all images, symbols, icons, awards, celebrations, and other artifacts that are added to the formal curriculum (Gay, 2002). Examples of symbolic curricula include how desks are set up, bulletin boards, how wall space is used, and video clips used to reinforce learning.

Effective educators recognize that it is not always possible to control the formal curriculum (Osborne, 1996). Therefore, culturally relevant educators understand and include symbolic curricular material to represent the demographics of the students they teach. Furthermore, they represent through the symbolic curriculum a variety of ages, places, genders, languages, and (a)spirituality, serving as an extra opportunity to intentionally include historically under-valued institutions and people in the formal curriculum (Gay, 2002). In addition, because parents are seen as valuable contributors to the learning process, they are involved as much is possible in meaning-making of the formal curricula (Osborne, 2006). Therefore, a culturally relevant teacher is purposeful in selecting and providing opportunities for parents from marginalized (a)spiritual communities to participate in the teaching process—thereby valuing their knowledge, experiences, and traditions (Olivos, Jimenez-Castellanos, & Ochoa, 2011). Finally, media and experiential learning activities are carefully chosen to celebrate and be sensitive to the students' experiences, values, heritage languages, religions, and traditions (Slattery, 2012).

Recently, I was teaching an evening class that coincided with the Muslim holiday of Ramadan. I had no formal control over the time of the class nor the length of the term. However, I knew several of the students in the class were practicing Muslims and that a simple email could demonstrate an (a)spiritually relevant stance in the symbolic curriculum of the class:

> *It is always acceptable to eat/drink during class. I wanted to make that explicitly known for this week as I know that some of you celebrate Ramadan and that sunset coincides with the time we are in class. Please let me know if there are any adaptions I can make to ensure your health and well being. Ramadan Mubarak!*

One of the Muslim students in this graduate-level class noted that this was the first time in her whole schooling career that Islam was mentioned positively in public education. In addition, students from all backgrounds became much more open to discuss and critique all elements of culture and identity following this email and the class discussions grew much more nuanced and critical for the remainder of the semester.

### Procedural Curricula
The interactions between students, and from teacher to students, and how discussions, questions, and class time are utilized were described as pedagogy in some articles, while they were conceptualized as part of curricula in others in the literature regarding culturally relevant pedagogy/curricula. Realizing that pedagogy and curriculum often overlap (Slattery, 2012), for the purposes of this paper, I label these interactions and time usages as *procedural curricula*. Culturally relevant teachers embrace a process whereby *both* teachers and learners join in a shared undertaking and *both* are shaped through this experience (Ettling, 2006; Taylor, 2006). Willingness to listen, speak, and change, if necessary, are crucial for

the right atmosphere to exist for a CRP/CRC classroom (Mezirow, 2000). Therefore, as noted above, it is not necessary for an educator to be from a specific (a)spiritual community to proactively include under-represented narratives in the procedural curricula.

Educators must position themselves as co-learners with their students, their families, and their (a)spiritual communities. Thus, educators listen carefully to both what is voiced and unvoiced in educational contexts. Often, if left unchecked, White (Protestant) male voices dominate classroom discussions, both by class time used for and by value given their contributions by educators (hooks, 1994). Culturally (a)spiritual relevant teachers recognize those who have been silenced and attend more fully to sidelined voices (Johnson-Bailey & Alfred, 2006).

Culturally relevant teachers attend to how much time *they* spend talking versus how much time their *students* spend talking. hooks (1994) noted that when most educators want a "safe" classroom environment, it typically means that they want to lecture and have the students be silent so there is no conflict or uncomfortable discussion. CRP/CRC teachers also help students understand that capitalist culture conspires against collaborative thinking and teaches us to think adversarially rather than collectively (Mezirow, 2000). Culturally relevant educators encourage cross-cultural and cooperative learning, which, as stated above, often coincides with the communal ways of knowing of many underrepresented religio-cultural communities in U.S. public schools (Kagan, 1994).

(A)spiritually relevant educators also aim to limit microaggressions, stereotypes, and deficit models from both their own speech and from student speech (Steele, 2009). Microaggressions are "verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of color" (Sue et al., p. 271). CRC literature recognizes that these are daily, commonplace indignities that marginalized groups face from dominant groups (Ladson-Billings, 2009b). Therefore, (a)spiritually responsive teachers reject derogatory comments, dismissive looks, improper tones, invalidations, and stereotypical comments from their students and ask students to help them eliminate them from their actions, as well (Solórzano & Yosso, 2009). CRC teachers incorporate these actions as teaching moments to help students challenge and disrupt inequities (Gay, 2003).

### Toward an (A)spiritually "Real"-evant Curriculum
As argued in Lingley's (2016) article, whether directly addressed or not, (a)spirituality is deeply embedded within the worldview of many students in K–12 classrooms. Similar to identities of race, (trans)gender, (a)sexuality, (dis)ability, and social class, ignoring these important characteristics of students' lived experience is detrimental to learning outcomes and reinforces dominating narratives. I agree with Lingley's postulation that mandating an (a)spiritual curriculum could be detrimental by either privileging Judeo-Christian religion or by invoking "secularized" forms of Asian spiritual practices such as mindfulness. Furthermore, Lingley's postulation that excluding (a)spirituality from classroom instruction reifies the Western male binary that cleaves spirituality (and many other marginalized identities) away from knowledge

production and schooling. However, for educators seeking to be responsive to students' multi-faceted identities, including their (a)spirituality through formal, symbolic, and procedural curricula grant permission to reject the Western binary of spiritual versus secular ways of knowing. In turn, a curriculum representing the varied ways of knowing of the students will create a safe environment for critical thinking and promote students' capacity to become social change agents.

### References

Bell, D. A. (2009). Who's afraid of critical race theory? In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 37–50). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bell, D. A., Jr. (2009). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 73–84). New York, NY: Routledge.

Crenshaw, K. (2009). Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 213–246). New York, NY: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of "No Child Left Behind." *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(3), 245–260.

Ettling, D. (2006). Ethical demands of transformative learning. New Directions for Adult & *Continuing Education, 109*, 59–67.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116.

Gillborn, D. (2009). Education policy as an act of White supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory, and education reform. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 51–72). New York, NY: Routledge hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice, 42*(3), 195–202.

Johnson-Bailey, J., & Alfred, M. (2006). Transformational teaching and the practices of Black women adult educators. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education, 109*, 49–58.

Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning.* San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Reading between the lines and beyond the pages: A culturally relevant approach to literacy teaching. *Theory into Practice, 31*(4), 312–320.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009a). *The dream-keepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2009b). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 17–36). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of "White privilege." In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 261–276). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lingley, A. (2016). Democratic foundations for spiritually responsive pedagogy. *Democracy & Education, 24*(2), Article 6. Retrieved from http:// democracy educationjournal.org/home/vol24/iss2/6

Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Assoc. (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3–34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Olivos, E. M., Jimenez-Castellanos, O., & Ochoa, A. M. (2011). *Bicultural parent engagement: Advocacy and empowerment.* New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Osborne, A. B. (1996). Practice into theory into practice: Culturally relevant pedagogy for students we have marginalized and normalized. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 27*(3), 285–314.

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*, 5–19.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2009). Critical race methodology: Counter story-telling as an analytical framework for educational research. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 131–147). New York, NY: Routledge.

Slattery, Patrick (2012). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era: Teaching and learning in an age of accountability*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Smiley, T., & West, C. (2012). *The rich and the rest of us: A poverty manifesto*. New York, NY: SmileyBooks.

Steele, C. M. (2009). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 163–189). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271.

Tatum, B. D. (2009). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the restoration of hope. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 277-290). New York, NY: Routledge.

Taylor, E. (2006). A critical race analysis of the achievement gap in the United States: Politics, reality, and hope. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 71–87.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20–32.

Woolf, N. (2016, August 29). North Dakota oil pipeline protesters stand their ground: This is sacred land. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/aug/29/north-dakota-oil-pipeline-protest-standing-rock-sioux