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ABSTRACT

An Overview of Contributing Frameworks to Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy

Sarai Clemente Soli
Department of Teacher Education, BYU
Master of Arts

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP) is a framework designed to help traditionally marginalized students. Other frameworks have previously tried to draw on culture to help students in similar ways. However, Paris (2012b) claimed that the word sustaining enclosed a meaning of maintaining and enhancing these students’ language and cultural practices that no other frameworks did until that point. There is some confusion for educators and others about CSP since it is a newer framework and that there are many of these cultural frameworks analyzing similar concepts. Therefore, the purpose of this literature review was to examine these previous main frameworks that Paris cited as influencing culturally sustaining pedagogies (i.e., funds of knowledge, culturally responsive pedagogy, culturally relevant pedagogy, and culturally responsive teaching) and how these frameworks overlap with the four main key features of CSP. These four key features are: (a) centering of dynamic communities, their valued languages, practices, and knowledge across the learning setting; (b) student and intergenerational community agency and input; (c) working to be in good relationship with the land, with students, and communities; and (d) structured opportunities to contend with internalized oppressions, false choices, and inward gazes (Paris, 2021). The level of emphasis of each key feature by the main frameworks was also highlighted. Findings illustrate that the first CSP key feature was the most predominant since it was found in all previous frameworks. On top of that, the main framework that has influenced CSP the most is Culturally Relevant Pedagogy by Ladson-Billings since the four CSP features were represented in this framework.
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DESCRIPTION OF THESIS STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

This thesis, *An Overview of Cultural Frameworks Towards Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy*, is a literature review journal-ready thesis. Duke and Beck (1999) present the benefits of writing dissertations in an “article ready for publication” (p. 34) format. They advocate that this format will prepare future doctorates to “cultivate the writing skills necessary to succeed in the ‘real world’ of scientific research” (p. 33), and that these articles will reach out to more professionals in the field. Similarly, theses could benefit from these same advantages. Therefore, this thesis is written in a hybrid format. The hybrid format combines thesis requirements and journal publication formats with the final goal of writing an article ready for publication. The preliminary pages of the thesis include all the required sections needed for the university. The remaining majority of the thesis is written as a journal article following the stated length and elements needed for submission to the journal *Multicultural Perspectives*.

*Multicultural Perspectives* is an education journal known for being practitioner-friendly and for fostering a multicultural vision. The journal aims to “promote the philosophy of social justice, equity, and inclusion. It celebrates cultural and ethnic diversity as a national strength that enriches the fabric of society” (Taylor & Francis Online, 2024). Most of its readers are educators and people specializing in social interactions. The required elements for a journal article include: a title page, an abstract, keywords, an introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, references, and other supplemental materials. These elements align with that of a journal-ready thesis and can be found in the following pages.
Introduction

Culture is a term that is frequently used and familiar to many, yet this term has multiple definitions, bringing complexity to the concept. Many people associate culture with such concepts as race, nationality, and/or language. However, this narrow and static definition can lead to misunderstandings and stereotyping of individuals, especially those from traditionally marginalized groups (Dovidio et al., 2010; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003).

As the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018) states, “culture is a living system,” defining who we are, how we act, and “how people learn” (p. 23). González et al. (2006) give a more in-depth definition by saying that it is “what households actually do and how they think about what they do” (emphasis added, p. 10). The term “households” limits the idea of culture to a smaller group, specifically those you live with, and the term “think” shifts the focus from actions to the reasons behind them. Some theorists started developing ideologies or frameworks to help understand the importance of culture, and specifically, how to help teachers in the implementation of such practices.

Therefore, the study of integrating cultural pedagogies and instructional practices is not new. Sociocultural theory was first introduced by Vygotsky in the early 1900s. Vygotsky’s main point was that human beings develop through social interactions (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990). In studying human development, Gallimore and Tharp (1990) cited the need to focus not only on each individual but also on everything else that surrounds them and affects their development. Vygotsky’s work and the work of many other theorists highlights how crucial the study of culture is in education, the implementation of such pedagogies in the classroom to facilitate learning, and specifically, how these practices are needed for traditionally marginalized students.
The U.S. Civil Rights movement in the 1960s was the first step that led to the consideration of marginalized culture in the classroom and the establishment of multicultural education as a discipline in the field of education (Banks, 2016; Gay, 2013). Multicultural education is described as when “students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups will experience educational equality” (Banks, 1993, p. 3). This theory emerged in response to inequities caused by hegemonic school practices including those within the classroom (Banks, 2016). However, multicultural education has often been misunderstood, leading to superficial and deficit classroom practices that have promoted stereotypes and the perpetuation of the status quo (Haynes Writer, 2008; Nieto et al., 2008).

Despite various systemic attacks on multicultural education (Torres, 2023), its practices remain essential and necessary, especially for traditionally marginalized students. Multicultural educational practices have been found effective in many studies both in the U.S. and overseas (e.g., Aslan & Aybek, 2020; Dewi et al., 2020; Okoye-Johnson, 2011). Some main frameworks in the field of multicultural education include: funds of knowledge (González et al., 2006), culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) by Villegas (1991), culturally relevant pedagogy (CRvP) by Ladson-Billings (1995a, 1995b), and culturally responsive teaching (CRT) by Gay (2002). More recently, Paris (2012b) proposed Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP) as a framework that builds on previous work with the goal “to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling” (p. 93). The purpose of CSP is to reach out and empower students to become participating members in their communities and culture(s) while also enabling them to navigate the context of schooling. CSP is now considered an essential framework under the umbrella of cultural instructional practices in the classroom.
Statement of the Problem

The emergence and advancement of CSP highlights that the field is moving forward and considering the evolving strengths and needs of students, schools, and society. However, the shift and variation in the terminology of culturally informed pedagogical frameworks often creates confusion and frustration, leaving some individuals, including scholars and practitioners, unclear about the differences between frameworks and the specifics of CSP. Lack of clarity is not a new phenomenon in cultural studies; for example, a study of culturally informed literacy studies found many of the reviewed papers claimed to use one particular theory but had limited understandings, general misconceptions, or misguided conceptualizations of the cited frameworks (Kelly et al., 2021). Understanding CSP and these main frameworks can be helpful in two different ways. First, scholars can continue to advance scholarly work to ensure the field is meeting the evolving needs of traditionally marginalized students. Second, teachers can adjust their classroom practice with the hopes of providing meaningful learning opportunities for all students.

Statement of the Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this literature review is to learn and understand the different frameworks that have shaped CSP and its conceptualization. Paris (2012b) shared how CSP was built upon previous frameworks to establish instruction that resulted in deeper cultural implications, particularly for traditionally marginalized communities. However, Paris’ work does not clarify how CSP aligns or differentiates from previous multicultural educational frameworks. It is crucial to understand the significant ideas and concepts that CSP is built upon, how previous frameworks and CSP overlap, and how CSP extends them. As a classroom teacher, I aim to learn more about these main frameworks and CSP in order to obtain a thorough cultural
understanding, which will allow me to move from superficial to deeper cultural practices and better meet the needs of my students, particularly those from traditionally marginalized groups. The research questions guiding this literature review are: What main multicultural education frameworks have influenced Paris in the formulation of CSP? To what degree are the key features of CSP included in and emphasized by these influential frameworks?

**Methodology**

Literature reviews provide readers with a narrowed and comprehensive review of “primary research and scholarship … in order to bring coherence and perspective to problem areas” (Cooper, 1988, p. 105). The synthesis of scholarship in a literature review can provide clarity and coherence to academics and practitioners alike. There are various types of literature reviews for various purposes. In this literature review, I follow an integrative research method. Scholars differ in their understanding of integrative research (e.g., Cooper, 1988; Jackson, 1980; Strike & Posner, 1983; Torraco, 2016). For this study, I drew upon Jackson’s (1980) conceptualization of an integrative approach with the goal of evaluating and synthesizing research and concluding generalizations from the review.

In addition to this overall goal, this literature review is an integrative literature review for two main reasons. Torraco (2016) explains that integrative reviews focus on topics that continue to be studied and developed by different scholars but have not been recently analyzed from a “comprehensive review” perspective (p. 404). As a more recent framework, CSP continues to be developed and refined. Thus, it would be beneficial to have a comprehensive literature review of CSP to more clearly outline its tenets and application. Additionally, integrative reviews direct their analysis toward popular topics of the literature that have caused confusion or tension, which
in the case of CSP was not clearly defined and did not specify how this new multicultural education framework built on previous ones (Paris, 2012a, 2012b).

**Positionality**

I am a white woman from Spain. Thus, Spanish is my first language and English is my second. I am a Spanish dual language bilingual teacher who generally teaches Latino students. I immigrated to the U.S. in 2006, and I now enjoy U.S. citizenship after marrying a Samoan who was also naturalized. I understand positionality as an important reflective activity in research to disclose privilege and develop empathy and understanding of students with different privilege levels. Through my work experience, I have observed how traditionally marginalized or minoritized students in the context of schooling and their communities are often neglected in order to give greater attention to the majority status population. This negates one of the main goals of dual-language bilingual education (DLBE) programs to “provid[e] bilingual communities with a meaningful and equal educational opportunity for their children” (emphasis added, García et al., 2018, p. 44). Therefore, my own lived experiences as a teacher and advocate, particularly for my traditionally marginalized students, compelled me to explore and understand the concept of culturally informed pedagogies. I understand that my background, teaching experiences, and the desire to learn how I could improve my practice to better support my students inform this study and analysis of both CSP and the main frameworks that have influenced it.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

As noted, Paris (2012b) coined the phrase *culturally sustaining pedagogies* as a response to previous work regarding the use of culture in teaching contexts. In fact, many main works were cited in his article in which he introduced the term. I engaged in a multi-step process to
determine the main frameworks and better understand the tenets of CSP; I began with an
examination of Paris’ writings about CSP and influential frameworks on the theory. From
January 2023 to April 2023, I collected data through a series of two searches supported by
databases as explained below. First, I collected and reviewed main multicultural educational
frameworks from which CSP originates. Second, I reviewed Paris’ scholarly work about CSP to
analyze the concept and framework itself to better understand its foundations.

**Review of Main Frameworks**

To review the major frameworks that have influenced CSP, I returned to Paris’ (2012b)
article where he proposes CSP as a new framework for attending to culture in pedagogy. This
article analyzes and critiques how some specific frameworks have shaped the concept of culture
in the field of multicultural education throughout the years and influenced CSP. I used this article
to guide my search for the main frameworks and their authors. Three multicultural educational
frameworks were cited: (a) funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992), (b) CRvP (Ladson-Billings,
1995a, 1995b), and (c) CRP (Cazden & Leggett, 1976; Gay, 2002). However, due to the fact that
the work of Cazden and Leggett (1976) is not highly cited within the field of multicultural
education, I decided to exclude their work from this study. In his 2012 article, Paris (2012b)
points out that Gay’s work has had a lesser impact in the field, but I decided it was important to
study and analyze this framework due to its implications for culturally informed pedagogies. It is
also important to acknowledge that Gay used the term CRT (Gay, 2002) instead of CRP, and I
will therefore use this term as well. In addition, Villegas (1991), another influential author in
multicultural education, initially introduced the framework of CRP (terminology mentioned by
Paris in his work as mentioned above), which later evolved into the term culturally responsive
teacher (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Therefore, due to the importance of Villegas’ work in the
multicultural field and since the terminology is very similar to Gay’s work, I decided it was necessary to also study and analyze this framework to shed light on how it could have influenced CSP. I collected and reviewed all the relevant literature that clearly laid out the theoretical foundations of each framework written by the scholar(s) who proposed them. This allowed me to determine their tenets and how they have influenced and/or aligned with CSP. The year range for these searches in the different databases detailed below was from 1990 to 2023. See Table 1 for a full list of frameworks, authors, sources, and other information.

For the framework regarding funds of knowledge, I focused my literature search on the original authors of this framework, Luis C. Moll, Cathy Amanti, Deborah Neff, and Norma González. First, I found the article considered to be the first and original piece written about this framework (see Table 1). Second, I also decided to include the book *Funds of Knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities, and Classrooms* (González et al., 2006) due to its significance to the field. Thus, the main sources of information were this book and one journal article by (Moll et al., 1992).

For the other three frameworks, I limited all my data collection to original literature by the original authors for each framework. I considered it important to study the original source for each framework and analyze the authors’ own words and work instead of the understanding and/or interpretation of others. I also limited the data for these three frameworks to peer-reviewed journal articles. As illustrated in Table 2, I conducted an initial search supported by two databases: Google Scholar and ERIC. This search resulted in 104 literature pieces and was reduced to a total of nine peer-reviewed journal articles based on these criteria.

Data reduction for these three frameworks followed this process guided by the selection of articles that have been highly cited, as I considered that the most cited articles are those that
have had the most impact in the field. For CRP, I searched using the terms, “culturally responsive pedagogy” and “Villegas.” I found 23 articles and selected three of the most cited articles authored by Ana Maria Villegas (see Table 1). For CRvP, the keywords used to search were “culturally relevant” and “Ladson-Billings.” I found 73 journal articles and chose three of the most cited articles written by Ladson-Billings (see Table 1), which are articles that have laid a clear foundation for CRvP. Finally, I used ERIC to search the terms “culturally responsive teaching” and “Gay.” I found a total of eight articles, and I selected three articles authored by Geneva Gay in which the author explained CRT (see Table 1).

**Examining Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies**

I searched CSP articles written from 2012 to 2023 authored by Paris to understand how the different frameworks influenced CSP over time. This included how the tenets of each framework aligned with CSP. The search for articles about CSP was conducted in ERIC (EBSCO), Academic Search Ultimate, and ProQuest (all databases). The key terms used were “culturally sustaining pedagogy” and “Django Paris” as an author. This search yielded a total of 19 results: four articles with ERIC, three with Academic Search Ultimate, and 12 with ProQuest. However, seven articles were identified for use since some of the results were repeated in the databases (See Table 2). Five of the final articles had a focus on CSP and its theoretical foundations and the other two included references to the framework or the application of it.

After identifying each foundational article, the literature was read and studied. I identified and condensed the main and most significant ideas for each framework directly related to CSP. Then, I explored and analyzed the CSP framework, and its four key features as described in this approach.
Findings

The initial segment of the findings section, titled “Main Frameworks,” is dedicated to the identification and analysis of the key concepts introduced by these frameworks within the field. My analyses considered how these theories not only informed CSP but also how CSP literature authored or co-authored by Paris relates to these main frameworks. An outline of each theory’s tenets is described. This first section responds to the first research question in this study.

The second section of this section, titled “Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy,” aims to provide exploration of the fundamental concepts inherent to the framework of CSP. This section will analyze the theoretical underpinnings of CSP, highlighting its distinct approach to education that seeks not only to acknowledge but also to actively sustain the cultural identities of traditionally marginalized students as mentioned previously (Paris, 2012b). This second section serves as an introduction to the response to the second research question addressed in the last section in findings.

The final section, titled “The Four Key Features of CSP,” will provide a comprehensive analysis of each CSP key feature, examining its central premise in detail. Following this analysis, the section will explore how each main framework aligns with or overlaps with CSP’s key features. This examination aims to elucidate how these previous bodies of work have influenced towards CSP. This last section responds to the second research question of this literature review.

Main Frameworks

Main frameworks are examined in this section to understand their implications in educational contexts. These frameworks include funds of knowledge (González et al., 2006), CRP (Villegas, 1991), CRvP (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b), and CRT (Gay, 2002).
Funds of Knowledge

González et al. (2006) conducted a study of visits to marginalized families and communities and identified what they called the students’ *funds of knowledge* with the intent to implement such ideas or practices in the classroom. Funds of knowledge are described as the cultural knowledge that students acquire in their lives that they then bring into their public practices, including schools. This knowledge seems to be influenced by a child’s direct surroundings, such as family and close community.

González et al. (2006) showed that collaboration between teachers, students, and parents was crucial to identifying those students’ funds of knowledge and allowing space for students to implement them in the classrooms (Gutiérrez, 2008; Jaffe-Walter & Lee, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 2014; Paris, 2012b, 2021). The study of funds of knowledge suggested that effective teachers of marginalized students shift from being teachers to becoming learners of students’ funds of knowledge as mentioned by Ladson-Billings (2014). Therefore, identifying students’ ways of learning and knowing from home and connecting with a student’s community is one of the key tenets of CSP (Paris, 2012b, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014), an overlap that will be analyzed later in this study.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

The term CRP originated with a study and subsequent paper by Villegas (1991). The goal of this work was to find solutions to support traditionally marginalized students through different cultural challenges that they face while learning in public schooling. The first part of the study was a literature review of possible reasons for these challenges and findings of helpful classroom strategies for traditionally marginalized students. The reviewed articles were selected by a committee of experts in the field chosen by Villegas, and this same committee reviewed
Villegas’s findings as well. The second part of the study was the identification of what teachers “need to know and do in order to work effectively with a culturally heterogeneous population” (Villegas, 1991, p. 1). These perspectives and strategies were identified as culturally responsive pedagogies or CRP.

Villegas’s (1991) first article and more recent articles written along with Lucas (e.g., Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007) identified six different CRP strands for a teacher to develop: (a) sociocultural consciousness, (b) an affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds, (c) commitment and skills to act as agents of change, (d) constructivist views of learning, (e) learning about students, and (f) culturally responsive teaching practices. Villegas and Lucas (2002) highlight that these strands are not fixed, and there is space for adjustments. Teachers should make modifications according to each student’s individual needs.

Moreover, Villegas and Lucas (2002) also call for teachers and administrators to have conversations to align what can be done to “promote a more equitable and just society” (p. 30). Preparing teachers and showing what these strands look like in practice should be emphasized to ensure needed curriculum change can effectively happen to benefit traditionally marginalized students. These strands and the call for more sociocultural integration in both curriculum and practices align with tenets of CSP (e.g., Paris, 2012a, 2012b, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014), an alignment that will be examined in more detail later in this study.

**Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

Ladson-Billings (1995b) introduced the concept of CRvP. The acronym CRvP will be used throughout this review of the literature to differentiate it from Villegas’ (1991) CRP. The main purpose of this work was to identify what several “outstanding” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 471) teachers of mostly African American students, needed to do to ensure the students could
receive excellent teaching and improved academic outcomes. This article explains that to enact CRvP in the classroom, teachers’ practices “must meet three criteria: an ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and the development of sociopolitical or critical consciousness” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 483). All three criteria are reflected in CSP even though CSP places a bigger emphasis on cultural competence and critical consciousness (e.g., Paris, 2012a, 2012b, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014). Ladson-Billings also describes three “broad teaching behavior[s]” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 478) that could help teachers. These include, “regarding self, and others, social relations, and knowledge” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 483). The suggested behaviors emphasize the importance of teacher–student and student–student collective work, emphasizing community, rather than individualism, in the process of a continuous acquisition and development of knowledge. These three propositions align with CSP (Paris, 2012a, 2012b, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014) and will be studied later.

Ladson-Billings (2014) updated this framework to what the author entitled “Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. the Remix” after Paris’ (2012b) notions to shift the concept from relevant to sustaining. Ladson-Billings (2014) accepted and gracefully embraced the critique, acknowledging the importance of viewing culture as something “more dynamic” (p. 75). Ladson-Billings explained that culture is not static, it evolves. Therefore, there is a continual need to reassess and readjust to meet and sustain the cultural needs of traditionally marginalized students while supporting their academic success, and this aligns with CSP (Paris, 2012b, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014).
**Culturally Responsive Teaching**

Another theoretical framework to CSP is CRT (Gay, 2002). In CRT, teachers need to focus on and include practices that draw upon the different cultural ideas and experiences that diverse students bring into the classroom “to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective to them” (Gay, 2013, p. 51). In doing so, many students become responsive to such practices, and as a result, better academic achievement is attained. Gay (2002) presents five different factors to guide teachers in facilitating the implementation of CRT: (a) learning about cultural diversity or “multi-cultural competencies” (Gay, 2015, p. 124), (b) including ethnic and cultural content in the curriculum, (c) caring and building learning communities, (d) communicating with ethnically diverse students, (e) responding to ethnic diversity in the delivery of instruction. The application of these factors will enable traditionally marginalized students to learn more successfully, and therefore, solve “the problem of underachievement” (Gay, 2002, p. 114).

Gay (2013) also describes how any classroom setting may have a variety of cultural differences between students and teachers, and these can generate difficulties in teaching and learning. Therefore, CRT calls for teachers to implement thorough practices that go beyond a superficial level by drawing upon a student’s lived experience. These practices could be necessary bridges to make connections between the different cultures and contexts. As previously noted, culture defines both the mindset and practices of our students, shaping their identities. The CRT framework aligns with CSP in terms of the factors and strategies/suggestions discussed (Paris, 2012a, 2012b, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014), alignments that will be explored later in this study.
Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy

In this section, I identify and analyze the principal points that CSP contributes to the field of multicultural education. CSP (Paris, 2012b) directs teachers toward cultural practices that integrate students’ culture, just as the frameworks of funds of knowledge (González et al., 2006), CRP (Villegas, 1991), CRvP (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b), and CRT (Gay, 2002). However, CSP goes beyond and encourages teachers to reach students and empower them to sustain and contribute to their communities and culture(s). This aspect of sustainability is unique and important. In fact, Paris (2012b) described a main objective of CSP in his first article was “to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism” (p. 93) and enact equitable education. This framework was seen as a way to move beyond being only relevant or responsive to students’ cultures and needs. Paris (2012b) found these terms to be unsatisfactory and inadequate. Therefore, CSP was created to “support young people in sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of their communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence” (p. 95). By introducing the term sustaining, Paris (2012b) calls attention to the need to support students while also empowering them to navigate within their culture(s) of practice and dominate culture (Paris, 2012b; Paris & Alim, 2014).

In 2014, Paris and Alim worked collaboratively to further develop the concept of CSP. They noted an urgent need for supporting cultural pluralism in the education system (Paris & Alim, 2014). With more than one culture influencing the way to have access and attain success, cultural pluralism supported by a CSP approach can impact not only how we perceive and support our traditionally marginalized students, but also the knowledge, skills, and practices that must be taught to all students in the classrooms to ensure success in a multicultural society (Paris, 2012b; Paris & Alim, 2014).
Paris’ most recent article develops and summarizes four key features of CSP, and these provide a valuable review of how to enact CSP. The four key features include (a) centering of dynamic communities, their valued languages, practices, and knowledge across the learning setting; (b) student and intergenerational community agency and input; (c) working to be in a good relationship with the land, with students, and communities; and (d) structured opportunities to contend with internalized oppressions, false choices, and inward gazes (Paris, 2021, p. 367). Paris suggests using these features in the form of questions to reflect and assess if practices in our schools and states are being constructed and implemented in culturally sustaining ways. Paris (2021) adds that when we are enacting CSP, we are not only “offering access to the system as it is, but about transforming spaces toward what they could and should be” (p. 373).

The Four Key Features of CSP

The four key features of CSP are important in summarizing and truly conceptualizing CSP and aspects of these features can also be found within and across the main frameworks in varying degrees. Table 3 illustrates how the four CSP features stated above directly relate to the frameworks introduced earlier. Therefore, I will describe and define each of Paris’ key features of CSP below. This will then be followed by discussions about how each main framework aligns or overlaps with each key feature of CSP. The following descriptive categories will be used to describe this overlap:

- *Completely or Partially:* to describe the extent to which the main frameworks include the various elements of each key feature identified by Paris.
- *Low, Medium, or High:* to describe the level of emphasis placed on each key feature within the main frameworks, whether the framework was completely or partially addressed in each one of the key features.
Centering of Dynamic Communities, Their Valued Languages, Practices, and Knowledge

Across the Learning Setting

As mentioned earlier, CSP does not focus on practices being relevant or responsive, but aims to assist traditionally marginalized students in sustaining their languages, practices, and knowledge. An important aspect of this feature of CSP is what Paris (2012b) first introduced and was then expanded to the term “heritage practices and community practices” (Paris & Alim, 2014, p. 90). This was later more precisely defined by Paris (2021) as “dynamic communities” (p. 365) where a youth perceives and grasps “race, ethnicity, language, literacy, and cultural practices in both traditional and evolving ways” (Paris & Alim, 2014, p. 90). Therefore, Paris proposes youth spaces, a term that describes practices that support this dynamic concept (Moore & Paris, 2021; Paris, 2012a). The purpose of these spaces is to provide opportunities for the students to read texts where they feel identified and seen by “seeking to make critical, relevant, and sustaining connections from characters and themes in classroom literature to issues that matter to students and communities” (Paris, 2012a, p. 8). These spaces would also expand the ways these students express themselves. Some examples of expression could be singing, rapping, open mics, and social media (Moore & Paris, 2021; Paris, 2012a). Finally, these spaces intend to encourage students to seek and write about issues that they might be confronting in their personal lives or communities. Paris believes that through the study of such issues, students will see that they can be their own voices when fighting for their rights (Paris, 2012a). Therefore, the inclusion of these spaces in instruction ensures that the communities remain dynamic and sustained.

The significance of learning from and centering practices in traditionally marginalized communities also emerged as a common and crucial element across all the main frameworks.
Communities offer insights into how traditionally marginalized groups approach life, which is intertwined with their learning methods. Consequently, what we learn from the communities can be integrated into the youth spaces advocated by Paris (Moore & Paris, 2021; Paris, 2012a). Therefore, this key feature overlaps with aspects present in previous frameworks as illustrated in Table 3. However, I will further elaborate on this overlap within each main framework.

Research about funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992) is mostly based on the importance of communities while learning from them and acknowledging what they have to contribute. Specifically, this work focuses on the ways families strengthen the “exchange of resources, including knowledge, skills, and labor” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 133) and the disconnect between these traditionally marginalized community practices and classroom practices. Therefore, the overlap between the first CSP key feature focuses on communities and the funds of knowledge framework is found in both sources (i.e., González et al., 2006; Moll et al., 1992). This overlap is defined as completely because of the inclusion of all the elements listed, namely communities, language, practices, and knowledge. The emphasis on this key feature is also identified as high because of its prominence within the funds of knowledge framework.

The work of CRP also intently focuses on this feature. For example, Villegas and Lucas’ article (2007) presents the case of a traditionally marginalized student whose teachers “perceived her as lacking in language and math skills, having little initiative, and being generally disinterested in learning” (p. 1). After learning about her personal life and observing her in the community, they discovered that she took care of her siblings daily before and after school and assisted with the family business on weekends where she used financial skills and served as a translator for her parents. This discrepancy between her performance in school and what she was doing in her home/community illustrated why it was so important to close the gap between
school and home/community culture by learning about and centering on their communities. As Villegas and Lucas point out, “learners use their prior knowledge and beliefs to make sense of the new ideas and experiences they encounter in school” (2007, p. 2). Consequently, these authors contend that students will not make the connections necessary to access learning if classroom practices are not centered in marginalized communities (Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Similar references about centering marginalized communities are found throughout Villegas’ work. This key feature of a focus on community is represented in all three of Villegas’ articles analyzed, and therefore, the overlap is described as completely and high.

CRvP sees the importance of communities as essential in developing and achieving academic success, cultural competence, and critical consciousness (the three criteria needed for this framework as explained previously). Ladson-Billings explains that the inclusion of traditionally marginalized students’ culture in classroom practices provides them with access to learning (1995b), and following Paris’ critique, Ladson-Billings expanded to include the dynamic concept by asserting that “culture is always changing” (2014, p. 75). Society and cultural groups evolve, therefore, one must be willing to view culture as dynamic, not static. Consequently, centering communities’ key feature is found in the three articles by Ladson-Billings, therefore the overlap is identified as completely. The level of emphasis placed on this feature is high across all Ladson-Billings bodies of literature.

A foundational aspect of the CRT framework centers on learning about “ethnic groups’ cultural values, traditions, communication, learning styles, contributions, and relational patterns” (Gay, 2002, p. 107). Gay (2002) asserts that anything taught in the classroom should be based on these cultural and contextual characteristics. Therefore, it is essential to thoroughly study these characteristics beforehand to acquire the necessary knowledge. Gay (2002) adds that teachers
should also evaluate their curriculum to guarantee that their students’ characteristics are accurately represented. These pedagogical actions are seen as being able to foster learning within traditionally marginalized communities. Hence, the overlap between CSP’s first key feature focused on community and all three of Gay’s articles is described as completely, and the emphasis placed on this feature across the articles analyzed is high.

**Student and Intergenerational Community Agency and Input**

Paris and Alim (2014) emphasize the importance of identifying and sustaining the strengths and contributions that traditionally marginalized students and their families bring to any community based on their backgrounds and identities. This approach complements the perspective of the culture of power, (Delpit, 1995) which highlights the disempowerment experienced by many traditionally marginalized communities, who lack access to structures of power and similar benefits in relation to the white majority communities. As Paris and Alim (2014) explain, there has been a tendency in education to teach marginalized students practices of the majority population because those are what have been considered the way to be successful, and this has led to dire consequences including the suppression of their language(s) and family traditions. However, the rationalization given for such actions often overlooks how marginalized students’ “cultural and linguistic practices are of value in their own right and should be creatively foregrounded” (Paris & Alim, 2014, p. 87). Paris (2021) further explains that traditionally marginalized students, families, elders, and communities are already fighting to sustain what they know is of value about themselves through movements such as Black Lives Matter or the renaming of state institutions (Tanner, 2021), showing their initiative to sustain their cultural communities. Hence, Paris makes a call for teachers to join these communities in their causes to attend representation and power.
Students’ agency and input is mentioned in all of the main frameworks (see Table 3). The overlap between this second key feature of CSP and every main framework is described in more detail below. One example of this feature is represented in Moll et al. (1992) funds of knowledge’s article highlighting the body of knowledge gleaned from specific family members within a specific practice or context. The authors collaborated with the students to select a project that directly aligned with their communities’ practices. Students took on the role of project manager, responsible for reaching out to community contacts who would come to the classroom and teach them about topics related to the project. As a result, community members were directly involved in instructing and shaping the practices and learning being developed. Therefore, students and community members had agency and input just as Paris mentioned in this key feature. Even though this concept appears in both the book and article (González et al., 2006; Moll et al., 1992), there are limited opportunities for these traditionally marginalized students or communities to stand up for their beliefs as mentioned in CSP. Thus, the overlap between funds of knowledge and CSP for agency and input is determined partially present. The emphasis is identified as high because this feature was preeminent throughout their work, even without all of the elements.

Villegas and Lucas’s (2002) work had a similar approach to this concept under their second strand of “an affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds” (p. 23), their sixth strand focused on practices and the fourth strand of “constructivist views of learning” (p. 25). In this framework, students’ input and agency manifest when teachers recognize that traditionally marginalized students possess background knowledge that equips them with the same level of competence as any other student. Additionally, teachers must make sure that these students have a space in the classroom for them to show and apply that
knowledge. Some practical examples of Villegas’ (1991) views include peer centers where students are responsible for their own learning as well as inquiry or action research projects where students choose and lead the projects on topics of interest with the involvement of their communities (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Villegas and Lucas (2002) briefly mention the importance of students being “active participants in a democracy” (p. 25), echoing Paris’ emphasis on students and communities actively advocating for their rights. All of the components of this CSP key feature related to agency and input are represented in this work. The overlap of the elements of this feature is determined to be completely. However, due to the level of emphasis not being as prominent as the other key features, the level of emphasis is identified as medium.

As noted earlier, one of the domains in Ladson-Billings’ framework is identified as “cultural competence” (1995a, p. 160), and it exemplifies this key feature of CSP related to agency and input. Within cultural competence, teachers guide students to recognize the value in their own culture, integrate these aspects into learning and their practices, and then articulate their work to others to foster mutual understanding. Through this process, students become responsible for their learning. Ladson-Billings (1995a, 1995b) also describes how CRvP should encourage students to think critically about topics that might be affecting them and their communities directly. Additionally, emphasis is placed on including parents in classroom practices as a “knowledgeable and capable resource” (Ladson-Billings, 2014, p. 161). This theme of agency and input is shown in all three articles by Ladson-Billings (see Table 1). Therefore, the overlap between elements of this feature of CSP and CRvP is described as completely, and the level of emphasis placed is determined to be high.
Gay (2015) presents this feature of agency and input from a more subtle perspective called “multi-cultural competencies” (p. 124). The author explains that it is critical to acknowledge that society is made up of a variety of cultures. Students must gain an understanding of their cultural values and others. By placing these traditionally marginalized students in a position where they are the knowledgeable ones, an exchange of learning happens for all students. As Gay (2002) says, “ethnic individuals and groups have been making worthy contributions to the full range of life and culture” (p. 107); thus, teachers should establish a space for this exchange to happen. Even though this second key feature is present in Gay’s work, it is only found in one of her articles (see Table 1). Due to the focus of her work being more targeted toward what teachers must do, and not finding many references to students’ or communities’ input, the overlap of this element of CSP and CRT is identified as partially present, and the level of emphasis for this feature is deemed to be low.

**Working to Be in a Good Relationship With the Land, With Students, and Communities**

In his most recent article, Paris (2021) points out the importance of creating “reciprocal relationships” (p. 367) either at work or in community settings, specifically with the Indigenous communities. CSP proposes that cultivating these relationships involves listening to and acting upon the voices and actions of these particular communities. This type of relationship is exemplified by Paris himself in his article “Become History: Learning from Identity Texts and Youth Activism in the Wake of Arizona SB1070” (2012a). Paris presents a vignette where he joins a group of students who go to protest the Arizona SB1070 which allowed law enforcement to require proof of legal documentation to any immigrant. By Paris joining this group of youth, he not only showed that these students mattered to him but also that the cause mattered to him. He established a relationship with the students and communities. Paris also acknowledged within
this vignette the importance of the message these students were sharing, their initiative and agency to act, and the type of texts they used to share their beliefs. All of these aspects are crucial when establishing relationships and sustaining the communities, cultures, and rights of these traditionally marginalized students. At the same time, he followed his own call to action mentioned in the previous key feature regarding agency and input, and this same urgency to act to create change in society will also be developed in the next key feature.

Establishing good relationships with the students and communities is also mentioned in every main framework in this study. However, the idea of establishing good relationships with the land has been a difficult aspect to find within the frameworks. For this reason, I identified every main work as partially overlapping with this key feature of CSP except for CRvP. How much emphasis of this feature is placed within each main framework (see Table 3) will be described in more detail below.

The funds of knowledge framework (Moll et al., 1992) emphasized the significance of visiting traditionally marginalized communities to build relationships with students and parents and to learn from their experiences. The authors acknowledged that establishing these relationships brings reciprocity, and thus “leads to the development of long-term relationships … and provides contexts in which learning can occur” (Moll et al., 1992 p. 134). References to the importance of relationships with the land are not found in this work, but there is an emphasis on the importance of establishing good relationships with the students and communities. Thus, the overlap with this key feature of CSP is partially and the emphasis is determined to be high.

One of the strands CRP lists is “learning about students” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 26). In this strand, teachers must get to know their students so they can include topics that matter to them and practices that apply to how students learn (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007). To achieve
such an objective, suggestions are given to visit the community and its members to learn directly from them. Therefore, working to be in good relationships with students and communities is mentioned to some extent in all three CRP articles (see Table 1), but references to the land are not mentioned. Hence, the inclusion and overlap of this feature of CRP is described as partially present. This feature is mentioned minimally in the work, and consequently, the level of emphasis is low.

CRvP points out that to achieve the key goals of “academic success, cultural competence, and critical consciousness,” (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 480) teachers must create student–teacher and facilitate student–student social relations. Ladson-Billings (1995a) observed that teachers who went the extra mile to be part of the traditionally marginalized community, by moves such as living in the school area or coming to shop in the community stores, established relationships of trust. Additionally, Ladson-Billings (1995a) observed a teacher working with traditionally marginalized students whose final project involved presenting a plan for repurposing unused marketplaces to the City Council. This is the only example that I found in all of the main framework articles studied that provided ideas for working on relationships with the land. Thus, the overlap of the elements of this key feature of CSP is identified as completely. Because this feature is included within one out of the three Ladson-Billings articles analyzed, the emphasis is determined to be low.

As mentioned under the first CSP key feature, all three CRT articles emphasize the importance of deepening teachers’ knowledge of what traditionally marginalized communities practice and how to avoid popular misunderstandings to establish good relationships (Gay, 2002). Gay (2002) also indicates that teachers’ ideas toward traditionally marginalized students will shape the type of relationship being established. Depending on those ideas, teachers will
create either a positive or negative environment where students can feel safe (or unsafe) to become active learners (Gay, 2015). Gay proposes that a way to create good relationships with traditionally marginalized students is by “building community” (Gay, 2002, p. 110) through communication. Finally, Gay’s (2002) article stated the need for caring to develop positive relationships because “caring is a moral imperative, a social responsibility, and a pedagogical necessity” (p. 109). Therefore, the overlap exists across various elements of this key feature, except for fostering a positive relationship with the land. The overlapping between CRT and this feature of CSP is seen as partially. The level of emphasis on this key feature across the articles reviewed is medium.

**Structured Opportunities to Contend With Internalized Oppressions, False Choices, and Inward Gazes**

In his last key feature, Paris (2021) emphasized the importance of helping traditionally marginalized communities (and ourselves) suppress the misbelief that what these communities bring to the education table, and consequently to society, is insufficient. The concept of internalized oppression has been frequently discussed in the cultural world due to the seriousness of its implications. Internalized oppression can be explained as the discriminatory experiences that traditionally marginalized groups suffer by the community of power, and the acceptance by some people of the traditionally marginalized group of that discrimination (Tappan, 2006). Paris (2021) describes this urgency as “contending with false choices between sustaining lifeways and critical uptake of dominant practices” (p. 367). He expresses how there has been a pattern of believing that in education, communities, and society in general, the only community with value has been Whiteness, and these beliefs have led to stereotypes, racism, and injustices. In many cases, some of these false beliefs have also been accepted by people of color, such as foreign
parents asking their United States-born kids to speak only English because they believe this will bring much more success to their families (Cox et al., 2021; Rodriguez, 1983). Additionally, Paris (2021) cites “the need for an inward gaze” (p. 366) where one looks into their own beliefs about traditionally marginalized communities, identifies wrong convictions perpetuated by the dominant society, and makes the necessary changes. Paris (2021) advocates for internally pondering our own beliefs and how our pedagogies could stop centering on Whiteness, move away from dominant White policies, and consequently, advocate for social justice through multicultural education (Paris, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014). Therefore, all individuals, particularly educators, should “divest from whiteness” (Paris, 2021, p. 368) by revising and changing when needed the spaces given to students, thus ensuring these white beliefs are not perpetuated.

This last key feature of CSP is critical for teachers to develop, and the significance of this feature is further underscored by its presence in all of the main frameworks, with the exception of funds of knowledge. Therefore, my analysis of the overlapping of each main framework with this key feature of CSP is described below.

The funds of knowledge article emphasizes “seeing beyond stereotypes” (Moll et al., 1992, p. 136) when going to traditionally marginalized communities to identify their funds of knowledge. An example they provide of this concept is the assumption that a student from Mexico does not travel over the summer to visit their relatives. When Mexican students visit their families in Mexico, they are immersed in various social settings that offer significant learning opportunities, and teachers should understand and learn about these funds of knowledge. This framework focused on identifying and implementing such social and cultural knowledge in classroom practices rather than discussing how to work against those stereotypes. This shift towards practices made it difficult to find references on how teachers and students should
personally work on those inward gazes, as suggested by Paris, or “stereotypes,” as identified by Moll et al. (1992, p. 136). Therefore, the overlapping between funds of knowledge and CSP is identified as partially present. The level of emphasis is described as low due to the limited focus on this idea throughout the article and book.

For CRP (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007), the three strands of sociocultural consciousness, affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds, and commitment and skills to act as agents of change work towards this last key feature of CSP. Even though Villegas and Lucas’ points are not as direct or strong as in CSP, they provide similar ideologies and suggestions for teachers to apply to overcome internalized oppressions, false choices, and inward gazes. This includes how a “teacher must not only understand their own sociocultural identities but also come to recognize the intricate connection between schools and society” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 22). It is a teacher’s “moral obligation” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 24) to work towards overcoming inequities that exist in schools and generally in society. Since all the ideas of this key feature of CSP are present in all three CRP articles, this framework is deemed as completely overlapping with CSP. Additionally, the level of emphasis on this feature within CRP is deemed high.

The CRvP (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b, 2014) framework includes this key feature of CSP through what is called “cultural critique” or “critical consciousness” in the first two articles and the term “sociocultural consciousness” in the third article. A clear example of internalized oppression and false choices is found when Ladson-Billings (1995a) shares how some African-American students who were doing well academically chose to separate themselves from the other African-American students to avoid being seen negatively by their teachers. Ladson-Billings (1995b) states that a key aspect of CRvP is that traditionally marginalized students
“must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order” (p. 169). Without this critical consciousness, traditionally marginalized students can continue developing internalized oppression and miss the understanding of how to make choices that will help them change their marginal situation. Therefore, Ladson-Billings (1995b) encourages teachers to help students “develop a broader sociopolitical consciousness” (p. 162) empowering them to act critically to address and change the inequities they often face, all while maintaining their identities. Additionally, the concern was raised that some teachers may lack awareness of, or even deny, the existence of current social injustices. Therefore, Ladson-Billings (2014) calls on teachers to work within themselves and with other teachers to shift those same inequities aligning with Paris’ inward gaze view. The overlapping between this framework and this CSP’s key feature is determined to be completely as it is found in all three articles, and the emphasis level is high.

In the CRT framework similar points are developed across the literature studied, especially in the article called “Teaching to and Through Cultural Diversity” (Gay, 2013). Gay (2002) explains that many misconceptions about traditionally marginalized students are due to teachers’ lack of knowledge about these communities and what they have and can accomplish. Additionally, the declaration is made that “no ethnic group should have exclusive power … over others” (Gay, 2015, p. 125). An important concern that is also highlighted focuses on how some people might be unwilling to make changes, believing they are avoiding conflict. These ideas align with the concepts of internalized oppression, false choices, and inward gazes. Thus, Gay (2002, 2013) encourages readers to work on self-educating and/or educating others to clarify the misconceptions. What and how we teach traditionally marginalized students reflects our beliefs. Therefore, prospective and practicing teachers alike should “critique their own belief about
culturally diverse students” (Gay, 2013, p. 55), and then make the necessary changes for the benefit of traditionally marginalized students. Accordingly, CRT’s framework is determined as completely overlapping with this last CSP’s key feature. The emphasis level across the articles studied is high as is discussed in all three articles.

After analyzing CSP and all of the main frameworks as found in Table 3, findings suggest that the majority of overlap between the frameworks and CSP is focused on getting to know traditionally marginalized students and how to help them maintain and contribute to their culture(s). Another main finding is the importance of self-reflection about one’s own knowledge and beliefs, particularly about traditionally marginalized communities, and therefore, making the appropriate adjustments needed for their benefit. All of the frameworks are united in these similar ideologies and build upon each other. CSP has been influenced by previous main work in the field and each framework contributes important aspects and nuances to CSP.

Discussion

This literature review was an opportunity to attain a greater picture of how previous main frameworks about multicultural education have influenced the creation of CSP (Paris, 2012b) and how each framework aligns with the four main features of CSP. Additionally, this study illustrates how these main frameworks can be seen as a timeline, building on one another from funds of knowledge (González et al., 2006) to CRP (Villegas, 1991) to CRvP (Ladson-Billings, 1995b) and CRT (Gay, 2002).

Scholars have been studying the concept of culture and the importance of its implementation within the classroom for the last several decades (e.g., Banks, 1993; Gay, 2002; González et al., 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Therefore, it is not surprising that these frameworks or theories influence one another. In fact, it is more than
likely that they will keep influencing each other as time progresses. However, the variety of frameworks related to multicultural education and/or the role of culture in education can lead to confusion for teachers desiring to improve their practices to benefit traditionally marginalized students. With the intent to bring some clarity, I share three overall implications or themes for teaching and learning with CSP: (a) teachers’ inclusion of all students’ communities, (b) teachers’ examination of introspective beliefs, and (c) teachers’ advocacy and activism.

**Teachers’ Inclusion of All Students’ Communities**

One important implication of this work is that teachers must try to include in their school practices all communities represented in their classrooms. This is to benefit all students, but more importantly, it will benefit traditionally marginalized communities. This theme or idea was found across every main framework. As stated previously, successfully involving all communities requires teachers to first get to know their students (Gay, 2002; González et al., 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1995a, 1995b; Paris, 2012b, 2021; Paris & Alim, 2014; Villegas & Lucas, 2007), and then use the knowledge attained in classroom pedagogy.

One successful and powerful way to accomplish this process of getting to know your individual students is by doing home and/or community visits (e.g., González et al., 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Through these visits, educators can observe how students interact with others, and this may prove helpful in determining what practices and/or strategies would be most beneficial in the classroom (González et al., 2006). This can also establish a relationship of trust (Gay, 2015; Paris, 2012b). For example, Paris’ 2012a article demonstrates this type of relationship. The author and a student experienced multiple encounters inside and outside of the classroom. During those encounters, they would exchange verbal and written texts proving that those interactions were crucial to building a relationship of trust. Therefore, visiting traditionally
marginalized students will not only provide teachers with information needed for classroom practices but also will establish relationships of trust between student and teacher.

**Teachers’ Examination of Introspective Beliefs**

Working on introspective beliefs is another theme or implication of this work. After learning about these traditionally marginalized communities and what they can do, teachers should work on their introspective beliefs. Introspective beliefs could be understood as the examination and self-evaluation of one’s beliefs, including their thoughts and feelings. Gay (2015) adds to this notion stating, “Teachers’ beliefs about ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity determine their instructional behavior” (p. 126). In other words, teachers teach what they believe in. Consequently, if teachers believe that traditionally marginalized communities are always going to score less than the rest, they will teach according to that belief. If they believe that the only way to be successful in society is by acting White, they will teach White practices. Therefore, it is very important to start questioning themselves and where they stand when it comes to traditionally marginalized communities (Gay, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2014; Paris, 2021). Without truly being committed to issues of equity for students, teachers will not be able to make the changes needed for the traditionally marginalized communities.

**Teachers’ Advocacy and Activism**

The third and final theme or implication involves Paris’ idea that work is the urgency to act. This draws from an activist point of view. Paris (2021) suggests two different ways of how to encourage action. As previously mentioned, teachers must join the traditionally marginalized communities in their activist movements. As he explains, it is “not about offering access to the system as it is, but about transforming spaces toward what they could and should be” (Paris, 2021, p. 373). This transformation should not only occur in our classrooms but also within our
society (Caraballo et al., 2020). In his work, Paris (2021) suggests that teachers must be prepared “to resist and refuse when institutional, governmental, or other policies and practices reinforce these false and damaging beliefs in superiority, in extraction and dispossession” (p. 369).

Achieving the goals of CSP is a challenging and involved process, but without proactive efforts for change, things will remain the same. Traditionally marginalized students rely on our advocacy. This begs the question, if we do not advocate for them, who will?

Limitations

This study of the main contributing frameworks and CSP does have some limitations. One limitation is the application of this work in terms of age group. The CSP work analyzed in this study was oriented toward secondary and higher education settings. There is not much reference found for elementary education and its implications within that age community in the articles studied. However, there is application in these primary and early childhood settings. For example, elementary teachers could work on the second CSP key feature “student and intergenerational agency and input” (Paris, 2021, p. 367). They could learn more about what these traditionally marginalized students and their families know and practice, implement such practices in their instructions, and even invite family members to come and become the knowledgeable ones in the classroom. Young children usually enjoy having their family members visit their classrooms. Therefore, further exploration of CSP in this age range would be beneficial.

Another limitation of this study centers on the contexts of application. Most of the CSP literature studied in this review focuses on a U.S. audience, but the international work in multicultural education is growing. For example, Gay’s 2015 article presents how CRT could be applied internationally, at the same time as it acknowledges some limitations and provides
possible solutions to such limitations. Consequently, even though CSP could potentially have valuable international implications, the CSP features would benefit from incorporating an international dimension. For that reason, more exploration of CSP’s international implications would be valuable.

A final limitation is that CSP is a framework that is still evolving, and therefore, the body of literature available and its content is developing. In the last decade, Paris has invested time and effort to more fully define this new framework (e.g., Paris & Alim, 2014). This study was limited to the CSP resources that were available at the time and the limitations of current CSP understandings within these resources. Additionally, the articles used in this study were purposively selected. Other articles may have been selected and this may have provided other opportunities or insights.

**Conclusion**

CSP has important implications for multicultural education. Keeping in mind how institutional and societal power structures operate and influence the education system, CSP can serve as a “bridge” between home, school, and community practices to ensure all students are empowered to contribute to, navigate within, and sustain their own communities of practice. This review of literature may provide added clarity to readers, and hopefully, this can influence teachers to better understand CSP and other main multicultural educational frameworks and find ideas on how to help students feel connected and included. As educators implement CSP with a clearer direction in how to support their traditionally marginalized students, these students will be more likely to succeed in their schooling. As Alim et al. (2017) point out, the purpose of CSP is to bring together “young people, educators, communities, scholars of color, scholars in our collective struggle against any education system that constrains and contains us” (p. 24–25). This
work requires unified efforts, with a steadfast commitment to supporting all students, particularly those from traditionally marginalized communities.
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Tables

Table 1

Literature Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Frameworks &amp; CSP</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Relevant Pedagogy</td>
<td>Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladson-Billings, G. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris, D. (2012b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Data Collection and Reduction for the Main Frameworks of the Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Frameworks (culturally responsive pedagogy, culturally relevant pedagogy, and culturally responsive teaching)</th>
<th>Initial Search in Database</th>
<th>Data Reduction</th>
<th>Final Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Overlapping of Main Frameworks and Cultural Sustaining Pedagogies’ Key Features*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Funds of Knowledge</th>
<th>Culturally Responsive Pedagogy</th>
<th>Culturally Relevant Pedagogy</th>
<th>Culturally Responsive Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centering of Dynamic Communities, their Valued Languages, Practices, and Knowledge Across the Learning Setting</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Intergenerational Community Agency and Input</td>
<td>Partially / High</td>
<td>Completely / Medium</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
<td>Partially / Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working to Be in a Good Relationship with the Land, with Students, and Communities</td>
<td>Partially / High</td>
<td>Partially / Low</td>
<td>Completely / Low</td>
<td>Partially / Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Structured Opportunities to Contend with Internalized Oppressions, False Choices, and Inward Gazes</td>
<td>Partially / Low</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
<td>Completely / High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>