What Are We Seeking to Sustain Through Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy? A Loving Critique Forward

DJANGO PARIS
Michigan State University

H. SAMY ALIM
Stanford University

In this article, Django Paris and H. Samy Alim use the emergence of Paris's concept of culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP) as the foundation for a respectful and productive critique of previous formulations of asset pedagogies. Paying particular attention to asset pedagogy's failures to remain dynamic and critical in a constantly evolving global world, they offer a vision that builds on the crucial work of the past toward a CSP that keeps pace with the changing lives and practices of youth of color. The authors argue that CSP seeks to perpetuate and foster linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling and as a needed response to demographic and social change. Building from their critique, Paris and Alim suggest that CSP's two most important tenets are a focus on the plural and evolving nature of youth identity and cultural practices and a commitment to embracing youth culture's counterhegemonic potential while maintaining a clear-eyed critique of the ways in which youth culture can also reproduce systemic inequalities.

In this article we build from Paris's (2012) conceptualization of *culturally sustaining pedagogy* (CSP) to offer a loving critique forward in three parts. We orient our critique by building on the crucial asset-based pedagogical work of the past and use *loving critique* to denote the position of deep respect from which we problematize and extend three areas of scholarship and practice:

1. Previous conceptualizations of asset pedagogies
2. Asset pedagogies that foreground the heritage practices of communities of color without taking into account contemporary/evolving community practices

3. Asset pedagogies that do not critically contend with problematic elements expressed in some youth cultural practices.

Before moving into these critiques, it is important to share where we stand in this work. First, we recognize that we are implicated in all three of our loving critiques, as some of our own research and teaching has uncritically taken up and built on previous notions of asset pedagogies, has at times reified traditional relationships between race/ethnicity and cultural practice, and has not directly and generatively enough taken up problematic elements of youth culture. Indeed, our own experiences as researchers and teachers who need to push further are foundational to our coming to these critiques. Second, as scholars committed to educational justice, we live, research, and write with the understanding that our languages, literacies, histories, and cultural ways of being as people of color are not pathological. Beginning with this understanding—an understanding fought for across the centuries—allows us to see the fallacy of measuring ourselves and the young people in our communities solely against the White middle-class norms[1] of knowing and being that continue to dominate notions of educational achievement. Du Bois (1965) of course, theorized this over a century ago with his conceptualization of double consciousness, "this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity" (p. 45). In our work here we are committed to envisioning and enacting pedagogies that are not filtered through a lens of contempt and pity (e.g., the "achievement gap") but, rather, are centered on contending in complex ways with the rich and innovative linguistic, literate, and cultural practices of Indigenous American, African American, Latina/o, Asian American, Pacific Islander, and other youth and communities of color.

We move away from the pervasiveness of pedagogies that are too closely aligned with linguistic, literate, and cultural hegemony and toward developing a pedagogical agenda that does not concern itself with the seemingly panoptic "White gaze" (Morrison, 1998) that permeates educational research and practice with and for students of color, their teachers, and their schools.[2] In a 1998 interview, Toni Morrison famously responded to misguided critiques of her books with the rebuttal, "As though our lives have no meaning and no depth without the White gaze. And I have spent my entire writing life trying to make sure that the White gaze was not the dominant one in any of my books." We ask: What would our pedagogies look like if this gaze weren't the dominant one?[3] What would liberating ourselves from this gaze and the educational expectations it forwards mean for our abilities to envision new forms of teaching and learning? What if, indeed, the goal of teaching and learning with youth of color was not ultimately to see how closely students could perform White middle-class norms but to explore, honor, extend, and, at times, problematize their heritage and community practices?

By committing to this focus, we are not putting aside issues of access and equity for students of color; rather, we are reframing them. For too long, scholarship on "access" and "equity" has centered implicitly or explicitly around the question of how to get working-class students of color to speak and write more like middle-class White ones. Notwithstanding the continuing need to equip all young people with skills in Dominant American English (DAE)[4] and other dominant norms of interaction still demanded in schools, we believe equity and access can best be achieved by centering pedagogies on the heritage and contemporary practices of students and communities of color. As Alim (2007a) argues, youth cultural and linguistic practices are of value in their own right and should be creatively foregrounded rather than merely viewed as resources to take students from where they are to some presumably "better" place, or ignored altogether. Furthermore, as a result of continuing demographic change toward a majority multilingual society of color, fostering linguistic and cultural flexibility has an instrumental purpose for both students of color and White students: multilingualism and multiculturalism are increasingly linked to access and power in U.S. and global contexts.

CSP in the Tradition of Asset Pedagogies

Paris's (2012) conceptualization of CSP attempts to shift the term, stance, and practice of asset pedagogies toward more explicitly pluralist outcomes. Let us briefly distill and nuance that discussion. Deficit approaches to teaching and learning have echoed across decades of education in the United States. Such approaches view the languages, literacies, and cultural ways of being of many students and communities of color as deficiencies to be overcome if they are to learn the dominant language, literacy, and cultural ways of being demanded in schools. Building on and bolstering court rulings and subsequent policies throughout the 1960s and 1970s that required schools to attend to the languages (e.g., Spanish, Navajo, Chinese, African American Language) and, less so, cultures of communities of color (e.g., *Lau v. Nichols, MLK Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor School District*),[5] collaborations between researchers and teachers proved deficit approaches untenable and unjust (Cazden & Legget, 1976; Heath, 1983; Labov, 1972; Moll, 1992; Smitherman, 1977, 1981). With this research as a foundation, *asset pedagogies* were enacted and understood in ever more complex ways by teachers and researchers throughout the 1990s and into the 2000s (Ball, 1995; Garcia, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lee, 1995; McCarty & Zepeda, 1995; Moll & Gonzales, 1994; Nieto, 1992; Valdés, 1996). These pedagogies repositioned the linguistic, literate, and cultural practices of working-class communities—specifically poor communities of color—as resources and assets to honor, explore, and extend. Ultimately, such pedagogies have also been intended to assist students in accessing DAE language and literacy skills and other White middle-class dominant cultural norms of

acting and being that are demanded in schools (e.g., teaching DAE language and literacy through engaging Hip Hop language and literacy). One of the most important theoretical statements of this asset pedagogies movement was Ladson-Billings's (1995) landmark article "Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." Indeed, her concept of culturally relevant pedagogy has become ubiquitous in educational research circles and in teacher education programs.[6] This speaks to the lasting conceptual value of the term and, more importantly, to Ladson-Billings's illumination of the concept through her work with successful teachers of African American students. We, like countless teachers and university-based researchers, have been inspired by what it means to make teaching and learning relevant to the languages, literacies, and cultural practices of students in our communities.

Although it is clear that Ladson-Billings's formulation laid the groundwork for maintaining the heritage cultural ways of students of color and also for encouraging students to critique dominant power structures, we believe much of the work being done under the umbrella of culturally relevant pedagogy has come up short of these goals. Indeed, the very term *relevance* does little to explicitly support these goals. It is quite possible to be relevant to something without ensuring its continuing presence in students' "repertoires of practice" (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003) and in our classrooms and communities. We believe that culturally relevant pedagogy and, specifically, the way it has been taken up in teacher education and practice should be revised forward from the crucial work it has done over the past two decades (Alim, 2007a; Paris, 2012). We make this call with deep respect for the work we have cited to this point, for it has allowed us all to move beyond rationalizing the need to include the linguistic, literate, and cultural practices (e.g., Hip Hop) of our communities meaningfully in educational spaces. Rather, we begin with this as a given and ask, *for what purposes and with what outcomes?*

It is toward this end that Paris (2012) offers the concept and practice of culturally sustaining pedagogy, which has as its explicit goal supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism in practice and perspective for students and teachers. CSP seeks to perpetuate and foster—*to sustain*—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling and as a needed response to demographic and social change. CSP, then, links a focus on sustaining pluralism through education to challenges of social justice and change in ways that previous iterations of asset pedagogies did not.[7] We believe the term, stance, and practice of CSP is increasingly necessary given the explicit assimilationist and antidemocratic monolingual/monocultural educational policies emerging across the nation.

Arizona House Bill 2281 (HB2281) is a particularly egregious example of such policies (though it is by no means alone in this regard; ["standard"] English Only laws enacted in several states are yet another example). Popularly known as the "Ethnic Studies Ban," HB2281 was invoked by the state board of education and the local school board to close the academically successful

Mexican American Studies (MAS) program in the Tucson Unified School District. This closing included the removal of, among other texts, Latina/o and Indigenous American literature and history from classrooms. In addition, the bill forbade teachers in the program from using remaining canonical texts in ways that focused on themes of race and oppression (Acosta, 2007, 2012).[8]

Along with the need to combat such oppressive educational and social policies, there is also an interrelated rationale for CSP. For too long, arguments for including the languages, literacies, and cultural ways of being of communities of color in classroom learning have been centered on the importance of honoring and valuing our communities. Although we believe in and build on the research and theory that have shown us that there is inherent value in fostering a pluralist society through education, we also highlight a wholly instrumental, contemporary rationale for CSP. Given current U.S. demographic shifts toward a majority multilingual, multicultural society of color (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006; Smelser, Wilson, & Mitchell, 2001; Wang, 2013) embedded in an ever more globalized world, cultural and linguistic flexibility is not simply about giving value to all of our communities; it is also about the skills, knowledges, and ways of being needed for success in the present and future. As our society continues to shift, so does the "culture of power" (Delpit, 1988). Increasingly, we can no longer assume that the White, middle-class linguistic, literate, and cultural skills and ways of being that were considered the sole gatekeepers to the opportunity structure in the past will remain so as our society changes. CSP, then, is increasingly needed not only to promote equality across racial and ethnic communities but also to ensure access and opportunity.

Alim and Smitherman (2012) show that over the last decade, shifting demographics in the United States have quietly ushered in a new relationship between DAE and power. During the 2012 presidential election, for example, Mitt Romney's inability to shift between speech styles was a prime example of how DAE monolingualism can act as a deficit in certain contexts. On the other hand, Barack Obama's linguistic flexibility showed that speaking DAE while also being fluent in African American Language or knowing some Spanish can prove effective in certain contexts (Alim & Smitherman, 2012). Traditionally, we have taught youth of color and their teachers that DAE and White middle-class cultural practices are the sole key to power. Ironically, there is accumulating evidence that this outdated philosophy will not grant our young people access to power but rather, in our increasingly diverse society, it might reduce that access.

To offer youth full access to power, then, we must understand that power is now based in part on one's ability to communicate effectively to more than "standard" English monolinguals/monoculturals, who are becoming a shrinking share of the U.S. population. As youth of color learn DAE (and other dominant skills and knowledges) *and* maintain their multiple ways of speaking and being, it is DAE monolinguals/monoculturals who may increasingly find

themselves at a disadvantage. CSP, then, is necessary to honor and value the rich and varied practices of communities of color *and* is a necessary pedagogy for supporting access to power in a changing nation.

Sustaining Heritage and Community Practices

Our second loving critique examines how asset pedagogies too often draw overdeterministic links between race and language, literacy, and cultural practice. As those of us committed to educational justice seek to perpetuate and foster a pluralist present and future through our pedagogy, it is crucial that we understand the ways young people are enacting race, ethnicity, language, literacy, and cultural practices in both traditional *and* evolving ways.

The vast majority of asset pedagogy research and practice has focused on the racialized and culturally situated heritage practices of our communities (e.g., Indigenous American languages and cultural ways of knowing, African American Language and cultural ways of knowing) (see Lee, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Valdés, 1996). There is good reason for this focus as the heritage practices and ways of knowing of our communities continue to be the target of deficit approaches and this research and practice explicitly supports needed asset approaches. More recently, linguistic, pedagogical, and cultural research has built on this crucial earlier work by pushing against the tendency of researchers and practitioners to assume unidirectional correspondence between race, ethnicity, language, and cultural ways of being (Alim & Reyes, 2011; Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003; Irizarry, 2007; O'Connor & Brown, 2014; Paris, 2011; Wyman, McCarty, & Nicholas, 2014). These scholars have shown that such assumptions have led to the unfortunate simplification of asset pedagogies as being solely about considering the heritage or traditional practices of students of color in teaching while simultaneously ignoring the shifting and evolving practices of their communities. The result has been the oversimplification of what teachers are seeking to sustain as only, for example, African American Language for African American students or Spanish among Latina/o students (a one-to-one mapping of race and language). This oversimplification goes beyond language, where communities of cultural practice, such as Hip Hop, are assumed to be only a cultural resource for teaching with Black or even with Black and Brown students.

To move us out of this overly deterministic rut while continuing to attend to sustaining heritage ways, we offer the terms *heritage practices* and *community practices* (Paris, 2012). These terms are based in contemporary understandings of culture as dynamic, shifting, and encompassing both past-oriented heritage dimensions and present-oriented community dimensions. These dimensions in turn are not entirely distinct but take on different salience depending on how young people live race, ethnicity, language, and culture.

To illustrate what we mean by heritage and community practices, we draw from our research (Paris, 2011; Alim, 2011) in local and international con-

texts, part of a recent line of inquiry that has sought to both solidify and disrupt traditional assumptions about linguistic and cultural ownership and practice. In this work, we examine how young people both rehearse preconceived versions of racial/ethnic and linguistic difference and, importantly, offer new ones (Alim & Reyes, 2011; Irizarry, 2007; Martínez, 2012; O'Connor & Brown, 2014; Paris, 2009, 2011). Paris (2011) worked with youth in a California high school and community to explore the important ways that African American students navigate identities through the heritage practices of African American Language (AAL) and Hip Hop cultures. What he learned was that, in addition to African Americans, many Mexicana/o, Mexican American, and Pacific Islander youth also navigated identities through their participation in AAL and Hip Hop cultural practices. Moreover, they did so while simultaneously participating in their own heritage practices of, for example, Spanish or Samoan and other cultural practices (clothing, ways of believing), passed down from the elders in their ethnic communities.

In this way, much like the youth practices documented in Alim's studies of global linguistic flows (2009) and global "ill-literacies" (2011), youth were fashioning new linguistically and culturally dexterous ways of being Latina/o or Fijian that relied on more than "traditions." These complex, fluid relationships among race, culture, and language have been overlooked by previous versions of asset pedagogies, which would most likely deem these cultural practices associated with African American and Caribbean American culture (Chang, 2005) and therefore not pedagogically useful beyond those communities. Furthermore, African American and Pacific Islander youth in Paris's (2011) work were also sharing in, and seeking to learn, the Spanish language with their Latina/o peers is yet another example of forging dexterous linguistic identities that belie easy categorizations of what it means to be Black or Brown. These fluid identities continue to emerge and evolve in Alim's ongoing research in the same community, as evidenced through transcultural participation in musical and verbal artistic forms such as Hip Hop and Reggaeton.

These examples show that while it is crucial that we work to sustain African American, Latina/o, Asian American, Pacific Islander American, and Indigenous American languages and cultures in our pedagogies, we must be open to sustaining them in both the traditional *and* evolving ways they are lived and used by young people. Our pedagogies must address the well-understood fact that what it means to be African American or Latina/o or Navajo is continuing to shift in the ways culture always has. Unfortunately, the most lasting frameworks for asset pedagogies—the funds of knowledge (Moll & González, 1994), the pedagogical third space (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999; Gutiérrez, 2008), and culturally relevant pedagogy—have too often been enacted by teachers and researchers in static ways that focus solely on the important ways racial and ethnic difference was enacted in the past

without attending to the dynamic enactments of our equally important present or future. As youth continue to inhabit a world where cultural and linguistic recombinations flow with purpose, we need pedagogies that speak to this new reality—as Pennycook (2007) puts it, pedagogies that "go with the flow."

Further Inward: Critical Reflexivity

Our first two critiques involved the need for asset pedagogies to sustain the cultural and linguistic practices of communities of color for a pluralist present and future and to do so in ways that reflect our increasingly fluid understanding of the evolving relations between language, culture, race, and ethnicity. In our final loving critique, we turn our gaze inward, on our own communities and cultural practices as people and scholars of color. Here, we are primarily interested in creating generative spaces for asset pedagogies to support the practices of youth and communities of color while maintaining a critical lens vis-à-vis these practices. Providing the example of Hip Hop as a form of the cultural and community practice that pedagogies should sustain, we argue that, rather than avoiding problematic practices or keeping them hidden beyond the White gaze, CSP must work with students to critique regressive practices (e.g., homophobia, misogyny, racism) and raise critical consciousness.

We are also implicated in this final critique, since our own research on and practice of Hip Hop pedagogies have not always taken up these problematic elements in the direct ways that we forward here. And so we migrate further inward to consider what Alim (2011) calls "ill-literacies"—counterhegemonic forms of youth literacies—and ask, "What happens when ill-literacies get ill?" In other words, what happens when, rather than challenging hegemonic ideas and outcomes, the cultural practices of youth of color actually reproduce them, or even create new ones? Indeed, most of the research and practice under the asset pedagogies umbrella, including the frameworks of the funds of knowledge, the pedagogical third space, and culturally relevant pedagogy, too often view youth cultures through a purely positive or progressive lens. This is true as well for the pedagogical traditions founded on these frameworks, like the hugely influential Hip Hop pedagogy movement.

The vast majority of Hip Hop education research and pedagogy has focused on the many progressive, justice-oriented aspects of Hip Hop. There is good reason for this. For one, there is, of course, much in Hip Hop's past and present that is explicitly concerned with social justice. Furthermore, most advocates of Hip Hop pedagogies are consciously engaging in a project that views deficit thinking as a product of White supremacy and the racism it engenders. However, it is crucial to build on this work by engaging in reflexive analyses that are not bound by how educational systems that privilege White middle-class norms view the practices of communities of color.

In nearly all of the U.S. and international research on Hip Hop pedagogies, youth's spoken, rhymed, and written texts are seen only as challenging pre-

scriptive, restrictive, and antidemocratic notions of culture, citizenship, language, literacy, and education. With a few important exceptions (Hill, 2009; Low, 2011; Petchauer & Hill, 2013), studies rarely look critically at the ways in which youth might reify existing hegemonic discourses about, as examples, gender, race, sexuality, and citizenship. In other words, Hip Hop pedagogies have tended to be largely celebratory and have ignored the contradictory forces found within all popular cultural forms (Giroux, 1996). Thus, CSP must interrogate and critique the simultaneously progressive and oppressive currents in these innovative youth practices, as has been done consistently for research on Hip Hop music and culture outside education (Alim, Lee, & Carris, 2010, 2011; Neal, 2006; Perry, 2004; Rose, 1994).

For example, many authors in the field of Hip Hop pedagogy (e.g., Alim, 2004; Emdin, 2010) argue for the use of rap battles (improvised verbal duels) in classroom learning. Yet, few take up the fact that the Hip Hop battle can sometimes be a masculinist space that excludes young women, queer youth, and young men of color who do not identify as Black (even as young women, queer youth, and youth who are not Black continue to "roc the mic"). To name a simple example, scholars rarely include a gendered analysis of classroom participation when using Hip Hop. CSP must contend with the possibility that while Hip Hop pedagogies that utilize rap battles (as one among many examples of Hip Hop pedagogical practices) may seemingly serve the needs of many students of color, particularly young men, they may unwittingly reproduce forms of exclusion in our classrooms and communities.

To illustrate what CSP must contend with as it seeks to perpetuate and foster a pluralist and egalitarian present and future, we turn to one representative example of a rap battle.[9] This battle took place between an African American youth emcee and a Filipino youth emcee during an evening competition at a small youth performance space in Los Angeles. In these battles more generally, youth use an array of nonverbal gestures and heterogeneous linguistic styles to accentuate racialized disses.[10] In this battle on this evening, the African American youth emcee rapped in mock varieties of English (known as "Mock Chinglish" in the linguistics literature (Chun, 2004)), made stereotypical disses about the Asian male body, and employed a variety of other racialized and gendered insults as verbal game pieces against his Filipino opponent. Meanwhile, the Filipino youth emcee countered in the battle defending himself by also hurling his own gendered insults, referring to his opponent's large chest as female breasts. This was done in more colorful language than we use here, of course, which brings up still other challenging issues for CSP as it seeks to generatively join Hip Hop and other youth practices. Also of note was the Filipino youth emcee's—and other youth who were not Black—seeming unwillingness to use race as a resource for insulting Black opponents in these rap battles. While a more thorough analysis of the emcees' remarks is beyond the scope of this article, the rap battle illustrates aspects of youth culture that CSP must interrogate.

In this brief battle, both youth demonstrated incredible linguistic skills, witty use of humor and ritual insults, and the kind of verbal virtuosity that is generally associated with the best emcees in Hip Hop—the same kind of linguistic and cultural ingenuity and skill that asset pedagogies (including our own) tend to highlight. There is no doubt that these young men are talented verbal artists. But they were also reinscribing racial, ethnic, and gendered stereotypes that, even within the complicated rules of ritual insult and rap battles, sometimes cross lines of indignity and hurt for participants. In classrooms that are home to students across race, gender, sexuality, class, language, and citizenship status, the disses and identity positionings common in Hip Hop battles can often counter the equity-oriented ideologies and practices that asset pedagogies espouse. This might especially be the case when such Hip Hop practices align with dominant U.S. discourses of exclusion, such as when young men refer to young women with pejorative terms that perpetuate women's marginalized status, or when Black youth refer to Latina/o youth in terms that uphold discriminatory discourses about immigrant status.

The revoicing of racist, misogynistic, homophobic, and xenophobic discourses does occur in some forms of commercial rap as well as in some rap produced by youth in our communities. We must work toward a CSP that sustains the many practices and traditions of communities of color that forward equity (like much of Hip Hop does). At the same, our pedagogical stance should also help youth, teachers, and researchers expose those practices that must be revised in the project of cultural justice. We believe CSP is ideally positioned to support this work with its explicit centering on the practices of youth of color; its emphasis on critical engagement with the dynamic, shifting nature of race, ethnicity, language, and cultural practice; and its commitment to critically sustaining our plural present and future. Our goal is to find ways to support and sustain what we know are remarkable verbal improvisational skills while at the same time open up spaces for students themselves to critique the ways that they might be, intentionally or not, reproducing discourses that marginalize members of our communities. As Low (2011) argues, the very real and difficult tensions found within youth cultures are not reasons to inhibit their use in schools but, rather, to demand their use in the development of more critical approaches.

Of course, we recognize that youth are sometimes conscious of their shared marginalizations and also of their distinct experiences of racialization and linguistic hegemony. It is also possible that youth engage in these reinscriptions of stereotypes as part of a long tradition of communities of color turning pain into humor and using humor to ridicule and expose racist legacies and ideologies (Carpio, 2008; Paris, 2011). We are also not interested in joining a divide-and-conquer tradition, interpreting the rap battle as an example of racial division and infighting, not least because the two young men in the rap battle were active members of a local Hip Hop scene that crossed racial/ethnic differences and were known to be friendly with each other. Still, the cir-

culation of problematic discourses can have tangible consequences. In recent years, the campaign against the use of "illegal" to describe immigrants, for example, became increasingly urgent as hate crimes against Latinas/os rose to alarming levels. CSP, then, must engage critically with young people about the impact of their words and the full range of their funds of knowledge and create third spaces that take on both the liberatory and the restrictive. Too often we invite youth and community practices into the classroom without being open to their full complexity, even as we know that Hip Hop is as liberatory as it is problematic. Essentially, we cannot continue to half-step asset-based pedagogies.[11]

Reflecting Forward on CSP

What are we seeking to sustain in a culturally sustaining pedagogy? To answer this question, we find ourselves at the edge of asset-based, critical pedagogies. While a few scholars have begun to provide rich and varied examples of CSP across Indigenous, Latina/o, African American, and Asian American communities (Alim, 2007b; Chang, 2010; Irizarry, 2011; Kinloch, 2010; McCarty & Lee, 2014), we offer our three loving critiques as a needed way forward. It is an invitation, with the full knowledge that the CSP we are calling for has very rarely been enacted—by us or by the many extraordinary researchers and teachers doing this work. The future of CSP must extend the previous visions of asset pedagogies by demanding explicitly pluralist outcomes that are not centered on White, middle-class, monolingual, and monocultural norms of educational achievement. As we reposition our pedagogies to focus on the practices and knowledges of communities of color, we must do so with the understanding that fostering linguistic and cultural flexibility has become an educational imperative, as multilingualism and multiculturalism are increasingly linked to access and power. At the same time, CSP must resist static, unidirectional notions of culture and race that reinforce traditional versions of difference and (in)equality without attending to shifting and evolving ones. Finally, CSP must be willing to seriously contend head-on with the problematic as well as the many progressive aspects of our communities and the young people they foster.

As we move forward, we recognize that CSP might face an uphill battle, not just from those invested in status quo monolingual and monocultural pedagogies, and the privilege and power such pedagogies seek to perpetuate, but also from the very communities CSP aims to serve. Research on African American Language (AAL), for example, has shown that the staunchest opponents of its use in schools can sometimes be African Americans themselves, including those who speak AAL fluently. For a host of complicated reasons having to do with the coupling of internalized oppression and the very real need for access to material resources, many in the United States view the educational choice to be between learning only "standard" English for access to power or valuing

AAL (or Spanish or Tagalog or Navajo) for cultural purposes. We must continue to be prepared to show that this is a false choice. Pedagogies can and should teach students to be linguistically and culturally flexible across multiple language varieties and cultural ways of believing and interacting. All of us—across race and ethnicity—must understand that the link between DAE and other dominant cultural norms and access to power continues to shift.

Taking up the three critiques we offer here is difficult, inward-looking, and uncertain work. But, in all honesty, that has always been the case in the struggle for educational justice for people of color. As the United States continues to change, and as we continue to think through the promises and challenges posed by CSP, we ask that youth, educators, and researchers join us to take this struggle further, with love.

Notes

1. White middle-class norms of language, literacy, and cultural ways of interacting demanded for access and achievement in school have been documented and contrasted with the norms of working-class communities of color (and, less so, working-class White communities) across four decades of scholarship. Regarding White norms of "standard," or Dominant American English, language use, see Alim (2007a), Garcia (1993), Labov (1972), and Smitherman (1977). Regarding White middle-class literacy norms, see Ball (1999), Heath (1983), and Kirkland (2013). Regarding White-centered cultural norms of interacting (including language), see Lee (2005), Leonardo (2009), Romero (1994), and Valdés (1996).
2. Tuck and Yang (2014) importantly refer to this as the "colonial settler gaze."
3. While our argument in this article focuses on the racialized, classed, and cultural/linguistic dimensions of the White gaze as it negatively influences pedagogy, we want to explicitly name the kindred, interrelated patriarchal, cisheteronormative, English-monolingual, xenophobic, Judeo-Christian gazes that also dominate and constrain the possibilities for equitable pedagogies in the United States.
4. Dominant American English is commonly referred to as "standard" English, a term reframed in Paris (2009) to foreground issues of power and privilege.
5. *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) was brought and won on behalf of Chinese-speaking Chinese American students in San Francisco who claimed a lack of equal educational opportunity based on language discrimination. The Supreme Court's decision for the plaintiffs relied on the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which explicitly banned educational discrimination based on race or national origin. *MLK Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor School District* (1979), more commonly known as the "Black English Case," was brought and won by families of eleven African American students in Ann Arbor, Michigan, who had been diagnosed as "linguistically handicapped" by the district's speech pathologist. The families contended that the children had been misdiagnosed and miseducated as a result of their strong use of AAL (Smitherman, 1981).
6. Other important terms and formulations that have looked to forge asset pedagogies with students of color include, but are not limited to, culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2000), culturally congruent pedagogy (Au & Kawakami, 1994), culturally compatible pedagogy (Jacob & Jordan, 1987), engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994), and critical care praxis (Rolón-Dow, 2005). We focus on the term and formulation of culturally relevant pedagogies as it has become the most used, short-handed term and concept in teacher education, teacher practice, and research on teaching and learning.

7. We of course understand that all terms and conceptualizations are susceptible to misappropriation and that CSP is no different, even if it is an important shift in the current moment. As an example, culturally relevant pedagogy—which as a term has done as much work toward justice as any—was recently grossly misappropriated by Tucson School Board member and supporter of HB2281 Mark Stegemen, who was quoted as saying, "It was 'important to find a hook of some kind' to keep students in school, 'and culturally relevant pedagogy can be that hook' as long as the content was 'politically neutral'" (Santos, 2013).

8. In fall 2013, after more than two years, the ban on seven of these books was rescinded by a newly constituted school board. The books are now deemed "supplemental texts." As well, a new iteration of the Mexican American Studies program was reinstated in the fall of 2013 by a federal court desegregation order. The new classes are no longer called "Mexican American Studies", but rather are named "Culturally Relevant Classes," a term, as we mention in note 7, that some proponents of HB2281 have grossly misappropriated. Finally, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal believed the new courses still violated HB2281. After having the courses investigated, he gave preliminary state approval (Huicochea, 2013; Robbins, 2013). Given this contested situation, the content and future of the new courses is by no means certain.

9. See Alim, Lee, and Carris (2010) for a full analysis of this and other battles.

10. We should note that as part of the African American rhetorical tradition of ritual insult (Smitherman, 1977; Alim, 2004; Paris, 2011), the disses in these battles must not be seen by Hip Hop outsiders as simply mean-spirited verbal attacks but, rather, as insiders see them: as verbal game pieces in a contest of linguistic and cultural ingenuity and prowess. Notwithstanding this tradition, however, our point is that some of the belief systems reinforced in these battles (and in many youth practices) must be critically interrogated in generative ways with youth.

11. Shout out to Big Daddy Kane (1988) and his classic track "Ain't no Half-Steppin" for helping us consider the steps we are not taking with asset pedagogies, and the many steps we still need to take.

References

Acosta, C. (2007). Developing critical consciousness: Resistance literature in a Chicano literature class. *English Journal, 97*(2), 36–42.

Acosta, C. (2012, January 23). Banning critical teaching in Arizona: A letter from Curtis Acosta. *Rethinking Schools Blog*. Retrieved from http://rethinkingschoolsblog.wordpress.com/2012/01/23/banning-critical-teaching-in-arizona-a-letter-from-curtis-acosta/

Alim, H. S. (2004). *You know my steez: An ethnographic and sociolinguistic study of a black American speech community*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alim, H. S. (2007a). "The Whig Party don't exist in my hood": Knowledge, reality, and education in the Hip Hop Nation. In H. S. Alim & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Talkin Black talk: Language, education, and social change* (pp. 15–29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Alim, H. S. (2007b). Critical hip-hop language pedagogies: Combat, consciousness, and the cultural politics of communication. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 6*(2), 161–176.

Alim, H. S. (2009). Intro: Straight outta Compton, straight aus München; Global linguistic flows, identities, and the politics of language in a Global Hip Hop Nation. In H. S. Alim, A. Ibrahim, & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Global linguistic flows: Hip Hop cultures, youth identities, the politics of language* (pp. 1–24). New York: Routledge.

Alim, H. S. (2011). Global ill-literacies: Hip Hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of literacy. *Review of Research in Education, 35*(1), 120–146.

Alim, H. S., Lee, J., & Carris, L. M. (2010). "Short fried-rice-eating Chinese MCs" and "Good-hair-havin Uncle Tom niggas": Performing race and ethnicity in freestyle rap battles. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 20*(1), 116–133.

Alim, H. S., Lee, J., & Carris, L. M. (2011). Moving the crowd, 'crowding' the emcee: The production of Black normativity in freestyle rap battles. *Discourse and Society, 22*(4), 422–440.

Alim, H. S., & Reyes, A. (2011). Complicating race: Articulating race across multiple social dimensions. *Discourse and Society, 22*(4), 379–384.

Alim, H. S., & Smitherman, G. (2012). *Articulate while Black: Barack Obama, language, and race in the U.S.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Au, K., & Kawakami, A. (1994). Cultural congruence in instruction. In E. Hollins, J. King, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating knowledge base* (pp. 5–23). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ball, A. (1995). Text design patterns in the writing of urban African American students: Teaching to the cultural strengths of students in multicultural settings. *Urban Education, 30*(3), 253–289.

Carpio, G. (2008). *Laughing fit to kill: Black humor in the fictions of slavery.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Cazden, C., & Leggett, E. (1976). Culturally responsive education: A discussion of LAU remedies II. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Chang, B. (2010). *The Platform: Liberatory teaching, community organizing, and sustainability in the inner-city community of Los Angeles Chinatown.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Chang, J. (2005). *Can't stop, won't stop: The history of the hip hop generation.* New York: Picador.

Chun, E. (2004). Ideologies of legitimate mockery: Margaret Cho's revoicings of mock Asian. *Pragmatics, 14*(2), 263–289.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(3), 280–298.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1965). *The souls of black folk.* New York: Avon Books. (Original work published 1903)

Emdin, C. (2010). *Urban science education for the hip-hop generation.* New York: Sense.

Garcia, E. (1993). Language, culture, and education. *Review of Research in Education, 19* (1), 51–98.

Garcia, E., & Cuellar, D. (2006). Who are these linguistically and culturally diverse students? *Teachers College Record, 108*(11), 220–246.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching theory, research, and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Giroux, H. (1996). *Fugitive cultures: Race, violence, and youth.* New York: Routledge.

Gutiérrez, K. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2), 148–164.

Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P., Alvarez, H., & Chiu, M. (1999). Building a culture of collaboration through hybrid language practices. *Theory into Practice, 38*(2), 87–93.

Gutiérrez, K., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning. *Educational Researcher, 35*(5), 19–25.

H.B. 2281. 49th Leg., 2d Reg. Sess. (Ariz. 2010).

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, M. L. (2009). *Beats, rhymes and classroom life: Hip-hop pedagogy and the politics of identity.* New York: Teachers College Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress.* New York: Routledge.

Huicochea, A. (2013, October 17). *Arizona Daily Star.* State gives its official approval to TUSD's culturally relevant classes. Retrieved from http://azstarnet.com/news/

local/education/state-gives-its-official-approval-to-tusd-s-culturally-relevant/
article_6fbb7d53-c464-583c-be7e-b4f3fbaaad62.html

Irizarry, J. (2007). Ethnic and urban intersections in the classroom: Latino students, hybrid identities, and culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(3), 21–28.

Irizarry, J. (2011). *The Latinization of U.S. schools: Successful teaching and learning in shifting cultural contexts.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Jacob, E., & Jordan, C. (1987). Moving to dialogue. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*(1), 259–261.

Kane, B. D. (1988). *Long live the Kane.* New York: Cold Chillin' Records.

Kinloch, V. (2010). *Harlem on our minds: Place, race, and the literacies of urban youth.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kirkland, D. (2013). *A search past silence: The literacy of young Black men.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Lee, C. D. (1995). A culturally based cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching African American high school students skills in literary interpretation. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(4), 608–630.

Lee, S. (2005). *Up against Whiteness: Race, school, and immigrant youth.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). *To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Low, B. E. (2011). *Slam school: Learning through conflict in the hip-hop and spoken word classroom.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Martínez, D. C. (2012). *Expanding linguistic repertoires: An ethnography of Black and Latina/o youth communication in urban English language arts classrooms.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

McCarty, T. L., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 101–124.

McCarty, T. L., & Zepeda, O. (1995). Indigenous language education and literacy: Introduction to the theme issue. *Bilingual Research Journal, 19*(1), 1–4.

MLK Elementary Sch. Children v. Ann Arbor School Dist., 473 F.Supp. 1371 (E.D. Mich.1979).

Moll, L. (1992). Literacy research in community and classrooms: A sociocultural approach. In R. Beach, J. L. Green, M. L. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives in literacy research* (pp. 211–244). Urbana, IL: National Conference on Research in English and National Council of Teachers of English.

Moll, L., & González, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 26*(4), 23–41.

Morrison, T. (1998, March). From an interview on *Charlie Rose.* Public Broadcasting Service. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F4vIGvKpT1c

Neal, M. A. (2006). *New Black man.* New York: Routledge.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* New York: Longman.

O'Connor, B., & Brown, G. (2014). Just keep on expanding outwards: Embodied space as cultural critique in the life and work of a Navajo Hip Hop artist. In L. Wyman, T.

McCarty, and S. Nicholas (Eds.), *Indigenous youth and multilingualism: Language identity, ideology, and practice in dynamic cultural worlds.* New York: Routledge.

Paris, D. (2009). "They're in my culture, they speak the same way": African American language in multiethnic high schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(3), 428–447.

Paris, D. (2011). *Language across difference: Ethnicity, communication, and youth identities in changing urban schools.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows.* New York: Routledge.

Perry, I. (2004). *Prophets of the hood: Politics and poetics in Hip Hop.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Petchauer, E., & Hill, M. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Schooling hip-hop: Expanding hip-hop based education across the curriculum.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Robbins, T. (2013, July 24). *National Public Radio.* Tucson revives Mexican-American studies program. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/blogs/codeswitch/2013/07/24/205058168/Tucson-Revives-Mexican-American-Studies-Program

Rolón-Dow, C. (2005). Critical care: A color(full) analysis of care narratives in the schooling experiences of Puerto Rican girls. *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(1), 77–111.

Romero, M. E. (1994). Identifying giftedness among Keresan Pueblo Indians: The Keres Study. *Journal of American Indian Education, 34*(1), 1–16.

Rose, T. (1994). *Black noise: Rap music and Black culture in contemporary America.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Santos, A. (2007, February 7). A long struggle for equality in schools. *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/08/education/tucson-school-district-struggles-for-equality.html?_r=0

Smelser, N., Wilson, J., & Mitchell, F. (Eds.). (2001). *American becoming: Racial trends and their consequences.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Smitherman, G. (Ed.). (1981). *Black English and the education of Black children and youth.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry for youth and communities* (pp. 223–247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Wang, H. L. (2013, June 13) Census shows continued change in America's racial makeup. *National Public Radio.* Retrieved from: http://www.npr.org/blogs/codeswitch/2013/06/13/191266414/census-shows-continued-change-in-americas-racial-makeup

Wyman, L., McCarty, T., & Nicholas, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Indigenous youth and multilingualism: Language identity, ideology, and practice in dynamic cultural worlds.* New York: Routledge.