Culturally responsive education as cross-cultural pedagogy for the acquisition of competencies

Ángel Llorente Villasante[1] Martha Lucía Orozco Gómez[2]

[1] Universidad de Burgos, Spain
[2] Universidad de Burgos, Spain

Abstract

The nexus between family and school is always necessary in the personal development of each student and, consequently, in educational work. However, at times, there are structural, procedural, and emotional difficulties that limit this contact. In the relationship with families of students from diverse cultural backgrounds, some of these difficulties are exacerbated by cultural clashes and a lack of guidance on how to overcome them. This leads to a lack of understanding of the positive effects of such collaboration on the development of students and the community. Culturally Responsive education is a pedagogical approach which facilities and fosters this relationship between school and family. This pedagogy has possibilities to be implemented in different contexts, which means developing a set of competencies needed for a better education process. The purpose of this research has been to identify how culturally relevant education can be a valid, genuine, and legitimate option for exercising cross-cultural pedagogy in the contexts where it is implemented. Additionally, it seeks to thoroughly understand the theoretical aspects of carrying out this practical exercise and thus achieve training in communicative, cross-cultural, social, democratic or organizational competencies that this pedagogy involves and generates. In this way, it promotes better training for teachers, both in service and in education. A scientific research methodology has been used through a critical literature review that allows analyzing the most relevant theoretical aspects to achieve a committed practice of this pedagogy. The research offers different proposals to facilitate the implementation and development of culturally relevant education as cross-cultural pedagogy. The importance of considering the theoretical foundations of this pedagogy and the competencies that can be developed through its implementation in classrooms is highlighted. Therefore, this work focuses on providing a comprehensive understanding of how culturally relevant education can improve the relationship between family and school in culturally diverse contexts, emphasizing the importance of theoretical and practical preparation of teachers.

Keywords : culturally relevant education, cross-cultural pedagogy, teacher training, competencies, culturally diverse contexts.

1. Introduction

Globalization and political and economic crises present in many parts of the world have fostered and driven migratory movements, forming a new constellation of cultural diversity in European classrooms (OECD, 2019). According to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, there are approximately 7,000 languages spoken worldwide, and many of these languages are represented within the student populations of classrooms today (UNESCO, 2019). Recent scientific literature reveals an ongoing cultural, linguistic, and racial incongruence between the teaching staff and the identity of students in many classrooms across different countries. This incongruence affects the learning and academic development of students as well as their emotional well-being (Abacioglu et al., 2022; Iversen, 2020; Benediktsson et al., 2019; Lundberg, 2019). This occurs primarily because educational systems have not adapted to the cultural characteristics and influences of culturally diverse students. The majority of these educational systems remain monocultural and ethnocentric. Additionally, many teachers resist change when it comes to innovating or adapting learning processes to ongoing social changes (Córica, 2020).

As a result, this situation translates into a lack of educational equity in classrooms, causing students with diverse cultural backgrounds to lack the same opportunities as their native counterparts. Considering one of the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda, specifically Goal 4, education should be a right for all students, at least at the primary and secondary levels. This education should be of quality and equitable (UNESCO, 2015). However, as observed, this equitable education that ensures greater social justice in classrooms may not be taking place in many locations due to the aforementioned incongruence. Furthermore, this incongruence is not exclusive to teachers but is also observed because many schools are sometimes skeptical about including communities in student education. This separation leads to the learnings promoted by schools being often disconnected from the learnings occurring in contemporary societies.

In response to this situation, Culturally Relevant Education (CRE, from now on) seeks to eliminate this cultural incongruence between teachers, the community, and students through pedagogy that seeks meaningful learning, considering cultural influences and valuing each student's previous experiences. Recognizing that classrooms increasingly include students from diverse backgrounds, it is important and perhaps necessary to consider such pedagogies internationally so that educational environments can use CRE as transcultural pedagogy, adequately addressing the demands of today's society. Studies show that other field experiences with transcultural pedagogies allow for increased cultural competence, improved self-efficacy, and awareness of global issues while valuing local traditions and beliefs (Marx and Moss, 2011; Stachowski and Frey 2003; Stachowski. et al, 2003). Improving in all these aspects is essential for educational practice in any context; thus, CRE serves the acquisition of competencies, as it requires teachers to acquire specific and characteristic knowledge, skills, and dispositions toward this pedagogy (Vavrus, 2008). It is worth noting that these

competencies are not only acquired by teachers but, once acquired, teachers must work on them and ultimately transmit them to their students so that they internalize them.

Considering the aforementioned aspects, the objectives of this research were:

1. Justify culturally relevant education as a genuine and legitimate option for exercising transcultural pedagogy in any context where it is implemented.
2. Understand the theoretical aspects of CRE to carry out this practical exercise and thus achieve training in communicative, cross-cultural, social, democratic, or organizational competencies (curriculum/assessment) that this pedagogy implies and generates.

2. Culturally Responsive Education as a cross-cultural pedagogy to acquire competencies.

2.1 Culturally Responsive Education

The term ''culturally responsive teaching'' has beenaround for decades, but it seems to have received more attention in recent years (Pasternak et al., 2020). This pedagogy emerged in the 1990s in the North American context, stemming from research surrounding the work of multicultural education in the classroom. It aimed to challenge more traditional education that did not pay sufficient attention to the gap between school and students' homes. The ethnic, racial, and social diversity that the U.S. has always had has been reflected in classrooms since the end of the Jim Crow Laws and the rise of the civil rights movement. Since then, a series of legislations, such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, or the more recent Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, among others, seem to manifest governments' commitment to equitable and social justice in schools.

Terms like "culturally appropriate" (Au and Jordan, 1981), refers to a pedagogy taught in Hawaii that incorporated aspects of students' cultural Hawaiian backgrounds; "culturally congruent" (Mohatt and Erickson, 1981, p. 117), in this case, using "mixed forms" that combined Native American and English language; or "culturally responsive" (Cazden and Leggett, 1981), used to foster similar linguistic interactions between teacher and student, led to the term "culturally relevant education" (Ladson-Billings, 1995). According to this author, it consists of three equally important elements: cultural competence, student academic achievement, and socio-political critical awareness (Ladson-Billings, 1995). The second element has evolved toward an approach more focused on the comprehensive education of the student, critically questioning Eurocentric principles and ideas (Harmon 2012), thereby impacting the academic achievement of the student. Ladson-Billings' (1995) research line has been reinterpreted by other authors (Paris and Alim, 2017) and has influenced the complementation of the previously mentioned term "culturally responsive" with pedagogical perspectives (Gay, 2010; Nieto, 2004; Villegas and Lucas, 2002). While there are differences in conceptualization, all works advocate for a structural change from traditional educational models to a new training paradigm based on critical problem-solving (Irvine and Armento, 2001) and a meaningful relationship between teacher, student, family, and cultural resources, affirming cultural diversity and thereby reducing the school performance gap between

students of the majority culture and their low-income, minority peers (Nieto, 2004; Nieto and Bode, 2018; Vavrus, 2008).

Within the broad field of research related to this pedagogy, two more recognized trends have been observed in the works of Gloria Ladson-Billings and Geneva Gay. The first is more oriented toward analyzing the student, the social spheres of power and authority surrounding them, and the teacher's attitude when educating as transformative axes. The second seeks a teacher's practice that takes into account a dialogical relationship between classroom pedagogies and the identities of the teacher and student to achieve this change. While these authors recognize variables, they also indicate that the choice of referring to the term with one expression or another is a matter of choice, in line with other works such as Dover (2013) or Aronson and Laughter (2016), which incorporate them into the same framework.

More recently, other authors have made significant contributions to the field of study, with discussions that have led to the evolution of the term, reaching a culturally sustainable/revitalizing pedagogy (Paris and Alim, 2017; McCarty and Brayboy, 2021). This occurs when the school sustains the linguistic and cultural identities of young people and communities that have been continuously damaged and erased from school. Authors like Hollie (2011) argue that issues such as language, gender, or students' social class need to be introduced into CRE, in addition to issues related to cultural or ethnic identity. From the more psychological aspects of students, for example, CRE shows how students' cognitive processes improve when their cultural aspects are considered (Hammond, 2015). Moreover, it is essential to emphasize that CRE should be understood as a mental model that not only benefits students but must be acquired by teachers, more than being a list of actions to bring to the classroom (Stembridge, 2020). The latter author emphasizes the importance of interpreting this pedagogy with scientific and pedagogical rigor, grounded in equity, and formulates five key questions for its implementation in the classroom.

2.2. Acquire competencies through Culturally Responisve Education as a cross-cultural pedagogy

Conscious that every teacher brings a certain cultural capital (Bourdieu, 2011) to their classroom, significantly influencing their educational practices and how these are executed, we can note that teachers often act under the influence of their personal characteristics and ideas. These factors determine their future competencies and the justifications for acquiring them. To implement Culturally Relevant Education (CRE) in the classroom, there is evidence showing that teachers must acquire specific competencies and possess certain characteristics (Rychly and Graves, 2012; Vavrus, 2008; Villegas and Lucas, 2002) in educational environments. Among these competencies and characteristics, we must differentiate between two fronts through which teachers engage in CRE: professional competence and practice, and attitudes and dispositions of each teacher (Aronson and Laughter, 2016). Authors like Villegas and Lucas (2002) establish a series of characteristics, also known as competencies, that teachers must fulfill to practice CRE in classrooms. These include developing a socio-cultural awareness of their own identity and socio-cultural influences, commitment and sufficient skills to act as agents of change, adopting a constructivist vision of learning, and cultivating a positive attitude toward students of diverse cultural backgrounds. As Gorski (2010) points out, it is necessary to be aware of one's own biases about cultural differences to acquire competencies in CRE.

The second mentioned front of attitudes and dispositions toward CRE is more critical than the competencies that may be developed afterward. This is because reflective teaching about educational practices, considering CRE as a fundamental pedagogy, should precede any teaching practice. In this way, teachers with positive and favorable attitudes toward CRE can perceive it as a transcultural pedagogy that can be implemented not only in their familiar context but also in other less familiar places. Even before the appearance of the term, concerns were reflected on two related fronts: the teaching dimension (Gay, 1978) and the diversity of ethnic identity in the classroom (Gay, 1994). From this connection, the term has gone through several stages, initially focusing more on the curriculum structure and possibilities for action through its adjustment (Gay, 1975). Later, it shifted toward a clear intention of action in potential agents of educational change, the teaching staff, recognizing a series of competencies in them based on their responsibility, commitment, and training. Six clear principles of action were established: teachers should socially and academically empower all their students, be multidimensional, validate all students' cultures, be socially, emotionally, and politically understanding, transform schools and societies, and ultimately be emancipatory and liberating from oppressive educational practices and ideologies (Gay, 2010). Later, humanistic and ethical principles were added (Gay, 2018). CRE provides a valuable opportunity to rethink teacher training from social parameters that link students' meaningful learning to their experiences, identities, and experiences to achieve critical and liberating action that values all classroom cultures equally. Siwatu (2007) states that students must be provided with the knowledge and skills needed to function in the mainstream culture while maintaining their cultural identity, native language, and cultural traditions. This teacher

training, considering identities and dialogism in learning, materializes in CRE and can be carried out in a transcultural manner in classrooms by resorting to third educational spaces that facilitate cultural exchange and allow understanding students' identity influences (Llorente Villasante et al., in press).

All these mentioned teacher characteristics and skills would be desired in the majority of teachers. However, the reality differs in this regard, and often, even if a teacher is committed to their work and has high expectations of working in a culturally adapted way with their students, it is challenging because many teachers have little knowledge of the cultures in their classrooms (Samuels, 2018). This situation may be primarily caused by a lack of contact with certain cultures present in society but with which teachers are not familiar. Therefore, using CRE as a transcultural pedagogy will allow teachers to learn about different cultural aspects of the contexts in which it is implemented. This way, some shared problems between countries when practicing this pedagogy, such as language fluency among students in the classroom, culturally diverse assessment, or support conditions to respond to culturally diverse students, can be addressed (Herzog-Punzenberger et al., 2020). Similarly, implementing CRE as a transcultural pedagogy could contribute to and expand international research aimed at understanding the culturally responsive organizational practices, behaviors, and competencies of educational leaders (Brown et al., 2022).

3. Method

This qualitative study aims to justify culturally relevant education as a transcultural pedagogy that contributes to competency acquisition through scientific research conducted via a critical literature review (Grant and Booth, 2009). The search was non-exhaustive, focusing on the analysis of the most significant and representative elements in the field of study. This approach allowed us to collect information more precisely, facilitating data synthesis.
Theoretical aspects were analyzed to inform a committed practice of this pedagogy, fostering communicative, cross-cultural, social, democratic, and organizational competencies. It is important to note that this work is part of a broader ongoing research project. Therefore, some results achieved so far are presented, along with potential future outcomes considered as possible lines of further investigation.

Given the potential for bias in critical literature reviews, it's crucial to reflect on the search processes (Guirao Goris, 2015). A search was conducted on works related to culturally relevant education in two different databases: Scopus and WoS. The descriptors used were "cultural relevant education * cross-cultural pedagogy" and "cultural relevant education * competencies." Documents published in English from 1995 to 2023 were collected. Google Scholar was use to explore relevant contributions from secondary sources linked to experts in the field, supporting our current proposal. Following this process, an analysis of the sources was conducted to contribute to the general debate, presenting culturally relevant education as a transcultural pedagogy for competency acquisition.

4. Results

4.1 Competencies acquired through Culturally Responsive Education

Currently, several studies have demonstrated how the implementation of Culturally Relevant Education (CRE) in the classroom contributes to the development and acquisition of competencies by teachers (Villegas and Lucas, 2002; Gay, 2018; Karatas, 2020). This, in turn, directly impacts the development of these competencies among the students of those teachers. The competencies developed and acquired are diverse, including those related to STEM competencies (Ogodo, 2022), self-efficacy (Siwatu, 2007; 2015), and others associated with reducing burnout in the educational context (Siskind et al., 2022). However, it is important to note that there are differences in the competencies related to CRE within teacher training programs (Gulya and Fehérvári, 2023), making it challenging to determine all the competencies developed through this pedagogy or select some of the most representative ones. Nevertheless, it seems clear that these competencies should be directed toward the personal and professional development of teachers (Gay, 2018; Stembridge, 2020; Karatas, 2020). Therefore, we will try to focus the analysis on competencies that are related in some way to these personal and professional areas.

These competencies can be grouped into those that are communicative, cross-cultural, social, democratic, and organizational, with the latter specifically related to curriculum adaptation in the teaching-learning process and student assessment. However, it is important to note that these competencies are developed and acquired from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives. This is why there are measurement instruments for CRE that consider both approaches. Additionally, we find it necessary to consider some institutional documents that outline the competencies that should be developed or acquired to implement CRE in the classrooms. Therefore, in the following table, both the quantitative (green) and qualitative (blue) approaches for the assessment of competencies are presented, along with two institutional reports (gray) that we consider relevant and important in indicating the skills that every teacher should have to implement this pedagogy in the classroom.

Table N°01: Competencies developed through CRE

	Communicative	Cross-cultural	Social	Democratic	Organizational (Curriculum and Assessment)
The Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-efficacy Scale (2007)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
The Culturally Responsive Classroom Management Self-Efficacy Scale (2017)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
The Dispositions for Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Scale (2018)		✓	✓	✓	
The Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol (2016)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
The Culturally Responsive Teaching Survey (2017)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
The Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Education Framework (2018)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Culturally Responisve Teaching : A Reflection Guide (2020)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Source: own elaboration based on the documents presented

As observed, some of the most used and representative instruments in the scientific literature for the development of CRE by teachers, along with other official documents outlining the key competencies for teachers to implement CRE in classrooms, demonstrate how this pedagogy leads to the development and subsequent acquisition of communicative, intercultural, social, democratic, and organizational competencies. Looking at some of these quantitative instruments, which, as mentioned, are among the most significant in CRE work, we can note that these competencies are fulfilled in almost all cases. In instances where this is not the case, such as in the Dispositions for Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Scale by Whitacker and Valtierra (2018), the authors acknowledge considering a dimension that takes into account curriculum adaptation from the CRE perspective. However, this dimension was not confirmed in their statistical analyses. Regarding communicative competencies, it may be inferred in the dimension of educational praxis but is not clearly observed. In relation to the collected qualitative instruments, some of the most relevant within studies analyzing CRE, Rhodes (2017) in her proposal of The Culturally Responsive Teaching Survey does not include curriculum adaptation among its items. However, it is mentioned with the aim of complementing it, exclusively with classes related to international events. As for the selected institutional documents, considered among the most comprehensive and up-to-date, it can be affirmed that both documents encompass and include all the competencies mentioned in this section as developed by CRE.

This analysis, although it clearly and evidently demonstrates how, when evaluating ECR, both quantitatively and qualitatively, some of the selected competencies are analyzed and assessed, it is limited in some respects. Firstly, we must be aware that there are other measurement instruments that could also be considered, both in the quantitative domain (Chuang et al., 2020; Hsiao, 2015), including the evaluation of teachers by students (Dickson et al., 2016), as well as in the qualitative domain (Boon y Lewthwaite, 2015; Kea y Trent, 2013). However, as mentioned earlier, some of the most representative, relevant, and current ones addressing the assessment of the capabilities and competencies necessary for this pedagogy are included. Furthermore, it should be noted that competencies related to ECR have been attempted to be measured in most cases with quantitative techniques when, in reality, the pillars on which it is based this pedagogy are characterized by their qualitative and humanistic features when it comes to education. Apart from considering the communicative, cross-cultural, social, democratic, and organizational competencies due to the importance they have in the personal and professional realm, we also consider that most of these competencies are related to this qualitative and humanistic approach to teaching.

4.2 Culturally Responive Education as a cross-cultural pedagogy. Why? What for? And How?

Among the extensive research on this pedagogy, as evident from its place of origin, there is a large number of works focused on its implementation in the American context (Cruz et al., 2020; Griner and Stewart, 2013; Morrison, Robbins, and Rose, 2008), but also in other places such as China (Chou et al., 2018), Spain or Finland (Meléndez-Luces and Couto-Cantero, 2021; Acquah et al., 2019), Ghana (Anlimachie et al., 2023), or Australia and New Zealand (Harrison & Skrebneva, 2020; Cristopher and Rata, 2018). If we observe the abundance of works conducted internationally, it seems clear that CRE has gradually become a transcultural pedagogy that has been implemented in different contexts. However, one must be aware of the differences that exist between one context and another when implementing CRE and adapting educational environments to each location. For example, the curriculum of each context must be considered to see how it is possible to carry out this pedagogy by modifying, if necessary, some teaching styles that are characteristic of the educational environments of each place. Considering that CRE has faced some difficulties in implementation for various reasons, it is essential to address these challenges.

Years ago, Sleeter (2012) pointed out that there have always been obstacles to implementing such pedagogies in formal education due to the standardized nature of the curriculum and teaching styles. However, the same author also noted that it is necessary to combat this situation to demonstrate the connection between CRE and student outcomes, to educate parents, teachers, and educational leaders about CRE, and to reconsider the public debate on education in diverse and historically marginalized communities. Therefore, it is essential for CRE not only to overcome these obstacles, including issues related to assessment, which is gradually happening today (Ragoonaden and Muller, 2017; NYSED, n.d.), but also, from a global perspective, to address these obstacles more effectively and facilitate the identification of areas for improvement regarding CRE in different contexts, working collaboratively.

In today's globalized world, it is necessary to educate students with the skills to navigate this interconnected world for three clear reasons: the global economy and changing demands of work, global migration with consequent diversity as the norm, and climate instability and environmental management (Boix-Mansilla and Jackson, 2011). Therefore, the education of all students should be aimed at achieving learning that includes problem-solving and reasoning skills; the development of cultural competence that helps students appreciate their own culture while developing fluency in at least one other culture; and the promotion of critical awareness to identify, analyze, and solve real-life problems, especially those resulting from social inequalities (Paris and Alim, 2017; Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995). CRE as a transcultural pedagogy would facilitate the acquisition of these skills that should address the mentioned educational needs, allowing students to thrive in a globalized world. However, it is necessary for teachers to be competent in these global understandings to create citizens who choose to live in a humane, ethical, egalitarian, or socially just world, rather than in a chaotic, uncertain, insecure, or inhumane one (Ukpokodu, 2020). The Critical Cosmopolitan Theory (Byker, 2013) can guide the preparation of globally competent and culturally responsive teachers who prepare new generations for these global relationships, leveraging what the

teacher knows and what students can offer about cultural diversity in their local contexts and applying this knowledge to understand global contexts (Byker and Marquardt, 2016). This can be done in the classroom through situated practice (Kherkoff and Cloud, 2020), valuing the voices in the classroom to create relevant learning for all students that also prepares and reveals socio-political issues of the local community and recognizes that these issues are related to global connections.

As we have observed, CRE has extensive benefits within educational communities as it improves student learning in various areas and helps acquire new competencies necessary for societal development. In addition to the presented overview of how this pedagogy is developing worldwide and its direct implications for shaping global students, it may suggest that CRE should be implemented as a transcultural pedagogy in various contexts. However, as Gay (2015, p.136) pointed out, it is important to inquire "to what extent culturally responsive teaching can be a viable and vibrant transnational effort without compromising the integrity of its mandates for localized contextual specificity." This is where the complexity lies, as one must avoid possible misinterpretations of CRE that occur in some educational environments, turning this pedagogy into a tool for assimilation (Evans et al., 2020). Additionally, one should refrain from the tendency to commodify cultures detached from their context.

Another added problem arises when each country names its ethnically or culturally diverse population differently and also changes the type of representation that population has in the value system, political sphere, or educational practices of each country (Morning, 2008). Being aware of these complexities, it would be too idealistic to think that from this review, we could propose how to develop a transcultural CRE. Therefore, let's present some of the experiences that have been carried out in this direction and that improve not only the learning of the students but also the training of teachers. It is true that to successfully implement CRE with students, teachers must "develop complex and comprehensive sets of knowledge and skills, both academic and social, political, moral, personal, intracultural and intercultural, national and international" (Gay, 2015, p.132).

In the study by Jester and Fickel (2013), 53 student teachers on practicum were introduced to schools in Alaska to learn how to work in a culturally responsive manner. Their findings show that teachers, in addition to working from a sociocultural awareness about themselves and the context in which they find themselves, should involve indigenous elders from the community to transmit native language and traditions in schools. Teachers should pay attention to these explanations just as students do. The study also demonstrates the importance of considering the local context in a transcultural experience through the Cultural Standards for Educators (CSE) (Alaska Native Knowledge Network, 1998), developed by native Alaska educators to promote the well-being of all students while working on CRE. Years later (Jester, 2017), it has been observed that it is still crucial to train future educators in culturally sustaining/revitalizing strategies (Paris and Alim, 2017; McCarty and Brayboy, 2021) and the value of using transcultural places and classrooms for this purpose.

The work of Dajani and Meier (2019) has immense value as it provides evidence from two diverse contexts, the American and the Palestinian, regarding the application of CRE through the role of narrative. In their study, the authors analyze the benefits of children's literature applied to culture or co-constructed stories between family and students, among other aspects.

They conclude that these initiatives can contribute to creating a community literacy classroom or culturally responsive ways of thinking that value students' life stories. Additionally, similar pedagogical benefits are observed in both contexts. However, while it is the predominant trend, not all studies have focused on university students and their training; there are also experiences in schools focusing on students and in-service teachers. For instance, the work of Anlimachie et al. (2023) investigates CRE strategies to improve educational outcomes in a rural elementary school in Ghana. Among the results, the importance of teachers' sociocultural awareness of students' cultural and rural backgrounds is observed to develop CRE that leverages, shares, sustains, and celebrates students' cultural capital at home and in school for greater learning outcomes.

5. Conclusion

This work contributes to teacher education from a broad perspective that considers both personal and professional skills when teaching. This education can be provided through communicative, intercultural, social, democratic, or organizational competencies that can be developed through CRE. However, it is essential to recognize that these competencies can be developed using both quantitative and qualitative approaches, as there are instruments for this purpose. Some of the instruments mentioned in this review are representative, relevant, and current within the research being conducted on these topics. However, it is important to note that the selection of instruments is entirely subjective but guided by the considered competencies that align with the foundations of previous works linking these teaching competencies in personal and professional domains.

Furthermore, having highlighted the importance of considering CRE as a transcultural pedagogy and having addressed the questions of why, for what purpose, and how this can be done, it is important to emphasize the significance of examining similar spaces or contexts where the implementation of this pedagogy can be analyzed. For example, analyzing the attitudes, dispositions, or beliefs of teachers regarding CRE to observe possibilities for implementation in different contexts, considering the attitudes, knowledge, and beliefs of teachers in each. However, despite extensive studies in this direction, as observed, research in the Spanish language in this regard is not as developed. Therefore, to contribute to this body of research, it would be advisable to translate and adapt to Spanish some of the mentioned quantitative or qualitative instruments that allow the observation of how CRE can be understood as a transcultural pedagogy in Spanish-speaking classrooms.

Bibliography

Abacioglu, C. S., Fischer, A. H., y Volman, M. (2022). Professional development in multicultural education: What can we learn from the Australian context?. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *114*, 103701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103701

Acquah, E.O., Szelei, N., & Katz, H.T. (2019). Using modelling to make culturally responsive pedagogy explicit in preservice teacher education in Finland. *British Educational Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3571

Adrian Lundberg (2019) Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism:findings from Q method research, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *20*(3), 266-283. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1495373

Alaska Native Knowledge Network. (1998). Alaska standards for culturally responsive schools: Cultural standards for students, educators, schools, curriculum, community. Fairbanks, AK: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/

Alison G. Dover (2013) Teaching for Social Justice: From Conceptual Frameworks to Classroom Practices, Multicultural Perspectives, 15:1, 3-11. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2013.754285

Anlimachie, M. A., Abreh, M. K., Acheampong, D. A., Badu, S., Alluake, S., & Deborah Newman, D. (2023). Enacting culturally responsive pedagogy for rural schooling in Ghana: A school-community-based inquiry. Pedagogy, Culture & Society. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2023.2205861

Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(1), 163–206. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582066

Au, K., & Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography (pp. 139-152). Rowley.

Benediktsson, A. I. (2023). Culturally responsive assessment in compulsory schooling in Denmark and Iceland-An illusion or a reality? A comparative study of student teachers' experiences and perspectives. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.5392

Boix-Mansilla, V., & Jackson, A. (2011). Educating for global competence: Preparing our youth to engage the world. Asia Society. https://asiasociety.org/files/book-globalcompetence.pdf

Boon, H. J., & Lewthwaite, B. (2015). Development of an instrument to measure a facet of quality teaching: Culturally responsive pedagogy. *International Journal of Educational Research, 72*, 38–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.05.002

Bourdieu, P. (2011). The forms of capital (1986). In I. Szeman & T. Kaposy (Eds.), *Cultural theory: An anthology* (pp. 81–93). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, M., Altrichter, H., Shiyan, I., Rodríguez Conde, M. J., McNamara, G., Herzog-Punzenberger, B., Vorobyeva, I., Vangrando, V., Gardezi, S., O'Hara, J., Postlbauer, A., Milyaeva, D., Sergeevna, N., Fulterer, S., García, A. G., & Sánchez, L. (2022). Challenges and opportunities for culturally responsive leadership in schools: Evidence from Four European countries. *Policy Futures in Education*, *20*(5), 580-607. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103211040909

Byker, E.J. (2013). Critical cosmopolitanism: Engaging students in global citizenship competencies. *English in Texas Journal, 43*(2), 18–22.

Byker, E. J., & Marquardt, S. K. (2016). Using critical cosmopolitanism to globally situate: Multicultural education in teacher preparation courses. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 7*(2), 30-50. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ EJ1121646.pdf

Cazden, C., & Leggett, E. (1981). Culturally responsive education: Recommendations for achieving Lau remedies II. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography (pp. 69-86). Rowley.

Córica, J. L. (2020). Resistencia docente al cambio: Caracterización y estrategias para un problema no resuelto. *RIED-Revista Iberoamericana De Educación a Distancia*, *23*(2), 255–272. https://doi.org/10.5944/ried.23.2.26578

Cristopher Lynch & Elizabeth Rata (2018) Culturally responsive pedagogy: A New Zealand case study, International Studies in Sociology of Education, 27:4, 391-408, DOI: 10.1080/09620214.2018.1468274

Cruz, R. A., Manchanda, S., Firestone, A. R., & Rodl, J. E. (2020). An Examination of Teachers' Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *43*(3), 197–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406419875194

Chou, P.I., Su, M.H. & Wang, Y.T. (2018). Transforming teacher preparation for culturally responsive teaching in Taiwan. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 75*(1), 116-127. Elsevier Ltd https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.06.013

Chuang, H.-H., Shih, C.-L., & Cheng, M.-M. (2020). Teachers' perceptions of culturally responsive teaching in technology-supported learning environments. British Journal of Educational Technology, 51(6), 2442–2460. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12921

Dickson, G. L., Chun, H., & Fernandez, I. T. (2016). The Development and Initial Validation of the Student Measure of Culturally Responsive Teaching. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, *41*(3), 141-154. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508415604879

Evans, L., Turner, C. R., & Allen, K. R. (2020). "Good teachers" with "Good intentions": Misappropriations of culturally responsive pedagogy. Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching and Research, 15(1), 1–24. doi:10.51830/jultr.3

Gay, G. (1975). Organizing and designing culturally pluralistic curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 33*, 176–183.

Gay, G (1978). Multicultural Preparation and Teacher Effectiveness in Desegregated Schools. *Theory into Practice, 17(2), 149-156.* doi:10.2307/1475340

Gay, G (1994). *At the Essence of Learning: Multicultural Education*. Kappa Delta Pi.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers college press.

Gay, G (2015) The what, why, and how of culturally responsive teaching: international mandates, challenges, and opportunities, Multicultural Education Review, 7:3, 123-139. https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2015.1072079

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers college press.

Gorski, P. C. (2010). The scholarship informing the practice: Multicultural teacher education philosophy and practice in the US. International Journal of Multicultural Education, 12(2), 1–22. https://ijme-journal.org/index.php/ijme/article/view/352/513

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health information & libraries journal*, *26*(2), 91-108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x

Griner, A. C., & Stewart, M. L. (2013). Addressing the Achievement Gap and Disproportionality Through the Use of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices. *Urban Education*, *48*(4), 585–621. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912456847

Guirao Goris, S. J. A. (2015). Utilidad y tipos de revisión de literatura. *Ene*, *9*(2), 0-0. https://dx.doi.org/10.4321/S1988-348X2015000200002

Gulya. N. & Fehérvári. A. (2023) Fostering culturally responsive pedagogy related competencies among pre-service teachers: a systematic review of the recent research literature. *Research Papers in Education*.1-31. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2023.2228312

Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Corwin Press.

Harmon, D. A. (2012). Culturally responsive teaching though a historical lens: Will history repeat itself? Interdisciplinary. *Journal of Teaching and Learning, 2*(1), 12–22.

Harrison, N., & Skrebneva, I. (2020). Country as pedagogical: enacting an Australian foundation for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *52*(1), 15-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2019.1641843

Herzog-Punzenberger, B., Altrichter, H., Brown, M. *et al.* Teachers responding to cultural diversity: case studies on assessment practices, challenges and experiences in secondary schools in Austria, Ireland, Norway and Turkey. *Educ Asse Eval Acc* **32**, 395–424 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-020-09330-y

Hollie, S. (2011). *Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning: Classroom practices for student success.* Shell Educational Publishing

Hsiao, Y.-J. (2015). The Culturally Responsive Teacher Preparedness Scale: An exploratory study. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 8*(4), 241–250. https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v8i4.9432

Iversen, J. Y. (2020). Pre-service teachers' translanguaging during field placement in multilingual, mainstream classrooms in Norway. *Language and Education*, *34*(1), 51-65. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1735400

Kea, C. D., & Trent, S. C. (2013). Providing culturally responsive teaching in field-based and teaching experiences: A case study. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning, 3*(2), 82–101.

Kerkhoff, S. N., & Cloud, M. E. (2020). Equipping teachers with globally competent practices : A mixed methods study on integrating global competence and teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 103*, 101629. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101629

Ladson-Billings, G (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32 (3) 465-491. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Llorente Villasante, Á., Orozco Gómez, M. L., y Sanz Leal, M. (2024). Culturally Responsive Education: Educational Analysis of the Third Space. *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria, 36*(1), XXX-XXX. https://doi.org/10.14201/teri.31408

Majida 'Mohammed Yousef' Dajani & Daniel R. Meier (2019) The role of narrative in culturally responsive literacy education – a collaborative project in U.S. and Palestinian preschools, International Journal of Early Years Education, 27:1, 68-81. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2018.1458599

Marx, H., & Moss, D. M. (2011). Please Mind the Culture Gap: Intercultural Development During a Teacher Education Study Abroad Program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(1), 35-47. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110381998

McCarty, T. L., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2021). Culturally respon-sive, sustaining, and revitalizing pedagogies: Perspectives fromNative American education.The Educational Forum,85(4),429–443. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2021.1957642

Meléndez-Luces, J. & Couto-Cantero, P. (2021). Engaging Ethnic-Diverse Students: A Research Based on Culturally Responsive Teaching for Roma-Gypsy Students. *Educ. Sci. 11*, 739. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11110739

Mohatt, G., & Erickson, F. (1981). Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa school: A sociolinguistic approach. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography (pp. 105-119). Rowley.

Morning, A. (2008). Ethnic classification in a global perspective : A cross-national Survey of the 2009 census round. *Population Research and Policy Review, 27*, 239–272. DOI 10.1007/s11113-007-9062-5

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*(4), 433–452. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680802400006

Muñiz, J. (2020). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: A Reflection Guide*; New America. https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/policy-papers/culturally-responsive-teachingcompetencies/

New York State Education Department (NYSED). (n.d.). Culturally responsive-sustaining education framework. The University of the State of New York. http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/programs/crs/culturally-responsivesustaining-education-framework.pdf

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. Pearson Allyn & Bacon

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2018). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* Pearson.

OECD. (2019). *TALIS 2018 results (Vol. I): teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. Paris : OECD.

Ogodo, J.A. (2023) Developing STEM Teachers' Cultural Competence through an Urban Teaching Curriculum : A Cultural Border Crossing Experience, *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 34*(3), 267-286. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2022.2046248

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world. Teachers College Press.

Pasternak, D. L., Evans, L. M., Allen, K. R, Turner, C. R., Knapp, J., Harris, A., Wu, X., Bartlett, M., Worm, J., Taylor, K., & Nix, T. (2020). The sociohistorical evolution of the language of culturally-based pedagogy and its impact on teacher education. Urban Education, 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085920959123

Powell, R., Cantrell, S. C., Malo-Juvera, V., & Correll, P. (2016). Operationalizing Culturally Responsive Instruction: Preliminary Findings of CRIOP Research. *Teachers College Record*, *118*(1), 1-46. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811611800107

Ragoonaden, K., & Mueller, L. (2017). Culturally responsive pedagogy: Indigenizing curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education 47*(2), 22–46. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v47i2.187963

Rhodes, C. M. (2017). A validation study of the culturally responsive teaching survey. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5(1), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2017.050106

Rychly, L., & Graves, E. (2012). Teacher characteristics for culturally responsive pedagogy. Multicultural Perspectives, 14(1), 44–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2012.646853

Siskind, D. G., LaParo, K. M., Crosby, D. A., Hestenes, L., & Mendez Smith, J. (2022). Who's teaching the teachers? An exploration of early childhood teacher preparation program faculty's cultural competence, work burnout, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, *44*(3). 425-444. https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2022.2086509

Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(7), 1086-1101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.07.011

Siwatu, K. O., Putman, S. M., Starker-Glass, T. V., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). The Culturally Responsive Classroom Management Self-Efficacy Scale: Development and Initial Validation. *Urban Education*, *52*(7), 862-888. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915602534

Sleeter, C. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education, 47*, 562–584. doi:10.1177/0042085911431472

Stachowski, L. L., y Frey, C. J. (2003). Lessons learned in Navajoland: Student teachers reflect on professional and cultural learning in reservation schools and communities. Action in Teacher Education, 25(3), 38–47.

Stachowski, L. L., Richardson, J. W., & Henderson, M. (2003). Student teachers report on the influence of cultural values on classroom practice and community involvement: Perspectives from the Navajo Reservation and from abroad. The Teacher Educator, 39(1), 52–63.

Stembridge, A. (2020). Culturally responsive education in the classroom: An equity framework for pedagogy. Routledge.

Timothy E. Jester & Letitia H. Fickel (2013) Cross-Cultural Field Experiences in Alaska Native Villages: Implications for Culturally Responsive Teacher Education, The Teacher Educator, 48:3, 185-200. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2013.793762

Timothy E. Jester, "Preparing Culturally Sustaining/ Revitalizing Educators: Lessons from Field Experiences in Alaska Native Village Schools" In Culturally Sustaining and Revitalizing Pedagogies. Published online: 07 Jun 2017; 127-146. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-368720150000029012

UNESCO. (2015). *Declaración de Incheon para la Educación 2030*. https://bit.ly/2IJkeyi

UNESCO. (2019). Why language matters for the SDGs. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000372765

Ukpokodu, O. N. (2020). Marginalization of social studies teacher preparation for global competence and global perspectives pedagogy: A call for change. *Journal of International Social Studies, 10*(1), 3-34.

Vavrus, M. (2008). Culturally responsive teaching. In T. L. Good (Ed.), 21st century education: A reference handbook (pp. 49–57). SAGE Publishing

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. Journal of Teacher Education, 53, 20-32. doi:10.1177/0022487102053001003

Whitaker, M. C., & Valtierra, K. M. (2018). The Dispositions for Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Scale. *Journal for Multicultural Education, 12*(1), 10 -24. https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-11-2016-0060