

Perceptions of Students towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Shireesh Pal Singh*

Abstract

Culturally responsive teaching demands diligent efforts and dedication for the high-level success of diverse students. A culturally responsive teacher recreates teaching-learning situations so that students work collaboratively with their peers and teachers to improve their achievement. Those practicing culturally responsive pedagogy must have high and positive expectations for their students to help them achieve academic success and reach their maximum potential. This research aimed to determine students' perception of culturally responsive pedagogy, as their responses will help to develop a framework for the same. Investigator selected 200 school students as a sample of research. A self-made three-point Likert scale was used to collect data, parametric and non-parametric statistics were used to analyze the data. The research results reveal that most students positively perceive culturally responsive pedagogy and have shown no differences when we compared them based on gender, category, and locale.

Key Words: Perception, Students, Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

1.1.0. Background

Culturally responsive pedagogy can be comprehensively defined with the work of Gay (2010), Nieto et al. (2008), and Ladson-Billings (1995a). According to Ladson-Billings (1995b), culturally responsive pedagogy is devoted to individual and collective acknowledgment. A culturally responsive teacher recreates a teaching-learning situation so that the students work collaboratively with their peers and teachers to improve their achievement. Culturally responsive teaching demands diligent efforts and dedication for the high-level success of diverse students.

Culturally responsive teaching holds an action-oriented caring stance that uses

imaginative strategies and demonstrates high expectations to ensure academic success for ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students. Culturally responsive caring is a social responsibility, a moral commitment, and a pedagogical obligation. It requires that teachers use their knowledge, understanding, and strategic thinking to decide how to act in the best interest of their students. It realizes the connections students have with society, their communities, and each other.

Culturally responsive pedagogy is a learner-centered approach to teaching that includes cultural references and perceives the significance of learners' cultural backgrounds and experiences in all facets of learning and shows how learning takes place

* Professor, School of Education, Mahatma Gandhi Antarrashtriya Hindi Vishwavidyalaya (A Central University), Wardha – 442001; E-mail -shireeshsingh1982@gmail.com

in a different cultural backdrop (Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Gay, 2010). Gay has proposed the viable definition for culturally responsive teaching as 'using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant and effective for them' (Gay, 2010, p. 31).

According to Ladson-Billings (1995b), Culturally Relevant Teaching refers to integrating students' background knowledge and prior sociocultural experiences into the curriculum and classroom teaching. Culturally Responsible Pedagogy is a pedagogy that reorganises the students' knowledge backgrounds, language, family structure, and social or cultural differences in order to acknowledge the psychological facts that all learners learn differently (Gay, 2002; Villages and Lucas, 2002). It is a student-centered approach to teaching, which recognises the importance of the student's cultural background and is meant to promote engagement, enrichment, and achievement of all the students by grabbing a wealth of diversity, acknowledging and nurturing the students' cultural strengths, and authenticating the students' lived experiences and their place in the world (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The philosophy behind culturally responsive pedagogy is beyond identifying the cultural uniqueness of each student. It focuses on intentionally nurturing it to create and facilitate adequate learning conditions. A culturally relevant teaching approach is more suited to urban schools, where the teachers find it challenging and ill-prepared to address the student's linguistic, cultural, and racial differences. The underlining assumption of culturally responsive pedagogy is that cultural diversity is a boon that enriches the learning of all students, not a shortfall to overcome. According to Saenger (2002), the term 'culturally relevant pedagogy' is inter-changeably with several terms such as culturally appropriate, responsible, congruent, compatible, and multicultural

to explain a variety of productive teaching approaches in culturally diverse classrooms. Responsive means behaving appropriately in the teaching-learning context. Teachers should be responsive to their students by assimilating elements of their culture into their teaching. A culturally responsive teacher makes explicit the cultural issue, as central, to their teaching, learning, and schooling. This teaching stance is often not apparent in the rural educational context but in city schools where the teacher counters a variety of cultures in their teaching practices. Inquiring and interrogating on the issue of power, social justice, equality, and equity are typical in culturally responsive classrooms. A color-blind approach to teaching does not make any sense as it ignores critical aspects of the student's identities and sense of self (Staires, 2007). The practice of freedom, equality, and social justice is the key to culturally responsive teaching, which is centered on social change and justice and emboldens learners to engage in initiatives for social engagement. Gay (2010) conferred a list of 18 viable pillars of culturally responsive teaching, which included knowledge, attitudes, and skills during pre-service education programs to improve the school accomplishment of learners from diverse cultures. Culturally relevant teaching centres the students' culture in the teaching-learning process through three approaches: high expectations, promoting cultural competence, and promoting critical consciousness (Dickson, Chun, & Fernandez, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Morrison al., 2008). For expectations, culturally relevant teachers overture a challenging curriculum and scaffold the student's learning. The teachers create a classroom environment that is respectful and inclusive and help learners to understand the cultures of their peers based on the learners' strengths. Culturally relevant teachers also create a cooperative and experiential learning environment where learners work in groups through activities. Teachers first understand the learners' culture by visiting their communities and home lives to promote cultural competence.

Moreover, teachers stimulate the learners' perceptions of their own and their peer's cultures by providing content from varied backgrounds. Culturally relevant teachers also adopt the learners' experiences, skills, and knowledge gained from their surroundings as considered in the classroom. Freire (2001), in his book *Pedagogy of Freedom*, urges all educators seeking an alternative to repressive education to renew their efforts to combat the cultural and social forms of discrimination. Culturally responsive pedagogy has this transformative potential if it continues revealing and engaging with social conditions that affect the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Culturally responsive teaching is a broad term that encompasses a variety of approaches, such as culturally relevant, culturally sensitive, culturally congruent, and culturally contextualized pedagogies.

Those practicing culturally responsive pedagogy must have high and positive expectations for their students to help them achieve academic success and reach their maximum potential. High expectations refer to the ability to communicate positive and specific expectations to students about what they are expected to achieve and be able to do (Cahnmann, 2005; Cahnmann & Remillard, 2002; Mitchell, 1998). Culturally responsive teachers possess positive and asserting views of their students and their ability to learn and achieve high success. They demonstrate genuine respect for students and create a classroom that promotes strong belief in their learning capabilities. They consider students' social and cultural identities as assets rather than barriers. They also devise instructional strategies through challenging and engaging exercises in the context of students' social and cultural backgrounds (Heilberg, Tharp, & De-Geest, 2000).

Following are the ways through which a teacher can demonstrate and nurture culturally responsive pedagogy in their classrooms:

- Spending time with the students outside classrooms.

- Relate the students' home environment with the school's culture.
- Build rapport with the parents of the students.
- Resolve student-teacher conflicts.
- Assimilating the cultural norms, values, and beliefs of other cultures.
- Promote problem-solving and participatory experiences.
- Appreciate the students' learning capabilities.
- High expectations for the students' academic success.
- Incorporate narratives of various cultures while teaching in the class.
- Culturally relevant teaching strategies.
- Culturally familiar examples.
- Engaging in different multicultural activities of the school.
- Multiple alternative assessment (portfolio, rubrics, and anecdotal records, etc.) techniques.
- Incorporating assessment as learning (self and peer assessment).

Some students are more susceptible to low expectations due to societal biases and stereotypes linked with their sociocultural identity. These societal biases negatively and concretely impact the academic performance of ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students. Over time, low expectations hinder learning and negatively affect the students' attitudes and motivation, leading to fulfilling prophecies. Educators can play a prominent role in eliminating such persistent discrepancies in the student's achievement by consciously demonstrating specific, observable, and measurable behaviors and instructional practices to all students (Kransnoff, 2016).

This research was conducted in a phased manner. In the first phase, to explore the cultural intelligence of teachers and patterns of culturally responsive pedagogy adopted by them in schools, the investigators developed a cultural intelligence scale. The elements of the cultural intelligence scale were identified

by studying the review of research works and other relevant literature. In the second phase, to study the attitude of teachers and teacher educators towards culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP), an attitude scale was developed. In the third phase, to explore the perception of students towards culturally responsive pedagogy, a perception scale was developed by the investigators. Finally, the investigators presented a comprehensive framework for culturally responsive pedagogy, which is validated by the experts in the field.

This research was carried out to discover the elements of culturally relevant pedagogy and develop the framework for culturally responsive pedagogy. Research shows that no teaching strategies will persistently engage all the students in the teaching-learning process. The key is to help the learners to relate teaching content to their cultural background. Research indicates that teaching ignoring the students' cultural norms and communication stimulates students' resistance, while responsive teaching accelerates student involvement. To that end, the investigator has developed a comprehensive framework for culturally responsive pedagogy that crosses disciplines and cultures to engage and motivate learners while respecting their cultural norms and values. It holds the dynamic mix of class, caste, gender, religion, region, and family that contributes to every student's cultural identity.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy is devoted explicitly to both individual and collective acknowledgment. A culturally responsive teacher creates a teaching-learning situation so that the students work collaboratively with their peers and teachers to improve their achievement. Culturally responsive teaching holds an action-oriented, caring stance, which uses imaginative strategies and demonstrates high expectations to ensure academic success for ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students. Culturally responsive caring is a social responsibility, a moral commitment, and a pedagogical

obligation. It requires that the teachers use their knowledge, understanding, and strategic thinking to decide how to act in the best interest of their students.

Based on reversing culturally responsive teaching literature and data analysis of cultural intelligence, the attitude of teachers, and the perception of students, the investigators have identified the following crucial elements regarding the framework of culturally responsive teaching. The elements are Collaborative Teaching, Instructional Scaffolding, Social Justice, Critical Thinking, Child-Centered Instruction, and Assessment Practices.

Based on the above ten identified dimensions of culturally responsive pedagogy, the researcher has developed a perception scale to know the perception of students towards culturally responsive pedagogy; How they feel and react when the teacher is using or would create a culturally responsive environment during their teaching-learning process.

1.2.0. Rationale of Research

Researchers have found that most research on Culturally Responsive Pedagogy has been conducted to assess teachers' perceptions and provide a conceptual backdrop for culturally responsive pedagogy. Few studies were conducted on the influence of culturally relevant teaching on racial socialisation in schools (Aronson et al., 2016; Morrison et al., 2008; Aldana & Byrd, 2015). Some research was conducted on culturally relevant teaching, critical consciousness, and academic achievement, such as Christianakis (2011), Rodriguez et al. (2004), Epstein, Mayorga, & Nelson (2011), Martell (2013), Stovall (2006), Laughter & Adams (2012). Some of the researchers explored the attitude of teachers toward culturally responsive pedagogy, such as Aldana et al. (2012), Brozo et al. (1996), Dessel et al. (2006), Spencer et al. (2008), Thomas et al. (2008).

Various studies were also conducted on the relationship between culture and

learning to explore how cultures impact the students' abilities to participate and learn (Boykin et al., 2005; Charlesworth, 2008; Tsou, 2005). It was evident from the reviews of related literature that no study was found in the researchers' knowledge of developing a framework for Culturally Responsive Pedagogy in the Indian context. The primary and crucial reason for selecting this study has been the absence and lack of a single research that addresses the issues related to students' perception of implementing culturally responsive pedagogy in their classrooms.

1.3.0 Research Objectives

To study the perception of students towards culturally responsive pedagogy.

- To explore the perception of students towards culturally responsive pedagogy.
- To compare the mean perception score of male and female students towards culturally responsive pedagogy.
- To compare the mean perception score of rural and urban students towards culturally responsive pedagogy.

- To compare mean perception scores based on caste categories such as Schedule Caste/ Schedules Tribe (SC/ ST), Other Backward Class (OBC), and General category Students towards culturally responsive pedagogy.

1.4.0. Research Design

As the given research was carried out on a sample of students to investigate their perception of culturally responsive pedagogy, the researchers adopted a descriptive survey method as the research design. A three-point Likert Scale was developed and administered to 200 school students to study students' perception of culturally responsive pedagogy. The perception scale has 48 items distributed under different dimensions of culturally responsive pedagogy.

1.5.0. Sample

Two hundred secondary school students were selected to know their perception of culturally relevant pedagogy. The following tables show the distribution of samples.

Table.1. School-wise Distribution of Sample

S.N.	School Name	Male	Female	Total
1.	Rashtrabhasha Madhymik Vidyalaya, Wardha	5	5	10
2.	Swawlambi Vidyalaya, Wardha	9	1	10
3.	Saraswati Vidyalaya, Shankarnagar, Wardha	5	5	10
4.	Bhavan Loyads Vidya Niketan, Wardha	3	7	10
5.	Aragami High School, Pipri Meghe, Wardha	7	13	20
6.	New English High School, Wardha	1	13	14
7.	Daulat Sing Vidyalaya, Wardha	9	11	20
8.	New Kamla Nehru High School, Wardha	8	13	21
9.	Ramabai Deshmukh Public School, Wardha	11	17	28
10.	Ratnibai Vidyalaya, Wardha	3	19	22
11.	Sant Tulsi Global School, Wardha	6	3	9
12.	Sadhana Inter College, Karui, Azamgadh, U.P.	4	2	6
13.	Rohit Shikshan Sansthan, Azamgadh, U.P.	0	6	6
14.	Maharshi Arbind Shikshan Sansthan, Azamgadh, U.P.	14	0	14
Total		85	115	200

Table 2. Area-wise Distribution of Sample

Locale	No of Students	Total Students
Rural Students	77	200
Urban Students	123	

Table 3. Category-wise Distribution of Sample

S.N.	Category	Students
1.	SC/ST	51
2.	OBC	104
3.	GENERAL	45
Total		200

1.6.0. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

To find out the perception of students towards culturally responsive pedagogy. The perception scale, having 48 items, was administered to a sample of 200 students from 14 schools. The data were further categorized and analyzed concerning the overall perception and dimensions-wise perception towards culturally responsive pedagogy. The mean perception scores towards culturally responsive pedagogy were

further analysed based on gender, category, and locality using various statistical techniques.

1.6.1. Overall Perception of Students towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy.

To assess students' overall perception of culturally responsive pedagogy, item-wise responses of students have been presented and analyzed with the help of mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variance. The results are shown in the following table.

Table.4 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	C.V
Mean	48	2.2759	.19342	8.49861
Valid N (listwise)	48			

From Table 4, it can be seen that the mean score of the perception of culturally responsive pedagogy for students was found to be 2.27 on a scale of three. This reflects that students have a favorable reaction toward culturally responsive pedagogy. Further, the standard deviation is 0.19, which shows relatively tiny variations, and the coefficient of variance is 8.49%, which is relatively low and indicates that, as a group, the reaction towards culturally responsive pedagogy of the students was almost invariant and strongly favorable.

1.6.2. Comparison of Perception of Students towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy based on Gender, Category and Locale

Parametric tests are based on the assumption that the data should have an expected or Gaussian distribution. The tests for normality calculate the probability that the sample has been drawn out from an average population. The null hypotheses used are:

Ho: The sample data do not significantly deviate from normality.

Testing and Interpretation of Normality Hypothesis: Perception of Male and Female Students Towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy after Winsorization.

In the following Table 5, we have presented the result after the Winsorization of data.

From Table 5., it is evident that the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the

Table 5. Tests of Normality

Criterion Variable: Perception towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy							
	Gender	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Perception	Female	.110	115	.002	.964	115	.004
	Male	.067	85	.200*	.983	85	.348

perception scores of female students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is 0.110, whose probability of significance at df (115) is .002, which is less than 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it is significant at a 0.01 level of significance. In this perspective, the null hypothesis, “the given distribution of the perception scores of female students towards culturally responsive pedagogy does not differ significantly from the normal distribution of perception scores,” is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality of perception scores of female students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is not yet satisfied even after Winsorization.

It is also observed from the above Table 5, that the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the perception scores of male students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is 0.067, whose probability of significance at df (85) is .200, which is more than 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it is

not significant at a 0.01 level of significance. In this perspective, the null hypothesis, “the given distribution of the perception scores of male students towards culturally responsive pedagogy does not differ significantly from the normal distribution of perception scores,” is not rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality of perception scores of male students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is fulfilled.

It is evident, from the above explanation, that even after the Winsorization of data, the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test shows that the distribution of female perception scores still does not fulfill the assumptions of normality, on account of which the investigators employed a non-parametric test (Mann Whitney U – Test) for further analysis of data.

Testing and Interpretation of Normality Hypothesis: Perception of Rural and Urban Students towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy after Winsorization.

Table 6 . Tests of Normality: Kolmogorov-Smirnova

	Area	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Perception Score	Rural	.066	77	.200*	.980	77	.279
	Urban	.112	123	.001	.967	123	.004

From Table 6, it is evident that the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the perception scores of rural students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is .066, whose probability of significance at df (77) is .200, which is more than 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it is not significant at 0.01 level of significance. In this perspective, the null hypothesis, “the given distribution of the perception scores of rural students towards culturally responsive pedagogy does not differ significantly from the normal distribution of perception scores,” is not rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality of perception scores of rural students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is satisfied or fulfilled.

It is also observed from Table 6, that the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the perception scores of urban students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is 112, whose probability of significance at df(123) is .001, which is less than 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it is significant at 0.01 level of significance. In this perspective, the null hypothesis, “the given distribution

of the perception scores of urban students towards culturally responsive pedagogy does not differ significantly from the normal distribution of perception scores,” is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality of perception scores of urban students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is not fulfilled.

It is evident from the above explanation that even after the Winsorization of data, the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test shows that the distribution of urban perception scores still does not fulfill the assumptions of normality. However, the boxplot shows the normal distribution, on account of which the investigator has employed a non-parametric test (Mann-Whitney U – Test) for further data analysis.

Testing and Interpretation of Normality Hypothesis: Perception of different caste categories such as Schedule Caste/ Schedules Tribe (SC/ST), Other Backward Class (OBC), and General category Students towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy after Winsorization.

Table 7: Tests of Normality— Kolmogorov-Smirnova

	Category	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Perception Score	SC/ST	.094	51	.200*	.970	51	.211
	OBC	.081	104	.089	.972	104	.028
	General	.116	45	.153	.950	45	.050

From the Table 7, it is evident that the statistical value of Kolmogorov-Smirnova of the perception scores of SC/ST students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is 0.094, whose probability of significance at df (51) is .200, which is more than 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it is not significant at a 0.01 level of significance. In this perspective, the null hypothesis, “the given distribution of the perception scores of SC/ST students

towards culturally responsive pedagogy does not differ significantly from the normal distribution of perception scores,” is not rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality of perception scores of SC/ST students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is satisfied or fulfilled.

It is also observed, from Table 7, that the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the perception scores of OBC students

towards culturally responsive pedagogy is .081, whose probability of significance at df (104) is .089, which is more than 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it is not significant at 0.01 level of significance. In this perspective, the null hypothesis, “the given distribution of the perception scores of OBC students towards culturally responsive pedagogy does not differ significantly from the normal distribution of perception scores,” is not rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality of perception scores of OBC students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is fulfilled.

It is also observed, from Table 7, that the statistical value of the Shapiro-Wilk test of the perception scores of General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is 0.950, whose probability of significance at df (45) is .050, which is more than 0.01 level of significance. Hence, it is not significant at 0.01 level of significance. In this perspective, the null hypothesis, “the given distribution of the perception scores of General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy does not differ significantly from the normal distribution of perception scores,” is not

rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the assumption of normality of perception scores of General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is fulfilled.

It is evident from the above explanation that after the Winsorization of data, the statistical value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test shows that the distribution of SC/ST, OBC, and General student’s perception scores fulfills the assumptions of normality, on account of which the investigator has employed a parametric test (One-way ANOVA) for further analysis of data.

Comparison of Mean Perception Scores of Male and Female Students Towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy.

The second sub-objective of the study was to compare the mean perception scores of male and female school students toward culturally responsive pedagogy. The data were analyzed with the help of the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U – Test to compare the mean perception scores of male and female students. The results are given in the Table below.

Table 8: Summary of Mann-Whitney U – Test for Mean Perception Scores of Male and Female Students Towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy based on Category

	Locale	(N)	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U Value	Sig.	Remark
Perception Score	Female	115	109.09	3,900.00	0.015	Significant
	Male	85	109.09			
	Total	200	88.88			

It is evident from Table 8, that both groups can be considered uniform because of excess similarity in the distribution of dependent variables in both groups. Therefore, it can be said that the p-value obtained from the Mann-Whitney U – Test is reliable. Further, it is evident, from Table .8, that the test statistics of the perception scores of school students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is $U = 3900.0$, whose probability of significance is .015, which is less than a .05 level of

significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “there is no significant difference in mean perception scores of school students towards culturally responsive pedagogy,” is rejected. It is clear from the mean ranks shown above in Table 8, that the mean rank of female students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is 109.09, which is significantly higher than that of male students, whose mean rank is 88.88. Hence, it can be said that female students have a higher positive

It is evident from the above Table 9 that both groups can be considered uniform because of excess similarity in the distribution of the dependent variable in both the groups. Therefore, it can be undoubtedly said that the p-value obtained from the Mann-Whitney U – Test is reliable. Further, it is evident from Table 9 that the test statistics of the perception scores of school students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is $U = 4445.0$, whose probability of significance is .465, which is more than at .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “there is no significant difference in mean perception scores of rural and urban school students towards culturally responsive pedagogy,” is retained. It is clear from the mean ranks shown above in Figure 4.58 that the mean rank of rural students towards culturally responsive

pedagogy is 104.27, similar to that of urban students, where the mean rank is 98.14. Hence, it can be said that rural students have similar perceptions of culturally responsive pedagogy to urban students.

Comparison of Mean Perception Scores of SC/ST, OBC, and General Students Towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

The fourth sub-objective of the study was to compare the mean perception scores of SC/ST, OBC, and General school students towards culturally responsive pedagogy. For comparing the mean perception scores of SC/ST, OBC, and General students, the data was analyzed with the help of one-way ANOVA. The results are given in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Group Statistic

Criterion Variable: Perception towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
SC/ST	51	109.90	10.64	1.490
OBC	104	108.73	9.66	.947
General	45	111.68	9.01	1.34
Total	200	109.69	9.80	.693

Table 10 shows that the standard deviation of the perception scores of SC/ST students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is 10.64, which is greater than the distribution of attitude scores of OBC students, which is 9.66, and General students, which

is 9.01. This is almost equal in all the groups; therefore, it can be concluded that assumptions of homogeneity of variance between SC/ST, OBC, and General students are not violated.

Table 11: Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Leven's Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.746	2	197	.476

Further, it can be observed from Table 11, that statistic of Leven's test for equality of variance ($F = .746$, $P = .476 > .01$) is not

significant at the .01 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant difference in the homogeneity

of variance of SC/ST, OBC, and General students' group," is not rejected. Hence, the assumptions of homogeneity of variance are

satisfied here. In this situation, a p-value of traditional ANOVA would be considered to match the results.

Table 12: Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Teacher's Perception Towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy based on Category

Criterion Variable: Perception towards Culturally Responsive Pedagogy					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	277.779	2	138.890	1.451	.237
Within Groups	18860.616	197	95.739		
Total	19138.395	199			

Table 12 shows that F-value is 1.451, whose probability of significance (df - 2, 197) is .237, which is greater than 0.05. Hence, it is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. It indicates that the mean attitude scores of SC/ST, OBC, and General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy do not differ significantly. Hence, the null hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in mean perception scores of SC/ST, OBC, and General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy," is not rejected. Therefore, it may be concluded that the perception of SC/ST, OBC, and General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is equally optimistic.

1.7.0. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1.7.1. Findings

The following are the findings of the present research:

1. The mean scores of students' perceptions of culturally responsive pedagogy were favorable. Further, the standard deviation showed relatively small variations, and the coefficient of variance is below 10, which is relatively low. This indicates that the group's reactions towards culturally responsive pedagogy for students were almost invariant, and the reactions were strongly favorable.
2. The perception scores of male and female school students towards culturally responsive pedagogy were found to be significant. The mean ranks clearly showed that the female students' perception of culturally responsive pedagogy is significantly higher than that of male students. Hence, it can be concluded that female students have a higher positive perception of culturally responsive pedagogy than male students.
3. The perception scores of rural and urban school students towards culturally responsive pedagogy were not found to differ significantly. The mean ranks showed that the perception of rural students towards culturally responsive pedagogy was equal to that of urban students. Hence, it can be concluded that both rural and urban students have similar positive perceptions of culturally responsive pedagogy.
4. The mean perception scores of SC/ST, OBC, and General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy do not differ significantly. Therefore, it may be concluded that the perception of SC/ST, OBC, and General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is equally optimistic.

1.7.2. Discussion of Findings

It is clear from the results that the perception of students towards culturally responsive pedagogy is found to be favorable. This is a positive finding. This finding is supported by Samuels, Samuels, & Cook (2017); Huh, Choi, & Jun (2015); and Savage et al. (2011). However, Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr (2000) reported findings differently than our research. It was found from the research review that there were only few research works where the perception of students towards culturally responsive pedagogy was assessed, and most of the research work based on culturally responsive pedagogy was done outside India. So, the findings have been supported based on these available research studies.

Further, students' perception of culturally responsive pedagogy was found to differ significantly when compared based on Gender. The perception of female students towards culturally responsive pedagogy was found to be significantly more positive than that of male students. It reflected that the female students perceive culturally responsive pedagogy as an instructional practice equally conducive to learning for all students. They positively perceive multicultural knowledge and awareness and advocate freedom, equality, and justice for everyone. The female students might be more sensitive and sensible towards the critical components of culturally responsive pedagogy than the male students.

Furthermore, the perceptions of rural and urban students were found to be equally positive towards culturally responsive pedagogy. It indicates that both rural and urban students support multicultural awareness, high expectations, collaborative learning, critical thinking, and instructional scaffolding as the fundamental dimensions to fulfill the goal of multicultural education. They both seem to perceive culturally responsive pedagogy as a progressive approach to empowering the classroom and total school environments.

It was also found, from the present findings, that the mean perception scores of SC/ST, OBC, and General students towards culturally responsive pedagogy were not found to differ significantly. It informs that students belonging to different social categories promote culturally responsive pedagogy practices, which, in turn, can bridge the cultural gaps between teachers and students to facilitate the academic achievement of all students. The students might have high expectations from their teachers to appreciate the students' learning capabilities and individual differences, irrespective of their sociocultural background.

Acknowledgment: Author is thankful to IUCTE, Department of Education [CASE & IASE] Faculty of Education and Psychology, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodara, Gujarat. for the financial support in conducting this research study successfully.

Reference

- Aceves, T. C., & Orosco, M. J. (2014). Culturally Responsive Teaching — CEEDAR (Document No. IC2). Retrieved from the University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center, 1-37. <http://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/innovation-configurations>.
- Aldana, A., & Byrd, C. M. (2015). School Ethnic-racial Socialization: Learning about Race and Ethnicity among African American Students. *The Urban Review*, (Research Gate). 47(3), 563-576. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281443634>
- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 78(2), 180-185.

- Aronson, B., Amatullah, T., & Laughter, J. (2016). Culturally relevant education: Extending the conversation to religious diversity. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 18(3), 140–149. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306068410>.
- Aronson, B. & J. Laughter. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(1), pp. 163–206.
- Boykin, A. W., A. Albury, K. M. Tyler, , E. A. Hurley, , C. T. Bailey, & O. A. Miller. (2005). Culture-based perceptions of academic achievement among low-income elementary students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 11(4), 339–350.
- Burton, L. J., & S. M. Mazerolle. (2011). Survey Instrument Validity Part I: Principles of Survey Instrument Development and Validation in Athletic Training Education Research. *Athletic Training Education Journal*, 6(1), 27-35.
- Hahnemann, M. (2005). Translating Competence in a Critical Bilingual Classroom. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 36(3), 230-249. doi:10.1525/aeq.2005.36.3.230
- Cahnmann, M. S., & J. T. Remillard. (2002). What Counts and How: Mathematics Teaching in Culturally, Linguistically, and Socioeconomically Diverse Urban Settings. *Urban Review*, 34(3), 179-204.
- Christiana is, M. (2011). Parents as “help labor”: Inner-city Teachers’ Narratives of Parent Involvement. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(4), 157-178.
- Charlesworth, S. (2008). Claiming Discrimination, Complaints of Sex and Gender Discrimination in Employment under the Victorian Equal Opportunity Act 1995. School of Global Studies, Social Science & Planning Working Paper Series. Melbourne: RMIT University.2-23.
- Charlesworth, Z. M. (2008). Learning Styles Across Cultures: Suggestions for Educators. *Education and Training*, 50(2). 115–127. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.Edu.Documents/44390711>.
- Dessel, A. (2010). Prejudice in Schools: Promotion of an Inclusive Culture and Climate. *Education and Urban Society*, pp. 42, 407–429. Doi: 10.1177/0013124510361852.
- Dessel, A., E. R. Mary, & B. G. Sarah. (2006). Using Intergroup Dialogue to Promote Social Justice and Change. *Oxford Journals*, 51(4), 303–315. www.jstor.org/stable/23721215.
- Dessel, A., M. E. Rogge, & S. B. Garlington. (2006). Using Intergroup Dialogue to Promote Social Justice and Change. *Social work*, 51(4), 303–315.
- Epstein, T., E. Mayorga, , & J. Nelson, (2011). Teaching about Race in an Urban History Class: The Effects of Culturally Responsive Teaching. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(1), 2–21.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for Culturally Responsive Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106–116.
- _____ (2010). *Culturally Responsive Teaching (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. 31.
- Hilberg, R. S., R. G. Tharp, , & L. DeGeest, (2000). The efficacy of CREDE’s Standards-based Instruction in American Indian Mathematics Classes. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 33(2), 32–40. doi:10.1080/1066568000330206
- Huh, H. K., S. W. Choi, & J. Jun. (2015). Relationships Among Multicultural Sensitivity, Multicultural Education Awareness, and Level of Multicultural Education Practice of South Korean Teachers. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 12(1).107-126.
- Krasnoff, B. (2016). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: A Guide to Evidence-based Practices for Teaching all Students Equitably*. Region X Equity Assistance Centre Education Northwest.
- Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a Cultural Race Theory of Education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279676094>.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that is just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476635>

- Laughter, J. C., & Adams, A. D. (2012). Culturally Relevant Science Teaching in Middle School. *Urban Education (SAGE)*, 47(6), 1106–1134.
- Mortell, C. C. (2013). Race and histories: Examining culturally relevant teaching in the U.S. history classroom. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 41, 65-88.
- Mitchell, A. (1998). African American teachers: Unique roles and universal lessons. *Education and Urban Society*, 31(1), 104–122. doi:10.1177/0013124598031001008
- Morrison, J. et al. (2008). How did formative research inform the development of a women's group intervention in rural Nepal? *Journal of Perinatology*.14-22 https://www.cresearchgate.net/pub.lication/51435226_Howdid_formative_research_inform_the_development_of_a_women's_group_intervention_in_Nepal.
- Nieto, S. P., Kang, B. E., & Raible, J. (2008). Nieto, Sonia, Patty Bode, Eugenie Kang, and John Raible, "Identity, Community, and Diversity: Rethorizing Multicultural Curriculum for the Postmodern Era," pp. 176-197 in F. Michael Connelly, Ming Fang He, and JoAnn Phillion, eds., *The SAGE Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008.
- Rodriguez, J. L., Jones, E. B., Pang, V. O., & Park, C. D. (2004). Promoting academic achievement and identity development among diverse, high school students. *The High School Journal*, 87(3), 44-53.
- Saenger, E. B. (2002). Culturally Responsive Teaching: Lesson Planning for Elementary and Middle Grades, by Jacqueline Jordan Irvine and Beverly J. Armento. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(2), 203-205.
- Savage, C., Hindle, R., Meyer, L. H., Hynds, A., Penetito, W., & Sleeter, C. E. (2011). Culturally responsive pedagogies in the classroom: Indigenous student experiences across the curriculum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(3), 183–198.
- Samuels, A. J., Samuels, G. L., & Cook, T. M. (2017). Examining perceptions of culturally responsive pedagogy in teacher preparation and teacher leadership candidates. *SRATE Journal*, 26(2), 50-60.
- Spencer, M. S., Brown, M., Griffin, S., & Abdullah, S. (2008). Outcome evaluation of the intergroup project. *Small Group Research*, pp. 39, 82–103. doi:10.1177/1046496407313416.
- Staires, A. J. (2007). Culturally responsive teaching: The Harlem renaissance in an urban English class. *The English Journal*, 96(6), 37-42. <https://www.Jstor.org/stable/30046750>.
- Stovall, D. (2006). We can relate Hip-hop culture, critical pedagogy, and the secondary classroom. *Urban Education*, pp. 41, 585–602. doi:10.1177/0042085906292513
- Thomas, O., Davidson, W., & McAdoo, H. (2008). An Evaluation Study of the Young Empowered Sisters (YES!) Programme: Promoting Cultural Assets among African American Adolescent Girls through a Culturally Relevant School-based Intervention. *Journal of Black Psychology*, pp. 34, 281–308. doi:10.1177/0095798408314136.
- Tsou, W. (2005). The Effects of Cultural Instruction on Foreign Language Learning. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 36(1), 39–57.
- Villages, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating Culturally Responsive Teachers: A Coherent Project*. Albany: State University of New York, 88,98.