In addition, several secondary literature pieces on culturally relevant pedagogy and culturally responsive teaching are presented in this review. Most of the secondary literature draws upon Gay's work on culturally responsive teaching and Ladson-Billings' work on culturally relevant pedagogy. While reading and reflecting upon these scholarly articles, I observed that the terms culturally responsive and culturally relevant pedagogy were used interchangeably by many of the authors. Indeed, very often when scholars argued a perspective on making teaching more relevant to the students' lives they would quote both Ladson-Billings and Gay to support their claims. Thus, for many scholars it seems that both culturally responsive teaching and culturally relevant pedagogy have the same prospective goals, audiences, and as a result can be used interchangeably and in union.

The literature on culturally relevant pedagogy [1] and culturally responsive teaching [4] are used to help gain an insight on the theoretical basis of CRRP as that is what informed the DSI. However, to be critical of this theoretical framework I also used an anti-neoliberal lens informed by the work of Apple [5], McLaren, Macrine, and Hill [6], Hyslop-Margison and Sears [7] and Giroux H. and Giroux S. [8] for the theoretical framework of this article.

3. Methodology and Methods

This is a article is informed by a practitioner research methodology described by Cochran-Smith and Lytle [9]. As Campano and Simon [10] state there are multiple versions of practitioner research; in this article, a critical version of practitioner research that is also action based is used.

The main reason practitioner research methodology is used in this study is because, I explore an initiative put forth by an initial teacher education program that involves educators in the context of public school practicums. According to Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Susan Lytle [9], the two core concepts of practitioner research are:

(1) teaching is a deliberative (not a technical) profession, practitioners generate knowledge for practice, and (2) contextualized questions and uncertainties are brought forward by practitioners which are based on issues of teaching and learning at all levels (p. 20).

This study questions key practices in teacher education; in particular, practices of teachers, associate teachers, theory and practice, equity-based pedagogy, and critical pedagogy. Moreover, this study has been undertaken in an attempt to generate new knowledge for practice that teacher education practitioners can use. The questions that emerge from the content and analysis of the interviews I conducted present several

uncertainties and questions for teacher candidates and associate teachers. Furthermore, it is important to note that these questions and uncertainties came from practitioners [9] "...examining their own assumptions, deepening their local knowledge by gathering data, asking questions, and working towards social justice" (p. 74).

4. Methods and Analysis

In the larger study on which this article is founded upon, collaboration was undertaken through the process of "member checking"[4] with the developers of the DSI. I used the strategy of "member checking" to ensure that my interpretations of their responses in interviews were accurate, and also to provide them an opportunity to provide their feedback on initial themes and findings that emerged during the data analysis phase of this study. The assumptions about links of knowledge, knowers, and knowing were also articulated by the participants in this study during their interview process and highlighted through the study's findings.

Moreover, these assumptions were significant because they provided insight on the nuances between various participants' interpretations of the content in the DSI, recognizing whose interpretations count, and how this affected the experience each participant had in the DSI. The professional context of this larger practitioner study was the university and school site-based classrooms in which field-notes were taken. In addition, the reflections, statements, questions, and messiness involved in understanding participants' voices in class observation in contrast to in interviews demonstrated to me the blurred boundaries of inquiry and practice. Thus, there were multiple opportunities of data gathering (field notes, interviews, critical reflections) and analyzing the data was complex and often multi-layered when exploring what patterns/themes appeared in the data.

5. The Three Excerpts and Findings

In relation to the DSI itself, many participants in the interviews articulated several concerns about the DSI and how sometimes there was a disconnect between how CRRP work was understood and taken up in the Initial Teacher Education program. Interestingly, how CRRP was understood and taken up in the participant's teaching experiences during practicum was inconsistent with what the developers of the DSI had taught. In particular, the practices and pedagogy of CRRP as understood by the participants in the following three

---

[4] "Member checking" is a phrase coined by Patti Lather [13] that contributes to a catalytic validity.