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Abstract

This paper describes a review of the research developed on the English Language Teaching Practicum (ELTP) as part of a doctoral study on the senses of the ELTP through the experiences and interrelations of the English language teaching practicum community (ELTPC): preservice teachers (PTs), school and university mentors, (SMs-UMs [1]) in the Colombian context. In the first part, the paper situates the ELTP in Initial Language Teacher Education (ILET) and elaborates on the contributions Colombian English Language scholars have made in regard to the ELTP. This review portrays instructional processes, reflective approaches, beliefs, expectations and dichotomies, identity construction, and research as a central axis in ELTP core tendencies. The majority of the studies continue to invisibilize the three-voiced experiences of those subjects who live the ELTP. In the second part, the paper discusses pedagogical colonialism in English Language Teaching (ELT) extended to the ELTP as a static-limited conceptualization that normalizes ELTP.

[1] These terms are used in this paper to address cooperating teachers and university advisors, which have been traditionally named in the literature.
From a decolonial standpoint, I would affirm that understanding the senses of the ELTP through the experiences and interrelations of pre-service teachers, school, and university mentors might contribute to questioning the hegemonic views rooted in epistemic perspectives of the Global North that have dominated the ELT field and therefore the ELTP. Furthermore, we can comprehend the holistic formation processes that pre-service teachers go through with their SMs and UMIs to envision different ways of being, doing, and thinking about the plurals and particularities of the ELTP.
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Introduction

As a teacher educator who has experienced ELT in diverse perspectives and contexts, I have been concerned and fully involved with the ELTP in Initial Language Teacher Education. This entails a personal, professional, emotional, and situated endeavor in accompanying the process pre-service teachers or PTs live in this formation journey, which has an enormous impact on PTs and those who are with them, both SMs (school mentors) and Ums (university mentors). These subjects constitute an English Language Teaching Community (ELTPC) in our diverse educational contexts, where the ELTP is developed. In this vein, the ELTP formation process-journey becomes pertinent and relevant due to its contribution from and to the subjects involved in this process, their school, and university contexts, as they can broaden and deepen the perspectives of Initial Language Teacher Education Programs (ILTEPs). Thus, this paper intends to situate the ELTP within ILTE and provide an initial research background to understand the ELTP and its developments in the Colombian context. In the second part, the paper discusses pedagogical colonialism, which has been a central aspect in reflecting on our profession today. Moreover, pedagogical colonialism has definitely normalized the ELTP with a static-limited conception of instructional action in the classroom, and it has ignored the ELTPC, especially the ways they make sense of it through their experiences and interrelations.

The Teaching Practicum in Initial English Language Teacher Education

The ELTP has been regarded as one of the crucial stages to situate PTs in the real contexts of teaching (Sandholts & Dadlez, 2000) due to the conceptions and pre-service teacher education models constructed to professionally prepare future teachers. Some of these conceptions have been to some extent limited to a static, monolithic, agentive-empty concept sustained with the belief that ELT relies only on its linguistic and didactic dimensions (Samacá, 2020) to respond to the demands of globalization. Most of the times, western ways of ELT are adopted as a mandate. In this context, models have followed and still maintain a language teaching and learning view grounded on the contributions of the Global North, as seen in effective language teaching, a rational and instrumental perspective (Brown, 2001; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Freeman & Richards, 1996;
Harmer, 2006, 2007; Hedge, 2000; Richards & Crookes, 1988; Richards & Rodgers, 2005; Shulman, 1987); a reflective practice on the relationship between practice and theory in the instructional process (Barlett, 1990, 1994; Crandall, 2000; Loughran, 2002; Richards & Lockhart, 1998; Schön, 1987; Wallace, 1991; Zeichner, 1990, 1992, 2010); a socio-cultural view of Second Language Teacher Education (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2001; Farrell, 2003; Singh & Richards, 2006); a space for research to nurture the knowledge teachers construct (Shulman, 1987; Stenhouse, 1985); and more situated models for context-sensitive language pedagogy (Canagarajah, 2002; Kumaravadivelu, 2003) creating the possibility to situate research as pivotal in the understanding of teachers’ practices.

Some of these models maintain their relevance in the Colombian context where the Ministry of Education (MoE) has made the following explicit:

a) The need to train a teacher who develops pedagogical theory and practice as a fundamental aspect of teacher training, strengthening research in the pedagogical field and subject knowledge with the highest ethical and scientific quality (Law 115, 1994).

b) The teaching practicum as the fundamental strategy that combines the pedagogical processes of interaction between the participants of the pedagogical event (educators and students) and the didactic process of school learning constructions through teachers’ mediation (The Colombian Teacher Education System and Policy Guidelines, 2013).

c) The teaching practicum as a self-reflection process that also becomes the space to conceptualize, research, and conduct didactic experimentation. In the practicum, PTs address knowledges from different disciplines and enrich the comprehension of the educative process and the teachers’ work. The teaching practicum provides PTs with the possibility to reflect critically about their practices, thereby, developing future Teachers’ competencies (Pedagogical practice as a learning scenario, 2017).

Nonetheless, these views under the perspective of globalization have subsumed
teacher education within homogenizing fields, finding political and epistemic on the international agency validation. In this way, the general learning view updates its functions and procedures in terms of capitalization, constituting regimes of truth on teachers¹ (Martínez Boom, 2016).

Likewise, the MoE has required Initial Teacher Education Programs to be reformed “to obtain, renew or modify qualified registry certificate” Resolution 18583, 2017, p. 3), or high-quality accreditation to continue offering their programs to the Colombian community. The MoE’s intention is to qualify well-prepared teachers that can lead the way in high educational quality, develop pedagogical and research skills, and meet higher language proficiency certifications. The focus continues to be on instrumental principles of homogenization, productivity, and the rationality to produce effective teachers, thus perpetuating static-traditional models in which “curricula are preconceived and minimize social realities” (Ramos, 2018, p. 145). Additional this “pedagogical and educational practice refers to the process of appropriation of knowledge and practices that make up the professional practice of the graduate” (p. 7). Arguably, the ELTP is a hierarchical structure constituted by certain entities, which invisibilize the subjects involved in the process: PTs, SMs and UMs. These visions maintain the status quo rather than develop more critical alternatives to situated teaching, thereby, ignoring the ELTPC views and understandings of education.

It is relevant to mention that the “pedagogical and educative practice”, as stated above, has been challenged and reconstructed through the work of Global South scholars. De Tezanos (2007) argued that “the idea of the teaching practice emerges as the contemporary expression to name the teachers’ work” (p. 11). Zuluaga (1999) contended that “pedagogy is not only a discourse about teaching, but also a practice whose application relies on discourse” (p. 10). Additionally, Davini (2015) questioned the ELTP vision as something that only “represents the doing, as the activity in the real and visible world. It's simple, but it's also simplistic: practices are limited to what people do” (p. 24). The author also mentioned that this restricted view of the ELTP obscures the meaning of “no doing without thinking, and that the practices are the result of the subjects, who always involve the thought and valuation, as well as diverse notions or images in the world” (p. 24). While undoubtedly the

¹ The translation is mine.
teaching practicum is the stage of first professional socialization framed within the pedagogical knowledge, PTs start elaborating from their experiences in learning to teach (Menghini & Negrini, 2008, as cited in Segovia, 2008). Therefore, it is necessary to add to the discussion that the ELTP is also a social practice, a knowledge space that is co-constructed through the subjects who are involved in this process-journey.

Thus, the ELTP plays a key but challenging role depending on the conceptions and meanings we assign to it. Several “scholar-experts”\(^2\) have traditionally considered the Teaching Practicum (TP) as an applied science; the pre-service teacher’s work was to apply what he/she had learned at the university during the practicum (Stones, 1984). Additionally, PTs had to implement the content, skill, and/or technique knowledge to teach students adequately (Woodward, 1991); nevertheless, the university faculty did not always reflect on the real classroom context (Zeichner, 1992). In this sense, we may consider the technical, practical, and critical-emancipatory conceptions on the teaching practicum (Mendoza et al., 2002, as cited in Baquero, 2007).

The first concept of ELTP proposes learning by apprenticeship of observation. This entails imitating SMs’ practices in the classroom. However, this conceptualization clearly illustrates an instrumentalized view with the tendency to replicate models and practices that deal with the teaching dimension. Gaitán et al. (2005) stated situated the “Practicum as doing within a tradition framework, and by the experience itself levels of competency are acquired.” The latter suggests a more reflective dimension of teaching considering the social and educational reality encompassing a more holistic view, where the UMs play a key role. In this regard, Zeichner (1995) stated that it is “an important occasion for teacher learning and not merely a time for the demonstration of things previously learned” (p. 124). Shulz (2005) also asserted that emphasizing technical knowledge is a small part of teachers’ knowledge and not sufficient for the preparation of teachers for the professional role of teaching. Rather, teacher preparation requires a reflection-in-action, as suggested by Schön (1987), or a space for research to nurture the knowledge teachers construct, as advocated by Stenhouse (1985). The previous point can be
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\(^2\) I use this term to denote that second Language Teacher Education has been created, planned, and modeled from several authors in the Global North.
seen from an emancipatory point of view, in which teachers become intellectuals that contribute to community and school knowledge and (Mendoza, 2002, as cited in Baquero, 2007). This would embrace what Mejia (2012) understood as “constructing a project that makes sense for every agent involved in the pedagogical experience. It has significance for everyone and his/her context and everyone is able to control and transform” (p. 131).

It is worth noting that the ELTP by nature configures the subjects involved in it. Accordingly, teachers are social, cultural, and political beings who accept or resist the homogenizing visions of teaching. The ELTP also provides teachers with the possibility to experience and critically reflect upon the issues concerning the experience of teaching in tandem with their own understandings of educational theories, even if at the core of the ELTP are the pre-service teachers. This is why Davini (2015) highlighted that the ELTP has to do with practices not exclusively referred to the development of operative, technical or doing skills, but to the capacity for intervention and teaching in complex real contexts, in situations that involve different dimensions and, often, to the contextualized treatment of challenges or ethical dilemmas in social and institutional environments. (p. 29).

PTs are not alone as their SMs and UMs also share a co-responsibility in this formation process. This is why the practicum should be an opportunity for teacher educators and experienced schoolteachers to accompany PTs through a horizontal relationship—locating and dislocating our perspectives—going from the instructional to the reflective and emancipatory, and hopefully decolonial ways of envisioning the pedagogical experience. This implies that the ELTP should no longer be understood as merely putting theory into practice; rather, it should be seen as a learning opportunity in which pre-service teachers engage, along with school teachers and university mentors, in the process of thinking what, what for, how, and who with as they are living the ELTP, making their “embodiment histories of learning and teaching” explicit (Pennycook, 2007, p. 333) through their memories, vision, and idealizations as students, as language learners, and as future teachers (i.e. the relationships they have constructed and expect to construct among themselves, with their teachers, SMs and UMs, and their
students). These comprehensions challenge the traditional ELTP’s views, as it might bring different understandings and developments of teaching in initial language teacher education programs, which represents a valuable social and complex field in the pre-service teachers’ formation process and their initial constructions of knowledges when situated in the real contexts of teaching. This involves lived and shared moments, inhabited spaces, co-constructed momentums of self, and collective reflections that construct and reconstruct diverse ways of understanding pedagogy through the experience of those of us who live the practice in educational contexts.

The ILTEP where this doctoral project will be developed, has constructed a humanistic interdisciplinary curricular proposal that embraces a critical, socio-cultural, reflective and research approach to the formation of language teachers (Educational Project, 2010). Thus, the ELTP has been named ‘Pedagogical Practice’, and it is understood as the development of theoretical-practical processes that range from academic and pedagogical formation processes to interaction and experiences in school contexts that account for the capacity for continuous interaction with other subjects and strategies for solving various social, academic, and cultural pedagogical processes that strengthen PTs’ future professional teaching and research practices, as well as the development of critical and reflective positions of the process through theoretical contributions and practical knowledge (LLEEI- Ajustes Curriculares, 2016). From a decolonial locus of enunciation, I would contend that the ELTP would encompass interconnectedness, interactions, and experiences between the ELTP and second language pedagogy, educational policy, curriculum, and methodology in an intentional social praxis that might contribute to considering “others” in order to situate the holistic formation process that PTs go through along with SMs and UMs. Additionally, this holistic process engages reflection on the ways of being, doing, and thinking about the plurals and particularities of the ELTP. Pedagogical practices not only relate to teaching practices in the ELT context, but they also need to consider socially situated co-constructions of knowing and relationships. Furthermore, the ELTP needs to recognize its subjects and their dynamic dimensions that might bring together educators and learners around emancipatory pedagogical experiences.
The Review: Colombian Scholarly Work on the Teaching Practicum

ELT research has been growing and nurturing the field and has definitely contributed to expanding our visions on the linguistic, pedagogical, social, cultural, and political dimensions of our profession. The ELTP is an area of interest for teacher educators and researchers because of the conceptions, perceptions, beliefs, dynamics, contexts, and diversities that have been constructed by its participants and the implications it might have for initial language teacher education programs. Being aware of this multilayered process, I conducted a search on the key terms “teaching practicum”, “initial teacher education”, and “ELT” in the Colombian ELT context using Scielo and Redalyc data bases. I also considered Colombian authorship as the most important criterion. The 37 resulting research studies and reflection reports were retrieved from 10 local journals and 1 international journal from 2003 to 2020: PROFILE, Ikala, Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, HOW, Lenguaje, Folios, Hechos y Proyecciones del Lenguaje, Actualidades Pedagógicas, Educación y Ciudad, Signo y Penseamiento, and English Language Teaching. Most scholars who have undertaken research in this area are teacher educators enrolled in ILTEPs, M.A., and Doctorate Programs. One schoolteacher co-authored one of the research studies. It is worth noting that the ELTP was developed mostly in public schools, with only a few studies in private schools and universities.

As mentioned above, this exploratory landscape will provide a picture of contemporary Colombian scholarly work. The results are described taking into account some trends established by the themes of the research reports, as follows: instructional processes, challenges, epistemological reconfigurations of ELT, reflective approaches, dichotomies, identity construction, and the role of research in the ELTP. Regardless of the epistemological perspectives assumed in these studies, all of them constitute co-constructed efforts to develop understandings of the ELTP in the Colombian context. These studies developed qualitative research approaches (case studies, interpretive, descriptive, narrative and action research projects). They focused primarily on the voices of pre-service teachers (PTs, also called student-teachers STs, and teacher trainees). These terms are respected in the form they are used in each report. Some studies address both pre-service teachers’ and university
mentors’ voices. Only one study reported school mentors’ (cooperating teachers’), university mentors’ and pre-service teachers’ voices, thus demonstrating the absence of these three-voiced experiences in most of the studies to understand the sense of the ELTP from those who live the reality of the practicum.

**ELTP: Instructional Processes and Challenges in the Classroom**

Teaching English to students in real school settings is one of the major concerns for PTs. Learning to plan, teach, and design the materials for their classes bring several expectations for PTs and their UMIs. Despite having a well-prepared class, classroom management questions PTs’ personal abilities to deal with behavior problems and has itself constituted a challenge as it directly influences the teaching and learning process in the classroom. In this regard, Quintero and Ramirez (2011) described a study on how teacher trainees

3 I have respected the name given by the authors. This name corresponds to pre-service teachers and is the name I have used along the paper.

video/audio taping, transcriptions, and documentary analysis, the researchers found that teacher trainees’ interpretation of the classroom setting transcends the traditional view of classrooms. Instead, they looked at them as places full of life, experiences, and stories to discover, which opposed an outside view of a noisy and disruptive environment. Rather, the classroom was a real learning environment where students had the chance to express themselves and fulfill learning activities. Although teacher trainees share this view, a lack of discipline at the institutional level mostly focused on social behavior. In other words, children are expected to be nice and respectful to others, protect school property, and wear their uniforms properly (without make-up or accessories). The school codes reflect the fact that the classroom is somehow seen as a separate setting where teachers are assumed to have total control, which makes PTs feel unexperienced in regard to on-the-go decisions.

Similarly, Macías and Sánchez (2015) looked at classroom management challenges among pre-service foreign language teachers, the approaches confronting them, and alternatives to improve classroom management skills. In this sense, the inadequate classroom conditions and explicit
acts of misbehavior, regardless of subject or experience, were some of the challenges faced by the student-teachers. In addition, establishing rules and reinforcing consequences of misbehavior were the main approaches to classroom management. They have concluded that having more contact with actual classrooms and learning from experienced others were options to developing classroom management skills. Therefore, the authors have implied that more contact with students in the classroom leads to better learning environments. Although it is important to maintain good classroom management, it is also necessary to teach a class in the ELTP, which demonstrates the PTs’ capacities to deal with behavioral issues. Classroom management cannot be seen as a homogeneous set of strategies that works for everyone. Although these reports address relevant reflections on the value of classroom management, it is also important to understand that teaching is a lived experience that entails the construction of relationships with students and teachers and the understanding of the complex dynamics of the school context.

**ELTP: Reflective, Mentoring and Evaluation Approaches**

**Reflective and Mentoring Approaches.** To start, Bonilla and Méndez (2008) reviewed different methodologies for mentoring the teaching practicum and its relevance in ILTEPs. Bringing to the discussion the professional formation of language teachers (Dewey, 1938; Farrel, 1998; Gutierrez, 1996; Loughran 2002; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Tsui, 2003; Wallace 1991, 1996), the researchers describe the mentoring models depicted in the literature and make a mentoring didactic proposal with a reflective orientation including group discussions, individual conversations, complementary readings, multi-observation, and writing exercises. They concluded by claiming that mentoring has been regarded as a central process which includes more than simply supervising student-teachers’ tasks. Instead, it has to do with helping student teachers understand and reflect upon the realities they are facing in their experiences. Méndez and Bonilla (2016) reported on another study that attempted to identify the challenges of disciplinary integration in a BA program. Data revealed that the preparation for the teaching practicum needs to be strengthened
interdisciplinarily by other academic subjects and fields since the knowledge teachers and students had of the pedagogical model of the program was fragmented. In this vein, there is a need to have a greater appropriation of the concept of interdisciplinarity and the problematic methodology underlining the curriculum.

Following a problem-based methodology, Méndez and Pérez (2017) conducted a research study to inquire about the practicum. Through interviews, reflective journals, and sessions, PTs and UMs reflected upon the difficulties of being an English teacher and how the classroom came to be an experiential context of methodological, epistemological, and pedagogical approaches to understand the complex nature of a teaching practicum. At the same time, they implemented an instructional intervention relevant to their teaching context. Data revealed a misunderstanding of the practicum setting and difficulties in the design of instructional interventions due to the insufficient time available to fully immerse in the context. Additionally, the authors found a technical view of planning that affected creativity, a disconnected view of research in project-based teaching, and a focus on behaviorist classroom management. It is worth noting that although UMs recognized their PTs’ strengths and personalities as being unique, PTs undervalued their own performance because of that imagined identity embedded in the notion of an ideal teacher.

In the same line of thought, Viáfara (2005a) developed a study on the design of a reflective framework of tasks (Loughran, 2002; Pollard & Tann, 1993; Rodgers, 2002; Wallace, 1991) to support the preparation process of student teachers4 in the ELTP. He implemented journal writing, conferences among the counselor and the student teacher, and focused reflection on tasks and responses to observation notes to portray how the reflective framework supports student-teachers’ learning in the ELTP. In a second study, Viáfara (2005b) explored student teachers’ opinions about their counselor’s notes and the nature of their responses to those records in order to support the students’ learning process. Accordingly, the student teachers gained support and different perspectives, which served to build meaning for their teaching. In a third study, Viáfara (2011) focused on how student-teachers dealt with the
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4In this review, the terms students-teachers, pre-service teachers, teacher trainees, and prospective teachers have been used respecting the names given in each one of the articles. By the same token, the terms cooperating teachers, practicum advisors, practicum directors, practicum director, and pedagogical advisor are used for the same purpose.
challenge of using the L2 in public school classrooms. He maintained his interest in a reflective teaching preparation model (Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Wallace, 1991), which urged him to implement field notes, interviews, and student teachers’ portfolios to explore their attitudes and strategies. The teacher researcher concluded that PTs’ teaching context, their preparation, and their history as learners influenced their decisions as English teachers by identifying the strategies they deployed in order to interact in English with their students.

Arenas, Bermúdez, and Fandiño (2015) reported on a systematization exercise that focused on the nature and scope of the teaching practicum directors’ work in a languages program from 2013 to 2014 (one year). The authors reflected on the conceptions, actions, roles, and challenges that emerge from the different functions assumed by the practicum directors when acting as intermediaries between academia and school reality. Using teachers’ diaries and assuming a critical and interpretive approach, practicum advisors reflected on three moments: the experience in the practicum, the interpretation of the experience and the proposal of theoretical and practical guidelines to strengthen their work. Findings revealed that practicum directors should move from an instrumental to a more grounded mentoring process and that the level of reflection should also transcend the empirical and practical to a more critical level of reflection.

Castañeda-Peña, Rodríguez-Uribe, Salazar-Sierra, and Chala-Bejarano (2016) attempted to identify and characterize the space of the pedagogical advisor in the teaching practicum. For this reason, they focused on aspects pre-service teachers in a modern languages program at a private university made relevant in their self-assessment reports regarding the relationship with their advisor, namely: linguistic, social, cognitive, educational, emotional, and pedagogical, at the end of their teaching practicum. The findings portrayed PTs’ narrative events around the pedagogical, social, and emotional aspects, recognizing the close bonds constructed with their pedagogical advisors in which the advisors’ support, experience, attitude, and knowledge were highlighted. The researchers concluded that there seemed to be an implicit construction of knowledge emerging from the relationship among the teachers-to-be, their pedagogical advisor, and the didactic elements. The latter was prioritized in the act of teaching itself.
In a similar context, Bonilla and Samacá (2020) explored how modern and postmodern views of education have impacted teacher educators (TEs) and student-teachers’ (STs) pedagogical action during their practicum. Through oral narrative accounts, and following a qualitative narrative analysis, findings revealed that even though TEs and STs aligned themselves with discourses of generational change regarding conceptions of knowledge construction, which allows flexibility in guiding pedagogical actions, there is a tendency to shape practices based on the ideals of fixed defined generations and views of education. Nevertheless, the flexible process portion struggled with the idea of TEs controlling STs’ progress in their practicum. Findings also indicated that STs and TEs are unable to strike a balance between theory and practice, most of the time trivializing both teaching and classroom in an instrumental rationality that might undermine reflection. In these studies, the effort to mentor PTs in their ELTP is evident through reflective models that seem to implicitly privilege the didactic dimension of teaching and a reflective view of this dimension in which both PTs and UMs are involved. However, it would be important to open the possibility to understand the perspectives SMs (schoolteachers or cooperating teachers) have constructed around ELT given that they know more about the complexities of the school students and their contexts.

**Reflection in relation to beliefs and perceptions.** Concerned with student-teachers’ expectations towards the ELTP and following a reflective approach (Barlett, 1994; Farrell, 2003; Ferraro, 2008; Richards, 1990; Schön, 1983), Prada and Zuleta (2005) addressed the experiences of fourth-grade primary school teachers by examining the difficulties they went through in the ELTP. The findings revealed that the reflective practice allowed the student-teachers to handle different situations they faced with classroom management, i.e. getting experts’ advice and creating solutions. In the same vein, Zambrano and Insuasty (2009) examined the student-teachers’ perceptions about the implementation of reflective teaching (Barlett, 1994; Nunan & Richards, 1994) tools in the practicum in a foreign languages program at a public university. Data showed that the student-teachers made significant progress in the conceptualization of reflective teaching and in the use of journals and blog discussion for this purpose. In a
second study, Insuasty and Zambrano (2010) examined how student-teachers could be empowered as more reflective practitioners through journal keeping and blog group discussions in the teaching practicum (TP). Data collected through journals, blogs, conferences, and a questionnaire demonstrated that STs expanded their insights into reflective teaching and adopted a more reflective and critical attitude in their practicum. The STs went beyond the mere description of what goes on in class by giving a theoretical sense to classroom incidents, finding inconsistencies between teaching intentions and teaching actions, identifying things worth improving, and adopting courses of action. In a third effort, Insuasty and Zambrano (2014) conducted a study on the reflective supervision experiences in the TP. For this purpose, a reflective supervision proposal (Richards & Nunan, 1994) was implemented. Findings suggested that both practicum advisors and student-teachers highlighted the importance to provide and receive feedback informing not only what happened in the classroom, but also reflecting upon their teaching practice.

By the same token, Camacho, Durán, Albaracín, Arciniegas, Martínez, and Cote (2012) attempted to understand how a process of reflection helped student-teachers throughout their first teaching experience in public schools. Data were collected through classroom observations, students’ reflective journals, lesson plans, and semi-structured interviews. Following the reflective models by Schön (1987) and Van Manen (1977), the authors revealed that reflection in action and on action is directly linked to the events in the classroom setting, helping the teachers to improve their teaching practices and the unexpected situations they had to deal with. Through reflection, the STs moved from a technical to a practical level when supporting their actions with their theoretical views on language teaching. They further advanced to a critical level of reflection through questioning of moral and ethical issues. Cote (2012) also carried out a study on the role of reflection on pre-service teachers’ first teaching experience while completing their practicum in public high schools, a primary school, and one public university. The author followed the same reflection models (Schön (1987) and Van Manen (1977)), STs’ reflective journals, one-on-one interviews, and classroom observations. The findings demonstrated that reflection on action and reflections in action enabled participants to redirect teaching processes. In regard to the levels of
reflection, this study found that although all the student-teachers reached the first and second level of reflection, only two participants reached the third level, that is, critical reflection.

Aguirre (2014) explored pre-service teachers’ beliefs about their roles as teachers in pedagogical and emotional aspects of their students in elementary language classrooms. Through log entries and pedagogical reflections, the author revealed that serving as emotional support for their students and identifying their academic needs are the main teacher roles within the classroom. Likewise, Morales (2016) inquired about the role of the teaching practicum on student-teachers’ attitudes toward teaching while being immersed in an English teaching practicum. Data were collected through interviews, questionnaires, verbal reports, and artifacts. Results indicated that the English practicum provided PTs with opportunities to reflect and develop awareness, positive attitudes, and satisfaction towards their teaching practice. PTs expressed that teaching was meaningful work for societal construction. They declared teaching takes place when teachers and students interact in order to build new understandings of contents.

Durán, Lastra, and Morales (2017) also unveiled pre-service teachers’ beliefs about English teaching strategies, inquired about the origin of those beliefs, and sought the effect didactics and teaching practicum courses had on their reconstruction and evolution. Through students’ language learning histories, interviews, students’ reflection journals, teaching portfolios, and classroom observations, the authors revealed that STs transformed their self-perception as teachers mediated by ongoing reflection. They compared the so-called traditional methodology with their own classroom-based techniques and principles and their pedagogical practice. They found themselves moving from these traditional practices which have permeated their language learning histories and found new ways to see their learners. Correspondingly, Suárez and Basto (2017) attempted to identify pre-service teachers’ beliefs about teaching English and track their potential changes throughout the teaching practicum in a public university. Data were gathered through a language learning inventory before the practicum, journal entries while doing the TP, and two semi-structured interviews at the end of the teaching practicum. Findings indicated that the beliefs of motivation, error correction,
teaching mechanisms, and teaching pronunciation changed when they faced the reality of the classroom.

From a more critical view of ELT, Gutiérrez (2015) explored the beliefs, attitudes and reflections of student-teachers (in a foreign language teaching program at a public university) towards the exploration of critical theories and the design and implementation of critical lessons. Data collected included audio-recordings of class discussions, individual interviews with the participants, their reflections during different stages, and class observations of their lesson implementation. Findings indicated that exposing future EFL teachers to critical literacy approaches to language teaching may influence their perspectives towards education and their teaching practice, backgrounds, and prior beliefs. Additionally, the author found that participants believed that changing the education system in Colombia would be difficult because the learners’ ages have to be part of critical discussions, and the acknowledgment of learners’ parents in terms of discussing specific topics like politics and sexuality are challenges to be addressed. Most studies in this section have had reflection at the core of the formation process in the ELTP. Some authors suggest that reflection should not be taken for granted in teacher development, and it is a position I agree with. Nonetheless, reflection has maintained a focus on the instructional dimension of language teaching (Gutiérrez, 2015; Samacá, 2018, 2020) ignoring other aspects, dimensions, situations, feelings, and uncertainties, that are also part of the experience in the ELTP.

**Evaluation of the ELTP.** Chaves (2008) reported an ethnographic research study that described a retrospective evaluation of the practicum during 2003 and 2004 in a B.A. in Modern Languages program at Universidad del Valle. He identified the strengths, weaknesses, and proposals necessary for the initial language teacher education program in its accreditation process. The variables for the analysis contained the conceptual bases in the student-teachers’ TP proposal and the TP teachers’ counseling, which included aims, approaches, methodological strategies, resources, and evaluation, as well as connections with the pedagogical formation component of the curriculum. The results considered two stages: student-teachers’ visions before the TP and their visions after conducting their TP. The former revealed a lack of knowledge in regard to operational
aspects and the nature of the TP. In other words, they were skeptical towards the difficulties found in the TP and the mismatch between theory and practice. For example, the student-teachers had to restrict or limit their methodological decisions to the communicative approach. The latter maintained the preliminary conception that the school’s vision remained over the proposals constructed at the university level. The student-teachers developed a more critical perspective as to what they did in the TP. The TP is not only a space for application but for learning. Among the strengths are the formation in materials design, lesson plan quality, and the relationship between the student-teachers and their counselor. It is worth highlighting that the student-teachers’ counselors manifested the need to have explicit guidelines to conduct the TP and discussion sessions to share what they had done in the counseling sessions with their students. A similar study conducted an evaluation of the ELTP using diaries and written reflections. Rodríguez (2009) found that although there was a growth process of STs and their counsellors from the development of the “what” and “how” of English teaching as compared to the “why” of teaching, there was little reference about the contexts in which STs developed their TP. It seemed as if the STs assumed a standardized environment without any relation to the social, cultural, economic, educational, and political conditions of the school contexts. Another relevant aspect of this evaluation is that the TP was centered exclusively on STs’ work in the classroom, validating once more the homogenizing discourses and practices constructed around ELT in the Global North. We can notice here the importance of constant evaluation and reflection on the ELTP. However, as mentioned in previous sections, results focus more on knowledges STs are supposed to possess and instructional aspects of teaching in the classroom, thus demonstrating that our field is still colonized by learning and teaching epistemologies of the north in order to become a language teacher.

The Experience in the ELTP: From Expectations to Dichotomies

Castañeda-Trujillo and Aguirre-Hernández (2018) show the results of a pedagogical experience with a group of preservice English teachers during their first semester of teaching practicum. The analysis of the PTs’ reflection papers showed that their voices acknowledged a more human
and social understanding of their classrooms, their mentors’ personal experiences contributing to the reflection in the ELTP, and the identification of normalizing ELT processes while reflecting on the PTs’ experiences. Likewise, Lucero and Roncancio (2019) discussed English language pre-service teachers’ pedagogical practicum experiences at a private university. Through their teacher journals and group talks, pre-service teachers discussed that their first practicum experiences were full of feelings and emotions during this period at diverse schools and with different mentor teachers. The PTs experienced high levels of anxiety because they felt unprepared to teach a class, lacked preparation and knowledge from their teaching program, and did not receive as much guidance during lesson planning. Another result from the study revealed that mentor teachers’ anecdotal discourses have remarkable effects on their first teaching practices. Although the analysis portrayed that mentors mainly highlight PTs’ mistakes and weaknesses, PTs acknowledge the efforts that their mentor teachers make, so that they can be more autonomous. These first experiences, in turn, develop the foundation upon which they construct themselves as English language teachers.

Fajardo and Miranda (2015) were concerned with the disconnection between the practicum and pre-service teachers’ sense of affiliation with the teaching profession. Interviews and online blogs were used to collect data, one before the practicum started to explore their sense of identification and one in the last week of the practicum to see the effect that it caused on their professional sense of affiliation with teaching. The content analysis portrayed that PTs exhibited positive and stable identities as they constructed relationships with the pupils and institution where they were working. The PTs also wished to improve their qualifications at the graduate level and travel to English speaking countries to enhance their communicative skills. While a strong motivation for teaching was manifested before the practicum, this changed afterward because of pupils’ misbehavior, conflicting perceptions, and frustrations as a result of the supervisors’ feedback. In the same vein, Pinzón and Guerrero (2018) developed an introspective research study to document the student-teacher’s experience during her teaching practicum as she implemented m-learning in a public school in Bogotá. The study was developed with her research advisor. The analysis of data (narrative introspection,
introspective interview, and lesson plans) showed that the student-teacher lived her teaching practicum within dichotomies in three dimensions: 1) the negotiations between her expectations given during her undergraduate courses; 2) the reality lived in the practicum and her personal epistemology, reality, and interest in solving technological flaws; and 3) her frustration and achievements.

**Identity Construction in the ELTP**

From a more socio-critical perspective, Díaz (2013) aimed to describe the way foreign language student-teachers from a public university constructed their identity through their actions and decisions at the school setting where they developed their ELTP. STs’ reflections, diaries, and the participants’ advisor’s observations during her visits to schools revealed that STs adhere to the reality of the school structure, negotiate with it, and some of them moved from dependent to independent decision makers. This last aspect made STs into actors instead of spectators of the ELT process. With the same interest, Montoya-López, Mosquera-Andrade, and Peláez-Henao (2020) inquired about policy agency within PTs’ construction of teacher identity in their ELTP, drawing on a critical sociocultural approach to narrative inquiry, language policy, and teacher identity. Narratives collected through interviews and the PTs’ journals portrayed their social and critical awareness when reflecting and making decisions on foreign language policies regulating their pedagogical practices at schools. The study illustrated a dichotomy and contradiction between the PTs feelings of frustration and disappointment in trying to participate when policy arbiters discussed structures and their actions reflected methodological concerns rather than addressing social or critical awareness in curriculum design and development. The researchers considered it a priority to support pre-service teachers in strengthening their identities with solid theoretical constructs in order to build micro political agency to overcome political tensions and negotiate their participation in policy decision-making. More recently, Ubaque-Casallas and Aguirre-Garzón (2020) carried out a narrative study aimed at exploring the possible forms of professional personal-local knowledge STs encounter and produce when they plan language lessons. The findings suggested that STs resignified certain methodological yet hegemonic constructions of teaching and learning.
These constructions seemed to be largely acquired or borrowed from their ILTEPs, and the knowledge of themselves as teachers is shaped by the circumstances they face in the process of planning and teaching classes. These studies clearly depict the flows through which PTs start constructing their identity as English language teachers. This entails a never-ending, self-recognition process and the recognitions of others in a socio-cultural context. Furthermore, the process is made possible by the personal and social conditions and decisions that craft PTs’ decision to become a teacher, as well as the people who have influenced their decisions and experiences. Students, peers, schoolteachers, teacher educators, the school context, their families, and others are part of the process (Samacá & Barón, 2013). Finally, PTs come to recognize and challenge the homogeneous and static must-be discourses of who the language teacher is under the narratives of neoliberalism.

Research as a Central Axis to Transform the Practicum

Frodden and López (1998) reported the experience of a participatory action research teaching practicum through mutual collaboration between the university and school. The authors pointed out that the schoolteachers’ view of ELTP may have become routinized and could be updated. Using portfolios, diaries, and questionnaires, the trainees observed, reflected, and evaluated the actions they took in the classrooms. Findings illustrated that in the first teaching practicum course, the dialogue between cooperating teachers and trainees brought up difficulties because of the critical and judgmental observations towards the school and classroom settings. As trainees were not motivated towards teaching in high school, proposing projects with teachers should have helped them organize and systematize the process to arrive at solutions and changes in the teachers’ roles. In the second teaching practicum course, there was support in some cases from cooperating teachers, who established an effective dialogue. However, other cooperating teachers complained. Cadavid (2003) reported on a study in which the PTs implemented a spiral thematic curriculum to determine its effects on teaching English to children in a public primary school. Through journals, both UM and PTs identified that children were involved in learning English in a meaningful way. They felt motivated and were aware of the importance of
learning English. PTs’ reflections on their learning process and performance reinforced topics in other content areas. There was a move from grammar-based classes to students’ learning process which brought on the realization that ELT should be used to promote values and be a way to contribute to children’s personal development.

Quintero, Zuluaga, and López (2003) carried out a study that supported the vision of how research improved English lesson planning as a fundamental stage in reflective teaching with PTs. Following the spiral reflection on action, they questioned the problem in the lesson plan. The authors asserted that it is relevant to guide PTs in a reflective component, and their actions should not be limited by the lesson plan contents, methodologies, time, and materials. In fact, PTs can engage in research to understand to what extent their lesson plans were successful and what aspects need to be improved. The findings illustrated that PTs valued the lesson planning process, their analysis, and the actions they assumed to improve them. The lesson plan became the object of transformation.

In a B.A. program in Spanish, English, and French at a private university, Baquero (2007) conducted a study that conceived the teaching practicum as a practice based on educational action-research. Its purpose was to characterize the methodological and conceptual aspects developed in the pedagogical practice and how the educational action-research contributes to the transformation of these processes, meanings, and forms in the teaching practicum. He concluded that there exists a predominance of the technical-instrumental rationality in the development of the teaching practices in the faculty of education, and the implementation of action research can generate transformations in the teaching practices.

Ruiz and Cárdenas (2008) reported a mixed method study aimed at determining the impact of the research component on students’ academic lives in an ILTEP at a public university. This study took place during the years 2000 and 2001 and focused on three major concerns: 1) to inquire about students’ experiences in the classroom research seminars, 2) to determine the impact of the classroom research component in the development of students’ degree work, 3) to establish the relationship between classroom research and the teaching practicum. For the purpose of this review, I focus only on the last concern. Data were collected through surveys of students who
were about to finish their studies. Findings suggested that the classroom research orientation contributed toward knowing more about the different institutions and their academic and administrative structure through the processes of observation and description. It also provided theoretical tools to conduct the degree work in the teaching practicum. In regard to the classroom setting, research contributed toward finding solutions to challenges, addressing problems as opportunities for research, and establishing a constant bond between research and the ELT classroom. It also helped students understand that the classroom setting is a unique but complex “universe” along with the pedagogical relations that are interwoven within it. Moreover, the students were able to comprehend the actual reality of foreign languages tendencies, materials, and practices that relate to theory. They could foresee possible situations students will be exposed to in their professional future. Finally, they also presumed themselves as more critical and reflective in regard to their work.

Quintero and Ramírez (2009) were interested in establishing the impact of an action research model on the professional and personal education of beginning teachers along their teaching practicum at public, elementary, middle, and high schools. They considered the foreign language classroom as a laboratory, where every single move is a source of reflection and research. The authors followed the action research model (Elliot, 1998; Kemis & McTaggart, 1995; Stenhouse, 1975) and used evaluation sessions, advisors’ testimonies, administrators’ interviews, and document analysis. The results revealed that there was a gradual growth of teacher trainees’ self-awareness of the teachers’ role. Their conceptions of teaching transformed into more reflective practices integrating theory and practice and having a closer relationship between pedagogy and research. A mastery of research skills and curriculum reinforcement in the participant institutions was obtained because of the teacher trainees’ interests in complying with curriculum guidelines both at the school and the MoE levels. Similarly, McNulty (2010) developed a case study to examine preservice teachers’ (PTs) and advisors’ (PAs) beliefs about action research methodology to identify topics, questions, and roles. Structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were used with the participants. Results showed that journal writing, collaborative dialogue, exploring
and expanding PTs’ and PAs’ theoretical base, delimiting topics, and demonstrating work were useful strategies. Though pre-service teachers took ownership of choosing topics (teaching methods, teaching techniques, syllabi, classroom management) and formulating questions, intrapersonal and interpersonal reflections combined with critical dialogic questioning provoked the PTs and PAs to actively participate in this process. The researcher concluded that the methodological process used to identify the topics and formulate the research questions is associated with a reflective professional development endeavor with individual and group reflection.

In the same vein, Guerra, Sanchez, Rodríguez, and Díaz (2015) reported a multi-case study that brought together the experiences and reflections of student-teachers, cooperating teachers, and advisors about the action research process within the framework of the academic practicum in a foreign language teaching program. Through observations, interviews, focus groups, and research report analyses, the researchers recognized the personal, professional, and political dimensions that guide participants’ teaching and research actions. Findings shed light on issues such as collaboration and engagement to promote conversations that actually connect life in schools and life at the university and to support continuous and reciprocal learning for teachers. The insights showed that the teachers, students, and administrators in the teaching program and their colleagues in the public schools need to strengthen their links through proposals of experiential learning which promote joint efforts to promote and sustain a better society.

Abad and Pineda (2018) shared their experience of becoming language teachers and researchers within the context of an English teaching program at a private university. One of the STs described how, through her participation in a research incubator, she actively engaged in research, which allowed her to develop research competencies and inform her own teaching practicum. Findings revealed that research training supported by mentoring has an enormous potential to further teachers’ professional development, as well as to reconfigure the relationships with students, parents, colleagues, and supervisors. Additionally, research training helped the authors reframe their teaching identities in light of their role as active agents of change within their own school communities, bridge existing gaps between educational theory and teaching practice, and strengthen a
school-university partnership. As a result, doing research builds teachers’ knowledge and raises their status as professional educators.

In this section, I have portrayed an initial landscape of research in the ELTP in the Colombian context. This revision has identified five core tendencies: *instructional processes and challenges; dialogical, reflective, mentoring, and evaluation approaches; reflection; expectations; and dichotomies and the role of research in the ELTP*. Most studies have drawn on Global North frameworks, validating a functional perspective of the ELTP and setting aside the possibility of co-construction of a more locally designed perspective. Most studies have also focused their attention on PTs, or PTs and UMs. Little research considering the voice of SMs has been developed so far, indicating that their voices have been absent, invisibilized, and neglected in the understandings of the ELTP. In the following section, from a decolonial perspective, I will discuss pedagogical colonialism that has ingrained the ELTP.

**Understanding Pedagogical Colonialism in ELT**

Situated within a decolonial perspective and in an attempt to understand how the ELTPC experiences the ELTP, this section addresses a critical reflection towards the understandings of how pedagogical colonialism has ingrained itself in the ELT field and, therefore, in our practices\(^5\) within our educational contexts. In doing so, pedagogical colonialism has extended into the ELTP pre-service teachers’ development as part of the formation process in initial language teacher education programs (ILTEP). In discussing what pedagogical colonialism\(^6\) represents, Huergo and Morawicki (2010) mentioned that it is “a colonization that produces ‘epistemological pathologies’ insofar as it forces facts—stubborn facts—or simplify and flatten them from ‘universal’ ideas and doctrines” (p. 13). In our field, this entails a

---

5 *Practices* that cannot be reduced to what Giroux (1988) has called a technocratic approach to both teacher preparation and classroom pedagogy. Instead, *these practices* can address from a decolonial stance other forms of thinking, doing, and understanding of school contexts (De Sousa, 2010).

6 Pedagogical colonialism is a term taken from Jauretche (2002), an Argentinian thinker, writer, and politician, who claims that pedagogical colonization takes place in the name of particular values constructed as universal and supported by an *intelligenzia* (native) that shapes a mentality that seeks to silence, obturate, and colonize popular cultures.
colonial presence of being and knowing enshrined in a coloniality of ideological foundations that is evident, as Phillipson (2003) underlines, on the pillars on which ELT was built: the unanalyzed experience of teaching English and the theoretical disciplines which were considered relevant to language teaching in the endeavor of spreading the English language. This may represent a subalternity in neoliberal practices that are now ruling educational and, therefore, language policies in our context. According Jauretche (2008), educational and language policies are produced in conjunction with a legal statute of imperialist colonialism.

English language teaching colonialism has made itself present in several ways: accepting that the language to teach and to learn is English over other majority and minority languages in our country; following the standard teaching methods and textbooks that have intended to homogenize ELT classroom practices, learnings and interactions; use of the language (to have a near-native-like control); and believing in language certification as the only form to demonstrate that people speak a language, to name a few of them. These ideas have definitely maintained a pedagogical knowledge expanded by Western thought, which promotes “unique” and limited ways to teach and learn a language. It is not secret that based on this view, ELT has been, to some extent, reduced to a very technical field, where the purpose is to teach and/or learn English because of the socio-economic demands of neoliberalism. This implies that even though English has been seen as a language of global communication in several areas, the obstacle, most of the time, relies only on English proficiency and has serious implications in its teaching and learning process.

This linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 2003) has various implications. First, as mentioned above, ELT might be reduced to an instrumental practice that seems to be normalized in this contemporary age of “standardized” education (Magrini, 2014). What seems to matter most is English proficiency certification. We might witness this in the proliferation of English language institutes, that by adopting the Western mode of thinking, promote English language certification, and the teaching practice is depleted to testing. In addition, mass-media promotes learning English with this only-fractionated view of the language and acritically supports the Bilingual Program in Colombia. We may also notice that
Educational policies rule curriculums and pedagogical practices that rely on language proficiency because it is the form through which the government (I refer to Colombia) demonstrates and controls ‘results’\(^7\). Second, instrumental practice is concerned with initial language teacher education programs because the new reform to the Schools of Education\(^8\) requires that pre-service English teachers demonstrate a C1 level, which has been extended to other areas of the student-teachers’ academic life. For example, STs will have to prove they are at a level A2 in the first two years of college and a B1 or higher from the third year after implementing the Licensure Programs Restructuring Process.

Third, most of the English teaching and learning theories and practices have been limited to only the didactic dimension (methods, strategies, materials, evaluation, and assessment) theories. On the one hand, they have been constructed by ‘experts’ in this field\(^9\). However, without the intention to deny their contributions, they have been universalized without considering the particularities of our contexts. Therefore, this knowledge has been transformed into standard processes and actions that create static visions of what ELT should be and determine an only-one-method perspective. Most of the time, the discourse has led to an idea that these theories and practices are the only possibilities to teach and learn a second language. Once again, pedagogical colonialism is present to let us know that we might become submissive, conformist, and passive technicians (Crandall, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

Fourth, this didactic dimension helps us reflect on our profession today. As mentioned previously, it seems that ELT has only been related to instrumental and sometimes practical practices (Crandall, 2000). Is this what we should focus on in our profession? Are these only what initial language teacher education programs in Colombia establish as formation purposes? Is this what the English Language Teaching Practicum relies on? In regard to the first question, from my experience as a teacher educator in public universities, I would claim that it is not. It is necessary for English teachers to learn the techniques of how to teach, but they should not adopt

---

\(^7\) ‘Results’ in these perspectives relate to technical and instrumental approaches for the production of knowledge (Magrini, 2014).

\(^8\) *Resolución 18583 de 2016* emanated by the Ministry of Education.

\(^9\) ‘Experts’ who belong to Global North as described by Kachru (1985, cited in Phillipson, 2003) in his categorization of countries in which English is used. Nonetheless, Colombia is not considered yet in the expanding circle, in fact, just a few Latin American countries are (Mckay, 2009).
methods of best practice verbatim. It is necessary to reflect and make informed decisions towards more emancipatory practices that construct, re-construct, and reposition not only this didactic dimension, but also pedagogical knowledges\textsuperscript{10} that might be co-constructed in our educational contexts with teachers and students. Pedagogical pluralism\textsuperscript{11} might help us recognize and understand that other issues affect and influence our students in the language classroom and school by looking at the situation through decolonial lenses\textsuperscript{12}. Likewise, we can embrace a holistic process in praxis. We, as English teachers, play several roles in our contexts other than just merely teaching an English class; the question is, what can we and our students do with the language we teach? How do we look at the language? What can we learn, re-learn and transform?

In regard to the second question, I would definitely affirm that the instrumental dimension of teaching is present, but it does not constitute the only purpose of teaching programs. When they are concerned with pre-service teacher education, some teacher educators, hopefully all of them, might be critically engaged in the formation of English teachers who can reinterpret, reevaluate, and reconceptualize what English language teaching and learning is about. From a decolonial perspective, this embraces the construction of new relationships with Western thinking and develops a sense of belonging as to whom and where we are. In this sense, we work from a South that has a locus of enunciation that recognizes diversity, multiplicity of realities, and possibilities not only to teach a language but to use it as a tool to know about our world (De Soussa, 2010).

With respect to the third question, I would contend that the teaching practicum is the stage, the space, the context, but also, as Ortega (2018) mentioned, “the intentional formation action that embraces times lived together, inhabited spaces, rituals, a collective way of life, and reflexivity productions, from which qualities that make

---

\textsuperscript{10} For Zuluaga (1999), “pedagogy is not only a discourse about teaching, but also a practice whose application relies on discourse” (p. 10). Grounded on Foucault’s (1970) concept of knowing, Zuluaga (2014) asserted that “Knowing is a methodological notion that applied to pedagogy designates the pedagogical knowledge” (p. 78). This implies the possibility to explore, from practical experiences, teaching, its subjects, their contexts, and conceptual situations of pedagogy. Thus, she asserted that her understanding of pedagogy has to do with “the discipline that conceptualizes, applies and experiences knowledge related to the teaching of specific knowledges, in different cultures” (p. 10). This translation is mine.

\textsuperscript{11} I use this term to pertain to one’s own pedagogies different from the universal ones.

\textsuperscript{12} The decolonial perspective or decolonial turn is a posture of critical resistance that questions practices set up in our societies and alternatives to make our thoughts visible (De Soussa, 2010).
it unique and specific emerge”\(^\text{13}\) (p. 5). Therefore, the teaching practicum is the construction and public action of the teacher in a situated-social place. This vision might deconstruct the reality of teachers’ work and would contribute to new understandings of how the ELTPC experience it. This entails for the ELTPC to bring their personal stories, formative journey, endeavors, and repertoire of knowledges, as well as ethical, esthetical, and political visions into the recreation of situated learning experiences that transcend the instructional dimension of teaching.

Thus, the formation process that is provided to pre-service teachers at the university is relevant but not enough. Teacher learning during the practicum is filtered by the senses\(^\text{14}\) pre-service teachers, along with school and university mentors, co-construct around their practices (Samacá, 2018). Therefore, the ELTP might be enriched by this community, where their living experiences co-construct senses in that purpose of learning to teach and becoming a language teacher. It is worth noting that although the teaching practicum cannot prepare teachers for the range of responsibilities and dynamics they will deal with when becoming English teachers, it will suggest new ways of thinking, being, and doing. PTs can share and problematize their daily encounters and challenge the relationships of domination and subordination seen in pedagogical colonialism, which has restrained teachers to technical or instrumental action in the English language classroom and school context because of the institutional demands\(^\text{15}\) of the Ministry of Education (MoE), universities, and schools underlined in educational and language policies. Pedagogical colonialism emphasizes the fact that our profession in ELT has been objectified to the extent of limiting the roles and positionalities of the ELTPC in the ELTP.

In order to initially comprehend what subjects of teaching represent, Zuluaga (1999), a Colombian pedagogue, distinguishes two subjects. The first one relates to the sciences and knowledges from a method because knowledge is completely formed from an instrumental conception of the teaching method, socially recognized

---

\(^{13}\) My own translation from Spanish.

\(^{14}\) These senses may contain views, beliefs, assumptions, and conceptions around how the teaching practicum is experiences by pre-service teachers, cooperating teachers, and university mentors.

\(^{15}\) As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the certification policy in our area is a demand that alienates curricular decisions and classroom practices within the production of knowledge.
because he/she has the method as a fundamental tool. The more uprooted from knowledge the teacher is in a social formation and the greater his/her cultural uprooting is, the more emphasis on his/her methodological labor is placed. However, there is another teacher subject recognized, not from the teaching method, but from the knowledge he/she transmits. He/she can be a math, physics, philosophy, sociology teacher, etc. That is to say, his/her status as a teacher in society is recognized from another knowledge that is not Pedagogy. Nevertheless, the two subjects teach, but the difference between those two subjects is a result of the form of institutionalization and social adequacy of knowledge (p. 49).16 This differentiation is related to a subjective notion and posits the need to understand that the teacher is a knowing subject, a subject of pedagogical knowledge who positions him/herself in a knowing field, exploring how relationships form and develop though his/her interactions in the educational context. To me, these subjects are human beings that are social and political because of their dialogical interactions and because they are able to reflect, express, produce, question, construct, and co-construct knowledges. This is consistent with what Giroux (1998) calls ‘teachers as intellectuals’ in his attempt to argue the ways to rethink and restructure the nature of their work. This category suggests recognizing an “intellectual” as opposed to an instrumental laborer, thereby, clarifying the ideological conditions for teachers to act as ‘intellectual’ and elucidating the roles teachers play in “producing and legitimating various political, economic and social interests through the pedagogies they endorse and utilize” (p. 125).

Going back to the ELTPC, these visions lead us to think about the subjects we encounter in educational contexts in everyday interactions. To start, PTs17 are the ones for whom the teaching practicum is constructed18 and through whom they become closer to their future profession. Who are they? Student-teachers who have expectations and who are anxious about their encounters with their students. They are expected to experience ELT and to be closer to what becoming an ELT teacher entails. These experiences might push them

16 This translation is mine.
17 They are also called student-teachers, prospective teachers, future teachers, novice teachers, teacher trainees, and apprentices in the literature.
18 Initial language teacher education programs in Colombia are concerned about the preparation process their student-teachers go through in an endeavor to provide spaces for high quality educational and pedagogical processes in this stage. They have designed these practicum experiences in the middle or at the end of the programs.
to externalize their inner emotions that are present in their classrooms and school contexts, where they are not alone. Both school and university mentors accompany them in this formation journey. Thus, the ELTP opens the possibility for several relationships through which the ELTPC might be involved in a process of critical reflection about the instructional dimension of teaching, but also become part of the personal dimension weaving pedagogical bonds that recognize the others through the dialogical encounters through which education and pedagogy reveal new senses. School mentors are those subjects who have, from my perspective, a very influential role in pre-service teachers’ construction of their identities, their roles, and positionalities. They are experienced teachers who support the learning process for pre-service teachers through co-teaching, guidance, and supervision. They have experiences to tell because they have constructed their personal ways of teaching. However, their influence has not been considered as significant in most research studies on the ELTP.

The last subjects of this ELTPC are university mentors. They play a crucial role in mentoring pre-service teachers. They also support, guide, influence, and challenge pre-service teachers’ beliefs and practices. They configure the dichotomy between the positionality of the expert (knows what, how, and why things should be done) and the positionality of the learners, who are also constructing understandings of language teaching. By and large, these subjects shed light on the knowledges that can be ferreted out and reconstructed through the direct and indirect experiences in the ELTP. The concern relies on maintaining pedagogical colonialism that does not allow possibilities to transform and reposition this significant but complex social practice in the pre-service teachers’ formation process.

From a decolonizing perspective, delinking from the rational view of the ELTP as a practice of control (Ortega, 2018), I claim a process of recognizing the ELTPC as knowing subjects who construct a practicum of addressing the realities of our school contexts. These reflections take us through dialogical encounters that help us

---

19 The language classroom cannot be seen as “closed boxes” (Pennycook, 2005) focused only on the instructional dimension of teaching. Instead, they should be seen as spaces that have a reciprocal relationship with the outside world affected by the real representation of our societies (Samacá, 2012).

20 Also called in the literature cooperating teachers, school teachers, head teachers, and homeroom teachers.

21 Also called in the literature practicum supervisors, counselors, practicum advisors, practicum directors, and practicum directors.
understand and critique (or critically transmit) our visions towards English language teaching in the periphery to new and heterogeneous ways of a situated teaching. I have also identified that we, and I include myself here, have been thinking about second language pedagogy from conceptual perspectives, thus, somehow distancing ourselves from the school contexts’ lived experiences, the others we share with, and our own knowledges and practices due to the discourses imposed by neoliberal agendas running education. Writing this review, I have confronted (and even confined) myself to reflecting upon how to disrupt these vertical, homogenizing, and totalizing hegemonic matrices of teaching and the importance of that reflection that is self-placed and embodies a body in a specific territory. What I suggest is to recognize teaching as a lived experience understood in its nature and how it is perceived from and in the events located in time, lived temporarily, and situated in moments, places, and relationships. These school teaching practicums most of the time request must-know-be-do discourses which hardly recognized the teachers, students, and the school contexts because of its functionalist and expert view. This perspective has placed the importance on an impersonal preparation in competencies and upon which “the accent has been placed on knowing-doing rather than on the experience of knowing-expressing” (Bárcena, Larrosa, & Mélich, 2006 p. 241). I truly think that recognizing pedagogical colonialism and its implications might lead the ELT community to reclaim and propose new understandings of our profession.
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