Praxeological Practices

Writing an editorial stands out in the Dossier called *Multiplicity of pedagogy: historical and conceptual conferences*. It implies having a critical view from the inside of our beings as professors reflecting on the arrangement that UNIMINUTO has been building on pedagogical praxeology. It also involves the influence it has on our pedagogical practices. In this way, we could provide a broad and comprehensive vision of the co-construction processes in education, its direct and indirect effects that this rationality has on our teaching performance.

From this critical point of view, it is imperative to recognize that the pedagogical praxeology of UNIMINUTO, devised by Father Carlos Germán Juliao Vargas, details some understandings about learning and teaching processes in education. To do so, he takes multiple pedagogical perspectives such as anthropological and socials mainly to establish its singular distinction (Juliao, 2020a). This dialogic relation combines a set of ideas and principles that comprises a particular way to assume learning and teaching processes rediscovering the actors of the pedagogical perform. For instance, it mixes curriculum from the perspective of student as the center of the process; the development of communication skills; complexion of student's needs and expectations of learning; negotiation of meanings; student's autonomy; and the development of the socio-cultural dimension related to the person not only as future professionals but as human being, without fragmentation, but from a conception of integrality.

It is also important to remains that Praxeology also makes a special distinction between practice and praxis. The first one is more operative and focused on results; the second one is a reflection about what is done, focused on constructed knowledge. From this perspective, knowledge is built up based on the structure of an experience considered appealing and relevant. To develop reflective process in an effective way, praxeology as an approach proposes four stages: a) observing, as a phase of exploration, analysis and synthesis that responds to what happens; b) judging, as a reaction phase, responds to what can be done;
c) acting that responds to what we do specifically; d) creative return, phase of reflection in action, responds to what we learn from what we do, collects and reflects on the learning acquired in a process, by becoming aware of the complexity of acting and its future projection, Juliao (2011) cited in Cely & Ramirez (2013). In this way, practices from the view of praxeology are seen from the perspective of praxis as a conscious process of reflection.

Throughout the conception of the pedagogical praxeology as an approach, there have been multiple visions explored; here, two of them are going to be highlighted. The first, the reflection on the theory, involves different sources and socio-analytical currents; the second refers to the systematization of the practices processes, which take into account the different transformations and reciprocated feedback, (Juliao, 2020b). The above corresponds to a logical structure that studies human actions in a dynamic way. It unconditionally recognizes the contributions that come from the two sources without placing practices in a lower place and prioritizing theories or vice versa. It is of the essence to recognize the necessity to put both in an effective dialogue due to the contributions for the understanding of the complexity of current educational context.

Praxeology as a pedagogical approach studies the logical structure of human actions. In this sense, it conceives the person as a being endowed with sensible-rationality and an incredible capacity to preserve the desire of learning lifelong with the same eagerness that wants to preserve the wish of living, (Juliao & Barón, 2013). In this way, the pedagogical act becomes an event that impacts person’s life and transcends human aspects because it encompasses both. Pedagogical Praxeology focuses on the improvement of pedagogical practices through its four moments. It embodies their respective questions (Juliao, 2011); 1) Observe: What happens to my practice?, 2) Judge: What can be done with my practice?, 3) Act: What do we do specifically to improve my practice?; 4) Creative return: What do we learn from what we do?.

Juliao has proposed, on several occasions, following these steps: first, in a personal way, and second, in an interpersonal way. In both cases, it acts as a mirror that reflects our actions, with the ability of being able to observe ourselves keeping a careful distance between the present and past; but with the enormous advantage that intra-subjectivity permits to bump into ourselves, like a moment of intimacy, of surrender and self contemplation of learning and teaching processes that can be transformed into conscious and reflective action (Cadena, et al. 2019).

Humans are praxeological beings by inheritance; they are entities who act, who reflect about their acting, trying to improve their
actions to finally find happiness. Being an authentic human being consists, then, on searching tirelessly, again and again; it is the chief of human life,(Juliao, 2011). According to this, reflection must be a conscious and constant practice that leads professors to improve their performance which is rewarding and profitable for his professional life.

Cirocki& Farrell, (2017b) state that reflective professors are committed to their learning processes lifelong because when engaged in continuing reflective practice, they have the opportunity to (re)construction their professional identity. The reflection on the practice has an impact on teaching performance, not only because it allows teachers to expand their knowledge and improve their act of teaching; but because it gives them self-confidence and allows them to enjoy what they do. Although sustained reflective practice could be challenging, it gives teachers the opportunity to self-assess their teaching knowledge and improve as professionals.

Reflective practice implies that professors take the responsibility of examining their professional practice regarding to what they do, why and how they do it. All these reflections are about activities inside or outside the classroom; so these practices become significant for teachers in a personal way. (Farrell, 2015). Regarding to practice, it is important to remain that it cannot be addressed separately; it must be accompanied by theory, as theory assume an outcome while practice permits to analyze theory to verify its accuracy.

Bearing in mind the significance of reflective practice, it is important to appraise the benefits of the praxeological method to analyze human actions which allow discovering theoretical positions that have remained in the memory of being teachers in everyday life in a conscious or unconscious way. It contributes to human transformation through concrete actions that allow us to recognize the result of our performance. The four questions suggested in pedagogical praxeology become the base for permanent reflection and transformation of what we do as teachers and that are still hidden behind the concepts.

They guide the process of reflection through the four fundamental and challenging questions about our actions in the classroom like a journey through oneself. That guide makes its way little by little to the extent; it helps us to liberate ourselves and distinguishes what identifies us from those others who have passed through our existence, (Pineda & Orozco, 2016). Reflection becomes an integral and critical part of the practice because it looks for a variety in multiple ways, with the purpose of allowing a permanent renewal of pedagogical practices (Juliao, 2015). It invite to accomplish learning
and teaching processes consciously; and it contributes to the social transformation that UNIMINUTO promotes from its own mission.
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