

Pedagogical coexistence among graduate students: a case study¹

Convivência Pedagógica entre estudantes na pós-graduação: um estudo de caso²

*Maria Eliza Mattosinho Bernardes*³
*Ana Karina Amorim Checchia*⁴

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes pedagogical coexistence in the continuing education of teachers in a graduate course, based on the cultural-historical approach rooted in historical and dialectical materialism. The qualitative research used empirical material from conversation circles held with participants, which were analyzed using content analysis. The results demonstrate that pedagogical activity, when intentionally and collectively organized, promotes the integration of affective, volitional, and cognitive dimensions, enabling experiences endowed with meaning and purpose. It was observed that pedagogical coexistence contributes to conceptual appropriation, the transformation of consciousness, and teacher self-production, constituting a social and humanizing praxis. The study concludes that pedagogical coexistence, understood as the unity of teaching and learning, constitutes a strategic dimension for ensuring critical teacher education, the humanization of academic relationships, and the consolidation of educational

RESUMO

O artigo analisa a convivência pedagógica na formação permanente de professoras/es em uma disciplina de pós-graduação, fundamentando-se no enfoque histórico-cultural de matriz materialista histórica e dialética. A investigação, de caráter qualitativo, utilizou como material empírico a roda de conversa realizada com os participantes, analisada por meio da técnica de análise de conteúdo. Os resultados evidenciam que a atividade pedagógica, quando organizada de forma intencional e coletiva, promove a integração das dimensões afetiva, volitiva e cognitiva, possibilitando vivências dotadas de significado e sentido. Observou-se que a convivência pedagógica contribui para a apropriação conceitual, a transformação da consciência e a autoprodução docente, configurando-se como práxis social e humanizadora. Conclui-se que a convivência pedagógica, entendida como unidade entre ensino e aprendizagem, constitui dimensão estratégica para assegurar a formação docente crítica, a humanização das relações acadêmicas e a consolidação de práticas

¹ English version: Celso Rimoli (traducao@tikinet.com.br).

² This study was funded by FAPESP, process no. 2022/06977-5.

³ Faculty member at the School of Arts, Sciences and Humanities at the University of São Paulo, and at the Graduate Program in Education at FEUSP. Collaborative researcher with the Alfredo Bosi Chair of Basic Education at the Institute for Advanced Studies (USP). Leader of the Research Group on Education, Society and Public Policy (GEPESPP) and of the Laboratory for Education and Psychological Development (LEDEP). Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4958-5647>. E-mail: memberna@usp.br.

⁴ Professor in the field of Educational Psychology at the School of Arts, Sciences and Humanities at the University of São Paulo and at the Graduate Program in Education at FEUSP. Member of the Interinstitutional Laboratory for Studies and Research on School Psychology (LIEPPE) of the Institute of Psychology at the University of São Paulo. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7792-3124>. E-mail: karinaac@usp.br.

practices committed to human emancipation.

educativas comprometidas com a emancipação humana.

Keywords: Pedagogical coexistence. Teacher education. Cultural-historical approach. Pedagogical activity. Experience.

Palavras-chave: Convivência pedagógica; Formação docente; Enfoque histórico-cultural; Atividade pedagógica; Vivência.

1 Introduction

This study aims to analyze the coexistence and experiences in the continuing education of teachers who participated in a graduate-level course as teacher-students⁵. It considers the affective, volitional, and cognitive dimensions involved in conceptual appropriation, transformation of consciousness, and psychic development.

It is grounded in the cultural-historical approach, rooted in historical and dialectical materialism, based on the analysis of historical facts in science and on the conception that human development takes shape within the historical and social conditions in which individuals live. Thus, social relations – especially production relations, considered the basis of all human coexistence – are understood as those driving the formative process.

The categories underpinning the cultural-historical approach are labor, the material character of human existence, and the historicity of facts (Tanamachi, Asbahr, Bernardes, 2018). As Marx explains in the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (2010), labor is understood as a conscious human vital activity. While animals coincide with their vital activities, “man makes his own vital activity an object of his will and consciousness”, and it is this conscious and free vital activity that distinguishes human beings from animals (Marx, 2010, p. 84). Therefore, labor, understood as an activity directed toward a defined end, is considered the human activity *par excellence*, through which, by transforming nature, the subject simultaneously transforms and humanizes themselves.

⁵ The research participants are identified in this text as student-teachers, given that they work professionally as teachers in their social practice, while simultaneously acting as graduate students engaged in a process of continuing education.

The material character of human existence refers to the understanding that the mode of production constitutes the foundation of social relations. In other words, by situating matter as the basis for understanding reality, Marx and Engels affirm in *The German Ideology* (2007, p. 94) that “men, in developing their material production and their material intercourse, transform, along with this reality, their thinking and their way of thinking”. Thus, the human being is both the subject and object of human activity, since, by producing the conditions of existence, they transform objective reality and are dialectically transformed by it. In turn, the transformation of society and concrete life produces changes in consciousness and human behavior, which elevates historicity to an essential dimension in the formation of the psyche.

Marx in the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (2010) addresses the historicity of facts, alluding to the social and historical constitution of phenomena, conceiving of human beings as social and historical beings, both products and producers of the relations historically constructed by humanity. According to Marx, “man produces man, himself and other men [...]; just as society produces man as man, society is produced by the man” (2010, p. 106).

These categories of the historical and dialectical materialist method, according to Tanamachi, Asbahr, and Bernardes (2018), are what distinguish the cultural-historical approach. It explains concrete reality and the possibilities of its transformation.

Based on these theoretical and methodological principles, this study aims at deepening the understanding of the pedagogical dimension of coexistence in school life. Such coexistence is conceived within interpersonal relationships that evidence teaching and learning processes as products of concrete conditions of existence mediated by culture. In this process, the affective, volitional, and cognitive dimensions of human development are integrated.

Vygotsky (2010) highlights this integration in the formation of the interfunctional unity of the psyche, marked by the inseparability of higher mental functions. This study emphasizes the concepts of experience and activity in the analysis of coexistence within pedagogical processes. According to Vygotsky (2010),

these concepts are understood as functional units to analyze the formation and development of the human psyche, based on the mediation of meanings in interpersonal relations.

The concept of experience is a central category in Vygotsky's work (1997, 2004a), proposing the overcoming of Cartesian dualism and idealist or mechanistic approaches. Grounded in historical-dialectical materialism and influenced by Baruch Spinoza's monist philosophy, Vygotsky (2004b) states that experience emerges as a functional unit that analyzes the complex and dynamic dialectical relationship between the subject and the social and cultural environment.

Regarding the concept of activity, Vázquez (1977) and Bernardes (2012) affirm that it arises from Marxian thought, which understands it as the human action that transforms nature and, dialectically, transforms human nature itself. It relates directly to the conception of labor and praxis as a consciously and intentionally organized activity, mediated by tools and signs. According to Vygotsky (2019, p. 105), mediated activity constitutes the "structural basis of the cultural forms of behavior," as it uses external signs as a means for development.

Within the scope of this study, the aforementioned concepts are employed to understand the articulation between interpersonal relations and mediated activity in teaching and learning processes, thereby revealing the concreteness of pedagogical coexistence in teachers' continuing education. To this end, records of participants' contributions during a discussion circle held with teacher-students enrolled in a graduate course taught by the authors were analyzed.

2 Experience and coexistence in human development

The history of psychology as a science, formalized from the mid-nineteenth century onward, reveals a deep relationship with the context of capitalist consolidation. It also reflects the effort to overcome a psychology based on fragmented propositions derived from physiology, which became consolidated in the twentieth century under the influence of behaviorism and other psychological theories such as psychoanalysis, phenomenology, and Gestalt psychology.

This situation was analyzed at its roots by Vygotsky (2004a) in *The Historical Meaning of the Crisis in Psychology: A Methodological Investigation* (1927). The author argued that such crisis was, fundamentally, a methodological one. To overcome it, he proposed the need to establish a general psychology capable of transcending the partial explanations of psychological constitution and development – one grounded in a theory that would explain the historical development and constitution of the concrete human being in their totality.

To substantiate his position, Vygotsky (2004b) proposes following Marx's inversion method, asserting that "the anatomy of man is the key to the anatomy of the ape." In developmental psychology, this means that "[...] we can fully understand a given stage of the developmental process [...] only if we know the result toward which this development is directed, the final form it adopts, and the manner in which it does so" (Vygotsky, 2004b, p. 207). The aim is to overcome theories grounded in empirical observation and generalization, adopting instead a methodological framework that incorporates categories and concepts progressing from the most elaborated (abstract) to the empirical. The essence of the method lies in the analysis of "concrete, historically living events" (Vygotsky, 2004b, p. 210).

Vygotsky and Luria (1996) understand human development as a complex process experienced by individuals, constituted through the social relations that mediate human production, understood as both material and nonmaterial culture. According to Arias Beatón (2005, p. 113), psychological development is conceived as "a very complex process originating in the conditions and organization of the social and cultural context that influence the subject throughout their personal history [ontogenesis]". This personal history "is ultimately produced as a result of the accumulation of individual experience" (p. 113).

From this perspective, Vygotsky (2004a, 2018) argued that the study of human development should not be limited to the sum of isolated elements such as sensations, perceptions, and memory. The author asserts that, it is fundamentally important to identify a unit that contains the essential

properties of the whole. A cell that, when analyzed, reveals the nature of the complex phenomenon of cultural development of the child. León and Calejon (2017, p. 124), referred to the unit of analysis in Vygotsky's work, pointing to the author's use of the metaphor of water to explain the constitution of the human psyche, aiming at "[...] usefulness in the treatment of psychology, of his dialectical and complex vision".

In this sense, human activity (in a Marxian perspective) and experience are identified as functional units in the analysis of human development, with the potential to overcome the understanding of the child as a merely natural being, i.e., one who develops through biological maturation. The child is thus conceived as a social being whose biopsychic basis is socially constituted and mediated by meanings within human interrelations.

Vygotsky (2004a) asserts that the subject experiences reality, and this experience is the driving force of development. Experience should be understood as the means by which environmental influences are transformed into internal forces that constitute consciousness and personality. It is considered the unit in which the social is internalized and the individual is projected outward, transforming both external reality and the subject's own inner reality.

Vygotsky (1996) questioned the mechanistic view that reduced psychological development to mere biological processes. The complex relationship between emotion and affect was one of the central themes of this critique. The author believed the affective dimension is inseparable from the cognitive dimension, from thought and language, and integrates all higher psychological functions. As Vygotsky (1997, p. 268) stated, "[...] thought and affect represent parts of a single whole – human consciousness". In the uniqueness of each individual, the cognitive, volitional, and affective dimensions are integrated in experiences of subjects in activity, forming consciousness and personality.

Nonetheless, it is worth clarifying the concepts of *experience*, regardless of the possible questions about the meaning of this concept in different languages. The central issue to be considered refers to the type of experience subjects undergo and how the experience lived by them affect their formation process and

psychological development. This concerns the process of subjectivation of objective conditions in concrete life, which occurs in a singular manner, since each subject experiences a given situation in a unique and personal way.

Objective conditions refer to the social context, concrete relations, and modes of production in a given society, culture, and historical moment. Subjective conditions relate to the individual's current level of development and their capacity to attribute meaning to concrete reality. Thus, experience should be understood as emerging from the relationship between social reality and its meanings, and the subjects who personally attribute meaning to experiences, constituting the social situation of development.

When experiences arise from the subject's social situation of development, they are imbued with meaning and personal significance. They also prompt subjects to act upon this social situation, seeking to transform it and, dialectically, to transform themselves in relation to it. This process underlies the development of human subjectivity, understood as a species-specific characteristic, since only human beings can produce meanings from their own experiences. From this perspective, subjectivation is the process through which subjects attribute meaning to their lived experiences, appropriating content and transforming it into a constitutive element of their psychological nature.

The relationship between the social situation of development, constituted through the subjects' interaction with the environment (Vygotsky, 2018), and the appropriation of historically developed culture is objectively linked to educational processes. This occurs particularly in pedagogical processes in which teaching, study, and learning are intentionally organized. Thus, through interpersonal relations, coexistence becomes objectified among subjects as they create social situations that affect each person differently and uniquely, according to the meanings previously attributed to concrete reality.

It is therefore necessary to systematize some knowledge that can explain the organization of modes of action in conscious activity. This is objectified in relationships between intentionally organized pedagogical

processes, aimed at teaching, studying, and learning in the school context promoting psychological development, which is called pedagogical activity (Bernardes, 2009, 2012).

3 Coexistence in pedagogical activity

Pedagogical activity is understood as a particular aspect of activity aimed at human formation in general and oriented towards the humanization of the subjects themselves. Bernardes (2011) calls this broader dimension of human formation that emerges from social relations in different contexts, whose object is education in general, not that systematized educational activity. It refers to a general process of education that takes place in daily interpersonal relationships, whether in family life or in different social groups, as highlighted by Heller (2016).

Systematized education—as it occurs in schools or social groups whose teaching and learning processes require mastery of didactic and pedagogical knowledge—is referred to by Bernardes (2009) as *pedagogical activity*, understood as a practice whose purpose coincides with the very goal that guides it. Unlike educational activity, which manifests diffusely and spontaneously in daily life, pedagogical activity is distinguished by its conscious intentionality and by the mediation of theoretical knowledge, which transcends the mere reproduction of immediate life. Therefore it is constituted by a set of organized and oriented actions whose central purpose is the formation and cultural development of subjects in the sphere of non-everyday life (Vygotsky, 1996; Heller, 2016).

In general terms, pedagogical activity is understood as a mediated process (Vygotsky, 2019), since it employs cultural signs and instruments as mediators of human development. It is socially constructed, as it becomes objective through the relationships among the subjects who participate in it. It is intentionally directed toward an end and is constituted dialectically through the movement of overcoming its own contradictions. Thus, according to Bernardes (2009), pedagogical activity is understood as a dialectical unity arising from the activity carried out by the subjects who compose it, whether teachers or students. For this

to occur, it is necessary that the motives, goals, and actions of the subjects in activity correspond to one another and are directed toward a shared purpose – learning and human emancipation.

Pedagogical activity differs from fragmented actions that reduce the educational process to the protagonism of only one of its participants, as it is oriented toward a socially defined purpose: the human development of all those involved, across different levels of education, from early childhood to professional training. This activity is not reducible to spontaneous, reproductive, or isolated practices, as it is grounded in the principle that human development occurs through social and cultural mediation. Therefore, it is a process dialectically realized in the interaction between subjects engaged in activity, whether in the teaching activity performed by the teacher (Moura, 1997) or in the study activity carried out by students (Leontiev, 1983). It constitutes a conscious practice, intentionally organized and directed toward human formation and development. Thus, pedagogical activity must create the necessary conditions for learning to occur among both students and teachers, establishing itself as a privileged space for the appropriation of historically developed knowledge.

Pedagogical activity, therefore, is constituted as a joint practice between teachers and students. Both are active subjects in continuous development, who recognize their social roles as they appropriate historically produced knowledge and, simultaneously, produce new knowledge through interpersonal relations.

In the case of teachers currently working, the meaning of their social function is to teach, as emphasized by Paulo Freire in *Education for Autonomy* (2004), and Moura (1997), when proposing the Guiding Activity of Teaching as mediation in pedagogical processes. For the students, in turn, the meaning of social function is linked to studying, whose objective is the appropriation of historically developed knowledge, oriented towards their emancipation. Understanding pedagogical activity as a dialectical unity reveals that both teachers and students are involved in the formative process, in which both teach and learn – even if in distinct dimensions – related to the mastery of theoretical and scientific

knowledge. It is, therefore, a continuous movement of self-production and mutual transformation, in which subjects are simultaneously constituted through the appropriation of historically developed knowledge.

It follows that coexistence among the subjects engaged in pedagogical activity is objectified through interpersonal relations. Within these relations, appropriate and necessary social situations are created for the development of higher psychological functions, understood as an interfunctional unity (Vygotsky, 1996). Thus, the experiences within this process reveal formative experiences, as they articulate the objective and subjective dimensions of pedagogical activity, constituting social situations of development.

Hence, pedagogical activity is conceived as a practice oriented toward a specific purpose: the *omnilateral* development of the subjects involved and the conscious, intentional organization of systematized pedagogical actions. According to Bernardes (2012), this involves the double objectification of pedagogical activity – the development of higher psychic functions and the elaboration of a properly organized pedagogical instrument for learning to occur. In this sense, pedagogical activity should be understood as praxis, since it is collective and transformative of interpersonal relationships, oriented towards properly organized teaching and learning that promotes the development of the individuals involved in the activity.

As a unity, pedagogical activity integrates a system of actions and operations that consciously articulate: a) objective actions in the field of cooperative and collaborative conduct among the subjects engaged in activity; b) the actual object of study, as a historically elaborated production that assumes both ideal and material form in concrete reality; and c) theoretical-practical knowledge, which underpins integral formation and guides the execution of pedagogical actions by the subjects in activity.

It is important to emphasize that, to objectify this system of conscious actions and operations, professional formation must develop teachers' awareness of:

- a) their social role within a class-based society; b) the importance of organized teaching aimed at promoting the

development of psychological functions, since this does not occur spontaneously or naturally; c) social relations based on collaborative and collective processes marked by respect, affection, and mutual support to overcome momentary teaching and learning difficulties; and d) the relevance of recognizing the historicity of the real object of study – material or otherwise – as a universal right of access to human production (Bernardes, Barbosa & Lopes, 2021, p. 161).

From a materialist, historical, and dialectical conception of the formation of consciousness, the authors understand that teachers' awareness of these aspects is constituted throughout their ongoing formation. Dialectically, “[...] the teacher's conscious conduct in exercising their social function is fundamental to the formation/transformation of students' awareness of their own social role in society [...]” (p. 161). This also includes recognizing the importance of appropriating theoretical and practical knowledge as an essential condition for development and for emancipation as active subjects in a class-based society.

The dialectical nature present in the objectification of the system of actions within the pedagogical activity is essential for all subjects involved in the activity to transform themselves, to develop and produce transformations in their social practice and in the society in which they are situated. From this perspective, Bernardes (2012) states that the system of pedagogical actions materializes what Vázquez (1977) calls revolutionary praxis, which can be understood through three interrelated dimensions.

First, the author emphasizes that “men are not only the products of circumstances, for they are equally the products of men” (p. 159). Applied to pedagogical activity, this means that although subjects are conditioned by the historical, cultural, and social circumstances in which they live, they are also capable of acting upon them, transforming them through education and the production of knowledge.

Second, by affirming that “the educators themselves must be educated” (p. 159), Vázquez reinforces the dialogical and collective nature of pedagogical activity. In this conception, teachers and students engage in a process of mutual and continuous formation, in which teaching and learning emerge as reciprocal

processes. These processes challenge rigid hierarchical positions, fostering the sharing and transmission of knowledge historically developed through collective and collaborative means.

Finally, the statement that “the circumstances which modify man are simultaneously modified by him” (p. 160) highlights the dialectical nature of human formation. In the context of pedagogical activity, this implies recognizing that the educational process not only transforms individuals but also reconfigures the social and cultural conditions in which they act, establishing a relationship of mutual determination between education and society.

Thus, understood as revolutionary praxis, pedagogical activity constitutes a collective, conscious, and transformative movement in which the formation of subjects is intrinsically linked to the transformation of social reality. The complexity of organizing teaching at different educational levels, based on the system of actions and operations within pedagogical activity, requires that teachers master knowledge from multiple fields – among them didactics, educational psychology, teaching methodologies, educational public policies, and the specific epistemic knowledge of their discipline. The principles underlying well-organized teaching, which fosters psychic development and human emancipation, are generalizable and should be incorporated into all stages of teacher education.

The following section presents the empirical study on coexistence and the constitution of experiences in the continuing education of teachers participating in a graduate-level course. The assumptions discussed above guide the organization of teaching through pedagogical activity understood as a revolutionary praxis.

4 Coexistence and experience in the continuing education of teachers

The field study on coexistence and experience as constituent elements in the continuing education of student-teachers comprised two stages: a) the organization of modes of action within pedagogical activity; and b) the experiences of student-teachers in continuing education.

4.1 Organization of modes of action in pedagogical activity

The analysis of coexistence and experiences in the continuing education of participating student-teachers was conducted within the course *Contributions of historical-dialectical materialism to psychology and education*. This course was offered during the second semester of 2024 as part of a Graduate Program in Education at a public university in São Paulo.

The course focused on the study of the foundations of historical-dialectical materialism as the epistemological basis of the critical perspective in school and educational psychology, in articulation with the cultural-historical approach. In this context, the theoretical and methodological assumptions of the critical movement in these fields were presented and analyzed, discussing their contributions to school education. Furthermore, the course examined the complexity of schooling-related problems, as well as the social and historical constitution of subjects, psychic development, learning, and phenomena situated at the intersection between psychology and education.

Accordingly, the course objectives were: a) to present and analyze the epistemological foundations of historical-dialectical materialism; b) to promote the understanding and analysis of the theoretical and methodological foundations of school and educational psychology from a critical perspective and of cultural-historical psychology; c) to critically discuss the historical, social, and cultural dimensions of the phenomena investigated at the interface between psychology and education; and d) to analyze the contributions of the critical perspective in school and educational psychology and of cultural-historical psychology to education.

The organization of actions within pedagogical activity included the collective organization of the solidarity coffee gathering⁶, the preliminary study of assigned reading materials, dialogical lectures conducted by the professors, and

⁶ The solidarity coffee gathering was identified as one of the elements in the organization of the pedagogical activity, given the importance attributed by the research participants to this social situation as one that contributed to the constitution of the study collective. During the *café solidário*, the student-teachers shared both the food they brought and their reflections that articulated theory and professional practice.

seminars prepared by the student-teachers as expressions of their appropriation of the content and its relationship with their social practice. There was also a discussion circle on the participants' experiences throughout the training process.

The discussion circle with the student-teachers – held as the closing activity of the course and serving as a source of analysis for this article – included teachers from early childhood education and from elementary and secondary schools in both public and private institutions in the state of São Paulo, Brazil. This activity was part of the formative assessment, fostering the expression of concept appropriation, reflection on the course content, manifestations of the student-teachers' awareness in their formative process, and the attribution of meaning to the course by its participants. Among the several issues addressed in the discussion circle, the material analyzed in this study was based on responses to the following question: *Was taking this course an experience for you? Why?*

To investigate coexistence and experiences in the continuing education of student-teachers, the material obtained from the transcription of the discussion circle recording was subjected to content analysis, following Bardin's (2011) methodological framework. The central emerging themes were examined in articulation with the research objectives, which allowed the development of analytical elements grounded in the cultural-historical approach. Two student-teachers' statements were selected, as they revealed the appropriation of the course content, the transformation of consciousness, and the process of self-production. The analysis considered the integrality of the human psyche, identified in the affective, volitional, and cognitive dimensions that constitute experiences.

4.2 Experiences of student-teachers in continuing education⁷

The dataset presented derives from the transcription of an MP4 video recording of the discussion circle held on December 5, 2024. It was part of the course's assessment exercise, aiming to evaluate the participants' appropriation of the studied content.

⁷The research was approved by the Research Ethics Committee for Human Subjects. CAAE: 73570723.0.0000.5390

The analyzed material was organized into episodes expressing the meanings attributed by the student-teachers to the graduate-level course as part of their continuing education process. The episodes are identified as follows: a) Episode 1 – Affect, volition, and cognition in the process of self-production; and b) Episode 2 – Attribution of meaning in concept appropriation. Each episode was identified by a theme, indicated in its title, which synthesizes the general content of the participants' reflections. The content is subdivided into subthemes that highlight the particular aspects discussed in relation to the central theme. Inspired by Luria (1987), verbal enunciation involved the formation of a general subjective meaning that was later transformed into a system of socially understandable meanings. In this process, subjects learned to convert such meaning into shared language, unfolding into two structural elements: the *theme*, referring to the object of communication, and the *rHEME*, which introduced new elements about that object. From this relationship, a coherent semantic chain is built, in which the formulation of the enunciation involves the clear definition of its objectives, the communicative task to be accomplished, the information to be transmitted, and the interlocutor's profile.

In the transcription of the audio, certain aspects considered relevant in the student-teachers' accounts were highlighted in bold. This included the perception that the course itself became a formative experience in their personal and professional development.

Episode 1: Affect, volition, and cognition in the process of self-production

**Affection in the coexistence among course participants*

To me, [taking this course] was really an experience [...]. First, because of the collective aspect. I think all the discussions, the solidarity coffee, and every moment we had together as a group, our discussions, all of it left a strong impression on me. It all contributed to me liking this course, to wanting to come all the way from another state just to be here [...]. It also changed the way I see the world and how I interact with it. I think it shows how much this course affected me – emotionally, but also intellectually – the way I look at things and got theoretical grounding, a new lens to look through. [...] We can see the dedication, both from the professors and everyone here.

** Emotions and singularities of subjects*

[...] now I'm **going to say something** [an aspect] personal. I once had a **panic attack here** [...]. And the professor really helped me calm down. [...] She asked me if I was okay. [...] **And that hug meant a lot to me**. That moment, even though the panic didn't disappear right away was... (cries). Then I started to pull myself together, to calm down [...]. It took, like, half an hour, but in the end, I said, "No". I tried to come back, and I'm staying, I managed to follow the rest of the class. [...] Because sometimes we're not doing well, we can't always perform our best here in the course, right? [...] As I came from another field [...]. I told the professor at the beginning that I have a lot of difficulty [...].

** Coexistence in pedagogical activity*

It's a mix of things... the way you welcomed us, for to us talking about the solidarity coffee at the start, **making us feel at home, and acknowledging our difficulties**. Also, the fact of not making the final project the main goal of the course, without a grade. Because if it were graded, maybe instead of paying attention here [...], I'd be frantically trying to copy every slide, because in the end I'd have to deliver something, right?

And since everything in the process was aimed at our learning, I think I saw it very differently. **Reading the texts wasn't about getting a grade**. It was because I wanted to clear up my doubts. I wanted to be sure that I understood them. I wanted to know if I was really grasping what the texts meant. [...] **The readings were really hard, and we came to class and told them when we didn't understand something**. Like, What the author said in this part didn't make sense to me. **And not every course gives you the comfort of saying to the professor, "I didn't get it"**.

So, I think that all that made the difference. The lecture makes sense in that context [...]. You're listening to the lecture to see if you can understand what you read in the text. Maybe if you hadn't read it, the lecture wouldn't make much sense either. **The professors strived to give a lecture to clarify the difficult parts of the text, to answer our questions, making the environment comfortable for us to share our doubts**. So I think all that made the lectures you gave really meaningful.

I think if any one of those pieces were different, maybe things wouldn't have flowed the way they did. So, to me, it's really this whole.

** Self-production as a student and as an education professional*

[If it had been in another format], **I don't know if I would have continued. I don't know if I'd have had the same motivation or the same desire to stay here**. [...] All of this leaves a mark on us, affects us. So, we want to commit, we want to take part in these moments. [...] **The fact that I wanted to be here, that I wanted to play my role as a student, that's going to**

make a difference in my professional life, and in my personal life. And that's it – something that's going to stay with us for the rest of our lives. [...]

So, all of that made this course a real experience for me. (*Oral record, Student 1, 11/05/2024*)

Episode 1 is composed of four rhemes. The first, *Affection in the coexistence among course participants*, the student-teacher expressed her appropriation of the concept of *experience* (Vygotsky, 2018) – one of the core contents of the course – as well as discussed the importance of the collective characteristic of the study present in the different group activities (Bernardes, 2025). It became evident that the experience in the course affected her in such a way because of the coming from another state to be in the study activity (Leontiev, 1983). She was also affected by the different way she began to understand social relations.

The second rheme of the episode, *Emotions and the singularities of subjects*, the student-teacher revealed a particular aspect of her subjectivity by recounting a panic attack she experienced during one of the classes and the resulting learning difficulties due to her unfamiliarity with the course content. Nonetheless, she highlighted the importance of collaboration and support within the system of actions in pedagogical activity (Bernardes, 2012). This entailed respect for individual differences and teaching interventions within the field of possibilities for learning in pedagogical action, understood as the zone of proximal development (ZPD), a concept by Vygotsky (1996). The professor's conduct was regarded as essential for the student-teacher to overcome her personal difficulties in that social situation and to remain engaged in the study activity.

In the third rheme, *Coexistence in pedagogical activity*, the unity between teaching and study relations within pedagogical activity became evident, oriented toward the learning of the subjects engaged in it (Bernardes, 2009). The modes of action privileged students' learning and development rather than the mere reproduction of knowledge. By attributing meaning to the actions within pedagogical activity aimed at learning the studied content, a favorable space for coexistence was created, in which the student-teacher reaffirmed her role as a learner, feeling comfortable expressing doubts,

sharing difficulties, and engaging in collective debates. The organization of pedagogical actions revealed activity as praxis — a conscious, collective, and transformative process of both external and internal reality (Vázquez, 1977). It also showed how the course contributed to her self-formation as a student and education professional. The motives that led the student-teacher to remain engaged in the study activity were her desire to learn and to participate in the collective study environment. She exemplified how pedagogical coexistence, grounded in respect, collaboration, and the attribution of meaning to the object of study, can generate effective motives (Leontiev, 1983) that encourage subjects to appropriate theoretical and scientific content, positively influencing their personal and professional development.

The last rheme of the episode, *Self-production as a student and as an education professional*, illustrates how pedagogical coexistence, together with the mediation of theoretical and scientific content, constituted an essential condition to organize the modes of action in pedagogical activity so that it could be realized as a humanizing and emancipatory practice. The episode revealed the unity in the constitution of subjects, emerging from the affective, volitional, and cognitive dimensions present in interpersonal relations. The same occurred in the organization of teaching and study actions that integrate activity and pedagogical coexistence, aiming to promote the *omnilateral* development of the subjects.

Episode 2 – Attribution of meaning in concept appropriation

* *Emotion in pedagogical activity*

What motivated me to take and remain in this course was joy. The more I read, the more I liked it. I thought, “My goodness! This is what was missing! This was the gap in my teacher training”. And then I was able to understand Vygotsky better, having previously studied Marx [...] understanding his epistemological basis, which Marx brings. [...] And the selection of texts was very interesting. That gave me even more energy to read the texts for the following classes. So, it was really the joy of learning.

[...] A very important concept that I had always found difficult to understand was the ZPD. I never quite got it till then, but

understanding the context in the text we read about actual development, the ZPD, and the examples that Vygotsky used, **I finally understood it**. I said, “**Wow! Amazing!**” It was really cool. That concept applied to basically everything we studied afterwards. I had always heard the term without **really understanding what it meant, but this time I did**. So, it was very interesting.

* *Conceptual appropriation in the teacher's self-production movement*

[...] Something funny happened in one class. A student of mine did an exercise and said she didn't understand it. I asked, “Did you do the exercise?” She said, “Yes, but I had help from a classmate”. **Then I thought, “ZPD!” That opens a field of possibilities. So, in the following class, I brought something to work on with that student, starting from those possibilities to help her reach the level of actual development regarding that topic.** So, for me, this course has contributed immensely. [...] You also understand how the human being functions and develops.

* *Pedagogical coexistence and concept appropriation*

[...] **And another fundamental concept was that of unity.** [...] Understanding what unity is, that it must contain the properties of the whole, was very important for understanding everything else discussed later. [...] **The purpose of doing the final assignment of the course was to practice Vygotsky's concept of unity.** Because in our group we did everything together, in the same task of discussing the theme and developing an intervention strategy. [...] I think **the unity of this course is collectivity. From the perspective of our studies, unity would be the sharing of ideas.** I really liked your opinions on the texts and the discussions in class.

It's a sharing of knowledge. We are being mediated by knowledge, but we are sharing it. [...] Our solidarity coffee was shared, too. So, I think that it influences learning. **How did we learn? The same way we made the coffee: collectively.** So, each of us do an individual task and then bring both the food and our understanding of the texts to the group, so we can debate collectively. And that changes our individual perception of that thing. **So, I think the unity of this course is collectivity.**

* *Teacher's self-production in pedagogical coexistence*

[...] **And this course changed my perspective on mathematics itself.** No mathematical object arose from nothing. **It emerged because of a certain social, historical, and cultural demand.** So, **my task is to understand what that historical demand was. Because by understanding that, I can design an activity to engage students in that demand.** (Oral record, Student 2, 11/05/2024).

The second episode, *Attribution of meaning in concept appropriation* is composed of four rhemes. They reveal the course as an experience in personal and

professional formation and assign special meaning to pedagogical coexistence (Bernardes, 2025).

In the first rheme, *Emotion in pedagogical activity*, the student-teacher expressed his emotion upon being able to understand theoretical concepts of cultural-historical psychology that he had not previously grasped. He related them to their theoretical-methodological foundation – dialectical historical materialism. He stated, “It was truly joyful.” This fact evidences how the affective and cognitive dimensions integrate in learning and development (Vygotsky, 2018).

In the second rheme, *Conceptual appropriation in the teacher's self-production movement*, the student-teacher manifested dialectic in his praxis. He demonstrated that the concept learned in the course transformed his pedagogical practice, which became consciously organized and grounded in theoretical knowledge appropriated through study activity. By linking the concept to his own teaching practice, by recognizing a situation of mutual help among his students as a manifestation of the ZPD, he used theory as a mediating instrument to organize his social practice, which was teaching.

In the third rheme, *Pedagogical coexistence and concept appropriation*, the student-teacher expressed the importance of understanding the concept of unity in the studied theory. Moreover, he revealed the meaning attributed to the study collective in organizing actions within pedagogical activity aimed at learning. He used an analogy to emphasize the importance attributed to pedagogical coexistence in learning concepts by stating: “How did we learn? The same way we made the coffee: collectively”. This understanding highlights one of the theses of the cultural-historical approach, in which Vygotsky (1996) asserts that learning initially occurs in the interpersonal dimension and is later internalized in the intrapersonal dimension. In his analysis, the student-teacher synthesized his conceptual appropriation by stating: “[...] I think the unity of this course is collectivity”.

In the last theme, *Teacher's self-production in pedagogical coexistence*, the student-teacher expressed his process of transformation. He concretely demonstrated the synthesis of the system of actions within pedagogical activity by affirming that learning in the course transformed his relationship with his object

of study and work—mathematics as a historical and cultural production—as well as the way he organized his teaching and study actions as a teacher. This repositioning confirms the premise that the teacher also educates himself, as stated by Vázquez (1977). It shows that the organization of pedagogical activity not only conveyed complex theoretical and scientific content but also generated experiences that affected the research participants, transforming their consciousness and social practice as teachers.

5 Final considerations

The analysis undertaken in this study made it possible to understand that pedagogical coexistence, within the cultural-historical approach, is not merely a relational dimension of teacher education but a theoretical-practical category that structures the pedagogical process. Its genesis and development are rooted in concrete material, social, and historical conditions. Far from being confined to the sphere of interpersonal interaction, pedagogical coexistence manifests as an expression of consciously oriented human activity (Leontiev, 1978), mediated by signs and cultural tools, and objectified in the dialectical unity of teaching and learning. By integrating the affective, volitional, and cognitive dimensions of the psyche, it enables subjects not only to appropriate the products of historically accumulated culture but also to qualitatively transform their consciousness and, consequently, the forms of their social insertion (Vygotsky, 1996, 2004).

From this perspective, pedagogical coexistence can be understood as a form of social praxis (Vázquez, 1977), as it embodies the unity of theory and practice within pedagogical activity and serves as a key mediation for producing new forms of subjectivity and social consciousness. Intentionally organized pedagogical activity enables knowledge to move from the interpersonal to the intrapersonal plane, fostering the internalization of scientific concepts and reorganizing structures of consciousness in a movement that is both individual and collective. In this way, the process transcends empiricist and spontaneous conceptions of teaching, affirming education as a transformative social practice linked to the

historicity of human labor and to the omnilateral formation of the subject (Marx & Engels, 2007; Bernardes, 2009, 2012).

The empirical investigation showed that pedagogical coexistence, when organized as a collective study environment, enhances processes of experiences imbued with meaning and personal significance that function as driving forces of development (Vygotsky, 2004b, 2018). In this dynamic, the appropriation of theoretical knowledge is not limited to the reproduction of content; rather, it becomes an instrument for reorganizing conscious activity and reconfiguring the subjects' social practice. The collective dimension of pedagogical activity, by integrating collaboration, dialogue, and respect for singularities, operates as a privileged means for producing effective motives (Leontiev, 1983) that drive subjects toward the study activity and the construction of new modes of action upon objective reality. Thus, pedagogical coexistence fulfills a central ontogenetic role, contributing to the formation of critical consciousness and to the qualitative transformation of the teacher's personality.

Finally, understood as a strategic category of praxis, pedagogical coexistence transcends the methodological sphere and asserts itself as a political-pedagogical horizon committed to human emancipation. It underscores the need to organize formative processes that, beyond transmitting knowledge, also create objective and subjective conditions for the constitution of historical subjects capable of critically engaging with and transforming the contradictions of reality. This understanding assigns to educational research and pedagogical practice the task of developing proposals that integrate the historicity of human formation, cultural mediation, and the collective dimension of learning. In doing so, it consolidates an educational project oriented toward social justice, equality, and the humanization of social relations within formative contexts. Hence, expanding such investigations across different educational levels represents not only an academic necessity but also an ethical and political imperative in the face of contemporary educational challenges.

Convivencia Pedagógica entre estudiantes de posgrado: um estudio de caso

RESUMEN

Este artículo analiza la interacción pedagógica en el desarrollo profesional continuo de docentes en un curso de posgrado, con base en un enfoque histórico-cultural arraigado en el materialismo histórico y dialéctico. La investigación cualitativa utilizó como material empírico el círculo de discusión realizado con los participantes, analizado mediante análisis de contenido. Los resultados muestran que la actividad pedagógica, cuando se organiza intencional y colectivamente, promueve la integración de las dimensiones afectiva, volitiva y cognitiva, posibilitando experiencias significativas y propositivas. Se observó que la interacción pedagógica contribuye a la apropiación conceptual, la transformación de la conciencia y la autoproducción docente, configurándose como una praxis social y humanizadora. Concluye que la interacción pedagógica, entendida como una unidad entre enseñanza y aprendizaje, constituye una dimensión estratégica para asegurar la formación crítica docente, la humanización de las relaciones académicas y la consolidación de prácticas educativas comprometidas con la emancipación humana.

Palabras clave: Convivencia pedagógica. Formación docente. Enfoque histórico-cultural. Actividad pedagógica. Experiencia.

4 References

ARIAS BEATÓN, G. *La Persona en el Enfoque Histórico Cultural*. São Paulo: Editora Linear B, 2005.

BARDIN, L. *Análise de conteúdo*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2011.

BERNARDES, M. E. M. Ensino e aprendizagem como unidade dialética na atividade pedagógica. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*. São Paulo, v. 13, p. 235-242, 2009.

BERNARDES, M. E. M. Modos de ação na atividade pedagógica: uma proposição de ensino e aprendizagem ativos. In: *Congresso Internacional PBL 2010*. São Paulo: USP, 2010a.

BERNARDES, M. E. M. A educação como mediação na teoria histórico-cultural: compromissos ético e político no processo de emancipação humana. *Revista Psicologia Política (Impresso)*, Florianópolis, v. 10, p. 293-296, 2010b.

BERNARDES, M. E. M. *Mediações simbólicas na atividade pedagógica: contribuições da teoria histórico-cultural para o ensino e a aprendizagem*. Curitiba: Editora CRV, 2012.

BERNARDES, M. E. M.; BARBOSA, A. P.; LOPES, M. A. C. Desdobramentos da pandemia Covid-19 na educação formal: uma análise da unidade afeto-cognição. *Revista Interinstitucional de Educação e Tecnologia (RIET)*, v. 2, n. 2, p. 218-245, 2021.

BERNARDES, M. E. M. Convivência pedagógica: um estudo a partir do enfoque histórico-cultural. In: PINHEIRO, V. P. G.; BERNARDES, M. E. M.; ROCHA, M. S. P. M. L. (org.). *Psicologia da educação e processos educacionais: contribuições de diferentes perspectivas teóricas*. Coleção Psicologia da Educação: pesquisa e formação, v. 4. São Paulo: EACH/USP, 2025. Ahead of print.

FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2004.

HELLER, Agnes. O cotidiano e a história. 11º ed. São Paulo / Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2016.

LÉON, G. F.; CALEJON, L. M. C. C. Vivência, situação social do desenvolvimento e práxis. In: BERNARDES, M. E. M; ARIAS BEATÓM, G. *Trabalho, educação e lazer: contribuições do enfoque histórico-cultural para o desenvolvimento humano*. São Paulo: Edições EACH, 2017. p. 123- 141.

LEONTIEV, A. N. *Atividade, consciência e personalidade*. Lisboa: Horizonte Universitário, 1978.

LURIA, A.R. *Pensamento e linguagem: as últimas conferências de Luria*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1986.

MARX, K. *Manuscritos econômico-filosóficos*. Tradução: Jesus Ranieri. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010.

MARX, K; ENGELS, F. *A ideologia alemã: crítica da mais recente filosofia alemã em seus representantes Feuerbach, B. Bauer e Stirner, e do socialismo alemão em seus diferentes profetas (1845-1846)*. Tradução: Rubens Enderle, Nélio Schneider, Luciano Martorano. São Paulo, SP: Boitempo, 2007

MOURA, M. O. de. A atividade de ensino como unidade formadora. *Bolema* (Rio Claro), UNESP, v. 12, p. 29-43, 1997.

TANAMACHI, E. de R.; ASBAHR, F. da S. F.; BERNARDES, M. E. Teoria, método e pesquisa na Psicologia Histórico-Cultural. In: BEATÓN, G. A.; SOUZA, M. P. R. de; BARROCO, S. M. S.; BRASILEIRO, T. S. A. (org.). *Temas escolhidos na Psicologia Histórico-Cultural: interfaces Brasil –Cuba*. Volume II. Maringá: Eduem, 2018.

VÁZQUEZ, A. S. *Filosofia da práxis*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1977.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. *Psicologia pedagógica*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. Quarta aula: a questão do meio na pedologia. Tradução: Márcia Pileggi Vinha. *Psicologia USP*, São Paulo, v. 21, n. 4, p. 681-701, 2010. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0103-65642010000400003>. Acesso em: 22 jul. 2025.

VYGOTSKI, L. S. *El problema del retraso mental*. I: VYGOTSKI, L. S. Obras escogidas V. 2a ed. Madrid: Visor Dis. SA., 1997.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. O significado histórico da crise da psicologia: uma investigação metodológica. In: VIGOTSKI L. S. *Teoria e método em psicologia*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004a. p. 281-383.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. *Teoría de las emociones: estudio histórico-psicológico*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2004b.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. *Sete aulas de Vigotski sobre os fundamentos da pedologia*. Rio de Janeiro: E-Papers, 2018.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. *Obras escogidas*. Tomo V: Fundamentos de defectología. 2. ed. Madrid: Visor, 2019.

VIGOTSKI, L. S; LÚRIA, A.R. *Estudos sobre a história do comportamento: simios, homem primitivo e criança*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1996

VYGOTSKY, L. S. *A formação social da mente*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1991.

Received in February 2025
Aproved in October 2025