ISSN 1982-5587

Research reports

A necessary turn in continuing teacher education

Un giro necesario en la formación continuada del profesorado

Roseli Rodrigues de Mello[1,2,3]*, Rafaela Maria Rodrigues[2,3], Bruno Cortegoso Prezenszky[2]

[1] Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), Centro de Educação e Ciências Humanas, Departamento de Teorias e Práticas Pedagógicas, São Carlos, SP, Brasil
[2] Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), Centro de Educação e Ciências Humanas, Núcleo de Investigação e Ação Social e Educativa (NIASE), São Carlos, SP, Brasil
[3] Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação, São Carlos, SP, Brasil

HOW TO CITE: MELLO, R. R.; RODRIGUES, R. M.; PREZENSZKY, B. C. A necessary turn in continuing teacher education. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 20, e20222, 2025. eISSN: 19825587. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v20i00.2022202

Abstract
Teaching has been considered the *locus* and content of teacher training, losing the link with the social function of the profession. Therefore, it is necessary to turn the debate around, reconnecting teaching with its intellectual nature, focused on student learning. The article shows a training process developed in a case study at a full-time kindergarten and primary school in a medium-sized city in the state of São Paulo. After the course, the teachers answered a questionnaire and the school managers produced reports on the training process and practices in the school. Quantitative and qualitative data were produced and organized into inductive and deductive categories. The results highlight the engagement of the teachers to the training process. When implementing some of the actions studied, the managers highlighted that there had been a significant improvement in the tools acquired for school practices. The need for scientific evidence as basis for in-service teacher education was demonstrated.

Keywords: teacher education; in-service education; teaching practice.

Resumen
La práctica docente se ha considerado lugar y contenido de la formación del profesorado, perdiendo el vínculo con la función social de la profesión. Es necesario un giro en el debate, reconectando la docencia con su naturaleza intelectual, orientada hacia el aprendizaje de los alumnos. El artículo presenta un proceso de formación desarrollado en estudio de caso en una escuela infantil y primaria de jornada completa en ciudad mediana del estado de São Paulo. Tras la formación, los profesores respondieron un cuestionario, y las gestoras elaboraron informes y participaron en un grupo focal sobre el proceso de formación y la enseñanza en la escuela. Fueron producidos datos cuantitativos y cualitativos, organizados en categorías inductivas y deductivas. Los resultados evidenciaron la adhesión de los profesores al programa. Al poner en práctica las acciones estudiadas, las directoras destacaron que se había producido una mejora significativa en las herramientas adquiridas para las acciones educativas. Se demuestra la necesidad de una base científica para la formación continua del profesorado.

Palabras clave: formación de profesores; formación en servicio; práctica docente.

***Corresponding author:** roseli@ufscar.br

Submitted: May 09, 2025
Reviewed: October 14, 2025
Approved: October 16, 2025
Financial support: The authors declare that they received financial support from the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP, Brazil) (Grant: Public Teaching, process number 2022/06825-0) for the research, authorship, and publication of this article. The funder did not participate in the study design, data collection, analysis and interpretation, writing of this article, or the decision to submit it for publication.
Conflicts of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.
Ethics committee approval: CAAE 69346223.0.0000.5504.
Data availability: Request access to the author corresponding to the repository: https://repositorio.ufscar.br/workspaceitems/35653/view. Study conducted at Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), São Carlos, SP, Brasil.

INTRODUCTION

In a broad sense, in the last decade of the twentieth century and in the first decades of the twenty-first century, international research, policies, and debates on teacher training have focused on the study and intervention based on the thinking (Clark; Yinger, 1977; Borko; Livingston; Shavelson, 1990; Brugar et al., 2023) and beliefs of teachers (Fives et al., 2019; Clark; Peterson, 1984; Ashton; Davies, 2015; Widiastuti et al., 2020), besides living and practicing with classmates in specific schools (Hayes, 1990; Yogev, 1997), or as communities of practice (Sutherland; Scanlon; Sperring, 2005; Westheimer, 2008; Jiménez-Silva; Olson, 2012. Mentoring and tutoring processes (Feiman-Nemser; Parker, 1992; Hansford; Ehrich; Tennent, 2004; Hudson; Spooner-Lane; Murray, 2013) also point out as topics of study and as training actions. Authors such as Shulman (1986), Elbaz (1983), Clandinin (1986) and Darling-Hammond (2020) are fundamental references in this debate.

Over the decades, the evolution of approaches, which are not mutually exclusive, deepened differences based on theoretical views of the teaching process and the role of the teacher. In many cases in Brazil, effective teaching is, at the same time, the place, the subject, and the sole purpose of training, with the risk that teaching is analyzed as if the profession was of one "being for oneself" and not of one "being with the other" (Freire, 2003) and, we add, "one being for the other being," since the social responsibility of the profession is training for citizenship. There have been splits that could not be shown as opposing elements, such as teaching process *versus* learning outcomes or policies for the control of teaching and teaching performance for equity and social justice. Note that Darling-Hammond (2020) makes a broad synthesis regarding the need to base initial and continuous teacher training on the findings shown by the science of education so that the expertise is focused on improving the lives of citizens. In turn, Cochran-Smith (2020) stresses the need for teachers to commit to social justice and equity. Although we have walked along more subjectivist paths of teaching in Brazil, in other regions of the world we find support to debate the paths focused on the connection between teacher training and performance, and students' academic achievements in terms of scientific knowledge and ethical training, at the same time.

The synthesis made by Ferreira, Marques and Santos (2024, p. 70) expresses the idea regarding teacher development not only as a professional need, but also as a social responsibility. These authors indicate that

> The current demands of being a teacher make it essential for the teachers to recognize themselves as professionals in constant learning and development and as permanent learners who consider their success related to the level of success achieved by the students.

They add the idea that it is important to understand teacher learning as permanent, in which the teachers are conceived as learners of their own significant teaching practice, from a perspective of reflective activity, as proposed by Schön (1991). Davis et al. (2012) conclude that there is a global consensus regarding teacher training: being a teacher implies a permanent process of personal and professional development.

However, considering subjectivist features in the contributions of training, note that studies of teacher training, or on teacher professional development, or on teaching actions aimed at practical and ethical reflections, if endogenous, can break the very meaning of the profession, which is social. In other words, by emphasizing the role of the professional of education only as a person, or only as a practitioner, the risk is to forget the intellectual role that they have and that must be focused on the purpose of their work, as already said, which is social. Thus, combining teacher training with the results of instrumental learning and the ethical training of students is what characterizes the profession.

This article shows the research data on a dialogic model of continuous training for education professionals, developed with a nursery and primary school in Brazil. This school, which is in a city in the interior of the state of São Paulo, has 1,200 students and 126 teachers.

Based on a theoretical framework, which is based on studies on school effectiveness and the efficiency of teaching performance for student learning and ethical development, an alternative to go further is proposed: to adopt training from a dialogic perspective and based on evidence of social impact. The aim is to deepen the debate about the social and intellectual meaning of teaching and, simultaneously, to reflect on the approaches and sources of their training.

Meaning and sense of teaching: school success of students and fruitful coexistence among all

Vygotsky (2009) offers the concepts of meaning and sense, which are useful for the arguments developed in this article. Meaning refers to objective and shared aspects, closer to the concepts established by the culture. Nevertheless, meaning enables us to understand that we are dealing with more subjective, idiosyncratic, and personal aspects. Although the senses may move away from meaning, the two are linked in the thinking process. On this point, Freire (2003) highlights the direct relationship between objectivity and subjectivity, arguing that there is no objectivity without subjectivity and, at the same time, there is no subjectivity without objectivity. This relationship constitutes the basis of the concept of intersubjectivity, which

emphasizes dialogue as the main operative. The construction of reality is social and involves all the people who are in it (Berger; Luckmann, 1973). Therefore, Tomasello et al. (2005) also provide insight into the human mind as a dialogic mind, that is, what one thinks and does is directly related to its interactions.

Thus, the social role of teachers in direct interaction with students is essential for the success of learning and their ethical training. However, if educational actions are based on mistaken assumptions (for example, the idea that human development occurs in consecutive phases, or the idea that adults should not guide students' learning – see American Psychological Association, 2015), educational actions that will slow down the learning and development of children, adolescents, young people, and even adults will be generated. Thus, it is necessary to reposition the theories, discourses, and training actions of teachers so that professionals do not fail to consider the direct impact that their beliefs, choices, and actions have on students. Therefore, it is not enough to investigate the form used for teacher training in degree or in service. The choice of content in training is essential. In this sense, we must ask ourselves: reflection on what? Thought about what? Dialogue about what? Criticism about what? Mentoring on what?

To fulfill its social role, the meanings of teaching should be built via a broad dialogue between different school and non-school actors, based on evidence of social impact aimed at achieving high-quality scientific learning for all students, also focusing on fruitful coexistence among all. To achieve the social impact of science, in social sciences and education, Flecha (2015) indicates that it is necessary to guarantee the population broad access to: a) reviews of what has been produced between the different topics in scientific research published in scientific journals; and b) analysis and dissemination of where this knowledge was transferred and what results were achieved.

Thus, processes and results can go into public dialogue, linking meaning and point in the best way possible. Then, having as a parameter of action for teaching is the point of arrival of what the community dreams of, in the intellectual formation and, at the same time, the ethical training of students. Therefore, taking the objective world, the social world, and the subjective world of the actors (Habermas, 1992) of a school community is a concrete path for dialogue and consensual actions, as the transformation of schools into learning communities has already demonstrated (Aubert et al., 2016; Flecha, 1997). As far as teacher training is concerned, the meanings of teaching are connected to success in training students. According to what science already demonstrates, as described by Darling-Hammond (2020). Successful Educational Actions (Flecha, 2015), of which the Pedagogical Dialogic Training of Teachers is highlighted in this article, are based on evidence of social impact.

Successful educational actions are those that meet four fundamental criteria (Flecha, 2015): 1. To be generating the greatest improvements in results in practice; 2. Transfer of that success to various contexts; 3. That the two previous points are demonstrated in scientific research that considers all voices; 4. That the three previous points have been recognized via publications belonging to the international scientific community.

These criteria were used in the research entitled Includ-Ed, developed in 14 countries of the European Union and coordinated by the Research Community in Excellence for All (RCEA), of the University of Barcelona. Seven Successful Educational Actions (SEA) were designed and validated: dialogic gatherings (Mello; Braga; Gabassa, 2012), interactive groups (Oliver; Valls, 2004), educational participation of the community, extension of study time or the tutored library (Aubert et al., 2016), family training (Flecha, 2015), dialogic model of conflict prevention and resolution (Flecha, 2015), and the scientific dialogic training of teachers. This paper focuses on the latter SEA.

Dialogic and Scientific Teacher Training refers to teacher training based on scientific and theoretical dialogic approaches, aiming to go beyond pedagogical actions based solely on opinions, to adopt evidence recognized by the scientific community. Teachers need to be in constant training, but they also need training to develop SEA in school, and that is why the Dialogic Pedagogical Gatherings (DPG) are held. This social gathering, aimed at teachers, is characterized by being a dialogue group between teachers in which shared readings of pedagogical texts, proven by science and with a dialogic and transformative perspective,

are proposed, and ideas such as the collective construction of knowledge and the essential relationship between theory and practice are highlighted. At that moment, in addition to theory, feelings and experiences that permeate the action of teaching and learning can be shared (Gomes, 2016).

Various studies have highlighted the DPG as a key tool for the initial and continuous training of teachers, enabling access to scientific publications of international impact. This generates the collective construction of knowledge, reflection between theory and practice, the increase in the capacity for communication and argumentation, the promotion of solidarity coexistence, pedagogical autonomy, and instrumental learning. Some of the research has proven the transferability of DPG to the Brazilian context (Silva; Braga; Mello, 2022; Silva, 2023; Rodrigues, 2023; Silva et al., 2023).

Silva; Braga; Mello (2022) highlight the importance of training in Dialogic Learning, especially via DPG, during social isolation and distance learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This training, based on scientific evidence, has helped professionals to face professional and everyday challenges, being the key to transformation.

Silva (2023) highlights that DPG promotes the autonomy and security of teachers in pedagogical decision-making, by deepening their theoretical and scientific foundations. Rodrigues (2023) points out that DPG are essential for addressing and preventing violence in school, such as sexual violence against children and adolescents. In the same year, in a study derived from the Dialogic Learning training course during the COVID-19 pandemic, Silva et al. (2023) observed that DPG provided support to participants to cope with challenges in both daily school and personal lives.

In summary, DPG appears as a transformative strategy in the educational field by bringing together theory and practice in a space for discussion and collaborative reflection among educators. Evidence-based training strengthens not only the professional development of teachers, but also the promotion of a more inclusive and safe school environment. The research highlights the vital role of DPGs in shaping and overcoming contemporary challenges, from adaptation during crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic to prevent violence in the school environment. In this way, by promoting autonomy, security, and solidarity among educators, DPG have established themselves as an essential tool in the construction of humanized and quality education. In previous research, the research team of the authors of this article have developed the transferability of the Dialogic Pedagogical Gatherings to Brazil, in training actions conducted in subjects of Pedagogy and Teachers, as well as in actions of continuous training of teachers in practice. Now we do it in actions in a single school, that is, in in-service teacher training based on a school.

METHOD

The article disseminates part of the data from the research promoted by the São Paulo State Research Foundation (FAPESP). The research was conducted between May 2023 and April 2025, in the Public Education Improvement Program. Training based on evidence of social impact is one of the objects studied throughout the project.

The case study: teacher training based on evidence of social impact

With the challenge of combining teacher training with the results of instrumental learning and the ethical training of students, the work of evidence-based training of social impact evaluated in a case study of a preschool and primary school in a city in the interior of the State of São Paulo, in Brazil, is shown.

Throughout 2023, 11 online and four face-to-face training meetings were held. The meetings with the teachers and with the school's management team lasted two and a half hours, in which the following topics were worked on: dialogic learning in the information society, the bases, evidence, and deepening of each SEA mentioned.

For each meeting, the professionals read in advance a text on the topic indicated by the research team and highlighted paragraphs to comment on during the meeting. In the dynamic, a person from the research team made a brief presentation of the content, followed by

turns of words among the participants. In general, the professionals had doubts, thoughts, disagreements, and reflections with arguments aimed at teaching practice. Note that this dynamic corresponds to the basic structure of the Dialogic Pedagogical Gatherings, created and researched for validation by researchers from the International Research Community in Excellence for All (RCEA), of the University of Barcelona (Flecha, 2015).

The co-creation, organization, and data analysis

The school's educators began to implement successful educational actions throughout 2023 and during the process they shared doubts, results, and opinions regarding the development process and results. Usually, the materials that encourage discussions are recorded in photos, videos, and written stories. At the end of the training stage, the teachers individually answered a survey with six sections (personal characterization, socioeconomic profile, reading and internet use habits, professional data, professional training, and contributions of the pedagogical dialogic training conducted in the research) with 43 closed questions and 13 open questions. In this text, the questions in section five of the survey (closed and on a Likert scale) are analyzed on aspects related to undergraduate and postgraduate training itself, previous and in-school teaching experience, relationship with the school and the profession, and the closed and open questions on the training experience and the possibility of continuing to implement evidence-based actions with social impact.

The management team has produced a report that characterized the school in its history, routines, training processes, experience of the school's management team, the surrounding community, family members, students, and challenges to be met. Moreover, they participated in a foc1us group on the training and action experience in the school based on evidence of social impact. Each participant has also filled out an individual report about the experience. The data emerges from that set of materials.

The qualitative data were transcribed by the research team, resulting in textual material. The textual data obtained in the reports, in the focus group, and in the open questions of the questionnaire were read by the authors of the article and organized separately, generating themes and categories of analysis (Bogdan; Biklen, 1991). Subsequently, in online meetings, data and arguments have been discussed to arrive at the emerging categories of the material. Quantitative data were organized and handled as a percentage, since it is a single school as a case study.

The school and the people involved in the research

Based on both the report produced by the school directors and the focus group, it can be stated that the school building is in the suburbs of the city, reaching the outskirts. The school is made up of a large space of gardens, sports stable, and other free spaces, classes take place among 21 classrooms that belong to the building. There are more than 41 classrooms in other buildings, which are farther away from the central building. Thus, regarding 2023, 62 classrooms serve 1,200 students, of which 50.4% were female and 49.53 were male, 49 classes were held in full shifts. As the building does not cover all the students at the same time, for the daily operation of the classes, every day, from 7:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., half of the students remain in the school building while the other half travel in buses to five other buildings where complementary activities are conducted. After lunch, the students who were outside return to the central school in the same buses and those who have studied at the school in the morning get on the buses to attend, in the afternoon, the complementary activities in the other buildings. The buses return to school at 4:30 p.m. with the second half of the students. This is meticulously prepared and accompanied by the managers and assistant staff of the school. The flow of students in the school building is so intense that there are traffic lights in its corridors, such as those on city corners. This school has impressive flow and demand and makes us doubt that the slightest care would be possible with good coexistence and learning.

The institution was created in 1998 and five different people occupied its management in its first two years. It was considered a very difficult school organization. In 2000, Aline (not her real name) took over as a director, in which she remains to this day. When Aline took over the job and soon showed the teaching and support team with a proposal for both the organization of teaching and the operation of the school, she has made it clear that she

would be willing to negotiate other ways of working in case the team had a better proposal to guarantee the learning of the students. In the focus group, during the 23 years of work, Aline was composing the team and generating trust and distributed action, which leads to understand her leadership as a promoter of the success of the school, that is, a leadership that "allows others to act" and that "encourages the will of the other" (Costa; Bento, 2015), or how they define Maureira-Cabrera et al. (2023), a distributed leadership. But, most importantly, what the people on the management team describe over the years the leadership exercised by Aline works more as an inclusive orientation and good academic results, as highlighted in the study by Valdés (2023) on schools where leadership is noticeable.

The school of this case study, contrary to predictions due to the composition of its student body by population at risk (poverty, unemployment, housing in drug trafficking neighborhoods) was, with the work of management, teaching, and support, building better learning for the students. This can be seen in the evolution of the performance indices of its students in national exams: 4.0 (in 2007), 4.5 (in 2009), 4.8 (in 2011), 5.1 (in 2013), 6.0 (in 2015), 7.0 (in 2017), 7.3 (in 2019), 7.1 (in 2021) – Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anisio Teixeira (2023). When the development of the intervention and research project was proposed in 2022, the school's index had dropped 0.2, from 2019 to 2021, and new difficulties had been imposed on professionals with the return to school after the COVID-19 pandemic, these were the express reasons for the adherence of the management team to the proposal.

Thus, the dialogic pedagogical training of the school team began in 2023, with 113 teachers, ten school managers (including directors, sub-directors, pedagogical coordinators, classroom shift management, playground management), and two coordinators linked to the city's Ministry of Education. Of that total, 58 teachers were on a stable contract at the school, which means that in a new school year they would be the ones who would remain in school; the others could lose their jobs to those who accumulated a higher score in working life.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the report written by two coordinators linked to the Ministry of Education, it was indicated that there are three types of training action aimed at teachers in the municipality: a) once a month, at the city's teacher training center, talks are given on topics that seem important to the technicians of the Secretariat itself; b) weekly, in the schools themselves, training is organized by the management team, and c) individual training, on the individual initiative of the teachers themselves. When comparing these training actions, they are not different from those developed in other locations in Brazil since the first decade of the twenty first century. Study developed by Davis et al. (2012) already indicated this type of trend in the country.

The surveys addressed to the school's teachers – 41 of the 126 teachers signed the free and informed consent term to answer the questions, therefore, 33% of the teachers in training – denote characteristics of the training of the staff in that educational unit. Of the participants, 39 were women and two were men. Ten (24.4%) teachers were beginners, that is, with up to five years of experience; 36.6% were in the middle of their careers (six to 15 years of experience) and 39% were between 16 and 25 years of profession, or more. Although 23.3% had worked in that school for more than six years, most, 76.7%, had been working for five years or less. A total of 61% were dedicated only to that school, while 31.7% worked in two schools and 7.3% in at least three schools – which is common in Brazil and has a great impact on the quality of work and at the same time on teacher health. Regarding weekly hours worked at school, including the period reserved for studies and pedagogical meetings, 38.8% dedicated up to 30 hours per week and 61.20% dedicated 30 to 40 hours of weekly work at school – which is one of the few in Brazil full-time (data from the Ministry of Education indicate that in 2022 only 14% of the country's students studied in full-time school, while all the others were in schools with five-hour shifts.

Regarding the undergraduate training of the school's teachers, 100% of the teachers have completed the specific teaching or pedagogy. Regarding training by individual initiative, 87.8% have been dedicated to postgraduate training, with 85.7% in 360-hour specialization. In 2023, 19.5% were self-employed in further training. This situation is much better than the Brazilian average, as about 40% of teachers in Brazil have inadequate training (Brasil, 2024).

Regarding the Pedagogical Dialogic Training conducted in the school, in the research in 2023, on the Likert scale, the options were as follows: I totally disagree, I disagree, I agree, I totally agree. Considering the last two alternatives, most teachers have answered that the action has contributed reasonably or a lot to: a) Deepen knowledge of the contents taught: 78%; b) Understand the learning process: 83%; c) To improve the evaluation processes of the classes: 75%; d) Improve teaching practices: 80%; e) Improve conflict mediation in class: 80%.

The high percentages demonstrate a high impact of the readings and dialogues conducted throughout the training meetings. They seem to have offered instruments for teaching action. This means that training anchored in scientific evidence of impact, such as SEAs, offered effective resources to teachers for their practice involved in learning and the ethical training of students. Recovering that one of the reasons that has led the management of the school to adhere to the research was the increase in conflicts among students in the return to in person classes, after the COVID-19 pandemic, the 80% who were indicated to the contribution of the training in the improvement of conflict mediation in class is a significant percentage.

Regarding successful educational concepts and actions, the training topics indicated by more than 50% of the teaching staff as very relevant were: 1) Dialogic literary gatherings (80.5%); 2) Dialogic Learning (65.9%), 3) Reading (56.1%), and 4) Interactive Groups (51.2%).

The Dialogic Literary Gatherings were, moreover, the most developed SEA in the school, receiving approval from the teaching staff, family members, and students. Ruth (vice-principal of the school) explains, in her personal report, the impact of DLD on teaching practice in the school:

> []...] *They* [the first-grade teachers] *reported that they could observe a significant improvement in the students' orality and reading comprehension. The research brought changes in how to think about the development of more dialogic practices and strategies, focusing on reading objectives and activities*.

Sandra Laura, pedagogical coordinator of elementary education, has also recorded in her individual research report the impact of the implementation of DLDs:

> [...] *the accomplishment of Dialogic Literary Gatherings has encouraged teachers to validate and value the SEAs, once it is already possible to observe positive results in orality and argumentation, regarding speaking turns and motivation to read*.

Sandra Leite, reading coordinator at the school, in her report describes:

> *Improvement in coexistence between peers because students began to observe their attitudes and those of their colleagues by the principles of dialogic learning; development of argumentative speech and improvement of the students' vocabulary repertoire, because, before, students had only expressive speech (affirmative or negative), without elaborating a logical argument that would lead them to a reason, and now they know the meaning. They began to use other groups of words present in classical texts*.

Aurea Rita, coordinator of playground and flow at the school, has indicated that knowing and implementing the Dialogic Literary Gatherings led the managers and teachers to transform the reading project that they had already been developing in the school for six years and for which they were very appreciative. Of the 28 titles read by primary school children throughout the five years of studies, the teachers chose new titles, now among those of universal classic literature, as shown by the evidence of the impact of DLDs.

In the questionnaire, when surveyed about how they felt about autonomously implementing SEAs in their classrooms in 2024, only 17.1% indicated that they felt safe to do so. The other professionals indicated: a) needing support for the performance of each SEA (36.6%); b) studies and dialogues in the hours of weekly formative study of teachers in the school (26.8%), and c) new intensive training (14.6%). Two teachers replied that they did not intend to work with the SEAs, justifying that "I do not feel motivated", "there is not enough time in my classes".

When asked about suggestions for training in the following year, note that most of the answers to the questionnaire were that they would not have them. Only three teachers had answers that refer to current dominant training practices in Brazil and disconnected from training based on impact evidence: a) discussion of teaching cases; b) that they were expository and online talks (justification: they would be more dynamic); c) "less theoretical contribution and more exchange of experiences/perception to improve motivation".

In coherence with the dialogic pedagogical training of teachers, for the study of educational actions that guarantee learning success and good interactions between students, there were five suggestions, four of which point to the exemplification of SEAs based on specific situations shown in video, and/or presentation of perceptions or experiences of those who conducted. One answer points to the need to have more availability of schedules to conduct SEA at school. In all the suggestions, concrete examples of how to implement the SEA arise as a complement to the readings of the texts studied and that they show actions based on scientific evidence with social impact, that is, with improvement of the school life of the students.

In the individual reports of the school managers, responsible for teacher training in the institution, their findings and perceptions show many transformative elements and only one exclusionary in the training conducted at the school in 2023.

Aline argued for the development of professionalism and teaching skills based on scientific evidence and more responsible with the social impact of the practice. Thus, the teaching action ceases to be opinionated and concludes: "[...] *it drives more consistent action, dissecting them for the place of intellectual professionals that they are*". In the same direction, Amanda (vice-principal) underlines the scientific bases of the texts for teacher training, overcoming the opinionated ideas that led to the dialogues in the school, before the research intervention. However, it indicates the insufficiency of training conducted in 2023 for the awareness, adhesion, and autonomy of all teachers. This is in line with previous research that points to DPG as a continuous process of teacher training and sustainability of SEAs. In her own words: "I consider it appropriate to indicate that we observe that only the theoretical/scientific training process is not enough to sensitize and mobilize teachers to implement the SEAs."

Rosa (vice-principal), for her part, pondered that the DPG had an impact on two aspects in the school's work: on the change in the thinking of the teaching staff based on scientific knowledge, seeking learning results for students and in teaching practice with more dialogic actions with students, and the understanding that it is necessary to offer scaffolding to them, which did not happen before. Laura (general pedagogical coordinator) expressed herself in this same sense.

Sandra Leite (reading coordinator) highlighted the DPG as a place for reflection but situated in scientific knowledge and evaluation of one's own practice. The incentive to read, both for teachers and for students, is also underlined by it. Before training, teachers were little dedicated to reading and much less to scientific texts.

Julia (pedagogical coordinator) argues, in the same sense as the previous colleagues, emphasizing the professional and personal development of the team fostered by the DPG:

> *In addition to the reflections made during the tasks and meetings on the topics and contents, these activities have had a positive impact on practice, improving and contributing to the learning experience of students, favoring their academic and personal development*.

Sandra Laura, primary pedagogical coordinator, seems to synthesize the thinking of the others regarding the enrichment provided by DPG to the training of in-service teachers in the school:

> *Collective reflections on the work of teachers: pedagogical actions based on scientific knowledge* [to promote results] *and not on common sense/experiences; Development of more dialogic practices/strategies; focus on reading objectives and activities (SME Curriculum, SEAs); The articles, videos, considerations, and activities conducted in the teacher training meetings with the research team served as a basis for subsequent discussions during the meetings held between the coordinator and the team of teachers. As a result, we began to have a more critical and dialoguing look at the practices already conducted, the teaching situations and the interventions with the students*.

Ruth, coordinator of early childhood education, agrees with what Sandra Laura explains about DLDs. And such as Amanda, she mentions her high expectations with the implementation of SEA to encourage family participation in school. Finally, Aurea Rita, playground and flow coordinator at the school, understands that the training actions of the managers, based on scientific knowledge and social impact, are a path that is working:

> *I think we're moving in an assertive direction toward progress in our students' learning. The planning and implementation of the AES are becoming increasingly consolidated and are being accepted and understood by school staff and the community*.

Finally, it is important to highlight that in this first year of implementation of the Dialogic Pedagogical Gatherings in the school, a different element has emerged in the communicative focus group conducted with the school administrators and some teachers, and this refers to the fact that the articles studied were often in a language other than Portuguese. Julia explains the difficulty:

> *I had a little bit of difficulty when the English texts came in, and then I started, wow, now what? Because it's the weekend, you have Sunday to read and answer, and then it's over. I found it a little difficult at the time; I had to translate to respond, so I was a little late for the activities*.

It is important to consider that, in Brazil, there has been a coercive discourse against learning English for decades, mainly in relation to the popular classes, with the argument that it would be a kind of domination/colonization. So the English proficiency rate is low. Even with the use of online translators, many people report difficulty.

Considering data from the first year of research, it can be concluded that dialogic training based on reading and discussion of scientific texts with evidence of social impact produces immediate results in the improvement of training and teaching practice based on student learning and improvement of coexistence. Confronting the habit of opinionated training practices, anchored only in idiosyncratic experiences, is a challenge, but the verification of results in the improvement of learning and coexistence in the school is what seems to motivate teachers to do so.

The results are consistent with other studies. The global movement for evidence-based teacher training aims to use international knowledge in favor of educational improvement (Roca-Campos et al., 2021). Research in several countries indicates that when educators have access to scientific knowledge and base their decisions on it, academic results and school climate tend to improve significantly (Toom et al., 2010; Alton-Lee, 2011; Sahlberg, 2011; Dunn et al., 2013).

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it is important to highlight the partial aspect of the study, needing to delve into the elements that are shown as obstacles to training based on evidence of social impact and to adherence to the SEAs.

As for teacher training, it is a matter of integrating the three worlds that Habermas (1992) deals with: the objective world (scientific bases of social impact), the social world (values of that community), and the subjective world (the way in which each person lives, feels, and thinks about their teaching). But it moves based on knowledge, surrounding expectations, and the exchange of visions in established dialogues.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All researchers, school administrators, education secretaries, school teachers, students, and their families who have made this research possible.

REFERENCES

ALTON-LEE, A. (Using) evidence for educational improvement. **Cambridge Journal of Education**, Cambridge, v. 41, n. 3, p. 303-329, 2011. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2011.607150.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. **Os 20 princípios mais importantes da Psicologia para o ensino e a aprendizagem, desde o pré-escolar ao secundário**. Washington, D.C.: APA, 2015. Available from: http://www.apa.org/ed/schools/cpse/top-twenty-principles.pdf. Access in: 20 Apr 2024.

ASHTON, S.; DAVIES, R. S. Using scaffolded rubrics to improve peer assessment in a MOOC writing course. **Distance Education**, v. 36, n. 3, p. 312-334, 2015. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2015.1081733.

AUBERT, A. *et al*. **Aprendizagem dialógica na sociedade da informação**. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2016.

BERGER, P.; LUCKMANN, T. **A construção social da realidade**: Tratado de Sociologia do Conhecimento. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1973.

BOGDAN, R.; BIKLEN, S. **Investigação Qualitativa em Educação**. Porto: Porto Editora, 1991.

BORKO, H.; LIVINGSTON, C.; SHAVELSON, R. J. Teachers' thinking about instruction. **Remedial and Special Education**, Austin, v. 11, n. 6, p. 40-49, 1990. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259001100609.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Escola em Tempo Integral**. 2024. Available from: https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br/escola-em-tempo-integral/contexto. Access in: 20 Apr 2024.

BRUGAR, K. *et al*. Preparing the expert novice: preservice teacher thinking and efficacy in inquiry design. **Journal of Teacher Education**, Washington, v. 74, n. 5, p. 495-507, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871231202956.

CLANDININ, D. J. **Classroom pratice, teacher images in action**. Londres: The Falmer Press, 1986.

CLARK, C. M.; YINGER, R. J. Research on teacher thinking. **Curriculum Inquiry**, Toronto, v. 7, n. 4, p. 279-304, 1977. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1977.11076224.

CLARK, C.; PETERSON, P. **Teachers' thougth processes**. New York: Macmillan, 1984. (Occasional Paper, 72).

COCHRAN-SMITH, M. Teacher education for justice and equity: 40 years of advocacy. **Action in Teacher Education**, Washington, v. 42, n. 1, p. 49-59, 2020. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1702120.

COSTA, A.; BENTO, A. Práticas e comportamentos de liderança na gestão dos recursos humanos escolares. **Ensaio:** Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação, Rio de Janeiro, v. 23, n. 88, p. 663-680, jul./set. 2015

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. Accountability in Teacher Education. **Action in Teacher Education**, Washington, v. 42, n. 1, p. 60-71, 2020. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1704464.

DAVIS, C. *et al*. **Formação continuada de professores:** uma análise das modalidades e das práticas em estados e municípios brasileiros. São Paulo: FCC/DPE, 2012. Available from: https://publicacoes.fcc.org.br/textosfcc/article/view/2452/2407. Access in: 20 Apr 2024.

DUNN, D. *et al*. Evidence-based teaching: tools and techniques that promote learning in the psychology classroom. **Australian Journal of Psychology**, Melbourne, v. 65, n. 1, p. 5-13, 2013. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12004.

ELBAZ, F. **Teacher thinking:** a study of practical knowledge. London: Routledge, 1983. 254 p.

FEIMAN-NEMSER, S.; PARKER, M. B. **Mentoring in context**: a comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 1992. (NCRTL Special Report).

FERREIRA, M.; MARQUES, A.; SANTOS, S. Foundations of teaching and learning – a study with teachers on conceptions and pedagogical practices. **International Journal of Instruction**, Eskişehir, v. 17, n. 2, p. 6-84, 2024. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2024.1725a.

FIVES, H. *et al*. Reviews of teachers' beliefs. *In*: NOBLIT, G. W. (ed.). **Oxford research encyclopedias in education**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

FLECHA, R. **Compartiendo palabras**: el aprendizaje de las personas adultas a través del diálogo. Barcelona: Paidós, 1997

FLECHA, R. **Successful educational actions for inclusion and social cohesion in Europe**. Cham: Springer, 2015. 108 p. (Springer Briefs in Education). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11176-6.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da Esperança**: um reencontro com a pedagogia do oprimido. 11. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz & Terra, 2003.

GOMES, R. N. **Tertúlia Dialógica Pedagógica das obras de Paulo Freire na Formação do Coordenador Pedagógico**. Barcelona: Comunidad de Aprendizaje, 2016. p. 12-24.

HABERMAS, J. **La acción comunicativa I y II**. Madrid: Taurus, 1992.

HANSFORD, B.; EHRICH, L.; TENNENT, L. Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: a review of the literature. **Educational Administration Quarterly**, Columbus, v. 40, n. 4, p. 518-540, 2004. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X04267118.

HAYES, D. Opportunities and obstacles in the competency-based training and assessment of primary teachers in England. **Harvard Educational Review**, Cambridge, v. 69, n. 1, p. 1-29, 1990. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.69.1.786253760356v747.

HUDSON, P.; SPOONER-LANE, R.; MURRAY, M. J. Making mentoring explicit: articulating pedagogical knowledge practices. **School Leadership & Management**, Abingdon, v. 33, n. 3, p. 284-301, 2013. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2012.724673.

INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE ESTUDOS E PESQUISAS EDUCACIONAIS ANISIO TEIXEIRA - INEP. **Adequação da Formação Docente. Ano de 2023**. 2023. Available from: https://www.gov.br/inep/pt-br/acesso-a-informacao/dados-abertos/indicadores-educacionais/adequacao-da-formacao-docente. Access in: 20 Apr 2024.

JIMENEZ-SILVA, M.; OLSON, K. Preparing teachers to work with English Language learner through a teacher-learner community of practice. **International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education**, Fort Collins, v. 24, n. 3, p. 335-348, 2012.

MAUREIRA-CABRERA, O. *et al*. Liderazgo Distribuido en Centros Escolares: cambios en la percepción de prácticas educacionales. **Ensaio:** Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação, Rio de Janeiro, v. 31, n. 121, p. e0233839. 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362023003103839.

MELLO, R.R.; BRAGA, F. M; GABASSA, V. **Comunidades de aprendizagem**: outra escola é possível. 1. ed. São Carlos: EDUFSCar. 2012.

OLIVER, E.; VALLS, R. **Violencia de género**: Investigaciones sobre quiénes, por qué y cómo superarla. Barcelona: Hipatia, 2004.

ROCA-CAMPOS, E. *et al*. Educational Impact Evaluation of Professional Development of In-Service Teachers: The Case of the Dialogic Pedagogical Gatherings at Valencia "On Giants' Shoulders". **Sustainability**, Basel, v. 13, n. 8, p. 4275, 2021. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084275.

RODRIGUES, R. M. **Tertúlias Dialógicas Pedagógicas na formação docente**: prevenção de violência sexual contra crianças e adolescentes. 2023. 200 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, 2023. Available from: https://repositorio.ufscar.br/handle/ufscar/17791. Access in: 20 Apr 2024.

SAHLBERG, P. The professional educator: lessons from Finland. **American Educator**, Washington, v. 35, p. 34-38, 2011.

SCHÖN, D. **The reflective practitioner:** how professionals think in action. Londres: Avebury, 1991.

SHULMAN, L. S. Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching. **Educational Researcher**, Washington, v. 15, n. 2, p. 4-14, 1986. Available from: https://depts.washington.edu/comgrnd/ccli/papers/shulman_ThoseWhoUnderstandKnowledgeGrowthTeaching_1986-jy.pdf. Access in: 20 Apr 2024.

SILVA, A. R. N.; BRAGA, F. M.; MELLO, R. R. Formação pedagógica em aprendizagem dialógica em tempos de distanciamento social. **Crítica Educativa**, Sorocaba, v. 8, n. 3, p. 1-20, 2022.

SILVA, V. M. *et al*. Formação pedagógica em aprendizagem dialógica: contribuições para a formação de professores(as) em tempos de distanciamento social. **Educação em Revista**, Belo Horizonte, v. 39, e37653, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-469837653.

SILVA, V. M. **Tertúlia Dialógica Pedagógica**: formação permanente e continuada do professorado com base em evidências científicas. 2023. 188 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, 2023. Available from: https://repositorio.ufscar.br/handle/ufscar/17694. Access in: 20 Apr 2024.

SUTHERLAND, L. M.; SCANLON, L. A.; SPERRING, A. New directions in preparing professionals: examining issues in engaging students in communities of practice through a school-university partnership. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, New York, v. 21, n. 1, p. 79-92, 2005. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.11.007.

TOMASELLO, M. *et al*. Understanding and sharing intentions: the origins of cultural cognition. **The Behavioral and Brain Sciences**, Cambridge, v. 28, n. 5, p. 675-691, 2005. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X05000129. PMid:16262930.

TOOM, A. *et al*. Experiências de uma abordagem baseada em pesquisa para a formação de professores: sugestões para políticas futuras. **European Journal of Education**, London, v. 45, p. 331-344, 2010. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2010.01432.x.

VALDÉS, R. Práticas de liderança em escolas com orientação inclusiva e bons resultados acadêmicos. **Educucação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 44, p. e250906, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/ES.250906.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. **A construção do pensamento e da linguagem**. 2. ed. Tradução Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2009.

WESTHEIMER, J. Learning among colleagues: teacher community and the shared enterprise of education. *In*: COCHRAN-SMITH, M. *et al*. (ed.). **Handbook of research on teacher education**. Reston, VA: Routledge, 2008.

WIDIASTUTI, I. A. M. S. *et al*. Dissonances between teachers' beliefs and practices of formative assessment in EFL classes. **International Journal of Instruction**, Eskişehir, v. 13, n. 1, p. 71-84, 2020. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1315a.

YOGEV, A. School-based in-service teacher education in developing versus industrialized countries: comparative policy perspectives. **Prospects**, Dordrecht, v. 27, n. 1, p. 131-149, 1997. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02755360.

Authors contribution
RRM: Acquired funding, Designed the study, Provided overall guidance for the study, Collected data, Wrote the first draft of the text, Reviewed, Approved the final manuscript. RMR and BCP: Collected the data, Reviewed its analysis, Reviewed the final manuscript. The authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Editor: Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli
Deputy Executive Editor: Profa. Dra. Flavia Maria Uehara