

**FOR A "PEDAGOGY OF ENCOUNTER" – BONDING, LISTENING, AFFECTION
AND RECOGNITION IN THE TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP IN
HUMANIZED EDUCATION BASED ON THE THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS
OF PAULO FREIRE, BELL HOOKS AND HAIM GINOTT**

**POR UMA "PEDAGOGIA DO ENCONTRO" – VÍNCULO, ESCUTA,
AFETIVIDADE E RECONHECIMENTO NA RELAÇÃO PROFESSOR-ALUNO NA
EDUCAÇÃO HUMANIZADA A PARTIR DAS CONTRIBUIÇÕES TEÓRICAS DE
PAULO FREIRE, BELL HOOKS E HAIM GINOTT**

**POR UNA "PEDAGOGÍA DEL ENCUENTRO" – VÍNCULO, ESCUCHA, AFECTO
Y RECONOCIMIENTO EN LA RELACIÓN PROFESOR-ALUMNO EN LA
EDUCACIÓN HUMANIZADA BASADA EN LOS APORTES TEÓRICOS DE
PAULO FREIRE, BELL HOOKS Y HAIM GINOTT.**



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n7-204>

Submission date: 06/16/2025

Publication Date: 07/16/2025

**Antonio Nacílio Sousa dos Santos¹, José Neto de Oliveira Felipe², Douglas Luiz de
Oliveira Moura³, Edimar Fonseca da Fonseca⁴, Ana Cláudia Afonso Valladares-
Valladares-Torres⁵, Alex de Mesquita Marinho⁶, Dalva de Araujo Menezes⁷, Márcia**

¹Doctorate student in Social Sciences

Institution: Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES)

Address: Horizonte, Ceará – Brazil.

E-mail: naciliosantos23@gmail.com

²Doctorate student in Teaching of Exact Sciences (UNIVATES)

Institution: Faculty of Caldas Novas (UNICALDAS)

Address: Caldas Novas, Goiás – Brazil.

E-mail: profnetomatfis@gmail.com

³Doctorate student in Psychology

Institution: Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ)

Address: Angra dos Reis, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.

E-mail: douglasmourapbi@ufrj.br

⁴Dr. of Science Education

Institution: Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)

Address: Caçapava do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul – Brazil.

E-mail: fonseca.edimar@gmail.com

⁵Dr. in Psychiatric Nursing

Institution: University of Brasília (UnB)

Address: Brasília, Distrito Federal – Brazil.

E-mail: aclaudiaval@unb.br

⁶Master of Philosophy

Institution: Federal University of Piauí (UFPI)

Address: Lagoa de São Francisco, Piauí – Brazil.

E-mail: alexmarinho@prp.uespi.br

⁷Doctorate student in Education

Institution: Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC/PR)

Address: Parnaíba, Piauí – Brazil.

Email: profdalva.araujophb@gmail.com

**Renata Ferreira Prado⁸, Sandro de Carvalho Teles⁹, Raíla Suelen Pereira Viana¹⁰,
Fábio Peron Carballo¹¹, Tiago Piñeiro Martins¹², Mônica Orrico Coutinho Piñeiro
Martins¹³, Franklin Wezenhouer Da Silva Peixoto¹⁴, Ana Karolina Fonseca De Paula
Sales¹⁵ and Edinéia de Sena Silva Lopes¹⁶**

ABSTRACT

In pedagogical relations, the encounter between teacher and student carries formative potentialities that go beyond the mere transmission of contents. In an educational scenario marked by technicality, impersonality and productivist logic, this article proposes the unprecedented formulation of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" as a methodological and philosophical alternative to the pedagogy of performance and banking education. Based on the pillars of bonding, listening, affection and recognition, this pedagogy shifts the centrality of content to the centrality of relationship, understanding that learning is only possible in contexts of trust, presence and ethical commitment. The question that guides the research is: how do the affective bond, mutual recognition and active listening contribute to a humanized education in teaching practices? Inspired by the contributions of Paulo Freire (1967; 1971; 1974; 1977; 1983; 1992; 1996; 2000; 2014), bell hooks (2010; 2013; 2019) and Haim Ginott (1975; 2008), the study also dialogues with authors such as Carl Rogers

⁸Degree in Pedagogy

Institution: Instituto Superior de Educação Programus (ISEPRO)

Address: Timon, Maranhão – Brazil.

E-mail: marciarfp1980@gmail.com

⁹Doctorate student in Literature

Institution: University of Brasília (UnB)

Address: Brasília, Distrito Federal – Brazil.

Email: sandro.telesunb@gmail.com

¹⁰Professional Master's Student in Philosophy

University: Federal Institute of the Sertão Pernambucano (IFSertãoPE)

Address: Petrolina, Pernambuco – Brazil.

Email: raila.suelen@aluno.ifsertao-pe.edu.br

¹¹Dr. in Educational Sciences/Educational Psychology

Institution: Wellness – Integrated Health Center

Address: Divinópolis, Minas Gerais – Brazil.

E-mail: peronmg@hotmail.com

¹²Dr. in Educational Sciences

Institution: World University/Reconh. by the University of Western São Paulo.

Address: Salvador, Bahia – Brazil.

E-mail: tiagopineiromartins@gmail.com

¹³Master of Science in Education

Institution: Universidad Interamericana.

Address: Salvador, Bahia – Brazil.

Email: monicaocf2@gmail.com

¹⁴Graduated in Music

Institution: Federal University of Ceará (UFC)

Address: Iguatu, Ceará – Brazil.

E-mail: wezenhouer@outlook.com

¹⁵Master in Emerging Technologies in Education

Institution: Must University/USA;

Address: Barra do Pirai, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.

Email: anakarolinafonseca0@gmail.com

¹⁶Master's student in City, Identity, Territory and Education

Institution: Federal University of Pará (UFPA)

Address: Igarapé-Miri, Pará – Brazil.

E-mail: isadoraeduda0109@gmail.com

(1994), Donald Winnicott (1975), Henri Wallon (1981) and Maurice Tardif (2014), in order to broaden the understanding of the subjective and relational aspects of educational action. The research has a qualitative approach (Minayo, 2007), of a bibliographic nature (Gil, 2008) and guided by an analytical-comprehensive bias according to the interpretative perspective of Weber (1949). The findings reveal that the affective bond is a structuring element of the pedagogical action, not an adornment; that active listening promotes student belonging and engagement; that affection, when incorporated as an ethical posture, strengthens the recognition of the other as a subject; that the teaching authority is legitimized in horizontality and coherence. It is concluded that the "Pedagogy of Encounter" inaugurates a new praxis centered on the humanization of school relations and the reconstruction of the school as a space of dignity, dialogue and care.

Keywords: Pedagogy of Encounter. Affective Bond. Sensitive listening. Humanized Education.

RESUMO

Nas relações pedagógicas, o encontro entre professor e aluno carrega potencialidades formativas que vão além da mera transmissão de conteúdos. Em um cenário educacional marcado pelo tecnicismo, pela impessoalidade e pela lógica produtivista, este artigo propõe a formulação inédita da "Pedagogia do Encontro" como alternativa metodológica e filosófica à pedagogia da performance e à educação bancária. Pautada nos pilares do vínculo, da escuta, do afeto e do reconhecimento, essa pedagogia desloca a centralidade do conteúdo para a centralidade da relação, entendendo que a aprendizagem só é possível em contextos de confiança, presença e compromisso ético. A questão que norteia a pesquisa é: como o vínculo afetivo, o reconhecimento mútuo e a escuta ativa contribuem para uma formação humanizada nas práticas docentes? Inspirado nas contribuições de Paulo Freire (1967; 1971; 1974; 1977; 1983; 1992; 1996; 2000; 2014), bell hooks (2010; 2013; 2019) e Haim Ginott (1975; 2008), o estudo dialoga também com autores como Carl Rogers (1994), Donald Winnicott (1975), Henri Wallon (1981) e Maurice Tardif (2014), a fim de ampliar a compreensão dos aspectos subjetivos e relacionais da ação educativa. A pesquisa tem abordagem qualitativa (Minayo, 2007), de cunho bibliográfico (Gil, 2008) e norteada por um viés analítico-compreensivo segundo a perspectiva interpretativista de Weber (1949). Os achados revelam que o vínculo afetivo é um elemento estruturante da ação pedagógica, não um adorno; que a escuta ativa promove o pertencimento e o engajamento dos alunos; que o afeto, quando incorporado como postura ética, fortalece o reconhecimento do outro como sujeito; que a autoridade docente se legitima na horizontalidade e na coerência. Conclui-se que a "Pedagogia do Encontro" inaugura uma nova práxis centrada na humanização das relações escolares e na reconstrução da escola como espaço de dignidade, diálogo e cuidado.

Palavras-chave: Pedagogia do Encontro. Vínculo Afetivo. Escuta Sensível. Educação Humanizada.

RESUMEN

En las relaciones pedagógicas, el encuentro entre profesor y alumno conlleva potencialidades formativas que van más allá de la mera transmisión de contenidos. En un escenario educativo marcado por el tecnicismo, la impersonalidad y la lógica productivista, este artículo propone la formulación inédita de la "Pedagogía del Encuentro" como alternativa metodológica y filosófica a la pedagogía del rendimiento y la educación

bancaria. Basada en los pilares del vínculo, la escucha, el afecto y el reconocimiento, esta pedagogía desplaza la centralidad del contenido hacia la centralidad de la relación, entendiendo que el aprendizaje solo es posible en contextos de confianza, presencia y compromiso ético. La pregunta que guía la investigación es: ¿cómo contribuyen el vínculo afectivo, el reconocimiento mutuo y la escucha activa a una educación humanizada en las prácticas docentes? Inspirado en los aportes de Paulo Freire (1967; 1971; 1974; 1977; 1983; 1992; 1996; 2000; 2014), bell hooks (2010; 2013; 2019) y Haim Ginott (1975; 2008), el estudio dialoga también con autores como Carl Rogers (1994), Donald Winnicott (1975), Henri Wallon (1981) y Maurice Tardif (2014), con el fin de ampliar la comprensión de los aspectos subjetivos y relacionales de la acción educativa. La investigación tiene un enfoque cualitativo (Minayo, 2007), de carácter bibliográfico (Gil, 2008) y guiada por un sesgo analítico-comprensivo según la perspectiva interpretativa de Weber (1949). Los hallazgos revelan que el vínculo afectivo es un elemento estructurante de la acción pedagógica, no un adorno; que la escucha activa promueve la pertenencia y la participación del alumnado; que el afecto, al incorporarse como postura ética, fortalece el reconocimiento del otro como sujeto; que la autoridad docente se legitima en la horizontalidad y la coherencia. Se concluye que la "Pedagogía del Encuentro" inaugura una nueva praxis centrada en la humanización de las relaciones escolares y la reconstrucción de la escuela como un espacio de dignidad, diálogo y cuidado.

Palabras clave: Pedagogía del Encuentro. Vínculo Afectivo. Escucha Sensible. Educación Humanizada.

BETWEEN NUMBERS AND SILENCES: THE EMPTYING OF RELATIONSHIPS IN THE CONTEMPORARY SCHOOL AND THE URGENCY FOR A "PEDAGOGY OF ENCOUNTER".

In recent decades, there has been a growing technification of pedagogical practice, accompanied by an exhaustive productivism that reduces teaching to goals, spreadsheets and performance indexes. This technical and instrumental logic, which superimposes itself on the humanizing sense of education, ends up emptying the ethical power of the educational relationship. As a result, the school space has been occupied by a pedagogy of performance¹⁷, which values quantifiable results to the detriment of meaningful bonds. As Christian Laval points out, "[...] evaluation is reduced to quantitative criteria, and the function of transmitting culture and forming common values gives way to the teaching of skills and abilities to the future professional" (2019, p. 28). Likewise, bell hooks denounces that "[...] school should not be a place where students are indoctrinated to support white supremacist imperialist capitalist patriarchy, but rather a place where they learn to open their minds and engage in rigorous study" (2013, p. 54). Thus, it is understood that the problem is not only pedagogical, but structural: there is a colonization of education¹⁸ by economic rationality, which undermines its relational and ethical bases.

In the banking conception of education, knowledge is a gift granted by those who consider themselves to be its possessors to those who they consider to know

¹⁷ Performance pedagogy refers to an educational approach centered on obtaining measurable results, such as grades, rankings, and productivity goals, to the detriment of the integral formation of the subjects. This model has been consolidated in contexts marked by neoliberal rationality, where education is understood as a service and the student as a client. In this logic, teaching is instrumentalized by performance metrics, standardized evaluations and control of results, reducing the complexity of the educational act to technical efficiency and the reproduction of content. Instead of favoring critical thinking, creativity and human bonding, performance pedagogy values competitiveness and the achievement of goals, emptying the ethical and formative sense of the school. As Laval points out, this model transforms the school into a space for business management, where "[...] evaluation is reduced to quantitative criteria, and the function of transmitting culture and forming common values gives way to the teaching of skills and abilities for the future professional" (LAVAL, 2019, p. 28). Such a perspective compromises the construction of an emancipatory education, committed to dialogue, justice and the full formation of the subjects. See: LAVAL, Christian. *The school is not a company: neoliberalism in attack on public education*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2019.

¹⁸ There is a colonization of education by economic rationality when the principles and objectives of the market begin to dictate the purposes, contents and modes of organization of teaching. In this process, the logic of profit, competitiveness and productivity overlaps the ethical, social and formative commitment of education, transforming it into a commodity and the subjects into human resources to be trained. The school, then, loses its public and collective character, being reconfigured by management models inspired by the private sector, which prioritize efficiency, performance and employability. The colonization of education is also manifested in language, curriculum policies and forms of evaluation, where terms such as "entrepreneurship", "competence" and "innovation" displace fundamental concepts such as emancipation, criticality and citizenship. As Dardot and Laval (2016) analyze, "neoliberalism is not content with transforming the State and the economy: it seeks to produce a new subject, adapted to generalized competition and the logic of capital valorization" (p. 35). Thus, education ceases to be a universal right and becomes an instrument of adjustment to the interests of the market. See: DARDOT, Pierre; LAVAL, Christian. *The new reason of the world: an essay on neoliberal society*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.

nothing. [...] The teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary 'opposite' [...]. Banking education maintains and still reinforces the contradictions through the following practices and attitudes, which reflect the oppressive society as a whole: a) the teacher teaches, the students are taught; b) the teacher knows everything, the students know nothing; c) the teacher thinks for himself and for the students; d) the teacher speaks and the students listen; e) the teacher establishes the discipline and the students are disciplined" (Freire, 1979, p. 76).

In addition, it is important to highlight that this technical-productivist scenario profoundly compromises the subjective and relational dimensions of the educational act. The classroom, once a symbolic space for meeting and creation, has become, in many contexts, an automated environment, devoid of listening, affection and mutual recognition. The educator is often reduced to the executor of contents, while the students are treated as passive receivers of information. Paulo Freire already warned that "[...] the educational relationship cannot be a one-way street, from teacher to student, because it is in dialogue that the subjects are humanized" (2014, p. 89). Likewise, Haim Ginott emphasizes that "[...] the emotional tone of the teacher is the emotional climate of the classroom" (1975, p. 67), revealing how much the affective bond directly interferes in the quality of learning and in the emotional health of students. Thus, it becomes urgent to rescue the value of human relationships in the formative process.

However, despite the progressive emptying of educational relations, there is still resistance. Many educators continue to seek alternative ways to build more humane and transformative practices. However, they face a significant gap: the absence of structured methodologies that value the encounter as the central axis of training. Most contemporary training proposals continue to be centered on technical skills, disregarding affection as a formative category and listening as a pedagogical practice. As bell hooks observes, "[...] Love is an act of will – that is, both an intention and an action – and requires that we strive to nurture our own spiritual growth and that of others" (2020, p. 35). In a complementary way, Carl Rogers argues that "[...] An atmosphere that allows the student to feel psychologically safe is essential to meaningful learning" (1994, p. 4). Therefore, the lack of structured practices that integrate affection, listening and recognition limits the possibilities of an integral education.

It is in this context of ethical and relational crisis in education that the formulation of the theoretical proposal of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is justified. It is a methodological and philosophical alternative that is anchored in bonding, active listening, affection and recognition of the other as an integral subject. In other words, a new teaching praxis is proposed that goes beyond the transmission of content and is committed to the

construction of genuinely human relationships in the classroom. As Paulo Freire states: "[...] teaching requires loving the students" (1996, p. 120). Complementing this perspective, Winnicott states that "[...] To play, it is necessary for the child to feel safe. Only in this way can it symbolize and create" (1975, p. 65). Therefore, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is based on the principle that learning is only possible when there is an environment of affective trust, reciprocal listening and appreciation of subjectivity.

Affectivity does not scare me, that I am not afraid to express it. [...] It is also false to take as irreconcilable teaching seriousness and joy, as if joy were the enemy of rigor. [...] Teaching and learning cannot take place outside of search, outside of beauty and joy. Disrespect for education, for students, for educators corrodes or deteriorates in us [...] the joy necessary for teaching (Freire, 2014, p. 115).

It should be noted that the concept of "Pedagogy of Encounter", as formulated here, is unprecedented in the academic literature¹⁹. Although there are fragmented contributions that value the pedagogical bond, none proposes a structured model that has the encounter as a founding category of educational practice. Therefore, this research proposes the systematization of this pedagogy as a new praxis, capable of operating profound transformations in the teacher-student relationship. As Paulo Freire argues: "[...] those who teach learn by teaching and those who learn teach by learning" (2014, p. 26), which indicates a dialogical and horizontal relationship. Henri Wallon, on the other hand, when addressing the role of emotions in the educational process, points out that "[...] affectivity is not only a state, but a force that organizes psychic life and guides behavior" (1981, p. 23). In this way, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is constructed as a counterpoint to sterile technicality and as an invitation to the reinvention of educating based on living, affective and transforming relationships.

¹⁹ It should be noted that the concept of "Pedagogy of Encounter", as formulated here, is unprecedented in the academic literature. Although it dialogues with established references of critical pedagogy and humanizing education, such as Paulo Freire, bell hooks and Haim Ginott, the proposal systematizes a specific methodology centered on the pillars of bonding, listening, affection and recognition as constitutive foundations of teaching practice. It is, therefore, an original elaboration that seeks to respond to the contemporary challenges of education marked by the depersonalization of school relations, by the technification of processes and by the logic of performance. The novelty of the proposal lies in the articulation of these foundations in an integrated methodological praxis, which repositions the encounter between teacher and student as the structuring nucleus of the educational process. It is not a simple rescue of pre-existing ideas, but a theoretical and practical recombination capable of inaugurating new possibilities of pedagogical action in the daily life of the classroom. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of autonomy: knowledge necessary for educational practice*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2014.; HOOKS, bell. *Teaching critical thinking: practical wisdom*. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes, 2010.; GINOTT, Haim. *Between parents and children*. São Paulo: Summus, 2008.

It should be noted that the choice of the three authors on which this proposal is based – Paulo Freire, bell hooks and Haim Ginott – is not random, but results from an ethical and pedagogical convergence around the centrality of the human in the educational process. Each one, in their own way, contributes to the construction of an education that is rooted in the recognition of the other as a subject of desire, history and dignity. Freire insists that "[...] dialogue does not impose, manipulate, domesticate, hide, but problematize, reveal, unveil" (1977, p. 44). Ginott, on the other hand, recalls that "[...] teachers have the power to build or destroy a child's self-esteem in a matter of seconds" (2008, p. 91). Therefore, the foundation of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is in the commitment to care, respectful listening and the acceptance of emotions as an inseparable part of the teaching and learning process.

Therefore, it is essential to recognize that the crisis experienced by education is not only institutional or curricular, but above all relational. The managerialist model²⁰, defended by neoliberal agendas, transformed the teacher into a technician of instruction and the student into a client-consumer of educational services. This logic empties the affective bond, eliminates the space for listening and compromises integral formation. As Christian Laval denounces: "[...] the school, when managed as a company, ceases to be a common good and becomes a service aimed at productive efficiency" (2019, p. 43). In consonance, bell hooks maintains that "[...] when there is love in the classroom, there is a space in which fear is dispelled and trust can flourish" (2013, p. 129). Therefore, it is in this terrain of tensions and resistance that the "Pedagogy of Encounter" emerges as a critical, radical and humanizing alternative.

Engaged pedagogy establishes a mutual relationship between teacher and students that fuels the growth of both parties, creating an atmosphere of trust and commitment that is always present when genuine learning happens. [...] The love between teacher and student makes recognition possible; It offers a space where there is an intersection of academic efforts with the more generic efforts of all of us to be psychologically whole (HOOKS, 2010, p. 149).

²⁰ The managerialist model, defended by neoliberal agendas, transformed the teacher into a technician of instruction and the student into a client-consumer of educational services. In this logic, the pedagogical relationship is emptied of its formative and ethical character, being replaced by a dynamic of accountability, standardization of results and focus on efficiency. The teacher ceases to be a creative and reflective subject to assume the role of executor of goals, while the student is questioned as a user of a service that needs to generate return, performance and certification. This entrepreneurial rationality has colonized the pedagogical practice, imposing a technocratic view of the school, which subordinates the educational processes to quantitative indicators and goals. As Laval (2019) analyzes, "the teacher is no longer recognized as an intellectual, but as an executor of programs, whose results are measured based on criteria of productivity and profitability" (p. 47). The school space, therefore, undergoes a process of commodification that compromises the construction of meaningful bonds and the critical formation of the subjects. See: LAVAL, Christian. *The school is not a company: neoliberalism in attack on public education*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2019.

The "Pedagogy of Encounter", by proposing listening as one of its pillars, restores to educational practice the dialogical and relational character that is constitutive of it, but often neglected. Listening, in this sense, is not passivity, but active openness to the other and recognition of their uniqueness. As Paulo Freire points out: "[...] teaching requires knowing how to listen" (1996, p. 120), pointing to a listening that is not limited to listening, but implies attention, acceptance and responsibility. In a complementary way, Haim Ginott states: "[...] it is not what I say, but the way I say it that has the greatest impact" (1975, p. 81). In other words, listening is also communicating with affection, recognizing that the way one interacts in the classroom is as formative as the content taught.

In the same way, affection needs to be rescued as a structuring element of teaching practice, and not just as a subjective adornment. This is because, in human interactions, affection is not an "extra", but rather what sustains listening, enables trust and makes knowledge a lived experience. As bell hooks observes: "[...] the deepest teaching only happens when the teacher is willing to involve the heart, body and mind" (2013, p. 21). In resonance with this perspective, Carl Rogers states that "[...] the conditions that facilitate change are authenticity, unconditional positive consideration and empathetic understanding" (1994, p. 22). Teaching, therefore, is also a gesture of surrender, of affective presence.

I communicate with them in an affectionate way. I take every opportunity to help them develop their self-confidence. If loving communication can return to sick children in a healthy way, its principles and practices belong to parents and teachers. [...] Only those who are in daily contact with the boys can help them to heal psychologically²¹ (Ginott, 2008, p. 17).

Meanwhile, it is essential to observe that the recognition of the other is not restricted to the level of cordial coexistence, but constitutes the ethical basis of the pedagogical relationship committed to liberation. Recognizing the student as a subject implies respecting their history, their knowledge, their affections and their silences. Paulo Freire emphasizes that "[...] the denial of the other, of his presence in the world, is also a denial of oneself as an educator" (2000, p. 36). Likewise, bell hooks (2010) reinforces that "[...] teaching is an act of affirmation of the other's being, it is the place where we recognize the value of

²¹ Our translation.

difference as a source of learning" (p. 44). Therefore, to recognize is also to break with authoritarian and colonizing practices of the traditional school.

Thus, by placing the bond as the foundation of educational action, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" proposes to overcome the functionalist logic that transforms the classroom into a space of control and homogenization. The bond is not limited to sympathy or occasional affinity, but to the ethical and constant construction of a relationship based on trust, mutual listening and reciprocal appreciation. As Paulo Freire (2014: 103) states: "[...] The training of a good teacher involves their ability to establish an affective and respectful relationship with the students". In consonance, Haim Ginott (1975) observes that "[...] teachers are not only transmitters of knowledge, but shapers of attitudes and human relationships" (p. 73).

Listening, in the sense discussed here, means the permanent availability on the part of the subject who listens to be open to the speech of the other, to the gesture of the other, to the differences of the other. [...] True listening does not diminish in me, in any way, the ability to exercise the right to disagree, to oppose, to take a stand. [...] It is by listening well that I prepare myself to better place myself, or rather, to situate myself from the point of view of ideas (Freire, 2014, p. 104).

Thus, this research takes as its object the subjective and relational dimensions of pedagogical practice, understanding them as structuring elements of a truly humanized education. With the aim of investigating how the affective bond, active listening and recognition contribute to the construction of a more ethical and transformative teaching praxis, the unprecedented formulation of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is proposed here. The question that guides this study is: how can this pedagogy operate a rupture with hegemonic models centered on technical efficiency and establish, in its place, a pedagogy of care and presence? To this end, it is essential to state, as Freire does, that "[...] it is necessary to teach with the loving conviction that the world can be transformed" (1974, p. 17). In parallel, bell hooks emphasizes that "[...] the radical classroom is the one in which the subjects meet, transform themselves and become more human" (2013, p. 63). In short, it is a matter of giving back to education what has been progressively kidnapped from it: its capacity for encounter, listening and affection as foundations for a more just and sensitive world.

METHODOLOGICAL PATHS FOR AFFECTIVE AND TRANSFORMATIVE LISTENING

The present research was conducted under the precepts of the qualitative approach, which proved to be more appropriate to the investigation of the subjective and relational

dimensions of pedagogical practice. According to Minayo (2007), "[...] qualitative research answers very particular questions [...] with a level of reality that cannot or should not be quantified" (p. 21). This methodological option allowed us to enter the universe of meanings attributed to pedagogical relationships, listening practices and mutual recognition. In addition, Gil (2008) points out that "[...] qualitative research allows for a richer and more detailed approach to complex phenomena, such as those involving human interactions" (p. 115), which legitimized its choice.

Qualitative research is particularly suited to exploring and understanding complex social phenomena that cannot be reduced to isolated variables. It allows access to the participants' point of view, their daily practices and the meanings they attribute to their actions. Its main objective is to understand the social world from the perspective of those involved, offering a dense and contextualized interpretation of the reality studied. The qualitative researcher acts as an instrument for collecting and interpreting data, building knowledge in a reflective and interactive way (Flick, 2009, p. 21).

The methodological design assumed a bibliographic and comprehensive character. Bibliographic research, as Gil (2008) explained, was defined as that which "[...] is developed from material already prepared, consisting mainly of books and scientific articles" (p. 50), being particularly useful when the research problem demands interpretative breadth. The Weberian understanding, in turn, offered theoretical subsidies to capture the meaning of human practices in the classroom, valuing the meanings that emerge from the relationships between educators and students.

Inspired by the tradition of comprehensive research, this study adopted interpretative analysis as the central axis of data treatment. As Weber (1949) pointed out, comprehension involves capturing "[...] the meaning subjectively aimed at by actors, in the course of a concrete activity" (p. 110). Likewise, Minayo (2007) argued that "[...] interpretation consists of relating the semantic structures with the social structures of the utterances" (p. 90), making it possible to articulate the theoretical discourses with the complexity of affects, bonds and pedagogical listening.

The methodology was structured in three complementary phases: theoretical delimitation of the object, bibliographic collection and comprehensive analysis. This division dialogued with the proposal of Minayo (2007), for whom qualitative research "[...] it is fundamentally realized by a language based on concepts, propositions, hypotheses, methods and techniques [...] in a spiral work process" (p. 25). In tune, Flick (2009)

emphasizes that "[...] qualitative research is a reflective practice in which the researcher needs to maintain a constant dialogue between theory, method and empirical material" (p. 23), which guided the interpretative rigor adopted.

The exploratory phase consisted of the precise delimitation of the object, the raising of theoretical assumptions and the formulation of the starting question. According to Minayo (2007), this stage is the "[...] time dedicated – and which deserves commitment – to define and delimit the object, to develop it theoretically and methodologically" (p. 26). Likewise, Gil (2008) clarified that the formulation of the problem "[...] requires clarity, feasible delimitation and empirical foundation" (p. 38), which required careful planning from the beginning of the investigation.

Data collection involved the analysis of 30 fundamental works by authors such as Paulo Freire, bell hooks and Haim Ginott, among other humanist thinkers of education. Gil (2008) reiterates that bibliographic research "[...] offers the advantage of allowing coverage of a wider range of phenomena than it would be possible to research directly" (p. 51). Minayo (2007), in turn, points out that "[...] the richness of subjective reality requires from the researcher an interpretative immersion that cannot be reduced to quantitative indicators" (p. 21), which justified the exclusive choice of bibliographic and theoretical sources.

Bibliographic research is essential for the construction of the object of study, as it allows the researcher to locate, understand and dialogue with the existing collection on the subject. This stage makes it possible to capture the complexity of the object in a broader way, providing theoretical and critical support. The bibliographic survey is, therefore, one of the moments of greatest reflective density, since it requires from the researcher not only a survey of sources, but also their careful analysis and reasoned interpretation (Minayo, 2007, p. 54).

The analysis of the material was guided by a hermeneutic and dialectical posture, which combined listening to the text, ordering the data and elaborating theoretical inferences. According to Minayo (2007), "[...] the qualitative analysis seeks to interpret the meanings, values and intentions of the subjects" (p. 27), and, in this sense, listening to the material read was understood as a pedagogical practice in itself. For Weber (1949), "[...] understanding does not eliminate the subjectivity of the actors; rather, it considers it as the essence of social action" (p. 90), which supported the legitimacy of the comprehensive method in this research.

The data treatment was carried out through exhaustive reading, thematic categorization and articulation of the concepts among themselves. Minayo (2007) recommends that the researcher "[...] carry out a dialogue with the material, establishing relationships between empirical and theoretical categories" (p. 91). This orientation was put into practice by integrating, for example, the concepts of bonding, listening and affection with Freirean categories such as "dialogue", "recognition" and "lovingness", all operated in the light of an ethical and emancipatory perspective.

Methodological credibility was ensured by the triangulation of authors and the consistency of the critical analysis. As Flick (2009) observed: "[...] the diversity of theoretical perspectives enriches understanding and broadens interpretative validity" (p. 42). In addition, Minayo (2007) points out that "[...] interpretation is the starting and ending point of qualitative research, as it is born from the subjects' speeches and returns to them in the form of elaborated knowledge" (p. 93), justifying the effort to maintain internal coherence between object, referential and method.

Finally, it is essential to highlight that the "Pedagogy of Encounter" was not limited to a proposal aimed at student learning, but was configured as a powerful way to re-signify teaching itself. Faced with a scenario marked by work overload, performative logic and the dehumanization of school practices, this pedagogy enabled the educator to return to what is most essential in his craft: the genuine encounter with the other. By favoring sensitive listening, valuing the lived experience and recognizing the uniqueness of each subject, the teacher reestablished the link between teaching and caring. In this same dynamic, students came to be understood in their entirety – as subjects who learn not only intellectually, but also in a sensitive, ethical and relational way.

FOR A "PEDAGOGY OF ENCOUNTER" – BONDING, LISTENING, AFFECTION AND RECOGNITION IN THE TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP IN HUMANIZED EDUCATIONAL TRAINING

Education has always been structured as an encounter between subjects. However, in the complexity of current times, marked by liquid relationships and fragile bonds, this encounter needs to be intentionally cultivated, rescuing its ethical and affective dimension. Teaching, therefore, is not only transmitting content, but making oneself available to the other with listening, presence and sensitivity. As Paulo Freire (2014) reminds us: "[...] the practice of education implies the constant reinvention of the very act of educating, in the

light of the reality of the students" (p. 84), which implies recognizing the other as a legitimate subject of knowledge. In a complementary way, bell hooks states that "[...] in the classroom, the ability to teach well is directly linked to our emotional and intellectual engagement with students" (2013, p. 109), revealing that the pedagogical encounter is only effective when it is anchored in loving-kindness and mutual respect. Therefore, more than a technique or a method, education becomes, above all, a relationship.

All meaningful love relationships empower each person involved in the mutual practice of partnership. The love between teacher and student makes recognition possible; It offers a space where there is an intersection of academic endeavors with the more generic endeavors of all of us to be psychologically whole. [...] Love in the classroom prepares teachers and students to open their minds and hearts. It is the basis on which all meaningful education is built (hooks, 2010, p. 149).

It is essential to observe that the true pedagogical act is not carried out in the repetition of formulas, but in the living encounter between educator and student. In this sense, teaching is configured as a relational experience, in which both mutually transform each other. The encounter, therefore, is not an accidental event in education, but its very essence. As Paulo Freire (1992) states: "[...] teaching requires the recognition that one does not educate alone, but in communion with the students" (p. 87). Likewise, Haim Ginott points out that "[...] what I say and how I say it can encourage or limit the emotional growth of my students" (1975, p. 63). In other words, the encounter does not take place only in the plane of ideas, but in the bond that is built in presence, listening and shared affectivity. In this way, the pedagogical act ceases to be a technical act and becomes profoundly human.

Thus, it is necessary to break with the conception of the school as a merely instructional space, aimed at the linear transmission of contents. The school, before being an institution of fixed norms and curricula, is a territory of encounters, affections and conflicts. In it, not only knowledge, but subjectivities, ways of being, feeling and living together are constructed. As bell hooks (2013: 132) reminds us: "[...] An engaged pedagogy recognizes the impact of passion in the construction of learning communities", reaffirming the transformative potential of the school space when it is thought of as a place of real human exchanges. In addition, Maurice Tardif observes that "[...] the teaching practice is built on the articulation between lived knowledge and the daily school reality" (2014, p. 91), revealing that the most lasting learning is the one that is anchored in the experiences lived among the subjects. Thus, instead of being a center of instruction, the school should be

conceived as a relational space, in which the construction of knowledge is inseparable from the construction of bonds.

It cannot be ignored that teaching, in Freire's perspective, is first and foremost a human event, marked by dialogicity, listening and co-authorship. Teaching is not transferring knowledge, but creating the conditions for knowledge to emerge from the relationship between subjects who recognize and listen to each other. As Paulo Freire (1974: 97) emphasizes: "[...] dialogical practice requires openness to the other and constant willingness to start over", indicating that teaching requires recognizing the presence of the other as legitimate and necessary to the very existence of the educator. Similarly, Carl Rogers argues that "[...] it is in the relationship of mutual trust that the learning that transforms occurs" (1994, p. 67). In other words, teaching is not a one-way street, but a meeting of lives, in which knowledge is constituted in the shared movement between question and answer, listening and speaking, doubt and construction.

The beauty of the act of educating requires from me, the educator, an ethical posture that is based on respect for the knowledge of the students, on permanent curiosity, on the humility to listen and learn from them, on the recognition that education is a process of mutual construction, in which both – educator and student – become subjects of knowledge. [...] Teaching requires, above all, the courage to love, to believe in men, to fight with them for their liberation (Freire, 2014, p. 112).

As a result, it is urgent to break with the banking education model²², which treats students as empty containers to be filled with ready-made content. This logic dehumanizes, silences and neutralizes the protagonism of students, denying them the right to speak and autonomous thought. Paulo Freire warns us that "[...] in the banking view, the educator is the one who knows and the students are those who know nothing" (2014, p. 58), pointing out the authoritarian asymmetry that sustains this pedagogy of oppression. On the other hand, bell hooks proposes a radical inversion of this logic by stating that "[...] Teaching for

²² The banking education model, criticized by Paulo Freire, is based on the idea that teaching consists of "depositing" ready-made content in the minds of students, treated as empty containers to be filled. This conception reduces the educational act to a mechanical, authoritarian and unilateral practice, in which the teacher is the only holder of knowledge and the student a passive subject, deprived of the right to criticism, creation and collective construction of knowledge. In this logic, knowledge is not problematized, but transmitted in a fragmented and decontextualized way, inhibiting autonomous thinking and transformative consciousness. As Freire (2014) states, "in the 'banking' view of education, knowledge is a gift from those who believe themselves wise to those who believe they know nothing" (p. 72). In opposition to this model, the author proposes a dialogical pedagogy, in which educator and student recognize each other as subjects of the process, learning in communion and acting critically on the reality they share. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2014.

freedom is teaching to think critically, it is teaching to doubt, to question, to desire to be more" (2010, p. 41). Therefore, educating for freedom is to recognize the other as a historical and epistemic subject, as someone capable of interpreting and transforming the world. It is a pedagogy that does not deposit content, but cultivates consciences.

It is essential to understand that education does not take place only on the rational level, but involves the totality of the subject – their affections, their corporeality, their history and their resistances. The classroom cannot continue to be thought of as a space of neutrality, where only the mind is summoned, while bodies are silenced and subjectivities excluded. As bell hooks states, "[...] liberating education must create space for the body, for feelings, for the desire to learn that is born of pleasure and not of fear" (2010, p. 73). In a complementary way, Henri Wallon recalls that "[...] emotions are not the opposite of reason, but its foundation" (1981, p. 37), pointing to the inseparable integration between cognition and affectivity in the formative process. In this way, education as an encounter requires the educator to consider the student not as a disembodied spirit, but as a speaking body, a subject of desire and presence. It is in the recognition of the wholeness of the other that teaching gains meaning and becomes humanized.

Even so, even if often underestimated, the emotional tone of the educational relationship plays a decisive role in the constitution of the school environment and in the quality of pedagogical interactions. It is no exaggeration to say that, more than the contents taught, it is the way in which it is taught that remains in the affective memory of students. Haim Ginott reminds us that "[...] I'm the one who creates the mood. I am the one who can make it happy or sad, human or inhuman" (1975, p. 42), calling attention to the emotional responsibility that falls on the teacher. Similarly, Paulo Freire states that "[...] teaching requires respect for the autonomy of the student's being" (1996, p. 67), recognizing that there is an ethical bond that precedes any transmission of knowledge. In times when affections are treated as secondary or superfluous elements, rescuing the emotional tone of the pedagogical encounter is also recovering the dignity of education as a relationship between human beings.

Affectivity is not excluded from knowability. What I obviously cannot allow is that my affectivity interferes with the ethical fulfillment of my duty as a teacher, in the exercise of my authority. [...] Teaching is a joyful experience by nature. It is also false to take as irreconcilable teaching seriousness and joy, as if joy were the enemy of rigor. [...] Teaching and learning cannot take place outside of search, outside of beauty and joy (Freire, 2014, p. 115).

Therefore, it is essential to recognize that emotions are not peripheral to the educational process, but constitute the environment that makes it possible or unfeasible. The classroom is crossed by emotional climates that profoundly influence engagement, confidence, and willingness to learn. As Haim Ginott (2008: 77) teaches: "[...] the way teachers treat their students influences the behavior of students more than the content of the classes". In other words, it is not enough to master the content: it is necessary to be emotionally available to the other. In this sense, Carl Rogers reinforces that "[...] when the educator is congruent, empathetic and offers unconditional positive consideration, a space conducive to growth is created" (1994, p. 48). In other words, it is the affective climate that allows or blocks learning. Thus, teaching is also taking care of the relational environment in which knowledge is built, and this requires awareness, listening and affective intentionality.

In addition, it is important to highlight that the emotional state of the teacher not only influences the classroom environment – it shapes it. The way the teacher arrives, speaks, looks and reacts has a direct impact on the affective disposition of the students. In liquid times, as Bauman reminds us, marked by fragile bonds and volatile relationships, "[...] the fear of lasting engagement makes human connections superficial, disposable" (2004, p. 18). This is evident in classrooms where teachers, immersed in stress, devaluation or even disillusionment, end up transmitting insecurity and emotional detachment to students. A recurring example is that of an educator who, overwhelmed by bureaucratic demands and dehumanized demands, enters the classroom visibly exhausted, avoids eye contact, does not respond with interest to questions and limits himself to projecting content. The silence of the students, in this case, is not a sign of attention, but of withdrawal. As Ginott (1975: 50) points out: "[...] with a word I can humiliate or honor, with a look I can stimulate or paralyze." Therefore, the atmosphere of the room does not depend only on the structure of the class, but on the affective presence of the educator – or the absence of it.

In times marked by the virtualization of relationships, in which "being together" is often limited to digital connectivity, it becomes increasingly difficult to sustain deep bonds in the school space. We live in an era of "far-near", as Zygmunt Bauman describes, in which "[...] connections can be broken long before one begins to hate them" (2004, p. 13), revealing the ephemerality of ties and the fragility of affective commitments. This is directly reflected in the classroom, where teachers and students share the same physical space, but often do not truly meet. Interaction becomes mechanical, listening rarefied and presence symbolic. As Paulo Freire (1967: 27) warns: "[...] education as a practice of

freedom requires the educator to meet with the students in the act of knowing", which is not possible when relationships are limited to the fulfillment of tasks. Thus, the contemporary challenge of education is to reverse this logic of superficiality and restore the encounter as an experience of real presence, ethical commitment and mutual transformation.

None of the connections that will fill the gap left by absent or obsolete bonds has, however, the guarantee of permanence. In any case, they only need to be loosely tied, so that they can be undone again, without much delay, when the scenarios change – which, in liquid modernity, will certainly occur repeatedly (Bauman, 2004, p. 7).

Despite this, it is still possible to find gaps of resistance to the superficiality that characterizes relationships in liquid times. One of these gaps is authentic listening—one that requires real presence, mindfulness, and suspension of judgment. Listening is more than listening: it is recognizing the other as someone who deserves time, silence and space. As bell hooks (2010: 86) argues: "[...] deep listening is a form of generosity that transforms the classroom into a place of healing", revealing that listening is also caring. Paulo Freire, in turn, states that "[...] there is no dialogue if there is not a deep love for the world and for men" (1974, p. 46), indicating that listening requires affective openness and ethical availability. In times when attention has been captured by devices, and speed has replaced encounter, listening to the other is almost a revolutionary act. Therefore, cultivating listening in the school environment is to resist the logic of the disposable, and to affirm that each subject deserves to be heard – for real.

Thus, it is possible to affirm that the reconstruction of the pedagogical act necessarily involves the valorization of bonds, listening, affection and recognition. Such dimensions can no longer be treated as peripheral or accessory elements of educational practice, but as its ethical-affective foundations. Teaching is, above all, bonding – not in an invasive or controlled way, but with respect, listening and affective surrender. As bell hooks states: "[...] What makes teaching liberating is our ability to connect with students so that learning is an experience of belonging" (2010, p. 59). In the same way, Paulo Freire (2000) reminds us that "[...] the pedagogical relationship is a meeting of subjects who recognize themselves as unfinished" (p. 37), which requires humility, presence and openness to the unexpected. In times when human relationships have become liquid, fragile and fleeting, to defend a pedagogy of encounter is to insist, lovingly, on the power of the bond as a condition for the flourishing of a truly transformative education.

Thus, educational practice has always been designed as a relational experience, but the bond that sustains it is not always understood as its deepest foundation. In addition to strategies, plans and curricula, what sustains the pedagogical action is the possibility of building meaningful bonds between teacher and student. Consequently, teaching is, above all, to bond, to get ethically involved with the other, to recognize their presence and their history as constitutive of the educational process. Paulo Freire emphasizes that "[...] affectivity is not excluded from knowability" and that "[...] I cannot condition the evaluation of a student's school work to the greater or lesser well-being I have for him" (2014, p. 125). In a convergent way, bell hooks states that "[...] the love between teacher and student makes recognition possible; it offers a space where there is an intersection of academic efforts with the more generic efforts of all of us to be psychologically whole" (2010, p. 112). Therefore, the bond is more than affection –
it is the very terrain where knowledge is anchored, flourishes and shares.

It is not only interesting but profoundly important for students to perceive the differences in understanding the facts; the sometimes antagonistic positions between teachers in the appreciation of problems and in the equation of solutions. But it is essential that they perceive the respect and loyalty with which a teacher analyzes and criticizes the attitudes of others. [...] It is that I am absolutely convinced of the ethical nature of educational practice as a specifically human practice (Freire, 2014, p. 102).

It is essential to note that, even before any content is presented, there is a relationship to be established. The bond not only precedes the act of teaching, but also makes it possible. In other words, trust, listening, and emotional safety are not appendages of learning, but its legitimate mediators. As Haim Ginott (1975) argues: "[...] what most influences a child's attitude is the emotional tone of the relationship" (p. 61). This means that knowledge does not circulate in a vacuum, but moves among subjects who recognize each other. In the same way, Paulo Freire invites us to understand that "[...] the educational practice has to be at the service of man's reunion with knowledge, with the other, with the world" (1983, p. 23). Therefore, the bond is not a lateral resource to teaching: it is the bridge through which knowledge crosses. And when that bridge is broken, no content reaches its destination.

Not only does the mind learn, but also the heart participates in the act of knowing. In pedagogical contexts marked by listening, welcoming, and affectivity, learning becomes more lasting and meaningful. This is because affection mobilizes attention, sustains interest

and favors the construction of meaning. As bell hooks recalls: "[...] affection creates the environment in which thought can thrive" (2010, p. 107). Similarly, Carl Rogers (1994) observes that "[...] learning occurs more easily in a climate of warm acceptance, in which fear is absent" (p. 40). Therefore, teaching with affection is not sentimentality: it is creating the emotional conditions necessary for the student to fully engage in the learning process. Affection, in this case, does not adorn the teaching – it sustains it.

As education is crossed by logics of productivity, control and measurement, the human bond is shifted to the margins, as if it were a distraction from "serious" pedagogical work. However, it is precisely this dehumanization that compromises the formative sense of the school. In times of exacerbated technicality, it is urgent to resume a relational pedagogy, capable of restoring centrality to the encounter between people. As Paulo Freire points out: "[...] banking education is fundamentally incompatible with an authentic relationship of communion" (2014, p. 69). Likewise, bell hooks warns that "[...] when education is disconnected from emotion and relational experience, it becomes sterile, without the power to transform" (2010, p. 97). Thus, bonding is also a gesture of resistance in the face of dehumanized rationality: it is affirming that teaching is, above all, touching the other – ethically and affectively.

In Freire's perspective, the bond is not a spontaneous result or a casual affinity, but rather a political and ethical construction that takes place in the process of praxis: reflection and action on the world to transform it. The bond is established in the commitment of the educator to the student as a historical subject, as someone who is not only there to learn, but to participate in the construction of himself and reality. As Paulo Freire states, "[...] no one educates anyone, no one educates himself, men educate themselves, mediated by the world" (2014, p. 72). This means that the bond takes place in mediation with the lived world, in the sharing of experiences, pains and hopes. In a complementary way, bell hooks (2013) stresses that "[...] commitment and care are part of the ethics of engaged education" (p. 101). Therefore, Freire's bond is the result of listening, humility and openness to dialogue – it is not born ready, it is forged in the mutual commitment to transform.

We need to know that, without certain qualities or virtues such as loving-kindness, respect for others, tolerance, humility, a taste for joy, a taste for life, openness to the new, availability to change, persistence in the struggle, refusal of fatalism, identification with hope, openness to justice, a pedagogical-progressive practice is not possible, which is not done only with science and technique (Freire, 2014, p. 104).

Although often treated as a personal quality, empathy, in the educational context, must be understood as an ethical and political act. It is not limited to "putting oneself in the place of the other", but to recognizing this other in its complexity, uniqueness and historicity. Pedagogical empathy therefore requires committed listening, a suspension of judgment and an affective openness that goes beyond mere tolerance. It is a movement that destabilizes the position of absolute authority of the teacher and invites him to walk with, and not over, the students. As Haim Ginott rightly observes: "[...] teachers need to remember that what they say and how they say it can reinforce or undermine a student's sense of personal worth" (1975, p. 59). This implies that every pedagogical relationship carries an emotional charge that can be liberating or inhibiting, and that empathy is the channel through which subjectivities are affirmed. Paulo Freire (1996) deepens this gesture when he states that "[...] the arrogance of knowledge that is not open to the knowledge of the other is an obstacle to meaningful learning" (p. 43). Thus, more than an individual virtue, empathy is a pedagogical gesture that reconfigures the classroom as a territory of encounter, and not of judgment; of opening, not closing; of recognition, not domestication.

It should be noted that, beyond the mere exchange of words, dialogue, in Freire's perspective, is a way of being-in-the-world with the other. It requires an attitude of active listening, humility in the face of the other's knowledge and, above all, a willingness to be transformed in one's own relationship. The bond that is formed in this process is not decorative, but constitutive: it is the means by which knowledge circulates, identities are affirmed, and consciousnesses expand. Dialogue, in this sense, not only enables teaching – it is the very act of educating in its humanizing fullness. As Paulo Freire points out, "[...] without a deep love for the world and for men, dialogue is a farce" (1974, p. 46). This means that dialogue requires an affective surrender, an ethical commitment to the other that transforms him into a co-author of the educational process. In a convergent way, bell hooks states that "[...] The democratic classroom is sustained by conversations that value all voices" (3WWE2013, p. 115). Therefore, dialogue founds the bond because it breaks the hierarchy of imposed knowledge, invites sharing, legitimizes lived experiences and inaugurates a space for the collective construction of knowledge. Teaching dialogically is, therefore, an act of resistance to the pedagogy of silence, to the culture of indifference and to the logic of imposition.

Authentic education, let us repeat, is not made of A to B or of A on B, but of A to B, mediated by the world. A world that impresses and challenges both of them, giving rise to visions or points of view about it. Visions impregnated with anxieties, doubts,

hopes or hopelessness that imply significant themes, based on which the programmatic content of education will be constituted (Freire, 2014, p. 94).

Although often excluded from the pedagogical vocabulary because they are considered subjective or inappropriate, love and eros²³ are profound forces that sustain the desire to learn and teach. Love, here, not as romanticization, but as an ethical commitment to the life of the other; and eros, not as sexualization, but as vital energy, creative impulse, desire for encounter. The separation between reason and affection, between body and mind, is one of the hardest legacies of Cartesian thought that permeates our schools – and that blocks the transgressive power of desire as a pedagogical force. As bell hooks (2010) states: "[...] eros is the energy that moves us toward a meaningful connection with others and the world" (p. 117). To love in education is to affirm that no one is disposable, that everyone deserves care, that listening is an act of loving presence. Paulo Freire, with his generous radicalism, insists that "[...] Love is an act of courage, never of fear; it is the commitment to others" (2014, p. 89). Therefore, to recognize love and eros as founding elements of pedagogical action is to re-enchant the act of teaching and learning – it is to affirm that every educational transformation is born, above all, from the desire for encounter, from care for the other and from betting on the power of the relationship.

For bell hooks, the desire for connection is a political, epistemic and pedagogical force. In his words, the desire to be with the other – and to learn from him – is not a naïve or spontaneous gesture, but a practice of resistance in a world marked by fragmentation, individualism and hierarchy. Teaching, therefore, implies desiring the encounter, desiring the bond, desiring sharing. This desire, when recognized as legitimate, reconfigures the teaching experience and shifts the center of pedagogical action from control to care. As she clearly states, "[...] The passion for knowledge and for the other is what makes the classroom vibrate with life" (HOOKS, 2010, p. 132). In this sense, engaged teaching is only achieved when there is an affective disposition for the encounter – a willingness that

²³ The concept of *eros*, historically associated with desire, vital impulse and creative force, can be re-signified in the field of education as the founding energy of authentic pedagogical relationships. Far from being reduced to a romantic or sexual connotation, *eros* in teaching is related to the passion for knowledge, the desire to meet the other and the affective commitment to the learning process. When present in educational practice, *eros* animates the gesture of teaching, promotes the ethical and emotional involvement of the teacher and mobilizes the student to be enchanted with knowledge. As hooks (2010) points out, "[...] erotic energy is the energy of commitment, investment, the desire to build a meaningful relationship between teacher and student" (p. 101). Thus, *pedagogical eros* breaks with the instrumental coldness of technicist education, conferring meaning, intensity and humanity to the act of educating. See: HOOKS, bell. *Teaching critical thinking: practical wisdom*. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes, 2010.

recognizes interdependence as a strength, and not as a weakness. In a complementary way, Henri Wallon reminds us that "[...] emotion plays a central role in the formation of the bonds that structure intelligence" (1981, p. 84). Thus, the desire for connection is not an exception, but the silent rule that sustains every formative relationship. To recognize this is to give legitimacy to what has so often been made invisible by rationalist and technicist logic: the fact that we learn best when we want to be together.

It is essential to note that passion, often seen as an excess or as a threat to rationality, is, in fact, a vital force that sustains engaged teaching. Passion is not the enemy of rigor, but its ally; it is what mobilizes the educator to continue, even in the face of adversity, lack of recognition, exhausting routines. In a school scenario often marked by institutional coldness and the logic of performance, passion is what prevents the total anesthesia of the pedagogical gesture. As bell hooks (2013) states: "[...] teaching is always an act of passionate commitment" (p. 134). Passion, in this case, is not just feeling: it is the power of presence, it is what allows the teacher to leave the automatism and involve himself, body and soul, in the experience of teaching. Paulo Freire (2000) also understands this dimension as constitutive of teaching practice, when he says that "[...] teaching requires the risk of the passionate gesture; what educates is the loving surrender to the world and to the subjects with whom one walks" (p. 52). At a time when passion is confused with imbalance and lack of control, recognizing it as an energy that humanizes teaching is to claim a pedagogy of affection, surrender and meaning.

Love in the classroom lays a foundation for learning that welcomes and empowers everyone. [...] When these basic principles of love form the basis of teacher-student interaction, the mutual pursuit of knowledge creates the conditions for optimal learning. Teachers, then, learn as they teach, and students learn and share knowledge. [...] When we teach with love, we are better able to address the specific issues of each individual, while simultaneously integrating those issues into the classroom community (hooks, 2010, p. 267).

It cannot be ignored that the pedagogical bond is also built in the gestures, looks, silences and presences that cross the body of the educator and the student. The educational relationship is not only discursive – it is sensitive, bodily, affective. In the classroom, much is taught with the tone of the voice, with the way one looks, with the silent listening that welcomes the word of the other without interrupting. The body, in this sense, is the primary language of the bond. As Haim Ginott (1975) points out: "[...] my reaction – words, tone of voice, facial expression – can provoke or calm a crisis, and also stimulate or discourage learning" (p. 78). Therefore, the bond is not restricted to the plane of intention: it

manifests itself in the materiality of the presence, in the quality of the attention and in the sensitivity of the gesture. Paulo Freire also recognizes this dimension when he states that "[...] it is necessary to be with the students, to be with them, so that the encounter can take place" (Freire, 1996, p. 89). This means that the bond is not an abstraction, but a living process, which pulsates between the present bodies – bodies crossed by stories, pains, desires and hopes. To recognize this corporeality is to open the school to a pedagogy that welcomes the human in its entirety.

Thus, it is possible to affirm that the bond not only brings teacher and student closer, but also sustains the feeling of belonging to the educational experience. When there is a bond, there is trust – and it is on this trust that the necessary environment is built for the subject to take the risk of learning, making mistakes, asking questions, creating. Feeling like you belong is not just being physically present, but being recognized as someone who matters, whose trajectory is worthy of attention. As Paulo Freire (1987: 41) points out: "[...] trust between those who educate and those who are educated is one of the foundations of dialogue." It is in this space of trust that learning unfolds, not as an imposition, but as a shared discovery. Similarly, bell hooks states that "[...] when students feel that they belong in a learning space, they engage more authentically" (2010, p. 121). The bond, in this case, is not only a relational resource, but an invisible structure that sustains freedom, listening and joint growth. In times of fragmentation and indifference, making the classroom a place of belonging is perhaps one of the most radical forms of pedagogical care.

In an educational scenario increasingly marked by standards, standardized evaluations and meritocracy, the bond emerges as a force that resists the logic of exclusion. He affirms the uniqueness of each student as a condition for the construction of the common. By recognizing the other in its entirety – with its pains, rhythms, silences and knowledge – the educator breaks with the homogenizing tendency of the traditional school. To educate with bond is to affirm that no one is excessive, that no body is inadequate, that every voice has the right to be heard. As Paulo Freire (1996) argues: "[...] the uniqueness of the subjects is a datum that we have to reckon with in educational practice; respecting it is a condition for the act of teaching" (p. 45). In a complementary way, Haim Ginott emphasizes that "[...] Each child is unique. There is no single correct approach for all" (1975, p. 81). The bond, therefore, is also a politics of difference, a pedagogy of listening that welcomes subjectivities as raw material for learning. There is no true bond where standardization reigns – there is only bond where singularity is celebrated as a formative power.

True education is, therefore, an act of love, therefore, an act of courage. You cannot fear debate. The analysis of reality. It cannot escape the creative discussion, under penalty of being a farce. [...] It cannot serve the domestication of men. It cannot be enslaving. It has to be based on the recognition of the other, of their right to say their word, to be heard. It is, therefore, a profoundly human and liberating act (Freire, 2014, p. 76).

Thus, the bond in education cannot be understood as something too accessory or subjective to be among the pillars of pedagogical practice. On the contrary, it is its backbone, its invisible but fundamental structure. It is through the bond that trust is sustained, that affection is given, that listening is legitimized, that dialogue is founded and that the commitment to the dignity of the other is affirmed. Bonding, in this context, is an ethical act – because it recognizes the other as a subject of law; it is an affective act – because it welcomes its humanity in its entirety; and it is a political act – because it opposes the forms of silencing, exclusion and dehumanization that still persist in everyday school life. As Paulo Freire states: "[...] it is impossible to educate without the courage to love, without the willingness to bond with the other in the common search for meaning" (2000, p. 71). Likewise, bell hooks reminds us that "[...] it is love that gives us the courage to confront systems of domination and create new ways of teaching" (2010, p. 151). In view of this, teaching that assumes the bond as the center does not only transform the classroom – it transforms the subjects who inhabit it. It is on this common, affective and ethical ground that the pedagogical hope of a world in which the act of teaching is, in fact, an act of caring.

It is essential to observe that, in times of increasing rationalization of the school, listening reveals itself as a subversive practice – as it shifts the center of the educational process from control to openness, from monologue to dialogue, from imposition to recognition. Listening, in this sense, is not a passive gesture, but an active action of welcoming otherness, which is transformed into a method of critical and emancipatory formation. When we truly listen, we make room for the other to exist, so that their word inhabits the pedagogical scene and transforms the paths of learning. As Paulo Freire (2014) states: "[...] It is in this sense that it is imperative for me to listen to the student in his doubts, in his fears, in his provisional incompetence. And by listening to him, I learn to talk to him" (p. 101). In other words, listening is also a form of teaching – perhaps the most powerful of them, as it supposes the recognition of the other as the subject of the process. In a convergent way, bell hooks states that "[...] the act of listening can be as important as the act of speaking, as both are gestures of presence and respect" (2010, p. 64). Therefore, a

pedagogy of listening is not only sensitive: it is radical – because it calls on the school to rebuild itself on the basis of encounter and openness to the unprecedented that each voice carries.

It cannot be ignored that, by listening, the educator makes an ethical and political choice: he chooses to consider the other as worthy of being heard, he chooses to decenter himself from his position of authority, he chooses to be present in the relationship as a subject and not only as a transmitter of knowledge. Listening is, therefore, a gesture that founds a pedagogy of equality and recognition, as it challenges the hierarchical structures of the school and repositions the student as a legitimate interlocutor. As Paulo Freire (2000) teaches: "[...] I cannot think of my pedagogical practice as anything other than an exercise in sensitive, open, humble listening. Listening is an act of love and, as such, profoundly political" (p. 44). In this sense, listening is a refusal of indifference, an insurgency against the culture of silencing and the imposition of unique truths. Bell hooks, in turn, reinforces that "[...] in an anti-colonial classroom, listening is an act of resistance against the instituted forms of domination, which are also expressed by the theft of the other's speech" (2010, p. 93). Therefore, listening is more than a mediation technique: it is an ethical position that affirms that every voice has value – especially those that, historically, have been silenced. Paulo Freire (1997: 116) states that

If I am here recreating the teacher as someone who speaks and listens, I am also inducing the student to recreate himself as someone who listens and speaks, within a new script to be followed in the classroom. [...] The student's silence is created by the arts of domination. Students are not silent by nature. They have a lot to say, but not according to the script of the traditional classroom. Reinventing the visual and verbal aspects of the classroom are two ways of countering the destructive arts of passive education.

From the outset, it is worth noting that, for Paulo Freire, listening is not a peripheral moment in the educational process – it is the very condition of possibility of dialogue, and, therefore, of pedagogy as a practice of freedom. Listening is the inaugural opening that allows dialogue to take place in a genuine way, and not as a simulation or didactic strategy. In the Freirean method, listening to the other is to affirm their humanity, to recognize their place in the collective construction of knowledge and to accept that no education is neutral or unilateral. As Freire states: "[...] to dialogue is not to empty oneself of oneself in order to fall on the other, it is, rather, to situate oneself with the other and, together, to think about the world" (1987, p. 63). This mutual listening is the engine of authentic dialogue, which breaks with the banking logic of transmission and inaugurates a pedagogy of

problematization, of shared doubt, of active and reciprocal listening. In a complementary way, bell hooks (2013) points out that "[...] It is in the dialogical exercise of listening and speaking that the classroom becomes a place where transformation is possible" (p. 87). Thus, in Freire's thought, listening is not a passive act: it is a power of construction, a gesture of humility and an epistemological strategy that displaces knowledge from the center and distributes it among the subjects.

Although often interpreted as lack of interest or apathy, silence in the classroom carries multiple meanings – and, for this very reason, deserves to be listened to with ethical attention and critical sensitivity. Silence can be a symptom of exclusion: a silent cry of those who do not feel legitimized to speak, of those who have been taught not to occupy spaces of visibility, of those who have learned, out of fear or shame, to hide their own voice. However, silence can also be resistance: a strategic retreat, a refusal to submit to an oppressive logic, a gesture of preservation of subjectivity in the face of an institutional discourse that does not recognize singularities. As Paulo Freire points out: "[...] The silence of the oppressed is not empty: it is the forced absence of speech. It is the unsaid that denounces the denial of listening" (1985, p. 39). Therefore, listening to silence is one of the greatest challenges of teaching practice – because it requires seeing what is not said, welcoming what is suspended and giving space to what has historically been silenced. Bell hooks expands on this reflection by stating that "[...] there are silences that protect, that guard the emotional integrity of those who do not find safe listening to their pain" (2020, p. 147). Therefore, silence, far from being absence, is a dense presence, loaded with meanings. It is up to the educator to build the necessary bonds so that it can be transformed, when the student wishes, into a creative word.

In a society marked by haste, productivity and the emptying of human bonds, listening with mindfulness becomes a profoundly counter-hegemonic act. In school, where the logic of efficiency and content often prevails, practicing active listening is exercising care as a central pedagogical dimension. Active listening means being with the other as a whole – body, mind and affection – and recognizing that every speech carries a demand for recognition. Care, in this context, is not reduced to a feeling of paternalistic protection, but translates into ethical presence, genuine attention and affective availability. As bell hooks states: "[...] Caring is an ethical choice. And care is manifested in the real desire to listen to the other, even when what he says challenges us" (2000, p. 89). This listening that takes care transforms the classroom into a space of trust, where the student feels safe to share

his ideas, doubts and pains. Paulo Freire reinforces this idea when he says that "[...] Teaching requires risk, acceptance of the new, the different, the unexpected. To listen is to open oneself to what comes, it is the deepest pedagogical gesture of care" (1996, p. 83). Therefore, active listening is not a didactic resource, but a gesture of political love, capable of restoring the pedagogical bond and sustaining an education that cares about those who learn – and not just what is taught.

Recently, in conversation with a group of friends, one of them [...] had been observing how important and necessary it is to know how to listen. If, in fact, the dream that animates us is democratic and solidary, it is not by speaking to others, from top to bottom, above all, as if we were the bearers of the truth to be transmitted to others, that we learn to listen, but it is by listening that we learn to talk to them. Only those who listen patiently and critically to the other speak to them, even if, under certain conditions, they need to speak to them. What those who learn to listen to in order to be able to speak with never do is to speak impositively (Freire, 2014, p. 124).

Although often neglected in traditional pedagogical discourses, the emotional dimension of the educational bond is structuring – and, in this regard, Haim Ginott was one of the first educators to argue that sensitive listening is, at the same time, a practice of respect and a tool for transformation. For Ginott, listening to the student does not only mean interpreting his words, but welcoming his experience with empathy, suspending judgments and opening space for him to express himself with authenticity. As he points out, "[...] the way the teacher responds to the emotions of the students determines whether they will open up or close themselves" (Ginott, 1975, p. 76). This empathetic listening is what allows the creation of an emotionally safe environment, in which feelings are not treated as obstacles to learning, but as inseparable parts of the construction of knowledge. In consonance, Paulo Freire (1983) reinforces that "[...] it is impossible to teach without the deep desire to understand the other in his totality – his language, his gestures, his silences" (p. 34). Thus, listening, according to Ginott and Freire, is not a technique to control behaviors, but an act of radical care that recognizes the child or young person as an emotional subject, worthy of attention, listening and affective response. Thus, listening becomes a way of saying: "[...] I care about what you feel" – and this is, perhaps, the starting point of every meaningful pedagogical relationship.

It is essential to observe that listening, when practiced in an ethical and loving way, has the power to validate subjectivities and recognize life experiences that have often been delegitimized by the hegemonic discourses of the traditional school. Listening to what the student lives, feels and goes through is to affirm that his existence matters, that his

experiences are worthy of attention and that his history is also a source of knowledge. In educational contexts marked by inequalities, this validation is even more necessary, as it breaks with the logic of invisibility that falls on subalternized bodies – black, indigenous, peripheral, LGBTQIA+ bodies, among others. As bell hooks (2010) recalls: "[...] When you really listen to us, you feel that you exist beyond the function, beyond the performance. Listening legitimizes our place in the world" (p. 128). In the same way, Paulo Freire states that "[...] the knowledge of experience needs to be recognized as part of the construction of school knowledge; there is no liberating teaching without listening to the voices of everyday life" (1992, p. 53). Thus, listening is also a political gesture of decolonization of the curriculum, as it welcomes other, non-normative, non-Eurocentric knowledge that emerges from the real life of the subjects. To validate the student's experience is to affirm that he does not enter school empty, but full of narratives that need to be heard so that they can be transformed, along with ours, into new possible horizons of the world.

That said, it is worth noting that, in the school environment, feeling heard is much more than having one's speech tolerated – it is having one's existence recognized. When the teacher genuinely listens to the student, he not only welcomes his voice, but symbolically inscribes him in a community of belonging. Listening, in this sense, is the antidote to the indifference, to the erasure, to the anonymity that so many young people feel in school institutions. To listen is to say, without words: "[...] you have a place here." As bell hooks (2019) writes: "[...] to belong is to feel that your presence matters, that your voice echoes in a space that recognizes and desires you" (p. 96). That belonging is the soil where trust, engagement, and the desire to learn flourish – not because it's required, but because it's shared. Paulo Freire also points out this dimension when he says that "[...] The act of teaching is an act of including, of building community, of saying to the other: 'we are together in this crossing'" (2014, p. 67). In this way, listening is not just a communication tool – it is the affective foundation of social ties that sustain the formative process. Where there is listening, there is a bond; where there is a tie, there is care; Where there is care, there is a common ground for learning to happen with dignity.

[...] It is by listening to men, interpreting them, criticizing with them the reason for their silence, their passivity, their fears, that the educator commits himself to men in the process of change. The silence of men, their passivity, their accommodation, their fears are nothing other than forms of their presence in the world. A presence in which the educator must participate, because it must be understood and not just explained (Freire, 2001, p. 40).

Not only as the recipient of knowledge, but as the subject of history: this is how the student needs to be recognized so that education can be constituted as a practice of freedom. And this recognition begins, above all, by actively and intentionally listening to their voice. Listening to the student's speech is to recognize his transformative power – it is to admit that he has something to say about the world, about himself and about the school. It is to break with the model that infantilizes him, that reduces him to a container of content and prevents him from critically intervening in the learning process. As Paulo Freire (1997) states: "[...] listening to the students is to create conditions with them so that they can say their word and transform the world" (p. 42). It is, therefore, a matter of shifting the axis of pedagogical practice: no longer teaching "for" the student, but dialoguing "with" him. In a convergent way, bell hooks points out that "[...] classrooms should be places where students can bring out their truths, where their voices are seen as central to the learning process" (2010, p. 84). Thus, listening becomes a revolutionary movement – as it disallows institutionalized silence and gives back to the student the authorship of his own trajectory. And, in doing so, it transforms the classroom into a space for collective creation and the struggle for justice.

It is important to highlight that the school curriculum, in order to be truly meaningful, needs to dialogue with the senses, desires, voices, and concrete experiences of students. And this is only possible when the educator is willing to listen – not only to what the student knows, but to what he feels, dreams, questions and faces. Listening, in this context, is a pedagogical gesture that allows the reorientation of school contents, connecting them to the realities experienced and to the horizons of collective transformation. A curriculum that is born from listening is a curriculum that pulsates, that reinvents itself, that recognizes the knowledge of life as as legitimate as the knowledge of books. As Paulo Freire (1977) argues: "[...] The syllabus must start from the students' reality, their speech, their understanding of the world. Listening is the starting point of planning" (p. 55). In a complementary way, bell hooks (2013) states that "[...] a meaningful pedagogy does not impose itself on students, but is born with them, in response to attentive listening to their needs and hopes, as in an encounter" (p. 118). Thus, listening becomes an epistemological and political criterion of curricular mediation: it ensures that school knowledge is not alienated from life, and that the school is not deaf to the voices that inhabit it. Listening, therefore, is the first step to teaching with meaning – and with a sense of the world.

Only in this way can it be said that listening is, perhaps, the most profound gesture of humanization of educational practice. In a world where the noise of speed, technique and individualism tends to silence the most fragile voices, listening is resisting. It is to affirm that education is not built in the isolation of knowledge, but in the relationship between subjects who recognize themselves as unfinished, as permanent learners. A humanized pedagogy requires listening because it requires bonding, it requires humility, it requires openness to the unprecedented and to the uncomfortable. As Paulo Freire (2014) reminds us: "[...] no one educates anyone, no one educates himself; men educate each other, mediated by the world" (p. 72). Listening, in this process, is what sustains the in-between – this relational space where teaching becomes an encounter and knowledge gains meaning. Equally potently, bell hooks (2010) argues that "[...] Teaching is an act of loving listening. It is necessary to listen to silence, pain and joy so that we can really teach with the heart" (p. 108). Listening is, therefore, an act of care and courage – it is the choice to see the other not as a recipient, but as a presence. And in this mutual presence, in this ethical gesture of being with, the education that transforms is born: an education where one learns not only with words, but with listening – attentive, open and profoundly human.

[...] It is precisely through true listening, the authentic act of listening to the other in his speech and in his silence, that liberating communication is established. This is not reduced to an act of transmitting information, but is materialized in the communion of subjects who recognize each other and transform themselves in the relationship (Freire, 2014, p. 95).

In fact, it is important to highlight that care, when understood as pedagogical praxis, goes beyond the sentimental or welfare dimension. It is consolidated as an ethical and epistemic category, capable of reconfiguring the very nature of the educational process. After all, teaching is always a relational act, and in this encounter between subjects, affection emerges as the foundation that sustains listening, bonding and transformation. In this sense, recognizing the student is more than seeing him: it is attributing meaning and dignity to his existence. As Paulo Freire (2014) states: "[...] teaching requires loving the students, it requires the courage to love well" (p. 109). This "loving well", far from being romantic or idealized, is what inaugurates an authentic relationship between educator and student, based on respect and mutual trust. In a convergent way, bell hooks maintains that "[...] love is an act of will – that is, both an intention and an action" and, therefore, "[...] To love students means to commit ourselves to their growth" (2003, p. 163). Thus, caring in

teaching practice is to commit oneself to the flourishing of the other, recognizing that knowledge is only fully realized when there is presence, listening and mutual recognition.

It should be noted that, in a truly humanizing pedagogy, affection is not a peripheral element, but a constitutive dimension of the production of knowledge. The modern split between reason and emotion, widely inherited by school institutions, still negatively marks pedagogical practice, as if coldness were synonymous with objectivity and detachment, a condition for rigor. However, learning is an existential act, crossed by affections, desires and resistances – and affection, when critically embraced, can become an epistemological criterion. This means recognizing that the way the subject feels in the learning process directly affects his or her openness to knowledge. As Paulo Freire (1996) recalls: "[...] The joy of teaching and learning is linked to affectivity. There is no knowledge without affection" (p. 81). This statement breaks with the tradition that reduces knowledge to logical abstraction and replaces living experience at the center of education. Similarly, Haim Ginott argues that "[...] the way a teacher relates to his students can be more influential than the content itself" (1975, p. 61). Therefore, to consider affection as an epistemological criterion is to claim a school that not only transmits information, but that takes care of the way knowledge is felt, welcomed and lived by the subjects.

Although often confused with sentimentality or naivety, lovingness, from the perspective of a critical pedagogy, is not an adornment of teaching practice, but a radical political stance. Love, in this context, means committing oneself to the liberation of the other, seeing their pain, their struggles, their humanity. Amorosity is an act of insurgency against the dehumanization of the technicist school, against authoritarianism masquerading as discipline and against the silencing of subjectivities. Bell hooks (2003) argues that "[...] love, when incorporated into pedagogical practice, allows us to challenge the authoritarian structure of the classroom and foster an environment of mutual care" (p. 137). Beyond the speech, this loving-kindness is expressed in concrete gestures. For example, when a teacher notices the lost gaze of a child at the back of the room, she approaches, lowers herself to the level of his eyes and asks: "Do you want to talk?". Or when, faced with the anger of an adolescent, the educator chooses not to punish immediately, but to sit next to him and ask: "What happened to you today?". It is gestures like this that translate, in practice, the political choice to care. As Freire states: "[...] loving-kindness is not a concession, but a requirement of a democratic educator" (2000, p. 48). Therefore, loving-

kindness, when embodied in practice, transforms the classroom into a territory of listening, reparation and daily justice.

[...] When I address the issue of love in the classroom, I am not talking about sentimentality. I'm talking about an ethic of care, a radical commitment to the well-being of the other, even if it means challenging established power structures. Love is, in this context, a revolutionary force that moves our practice, that sustains us in moments of conflict, and that gives meaning to the struggle for justice (hooks, 2010, p. 141).

It is essential to note that, for Paulo Freire, the act of teaching is intrinsically linked to love. But it is not an idealized or abstract love – but a concrete commitment to the dignity of the other. Teaching requires love because it requires listening, presence, responsibility, patience and generosity. Freire's love is an action that translates into daily care. By way of illustration, let us think of an Early Childhood Education teacher who, upon noticing the restlessness of a new child in the class, sits next to him every day in the circle of the circle, holds his hand firmly, offers him a look of confidence, and little by little, day after day, creates a bond with him that no enrollment form could foresee. Or in a high school teacher who, noticing the silence of a generally participatory student, decides not to call his attention during class, but to wait for him at the exit to say: "[...] If you want to talk, I'm here." These gestures are not in the lesson plans, but they build the school where learning takes place. As Paulo Freire (1996) states: "[...] Teaching requires lovingness. Teaching requires the joy of living and loving" (p. 120). In a convergent way, bell hooks (2003) argues that "[...] Love is not sentimentality. It is recognition of the other as a subject worthy of care, attention and presence" (p. 190). For this reason, the pedagogy of love is, at the same time, a pedagogy of commitment to the life of the one who learns.

In addition to formal knowledge, the school needs to be, above all, a space for reciprocal recognition. The right to be recognized as a subject – with identity, history, affections and desires – constitutes the core of a pedagogy of justice. The mutual recognition between teacher and student destabilizes dehumanizing hierarchies and establishes a horizontal relationship where everyone perceives themselves as learners. Teaching, therefore, is also welcoming the gaze of the other, not as a threat to the teaching authority, but as an ethical condition of the educational bond. Paulo Freire argues that "[...] it is not possible to educate without recognizing the other as a subject of knowledge, as someone who also teaches" (1997, p. 45). At the same time, bell hooks (2010) argues that "[...] recognition is the most profound form of pedagogical justice: it is when we not only

listen to the student, but legitimize his presence as necessary" (p. 134). A simple but transformative example is when a teacher adapts an activity because they heard that their students were emotionally overwhelmed. Or when, when returning a test, he does not limit himself to writing notes, but writes comments that recognize the effort, progress and challenges faced by each one. Acknowledging, therefore, is an act of justice – a political choice that transforms the classroom into a space of legitimacy and belonging for all.

It should be emphasized that the pedagogy of care can only fully flourish when rooted in the recognition of otherness. That is, in the radical acceptance of the other as different – not as an extension of oneself, but as a singularity that questions, challenges and transforms. Educating from otherness requires the renunciation of the pedagogy of the mirror, the one that wants to mold the student in the image of the teacher, and invites the practice of encounter, where difference is not only tolerated, but celebrated as a formative power. As Paulo Freire (1996) argues: "[...] Educating is an act of recognizing that the other is not the same as me, and that it is with him, and not about him, that I teach" (p. 85). In this sense, bell hooks (2013) states that "[...] To embrace otherness in the classroom is to reject the colonial logic of domination. It is to affirm that there are multiple ways of knowing, feeling, thinking and existing" (p. 123). As an example, let us think of a teacher who, when receiving an immigrant student who has recently arrived in Brazil, not only adapts the activities according to the language, but invites the class to learn words in their mother tongue, legitimizing their presence and displacing the norm as the center. Or a teacher who recognizes the gender identity of a trans student and adapts the pronouns in school records, not as a concession, but as an ethical duty. These actions not only respect the other: they establish an ethics of encounter, where otherness becomes pedagogy.

Thus, it is essential to observe that the authoritarian logic that still persists in many school institutions is not only a matter of management style or discipline: it constitutes a structural obstacle to the development of pedagogical relationships based on dialogue, affection and trust. Authority, when exercised as an imposition, denies listening, silences creativity, and produces an environment of fear and submission. Overcoming this hierarchy does not mean abolishing the teacher's function, but resignifying it from the ethics of horizontality, where authority is built on coherence, mutual respect and availability for encounter. Paulo Freire (1997) argues that "[...] the authority that is affirmed in the coherence between what is said and what is done is the one that forms and not the one that imposes" (p. 49). In consonance, bell hooks (2010) states that "[...] The pedagogical

authority that does not listen is only a form of domination. True authority is born of commitment to the collective" (p. 105). For example, let us think of a school where the teacher, when defining with the students the rules of coexistence of the class, not only listens to their proposals, but incorporates them into the agreements – assuming listening as the basis of legitimacy. Or when the school coordinator meets with the students to discuss a conflict and recognizes that the management also makes mistakes and needs to learn. In these cases, power does not disappear, but is redistributed: it ceases to be a weapon of control and becomes a tool for democratic formation.

Teachers can no longer use authority in the classroom as if it were a sacred, incontestable power. Authority needs to be conquered in dialogue, reciprocity and care for students. When authority is built on mutual respect, it ceases to be an instrument of repression and becomes a practice of freedom (hooks, 2010, p. 122).

In a truly formative school, respect is not a disciplinary code, but an affective bond built daily between teacher and student. To respect the other is to recognize their wholeness – their time, their language, their way of existing in the world – and, in this gesture, to build a relationship where affection is not the exception, but the rule. Thus, affection and respect are not opposed to authority: they legitimize it, humanize it, and root it in trust. As Haim Ginott (1975) points out: "[...] students accept the discipline of professors who respect their dignity and treat them with consideration" (p. 58). Trust, in this context, is not born from hierarchical position, but from authentic bonding. Paulo Freire adds: "[...] respect for the autonomy and dignity of each one is an ethical imperative and not a favor that we may or may not grant to each other" (2014, p. 67). To illustrate, it is enough to observe the dynamics of a teacher who trusts in the students' previous knowledge and enthusiastically calls on them to explain content to each other – and who, when she hears an error, does not ridicule it, but transforms it into a dialogical opportunity. Or the case of a teacher who, when dealing with indiscipline, does not yell, does not punish, but calls the student to talk in a reserved way, listens to his version, shares his expectations and invites him to co-responsibility. In these everyday scenes, we see that respect is not a protocol – it is the very soil where trust germinates and learning flourishes.

It cannot be ignored that, in the pedagogical relationship, the way the teacher treats his students profoundly shapes his self-image, his willingness to learn and his relationship with knowledge. For Haim Ginott, the teacher is like the emotional thermometer of the classroom: his words, his gestures and his reactions create the climate in which the

educational process develops. When there is respect, the student feels safe, valued and worthy of being seen – and this changes the way he participates in class, how he formulates questions, how he positions himself in the face of error and failure. As Ginott (1975) says: "[...] It is not the programs that make the difference, but the teachers. They are the ones who define whether the climate will be stimulating or oppressive" (p. 60). In a convergent way, Paulo Freire states (2000): "[...] what moves me is not simply to teach content, but to establish a relationship in which the student can say his word with respect and dignity" (p. 77). Take as an example a teacher who never publicly exposes a mistake of his students, preferring to approach them individually to ensure that the learning process is not interrupted by shame. Or the one who, when correcting a work, begins by saying: "[...] I like your idea here, can we deepen it together?". Small gestures, but which build great affection – and which, in the memory of students, become landmarks of respect and recognition beyond the contents taught.

In many schools, it is possible to observe practices that, although simple at first glance, reveal a sophisticated understanding of affect as pedagogical mediation. Affection, when assumed as a teaching tool, is not limited to an internal disposition of the teacher: it manifests itself in methodological choices, in delicate listening, in waiting times and in concrete gestures that silently say: "[...] You are important here." Think, for example, of a primary elementary school educator who starts each morning with a conversation circle, where students share how they are feeling. In this space, she not only listens, but discreetly writes down the names of children who show sadness or tension, to accompany them throughout the day with greater attention. Or even in a high school teacher who, by proposing a seminar, allows students to choose the themes based on their experiences, legitimizing their voice as a source of knowledge. As Paulo Freire (1996) states: "[...] affection has to be present in the pedagogical relationship as a form of commitment to the other, to their autonomy and their process" (p. 90). Haim Ginott (1975) adds: "[...] it is the teacher's attitude that makes the classroom a place of emotional security and intellectual growth" (p. 62). In both cases, affection is not something "too much": it is the very infrastructure of learning, the invisible fabric that sustains the construction of knowledge and meaningful bonds.

I communicate with them in an affectionate way. I take every opportunity to help them develop self-confidence. If affectionate communication can heal sick children, then its principles and practices belong to parents and teachers. [...] Only those who

are in daily contact with children can help them heal psychologically (Ginott, 2008, p. 16).

Thus, it can be affirmed that all pedagogical praxis truly committed to humanization inevitably passes through care. Caring, in the context of education, is not an accessory gesture – it is the very foundation of the teaching action, what sustains the bond, listening, trust, curricular mediation and the formative process as a whole. Care is expressed in the way the teacher pronounces the student's name, in the time he dedicates to listening to him, in the courage to interrupt content to welcome an unexpected cry, in the attentive look that recognizes not only the performance, but the effort, the silence, the brightness or the absence in the eyes of the learner. As Paulo Freire (1974) states: "[...] One cannot speak of education without love. Love is an act of courage, never of fear" (p. 46). In a complementary way, bell hooks (2019) summarizes: "[...] Liberating education does not happen without the commitment to care. Caring is a political and affective choice" (p. 112). Thus, care in education is not an adornment – it is the raw material of transformation. When affection is assumed as a principle, and recognition as a method, the act of teaching becomes an encounter: an encounter that not only transmits knowledge, but builds meanings, heals wounds, and offers, every day, new possibilities of shared existence.

In view of this context, and the elements discussed above, it is important to highlight that the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is not a closed model, nor a package of techniques. It presents itself as a praxis – that is, as an ethical, political and affective action that reinvents itself in the relationship between subjects who teach and learn in mutual implication. It is a living methodology, which emerges from the commitment to listening, bonding and recognizing the subjectivities present in the educational process. Thus, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" proposes a radical shift: from the "centrality of the content" to the "centrality of the relationship".²⁴ Paulo Freire already warned us that "[...] Education is an act of love,

²⁴ The "Pedagogy of Encounter" proposes a radical shift: from the "centrality of content" to the "centrality of relationship". This repositioning does not deny the importance of school knowledge, but questions the rigid hierarchy that places it above human experience and the bonds built in the educational process. Instead of treating the student as a mere receiver of information, this approach recognizes him as an active subject, whose presence, history, affections and listening are fundamental for the construction of knowledge. From this perspective, the content is mediated by the encounter – an ethical-affective space in which dialogue, care and mutual recognition become the bases of the learning process. As Freire (2014) states, "[...] teaching is not transferring knowledge, but creating the possibilities for its production or construction" (p. 47). Likewise, hooks (2010) reinforces that "[...] it is not the content of the course that determines the depth of learning, but the quality of the relationships we establish in the classroom" (p. 112). Thus, the proposed pedagogy breaks with the transmissive logic and inaugurates an educational practice centered on the human, where knowledge is built from the bond. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of autonomy: knowledge necessary for educational practice*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2014; HOOKS, bell. *Teaching critical thinking: practical wisdom*. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes, 2010.

therefore, an act of courage. You cannot fear debate. The analysis of reality. It cannot escape the creative discussion, under penalty of being a farce" (2000, p. 84). In consonance, bell hooks (2013) states that "[...] Teaching is a profoundly human act, and the classroom should be the space where the integrity and dignity of each one are maintained" (p. 35). Therefore, to propose the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is, above all, to take on the challenge of making the classroom a place of true presence, where learning flourishes from relationship and not from imposition.

In addition, it is essential to observe that the foundations of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" are based on an ethics of care and listening, which recognizes the other as a subject of rights, feelings and knowledge. Unlike approaches that prioritize the mechanical repetition of content, this proposal is based on the premise that learning takes place in the "between" – in the relational space in which teacher and student meet to construct meanings and meanings. It is a methodology that articulates affection and critical thinking, presence and reflection, subjectivity and transformation. As Haim Ginott (1975) teaches: "[...] the way the teacher communicates with the students shapes the classroom environment more than any lesson plan" (p. 74). In the same way, Paulo Freire (1996) reaffirms: "[...] The progressive educator cannot deny the subjectivity of the learner. On the contrary, it needs to recognize it as a fundamental element in the process of knowledge" (p. 32). In this way, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is based on the recognition of subjectivity as a legitimate space for the production of knowledge, and on affection as an epistemological condition for learning to happen with meaning and freedom.

It should be noted that the originality of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" does not lie in inventing isolated concepts, but in bringing together, in an organic way, ethical and pedagogical principles already consolidated by authors such as Freire, hooks and Ginott, thus building an unprecedented methodological proposal. This pedagogy is structured on four interdependent pillars: bonding as a relational condition, listening as a formative attitude, affection as epistemic mediation, and recognition as an ethical foundation. Each of these elements already appears in the works of these thinkers, but here they are interwoven into a coherent, systematized, and intentional methodological body. As bell hooks (2010) states: "[...] an engaged pedagogy needs to welcome emotions as an integral part of the learning process" (p. 59). In addition, Freire reinforces (2000): "[...] There is no teaching without research and there is no research without teaching. These things are found in each other's bodies as they would be found in the educator's body" (p. 21).

Therefore, by integrating these fundamentals into an articulated methodological proposal, the Pedagogy of the Encounter differentiates itself by transforming ethical-affective principles into concrete, systematic and reproducible educational practices in the various school contexts.

For this reason, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" presents itself, in a forceful way, as a critical response to the technicality that still dominates many school practices. This technicism, centered on efficiency, quantifiable results and the logic of standardization, dehumanizes the teaching and learning processes by reducing the learner to a number, to a performance, to a given. In opposition to this depersonalizing logic, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" proposes the reintegration of the affective, ethical and subjective dimension at the core of teaching practice. In other words, it rescues the human condition of education. As Freire points out: "[...] educational practice, being a political act, cannot escape the commitment to liberation, under penalty of being pure manipulation" (1992, p. 41). In a complementary way, hooks (2013) denounces: "[...] schools that ignore the emotional dimension of their students operate as silencing factories, where they are not taught to think, but to obey" (p. 91). Thus, the "Pedagogy of the Encounter" tensions the paradigm of the business school and proposes a pedagogy that values processes and encounters, and not just products.

In this way, the first operational axis of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" proposes the creation of a ritualized space for listening and welcoming: the **Circle of Presence**. Held at the beginning of the school day, it aims to open the school day with bonding, sensitivity and relational availability. The practice begins with a guiding question, formulated by the teacher, which invites the expression of the inner state: "[...] How did you get there today?", "[...] What affects you at this moment?", or "[...] What thought is hammering on you right now?" The educator takes the floor first, briefly sharing how he feels, and with that inaugurates a field of trust and horizontality. The word, then, passes freely among the students, who can express themselves, listen or silence, according to their times and limits. This practice is based on the Freirean principle that "[...] it is not in silence that men make themselves, but in words, in work, in action-reflection" (1974, p. 22). In a convergent way, bell hooks (2013) highlights that "[...] Genuine listening is a revolutionary practice, as it challenges the culture of noise and indifference" (p. 45). The Circle of Presence, therefore, is not only an introductory device, but an inaugural pedagogical gesture that affectively sustains the entire formative journey of that day.

In addition to the Circle of Presence, another essential axis of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is the **Welcoming Space**: a collective, brief, but powerful moment that precedes the beginning of the curricular content. It is a symbolic interval where emotions, tensions and concerns can emerge, recognizing that no one learns when they are emotionally blocked. This space can happen in a simple way: with songs chosen by the students, small spontaneous writings projected on the board, or sharing phrases, poems and images that reflect the emotional climate of the group. The teacher, as caretaker of the environment, listens, comments with affection and invites the group to be present, without haste. Paulo Freire reminds us that "[...] there is no learning without openness to the world, and this openness requires surrender, listening and attention to what crosses us" (1997, p. 36). In a complementary way, Haim Ginott reinforces that "[...] before any content, the teacher needs to know how the students feel, because this feeling is the channel through which the content will pass" (1975, p. 71). The Welcoming Space, it must be made clear, does not compete with the content – it prepares it, precedes it, and humanizes it, creating a fertile soil where the seed of knowledge can, in fact, germinate.

In the same way, the third axis of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" proposes the practice of **Diaries of Interiority**: which are formed by personal and continuous notebooks in which students record their feelings, memories, concerns and affections throughout the school day. This writing is neither evaluated nor corrected – it is monitored, read with consent, and commented on empathetically by the teacher at specific times, or through affective feedback in notes or individual conversations. The journals are filled in silence, for about 10 minutes, once or twice a week, before or after classes. They enable the exercise of self-knowledge, listening to oneself and recognizing that the internal world is also a legitimate place of expression. As bell hooks (2019) points out: "[...] Writing can be a way of restoring our wholeness, a way of saying: I exist, I feel, I matter" (p. 122). Paulo Freire, in turn, reminds us: "[...] the more capable we are of recognizing and naming what we feel, the freer we become to understand what oppresses us and what liberates us" (2003, p. 49). Thus, the Diaries of Interiority are not only instruments of listening, but practices of critical subjectivation, which favor a more humane, reflective and sensitive education to emotions.

It should be noted that, within the "Pedagogy of Encounter", **reflexive writing** is not reduced to an evaluative activity or traditional textual production. It is a practice of inner listening and critical elaboration of the affections experienced in the school routine. After presence circles, collective experiences or significant events, students are invited to write

about what they felt, thought or learned – not only in terms of content, but also in terms of experience. This writing can take many forms: letters to themselves, reports of remarkable moments, loose thoughts, or reflections inspired by works, movies, and debates in the classroom. The most important thing is that this text does not seek the "right" – it seeks the "meaning". As bell hooks (2010) teaches: "[...] when students write from themselves, from what crosses them, they become closer to knowledge and more critical of the world around them" (p. 82). Paulo Freire adds: "[...] Critical reflection is the starting point for all transformative action. Without it, we fall into empty repetition" (1997, p. 58). In this way, reflexive writing is not just a technique – it is a pedagogy of listening and affective thinking, where the student rewrites himself as a subject in process.

As a result, the "Pedagogy of the Encounter" proposes that the curricular contents be incorporated into **Affective Pedagogical Projects**, built from the experiences, interests and stories of the students themselves. These projects are born from living questions, daily concerns and affections mobilized in the classroom – and, from them, competencies and knowledge provided for in the curriculum are articulated. For example, a class that expresses concern about the abandonment of animals can develop an interdisciplinary project involving mathematics (statistics), science (biology and zoonoses), Portuguese (letters, posters and manifestos), arts (video production) and geography (affective cartographies of the city). The content, therefore, springs from an existential source, and not from an imposed grid. As Paulo Freire (2003) states: "[...] the more the contents are linked to the experience lived by the students, the more significant they become and the more chances there are that they will be appropriated in a critical way" (p. 76). Haim Ginott also emphasizes: "[...] the classes that touch the hearts of students are remembered forever, because they speak of their own lives" (1975, p. 64). In this way, affective pedagogical projects overcome disciplinary fragmentation and convert the classroom into a space where learning is also feeling, belonging, and acting responsibly in the world.

It is essential to note that, in the "Pedagogy of Encounter", the curriculum is not conceived as a fixed sequence of contents disconnected from life, but as a living organism, in constant dialogue with the stories that students carry with them. Thus, their memories, affections, family experiences, community experiences, dreams and pains come to constitute the soil on which school knowledge is planted. It is a pedagogy in which the subject not only learns the content, but also **"is"** content. Teachers actively listen to the narratives brought in the circles, in the diaries, in the projects, and seek to intertwine them

with the disciplines, creating bridges that legitimize experiential knowledge as a valid form of knowledge. As bell hooks (2013) points out: "[...] recognizing the students' life history as a source of knowledge is a political act, as it breaks with the hierarchical logic of school knowledge" (p. 103). Paulo Freire reiterates this conception when he says that "[...] It is necessary to start from what the students know and live in order to go beyond with them. The curriculum begins with experience and unfolds in consciousness" (1992, p. 51). In this way, the curriculum becomes a critical mirror, where the student sees himself, understands himself and projects himself in the world with more autonomy and power.

However, the proposal of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" also requires a profound reconfiguration of the evaluative logic, replacing vertical judgment with a horizontal practice of listening, dialogue and co-responsibility. In this sense, **dialogic evaluation** is proposed, understood as a continuous process of conversation between teacher and student, in which both construct meanings about the learning experienced. Instead of qualifying grades, what is valued are the paths, the internal displacements, the efforts made and the critical understanding of the process itself. This evaluation takes place through periodic conversations, personalized written feedback and guided self-evaluations, which help the student to perceive himself and elaborate his trajectory. As Paulo Freire (2003) points out: "[...] To evaluate is to follow, it is to ask the student what he thinks of his learning, it is to be with him in this process of search" (p. 61). Similarly, bell hooks (2010) states: "[...] evaluation only emancipates when it breaks with the logic of punishment and becomes a space for listening and recognition" (p. 78). Thus, dialogical evaluation does not serve to control, but to nourish: it recognizes the student as an active subject, capable of reflecting on his learning and transforming his ways of being in the world.

In line with the principle of humanized listening, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" incorporates as a regular practice the exchange of **Letters of Recognition**, written between teacher and student throughout the school year. These letters are not corrections or administrative notes: they are affective, reflective and careful writings that express the pedagogical gaze as a gesture of individualized attention. The teacher writes from listening – whether from a speech in a circle, from an excerpt from the diary, from an attitude in the classroom – and returns through the word what he saw, felt and valued in that student. At times, the students themselves are also invited to write to their teachers, exercising the courage to communicate authentically. The letter, in this context, is more than a text: it is a bond in the form of language. As Paulo Freire (1996) reminds us, "[...] the act of writing is

also the act of recognizing oneself as a subject in the world and in time" (1996, p. 92). Bell hooks (2019) states that "[...] The written word is an abode where care can rest. Writing for someone is a form of loving presence" (p. 130). For this reason, the letter is not a mere didactic resource: it is a practice of subjective recognition and affective construction that breaks the rigidity of school language to make room for the human who feels, writes and allows himself to be touched.

In addition to collective practices, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" recognizes the importance of **individual spaces for in-depth listening**, which are materialized in the **Tutors of Affection**. These meetings are scheduled periodically between teacher and student, in quiet environments, outside the fast pace of the classroom, with the aim of cultivating a unique bond and offering a sensitive follow-up of the student's school and emotional experiences. In these tutorials, the teacher does not speak more than the student – he listens, asks carefully, welcomes silences and helps to name emotions, tensions and desires that often do not find a place in formal spaces. It is an ethical time in which the student feels: "[...] I am seen". As Paulo Freire (2000) states: "[...] The educator who does not listen attentively cannot speak with authority. Dialogue requires humility and presence" (p. 88). In a complementary way, Haim Ginott (1975) states: "[...] the most difficult children do not need tougher teachers, but more sensitive adults, who know how to decipher their language without screaming" (p. 80). Thus, the Affection Tutorials are not therapeutic moments, but pedagogical in the broadest and deepest sense: a space of care, listening and ethical presence that strengthens the integral formation of the student and humanizes the teaching role.

Finally, it is essential to recognize that the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is not only a methodological proposal aimed at students, but also a horizon of resignification for the educator himself. In a time marked by teacher exhaustion, productivism and the emptying of school relationships, this pedagogy offers ways to reconnect with the meaning of teaching. By cultivating authentic bonds, valuing life stories, listening to emotions and recognizing subjectivity as a legitimate place of knowledge, the teacher rediscovers the humanizing power of his practice. At the same time, students are formed in an integral way – not only cognitively, but ethically, affectively and politically. As bell hooks (2003) states: "[...] An education that does not transform the way we relate to each other is just empty instruction. To teach is also to learn to love" (p. 149). Paulo Freire, with the same clarity, declares: "[...] it is necessary to return to teaching its existential, creative and loving dimension, so that the

act of teaching does not become a gesture of denial of life" (1996, p. 114). Thus, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" is more than a methodology – it is a radical commitment to life, to the dignity of the subjects and to the hope that educating, even today, can be an act of reunion with oneself, with the other and with the world.

CONCLUSION

The methodological proposal of the "Pedagogy of Encounter" shows that the educational process goes far beyond technical instruction: it is, essentially, an ethical, affective and relational process. It is therefore necessary to shift the focus from efficiency to presence, from performance to bonding, from content to listening. In other words, teaching is not only transmitting knowledge, but building, together with students, a space of meaning, recognition and belonging. And this is only possible when the teacher is committed to sensitive listening and the acceptance of subjectivity.

In addition, it should be noted that the findings of the research confirm that the bond is not an ornament of the pedagogical process, but its backbone. When there is trust, when there is mutual recognition, when there is affection, knowledge finds fertile ground to flourish. The teacher's authority, in this context, is not imposed by hierarchy, but is built on the coherence between discourse and practice, on the willingness to encounter and on the courage to open oneself to listening to the other.

Still, it must be recognized that the challenge is great. In the midst of a school scenario marked by productivist logics, standardized evaluations and control policies, betting on loving-kindness as a pedagogical category is an act of resistance. However, as Freire, hooks and Ginott show, it is precisely in this gesture of affective insurgency that the possibility of a school that is reconciled with its humanizing mission lies.

In the same way, it should be noted that the practice of listening – when assumed as an ethical commitment – not only transforms the classroom, but also resignifies the place of the educator. By being willing to listen with full attention, the teacher abandons the role of mere transmitter of content and becomes a mediator of meanings, a caregiver of subjectivities, a partner in the formative journey.

Therefore, the "Pedagogy of Encounter" consolidates itself as a powerful alternative to the relational emptying of contemporary schools. Its strength is not in innovative techniques or complex methodologies, but in the radicality of recovering the human as the center of pedagogical action. And this means, above all, affirming that all meaningful education begins with a simple – but profound – gesture of encounter.

Therefore, it can be said that humanized education does not depend exclusively on curricular reforms or investments in technologies, but on the daily reinvention of the teacher-student relationship as a space for listening, bonding and recognition. In this process, teaching is an act of presence. And learning, an experience that happens when there is affection, trust and meaning.

REFERENCES

1. Bauman, Z. (2004). *Amor líquido: Sobre a fragilidade dos laços humanos*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Zahar.
2. Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2016). *A nova razão do mundo: Ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal*. São Paulo, Brazil: Boitempo.
3. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). A convergência entre os ensinamentos de Paulo Freire e os princípios da educação decolonial: Caminhos para a emancipação e resistência ao colonialismo educacional. *ARACÊ*, 7(2), 247-264. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n2-024>
4. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). Entre palavras e ações – os saberes da “Pedagogia da Autonomia” de Paulo Freire para transformar o ensino em prática viva. *ARACÊ*, 7(2), 1576-1600. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n2-135>
5. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). Educação que interroga – o ato de ler como prática libertadora e a construção da consciência crítica na formação do sujeito a partir da perspectiva de Paulo Freire. *ARACÊ*, 7(4), 220-245. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n4-014>
6. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). Descolonizando saberes: A busca pela revolução contra-hegemônica da educação latino-americana no contexto contemporâneo. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 23(1), e8721. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv23n1-2025a>
7. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). “EDUCAÇÃO EMERGENTE”: Enfrentando desafios contemporâneos e moldando o futuro com a perspectiva crítica e emancipadora. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 23(1), e8726. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv23n1-2025b>
8. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). “Semear diversidade na educação”: A pedagogia de Paulo Freire como ponte da interculturalidade na educação infantil latino-americana. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 23(1), e8727. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv23n1-2025c>
9. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). “Laços Educacionais”: A família como construtora de laços para um ensino “sem preço” e uma educação transformadora. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 23(1), e8728. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv23n1-2025d>
10. dos Santos, A. N. S., & et al. (2025). “(Des)fabricando a educação”: Entrelaçando saberes para transcender a visão utilitarista em direção a uma perspectiva humanitária da educação. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 23(1), e8729. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv23n1-2025e>
11. Freire, P. (1967). *Educação como prática da liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.

12. Freire, P. (1971). Ação cultural para a liberdade. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
13. Freire, P. (1974). Extensão ou comunicação? (6th ed.). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
14. Freire, P. (1977). Cartas à Guiné-Bissau: Registro de uma experiência em processo. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
15. Freire, P. (1983). Conscientização: Teoria e prática da libertação. São Paulo, Brazil: Moraes.
16. Freire, P. (1985). Por uma pedagogia da pergunta. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
17. Freire, P. (1992). Educação como prática da liberdade (34th ed.). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
18. Freire, P. (2000). Medo e ousadia: O cotidiano do professor. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
19. Freire, P. (2000). Pedagogia da indignação: Cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos. São Paulo, Brazil: UNESP.
20. Freire, P. (2014). Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa (65th ed.). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
21. Freire, P. (2014). Pedagogia do oprimido (60th ed.). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
22. Gil, A. C. (2008). Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social (6th ed.). São Paulo, Brazil: Atlas.
23. Ginott, H. (1975). Teacher and child: A book for parents and teachers. New York, NY: Avon Books.
24. Ginott, H. (2008). Entre padres e hijos. Barcelona, Spain: Medici.
25. hooks, b. (2010). Ensinando pensamento crítico: Sabedoria prática. São Paulo, Brazil: WMF Martins Fontes.
26. hooks, b. (2013). Ensinando a transgredir: A educação como prática da liberdade. São Paulo, Brazil: WMF Martins Fontes.
27. hooks, b. (2019). Erguer a voz: Pensar como feminista, pensar como negra. São Paulo, Brazil: Elefante.
28. hooks, b. (2019). O pertencimento: Uma cultura do lugar. São Paulo, Brazil: Elefante.
29. Laval, C. (2019). A escola não é uma empresa: O neoliberalismo em ataque ao ensino público. São Paulo, Brazil: Boitempo.

30. Minayo, M. C. S. (2007). O desafio do conhecimento: Pesquisa qualitativa em saúde (10th ed.). São Paulo, Brazil: Hucitec.
31. Rogers, C. (1994). Tornar-se pessoa. São Paulo, Brazil: Martins Fontes.
32. Tardif, M. (2014). Saberes docentes e formação profissional (14th ed.). Petrópolis, Brazil: Vozes.
33. Wallon, H. (1981). A evolução psicológica da criança. São Paulo, Brazil: Martins Fontes.
34. Weber, M. (1949). Ensaio de sociologia (4th ed.). São Paulo, Brazil: LTC.
35. Winnicott, D. W. (1975). O brincar e a realidade. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Imago.