

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4322/aletheia.017.en>

Promotion of prosocial behaviors and social skills in preschool lesson plans

Iara da Silva Freitas
Márcia Helena da Silva Melo

Abstract: The literature highlights that promoting prosocial behaviors and social skills should be among the priorities in educational projects. Lesson plans can give intentionality to educational actions and influence pedagogical practices. This study aimed to identify activities planned by preschool teachers, focusing on content related to the promotion of prosocial behaviors and social skills. Four teachers from a municipal preschool in southeastern São Paulo participated in the research. Data were extracted from weekly lesson plans, and descriptive analyses were conducted. The results indicated a small number of planned activities related to the promotion of prosocial behaviors (0.2%), social skills (2.7%), or other themes related to socialization (8.8%), compared to other pedagogical content (88.3%). The findings suggest the need for investment in teacher training, including the planning of activities aimed at developing high-quality interpersonal relationships to enhance the teaching-learning process in preschool.

Keywords: prosocial behavior; preschool; social skills; lesson plans.

Promoção de comportamentos pró-sociais e habilidades sociais em planejamentos da educação infantil

Resumo: A literatura aponta que a promoção de comportamentos pró-sociais e habilidades sociais deveria estar entre as prioridades em projetos educacionais. Planejamentos de ensino podem conferir intencionalidade a ações educativas e influenciar práticas pedagógicas. Este estudo teve como objetivo identificar atividades planejadas por professores da educação infantil, com foco em conteúdos relacionados à promoção de comportamentos pró-sociais e habilidades sociais. Participaram da pesquisa quatro professoras de uma escola municipal de educação infantil localizada no sudeste paulista. Foram extraídos dados de planejamentos semanais e realizadas análises descritivas. Os resultados indicaram pequena quantidade de atividades planejadas referentes à promoção de comportamentos pró-sociais (0,2%), habilidades sociais (2,7%) ou outros temas relacionados à socialização (8,8%), quando comparado a outros conteúdos pedagógicos (88,3%). Os achados convidam ao investimento na formação de professores, incluindo o planejamento de atividades voltadas ao desenvolvimento de relacionamentos interpessoais de qualidade, de modo a potencializar o processo de ensino-aprendizagem na educação infantil.

Palavras-chave: comportamentos pró-sociais; educação infantil; habilidades sociais; planejamentos de ensino.

Introduction

Lesson plans constitute tools capable of intervening in real situations to promote transformation, allowing teachers to think and modify the actions to be executed. Despite this, they are often perceived as just another pile of papers, adding to the workload already experienced by teachers in their daily school lives (Vasconcellos, 2012). Fusari (1998) adds that educators may sometimes create lesson plans merely to fulfill imposed conditions, occasionally transcribing documents from the previous year to submit to

administrators, or even neglecting them, considering them dispensable to the development of pedagogical practice.

Ostetto (2016) emphasizes that the act of planning provides intentionality to educational actions and involves outlining, programming, and documenting the teacher's work proposal. Otherwise, there is a risk of remaining in the realm of ideas and concepts. According to the author, planning should originate from a reflective process where the educator considers the reality in which they teach, seeking causes and solutions related to the difficulties encountered in meeting the learning needs of children. Specifically regarding the preschool stage, the researcher highlights the existence of different forms of planning (based on activity lists, developmental areas, themes, commemorative dates, or knowledge areas). She clarifies that the guiding element of actions should be a clear understanding of why and for whom the planning is being done.

Martins and Marsiglia (2015) add that planning should be linked to the content to be taught, and these, in turn, should align with the intended objectives. This process occurs at different times, from annual plans that unfold into semester, bimonthly, and weekly plans, to the planning of each class. Despite this, throughout its history, preschool education has faced extensive difficulties in establishing content, given that lingering custodial and welfare-oriented conceptions can contribute to restricting content to the reproduction of education promoted in everyday life and by the culture of common sense. In this sense, the authors point out that content in this stage of education requires definitions and redefinitions, which is why lesson plans and consistent teacher training are paramount.

According to the Brazilian Common Curricular Base (*Base Nacional Comum Curricular* - BNCC) (Brazil, 2017), preschool education constitutes the first stage of basic education and aims at the comprehensive development of children up to the age of five, encompassing physical, psychological, intellectual, and social aspects, complementing the actions of the family and the community. In preschool education, the structuring axes for children's learning and development are interactions and play, ensuring the rights to play, socialize, explore, participate, know themselves, and express themselves.

Pinto and Branco (2009) analyzed the beliefs, values, and conceptions of preschool teachers regarding the theme of the relationships between development, socialization, and preschool education. Sixteen teachers participated in the research, responding to interviews and attending focus group sessions. The results showed that a small portion of educators demonstrated an understanding of the integrated nature of cognitive, emotional,

and social development and their interconnection in the teaching-learning process. Additionally, despite mentioning socialization as a primary objective and defining it as interaction, their activity routines mainly focused on cognitive and psychomotor development. The findings emphasized that, given the conceptions of the interviewed educators, it is quite likely that they improvise actions without clarity about their objectives, highlighting a need for further training.

In turn, Corrêa (2018) investigated teachers' conceptions regarding the role of preschool education and its implications for the construction of lesson plans. Thirty-eight teachers from different schools participated in the study and responded to questionnaires. The municipality where the study was conducted had a Pedagogical Laboratory for Preschool Education, composed of teachers from the network who developed 50% of the curriculum activities to be implemented with the children. The other half was the responsibility of the class teacher, and the laboratory also provided occasions for continuing training to assist in the process. The results regarding teachers' conceptions highlighted the intertwining of care and education and the emphasis on the socialization process as functions of preschool education. There was also an understanding of lesson planning as a work tool, reflected in the planning of the participants' pedagogical actions, demonstrating an intentionally organized teaching process for the development of objectives.

Alvestad and Sheridan (2015), in an international context, investigated teachers' experiences concerning challenges, problems, and dilemmas related to planning in preschool education. Nine teachers from four educational institutions participated in the study, responding to individual interviews. In the context of the study, educators had a specific planning structure, a guiding curriculum regarding values, content, and tasks to be followed in the preschool stage. The results indicated that the majority of teachers argued in favor of a more flexible planning that could take into account the interests and previous experiences of the children, as well as the composition of the group and the characteristics of the school.

According to Azambuja, Conte, and Habowski (2017), discussions about planning in preschool education point to the need for activities aimed at collective emancipation within a teaching framework that develops interrelated competencies. According to the authors, the exercise of citizenship begins in childhood, in reciprocal relationships, and the school is a space to address coexistence, alterity, generous behaviors, interpersonal

relationships, which can occur in the understanding and encounter with others. Such proposals align with projects in the field of prosocial behaviors and social skills.

The term "prosocial behavior" designates a voluntary action directed towards benefiting another individual. Throughout the life cycle, these actions are of fundamental importance for the quality of interpersonal relationships and tend to predict various positive outcomes for both the individual displaying them and others participating in the interaction (Eisenberg, Spinrad, & Knafo-Noam, 2015). Such behaviors have been organized into different categories, including help (teaching, explaining, retrieving an object, providing assistance in tasks), cooperation (collaborating with ideas proposed by others in activities or games, establishing partnerships), sharing (offering an object, allowing its use, sharing food and toys), and comfort (providing physical comfort, offering words of consolation for others facing difficulties, trying to cheer up another child), that are focal points of studies concerning prosocial behaviors in preschool children (Ramaswamy & Bergin, 2009).

Regarding integration into educational curricula, the teaching of prosocial behaviors constitutes a subgroup of the field of Social-Emotional Learning, which, in turn, falls under the category of so-called Non-Cognitive Skills. The term "Non-Cognitive Skills" has received criticism in the literature, as a construct should not be defined by what it is not (Bergin, 2018). Additionally, some authors propose that such skills often rely on cognition, learning, and memory (Mondi, Giovanelli, & Reynolds, 2021).

Social-Emotional Learning is divided into five core competencies, namely self-awareness, self-regulation, social awareness, responsible decision-making, and relationship skills (CASEL, 2017). The relationship skills include both intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions, with the latter specifically encompassing prosocial behavior (Domitrovich, Durlak, Staley, & Weissberg, 2017).

Over the past two decades, an increasing number of studies have turned attention to prosocial behavior, focusing on the integration of diversity, the construction of a more just and collaborative society, and the reduction of violence (Caprara, Alessandri, & Eisenberg, 2012). Recent research demonstrates that the promotion of prosocial behaviors in the school context is also related to the decrease in aggressive and disruptive behaviors, improvement in teacher-student and peer relationships, cooperation with others and tasks, favoring academic performance (Berger, Benatov, Cuadros, VanNattan, & Gelkopf, 2018; Bergin, 2019; Freitas, Oliveira, Lima, & Melo, 2021; Longobardi, Settanni, Lin, & Fabris, 2021; Yao & Wong, 2021).

On the other hand, the construct of social skills, more widely disseminated in Brazil, primarily comprises behaviors that enable an individual to deal competently with social situations, benefiting the quality of relationships, which are also part of individuals' socioemotional development (Del Prette & Del Prette, 2013; 2014). Del Prette and Del Prette (2013) proposed seven interdependent and complementary classes of social skills, of greater relevance in childhood, namely: assertiveness (agreeing or disagreeing with opinions, defending one's own rights, resisting peer pressure); self-control and emotional expressiveness (managing anxiety, tolerating frustrations, expressing positive and negative emotions); civility (greeting people, saying goodbye, using expressions like "thank you," "please," "sorry," waiting for a turn to speak, following rules); empathy (expressing understanding of the other's experience or feeling, listening, and showing interest in peers); making friends (introducing oneself, initiating and maintaining conversation, asking and answering questions by offering self-disclosure); academic social skills (participating in discussions, following instructions related to academic behaviors); and interpersonal problem-solving (identifying, evaluating, and implementing possible alternatives to interpersonal problems).

In Brazil, the Ministry of Education (MEC) commissioned a study from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) regarding the integration of intentional pedagogical practices aimed at developing socioemotional skills as a path to academic success in Basic Education. The objective was to provide support for the formulation of educational public policies. The results highlighted, above all, the need to invest in the teacher's repertoire, providing support for practice, to create learning conditions that benefit the overall development of students (Abed, 2016).

Studies indicate that promoting prosocial behaviors and social skills among children should be a priority in educational institution projects. In this sense, there is a need to understand plans in this regard, given their potential influence on pedagogical practices (Al-Thani & Semmar, 2017; Bergin, 2014). According to the literature, in preschool curricula, academic content has disproportionately received greater attention compared to those related to socioemotional development (Barrios & Branco, 2021; Bolsoni-Silva et al., 2013; Kuebel, 2017). Based on the above, the present study aims to identify activities planned by preschool teachers, focusing on content related to the promotion of prosocial behaviors and social skills.

Method

Participants

The study included four teachers from a public municipal preschool located in a city in the southeastern region of the state of São Paulo, Brazil. All versatile teachers from the institution's afternoon session participated, responsible for Kindergarten I and Kindergarten II classes (educational stages where children aged approximately four and five years are enrolled, respectively). The school was chosen as the largest educational institution in the municipality, situated in a neighborhood with significant infrastructure demands and social issues such as unemployment, insufficient slots in early childhood education centers, violence, and drug trafficking.

Instrument

Lesson Plan Data Extraction Form: This instrument was developed by the researchers based on the format of the lesson plans created by the participating teachers. The form includes a section for the identification of the teacher, class, and reference week. Additionally, it contains fields for recording the programmed content and checkboxes to indicate the presence of planned activities related to the promotion of prosocial behaviors (in the categories help [aH], cooperation [aCp], sharing [aS], and comfort [aCf]) and social skills (in the categories assertiveness [aAST], self-control and emotional expressiveness [aSCEE], civility [aCV], empathy [aE], making friends [aMF], academic social skills [aASS], and interpersonal problem-solving [aIPS]). These categories were established and formulated based on the literature related to prosocial behaviors and social skills in childhood (Del Prette & Del Prette, 2013; Ramaswamy & Bergin, 2009), as demonstrated in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively.

Table 1

Categories of activities related to the promotion of prosocial behaviors

Category and Abbreviation	Description
Help (aH)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote, among children, behaviors such as teaching, explaining, picking up an object, and providing assistance in tasks to a peer.
Cooperation (aCp)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote, among children, behaviors of collaborating with ideas proposed by others in activities or games, and establishing partnerships.

Sharing (aS)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote, among children, behaviors of offering an object, authorizing a peer to use an object, and sharing toys and food.
Comforting (aCf)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote, among children, behaviors of providing physical comfort, offering words of comfort to others facing difficulties, and trying to cheer up another child.

Table 2*Categories of activities related to the promotion of social skills*

Category and Abbreviation	Description
Assertiveness (aAST)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote behaviors such as managing anxiety, tolerating frustrations, and expressing positive and negative emotions.
Self-Control and Emotional Expressiveness (aSCEE)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote behaviors such as agreeing or disagreeing with opinions, defending one's rights, and resisting peer pressure.
Civility (aCV)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote civil behaviors among children, such as greeting people, saying goodbye, using phrases like "thank you," "please," "sorry," waiting for their turn to speak, and following rules (not related to academic behaviors).
Empathy (aE)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote behaviors of expressing understanding of others' experiences or feelings, actively listening, and showing interest in their peers.
Making Friends (aMF)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote behaviors related to making friends, including introducing oneself, initiating and maintaining conversation, and asking and answering questions while sharing self-disclosure.
Academic Social Skills (aASS)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote social skills related to academic settings, such as participating in discussions and following instructions related to academic behaviors.
Interpersonal Problem-Solving (aIPS)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote skills in identifying, evaluating, and implementing possible solutions to interpersonal problems.

The instrument also includes sections for recording contents related to the theme of socialization (but not specifically prosocial behaviors or social skills - Other socialization contents [aOS]), and other pedagogical contents (Other pedagogical contents [aOP]). Table 3 presents the titles, abbreviations, and descriptions of the mentioned categories.

Table 3

Categories of activities related to other socialization contents and other pedagogical contents

Category and Abbreviation	Description
Other Socialization Contents (aOS)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote learning related to the theme of socialization that, due to lack of specifications or being discrepant from other categories, could not be incorporated into any of them.
Other Pedagogical Contents (aOP)	Indicates activities planned by the teacher to promote learning that are not directly related to the theme of socialization.

Data Collection

The lesson plans were individually requested from the afternoon teachers throughout each quarter of the 2018 school year. Each document, organized weekly, comprised activities planned for five days of classes (except for weeks with holidays or non-working days according to the school calendar). Subsequently, the researchers requested permission to make photocopies of the documents and then proceeded with the records on the Lesson Plan Data Extraction Form.

Data Analysis

The data extracted from the lesson plans were categorized and tabulated in a spreadsheet to facilitate visualization. To validate the categorization performed by the researchers, the material was subjected to evaluation by two independent judges, postgraduate researchers in psychology.

To verify the reliability of the assessments, analyses were conducted to calculate the Kappa coefficient (Cohen, 1960), with the result obtained equal to 0.49, indicating moderate agreement (Confidence Interval [CI]: 0.40-0.58), considering $p < 0.001$. To understand the reasons for this level of agreement, an analysis comparing the responses of Judge 1 and Judge 2 was performed. It was found that, for the category of activities that predominated in the coding, that is, aOP, the Kappa was 0.89 (CI: 0.73-1.00), and this value demonstrates almost perfect agreement.

However, for the others, due to the small number of records, it was not possible to obtain an interpretable Kappa value, except for aOS, whose coefficient was 0.60 (CI: 0.40-0.70), which shows moderate agreement. Based on this, it was decided to proceed

with the discussion of doubts or inconsistencies present in the evaluations between researchers and judges until a consensus was reached. After this process, the absolute and relative frequencies of records in each category were calculated, and descriptive analyses were performed.

Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted after approval from the (information suppressed to avoid identifying the authors) (CAAE No. [information suppressed to avoid identifying the authors]), and with the school's consent. The participation of the teachers was formalized through reading and signing the Informed Consent Form, following Resolution 466/12 of the National Health Council.

Results

The teachers will be identified in this study as P1, P2, P3, and P4, with the first two being responsible for Kindergarten I classes and the latter two for Kindergarten II classes. The age of the educators ranged from 28 to 46 years, with an average of 39. All had a degree in pedagogy, three had completed postgraduate studies (*lato sensu*), and their teaching experience in preschool varied from 1 to 15 years. Each class had an average of 24.5 children.

In total, 57 weekly lesson plans were presented by the teachers. P1 and P2 shared the development and use of the documents, while P3 and P4 did it individually. P4 prepared these documents every week of the school year, presenting 11, 10, 10, and 10 plans in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarters, respectively. P1 and P2 provided five plans in the 3rd quarter and five in the 4th, and P3 submitted four in the 1st and two in the 2nd quarter.

Regarding the format, the documents were structured as tables, with a column for the schedules of each element in the school routine and others for the five days of the week. The rows (from which data were extracted for this study) included the activities proposed by the teachers, their respective schedules, as well as the periods reserved for snacks and oral hygiene.

Concerning the content of the plans, the data indicate that 0.2% of activity records referred to a category related to prosocial behaviors (aCp), 2.7% belonged to categories related to social skills (aCv and aASS), and 8.8% referred to other socialization contents

(aOS), while 88.3% of the records were related to other pedagogical contents (aOP). In total, 402 activities were recorded. Table 4 presents absolute frequencies, relative frequencies, and the total number of activities in each analysis category.

Table 4

Frequency of activities by category in lesson plans

Category	Total records
AH	0 (0.0%)
aCp	1 (0.2%)
aS	0 (0.0%)
aCf	0 (0.0%)
aAST	0 (0.0%)
aSCEE	0 (0.0%)
aCv	8 (2.0%)
aE	0 (0.0%)
aMF	0 (0.0%)
aASS	3 (0.7%)
aIPS	0 (0.0%)
aOS	35 (8.8%)
aOP	355 (88.3%)
Total	402 (100%)

Notes. aH: help; aCp: cooperation; aS: sharing; aCf: comforting; aAST: assertiveness; aSCEE: self-control and emotional expressiveness; aCv: civility; aE: empathy; aMF: making friends; aASS: academic social skills; aIPS: interpersonal problem-solving; aOS: other socialization contents; aOP: other pedagogical contents.

Regarding the plans within each category, it is noteworthy that aCp involved an activity called “Working on Cooperation”, aCv mainly included activities related to rules and agreements, aASS comprised directed play and drawing, and aOS encompassed primarily conversation circles. In turn, aOP involved activities related to learning letters, numbers, colors, contact with textures, nursery rhymes, collages, use of modeling clay, among others. Table 5 presents examples of activity titles found in the weekly plans presented by the teachers in each category.

Tabela 5*Activities identified in lesson plans*

Category	Activity
aCp	Working on Cooperation
aCv	Agreements: yes/no; circle with gestures/rules; circle with agreements; drawing and poster about agreements; magic words (please, thank you, sorry, excuse me); discussion about: “can and cannot”
Aass	Directed drawing; Directed play
aOS	Conversation circle: how I recognize myself; conversation circle: personal hygiene; conversation circle: healthy eating; conversation circle: Black Awareness Day; conversation circle: environment; working on respect
aOP	Alphabet copy; Continue the numeral sequence; Identify animals; Dominoes; Coloring with crayons on rough surface; Nursery rhyme; Free drawing; Reading; Mobile alphabet; Counting students; Classification: bigger/smaller; Puzzle; Texture; Tongue twister; Laterality (right and left); Primary colors; ABC; Crossword puzzle; Addition with drawings; Day/night poster; Chart, crepe paper collage; Playdough.

Notes. aCp: cooperation; aCv: civility; aASS: academic social skills; aOS: other socialization content; aOP: other pedagogical content.

The contents recorded in the categories aCp, aCv, aASS, and aOS covered themes (e.g., working on cooperation; agreements: yes/no; magic words - please, thank you, sorry, excuse me; working on respect), methods (e.g., directed drawing; directed play), or a combination of both (e.g., drawing and poster about agreements; conversation circle: personal hygiene). Regarding the records obtained in the category aOP, they included ways of carrying out activities (e.g., alphabet copy; continue the numeral sequence; identify animals), resources and/or materials to be used (e.g., mobile alphabet; nursery rhyme; chart; playdough), themes (e.g., texture; laterality; primary colors), or a combination of the aforementioned elements (e.g., coloring with crayons on a rough surface; crepe paper collage).

Discussion

The data from this study showed a variation in the routine of lesson plan development among the teachers. P4 consistently presented her plans throughout all weeks of the school year, unlike P1, P2, and P3. In this aspect, the findings contrast with those of Alvestad and Sheridan (2015) and Corrêa (2018), where 100% of the teachers in the samples reported continuously creating or collaborating on lesson plans.

Regarding content, the weekly plans of the participating teachers primarily involved activities related to pedagogical objectives that did not directly address the promotion of prosocial behaviors, social skills, or other aspects related to socialization, with only a small portion dedicated to these themes. These findings align with those of

Kuebel (2017), who highlights that contents related to other pedagogical aspects have been more privileged in preschool than those focused on socioemotional development. According to Pinto and Branco (2009), although teachers consider socialization a fundamental purpose of preschool, activities related essentially to psychomotor and cognitive development dominate lesson plans.

The results may indicate a potential obstacle to promoting prosocial behaviors and social skills and prompt reflection on the place these contents occupy in the school curriculum. Alvestad and Sheridan (2015) note that the goals of a school curriculum reflect societal notions about what children need to learn upon entering the educational institution and, in the long run, the type of characteristics valued in citizens that a given society aims to cultivate.

It is considered that if socioemotional development-related contents are not clearly present in formal curricula, teachers may not plan for them, leading to unintentional actions in teaching practice. Such consequences can negatively impact children's learning of these contents (Al-Thani & Semmar, 2017; Bergin, 2014; Kuebel, 2017). In this regard, the data from this study also suggest the possibility that the school might be underutilizing training opportunities that could enhance the learning of other pedagogical contents and positive outcomes throughout the educational journey and in other life contexts (Bergin, 2018; Del Prette & Del Prette, 2014; Freitas et al., 2021; Yao & Wong, 2021). The literature suggests that, in addition to the elements of a curriculum, plans that also consider the interests of children can contribute to promoting their autonomy and better interactions in school (Alvestad & Sheridan, 2015; Azambuja et al., 2017).

As for activities planned by teachers on the theme of socialization, Barrios and Branco (2021) point out that these mainly relate to social coexistence rules, a strategy that, if used exclusively and unilaterally established by adults, may fail to prioritize the development of cooperative relationships with children. It is noteworthy that the findings of the present research confirm a concentration of planned activities aimed at establishing agreements and rules, encompassed by the “civility” category in the subgroup of social skills, but also present a significant number of activities titled “roda de conversa” (conversation circle), involving different themes. This diversity may represent progress in diversifying planned activities aimed at benefiting positive social interactions.

Concerning the format, the organization of the plans presented by the participants seems to fit the model of listing activities. According to Ostetto (2016), this structuring is based on time intervals for each activity, where the teacher alternates activities with

routine moments such as meals and hygiene, using a simple list that does not include the description of objectives, execution mode, or evaluation criteria. According to the author, this planning format presents complications since it relies more on time organization than on educational aspects related to children's learning. She argues that these issues can directly influence the effectiveness of educational action in achieving the maximum potential of child development. Additionally, presenting activities in terms of themes, execution methods, or methods and materials can serve as a guide for the teacher who created the plan but may hinder other professionals, such as substitute teachers, from following the plan in the absence of the regular teacher on a school day.

Beyond the content and formats of the plans, the data from this study prompt reflections on the function that these plans have in the perception of teachers, how they understand their importance, what guides practice in their absence, and what can contribute to investing in their development. The literature suggests that teachers often perceive plans as a purely bureaucratic task, devoid of utility for the development of pedagogical practices, leading them to resort to improvisations in their daily routines (Fusari, 1998; Vasconcellos, 2012).

It is also worth noting that the reliance on improvisation in practice may be even more present in preschool due to biases of exclusively welfare-oriented conceptions still held by some professionals in relation to this stage of education. In other words, there is a risk that content is limited to common sense and the reproduction of education and care as seen in other spheres of daily life, hence the lower importance given to planning. Moreover, these aspects may be related to deficits in training as well as the overload experienced by teachers in the educational system. In this direction, Martins and Marsiglia (2015) emphasize that teachers aspire to do good work; however, concrete conditions for such work may be lacking. Therefore, facilitating discussions about planning and envisioning possibilities for its integration into the teacher's daily routine, considering their understanding, work conditions, and the context in which they are involved, proves to be crucial.

The results of this study have implications for the discussion on the quality of psychology teaching in undergraduate courses and its scope in terms of theoretical and practical aspects. Research highlights that contents related to the development of interpersonal relationships based on social values compatible with citizenship may not even be present in the teacher's formative journey, creating a gap that has repercussions in practice (Abed, 2016; Barrios & Branco, 2021; Pinto & Branco, 2009). Similarly,

Bolsoni-Silva et al. (2013) emphasize the need to rearrange teaching procedures to provide teachers with continuing training that covers relevant cross-cutting themes, as mentioned above. It is considered that, for such a reorganization of content and strategies to become possible in practice, and for them to encompass the purpose of the integral development of children, as advocated by the BNCC (Brazil, 2017), the planning process seems to be an indispensable step.

Concerning the limitations of the research, the small number of analyzed lesson plans, participating teachers, and the fact that they belong to only one school are highlighted, which does not allow for the generalization of results. Considering that the Brazilian educational context is very diverse, it is suggested that future studies investigate the existence of planned activities to promote prosocial behaviors and social skills in preschool institutions in different cities and regions of the country. It is also relevant to assess teachers' conceptions regarding these contents, the existence of strategies related to their promotion in schools, whether they are intentional, how they are documented, and the repertoire of educational social skills of teachers. Future studies should include a consultation with teachers, in addition to requesting lesson plans, for a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of the proposed activities in the documents.

In conclusion, the findings of this study invite public policy managers and educational institutions to invest in the initial and continuing training of teachers and support teachers in the development of lesson plans, including activities aimed at promoting prosocial behaviors and social skills, to enhance the teaching-learning process in preschool. To achieve this, the needs of teachers and children, as well as their previous experiences and the social context in which they are inserted, must be considered.

References

Abed, A. L. Z. (2014). O desenvolvimento das habilidades socioemocionais como caminho para a aprendizagem e o sucesso escolar de alunos da educação básica. *Construção Psicopedagógica*, 24(25), 8-27. Recuperado em <http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/cp/v24n25/02.pdf>.

Al-Thani, T., & Semmar, Y. (2017). An exploratory study of teacher's perceptions of prosocial behaviors in preschool children. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 53(1), 145-150. doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.01.005

Alvestad, T., & Sheridan, S. (2015). Preschool teachers' perspectives on planning and documentation in preschool. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(3), 377-392. doi: 10.1080/03004430.2014.929861

- Azambuja, P. L., Conte, E., & Habowski, A. C. (2017). O planejamento docente na educação infantil: metamorfoses e sentidos ao aprender. *Pesquisa em Foco*, 22(2), 377-392. Recuperado em https://ppg.revistas.uema.br/index.php/PESQUISA_EM_FOCO/article/view/1503
- Barrios, A., & Branco, A. U. (2021). Desenvolvimento moral na educação infantil: um estudo cultural construtivista. *Educação*, 44(2), 1-14. doi: 10.15448/1981-2582.2021.2.32874
- Berger, R., Benatov, J., Cuadros, R., VanNattan, J., & Gelkopf, M. (2018). Enhancing resiliency and promoting prosocial behavior among tanzanian primary-schools students: a school-based intervention. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 55(6), 821–845. doi: 10.1177/1363461518793749
- Bergin, C. (2014). Educating students to be prosocial at school. Em L. M. Padilla-Walker & G. Carlo (Eds.), *Prosocial development: a multidimensional approach* (pp. 279–301). Nova York: Oxford University Press.
- Bergin, C. (2018). *Designing a prosocial classroom: fostering collaboration in students from pre-k-12 with the curriculum you already use*. Nova York: Norton.
- Bergin, C. (2019). Prosocial goals. Em M. H. Jones (Org.), *Social goals in the classroom: findings on student motivation and peer relations* (pp. 93–110). Nova York: Routledge.
- Bolsoni-Silva, A. T., Verdu, A. C. M. A., Carrara, K., Melchiori, L. E., Leite, L. P., & Calais, S. L. (2013). *Temas em Psicologia*, 21(2), 347-359. doi: 10.9788/TP2013.2-04
- Brasil (2017). *Base nacional comum curricular*. Recuperado em <http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br>
- Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G., & Eisenberg, N. (2012). Prosociality: the contribution of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(6), 1289-1303. doi: 10.1037/a0025626
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37-46.
- Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2017). *Framework for systemic social and emotional learning*. Recuperado em <http://www.casel.org/what-is-sel>
- Corrêa, A. Q. (2018). *Concepções de professoras da educação infantil acerca do planejamento de ensino: fatores determinantes*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Araraquara, SP, Brasil.
- Del Prette Z. A. P., & Del Prette, A. (2007). Aprendizagem socioemocional na infância e prevenção da violência: questões conceituais e metodologia da intervenção. Em Z. A. P. Del Prette & A. Del Prette (Orgs). *Habilidades sociais, desenvolvimento e aprendizagem* (pp.83-127). Campinas: Alínea.

- Del Prette, Z. A. P. & Del Prette, A. (2011). *Psicologia das habilidades sociais na infância: teoria e prática*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Domitrovich, C. E., Durlak, J. A., Staley, K. C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Social-emotional competence: an essential factor for promoting positive adjustment and reducing risk in school children. *Child Development*, 88(2), 408-416. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12739
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., & Knafo-Noam, A. (2015). Prosocial development. Em M. E. Lamb & R. M. Lerner (Orgs), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science, socioemotional processes* (Vol. 3, pp. 610–656). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Freitas, I. S., Oliveira, G. E., Lima, V. S., & Melo, M. H. S. (2021). Evidence-based intervention for promoting prosocial behavior in schools: integrative review. *Psicologia: Teoria e Prática*, 23(3), 1-30. doi: 10.5935/1980-6906/ePTPPE14091
- Fusari, J. C. (1998). *O planejamento do trabalho pedagógico: algumas indagações e tentativas de respostas*. São Paulo: FDE.
- Kuebel, L. (2017). *Effectiveness of a social skills curriculum on preschool prosocial behavior and emotion recognition*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade de Dayton, OH, Estados Unidos.
- Longobardi, C., Settanni, M., Lin, S., & Fabris, M. A. (2021). Student–teacher relationship quality and prosocial behaviour: the mediating role of academic achievement and a positive attitude towards school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(2), 547–562. doi: 10.1111/bjep.12378
- Martins, L. M., & Marsiglia, A. C. G. (2015). Contribuições para a sistematização da prática pedagógica na educação infantil. *Cadernos de Formação RBCE*, 6(1), 15-26. Recuperado em <http://revista.cbce.org.br/index.php/cadernos/article/view/2079/1035>
- Mondi, C. F., Giovanelli, A., & Reynolds, A. J. (2021). Fostering socio-emotional learning through early childhood intervention. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 15(1), 1-43. doi: 10.1186/s40723-021-00084-8
- Ostetto, L. E. (2016). Planejamento na educação infantil: mais que a atividade, a criança em foco. Em L. E. Ostetto (Org.), *Encontros e encantamentos na educação infantil* (pp. 175-200). Campinas: Papirus.
- Pinto, R. G., & Branco, A. U. (2009). Práticas de socialização e desenvolvimento na educação infantil: contribuições da psicologia sociocultural. *Temas em Psicologia*, 17(2), 511-525. Recuperado em http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413-389X2009000200020
- Ramaswamy, V., & Bergin, C. (2009). Do reinforcement and induction increase prosocial behavior? Results of a teacher-based intervention in preschools. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 23(4), 527-538. doi: 10.1080/02568540909594679

Vasconcellos, C. S. (2012). *Planejamento: processo de ensino-aprendizagem e projeto político-pedagógico*. São Paulo: Libertad.

Yao, Z., & Wong, L. (2021). The effect of the Dizi Gui intervention on peer relationships and teacher-student relationships: the mediating role of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Moral Education*, 50(3), 384-400. doi: 10.1080/03057240.2020.1722080

Recebido em 09 de dezembro de 2022

Aprovado em 19 de dezembro de 2023
