
WORKSHOPS ON LISTENING: CLINICAL PRACTICE IN PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING

Oficina de Desenvolvimento da Escuta: Prática Clínica na Formação em Psicologia

Talleres de Desarrollo de Escucha: práctica clínica en la formación en psicología

SHIRLEY MACÉDO
GLEDSON WILBER DE SOUZA
MONZITTI BAUMANN ALMEIDA LIMA

Resumo: Esta pesquisa teve por objetivo geral compreender sentidos da experiência de participação em oficinas de desenvolvimento da escuta entre estagiários de Psicologia, que as frequentaram antes de adentrar o estágio. Especificamente, buscou-se descrever como competências despertadas e desenvolvidas naquelas oficinas estariam sendo operacionalizadas no estágio; compreender como mudanças em modos de subjetivação desses estudantes favoreceram a inserção e a manutenção no estágio; e avaliar, na perspectiva destes estagiários, a operacionalidade da oficina para ser ofertada ao estudante em formação. Usando a hermenêutica colaborativa, uma proposta em pesquisa fenomenológica, entrevistaram-se 14 estagiários, subdivididos em três grupos de discussão, que puderam resgatar e analisar conjuntamente o sentido daquela vivência. Os resultados apontaram que a oficina promoveu alcance terapêutico; favoreceu autoconhecimento; teve o sentido de ressignificação compartilhada da angústia em relação à futura prática do estágio; dirimiu ansiedade em relação às limitações pessoais; promoveu desenvolvimento de competências; e favoreceu organização, sistematização e foco da escuta. Os colaboradores reconheceram a necessidade da oficina antes do estágio, mas sem ser obrigatória. Concluiu-se, principalmente, que essa pode ser uma prática de capacitação, humanização e cuidado a futuros estagiários num serviço-escola de Psicologia, pois foi reconhecida pelos colaboradores como espaço de acolhimento e cuidado de si.

Palavras-chave: Escuta; Pesquisa Fenomenológica; Formação do Psicólogo.

Abstract: This research aimed to understand the meanings of participating in workshops on listening development among Psychology interns, who attended the workshops before starting the internship. Specifically, the goal was to describe how the awakened and developed competences in those workshops were being operationalized in the internship; to understand how the changes in modes of subjectification of these students favored the insertion in the internship; and to evaluate, from the interns' perspective, the operability of the workshop offered. By using collaborative hermeneutics, a proposal in phenomenological research, 14 interns (divided into three discussion groups) were able to rescue and analyze the meaning of that experience. The results showed the workshop promoted therapeutic reach; favored self-knowledge; had the sense of shared re-signification of anguish in relation to the future practice of the internship; decreased the anxiety about personal limitations; promoted skills development; and favored organization, systematization and focus of listening. Employees acknowledged the need for the workshop prior to the internship, but not mandatory. Mainly, it was concluded that this could be a practice to enable humanization and caring for future interns in a Psychology school-service, since it was recognized by the employees as a space for welcoming and caring for oneself.

Keywords: Listening; Phenomenological Research; Formation of the Psychologist.

Resumen: Esta investigación buscó comprender sentidos de la experiencia de participación en talleres de desarrollo de la escucha entre pasantes de Psicología. Se buscó describir cómo competencias despertadas y desarrolladas en aquellos talleres estarían siendo instrumentalizadas; comprender cómo cambios en modos de subjetivación de estos estudiantes favorecieron la inserción y el mantenimiento en la pasantía; y evaluar, en la perspectiva de estos pasantes, la instrumentalización del taller para ser ofrecida al estudiante. Usando la hermenéutica colaborativa, una propuesta en investigación fenomenológica, 14 pasantes, subdivididos en tres grupos de discusión, pudieron rescatar y analizar el sentido de aquella vivencia. Los resultados mostraron que el taller promovió alcance terapéutico; favoreció el autoconocimiento; tuvo el sentido de buscar una significación compartida de la angustia concerniente a la futura práctica de la pasantía; dirimió la ansiedad relacionada a las limitaciones personales; promovió el desarrollo de competencias; y favoreció la organización y foco de la escucha. Los colaboradores reconocieron la necesidad del taller antes de la pasantía, pero sin obligatoriedad. Se concluyó que esa puede ser una práctica de capacitación, humanización y cuidado a futuros pasantes en un servicio-escola de Psicología, reconocida por los colaboradores como espacio de acogida y cuidado de si.

Palabras clave: Escucha; Investigación Fenomenológica; Formación del Psicólogo.

Introduction

The clinical listening in the psychological practice is not a common listening, but a differentiated hearing, because those who listen and who speak open themselves to the otherness experience and produce new meanings that favor new ways of feeling, thinking and acting (Dourado, Macêdo & Lima, 2016).

Bandeira et al. (2006) and Heckert (2007) have argued that even clinical listening being part of the interpersonal skills that must be developed in a Psychology course, the academy does not always achieve this goal, because teaching to listen would be impossible only by a pedagogical act or by theoretical contents that are applied in the classroom aiming the learning of a technique. For the authors, listening develops in experimentation, in the course of training as a psychologist.

However, in view of the fact that the graduated psychologist's training processes, for the most part, disregard the learners' knowledge and experience, would be a challenge for those who teach ways of educating in ways that foster experimentation, reflection, thoughts and exchange of experiences, so that learners can reinvent the world and themselves in daily contact with the difference of the other, since every process of formation is a process of production of subjectivities (Heckert, 2007). Therefore, it would be in the contact with the other, in the experience of practice, that the student of Psychology could use the device of clinical listening, improving the competence to listen and, as Lima (2005) would say, transiting between the care and the knowledge of the self, to help those who carry a certain kind of suffering.

Classroom activities, strictly academic, do not allow the Psychology student to deepen listening. This deepening is very much related to self-care and self-listening, and the student only comes to worry about it in an individual psychotherapeutic process, at the moments of end-of-course internships (Meira & Nunes, 2005), investing very late in the tool that will allow it to be more effective in the career. And it is only in the last year that the students effectively have structured formation experiences, this period being a milestone in university life, since it is the preparation for entry into the professional world (Dourado, Quirino, Lima & Macêdo, 2016). However, prior to this, the overvaluation of theoretical knowledge to the detriment of practical knowledge has not allowed undergraduate psychology institutions to guarantee a solid formation and to overcome the dissociation between theory and practice (Cruz & Schultz, 2009).

Although, since entering the university, the student has representations of what a psychologist is and incorporates them as the course progresses (Gondim, Luna, Souza, Sobral & Lima, 2010), the practical activities in the internship periods come becoming an important structuring axis of the professional identity, as a way of formation, ascension and achievement. But if students are not aware of

their modes of interpersonal relationships with patients, teams, and supervisors, or how their feelings may interfere with their professional skills, their internship experiences may compromise their health, or even prevent them from understanding themselves and the other in the relationship with a patient (Rudnick & Carlotto, 2007).

It is necessary, therefore, that the Higher Education Institutions (HEI) in Psychology make efforts to offer practices in which the university students can have the chance to expand their possibilities of qualification. In this perspective, Dourado, Quirino, Lima & Macêdo (2016), in view of the National Curriculum Guidelines for undergraduate courses in Psychology (Resolution CNE/CES Number 5, March 15, 2011), envisaged a clinical practice in Organizational and Work Psychology, contextualized to contribute to the training of psychologists in Higher Education Institutions (HEI), and proposed listening development workshops with groups of undergraduate students from different periods of the course. They started from the idea that they would allow students to appropriate their singularities and promote new modes of subjectivation (feeling, thinking and acting), and, therefore, a therapeutic scope. According to the authors, the collaborators of their research recognized that listening is not something purely of one, but it happens in the relationship, in the contact with the other: it is necessary to say and to be listened in order to be able to listen to what is said. They also recognized in practice and in the experimentation of listening, the need to develop this competence for their future professional exercises as psychologists.

The authors argued that their results favored the development of skills instituted by National Curriculum Guidelines of the Ministry of Education, which propose that the future psychologist should be able to conduct counseling, counseling and psychotherapy; and generate knowledge from its professional practice. They also noted that these workshops allow to meet the profile required for the profession, a profile proposed by authors such as Malvezzi, Souza & Zanelli, (2010).

The originality of the study by Dourado, Quirino, Lima & Macêdo, among other factors, lies in the fact that the research is inserted in the interface between Organizational and Work Psychology and Clinical Psychology, since it was carried out with students from all periods, including interns of different emphases of the course, approaches and areas of Psychology. The results found suggest that workshops listening development - if inserted in the process of psychologist training, such as clinical practice of Organizational and Work Psychology in HEIs - may allow the student in training to find itself and the other, apprehending the subjects, the meanings of the shared experience in a group, the necessary elements for personal transformation in the direction of greater effectiveness for future action in the professional market.

According to Braga, Daltro & Danon (2012), clinical listening is an essential and indispensable

le to psychological doing, which constitutes as its main care device and that differentiates its work in comparison with other professionals. Therefore, listening development workshops seem to be a possibility, as a clinical practice in Organizational and Work Psychology, to extend the training of students, providing them with an effective alternative to investing in the career and future entry into the labor market.

In view of the above, the intention that permeated the present study, conducted with trainees who, when they were in the eighth period, about to enter the obligatory internship, participated in listening development workshops, was fed by the following questions: what are the meanings of participating in these workshops have for the practice of these students? What changes in modes of subjectivation favored insertion and maintenance in the internship? What skills were raised and developed in the workshops and were they being operationalized in the internship? How would these interns assess the operability of the workshop to be offered to the training student before the internship?

Regarding these questions, the general goal of the present study was to understand the meanings of experience of participating in workshops to develop listening for the practice of obligatory internship among psychology interns. The specific objectives were: to describe how competencies aroused and developed in those workshops were operationalized in the internship; to understand how the changes in modes of subjectivation of these students favored the insertion and the maintenance in the internship; and evaluate, from the perspective of these interns, the operability of the workshop to be offered to the student in training.

Methodology

The present study was based on the humanist-phenomenological approach, for which qualitative research is more adequate, considering that knowledge is being constructed according to the subjective realities that are characteristic of subjects inserted in certain social groups.

Thus, it was decided to investigate the senses and meanings of human experiences for individuals who lived them and shared them in a context of dialogue. In this type of research, subjectivity is included in the act of investigating of both the researcher and the investigated subject, recognizing the otherness. In view of this prerogative, the method of Collaborative Hermeneutics proposed by Macêdo (2015) was chosen, which is a methodological innovation and, although initially contextualized as a possibility of humanist-phenomenological action in the work clinic, has been sedimented as a praxis of intervention research.

The proposal is based on the theoretical perspectives of Carl Rogers (more specifically on concepts such as unconditional positive consideration and authenticity - facilitating conditions of

a clinical process), resulting from contemporary approaches between humanism and phenomenology, so well reflected by Holanda (2014); in the critical humanism and philosophical assumptions of Maurice Merleau-Ponty (considering the notions of intersubjectivity, world of life and incomplete epoché); and in the prepositions of Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics (in his conceptions of tradition, fusion of horizons, conversation and play of questions and answers).

Collaborative Hermeneutics, so called by Macêdo (2015), was built for group interventions and consists of a joint process of interpretation, based on the confrontation of traditions, that make possible an intersubjective encounter and the resumption of historical awareness among those involved in a dialogue. In this sense, the facilitator or researcher - without being instigated to totally suspend the own a priori of its experience, but to share them in what it perceives as meaningful to the collaborators (what is called incomplete *epochhē*) - seeks to promote a creative intersubjective action of meaning production in which the subjects, being affected by their traditions, engage in the conversation and, incarnated in the world, share experiences through intercorporeity, producing new meanings.

In this dialogical context, genuine trust among those involved is considered important - allowing respect for each other's descriptions and stories (unconditional positive consideration), as well as promoting a space for people to be more authentic in sharing experiences and expressing opinions. Trust, being present and supported in the dialogical process, favors the emergence of a foundation of cohesion, and the common commitment emerges when the dialogue walks and expands between the subjects, who argue and contradict, in a continuous game of asking and answering. The author proposes that "in the hermeneutic game, the understanding of the other necessarily requires an understanding of itself [...]. It is a question of apprehending meaning by considering the traditions of those involved and their incarnations in the world as constituents and constitutors of the emerging senses" (Macêdo, 2015, p. 210).

In this methodological context, the research collaborators were 14 interns from the 9th and 10th period of the Psychology course of the Federal University of the São Francisco Valley (UNIVASF), in Petrolina, State of Pernambuco, who had been in internship for at least two months, independently of the emphasis and the area chosen for internships and who participated in listening development workshops in the years 2014 and 2015, when they were in the 8th period.

The study was carried out with resources from the Institutional Program of Undergraduate Scientific Research (PIBIC CNPq/UNIVASF 2015-2016) and met the ethical precepts of researches with human beings, contained in Resolution CNE/CNS 466/2012. The collection only started after approval by the Research Ethics Committee of UNIVASF, registered under CAEE 44219715.1.0000.5196 and

authorized by opinion 1.068.786, dated May 18, 2015.

The collaborators were invited for the study in interns' meetings of the Center for Studies and Practices in Psychology (CEPPSI), a school service of UNIVASF, in the middle of the semesters 2015.2 and 2016.1, and only participated in the research after they volunteered to collaborate and signed the Free and Informed Consent Form.

The research was conducted in the context of discussion groups, which are considered by Laville and Dionne (1999) as an original instrument in qualitative research. In these groups, the subject can defend its opinions and challenge those of others, allowing the researcher to deepen its understanding of the answers obtained. Therefore, it was promoted in small groups (two with five and the other with four interns), that met, each, only once.

The interviews in the discussion groups, which were driven from a triggering question, took about ninety minutes each and were recorded in digital audio. This type of interview is indicated when the researcher wants to explore attitudes, opinions and behaviors, as well as observe processes of consensus and divergence (Turato, 2003).

The triggering question, proposed by Amatu- zzi (1993), is a question that puts the subject in contact with its experiences and allows it to describe them so that the researcher reaches their meaning. With the function of opening the dialogue, this question allows triggering the narrative of experience, a narrative that tends to be detailed with a focus on events and actions (Jovchelovitch & Bauer, 2001). However, the researcher must be attentive to the phenomenon that emerges and insert other questions throughout the dialogue, opening space to meet the objectives of the research.

In this study, the triggering question was: "How would you describe your experience in participating in workshops on listening development for your practical work as a Psychology intern?" With the question asked, the idea was for the researcher to access the experience and to favor possibilities for, effectively, the subjects to narrate and share, in a context of dialogue, their experiences.

In order to understand the interview records in the discussion groups, the research team (formed by the undergraduate scientific initiation students and the advisor teacher) was attentive to the steps of phenomenological analysis defined by authors such as Giorgi (1985), Forghieri (1993) and Macêdo (2000, 2006); or suggested by Amatu- zzi (2009) and Macêdo (2015). However, respecting that a phenomenological research is done while walking, led the process of analysis as described below, in order to start from the contact with the recordings to the final description of the significant elements and common meanings of the experience under investigation. The steps taken were:

a) The contents recorded in the discussion groups were later transcribed in full by the undergraduate scientific initiation students. However, each member of the research team listened to the

recording of each group and read the transcript as often as needed to describe the significant elements of the shared dialogue experience between researchers and collaborators. Each component of the research team, using the "insert comments" tool of the Word for Windows text editor, wrote about the meanings they had perceived in the transcript.

b) Secondly, members of the research team meet, read as many times as necessary the recorded conversation and the comments made by each one, negotiating differences to reach a consensus on how they would record the significant elements of the experience. This negotiation often took several meetings of the research team and culminated in a preliminary collective analysis of what was perceived of what was being shared by the interns of a particular discussion group, which was called presentification of the meanings of shared experiences. This process was done separately for each of the groups investigated.

c) Each preliminary analysis resulted in a text for the return interview of each group. This content was sent by e-mail to each collaborator of the group in order to review the text, make suggestions, add new elements and/or change the analysis of the group that participated in. A return period of 10 days was given for the returns, considering the time set for completing the survey. Few contributors responded to the emails, however, they did not propose any changes to what had been noticed by the research team.

d) After the returns, the research team, reconvened, made the final description of the Units of Meanings of the experiment investigated, considering what was commonly described in all the discussion groups, and these units - in bold in the next topic - came to be the basis for the discussion of the results of this study.

Results and Discussion

In order to maintain confidentiality regarding the statements of each collaborator, the acronyms C1 to C14 will be used as a way of naming them and preserving their identities, as well as the abbreviations P1 and P2 for the auxiliaries of research involved in the collection: people who, it is necessary to emphasize, were students of the same course who conducted some of the workshops as trainees when the collaborator interns of this research were in the eighth period.

It is worth noting, as the research methodology was anchored in a rescue of tradition, in Collaborative Hermeneutics, the researcher's role is, through conversation, to challenge traditions so that those involved, when they argue, will get a new look at their path (Macêdo 2015). The fact that PIBIC undergraduate students were the workshop trainees helped in two respects: they shared the experience with the subjects and were able to more clearly achieve the meanings of the experience investigated, as evidenced by some

possible devolution interviews. In addition, PIBIC undergraduate students developed their own listening, because both in the workshops and in the data collection of the research, a context of group dialogue was promoted, focused on sharing experiences. Further, sharing anxieties and knowledge about the process of becoming a psychologist in the same institution required the scholarship holders to become aware of differentiating the processes of others from theirs and not letting their perceptions interfere to the point of altering what they heard, being this is somewhat predicted by the method used.

Taking this from the content analyzed in the discussion groups, attempts were made to understand the Units of Meaning of the collaborators' experiences as they appeared with recurrence, taking into account also the common elements, that is, the meanings that were shared by the participants of one group were also present in the reports of the other collaborators from all the research groups. It is worth mentioning that the reports and dialogues that were established between research assistants and collaborators were extracted in view of the methodological proposal of a joint process of interpretation of shared experience in a group.

A first Unit of Meaning to stand out was the **therapeutic reach** that the workshops provided to collaborators at the time they attended them when they were eighth-grade students. They were considered as spaces where they could talk about themselves, but differed, in their perspective, from an individual psychotherapy, since the activities maintained the goal of focusing on the intersubjective process of producing meaning about being a student about to enter the internship. Even so, there seem to have been therapeutic processes, as they were able to talk about their issues and reflect on them in an environment of sharing experiences that promoted changes in their ways of feeling, thinking, and acting. The following excerpt illustrates this possibility:

You're not talking about theory, you're not talking about so-and-so, you're talking about you. (...) I think that there we were as a psychology student of the eighth period that was going to enter the internship, although there is something about us that we cannot separate, but we tried to work, the focus was the student who was entering the internship, (...) I think this breaks the possibility of talking more about you (C1).

Still in this sense, it is necessary to emphasize an observation on the part of the collaborators when they pointed out that the training, although offers support in the technical sense, does not pay attention to the questions related to their subjectivity, specifically in their needs of care, as can be understood in the excerpt of the C2 report:

I think the workshop is very important in this sense, to create a moment for people to

take care of themselves, to see their issues, no matter how small, because there are few meetings, but, to take care of yourself before taking care of the other. (...) We have a lot of technique, the course is very good, we feel very prepared to do a master's degree, a specialization, but it's not a course that takes care of the subjectivity of the students who are attending it.

This section of the report points to the possibility of the workshop to meet authors such as Heckert (2007), Heckert & Neves (2010), Rudnicki & Carloto (2007) and Mendes, Fonseca, Brasil & Dalbello-Araújo (2012), when discussing the formation of the psychologist, observe the teaching limitation that only aims at theoretical rigor. For the authors, it is necessary for the student of Psychology to live the process of listening and care, and then to work as a professional that deals with such dimensions of human life.

It is worth remembering here Amatzuzi (1990), who already emphasized the importance of listening and being influenced in a listening process. For the author, the first knowledge about the human is intimate knowledge, that produced by direct contact with the center of the person, which presumes an initial opening to strip away any other knowledge in order to hear and welcome experience, which, in the case of the present study, is the experience of listening.

Also remembered is Gadamer (2003), one of the philosophers on whose bases the method of this study relies on, the rescue of the tradition, or rescue of historical consciousness, as a movement of the subject to know itself from the immersion in its roots and past experiences. According to him, this course results in a new knowledge about itself. In the case of the interns collaborating in this study, the workshop, before the internship period, seems to have propitiated an appropriation of self-knowledge in order to find new ways of being to be in front of the other.

Self-knowledge, as a Unit of Meaning, is understood as a process of fundamental importance for entering the internship, as shown in the following dialogue:

C4: I felt that like (laughs), a handbrake: Stop! Because it is not just literature that you live your profession, but also self-knowledge, between the lines that have to be woven and observed. So, it was a handbrake for me, I usually verbalize a lot, both in the oral and in the paper. It was an exercise for me.

P 2: So, you bring one of the tripod points of the clinic, which is personal work, the need to take care of yourself and such.

C4: Yes!

P2: Do you feel it in the internship today?

C4: It's difficult to think about how I would be in the internship today if I had not done it, because it has no other way, it already was.

Another Unit of Meaning to be highlighted concerns the **improvement in the interpersonal relations** that the interns perceived as they entered the practice and which they attribute to the workshop, as the excerpt shows:

To listen a little bit about the battles that each one faces, it was interesting not to perpetuate this lack of listening. Some of us are also committed to listening a little. Since you do not have this listening to yourself sometimes, you have that moment with the other, and this at the internship is fundamental (C5).

As Lima (2005) and Coelho & Figueiredo (2004) have already told us, the job of the psychologist is to find a meeting of the senses, so that sharing experiences and recognizing otherness become essential for the professional performance. The workshop thus favored collaborators to identify their place in front of the other and, therefore, to observe their personal issues.

It was also understood by the discussions that arose in the groups that the workshop had a meaning of **resignification of the anguish in relation to the future practice of the internship**, propitiated by sharing the experiences of this anguish between colleagues of the same period and/or course. In addition, the interns showed a decrease in anxiety about the personal limitations recognized at the time of the workshops, and the power, at that time, to realize that their colleagues also had such limitations. This is observed in the dialog box below:

P1: Then, there is as if it were a resignification of that, it is not? [anguish and anxiety previously described] Being shared it already changes, is this?

C1: Knowing that this was not an isolated thing, it was something of the context, that everyone was experiencing it in a way (...) sharing the experiences, that moment was very important.

C6: But then, at the time of the workshop, you see that it is a shared feeling, that all your colleagues who are there with you during these first four years of the course, and it is not only you who are not knowing what to do.

These data confirm the proposal of Roriz (2010), which points the need to offer clinical practices that allow the subject to appropriate its anguish - which, in turn, is constitutive of human existence -, thus making the subject to invest in finding more authentic ways of being guided by the goal of care. The workshop, by proposing to be a clinical practice in an institution, seems to achieve

such success on the basis of what was understood from the meanings produced in the groups.

Skills developed in the workshops that were being operationalized in the internship were another Unit of Meaning identified. It was possible to perceive, through the group discussions, that these skills seem to attend to a significant extent, even indirectly, to the National Curricular Guidelines (CNE, 2011), which defend, in the formation of the psychologist, the development of competencies such as coordinating and managing group processes and to relate to the other in order to provide the development of productive interpersonal ties with their professional class. They also highlight skills to be acquired in a Psychology course, such as describing, analyzing and interpreting verbal and non-verbal manifestations as primary sources of access to subjective states. According to the collaborators, it is understood that they could, in the workshops: a) listen or silence themselves, to listen to the other; b) improve listening and sensitivity to listen to the other; c) interpret different forms of language of the clients; d) organize, systematize and focus on the act of listening; e) learn how to deal with the silence of a client; and f) working with groups.

From the perspective of the collaborators, it was a characteristic of the workshop to be a space in which they could reflect on the competence to deal with silence in the therapeutic process, as well as on the competences that have not yet been developed and which are important for practice:

C1: I think the workshop ends up working as a space of perception. We talk four years about silence, about the look, but I think that there are few spaces that we have in the course to experience the silence, and then when we have the opportunity to face this, people are always disturbed, without know how to act.

C7: Listening to silence for me today is much more peaceful, acceptable, easy, than it was that day that was our first direct contact with that in that workshop (...) It was possible to develop from the workshop. Improving with our practices obviously.

C14: For me it was wonderful, the dynamics of the look, the silence is very important. I think it's one of the things I'm taking to the clinic today.

In addition to the skills listed above, the following statements point to learning gains related to group dynamics techniques. Collaborators seem to have reached a level of shared experience that contributed to their current experiences in internship activities, especially those involving group processes. It is still possible to understand that more patience has been developed to wait for the time inherent in processes like these - what can be considered as one more acquired competence:

C3: It was a lot of expectation to be in a group and today in the internship, because I'm working with groups, I found it interesting that in a group you share things in common (...) Today, in the internship, I realize that in the group people do it too, as if it were a repetition of what happened in the workshop. It was interesting.

P1: Do you feel, in a way, more comfortable on the internship today?

C3: Yes, for having noticed a movement during the workshop as it is in the group, and today, it is interesting to notice this movement as well. (...) of the same thing, it was interesting to notice. Have a little more patience, I think, to deal with groups today.

It is possible to understand, therefore, that the workshop seems to have enabled the student's qualification, by collaborating with the development of basic skills proposed by the National Curriculum Guidelines for a psychologist to enter the job market of the profession (CNE, 2011), as well as with the future career of the intern of Psychology, as described by Malvezzi, Souza & Zanelli (2010).

From the identification of these competences, it is argued that the listening workshop seems to function as a call to the Psychology student for the responsibility of developing a qualified listening. The collaborators realized that the preparation to listen to the other is related to the need to listen to themselves, knowing how to identify personal issues that do not interfere with their practical performance in the internship. This constituted the Unit of Meaning **taking care of itself to care for the other** - unit tied to another - because they recognized the process as a learning gain, perceiving the workshop as the **first moment of contact with clinical listening in practice**, understood here as one more Unit of Meaning of the investigated experiment. See the excerpt from the dialogue below:

C11: How am I going to stop to listen, how am I going to stop to hear what those people are going to take to the school-service if I cannot stop for myself, you know?

C10: Maybe this is the first experience with this dosage of what is yours and what is of the other, because at that moment you are in a whirlwind (...) And, then, maybe it was a first experience for you to know how to dose, because life continues with its swirls.

P2: So, you saw the workshop as a learning gain in relation to this dosing of what is mine and what is in the other, what needs to be heard in me, what needs to be heard in the other?

C10: I think so, I guess we do not learn that from books.

The collaborators also agreed that, through the workshop, there was an **improvement in clinical listening**, due to the activity to allow a discussion about the experiences lived, as well as a greater sensitivity to the meaning and re-signification of what is being said by the clients that are attended by the interns. Below is an excerpt from the dialogue, which is part of this Unit of Meaning:

P2: What is the sense of your participation?

C1: Well, I think that what was left for me was the initial moment, we could kind of debate the versions of meaning, I think that's what really trains, let's say, our listening (...) I remember a little of the people in the psychological shift, that when, in supervision, comes a case everyone participates and ends up that helps a little.

P1: And what do you think you learn from the experience today, in the internship, of this feature [of the workshop being a sharing environment of experiences]?

C1: I think we become more attentive to some of the meanings of some things that are not immediately apparent in speech. And a greater sensitivity to seek a little more, and that is totally important in the clinic.

It is also understood that the methodology and operability of the workshop was recognized by the collaborators as having the meaning of a **practical initiation to the internship**, mainly in what concerns a training for understanding the language, favoring the awakening of **attention to the different forms of language** communicated by the clients during the services they performed:

C5: I realized a lot during the workshop meetings and I came to realize a return of this now in the stage, is that we learn that listening is not just listening to you literally, it's you listening to the gesture, it's you listening to the silence.

Eu percebi muito durante os encontros das oficinas e eu vim perceber um retorno disso agora já no estágio, é que a gente aprende que a escuta não é só o ouvir literalmente, é você escutar o gesto, é você escutar o silêncio.

C7: It brought me a lot of experience from the workshops, when I went to meet the first patient who had the silence. And you will listen to the silence, you cannot despair, you cannot leave there.

C13: In practice, the attendances that I made for sure appear, to be attentive, connecting there to the discourse of the people, not only the speech, but the body, as it presents itself.

Another Unit of Meaning tells of the **organization and focus of listening** that the workshop

provided. According to the collaborators, in the workshops they were able to organize and discipline themselves more in the act of listening to the other:

C5: When you arrive in the workshop, you already know the importance of listening, but I think that the way the workshops were organized makes us experience listening.

C7: Am I ready for clinical listening? (...) Sometimes, listening brings something that is yours but that does not fit in that process, and you have to distance yourself from it. I think it was meetings that made this kind of reflection possible for us

The above statements are well representative of what in the research method is considered incomplete *epokhē*. From a Merleau-Pontyana perspective, one could say that the collaborators struggled to suspend what would prevent the intersubjective encounter and that the workshop seems to have allowed the maturation of what Merleau-Ponty (2006) recalls: the greatest teaching of phenomenological reduction is impossibility of a complete reduction.

In addition, the collaborators acknowledged that the phase that preceded the internship was a significant moment in their academic trajectory, so they considered positive the offer of the workshop in that specific period:

I think it influences indirectly, mixes with many other experiences of the same phase, but, I think it influences positively, once you can think about it, I think that as much as you cannot calculate the gains of this, I believe you have a positive influence in this period, at the beginning of the internship. Perhaps an aspect of what is inherent in it (C10).

It was also possible to understand that for the collaborators, the workshop allowed the understanding that listening is independent from the approach and application area of Psychology. The following reports, besides making possible this idea, open to the possibility of understanding that the way the workshop was conducted did not bias the students to a listening based on the method used:

P2: Do you think that the approach of the mediator was present in the workshop at some point?

C10: I don't think that was negative, but I think so. This does not prevent us from being here on different approaches, but we do not fail to score the gains of the workshop.

C8: What is it that unites psychology? It is listening, because regardless of the approach you take, how you will perhaps interpret

what the client says, you have to listen to what it will bring you, even silence.

C7: The way the workshops were going on, in a very methodical and explanatory way, all activities were exhaustively explained and at the end of each meeting we could make a meaningful version and concretize in writing that experience and at the next meeting read it and remember and at the next meeting you can make a call. I think it was some of the points that made it easier to experience the workshop.

In the face of these dialogue stretches, it seems that even if the theoretical-methodological approach underlying the workshop was not checked, the collaborators were able to perceive and recognize the importance of a methodological systematization that helped to guide the process. They also pointed out that the learning gains promoted by the workshop were independent of the approach that the intern itself would choose to practice internship.

Finally, the collaborators signaled the relevance of offering workshops as a training activity in Psychology as a non-compulsory practice. According to them, it would be very important that the participants have availability and desire for the experience, especially for the therapeutic effect that the workshop promoted, although it has not been configured as a therapeutic group:

C14: I think the contact a little bit earlier of such dynamics, of these tools, I think would collaborate a lot for an immersion in these ways of getting in touch with each other, with care.

C1: As something available, let's say, an elective course, something available throughout the course, could be something that would be very valid.

C3: Maybe if we were forced to go through this to be able to enter the internship, we would not be talking here so positively and not so openly, because we were willing. We did not have to.

In the context of the workshop, the permissiveness of the environment - denoted in credibility and trust as facilitating functions - was essential for openness to experience, as Rogers (1997) said, and it was revealed in the speech of interns in bringing aspects that make this activity a privileged moment of speech and listening, such as sharing the same theme in question, the commitment of the subjects involved and welcoming the otherness that accompanies the process. Therefore, as a clinical practice, the workshop seems to have provided a space of trust among group members to share their particularities. At the same time, it indicates that it has fostered a feeling of self-confi-

dence for the internship practice, for the recognition of the trajectory experienced in the four years of the course. See:

C3: And the workshop comes to give a snap: look, we're here, going through the same situation, but you're prepared, you've spent four years here and it was not for nothing, and then I think the workshop, at least for me, was able to promote this.

C8: I think another important thing was the issue of caring for the intern. (...) Because in supervision what you know of the patient comes from the intern, and how are you? And the workshop comes for this, how are you there for this new context?

C9: I think the workshop proposes to be the care for the listener, I think this differential comes at the right moment.

C5: And I thought it was extremely important, a moment of care, a moment that you can also be heard. I can also have problems, I can express myself too, I can also, somehow, be heard.

Given this, responding to the last objective of the present research, it seems to have been possible for the collaborators to conceive the workshop on listening development as a space not only for training for the internship, but for humanization and care for the intern person, which allows us to think of this as a clinical practice in a psychologist training institution, as already proposed by Dourado, Quirino, Lima and Macêdo (2016).

Conclusion

Focusing on subjective aspects involved in undergraduate training, this research reached its objectives and allowed an expansion of the readings about the process of becoming a psychologist, as well as listening and caring. As important concepts of psychological science, listening and care were re-signified by the researchers involved, and the look on them was enriched with the production of know-how provided by the study.

It is believed that the presented results have brought important contributions to scientific productions on the mentioned theme, ratifying the possibility of thinking workshops on listening development as a component of pedagogical project of the Psychology course, considering its positive scope with attention to the development of skills of the interns involved. Moreover, it is recognized that academic activities such as these can be spaces for the exchange of students' experiences, so that, in the act of being cared for in a group facilitation process, they can also appropriate ways of feeling, thinking and acting that favor the care of others, in the contemporary world in which indi-

vidualism predominates to the detriment of solidarity.

There were limitations in the research related to the availability that the interns had to return the preliminary analysis, which reduced the number of subjects that collaborated effectively with the analysis of the data and generated setbacks for the final step of the analysis. But this did not significantly affect the study.

It is expected, therefore, that this research had collaborated for the professional training of the student of Psychology of UNIVASF; served as a source of indicators to offer these workshops as an additional training to subsidize the entry of students in the Psychology internships in the institution's school service, even in a non-mandatory form; and expanded knowledge of how to conduct a clinical practice in Organizational and Work Psychology in the context of university education. In this sense, studies are suggested that describe the ongoing conduction of these workshops and/or focus on the development of competencies that they can offer to groups of students from other specific periods of the course.

Finally, we expect that the present study may expand discussions and research on how the academic training in undergraduate courses in Psychology in Brazil has attended the National Curriculum Guidelines instituted by Ministry of Education regarding the development of skills and promote reflections in the academic context on the importance of activities focused on the said competences for a more effective practical action of future psychologists, especially regarding the device of clinical listening.

References

- Abbad, G.S., & Mourão, L. (2010). Competências profissionais e estratégias de qualificação e requalificação. Em A.V.B. Bastos, & S.M.G. Gondim (Orgs.). *O trabalho do psicólogo no Brasil* (pp. 380-418). Porto Alegre: Artmed.
- Amatuzzi, M. M. (1990). O que é ouvir. *Estudos de Psicologia*, 7 (2), 86-97.
- Amatuzzi, M. M. (1993) Etapas do processo terapêutico: um estudo exploratório. *Psicologia, Teoria e Pesquisa*, 9, 1-21.
- Amatuzzi, M. M. (2008). *Por uma psicologia humana*. São Paulo: Editora Alínea.
- Amatuzzi, M.M. (2009). Psicologia fenomenológica: uma aproximação teórica humanista. *Estudos de Psicologia*, 26 (1), 93-100.
- Bandeira, M., Quaglia, M. A. C., Freitas, L. C., Souza, A. M., Costa, A. L. P., Gomides, M. M. P., & Lima, P. B. (2006). Habilidades interpessoais na atuação do psicólogo. *Interação em Psicologia*, 10 (1), 139-149.

- Braga, A. A. N. M., Daltro, M. R., & Danon, C. A. F. (2012). A escuta clínica: um instrumento de intervenção do psicólogo em diferentes contextos. *Revista Psicologia, Diversidade e Saúde*, 1 (1), 87-100.
- Brasil, CNE/CES (2011). *Resolução N. 5, de 15 de março*. Recuperado em 12, setembro, 2015 de <http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&id=12991>
- Brasil, CNS/CONEP (2012). *Resolução N. 466, de 12 de dezembro*. Recuperado em 18, abril, 2015 de <http://bvsmis.saude.gov.br/bvs/saudelegis/cns/2013/res0466_12_12_2012.html>
- Ceccim, R. B. & Bilibio, L. F. S. (2004). Articulação com o segmento estudantil da área de saúde: uma estratégia de inovação na formação de recursos humanos para o SUS. Em Ministério da Saúde (Org.), *VER-SUS/BRASIL: cadernos de textos* (pp. 4-19). Brasília, DF: Gráfica Universitária.
- Coelho, N. E., & Figueiredo, L. C. (2004). Figuras de intersubjetividade na constituição subjetiva: dimensões da alteridade. *Interações*, 9 (17), 9-28.
- Cruz, R.M., & Schultz, V. (2009). Avaliação de competências profissionais e formação de psicólogos. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia*, 61 (3), 117-127.
- Dourado, A.M., Macêdo, S., & Lima, D. (2016). Experienciando a escuta clínica no estágio em psicologia: um estudo fenomenológico. Em A.A.S. Sampaio, & D.H.P. Espíndula. *Pesquisa e prática em psicologia no sertão* (pp. 471-495). Brasília: Instituto Walden 4. Recuperado em 12, dezembro, 2016 de <http://www.walden4.com.br/livros/w4/pdf/iw4_sampaio_espindula_1e_2016.pdf>.
- Dourado, A.M., Quirino, C.A., Lima, M.B.A., & Macêdo, S. (2016). Experiências de estudantes de psicologia em oficinas de desenvolvimento da escuta. *Phenomenological Studies: Revista da Abordagem Gestáltica*, XXII (2), 209-218.
- Forghieri, Y.C. (1993). *Psicologia fenomenológica. Fundamentos, método e pesquisas*. São Paulo: Pioneira
- Gadamer, H-G. (2003). *Verdade e método*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Giorgi, A. (1985). *Phenomenology and psychological research*. Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press.
- Gondim, S.M.G., Luna, A.F., Souza, G.C., Sobral, L.C.S, & Lima, M.S. (2010). A identidade do psicólogo brasileiro. Em A.V.B. Bastos, & S.M.G. Gondim (Orgs.). *O trabalho do psicólogo no Brasil* (pp. 223-247). Porto Alegre: Artmed.
- Heckert, A. L. C. (2007). Escuta como cuidado: o que se passa nos processos de formação e de escuta? Em R. Pinheiro, & R. A. de Mattos (Orgs.). *Razões públicas para a integralidade em saúde: o cuidado como valor* (pp. 199-212). Rio de Janeiro: ABRASCO/CEPESC.
- Heckert, A.L.C., & Neves, C.E.A.B. (2010). Modos de formar e modos de intervir: de quando a formação se faz potência de produção do coletivo. Em Ministério do Saúde. Secretaria de Atenção à Saúde (Org.). *Política Nacional de Humanização: formação e intervenção* (pp.13-28). (Série B. Textos Básicos de Saúde - Caderno HumanizaSUS, 1). Brasília: Ministério da Saúde.
- Holanda, A.F. (2006). Questões sobre pesquisa qualitativa e pesquisa fenomenológica. *Análise Psicológica*, 3 (XXIV), 363-372.
- Holanda, A.F. (2014). *Fenomenologia e humanismo. Reflexões necessárias*. Curitiba: Juruá.
- Jovchelovitch, S., & Bauer, M.W. (2002). Entrevista narrativa. Em M.W. Bauer, & G. Gaskell, G. (Orgs.). *Pesquisa qualitativa com texto, imagem e som. Um manual prático* (pp. 90-113). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Laville, C., & Dionne, J. (1999). *A construção do saber. Manual de metodologia da pesquisa em ciências humanas*. Porto Alegre: Artmed.
- Lima, D. (2005). *Algumas considerações sobre a escuta na abordagem fenomenológico-existencial*. Recuperado em 03, maio, 2015, de <<http://portalamazonia.globo.com/plantaopsicologico/algumasconsideracoesescuta.pdf>>
- Macêdo, S.M. (2000). Psicologia clínica e aprendizagem significativa: relatando uma pesquisa fenomenológica colaborativa. *Psicologia em Estudo*, 5 (2), 49-76.
- Macêdo, S. (2006). Condições de trabalho e saúde mental entre profissionais de psicologia na região metropolitana do Recife: um estudo fenomenológico. *Travessia*, VIII (1), pp. 141-158.
- Macêdo, S. (2015). *Clínica humanista-fenomenológica do trabalho. A construção de uma ação diferenciada diante do sofrimento no e por causa do trabalho*. Curitiba: Juruá.
- Malvezzi, S., Souza, J.A.J., & Zanelli, J.C. (2010). Inserção no mercado de trabalho: os psicólogos recém-formados. Em A.V.B. Bastos; S.M.G. Gondim (Org). *O trabalho do psicólogo no Brasil* (pp. 85-106). Porto Alegre: Artmed.
- Meira, C. H. M. G., & Nunes, M. L. T. (2005). Psicologia clínica, psicoterapia e o estudante de psicologia. *Paideia*, 15 (32), 339-343.
- Mendes, F.M.S., Fonseca, K.A., Brasil, J.A., & Dalbello-Araújo, M.D. (2012). VER-SUS: relato de vivências na formação de psicologia. *Psicologia Ciência e Profissão*, 32 (1), 174-187.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2006). *Fenomenologia da percepção*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Rogers, C. (1997). *Tornar-se pessoa*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Roriz, J.C.S. (2010). *Acolhimento e tematização da angústia na clínica fenomenológico existencial na contemporaneidade*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Instituto de Ciências Humanas e Filosofia, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro.

Rudnick, T., & Carlotto, M.S. (2007). Formação de estudante da área de saúde: reflexões sobre a prática de estágio. *Ver. SBPH, 10* (1), 97-110.

Turato, E.R. (2003). *Tratado de metodologia da pesquisa clínico-qualitativa*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

Shirley Macêdo Vieira de Melo é Professora do Colegiado de Psicologia, do Programa de Pós-Graduação Interdisciplinar em Dinâmicas de Desenvolvimento do Semi-Árido (PPGDides) e da Residência Multiprofissional em Saúde Mental da Fundação Universidade Federal do Vale do São Francisco (UNIVASF). É Doutora em Psicologia Clínica pela Universidade Católica de Pernambuco; Mestre em Psicologia Clínica pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas, SP; Especialista em Psicologia Clínica pela Universidade Católica de Pernambuco; Graduada e Bacharel em Psicologia pela Universidade Federal de Pernambuco; e Bacharel em Administração pela Faculdade de Ciências Humanas ESUDA. E-mail: mvm.shirley@gmail.com.

Gledson Wilber de Souza é Graduado no Curso de Psicologia pela Universidade Federal do Vale do São Francisco.

Monzitti Baumann Almeida Lima é Graduado no Curso de Psicologia pela Universidade Federal do Vale do São Francisco.

Received: May 26, 2017

First Revision: September 05, 2017

Accepted: October 02, 2017