

CONVIVÊNCIA PEDAGÓGICA NA ORGANIZAÇÃO COLETIVA DO ENSINO: ESTUDO SOBRE A DOCÊNCIA COMPARTILHADA NA EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR

PEDAGOGICAL COEXISTENCE IN THE COLLECTIVE ORGANIZATION OF
TEACHING: A STUDY ON CO-TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

CONVIVENCIA PEDAGÓGICA EN LA ORGANIZACIÓN COLECTIVA DE LA
ENSEÑANZA: UN ESTUDIO SOBRE LA DOCENCIA COMPARTIDA EN LA EDUCACIÓN
SUPERIOR

Maria Eliza Mattosinho Bernardes¹

Marcelo Alves Barros²

RESUMO: Este artigo analisa a convivência pedagógica na organização coletiva do ensino em uma disciplina de formação inicial de professores, voltada às metodologias ativas e à coaprendizagem em Ciências da Natureza. Fundamentado no materialismo histórico-dialético e no enfoque histórico-cultural, o estudo toma a atividade pedagógica como unidade analítica para compreender a docência compartilhada como prática socialmente organizada. Trata-se de um estudo de caso, com produção de dados por meio de entrevistas semiestruturadas com docentes participantes do planejamento e desenvolvimento da disciplina, analisadas à luz da Análise de Conteúdo. Os resultados evidenciam que a organização coletiva do trabalho docente possibilitou a constituição de uma unidade didático-organizativa do curso, sustentada por planejamento sistemático, revisões sucessivas e mediações didático-metodológicas e comunicacionais. Evidenciam-se, ainda, processos de aprendizagem profissional no coletivo, bem como a produção de mediações entre teoria e prática, mediadas por instrumentos culturais, protocolos de ensino e estudo sistemático. Ao mesmo tempo, emergem contradições relacionadas às condições institucionais, às exigências organizacionais do trabalho coletivo e às dimensões afetivo-volitivas implicadas na docência compartilhada. Conclui-se que a convivência pedagógica se objetiva como forma social da atividade pedagógica, constituindo-se como mediação central na produção de sentidos, na organização do ensino e no desenvolvimento profissional docente.

1

Palavras-chave: Convivência pedagógica. Atividade pedagógica. Teoria histórico-cultural.

¹Professor at the Escola de Artes, Ciências e Humanidades da Universidade de São Paulo, of the Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação at FEUSP, collaborating researcher at the Alfredo Bosi Chair in Basic Education - Instituto de Estudos Avançados da USP. Leader of the Líder do Grupo de Estudos e Pesquisa em Educação, Sociedade e Políticas Públicas (GEPESPP) and the Laboratório de Educação e Desenvolvimento Psicológico (LEDEP).

²Professor at the Instituto de Física de São Carlos da Universidade de São Paulo, collaborating researcher at the Programa de Pós-Graduação Multiunidades em Ensino de Ciências e Matemática (PECIM) at Unicamp

ABSTRACT: This article analyzes pedagogical coexistence in the collective organization of teaching within an undergraduate teacher education course focused on active methodologies and co-learning in Natural Sciences. Grounded in historical-dialectical materialism and the historical-cultural approach, the study takes pedagogical activity as its unit of analysis to understand co-teaching as a socially organized practice. This is a case study, with data produced with semi-structured interviews with teachers involved in the planning and implementation of the course, analyzed using Content Analysis procedures. The findings indicate that the collective organization of teaching enabled the constitution of a didactic-organizational unity of the course, sustained by systematic planning, successive revisions, and didactic-methodological and communicational mediations. The findings also reveal processes of professional learning within the teaching collective, as well as mediations between theory and practice, structured through cultural tools, teaching protocols, and systematic study. At the same time, contradictions emerge related to institutional conditions, organizational demands of collective work, and affective-volitional dimensions involved in co-teaching. The study concludes that pedagogical coexistence materializes as a social form of pedagogical activity, constituting a central mediation in the production of meanings, the organization of teaching, and teachers' professional development.

Keywords: Pedagogical coexistence. Pedagogical activity. Historical-cultural theory.

RESUMEN: Este artículo analiza la convivencia pedagógica en la organización colectiva de la enseñanza en una asignatura de formación inicial de docentes, orientada a metodologías activas y coaprendizaje en Ciencias de la Naturaleza. Fundamentado en el materialismo histórico-dialéctico y en el enfoque histórico-cultural, el estudio asume la actividad pedagógica como unidad de análisis para comprender la docencia compartida como práctica socialmente organizada. Se trata de un estudio de caso, con producción de datos mediante entrevistas semiestructuradas a docentes participantes en la planificación y desarrollo de la asignatura, analizadas a partir del Análisis de Contenido. Los resultados evidencian que la organización colectiva del trabajo docente posibilitó la constitución de una unidad didáctico-organizativa del curso, sustentada en planificación sistemática, revisiones sucesivas y mediaciones didáctico-metodológicas y comunicativas. Asimismo, se identifican procesos de aprendizaje profesional en el colectivo docente, así como mediaciones entre teoría y práctica, estructuradas por instrumentos culturales, protocolos de enseñanza y estudio sistemático. Al mismo tiempo, emergen contradicciones relacionadas con las condiciones institucionales, las exigencias organizativas del trabajo colectivo y las dimensiones afectivo-volitivas implicadas en la docencia compartida. Se concluye que la convivencia pedagógica se objetiva como forma social de la actividad pedagógica, constituyéndose como mediación central en la producción de sentidos, en la organización de la enseñanza y en el desarrollo profesional docente.

Palabras clave: Convivencia pedagógica. Actividad pedagógica. Teoría histórico-cultural.

INTRODUCTION³

Recent shifts in higher education, particularly within initial teacher preparation programs, have reopened discussions on how teaching and other teaching work are organized. The widespread adoption of active learning methodologies has challenged traditional practices by emphasizing student engagement, varied instructional strategies, and restructured classroom dynamics. However, most of these approaches remain technical and operational, prioritizing pedagogical procedures and tools without examining the underlying social relations underlying teaching as a historical practice.

Given this scenario, it becomes necessary to shift the analytical focus beyond the methodological dimension, taking teaching as a socially organized activity, rooted in concrete conditions and guided by educational goals. Grounded in historical-dialectical materialism, human activity forms the foundation to understand social life, serving as the process through which individuals produce and reproduce their existence. In this perspective, Marx and Engels (2007) argue that consciousness does not precede social practice but emerges through the relations individuals form while producing their material and cultural life.

The historical-cultural psychology develops this formulation by showing that psychological development is not an internal process, but the outcome of socially mediated relationships. Vygotsky (2010; 2018) shows that higher psychological functions develop through the appropriation of historically produced tools and signs, with language central to the organization of consciousness. Within this framework, *perezhivanie* (lived experience) is analytically relevant as it expresses how individuals make meaning of objective conditions, inseparably linking affective, cognitive, and volitional dimensions. The focus, therefore, is on not only what occurs in educational contexts, but on how participants experience and make meaning of them.

Within this framework, pedagogical activity is understood as a particular form of social activity whose specificity lies in the intentional organization of teaching and learning conditions. Drawing on Leontiev (1983), it is structured by purposes, actions, and means of realization, involving different subjects pursuing a common object: the appropriation of knowledge. It is not a sum of individual actions but an organized process involving

³ This manuscript utilized an artificial intelligence tool for linguistic review and writing enhancement. The analysis, data interpretation, and development of the scientific content are the sole responsibility of the authors.

coordination, mediation, and meaning-making within socially constituted relationships. As Bernardes (2009; 2012) argues, analyzing pedagogical activity requires us to consider how teaching is organized, how subjects participate, and the mediations that enable their relationship with knowledge.

It is within this framework that pedagogical coexistence is understood as a constitutive dimension of relationships established in the educational process. Unlike approaches that associate it with interaction, school climate, or behavior regulation, pedagogical coexistence concerns the historically produced ways in which subjects relate to one another and to knowledge within pedagogical activity. Bernardes (2025a; 2025b) argues that such relationships are not external to the educational process but directly contribute to the production of meaning and the constitution of consciousness by organizing the concrete conditions under which teaching takes place.

This understanding allows teaching work to be examined beyond its individual dimension, highlighting the centrality of collective forms of teaching organization. Viewing co-teaching as a social practice makes it possible to investigate how participants establish relationships, develop agreements, tensions, and reorganizations within the collective and how these processes shape a formative unity. Thus, pedagogical coexistence provides an analytical lens for understanding not only the quality of relationships but also and, above all, how they articulate with the organization of pedagogical activity and the production of meanings on teaching and learning.

Based on these considerations, this study seeks to understand and analyze the processes of objectification and subjectification involved in co-teaching, focusing on a collectively organized undergraduate teacher education course. It investigates how pedagogical coexistence takes shape in teaching organization, which mediations support the articulation between theory and practice, what kind of learning emerges within the teaching collective, and what contradictions arise in pedagogical activity. By addressing this problem, the article seeks to advance discussions of teacher education in higher education by emphasizing teaching as a social practice mediated by historically constituted relationships.

METHOD

This qualitative study is grounded in historical-dialectical materialism and the historical-cultural approach, viewing educational phenomena as socially produced, historically situated processes constituted through relationships between subjects and cultural objects. From this perspective, the analysis does not focus on isolated variables but on how pedagogical activity is organized, taking it as the concrete unit through which educational relationships are realized. Thus, pedagogical coexistence among professors is understood as a constitutive dimension of this activity, expressed in the mediations that organize collective work, produce meaning, and shape ways of acting, thinking, and feeling within the educational process.

The qualitative approach was adopted due to the empirical complexity of the object and due to the need to apprehend meaning-making processes within pedagogical activity that cannot be reduced to measurement or fragmented description. This approach takes into consideration the meanings attributed by participants, their forms of participation in the collective, and the symbolic mediations structuring their relationship with knowledge as central dimensions of the phenomenon under investigation. Accordingly, the analysis sought to apprehend the relationships, contradictions, and mediations that shape the organization of teaching work in its historical materiality.

The methodological strategy was a case study, understood as an in-depth investigation of a phenomenon in its concrete setting, considering its internal determinations and the specific conditions under which it occurs. According to Yin (2015), this approach enables the examination of complex processes in real-world contexts, facilitating analysis of dynamics, interactions, and forms of organization that cannot be separated from their conditions of production. In this study, the selected case allows us to examine co-teaching as a specific form of organizing pedagogical activity and to analyze how, within the teaching collective, mediations supporting the production of teaching are constituted.

The empirical setting was an undergraduate teacher education course offered at a Brazilian public university from August 29 to December 5, 2024, with a total workload of 45 class hours. Seven faculty members participated in its design, planning, and implementation, working as a collective responsible for defining content, organizing teaching situations, and supporting course participants, who included pre-service teachers and basic education teachers. This collective organization involved developing a shared pedagogical project that guided the definition of objectives, content, and forms of monitoring the educational process.

Regarding its didactic-pedagogical organization, the course was structured around teaching situations that integrated study, analysis, and the development of pedagogical proposals, based on the relationship between theoretical foundations and educational practices. The activities engaged participants in analyzing teaching and learning processes, developing instructional sequences, and reflecting on teaching practice. This approach enabled the appropriation of pedagogical knowledge related to concrete teaching situations.

Teaching organization incorporated various didactic-methodological strategies, including the flipped classroom, in which prior study of materials was combined with collective activities during in-person sessions. Other strategies included peer instruction, project-based work, inquiry activities, and problem solving. Rather than focusing on the adoption of specific procedures, however, it is important to emphasize that these resources functioned as instruments within a collectively organized pedagogical activity aimed at producing formative unity and mediating scientific knowledge.

Course planning was a collective, systematic, and ongoing process, structured through biweekly meetings. This enabled continuous construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the course.

Key elements of this process included systematic planning meetings organized as formative spaces for studying theoretical frameworks, defining learning objectives, and achieving conceptual alignment among professors. The joint development of materials and instructional sequences also reflected a collaborative rather than individualized approach to planning, incorporating practical activities, supporting materials, and teaching strategies. In addition, successive revisions and ongoing realignments characterized planning as an iterative and flexible process open to adjustments throughout the course.

Responsibilities were also distributed in an integrated manner within the collective and guided by a common pedagogical project, avoiding fragmentation of teaching activities. Finally, a didactic-organizational unity was established, with the course conceived as a coherent whole and sustained by a “guiding thread” that ensured consistency and progression throughout the course.

The collective was organized as a collaborative and dynamic system. It was grounded in continuous coordination, mediation processes, and shared monitoring of teaching practices.

This functioning can be understood through four main dimensions. The first concerned the organizational structure of collective work, characterized by synchronized teamwork based on common objectives, ongoing alignment, and interdependence among faculty. The second concerned concrete organizational arrangements, including systematic planning meetings, joint development of materials and activities, collaborative monitoring of classes, observation of classroom interactions, systematic documentation of the pedagogical process, evaluation meetings, and discussions of difficulties, adjustments, and strategy reorganization.

The third dimension concerned the collective's functioning dynamics, marked by negotiation, shared decision-making, the circulation of pedagogical knowledge, and the articulation of theory and practice. The fourth encompassed the mediations supporting pedagogical work, including didactic-methodological mediations (such as active methodologies, protocols, and instructional sequences), technological-communicational mediations (such as digital platforms and shared materials), and reflective mediations (such as collective discussions and ongoing evaluation processes).

The empirical corpus was constructed to apprehend meaning-making processes within pedagogical activity, focusing on co-teaching in its concrete realization. Semi-structured interviews were therefore conducted with two faculty members (P₁ and P₂) from the collective responsible for coordinating, planning, and implementing the course. They were selected because of their direct and continuous involvement in organizing the pedagogical work. This selection was not based on statistical representativeness but on the possibility of accessing, through these participants, the mediations structuring the activity and the meanings produced through collective work.

The interviews were conducted with informed consent, audio-recorded, and transcribed in full, preserving the discursive materiality required to analyze meaning-making processes. The interview guide covered thematic areas addressing different dimensions of pedagogical activity, including: (a) understanding collective work; (b) learning produced through coexistence with other faculty; (c) mediations established between theory and practice; (d) challenges and potentialities of co-teaching; and (e) ways of organizing teaching throughout the course. These areas were not initially treated as closed categories but as guiding instruments for discourse production, allowing meanings to emerge through the interaction between researcher and participants.

Content Analysis was used, which, according to Bardin (2016), is not a descriptive classification technique but a procedure for organizing and interpreting discursive material by identifying meaning nuclei. The analytical process therefore involved iterative reading, identification of units of meaning, and construction of interpretive categories articulated with the cultural-historical framework to apprehend the relationships, mediations, and contradictions underlying the collective organization of teaching work.

RESULTS

Regarding faculty perceptions of collective work, co-teaching was understood as the production of course unity, rather than as task division or the juxtaposition of individual interventions. Their accounts indicate that the collective constructed an integrated formative path in which teaching activities were organized around a common direction.

P₁ and P₂, both highly experienced professors, consistently expressed this understanding. P₁ stated that “the entire course became a unit,” while P₂ described collective work as a process in which the group “collectively builds, develops, reformulates, and keeps building... step by step.” These statements indicate that course unity emerged throughout the course through coordinated actions involving planning, revision, and alignment among participants.

8

In this process, periodic meetings played a central role in defining objectives, teaching strategies, and adjustments. A “guiding thread” organized the formative path, guiding content selection, activity design, and continuity across sessions. Maintaining this unity required ongoing coordination among professors, including negotiation of proposals, shared decision-making, and collective monitoring of class development.

Regarding learning arising from pedagogical coexistence among professors, the data indicate that participation in the teaching collective enabled them to rethink their ways of working. Their accounts show that this process extended beyond adopting teaching strategies to transform how they understood and organized teaching.

P₁ described the experience as “a very rich experience”, stating, “I learned a lot from the group,” while P₂ called it “a very rich experience”. In both cases, learning was linked to participation in collective activities – planning, discussion, and implementation – and to the need to take positions regarding shared decisions.

Exposure to different teaching approaches and the construction of consensus required them to reconsider assumptions and negotiate proposals, helping clarify criteria and broaden their understanding of their own work. This process was directly related to the concrete conditions of participation in the collective, particularly joint planning and activity analysis. At the same time, the accounts indicate that these learning processes were shaped by tensions arising from the articulation of different perspectives and experiences.

Regarding mediations between theory and practice, the data indicate that this relationship was not understood as the direct application of theoretical frameworks but as a mediation produced within the organization of collective work. The articulation of these elements occurred through different forms of activity organization and planning processes.

P1 emphasized that “theoretical frameworks were incorporated into the ways classes were organized,” particularly through didactic-methodological protocols. P2, in turn, highlighted “the role of systematic literature study and collective discussions during planning meetings,” in which proposals were reformulated according to the adopted frameworks. Both indicated that theory informed the planning, implementation, and evaluation of activities.

The accounts also indicate that this articulation extended to other teaching contexts, such as internships experiences and schools, revealing the circulation of elements across settings. In this process, collective discussions contributed to reorganizing participants’ practices, indicating that the relationship between theory and practice developed throughout the activity through ongoing revisions and adjustments.

Regarding the challenges and potentialities of co-teaching, the data show that the collective organization of teaching was shaped by tensions related to institutional conditions and the demands of group work. Building an integrated formative proposal required ongoing coordination, negotiation of perspectives, and decisions throughout the process.

Participants identified limitations related to infrastructure and the time available for collective planning, noting that frequent meetings, joint material development, and continuous monitoring of activities increased the teaching workload. Moreover, coordinating different approaches to teaching required negotiation that, at times, involved disagreements and reconsideration of positions.

At the level of participants’ experience, affective-volitional aspects emerged, including anxiety, insecurity, and overload, particularly in situations requiring planning to be

reorganized. At the same time, these conditions prompted collective strategies, mutual support, and the search for shared solutions. In this sense, tensions appear to be constitutive of the organization of co-teaching, highlighting the complexity of the relationships involved in the production of teaching.

DISCUSSION

Regarding the production of unity in pedagogical activity, the results indicate that the course's didactic-organizational unity did not result from a predetermined plan but from an ongoing process of collective construction. This finding suggests that teaching unity is not a technical data but a product of pedagogical activity as it unfolds in concrete practice.

From a historical-dialectical materialist perspective, this movement can be understood as a process of objectification in which the teaching collective's purposes become materialized in the organization of teaching. According to Marx and Engels (2007), human activity is goal-oriented and realized through practice, producing objectifications that mediate subsequent actions. In this case, course unity expresses such an objectification: it is a product of collective work that once constituted, guides and regulates teaching activity itself.

In dialogue with Leontiev (1983), pedagogical activity can be understood as a specific form of human activity structured by motives, actions, and operations. Course unity, therefore, is not merely a final outcome but part of the activity's organization, articulating objectives, content, and forms of teaching practice. The coherence observed thus cannot be explained by the adoption of particular methodologies but by the organization of collective work around a common object.

Regarding teaching learning within the work collective, the learning identified in the interviews indicates that the professors' professional development was directly linked to participation in collective work. In this case, professional development did not occur as a process external to practice but within the pedagogical activity itself.

From a historical-cultural psychology perspective, this movement can be understood as meaning-making through mediated social relationships. Vygotsky (2010; 2018) argues that human development occurs through the appropriation of cultural tools, transforming ways of thinking, acting, and feeling. In this context, coexistence among professors created conditions for new ways of understanding pedagogical work to emerge.

The learning described by participants as occurring “in practice” reflects a process in which participation in collective actions enables the reorganization of activity itself. In Leontiev’s (1983) terms, participation in a socially organized activity transforms subjects’ actions and expands their repertoires of practice.

Furthermore, the need for negotiation and collective decision-making contributed to the explanation of criteria and reflection on the work itself. This indicates that the professors learning is a socially mediated process inseparable from the conditions under which pedagogical activity takes place.

Regarding mediations between theory and practice in teaching organization, the findings indicate that this relationship was not a direct application of theoretical frameworks but a process mediated by the organization of pedagogical work. This challenges conceptions that treat theory as external to practice.

From a historical-cultural perspective, theory can be understood as a cultural tool that reorganizes subjects’ actions. Vygotsky (2010) emphasizes that tools and signs qualitatively transform human activity by mediating the relationship between subjects and the world. Thus, once appropriated by the professors, theory guides decisions, structures activities, and generates new ways of understanding practice.

11

The mediations identified—systematic study, material development, use of protocols, and collective discussions—show that the articulation between theory and practice is constructed within activity through ongoing processes of reworking. According to Bernardes (2012), this articulation is expressed in the organization of pedagogical activity, in which scientific knowledge mediates relationships between subjects and the object of teaching.

Theory therefore ceases to occupy an external position and becomes part of the organization of teaching itself. It constitutes an integral element of pedagogical activity.

Regarding the contradictions of co-teaching and participants’ experiences, the tensions identified in the results—related to institutional conditions, work organization, and affective-volitional dimensions—allow co-teaching to be understood as an activity shaped by contradictions. These contradictions are not external elements but constitutive aspects of pedagogical work organization.

Within the historical-dialectical materialist framework, contradiction is understood as a principle of movement and development, expressing the coexistence of opposing

determinations within the same reality. In the case analyzed, collective teaching organization enables the production of unity while simultaneously intensifying demands on participants, generating tensions when performing the activity.

This analysis can be deepened through the notion of *perezhivanie*. Vygotsky (2010; 2018) emphasizes that it expresses the unity between objective conditions and how subjects make meaning of them. Thus, anxiety, insecurity, and overload cannot be understood in isolation but as expressions of the concrete conditions in which pedagogical activity develops.

In this sense, pedagogical coexistence constitutes a space in which these contradictions become visible and operate as forces for transformation. The tensions experienced by the professors not only revealed limitations but also mobilized processes for reorganizing the activity, contributing to the development of new forms of collective practice.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The study revealed that, in the context examined, co-teaching is not an organizational arrangement aimed at dividing tasks, but a way of carrying out pedagogical activity in its collective dimension. Course unity was not established beforehand, but as a result of the teaching work conceived throughout the process, through decisions, adjustments, and reconfigurations guided by common purposes.

In this process, pedagogical coexistence proved inseparable from the organization of teaching, as it constitutes the relational field in which meanings are produced, criteria for action established, and forms of participation are defined. The learning identified indicates that teaching professional development does not occur apart from practice but within the dynamics of the activity itself, in which the need for collective coordination prompts the reconsideration of positions, clarification of underlying principles, and transformation of ways of working.

The analysis of the relationship between theory and practice showed that this articulation is constituted within pedagogical work and is mediated by processes of study, development, and evaluation that redirect teaching practice. Likewise, the tensions identified—related to institutional conditions, organizational demands, and affective-volitional dimensions—indicate that co-teaching develops under conditions that simultaneously create constraints and possibilities, forming a dynamic field for reorganizing the activity.

As a contribution, this study advances pedagogical coexistence as an analytical lens for understanding teaching, showing that relationships among subjects do not merely accompany

but constitute the pedagogical process. This perspective shifts the analysis from approaches centered on procedures toward investigating the social forms that organize teaching activity.

Finally, further research should examine different contexts and institutional arrangements to deepen the understanding of the multiple ways co-teaching is organized and their effects on teacher education.

REFERENCES

BARDIN L. **Análise de conteúdo**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2016.

BERNARDES MEM. Ensino e aprendizagem como unidade dialética na atividade pedagógica. **Psicologia Escolar e Educacional**, 2009; 13: 235-242.

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

BERNARDES MEM, CHECCHIA AKA. Convivência pedagógica entre estudantes na pós-graduação: um estudo de caso. **Obutchénie: Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica**, 2025; 9: e2025-34.

BERNARDES MEM. Convivência pedagógica: um estudo a partir do enfoque histórico-cultural. In: PINHEIRO VPG, BERNARDES MEM, ROCHA MSPML (org.). **Psicologia da Educação e Processos Educacionais**: contribuições de diferentes perspectivas teóricas. São Paulo: EACH/USP, 2025.

13

LEONTIEV AN. **Actividad, conciencia y personalidad**. Havana: Editorial Pueblo y Educación, 1983.

MARX K, ENGELS F. **A ideologia alemã**: crítica da mais recente filosofia alemã em seus representantes Feuerbach, B. Bauer e Stirner, e do socialismo alemão em seus diferentes profetas. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

VIGOTSKI LS. **Quarta aula**: a questão do meio na pedologia. *Psicologia USP*, 2010; 21(4): 681-701.

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

YIN RK. **Case study research**: design and methods. 5 ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2015.