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\textbf{Abstract:} This article aims mainly to appropriate the existing concepts about happiness in school dynamics. It specifically aims to demonstrate the importance of the relevance of happiness in the context of the school routine. The study starts from the characterization of what happiness is, from the historical perspectives and from the thinkers of education that dealt with the theme in their reflections and practices. It reflects on the utilitarian sense of the term and its condition of well-being, the latter being the meaning given to happiness. It addresses the dynamics of the school and happiness, presenting them as components of socioemotional education and human coexistence inserted in the school routine. It argues about dialogue as an enabler of well-being and the aspects that can promote happiness. It defines as a hypothesis that the pedagogical practice, the formed relationships and the good coexistence collaborate for the happiness in the school. From the documentary findings, the aspects considered as those that most contribute to happiness at school emerge, however, it ratifies, being the relational component - present, whether between the teacher and his peers, or between these and the other school agents permeates and animates the practice, pedagogical or extra-class activities. It concludes that socio-emotional education, dialogue, and human coexistence are constituted, according to what the bibliographic study reveals, as a contributing factor for the relevance of happiness in school dynamics.
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1. Introduction

Notably, the theme of happiness is not commonly prioritized treated in Brazilian school and education, in fact, there is little literature on the subject. However, with the advent of the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC), which brings, among other guidelines and leadings, socio-emotional competences, which include: Argumentation, Empathy and Cooperation, Self-Knowledge and Self-Care, Responsibility and Citizenship, Work and Life Project. In this idea, this subject gains breadth in the perspective of well-being, but still in a timid way, perhaps because it is in the implementation phase.

It should be emphasized in this line of thought that a child spends a good part of his day at school, some are even more active in the school environment than at home. Furthermore, if full time is considered, it is necessary to think that this relationship is intense and requires a pleasant environment, to provide children with well-being in order not to generate imbalance. This time it is noticed that there is a symbiosis between the school and the children and young people, who can mutually benefit in the construction of a citizen school that makes curricular activities a means for the common good. As far as this becomes possible, school dynamics will flow to both students and the school. Unlike, the school environment will become unbalanced, promoting malaise.

In this sense, Maturana argues:

Educating is the process in which the child or adult lives with the other and, when living with the other, spontaneously transforms itself, so that their way of living becomes progressively more congruent with that of the other in the living space. Therefore, educating occurs all the time and in a reciprocal manner. \cite{1}

Thus, it is expected that these characteristics complement each other in favor of a future that will promote happiness for everyone involved in this great purpose of life, which is education, especially for its main protagonist, the student.

In another sense, actions aimed at promoting well-being, that is, the happiness of students at school should be prioritized, considering that learning is closely linked to these factors.

It should be noted that Brazilian education is a constant issue for complex issues when it comes to addressing issues such as attractiveness to students, especially their well-being in the educational environment that encompasses inequalities. As a rule, discussions revolve around issues related to the allocation of financial resources, school infrastructure, the training of teachers and the devaluation of the teaching career in the country, leaving out the child and adolescent being, their integral formation and to enjoy a life of well-being.

It is observed that a school that is not attractive, does not concern itself with promoting well-being in its pedagogical activities or in its relationships, becomes an exclusive institution. This can be seen in the research data and some figures in the Brazilian Yearbook of Basic Education (CRUZ; MONTEIRO), edited by Editora Moderna and Todos pela Educação, which reflect this reality and the challenge that young people face, given the percentages: 1.5 million young people aged 15 to 17 are out of school; 11.5% of those who have access to
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schools fail. almost 7% drop out of school. Of these students, only 58.5% start elementary school and complete high school until they are 19 years old. [2]

In consultation with data from the Talis survey [3], there are records of many school environments, that bullying and aggression ended up being “normalized” and minimized, with negative impacts on learning. Hence, if there is no well-being at school, how can we guarantee learning? If you are not happy in an environment, how can you wish the student to stay?

Regarding these questions, it is necessary to do more research on the student at school and not only at school; the qualitative aspects, not just the quantitative ones; how they feel at school, not only the problems they encounter at school or what socio-emotional skills they should develop; it’s about what would make them happy at school, and not about what they need to meet the job market. It is about considering the school space in the full range of subjectivity of children and young people who inhabit it and spend a good part of their lives in it.

In this scenario, the present study aims mainly to investigate the aspects of school dynamics that can contribute to the happiness of students. To make learning a shared means of joy in which difficulties become challenging and motivating challenges. Specifically, it aims to analyze the contributions so that there is more investment in promoting well-being in the educational environment. It is justified to be relevant in large part by the differentiated focus on the dynamics of the school from the perspective of happiness, the well-being in the educational environment, the clarifications it provides about the nature and the importance of happiness at school, something specific to the educational universe, distancing themselves from the ephemeral or utilitarian concept of happiness, which you often value more perspectives of competitiveness than self-fulfilling perspectives.

In view of the above, this article begins with a brief introduction about well-being in Brazilian education, the parts of which it is composed: What is happiness; School dynamics and happiness; and For a school that promotes happiness; topics on approaches to happiness as well-being; happiness and education thinkers; happiness as an emotion inserted in the school through socioemotional education; happiness in human coexistence; and dialogue as a facilitator of well-being at school. It concludes with the final considerations and bibliographical references.

2. What is Happiness?

2.1 Happiness as well-being

Starting from the premise that even for the Greeks, happiness brought different perspectives, using the doxography of Demócrito (around 460-370 BC), in Estobeu, quoted by MARIÁS [4], who states: “the happiness (eudaimonía) also called euthymía (temper, mood, confidence); euestó (well-being, prosperity); symmetría (proportion, balance); ataraxia”.

Based on these terms, to give fluidity to the reading, it is necessary to clarify the concept of happiness addressed in this study.

Corroborating Frankl [5] points out that happiness cannot be sought unintentionally, but it must be the result of something, and there must be a reason to be happy. Juxtaposes, it is important to reflect on the reason for being happy at school because most of the students spend their day in the school space where they should promote conditions of well-being that allow them to better adapt. ConcordandoMarías alludes,

I would propose this formula: the present claim to happiness includes this well-being which in itself does not produce happiness; it is simply a requirement of it. The picture of happiness prevailing among Westerners of our time includes well-being, and if we don't have it, we feel deprived of something that we consider necessary as an ingredient, but which is not happiness. [4]

Based on the principle that happiness should be seen as part of a broader concept of well-being, this research will use the concept arising from Positive Psychology to understand these aspects contextualized in the dynamics of the school.

The immaterial asset provided by the school and the understanding of happiness based on well-being defined by the researcher Martin Seligman, a research psychologist at the University of Pennsylvania - United States of America (USA), is taken as the main reference for this study. idealized the referred concepts observing the multiple origins.

According to Seligman in positive emotion, engagement and meaning are the construct of well-being, are its elements, each of which contributes to life satisfaction and is measured entirely by the subjective report. In this regard, happiness and satisfaction with life are configured as elements of well-being. [6]

The author's clarifications follow that positive emotions are what we feel about pleasure, enthusiasm, ecstasy, comfort, and similar sensations. Essentially, engagement is about giving yourself completely to an activity, ultimately, the meaning of belonging and serving something that you believe being greater than yourself.

It is understood that happiness is operationalized or defined by satisfaction with life, through the
maximum feeling for positive emotion. To this end, if the school is capable of providing positive emotions in its activities, promoting projects that involve students and in the time they spend in the school environment, it will be promoting satisfaction with life, happiness and well-being at school.

In another perspective, Seligman employs happiness and well-being interchangeably, as comprehensive terms, including positive feelings (ecstasy and comfort) and positive activities (focus and dedication). For him, “it is important to recognize that” happiness “and” well-being “sometimes refer to feelings, but they can also refer to activities in which there is no feeling at all” [6]. In another, the author’s point of view, states that happiness and well-being are related to feelings when, he manages to maintain harmonious relations with the group in which I am inserted, and to feel joy and joy for being a part. And when there is no feeling, however, I feel happiness and well-being, when I manage to carry out an activity in the teacher’s good explanation.

This identification is projected not only by the fact of the aspects of the school dynamics that favor the well-being of the students due to their happiness, but also because it can be modified. Thus, the school can act to ensure the well-being of its students and not be satisfied with the installed malaise [6]. In this belief, Seligman believes that we can teach the skills of well-being and that all schools are them: having more positive emotions, giving more meaning, proposing better relationships and more positive achievements. And a little further, schools can change the way they work to provide an environment of well-being and happiness [6].

About this, Seligman versa

There are two reasons why well-being is taught in schools: the avalanche of depression and the nominal increase in happiness over the past two generations. A third reason is that greater well-being improves learning, the traditional goal of education [6].

About this, it also emphasizes that investing in well-being at school is perhaps one of the possibilities that many public policies need to contribute to the reduction of dropout and abandonment rates in solving the failure issue. In addition, increasing satisfaction with life also increases the possibilities of dreaming about the future and helps to achieve better learning and more creative thinking. Countless experiences of innovative schools show that when management is concerned with the well-being of children, with the joy and happiness of learning and acquiring new knowledge, evasion and abandonment are considerably reduced, according to a UNESCO publication on practices innovative ideas that show the importance of the school environment and other implicit factors [7].

2.2 Happiness and the Thinkers of Education

For many education scholars, including the Brazilian, happiness is measured as an important factor to be considered in the educational environment, since it involves relationship, engagement, pleasure, that is, a space in which positive emotions should be experienced, such as some authors, present throughout the text, call happiness.

It is a fact that happiness does not appear clearly in the speeches of several thinkers for the same reason as Trilla who opines happiness would not be an aim of education, but a meta-purpose - happiness is not strictly a psychic capacity, nor a content of learning, but a state, a situation, an experience, a sensation, or whatever you want to call it. [8].

As can be seen, educational thinkers reflected on the school, starting from the idea of happiness as the purpose of human life, but not as the specific purpose of education. In different perspectives, a selection of thinkers was made taking as a reference the contributions given in their lives and works and who showed concern for well-being in the educational environment.

Thus, in the view of the American educator philosopher and pedagogist John Dewey (Burlington, Vermont, October 20, 1859 - June 1, 1952), most schools are far from being an interesting place and a dangerous vanguard of a humanized civilization, as I would like it to be. However, this perception was perhaps not consensual, which leads us to think that happiness based on a pleasant place to be and care for the human being, possibly, was not present in the schools of his time, but it is something required for today's well-being society [9].

Gauthier and Tardif [10] placed French anarchist pedagogue and pedagogue CélestinFreinet (Gars, October 15, 1896 - Vence, October 8, 1966) as the representative of educators committed to their students beyond the cognitive, as human beings of integrity, they show love for the children, concerns with their physical, intellectual, and emotional development, and also with their happiness. Freinet identified with the current of the Nova School and led the so-called Democratic Schools, affirmed that pedagogy involves the concern with the formation of a social being that acts in the present and directs the pedagogical movement in defense of fraternity, respect and growth of a society cooperative and happy.

From the American behaviorist psychologist, inventor and philosopher Burrhus Frederic Skinner, (Susquehanna, March 20, 1904 - Cambridge, August 18, 1990), Gauthier and Tardif [10] think that he was very
critical because the school is not concerned with the well-being of students; he understood that the pedagogy applied at that time only produced incompetence and inadequacy of the students. With that, he realized that the children were anxious, insecure, and aggressive, so he considered applied pedagogy harmful to the students’ school experience, who, certainly, were unhappy. For Skinner and the other behaviorists, it was necessary that the students not only passively received the knowledge of the teacher, but that they were participants in its construction, being necessary that the teacher stimulated the desired behavior.

In addition to the aforementioned thinkers, in Brazil, Paulo Reglus Neves Freire (Pernambucano born in Recife, September 19, 1921) is an internationally renowned educator who believed in an education that would promote happiness and be part of the school, love, hope, happiness. About this, Freireversa,

There is a relationship between the joy necessary for educational activity and hope. The hope that the teacher and students together can learn, teach, make us uneasy, produce and together we can resist obstacles to our joy [11].

Another Brazilian who was a psychoanalyst, theologian, writer and expressive pastor in education Rubem Azevedo Alves (Boa Esperança, September 15, 1933 - Campinas, July 19, 2014), promoted that the teacher-student relationship would be one of the aspects responsible for the good -being and pleasure to attend school. According to Alves, it would make a student want to go to the educational environment for reasons,

[...]. When a master is admired, the heart orders the intelligence to learn the things that the master knows. Knowing what he knows becomes a way of being with him. I learn because I love, I learn because I admire. Knowing what he knows, I carry his briefcase, like “matafome”, I make love to him [12].

From what was exposed by education thinkers, it appears that the pedagogy of happiness has an important role that leads us to reflect on why it creates conditions for students to be happy. What they show in common is that they are concerned with the well-being of students, they have been proposing this care for many years, this place of importance in the integral training of students.

In the ideas of Goleman the understanding that when a child feels loved and cared for, worthy of the care of important people in his life, the resulting well-being creates a reservoir of positivity. This, in turn, seems to fuel another basic impulse: the desire to explore the world. It allows to infer in the context of the school that the well-being generates the desire to learn and to be engaged in this universe. Such a condition, would make this dynamic favorable is the need for school actors to understand,

[...] each of us has an innate temperament that makes us more or less prone to happy or sad days. Even with this basic information, research associates the types of care we receive in childhood with the brain's capacity for joy in adulthood. Happiness thrives on resilience, the ability to overcome obstacles and return to a calmer and happier state. There seems to be a direct link between resilience in stressful situations and the ability to be happy [13].

On the other hand, educators who thought of education in times past, today they defend well-being at school, even from different perspectives, suggest that the balance between cognitive and emotional aspects, pleasure and contentment will favor the learning environment.

There is a consensus on everything between these education thinkers and it is up to the school to promote the well-being of its students so that they feel happy and wish to be in the educational environment. For Trilla[8] and Dewey [9] show that it is necessary to create experiences and situations that transform the school into a place of pleasure, in which one has the desire to be. In this sense, Freinet and Goleman [13] exemplify the understanding that emotions promote well-being, where there is room for their expressions, respect and cooperativism, generates a reservoir of positivity, becomes capable of arousing the desire to learn and motivates perform environmental activities.

Although there are some particularities in the understanding of the concept of happiness, the aforementioned thinkers recognize that the school is an environment capable of promoting well-being, happiness, based on emotions, educational practices and relationships.

3. School Dynamics and Happiness

It is noticeable that an educational space can be a place of pleasure or suffering, depending on how its dynamics are presented daily to students who spend at least four hours in this environment. For Marías[4], the study can be an occupation that promotes happiness or not, but this will depend on how learning is presented.

In particular, when considering an educational space and proposing activities that provide happiness, it does not mean that the ultimate goal of education is happiness, which for Trilla[8] leads us to propose happiness no longer as an end, but as an educational means.

Dewey [9] juxtaposes in the pedagogy of happiness that is not in the how, but in the why. Accreditation that is always found that the man is involved in a socially useful activity, but whose service he does not understand and in which he has no personal interest. At school, he often acts thinking about the end, however, it makes the student's journey, his journey to the finish line, a burden, something regrettable to achieve and
without autonomy to decide.

In conjunction with families and students conforming to this educational model, they are conditioned to think of school as an end to be reached, the completion of high school to reach higher education. In this sense, they aspire to the university in an attempt to be happier doing what they dreamed of and very quickly to be compensated for the sacrifice. Guimarães, ratifies the thought, Modern man is practical. If you study for decades, it is not thinking about knowledge, but what you can gain from it, that is, in individual advantage. Hence it is worth knowing that you are linked to a profession. It is not by chance that the most competitive ones are the ones that provide more gains. If there is enthusiasm it is forged by the laws of the market.

Resuming Dewey who credits: “life does not support a passive existence, but rather a way of acting, the environment and the environment represent what influences this activity as a facilitating or impeding condition” [9]. Of that Trilla[8] recalls that it is time to claim what the new pedagogy did a long time ago to make many learning processes pleasant and pleasurable for the apprentice. situations of happiness without the need to convert classes into shows, entertainment, without transforming the teacher into an audience animator, or even making pedagogy something simplistic and meaningless. In the same logic, Trilla warns about the care to be taken with the pedagogy of happiness, states: “calibrate the fair portion of reality that is relevant in every moment” [8]. It allows the classes to have the usual route and provide happiness by using the didactics appropriate to the content, providing interaction and learning.

Goleman [13] narrates that the feeling of happiness causes one of the main biological changes, provides the body with total relaxation, as well as a willingness and enthusiasm to perform any task that arises and to move towards a wide variety of goals. It identifies in the dynamics of the school a power to use this scientific knowledge to give life to its activities, to enhance those that explore positive emotions, engagement and the sense of becoming the most satisfied and happy students, to reach the desired internal and external indexes in learning.

In representing this, we will use Maslow's pyramid of needs (1954), with adaptations by Fadel et. al. [15], to understand basic needs and their links with satisfaction and well-being. In this way, it is possible to understand what needs are capable of supporting the deepest aspirations and which would make sense of personal achievements.

![Figure 1: Maslow's Needs Pyramid](source: FADEL [15])

For Fadel et. al. considering adaptations made in figure 1, the pyramid shape shows the idea that the lower levels are more essential to a person's well-being, and that, if they are not satisfied, the needs of the upper levels will not be easily met [15].

In this context, it is inferred that the dynamics of the school is capable of promoting well-being, generating satisfaction and happiness for students, then they will be able to achieve high levels results, for find meaning in school and in their chores daily.

### 3.1 Happiness and the Thinkers of Education

The legitimacy of each student loyal to a school, which students demonstrates pleasure in being in that teaching and learning environment, certainly generates a duty of care and comprehensive training for her, especially including socio emotional education.

More than the school's relationship with its students, the school's commitment consists of the relationships it should foster among students, teachers, administrative staff, cleaning staff, etc., in short, between the entire school community. While they are not yours, there is nothing to worry about; but, if they are yours, care must be taken, according to the role of the school. For Goleman [13], emotions are important for rationality at school.
With other optics Piaget apud Taille et. al. [16]. He wrote: “human intelligence only develops in the individual due to social interactions that are, in general, too neglected”.

In this relationship, the social interactions between the school and the family, are important for human development. However, the problem of the impossibility of an active participation of the family in the education of theirs emerges, for which Goleman [13] proposes as a solution an approach on the part of schools in terms of the education of the student as a whole, that is, joining mind and heart in the classroom. This reflects the proposal of BNCC [17] when it brings the strand of socioemotional education to compose the cognitive curriculum, through the general competence, as defined “Knowing yourself, appreciating yourself and taking care of your physical and emotional health, understanding himself in human diversity and recognizing his emotions and those of others, with self-criticism and the ability to deal with them”. For the promotion of well-being at school, we cannot think only of the cognitive aspect

[...] we all have emotions, feelings, the need to create bonds and relationships with colleagues, teachers, family and friends, in short, with the world. We have moments of laughter, crying and sadness, we are faced with situations of suffering, injustices and in many of them we need to be strengthened. We are beings of relationship, full of life. There are infinite universes inside and outside of us - there is no escape from that [18].

As a result, cognition together with emotions shows the integrality of the human being, the completeness and the reinforcement of the need for comprehensive training. For Maturana[1], it is not be that leads us to action, but emotion, therefore, if we seek schools of excellence in their academic results, we must also invest in socioemotional education. Due to the marked inequalities in the country, with a good part of the families living in indecent conditions, the relevance of the school becomes decisive.

Casassus identifies an important dimension of being a human being, being an emotional being [19]. The philosopher Russell concludes: “It is amazing how men and women can increase happiness and efficiency by cultivating an orderly mind, that thinks appropriately at the right times and not inappropriately at all times” [20]. At this point, another important role of the school in the construction of an environment that promotes happiness is presented, which is teaching students to use cognition in their favor, to establish of their well-being, especially in times of network technologies taking a significant part students’ time.

The emotional education Casassus[19] explains that in a first instance leads us to observe these memories and situations in order to understand where our reactions come from and to ensure that each one can live his emotions in a productive way. However, what is expected is not the creation of a new school focused on this development or even a discipline with this focus. The light of Goleman's [13] thought would be to merge lessons on feelings and relationships with other subjects, which is the BNCC’s proposal as well.

The purpose of the statement by Casassus[19] in which emotions are feelings, brings the fact in times past, even in the most recent ones, that phenomena related to the psychological health of students were not treated, objectively in the context of the education system by schools, in general, as desirable. And the students were less taught how to deal with emotions. In many cases, they were repressed and they did not seek to know why they were experiencing those emotions.

In these referrals, safety is measured as an important component of happiness, according to Csikszentmihalyi [21], in addition to being the second factor of need to promote well-being as represented by the Maslow pyramid. For him, the security of knowing his emotions and having control over them can take children to a higher level of development, since they will know how to deal with themselves both in and out school life situations, that would happen to them. Seligman [6] adds that it is essential to find pleasure experience at school, but by itself it does not bring happiness, it is necessary to be safe to advance in positive emotions.

3.2 Happiness in Human Living

The perspective of human coexistence adopted in this study has to do with the quality of intimate networks as determinants for the happiness of the individual, pointed out by Dantas[22]. This guides the way I relate in the environments in which I am inserted, whether in the school class, in a smaller group of the class, with whom I identify most, the other groups formed in the school as a whole, in the family, etc., as well as in the realm referred in the approach to learning to live together presented at the 46th International Conference on Education of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Learning to live together, learning to live with others, means developing the understanding of others in a spirit of tolerance, pluralism, respect for differences and peace. Its central point is awareness, thanks to activities such as common projects or conflict management, growing interdependence - ecological, economic, social - of individuals, communities and nations in a world in which there are no longer geographical distances, having made more fragile and increasingly interconnected [23].

In this event, it is necessary for children and young people to learn to live together in such a plural and globalized world, vast in diversity and idiosyncrasies. It is necessary to realign the values of this society with the
The aim of the leaving well from the teaching to live together. Comer, reiterates: “when relationships improve in schools, children themselves become carriers of desirable values” [24]. I believe that learning to live together is one of the greatest challenges for peace and happiness between people and between nations. In this scenario, the role of the school through a management that transforms the school environment into a shared realm of education and training can contribute to the formation of lucid, conscious and emancipated minds, important factors for a dignified life. Joy and dignity are inseparable.

Unesco, in summary of the reflections and contributions of the 46th International Conference on Education, considers that a certain consensus is emerging among education agents in the world, due to the fact that “learning to live together in the 21st century” includes not only the dimension of “how to live together”, but another, equally essential, that is about “having the desire to live together” in a peaceful way. This implies saying that work is not enough to learn to live together, to be tolerant, for example, but to want to live this way so that there is peace.

According to Dantas[22], the fact of learning to live together is an emotional protection, as well as friendship is a source of satisfaction, because it induces positive moods, a lighter harmonic way of living life.

According to Russell, “an expansive and generous attitude towards others not only brings happiness to them, but is also a source of happiness for its owner, since it makes everyone appreciate him” [20]. Community life, just as it is at school, promotes well-being from the moment it demands an attitude of sharing life with others, of learning to live together with its pleasures and challenges.

For this, the dynamics of the school need to collaborate with the propitious environment for the promotion of this learning leaving together, in addition to broadening their horizons beyond the walls of school, because it is out there that there is a world of diverse conditions and human beings with countless needs. Robinson and Aronica point out that although happiness is an internal state, it is often stimulated through looking beyond oneself and engaging with the needs of others [25].

Russell encourages if a student knows and wishes to live together and in peace, he reveals a happy human in himself, and a pleasant company will increase his happiness [20].

3.3 Dialogue as a Facilitator of Well-being at School

In the search for the promotion of well-being at school, several competences and abilities could be inserted as possibilities for this purpose, such as responsibility and ethics. Nevertheless, dialogue presents itself as the most effective tool for aligning what is expected with what is in and at school. It determines that in an environment of teaching and learning based on dialogue, an empathic environment of collective construction is shown, positive emotions and engagement will be the result of a symbiotic relationship. The more of me in the environment, the more I want to be and belong to it, so the more satisfaction I have and the more authentic happiness I can feel.

For Freire [11], the subject who opens himself to the world and to others inaugurates with his gesture the dialogical relationship in which it is confirmed as restlessness and curiosity, as an inconclusion in permanent movement in history.

In terms of the philosophy of dialogue, the thought of Buber [26] describes true community life as one that allows each individual to relate to others in terms of the I / You relationship, and not in terms of the I-This relationship. Thus, it is the individual in relation to his fellow men, his equal. There is no dialogical relationship between the Self and the object.

The modern philosopher Han [27] states that individuals who come together in a swarm do not develop any Us, that is, if they have not developed the Self, individuality, communication one by one, it is not possible to think collectively, to realize the needs of others. This is an exercise that the school needs to provide in order to avoid the massification of people and the distance between them, because whenever there is a strong psychological repression, there is no authentic happiness [20].

In this conjecture, the dialogue aspect emerges as part of the school for the construction of happiness, a way that the alignment of intentions and realities with social beings could happen, rather than through dialogue. The school is accredited to be a social place where multiple and conflicting intentions are mixed. Hence, it becomes essential that, on a daily basis, there is dialogue to establish the best coexistence in the educational environment. According to Hameline, “in practice, when it is necessary to get up in the morning to” go to school”, it may be better to know that there are good reasons to do this” [28].

Rinaldi adds dialogue towards capacity, transformation, the idea of not as an exchange, as a process in which the possibility of controlling the final result is completely lost [29].

This author links dialogue to well-being, as follows:

This well-being is highly dependent on the quality of communication between the parties, the knowledge and awareness they have of their mutual needs and satisfactions, and the opportunities for encounter and gradual development that arise in the integrated system of communicative experiences [29].
In this rhetoric, dialogue appears as an essential element for the promotion of well-being, but it depends on the quality of communication. Environments where there is no opening for speech, or there is listening but there is no consideration, promote a false dialogue, and there is no well-being as a result. Investments should be made in dialogues that promote real communicative experiences, foreseeing the transformation of the educational environment.

It is up to the school to teach and practice to learn the dialogue, as it is a path for understanding and building consensus, providing well-being in the school dynamics and in their relationships.

4. For a School that Promotes Happiness

Today is time when children develop emotional problems, those were “adult things” before, such as: depression, anxiety, anticipated concerns about future, competitiveness and globalization. It encourages reflection on the well-being at school and the happiness of students. Children's mental illnesses need to be relieved and the pleasure of the journey towards the future to be a constant in school dynamics.

The world is changing and the school is being rethought around the world, as highlighted.

The school seeks to live with its loss of prestige and legitimacy. As it is it represents a target of aversion by adolescents and young people, if not by children. Violence largely erupts from malaise. Students agree on the value of education, but the school is unsatisfactory for them. What would the school be like? [30]

Roughly speaking Lenoir [31] indicates that happiness comes during the walk at school, when the result of the assessment that the subject makes of himself / herself as a student and the conditions existing in the dynamics of the school that enable learning, the protagonism of its actors and human relationships is positive.

In the context of globalization, Gauthier and Tardif [10] perceive education as an important vector for economic and social development. Schools seek to respond to this demand from the global economy, developing people so that this development can continue.

On the contrary, Csikszentmihalyi expresses that “the value of a school does not depend on its ability to train students to face the needs of life, but on the degree of continuous satisfaction that it can transmit” [21].

Dewey has always shown himself to be an advocate of education for well-being through the Escola Nova [9]. Among its defenses was that education that does not take place through forms of life, forms that are worth living for your own sake, is always a poor substitute for genuine reality and tends to overburden and weaken. In fact, this is what we see happening today.

Robinson and Aronica comment on surveys about parents’ expectations about their children and happiness is close to the top of their aspirations [25]. He considers that many of them subject their children to the reality of hours of uninterrupted studies in favor of a future that the son often did not have a part in choosing. Frankl defines the human being as the being that gets used to everything this is a fact during the study.

Dewey [10] perceives education as an important vector for the well-being of its students, it will not be possible to have a school that promotes happiness, it is necessary to remember that education requires intentionality and refuses spontaneity in action, which according to Aranha benefits from an unarmed spirit, willing to rebuild and open paths by force of imagination [33].

Therefore, to promote happiness at school, social commitment is essential for each educator and the mission of every school, as highlighted by Alencar.

In times of emotional abandon, anxiety, suicidal ideas, perhaps the school is the most conducive environment to promote the student’s well-being, which gives him the prospect of a better future, making him understand that, yes, it is possible to be happy in life [34].

It is noted, then, that some countries in the world show us that it is possible to achieve quality in education, good rates in internal and external assessments and well-being during their children's learning journey. In short, if each school is committed to the well-being and happiness of its students, it will not be necessary to compel them to dedicate themselves, they will do so for satisfaction, for engagement and for finding meaning in the process in which they are inserted.

5. Conclusion

As a closing, but not as a conclusion, considering that the subject is complex and there is much to be explored, as previously reported, it is up to us here, supported by Csikszentmihalyi to ratify: “Happiness, in
realidade, is a state that needs to be prepared, cultivated and defended by all of us” [21], to say that the school is not happy why each one of its students and collaborators arrive there happy, but because happiness is built, from the way they organize themselves, see the other, respect and, especially, because they act with intentionality, there is the desire that those who are living in the school environment feel well-being and pleasure in being there, there are actions to make it happen.

Based on the above, it is inferred that one must think, reflect and seek ways to promote happiness, well-being at school, based on socio-emotional education, the promotion of human coexistence and dialogue. It should be stressed that schools not only desire this environment, but that they act with intentionality and provoke happiness through concrete actions in their daily dynamics. So be it. For schools that promote happiness!
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