

Vygotsky's theoretical and methodological contributions to the practice and analysis of Psychology in Education

Apontamentos sobre os fundamentos
teórico-metodológicos de Vigotski para a atuação e a investigação
da Psicologia na Educação

Ana Karina Amorim Checchia¹

Celia Regina da Silva²

Elenita de Ricio Tanamachi³

Isabel Akemi Hamada⁴

José Alves Trindade⁵

Rosemeire Foltran⁶

¹ Psychologist, Member of LIEPPE – Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Universidade Paulista (UNIP), and Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7792-3124>. E-mail: anakarina.ak.ac@gmail.com.

² Psychologist, Member of LIEPPE – Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Universidade do Estado de Minas Gerais (UEMG/Ituiutaba), Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8010-6803>. E-mail: celia.silva@uemg.br.

³ Psychologist, Member of LIEPPE – Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho (UNESP/Bauru), Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5886-2215>. E-mail: tanamachi@uol.com.br.

⁴ Psychologist, Member of LIEPPE – Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3934-0171>. E-mail: belakemi@hotmail.com.

⁵ Historian, Member of LIEPPE – Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1465-350X>. E-mail: zealtrin@hotmail.com.

⁶ Psychologist, Member of LIEPPE – Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8095-4327>. E-mail: rosefoltran@gmail.com.

All authors participate in the study group on Vigotski and Marx at LIEPPE (Laboratório Interinstitucional de Estudos e Pesquisas em Psicologia Escolar e Educacional) at the Institute of Psychology of the Universidade de São Paulo.

ABSTRACT

This work was carried out by a study group from LIEPPE on Vygotsky and Marx to support the relevance of Cultural Historical Psychology, a theoretical approach that enables the comprehension between Psychology and Education to equip psychologists and teachers in their practices. It presents the approach that this study is based on, outlining four theses as a result of concise work. It proposes the dialectical historical materialism concept that enables both surpassed hegemonic concepts in Psychology that traditionally seek causes of school failure on individual process, and concepts that decline its theoretical and methodological specificities as science, in favor of reporting problems in school contexts in preference to a conceptual preparation of educational processes. This approach allows School Psychology workers a committed practice to human emancipation that will only be achieved with the surpassing of the capitalist mode of production towards creating a new society.

Keywords: School Psychology. Cultural Historical Psychology. Vygotsky. Dialectical historical materialism.⁷

RESUMO

O presente artigo foi elaborado a partir de estudos do grupo sobre Vigotski e Marx do LIEPPE para defender a pertinência da Psicologia Histórico-Cultural, perspectiva teórica capaz de subsidiar a compreensão das relações entre Psicologia e Educação, de modo a instrumentalizar a prática de psicólogos/as e professores/as. Apresenta os pressupostos teórico-metodológicos que orientam o estudo, delineando quatro teses, resultantes de um amplo trabalho de síntese. Propõe a concepção materialista histórica dialética que permite tanto superar concepções hegemônicas de Psicologia que, tradicionalmente, buscam as causas do fracasso escolar nos processos individuais, quanto concepções que abdicam de sua especificidade teórico-metodológica como ciência, privilegiando a denúncia dos problemas do contexto escolar em detrimento da instrumentalização conceitual dos processos pedagógicos. Essa perspectiva possibilita aos/as trabalhadores/as da Psicologia Escolar uma atuação comprometida com a emancipação humana, que só será alcançada por meio da superação do modo de produção capitalista rumo à construção de uma nova sociedade.

Palavras-chave: Psicologia Escolar. Psicologia Histórico-Cultural. Vigotski. Materialismo histórico-dialético.

1 Introduction

The text is based on studies conducted by the Vigotski and Marx group at LIEPPE (Laboratório Interinstitucional de Estudos e Pesquisas em Psicologia Escolar e Educacional—*Interinstitutional Laboratory for Studies and Research in School and Educational Psychology*) at the Institute of Psychology of the Universidade de São Paulo. The group consists of undergraduate students of psychology and pedagogy, as well as students enrolled in the graduate program in school psychology and human development at the university's Institute of Psychology and other universities. The group also includes teachers in basic and higher education, researchers, and education and psychology professionals.

We thank Flávia Asbahr for her careful reading and contributions to the final draft of our text.

⁷ Nossos agradecimentos a Rosa Amélia Okerenta pela tradução do resumo para a língua inglesa.

The group's purpose is to theoretically and methodologically appropriate content relevant to the relationship between psychology and education. This will enable its participants to become psychologists, teachers, and researchers. It will also help them understand their activity and respond to the ontological, gnosiological, epistemological, and logical dimensions of knowledge in general, as well as scientific knowledge itself, since academic training has not always guaranteed this understanding.

The group's work centers on studying the theories and methods of Vygotsky and Marx. Topics discussed by these authors are addressed to understand the path Vygotsky took to transform Marx's method in "*Capital*," which is lacking in psychology⁸. The central concepts addressed in Marx's work are also examined to think about research and/or intervention in education as an expression of the studied content.

These theoretical and methodological premises and the four theses, which are the result of joint research activities, comprise this text, whose purpose is to establish some observations on the relationships between the theoretical - methodological foundations proposed by Vygotsky for psychology and the processes of investigation and intervention by psychologists in school education, seeking to express the connection between the content studied and the objectives that guide the group's proposals. From this perspective, the first thesis points to the importance of reading Marx for understanding Vygotsky's works, which leads to the defense of the next thesis, according to which the historical-dialectical materialist method is the essence of the theory of social being and Historical-Cultural Psychology. Based on the two initial theses, the third proposes that Historical-Cultural Psychology transforms the content and form of analysis and

⁸ The expression refers to the text "The Historical Significance of the Crisis in Psychology," in which Vigotski emphasizes the need to formulate a method specific to psychology based on historical-dialectical materialism. In this text, the author draws an analogy between the analysis presented by Marx in *Capital*, stating that in order to have its own method, psychology will need to: "[...] create its own *Capital*" (VIGOTSKI, 1996, p. 393).

explanation of Psychology in the Education⁹, defending the need for the production of theoretical knowledge, which implies the educational dimension in the training of psychologists and the psychological dimension in the training of teachers and

educators in general, which constitutes the fourth thesis. In summary, the theses maintain that the historical-dialectical materialist method and Vygotsky's historical cultural psychology, transformed into the content of Psychology in Education, announce the theoretical-practical possibilities of its constitution as knowledge essential to the work of psychologists and teachers.

In conclusion, the text emphasizes, in its final considerations, the importance of the theory and method used and studied by the authors so that the activity of psychologists and teachers can aim to defend a new reality for school education. In addition to describing and denouncing it in its current barbaric state, it is necessary to explain it as a good for the collective life of free and universally human individuals, considering that "it is only in the community [with others that each] individual has the means to develop their faculties in every sense; only in the community, therefore, does personal freedom become possible" (MARX, 2007, p.64).

2 Group theses from the perspective of Vygotsky's psychology

The study of Vygotsky's works, at the beginning of this group's activities in 2003, took place through the exclusive reading of his texts and those of authors who, like us, emphasize the Marxian foundations present in his work. It should be noted that this was not the concern of most of the collectives existing at that time, whose readings were detached from these theoretical and methodological foundations, despite being repeatedly considered as a reference in psychology and education.

⁹ We use the terms Educational Psychology, Psychology of Education, and School Psychology interchangeably in the text to define the relationships between Psychology, Education in general, and school education, as these terms, traditionally used in the field and marked by the division between theoretical production and the application of this knowledge, do not apply to the theoretical methodological context defended here.

Such readings, which remain dominant in these areas to this day, are motivated both by a bourgeois ideological choice, which includes translations in which these foundations have been eliminated, and by an emphasis on the epistemological dimension of psychological science. In line with postmodern thinking, these readings do not question their purposes in the context of the ontological dimension of knowledge, limiting themselves to their immediate objectives. By way of illustration, we can refer to theoretical works that avoid Marxist authors; academic research, dissertations, and theses that announce, in their introduction and conclusion, the historical-dialectical materialist method, and historical-cultural psychology, but do not constitute an effective expression of these foundations.

In this framework, the continuity of our studies has enabled us to understand that it is essential both to read the works of Marx and Engels, authors who lay the foundations for Vygotsky's thinking, and to begin the process of proposing and defending theses to highlight these assumptions.

The drift between Vygotsky and Marx, which resulted in a loss of understanding of the Russian author, led us to propose the first thesis, the starting point for the organization of the group, which became the initial hypothesis of our work. With it, we argue that in order to read and understand Vygotsky, it is also necessary to read and understand Marx, and, in doing so, Historical-Cultural Psychology responds to the theoretical and practical needs of School Psychology. The thesis is justified insofar as Vygotsky elaborates his studies based on the conception of human beings and society presented by Marx in his social theory.

Recognizing the material and historic nature of existence raised questions about what and why to study Marx in accordance with the search for an understanding of psychology. This search aims to contribute to the constitution of free subjects. This understanding led us to emphasize the ontological dimension of work to understand how modes of production explain and produce the process of humanization and/or the alienated condition of individuals historically. According to Betty Oliveira (2001), addressing the historical and universal conditions of

human activity as an expression of the philosophy of being is the ontological dimension of social being in Marx. It is an unavoidable condition for the study of the concrete individual by psychology (verbal information).¹⁰

Marx conceived dialectical logic as the logic of knowledge and explanation of reality. This logic has the prerequisite for understanding reality as a particular condition in the singular-particular-universal relationship, mediating between the singular and universal conditions of humanization. The gnosiological and epistemological dimensions must also be considered; these are theories that explain the origin of knowledge in general and scientific knowledge, respectively.

Vygotsky takes up the assumptions of Marxian theory to propose a new interpretation of psychology. In his 1930 text, *The Socialist Transformation of Man*, the author relates the development of psychology as a science to the historical development of forms of social organization. He presents the individual within a given class as the object of study of psychology. This requires not only a description of personality but, above all, knowledge of the determinants of how it is constituted in the context of alienation, with a view to overcoming it as a historical achievement so that the subject can become free and universal.

To ascend to the full concrete form of this new man, we need a new psychology that theorizes the formation of the human personality while considering the real limits of the capitalist mode of production and how to overcome them. As Vygotsky (2004) wrote, "Along with the liberation of many millions of human beings [from oppression], there will come the liberation of the human personality from the shackles that restrict its development" (p. 9).

Vygotsky sought to explain this human formation by establishing, in his ontogenetic studies, the essentiality of psychological processes that had previously been considered empirically independent. To this end, he studied the relationships between development and learning, thought and language, and affections and

¹⁰ Exhibition by Betty Oliveira, entitled "A dialética do singular-particular-universal," presented at the 5th Social Psychology Meeting - ABRAPSO, Universidade Estadual Paulista UNESP - Bauru, SP, from August 16 to August 18, 2001.

emotions in the context of the constitution of consciousness and personality. He always started from real individuals with the aim of overcoming the conditions imposed by objective circumstances of adjustment and achieving human emancipation, which

[...] will only be fully realized when the real individual man has recovered the abstract citizen for himself and become a generic being in his capacity as an individual man in his empirical life, in his individual work, in his individual relationships, when man has recognized and organized his forces propres [own forces] as social forces and, as a result, no longer separate from himself the social force in the form of political force (MARX, 2010, p.54).

The demarcation of research/intervention topics, the object of psychology, and its analyses, always guided by a concern to think about human actions in the context of universal possibilities for development rather than in the context of particular possibilities, is the expression in Vygotsky's psychology of the scientific pattern developed by Marx.

This observation led us to understand that, in both Marx and Vygotsky, method is the essence of the theory of social being and of Historical-Cultural Psychology. This made it possible to defend our **second thesis**. With it, we propose that this is the great differential of Historical-Cultural Psychology because it explains

[...] reality and the concrete possibilities that exist for its transformation. The goal should be to overcome the particular conditions or circumstances of objectification/alienated appropriation in the sense of humanization, that is, in the sense of the emancipation of individuals (TANAMACHI et al., 2018, p.91-92).

The first and second theses are complementary. Initially, we should study Marx to understand Vygotsky. Now, when explaining the reasons for the first thesis, we find the fundamental assumptions for overcoming the misconceptions so often committed by psychologists and/or educators regarding Vygotsky's work in the method.

Psychologists often describe their role in education as if such a description were sufficient. To go beyond describing the investigated phenomena, the principles of historical-dialectical materialism teach us to look beyond appearances in order to align ourselves with the task of science: understanding the world in its concrete form. Psychologists must understand that knowledge is not effectively produced without explaining reality, and that it is impossible to go beyond the immediacy of phenomena without method. Similarly, it is impossible to overcome the limits placed on science by capitalist society without such an explanation.

In accordance with these principles, we must pay attention to productions that refer to the work of school psychologists and focus on pragmatic propositions about their work. These propositions take a technical approach that is detached from theoretical and methodological foundations and focus mainly on implementing intervention procedures. This reveals the absence of a theoretical conception once again.

Furthermore, in the field of School Psychology, there are frequent complaints about generalized, individualizing, and medicalizing psychological practices as an end in themselves. We therefore emphasize the importance of going beyond these complaints and explicitly state propositions aligned with the theoretical and methodological assumptions that underpin such activity. For historical-cultural psychology, these proposals must be based on the fundamentals of historical-dialectical materialism.

Understanding these misinterpretations of psychology in education was crucial to taking a leap forward in the group's studies and seeking, through the development of the theses announced thus far, to overcome this condition of training and practice of psychologists.

The systematic study of content arising from the group's needs is expressed in the following themes: the relationship between the research method and the method of knowledge specific to the objects under study. In other words, the question of proposing purposes for immediate objectives; the emphasis on the analysis and description of reality, as well as its explanation; and the analysis of

the objects and themes of investigation and intervention in the context of universal and particular possibilities of development. These possibilities are to be taken as mediators: the proposition of knowledge in all its dimensions as the main reference of the university and the prior nature of the object in relation to the subject in the research process. This subjugates the investigating subject to the investigated object. This is the proper order of dialectics. These themes made it possible to propose the following two theses, even though more content could be included.

The process of developing the initial theses confirms the necessity of adopting the historical-dialectical materialist method and its implications for historical-cultural psychology as a prerequisite for a genuine comprehension of Vygotsky's work. This allows us to understand the theory as it was developed and transform our understanding of current reality, leading to changes in the research and practice of school psychology.

These changes are represented in the **third thesis**, which announces the transformation of the content and form of analysis and explanation in Educational Psychology, creating the objective basis for the transformation of the psychologist's activity. Thus, the elaboration of the theoretical specificities of the field explains the critical dimension attributed to it and equips professionals to intervene and investigate phenomena they encounter in their work.

From this perspective, Vygotsky's research “[...] aims to explain both the constitution of psychology as a science at a specific historical moment and to propose a way for it to respond to its place in the process of humanization.” (TANAMACHI et al., 2018, p. 98-99)

In studying the historical significance of what he called the crisis in psychology, Vygotsky wrote one of his fundamental texts, often overlooked by researchers and academics in the field, in which he presents the basis for transforming the content and form of psychology, which in the context of education constitutes the present thesis. In this text, the author accurately expresses how he appropriated Marx's method and transformed it into a method of psychology. He warns of the impossibility of superimposing philosophical postulates on scientific

data and of the mechanical, superficial, and reductionist appropriation of Marxist theses by psychological science, and he defends the thesis that it lacks a General Theory, its own “Capital.” As a result,

[...] Vygotsky introduced into the reality of psychology the relationship between the individual and the human race, mediated by particular conditions. Thus, in explaining the history of the constitution of psychology, he presents important elements for overcoming its condition as partial knowledge, expressed in psychological theories, and its constitution as a general theory. In this case, the singular-particular-universal relationship has, in the various psychological theories already established, the mediating elements between knowledge in general and General Psychology as the ‘Capital’ of Psychology (TANAMACHI et al., 2018, p. 98).

When considering the dialectic of the singular-particular-universal, Vygotsky brings to psychology the ontological dimension of social being, placing human emancipation as the goal of this science. Thus, he positions it as knowledge from the perspective of overcoming current society, without limiting himself to the relationship between the individual and society in its particularity, taken as a mediator between the constitution of the singular individual and human generality, necessary for the process of humanization. In line with Marxian precepts, he states that

It is impossible to be the owner of the truth about a person and of the person themselves as long as humanity is not the owner of the truth about society and of society itself. On the contrary, in the new society, our science will be at the center of life. “The leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom” will inevitably raise the question of mastering our own being, of subordinating it to ourselves (VYGOTSKY, 1996, p. 417).

In pointing to this goal, human emancipation, both for psychology and for educational psychology, we must be aware of the limitations of the concrete reality of today's society, capitalist society, which forges selfish individuals¹¹, bound to

¹¹ This selfish individual, according to Marx, is “[...] man as a member of bourgeois society, namely,

private interests; however, these limitations cannot restrict either the individual or the development of psychological science. Thus, it is essential that both the production of knowledge and professional practice find their space for social transformation, which can only be led by individuals who are not adapted and conformed to the *status quo*, so as not to be complicit in the establishment of barbarism, with a high degree of degeneration of human conditions.

This commitment assumed by Vygotsky to Historical-Cultural Psychology as an expression of the Marxian method enabled the investigation of numerous themes that can be considered necessary principles for the investigation of psychological processes and that offer alternative theoretical-methodological paths to Psychology in Education.

A fundamental premise is the need to overcome the technical limitations of professional practice. This practice is restricted to describing reality and analyzing appearances. It is limited to considering the empirical individual. By not embracing theories of knowledge in all their dimensions—ontological, gnosiological, epistemological, and logical—this practice exempts itself from proposing work in the context of knowledge. Historical-Cultural Psychology, therefore, defines the concrete individual as a synthesis of multiple determinations whose uniqueness, according to Kosik (1976), can only be perceived in its grandeur when understood in social reality.

From this perspective, it is essential to consider that "the *praxis* of man is not practical activity as opposed to theory; it is the determination of human existence as the *elaboration* of reality" (Kosik, 1976, p. 202). Therefore, the theoretical thinking and activity of psychologists must be guided by methods of knowledge and investigation specific to their field, which must be developed during the process of elaboration. As stated by Vygotsky (2018), "If each science has its specific attributes and objectives, then it is clear that it also elaborates its specific methods of study and paths of investigation" (p. 37).

as an individual withdrawn into his private interest and his private whim and separated from the community" (2010, p. 50).

As a method of knowledge, the author incorporates historical-dialectical materialism and its main categories, transforming the method of psychology. With this reference, he proposes some specific features for the research method, namely:

- ***unit analysis method***, to replace the element analysis method, taking as a unit “the part of a whole that contains, even if in embryonic form, all the fundamental characteristics of the whole” (VIGOTSKI, 2018, p. 40);

- ***comparative genetic method***, that compares development at different ages, in the order of its genesis and not randomly. “This comparison is the main method with the help of which we can obtain our knowledge about the character and trajectory of development” (VYGOTSKY, 2018, p. 54);

- ***clinical method*** that is not limited to the study of symptoms, but seeks to identify their underlying causes, looking at the process as a whole. In Vygotsky's words, the clinical method “[...] treats the manifestations observed in child development only as characteristics behind which it attempts to identify how the development process that led to the emergence of these symptoms unfolded or occurred.” (VYGOTSKY, 2018, p. 50).

In all research methods, emphasis is placed on psychological processes, viewing them not only as products of psychological development, which allows us to understand how a given phenomenon develops in the social history of individuals.

According to Shuare (1990), Vygotsky is the creator of non-classical psychology, understood as the science that studies how the objective world of art, work tools, and industry mediates the constitution of the individual. It is a psychology that not only proposes to study the psyche, but also to understand it in order to master and transform it. It is, therefore, a science whose goal is the mastery of its object of study, defined in Vigotski's work (1988) as the constitution and historical development of the human psyche (TANAMACHI et al., 2018, p. 100).

When applied to the work of school psychologists, these principles pave the way for the theoretical development of the field, offering a path forward beyond its apparent stagnation and corporate nature. These principles give the study of

school psychology a purpose beyond the field's specific context of public, state-funded, free, secular, quality education for all.

This process ensures well-defined spaces for psychologists, teachers, and other school personnel and explains what psychology in education is. This allows us to understand the central role of school learning in humanizing individuals, the psychologist's role in education, and the evaluation and addressing of demands.

Regarding professional activity, we emphasize that psychologists must critically engage with the reality of schools and traditional psychological approaches, which are limited to adjustment. The explanation of this work gives it autonomy, authority, and authorship, as well as its specificity. This is only possible when theoretical and conceptual thinking are established within a knowledge context. It is a challenging learning process that transforms psychologists and those who interact with them rather than a spontaneous and natural consequence of investigating and intervening.

Finally, we highlight the main topics studied that are fundamental to supporting this thesis: historical development of the human psyche as an object of psychology and the debate on the object of school psychology; research method and knowledge method; psyche as a psychological reflection of reality; mediated activity as the basis for the movement of appropriation of objective reality and unity of consciousness constitution; analysis of psychological development processes; investigation of higher psychological functions; investigation of “fossilized behavior”; and the concept of the zone of proximal development. We note that these themes, although they comprise the group's studies, are still in the process of becoming systemized.

The content studied led us to the preliminary outline of our **fourth thesis**, which proposes the implication of the previous ones in the context of Psychology in Education, more specifically to address the delimitation of the spaces that belong to psychologists and teachers in the debate on the urgency of theoretical elaboration in the area. Thus, it argues that School Psychology, by overcoming its

merely technical condition, assumes its place in the practical theoretical context that is proper to it as an educational dimension of Psychology and the training of psychologists and as a psychological dimension of the training of teachers and educators in general.

The thesis begins to take shape based on a quote from Rubinstein, cited by Davidov¹², when he discusses the “internal unity between child development and the pedagogical process”¹³ (1988, p. 58) and proposes elements for us to reflect on the different approaches that Psychology and Pedagogy as sciences take in relation to these processes. According to the author,

[...] the object of psychology is the laws governing the development of the child's psyche; from this point of view, the pedagogical process is its condition. The object of pedagogy is the specific laws of education and teaching; here, the psychological properties of the child, at different levels of development, appear only as conditions that must be considered. ‘What is the object for one of these sciences acts as a condition for the other’ (DAVIDOV, 1988, p. 58-59).¹⁴

By contextualizing the contribution of these authors linked to historical-cultural theory in the field of training and practice of psychologists and teachers, Tanamachi establishes the relationship between the constitution of the object of psychology, philosophy, and pedagogy, concluding that

[...] that which constitutes the object of philosophy—the purposes (the why and what for of the process of humanization of individuals) and of psychology—the explanation of how learning and development enable individuals, through educational activity, to take conscious control of singular and universal reality, is a

¹² The contribution of these authors to the outline of the thesis in question was first presented by Tanamachi in 2006, in the text entitled *A mediação da Psicologia Histórico-Cultural na atividade de professores e do psicólogo* (TANAMACHI, 2006)

¹³Free translation from spanish: “interna entre el desarrollo del niño y el proceso pedagógico” (DAVIDOV, 1988, p.58).

¹⁴ Free translation from spanish: “El objeto de la psicología son las leyes de desarrollo de la psiquis del **niño; desde este punto de vista, el proceso pedagógico es su condición. El objeto de la pedagogía son** las leyes específicas de educación y enseñanza; aquí las propiedades psíquicas del niño, en los diferentes peldaños de su desarrollo, aparecen sólo como condiciones que deben ser tenidas en cuenta. ‘Lo que para una de estas ciencias es objeto, para la otra actúa como condición.’” (DAVIDOV, 1988, p. 58-59).

condition for school education to fulfill its purpose, that is, the effectiveness of teaching/learning, through pedagogical resources concretely organized by the teacher. Therefore, the educational and psychological dimensions must be present in the training of teachers and psychologists. Both, as sciences, are present in the humanization process (TANAMACHI, 2006, p. 73).

We propose to analyze and explain the reality of psychology in education to transform the theoretical and methodological content that underpins its practices. This will allow us to overcome the predominant views of psychology that traditionally seek the causes of academic failure in individual processes and the views that abandon psychology's theoretical and methodological specificity as an autonomous science. These predominant views privilege the denunciation of the limits to be faced in the school context to the detriment of the conceptual instrumentalization of pedagogical processes. We call this the commitment of school psychology to the emancipation of individuals (psychologists, teachers, and students), which considers singular human actions within the context of universal possibilities for development without limiting itself to the particular possibilities of current society.

Thus, we cannot understand it as a specialty, but rather as content that shapes psychologists—its educational dimension. Similarly, content related to educational psychology cannot be taken as a jumble of generic concepts to be memorized by teachers, but rather as conceptual tools that help guide and organize their pedagogical work in its psychological dimension.

The realization that this thesis does not include a set of topics as presented at the end of the previous ones shows that we are facing both a synthesis of the content already studied and the announcement of the next fundamental activities for the group. Our ongoing challenge is to go beyond the **work** of the school psychologist, considered in terms of analysis and description, albeit critically, incorporating it into the **essence** of School Psychology, possible in terms of theoretical explanation, transformed into an area of knowledge.

Final considerations

If, by the end of this text, we have managed to explain *why, for what purpose,* and *how* school psychologists need to study Vygotsky's psychology, then this article will have fulfilled its purpose of expressing the theoretical and practical activities of the study group.

Our theses emphasize historical-dialectical materialism as a method for understanding Historical-Cultural Psychology because it responds to the ontological dimension of the constitution of social being and to other dimensions of knowledge. It is urgent to understand that both the subtle disqualification of knowledge by the social and human sciences today and the apparent disregard for science in general reveal the ideological imperative present in the hegemonic thinking of Psychology in Education. This occurs to the extent that research and interventions in the field are based on theoretical, philosophical, and methodological foundations that are clearly committed to maintaining the *status quo*, which only describe and denounce reality, devoid of the perspective of reason, which allows us to know it in its matrix and totality.

In this context, the impossibility of radically transforming the established order implies the fragmentation of knowledge. It is not possible to know reality through reason; therefore, the idea of totality is opposed. Therefore, only changes with specific causes remain, and these changes do not allow us to understand the essence of phenomena, thus reproducing capitalist irrationality. According to its logic, capitalism uses all possible means to defend its permanence. Ideologically, it replaces rationalist thinking with irrationalism, which is present in all areas of society, including the economy, politics, education, labor, and so on, as well as within universities, associations, and professional organizations of various kinds.

Given this, we emphasize the need for all of us to be attentive to the theoretical and methodological assumptions underlying the investigations conducted in our research and professional practices. This ensures consistency between these assumptions and the goals defended in our investigative

processes in terms of both research and practice. From this perspective, the proposed theses argue that school psychology must establish itself as a field of study to avoid the trivialization of the profession. We must be attentive to the rationality and science we choose.

Our commitment is to collectively study Vygotsky and Marx and share topics relevant to Psychology and Education (learning, development, consciousness, affections, emotions...), analyzing and explaining what individuals (students, teachers, principals, coordinators, psychologists...) are and what they need to become (overcoming the alienating environment of the teaching and learning process) in order to become outraged individuals, capable of consciously intervening in reality.

This is still a major challenge when we aspire to a new reality for psychology and school education.

References

- DAVIDOV, V. *La enseñanza escolar y el desarrollo psíquico: investigación teórica y experimental*. Tradução: Marta Shuare. Moscú: Editorial Progreso, 1988.
- KOSIK, K. *Dialética do Concreto*. 2ª ed. Tradução: Célia Neves e Alderico Toríbio. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra, 1976 [original tcheco 1963]
- MARX, K.; ENGELS, F. *A Ideologia Alemã*. Tradução: Rubens Enderle, Nélío Schneider, Luciano Cavini Martorano. São Paulo, SP: Boitempo, 2007. [original alemão, 1845-1846].
- MARX, K. *A Questão Judaica*. Tradução: Nélío Schneider. São Paulo, SP: Boitempo, 2010. [original alemão, 1976, v.1]
- SHUARE, M. *La Psicología Soviética como yo la veo*. Moscú: Editorial Progreso, 1990.
- TANAMACHI, E. R. A mediação da Psicologia Histórico-Cultural na atividade de professores e do psicólogo. In: MENDONÇA, S.G.de L; MILLER S. (orgs). *Vigotski e a escola atual: fundamentos teóricos e implicações pedagógicas*. Araraquara, SP: Junqueira & Marin, 2006. p. 65-84

TANAMACHI, E. R. *et al.* Teoria, Método e Pesquisa na Psicologia Histórico-Cultural. In: SOUZA, M.P.R.; BEATÓN, G.A.; BRASILEIRO, T.S.A. SHIMA, S.M.B. (orgs). *Temas escolhidos na Psicologia Histórico-Cultural: interfaces Brasil-Cuba*. Maringá, PR: Eduem, 2018. p. 91-108. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36311/2017.978-85-7983-879-8.p63-80>.

VIGOTSKI, L.S. *A transformação socialista do homem*. Tradução: Roberto Della Santa Barros. In: Varnitso, 3, p. 36-44 (original em russo). 1930. Primeira Edição: 1930. Tradução: anônimo para o Marxists Internet Archive, Julho de 2004. Disponível em: <https://www.marxists.org/portugues/vygotsky/1930/mes/transformacao.htm>. Acesso em: 24 out. 2021.

VIGOTSKI, L.S. *Formação social da mente: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos superiores*. Org. Michael Cole [et al.] 3ª ed. Tradução: José Cipolla Neto, Luís Silveira Menna Barreto, Solange Castro Afeche. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1988. [original em inglês]

VIGOTSKI, L.S. *Teoria e Método em Psicologia*. 1ª ed. Tradução: Claudia Berliner. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes, 1996. [original em russo, 1982]

VIGOTSKI, L.S. O significado histórico da crise da Psicologia. In: *Teoria e Método em Psicologia*. 1ª ed. Tradução: Claudia Berliner. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes, 1996. [original em russo, 1982]

VIGOTSKI, L.S. *Sete aulas de L.S.Vigotski sobre os fundamentos da pedagogia*. Tradução e organização: Zoia Prestes, Elizabeth Tunes, Cláudia da Costa Guimarães Santana. 1ª ed. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: E-Papers, 2018. [traduzido do original russo, 2001]

Received in November 2021.

Approved in November 2021.