

A discursive analysis of the terms Обучение (Developmental Learning) and Воспитание (Education) in the Foundations of Defectology in L.S. Vygotsky (1924-1931)¹

Uma análise discursiva dos termos Обучение (Aprendizagem Desenvolvimental) e Воспитание (Educação) nos Fundamentos da Defectologia em L.S. Vigotski (1924-1931)

Márcia Cristina Barreto Fernandes de Abreu²
Andréa Maturano Longarezi³

ABSTRACT

The paper proposed a discursive analysis of the terms Обучение (Developmental Learning) and Воспитание (Education) with the general aim of verifying the conceptual field of the above terms in the writings on the Foundations of Defectology by L.S. Vygotsky (1924-1931). The methodological path was characterized by an investigation of the dimensions of the conceptual and discursive field, based on the identification and analysis of the terms: Обучение (Developmental Learning) and Воспитание (Education) in the Russian version and translated into Portuguese, through the digital translation platforms: Google Translate and Deepl Translate. In the results, it was possible to significantly identify the term *obutchénie* in the meaning (sense) of developmental learning in the texts that make up the Fundamentals of Defectology in L.S.

RESUMO

O artigo propôs uma análise discursiva dos termos Обучение (Aprendizagem Desenvolvimental) e Воспитание (Educação) tendo como objetivo geral verificar o campo conceitual dos termos acima citados nos escritos sobre os Fundamentos da Defectologia em L.S. Vigotski (1924-1931). O percurso metodológico se caracterizou por uma investigação das dimensões do campo conceitual e discursivo, a partir da identificação e análise dos termos: Обучение (Aprendizagem Desenvolvimental) e Воспитание (Educação) na versão russa e traduzidas para o Português, através das plataformas de tradução digital: Google Tradutor e Deepl Translate. Nos resultados foi possível identificar de modo significativo o termo *obutchénie* no significado (sentido) de aprendizagem desenvolvimental nos textos que compõem os Fundamentos da Defectologia em

¹ English version by Bruno Irineu Barreto Fernandes. E-mail: brunoibfrnnds@gmail.com.

² Docente da Universidade Federal do Tocantins - Campus de Arraias. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9571-6682>. E-mail: mcbfabreu@ugt.edu.br.

³ Pós-doutora em Educação, pela Faculdade de Educação da Universidade de São Paulo (2018). Doutora em Educação Escolar pela Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho (2001); mestre em Educação - Metodologia do Ensino- pela Universidade Federal de São Carlos (1996) e graduada em Ciências Sociais (Licenciatura Plena e Bacharelado) pela Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho (1992) Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5651-9333>. E-mail: andrea.longarezi@gmail.com.

Vygotsky, as well as to verify the relevance of the term *воспитание* (Education) as a mobilizer of learning and development processes in typical children, especially in atypical children.

Keywords: Defectology. Discourse analysis. Обучение (Developmental Learning) and Воспитание (Education).

L.S. Vigotski, bem como constatar a relevância do termo *воспитание* (Educação) como mobilizadora dos processos de aprendizagem e desenvolvimento nas crianças típicas, em especial, nas crianças atípicas.

Palavras Chaves: Defectologia. Análise discursiva. Обучение (Aprendizagem Desenvolvidamental) e Воспитание (Educação).

Introduction

Learning and development processes in human beings can be understood through scientific studies of the ways in which humans, immersed in culture, change quantitatively and qualitatively over time (Abreu, 2006; Papalia, 2000). There are analyses concerning the need to relativize the nature of the biological traits inherited by the individual, emphasizing the predominance of education over learning and human development. The diversity and uniqueness of developmental processes in human beings are directly linked to the social, cultural, and historical mechanisms that produce a constant movement of constitution and modification of the physiological and psychological aspects of human activity.

In Cultural-historical psychology and in Developmental Theory, the study of the concept of *Obutchénie* first considers that *obutchénie* “[...] is not the same as development.” (ВЫГОТСКИЙ (VYGOTSKY), 1956, p.449, apud Longarezzi, 2020), nor does it directly and unconditionally correspond to development; which leads us to understand that there are different modes of *obutchénie*. Secondly, because from the historical and cultural perspective, the *obutchénie*-development relationship is revolutionized by the idea that the former can drive the latter if it is organized with that purpose. For the Belarusian psychologist L. S. Vygotsky (1896–1934), “[...] the only good *obutchénie* is that which leads development” (ВЫГОТСКИЙ, 1956; LONGAREZZI, 2020).

Language, a sign par excellence, is the main mediator between the cultural and biological worlds. It is impossible to conceive of cognitive development outside the cultural world, without the use of language. Mental activity takes place through meaning-making, i.e. semiotics. Meaning-making constitutes the

expression of the relationship between the sign and an isolated reality, with another reality that can be substituted, represented, or symbolized by it (ABREU, 2006; PUCETTI, 2002). In this way, from collective behavior, from the child's collaboration with the people around them, and from their social experience, psychological functions emerge in human beings.

The processes of learning and the development of signs go through four basic stages: (1) the natural or primitive stage, characterized by pre-intellectual language and pre-verbal thought; (2) the so-called naïve psychology stage, in which the child explores the physical properties of their own body and surrounding objects, applying this experience in the use of tools; (3) the use of external signs (external operations), which serve as aids in solving internal problems; and (4) growth from the outside in (internal signs), where external operations become internalized and undergo a profound transformation. The development of a child's logic is a direct function of their socialized language, and the development of their thinking depends on mastering the social means of thought—that is, language (VYGOTSKY, 2001; ABREU, 2006). The use of signs enables human beings to develop a specific behavioral structure that diverges from biological development and gives rise to new forms of psychological processes.

Meaning corresponds to the unit of analysis that unites thought and language (word); it refers to generalization, to the specific, authentic, and indisputable act of thought, insofar as thought is related to and materialized in the word. The concept of discursive activity stems from a dialogical approach, which focuses on the interaction process conceived as a condition for subjectivation and as the essence of human social life. Language is not a reflection of reality, nor does it have a reproductive function, but rather a creative function or one of (re)interpreting reality. The concrete reality of language, as discourse, is not an abstract system of linguistic forms, nor a monological and isolated utterance—it is the social event of interaction (YÉPEZ, 1997; ABREU, 2006). The genesis and development of higher psychological processes are fundamentally characterized by interactive processes maintained with others. The constitution of thought and language is the most important factor in mental development, especially in the

formation of scientific concepts, since the content of historical experience is not only present in material tools but is also generalized and verbally reflected in language. The process of conceptualization coincides with the process of constituting thought. As language and thought are mutually constituted, the general law that guides the development of higher functions is the fundamental principle for understanding conceptualization (VYGOTSKY, 1991). The word plays the role of a means for the constitution of a concept and later becomes its symbol, both in everyday and scientific concepts.

Everyday concepts are formed through daily experience, in relation to the *social others* and to cultural goods, in an unsystematic way. The child becomes aware of the possibility that different words can offer verbal formulations and of the arbitrary use of concepts, establishing complex logical relationships between them. The child appropriates the concept, becomes aware of the object represented, but is not yet conscious of the concept itself or of the act of thinking through which the object is conceived. Scientific concepts, on the other hand, are formed from what was not fully developed in everyday concepts; they are systematized, conscious, subject to deliberate control, and generally the product of formal schooling. In the formation of scientific concepts, the meaning of the word evolves, leading to increasingly elaborate generalizations (VYGOTSKY, 2001). When a concept becomes part of a system, it can be subjected to consciousness and deliberate control—consciousness meaning generalization. An everyday concept paves the way for a scientific concept, and its descending development creates a series of structures necessary for the evolution of its more primitive and elementary aspects. Scientific concepts provide structures for the ascending development of the child's everyday concepts toward consciousness. It is in the nature of concepts to presuppose an interrelation among various concepts within a system, in which the degree of generality is the basic psychological variable. The coordinates of longitude and latitude can serve to illustrate the relationship between concepts (VYGOTSKY, 2001; ABREU, 2006). Longitude indicates a concept's location between the extremes of abstract conceptualization (scientific concepts) and immediate sensory apprehension of

an object—that is, its degree of concreteness and abstraction. Latitude represents the objective reference of the concept (everyday concepts) and the aspect of reality to which it applies.

The analogy of coordinates, as described, aids in understanding that a more generalized concept can be applied to a broader content area, serving to characterize the necessity for each concept to be situated within two continua: one representing an objective content and the other representing the acts of thought that grasp this content. The intersection of the two determines the relationships between the given concept and others—that is, its superordinate and subordinate concepts. It is the position of a concept within a total system of concepts that Vygotsky (2001) refers to as the *measure of generality*. The measure of generality determines the possible intellectual operations with a given concept and requires a certain movement within the coordinate network. Changes in the development of the structure produce changes in operations. As higher levels of generality are reached, they become more accessible to the child. The development of everyday and scientific concepts is part of learning the semantic aspect of language. Thus, the development of concepts and of word meanings is the same process and presupposes the constitution of the very higher psychological processes that underpin it.

In the intertwining of thought and language in the constitution of higher mental functions, meaning—as a unit of analysis—is a fundamental tool for clarifying the process of conceptualization from the cultural-historical perspective (ROSSI, 1998; ABREU, 2006). Meaning belongs to two different spheres of psychic life: it is a phenomenon of thought insofar as thought is expressed through speech, and a phenomenon of speech insofar as it is connected to thought and illuminated by meaning. Ultimately, meaning is a phenomenon of verbal thought or meaningful speech—a union of word and thought. The meaning of a word is not determined by thought, but by use—by normative social rules of usage, according to context (LAMPREIA, 1999).

There are three stages of concept development proposed by Vygotsky (2001), Rossi (1998), and Abreu (2006). The first stage, called *Heaps*, is characterized by

the formation of an unordered plurality—the discrimination of a heap of objects that lacks sufficient internal foundation. The meaning of the word appears as a syncretic chain linked in a mixed image. It represents a diffuse and undirected extension of the word’s meaning (or of the sign that replaces it). The second stage, *Thinking in Complexes*, marks the beginning of verbal thought functioning, where the connections between objects become concrete and factual, discovered through direct experience. The meaning of the word refers to the same objects that the adult has in mind—that is, there is identity in referents. However, the child uses different mental operations to think about the same object. The use of the same referent ensures mutual understanding between adults and children, although their meanings do not coincide. The formation of complexes is responsible for the phenomenon in which the same word may present different meanings in different situations, as long as there is an associative link between them. The word used in complex thinking is not a direct symbol of a concept; rather, it forms an image, a figure, a mental sketch of the concept. In the third stage, *Actual Concepts* or “true” concepts, the child isolates and abstracts the attributes of objects from the totality of the concrete experience in which they are embedded, through a movement of analysis and synthesis. These intellectual operations are guided by the use of the word as a tool to focus attention, abstract certain traits, synthesize them, and symbolize them through a sign. The role of words meaning at this stage is to shape the abstract synthesis of thought, thus becoming a symbol. The development of these processes culminates in the formation of concepts that begin in the earliest stages of childhood, although the intellectual functions that form the psychological basis for concept formation only become structured and developed during puberty. Throughout the process of concept formation, the functional use of the word or other sign serves as a means of actively guiding understanding, discrimination, abstraction, and the synthesis of attributes. In other words, concept formation is a specific and original form of thinking—it is a process that presupposes mastery over the flow of one’s own psychological processes through the functional use of the word or sign (VYGOTSKY, 2001).

The Fundamentals of Defectology (VYGOTSKY, 1983) lists 31 texts produced between 1924 and 1931, in which the Russian author argues that the constitution of higher psychological processes in individuals with disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders is defined by social activity. He observes that the social environment tends to organize itself in ways that create favorable conditions for the development of the typical human type, which in turn creates difficulties for atypical individuals in developing psychological functions and mastering psychological tools. Therefore, it becomes necessary to reflect on the relationships established between learning and development in atypical children, as well as on social education as a driving force behind learning processes in said children.

This research proposal aims to conduct a discursive analysis of the concepts *obutchénie* (Developmental Learning) and *восnumanie* (Education) in the writings found in *The Fundamentals of Defectology*, posing the following research problem: Is it possible to identify the concept of *obutchénie* in the sense (meaning) of developmental learning in the texts that comprise *The Fundamentals of Defectology* by L.S. Vygotsky? What is the relevance of *восnumanie* (Education) for mobilizing the processes of learning and development in atypical children?

In this regard, the general objective is to examine the conceptual and discursive field of the terms *obutchénie* (Developmental Learning) and *восnumanie* (Education) in the writings found in *The Fundamentals of Defectology* by L. S. Vygotsky (1896–1934), based on the Russian-language edition published in 1983, following the framework of Discourse Analysis (DA). The specific objectives are: to present a brief contextualization of the production of *The Fundamentals of Defectology*; to discuss the concept of Developmental Learning and the concept of Social Education; to investigate the conceptual and discursive dimension of the research corpus (excerpts) collected from the texts that comprise *The Fundamentals of Defectology* by L. S. Vygotsky (1896–1934); and to analyze the effects of meaning of the terms *obutchénie* (Developmental Learning) and *восnumanie* (Education) in *The Fundamentals of Defectology*.

Fundamentals of Defectology

Studying L. S. Vygotsky (1896–1934) means returning to the origins of the history of Psychology from a historical and cultural perspective. Although he lived a short life, Vygotsky produced what can be considered the foundational principles for the development of Marxist Psychology in the context of post-Revolutionary Russia (1917 onwards). It is essential to recognize that many of the concepts studied and researched within this approach to Russian Psychology—even today—are developments stemming from the writings of L. S. Vygotsky and his contemporaries, particularly A. R. Luria (1902–1977) and A. N. Leontiev (1903–1979). These two prominent figures, among many others, carried forward the research following Vygotsky's early death, ensuring the continuity of this vital area of historical and cultural psychological studies, which remain active and influential to this day.

The fundamental basis of the hypotheses concerning human learning and development is that higher psychological processes in human beings are mediated by language (semantic) and are not structured in fixed anatomical locations within the neurological system, but rather in complex, dynamic, and historically changeable functional organizations. This gives rise to an interest in studying the phenomenon of the establishment, loss, and recovery of functions at the neurological system level, in an attempt to construct the theoretical foundations of a psychological science that could transcend both idealist and mechanistic materialist conceptions. To establish the necessary connections on this subject, it is essential to consider not only the general relationship between learning and development, but also the relevance of Education as a driving force behind the processes of learning and development in human beings (VYGOTSKY; LURIA; LEONTIEV, 2010).

In this context of building an education based on Marxist principles, L. S. Vygotsky demonstrated a strong interest in deepening his studies on Defectology. In 1925, in Moscow, he took charge of the Psychology Laboratory dedicated to observing and studying children (people) with disabilities, which later became the Experimental Institute of Defectology. One of the main goals of said institution

was to understand the organization of psychological functions and behaviors in children (people) with disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders. As such, Vygotsky's studies contributed not only to comprehension but also to clinical care, educational interventions, and the development of theoretical work marked by its theoretical, methodological, clinical, and educational complexity. His work was grounded in carefully constructed foundations tailored to each type of disability and neurodevelopmental disorder (ABREU, 2006).

There is great diversity among the paths that learning and development processes can take, and L. S. Vygotsky (1983), in *The Fundamentals of Defectology*, dedicates himself to investigating the differences in learning and development shaped by disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders. Defectology is a field of study focused on the characteristics of learning and development in individuals who face a defect or deficit. It supports the thesis that a child whose development is "complicated" by a defect (such as disabilities or disorders) is not necessarily less developed than so-called typical children; rather, they are atypical children who present a unique mode of learning and development (KRUNEGEL, 1927; VYGOTSKY, 1983).

The studies that comprise *The Fundamentals of Defectology* were conducted between 1924 and 1931. Through his research on Defectology, the Russian author produced more than thirty articles that were later compiled into a 1983 publication. This compilation presents a *state of the art* review of the knowledge on disabilities and disorders produced in various countries, such as Germany, France, and even the United States. Framed within a dialectical structure of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, Vygotsky argues for a significant shift in both the interpretation and the clinical and pedagogical interventions for children with disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders in his time, emphasizing that social experience and education are the primary drivers of learning and development in atypical children, thus asserting the idea that learning precedes and propels development. In this view, it is not the biological or genetic characteristics of a disability or disorder that define the learning and developmental outcomes of an atypical child, but rather the material, social, cultural, and historical conditions

experienced through learning processes—conditions that can profoundly transform the constitution of the child's higher psychological functions. For Vygotsky (1983) and Abreu (2006), the atypicality addressed by Defectology does not dismiss organic maturation; instead, it places it in a secondary role by emphasizing the social determination as the central reference for the subject's development of higher mental processes.

The reading and analysis of the texts indicate that the production of *The Fundamentals of Defectology* can be divided into three distinct yet complementary phases. In the first phase, L. S. Vygotsky demonstrates a strong interest in conducting a literature review of research on Defectology, including studies from France, Germany, and the United States. During this period, he dedicates his writings to exploring the psychology and pedagogy of atypical childhood, focusing on deficits—understood as disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders—and how these relate to processes of compensation and overcompensation. In the second phase, his work shifts to emphasize the social principles underlying the education of individuals with disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders. Here, Vygotsky explores the particularities of each condition, discussing intellectual disability, hearing impairment and deafness, deafblindness, physical disability, and what we now classify as neurodevelopmental disorders. The third phase is characterized by his focus on diagnostic aspects, the features of clinical and educational interventions, and a critical analysis of the limitations and possibilities of Defectology in his time (Vygotsky, 1983).

Vygotsky (1983), Abreu (2006), and Rey (2012) state that the organic structure, the specific psychological structure, the type of development, and the constitution of psychic processes distinguish a child with a disability from a child without a disability [...] in short, disability is a particular variety—a type of development with a specific, qualitative variation, rather than a quantitative variant of non-disability. In this sense, it becomes necessary to assign to the education of atypical children the role of providing mediations that allow them to reach levels of learning and development that enable the constitution of human psychic functions. This education consists of employing

diverse methodologies, adapting and making accessible the resources of culture itself to stimulate the processes of compensation and overcompensation in atypical children.

Developmental Learning and Its Characteristics in the Fundamentals of Defectology

Developmental learning finds support in the theory of L.S. Vygotsky (1935/2013), which defends the thesis that effective learning is that which stimulates and creates conditions for development because, instead of acting only on already mature functions—without ignoring the level reached—it is oriented toward the future of development, where psychological formations are in the initial stages of construction (PUENTES, 2020). Thus, developmental learning can only be established based on appropriate organizational conditions.

Vygotsky (1996) stated that learning is not development; however, the proper organization of a child's learning will lead to psychic development. Developmental learning is characterized, in its initial phase, as assisted, guided, or regulated, and it becomes autonomous in the final stage: self-guided and self-regulated. (PUENTES, 2020). *Obutchénie* (developmental learning) is a process, a movement. Vygotsky (1996) states that *obutchénie* is a universal and internal movement, necessary for the development process, which constitutes the higher psychological function in the child. *Obutchénie* guides and stimulates other internal processes of development. Human development occurs through the formation of these connections. L.S. Vygotsky considered that the learning process takes place through the appropriation (internalization) of external, social experience, which exists in the mediators of cultural production, such as language, books, etc. (Puentes, 2020). *Obutchénie* (learning) is not a spontaneous moment in the student's development; it occurs based on appropriate learning organization conditions that can lead to psychic development (L.V. VYGOTSKY, 1996 and PUENTES, 2020).

Children with disabilities are called to actively participate in collective activities. Vygotsky (1983), Abreu (2006), and Dainez and Freitas (2018) consider that an education disconnected from social interactions between typical and atypical children impacts the possibility of developing psychic functions. Therefore, they consider social education as a dimension of school support for atypical children. This means that atypicality demands even closer, guided, and continuous forms of mediation—auxiliary resources to enhance the child's participation in collective and collaborative activity.

Through the construct of education, Vygotsky (1983) and Dainez and Freitas (2018) advocate for an education that shifts the focus from the organic deficit to the integral formation and cultural development of the higher psychic processes in the child; moving towards the constitution of mediated psychic functions. The social function, the collective activity, when transformed into a mediated psychic function performed in collectively organized activity, modifies/changes the organic dimension.

Education in the writings of L.S. Vigotsky and its characteristics in the Fundamentals of Defectology

A.N. Leontiev (1978) and Longarezi, A.M.; Franco P.L.J. (2013) state that the development of psychic processes has its origin in human social relations, in their social and cultural context, through their productive activity. For the authors, psychic processes are produced by society in the historical process of the development of language and the development of forms of social consciousness; in them, it is expressed the movement of human science and its cognitive resources. Psychic processes are subordinated to cultural, social, and historical laws.

The development of psychic processes in human beings has as its source the interactions and experiences of humans with the cultural, social, and historical context; humans appropriate, transform, and transmit the social and historical practice of humanity, transforming themselves. It is important to emphasize the role of school education in this context from the perspective of

establishing the relationships between social meaning and personal sense (LONGAREZI, A. M.; FRANCO P. L. J, 2013).

L.S. Vygotsky (1984), Abreu (2006), and Longarezi, A. M.; Franco P. L. J (2013) indicate that the process of education enables the appropriation of cultural signs and, as psychological mediators, contributes to the process of appropriation and internalization of social experience at the interpsychological level (world-nature-humans) to the individual experience at the intrapsychological level (development of higher psychic functions).

Vygotsky (1984), Abreu (2006), and Longarezi & Franco (2013) point out that education is the process through which humans appropriate culture and become human. School, in turn, is the institution socially defined as the space for the appropriation of a special type of knowledge produced by humanity—scientific knowledge. From the perspective of the cultural-historical theory, school education has as its object the development of students' psychic capacities, of their higher psychological functions, particularly theoretical thinking through the appropriation of scientific knowledge, and this premise also applies to atypical students.

Vygotsky (1997); Abreu (2006) and Dainez and Freitas (2018) argue for the organization of a social education for atypical children that is attentive to the social possibilities of human learning and development. In this sense, the concept of social education worked on by Vygotsky (1997, 2004) is configured as an innovative guideline, presenting itself as a horizon to be socially projected and achieved in the education of our children (with disabilities). The central idea is that education is seen as part of social life and as the organized participation of children in this life. Education and teaching in society, through society, and for society: this is the foundation of social education. (VYGOTSKY, 1997, p.125).

The foundations of developmental learning and developmental didactics can be located in the cultural-historical psychological principles inaugurated by Vygotsky and, therefore, grounded in historical-dialectical materialism. It is important to consider that the concept of learning and the concept of development in human beings are directly associated with the concept of education. For this

reason, we have selected for the present study a Discourse Analysis (DA) of the terms: Developmental Learning and Education in the articles that make up the Foundations of Defectology (Vygotsky, 1983).

Methodological Path

The methodological path is characterized by an investigation on the dimensions of the studies on the conceptual and discursive field of the terms *obutchénie* (Developmental Learning) and *bocnumanie* (Education) in the writings on the Foundations of Defectology by L. S. Vygotsky (1896-1934), adopting the orientation of Discourse Analysis (DA). For this purpose, we took as a device for constructing the research corpus, in the first moment, the identification in the texts of the occurrence of the terms *obutchenie* and *bocnumanie*, collecting the excerpts to be analyzed. The excerpts were extracted from the publication in Russian language (Выготский, 1983) and translated into Brazilian Portuguese by two digital translation platforms: “Google Translator” and “DeepL Translate.” The translations were carried out with the support of the research group investigating the field of developmental didactics in the production of historical and cultural Psychology. Thus, the excerpts selected for the Discourse Analysis were those in which, after discussions and analyses within the research group, the terms *Obutchénie* meaning Developmental Learning and *Воспитание* meaning Education were identified.

Regarding the excerpts, it can also be indicated that *Воспитание* (Education) occurs in 18 of the 31 texts, and *Obutchénie* (Developmental Learning) occurs in 14 of the 31 texts that make up the Fundamentals of Defectology. In the production of the research corpus, 219 excerpts using the term *Obutchénie* were collected, of which 88 carried the meaning of Developmental Learning, representing 40% of the total findings. Regarding the term *Воспитание*, 162 excerpts were collected, of which 88 carried the meaning of Social Education, representing 54% of the total findings. For the interpretation of the research corpus, French-line Discourse Analysis (DA) was used, defining Pêcheux (2012) as the main theoretical reference. In this DA perspective, the subject is the result of

the relationship between language and history; therefore, it is not the sole source of meaning, nor the element in which discourse originates; the subject is constituted primarily from their relationship with the Other.

Pêcheux (2012) states that the discursive event functions as a principle that organizes and moves the relationship between context, actuality, the space of memory, and the return of a saying in the historical chain of signifiers. The event is responsible for a saying that produces meanings for the subject (PÊCHEUX, 2012). In the discursive event, actuality (the said here and now) and memory (what was said before and elsewhere) intersect. Also, according to Pêcheux (2012), in the activity of reading and reconstructing the discursive event through memory, the implicits are mobilized and reestablished by the discourse analyst. Below are listed ten of the thirty-one texts that make up the Fundamentals of Defectology, considering the incidence of concepts and the chronological organization of the production of the texts that compose the Fundamentals of Defectology, a study conducted by SARTINI, 2024.

Text 01: 1924 [1983]: Towards the Psychology and Pedagogy of Atypical Childhood.

When addressing the schooling of atypical children, especially blind children, L.S. Vygotsky defends the need to build a synthesis regarding the characteristics of care for these children, since in his time there was a guideline for special schools for blind children, and he advocated for the necessity of joint education between blind and sighted children. Understanding that the school experience of "inclusion" favors Obutchénie.

“To overcome the antisocial nature of special schools, it is necessary to conduct a scientifically grounded experiment in the joint learning and education of blind and sighted children, an experiment that has a great future ahead. The circle of development here is dialectical: first the thesis of general education for atypical and typical children, then the antithesis of special education. Our task is to create a synthesis, uniting the healthy elements of the thesis and the antithesis into a higher unity.” (Excerpt 26, page 75).

The excerpt discusses the need for adapting Obutchénie to the characteristics of the child. L.S. Vygotsky stated that "obutchenie (learning) is not development, but the proper organization of obutchenie (learning) in a child leads to psychological development.

"Learning must be guided by the interests of the children and not against them. The specific characteristics of the atypical child should be taken as allies of their development and not as their enemies" (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 80).

L. S. Vygotsky defends the thesis that the learning and development of typical and atypical children are similar processes, and that it is through the educational process that we can build possible forms of constitution of the psychic functions.

"The education of an atypical child (blind, deaf) is exactly the same process of developing new forms of behavior, of establishing conditioned reactions as in a normal child. Therefore, the issues of educating atypical children can only be resolved as a problem of social pedagogy." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 70)

"The social education of an atypical child, based on methods of social compensation for their natural defect, is the only scientifically solid and ideologically correct form." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 70)

The cultural development of the atypical child requires study since, in general, we use the development of the typical child as a reference and as the only possibility for the constitution of higher psychological processes. In the case of the typical child, the planes of learning and development coincide and merge with the culture. It is necessary to observe the variations of atypical development as a way to convert the social and cultural context into a favorable locus for the learning and development of children with disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders.

Text 02: 1924–1927: Defect and Compensation.

The issue of compensation in the learning and development of the atypical child is related to the social conditionality of the constitution of higher psychological processes, which are established through the organization of the children's collective, in children's movement, and in sociopolitical education.

"It may seem paradoxical, but the deaf child is more likely to speak than a hearing child and is drawn to speech. Our learning progressed, and the deaf, without any education, nonetheless developed their own language, which emerged from this desire. There is the reason for our failure in developing oral speech in the education of the deaf." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 40).

Vygotsky (1983) warns of the social determination in the processes of learning and development, referring here to sign language, conceived and created within the social and cultural context of deafness. He contrasts this with the failure of the oralization attempts that were imposed on deaf individuals in that historical context.

"The education of atypical children must be based on the fact that, simultaneously with atypia, there are also psychological tendencies in the opposite direction—compensatory possibilities to overcome the atypia—which emerge in the child's development and should be included in the educational process as its driving force" (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 40).

The development of the deaf child proceeds, qualitatively, in a different direction from that of the hearing child, since it depends on different cultural aspects for access to communication, which is the essential factor for their learning and development. Education must be attentive to the necessary adaptations to meet these specific needs.

Text 03: 1928 [1983]: Social Principles of Education for Deaf Children.

Vygotsky asserts that the education of the deaf child must emphasize the establishment of language (idiom). Currently, Sign Language is considered the reference language for deaf individuals. Sign Language underpins the understanding of deafness as a cultural and linguistic difference, and as a possibility for the psychic development of the deaf human being.

"Here, the learning of speech begins with its natural potential: children's babbling, natural facial expressions, and gestures constitute the basis for the development of speech skills. Speech is seen as part of the child's social life." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 104).

The constitution of higher psychological processes is permeated by the learning of a language. In the case of deafness, the need and desire to communicate give rise to sign language. The word or the sign in sign language represents symbolic mediation. It is not possible to think of symbolic activity outside the cultural world and without the use of language. — L. S. Vygotsky.

"Learning must be guided according to the child's interests and not against them. The child's instincts must be allies and not enemies. It is necessary to create the need for a universal language so that speech can develop. Experience speaks in favor of this fact." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 111).

Defectology is based on a dialectical-materialist foundation, upon which the possibility of organizing a social education is established—one that consists of articulating the education of atypical children with the general methodological principles used in the education of typical children.

"Work, society, and nature are the three main directions toward which educational work in school is directed. I will not repeat here the well-known ideas of the school of labor, but I must emphasize that, in relation to a deaf child, education for work offers a way out of all impasses." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 112)

In pedagogical intervention for disability, it is necessary to consider three aspects: identifying where and how the disability manifests; in what way the child faces their disability; and how the school can collaborate in the child's confrontation with the differences that affect one child or another. - L. S. Vygotsky.

Text 04: 1928 [1983]: On the compensatory issue in the learning and development processes of children with intellectual disabilities

Vygotsky (1983) and Abreu (2006) indicate that atypical development in intellectual disability demonstrates that the pedagogical and psychological framework is not a homogeneous whole. The manifest symptoms cannot be placed on the same level, but as a complex structure whose driving force of learning and development lies in the understanding of the interaction between the organic and the cultural.

"On the other hand, by reducing it to elementary learning, to the reduced program of the five-year school at best, it becomes clear the limits of development, calling into question the possibility of greater learning and adaptation of the child." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p.132)

Vygotsky (1983) asserts that the variations of intellectual disability are as many as the factors of perception and internalization of the existing relationships with the social, cultural, and historical world that permeate the experiences of children. Within the complex development of higher psychological functions, various factors influence the formation of mental structures. According to the complexity of mental structures, qualitatively different types of intellectual disability are constituted. Ultimately, the more a child is stimulated and the earlier they attend school, the better their learning and development will be.

"The special school follows the path of least resistance, adjusting and adapting to the child's deficit: the child with intellectual disability has greater difficulty in appropriating abstract thinking, excluding their material for everything that demands the development of abstract thinking, and bases learning on the concrete and visualization." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 135).

One of the fundamental tasks of education, according to L. S. Vygotsky (1983), would be to discover the inner structure of the learning process - its logic of unfolding. The psychic structure of students is shown to be constituted by an underground network of processes that have their own logic and move throughout the course of school learning. Therefore, the author points out that special schools may not be the best option for the schooling of children with intellectual disabilities, since by adjusting to the child's disability, they may inhibit the possibility of access to concrete thinking, which could lead to the construction of more elaborate knowledge.

"The higher motor functions are the most nourishing because they are not phylogenetic, but acquired in ontogenesis. The results of experimental studies show that the highest psychological processes are the most nourishing because the

source of development of their structure is the social education of the child.” (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 132).

Vygotsky (1983) cites the II Congress of Social and Legal Protection of Minors, held in 1924 in the Soviet Union, as a milestone for establishing criteria for organizing teaching work in institutions for atypical children, with the task agreed upon to articulate special pedagogy for atypical children with the general principles and methods of social education for children in the Soviet school.

Text 05: 1928 [1983]: (Atypical childhood).

Pedology must establish what to study about atypical childhood. In this direction, it is necessary to prioritize the indication of fundamental concepts related to pedagogical research, namely: diagnosis, prognosis, and prescription. The creation of pedological care for atypical childhood requires the distinction and empirical and theoretical description of the elements and forms in which the learning and development of the typical child and the atypical child begin.

“There are children who experience difficulties in the educational process due to a disorder, but there is another group of children who face learning difficulties as a consequence of family education and values. Thus, the insufficiency of the ‘common base’ inhibits psychological development, preventing the child from studying at school and acquiring the knowledge that other children acquire.” (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 143)

In his studies, Vygotsky (1983) asserts the existence of a complex investigation into hereditary data and their relationships with the cultural and social aspects that permeate the history of child development. Thus, he points to the family as the core that will constitute the basis for the analysis of psychic processes. If there is a failure in this basic family formation process, the schooling of children will be impaired.

“Whereas in the past a child’s difficulty was understood merely as a system of disadvantages, modern psychology strives to reveal what lies behind these disadvantages. While old education tended to yield to the disadvantage, to follow it, the current approach takes the disadvantage into account but yields strategically to gain advantage

over it and overcome the deficiency that made the child difficult to educate and learn” (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 149).

A child may encounter difficulties within the same family and social context that can negatively influence the formation of their personality. Therefore, educators face the prolonged challenge of developing knowledge about how to intervene in the child's learning and development process to minimize the negative influences on the child's personality formation.

Text 06: 1929 [1983]: Introduction: Main Problems of Defectology.

Vygotsky (1983) points out that one of the issues in the old defectology is the fact that it relied on an arithmetic (quantitative) conception of the sum of defects, whereas in its current conception it is based on dialectics and historical materialism, which seeks the articulation between theory and practice and relies on culture and education.

"The problem of cultural development includes all the most important issues of school learning, in particular, the problem of analytical and synthetic methods of learning for the deaf. Defectologists are concerned that speech is posed as a question: whether children should be mechanically instilled with simpler elements of speech competencies, how to educate them, how to teach them to speak, and how to develop their speech competencies." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p.29)

In the case of deafness, one of the aspects that enables the psychic constitution of the deaf child is access to Sign Language as their first language. It is important to remember that Sign Language, from a socio-anthropological perspective, considers deaf culture as constructed by the deaf community—a culture different from the hearing culture.

"The child with intellectual disability, more than the typical child, needs to discover these connections in the learning process. The fact that this complex is more difficult than the "scarf" complex has a positive merit in the program, as establishing surmountable difficulties means fulfilling the creative tasks of education in relation to development” (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 32).

In intellectual disability, culture is configured as the result of human activity and social experience, as well as the substrate for learning and development. The social context, especially the school, needs to establish an organization that offers opportunities for learning and development for atypical children. There is no possibility of learning and development detached from social and collective experience.

“In order not to build on sand, to avoid the eclectic and superficial empiricism that characterized it in the past, to move from a pedagogy of medicating the illness to a creatively positive pedagogy, defectology must rely on the dialectical-materialist philosophical foundation on which our general pedagogy is based and on the social foundation on which our social education is based. This is the problem of our Defectology” (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 33).

Vygotsky (1983) investigated the learning and development of typical and atypical children, observing disabilities and neurodevelopmental disorders. In his research, he sought to highlight the internal structure of disabilities and disorders, from the origin of primary symptoms to the unfolding of secondary and tertiary symptoms, examining the nexuses and interfunctional relationships by tracing the understanding of the specificities of the singular, integral personality constitution of the atypical child.

Text 07: 1929 [1983]: Basic notions of work with intellectual disability and physical disability.

Vygotsky (1983), when analyzing the qualitative peculiarity of the type of development on atypical children, indicates that the specificity of the organic and psychological structure, the type of development, and personality are what differentiate the atypical child from the typical child; however, these are not strictly quantitative proportions, as he declares childhood intellectual disability as a singular variety, as a special type of qualitative development.

“The psychological bases of education and learning of a blind child: the main peculiarity of the internal and external development of a blind child is a severe impairment of their spatial perceptions and

representations, limited freedom of movement, helplessness regarding space. All other cognitive abilities of a blind child can function fully.” (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 183).

The positive peculiarity of the atypical child also originates, first of all, not because one or another function observed in a typical child disappears, but because this disappearance of functions gives rise to new formations that represent, in their unity, a reaction to the disability—a compensation in the process of development and learning. Atypical children reach goals in a different way, through another path, with other means, and it is very important for the educator to understand the peculiarity of the path along which they must guide the child. The law of the transformation of the "less" of the disability into the "more" of compensation/supercompensation provides the key to access this peculiarity — L. S. Vygotsky.

"The names of Helen Keller and Laura Bridgman are well known—two deafblind women who, through learning and education, achieved a high level of mental development. Helen Keller became a famous writer, a symbol of optimism. The information about Laura Bridgman is more modest, but also reliable and scientifically accurate: both mastered language, reading, writing, elementary arithmetic, geography, and natural history." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 185)

Learning significantly alters aspects related to human development and learning, and in the specific case of deafness and deafblindness, Sign Language functions as a sign par excellence, with the same role as spoken language for hearing people. The study of defectology seeks to understand the possibilities of human construction marked by a deficit, explicitly reflecting the process of modifying social and cultural (external) aspects and their impact on psychological (internal) processes. Defectology is grounded in the social determination of the subject, as achievements realized through human activity in the world (VYGOTSKY, 1983 and ABREU, 2006).

"Mentally disabled children refer to the entire group of children who fall behind the expected level of development and, in the learning

process, show an inability to keep up with other children of the same age." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 186)

A person with intellectual disability can never be presented as a person with an intellectual disability in general. It is always necessary to ask what the specific nature of the intellectual disability is; that is why there are possibilities for substitution, and it is necessary to make them accessible to people with an intellectual disability. Following up in this formulation, the idea is clearly expressed that within this complex formation, different factors are included, and that, according to the complexity of its structure, not just one but many qualitatively different types are possible.

"Therefore, the education of a child with a defect is a social education. Similarly, the processes of compensation that arise in such a child under the influence of the defect are directed primarily not along the line of organic substitution of the defect (which is impossible), but along the line of psychological overcoming, substitution, leveling of the defect, along the line of achieving social completeness or approaching it." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 183)

Social validity is the ultimate goal of education, since all the processes of overcompensation are directed toward achieving a social position.

Text 08: 1929 [1983]: Basic Points of Pedological Planning in the Field of Atypical Childhood.

By demonstrating what is common in the educational tasks for both typical and atypical children, L.S. Vygotsky defends the thesis of the need to combine educational influence with the aspirations and desires of the children.

"The general objectives and tasks of education and learning outlined by our pedagogy are at the same time the objectives and tasks of special education for atypical children. The general laws of child development and education are simultaneously the laws of development and education of the atypical child. The only particularity is that these general educational tasks are solved with the help of specific means; the general developmental objectives will be achieved as peculiar and adapted forms of learning." (VYGOTSKI, 1983, p. 191)

VYGOTSKI (1983) states that the general laws of the development of the child's organism and of their education are, at the same time, the laws of development and education of the child with difficulties. The entire peculiarity lies only in the fact that these general educational tasks are solved with the help of special means, and these general developmental objectives are achieved through peculiar ways. The study of these peculiar ways of development of the child with difficulties and the creation of special means to achieve the general educational objectives constitute the fundamental task of scientific research work in the pedagogical sphere.

Text 09: 1931 [1983]: Defectology, teaching, development, and education of the atypical child.

The teacher needs to understand that, when entering culture, the child not only takes something from culture, assimilates something, apprehends something from the external environment, but also the culture itself reworks the entire conduct of the child and reestablishes the whole course of development in a new way.

"They studied, for example, how the development of speech or the learning of arithmetic depended on the natural functions of the child, how they are prepared in the process of their natural growth, but they did not study the reverse: how the learning of speech or arithmetic reorganizes the natural functions of the student, how it reorganizes the entire course of their natural thinking, uproots and displaces the old lines and tendencies of their development." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 167).

The differentiation of the development planes in behavior (biological and cultural) becomes the starting point for the new theory of education. For the first time, the dialectical approach to child development is introduced into the problem of education. Previously, by not differentiating the two planes of development, biological and cultural, one could naively imagine that the child's cultural development was a direct confirmation and consequence of their biological development. Ultimately, the processes of learning and development depend on the interaction between biological and cultural aspects. L.S. VYGOTSKY (1983).

Text 10: 1931 [1983]: The Collective as a Factor in the Development of the Atypical Child.

L.S. Vygotsky (1983) asserts that the pedagogy of the blind must take into account the problem of cooperation with the sighted, which here reveals itself as the main pedagogical and methodological problem in the learning of blind individuals.

"Collective thinking is the main source of compensation for the consequences of blindness." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 214).

The pedagogy of the blind must take into account the problem of collaboration with the sighted. Collective thinking is the fundamental source of compensation for the consequences of blindness. By stimulating collective thinking, we can break the chain created around the defect and eliminate the very cause of insufficient development and learning of higher psychological functions in the blind child, discovering infinite and unlimited possibilities.

"Therefore, the traditional view of competition and mutual inhibition of different forms of speech in the development of a deaf person must be changed, and the issue of their cooperation and structural complementation at different stages of learning must be raised both theoretically and practically. The latter, in turn, requires a complex and differentiated approach to speech." (VYGOTSKY, 1983, p. 217)

The role of the collective as a factor in the development of the atypical child is clearly presented in the sphere of the development of deaf children, highlighting that all the severity and all the limitations created by deafness are contained not in the deficiency itself, but in the consequences - in the secondary complications that emerge - Vygotsky (1983).

Final Considerations

The proposed research conducted a discursive analysis of the concepts *obutchénie* (Developmental Learning) and *восnumanie* (Education) in the writings

on the Foundations of Defectology, achieving the proposed objectives. In response to the research problem, it was possible to significantly identify the term *obutchénie* in the meaning (sense) of developmental learning in the texts that make up the Foundations of Defectology by L.S. Vygotsky, as well as to verify the relevance of the term *восnumanie* (Education) as a mobilizer of the processes of learning and development in typical children, especially in atypical children, for whom educational processes demand closer, guided, and continuous forms of mediation, with the use of auxiliary resources to encourage and include the atypical child in collective and collaborative activities.

Work is the axis around which life in society is organized and structured. Labor activity is linked to human social life and the study of nature. Work, society, and nature are the three fundamental axes that guide educational and instructional work in school. The social, cultural, and historical context is a fundamental factor of any educational system. The school must be understood as an instrument of social education, as a place and a way to organize typical and atypical children into the life that surrounds them. Language is the sign par excellence; it is the bearer and transmitter of social experience. Without language, there is no consciousness, nor self-consciousness.

The transformation of the biological matter of the human being into a historical form is always a complex process of change in the form of learning and development, and not simply a process of organic change. In the history of learning and cultural development of the typical or atypical child, education must be attentive to observing the challenges. Life is complex and differentiated, the typical or atypical child will need to find a place (locus) as an active participant in their social, cultural, and historical context. From a historical and cultural perspective, the relationships between learning and development are concretized in the assertion that learning can induce development if it is structured considering the proposed objectives for Education.

Un análisis discursivo de los términos Обучение (Aprendizaje evolutivo) y
Воспитание (Educación) en Fundamentos de defectología de
L.S. Vigotski. Vygotsky (1924-1931)

RESUMEN

El artículo propuso un análisis discursivo de los términos Обучение (Aprendizaje evolutivo) y Воспитание (Educación) con el objetivo general de verificar el campo conceptual de los mencionados términos en los escritos sobre los Fundamentos de la Defectología en L.S. Vygotsky (1924-1931). El recorrido metodológico se caracterizó por una investigación de las dimensiones del campo conceptual y discursivo, a partir de la identificación y análisis de los términos: Обучение (Aprendizaje evolutivo) y Воспитание (Educación) en la versión rusa y traducidos al portugués, utilizando las plataformas de traducción digital: Google Translate y DeepL Translate. En los resultados, fue posible identificar significativamente el término obutchénie en el significado (sentido) de aprendizaje desarrollador en los textos que componen los Fundamentos de Defectología de L.S. Vygotsky, así como verificar la relevancia del término воспитание (Educación) como movilizador de los procesos de aprendizaje y desarrollo en niños típicos, especialmente en niños atípicos.

Palabras clave: Defectología. Análisis del discurso. Обучение (Aprendizaje del desarrollo) y Воспитание (Educación).

References

ABREU, M.C.B.F. *Desenvolvimento de conceitos científicos em crianças com deficiência mental*. Dissertação de Mestrado. Universidade Católica de Brasília. Mestrado em Psicologia. Brasília, 2006.

Выготский-Л. С. В 92. *Собрание сочинений*: В 6-ти т. Т. 5. Основы дефектологии/Под ред. Т. А. Власовой. М.: Педагогика., 368 с (Акад. пед. наук СССР), 1983.

DAINEZ, D., & FREITAS, A. P. de. Concepção de educação social em Vigotski: apontamentos para o processo de escolarização de crianças com deficiência. *Horizontes*, 36(3), 145–156. 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24933/horizontes.v36i3.685>.

REY, F. L. G. (2012). *O pensamento de Vigotski: contradições, desdobramentos e desenvolvimento*. L. L. Oliveira (Trad.). São Paulo: Hucitec.

LAMPREIA, C. Linguagem e atividade no desenvolvimento cognitivo: algumas reflexões sobre as contribuições de Vygotsky e Leontiev. *Revista Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*. Vol.12, 225-240. 1999

LEONTIEV, A. *O desenvolvimento do psiquismo*. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 1978.

LONGAREZZI, A. M. Gênese e constituição da Obutchénie Desenvolvimental: expressão da produção singular-particular-universal enquanto campo de tensão contraditória. *Educação*, 45(1), e98/1–31.2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5902/1984644448103>

LONGAREZZI, A. M.; FRANCO, P. L. J. Educação escolar enquanto unidade significado social/sentido pessoal. *Nuances: Estudos sobre Educação*, Presidente Prudente, v. 24, n. 1, p. 92–109, 2013. Disponível em: <https://revista.fct.unesp.br/index.php/Nuances/article/view/2157>. Acesso em: 25 ago. 2024.

KRUNEGEL M. *Die motorische Befähigung Schwachsinniger Kinder im Lichte des Experiments*, Ztschr. f. Kinderforschung, B. 33, 1927, H. 2. (Krunegel M. As capacidades motoras das crianças com deficiência mental à luz da Experiência, -Ztschr. f. Kinderforschung, B. 33, 1927.

PAPALIA, D. *Desenvolvimento Humano*. 7ª edição. (Bueno, D., Trad.) Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2000.

PEUCHEUX M. *O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento*. Trad.: ORLANDI, Eni P. 6 ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2012.

PUC CETTI, R. *A arte na diferença: um estudo da relação arte/conhecimento do deficiente mental*. Tese de Doutorado. Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Metodista de Piracicaba. São Paulo. Brasil, 2002.

PUNTES, R. V. Uma nova abordagem da Teoria da Aprendizagem Desenvolvimental. *Educação*, [S. l.], v. 44, p. e48/ 1–27, 2019. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/reeducacao/article/view/37312>. Acesso em: 2 abril. 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5902/1984644437312>.

ROSSI, T.M.F. *O pensamento conceitual: a subversão do simples e do concreto*. Tese de Doutorado. Instituto de Psicologia. Universidade de Brasília. Brasília. Brasil.1998.

SARTINI. B. C. *O Conceito de Obutchenie nas obras de L. S. Vigotski*. Em fase de elaboração, 2024.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. *Fundamentos da Defectologia*. Obras Escogidas. Tomo V. Editora Pedagógica, Moscou, 1983. De la traducción: Julio Guillermo Blank, 1997. Presente edição: Machado Grupo de Distribución, SL, 2012.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. *Pensamento e linguagem*. (Camargo, J.L., Trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes.1991.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. *A construção do pensamento e da linguagem*. (Bezerra, P., Trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes. 2001.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. Psicologia concreta do homem. *Educação & Sociedade*, ano 21, n. 71, 2000.

YÈPEZ, M.T. Os discursos e a dimensão simbólica: uma forma de abordagem à Psicologia Social. *Jornal Estudos de Psicologia*, Vol. 04, 39-59. 1997.

VIGOTSKI, L. S; LURIA, A.R; LEONTIEV, A.N. *Linguagem, Desenvolvimento e Aprendizagem*. Tradução de: Maria da Pena Villalobos. - 11a edição - São Paulo: ícone, 2010.

Received in November 2024.
Aproved in December 2024.