

Cultural-Historical Psychology and Developmental Learning Theory: contributions from the Kharkiv group^{1 2}

*Andréa Maturano Longarezi*³

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes the process that led Kharkiv/Ukraine to become the protagonist in the emergence and consolidation of historical-dialectical materialist pedagogical psychology, which was structured in the 1920s in the former Soviet Union. The theoretical study demonstrates the academic-scientific contributions of the Ukrainian city in two periods: from 1930 to 1936, with the creation of the Kharkiv School of Psychology; and from 1963 to 2024, with the founding of the Kharkiv Group. The results demonstrate that in the first period the foundations of the Psychological Theory of Activity were developed and, in the second, the Pedagogical Theory of Study Activity was developed. Both are based on and investigate the activity-development relationship; they are based on the theoretical contributions of activity; they are influenced by P.Ya. Galperin and P.I. Zinchenko; have the direct participation of P.I. Zinchenko and are associated with his ideas. It is concluded that Kharkiv's scientific activity plays an important role in the structuring of cultural-historical psychology and the theory of developmental learning.

KEYWORDS: Historical-Cultural Psychology; Developmental Learning Theory; Kharkiv School of Psychology; Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin Didactic System; Kharkiv Group.

¹ Article prepared with data from research carried out with funding from CNPq and Fapemig.

² English version by Silvia Iacovacci. E-mail: siacovacci@gmail.com.

³ Post-doctorate in Education (USP). PhD in School Education (UNESP). Federal University of Uberlândia, Uberlândia, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5651-9333>. E-mail: andrea.longarezi@gmail.com.

*Psicologia histórico-cultural e Teoria da Aprendizagem
Desenvolvimental: contribuições do grupo de Kharkiv*

RESUMO

O artigo analisa o processo que leva Kharkiv/Ucrânia a protagonizar o cenário de emergência e consolidação da psicologia pedagógica materialista histórico-dialética, estruturada nos anos de 1920 na ex-União Soviética. O estudo teórico demonstra as contribuições acadêmico-científicas da cidade ucraniana em dois períodos: de 1930 a 1936, com a criação da Escola de Psicologia de Kharkiv; e de 1963 a 2024, com a fundação do Grupo de Kharkiv. Os resultados demonstram que no primeiro período são elaboradas as bases da Teoria Psicológica da Atividade e, no segundo, desenvolve-se a Teoria Pedagógica da Atividade de Estudo. Ambos se fundamentam e investigam a relação atividade-desenvolvimento; se baseiam nos aportes teóricos da atividade; são influenciados por P.Ya. Galperin e P.I. Zinchenko; contam com a participação direta de P.I. Zinchenko e estão associados às suas ideias. Conclui-se que a atividade científica de Kharkiv tem papel importante na estruturação da psicologia histórico-cultural e da teoria da aprendizagem desenvolvimental.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Psicologia Histórico-Cultural; Teoria da Aprendizagem Desenvolvimental; Escola de Psicologia de Kharkiv; Sistema didático Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin; Grupo de Kharkiv.

*Psicología Histórico-Cultural y Teoría del Aprendizaje del
Desarrollo: contribuciones del grupo de Kharkiv*

RESUMEN

El artículo analiza el proceso que llevó a Kharkiv/Ucrania a convertirse en protagonista del surgimiento y consolidación de la psicología pedagógica materialista histórico-dialéctica, que se estructuró en la década de 1920 en la antigua Unión Soviética. El estudio teórico demuestra las contribuciones académico-científicas de la ciudad ucraniana en dos periodos: de 1930 a 1936, con la creación de la Escuela de Psicología de Kharkiv; y de 1963 a 2024, con la fundación del Grupo Kharkiv. Los resultados muestran que en el primer periodo se sentaron las bases de la Teoría Psicológica de la

Actividad y en el segundo se desarrolló la Teoría Pedagógica de la Actividad del Estudio. Ambas se basan e investigan la relación actividad-desarrollo; se basan en las aportaciones teóricas de la actividad; están influidas por P.Ya. Galperin y P.I. Zinchenko; cuentan con la participación directa de P.I. Zinchenko y están asociadas a sus ideas. La conclusión es que la actividad científica de Kharkiv desempeñó un papel importante en la estructuración de la psicología histórico-cultural y la teoría del aprendizaje del desarrollo.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Psicología Histórico-Cultural; Teoría del Aprendizaje del Desarrollo; Escuela de Psicología de Kharkiv; Sistema Didáctico Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin; Grupo de Kharkiv.

* * *

Introduction

The cultural-historical approach was born in the midst of the Russian Revolution, in the 1920s, at a time when psychology was undergoing profound changes. In addition to L.S. Vigotsky, such psychologists as S.L. Rubinstein, A.R. Luria, G.D. Lukov, V.I. Asnin, A.N. Leontiev, A.V. Zaporozhets, L.I. Bozhovich, P.I. Zinchenko, etc. participated in the extensive and complex experimental work that led to the formulation of a new psychology. The production that characterized psychology in this period was underlined by the various political movements and was constituted in the midst of the changes that the various countries of the former Soviet Union experienced in the decades following the 1917 revolution.]

Developmental learning emerged decades later, in the 1950s, in the face of the need to structure an educational program oriented to the society shaped by the political-economic-cultural conditions that emerged after the revolution. The construction of a new approach in the field of school education resulted from the joint and interdisciplinary work of many teams of philosophers, physiologists, philologists, psychologists,

didactics, methodologists and professors working in different provinces of the former Soviet Union, including Moscow, Tula, Kharkiv, Riga, Kiev, Volgograd, Dushanbe, Tula, Tomsk, Leningrad, Kalinin, Gorki, Omsk, and others. In this context, Moscow (capital of Russia) and Kharkiv (capital of Ukraine from 1919 to 1934) stand out as centers of experimental studies.

In the case of Moscow, the important role it played in the process of establishing and consolidating both cultural-historical psychology and the theory of developmental learning has been recognized. From a historical point of view, this can be emphasized for many reasons. Moscow represents:

- (1) the cradle of the first theses on the relationship between education, learning, and development, which underpinned the foundations of the psychology that emerged in the revolutionary period;
- (2) The place where the first general laws of development were formulated from a historical-dialectical materialist perspective;
- (3) the first source of experimental and laboratory studies carried out by psychologists who worked intensively to develop a new psychology;
- (4) the place where the first school experiments were born;
- (5) a space that managed to encompass studies guided by different didactic approaches and that included experiments that led to the construction of the three most widespread alternative developmental didactic systems;
- (6) a movement of expansion of experimental activities that reaches a significant number of classes of students;
- (7) a place that begins to structure laboratory schools;
- (8) the site of the experimental establishment of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, which was granted the status of "Moscow Experimental School ¹ 91 of the Russian Academy of Education" by the Ministry of Education.

Kharkiv, on the other hand, had more timid public recognition. The innovative and creative work carried out in the former Ukrainian capital was not as widespread as that in Moscow, but it was extremely important for research in the field of the activity approach in pedagogical psychology, both from a psychological and didactic perspective. Its prominence is expressed, in particular, by the research carried out which played a crucial role in the constitution and consolidation of this theoretical and methodological field at different historical moments: in the 1930s and the 1960s. Two time frames, separated by just over 30 years (1931 and 1963), record periods marked by the active work of researchers that lead to the establishment of important psychological and didactic schools, guided by historical-dialectical materialism.

Knowledge of Kharkiv's contributions in both periods and, in particular, of the historical, epistemological, theoretical and methodological connections between them is taken up here as an object; especially as it is still incipient in Brazil and a demand for research in the area.

The article, although an introductory study on the subject, seeks to give visibility to the important work carried out in the former capital of Ukraine, with a view to analyzing the process that placed it in the scenario of the emergence and consolidation of historical-dialectical materialist pedagogical psychology. It aims to highlight the importance of Kharkiv in the academic-scientific circuit that led to the emergence of a new psychology and a developmental perspective on education.

The text, the result of theoretical research, brings together historical events, as well as points of interest, objects of study and theoretical-methodological approaches that indicate the contributions of the work carried out in Kharkiv to the constitution and consolidation of cultural-historical psychology and the theory of developmental learning.

Kharkiv's participation in the history of building this new psychological and didactic perspective, identified in the 1930s and 1960s

respectively, is portrayed here in two parts: (1) the Kharkiv School of Psychology (1930-1936) and (2) the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin Teaching System: Kharkiv Group (1963-2024).

Kharkiv School of Psychology (1930-1936)

The first moment when the Ukrainian city played a leading role in the emergence of a new psychology of Soviet origin can be traced back to the 1930s, with the solid work of a group of Soviet psychologists, which gave rise to the so-called Kharkiv School of Psychology.

The history of the formation of this school takes us back to the late 1920s and early 1930s, which were marked by the actions of the Stalinist government, which strongly opposed both the "dialecticians", called "Menshevik idealists" by Y. Stalin (members of A.M. Deborin's group), and the mechanistic materialists (led by A.K. Timiryazev). But the vulgar materialists, led mainly by P.F. Yudin and M.B. Mitin, came to power. This led to the downfall of the Deborinists, which greatly affected the historical-dialectical materialist psychology in the ascendancy.

Since L.S. Vygotsky's philosophical conceptions were close to the Deborinist perspective, his work was greatly affected, and the Academy of Communist Education, considered to be the stronghold of L.S. Vygotsky's group, was discredited in 1930. The Faculty of Social Sciences, declared "Trotskyist" in 1931, was renamed an institute and exiled to Leningrad. Many scientific and educational institutions were closed.

J. Stalin established a persecution state in Moscow, which led to the dismissal of several psychologists and the exclusion of psychology as a discipline at Moscow University. With the closure of institutions and laboratories in Moscow, L.S. Vygotsky, A.R. Luria, A.N. Leontiev, L.I. Bozhovich, A.V. Zaporozhets, M.S. Lebedinsky, and several other unemployed or persecuted psychologists were invited by S.I. Kantorovich, the commissar for psychology at Moscow University. Kantorovich, the

Ukrainian People's Health Commissar, invited them to join the psychoneurological center that was being created at the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Institute, which became the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy in Kharkiv in 1932.

In this scenario, the Kharkiv School of Psychology was born with the participation of a significant number of specialists in various fields (philosophy, psychology, medicine, etc.), most of whom came from Moscow. In addition to L.S. Vigotski, the group included A.N. Leontiev, A.V. Zaporozhets, L.I. Bozhovich, T.O. Ginevskaya, K.E. Khomenko, A.R. Luria, P.I. Zinchenko, P.Ya Galperin, A. I. Rosenblum, G. D. Lukov, V. I. Asnin, V. V. Mistyuk, L. I. Kotlyarova, E. V. Gordon, G. V. Mazurenko, O. M. Kontsevaya, T. I. Titarenko, M. S. Lebedinsky, L. L. Rokhlin, etc.

The move of A.N. Leontiev, A.R. Luria and L.I. Bozhovich to Ukraine in 1931 marked the beginning of the rise of the Kharkiv school. L.S. Vygotsky, on the other hand, did not settle in the Ukrainian city, although he actively participated in the group's activities in Kharkiv and was appointed head of the Department of Genetic Psychology at the State Personnel Training Institute of the People's Commissariat for Health of the SSR/Ukraine (Vigodskaia; Lifanova, 1996).

The political situation of the time was the main reason for the mobilization that led to the establishment of this important research center, and the work done during this period shaped Soviet psychology, given the course of the research conducted by the group. This research was connected with the newly created psychiatric center at the Professor Rokhlin Hospital. The group there shared an apartment rented by Professor Rokhlin for the so-called Moscow Commune. Gradually the group grew to include not only Russians but also Ukrainians.

Under the leadership of A.N. Leontiev, the Kharkiv Psychological School included postgraduate students from the Pedagogical Institute and the Pedagogical Research Institute, when A.V. Zaporozhets, T.O. Ginevskaya, P.Ya. Galperin, P. I. Zinchenko, V. I. Asnin, G. D. Lukov, K. E. Khomenko, V.

V. Mistyuk, L. I. Kotlyarova, D. M. Dubovis-Aranovskaya, E. V. Gordon, G.V. Mazurenko, O.M. Kontsevaya, A.N. Rosenblum, T.I. Titarenko, I.G. Dimanshtein, Solomakhina and F.V. Bassin.

Over time, A.R. Luria divided his time between Moscow and Kharkiv; L.S. Vygotsky divided his time between Moscow, Kharkiv, and Leningrad; and L.I. Bozhovich moved from Kharkiv to Poltava, although he continued to work with the group. A.N. Leontiev, however, settled in Kharkiv, where he lived for almost 5 years and established himself as the head of the department and a full member of the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy; after A.R. Luria's final departure, he became responsible for the entire psychology sector.

The move of A.N. Leontiev, A.R. Luria and L.I. Bozhovich to Ukraine in 1931 marked the beginning of the rise of the Kharkiv school. L.S. Vygotsky, on the other hand, did not settle in the Ukrainian city, although he actively participated in the group's activities in Kharkiv and was appointed head of the Department of Genetic Psychology at the State Personnel Training Institute of the People's Commissariat for Health of the SSR/Ukraine (Vigodskaia; Lifanova, 1996).

The political situation of the time was the main reason for the mobilization that led to the establishment of this important research center, and the work done during this period shaped Soviet psychology, given the course of the research conducted by the group. This research was connected with the newly created psychiatric center at the Professor Rokhlin Hospital. The group there shared an apartment rented by Professor Rokhlin for the so-called Moscow Commune.

Gradually the group grew to include not only Russians, but also Ukrainians.

Under the leadership of A.N. Leontiev, the Kharkiv School of Psychology included postgraduate students from the Pedagogical Institute and the Pedagogical Research Institute, when A.V. Zaporozhets, T.O. Ginevskaya, P.Ya. Galperin, P. I. Zinchenko, V. I.

Asnin, G. D. Lukov, K. E. Khomenko, V. V. Mistyuk, L. I. Kotlyarova, D. M. Dubovis-Aranovskaya, E. V. Gordon, G.V. Mazurenko, O.M. Kontsevaya, A.N. Rosenblum, T.I. Titarenko, I.G. Dimanshtein, Solomakhina and F.V. Bassin.

Over time, A.R. Luria divided his time between Moscow and Kharkiv; L.S. Vygotsky divided his time between Moscow, Kharkiv, and Leningrad; and L.I. Bozhovich moved from Kharkiv to Poltava, although he continued to work with the group. A.N. Leontiev, however, settled in Kharkiv, where he lived for almost 5 years and established himself as the head of the department and a full member of the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy; after A.R. Luria's final departure, he became responsible for the entire psychology sector.

This period was marked by a rift between A.N. Leontiev and L.S. Vygotsky. A.N. Leontiev and L.S. Vygotsky. While A. N. Leontiev in Kharkiv emphasized the place of practical activity in the process of human constitution, L. S. Vygotsky in Leningrad emphasized speech as the constitutive unit of consciousness, at which point he strengthened his bond with D. B. Elkonin (Longarezi; Franco, 2013; 2015). The work coordinated by A. N. Leontiev focused on the communicative process through human activity, and that of L. S. Vygotsky on the problem of the unity of affect and intellect, presenting the meaning/word as the unity of consciousness (unity between thought and speech). Although L.S. Vygotsky did not reject the activity approach from this point of view, he emphasized language as a signal for the communication of consciousness (Vygotski, 1999).

There are two lines of thought that guided the work of L.S. Vygotsky in the 1930s, as he moved between Moscow, Kharkiv and Leningrad, and A.N. Leontiev, at the head of the Kharkiv School. The first (from the perspective of L.S. Vygotsky) points to affective tendencies, emotions, and feelings in the relationship between the constitution of consciousness and the unity of communication-consciousness; and the

second (based on A.N. Leontiev) emphasizes practical activity, objective action, and the unity of activity-consciousness (Leontiev; Leontiev; Sokolova, 2005).

The distance of the Kharkiv School of Psychology from Vygotsky's thought is yet another indication of the diversity that characterizes the history of the constitution of cultural-historical psychology, built on theories expressed by different interpretations, with peculiarities that give identity to the approaches developed since then by different generations: 1) activity theory, 2) personality theory, 3) subjectivity theory, 4) the 3rd generation of activity theory, 5) macrocultural macroculturalpsychology, 6) radical-local teaching and learning, 7) the clinical approach to activity, among others (Longarezi, 2023a).

The history of a little more than a century of development of this psychological and didactic approach, which leads in different directions, is marked by political and ideological situations; it also reveals the importance of the work of the Kharkiv School of Psychology in the first half of the 1930s.

The activities of this group were interrupted in 1936 when the Central Committee issued a decree ending the work of pedologists in schools and abolishing pedology as a discipline. What had begun in 1930 with the Behavioral Congress and in 1931 with the First Psychotechnical Congress of the AII-Union, held in Leningrad, was intensified in 1932 by strong attacks on pedology. Psychology, which at that time was connected with pedology, faced serious consequences. The decree imposed a new approach to the field with the unification of the behavioral sciences, determined to be guided by the Marxist-Leninist perspective. The regulations imposed by the decree affected psychology and had a significant impact on production at the time. As a result, the Kharkiv School of Psychology was dismissed, although its approach already expressed distance and, to a certain extent, opposition to L.S. Vygotsky's

interpretation of pedology, from which it was presented as a synthesis of various sciences (physiology, defectology, psychology, and pedagogy).

Thus, the Kharkiv Psychological School (1930-1936) played an important role in the elaboration of the general theses of the Psychological Theory of Activity systematized by A.N. Leontiev in Moscow after the dissolution of the group. The work carried out in this school emphasizes the studies of the relationship between activity and consciousness, which define the foundations of the theory of activity. In other words, the Kharkiv School of Psychology developed the core foundations of Leontyev's theory. In this sense, the genesis of the theory, which was widely disseminated and guided important developmental didactic systems developed later, can be traced back to the research of this school; which, in our opinion, expressively marks one of Kharkiv's first and most decisive contributions to the circuit of Soviet psychology and didactics.

Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system: Kharkiv Group (1963-2024)

Almost three decades later, in the early 1960s, the activities in Kharkiv marked another moment of contributions to the cultural-historical approach, now expressed in the field of developmental learning theory, especially in the context of the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system. This educational perspective is characterized by its heterogeneous nature and can be understood in different variants, including the Kharkiv one. In view of this complexity, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the scenario of the emergence of the Kharkiv group (1963-2024).

Cultural-historical psychology, based on historical-dialectical materialism, spread and consolidated in several Soviet republics and remained active even after the untimely death of L.S. Vygotsky in 1934. This perspective reached the school through a series of experimental studies aimed at structuring a new educational program. Some experimental learning models implemented were structured solely on the

basis of the central theses of Vygotsky's psychology, others were also based on the foundations of the Psychological Theory of Activity from the perspective of A.N. Leontiev.

The first experimental initiative in educational institutions was carried out in 1957 in Moscow, in the school ¹ 172. Under the coordination of L.V. Zankov and with the cooperation of Professor N.V. Kuznetsova, the work began with only one class of students, but underwent a significant expansion, reaching several schools in more than 50 territories, regions and autonomous republics of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR). The result of 20 years of experimental activity of L.V. Zankov led to the construction of the didactic system of the same name (see: Longarezi, 2023b), whose approach is essentially based on the cultural-historical psychology guided by L.S. Vygotsky.

In addition to L.V. Zankov, the Moscow psychologists D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davidov can be considered pioneers of this work in school institutions. They began to conduct large-scale experiments in Russian schools a year after L.V. Zankov's first experiments in School No. 172. They were soon joined by P. Ya. Galperin, G. F. Talízina, V. V. Repkin, Y. Lompscher, and others. They are expressively oriented to the Lontivian perspective of activity.

The work begun at the end of the 1950s expanded considerably and began to be carried out in Moscow, Tula, Kharkiv, Riga, Kiev, Volgograd, Dushanbe, Tula, Tomsk, Leningrad, Kalinin, Gorki, Omsk, Berlin, and elsewhere. This growth was accentuated from 1958 with the promulgation of the resolution "On the Work of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the Transcaucasian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFST) and on the Strengthening of its Relations with Schools and Pedagogical Research Centers". The established guidelines promote a rapprochement between research centers and primary schools and lead to a significant expansion of laboratory schools.

The efforts of the various teams led to the structuring of more than 20 teaching systems. The Zankov, Galperin-Talízina and Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin systems (see more in Puentes; Longarezi, 2020; Longarezi, 2020; Longarezi; Puentes, 2023) can be considered the most famous. The work of the Kharkiv group, starting in 1963, is in the context of the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin system, so we will focus on it.

Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system

Following the efforts of the Kharkiv group to create this system, the Ukrainian city once again became the protagonist in the emergence and consolidation of the cultural-historical approach, but this time with a focus on the processes of school education, which gave rise to theories of developmental learning, in particular the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin system.

The first experimental work on classes of students within the framework of this system was carried out in the city of Moscow and conducted by D.B. Elkonin. The almost simultaneous inclusion of V.V. Davidov gives him the prerogative of having participated from the very beginning in the elaboration and experimentation of the concept, structure, objective, and content of study activity, which as a theory constitutes the core of this didactic system. This educational perspective is based on the psychological theory of study activity developed by A.N. Leontiev.

With the expansion of experimental activities, the group also included V.I. Slobodchikov, A.K. Márkova, A.I. Aidarova, L.A. Radzikhosky, A.Z. Zak, L.A. Ponomariev, K.V. Bardin, E.E. Shuleshko, E.A. Faraponova, K.P. Maltseva and P.M. Iakobson, among others. Maltseva and P.M. Iakobson, among others. It was also necessary to create special experimental institutions. Moscow School No. 91, the first of them, was transformed into the experimental institute of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and became the central laboratory of the system. Moscow was established as one of the main research centers responsible

for this new educational program, and D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davidov were its forerunners.

The power of the work projected the system internationally. The studies led by D.B. Elkonin's team launched a series of experiments and pushed the boundaries. With the support and guidance of various psychologists, didacticians, methodologists, philologists, linguists, and professors, the experiments reached various provinces of the former Soviet Union. The work of groups in Moscow, Kharkiv, Kiev, Riga, Tula, Berlin, etc. led to the creation of variants of the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system.

In this scenario, Kharkiv stands out as one of the most powerful groups with innovative and creative contributions to this new educational program, and for this reason it is not an "arm" of the Moscow group, but has its own "body". Schools #4 and #17 in Kharkiv, along with School #91 in Moscow, became the main centers where the new educational system was born and shaped (Repkin; Repkina, 2018a).

This contextualization sets the scene in which, thirty years later, in the context of the development of a new psychology, the former capital of Ukraine once again occupies the leading role in the history of the emergence and consolidation of the psychological and pedagogical approach that emerged from L.S. Vigotki's school.

The group from Kharkiv

The Kharkiv Group, founded in 1963, took shape when it took up the problem of developmental learning as the central focus of the work of the team at the Kharkiv Pedagogical Institute. The first studies were carried out by graduate students, including V.V. Repkin, F.G. Bodanski, and G.K. Sereda, in a joint effort with elementary school professors from School No. 62, which was later expanded to include Schools No. 17 and 4 in Kharkiv. To these efforts was added the work of the research laboratory established at the

Pedagogical Institute under the direction of F.G. Bodansky with the participation of P.S. Zhedek, A.I. Aleksandrova, A.M. Zakharova, Y.P. Barkhaev, etc. (Davidov, 1997).

The creation of the group, which was strongly influenced by the ideas of A. N. Leontiev, P. Ya. Galperin and P. I. Zinchenko, was the initiative of V. V. Repkin, who moved to Kharkiv at the invitation of P. I. Zinchenko to pursue his postgraduate studies. The former student of P. Ya. Galperin and former supervisor of A.N. Leontiev, together with his wife G. Repkina, joined the work carried out in Kharkiv and became the research partner of P.I. Zinchenko (Repkina, 2023).

The genesis of the studies of V.V. Repkin in the Ukrainian city is closely connected with the active research work of P.I. Zinchenko, although it bears traces of the thinking of P.Ya. Galperin and A.N. Leontiev. The partnership with P.I. Zinchenko was especially decisive for the young couple V. Repkin and G. Repkina to make the study activity an object of research. V. Repkin and G. Repkina. Repkina.

The central problem that had accompanied P.I. Zinchenko's studies since the 1930s (the relationship between memory and activity) was developed at the Kharviv School of Psychology under the influence of its head, A.N. Leontiev. In the early 1960s, when he invited V.V. Repkin and G. Repkina to participate in his research as postgraduate students, he planned to expand the study beyond laboratory experiments. At that time, he was interested in studying the relationship between involuntary memory and the learning activity of schoolchildren. V. V. Repkin's teaching experience seemed fundamental to this new phase of study, which involved conducting natural experiments (in classrooms), and it was in this context that V. V. Repkin adopted developmental learning as the focus of his research (Repkina, 2023).

V. V. Repkin's approach to D. B. Elkonin and V. V. Davidov came later, when their research had already begun in Kharkiv. The task of launching the project at the school was a big one, and V.V. Repkin

approached them on P.P.'s recommendation. V. Repkin approached her on the recommendation of P. Ya. Galperin. Both had already done similar work in Moscow to lay the foundations for the construction of the Activity Theory of Study (Longarezi; Puentes, 2023).

V. V. Repkin's meeting with P. I. Zinchenko and P. Ya. Gaperin was fundamental for the creation of the Kharkiv group, as well as the subsequent contact with the ideas experimented with by D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davidov in Moscow. Thus, the circle of dialogue between V.V. Repkin and G.V. Repkina with A.N. Leontiev, P. Ya. Gaperin, P.I. Zinchenko, D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davidov.

This seems to us to be one of the main links between the Kharkiv School of Psychology of the 1930s and the group created in the 1960s. Both were connected with the work and ideas of P.I. Zinchenko, P. Ya. Galperin and A. N. Leontiev. The presence and influence of P.I. Zinchenko, who was an active member of the Kharkiv School of Psychology (1931), as well as the research that formed the basis for the activities of the Kharkiv Group, created three decades later (1963), stand out in this context.

In addition to the influences of its main interlocutors, the strand that emerges from the variant of the system produced in Kharkiv has an authorial perspective that marks the identity of the Ukrainian group, especially through the creative work coordinated by V.V. Repkin. They take as their perspective the relationship between study activity - subject/personality. The experimental process initiated by the group is not an extension of the work carried out in Moscow.

It's not surprising that V.V. Repkin's initial research in the Kharkiv group sought to understand the role of memory in learning, taking as a reference the research of P.I. Zinchenko. However, the focus was now on this process in the context of school education, and the research concentrated on studying the relationship between memory and learning in the context of study activity.

Therefore, in this new phase (from the 1960s), the Kharkiv Group turned its attention to experimenting with a new educational program, based on an approach in which it was important to study the type of study activity that, as a condition of its realization, allowed the subject and personality of study to emerge and develop. This is an important perspective that ensures the identity of the group, its focus of interest, its experimental activity and its delimitation of the content, objective, and structure of the study activity.

Unlike the Moscow group, which studied the development of theoretical thinking in the condition of study activity, the Kharkiv group focused on studying the conditions of development of the subject who can think theoretically (Asbhar; Longarezi, 2022).

Its first activities began with only a few people, V.V. Repkin, G.V. Repkina, F.G. Bodanski and G.K. Sereda, in addition to the collaboration of P.I. Zinchenko. Gradually, members of the Kharkiv Pedagogical Institute were included, P. Zhedek, Y. Barkhaev, E. Aleksandrova, etc. By the end of the 1960s there were about 15 researchers, plus postgraduate students of V.V. Repkin (N.I. Matveeva, I.I. Veshtak, V.T. Dorokhina), as well as Ph.D. students, including P.S. Zhedek and O.K. Dusavytskyi.

The entry of the Soviet and Ukrainian psychologist, Doctor of Psychological Sciences, O.K. Dusavytskyi was important, among other things, for the experimental work he conducted on the study of cognitive interests and personality development, which is central to the scope of the Kharkiv Perspective. His longitudinal studies of personality development correlated with the organization of study activity with young people aged 7 to 17 (Dusavytskyi, 1996a; 1996b; 2012; 2014), led him to determine the psychological regularities of personality development under the conditions of special training in study activity.

Official activities in the field of developmental learning were suspended in 1983-1987, when the laboratory of V.V. Davidov in Moscow and the experimental work of the Kharkiv group were closed by the Soviet

government authorities and the program of developmental learning was banned. It wasn't until five years later, in 1988, that the situation in the country changed and V.V. Repkin resumed his research. V. Repkin resumed his interrupted research. At that time he devoted himself to discovering the possibilities and conditions for spreading the system of developmental education in mass schools (Repkina, 2023).

V. V. Repkin worked intensively on the development of the system and joined the laboratory of the Institute of Pedagogical Innovations at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in Moscow, but didn't stay long. With the end of the Soviet Union in 1991, Ukraine became an independent country. V.V. Repkin and the Kharkiv group left the Moscow laboratory and founded the Independent Scientific and Methodological Center for Developmental Learning in Kharkiv. The work, now concentrated on the Ukrainian territory, brings developmental learning to the mass school and expands to Lugansk, Tomsk and Samara, where developmental learning centers are created with the personal support of V.V. Repkin.

For 60 years the activity of the group was uninterrupted. Despite the comings and goings caused mainly by political circumstances, its members have maintained active experimental activity and remained productive even in the face of difficulties arising from the war that broke out after Russia's invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 1944. Natalya V. Repkina, the daughter of V. V. Repkin and G. Repkina, has devoted special attention to continuing the work begun by the group; in particular, to systematizing and updating the approach that characterizes the Kharkiv work (Repkin, 2014; Repkin; Repkina; 1997; 2018b; 2018[2023]; 2019; 2023).

The variant perspective of the Kharkiv group is consolidated along at least three axes: (1) study of the processes of subject and personality formation in the condition of study⁴; (2) research of the concept, content,

⁴ On the concept of "personality" from the perspective of the Kharkiv Group, see more in Asbahr and Longarezi (2022) and Puentes (2019b; 2023a).

and structure of study activity in the "subject as source"⁵ approach; and (3) research of the theory and methodology of language learning⁶.

It is in these areas, already covered in previous studies (Longarezi; Puentes, 2023), that Kharkiv's greatest and most authentic contribution to the approach to developmental learning from the perspective of the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system, in the period from 1963 to the present, lies.

The Kharkiv Group (1963-1924) brought a new, creative and continuous approach, which meant that the research of study activity remained active, with innovative results. Hence, the power of the group's work, which put Kharkiv back on the circuit of cultural-historical psychology and developmental learning.

Conclusion

Kharkiv was at the forefront of the emergence and consolidation of pedagogical psychology with a historical-dialectical materialist approach, which was born in the former Soviet Union in the 1920s. It played a significant role in the constitution and rise not only of cultural-historical psychology, but also of developmental learning theory, which was characterized by two periods: from 1930 to 1936, with the creation of the Kharkiv School of Psychology, and from 1963, with the creation of the Kharkiv Group.

In the first period, from 1930 to 1936, the foundations for the construction of activity theory were laid. The work of the Kharkiv School of Psychology, which began in 1930, made it possible to define the foundations and central theses of the theory later developed by A.N. Leontiev. This school consisted of a significant number of psychologists, philosophers, physicians, etc. who devoted themselves to (1) the study of the content and structure of perceptual, mnemonic, and mental actions;

⁵ On the "subject as source", see more in Repkin and Repkina (2019) and Puentes (2019b; 2023a).

⁶ On language learning, see more in Longarezi and Puentes (2023).

(2) the study of generalization in children (including concepts); and (3) the role of activity in these processes.

The research carried out was fundamental to the elaboration of the concept, content, purpose, and structure of activity in human developmental processes. This work was essential for the systematization of the Psychological Theory of Activity, a cultural-historical theoretical contribution of undeniable relevance and impact both for the psychology that emerged in the first half of the 20th century and for the developmental education programs that were based on this approach in the second half of the last century. Representing the school where the foundations of this theory were born and developed, Kharkiv stands out in the circuit of cultural-historical psychology and developmental learning theory.

The second period, from 1963 to the present, was devoted to the structuring of a new educational program based on the developmental perspective that characterizes the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system. The experimental work carried out represents a breakthrough in the conception, purpose, and process of formation of the subject and the personality of the student in the condition of study.

The main contribution of the group in this connection is the theory of study activity. No longer a psychological theory, but a pedagogical theory of activity. The work orientation, which characterizes the activities of the group, is a pioneering interpretation of the study activity, which is focused on the development of the subject and personality of schoolchildren. In Kharkiv a new approach to study activity was introduced, with a different focus from the one spread in Moscow. From the point of view of the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system, significant progress was made, as it focused on the development of the subject and personality in the conditions of study activity. The work of the Kharkiv group in this new phase led to the elaboration of the concept of the "subject as a source" and the structuring of the theory of personality.

The experimental studies that began in the early 1960s were consolidated in an innovative perspective, whose contributions to the formation of the subject and personality in the condition of study have yet to be systematized and improved (see: Repkin; Repkina, 2019; Longarezi; Repkina; Puentes; Repkin, 2023); which keeps it up to date.

In any case, both groups, the one formed within the Kharkiv Psychological School in 1930-1936 and the one consolidated as a variant of the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin didactic system since 1963, have several points of contact:

(1) They take up the general theses arising from the activity-development relationship and are strongly influenced by the approach to activity treated in its relation to development.

They bring contributions to the study of activity as a trigger for development. The Kharkiv School of Psychology developed the basis for defining the concept, purpose, content, and structure of psychological activity, while the Kharkiv Group developed the same, but for a specific type of activity (study).

(2) They study the relationship between activity and development. In the first school this relationship is established between psychological activity and the development of consciousness, in the second between the activity of studying and the development of the subject/personality who thinks theoretically.

(3) They are based on the perspective of activity anchored in the work of A.N. Leontiev and count, directly or indirectly, on his participation. In the case of the former, as the head of the Kharkiv School of Psychology, and in the case of the latter, as the former supervisor of V.V. Repkin and active collaborator in the research of P.I. Zinchenko, who is a member of both schools.

(4) They are also inspired by the theoretical contributions of P. Ya. Galperin and P.I. Zinchenko, though indirectly.

(5) They are based on the active presence of P. I. Zinchenko, who in a certain sense was a member of both groups. He can be considered as one of those responsible for the establishment and/or consolidation of both the Kharkiv School of Psychology (1930-1936) and the Kharkiv Group (1963-2024).

(6) They have in their productions the substantial contributions of P.I. Zinchenko to the conceptions that were produced by both groups, each in its own time. The genesis of the work of both schools can be traced back to the ideas he defended and practiced.

In other words, the thought of A. N. Leontiev, P. Ya. Galperin and P.I. Zinchenko were present in both schools, which studied the development (of memory, consciousness, thinking, subject, personality, etc.) in the conditions of activity. For both the Kharkiv School of Psychology and the Kharkiv Group, activity was the central core of their research. This is a fundamental aspect of the connection between the groups.

Activity Theory began experimentally within the Kharkiv School of Psychology, and 30 years later it not only underpinned the experimental approach of the Kharkiv Group in schools, but was also the object of its study, deepening and development. The Kharkiv School of Psychology (1930-1936) studied and laid the foundations of the theory of activity psychology. The Kharkiv Group (1963-2024), in turn, was guided by these psychological foundations and developed a theory of study activity.

P. I. Zinchenko, who had conducted research directly with A. N. Leontiev in the 1930s, was the one who brought V. V. Repkin (A. N. Leontiev's former supervisor) to Kharkiv in the 1960s with the project of bringing research on activity development into the context of Ukrainian schools. Separated by just over 30 years, the Kharkiv School of Psychology and the Kharkiv Group have a strong relationship established by the research coordinated by A.N. Leontiev (leader of the former, as well as a strong influence on the latter) and P.I. Zinchenko (a member of both groups).

Kharkiv's scientific activity places it at different times in the circuit of cultural-historical psychology and developmental theory of learning. It reveals the important role played by the former capital of Ukraine in the structuring of a different psychological approach, as well as a new educational program.

References

ASBAHR, Flávia; LONGAREZI, Andréa M. Ascensão do conceito de personalidade na Teoria da Atividade de Estudo: contribuições das escolas de Moscou e Kharkiv. *Revista Educativa*. Puc-Go, Goiânia, v. 25, p. 1-29, 2022. Disponível em:

<https://seer.pucgoias.edu.br/index.php/educativa/article/view/12530>. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.18224/educ.v25i1.12530>.

DAVIDOV, V. V. História da formação do sistema de aprendizagem desenvolvimental (sistema D. B. Elkonin-V. V. Davidov). Parte II. *Вестник*, Riga, n. 3, 1997. Disponível em: <http://old.experiment.lv/>. Acesso em: 05 de fevereiro de 2024.

DUSAVYTSKYI, O. K. *Duas vezes dois = x?* Ciência e progresso. Conhecimento; Moscou; 1985.

DUSAVYTSKYI, O. K. *Desenvolvimento da personalidade em atividades de estudo*. Kharkov, 1996a.

DUSAVYTSKYI, O. K. *Desenvolvimento da personalidade e aprendizagem desenvolvimental*. Karazin KhNU, 1996b.

DUSAVYTSKYI, O. K. *Desenvolvimento da personalidade na comunidade estudantil: dependência da formação do interesse educacional*. 2012.

DUSAVYTSKYI, O. K. Educação desenvolvente e a sociedade aberta. *Ensino Em Re-Vista*, vol. 21, n.1, 2014. Disponível em:

<https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/emrevista/article/view/25053>. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.14393/ER-v21n1a2014-8>.

LEONTIEV, A. A. A vida e o caminho criativo de A. N. Leontiev. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, vol. 43, no. 3, May-June 2005, pp. 8-69.c 2005 M.E. Sarpe, Inc. All rights reserved. Tradução de Chrysantho Sholl Figueiredo.

LEONTIEV, A.A.; LEONTIEV, D.A.; Sokolova, E.E. Alexey Nikolaevich Leontiev: atividade, consciência, personalidade. Moscou: Smysl, 2005. S. 8-141.

LONGAREZI, A. M. Gênese e constituição da Obutchénie Desenvolvimental: expressão da produção singular-particular-universal enquanto campo de tensão contraditória. *Revista Educação* (UFSM), Santa Maria. Vol. 45, 2020, p. 1-32. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/reeducacao/article/view/48103/pdf>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5902/19846444448103>.

LONGAREZI, A. M. Teorias, conteúdos e métodos de aprendizagem em diferentes abordagens didáticas. In: Longarezi, A. M.; MELO, G. F. XIMENES, P. de A. S. (Orgs) *Didática, epistemologia da práxis e tendências pedagógicas*. Vol.1. 1. ed. - Jundiaí: Paco Editorial, 2023a. Disponível em: https://editorialpaco.com.br/ebook/gratis/9788546222940.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0v67pyXHmKPtWdB0XrU87o80G6TXOsk_Hm9bAUhpSGsDLkJTgtjfizQNA. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.33681/paco.ac-9788546222940>.

LONGAREZI, A.M. Sistema didático Zankov: sessenta e seis anos de trajetória experimental (1957-1977). *Obutchénie*. Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica. Vol. 7, n. 2, 2023b. Acesso em: <https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/Obutchenie/article/view/70261>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv7n2.a2023-70261>.

LONGAREZI, A.M.; FRANCO, P.L.J. Leontiev: a vida e a obra do psicólogo da atividade. In: LONGAREZI, Andréa Maturano; PUENTES, Roberto Valdés (Orgs.). *Ensino Desenvolvimental: vida, pensamento e obra dos principais representantes russos*. Livro I. Uberlândia. Edufu. 2013.

LONGAREZI, A.M.; FRANCO, P.L.J. Леонтьев: жизнь и деятельность психолога (Vida e obra do psicólogo da Atividade). *Дубненский психологический журнал* (Jornal de Psicologia de Dubna), Dubna/Rússia, n.1, 2015.

LONGAREZI, A.M.; PUENTES, R.V. Didática Desenvolvimental: os fundamentos de uma perspectiva crítica brasileira. In: LONGAREZI, A.M.; PIMENTA, S.G.; PUENTES, R.V. *Didática crítica no Brasil*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2023.

PUENTES, R. V.. Uma nova abordagem da Teoria da Aprendizagem Desenvolvimental. In: PUENTES, Roberto Valdés; CARDOSO, Cecília Garcia Coelho; AMORIN, Paula (Orgs.). *Teoria da atividade de estudo: contribuições de D. B. Elkonin, V. V. Davidov e V. V. Repkin*. 1. ed. Curitiba: CRV, 2019a.

PUENTES, R. V.. A noção de sujeito na concepção da aprendizagem desenvolvimental: uma aproximação inicial à teoria da subjetividade. *Obutchénie*: Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica, Uberlândia, v. 3, n. 1, p. 58-87, 2019b. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv3n1.a2019-50575>. Acesso em: 9 mar. 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv3n1.a2019-50575>.

PUENTES, R. V.. V. V. Repkin: concepção de sujeito da atividade de estudo (1990-2021). *Obutchénie*: Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica, Uberlândia, v. 7, p. 1-40, 2023a. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv7n1.a2023-69012>.

PUENTES, R.V.. Teoria da aprendizagem desenvolvimental: uma abordagem na perspectiva do Grupo de Kharkiv. In: LONGAREZI, A. M.; MELLO, G. F.; XIMENES, P. A. S.. (Org.). Didática, epistemologia da práxis e tendências pedagógicas. 1ed.Jundiaí: Paco Editorial, 2023b, v. 10, p. 225-256.

PUENTES, R. V.; LONGAREZI, A. M.. Sistemas didáticos desenvolvimentais. Precisoões conceituais, metodológicas e tipológicas. *Obutchénie: Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica*, v. 4, n. 1, p. 201-242, 2020. Disponível em: <http://www.seer.ufu.br/index.php/Obutchenie/article/view/57369>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv4n1.a2020-57369>.

REPKIN; V. V.. Ensino Desenvolvente e atividade de estudo. *Ensino Em Re-Vista*. Vol.21, n.1, 2014. Disponível em: <https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/emrevista/article/view/25054>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/ER-v21n1a2014-9>.

REPKIN; V. V.; REPKINA; N. V. *Aprendizagem desenvolvimental: teoria e prática*. Tomsk: Peleng, 1997.

REPKIN, V. V.; REPKINA, N. V. O Professor como coautor do sistema de aprendizagem desenvolvimental. In: REPKIN, V. V.; REPKINA, N. V. *O que é Aprendizagem Desenvolvimental: uma visão do passado para o futuro*. Moscou: Nekommercheskoye partnerstvo «Avtorskiy Klub». 2018a, p. 146 – 151.

REPKIN, V. V.; REPKINA, N. V. Estratégia educacional para o desenvolvimento de uma personalidade estável. In: *O que é a aprendizagem desenvolvimental: um olhar do passado para o futuro*. Moscou; Clube de Autores 2018b, p. 97-106.

REPKIN, V. V.; REPKINA, N. V. O conteúdo da aprendizagem desenvolvimental como problema didático-psicológico. In: LONGAREZI, A. M.; REPKINA, N. V.; PUENTES, R. V.; REPKIN, V. V. *Aprendizagem desenvolvimental e atividade de estudo: Abordagem na perspectiva do sistema Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin*. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2018 [2023].

REPKIN, V. V.; REPKINA, N. V.. Modelo teórico da aprendizagem desenvolvimental. In: PUENTES, R. V.; LONGAREZI, A. M. (org.). *Ensino desenvolvimental: sistema Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin*. Campinas: Mercado de Letras; Uberlândia: Edufu, 2019.

REPKIN, V. V.; REPKINA, N. V. O que é a aprendizagem desenvolvimental? In: LONGAREZI, A. M.; REPKINA, N. V.; PUENTES, R. V. REPKINA, V. V. *Aprendizagem desenvolvimental e atividade de estudo*. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2023.

REPKINA, N. V. Vladimir Vladimirovich Repkin: apontamentos para uma história de vida. *Obutchénie. Revista De Didática E Psicologia Pedagógica*, vol. 7, n. 1, 2023, p. 1–58. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv7n1.a2023-71020>.

VIGOTSKI, L.S. *Pensamento e Fala*. Ed. 5, rev. — Editora Labirinto, Moscou, 1999.

VLADIMIROVNA, G. O.. Papel da pesquisa de N. V. REpkina no desenvolvimento da teoria e da prática do Ensino Desenvolvimental. In: PUENTES, Roberto V.; LONGAREZI, A. M. (Orgs.). *Ensino Desenvolvimental: vida, pensamento e obra dos principais representantes russos*. Livro III. Campinas: Paco Editorial. Uberlândia. Edufu. 2019.

VIGODSKAIA G.L.; LIFANOVA T.M. *Lev Semenovich Vigotski. Vida. Atividade. Traços para o retrato*. - Moscou: Sysl, 1996. - 424 c.

ZINCHENKO, P.I. The problem of involuntary memory. *Soviet Psychology*, 2, 1939 [1984], p. 55-111.

Received in May 2024.

Approved in July 2024.