

CONTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY IN THE TEACHER GRADUATION COURSE IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN SÃO PAULO

Ana Karina Amorim Checchia ^{1,2}; Sandra Sawaya ²

ABSTRACT

The Psychology disciplines taught in Pedagogy are traditionally centered on human development and learning, while everyday school life is little analyzed; such centrality has been questioned by the critical movement in the field of School Psychology. Based on this perspective, this article aims to explain contributions that Psychology disciplines, taught in Pedagogy courses in private universities in São Paulo, can provide in the initial teacher training, for the understanding of the schooling process, based on subsidies offered by School Psychology. For this purpose, semi-structured interviews were carried out with four coordinators of Pedagogy courses and seven professors of these disciplines. It was identified the interviewees' search for inserting in this discipline the discussion of themes of School Psychology, such as school failure, medicalization of Education, stigmatization in school relations and daily school life, which are not included in the teaching plans. Therefore, the need to address issues in the field of School Psychology as a formative content for educators was evident.

Keywords: teacher education; pedagogy; school psychology

Contribuciones de la Psicología Escolar para formación de profesores en universidades privadas paulistas

RESUMEN

Las asignaturas de Psicología ofrecidas en la Pedagogía se centran, tradicionalmente, e el desarrollo humano y en el aprendizaje, pero el cotidiano escolar es poco analizado; tal centralidad sigue siendo problematizada por el movimiento crítico en el campo de la Psicología Escolar. Fundamentado en esta perspectiva, este artículo tiene por objetivo explicitar contribuciones que asignaturas de Psicología, ofrecidas en cursos de Pedagogía en Universidades privadas paulistas, pueden propiciar en la formación inicial de profesores, para la comprensión del proceso de escolarización, a partir de subsidios ofrecidos por la Psicología Escolar. Para tanto, se realizaron entrevistas semiestructuradas con cuatro coordinadores de cursos de Pedagogía y siete docentes de estas asignaturas. Se identificó la búsqueda de los entrevistados por insertar en esta asignatura la discusión de temas de la Psicología Escolar, como fracaso escolar, medicalización de la Educación, estigmatización en las relaciones escolares y el cotidiano escolar, que no están presentes en los planes de enseñanza. Se evidenció, por lo tanto, la necesidad de abordar cuestiones del campo de la Psicología Escolar como contenido formativo de los educadores.

Palabras clave: formación de profesores; pedagogía; psicología escolar

Contribuições da Psicologia Escolar para formação de professores em universidades privadas paulistas

RESUMO

As disciplinas de Psicologia ministradas na Pedagogia centram-se, tradicionalmente, no desenvolvimento humano e na aprendizagem, enquanto o cotidiano escolar é pouco analisado; tal centralidade vem sendo problematizada pelo movimento crítico no campo da Psicologia Escolar. Fundamentado nesta perspectiva, este artigo objetiva explicitar contribuições que disciplinas de Psicologia, lecionadas em cursos de Pedagogia em Universidades privadas paulistas, podem propiciar na formação inicial de professores, para a compreensão do processo de escolarização, a partir de subsídios oferecidos pela Psicologia Escolar. Para tanto, foram realizadas entrevistas semiestructuradas com quatro coordenadores de cursos de Pedagogia e sete docentes destas disciplinas. Identificou-se a busca dos entrevistados por inserir nesta disciplina a discussão de temas da Psicologia Escolar, como fracasso escolar, medicalização da Educação, estigmatização nas relações escolares e o cotidiano escolar, que não constam nos planos de ensino. Evidenciou-se, portanto, a necessidade de abordar questões do campo da Psicologia Escolar como conteúdo formativo dos educadores.

Palavras-chave: formação de professores; pedagogia; psicologia escolar

¹ Universidade Paulista (UNIP) e Universidade de São Paulo (USP) – São Paulo – SP – Brasil; anakarina.ak.ac@gmail.com

² Universidade de São Paulo (USP) – São Paulo – SP – Brasil; smsawaya@usp.br



INTRODUCTION

The Psychology disciplines taught in Pedagogy courses traditionally have the exposition of psychological theories about human development and learning as their main focal point, in order to focus the analysis of issues in the Psychology and Education interface in the individual scope, while the distance between the content taught in them and the school reality (Paini, 2006; Guerra, 2003; Gatti, 2009, Gatti & Nunes, 2009).

This centrality on the individual, underlying these disciplines, is an expression of the way in which Psychology is historically inserted in Pedagogy courses, which according to Antunes (2003) and Libâneo (2012), is marked by the psychologism (or psychologization) of Education, understood as the reductionism of issues that configure the educational context to the psychological or individual dimension, based on a “strictly psychological approach, which ignores the effect of social and political conditions on behavior, making the problems generated by the social and economic structure subjective” (Libâneo, 2012, p. 156).

In this sense, when contextualizing the teaching of Educational Psychology in teacher training, Libâneo says that it was reduced “to the description of theories about the stages of child development or the techniques of diagnosis and treatment of learning difficulties and emotional disorders” (2012, p.154), focusing its analysis on the abstract individual, without paying attention to the social and historical constitution of educational phenomena. In the face of such reductionism, the analysis of the school institution, the daily school life and the complexity of elements involved in the schooling process is recurrently absent from the teaching plans of Psychology in Pedagogy subjects, according to Pereira, Almeida and Azzi (2002), Gatti and Nunes (2009) and Larocca (2000) provide evidence in their research.

The questioning of the reductionism of social and educational issues at the individual level, as well as the relevance of analyzing daily school life and the schooling process in its complexity, have been emphasized throughout the critical movement in the field of School Psychology. Based on historical materialism, this critical perspective explains the roots of the phenomena studied in the Psychology and Education interface, as opposed to their naturalization, in order to pay attention to social, political, institutional and relational elements involved in the schooling process, placing it in the context current social system governed by the dictates of the capitalist production model (Patto, 1997, 2015).

Based on a critical perspective, the focus of analysis of the phenomena in this interface shifts from the centrality of the abstract individual to the reflection about the schooling process and the intersubjective

relationships that constitute daily school life, conceiving the subject as a historical being, product and producer of social relations and society (Souza, 2010). In this sense, school issues are investigated in the Brazilian educational context, analyzing how these objective conditions materialize in daily school life and their implications for schooling, as well as the specificity of this subject’s school life (Patto, 1997).

Considering the criticism of the psychologism of Education in teacher training and the reductionism of social issues to the individual in the field of School Psychology, we carried out a Post-Doctoral research by the USP Faculty of Education, in which we dedicated ourselves to the analysis of the following questions : *in what way are reflections carried out in the field of School Psychology, which focus on the analysis of the schooling process, present in the menus and reports of professors who teach Psychology disciplines in Pedagogy courses at private universities in the State of São Paulo? What contributions do these disciplines currently offer to teacher education, taking into account the criticisms that have been made to the reductionism of educational phenomena to the individual sphere?* Based on these guiding questions, our research **aimed to investigate the contributions that the Psychology disciplines, taught in Pedagogy courses in private universities in São Paulo, can provide in the initial training of teachers, for the understanding of the schooling process, based on subsidies offered by School Psychology.**

It was sought through this research, to provide a reflection about how the knowledge produced in recent years in the field of School Psychology, as an expression of this shift in focus of the critical movement, has been conveyed to Pedagogy students.

Finally, it should be noted that the importance of paying attention to Pedagogy courses in private universities stems from the large contingent of teachers exercising the teaching activity in schools, who are graduates of these courses in private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) (Almeida, Pimenta, & Fusari, 2016), regarding the significant prevalence of private HEIs in this country - which has 2,111 private institutions as opposed to 296 public (being 510 private and 99 public in the state of São Paulo) (INEP, 2017) - responsible, therefore, for the formation of most graduates of Pedagogy who work in public schools.

METHOD

For this investigation, a qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2006) was carried out, based on the case study (André, 1995), in four private universities in the city of São Paulo, among which there are both private institutions (in the sense strict: for-profit), as well as community and philanthropic (e.g, charitable: secular and confessional).

The research **participants**, referred to in this article by fictitious names, were four coordinators of Pedagogy courses and seven professors of Psychology disciplines in these courses. As **procedures** for this investigation, the following were carried out: a) individual interviews with research participants, totaling eleven interviews, using scripted **instruments** for semi-structured questions (Queiroz, 1983); b) document analysis, which involved the process of reading and analyzing syllabuses and teaching plans for subjects in this interface, taught in Pedagogy courses, as well as the curricular matrix of these courses. We sought to investigate in the interviewees' speeches and in the documents analyzed the structure of the courses, the content taught and the presence of knowledge given in the field of School Psychology in teacher education.

Finally, the **data analysis** was performed based on the proposal of "prose analysis" (André, 1983), through which central themes were identified from the reading of the investigated material and analyzed in the light of a critical perspective in School Psychology, which theoretically supported this research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It was possible to identify a strong incidence of Psychology disciplines in the researched Pedagogy courses. Among these courses, two have a three-year duration, while two are held in four years, and the four courses contain Psychology disciplines in their curriculum, with variations in their quantity and distribution throughout the courses. In one of the four-year courses, 3 compulsory Psychology subjects are taught (from the 1st to the 3rd period of the course), while in the other, in addition to 5 mandatory (between the 1st and 7th periods), 3 subjects are also offered electives. Regarding courses with a duration of three years, in one of them, 5 subjects are offered (from the 1st to the 5th period) and, in the other, 3 (between the 1st and the 5th), all of which are mandatory in these two courses. In the four courses, these subjects are offered without internships.

This incidence is confirmed, not only by the presence of these disciplines in half of the semesters that make up one of the courses and in more than half of the other two courses, reaching from the first to the penultimate period in the course with greater notoriety in this emphasis attributed to Psychology in Pedagogy, but also because of the fact evidenced in the analysis of the curriculum of Psychology courses, that it remains one of the pillars for the theoretical foundation that supports the teachers' training in these courses. Francisco, coordinator of one of the researched courses, explains this fact by stating that Psychology is the theoretical basis for the formation of pedagogues.

Historically considered as one of the *Fundamentals*

of Education, Psychology continues to consist, in the researched Pedagogy courses, in one of the areas responsible for the theoretical foundation that will give support, scientific legitimacy and guidance to teaching activities (Guerra, 2003). As Larocca (2000) clarifies, under the influence of a "technical rationality" model, it is up to the *Fundamentals of Education* to theorize about educational phenomena, while practice is purged from it, as an expression of a dichotomous view between theory and practice (p. 140).

In exercising this function, the presence of Psychology in Education has traditionally been characterized by its essentially theoretical character with a predominance of an abstract exposition of the psychological theoretical frameworks, which distance themselves from reflection about everyday school life, school institutions, the schooling process, or the objective and concrete conditions that make up daily school life played by different participants, including educators: "the school, as a social and teaching institution, is almost absent from the menus, which leads us to think about training more abstract character and poorly integrated to the concrete context where the professional-teacher will work" (Gatti & Nunes, 2009, p. 55). The absence of internships in Psychology disciplines in the four investigated courses reaffirms its eminently theoretical character, illustrating the "primacy of theory" detached from the school reality, present in such disciplines (Paini, 2006, p. 83).

The content taught in Psychology disciplines and the primacy of development and learning

The content taught in the investigated disciplines is coherent with the hegemonic structure present in the Pedagogy courses (Guerra, 2003; Paini, 2006; Gatti, 2009; Gatti & Nunes, 2009), which initially presents a **historical overview** that seeks to account for the articulation between Psychology and Education, and then focuses on the exposure of concepts related to **human development and learning**, based fundamentally on psychogenetic and cultural-historical approaches, with Piaget, Vigotski and Wallon as the main reference authors. In addition, it was possible to identify in the researched courses the presence of a discipline articulated to Psychology, recurrently referred to as **Inclusive Education**, which, when approaching school inclusion, involves the discussion of themes related to the Psychology and Education interface, as will be mentioned later.

In most of the analyzed courses, the initial **historical overview** is presented in the first period of the course in a discipline that seeks to introduce the Pedagogy student into the main theoretical currents of Psychology, placing it as a field of knowledge. The aim is to bring students closer to the relationship between Psychology and Education, through the exposition of psychological

theories. Therefore, in some institutions psychological approaches such as Psychoanalysis, Behaviorism and Gestalt are presented, seeking a link among such theories and Education. These data confirm the results found by Gatti (2009, p. 218), according to which this panorama includes references to cognitive and emotional development, including the Cognitivist perspective, in order to “analyze the contribution of psychological theories to the understanding of the teaching and learning process”.

Human development and learning constitute the centrality of the Psychology disciplines of the four researched courses and cover the following variety of configurations: a) there are courses in which *human development and learning* are addressed in the same discipline aimed at exposing central concepts proposed by Piaget, Vigotski and Wallon, seeking to pay attention to the educational implications of such theories. In some courses, propositions by Freinet and Emília Ferreiro about understanding the psychogenesis of written language are included in this discipline; b) in other courses, *development and learning* are approached exclusively based on Piaget’s theorizing in one discipline, while another discipline is dedicated to the propositions of Vigotski and Wallon about these processes, making dialectical historical materialism explicit as an epistemological basis of their theorizations; c) in addition to the theories mentioned above, there are courses that present a specific discipline about human development, which pays attention to each stage of human life, from the prenatal period to old age, in order to present cognitive and affective aspects, social and motors related to each stage of development, having as reference the proposition of authors such as Erik Erikson, Freud and Piaget; d) some courses include, in addition to the content mentioned above, theories about the *teaching and learning process*, presented in a specific discipline, through the exposure of epistemological models that guide pedagogical and psychological actions, with different psychological approaches applied to Education being explained, with the humanist, behavioral, psychoanalytic and psychogenetic, among others, confirming the approaches also found by Paini (2006); e) *learning* is also covered, in some courses, in a discipline on the *subject of learning*, analyzed from the Neurosciences and theoretical references such as Psychoanalysis, Constructivism and Phenomenology, or even in a discipline that addresses learning based on Erik Erikson’s theorizing and Neuroscience propositions about concepts such as memory, attention, concentration, consciousness and thought.

Linked to the Psychology disciplines, in the four investigated courses, there is a discipline identified as **Inclusive Education**, which generally discusses school inclusion, the principles that guide Special Education

and Inclusive Education, as well as the historical contextualization of its implementation in Brazil, the concepts of normality and disability, the processes of social and cultural exclusion and specificities of different special educational needs. By making references to the content discussed in it, the interviewed professors allude to relevant themes that are coherent with the contributions of School Psychology to teacher education, as will be mentioned in the next item.

The primacy of *development and learning* as the central focus of Psychology disciplines in Pedagogy expresses the socially widespread hegemonic assumption – reiterated by professors and students and endorsed by educational public policies (Levandovski, 2008; Checchia & Souza, 2016) – that the main Psychology’s contribution to teacher education would consist of providing a theoretical basis for understanding development and learning processes, identified as subsidies that should equip teaching practice.

However, this assumption has been problematized, as the intention to guide educational practical guidelines, based on “psychological investigations” is debatable given the impossibility of establishing a direct transposition between psychological theoretical foundations and pedagogical practice, according to Carvalho (2011) makes explicit when stating that “this postulated relation between teachers’ theoretical conceptions and their school practices is quite fragile” (p. 312), as it is not possible to “deduce” an educational practice from epistemological or theoretical premises, since “the principles do not carry within them the rule of their application” (p. 318). Thus, Carvalho emphasizes that teaching procedures and pedagogical action could only be understood and found models in the “culture of school institutions” or in the “school world”, which has traditionally been underestimated or ignored in Psychology disciplines, centered on development and in learning, where an abstract conception of the school context prevails (p. 317).

Azanha (1998) and Patto (2004) contribute to such problematization, by questioning the premise rooted in modern Pedagogy that effective teaching would be essentially the result of a “competent application of methodological knowledge, epistemologically based on other knowledge, especially of a psychological nature” (Patto, 2004, p. 64). In addition to emphasizing that practical derivations of theories are debatable, these authors emphasize that this premise is based on an “individual teacher-student relationship, a relationship of two abstracted from the institutional context” (Patto, 2004, p. 65), without considering that the quality of teaching, success and school failure involve a complexity of elements involved in its production. In this sense, Azanha (1998, p. 18) clarifies that one cannot seek to solve the problem of teaching quality through the

applicability of development and learning theories, with a model of teacher training in which “a psychological view of the student” and emphasizes that the teaching exercise “is only possible within the institutional framework of the school” and that the challenges of the contemporary school must be analyzed in the training of educators. One finds, therefore, in the propositions of these authors, the criticism of the *psychologism or psychologization* of Education and the need to pay attention, in teacher education, to the school context in its complexity.

The primacy of *development and learning* as the central focus of the disciplines investigated in this research consists of an expression of psychologism, which, as mentioned above, corresponds to the reductionism of social and educational phenomena to the individual scope or to the subjective dimension. Consistent with the hegemonic way in which Psychology is historically inserted in Pedagogy, these disciplines center on the individual the analysis of questions at the Psychology and Education interface, based on psychological theories about the development of the subject and learning, conceived as theoretical *foundations* that would support the instrumentalization of teaching practice. In this context, the “secular tendency” is evident, characteristic of psychologism, through which Pedagogy is based on Psychology anchored in the teaching and learning processes, “with the triumph of rationality that instruments technical progress” in Education (Patto, 2004, p. 65).

It should be emphasized that theorizations in the field of Developmental and Learning Psychology are relevant to teacher education, in the sense of elucidating specificities of the historically accumulated knowledge about these processes. However, the contributions of Psychology to the training of teachers in these disciplines should not be restricted to the scope of development and learning, but may encompass discussions held in the field of School Psychology, which have the schooling process as the focus of analysis, in order to pay attention to the complexity involved in everyday school life and to the relationships between the historical subjects that constitute it. The relevance of such discussions is intensified in view of the “psychologization of school problems” (Patto, 2004, p. 66) that traditionally prevails in the disciplines in this interface that focus the analysis of school issues on the individual, while the school and the schooling process are abstracted or little approached.

What we were able to identify in the investigated disciplines was the fact that although the knowledge given in the field of School Psychology about daily school life and the schooling process is not explicitly indicated in the teaching plans, the interviewed teachers announce the scope and limits of the presence of such

discussions, emphasizing its relevance for teacher education, as we will indicate in the next item.

Reaches and limits of the presence of discussions in the field of School Psychology in Pedagogy courses and their contributions to teacher education

When asked about the schooling process and the relational, political and institutional elements that have been addressed in School Psychology, the professors clarify that the knowledge given in this field is worked more explicitly in the *School Psychology* discipline, offered only in the Psychology course. Respondents who, in addition to being teachers of Pedagogy, teach this discipline in Psychology, emphasize the need and relevance of inserting such knowledge in teacher education, arguing that in this discipline the introduction to the critical perspective in School Psychology is presented, the questioning of blaming the individual for school failure and the medicalization of Education, as expressions of the reductionism of educational issues at the individual level, the production of school failure, the understanding of the complexity involved in the schooling process, educational public policies and daily school life, based on texts by Ana Bock, Marilene Proença R. de Souza, Elenita Tanamachi, Maria Helena Patto, Beatriz de Paula Souza, Maria Aparecida Moysés and Demerval Saviani, among others. Therefore, they consider that enabling the discussion of these themes to future educators would consist in a significant contribution of School Psychology to their training.

However, the professors state that such discussion is not explicitly contemplated in the curriculum of Pedagogy in a specific discipline or in the teaching plans of Psychology disciplines and add that there is a possibility of establishing some articulations between these themes and the content addressed in such disciplines, as will be indicated later, but consider that such association depends on the education, theoretical framework or academic and professional trajectory of the teacher that bring him/her closer to the discussions held in this field of knowledge.

Therefore, some interviewees believe that the *School Psychology* discipline should be included in the curriculum of Pedagogy, or that the syllabus of at least one discipline in this interface should include these themes: “the content of this Pedagogy discipline should be more similar to the subject of School Psychology that I teach in Psychology” (interview with teacher João Vitor).

To justify this statement, teacher João Vitor argues that there is a gap between the content taught in Psychology in Pedagogy disciplines and the school reality, so that the discussion about daily school life or schooling problems does not appear in his teaching plans, which, in turn, are the focus of analysis of School Psychology, which reiterates the importance

of providing the knowledge produced in this field to future educators.

Such distancing, recurrent in Psychology in Pedagogy disciplines, as well as the need to pay attention to the institution and the daily school life in them, are emphasized by Larocca (2000), Pereira, Almeida and Azzi (2002), Guerra (2003), Pains (2006) and by Patto (2004, p. 66), according to which these subjects lack the explicitness of “school as a social institution that carries an educational project that has philosophical, historical, social and political aspects that educators need to know” and which have been analyzed throughout the critical movement in the field of School Psychology.

The social and historical constitution of the school is addressed, according to João Vitor, in the *School Psychology* classes taught in the Psychology course, through which, according to this teacher, students begin to question the reductionism of social issues at the individual level, such as blaming students for school failure. However, the teacher emphasizes that as the disciplines in Pedagogy do not explicitly address these issues, without this theoretical foundation, the identification of such problematizations in the discourse of these future educators becomes less recurrent, while it is possible to identify in their arguments the reproduction of the search for explanations for schooling problems still centered on individual factors.

This finding is consistent with the identification of the reductionism of school failure at the individual level in the discourse of Pedagogy students from another University, which reproduces the blaming of students, families or teachers for the failure, which endorses the relevance of providing in the training of educators the criticism of this reductionism, which has been made in the field of School Psychology (Checchia, 2015).

It can be seen, therefore, that although the knowledge provided by School Psychology is present in the Psychology courses mentioned by the interviewees, it remains absent from the teaching plans of the Pedagogy disciplines. However, despite this absence, criticized by some teachers, it is possible to identify relevant topics related to the schooling process, discussed in this field of knowledge, such as the medicalization of Education, the problematization of psychodiagnostics in the school context, the “learning problems”, the stigmatization in school relationships, the criticism of the reductionism of social issues to the individual scope and the naturalization of school issues and the understanding of their social and historical constitution, mentioned below.

According to Rosa and Érica, professors at the same University, the *Inclusive Education* discipline is the one that most enables reflection on the schooling process, in conjunction with propositions in the field of School Psychology: when addressing mental disability and

deficiencies in the process of learning, *psychodiagnosis and the medicalization of Education are problematized, criticizing the stigmatization and pathologization of school complaints*. One of the basic texts used in the bibliography specifically addresses the issue of psychodiagnosis and presents a critical perspective of assessment and intervention by the psychologist focused on educational issues, in order to provide such a discussion.

Throughout the disciplines of Psychology in Pedagogy, Rosa and Érica seek to *question the stigmatization* of students in the school context, to *criticize the concept of “learning problems”* whose origin is traditionally associated with factors centered on the individual and the innate conception of intelligence, as an expression of the *reductionism* of social issues to the individual level. The professors emphasize the relevance of providing such questions to Pedagogy students, who will not have the opportunity to attend the *School Psychology* course, offered in Psychology, in which these themes are deepened; in view of this, they evidence and resent the absence of this field of knowledge in teacher education.

Narcisa, a professor from another university, also emphasizes the importance of problematizing reductionism at the individual level. According to her, this questioning can be carried out in the first subject offered in the Psychology and Education interface, when discussing a text by José Libâneo in which the author criticizes psychologization in Education and through which it is possible to reflect on the attribution of diagnoses and labels to students or expressions of reductionism such as the medicalization of Education, in order to rescue the social and historical dimension of the analyzed phenomena. The need for reflection on these labels is also emphasized by professor Fátima, when she alludes to the importance of questioning the *labels* that are attributed to students who are considered to be “having difficulties” or with “learning disorders” (interview with Fátima).

Finally, another teacher, Sofia, highlights that from the 1990s onwards, the Psychology disciplines in the Pedagogy course in which she teaches began to aim at the formation of a critical pedagogue, in order to provide the understanding *that man and educational phenomena are constituted socially and historically, in contrast to their naturalization*. Thus, she clarifies that the conception of man (and of students in the school context, more specifically), as a biopsychosocial subject, underlies such disciplines, being addressed in them.

These themes referred by the professors do not exactly consist of the syllabus of the disciplines as objects of study theoretically based on the texts contained in the basic bibliography of the teaching plans or in specific texts that address them, but rather,

according to the interviewees, arise from the discussion arising from the exposition of the content taught or the report of the students' experience.

The relevance of approaching these themes is also highlighted by professors of these Pedagogy disciplines (and other Undergraduate Degrees) from a public university in the state of São Paulo, who include in their syllabus the knowledge given in the field of School Psychology that involves reflection about the production of school failure and its reductionism to the individual sphere, the understanding of social, political and institutional elements involved in schooling, the problematization of school complaints (and schooling problems) and its pathologization, the intersubjective relationships that constitute daily school life and stereotypes that cross it (Checchia, 2015).

Discussions on these themes, carried out throughout the critical movement in School Psychology, can contribute to teacher education by providing an understanding of the complexity involved in the schooling process, questioning the scientific legitimacy of prejudices that permeate daily school life and explanation of the ideological character of naturalizing and reductionist theories that produce marks and effects in the school life of subjects and through which students, their families or teachers are blamed for school failure. Although they are not actually present in the teaching plan of the investigated subjects, the need and relevance of inserting such reflection in Pedagogy are endorsed by professors who seek to introduce it to students.

Teachers' conception of the contributions of the Psychology disciplines taught in Pedagogy

The interviewees claim that such subjects should provide future educators with a critical look that supports the understanding of the social and historical constitution of the subject, society and educational phenomena, as opposed to their naturalization, in order to situate schooling problems in the social and history context. Some professors emphasize that the main contribution of such disciplines to teacher education should be to provide a discussion about school failure and the themes referred to in the previous item, based on a critical perspective in School Psychology; in addition, they consider that it should be possible to reflect on how Psychology has historically influenced Education and how Psychology is conceived in schools in the current context, questioning the influence of medicalization, as well as offering a theoretical basis for dealing with problems education and for pedagogues and psychologists to understand each other in the dialogue regarding school issues.

It is evident, therefore, in the interviewees' discourse, both a rupture in relation to the hegemonic conception that the main contribution of these

disciplines should be the transmission of theorizations of development and learning as instrumentalization of teaching practice, as well as the need for such disciplines to offer contributions to the training of teachers through knowledge given in the field of School Psychology.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Given the primacy of development and learning in the investigated subjects and the still incipient presence of themes related to the schooling process addressed in the field of School Psychology, which are not effectively included in their teaching plans, but may become an object of discussion from the problematization of issues that permeate daily school life, mentioned by the interviewees, some teachers emphasize the need to include the knowledge produced in this area in their programmatic content and seek to introduce it to students, aiming to favor the critique of the naturalization and reductionism of school issues and social to the individual scope, as well as the understanding of the social and historical constitution of man and the phenomena in the Psychology and Education interface.

It is important to emphasize that as these themes mentioned by the interviewees are not present in the teaching plans of the disciplines of Psychology in Pedagogy; the inclusion of the discussion on these themes related to the schooling process, based on a critical perspective in the field of School Psychology, in teacher education, is conditioned to the individual initiative of teachers who have had access and appropriation in their academic or professional trajectory of a social and historical conception of these phenomena. This fact endorses the need for the knowledge accumulated throughout the critical movement in School Psychology to be officially included in the teaching plans of Psychology disciplines in Pedagogy courses.

The contributions of School Psychology to teacher education, based on a critical perspective, are based on an ethical and political commitment that involves the struggle for social transformation, for quality public education and for the humanization of man and school relations; therefore, they encompass the denunciation of mechanisms of exclusion, oppression and humiliation, underlying the capitalist mode of production, which permeate school relations and are endorsed by naturalizing psychological theories (Checchia, 2015). The reflection about the themes mentioned by the interviewees in light of the knowledge given in this field, allows future educators, protagonists of daily school life, to question the pathologization, stigmatization and dehumanization of school relationships, which have implications for daily school life and with which these professionals may not agree.

This issue is emphasized by Patto (2004, p. 70), who refers to the relevance of providing educators with a reflection about the ethical and political dimension of Education and argues that Psychology can offer an important contribution to the process of changing conceptions of educators when problematizing “beliefs and values rooted (some petrified) in the social imaginary” and adds that in this training, “critical theories must be rigorously appropriated, so that the questions posed to everyone by the action that is intended to transform the circumstances and men”.

Given the considerations presented so far, it is evident, therefore, the relevance that such reflections start to effectively compose the teaching plan of Psychology disciplines in Pedagogy courses, in order to provide a break with the hegemonic primacy of the individual, which historically constitutes them, and contributes to a critical training of educators, based on the analysis of daily school life and on the problematization of naturalization and reductionism in the Psychology and Education interface, which should not be legitimized or reproduced by teachers of these disciplines or by students, when throughout their training and performance as education professionals.

REFERENCES

- Almeida, M. I.; Pimenta, S. G.; Fusari, J. C. F. (2016). Inserção profissional de licenciados egressos da Universidade de São Paulo: processos de construção de identidades, socialização profissional e profissionalização docente. *Relatório Final da Pesquisa à Faculdade de Educação da Universidade de São Paulo*. Processo nº 2014/00217-2.
- André, M. E. D. A. de. (1995). *Etnografia da prática escolar*. São Paulo: Papirus.
- André, M. E. D. A. de. (1983). Texto, contexto e significados: algumas questões na análise de dados qualitativos. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, (45), 66-71.
- Antunes, M. A. M. (2003). Psicologia e educação no Brasil: um olhar histórico-crítico. In: M. E. M. Meira; M. A. M. Antunes (Eds.), *Psicologia escolar: teorias críticas* (pp.139-168). São Paulo, SP: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Azanha, J. M. P. (1998). Proposta pedagógica e autonomia da escola. *Cadernos de História e Filosofia da Educação*, II(4), pp. 11-21.
- Carvalho, J. S. F. de. (2011). A teoria na prática é outra? Considerações sobre as relações entre teoria e prática em discursos educacionais. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 16(47), 307-320.
- Checchia, A. K. A. (2015). *Contribuições da Psicologia Escolar para a formação de professores: um estudo sobre a disciplina Psicologia da Educação nas Licenciaturas* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo - SP. Recuperado de <https://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/47/47131/tde-07082015-114724/pt-br.php>
- Checchia, A. K. A.; Souza, M. P. R. (2016) A disciplina Psicologia da Educação na formação de professores: reflexões a partir da Psicologia Educacional e Escolar. In: H. R. Campos; M. P. R. de Souza; M. G. D. Facci (Eds.), *Psicologia e políticas educacionais* (pp. 295-323). Rio Grande do Norte: EDUFRN.
- Denzin, N. K.; Lincoln, Y. G. (2006). Introdução – A disciplina e a prática da pesquisa qualitativa. In: N. K. Denzin; Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Planejamento da pesquisa qualitativa – Teorias e abordagens* (pp. 15-41). Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed.
- Gatti, B. (2009). Psicologia da educação e formação de professores. Trabalho Encomendado – GT Psicologia da Educação, 32ª Reunião Anual da ANPED. Mimeo.
- Gatti, B. (2010). Psicologia da educação: conceitos, sentidos e contribuições. *Psicologia da Educação*, (31), 7-22. Recuperado de http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1414-69752010000200002
- Gatti, B.; Nunes, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Formação de professores para o ensino fundamental: estudo de currículos das licenciaturas em pedagogia, língua portuguesa, matemática e ciências biológicas*. São Paulo, SP: FCC/DPE.
- Guerra, C. (2003). *O ensino de psicologia na formação inicial de professores: constituição de conhecimentos sobre aprendizagem e desenvolvimento por estudantes de licenciaturas* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas - SP. Recuperado de <http://repositorio.unicamp.br/jspui/handle/REPOSIP/253639>
- Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira [INEP]. *Sinopse Estatística da Educação Superior 2016*. Brasília: INEP, 2017. Recuperado em 10 de março de 2018, de <http://portal.inep.gov.br/web/guest/sinopses-estatisticas-da-educacao-superior>.
- Larocca, P. (2000). O ensino de psicologia da educação sob o olhar de licenciados e licenciandos. In: R. Azzi; S. H. Batista; A. M. Sadalla (Eds.), *Formação de professores: discutindo o ensino de psicologia* (pp. 119-144). Campinas, SP: Editora Alínea.
- Levandovski, A. R. (2008). *Contribuição da disciplina Psicologia da Educação para a prática docente no Ensino Fundamental I – um estudo por meio da metodologia da problematização* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina - PR. Recuperado de https://bdtd.ibict.br/vufind/Record/UEL_085a551adbbfe9dd48b1d6053a032157
- Libâneo, J. C. (2012). Psicologia educacional: uma avaliação crítica. In: S.T. M. Lane; W. Codo (Eds.), *Psicologia social: o homem em seu movimento* (14ª ed., pp. 154-180). São Paulo, SP: Ed. Brasiliense.
- Paini, L. (2006). *Psicologia educacional: a vez e a voz dos acadêmicos de pedagogia das universidades estaduais do Paraná* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo - SP. Recuperado de http://bdtd.ibict.br/vufind/Record/USP_a31287ee34fd4d3f21f1e27246ca2d82
- Patto, M. H. S. (Ed.). (1997). *Introdução à psicologia escolar* (3ª ed.). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Patto, M. H. S. (2004). Formação de professores: o lugar das humanidades. In: R. Barbosa (Ed.), *Trajétorias e perspectivas da formação de educadores* (pp. 61-78). São

Paulo: Editora UNESP.

Patto, M. H. S. (2015). *A produção do fracasso escolar: histórias de submissão e rebeldia*. São Paulo: Intermeios.

Pereira, M. A. L.; Almeida, P. C. A. de; Azzi, R. G. (2002). A dimensão teórico-prática da psicologia educacional na formação de professores: a metodologia da problematização como desencadeadora da articulação entre teoria e prática. In: R. Azzi; A. M. Sadalla (Eds.), *Psicologia e formação docente: desafios e conversas* (pp. 185-211). São Paulo, SP: Casa do Psicólogo.

Queiroz, M. I. P. de. (1983). *Variações sobre a técnica de gravador no registro da informação viva*. São Paulo: CERU e FFLCH/USP.

Souza, M. P. R. de (2010). Retornando à patologia para justificar a não aprendizagem escolar: a medicalização e o diagnóstico de transtornos de aprendizagem em tempos de neoliberalismo. In: CRP/SP; GIQE (Eds.), *Medicalização de crianças e adolescentes: conflitos silenciados pela redução de questões sociais a doenças de indivíduos* (pp. 57-67). São Paulo, SP: Casa do Psicólogo.

This paper was translated from Portuguese by Ana Maria Pereira Dionísio.

Received: July 30, 2019
Approved: August 12, 2020