

Graduate and Undergraduate Studies: Neighbors Without Affinity?

Paulo Rogério Meira Menandro¹
Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória-ES, Brazil

Emmanuel Zagury Tourinho
Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém-PA, Brazil

Antônio Virgílio Bittencourt Bastos
Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador-BA, Brazil

Oswaldo Hajime Yamamoto
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Natal-RN, Brazil

Abstract: This article presents two sets of information of historical interest for Psychology: regarding the context in which the profession of psychologist was regulated, and the graduate level formation. These sets of information are used to discuss the difficulty in promoting de facto articulation between undergraduate and graduate level programs. This is an especially curious difficulty, as, since the initial phase of the organization of the Brazilian Graduate Program, the need to consider its integration with the undergraduate formation has always been highlighted. Nevertheless, some difficulties still persist with respect to this integration. Some proposals of activities that could provide articulation between the different levels of formation are presented for debate, both in the sphere of teaching and supervision, as well as in the context of research, with related activities that can serve the same purpose also being mentioned.

Keywords: graduate program, psychology undergraduate program, psychology graduate program, undergraduate and graduate interaction

Pós-Graduação e Graduação: Vizinhaça sem Afinidade?

Resumo: O texto apresenta dois conjuntos de informações de interesse histórico para a Psicologia: sobre o contexto no qual foi regulamentada a profissão de psicólogo e sobre a formação em nível de pós-graduação. Tais informações são utilizadas para discutir a dificuldade de promover articulação de fato entre a formação em nível de graduação e a pós-graduação. Trata-se de dificuldade especialmente curiosa, pois desde a fase inicial da organização da pós-graduação brasileira, a necessidade de considerar sua integração com a formação em nível de graduação foi sempre ressaltada. Ainda assim, persistem dificuldades relativas à essa integração. Algumas proposições de atividades que podem ensejar articulações entre os diferentes níveis de formação são apresentadas para o debate, tanto na esfera do ensino e da orientação como no âmbito da pesquisa, havendo menção, também, a atividades correlatas que podem servir ao mesmo objetivo.

Palavras-chave: pós-graduação, graduação em psicologia, pós-graduação em psicologia, integração graduação e pós-graduação

Pregrado y Postgrado: ¿Inmediaciones sin Afinidad?

Resumen: El artículo presenta dos conjuntos de información de interés histórico para la psicología: sobre el contexto en el que se reguló la profesión de psicólogo y la capacitación en el nivel de postgrado. Estas informaciones son utilizadas para discutir la dificultad de promover efectivamente la articulación entre la formación de pregrado y postgrado. Se trata de una dificultad especialmente curiosa porque, a partir de la organización inicial de los estudios de postgrado, la necesidad de considerar la integración con la formación a nivel universitario siempre se destacó. Sin embargo, siguen existiendo dificultades en relación a esta integración. Algunas propuestas de actividades que pueden llevar a las articulaciones entre los diferentes niveles de formación se presentan para el debate, tanto en el ámbito de la educación y orientación como en el contexto de la investigación, con referencia también a actividades relacionadas que puedan servir al mismo propósito.

Palabras clave: postgrado, licenciatura en psicología, estudios de postgrado en psicología, la integración de pregrado y postgrado

This article has two aims: (1) to identify and contextualize some issues related to what can be referred to as difficulties in articulation between levels of undergraduate and graduate formation, within the context of Brazilian Psychology, and (2) to bring together and present for debate some proposals that claim to indicate ways to expand the

articulation between the levels of training mentioned, aiming to provide mutual benefit. Regarding the structure of the article, it was considered that it would be necessary to initially register certain information about the context in which the profession of psychologist was regulated, since in this context issues related to the different levels of training were already present. Likewise, it was considered important to highlight various aspects of the history of the consolidation of graduate studies in Brazil, for the better comprehension of some factors which have permitted the understanding of the current scenario. The article directly addresses the dilemmas

¹ Correspondence address:

Paulo Rogério Meira Menandro. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia da Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo. Avenida Fernando Ferrari, 514. Campus Universitário de Goiabeiras. Vitória-ES, Brazil. CEP 29075-910. E-mail: paulomenandro@uol.com.br

and difficulties related to the articulation or integration of undergraduate studies with graduate studies. Certain items of legal texts regarding graduate studies are also discussed, which show that the articulation between undergraduate and graduate courses already appeared as a primary concern for the graduate course policymakers.

After the presentation of this collection of information of historical interest, we sought to characterize some difficulties concerning the articulation between the two levels of formation, interspersing this characterization with proposals regarding how to deal with them. These proposals are not presented with the formalization needed to be taken as a model for establishing rules, but should be understood as suggestions for consideration by interested parties according to the institutional reality in which they operate.

It should be clear that this article was written from a set of concerns raised at the outset of the examination of a number of issues specific to the context of the graduate course. This condition determined a direction of construction of the article that led, at various points, to a more detailed treatment of the data and references related to the graduate course. The understanding adopted was that this bias is not limiting for the reflections that will be developed, even though they are directed toward the graduate Program, the central focus of which cannot be separated from research and reflection, considering the Psychology formation in all of its levels and aspects.

Profession and Academic Formation: Historical Aspects

The graduate Program in Brazil, as it is understood today, is relatively recent. This statement is true for Psychology, which has been regulated as a profession for less than 50 years, and where the graduate Program completed four decades of existence a few years ago. Some years before the regulation of the profession some universities implemented Psychology courses at the undergraduate level, however, this formation was only officially recognized after the regulation of the profession. Although there were some attempts to create formation courses in Psychology from the 1930s, only in 1953 was a course with these characteristics implemented and maintained at the *Pontifícia Universidade Católica* of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio) (Bernardes, 2004). There are surveys of historical information about courses related to Psychology in the country that go back a long way in time, reaching the nineteenth century (Bernardes, 2004; Lisboa & Barbosa, 2009).

It is true that the regulation of the profession occurred within a framework in which many professionals worked in activities which, by their nature, were characterized as professional activities in Psychology. Institutions such as the Psychological Society of São Paulo already existed, created in 1949, as well as periodicals circulated devoted to the area – some of which, such as the Psychology Bulletin and Brazilian Archives of Psychology (initially named Brazilian Archives of Psychotechnology) remain in circulation (Guedes,

2010). It is possible to say that Law 4119 of 27/08/1962, which established the regulation conditions for the profession in the country, recognized and organized an already existing situation, and needed to ensure, for the professionals already working, conditions for the continuity of their work (Campos, 1992), even imposing, from the date of its publication, the requirement that the preparation for the profession start to be performed in a specific higher education course.

At the time of the regulation of the profession and with the completion of Protocol 403/62 of the then named Federal Council of Education, which established the characteristics of the curriculum of undergraduate courses in the area, several Psychology courses appeared (Lisboa & Barbosa, 2009). This was facilitated by the fact that many institutions already offered training in the area, including many private institutions encouraged by the growing demand of the population for psychological services, especially the growing urban population, which contributed to increase interest in the courses. It should be remembered that this moment was marked by a large presence of the State in society, with the dictatorial government demanding greater participation from the private educational institutions in the system, and providing conditions for that to happen, as a way of dealing with the “university crisis”, since the universities were important centers of resistance to the dictatorship (Bernardes, 2004). Today, the participation of private institutions as responsible for offering Psychology courses has grown enormously.

Lisboa and Barbosa (2009) point out that there was a long period without significant changes in the conditions of undergraduate formation in Psychology, a period that, somehow, ended with the return of the debates spurred by the publication of the book “Who is the Brazilian Psychologist?”, in 1988, under the initiative of the Federal Council of Psychology, which became the first major diagnosis of the profession and the formation in Psychology in the country. Over the following years, the debate continued fruitfully, however, only in 1996 was a government initiative solidified, with the enactment of the National Education Guidelines and Bases Law (LDB) (Law No. 9.394, 1996).

It is noteworthy, given the implications for subsequent events, that the construction of the LDB was based on the neoliberal perspective that presided over the actions of the government of the time (Yamamoto, 2000). Following the enactment of the law, the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) established the Committee of Specialists in Psychology Education, which had the development of a curricular guidelines project as its main objective, which would eliminate the formation structure supported in a minimum curriculum (Lisboa & Barbosa, 2009; Yamamoto, 2000). The proposal of the Curricular Guidelines only materialized in 2004, replacing the focus on content with the concern for the development of competences and abilities necessary for the professional practice and production of knowledge.

Lisboa and Barbosa (2009) registered another activity resulting from the institution of the LDB: the national

evaluation of undergraduate courses, started in 1996 with the General Test, formally called the National Course Examination (ENC), into which psychology was inserted between 2000 and 2003. A new evaluation system was adopted in 2004 (National Higher Education Evaluation System [SINAES]), which was part of the National Examination of Student Performance (ENADE), applied from 2006. It is possible to say that, until the present time, the contribution of the mentioned evaluation systems for the quality of Psychology education was of little significance.

Observations have been presented regarding some aspects of interest for the discussion of undergraduate psychology education, returning to the time of the regulation of the profession, which highlights other issues relevant to the propositions to be presented in this article. What was the mode of formation for those people who, at the time the regulation of the profession, already acted as psychologists or in similar roles? It is interesting to note that Decree No. 53.464 (1964), which regulated Law 4.119, makes it clear that positions of psychologist and psychometric technician already existed in the civil service itself, and among the military there were professionals trained in a Personnel Classification course, offered by the Ministry of War from 1949. The examination of Protocol No. 171 of October 25, 1949, of the Ministry of War, which created this course, reveals that it even included a curious course entitled Psychology of Military Commanders.

Some people had done their formation abroad, in specific courses or courses in which the curriculum showed affinity with Psychology. A study of the pioneers of Psychology in Brazil indicates that approximately one quarter of the professionals who contributed to the construction of the area were born in other countries and did their formation there (Rocha & Alencar, 2007). In addition to these people, there were Brazilians who also studied abroad.

Other people did their formation in the country, mainly in faculties of Philosophy, Education or Medicine, in which there were disciplines and chairs of Psychology or of specific psychologies. In such cases, the continuity of the formation was carried out in direct contact with the professionals established in hospitals, in schools of elementary or high school level, in institutions of planning and evaluation of public programs, in institutions of selection and training of personnel, or during the actual practice of certain activities (e.g., educational supervision), with support from the available literature, partly translated and partly produced in the country itself.

One point that needs to be emphasized here is the fact that, in addition to undergraduate training and proven professional experience in activities recognized as being within the scope of psychology, the formation above undergraduate level was also assumed to be sufficient to justify the recognition of the right to exercise the profession. The text of Law No. 4.119 (1962) mentioned the possession of the Certificate of Specialist in Educational Psychology, Clinical

Psychology or Psychology Applied to Work issued by a recognized or official higher education institution, after regular studies in graduate courses lasting at least two years, as a valid possibility for granting professional registry.

Immediately afterwards, Decree No. 53.464 (1964) added the possession of a Doctorate in Psychology, a Doctorate in Educational Psychology, and a Doctorate in Educational Philosophy or in Pedagogy as valid possibilities, since the thesis defended would deal with the subject of Psychology. Later, Decree-Law No. 706 (1969), extended the right of registration to holders of Psychology or Educational Psychology Graduate Course Certificates, even when performed after the date of the regulation of the profession, provided that the registration had been made prior to the 1967 school year. The establishment of this date, different to what had been suggested by the committee constituted by the Minister of Education to regulate aspects of the law that recognized the profession, generated discomfort, as was explained in the important text that is the transcript of a lecture given in 1963 by a member of that committee (Azzi, 2010).

These legal texts show that, prior to the regulation of the profession in the country, there were Graduate courses (or equivalent activities) in the area of Psychology - specialization, master's (a term not in fact mentioned in the legal provisions), and doctorate. In the 1940s there were already some specialization courses. The Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (*Capes*) has existed since 1951 without, however, performing many of the functions that characterize it today, especially regarding the regulation and evaluation of the graduate courses. The important point to make in relation to this reality is the fact that graduate certificates and titles were, at that time, used as evidence that their holders could be evaluated in society as possessing competences that authorize the professional practice. Thereafter, graduate level certificates or titles and professional practice would never again justify such decisions. The legislation failed to consider this possibility, because the academic institutions and professionals of Psychology in the country failed to discuss it.

The relationship with the professional formation became complementary. Specializations (which later became designated as a *lato sensu* graduate modality, i.e., in the broad sense of being subsequent to the graduation) are not a legal requirement for professional practice, although they may establish important differences in terms of competences. Masters' and Doctorates (designated as forms of graduate studies, i.e., in the strict sense of being stages of the formation with features and objectives) only constitute explicit requirements for the different levels in the teaching career in public (and, in rare cases, private) institutions and access to apply for certain research funding. Exceptionally, the title also makes a difference to the progression in the professional career of Psychologist in public institutions (as occurs in the universities).

The *lato sensu* graduate courses long overstepped the limits of the educational institutions, escaping stringent

regulations and assessments, however, and perhaps because of this, their relationship with the labor market was amplified. The *stricto sensu* graduate courses, conversely, became the target of increasingly detailed regulations with stringent requirements, and periodic evaluations, gaining a configuration that limited them in the education and research institutions, an issue that will be taken up later.

In the case of Psychology, in 2000, the Federal Council of the profession, as other professional councils had already done, decided to produce regulations regarding the conditions that allow the professional to claim the title “specialist”, however, with the caveat always prevailing that this “title” indicated a differentiated formation or dedication in relation to any subarea of knowledge, without being a condition for the exercise of the profession. Such legislation, as with other professions, established different requirements from the official ones with respect to the specialization as an academic title, giving rise to conflicting supervision among the actors in the *lato sensu* graduate courses. As a result, academic specialization titles and professional titles existed together in these areas, however, in some cases, were equivalent, but not necessarily.

In the case of the titles subsequent to the graduation that were considered equivalent to current *stricto sensu* graduate titles, their initial history was exclusively staged in the university environment. Several people in the area of Psychology obtained titles of this nature in Brazil, called the old system, without undertaking regular courses. In cases of Full or Associate Professorships the candidate preparing the study would be evaluated by scholars of great experience and prestige (renowned). Those concerned were people who were in the education profession. There was no supervision (at least formally). Titles of Master’s and Doctorate could also be obtained through a similar mechanism, however, there was formal supervision. For the Doctorate, there are records since the 1940s, but few cases until the 1970s. In other areas separate experiments occurred. Seixas, Coelho-Lima and Costa (2010) mention that in the 1950s and 1960s Brazilian universities entered into agreements with foreign institutions “that allowed many graduate programs to be created, especially in the field of engineering” (p. 60).

With the end of the old system, by virtue of the 1968 university reform (which abolished the chairs), the year 1972 was set as the deadline for a Doctorate in that system. As an illustration of what happened in the Institute of Psychology of the *Universidade de São Paulo* (USP), an institution that was and remains the largest public university in the country, it is recorded that in that single year 43 Doctorate Theses were defended, under the responsibility of only eleven supervisors: Arrigo Angelini (7 supervisions), Carolina Bori (13), Cícero Christiano de Souza (2), Durval Marcondes (1), Geraldina Witter (3), Maria José Aguirre (3), Odette van Kolck (4), Oswaldo Barros Santos (2), Ruy Coelho (1), Samuel Pfromm Neto (3), and Walter Hugo Cunha (4) (*Universidade de São Paulo*, 1987). Even today, no Graduate Program

of the area, some relying on many more than eleven supervisors, issues 43 Doctorates in one year.

That same year, regular graduate courses had already begun in the country, which started to be accredited in the early 1970s. The pioneering Master’s Course in Psychology in the country was created in 1966 at PUC-Rio, with this course only becoming accredited by the CFE in 1972. On December 20th 1968 the first Master’s Dissertation in the mentioned course completed under the formal course system was defended by Leonel Pinto Correa (an educator born in Portugal who worked for many years at the *Universidade Federal do Ceará*), under the supervision of Carlos Paes de Barros (Féres-Carneiro, 2007).

In 1974, there were eight Master’s Courses in Psychology in Brazil, based in only three Brazilian states: (1) PUC-Rio - from 1966; (2) USP – Experimental Psychology, from 1970; (3) USP – School Psychology, from 1970; (4) *Instituto de Seleção e Orientação Profissional* – Fundação Getúlio Vargas (ISOP-FGV) – from 1971; (5) *Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo* (PUC-SP) – Social Psychology, from 1972; (6) *Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul* (PUC-RS), from 1972; (7) *Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas* (PUC-Camp), from 1972; and (8) *Universidade Gama Filho* – Rio de Janeiro (UGF-RJ), from 1973 (Tourinho & Bastos, 2010). This highlights a curiosity: the existence of a *stricto sensu* graduate course in an institution that did not also provide formation at the undergraduate level – in ISOP-FGV – is unique in the area to this day. In addition to the preceding information clarification is needed: the Graduate Studies Program in Psychology of Education at PUC-SP, began operations in 1969, but always remained linked, in *Capes*, to the Education Area Coordination (data available at www.pucsp.br/pos/ped/docente.htm). At the beginning of 1974, there were no regular Doctorate courses in Psychology in the country, with the same happening in the other areas of the Humanities. Many areas of the Exact, Biological and Engineering sciences were already running some Doctorate courses in this year (MEC, 1974). The first Doctoral courses of the area were only created at the end of 1974.

All the observations in the preceding paragraphs have been made in order to characterize, in general, the context in which one aspect was consolidated, which is the main focus of the present reflection: what factors can be identified as contributing to the framework of difficulties for promoting actual integration between the levels of formation of the undergraduate and graduate courses in the area of Psychology?

This does not mean that, where these two levels of formation are present, there is no form of articulation or (mutual) contribution from one to the other. It is known, for example, that the performance in the ENADE examination of students from institutions that have *stricto sensu* graduate courses is higher than those of students from institutions without this type of graduate course, in all five main structural points of the curricula of undergraduate formation in the area (Féres-Carneiro,

Bastos, Feitosa, Seidl-de-Moura, & Yamamoto, 2010). Although this data does not ensure that the only possible interpretation is that the graduate course is beneficial for the undergraduate course, it is very suggestive that this relationship is, in fact, implied by the data. Furthermore, it should be noted that in many cases the opening of Master's courses came with the maturing of the research activities developed by professors who only worked, until then, at the undergraduate level, and constructed a base of knowledge production in this level. This base, to a greater or lesser extent, thereafter fed the formation for research at both levels.

As the title of the article shows, what is being asked is a question, with justifications and answers being sought regarding the possibility of another pattern of "neighbors". Merely recognizing and acknowledging this is insufficient given the potential contribution that the closer proximity of these "neighbors" can bring for the expansion of the limits of the area.

Undergraduate/Graduate Course Integration: Difficulties and Proposals

The previously mentioned date of 1974 was when those responsible for the educational policy of the country realized that the graduate program, although still incipient, was growing due to localized initiatives, sometimes due to the obstinacy of small groups of professors, and that this was occurring without planning, featuring surprising "spontaneous" growth. This realization led to the formulation of a five-year plan of actions and goals for the graduate program: the I National Graduate Plan (PNPG) (MEC, 1974), for the period 1975-1979. The text of the I PNPG contains elements that are worth retrieving in order to advance the issue, as some concerns were already being expressed that have survived the passage of time and remain current, as well as information that portrays the framework from which the elaborators of the plan worked.

The graduate system – an unusual expression at the time, although already used in the university system – was limited. Only 50 institutions offered Master's and Doctorate courses, consisting of 25 federal, 10 state and 15 private (MEC, 1974). The number of Master's Courses, considering all areas of knowledge, was less than two hundred. Only half of the professors of these courses had doctorate titles and almost a fifth of them had only completed the undergraduate degree. In the specific case of Psychology, the text of the I PNPG (MEC, 1974) states that, in 1973, there were already 56 undergraduate courses occupying 920 professors – the majority of whom had no title -, with 36 of these courses based in the southeast of the country. For the year 1975, it was expected that 215 vacancies would be offered in already existing Master's courses, 72% of them in the southeast and 28% in the southern region.

The text of the I PNPG (MEC, 1974) includes a "Diagnosis of the current situation" of the graduate program, prepared, obviously, 37 years ago. It identifies three sets of already existing problems in the courses. In one of them the

following problems were found: (1) instability arising from the weakness of the links between the courses and institutions; (2) the lack of guaranteed funding; (3) the employment and professional instability of the professors, technicians and support staff, which generated interruptions of projects and didactic work; and (4) the continued perspective of needing to reduce or cut funding. These were all aspects that prevented long-term commitments. Growth problems appeared within another set. Two main aspects were highlighted. One involved the fact that some areas were subject to strong pressure due to the number of candidates being greater than the number of places, with an unwanted contrast in other areas, despite being essential and strategic. The other aspect was the geographical concentration already evident at that time, implying a post-university migration process predominantly in one direction – from the medium and small cities to the areas of the large capitals - without the necessary return of people to their places of origin.

Another group of difficulties included what has been called performance problems:

The current master's and doctorate courses, on the whole, are very inefficient. Some approximate indicators of the overall performance show that the majority of the candidates did not even complete the credits and, particularly in the Master's courses, only about 15% achieved the title. The minimum times taken to obtain the degrees were approximately 2 and a half years for the master's, and more than four years for the doctorate. These figures are high compared with international standards and with the actual needs and possibilities of the country. Contributing to this situation, among a host of other factors, is the low proportion of full-time scholarship students - about 40% - and a very high dropout rate, linked to the needs of the labor market, which has not been adequately served by the specialization and improvement courses, unduly burdening the master's and doctorate courses (MEC, 1974, p. 124).

The description that the document classified as "performance issues" was reproduced as it appears in the original document, because it is directly related to one of the aspects that developed more within the context of the graduate courses: a virtual obsession to scrutinize and evaluate what is produced in each course – or, in current terms, in each Program. It is worth noting that the I PNPG (MEC, 1974) emphasized aspects related to the formation when addressing the performance problems. It is curious that the document does not refer to any proposal or indication of a need to evaluate the graduate program and even so, only two years after its appearance, *Capes* started what would become a complex and respected peer evaluation system. It is also remarkable that this evaluation added to the aspects related to the formation, the evaluation of the quality and of the volume of scientific, technical and cultural development production, which is now in fact the item with the greatest importance taken into account in the evaluation, especially after the III edition of the PNPG in 1986, which formalized the indication

that the production of knowledge is the aspect that should be favored in the evaluation system (Yamamoto, 2006; Yamamoto, Tourinho, & Menandro, 2007).

This article, however, does not intend to discuss the evaluation of the graduate Program in general, but rather to highlight the fact that even today the characteristics of the integration mechanisms between the graduate and undergraduate level Programs in the same institution carry inexpressive weight in the graduate Program evaluation model. The collaborative interaction with graduate Programs of other institutions, especially those located in regions where the need is greater, contributes more to the final evaluation of a Program than its articulation with the undergraduate course for which its own professors are co-responsible. Similarly, despite the clear qualitative improvement in the *stricto sensu* graduate Program, with a considerable impact on the structure of university research, management and evaluation policies of the undergraduate Program were, as a rule, nonexistent, which induced the search for interaction with the graduate Program. Except for the localized initiative of groups with activities in the two levels, it was difficult to structure activities that represented a more organic integration between the two levels of formation.

It is understandable that, in the framework that had existed for almost forty years, the urgency to develop the graduate Program and the limited framework of professionals prepared and available to do this, in practice, emphatically directed the focus of interest toward the graduate Program. It is important, however, to review the fact that, at various times, the text of the I PNPG highlighted the importance of the articulation between undergraduate and graduate Programs. Some examples of this concern are transcribed below: (a) "Teaching and research should be integrated at all levels, and the various levels must be articulated" (MEC, 1974, p. 120); (b) "It is appropriate to promote a progressive articulation of the curricula and educational work themes between the undergraduate and graduate levels" (MEC, 1974, p. 136); (c) "It is advisable to place greater emphasis on the use of laboratories and offices in projects of joint undergraduate and graduate activities, taking care of the scientific methodology involved, and of the progressive engagement of teams of students, professors and researchers in the long-term research lines" (MEC, 1974, p. 136); (d) "The integration of undergraduate education with graduate education leading a significant part of the teaching body of the department to perform activities simultaneously on the two levels is considered necessary, taking into account the best distribution of the workload" (MEC, 1974, p. 137).

It is true that the difficulties of proposing and effecting integration mechanisms between the undergraduate and graduate Programs, more elaborate than smaller initiatives arising from the fact that the installation of both levels share work spaces or function in contiguous spaces, are not just a thing of the past. In a recent text, produced as part of the Horizons Seminar of the Psychology Graduate Program in

Brazil, held in November 2008 in the city of Bento Gonçalves, RS, on the initiative of the Coordination of the area of Psychology in *Capes* and of the National Association of Research and Graduate Studies in Psychology (ANPEPP), with the support of the Graduate Program in Psychology of the *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul* (UFRGS), the matter was the object of interest. Féres-Carneiro et al. (2010), in the cited text, when dealing with gaps in the Brazilian graduate Program in Psychology, asked whether the formation at the undergraduate level can be considered a gap in the graduate Program, and propose a strategy of "increased investment in the proximity of the undergraduate Program with the graduate Program and the inclusion of research in the undergraduate Program" (p. 23).

Perhaps it could be said that the current situation is to be characterized in such a way that measures will be required in addition to the two main procedures used at the moment as integration strategies between the undergraduate and graduate Programs. One is the incorporation of some undergraduate students into training directed toward the scientific initiation, which brings the undergraduate students closer to the research developed in their institution, but without this being an integral part of the requirements for their formation. This kind of opportunity promotes greater familiarity with the day to day of scientific work and increases competences commonly introduced in curricular methodological disciplines, however, is usually restricted to a portion of the undergraduate student body, due to the scarcity of scientific initiation scholarships, among other reasons.

The other procedure is to provide graduate students with direct contact with a group of undergraduate students through the teaching internship – a procedure which still today, after several years of implementation, presents a great diversity of formats and the need for regulation. Nevertheless, there are already reports available regarding some interesting experiences related to this type of practice that involves the two levels of formation. An example is the text of Verhine and Dantas (2007), in which the authors describe how they faced what they class as the main challenges involved: "(1) the learning of the students at the undergraduate level under the responsibility of the scholarship recipient, (2) their learning/formation as teachers, and in addition, (3) the harnessing of this experience for the development of the dissertation/thesis" (p. 173). In some cases, this training procedure of the graduate students leads them to assume a significant part of the responsibilities regarding the undergraduate Program, under conditions that, for some, tend to compromise the quality of the education. Although it has positive aspects, this solution inevitably generates controversy.

In public universities, especially, since private institutions have greater freedom and flexibility to deal with staffing levels, a situation, unknown until recently, is consolidating. The departments are increasingly homogeneous, with many cases in which all the professors are doctors and develop research. The somewhat comfortable situation, in which a

group of professors is primarily devoted to the graduate Program and another group dedicated solely to the undergraduate program, has become unviable. It is true that doing the Doctorate has not given the professors direct access to formation functions in the graduate Program, however, it sometimes ends up being another component for the separation between the undergraduate and graduate Programs.

Faced with this situation, additional difficulties arise to reconcile the teaching body needed to meet the undergraduate formation, which involves great thematic diversity, with the organization of the graduate Program, which, by tradition, since the III PNPG, has been thought of as necessarily concentrated around a subarea of knowledge or of research lines (Yamamoto et al., 2007). It should be remembered that, in the cases of the pioneer Programs, all had a second name: Clinical or Social Psychology, School, Applied, or Experimental Psychology, or Psychology of the Personality, among others. Therefore, the increase in the specialization of teaching practice, which is concentrated more heavily in the graduate Program, follows the proposal for the organization of the graduate Program, in its initial stage, and from then accompanies the separation between the levels.

An additional aspect that should be highlighted in relation to Psychology is the fact that some areas of concentration (or research lines) are much more common in the graduate Programs than in others, even in a context of great diversity (Yamamoto et al., 2007). Clearly, this imbalance indicates that the graduate Programs of the area partially reflect the fields and domains involved in the formation of psychologists in the undergraduate Programs. It is possible, in this same domain, to add an issue that has not yet been incisively presented, but that the area will need to consider at some point. In recent years there have been numerous multidisciplinary graduate Programs, some of which have Psychology involved in the composition of the focus of the proposed formation and research. In the case of this type of Program, it will be impossible to establish precise correspondences between thematic areas of the undergraduate and graduate Programs, making the proposal of mechanisms for articulation between the two levels of training even more complex.

If the diversity of interests of the teaching body of the graduate Program do not expand evenly with the curricular requirements of the undergraduate Program - which, in fact, already happened, as discussed by Féres-Carneiro et al. (2010) - and considering that the same teaching body, will integrally be in both levels of training, what may occur? Will the emphasis need to be transformed into specializations? Is it feasible for each institution to have multiple Graduate Programs, one for each subarea?

It can be considered that the specialized practice in *stricto sensu* graduate courses need not be accompanied by the same thematic limitation, so that the contribution of a professor in the graduate education is relevant and enhanced by the competence in research that is developed

independently. For example, researchers in the area of Developmental Psychology are not necessarily restricted from giving, with competence and different results, Social Psychology disciplines, however, this alternative requires a still uncommon academic culture.

Final Considerations

Returning to the question contained in the title of this article, it is worth emphasizing that these are not neighbors without affinity. Maybe it is more productive to think that we are talking about neighbors, each with many attributes, resulting from the own growing demands and responsibilities, in the context in which time and motivation may be lacking for the interaction, for the rediscovery, and for the reconstruction. Even though this may not be the typical picture of some institutions, it adequately describes the reality of many.

At some point, certainly not too distant, it could lead to the situation where a university offers, for example, a *Formation and Knowledge Production Program in Psychology*, with various activities: stages of initiation to the knowledge and research in Psychology for high school education; undergraduate courses with disciplines, internships and other activities, which integrate university extension programs and scientific initiation internships articulated with graduate activities; improvement courses; specialization courses; master's degrees (academic and professional); doctorates; and internships for continued training after the doctorate. Differences in levels of formation do not disappear, however, what is emphasized is the articulation between them, implying commitments of solidarity that do not harm the activities of any of them. For this, new forms of integration between the undergraduate and graduate Programs need to start, perhaps immediately being put into practice, emphasizing here that the current rules do not impede such actions. It is possible to think of disciplines or activities that have special characteristics and that integrate the curriculum of both the undergraduate and the graduate Programs: these disciplines or activities can be offered to both levels simultaneously, even though the requirements for each group of students are not identical. Yamamoto (2006), for example, describes an interesting way of linking the two levels of learners: training in supervision, i.e., the development of competences involved in the supervision activities of students, by the graduate Program teachers. The author explains that

at the same time as the graduate students will be starting supervision activities - presumably an indispensable competence for those who wish to embrace the academic career - the undergraduate students have an additional opportunity to further their studies (Yamamoto, 2006, p. 276).

It is relevant to note that, in the *stricto sensu* graduate Program legislation, no restrictions are found regarding

this type of interaction. Often, the institutions that promote the courses create limitations, without realizing that they are imposing on themselves a model that prevents innovative experiences that can enrich the formation at all levels. The mention of activities that do not constitute formal disciplines is important because they can be presented in many different formats and involve undergraduate students and graduate students, either as apprentices or as instructors, depending on the experiences they have already undergone in their trajectory at the institution. Some activities that aim to amplify the integration between the undergraduate and graduate Programs already adopted by the field of Psychology, as described in their reports were examined and discussed by Yamamoto (2006).

Examples of possible activities that fulfill this purpose are presented (among these, some appear in the text above), to be considered along with other actions that each institution considers feasible and compatible with its characteristics: (1) monitoring the activities of high school students participating in (research, extension) programs in the institution, with or without a scholarship from the high school scientific initiation program; (2) participation (possibly as an instructor) in scientific writing workshops; (3) collaboration in the preparation of posters to be presented at scientific meetings and, when appropriate, in the preparation of articles to be submitted for publication; (4) training (possibly as an instructor) in the use of software for organizing and analyzing data; (5) training (possibly as an instructor) in the use of databases; (6) collaboration in the organization of events of interest for undergraduate and/or graduate Programs; (7) Technical and administrative assistance in editing journals and in the maintenance of specific institutional electronic pages, (8) collaboration in updating and maintaining library collections linked to small groups or graduate lines of research; (9) collaboration in activities of searching for and updating information necessary to maintain active records of the activities of the participants of all levels of training; (10) co-supervision of the conclusion work for the undergraduate course, in the case of master's and doctoral students; (11) participation in university extension activities, consistent with the emphasis of the undergraduate level formation and with the size of the groups to which they will devote themselves, which must have been planned considering those interested in vocational training as well as those interested in research, (12) participation of all in scientific initiation activities, which can reach all undergraduate students, and may be formally linked to the graduate Program, so that the undergraduate students would be placed in direct contact with the activities of the master's and doctoral students who, in turn, would gain experiences in supervision and mentoring as part of their formation.

The valorization of these activities requires an innovative view of the undergraduate formation process. The current focus on promoting competences and abilities for guiding the undergraduate pedagogical projects favors formation initiatives that reserve a great space for these activities, in the

place of formal disciplines, often taught with an emphasis on intellectual contents. The advancement of such a prospective, still being explored hesitantly in the area of Psychology, could make a big difference for integrating the undergraduate and graduate Programs. The importance of the graduate program in Psychology in the country has not, so far, translated into any form of legal requirement for the exercise of certain sectors of professional activity. It is understandable that it has been this way up to the present moment, considering the historical aspects already mentioned. Can the growth, the spread to all regions of the country, and the amplification of the diversity of Psychology graduate courses in Brazil be seen as factors that will press for changes in such a scenario? These are questions that cannot yet be answered with confidence, however, it also seems inappropriate to label them as absolutely extemporaneous.

A brief digression is justified here to address an issue that has not yet been produced in Psychology, an effect similar to that observed in other areas: the Professional Master's Degree. The Brazilian Graduate Program in Psychology is essentially "academic", leaving in the background the discussion regarding the formation of Masters and Doctors to work as professionals. In the Professional Master's a differentiated and flexible formation strategy should be adopted, thought of not in terms of lines of research, but in terms of area of competence for solving problems and for innovation (Fischer, 2010).

The Professional Master's was mentioned to highlight an interesting possibility of articulation between the undergraduate and graduate Programs that enables: curricular internships for undergraduate students developed in association with the final work of the Professional Master's, that could integrate research, technological development and innovation, and thus provide an updated and high level professional formation (Menandro, 2010). In the case of institutions such as the Federal Institutes of Education (especially in such cases, but not only them) that offer formation at high school, undergraduate and graduate levels, a threefold articulation will be facilitated between the master's activities, the curricular undergraduate internships and even laboratory and field internships and practices that the high school students must perform (Fischer, 2010; Menandro, 2010). Possibilities such as these should not be seen as unthinkable in the context of Psychology.

The PhD is now almost a requirement for an academic career, i.e., to practice in teaching and research in the major universities in the country, in which the selection procedures that do not require it have virtually disappeared. Today, for example, there are no more professor supervisors in the graduate Program of the area who have not obtained a PhD. Data from 1995 regarding the teaching body of the graduate Programs in the field of Psychology, collected from the print archives of *Capes* that are still not available in digital media, revealed several cases of non Doctorate professors who acted as advisors as little as 15 years ago. The Doctorate

title is also a condition to access almost all forms of research funding, which explicitly require this title, without generating legal controversies and without allowing any alternative type of universal access. Over the next decade, the *stricto sensu* graduate Program in Brazil will undergo new transformations and the practice in this level of formation will require new routines and new requirements for all involved. It is not unlikely that this process affects the exercise of the professions in the country.

In Brazil, none of the professional activities of psychologists require any kind of graduate formation in the strict sense. Is it justifiable to think about changing this condition? Would it contribute to society and to the prestige of the profession? Will, as in the past, graduate titles be sufficient for the exercise of the profession? It is worth remembering that the graduate Program flourished in an environment with 35 years of tradition of evaluation and simple reading of the report of the area regarding the evaluation within the Psychology Graduate Program context for the 2007-2009 triennium highlights the seriousness and relevance of the work done at this level of formation (Tourinho & Bastos, 2010).

This set of reflections finishes with the clarification that was designed in order to offer creative and viable articulation opportunities between the undergraduate and graduate Programs, however, assuming that the two levels of formation continue to exist in similar forms as they do today. This assumption can also be questioned, however, that would require the construction of another structure of argumentation that is not feasible within the limits of this article.

References

- Azzi, E. (2010). A situação atual da profissão de psicólogo no Brasil. In O. H. Yamamoto & A. L. F. Costa (Orgs.), *Escritos sobre a profissão de psicólogo no Brasil* (pp. 106-120). Natal: Editora da UFRN.
- Bernardes, J. S. (2004). *O debate atual sobre a formação em psicologia no Brasil - permanências, rupturas e cooptações nas políticas educacionais*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP.
- Campos, R. H. F. (1992). 30 anos de regulamentação: Análise. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 12(2), 5-7. doi:10.1590/S1414-98931992000200002
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia. (1988). *Quem é o psicólogo brasileiro?* São Paulo: EDICON.
- Decreto-Lei No. 706. (1969, 25 de julho). Estende aos portadores de certificado de curso de pós-graduação em psicologia e psicologia educacional, o direito assegurado pelo Art. 19 da Lei nº 4.119-62. Brasília: Presidência da República.
- Decreto No. 53.464. (1964, 21 de janeiro). Regulamenta a Lei No. 4.119, de agosto de 1962, que dispõe sobre a Profissão de Psicólogo. Brasília: Presidência da República.
- Féres-Carneiro, T. (2007). Memórias do curso de pós-graduação em psicologia da PUC-Rio: Comemorando seus 40 anos. *Psicologia Clínica*, 19(1), 217-225. doi:10.1590/S0103-56652007000100016
- Féres-Carneiro, T., Bastos, A. V., Feitosa, M. A. G., Seidl-de-Moura, M. L., & Yamamoto, O. H. (2010). Lacunas, metas e condições para a expansão da pós-graduação em psicologia no país. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 23(Supl. 1), 11-24. doi:10.1590/S0102-79722010000400003
- Fischer, T. (2010). Documento - sobre maestria, profissionalização e artesanato intelectual. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 14(2), 353-359. doi: 10.1590/S1415-65552010000200010
- Guedes, M. C. (2010). Enzo Azzi (1921-1985), um médico italiano na psicologia brasileira. In O. H. Yamamoto & A. L. F. Costa (Orgs.), *Escritos sobre a profissão de psicólogo no Brasil* (pp. 121-141). Natal, RN: Editora da UFRN.
- Lei No. 4.119, de 27 de agosto de 1962. (1962, 05 de setembro). Dispõe sobre os cursos de formação em psicologia e regulamenta a profissão de psicólogo. *Diário Oficial da União, seção 1*.
- Lei No. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. (1996, 23 de dezembro). Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. *Diário Oficial da União, seção 1*.
- Lisboa, F. S., & Barbosa, A. J. G. (2009). Formação em psicologia no Brasil: Um perfil dos cursos de graduação. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 29(4), 718-737. doi:10.1590/S1414-98932009000400006
- Menandro, P. R. M. (2010). Réplica 2 - Mestrado profissional, você sabe com quem está falando? *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 14(2), 367-371. doi: 10.1590/S1415-65552010000200012
- Ministério da Educação e Cultura. (1974). *I PNPG Plano Nacional de Pós-Graduação - PNPG 1975-1979*. Recuperado 01 de Outubro de 2011, de http://www.capes.gov.br/images/stories/download/editais/I_PNPG.pdf
- Rocha, N. M. D., & Alencar, M. A. (2007). Pioneiros da psicologia brasileira: Diversidade e ética. In M. A. T. Ribeiro, J. S. Bernardes, & C. E. Lang (Orgs.), *A produção na diversidade: Compromissos éticos e políticos em psicologia* (pp. 207-230). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Seixas, P. S., Coelho-Lima, F., & Costa, A. L. F. (2010). Caracterização de dissertações/teses que versam sobre a profissão de psicólogo no Brasil. In O. H. Yamamoto & A. L. F. Costa (Orgs.), *Escritos sobre a profissão de psicólogo no Brasil* (pp. 61-97). Natal: Editora da UFRN.
- Tourinho, E. Z., & Bastos, A. V. B. (Coords.). (2010). *Relatório de avaliação 2007-2009: Trienal 2010*. Recuperado 01 de Outubro de 2011, de <http://trienal.capes.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/PSICOLOGIA-rel-11set10.pdf>.
- Universidade de São Paulo. Instituto de Psicologia. Serviço de Biblioteca e Documentação. (1987). *Resumos de teses de psicologia, USP - 1934-1986*. São Paulo: IPUSP.

- Verhine, R. E., & Dantas, L. M. V. (2007). Estágio de docência: Conciliando o desenvolvimento da tese com a prática em sala de aula. *Revista Brasileira de Pós-Graduação*, 4(8), 171-191.
- Yamamoto, O. H. (2000). A LDB e a psicologia. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 20(4), 30-37. doi:10.1590/S1414-98932000000400004
- Yamamoto, O. H. (2006). Graduação e pós-graduação em psicologia: Relações possíveis. *Revista Brasileira de Pós-Graduação*, 3(6), 270-281.
- Yamamoto, O. H., Tourinho, E. Z., & Menandro, P. R. M. (2007). Pesquisa e pós-graduação em psicologia no Brasil: Linhas (e entrelinhas) de pesquisa. In M. A. T. Ribeiro, J. S. Bernardes, & C. E. Lang (Orgs.), *A produção na diversidade: Compromissos éticos e políticos em psicologia* (pp. 15-33). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.

Paulo Rogério Meira Menandro is Full Professor, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória-ES, Brazil.

Emmanuel Zagury Tourinho is Full Professor, Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém-PA, Brazil.

Antônio Virgílio Bittencourt Bastos is Full Professor, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador-BA, Brazil.

Oswaldo Hajime Yamamoto is Full Professor, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Natal-RN, Brazil.

Received: May 5th 2012

1st Revision: Mar. 4th 2013

Approved: Mar. 22nd 2013

How to cite this article:

- Menandro, P. R. M., Tourinho, E. Z., Bastos, A. V. B., & Yamamoto, O. H., (2013). Graduate and undergraduate studies: Neighbors without affinity? *Paidéia (Ribeirão Preto)*, 23(55), 187-196. doi:10.1590/1982-43272355201306