

DEGREE IN PSYCHOLOGY: THE EDUCATIONAL DIMENSION OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Marta Corrêa de Moraes ¹; Apoliana Regina Groff ¹

ABSTRACT

Among the work processes currently recognized by the National Curriculum Guidelines (DCNs) for Undergraduate Psychology Courses, there are the formative and educational processes, which clearly involve an educational dimension of the profession. However, the qualification in graduation - teacher training - is optional for the bachelor and provided for in a complementary pedagogical project to the training of the psychologist. Therefore, we aim to argue in this essay that, in addition to complementing the training of psychologists, enabling them to teach, a degree in psychology is essential to forge the educational dimension of professional practice.

Keywords: psychology; graduation; professional practice

Licenciatura en Psicología: la dimensión educativa de la práctica profesional

RESUMEN

Entre los procesos de trabajo actualmente reconocidos por las Directrices Curriculares Nacionales (DCNs) para los Cursos de Graduación en Psicología, están los procesos formativos y educativos, los cuales abarcan una dimensión evidentemente educativa de la profesión. Sin embargo, la habilitación en licenciatura - formación de profesor(as) - es facultativa al licenciado(a) y establecido en un proyecto pedagógico complementar a la formación del (de la) psicólogo(a). De ser así, objetivamos argumentar en este ensayo que, para más allá de complementar la formación del (de la) psicólogo (a) capacitándose en la docencia, la licenciatura en psicología es imprescindible para forjar la dimensión educativa de la práctica profesional.

Palabras clave: psicología; licenciatura; práctica profesional

Licenciatura em Psicologia: a dimensão educativa da prática profissional

RESUMO

Entre os processos de trabalho atualmente reconhecidos pelas Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais (DCNs) para os cursos de graduação em Psicologia, estão os processos formativos e educativos, os quais envolvem uma dimensão evidentemente educativa da profissão. Contudo, a habilitação em licenciatura - formação de professores(as) - é facultativa ao bacharel e prevista em um projeto pedagógico complementar à formação do(a) psicólogo(a). Sendo assim, objetivamos argumentar neste ensaio que, para além de complementar a formação do(a) psicólogo(a) habilitando-o(a) para a docência, a licenciatura em Psicologia é imprescindível para forjar a dimensão educativa da prática profissional.

Palavras-chave: psicología; licenciatura; prática profissional

¹ Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina – Florianópolis – SC – Brasil; martacorreamoraes@gmail.com; poligroff@gmail.com

INITIAL ARGUMENTS

Recently, in 2018, the Brazilian Association for Teaching Psychology (ABEP), the Federal Council of Psychology (CFP) and the National Federation of Psychologists (FENAPSI) began a process of reviewing the National Curriculum Guidelines (DCNs) for courses degree in Psychology. The result of this process, which brought together numerous contributions from the category, was approved by the National Health Council and is awaiting evaluation by the National Education Council. As the document “Year of Training in Psychology: review of national curriculum guidelines for undergraduate courses in psychology” assures, we sought to build a democratic process for reviewing the DCNs, as well as explaining the important contributions of Psychology to Brazil and to Latin America (Conselho Federal de Psicologia, 2018).

In the Art. 4, the DCNs state that “the undergraduate course in Psychology must ensure a scientific, ethical, political, generalist, humanist, critical, reflective, democratic and secular education, based on Human Rights” (CFP, 2018, p. 114). In this direction, they propose a training that guarantees to the graduates the basic and diversified domain of knowledge in Psychology, as well as a set of knowledge and practices that, organized in work processes, allow the psychologist to act in different contexts of professional insertion. No Art. 13, the DCNs list fifteen work processes currently recognized in the professional practice of Psychology, and, for the purpose of the discussions proposed here, we highlight three (CFP, 2018, p. 122):

VI - Educational Processes (teacher training/orientation; educational planning; development of educational projects; performance/intervention in formal and non-formal educational contexts; evaluation of educational processes; professional/vocational guidance; planning and monitoring of socio-educational measures); VII- Training Processes (training of professionals and workers from different areas); VIII- Formative Processes of Psychologists (training of psychologists at undergraduate or graduate level).

We understand that these work processes can be developed in companies and other organizations, in social policies and public policies involving different areas of action, such as health, social assistance, education, work, justice, among others, as well as in any context in which there is a demand for the formative and educational dimension of our profession. However, if we consider the way in which the psychologist is prepared in Psychology courses for such professional activity: “Is the development of the ability to teach already built in?” (Cirino, Knupp, Lemos, & Domingues, 2007, p. 29). In other words, at what point in the

training of psychologists are experiences and learning opportunities that enable this professional to develop educational and training processes for individuals and groups?

As predicted by the 2011 DCNs, in relation to the qualification that forms the graduate, the updated document maintains the training of Psychology teachers in a pedagogical project complementary to the training of the psychologist, being mandatory its offer for the courses and the student being given the option or not for the degree. Faced with the complementary perspective of this in the formation of the psychologist, as professors who work in both qualifications in psychology (bachelor’s and licentiate) at a Federal University, we are questioned by our students: why and what for do we have to study a degree in Psychology? What is the meaning of this academic commitment? Is there a job market for graduates in Psychology?

We will discuss the historical and current situation of the degree in Psychology in Brazil, detailing its relation with Basic Education, especially with High School, since this was a specific field of dispute for the performance of the teacher in Psychology (Leite, 2007; Soligo & Azzi, 2008). However, at the beginning of this conversation, we are interested in reflecting more broadly about the relation between Psychology and the educational processes involving individuals and groups, because “if psychological knowledge is not part of Basic Education projects and psychologists themselves do not give importance in fact, what does that mean? For what education would psychology be relevant?” (Barros, 2007, p. 33).

We would like, therefore, to link this reflection to the three work processes mentioned above, as these characterize the educational dimension of the profession more objectively. These work processes point to a myriad of possibilities for the role of the psychologist, for example, in the training of teachers at all levels of education, workers and/or managers) in organizational contexts and in public policies, with groups of family members, adolescents, etc. Recognizing, at least, that these are contemporary work demands for Psychology, we argue that, in addition to complementing the training of the psychologist, enabling him/her to teach, a degree in Psychology is essential to forge the educational dimension of professional practice.

In this sense, it is in the articulation between the training of the psychologist and the training of the graduate in Psychology that the student has the opportunity to appropriate a theoretical-methodological field that will support the practices at least related to training and educational work processes. In this direction, we will continue the arguments of this essay, seeking to position an ethical-political perspective for the educational/training performance

of the psychologist-teacher.

DEGREE IN PSYCHOLOGY

The history of Psychology as a science and profession is in line, in Brazil, with the constitution of the educational field, as it is there that it will find favorable conditions for its development and consolidation in the national scenario, still in the 19th century. About this history of meeting between Psychology and Education, several authors started to think/problematicize, especially as a way of denouncing a Psychology that, for a long time, produced countless stories of exclusion and violence, notably when their knowledge and practices were aimed at the poorest sections of the Brazilian population (Guzzo, Mezzalira, Moreira, Tizzei, & Silva Neto, 2010; Machado, 2016; Patto, 1990; Soligo & Azzi, 2008). The changes that took place in Brazil between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century will demand another form of social and political organization in which the formation of a “new” man/woman for a “new” world becomes a priority (Antunes, 2008). We live there the strengthening of liberal thought and also the search for modernity supported, above all, in the process of emerging industrialization in the country. In the center of this new social and economic configuration, which seeks to break with the agrarian-export model, hegemonic until then, the education of children becomes urgent, which translates into the diffusion of schooling for the mass of the Brazilian population and also the requirement of a greater systematization of pedagogical ideas. As well warned by Guzzo et al. (2010), Psychology, as a science and profession, emerges and consolidates in this context and, with its knowledge and practices, seeks to make bodies viable for this new form of sociability, configured by the dictates of capitalism on the rise. In this movement, it ignored the historical inequalities of a country marked by colonization. With that, it tried to act on the so-called learning problems and on the adjustment of children who did not correspond to the desired model of “good student”, promoting “a disservice to Education, with its connivance, as it sought adaptation and [...] conformity to a certain social reality, ignoring social inequality, exploitation, cultural domination and perverse social and educational practices of exclusion/inclusion” (Molon, 2002, p. 219).

Regarding teaching, Soligo and Azzi (2008) remind us that this is also one of the fields of insertion of Psychology in Education. The authors also highlight the programmatic unit of *Psychology*, which was included in the Philosophy course in the 1850s, at Colégio Pedro II, in Rio de Janeiro. Its insertion, it is important to remember, because it is configured as an attempt to build a school that should serve as a model for National Secondary Education. A few years later, in the 1890s, Psychology became part of the curriculum of Normal

Schools aimed at training teachers, which remains until today in several still existing teaching courses, including its presence in the level s higher in all undergraduate courses. In the case of the Federal University, where we work as professors, the Discipline of Educational Psychology is taught in sixteen undergraduate courses and the teaching internship in Psychology has been more frequent in Teaching Courses, although it is important to highlight its presence in Technical and in the continuing education of teachers. Therefore, it is relevant to point out the presence of these students in the Institutional Scholarship Program for Teaching Initiation (PIBID), from August 2010 to February 2018. Unfortunately, as Carvalho, Cord and Sganderla (2018) observe, the program has been undergoing changes and one of them was the withdrawal of its offer for some licentiate courses, among which is the Licentiate in Psychology.

It seems evident that, once again, we are facing setbacks for Education in general and for the degree in Psychology in particular, because, despite the struggles to maintain it as essential for the training of psychologists, we see its possibilities of training reduce even more. This is a trajectory made of advances and retreats that need to be considered, especially in the connection always necessary with the contexts in which the retraction and amplitude movements are engendered. Between comings and goings, Psychology “was present all the time, whether in regular education or in professional secondary education (in some areas, considered of extreme relevance, such as health, administration and teacher training)” (Soligo & Azzi, 2008, p. 64). An important milestone in the history of Psychology teaching took place with the approval of the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education - LDBEN nº 5.692/1971, which implemented in Brazil, in the midst of the military dictatorship, the so-called vocational education, with the objective that young people, especially from the popular classes, would finish high school with a profession. Which, in turn, was intended to guarantee the privileges of the Brazilian elite whose children would continue to access the University.

In that context, the disciplines of Psychology, Philosophy and Sociology were removed from the youth training curricula because they were considered harmful to training, especially due to the critical and reflective nature they sought to design. This policy, however, ended up weakening some of its objectives, as Leite (2007) rightly warns, because, on the one hand, the State was unable to invest in the professionalization conditions of high schools and, on the other hand, the university continued to be identified as the main route of social ascension for all sectors of the population, notably for the middle class. On the other hand, the withdrawal of disciplines from the area of Human

Sciences was certainly something that the Regime of Exception managed to impose, even though the movements of struggle and resistance to post-64 politics tried to break it.

According to Leite (2007, p. 12), in the field of Psychology, it is possible to highlight the movement of opposition to the directions that national politics had been imposing on the country and that found echoes in a part of Psychology that was used to its dictates. This opposition movement was created in the late 1970s and allowed “to win the elections for the Psychologists’ Syndicate in the State of São Paulo and, later, those for the Regional Council of Psychology of S. Paulo”. The platform of struggle included the defense of a democratic education and also the return of the discipline of Psychology to, then, secondary education. Discussions like this will be added to the struggles for the return to democratization of Brazilian society, which implied considering the directions and purposes of education in our country, marked, until then, by a deterministic, individualizing and biological vision of the educational phenomenon and the individual differences. Conceptions that were supported by many knowledge of Psychology, especially those identified with a functionalist, medicalizing and normative perspective that despised “the educational process as a multi-determined totality, relegating to the background, or omitting, factors of a historical, social, political, economic nature and, above all, pedagogical in determining the educational process” (Antunes, 2008, p. 472).

For Barros (2007), this narrow notion that was built among the psychologists about Education can also be considered one of the factors that contributed to the deep lack of interest of professionals in the teaching profession. Allied to this issue, one cannot forget that, between the regulation of the profession in 1962 until the democratic reopening in the early 1980s, there were more than two decades of training of psychologists in the context of the dictatorship. This is a mark that Psychology, as a science and profession, carries to this day, because in a political context in which social criticism could not be carried out and, at the same time, a technical perspective was proposed for basic education, field of work of Psychology, whether as a psychologist or psychology teacher, has become quite restricted. Thus, it is not surprising that,

precisely in the regulation of the profession, the field of education, which used to be the main base for the development of Psychology in Brazil, becomes secondary for professionals in the area. This is revealed not only in the curricular scope, but, above all, in the preference of students and professionals for the clinical and work organization fields. (Antunes, 2008, p. 472).

As Furlan (2017, p.53) rightly states, “situating the place of Psychology within this history allows us, therefore, to bring to memory an “other” historical narrative of Psychology that has been hidden or silenced”. This implies taking an accurate look at the relationship between Psychology and Human Rights and, consequently, at the impacts of the military-civil dictatorship (1964-1985) on the contemporary knowledge of Psychology (Furlan, 2017). In the years of the dictatorship, the context of the clinic took a prominent place, “despite the school and industry environments are also characteristic of that time, with Psychology, in these contexts, an instrument of exclusion” (Furlan, 2017, p. 93). However, it is important to highlight that, with the promulgation of the 1988 Constitution, Psychology began to gain momentum as an area committed to the demands of the Brazilian population, to the popular classes and to a democratic education and society.

Thus, it is in this same decade that we have the return of the discipline of Psychology in regular High School in the State of São Paulo, the result of countless discussions and articulations of the category in that State. However, the imminent optimism was shattered with the approval of the new Law of Directives and Bases of National Education (Law 9,394/96), because although it recognizes the importance of the Human Sciences in the citizenship formation of adolescents and young people, it started to incorporate only the Philosophy and Sociology subjects in the High School curriculum. In this dispute, Psychology lost space as a disciplinary field and started to appear as a transversal theme.

In the 2000s, new attempts were made to include Psychology in regular secondary education again, but they were not successful. What is observed is that the focus of the graduate’s performance is mainly focused on the last years of Basic Education. In this limbo, the DCNs for Psychology Courses, published in 2004, announced, at that time, another proposal for the degree, namely, a pedagogical project complementary to the training of the psychologist. Two significant consequences stem from this change in Psychology training:

The first was the drastic reduction in the offer of Degree in Psychology; the second was the shrinkage of the field of Education in training in Psychology, which is evidenced by the reduced offer of disciplines focused on the area and the limited number of emphases in Education listed in the different courses in the country. (CFP, 2018, p. 31).

In view of this, seeking to resume this important field of study and action, in 2008 the CFP instituted, “The Year of Psychology in Education”, and in the course of it, the publication of the guiding text for the National Seminar of the Year of Psychology in Education (CFP,

2008). In the same year, we also have the publication of the manifesto, “8 Reasons to learn Psychology in High School” (Conselho Regional de Psicologia São Paulo, 2008). This document, “supported by about twenty institutions in the area, resume Psychology in High School as a theme of militancy, asking psychologists to sign electronically and support the struggle” (Barros, 2007, p. 325). Among the important reasons listed in the document, number 4 (four) stands out in this text, without, however, ceasing to consider all the others as absolutely relevant: “4. Psychology has specific contributions to make as a discipline when discussing topics such as human rights, social humiliation, prejudice, development and learning processes” (CRP/SP, 2008).

Alongside the discussions mentioned above, we also see a strong movement of reflection and articulation of new National Curriculum Guidelines for Psychology Courses (Resolution nº 5/2011), which changed the previous one, from 2004 (Resolution nº 8/2004), in the Art. 13, starting to guide with greater precision the norms for the Complementary Pedagogical Political Project for the formation of graduates in Psychology. These Guidelines sought to emphasize the training of Psychology teachers, making it mandatory for Higher Education Institutions to offer this qualification, which is elective for academics. Which, in turn, led to numerous movements of curricular reformulation of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) committed to the objective of organizing the training of graduates in an organic, albeit complementary, way with regard to training of psychologist.¹

However, if High School as a field of work for the Psychology teacher has not been consolidated as a privileged space for the work of graduates, the scenario today is even more worrying. In this sense, it is necessary to highlight the historical setbacks, which affect, above all, the schooling processes in contemporary times. The High School Reform, approved by provisional measure No. 746/16, enacted in Law No. 13,415/2017, indicates “that another educational project is underway for Brazilian youth” (Conde, 2018, p.14). We approach this reflection when we observe that in the National Common Curricular Base for High School (Law 13.415/2017), the area of Human Sciences, for example, suffered new and sharp restrictions by “eliminating” the disciplines of Sociology, Philosophy, History and Geography, transforming these into “studies and practices”, without a defined workload, which can be taught by a teacher in the area, no longer requiring graduates for each specific discipline that makes up the Humanities and Social Sciences.

¹ Regarding the curriculum review carried out between the years 2014 – 2016, see the text by Ultramari and Naujorks (2018).

In view of the above, it is urgent to investigate the effects of this “new” High School for the training of teachers in Brazil, notably, due to the risk of “epistemological emptying of the area of Human Sciences [...] times when social memory is vilified with retrograde actions and the nefarious advance of the Movimento Escola sem Partido – ESP”² (Dantas, 2018, p. 111). This movement³ appears in 2004 on the national scene and its defenders advocate the neutrality of the curriculum and schooling, which brings us closer to recent history where the ahistorical, apolitical and technical perspective prevailed as a proposal for Brazilian education, during the period of the military dictatorship. In addition, Dantas (2018, p. 111) also draws our attention to a nefarious movement that, as a consequence, “has put under discussion in public universities the continuity of certain Degrees”.

On the other hand, it is equally important to point out that although we have talked so far about the (re) insertion of the Psychology Discipline in High School, since the degree courses enable teachers to work in Basic Education, which has been gaining ground. The strength of the actions promoted by ABEP, CFP and the Forum of National Entities of Brazilian Psychology (FENPB) is that the educational dimension of our profession transcends the limits of the degree and professional performance in a formal scope.

The Art. 37 of the DCNs for Psychology Courses, revised and updated in 2018, has the following objective for the complementary pedagogical project for the Training of Psychology Teachers:

- a) complement the training of psychologists, articulating the specific knowledge of the area with historical, political, philosophical, didactic and methodological knowledge, to act in teaching and in the construction and management of public education policies, as well as for the private system and the third sector, in Basic Education (Elementary School II, High School, Youth and Adult Education), in Professional and Technological Education courses and other modalities, in continuing education, as well as in non-formal and non-school education contexts. (CFP, 2018, p. 132-133).

In the direction of this objective, we understand that there is a field of action that is open not only to the graduate in Psychology, but also to the psychologist, especially in non-formal and non-formal education. school. By articulating the political-pedagogical

² School Without Party Movement.

³ Regarding the Movimento Escola sem Partido, consult the dossier on the subject published in 2018 by Quaestio - Journal of Studies in Education, available at: <http://periodicos.uniso.br/ojs/index.php/quaestio/issue/view/236>

proposal of teacher training in psychology with the work processes foreseen in the exercise of the psychologist profession, our reading points to the indispensability of the degree to compose the formation of the bachelor. On the other hand, it is true, as Barros (2007, p. 38) has already pointed out, that “for an education that is only adaptive, perhaps psychology is really dispensable. But if we take as a goal an education against barbarism, psychology becomes necessary and it is then necessary to question what kind of education is desirable”. In this direction, which educational dimension is being defended here in the work of psychologists?

LICENTIATE DEGREE AND THE EDUCATIONAL DIMENSION OF THE PROFESSION

The perspective the performance of the graduate in Psychology certainly requires articulating the ethical principles of our profession, with its educational dimension and the challenges of professional practice in the face of the denial of certain ways of existing and living, amplified in current times of new conservatism. Times that call us to the daily defense of fundamental principles that support the Psychologist’s Code of Professional Ethics (CFP, 2005), such as the defense of human rights, the rejection of all forms of oppression and violence, the health promotion and quality of life for individuals and groups.

The training of the psychologist-teacher is certainly one of the important places for the construction of the fundamental principles of our profession, especially when we consider the contexts in which their professional practice can reach, namely: educational processes with children, adolescents, young people, adults, family members and other groups, acting, for example, from an educational perspective, in the prevention and promotion of health and in professional guidance; teaching scientific contents of Psychology in lectures, mini-courses, interviews, social media, etc.; continuing education of other professionals, and even of colleagues in the profession, on different themes and problems on which Psychology has important contributions to make.

In the scope of this training is that educational praxis can and should gain centrality, designing professional practices capable of creating resistance and confrontations in a context in which neutrality seems to take the place of truth, where the intensification of hate speech towards difference and non-legitimation of critical and democratic debate has produced censorship and violence. Medicalizing practices are increasingly spreading through educational contexts and pathologization is treated as a right to the diagnosis of children with difficulties in the schooling process (Fórum sobre medicalização da educação e da sociedade, 2015). Faced with this medicalization of society, we understand

that the educational dimension of our profession has an important role in the elaboration of reflections that contribute to other modes of relationship among professionals and users of public education, health and social assistance services.

These and other discussions focus on the training of the graduate in Psychology, especially by linking them to educational processes. These are problematization that allow us to inquire about the meaning of the work of the psychologist-teacher in the face of adaptive and docile practices, whether in schools, companies, or public institutions. It should be noted that it is in the degree that there is an obligation for the Psychology student to take courses that deal with ethnic-racial relations and Brazilian Sign Language, for example. In addition to these, Oltramari and Naujorks (2018) also suggest the incorporation of the study of gender relations in undergraduate degrees. Elements that allow us to reaffirm the importance of the degree for the training of psychologists, whose performance transcends specific areas and places of education.

We understand, therefore, that training in Psychology should allow students to problematize the different ways of becoming a teacher and, also, to understand the epistemological foundations of the theories that support educational and training practices. Some questions can guide this action, such as: How do students conceive the profession of school and the work of the Psychology teacher? How do they understand the processes of teaching and learning and what are the implications of such understandings for their professional performance? How does the educational and training dimension of the profession appear and consolidate during graduation? Questions that need to consider issues of race, gender, sexuality, class and disability as priorities for understanding the inequalities that shape educational processes. How do these understandings support professional practice in the multiple contexts of the psychologist’s work?

We understand that the documents and theoretical productions that deal with the relation between Psychology and Education and, more precisely, about the training of the graduate in Psychology, seem blunt in emphasizing the educational dimension of our profession, which requires an attentive look at the broader educational policy and also at the different fields of action that the educational dimension of the profession can reach. Problematization like these, constituted since the beginning of graduation, seem to help expand and qualify the psychologist’s performance. An example of this can be found in Simão, Zurba and Nunes (2012), who base their practices on popular health education, based on Paulo Freire’s culture circle used as a tool to promote popular participation in the SUS. Or, still, in the technical references for the role of

the psychologist in the deconstruction of racism and in the promotion of racial equality (CFP, 2017), which implies, among other forms of intervention, sensitizing managers and professionals so that

[...] reflect about themselves, as subjects constituted in a society whose social imaginary marks the black woman in an inferior, oppressed and less valued place, occupying underemployed or restricted to art and sport. On the other hand, it is also worth reflecting that this same society socially values the white population, taking as “natural” the best social position occupied by this group. (CFP, 2017, p. 115).

Likewise, the technical references for the work of psychologists within the scope of socio-educational measures in confinement units (CFP, 2010) highlight the ethical-political dimension that the work within these institutions must achieve. Among the references, pedagogical actions stand out as a priority in the care of adolescents. Respect for the singularity and condition of subjects of rights, as well as the educational presence in the work developed in the units are the focus of their actions, which must be guaranteed with the (re) construction of political-pedagogical projects (PPPs) structured and implemented in accordance with these guidelines. Indications that position in Higher Education the pedagogical performance of psychologists-teachers in the construction of PPPs (Veiga & Fonseca, 2012) attentive to human formation and Human Rights, from their specific technical training for the function and of their belonging to the multiprofessional team.

With this, we wish to affirm the presence of the degree and its discussions as relevant to all other areas of activity of the Psychologist, so that they recognize in the daily life of their actions, the also educational character of their practices and how much a consistent understanding about education as a form of intervention in the world (Freire, 1996) can contribute to the ethical-political action of professionals and teachers in training. It seems evident, in the scope of the possible actions of the psychologists mentioned above, the indispensable approximation of the undergraduates to the school, organizational, social realities, which, in turn, affirms the inseparability among research, teaching and extension.

As we enter the field of teaching Psychology, emphasizes Souza (2013), we are opening up the possibility of studying the complexity of human formation. This also means affirming that our work as psychologists-teachers is to problematize and discuss issues that constitute processes of subjectivation in different contexts of human formation and that are the object of study of our science and profession. In this way, we are “denaturalizing the established, showing its historical-social dimension, analyzing the power

relations, the constitution of institutions, including the school, the social relations that are established in it” (Souza, 2013, p. 12). A movement that expands the contributions of a psychology teaching involved with children, youth and adults from the lower classes. This perspective assumes the formation of undergraduates who are sensitive to racial and gender relations, sexual diversity, social inequalities and the social model of disability.

In this direction, we wish that the arguments presented here gain emphasis on the always necessary articulation between research-teaching-extension that should forge the formation of psychologists-teachers in our country. That such problematization contribute to the production of knowledge about training processes in their multiple dimensions, as well as about the curricula that shape the training of Psychology teachers and professionals in Brazil.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

We understand that it is necessary to encourage and broaden the debate on the training of psychologists-teachers of Psychology, from a critical perspective and supported by contemporary themes, contextualizing them in a historical, cultural and ethical perspective; to collaborate with the discussion of the formation of Psychology teachers, building collective strategies to bring academics closer to this area of activity, intellectual production and research; bring the training process of the degree in Psychology students closer to the other areas of activity of the psychologist, qualifying them for insertion in formal and informal educational spaces, guiding and/or subsidizing their teaching practices with knowledge anchored in the critical perspective in education.

We hope to be able to contribute to projects for training professionals who are attentive to the social function of the public university and committed to transforming the deep inequalities that constitute the Brazilian social and educational context. That psychologists-teachers vigilantly position themselves in the face of the contemporary demands of Brazilian society and that they are capable of exercising their teaching, convinced that education is always an intervention in the world and that this, by in turn, requires considering the politics of our existence.

REFERENCES

- Antunes, M. A. M. (2008). Psicologia escolar e educacional: história, compromissos e perspectivas. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, 12(2), 469-475. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-85572008000200020>
- Barros, C. C. (2007). Reflexões sobre a formação de professores de Psicologia. *Temas em Psicologia*, 15(1), 33-39. Retrieved from: http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413-389X2007000100005

- Carvalho, D. C. de; Cord, D.; Sganderla, A. P. (Eds.). (2018). *Experiências docentes em psicologia: em foco o PIBID*. Florianópolis: NUP/CED/UFSC, Conselho Regional de Psicologia.
- Cirino, S. D., Knupp; D. F. D., Lemos, L. S.; Domingues, S. (2007). As novas diretrizes curriculares: uma reflexão sobre a licenciatura em Psicologia. *Temas em Psicologia*, 15(1), 23-32. Retrieved from: http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413-389X2007000100004&lng=pt&lng=pt.
- Conde, D. L. G. (2018). Prefácio. In: Carvalho, D. C. de; Cord, D.; Sganderla, A. P. (Eds.), *Experiências docentes em psicologia: em foco o PIBID* (pp. 14-17). Florianópolis: NUP/CED/UFSC, Conselho Regional de Psicologia.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia. (2005). Código de Ética Profissional do Psicólogo. Brasília: CFP.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia. (2008). Ano da Psicologia na Educação: textos geradores. Brasília: CFP e Conselhos Regionais de Psicologia.
- Conselho Regional de Psicologia São Paulo. (2008). Oito razões para aprender psicologia no ensino médio. São Paulo: CRP/SP. Retrieved from: http://www.crsp.org.br/portal/midia/fiquedeolho_ver.aspx?id=275
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia. (2010). Referências técnicas para atuação de psicólogos no âmbito das medidas socioeducativas em unidades de internação. Brasília: CFP.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia. (2017). Relações Raciais: Referências Técnicas para atuação de psicólogas/os. Brasília: CFP.
- Conselho Federal de Psicologia. (2018). Ano da formação em psicologia: revisão das diretrizes curriculares nacionais para os cursos de graduação em psicologia São Paulo: CFP/ABEP/FENAPSI.
- Dantas, J. S. (2018). O Ensino Médio em disputa e as implicações da BNCC para a área das Ciências Humanas. *Universidade e Sociedade*, 61, 106-115. Retrieved from: https://www.andes.org.br/sites/universidade_e_sociedade
- Fórum sobre medicalização da educação e da sociedade. (2015). Recomendações de práticas não medicalizantes para profissionais e serviços de educação e saúde. Brasília: CFP.
- Freire, P. (1999). *Educação como prática da liberdade*. 23 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.
- Furlan, V. (2017). Psicologia e a Política de Direitos: percursos de uma relação. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 37(spe), 91-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703070002017>
- Guzzo, R. S. L.; Mezzalira, A. S. C.; Moreira, A. P. G.; Tizzei, R. P.; Silva Neto, W. M. de F. (2010). Psicologia e Educação no Brasil: uma visão da história e possibilidades nessa relação. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 26(spe), 131-141. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-37722010000500012>
- Lei 5.692 de 11 de agosto de 1971. Fixa diretrizes e bases para o ensino de 1. e 2 grau, e da outras providências. *Diário Oficial da União (12/08/1971)*. Retrieved from: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l5692.htm
- Lei 9.394 de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. *Diário Oficial da União (23/12/1996)*, 27833. Retrieved from: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm
- Lei 13. 415 de 16 de fevereiro de 2017. Altera as Leis nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, e 11.494, de 20 de junho 2007, que regulamenta o Fundo de Manutenção e Desenvolvimento da Educação Básica e de Valorização dos Profissionais da Educação, a Consolidação das Leis do Trabalho - CLT, aprovada pelo Decreto-Lei nº 5.452, de 1º de maio de 1943, e o Decreto-Lei nº 236, de 28 de fevereiro de 1967; revoga a Lei nº 11.161, de 5 de agosto de 2005; e institui a Política de Fomento à Implementação de Escolas de Ensino Médio em Tempo Integral. *Diário Oficial da União (17/02/2017)*, 1. Retrieved from: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2015-2018/2017/Lei/L13415.htm
- Leite, S. A. da S. (2007). Psicologia no Ensino Médio: desafios e perspectivas. *Temas em Psicologia*, 15(1), 11-2. Retrieved from: <http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/tp/v15n1/03.pdf>
- Machado, L. A. (2016). Psicologia no Ensino Médio e Psicologia Escolar: história, diferenças e perspectivas. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, 20, (1), pp. 101-108. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-353920150201933>
- Molon, S. (2008). Entrelaçando a Psicologia e a educação: uma reflexão sobre a formação continuada de educadores à luz da Psicologia Sócio-Histórica. *Revista Contrapontos*, 2(2), 215-225. Retrieved from: <https://siaiap32.univali.br/seer/index.php/rc/article/view/144>
- Oltremari, L. C.; Naujorks, C. J. (2018). Entre Instituídos e Instituintes: os desafios da revisão curricular em um Curso de Licenciatura em Psicologia. In D. de C. Carvalho; D. Cord; A. P. Sganderla (Eds.), *Experiências Docentes em Psicologia - em foco o PIBID* (pp. 85-97). Florianópolis: NUP/CED/UFSC, Conselho Regional de Psicologia.
- Patto, M. H. S. (1990). *A produção do fracasso escolar*. São Paulo: T. A. Queiroz Editora.
- Resolução nº 5 de 15 de março de 2011*. Institui as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para os cursos de graduação em Psicologia, estabelecendo normas para o projeto pedagógico complementar para a Formação de Professores de Psicologia. *Diário Oficial da União (16-03-2011)*, seção 1, 19. Retrieved from: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=7692-rces005-11-pdf&Itemid=30192
- Resolução nº 8 de 7 de maio de 2004*. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais do curso de graduação em Psicologia. *Diário Oficial da União (18-05-2004)*, seção 1, 16. Retrieved from: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/rces08_04.pdf
- Simão, C. R. P.; Zurba, M. do C.; Nunes, A. de S. B. (2011). Educação Popular em Saúde: o círculo de cultura como

- ferramenta de promoção de participação popular no SUS. In M. do C. Zurba (Ed.), *Psicologia e saúde coletiva* (pp. 75 – 102). Florianópolis: Tribo da Ilha.
- Soligo, A. F.; Azzi, R. G. (2008). A psicologia no Ensino médio. In *Ano da Psicologia na Educação. Textos Geradores*. Brasília: CFP e Conselhos Regionais de Psicologia.
- Souza, M. P. R. de. (2013). Prefácio. In M. C. Sekkel; C. C. Barros (Eds.), *Licenciatura em Psicologia: temas atuais* (pp. 08 – 13). São Paulo: Zagodoni.
- Veiga, I. P. A.; Fonseca, M. (2012). *As dimensões do projeto político-pedagógico: novos desafios para a escola*. 9. ed. Campinas: Papirus.

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

Received on: February 07, 2020
Approved on: December 19, 2021