

Art and school education in Vygotsky: a counter-hegemonic position amidst ideological conflicts

*Arte e educação escolar em Vigotski:
posição contra-hegemônica em meio a embates ideológicos*

*Arte y educación escolar en Vigotski:
posición contra-hegemónica en medio de enfrentamientos ideológicos*

Laura Canciⁱ

Manuella Nagelⁱⁱ

Solange Aparecida da Rosaⁱⁱⁱ

ABSTRACT

The processes of creation and innovation are increasingly valued, while schools and school education are simultaneously criticized. With the aim of contributing to this debate, qualitative research was conducted based on historical-dialectical materialism as a method and on cultural-historical theory. Scientific articles that reference Lev Semenovich Vigotski were analyzed. Among the results, the following stand out: in Vigotski, art is not reduced to a social technique of feeling; partial understandings of Vygotskian theory may lead to a dichotomization between art or aesthetic education and school education; the importance of art is sometimes wrongly exaggerated, while school education is underestimated as a resource for the development of the creative subject; and authentic art lies beyond the developmental possibilities of children and adolescents and does not produce specifically moral results, nor is it mere entertainment or manipulation.

Keywords: Art. Ideology. Imagination. Creative Subject. School Education.

RESUMO

Cada vez mais valorizam-se os processos de criação e inovação e, concomitantemente, criticam-se a escola e a educação escolar. Com vistas a contribuir para o debate realizou-se pesquisa qualitativa pautada no materialismo histórico-dialético, enquanto método, e na teoria histórico-cultural. Foram analisados artigos científicos referenciados em Lev Semenovich Vigotski. Dentre os resultados, destacam-se: a arte, em Vigotski, não se reduz a uma técnica social do sentimento; entendimentos parciais da teoria vigotskiana podem levar à dicotomização entre arte ou educação estética e

ⁱUniversidade Comunitária da Região de Chapecó, Chapecó, SC, Brazil. Email: lauracanci@unochapeco.edu.br  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5277-6332>

ⁱⁱUniversidade Comunitária da Região de Chapecó, Chapecó, SC, Brazil. Email: manuella.nagel@unochapeco.edu.br  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6950-6809>

ⁱⁱⁱUniversidade Comunitária da Região de Chapecó, Chapecó, SC, Brazil. Email: solangerosa@unochapeco.edu.br  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9645-2893>

educação escolar; erroneamente, por vezes, exagera-se a importância da arte e subestima-se a educação escolar como recurso para o desenvolvimento do sujeito criador; a arte autêntica está para além das possibilidades de desenvolvimento das crianças e dos adolescentes e não tem por finalidade resultados morais, a mera diversão ou manipulação.

Palavras-chave: Arte. Ideologia. Imaginação. Sujeito Criador. Educação Escolar.

RESUMEN

Cada vez se valoran más los procesos de creación e innovación y, al mismo tiempo, se critica la escuela y la educación escolar. Con el fin de contribuir al debate, se realizó una investigación cualitativa basada en el materialismo histórico-dialéctico como método y en la teoría histórico-cultural. Se analizaron los artículos científicos referenciados en Lev Semenovitch Vigotski. Entre los resultados destacan los siguientes: el arte de Vigotski no se reduce a una técnica social del sentimiento; las comprensiones parciales de la teoría vigotskiana pueden llevar a dicotomizar la educación artística o estética y la educación escolar; A veces, se exagera la importancia del arte y se subestima la educación escolar como recurso para el desarrollo del sujeto creativo; El arte auténtico está más allá de las posibilidades de desarrollo de los niños y adolescentes y no está destinado a resultados morales, mera diversión o manipulación.

Palabras clave: Arte. Ideología. Imaginación. Sujeto Creador. Educación Escolar.

INTRODUCTION

In Brazil, creative and innovative processes are increasingly valued, and aesthetic and artistic practices are considered interventions that foster new ways of living and acting, as well as forms of resistance to subjugation and submission. Discussions grounded in “the ideas of authors aligned with perspectives commonly referred to as post-structuralist, philosophies of difference, postmodern” (Pereira, 2021, p. 5) have proliferated. Deleuze and Foucault are key references in debates on the relationship between aesthetics and politics, emphasizing the relevance of disputes promoted by artistic experience and understanding art as a means capable of constituting democratic devices aimed at political emancipation.

At the same time, criticism has been directed at schools and school education, alongside the identification of a need for historical transformations and for confronting challenges posed to the creative activity of teachers and children within the context of formal schooling: “under the domain of the broader field of education [...] our intention is to infiltrate this field with the purpose of undermining it and [...] allow the subversion of that civilizing expedient that is the school system” (Pereira, 2021, p. 12).

In the social sphere, school education is accused, both by the far right and by certain left-wing political positions, of fulfilling an ideological function. The right criticizes school education and art for their alleged ideological alignment with the left and for adherence to identity agendas, especially those related to gender. Certain leftist criticize education for reproducing the *status quo* but conceive art as essentially libertarian and emancipatory.

In this context, several questions arise: What is art? What is meant by art? In capitalist societies, in which everything is transformed into merchandise and ideas also become products to be marketed and consumed, is art liberating or an ideological instrument? What possibilities

exist in the relationships between art and school education and between school education and the development of imagination and creativity?

With the aim of contributing to this important debate in Brazil at the beginning of the twenty-first century and of reflecting on the teaching-learning process and the possibilities for developing creative subjects in schools, theoretical research was undertaken from the perspective of historical-dialectical materialism, in dialogue with historical-cultural theory, which also addresses aesthetics through the contributions of Lukács. Scientific articles based on the work of Lev Semenovitch Vygotski, an author internationally recognized for his research on education, art, and the process of human development, were analyzed.

To compile the set of articles to be analyzed, papers presented at meetings of the National Association for Research and Graduate Studies in Education (*Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Educação — ANPEd*) were initially examined, as this association is the principal entity in Brazil for the dissemination and discussion of research produced in master's and doctoral programs in education, specifically those presented in the working group whose thematic focus is Education and Art (GT24). After noting the absence, in this working group, of articles based on the previously defined theoretical approach and author, the Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO) platform was selected as the source of the articles analyzed.

The methodology adopted, the analyses conducted in dialogue with historical-cultural theory, and a summary of the main results are presented below.

METHODOLOGY

For Karl Marx, according to Lukács (2018), the process of knowing an object originates in work, which he also conceives as the origin of human consciousness and science. According to Tonet (2018), the more accurate the knowledge of the object, the greater the probability of achieving the intended goal. From this premise derives the essential purpose of scientific knowledge: to reproduce reality as it is, in itself, as faithfully as possible.

According to Paulo Netto (2011), in Marxian theory, criticism of existing knowledge does not consist in rejecting it or distinguishing the good from the bad, but rather in a rational examination that reveals the foundations, conditions, and limits of accumulated knowledge. In this sense, the present study analyzed articles that address the relationship between art and school education based on Vygotsky's theory in order to answer the following questions: What is art? What is meant by art? What possibilities are offered by the relationship between art and school education? How do the authors conceive the relationship between art and school education? How do they conceive the creative subject and the process of its development? Does school education contribute, or can it contribute, to the development of imagination and creativity? Is there theoretical consistency with Vygotski's work? In capitalist societies, where ideas are products to be marketed and consumed, is art liberating or an ideological tool?

To compile the articles to be analyzed, works presented at the annual meetings of ANPEd were initially sought, specifically those in working group GT24, whose thematic focus is Education and Art. The search was conducted using the keywords "art," "education," "imagination," "creative subject," and "Vygotsky" ("arte," "educação," "imaginação," "sujeito criador," and "Vigotski"). However, no articles were identified in the nine annual meetings held between 2009 and 2021 following the creation of GT24.

In view of these contingencies, a new search was conducted on the Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO) platform. This search initially yielded thirteen articles published between 2011 and 2020 in journals dedicated to educational studies. Based on their titles, eight articles were excluded after reading the abstracts and keywords: five because the term education referred to education

in general rather than school education; one because it addressed schools in Russia in the early 20th century; one because it focused on body culture; and another because it did not address art specifically. As a result, five articles were selected for analysis, as shown in Chart 1.

Chart 1. Articles on art and education in Vygotski.

Author	Title	Year	Journal
FERREIRA, Nathalia Botura de Paula; DUARTE, Newton.	Art and integral education: an historical-critical analysis	2011	Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação
BARROCO, Sonia Mari Shima; SUPERTI, Tatiane.	Vygotsky and the study of psychology of art: contribution for de human development	2014	Psicologia & Sociedade
ASSUMPÇÃO, Mariana de Cássia.	The relationship between art and life in Lukács and Vigotski	2014	Revista Aspas – USP
BARBOSA, Maria Flávia Silveira.	Vygotsky and the psychology of art: horizons for music education	2019	Cadernos Cedes
STEIN, Vinícius; CHAVES, Marta.	Art in the educational context: reflections on the development of aesthetic feelings	2020	Educação em Foco – UEMG

Source: prepared by the authors.

After the articles were selected, the analysis was conducted in light of Marx's contributions. According to Kosik (2002), the research method of historical-dialectical materialism begins with a thorough appropriation of the material, in which each aspect is examined in relation to internal coherence and the totality of the analyses. Subsequently, it becomes necessary to proceed further because, as Paulo Netto (2011) explains, it is in the "journey" in the opposite direction that the most "tenuous" abstractions and the simplest determinations are endowed with the relationships and dimensions they objectively possess and must acquire in order to reproduce, at the level of thought, the real concrete object. This process enables the attainment of a new synthesis, potentially producing new knowledge for humanity rather than solely for the individual researcher, since, in the latter case, the research would lack social relevance.

In summary, the analyses were conducted as follows: first, the articles were read and reread in their entirety, and the central ideas for analysis were identified and organized according to previously defined categories corresponding to the keywords "art," "education," "imagination," "creative subject," and "Vygotsky." During this process, additional categories were delineated: "catharsis," "emotions," and "consciousness." Finally, the subsets of ideas selected according to these categories were revisited in order to compare and identify similarities and differences among the authors' conceptions and in relation to Vygotskian theory, and to elaborate analytical syntheses through a process of movement between parts and whole.

What follows is a summary of the analyses, including the most relevant elements, considering that "the objective of knowledge is not to capture all the elements that make up the object, but only those that are necessary to achieve the desired goal, since the end determines what must be known" (Tonet, 2018, p. 105). It should be noted that the analyses required broadening the dialogue and incorporating the contributions of another important author, Georg Lukács. This inclusion does not compromise the coherence of the research at the ontological and epistemological levels, since both authors ground their work in Marxian theory and method and contribute to the development of historical-cultural theory.

ART IN VYGOTSKI: A SOCIAL TECHNIQUE OF FEELING?

What is meant by art in the articles analyzed? Is there consistency with Vygotski's theory? In *The Psychology of Art*, published in 1965, Lev Semenovich Vygotski defines art as "a social technique of feeling, an instrument of society through which it incorporates the most intimate and personal aspects of our being into the cycle of social life" (Vigotski, 1999, p. 315). However, this book — which constitutes the main reference, if not the only one, for some researchers — was written between 1915 and 1922 and, according to Prestes and Tunes (2012), there are reasons why it was not published before 1965. "Vigodskaja and Lifanova (1996) cite the position that Vygotski was dissatisfied with the method of analysis used and felt the need for new starting points" (Prestes and Tunes, 2012, p. 328).

It is noteworthy that Vygotski wrote this work at the beginning of his research in psychology. Only later, in collaboration with Leontiev and Luria, did he "effectively advanced toward the systematization of the principles that would constitute historical-cultural theory" (Martins, 2006, p. 49). The author continued his studies and developed his theory, transforming it into a more complex and qualitatively superior body of work than his initial writings.

As the author himself stated, "it must be said that in the fields of both new art studies and objective psychology, the basic concepts and fundamental principles are still being developed, that is, the first steps are being taken" (Vigotski, 1999, p. 3). In *Educational Psychology*,¹ the author also points out an exaggeration regarding the importance attributed to art in the process of human formation and development:

In psychological science and theoretical pedagogy, the question of the nature, meaning, purpose, and methods of aesthetic education has not yet been definitively resolved. From ancient times to the present day, extreme and contradictory points of view on this issue have appeared [...]. Many authors were inclined to deny almost any educational meaning to aesthetic experiences [...]. On the contrary, the tendency of psychologists from the other school of thought was to exaggerate the meaning of aesthetic emotions and see them as almost a radical pedagogical resource that solves all the difficult and complex problems of education (Vigotski, 2004, p. 323).

Prestes and Tunes (2012, p. 329), drawing on the contributions of Vigotskaia and Lifanova, argue that when seeking answers in *The Psychology of Art* to contemporary questions in psychology, creation, and aesthetics, it must be considered that "the answers did not satisfy Vygotski himself and, probably, cannot satisfy today's researcher."

Although Vygotski signed a publishing contract in 1925, he did not ultimately publish *The Psychology of Art*, either due to lack of time before his premature death, dissatisfaction with his initial answers, or other unresolved reasons (Prestes, 2012). Subsequently, he devoted himself to important studies on imagination and its developmental process, such as *Imaginação e criação na infância*, written in 1930 (Prestes, 2012), and *Conferências sobre Psicologia*, published in Brazil as *O desenvolvimento psicológico na infância*.

An examination of Vygotski's body of work within its historical process of elaboration allows the conclusion that his most developed and complex ideas on art and aesthetic education are not contained

¹ In Brazil, according to Prestes and Tunes (2012), this book was published in two editions, the first by the publisher Martins Fontes, translated from Russian by Paulo Bezerra. In this edition, chapters that do not exist in the original were added to the book; therefore, it is "important to highlight the misrepresentation of this book" (Prestes and Tunes, 2012, p. 315). Having made these relevant critical considerations, only the excerpts strictly necessary for the analyses were used from this book.

in his early works (*The Psychology of Art* and *Educational Psychology*). Consequently, limiting analysis to these texts to define art or to discuss the relationships between art, education, and human development, as observed in Barbosa (2019) and Stein and Chaves (2020), proves to be counterproductive.

The miracle of art is reminiscent of another miracle in the Gospel — the transformation of water into wine. The true nature of art always implies something that transforms, that transcends common feelings, and that same fear, that same pain, that same restlessness, when aroused by art, implies something above what is contained in them. And this something overcomes these feelings, transforms water into wine, and thus fulfills the most important mission of art. Art is to life as wine is to grapes, said one thinker, and he was absolutely right in pointing out that art draws its material from life, but produces something above and beyond that material, something that is not yet in the properties of that material (Vygotski, 1999, p. 307-308).

It is this “something more,” which is produced from life but goes beyond what is present in immediate life itself, that constitutes a key theoretical element. Although explained at that moment by the author in a manner that was not sufficiently elaborate, this element allows for a better understanding of his conception of art.

The idea that art enables the transformation of emotions, just as work enables the transformation of nature, briefly presented in *The Psychology of Art*, was more fully developed by the author in *Imaginação e criação na infância*, in which creative artistic activity is defined in clear reference to work as a vitally necessary creative activity. Thus, all “human activity that results in the creation of new images or actions, rather than the reproduction of previous impressions or actions from experience, belongs to this second type of creative behavior” (Vygotski, 2018, p. 15).

Furthermore, the author states that “imagination, the basis of all creative activity, undoubtedly manifests itself in all fields of cultural life, making artistic, scientific, and technical creation equally possible” (Vygotski, 2018, p. 16). For the author, the entire cultural universe is a product of human imagination and creation, and science itself is not possible without imagination; in other words, creative human activity is not limited to the field of art.

As noted, it is important to consider that in *The Psychology of Art*, when Vygotski stated that art enables the transformation of emotions, he was at the beginning of his research in the field of psychology. Only later did he deepen his studies and defend the dialectical principle of unity and non-identity between thought and emotions, as well as the thesis that all psychological functions operate in the form of psychological systems (Vygotski, 1997).

Therefore, if art enables the transformation of emotions, it concomitantly enables the transformation of thought, perception, memory, attention, and imagination — that is, of the human psyche as a whole and of consciousness itself. If this understanding is correct, then defining art as a social technique of feeling, or reproducing this notion without due consideration, as Barbosa (2019) and Stein and Chaves (2020) do, constitutes a theoretical mistake and contributes to reductionist readings of Vygotski’s theory of art.

Furthermore, if art is not reduced to the transformation of emotions but contributes to the transformation of all higher psychological functions and consciousness, then, although Vygotski does not indicate the development of consciousness in the sense proposed by Lukács (1968; 2018) — from consciousness in itself to consciousness for itself — it can be stated that there are sufficient theoretical elements in his theory to justify an ontologically coherent approximation with Lukács’ theory, as some researchers do in the articles analyzed (Ferreira and Duarte, 2011; Assumpção, 2014; Barroco and Superti, 2014).

In his lectures on psychology, written in 1932, Vygotski addresses higher psychological functions specifically and states that thought also develops and is the determining factor in the development of all other higher psychological functions (HPF), including emotions, whose origin stems from the fusion between natural psychic functions and verbal thinking, such as logical memory and conceptual perception. According to Vygotski (2000), the development of the human psyche is a complex dialectical process and necessarily involves qualitative leaps. This aspect had already been indicated in *The Psychology of Art*, in which the author cites the Gospel passage concerning the transformation of water into wine.

However, it should be noted that when addressing the topic of consciousness in 1933, the author limited himself to defining the problem and the premises for its study within dialectical materialist psychology. Only in his last theoretical work, written in 1934, the year of his death, when discussing thought and language, did Vygotsky return to the theme of consciousness and categorically state that words represent the highest stage of human psychological development, in clear reference to the Marxist and materialist conception of the process of phylogenesis:

In the beginning, it was not the word. First, it was action. The word is closer to the end than to the beginning of development. The word is the end that culminates the action. [...] Thought and language are the key to understanding the nature of human consciousness. [...] The word plays a prominent role not only in the development of thought, but also in that of consciousness as a whole (Vygotski, 2001, p. 346).

In this passage, he also states that thought and language constitute an indivisible whole and that a word without meaning is not a word. More importantly, the author emphasizes the importance of scientific concepts — true concepts — and the differences between these and spontaneous concepts, both in terms of quality and in relation to the developmental process in children and adolescents: “the enormous importance of scientific concepts for the development of children’s thinking stands out before us. [...] true concepts” (Vygotski, 2001, p. 217). Vygotski (2001, p. 216) justifies this statement by quoting Marx: “If the form of manifestation and the essence of things coincided, all science would be superfluous.” Essence, in the context of social being, is understood as historically produced, and science goes beyond naive positivist ontology, in which it is necessarily synonymous with objective truth.

Given that Vygotski starts from Marxian premises, and that Marx, according to Lukács (2018), understands his theory as science, philosophy, and ideology — that is, as a philosophically grounded and scientifically founded means of resolving social conflicts, as will be seen below — the term “scientific concepts” in Vygotskian theory must be understood in a broader sense. In his final work, the author states that the central aspect of his psychological theory is mediated action, and that the internal facet of mediated action is revealed in the dual function of the sign: communication and generalization.

He also states that speech produces changes in consciousness, which as a whole has a semantic structure, and that “meaning is the necessary, constitutive feature of the word itself” (Vygotski, 2001, p. 289). In other words, meanings, like words, have a social and cultural origin; however, meanings, according to the author, are not fixed in signs. Consequently, when Stein and Chaves (2020, p. 13) state that “aesthetic experience requires that meanings and senses be created by the subject themselves in particular ways,” a serious theoretical error is made, contributing to the misrepresentation of Vygotskian theory by promoting the false understanding that the meanings of a work of art are spontaneous and random creations of the subject.

Appropriating Vygotski’s understanding of the meaning of the word is crucial to understanding his theory, since, for the author, the development of the semantic aspect of language is the

fundamental and decisive process in the development of thought in children. The word is almost always ready when the concept is, because “at the moment a new word is learned, the process of developing the corresponding concept does not end, but only begins” (Vygotski, 2001, p. 284).

According to Vygotski (2001), meaning and the system of functions are interconnected, and meaning refers not only to thought but to consciousness as a whole. These theoretical elements make it possible to affirm that, in Vygotskian theory, there is a clear distinction between spontaneous and scientific concepts. Vygotski (2001) also emphasizes the uniqueness of the process of developing scientific concepts in comparison with spontaneous or everyday concepts and clearly articulates his understanding of changes in consciousness throughout human development. Psychological functions undergo qualitative leaps and transform, as does consciousness. Different forms of consciousness are therefore recognized, although they were not explicitly named by the author.

Thus, it is affirmed that, for Vygotski, art is not reduced to a social technique of feeling, but rather constitutes a means that enables the transformation of the entire human psyche and beyond. Among the articles analyzed, Ferreira and Duarte (2011), Assumpção (2014), and Barroco and Superti (2014) approach art more broadly and discuss art and school education as means of transforming the being in itself into the being for itself, as follows.

ART IN HISTORICAL-CULTURAL THEORY

Regarding the question “what is art?,” it can be stated that, for historical-dialectical materialism, art is not a form of representation whose end lies in itself and that therefore provides disinterested pleasure. Rather, art is a specific way of reflecting reality, a form of self-awareness of the human species that unfolds as a specific complex of social being grounded in work, whose original and fundamental form is the process of intentional transformation of nature (Lukács, 1968; 2018).

Aesthetic reflection creates, on the one hand, reproductions of reality in which the being-in-itself of objectivity is transformed into a being-for-us from the world represented in the individuality of the work of art; on the other hand, the effective exercise of these works awakens and raises human self-awareness (Lukács, 1968, p. 296).

Authentic art,² according to Lukács (2018, p. 620, emphasis added), tends to show, in the destinies of individual human beings, the path that leads “from human beings of the *generity* [genetic composition] in itself then given, towards a generity for itself”. By generity in itself, the author refers to the condition of human beings who, based on their genetically inherited biological foundation, have appropriated human culture through their relationships with other human beings and, as a result, have developed their consciousness at the level of consciousness in itself, characterized as uncritical and incapable of knowing and thinking beyond immediate reality and appearances. In agreement with Vygotski, it can be stated that, at this level of consciousness, pre-conceptual verbal thinking predominates, hence the limitations that are also characteristic of psychological functions prior to their transformation through the acquisition of true concepts.

This is a type of consciousness in which, despite knowing that they belong to the human race, the subject maintains an alienated relationship with it, as they do not perceive themselves as an

2 According to Lukács (1968, p. 290), “in great works of art, men relive the present and past of humanity, the prospects for its future development.” The author states that “masses of proletarians read Tolstoy with enthusiasm, just as masses of bourgeois read Gorky with enthusiasm” (Lukács, 1968, p. 289). In other words, authentic art addresses issues that matter to humanity and to the elevation of purely particular singularity; it goes beyond a direct and immediate relationship with any social class, even though class positioning has implications for the before and after of aesthetic experience.

integral, determined, and determining part of the society in which they live and work. Likewise, they do not recognize that they can exist as individuals only in/with the social being. Restricted to this level of consciousness, individuals remain individualistic, selfish, and unethical, incapable of assuming responsibility and committing themselves to all other human beings who constitute, together with the products and processes of work and culture in general, social being.

Despite the limits and prohibitions imposed by capitalist societies, human beings also develop another type of consciousness, which Lukács (2018) termed consciousness for itself. At this level, humans operate at a conceptual, scientific, and philosophical level of thought, are aware of their belonging to social being, and are able to position themselves beyond their personal and family interests. By grounding their actions in a hierarchy of values that transcends the limited interests of nation-states, social class, ethnicity, gender, etc., humans are able to act ethically and place humanity first.

According to Vygotski (1998a, p. 49), more than a highly developed intellect, volitional capacity and ethical positioning are determining factors capable of distinguishing “human beings from phylogenetically closer animals.” This highlights the importance of the humanities, philosophy, and art in human development.

Furthermore, for Lukács (2018, p. 535), a work of art, “when it is indeed art,” can, under certain conditions, contribute to increasing awareness of the human and social condition, functioning as a permanent orientation against alienation and, therefore, possessing a de-fetishizing character — an aspect discussed in greater detail below. In the author’s words, aesthetic reflection³ reproduces reality and renders it objective, enabling other human beings to appropriate the reality objectified and synthesized in the work of art. In this way, it becomes possible to reflect on the destinies of individual human beings or of humanity as a whole, even when the outcomes are tragic, thereby elevating consciousness to a more critical and reflective level, with critical understood as thinking and knowing reality beyond appearances.

This understanding is shared by all the authors of the articles analyzed, which are grounded in both Vygotski and Lukács (Ferreira and Duarte, 2011; Assumpção, 2014; Barroco and Superti, 2014). For Ferreira and Duarte (2011, p. 119), “authentic art, in addition to not being born of pleasure or pure delight, is concerned with representing, in a condensed and intensified manner, the reality that is presented in a diluted and superficial way in everyday life.” Thus,

works of art can be considered important mediations between the everyday life (water) of individuals and the richest production ever created by humankind (wine). By bringing individuals into contact with more developed forms of human subjectivity, artistic works enable the development of individual consciousness, moving from the in-itself to the for-itself (Assumpção, 2014, p. 45).

The meaning of art, according to Assumpção (2014, p. 45), “focuses on the possibility of overcoming everyday life” — that is, overcoming the limits of being human in everyday life, of the particular being and consciousness in itself, which is markedly pragmatic and restricted to the appearances and superficialities of reality. Everyday life is unavoidable; however, its barriers can be pushed back, and human beings can go beyond this dimension of life, although this does not entail a complete or absolute rupture (Lukács, 2018). In the process of transcending everyday

3 For the author, aesthetics is a science, just like art history, since “the aesthetic form in its genuine and original mode of manifestation, as we find it above all in the work of art, as the objectification of the aesthetic reflection of reality” (Lukács, 1968, p. 184), distinct from scientific reflection, creates, “on one hand, reproductions of reality in which the being-in-itself of objectivity is transformed into a being for us of the world represented in the individuality of the work of art; on the other hand the effective exercise of these works awakens and raises human self-awareness” (Lukács, 1968, p. 296).

life, the contribution of art can be particularly significant, as it allows, as indicated by Ferreira and Duarte (2011, p. 118), in agreement with Lukács (2018), “to advance consciousness toward a de-fetishized worldview.”

However, based on Vygotsky’s theory, different understandings of art and of the relationship between art and school education may be reached depending on how this theory is appropriated and how its historicity and Marxist foundations are understood. With regard to the articles analyzed, it was found that Barbosa (2019) and Stein and Chaves (2020) overvalue art’s contribution to transforming the human psyche by emphasizing emotions to the detriment of reason, thereby reproducing a false opposition between reason and sensitivity. As a result, they underestimate the contributions of school education in this process.

In contrast, Ferreira and Duarte (2011), Assumpção (2014) and Barroco and Superti (2014) not only understand Vygotski’s concept of art more broadly but also engage more deeply with Lukacsian discussions of consciousness. Although Assumpção (2014) does not address the development of the creative subject and imagination when examining art in relation to school education, if artistic, scientific, and technological creation, as well as the entire cultural universe, are products of human imagination and creation, it becomes essential to understand and explain how this necessary psychological function develops, as well as the subject involved.

THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING IMAGINATION AND THE CREATIVE SUBJECT

Does school education contribute, or can it contribute, to the development of imagination and creativity? According to Lukács (2018), work is the creative activity that gave rise to both culture and its products and to human beings themselves, who, by transforming nature, transform themselves. This process of humanization — phylogenesis — lasted thousands of years and culminated in the emergence of *Homo sapiens*, whose results are genetically transmitted to all members of the species (Leontiev, 1978), regardless of race or ethnicity. However, although the same biological basis (*Homo sapiens*) is genetically transmitted to new generations, specifically human psychological functions are not.

HPF must be formed and developed by each new representative of the species, through the appropriation of language, concepts, and cultural ways of being, thinking, feeling, and acting. It is important to emphasize that, in distinguishing between learning and development, Vygotski states that the production of the “learned is a necessary and universal aspect of the process of developing culturally organized and specifically human psychological functions” (Vigotski, 1998a, p. 118).

In the process of humanization — ontogenesis — learning promotes various internal development processes and creates the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), as summarized by Vigotski (1998a) in the General Law of HPF Development: before reasoning (thinking) occurs as an internal (intrapsychic) activity, it necessarily occurs as an external (interpsychic) activity.

In the same way that interactions between the child and people in their environment develop inner speech and reflective thinking, these interactions foster the development of the child’s voluntary behavior [...] the child becomes capable of subordinating their behavior to the rules of a group game, and only later does voluntary self-regulation of behavior emerge as an internal function [...]. Once internalized, these processes become part of the child’s actual developmental achievements (Vigotski, 1998a, p. 117-118).

As the author states, the social should not be mistakenly interpreted merely as collectivity or as a multiplicity of people. Therefore, it is naïve to assume that for children to develop thinking and other HPFs, it is sufficient simply to place them in contact with one another. This aspect of the

author's work appears to generate misunderstandings in Brazil when read in a reductionist manner, with excessive emphasis on social interactions.

In the same chapter of the book *Mind in Society*,⁴ the author states that the development of learning begins before school entry but does not end there; there is also learning that occurs at school, which is systematized and produces something fundamentally new in the child's development. At school, children acquire scientific concepts and conceptual systems.

More specifically with regard to imagination, Vigotski (1998b) criticizes Freud and Piaget and argues that idealism mistakenly attributed a primary creative activity to consciousness, as if it were an innate capacity present from birth. According to the author, research has shown that the process of developing imagination, like other higher psychological functions, is linked to language and that creative imagination is related to the transformation of reality. Therefore, it is realistic, conscious, and purpose driven, even in the field of artistic creation.

The author concludes that imagination is not merely one function among others, but rather "a more complicated form of psychic activity, a true union of various functions in their peculiar relationships" (Vigotski, 1998b, p. 127). For Vygotski, both realistic and visionary thinking have their main critical point with the emergence of language, but school learning is the crucial aspect in the development of children's thinking. Thus, as noted by Barbosa (2019, p. 33) and recognized in all the articles analyzed, there is, for Vygotski, no such thing as "innate gift or talent."

Creative activity, according to Vigotski (2018, p. 44), is a possibility open to everyone; however, the highest manifestations of creation are generally accessible only to a few great geniuses of humanity: "The privileged classes have an immeasurably higher percentage of inventors in the fields of science, technology, and the arts because it is precisely in these classes that all the necessary conditions for creation are present."

The processes of creation are observed in all their intensity in early childhood, in play. However, according to Vigotski (2018), because the creative activity of imagination is directly related to the richness and variety of accumulated experience — the raw material from which imaginative constructions are elaborated — and because children have less experience, children's imagination is poorer than that of adults.

Imagination is not a natural capacity of consciousness, nor is it given at birth. It is not a psychological function in itself, but rather a complex process resulting from the combination of other HPFs. The development of imagination depends on thinking, which develops through the appropriation of words and their meanings in a process that culminates in true concepts. It also depends on previous human experience and, equally, "on technical knowledge, traditions, that is, on the models of creation that influence human beings" (Vigotski, 2018, p. 31). In this sense, historically constituted school education is clearly important for the development of imagination and the creative subject, whether in the arts, technology, sciences, mathematics, or philosophy.

Therefore, the following question arises: how do the authors of the articles analyzed conceive of the creative subject and its developmental process? Assumpção (2014) and Barbosa (2019) do not address the development of imagination and the creative subject. It is possible that the latter author does not do so because her work is based solely on *The Psychology of Art and Educational Psychology* by Vygotski. Stein and Chaves (2020) cite several of Vygotski's works and recognize that the human psyche develops; however, they focus on the development of emotions and thus run the risk of distorting Vygotski's theory, as they do not include *Thinking and Speech*, the author's latest and most important theoretical effort.

4 This book has already been duly analyzed and criticized by Duarte (2000); however, in the absence of a better translation, it was used in the analyses with the greatest possible care so as not to misrepresent the author's theory.

Ferreira and Duarte (2011) and Barroco and Superti (2014), in contrast, explain the process of development of the creative subject and imagination in relation to human culture, science, philosophy, and art, and understand Vygotski's theory of art in relation to his complex body of work as a whole.

The following section addresses the more specific relationships concerning the pedagogical and ideological implications of Vygotski's theory of art.

ART AND SCHOOL EDUCATION: BETWEEN MISCONCEPTIONS, EXAGGERATIONS, AND IDEOLOGICAL CLASHES

In capitalist societies, where ideas are also products to be marketed and consumed by the public, is art liberating or an ideological tool? In this context, what possibilities are offered by the relationship between art and school education? In one of the articles analyzed, Stein and Chaves (2020, p. 208) state: "We understand that art can be used as a means to promote moral and social values, as well as for entertainment, but we emphasize that aesthetic experience should be provided as an end in itself."

This understanding is questionable, both with regard to aesthetic experience as an end in itself and to the use of art as a means of promoting moral values, since, according to Vigotski (2004, p. 325), "we can never be sure in advance of the kind of moral effect that this or that book will have." As an example, the author cites the story of the cricket and the ant, which results in children admiring and identifying with the joy of the cricket and not with the ant, the responsible worker, as morally desired (Vigotski, 1999).

The moral effect of art, when it exists, is casual and secondary; consequently, it is "unwise and unsafe to base the education" of moral behavior on it (Vigotski, 2004, p. 342). This aspect is acknowledged and discussed by Stein and Chaves (2020), but in a contradictory manner. The promotion of moral values is not specific to art, but rather to politics, religion, and education, and the values adopted depend on society, worldviews, and competing ideologies.

It should be noted that Marx, in *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, according to Lukács (2018, p. 398), describes art as an ideological form, but does so in order to differentiate it from the economic conditions of production, referring to "the legal, political, religious, artistic, or philosophical forms, in short, the ideological forms [...] means by which problems [...] can be made conscious and resolved." This concept of ideology differs from the negative critical meaning initially proposed by Marx in *The German Ideology*, defined as a means of concealing reality and social manipulation, "a logical, systematic, and coherent set of representations (ideas and values) and norms or rules of conduct that indicate to members of society what they should feel and how they should feel, what they should do and how they should do it" (Chauí, 1981, p. 11).

If ideology is not a means of concealing reality, as Chauí (1981) argues, but rather a means through which problems and conflicts can be made conscious and resolved, then art and works of art can, in accordance with different philosophical and political frameworks, generate different effects in a non-homogeneous world marked by disputes among distinct societal projects. Thus, art can both promote moral values and contribute to the concealment of reality, as occurs in capitalist society, which "fetishistically transforms [...] its forms into ends-in-themselves [...] and strives to make their genesis from the social being disappear [...] often precisely through an exaggerated emphasis on the latter" (Lukács, 2018, p. 475).

Like any other instrument, "the work of art itself is neither good nor bad, or, to be more precise, it implies enormous possibilities for good and evil, all of which depends solely on the use and destination we give to this instrument" (Vigotski, 1999, p. 322). In societies that consume

industrialized products, art is appropriated by the cultural industry and begins to fulfill a fetishizing role. However, in this case, is it art?

In Lukács' understanding (2018), authentic art, regardless of the set of ideas that underpin it, elaborates human problems and conflicts in its own way and transcends everyday life, allowing the recipient to place themselves beyond their particularity and to think, feel, and act as an individual for themselves, even if not immediately. In other words, authentic art is neither neutral nor limited to being a mere means of entertainment or social manipulation, nor does it have aesthetic experience as an end in itself.

Through art, the subject not only expands but also transforms their consciousness, thinking, and perceptual capacity, as well as emotions, which are immediately linked to everyday life in consciousness, thought, perception, and higher emotions. For this reason, Vigotski (1999) criticizes the reduction of art to simple emotional discharge or sublimation, as proposed by Freud, and affirms that, in the cathartic process of aesthetic reaction, the ultimate goal is the overcoming and resolution of situations of internal conflict — not in the sense of liberating the spirit from tormenting passions, but rather through the cognitive and emotional elaboration of reality, as indicated by Vigotski (2004). This process can generate transformations in the creative subject — artist, writer, playwright — and/or in the recipient, as well as indirectly in reality itself through creative actions.

It is important to note that, for both Vygotski and Lukács (2018), the recipient is not reduced to a mere listener or spectator; rather, the object of art is reproduced and interpreted in a complex manner, or the contents of the aesthetic experience are elaborated through a complex constructive activity, a true secondary creative synthesis. However, this secondary synthesis, however important it may be for the subject and their development, does not characterize authentic art.

Art can enable the transformation of the human psyche and consciousness from in itself to for itself, just as it enables subjects to conceptually reframe reality. However, the miracle of transforming human beings “from water to wine” is not the result of the isolated and/or exclusive work of art, since science and philosophy also perform this role.

As Ferreira and Duarte (2011, p. 123) state, for Lukács, “catharsis is not a category exclusive to the field of art,” even though the aesthetic experience enables human beings to “appropriate the wisdom deposited in art [...] a link of mediation between the merely particular human being (*partikularen*) and one who strives to be, inseparably, simultaneously individuality and generic being” (Lukács, 2018, p. 473-474). The specificity of art, according to Lukács (2018), lies solely in its method, which can radically affect human beings insofar as it produces an immediate psycho-affective impact. “Poetry or art are a specific mode of thought, which ultimately leads to the same thing as scientific knowledge [...] only it does so by other means. Art differs from science only in its method, that is, in the way it is experienced, psychologically speaking” (Vigotski, 1999, p. 34-35).

It is also important to note that, in the process of developing aesthetic sensitivity — the human capacity to feel and be moved by art — there is, according to Lukács (1968), a before and after, related to the life of the receptive subject:

No man directly becomes another man in artistic pleasure and through it. The enrichment obtained in this case is an enrichment exclusively of his personality. But this personality is determined in a classist, national, historical, etc. sense (in addition to being, within these determinations, formed by personal experiences), and the conviction that there is even a single man who can receive a work of art as a spiritual tabula rasa is also an empty illusion of aesthetes. No, all of his previous experiences, which live in him on the basis of his social determination, remain operative even during aesthetic pleasure (Lukács, 1968, p. 292-293).

When art casually generates catharsis in one individual or another, it draws into “this purifying fire the most intimate and vitally important commotions of the individual soul” (Vigotski, 1999, p. 315). Thus, the effect is not the same for everyone. As Barbosa (2019, p. 41) points out, “without the proper appropriation of artistic languages (the development of the ‘richness of subjective human sensitivity’), this potential will not be realized.” In this sense, the importance of aesthetic artistic experiences is evident.

Accordingly, Barroco and Superti (2014) affirm that art is a cultural product, a mediator between the individual and the human species, and a means of enabling the newly born to become human, and to develop their HPFs through the appropriation of the complex mental activities crystallized in art by those who produce it. On the other hand, prior appropriations — requirements for aesthetic experience — are not limited to artistic languages. Without the prior contribution of education, there would be neither artists nor recipients capable of being transformed through aesthetic experience. As Vigotski (1999) states, art is a complex activity and therefore demands thinking — the complex ability to think, feel, and imagine.

As Jesus said to his disciples in different passages of the biblical text, “those who have eyes to see, let them see,” and “those who have ears to hear, let them hear.” It is necessary to possess the ability to see, hear, and understand, as well as the sensitivity to be emotionally moved by authentic art. These abilities are developed in more complex societies through specialized education at various levels, since learning complex knowledge in relation to others both optimizes life time and favors more effective results. Other paths are also possible, such as spontaneous forms of self-education, participation in social and political movements, or systematized education through autonomous workers’ organizations.

However, not all individuals develop the necessary and sufficient capacity for thinking and sensitivity. A significant portion of humanity is limited to the aesthetic pleasure of everyday life, accustomed to taking pleasure in revenge and the death of others, to enjoying sexist and prejudiced satire, or to remaining unmoved by cruel and grotesque scenes or words. In such cases, the “exorcising power of higher emotions” (Vigotski, 2004, p. 343) does not materialize, nor does it complete the dialectic of the aesthetic process of “contradiction, inner repulsion, overcoming, and victory” (Vigotski, 2004, p. 345).

The effects of authentic art depend on the cognitive and emotional development, moral formation, worldview, and ethical positioning of the recipients. Art has libertine effects only on subjects with libertine inclinations; individuals unaccustomed to libertinism may, on the contrary, react with exasperation and indignation. In this sense, it is incorrect to accuse authentic art of fulfilling a specific political, moral, or ideological role — in a negative critical sense — as has occurred in contemporary Brazil.

Therefore, as Ferreira and Duarte (2011, p. 122) argue, art is defended as school content in order to promote the integral formation of human beings, “neither from a perspective that opposes reason, nor to the detriment of other school content.” However, recognizing that the recipient — children or adolescents — are in processes of physical, intellectual, emotional, ethical, and moral development, it is necessary to reflect on the content proposed and its effects.

It is also necessary to critically examine the place of art in school education, which, according to Barbosa (2019), has unfortunately been reduced to entertainment or support for other subjects. At the same time, care must be taken not to overvalue art to the detriment of other curricular components. Without learning to read, write, and calculate properly, and without the proper appropriation of scientific and philosophical concepts in school, the cathartic effects made possible by art cannot be achieved.

It should be emphasized that, even in school, art — or authentic art — is not art for art’s sake, is not an end in itself, and is not mere entertainment. Although, due to the objective conditions

of children's and adolescents' development, the results of exercises in creative processes do not constitute authentic art, schools can enable aesthetic experiences and contribute to

broaden a child's experience, if one wishes to create a sufficiently solid foundation for their creative activity. The more children see, hear, and experience, the more they know and assimilate; the greater the number of elements of reality available to them in their experience; all other circumstances being equal, the more meaningful and productive their imagination will be (Vygotski, 2018, p. 25).

No one creates from nothing; it is by combining and transforming existing elements that something new emerges. It is the role of the school to contribute to human development and to fulfill its unique social function of transforming consciousness from in itself to for itself, and elementary psychological functions into the higher functions necessary for imagination and creation. This is the miracle of schooling.

Among the articles analyzed, Ferreira and Duarte (2011), Assumpção (2014), and Barroco and Superti (2014), despite different levels of theoretical depth, arrive at similar conclusions. In contrast, Barbosa (2019) and Stein and Chaves (2020) exaggerate the importance of art and downplay school education as a resource for the development of the creative subject. The dichotomization of art and school education has serious consequences for both individual development and humanity, as it contributes to blocking or limiting possibilities for creation and the transformation of reality.

teaching is one of the main sources of development of children's concepts and a powerful driving force behind this process. In proposing this hypothesis, we base ourselves on the well-known fact that instruction during school age is a decisive factor, determining the entire intellectual development of the child, including the development of their concepts (Vygotski, 2001, p. 195).

In sum, in capitalist societies, works of art are also transformed into commodities, products to be marketed and consumed by the public. This contradiction is addressed in only some of the articles analyzed, perhaps because, in Brazil, Vygotskian theory is often appropriated without consideration of the distinct historical, social, cultural, political, ideological, and economic context in which the author lived and produced.

Art appropriated by the cultural industry often aims at immediate moral results or is reduced to a means of entertainment or manipulation. However, if reduced to a mere ideological-political instrument, authentic art does not contribute to critical reflection or to elevating human beings to the dimension of for itself, regardless of the ideological positions of creative subjects and the distinct moral and ideological effects on recipients, which cannot be determined in advance. Authentic art, in its historically constituted essence, is marked by complexity, dissent, criticism, and self-criticism, representing a refined form of expression of human dignity in the sense indicated by Pico Della Mirandola (2006).

Within this complex context, it is argued that both far-right positions and certain left-wing perspectives⁵ should reconsider their understanding of art and school education. Authentic

5 Norberto Bobbio (1995, p. 118-119) distinguishes between the political right and left on the basis of their positions regarding the ideals of equality and freedom: "a) on the far left are movements that are simultaneously egalitarian and authoritarian [...]; on the center-left, doctrines and movements that are simultaneously egalitarian and libertarian [...]; on the center-right are doctrines and movements that are simultaneously libertarian and unequal, including conservative parties, which differ from reactionary right-wing parties in their fidelity to the democratic method, but which, with regard to the ideal of equality, adhere to equality before the law [...]; on the far right, anti-liberal and anti-egalitarian doctrines and movements, of which I believe it is superfluous to give well-known historical examples such as fascism and Nazism."

art, together with scientific and ethical-philosophical school education, contributes to the development of self-awareness and critical reflection — in the sense of knowing and thinking about reality beyond appearances — which is a necessary condition for the survival of humanity and is also necessary, though not sufficient, for human emancipation that is not reduced to political emancipation⁶ and consciousness.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In Vygotski's work, art is not reduced to a social technique of feeling. He does not reduce the transformation of the subject to emotions alone, even when emotional effects are conceived as catalytic or cathartic. Nor does Vygotski restrict creative activity and the development of imagination to the field of the arts, or catharsis to mere emotional release. Art is a specific way of reflecting reality, a form of self-awareness of the human race and, like other creative activities, a process of cognitive and emotional elaboration that can result in transformations, both of the subject themselves and of reality.

To understand art within Vygotsky's theory, it is necessary to grasp key concepts such as consciousness, higher psychological functions, psychological systems, catharsis, imagination, and creation. Only some of the articles analyzed address art at this level of complexity. Even so, all of them make significant contributions by highlighting the importance of art for enriching and broadening subjects' worldview and for human development. However, while some emphasize the importance of school education as a whole for the culturalization or development of specifically human psychological functions and for the development of individuality for itself, other articles appear to dichotomize art and school education and/or to overvalue art.

Regarding the ideological debate, Assumpção (2014) argues that art can contribute to both revolutionary and conservative perspectives on the *status quo* and is the only author to defend art engaged in class struggle. In contrast, it is understood that both authentic art and the school in its classical format, as indicated by Saviani and Duarte (2012), address issues that concern humanity and the elevation of merely particular singularity; that is, they go beyond a direct and immediate relationship with any specific social class. This holds true even though class positioning has implications for the before and after of aesthetic experience and for the educational process, and despite the fact that education and art in a class-based society are forged within the scope of particular determinations.

The other articles transcend the immediate political and ideological dimension, remaining within the denser philosophical-theoretical field surrounding the category of individuality for itself. It is noteworthy that Ferreira and Duarte (2011) engage deeply in the theoretical-pedagogical debate on art, defend classical education, and criticize constructivism in education.

The materialist theory of human development and imagination developed by Vygotski in partnership with Luria and Leontiev allows the affirmation, as noted in all the articles analyzed, that there is no such thing as an innate talent or gift. Imagination, an intrinsic condition for creation, is not a natural capacity of consciousness, but rather must be developed. Historically constituted school education plays a predominant role in the development of imagination and the creative subject across all fields, including the arts, technology, science, mathematics, and philosophy. Thus, it is incumbent upon schools to effectively fulfill their

6 Politics, according to Lukács (2018), faces insurmountable structural limits within the capitalist system, a historical reality made evident in times of coups or threats of military coups; thus, political emancipation is insufficient. In a truly libertarian conception, human emancipation implies overcoming the alienating forces that oppress human beings and creating the conditions of existence in a freely associated manner, as advocated by Marx and discussed by Tonet (2005).

unique social function and to contribute to the transformation and development, in children and adolescents, of higher psychological functions and consciousness in the sense indicated by Vygotski and Lukács.

REFERENCES

- ASSUMPÇÃO, Mariana de Cássia. As relações entre arte e vida em Lukács e Vygotski. **Revista Aspas**, v. 4, n. 1, p. 41, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2238-3999.v4i1p41-49>
- BARBOSA, Maria Flávia Silveira. Vygotski e psicologia da arte: horizontes para a educação musical. **Caderno Cedes**, Campinas, v. 39, n. 107, p. 31-44, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1590/CC0101-32622019213310>
- BARROCO, Sonia Mari Shima; SUPERTI, Tatiane. Vygotski e o estudo da psicologia da arte: contribuições para o desenvolvimento humano. **Psicologia & Sociedade**, v. 26, n. 1, p. 22-31, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-71822014000100004>
- BOBBIO, Norberto. **Direita e esquerda: razões e significados de uma distinção política**. Translation: Marco Aurélio Nogueira. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade Estadual Paulista, 1995.
- CHAUÍ, Marilena. **O que é ideologia?** São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1981.
- DUARTE, Newton. **Vygotski e o “aprender a aprender”**: crítica às apropriações neoliberais e pós-modernas da teoria vigotskiana. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2000.
- FERREIRA, Nathalia Botura de Paula; DUARTE, Newton. As artes na educação integral: uma apreciação histórico-crítica. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 6, n. 3, p. 115-126, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v6i3.5006>
- KOSIK, Karel. **Dialética do concreto**. 7. ed. Translation: N. Célia and T. Alderico. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2002.
- LEONTIEV, Alexis N. **O desenvolvimento do psiquismo**. Lisboa: Horizonte, 1978.
- LUKÁCS, Georg. **Introdução a uma estética marxista**. Translation: Leandro Konder and Carlos Nelson Coutinho. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1968.
- LUKÁCS, Georg. **Para uma ontologia do ser social**. Translation: Sergio Lessa e revisão Mariana Andrade. Maceió: Coletivo Veredas, 2018. v. 13-14.
- MARTINS, Lígia Márcia. Implicações pedagógicas da escola de Vygotski: algumas considerações. In: MENDONÇA, Sueli Guadalupe de Lima; MILLER, Stella. (org.). **Vygotski e a escola atual: fundamentos teóricos e implicações pedagógicas**. Araraquara: Junqueira & Marin, 2006. p. 41-61.
- MIRANDOLA, Pico Della. **A dignidade do homem**. Translation: Luiz Feracine. São Paulo: Escala, 2006.
- PAULO NETTO, José. **Introdução ao estudo do método de Marx**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2011.
- PEREIRA, Marcos Villela. Educação e arte: dez anos de trajetória do GT24. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 26, e260043, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782021260043>
- PRESTES, Zoia. **Quando não é quase a mesma coisa**: traduções de Lev Semionovitch Vygotski no Brasil. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2012.

PRESTES, Zoia; TUNES, Elizabeth. A trajetória de obras de Vigotski: um longo percurso até os originais. **Estudos de Psicologia**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 3, p. 327-340, jul./set. 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-166X2012000300003>

SAVIANI, Dermeval; DUARTE, Newton (org.). **Pedagogia histórico-crítica e luta de classes na educação escolar**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2012.

STEIN, Vinícius; CHAVES, Marta. A arte no contexto educativo: reflexões sobre o desenvolvimento dos sentimentos estéticos. **Educação em Foco**, v. 23, n. 41, p. 91-109, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.24934/eef.v23i41.4785>

TONET, Ivo. **Educação, cidadania e emancipação humana**. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2005.

TONET, Ivo. **Método científico: uma abordagem ontológica**. 2. ed. Maceió: Coletivo Veredas, 2018.

VIGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **A formação social da mente: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos superiores**. 6. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1998a.

VIGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **O desenvolvimento psicológico na infância**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1998b.

VIGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **Psicologia da arte**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.

VIGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **Psicologia pedagógica**. Translation: Paulo Bezerra. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

VIGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **Imaginação e criação na infância: ensaio psicológico livro para professores**. Translation: Zoia Prestes and Elizabeth Tunes. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2018.

VYGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **Obras escogidas I**. 2. ed. Madri: Visor, 1997.

VYGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **Obras escogidas III**. 2. ed. Madri: Visor, 2000.

VYGOTSKI, Lev Semenovich. **Obras escogidas II**. 2. ed. Madri: A Machado Libros, 2001.

How to cite this article: CANCI, Laura; NAGEL, Manuella; ROSA, Solange Aparecida da. Art and school education in Vygotsky: a counter-hegemonic position amidst ideological conflicts. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 31, e310022, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782026310023>

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no commercial or associative interests that represent a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript.

Funding: The study received no funding.

Author contributions: Writing – First Draft, Writing – Revision and Editing, Methodology: Canci, L.; Nagel, M.; Rosa, S. A.

Data availability statement: The research data are available in the body of the article.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

LAURA CANCI holds a degree in Psychology from the Universidade Comunitária da Região de Chapecó (UNOCHAPECÓ).

MANUELLA NAGEL holds a degree in Psychology from the Universidade Comunitária da Região de Chapecó (UNOCHAPECÓ).

SOLANGE APARECIDA DA ROSA holds a master's degree in Education from the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC). She is a tenured professor in the Psychology Department at the Universidade Comunitária da Região de Chapecó (UNOCHAPECÓ).

Received March 25, 2024

Revised November 19, 2024

Approved December 4, 2024

Responsible editor: Edla Eggert  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1980-7053>

