

THE MEETING BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY OF CHILDHOOD

Patricia Maria Uchôa Simões^{1 2}, Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1606-7894>
Flávia Mendes de Andrade e Peres³, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3769-8110>
Jacqueline Travassos de Queiroz⁴, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7426-8323>

ABSTRACT. The text aims to build an interdisciplinary dialogue on conceptions of childhood, child development and education based on the propositions of Developmental Psychology and Sociology of Childhood for the study of children. The study presents axes of approximations and distances between these fields of knowledge based on an epistemological view that reveals interfaces and articulations between these perspectives regarding conceptions, approaches and methodologies. The studies of children and childhood in the contemporary world point to the need to deepen the understanding of phenomena from an interdisciplinary reflection on the historical and cultural constitution of the subject, the transformations along the development and the implications for education. It is an epistemological debate with implications in the discussion about ethics in research on/with children. The advances in this debate involve the same critical reflection of the human sciences on the relations of power and knowledge that have as central and constituent aspect the language for the understanding of human dimensions. At the end, there is a reflection on the formulation of a new conceptual, theoretical and methodological framework for the debate and research of childhood in the contemporary world.

Keywords: Childhood; development; psychology.

O ENCONTRO ENTRE A PSICOLOGIA E A SOCIOLOGIA DA INFÂNCIA

RESUMO. O texto tem como objetivo construir um diálogo interdisciplinar sobre concepções de infância, desenvolvimento infantil e educação, tendo como base as proposições da Psicologia do Desenvolvimento e da Sociologia da Infância para o estudo da criança. São apresentados eixos de aproximações e distanciamentos entre esses campos do conhecimento, a partir de um olhar epistemológico que revela interfaces e articulações entre eles. Os estudos da criança e da infância na contemporaneidade apontam para a necessidade de aprofundar a compreensão dos fenômenos, a partir de uma reflexão interdisciplinar sobre a constituição histórico-cultural do sujeito, as transformações ao longo do desenvolvimento e as implicações para a educação. Nesse contexto, apresenta-se um debate de natureza epistemológica com implicações na discussão sobre ética e outras relações metodológicas na

¹ Fundação Joaquim Nabuco, Recife-PE, Brazil.

² E-mail: pusimoes@gmail.com

³ Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Recife-PE, Brazil.

⁴ Universidade de Pernambuco, Garanhuns-PE, Brazil.



pesquisa sobre/com crianças. A partir de uma reflexão crítica semelhante à encontrada nas ciências humanas sobre as relações entre poder e saber, que têm como aspecto central e constituinte a linguagem para a compreensão das dimensões humanas, reflete-se sobre a formulação de um novo quadro conceitual, teórico e metodológico para o debate e a pesquisa da infância na contemporaneidade.

Palavras-chave: Infância; desenvolvimento; psicologia.

EL ENCUENTRO ENTRE LA PSICOLOGÍA Y LA SOCIOLOGÍA DE LA INFANCIA

RESUMEN. En este texto se tiene como objetivo construir un diálogo interdisciplinario sobre concepciones de infancia, desarrollo infantil y educación y tiene como base las proposiciones de la Psicología del Desarrollo y de la Sociología de la Infancia para el estudio del niño. Se presentan ejes de acercamientos y distanciamientos entre esos campos del conocimiento, a partir de una mirada epistemológica que revela interfaces y articulaciones entre esas perspectivas en cuanto a concepciones, enfoques y metodologías. Los estudios del niño y de la infancia en la contemporaneidad apuntan a la necesidad de profundizar la comprensión de los fenómenos a partir de una reflexión interdisciplinaria sobre la constitución histórica cultural del sujeto, las transformaciones a lo largo del desarrollo y las implicaciones para la educación. Se trata de un debate de naturaleza epistemológica con implicaciones en la discusión sobre la ética en la investigación sobre / con niños. Los avances en este debate involucran la misma reflexión crítica de las ciencias humanas sobre las relaciones de poder y saber que tienen como aspecto central y constituyente el lenguaje a la comprensión de las dimensiones humanas. Al final, se reflexiona sobre la formulación de un nuevo marco conceptual, teórico y metodológico para el debate y la investigación de la infancia en la contemporaneidad.

Palabras clave: Infancia; desarrollo; psicología.

Introduction

Since the late nineteenth century, there has been a concern with children and their development in the medical sciences, psychology and pedagogy; however, in other areas of the human sciences, as in the case of the social sciences, the interest in childhood as the focus of studies is more recent and the volume of works on the subject only became more significant from the 1980s when the field of social studies of childhood began to constitute as an independent discipline in the fields of Sociology of Family and Sociology of Education.

It was only in the last decades of the twentieth century that the Sociology of Childhood emerged as an alternative to the forms of conception of children and childhood in the study of classical sociology, inserting itself into a field understood as new social studies of childhood. Prior to this, when studying children and childhood based on concerns about family and education issues, the protagonism about their development and their constitution as a subject and citizen used to be withdrawn from the child. Perceiving the child beyond the social place of child or student allows understanding them as a social actor. Thus, childhood becomes understood as a social construction and not only as a stage of life characterized by biological aspects, disabilities and absences (Abramowicz & Moruzzi,

2016; Corsaro, 2011; Mayall, 2013; Nascimento, 2011; Prout, 2010; Sarmento, 2005, 2013, 2015; Wyness, 2012).

At the beginning of the 20th century, some theoretical tensions began to emerge on the subject in other fields of knowledge, such as psychology, and they debated, among themselves, different approaches on the psychological phenomenon, entangled by the human development phenomenon. In this epistemological space, some psychological currents identified the importance of childhood in their studies, contemplated the social aspect in their conceptions, conceived the child's social constitution and strengthened arguments about the psychological subject as an active being before knowledge. Among the approaches of psychology that stand from these bases, one could glimpse a promising dialogue with the new social studies that would arise with critics to the classical sociology.

In an interview with Müller (2007), William Corsaro, one of the important authors of the new field of social studies of childhood, says that his studies in the early 1970s were interested in language acquisition, since hegemonic approaches in that historical context of research with children, behavioral theories of child development and learning were simplistic and underestimated children's actions. It was in this way that Corsaro set out to study the theories of Piaget and Vygotsky, and was, according to him, influenced by them, in conducting his research for the social and cultural development of children in a more general way. However, in the book *Sociology of Childhood*, Corsaro (2011) makes some criticisms to Developmental Psychology, especially to Piaget and Vygotsky, presenting points in which his visions on the child and its development distanced themselves from the proposal undertaken by the Sociology of Childhood.

This article discusses some epistemological divergences pointed out by Sociology of Childhood on Psychology, specifically on the ideas of development of the psychic subject in Piaget and Vigotski. It became pertinent to add to the discussion the vision of Henri Wallon, although he has not been emphasized in the propositions of the authors of *Sociology of Childhood*. Thus, we can reflect on conceptual and theoretical formulations of psychology theorists that give rise to criticisms of the Sociology of Childhood, and we seek in the theoretical constructs the possibility of an interdisciplinary dialogue.

The objective is to help in the elaboration of a methodological field that considers the child as a social actor and childhood as a construction and structural category for the organization of society. Relationships between the perspectives of the Sociology of Childhood and Developmental Psychology on the child are established, whose differences, when examined beyond their appearance, may indicate a conceptual panorama for a new field in the studies of childhood.

Locating the meeting place between Sociology of Childhood and Psychology

In general, the perspective of the new social studies of childhood refuses interpretations of the sciences of the first modernity that are based on the beliefs of reason and progress. On the contrary, it seeks new forms of knowledge that consider the complexity and the (dis) order of childhood, relying on poststructuralist studies (Prout, 2010; Sarmento, 2013, 2015).

According to Prout (2010), Sociology of Childhood is born with the task of "[...] facing the complexity and ambiguity of childhood as a contemporary and unstable phenomenon" (p. 773). This author considers the necessarily hybrid character of childhood in the relation between the natural and the cultural not contemplated by the modern sciences. He highlights a necessary position in contemporary times, particularly on the part of the sciences that treat

the child beyond the structural-functionalist understanding, by integrating time and space in his studies.

Sarmiento (2005) proposes a "[...] concrete analysis of children as social actors" (p. 372) and considers that the modern sciences study the child due to its transience and adult dependence, in a linear and teleological perspective.

For Barbosa (2014), spaces for the investigation of childhood come from Psychology and Education and have an important role in the foundation of the new scientific field. However, although some studies of Developmental Psychology have helped formulating the new paradigm in social studies, emerging as the Sociology of Childhood, the authors of this new discipline had made strong criticism to the studies of Developmental Psychology in general and, in particular, to the works of Piaget and Vigotski.

Such criticisms are due, in part, to the fundamental assumption for the theorists of Sociology of Childhood that looks at childhood not as a moment of biological immaturity, that is, childhood is not characterized as a 'natural' or universal stage of existence but rather as a component structurally present (or not) in societies (Corsaro, 2011; Prout, 2010; Qvortrup, 2014; Sarmiento, 2005, 2013, 2015). They disagree, therefore, with any universal and unitary conception of childhood, a position they believe to be hegemonic in the studies of Developmental Psychology.

Despite these considerations, theorists of Sociology of Childhood criticize Developmental Psychology for emphasizing only the individual aspects, not encompassing the collective activities that create cultural routines between children and adults, and the processes of constructing children's cultures among their peers. On this, Corsaro (2011) outlines the field of Developmental Psychology in the constructivist perspective as a theory and research of the child's development as an individual. According to this author, the way in which cultural systems reflect interpersonal relationships in childhood and the role of children in the interpretative reproduction of cultural patterns is hardly considered.

It is important to consider that among the studies of Psychology, the internal divergences among its own theorists seem to remain an issue to be overcome from its origins. Not without reason, the early ideas of Vygotsky's school in the former Soviet Union of the early twentieth century were aimed at overcoming what he called the 'crisis of psychology' by perceiving a fundamental dichotomy in the way psychological models conceived the subject. On the one hand, there were approaches to the psychological phenomenon that did not consider the material conditions of existence for the understanding of consciousness; on the other hand, approaches that conceived environment-stimulated behavior, dissociating themselves from mental processes and cultural meanings. Thus, the crisis of psychology, as warned by Vygotsky, continued in the realization of a psychological science and, from it, several approaches were raised in the field that was constituted as Psychology.

However, in dealing with phenomena involving human development, one should make an exercise of looking at psychological approaches as historically situated. In this historical course, the conceptions of development are oriented, with greater or lesser strength, to distinct poles of the phenomenon that shape the way each one conceives the subject. From these positions between poles the perspectives of subject emerge in theoretical frameworks that establish, explicitly or implicitly, the relations between the biological and the cultural; between society and the place of other social individuals (adults and children) in development processes; and the game between passivity and activity in social interactions.

In this article, we state how the works of Piaget, Vigotski and Wallon on the development of the child can be crucial for the strengthening of the studies in Sociology of Childhood. The way in which Sociology and Psychology converge or distance themselves in their bases, and even the reflection on approximations and divergences between the psychological theories on the child's development, can open an organizing epistemological discussion of a new, unique and interdisciplinary field.

In the following sections, the review of these critiques seeks to establish a dialogue between these studies, considering human development in the light of reflections on nature and culture (1.1); and institutional and social interactions and adult-child relationship (1.2). Section 1.3 presents some implications of this discussion for research with children.

Nature-culture relationship and development conceptions

Despite considering the influence of the social environment in his writings, Piaget's work seeks a universality in studying the epistemic subject (Piaget, 1981). In this conception, the epistemic subject advocated by Piaget develops from equilibration processes as a characteristic of all individuals, therefore, a universal process. To describe this process, Piaget conceptualizes mental structures, such as reversibility, compensation and regulation, that work in theory as functional invariants, that is, they are independent of the social and historical context of the individual, whose cognitive development would happen due to such mechanisms (De la Taille, Dantas, & Oliveira, 2013).

For the cultural historical approach to human development, which has in Vygotsky's school its main references, the attempt of universality of psychological phenomena would not be sustained. De la Taille et al. (2013) affirm that the Vygotsky approach did not fail to "[...] admit universal factors" (p. 60) and point to two basic postulates dealing with the 'universal in man' in Vygotsky: the limits and possibilities defined by evolution of the species, providing a link between the biologically inherited structure and the historical elements of the process; the cultural factor as inherent in development, so that symbolic and social mediation in the psychic constitution are considered universal. These postulates reveal Vygotsky's understanding of the eminently social constitution of the individual, which relates the universal to the individual aspect in a dialectical process and has its emphasis in the specific historical context.

Wallon uses the idea of open or semi-programming to explain brain functions. According to him, the more complex a function, the more indeterminate, and therefore the less universal; and the more primitive, the more biologically determined and more universal. The subject, for Wallon, is determined both by the biological structure and by the historical conjuncture. In this way, he does not fail to consider the biological, and therefore universal, issues of human development. For Wallon (1979, 1986), development is the result of an integration of the motor, affective and cognitive dimensions of the subject. These dimensions have a link between them and constantly moving interactions that have settings as a result. With each configuration, there is a totality that expresses in the person, and the concept of integration is the great organizing concept of the theory. Within each of these configurations, there are new motor, affective and cognitive resources that will intermediate the activities previously acquired and prepare the change to a new configuration. Wallon combines organic conditions and social conditions in an open process in the development of the person, which is never finished.

The idea of stages is combined to the conception of development, based on an evolutionary perspective of human development that foresees the overcoming of nature by

reason, science and technique. For Piaget (1986), the development goes in the direction of the construction of formal logical structures in a progressive and closed form, without the possibility of other ways of knowing the world beyond the logical and mathematical one.

The conception of stages in Wallon (1995) differs from the Piagetian conception by not understanding the development in a linear, nor continuous form. Thus, for Wallon, development goes through crises, conflicts, ruptures and setbacks. However, from his historical-cultural perspective, Wallon understands the development of the child from the biological to the social aspect. Even admitting the integrality of the child, there is a direction that indicates a polarization in a teleological vision that also distances itself from the look of social studies of childhood.

In Vigotsky (2001, 2003), the idea of stages appears to explain the development of language and the use of signs and concept formation. For this author, the use of language implies forms and systems of categorization of experience, which determines the form of cognitive functioning. This relational nature of development and of possible stages approaches the conceptions of infantile cultures and peer cultures of Sociology of Childhood, but may suggest a fragmentation of development and thus open itself to criticisms about linearity in the proposed developmental trajectory, distancing the two perspectives. However, by overcoming some translation problems involving the instrument and the sign in the development of the child and the role of play, as pointed out by Prestes (2012), it is possible to highlight the role of the activity in the psychic development and to refer a genetic, analytical, functional and structural base of children's play.

Notwithstanding these considerations attesting to a Vygotsky interested in stages of development, but these conceived only by the changes in motives and impulses occasioned by the experience in guide activities, the criticism of the Sociology of Childhood is related to the conception of stages of development would be the mark of adult-centric rationality that does not recognize the child and childhood in the present, but the child as a being in becoming, and childhood as a passage, a transition, and that focuses development as a process that occurs in the individual.

However, propositions about cognitive development, as studied by Psychology, point to different ways of understanding the child throughout development. On this proposition, Corsaro (2011) states that "Piaget's notion of stages is important for the sociology of children because it reminds us that children perceive and organize their worlds in a qualitatively different from the way of adults" (p. 23).

Still relating the idea of stages of development and the nature-culture dilemma, we also highlight the negation of the new social studies of childhood to any understanding of childhood as a transitional stage to adulthood, as commonly found, and not as a phase with value in itself. Thus, the sociology of childhood ends up giving greater emphasis to the processes of transformation and less importance to the processes of adaptation in development (Corsaro, 2009, 2011). It distances itself from teleological understandings of development that aim at a specific point of arrival for development, thus considering them as deterministic visions.

At this point, Corsaro (2011) presents his critics to the concepts of internalization and zone of proximal development of Vygotsky, considering that these bring a deterministic conception of the processes of appropriation and reproduction of culture and society.

According to Corsaro's interpretation, through these concepts, Vygotsky presents the proposition that the child only participates in social life after internalizing the contents of culture, in a teleological vision of development. This positioning also suggests an opposition between interior/exterior aspects that the concept has. Corsaro's criticisms are because this

concept implies a temporal dimension that supposes a before and after, that is, the internalization would be the result of the individual's participation in the social activity.

According to the reflections of Prestes' work (2013), many of the criticisms of Sociology of Childhood may be due to partial or even misleading readings of the translations of Vygotsky's work in the West, or more precisely, due to conceptual confusion in reading the book *Mind in Society* (1978) that arrived in Brazil and derived several editions of *The Social Formation of Mind* (Vygotsky, 1988), being the major reference that Corsaro uses in his works. According to Prestes (2013), Vigotski understands that the child is "[...] immersed in culture; the social environment is constitutive of personhood" (p. 303), so the term internalization deals with a complex phenomenon and not a simple displacement of the external to the internal level.

Regarding the concept of a zone of proximal development, Corsaro (2011) points to a deterministic view of development that would underlie it, since children would internalize the adult world through what is shared with them and the culture would thus guide them in a in the game between actual and proximal development. For Prestes (2012), on the contrary, when Vigotski (2004) proposes to evaluate what the child can do with guidance or cooperation (proximal level), as something that in the future they will be able to do alone, it identifies the field of functions that are in the imminence to move to the real level, as a field of possibilities, but not in internal potential.

This reveals, in his theory, a character of unpredictability in development, as a result of the dialectical historical social relation of the child. Imminent development would not have a definite end, for nothing is determined. So, it could soon open up for unforeseen futures, even considering that there is creative action on the part of children in their established relationships with more able peers, who will be awakened by activities-guide. Seen from this perspective, the Vygotskian ideas about zones of development would approach, rather than distance, from the ideas of Sociology of Childhood.

Social interactions, adult-child relationship and child development

The social studies of childhood start from a conception of development that is inscribed in the historical and cultural dimensions of the society and propose a school capable of promoting these interactions and, in this sense, favor the formation of cultures with specific aspects of the children's world, with its own grammar (Sarmiento, 2015).

In Wallon's theory, it is possible to identify convergences with this position of Sarmiento, since, for him, educating is to promote conditions that respect the development process of the being, maintaining the integration of the sets (motor, affective, cognitive) and taking in considering the organic, neurological possibilities and the conditions of existence of the child. Therefore, adults should not take as a reference their adult perspective and it is, then, up to the school environment, specifically for the adult educator, to adapt the school environment to children's possibilities and needs. The child, in this perspective, would not have to adapt to the school, but the school should adapt to the child. More centrally, Wallon approaches the subject who seeks to historicize in the "[...] initial symbiotic undifferentiation to the growing subjectivation" (De la Taille et al., 2013, p. 61). The idea of Wallon is that of a subject in permanent opposition to the other and who, in this movement of intra and interpersonal tension, is constructed.

Thus, the differences between Piaget's more deterministic view, the consideration of the biological structure as constitution of Wallon's subject, and the autonomy of higher

psychological functions in relation to Vygotsky's hereditary control are variations in the deterministic understanding of development within psychological approaches.

The Vygotskian concept of internalization, as can be interpreted, would not emphasize an imposition of culture with determinations on the individual, but would open to the relevance of the action of the subject in the reconstitution, on an intrapsychic level, of a process that initially occurs in social interaction. The school, in Vigotsky (2003), should advance development by promoting collective learning activities. Despite having a previously planned objective, the scope of development depends, in the first instance, on the imminence of novelties in the Zone of Proximal Development or Zone of Imminent Development.

Thus, combined to the conceptions of children, social studies of childhood present a conception of development as a movement of transformations, not toward something, but as a result of the social interactions established among children and between children and adults. These transformations encompass co-construction, which implies the idea that, at the same time as they transform themselves, children transform others and the context in which they are inserted, and while they insert themselves into cultural routines, they produce child culture. Development, therefore, would not be determined in a linear dynamic, nor would it have a universal character ruled by natural patterns; rather, despite involving biological changes, it is a process fundamentally circumscribed by culture. This idea can dialogue directly with discussions on development as a process that goes from the interpsychic to the intrapsychic level, in the Vygotsky's general genetic law of development. Supported by dialectical materialism, for Vygotsky the transformation of the biological into the social aspect and the process of humanization occurs through the appropriation of the material conditions of existence that precede us, but this appropriation is not passive.

It is understood, therefore, that Piaget, Vygotski and Wallon thought of the child and the development considering universal factors, although the emphases on what would be (dis) continuous in the human individuals in different historical and social contexts gain importance and very different contours in each of these theorists. In the case of Piaget, his work looks for universal factors to explain development. The other two theorists do not ignore these factors, but do not place them as central in their theories, since they advocate a constant dialectical game between the biological and the cultural aspects. If there is a centrality of universality in their theories, it is precisely in the sense of opening oneself to the necessary social constitution of the subject. The nuances of the relations with the other, in the cultural contexts in which they develop, impact on such development, originating processes that cannot be seen in a teleological way.

In the reflection on social interactions and child development, Wallon states that the presence of the other guarantees not only the physical but also the cultural survival from the apprehension of predominant beliefs, techniques, instruments, ideas and affections in the culture in which each one is inserted. Wallon (1995) understands that social existence and individual existence are in the process of constant transformations, marked by the concrete and historical situation in which they occur. In this sense, this experience with the other is indispensable for the formation of the awareness of one's own capacities and for the understanding of the norms that their participation in the group imposes on them, thus building an image outside themselves that reduces them to the absolute spontaneity and the initial subjectivity.

Wallon proposed a conception of the integrality of human dimensions and of their constitution in culture and in the symbolic world that articulates with the propositions of the new social studies of childhood. By understanding that the other social is a primordial

element in the construction of the psychic awareness, Wallon approaches the concern of Corsaro (2011) to perceive in the cultural routines the emergence of the understanding of belonging to a certain social group. In this way, the constitution of the subject occurs in the sharing of meanings with the group in which it is inserted.

For his part, Corsaro (2011) proposes the circular web model as a metaphor to distinguish his conception from other ideas such as those that subsidize life-long stages of development models discussed in the previous section. In this web, there are several fields that make up the social institutions in which the children are inserted, either they are familiar, occupational and religious, as stable structures, but in permanent change. Children are protagonists and weave their webs. The family, at the center of the web, is to which other institutional domains with the participation of children in peer cultures are linked. This metaphor emphasizes four cultures of pairs: pre-school, pre-adolescence, adolescence and adulthood, which are webs collectively woven on the framework of cultural and institutional knowledge. Thus, social interaction, whether with peers or with adults, allows children to appropriate culture, accompanied by development processes, and to continuously recreate it.

Corsaro (2011) also understands that the appropriation of the world made by the child happens creatively and autonomously in relation to the culture of the adult world. Creative appropriation transforms information from the adult world into strategies that respond to the concerns and needs of their world, contributing autonomously to the reproduction of adult culture. It is in this scenario that Corsaro proposes the concept of interpretive reproduction, which focuses on creative and innovative aspects of child participation in social groupings. Children create and participate in their own unique peer cultures and select or appropriate information from the adult world to deal with their own unique concerns.

Corsaro's interpretive reproduction idea can relate to the idea of creative interpretation in Vigotsky (2010) that presents a notion of plastic and dynamic nervous system that, besides conserving, memorizing and reproducing, allows the creation and combination of new possibilities. This creative and combinatory function brings about new impressions and re-elaborations from past experiences, principles and approaches. Thus, human creations are the product of imagination and creation; the objects of our daily life are crystallized imagination. In early childhood, according to Vigotski (2010), creative processes emerge, especially in the games, set as creative re-elaboration of experiences, combining them and building new realities according to their interests and needs. Child fantasy is the result of imaginative activity, as it happens in the ludic activity in which the child emphasizes characters and artifacts of the everyday life, attributing to them something characteristic in order to make them different from the recognized previously. The convergence of these positions points to the social interaction and the autonomy of the child as marks of imminent levels of development that are not acquired passively.

Implications for research with children

Barbosa (2014) affirms that Developmental Psychology inaugurated qualitative forms in research on children, seeking the "[...] qualitatively different way of being and thinking, but not of inferiority" (p. 648) of the child in relation to the adult, through observation in natural environments, especially situations involving play.

When he points to the "[...] transmutation of the child-object research figure into the figure of the child as (co) researcher" (p. 44), Sarmiento (2015) advocates the use of participative research methodologies, taking the child from a construction of knowledge and

enabling a dialogue between child and researcher. The projection of the adult gaze on children "[...] makes the understanding of children's opinions impossible and is inattentive of their forms" (p. 45).

Thus, some contributions of Developmental Psychology to research methodologies with children, to the field of Sociology of Childhood are evidenced, especially among authors focusing on children's cultures, children's toys and games, gender and power relations in interactions among children and between adults and children.

The character of novelty constructed and carried out by the child unites these perspectives and proposes a new paradigm to think about childhood, their development and the implications that may come to exist in the school context. The new social studies of childhood propose a change in the conceptions of childhood, development and education, starting from the understanding of the child as an active being, constructor of knowledge and cultures, and the child with value in itself, with conceptual autonomy (Qvortrup, 2014) and specificities in relation to the other generations that are built in a certain historical and social context.

The studies of children and childhood in the contemporary world point to the need to deepen the understanding of the phenomena from an interdisciplinary reflection on the historical cultural constitution of the subject, the transformations along the development with implications for education. It is urgent to look at otherness and recognition of children and the world of children to discover new perspectives and, distancing from adult-centric looks, to reveal the child concealed by the webs of meaning of the adult world and the institutional/institutionalizing spaces of researchers (Cohn, 2013; Ferreira & Nunes, 2014; Motta & Frangella, 2013).

It is a debate of an epistemological nature and it is in this sense that the research agenda in the field of childhood needs to deepen the discussion about ethics in research on/with children. Delgado and Müller (2005) even said that "[...] when it comes to research with children, ethics is a fundamental aspect, since it is undeniable that there is an adult force based on physical size, power relations and arbitrary decisions" (p. 355). The concern of Sociology of Childhood with ethics in research with children is inserted between the recognition of the myth of scientific neutrality and the risk of relativism and pragmatism of the human and social sciences.

It is necessary to build a dialectical and interdisciplinary understanding of childhood that considers difference and strangeness as structuring elements of research. The break with adult-centered visions in research with children marks contemporary studies and is part of the emerging paradigm that scholars of childhood seek to build. In this sense, the study of childhood becomes beyond necessary, but essential for the understanding of society in contemporary times.

Final considerations

The studies carried out on children and development in the medical, psychological and educational areas have established an important knowledge base on childhood, which subsidizes forms of understanding and establishes contexts of action in child care. These studies have contributed to the construction of norms for childhood, which regulate intergenerational relations, pedagogical practices and school curricula or knowledge to be learned (Abramowicz & Moruzzi, 2016; Mayall, 2013; Sarmiento, 2013, 2015; Wyness, 2012). In the present article, we sought to reflect on possible relations between

Developmental Psychology and Sociology of Childhood, with impacts on a new methodological field for research with children.

As an area which, by its very nature, placed the themes of children and their development at the center of their concerns, Developmental Psychology - especially the works of Piaget, Vigotski and Wallon - has contributed to the emergence and strengthening of studies in Sociology of Childhood. This contribution occurred in the provision of new perspectives of studies on children and childhood for the classical approach of Sociology and new methodological procedures that made possible the construction of alternatives for research with children that focused on children's protagonism in the actions of everyday life.

The conceptions of children and development that permeate the new social studies and the dialogues with some conceptions about child development, as discussed in the previous sections, imply methodological research choices that enable seeing the child and appreciating the children's world in the sense of paradigm shift. These demands involve methodological choices that many studies in Developmental Psychology have already presented and that Sociology of Childhood has used as observations in natural environments of coexistence among children and between children and adults; and situations of interactions that enable analyzing the development process, rather than the product, focusing on microgenetic aspects of the production of meanings in contexts of culturally shared activities.

References

- Abramowicz, A., & Moruzzi, A. B. (2016). Infância na contemporaneidade: questões para os estudos sociológicos da infância. *Crítica Educativa*, 2(2), 25-37.
- Barbosa, M. C. S. (2014). Culturas infantis: contribuições e reflexões. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, 14(43), 645-667.
- Cohn, C. (2013). Concepções de infância e infâncias: um estado da arte da antropologia da criança no Brasil. *Civitas - Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 13(2), 221-244.
- Corsaro, W. A. (2009). Reprodução interpretativa e cultura de pares. In: F. Müller & A. M. Almeida (Orgs.), *Teoria e prática na pesquisa com crianças: diálogos com William Corsaro* (p. 31-50). São Paulo, SP: Cortez.
- Corsaro, W. A. (2011). *Sociologia da infância*. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed.
- De la Taille, Y., Dantas, H., & Oliveira, M. K. de. (2013). Mesa-redonda: três perguntas a Vygotskianos, Wallonianos e Piagetianos. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, (76), 57-64.
- Delgado, A. C., & Müller, F. (2005). Sociologia da Infância: pesquisa com crianças. *Educação & Sociedade*, 26(91), 351-360.
- Ferreira, M., & Nunes, Â. (2014). Estudos da infância, antropologia e etnografia: potencialidades, limites e desafios. *Linhas Críticas*, 20(41), 103-123.
- Mayall, B. (2013). *A history of the sociology of childhood*. London, UK: IOEPress.

- Motta, F. M. N., & Frangella, R. D. C. P. (2013). Descolonizando a pesquisa com a criança – uma pós-colonial de pesquisa. *Revista da FAEEBA-Educação e Contemporaneidade*, 22(40), 187-197.
- Müller, F. (2007). Entrevista com William Corsaro. *Educação & Sociedade*, 28(98), 271-278.
- Nascimento, M. L. (2011). Reconhecimento da sociologia da infância como área de conhecimento e campo de pesquisa: algumas considerações. In: A. L. Faria & D. Finco (Orgs.), *Sociologia da infância no Brasil* (p. 37-52). Campinas, SP: Autores Associados.
- Piaget, J. (1986). *A linguagem e o pensamento da criança*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Piaget, J. (1981). *A psicologia*. Lisboa, PT: Livraria Bertrand.
- Prestes, Z. (2012). *Quando não é quase a mesma coisa: análise de traduções de Lev Semionovitch Vigotski no Brasil*. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados.
- Prestes, Z. (2013). A sociologia da infância e a teoria histórico-cultural: algumas considerações. *Revista de Educação Pública*, 22(49/1), 295-304.
- Prout, A. (2010). Reconsiderando a nova sociologia da infância. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 40(141), 729-750.
- Qvortrup, J. (2014). Visibilidades das crianças e da infância. *Linhas Críticas*, 20(41), 23-42.
- Sarmiento, M. J. (2015). Uma agenda crítica para os estudos da criança. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 15(1), 31-49.
- Sarmiento, M. J. (2005). Gerações e alteridade: interrogações a partir da sociologia da infância. *Educação & Sociedade*, 26(91), 361-378.
- Sarmiento, M. J. (2013). A sociologia da infância e a sociedade contemporânea: desafios conceituais e praxeológicos. In: R. T. Ens & M. Garanhani. *Sociologia da infância e a formação de professores* (p. 13-46). Curitiba, PR: Champagnat Editora.
- Vigotski, L. S. (2001). *A construção do pensamento e da linguagem*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Vigotski, L. S. (2003). *A formação social da mente*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Vigotski, L. S. (2010). *Imaginação e criação na infância*. São Paulo, SP: Ática.
- Vigotski, L. S. (2004). *Psicologia pedagógica*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1988). *A formação social da mente*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wallon, H. (1995). *A evolução psicológica da criança*. Lisboa, PT: Edições 70.

- Wallon, H. (1986). O papel do outro na consciência do eu. In M. J. G. Werebe & J. Nadel-Brulfert (Orgs.), *Henri Wallon* (p. 158-167, Coleção Grandes Cientistas Sociais, 52). São Paulo, , SP: Ática.
- Wallon, H. (1979). *Psicologia e educação da criança*. Lisboa, PT: Editorial Veiga.
- Wyness, M. (2012). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Received: Oct. 25, 2017

Approved: Jul. 23, 2018

Patricia Maria Uchôa Simões: PhD in Cognitive Psychology at the Federal University of Pernambuco, researcher at the Joaquim Nabuco Foundation, professor at the Graduate Program in Education, Cultures and Identities of the Joaquim Nabuco Foundation/Federal Rural University of Pernambuco. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1606-7894>

Flávia Mendes de Andrade e Peres: PhD in Cognitive Psychology, Federal University of Pernambuco, Professor of the Graduate Program in Education, Cultures and Identities of the Joaquim Nabuco Foundation/Federal University of Pernambuco. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3769-8110>

Jacqueline Travassos de Queiroz: PhD in Cognitive Psychology, at the Federal University of Pernambuco, Professor of the University of Pernambuco. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7426-8323>