REVISTA TÓPICOS
ISSN 2965-6672 | Qualis A2

BETWEEN KNOWLEDGE AND DESIRE: CONNECTIONS AMONG PSYCHOANALYSIS, SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY, AND EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

ENTRE O SABER E O DESEJO: ARTICULAÇÕES ENTRE PSICANÁLISE, PSICOLOGIA ESCOLAR E PROCESSOS EDUCATIVOS

Ciências Humanas • 18/11/2026

REGISTRO DOI: 10.70773/revistatopicos/794740979

Antônio Zenon Antunes Teixeira

ABSTRACT

This qualitative literature review examines how psychoanalysis and school psychology can inform education while preserving the boundaries between teaching and clinical intervention. It discusses cognition, affectivity, subjectivity, emotional and transferential dimensions of pedagogical relationships, and the tension between universal educational rights and students' participation in school life. Drawing on Freud, Klein, Winnicott, and Lacan, it considers *holding* (welcoming) as a conceptual resource, not a proven condition for inclusion or autonomy. Developmental particularities, psychic suffering, and mood variations associated with bipolar disorder are addressed without reducing students to these conditions. Refusal to learn and apathy are not assigned specific psychic explanations or treated as grounds for clinical interpretation by educators. The synthesis proposes attention to bonds and singularity, continuing teacher education, and cooperation between education and health professionals with distinct roles. Flexibility in learning time and curricula is considered a possible response to diversity, not a guarantee of inclusion or emancipation. The study does not empirically evaluate interventions; comprehensive development, human emancipation, and social integration remain aims, not demonstrated outcomes.

Keywords: Education; Psychoanalysis; School Inclusion; School Psychology; Subjectivity.

RESUMO

Esta revisão bibliográfica qualitativa examina como a psicanálise e a psicologia escolar podem contribuir para a educação, preservando os limites entre docência e intervenção clínica. Discute cognição, afetividade, subjetividade, dimensões emocionais e transferenciais das relações pedagógicas e a tensão entre o direito universal à

educação e a participação dos estudantes na vida escolar. Com base em Freud, Klein, Winnicott e Lacan, considera o holding (acolhimento) um recurso conceitual, não uma condição comprovada de inclusão ou autonomia. Particularidades do desenvolvimento, sofrimento psíquico e variações de humor associadas ao transtorno bipolar são abordados sem reduzir os estudantes a essas condições. A recusa em aprender e a apatia não recebem explicações psíquicas específicas nem justificam interpretação clínica pelos educadores. A síntese propõe atenção aos vínculos e à singularidade, formação docente contínua e cooperação entre profissionais da educação e da saúde, com funções distintas. A flexibilização dos tempos de aprendizagem e dos currículos é considerada uma possível resposta à diversidade, não uma garantia de inclusão ou emancipação. O estudo não avalia empiricamente intervenções; desenvolvimento integral, emancipação humana e integração social permanecem como horizontes, não como efeitos demonstrados.
Palavras-chave: Educação; Psicanálise; Inclusão Escolar; Psicologia Escolar; Subjetividade.

INTRODUCTION

How can psychoanalysis and school psychology inform educational processes while preserving the distinction between pedagogy and clinical intervention? This article argues that their contribution lies in reflection on educational relationships, not in the transfer of clinical functions to teachers. It examines this position through two interconnected concerns: affective bonds in learning and the tension between the universal right to education and recognition of students' singularity.

Psychoanalysis emerged in the late nineteenth century from Sigmund Freud's investigations and introduced an approach to psychic suffering centered on speech. Within this framework, unconscious processes inform the interpretation of psychic conflict and human behavior, guiding specific methods of inquiry and listening (Lima, 2013).

The dialogue between psychoanalysis and education rests on the premise that teaching extends beyond curricular transmission and involves the dynamics of child development. Psychoanalytic perspectives offer conceptual resources for examining the desires, motivations, and drives that shape teaching and learning relationships (Lima, 2013).

Affective dimensions are central to the discussion of school learning. Salzberger-Wittenberg, Williams, and Osborne (1999) examine the emotional factors involved in teaching and learning, particularly the teacher–student relationship. Their work provides a theoretical reference for this study, rather than evidence of specific effects of psychic suffering on cognitive abilities.

Projective identification provides a theoretical perspective on the emotional dimensions of interpersonal relationships in educational settings (Salzberger-Wittenberg; Williams; Osborne, 1999). Its discussion in education requires attention to the physical, historical, and social context of teacher–student interactions. It neither implies that every behavior expresses repressed content nor assigns teachers a clinical interpretive role.

The distinction between teaching and psychoanalytic practice is central to this article. Hameline (1977) is included in the theoretical

framework, while the term “super-teacher” is used here as an analytical expression of this study, not as a verified formulation by the author. It questions the expectation that educators should resolve every student difficulty and reaffirms the specificity of pedagogical work.

Federn (1985) informs the discussion of psychoanalysis and pedagogy as distinct, non-interchangeable practices. Psychoanalytic training and transference are examined within this debate, without treating them as guarantees of a desire to learn or as grounds for turning the classroom into a clinical setting.

Listening and empathy are discussed as alternatives to rigid teaching practices. Burlingham (1937) informs the reflection on tolerance and attentive listening, understood here as educational orientations rather than guarantees of learning. These orientations do not assign teachers responsibility for the clinical analysis of children’s psychic conflicts.

The dialogue between pedagogy and psychoanalysis requires clear professional boundaries. Filloux (2002) contributes to the examination of risks associated with using analytical concepts outside their original context. Interdisciplinary collaboration is proposed here as a basis for reflection on educational relationships, not as a means of assigning teachers an analytical role or ensuring developmental outcomes.

The pedagogical relationship involves cognitive and affective dimensions, including acceptance and belonging. Hezs (2015) informs the discussion of mutual respect and the relationship between knowledge and affect. These dimensions contribute to the

analysis without constituting an exclusive explanation of the desire to learn.

Hezs (2015) also contributes to the dialogue between psychoanalysis and education. Drawing on this discussion, the article adopts a reflective approach to classroom dilemmas rather than a dogmatic application of analytical concepts. This orientation expresses the position of the present study, not a specific formulation attributed to the author.

Reflection on teaching practice encompasses everyday classroom interactions without making personal analysis a professional requirement. Freller (2001) informs the examination of content transmission, interaction, and the negotiation of boundaries as dimensions of the educational relationship. Their effects on students' moral and psychic development are not treated as deterministic.

Fantasy and creativity are examined as dimensions of childhood subjective experience. Archangelo et al. (2014) inform the discussion of play and pedagogical mediation, which are considered educational possibilities rather than proven solutions to fears, internal conflicts, or emotional blocks.

Referrals to mental health services in response to school difficulties raise questions about the limits of educational practice. Rubim and Besset (2007) inform the discussion of its psychoanalytic, ethical, and political dimensions. The present analysis does not establish an increase in such referrals.

Education, beyond its subjective dimension, carries the role of ensuring the exercise of citizenship and the realization of

fundamental rights. As highlighted by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, access to basic education must be universally guaranteed to all people, promoting the full development of the human personality (Brasil, 2018b).

In the Brazilian context, school inclusion is examined through the relationship between educational rights and conditions for participation. Voltolini (2004) distinguishes objective legal conditions from subjective conditions of inclusion. This distinction supports reflection on the limits of formal access without implying that all schools are segregating or attributing a general prescription for public-service reorganization to the author.

The anti-asylum perspective and the break with the hospital segregation model strengthened the movement toward inclusive school education. According to Voltolini (2005), the child with specific educational needs must be recognized primarily as a subject fully endowed with rights, moving beyond the stigmas of mere incapacity or idealization (Voltolini, 2005).

Peer interaction in mainstream educational settings is considered in relation to development and school participation. Camargo and Bosa (2009) contribute to this discussion within the scope of their literature review. School coexistence is not treated as a universal determinant of language, cognition, or identity.

Kupfer and Petri (2000) examine the therapeutic dimension of school inclusion within the specific scope of their article. Their caution against inclusion at any cost limits the generalization of this contribution.

The plurality of psychoanalytic schools informs the theoretical framework, which includes Zimerman (2010). This article brings Freudian, Kleinian, Winnicottian, and Lacanian perspectives into dialogue while respecting their conceptual differences. Such dialogue is an interpretive choice, not an automatic integration of teaching strategies or evidence of educational benefits.

Teaching authority and student autonomy provide a focus for the dialogue among psychoanalysis, school psychology, and contemporary educational processes. Lacanian accounts of the desiring subject and Winnicottian formulations of the holding environment serve as distinct conceptual references for this reflection. The analysis considers desire and affect while maintaining the boundaries between pedagogy and clinical intervention. The two concerns introduced at the outset unfold into the three analytical categories specified in the methodology. Affective bonds in learning are examined through analytic listening in the school and its pedagogical limits and through the subjectification of the learner through school bonds. The tension between the universal right to education and recognition of students' singularity is examined through obstacles to the social bond in inclusion, while also connecting with the second category's attention to singularity within educational relationships.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The dialogue between psychoanalysis and education draws on the Freudian distinction between conscious and unconscious processes to examine educational relationships. This perspective brings unconscious processes into the discussion of behaviors, inhibitions,

and inclinations, extending the analysis beyond an exclusively rational view of the student as a subject of knowledge (Lima, 2013).

The psychoanalytic foundations are organized around two axes: the unconscious and its relationship to learning, addressed by Breviglieri (2018) and Lira and Rocha (2012); and symbol formation in the Kleinian perspective, examined in Kristeva's (2002) work on Melanie Klein and Almeida's (2020) study of the Dick case. These contributions define the theoretical dialogue without justifying the transfer of clinical procedures to pedagogical practice.

The historical and epistemological foundations of psychology provide context for examining its relationship with education. Rather than a linear progression, the discipline's development involves exchanges among philosophy, empirical science, and conceptions of subjectivity. This perspective situates mental phenomena within the cultural and social contexts of individual experience (Teixeira, 2025b).

Sheikh's (2017) reading of Lacan examines subjectivity in relation to cultural participation and desire. It supports the conceptual discussion of the subject but does not, on its own, establish effects on learning or justify pedagogical procedures.

Psychoanalytic concepts are discussed as resources for reflecting on desire, affectivity, and subjectivity, rather than as clinical procedures transferable to the classroom. Hezs (2015) informs the consideration of teaching as an intersubjective relationship. This approach neither explains learning solely through the search for acceptance nor presumes unconscious conflict in every school interaction.

The relationship between psychological theory and educational purposes provides a common question for three distinct

contributions. Cunha (1998) addresses scientific paradigms and educational purposes; the collection edited by Mrech (2005) examines psychoanalysis and education; and Pisandelli's (2012) *As Sete Escolas da Psicanálise* presents analytical schools. These works situate the debate at different levels rather than establishing equivalence among schools or demonstrating the effectiveness of their educational application.

School psychology is examined at the intersection of teaching and learning processes and the socio-emotional dimensions of schooling. Teixeira (2025a) critiques clinical and pathologizing approaches and presents a preventive, democratic, and inclusive orientation for professional practice. This perspective is not assumed to be uniformly established across educational institutions.

Salzberger-Wittenberg, Williams, and Osborne (1999) examine the emotional dimensions of teaching and learning. Their contribution supports attention to students' and teachers' emotional experiences while avoiding automatic psychic explanations of school behavior or claims that listening guarantees cognitive development.

Schooling and subjectivity are addressed through Marsico and Iannaccone's (2012) chapter "The work of schooling," published in an edited volume on culture and psychology, and Gomes's (2014) dissertation on the educational self in adolescents and the dialogic production of meaning concerning parental participation in academic life. These works contribute complementary perspectives without, by their inclusion alone, establishing specific outcomes for relational bonds or learning.

Projective identification is used as a theoretical resource for examining the emotional dimensions of teacher–student relationships. Its discussion remains attentive to the historical, social, and institutional context of pedagogical interaction. School frustrations and behaviors are not presumed to express repressed content, and educators are not assigned a clinical interpretive role (Salzberger-Wittenberg; Williams; Osborne, 1999).

Hameline (1977) is included in the discussion of the limits of psychoanalytic concepts in education. The critique of the "super-teacher" ideal is developed here as an argument about professional identity, not as a verified paraphrase of that work. It clarifies pedagogical responsibility without making educators responsible for resolving all student anxieties.

Federn (1985) informs the reflection on teacher education and transference within educational relationships. Psychoanalysis and pedagogy are treated as distinct practices. Attention to relational dynamics is therefore differentiated from the clinical management of resistance and is not presented as a guarantee of overcoming learning difficulties.

Listening, patience, and tolerance are considered orientations for educational reflection. Burlingham (1937) contributes to this debate without establishing that these orientations mobilize internal resources or guarantee intellectual autonomy. The distinction between everyday schooling and the clinical setting remains central.

Filloux (2002) informs the examination of interdisciplinary cooperation, the limits of analytical concepts, and the idealization of educators. Collaboration is proposed in ways that respect children's

singularity and distinguish educational from clinical support, without assuming guaranteed effects on psychic maturation.

The discussion of psychological knowledge in school practice includes emotional and neuropsychiatric conditions relevant to learning. Pereira and Teixeira (2025) address mood variations in students with bipolar disorder. This topic is examined in relation to educational needs and professional boundaries, not as evidence that pedagogical sensitivity prevents school failure or dropout.

Freller (2001) informs the discussion of morality, ethics, and everyday school interactions. Responses to transgressions and the negotiation of shared rules are examined as dimensions of educational relationships. This study does not establish their causal effects on recognition of others or mutual respect.

School inclusion involves a tension between the universal right to education and students' singular experiences. Voltolini's (2004) distinction between objective legal conditions and subjective conditions of inclusion supports the examination of formal access and everyday participation. It does not imply a general characterization of schools as segregating or a single institutional solution.

The inclusion debate brings together complementary but distinct perspectives: prejudice and inclusion in Crochik (2011); intellectual disability and teaching practice in Araújo (2016); and psychoanalysis, special education, and inclusion in Vasques (2009). Their respective scopes are preserved. The thematic dialogue supports attention to students' singular experiences without yielding uniform explanations or specific pedagogical prescriptions on its own.

The relationship between mental health and pedagogy is examined through the affective and cognitive dimensions of learning. Pereira and Teixeira (2025) inform the discussion of mood variations and school support needs without implying uniform effects on attention, engagement, or emotional regulation. Educational support remains distinct from diagnosis and clinical intervention.

Critiques of asylum-based practices and institutional segregation inform the discussion of school participation among historically excluded groups. Voltolini (2005) contributes to the examination of inclusion's limits. The child with specific educational needs is approached as a subject of rights, without reduction to incapacity or heroic idealization. This study does not establish a causal relationship between institutional closures and expanded school access.

The discussion of inclusive public policies examines the relationship between legal requirements and institutional practice, including the limits of exclusively formal responses. Laplane (2007) contributes to this debate. Social contradictions and power relations are considered in the analysis of daily school life without assuming their uniform reproduction in every educational practice.

Peer relationships are considered in the discussion of development and participation in mainstream education (Camargo; Bosa, 2009). They are not treated as either a necessary condition or a sufficient cause of identity formation, language development, or cognitive maturation for every student.

The therapeutic dimension of school inclusion is considered within the specific scope examined by Kupfer and Petri (2000), not as a

universal function of schooling. Their caution against inclusion at any cost remains essential to this discussion.

Pedagogical work with students with atypical development is examined in relation to curricular flexibility and individual learning pace (Vasques & Baptista, 2006). Individualized planning, differentiated support, and dialogue between health and education professionals are discussed as possibilities for addressing educational needs, rather than guarantees of inclusion.

Psychoanalysis and school psychology provide resources for reflecting on diversity, ethics, and pedagogical flexibility (Zimerman, 2010; Teixeira, 2025a; Pereira & Teixeira, 2025). Emancipation, welcoming environments, and comprehensive development remain educational aims rather than demonstrated effects of adopting these frameworks.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative, exploratory-analytical design based on a literature review and theoretical reflection (Teixeira, 2025b). Its purpose is to map, organize, and critically examine conceptual literature linking psychoanalysis, educational processes, and school inclusion (Lima, 2013). The analytical corpus comprises three types of material: official documents, classic psychoanalytic works, and contemporary scientific articles indexed in recognized databases (Rubim & Besset, 2007).

The selection criteria were thematic relevance, conceptual rigor, and scope. The corpus brings together Freudian, Kleinian, Winnicottian, and Lacanian works and national and international studies addressing pedagogical transference, psychic suffering in learning,

and the inclusion of students with atypical development (Salzberger-Wittenberg, Williams, & Osborne, 1999; Voltolini, 2004; Zimerman, 2010). Two institutional texts provide the normative component: the *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* (Brasil, 2018a), for the discussion of comprehensive development, and "Article 26: Right to education" (Brasil, 2018b), for the discussion of educational rights.

The literature was interpreted through a hermeneutic-critical approach (Federn, 1985; Hezs, 2015). The interpretation addressed the explicit content of pedagogical propositions alongside the subjective and unconscious dimensions discussed in teacher–student relationships. Theoretical triangulation supported comparison between normative discourses on inclusion and the practical limits of teaching. Three categories organized this analysis: analytic listening in the school and its pedagogical limits; the subjectification of the learner through school bonds; and obstacles to the social bond in inclusion, examined in contemporary educational contexts (Laplane, 2007; Lerner & Voltolini, 2015).

The methodological account does not specify the databases consulted, search expressions, search period, or the sequence by which materials were retained or excluded. These reporting limitations prevent reconstruction of the corpus selection and assessment of the review's coverage. The discussion must therefore be read as a theoretical interpretation of the selected contributions, not as an exhaustive mapping of the literature.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The discussion follows the three categories outlined in the methodology, each developed as a corresponding analytical axis.

The first, analytic listening in the school and its pedagogical limits, asks how attention to emotional relationships can remain distinct from clinical interpretation. The second, the subjectification of the learner through school bonds, examines how singularity is considered within educational relationships. The third, obstacles to the social bond in inclusion, addresses the tension between educational rights and conditions for participation in contemporary educational contexts. School psychology and teacher education are considered across these axes.

Analytic listening in the school and its pedagogical limits

In this discussion, “analytic listening in the school” designates reflection on educational relationships informed by psychoanalytic concepts. It does not designate a clinical listening practice to be performed by teachers. The distinction concerns both the purpose of the reflection and the professional role of those involved.

The theoretical framework supports examination of transference in pedagogical relationships while distinguishing these relationships from analytical practice. Filloux (2002) identifies transference as central to the difficulties of applying psychoanalytic knowledge to pedagogy and warns that concepts may change meaning outside their theoretical-clinical context. Attention to transference is therefore used to clarify educational relationships, not to equate the teacher’s role with that of the analyst.

Reflection on classroom transference brings mutual recognition and respect into the analysis of educational relationships. The desire to learn is not explained solely through the educator’s acceptance. Relational bonds are discussed as a contribution to pedagogical

reflection rather than a guarantee of academic engagement, with attention to avoiding reductionism and preserving professional boundaries.

Salzberger-Wittenberg, Williams, and Osborne (1999) examine emotional factors in teaching and learning, particularly within teacher–student relationships. Their contribution supports consideration of emotional experience without automatically assigning a specific psychic explanation to refusal to learn or apathy.

Continuing teacher education is proposed as a space for examining the subjective dimensions of educational relationships. Such reflection may address disciplinary control, curricular rigidity, and students' emotional and intellectual needs while maintaining the boundaries of pedagogical practice.

Psychoanalytic knowledge in teacher education is discussed as a resource for examining relational bonds, trust in educational relationships, and the limits of intervention. Academic disinterest and failure are not treated as symptoms for teachers to interpret clinically. Professional development provides a setting for reflecting on authority rather than a guarantee of reconstructing it.

Power relations, academic productivity demands, and structural resources are examined as institutional conditions of teaching. These dimensions inform reflection on teacher malaise (*mal-estar docente*) and the possibilities of dialogic, welcoming practices. The literature review does not establish a causal relationship between these conditions and emotional burnout.

In response to these tensions, the dialogue between psychoanalysis and education is approached as a field of ethical reflection rather

than a set of technical solutions to school problems. It addresses responsibility for desire and recognition of others. A democratic school culture remains an educational aim, not a guaranteed result of adopting psychoanalytic principles.

The subjectification of the learner through school bonds

The learner's subjectification through school bonds brings the school environment into focus. The Winnicottian notion of *holding* provides a conceptual resource for this reflection and is discussed here in relation to welcoming (*acolhimento*). This theoretical transposition remains within the pedagogical boundaries established above: it neither equates school and clinical settings nor demonstrates that welcoming resolves anxieties or produces autonomy. Tolerance and flexibility are proposed as educational orientations.

Educational authority and participatory pedagogy are examined here through a Lacanian perspective on tensions among the subject of the unconscious, social norms, and relational bonds. Language and symbolic castration frame this conceptual discussion, while the paternal metaphor and the law serve as resources for reflecting on authority. The resulting consideration of students' relationships with knowledge, culture, and alterity is an interpretive possibility within this study, not a demonstrated effect of introducing these concepts into education.

This study proposes considering cognitive, affective, and biological dimensions in curricular planning. The historical and epistemological foundations of psychology provide context for that proposal by situating relationships among philosophy, science, and

subjectivity. The proposal is an interpretive choice, not a requirement established by the discipline's history or a guarantee of addressing diversity.

The theoretical analysis also considers sublimation as a destination of the drive (*pulsão*) associated with cultural and intellectual production. Within this framework, symbolic and affective experiences in school are discussed in relation to knowledge and creativity. This connection is presented as a conceptual interpretation, not as evidence that schooling necessarily transforms impulses into intellectual interest.

Cultural participation and humanization frame the discussion of schooling beyond instruction. Student bonds and participation, including those of learners with special educational needs or psychological distress, are considered without claiming that everyday schooling produces demonstrated effects on psychic structuring or the reinterpretation of life trajectories.

Obstacles to the social bond in inclusion

School bonds and students' singularity must be considered alongside the institutional conditions of inclusion. The central tension is between the universal right to education and everyday conditions for participation. The *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* (BNCC) establishes comprehensive student development as an educational orientation (Brasil, 2018a); it provides a normative reference, not evidence of institutional resources, professional development, or a uniform historical transition to inclusion. These conditions and critiques of hospital segregation remain objects of the discussion.

The analysis questions approaches to inclusion limited to formal compliance or idealized accounts of harmony. Educational rights are considered alongside concrete conditions for participation, without assuming that every inclusive discourse conceals prejudice or every protective measure produces exclusion. Recognition of each child's singularity is proposed as an orientation that avoids reduction to disability, not as a guarantee of resolving institutional difficulties.

The dialogue between school psychology and pedagogy encompasses the socio-emotional and historical dimensions of learning and development. In the Brazilian educational context, the discussion critiques pathologizing approaches and considers preventive, collaborative work with teachers. Stronger support networks and conflict resolution are proposed objectives of this partnership, rather than outcomes established by the present study.

Educational support, rather than teacher diagnosis, frames the discussion of mood variations and bipolar disorder. Students' educational needs are considered without reducing their identities to these conditions. Attention, emotional regulation, and engagement are relevant dimensions of the discussion, not uniform effects of the disorder. Sensitivity, flexibility, and interprofessional cooperation are proposed as support orientations, but this study does not establish their effects on dropout or continued school participation.

Respect for individual learning and elaboration time informs the discussion of singularity and educational homogenization. Flexibility in assessment, methodology, and pacing is proposed as a response to diversity while preserving the transmission of accumulated

cultural knowledge. It is not presented as a guarantee of inclusion or emancipation.

The dialogue among psychology, psychoanalysis, and education brings the study's theoretical perspectives into relation while preserving their differences. Joint consideration of affect and cognition, alongside the distinction between clinical work and pedagogy, supports reflection on education oriented toward human emancipation and comprehensive development.

An inclusive, humanized school remains an educational horizon shaped by difficulties, resistance, and possibilities for change. Attention to bonds and subjectivity informs pedagogical reflection without requiring clinical listening or interpretation of unconscious processes by educators. Individual and collective growth are educational aims, not outcomes demonstrated by this bibliographic analysis.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The dialogue between education and psychoanalysis developed in this study supports an understanding of teaching that extends beyond content transmission and disciplinary control. It emphasizes emotional experience and teacher–student relationships while preserving the distinction between pedagogy and clinical intervention. Refusal to learn, apathy, silence, and intellectual inhibition are therefore not automatically assigned a psychic explanation or treated as grounds for clinical interpretation by educators.

The analysis clarifies the limits of teaching practice without making teachers responsible for resolving every learning difficulty. Relational

bonds and recognition of others are considered educational dimensions, distinct from the clinical management of transference. Patience, tolerance, and welcoming are proposed as orientations for everyday schooling, not guarantees of autonomy or remedies for school failure. Affect contributes to the discussion of learning without explaining the desire to learn solely through educators' recognition and acceptance.

The discussion of school inclusion examines the tension between universal educational rights and concrete conditions for student participation. It highlights the limits of exclusively formal or idealized responses and proposes recognition of students' singularity without reducing them to disability, psychiatric conditions, or mood variations. Flexibility in learning time and curricula is considered a response to diversity rather than a guarantee of inclusion or emancipation. The school's cultural and humanizing contribution remains an educational horizon, not an empirically established effect.

In response to the guiding question, psychoanalysis and school psychology can inform education through reflection on educational relationships, students' singularity, and school bonds, rather than through clinical interpretation by teachers. The study therefore proposes interdisciplinary collaboration among psychoanalysis, school psychology, and education while maintaining their distinct functions. Cooperation between education and health professionals requires respect for the scope and limits of each profession.

As a bibliographic and theoretical study, this article offers an interpretation of the examined contributions rather than an empirical evaluation of school interventions. Its implications should

be understood within this scope and in relation to the institutional conditions of each educational context.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, Alexandre Patrício de. Melanie Klein e o processo de formação dos símbolos: revisitando o caso Dick. **Estilos da Clínica,** São Paulo, v. 25, n. 3, p. 552-567, 2020. Disponível em: https://www.revistas.usp.br/estic/article/view/169734/167440. Acesso em: 2 nov. 2026.

ARAÚJO, Nair Cristina Sousa de. Deficiência Intelectual e Atuação do Professor: Contribuições da Psicanálise e Educação. **Revista Científica Multidisciplinar Núcleo do Conhecimento,** v. 9, n. 1, p. 843-853, out./nov. 2016.

ARCHANGELO, Ana et al. Contribuições de uma área para o brincar em salas de aula do Ensino Fundamental. *In*: AYOUB, Eliana; PRADO, Guilherme do Val Toledo (org.). **Formação Docente em Diálogo:** Construindo parcerias entre a universidade e a escola pública. Campinas: Leitura Crítica, 2014. v. 2. p. 35-52.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular.** Brasília, DF: MEC, 2018a. Disponível em: https://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/8_versaofinal_site.pdf. Acesso em: 2 nov. 2026.

BRASIL. Ministério da Mulher, da Família e dos Direitos Humanos. **Artigo 26º: Direito à educação.** Brasília, DF, 2018b. Disponível em: https://www.gov.br/mdh/pt-br/assuntos/noticias/2018/dezembro/artigo-26deg-direito-a-educacao. Acesso em: 2 nov. 2026.

BREVIGLIERI, Henrique. O fundamento da Psicanálise: concepções acerca do inconsciente. **Paideia – Revista de Sociologia e Filosofia do Colégio Estadual do Paraná,** Curitiba, n. 11, ago./set. 2018.

BURLINGHAM, Dorothy. Die Einfühlung des Lehrers in das Kind. **Zeitschrift für psychoanalytische Pädagogik,** Wien, v. 11, p. 54-58, 1937.

CAMARGO, S. P. H.; BOSA, C. A. Competência social, inclusão escolar e autismo: revisão da literatura. **Psicologia & Sociedade,** v. 21, n. 1, p. 65-74, 2009.

CROCHIK, José Leon. Preconceito e Inclusão. **WebMosaica: revista do instituto cultural judaico Marc Chagall,** Porto Alegre, v. 3, n. 1, jan./jun. 2011.

CUNHA, Marcus Vinicius da. A psicologia na educação: dos paradigmas científicos às finalidades educacionais. **Revista da Faculdade de Educação,** São Paulo, v. 24, n. 2, p. 51-80, jul./dez. 1998.

FEDERN, Paul. A psicanálise a serviço da pedagogia (1930). *In*: CIFALI, Mireille; MOLL, Jeanne (org.). **Pédagogie et psychanalyse.** Paris: Dunod, 1985.

FILLOUX, Janine. Sobre o conceito de transferência no campo pedagógico. **Estilos da Clínica,** São Paulo, v. 7, n. 13, p. 42-77, 2002.

FRELLER, Cátia Regina. Moralidade, ética e inclusão escolar: furtos na escola. **Estilos da Clínica,** São Paulo, v. 6, n. 11, p. 33-46, dez. 2001.

GOMES, Ramon Cerqueira. **The constitution of educational self in adolescents:** a dialogical production of meanings about parental

participation in academic life. 2014. 163 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia) – Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 2014.

HAMELINE, Daniel. **Le domestique et l'affranchi:** essai sur la tutelle scolaire. Paris: Éditions Ouvrières, 1977.

HEZS, Gabriela. **Psicanálise e educação.** Escuta Flutuante, 2015. Disponível em: https://escutaflutuante.wordpress.com/2015/10/02/psicanalise-e-a-educacao/. Acesso em: 2 nov. 2026.

KRISTEVA, Julia. **Melanie Klein.** Rio de Janeiro: Rocco, 2002.

KUPFER, Maria Cristina Machado; PETRI, Renata. Por que ensinar a quem não aprende? **Estilos da Clínica,** São Paulo, v. 5, n. 9, p. 109-117, 2000.

LAPLANE, Adriana Lia Friszman de (org.). **Políticas e práticas de educação inclusiva.** Campinas: Autores Associados, 2007.

LERNER, Ana Beatriz Coutinho; VOLTOLINI, Rinaldo. Psicanálise, ética e inclusão escolar. **Nuances: estudos sobre Educação,** Presidente Prudente, v. 26, n. 2, p. 74-92, maio/ago. 2015.

LIMA, Ana Laura Godinho. A Psicanálise e a Educação: encontros e desencontros. **Revista Acadêmica de Educação,** v. 2, n. 1, p. 1-12, 2013.

LIRA, Jessica; ROCHA, Julliana. Freud: contribuições acerca da aprendizagem e suas implicações educacionais. **Vínculo,** São Paulo, v. 9, n. 2, p. 39-43, jul. 2012.

MARSICO, Giuseppina; IANNACCONE, Antonio. The work of schooling. *In*: VALSINER, Jaan (ed.). **Oxford handbook of culture and psychology.** New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. p. 830-868.

MRECH, Leny Magalhães (org.). **O impacto da Psicanálise na Educação.** São Paulo: Avercamp, 2005.

PEREIRA, Wilma Freire Arriel; TEIXEIRA, Antônio Zenon Antunes. Variações de humor na sala de aula: abordando a aprendizagem em indivíduos com transtorno bipolar. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales,** v. 18, n. 2, 2025. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.18n.2-026.

PISANDELLI, Sergio Pedro. **As Sete Escolas da Psicanálise.** [*S. l.: s. n.*], 2012. Disponível em: https://dokumen.tips/documents/as-setes-escolas-da-psicanlise-pablo-sete-escolas-da-psicanlise-introduo-.html. Acesso em: 2 nov. 2026.

RUBIM, Luiza Mendes; BESSET, Vera Lopes. Psicanálise e educação: desafios e perspectivas. **Estilos da Clínica,** São Paulo, v. 12, n. 23, p. 36-55, 2007.

SALZBERGER-WITTENBERG, Isca; WILLIAMS, Gianna; OSBORNE, Elsie. **The emotional experience of learning and teaching.** London: Karnac Books, 1999.

SHEIKH, Farooq Ahmad. Subjectivity, desire and theory: Reading Lacan. **Cogent Arts & Humanities,** [Abingdon], v. 4, n. 1, 1299565, 31 mar. 2017. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2017.1299565. Disponível em: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/23311983.2017.1299565. Acesso em: 2 nov. 2026.

TEIXEIRA, Antônio Zenon Antunes. A importância da psicologia escolar no contexto educacional brasileiro. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação,** v. 11, n. 11, p. 9945-9964, 2025a. DOI: https://doi.org/10.51891/rease.v11i11.22727.

TEIXEIRA, Antônio Zenon Antunes. Fundamentos históricos e epistemológicos da Psicologia: articulações entre filosofia, ciência e subjetividade. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação,** v. 11, n. 11, p. 8287-8305, 2025b. DOI: https://doi.org/10.51891/rease.v11i11.22671.

VASQUES, Carla Karnoppi; BAPTISTA, Claudio Roberto. Transtornos globais do desenvolvimento e escolarização: o convite à complexidade. *In*: BAPTISTA, Claudio Roberto (org.). **Inclusão e escolarização:** múltiplas perspectivas. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2006. p. 25-36.

VASQUES, Carla Karnoppi. Branco sobre o branco: psicanálise, educação especial e inclusão escolar. **Revista Educação Especial,** Santa Maria, v. 22, n. 33, p. 29-40, jan./abr. 2009.

VOLTOLINI, Rinaldo. A inclusão é não toda. *In*: COLLI, Fernando Anelli; KUPFER, Maria Cristina Machado (org.). **Travessias - inclusão escolar:** a experiência do grupo ponte Pré-escola terapêutica Lugar de Vida. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo, 2005. p. 149-155.

VOLTOLINI, Rinaldo. Psicanálise e inclusão escolar: direito ou sintoma? **Estilos da Clínica,** São Paulo, v. 9, n. 16, p. 92-101, jun. 2004.

ZIMERMAN, David E. **Psicanálise em formação.** Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2010.