

Pluralism and Heterogeneity as Criticism: Undergraduate History and Systems of Psychology Courses in Argentinian Psychology Education (1983–2017)

Catriel Fierro

National Council of Scientific and Technical Research (CONICET), Buenos Aires, Argentina,
and National University of Mar del Plata

Multiple studies have analyzed the aims, resources, and approaches to undergraduate and graduate history of psychology education in several countries. Argentina is one of the countries with the highest historiographical production in Latin America. However, to date, there are no published studies on the collective debates among professionals, institutions, and associations that were instrumental in the development of the historiography of science becoming a mandatory part of the curriculum in Argentinian psychology programs. This study describes and analyzes the role of undergraduate history of psychology courses in official debates that took place during the last 30 years regarding Argentinian psychologists' training and education, in the context of regional and international historiography. Data was retrieved from several primary sources, such as minutes and official dossiers, working documents on accreditation standards, and nationwide curricular diagnoses on undergraduate psychology education, as well as individual scholars' ideas. Our findings suggest that, in line with regional and international historiography, history of psychology courses in Argentina have repeatedly been considered as core content in debates and discussions about psychology education, from the restoration of democracy in 1983 to the present day, in which they are currently considered to be mandatory minimum curricular content. Although throughout its history Argentinian psychology has largely been reduced to the teaching of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis, historical education has been perceived as a gateway toward a more plural and critical local psychology. We conclude by discussing some potential and actual concerns that pose a threat to Argentinian undergraduate history courses.

Keywords: history of psychology in Argentina, teaching of the history of psychology, historiography, philosophy of science, psychoanalysis

Several studies have analyzed the aims, resources, and approaches to undergraduate and graduate history of psychology education in the United States, Canada, England,

This article was published Online First March 5, 2018.

Catriel Fierro, National Council of Scientific and Technical Research (CONICET), Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Faculty of Psychology, National University of Mar del Plata.

This research was partly supported by a grant from the National University of Mar del Plata, code 15/H226, and by a grant from the National Scientific and Technical Research Council in the context of Catriel Fierro's doctoral studies. I thank Modesto Alonso, Helio Carpintero, Cristina Di Doménico, Ana Jacó-Vilela, Hugo Klappenbach, Miguel Gallegos, Fernando Polanco, Juan Carlos Godoy, and Michael Sokal, who generously provided bibliography at the request of Catriel Fierro. Catriel Fierro also wishes to thank Alejandro Dagfal, whose comments on a previous version of this article greatly helped in improving its contents. Finally, I thank Susannah Mulvale and Fermín Breccia for their assistance in revising a first draft of the manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Catriel Fierro, Viamonte 2035, Eight floor, apartment "F", Mar del Plata, Buenos Aires, Argentina. B7600. E-mail: catriel.fierro@gmail.com

Ireland, Spain, and Germany (Barnes & Greer, 2014, 2016; Brock & Harvey, 2015; Carpintero et al., 2010; Chisvert-Perales, Monteagudo-Soto, & Mestre, 2016; Collins & Bunn, 2016; Fuchs & Viney, 2002; Krampen, 2016; Merced, Stutman, & Mann, 2017; Rutherford & Pickren, 2015; Smith, 2016). Along with Brazil, Argentina registers the highest historiographical production in Latin America. As a country with more than 101,000 psychology graduates, with 87,000 active psychology students in 41 universities, and with a ratio of one psychologist per 439 citizens (Alonso & Klinar, 2016), Argentina occupies a peculiar place in discussions on curricular aims and objectives of undergraduate history of psychology courses. Argentinian scholars have reflected on the educational purpose of the subdiscipline (Fierro & Di Doménico, 2016; Gallegos, 2016; Vezzetti, 2007; Vilanova, 1997a, 2000), and to a lesser extent, they have carried out empirical analyses on the modality and content of psychologists' undergraduate historical education (Fierro, Ostrovsky, & Di Doménico, *in press*). However, to date, there are no published studies on the debates on Argentinian undergraduate psychology education that took place among professionals, institutions, and associations, which led to the historiography of science becoming a mandatory content in local psychology programs. In other words, the ideas, claims, and perceptions regarding the history of psychology's undergraduate curricular role and inclusion have not been systematically analyzed.

These ideas, and their concrete products—official documents, legal resolutions, and accreditation standards—are of key importance for discussing the content of undergraduate course curricula in the history of psychology. Professional and institutional debates have influenced the definition of the subdiscipline in Argentina; the underlying curricular structure of undergraduate history of psychology courses; the presence, variety, and quality of history syllabi; and concrete historical instruction. Finally, the ideas and policies that emerged from the debates are themselves an essential part of the history of Argentinian psychology.

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the role of historical undergraduate courses in debates that took place during the last 30 years regarding Argentinian psychologists' training and education, in regional as well as in international contexts. We collected and analyzed the following sets of historical documents: (a) minutes and official dossiers from regional meetings on psychologists' training and education; (b) official resolutions and recommendations that were collectively drawn and agreed upon as a result of those meetings; (c) nationwide curricular diagnoses on psychology programs and their conclusions and recommendations for psychology education; (d) working documents on consensus regarding standards and criteria for the evaluation and accreditation of psychology programs; and (e) official ministerial resolutions and legal norms that effectively regulated those accreditation processes. We also critically assessed several secondary sources that have touched on these issues.

A content analysis was carried out on these sources to determine the insertion, description, and characterization of the history of psychology in psychology curricula. After a brief introduction to Argentinian psychology's recent history, we focus our analysis on issues and debates in psychology education that arose during the last three decades, and on the place of historical courses within those debates. We contextualize the debates with regard to several curricular revisions and changes that took place in Argentinian academic psychology during the 1990s and the 2000s, and that led to the evaluation and accreditation of psychology programs during the last decade. We also situate our analysis in the context of international proposals regarding historiography of psychology and psychology training and education. Thus, our analysis aims to contribute to wider debates on the present status and future concerns of historical education in psychology.

The History of Psychology in National and Regional Debates on Psychology Training and Education (1983–2001)

Between 1976 and 1983, a military dictatorship illegally governed Argentina, greatly interrupting and altering university and academic life. Enrollment in certain psychology programs—such as those at the universities of Buenos Aires, Tucumán, Rosario, and Córdoba, created between 1955 and 1964—was cancelled: Students were not permitted to enroll. Other psychology programs such as those at Mar del Plata and La Plata were completely shut down (Kierbel, 2016; Ventura, 2015; Vilanova, 1987). Academics were kidnapped, tortured, and forcibly disappeared in a state-orchestrated plan to eradicate “subversive,” left-wing ideologies. Klappenbach (2004) noted that

the House of Representatives and the Senate were closed; students, intellectuals, trade-union leaders, and political opponents were jailed or made to disappear. State-sponsored terrorism left many dead, maimed, or missing. Between 12,000 and 30,000 persons are estimated to be missing. (p. 133)

Thirty-four psychologists were kidnapped and disappeared between 1976 and 1982, among them the president of the Federation of Psychologists of the Republic of Argentina (FePRA). Many more exiled themselves in order to save their own lives. Overall, the dictatorship led to a stagnation of institutionalized scientific research, to the interruption of research and scholarly work, and to the sudden, violent cancellation of public intellectual debates, especially in the human sciences, of which psychology was often seen in Argentina as a key discipline.

The restoration of democracy toward 1983 and the reopening of psychology programs marked the beginning of the normalization of scientific and academic life. This normalization gave way to the restructuring of university resolutions, statutes, and legal norms; to the revision of public examinations that had resulted in the election of numerous professors during previous decades; to the return and reincorporation of excluded or exiled professors; to the design of new forms of university administration; and to debates and discussions on psychology education, among other novelties. Since 1967, psychologists—defined as psychiatrists and physicians’ “auxiliaries”—had been forbidden by law from the practice of psychotherapy (Dagfal, 2009). In 1985, the democratic recovery led to psychologists’ full legal recognition, regulation, and professionalization (Klappenbach, 2006; 2007).

The democratic normalization affected psychology curricula in two significant ways. First, it stimulated numerous curricular revisions in programs that had been designed during the military governmental regime or earlier. This was the case for psychology programs at the main state-run universities such as those in Buenos Aires, La Plata, Rosario, and Mar del Plata. Second, it entailed the implementation of new public examinations for reestablishing professorships within both old and newly created departments and undergraduate courses. Between 1985 and 1998, autonomous psychology departments were created for the first time in numerous universities; after decades of being housed in other departments, for the first time, Argentinian psychology had its own independent departments and faculties (Klappenbach, 2006). In this context, “the history of psychology slowly became an important field and led to both quantitative and qualitative research” (Klappenbach & Jacó-Vilela, 2016, p. 231). During this period, Lacanian psychoanalysis was replacing Kleinian psychoanalysis as the hegemonic theoretical perspective in academic and professional psychology (Dagfal, 2015), and psychologists’ preferred professional activity was clinical, private, psychodynamic psychotherapy (Alonso & Nicenboim, 1997; Fernández-Álvarez, 2008; Vezzetti, 1998a). Although democracy also served as the context for the curricular insertion of nonpsychoanalytical approaches (Korman, Viotti, & Garay, 2015), this was a slow process and did not affect psychoanalytic hegemony within most psychology programs. Finally, the democratic restoration and the ensuing

political stability led to the passing of a new Federal Law of Superior Education (LES) in 1995. Among other things, this law mandated that graduate and undergraduate programs had to be evaluated and accredited by the National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation (CONEAU). This had a systematic impact in psychology education, as will be discussed in the last section.

Between 1985 and 1995, however, numerous empirical studies underlined several deficiencies and limitations in Argentinian psychology education (Anonymous, 1987; Serroni-Copello, 1990; Vilanova, 1985, 1987/2003, 1993). These studies concluded that, as a consequence of diverse political, cultural, and intellectual forces, controlled, scientific, peer-reviewed research in the country was minimal to nonexistent (Conte, 1994). There also existed a great divide between “academic” and “applied” psychologists, with the latter holding a position of superiority, in a period in which professional psychologists numbered more than 40,000 (Alonso & Nicenboim, 1997). According to a report by Vilanova (1987/2003), because of Argentinian psychology’s singular developments between 1960 and 1980, toward the 1990s, professors and faculty were often inadequate, as they were not trained in psychology, they did not hold doctoral degrees in psychology nor in any other discipline, and they did not conduct research. Funding for psychology programs was scarce, massive enrollments greatly surpassed available faculty, and the access to international journals and databases was close to nonexistent. Finally, psychology curricula were found to be greatly outdated, with an almost total prevalence of psychoanalytic (Freudian, Kleinian, and Lacanian) theory in course readings and orientations. Undergraduate and graduate education had virtually no connection to contemporary international debates and developments in the field of psychological science.

To grasp the complexity of the situation, it is important to consider that higher education in Argentina differs in great measure from that in North America. In Argentina, as Hugo Klappenbach (2004) explained,

University degrees are not in arts or sciences, but in a specific scientific or professional field. That is, there are no majors leading to a bachelor’s degree. Undergraduate programs center on a single field of knowledge or profession. In psychology, the university degree is termed “licenciatura en psicología” (graduate in psychology), or simply, “psicólogo” (psychologist). After the customary 5 or 6 years of study, the “licenciatura” is the entry requirement to practice in clinical, educational, and forensic settings, including independent practice in psychotherapy. In a sense, the “licenciatura” is the first, last, and only university degree for the professional practice of psychology. . . . Usually, training after the “licenciatura” does not end in a master’s or doctorate, as neither is encouraged by universities. (p. 134)

By 1990, and in the new democratic climate, a reassessment of the type and quality of psychologists’ education took place both in Argentina and in Latin America more widely. As noted by Klappenbach (2003), “most prominent studies on psychologists’ university education can be traced back to the beginning of the 1990’s, carried out by researchers at the National University of Mar del Plata, such as Alberto Vilanova and Cristina Di Doménico” (p. 9). These debates were the context in which the issue of psychologists’ *historical education* was formalized.

History of Psychology as a Core Curriculum Content (1992–1999)

The first explicit ideas concerning the history of psychology’s educational role appeared in papers, research, and proposals by individual Argentinian psychologists, who were often professors of history courses. In a broad critique of Argentinian psychology curricula, psychologist-historian Alberto Vilanova (1994) argued that undergraduate course readings, content, and outlooks are

exclusively based on insights and speculations extracted from psychologists’ clinical settings, [confound] that speculation with the production of new knowledge, [have a marked] absence of empirical referents

or indicators, [are written in] an expletive and confusing style, admit no dissent or discussion, [and] resort to the principle of authority, as seen in calls for “returning to the masters” and for fidelity toward “eternal” texts. (p. 9)

Vilanova then added that obscure philosophies of science and distorted historical reconstructions of science served as a starting point for such psychology education. Regarding historiography, Vilanova claimed that in local psychology curricula,

the social history of knowledge, backed up by studies on the social, economic and political conditions of its production, is replaced by the history of the “great men” in which everything leads to, or all comes out of, Freud, Jung, Lacan or Reich. Thus, a museum of geniuses and an apocalyptic history where things happen before or after them reinforce neglecting concrete [empirical] research. (p. 10)

Vilanova (1997a) made the normative argument that history of psychology undergraduate courses should serve as students’ gateway into understanding psychology’s issues and topics, as an introduction to the professional role, as a tool for identifying epochal and national regularities in psychological science, as a way of assessing contemporary debates, and as an exercise of metatheoretical and metamethodological analyses. According to Vilanova, the history course should also serve three other purposes: promoting emotional detachment toward theories, discouraging irrational and celebratory attitudes toward psychological systems and “great men,” and articulating the difference between the basic and the professional—or applied—curricular cycles. However, those objectives were hard to reach in the context of traditional Argentinian psychology,

whose typical features are the isolation and disqualification of international psychology associations and events. . . . [The] purpose [of history courses] is only compensatory, and it cannot be guaranteed that the role of the history of psychology course as an achievement condition for a graduate profile does not disappear or gets diluted within the general curriculum. (Vilanova, 1997a, p. 23)

Telma Piacente (1998), a professor and researcher at the Faculty of Psychology of the National University of La Plata, shared Vilanova’s viewpoint. After emphasizing the harmful consequences of the uncritical assimilation of Freudism and Lacanism in Argentinian psychology curricula, Piacente pointed out that psychodynamic hegemony had provoked a retranslation and distortion of entire psychological systems and curricular areas, which were now misleadingly being read as clinical or Freudian topics even when they were not. Piacente also pointed out that psychoanalysis had become the standard parameter of metatheoretical analysis and critique toward other psychological positions. This phenomenon had previously been identified by Klappenbach (1985), who denounced a “closure” or cancellation of epistemological debates in Argentinian psychology because of the illegitimate predominance of a singular theory—psychoanalysis—as an unquestionable “Absolute Truth” (p. 7). In answer to this problem, Vilanova (1985) argued that the antidotes were, on the one hand, a *social history of science* that exposed the external causes of all scientific theories, and on the other hand, awareness of the fact that Argentinian psychology’s provincialism was the result of decades of internal, professional, and intertheoretical struggles at the expense of factual, critical, and empirical research. Such awareness could only be conveyed through historical content and courses.

Piacente (1998) underlined that such a situation was made possible in the first place precisely because of the absence of an historical “conscience” about psychology’s plurality and diversity: Psychology had not been invented on Freud’s couch but had a *diverse, plural, and polycentric* past. Local psychologists-historians identified numerous Kuhnian paradigms in psychology, such as humanism, behaviorism, and psychoanalysis (Keegan, 1986; Klappenbach, 1985; Vilanova, 1985). They also proposed several foundational “disciplinary programs,” such as German philosophical psychology, French psychopathology, and North American academic psychology (Klappenbach, 1994; Vezzetti, 1998b). Finally, they dismissed the notions that psychology had a *single* epistemic object, such as the unconscious, or

a *single* methodology, such as the clinical method, as “myths.” Enthroning one psychological object or method as the “authentic” one and suppressing the others only led to “all-explaining dogmas” (Vilanova, 1997b, p. 68). In Piacente’s terms, the lack of a minimum historical knowledge of psychology lent credence to the idea that only psychoanalysis had direct, privileged, and incontrovertible access to psychology’s epistemic objects:

Paraphrasing Danziger, one must try to solve the existence of pluralistic versions of psychology without reducing that existence to a series of monologues, each of which legitimizes specific interests. . . . The concepts and the methodological precepts of science are historical products, and the proposed epistemic objects in those precepts are also historical and consequently they change over time. (p. 281)

Years later, Ana Talak, a historian of psychology and Piacente’s colleague at La Plata, underlined the consequences of psychoanalysis’ enthronement from the 1960s onward as the dominant theoretical and *metatheoretical* position in the country. In Argentina, terms like “positivism” or “positivistic” are employed by graduates (especially by psychoanalysts) against nonpsychoanalytic scholars and researchers alike, with a negative connotation,

to designate any type of empirical or quantitative research, [showing] a basic ignorance of the meaning of the term and the epistemological and historical problems that psychology has faced and the ways in which it has responded to them. . . . [Such use] also implies a complete lack of a revised and grounded position on the problems of psychology’s scientificity and research. (Talak, 2009, p. 8)

These conceptual and theoretical misconceptions criticized by local historians were the product of decades of highly interested epistemological analyses of psychology. These analyses retrieved postmodern and relativist philosophies of science—specially, Feyerabend’s, Kuhn’s, and Hanson’s—so to render psychoanalytic knowledge claims as scientific. Backed by those epistemologies, Argentinian epistemological analyses often consisted in stretching of the concepts of “science,” “truth,” and “evidence” to the point at which uncontrolled, unchecked speculation could be considered the scientific standard. Nevertheless, it should not be concluded that positivism was adopted or recommended as a model of science by historians who criticized those misconceptions. First, and in a Popperian vein, numerous scholars such as Vilanova were opposed to positivism, and considered scientific knowledge (including *historical* knowledge) as *conjectural* and *provisional*. Second, the merits of postpositivist philosophies of science such as Kuhn’s, Lakatos’s, and Popper’s were debated by historians such as Bortnik (1992), Keegan (1986), Klappenbach (1985), and Piacente (1998), who often criticized positivist, textbook historiography. Third, critiques of psychology’s certainties and dogmas, and the defense of nonjustificationalist and fallibilistic historiographies often espoused by these scholars, suggest that local historians were far closer to critical-rationalist historiographies than to positivism. In the words of Vezzetti (2007), “any historical thinking that is willing to critically question current convictions and orthodoxies has a healthy, anti-dogmatic effect” (p. 154).

Thus, according to these scholars, by 1990, there seems to have been a doctrinal or partisan use of psychology’s history in certain Argentinian psychology programs. Indeed, curricular revisions sparked by the democratic recovery were sometimes exclusively aligned with dominant theoretical outlooks. As could be expected, such revisions affected history of psychology syllabi. For example, the National University of Rosario designed a new, heavily psychoanalytical curriculum in 1984 (Gallegos, 2012). In it, the first-year, mandatory History of Psychology course that had been part of the curriculum since 1956, and which covered several psychological schools and systems, was replaced by three mandatory courses: Historical-Epistemological Development of Psychology I, II, and III. These courses had (and still have) a strong Freudian and Lacanian orientation: Psychology was reduced to psychoanalysis, and its history was constructed exclusively through psychoanalytical readings and authors. This was also the case of the psychology curriculum at the National University of Tucumán: After 1983, the undergraduate history course

was named History of *Psychology* and Psychoanalysis in Argentina, but only offered content on Argentinian psychoanalysis.

Changes at other universities were more in line with a critical, plural historiography. Curricular revisions that took place between 1985 and 1990 at the University of Buenos Aires led to the creation of *two* alternative history of psychology courses, both of which taught multiple psychological schools and orientations. In 1988, a teacher of one of the courses, Cheiron member Hugo Vezzetti, created the Program in Historical Studies in Psychology at the University of Buenos Aires. The program, which he directed, was one of the first concrete, institutional spaces through which Argentinian scholars began to have sustained contact with international historiographies of psychology that were espoused by authors such as Kurt Danziger (Danziger, 1984), Laurel Furumoto (Furumoto, 1989), Michael Sokal (Sokal, 1984), and Mitchell Ash (Ash, 1983), among others (Klappenbach & Jacó-Vilela, 2016). Vilanova's own undergraduate Social History of Psychology syllabus, which included contents on functionalism, structuralism, behaviorism, psychoanalysis, and humanism, could also be seen as another expression of a plural historical reconstruction. Nevertheless, the situations at Rosario and Tucumán demonstrate that history of psychology was sometimes institutionalized in Argentinian psychology education in a whiggish fashion, with the aim of legitimizing psychoanalysis. Indeed, the claims by Vilanova, Piacente, and Vezzetti should be seen as a critique of the "official," hagiographic, and celebratory historiography of psychoanalysis that blossomed in Argentina after the institutionalization of psychoanalysis in 1942 (Rascovsky & Rosenthal, 1947) and which still permeates multiple groups and organizations (Plotkin, 2003).

Psychoanalysis was at the center of many of these historians' concerns. Describing his 20 years as professor of one of the history courses at the University of Buenos Aires, Vezzetti (2007) noted the curricular tension between an insider, celebratory history, which aimed to legitimize professional identities based in "origin myths," and a critical, "disruptive" history that showed psychology's multiple births, objects, and methods, thus expanding the disciplinary canon. This critical history made sense in a curricular scenario in which many influential and illustrious professors considered that "psychoanalytic reasoning is the only and sufficient instrument with which the psychologist must count in order to fulfill his professional task" (*Estudiantes y Docentes*, 1973, p. 37), and in which scholars argued that psychoanalysis was the *solely scientific psychology* and that the unique, sole psychological object was "the Unconscious, the Other" (Harari, 1973, p. 159). In this context, Vezzetti (2007) argued that a critical history of Argentinian psychology required "not only distancing ourselves from any presupposed identity (be it in the humanities tradition, in the natural sciences, in psychoanalysis, etc.) but considering the *diversity* of conditions, models, concepts and practices as a starting point" (p. 149). This meant that instead of conveying a feel-good, prefabricated story, undergraduate history courses should offer diverse, research-based narratives that reflected psychology's multiple "paradigms," objects, and applications. These ideas were shared by other psychologists-historians, such as Roberto Bortnik, according to whom psychologists-historians—even those with no thorough training in historiography of science—should reconstruct the history of their science *if* they could "transcend, or bracket their dogmatism, since historical thinking collides with the *certainty* with which the scientist usually operates in his or her practice" (Bortnik, 1992, p. 5). According to Bortnik, two intertwined local phenomena that should be tackled by history courses were the progressive decay and disappearance of Argentinian experimental psychology toward 1950, and the "narrowing" of psychologists' applied field toward psychoanalytic therapy. These phenomena were, in fact, being researched by several historians who were offering history courses (Dagfal, 1997; Klappenbach, 2006).

The 1993 Symposium on Psychology Education: Recovering the Boulder Model

Parallel to these discussions, Argentinian psychologists expressed similar concerns about the narrowness of local psychology at international forums. In 1993, at a symposium on psychology education at the 24th Inter American Congress of Psychology in Chile, Amalio Blanco from Spain, Cristina Di Doménico from Argentina, and Gustavo Pineda from Nicaragua echoed statements from a number of North American resolutions and debates on the teaching of psychology when debating Ibero-American psychology. Underlining the need for recovering the Boulder Model—the “scientist-practitioner” model for professional education and training of clinical psychologists—they quoted Harvard’s Commission of Twelve on the place of psychology in the ideal university: a Commission that, among other things, recommended history of psychology as an optional or advanced course (Gregg et al., 1970). At the same time, Blanco, Di Doménico, and Pineda (1993) also approvingly quoted and discussed several historical landmarks on psychology education such as the Boulder, Stanford, Miami Beach, and Chicago conferences’ recommendations:

The teaching of psychology must be guided by a spirit of constant revision—the problem with teachers isn’t their radicalism, but their conservatism, Robert McLeod points out—so that new generations look with some skepticism at the questions, and above all at the answers, raised and posed by previous generations. (p. 16)

The report by the Committee on Training in Clinical Psychology that led to the Boulder Model considered History of Psychology and Contemporary Schools of Thought as a recommended course in the General Psychology curricular area (Hilgard et al., 1947, p. 545). In the context of perceived deficits in psychology education in Latin America, Blanco et al. (1993) recognized the need to make students aware of the *historicity* of psychological knowledge and the *relativity* of psychological theories:

In a science such as ours, so traditionally subjected to diverse speculations, the majority of them lacking of the most elementary rigor and theoretical coherence, it becomes absolutely essential that before learning any technical skills, the student must be equipped with the necessary conceptual tools to draw a dividing line between scientific psychology and another psychology that has empty and capricious speculation or literature as its only base. Without a theoretical and experimental basis . . . the professional psychologist is at risk of becoming, at best, a counselor with goodwill and common sense, and at worst, a pompous charlatan. (p. 28)

Approvingly citing the 1987 Utah Psychology Education Conference, which treated History and Systems of Psychology as “basic knowledge in psychology,” the authors conceived history of psychology as a core element of that “theoretical basis.”

When criticizing regional undergraduate education, Blanco et al. (1993) drew on conclusions drawn from the First Latin American Conference on Psychologists’ Education. This conference, sponsored by UNESCO and the International Union of Psychological Science, and held in Bogotá in 1974, was organized by Colombian experimentalist and historian of psychology Rubén Ardila. The conference laid the groundwork for the 1978 Bogotá Model in undergraduate psychology education, which signified the regional reception and adaptation of the American Boulder Model (Gallegos, 2010). Regarding the constitution of the core curriculum in psychology, the conference concluded that it was necessary to acknowledge the fact that the main international psychological currents that had an impact in Argentina—namely, psychoanalysis, French psychology, reflexology, and behaviorism—were products of “a [specific] stage of psychology’s development and also [of] certain socio-economic conditions” (Ardila, 1978, p. 221). Communicating such an idea to psychology undergraduates required a philosophical and theoretically pluralistic curricular framework, which, in turn, required a historical perspective. Hence, the 1993 symposium could be considered a bridge between the *regional* considerations of the Bogotá Conference and *national* debates, given that Argentinian scholars at the 1993

symposium were both historians and researchers in the field of psychology teaching and education.

Between 1985 and 1995, as historians of psychology started participating in these debates, their ideas on undergraduate history education started to receive official treatment, and debates on historical education became institutionalized. Two spaces in which these collective, official debates took place were regional the Integrative Meetings of Psychologists of the Mercosur (IMPMs) and Argentina's Association of Academic Units in Psychology (AUAPsi).

The Integrative Meetings of Psychologists of the Mercosur (1994–2001)

In the regional Latin American context, the annual IMPMs began in 1994 in the context of the broader Educative Branch of the Mercosur (Di Doménico, 1996). The Mercosur is a subregional bloc that comprises several Latin American countries. Founded in 1991, it seeks the promotion of free trade; the fluid movement of goods, people, and currency; and educational integration. The IMPMs brought together national representatives of official psychology associations and organizations from Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Brazil. The meetings sought to design consensual policies for enabling an enriched and efficient scientific and professional exchange between the Mercosur countries. The IMPMs operated through task forces or commissions, in which each one worked on a definite topic such as legal, political, ethical, and work market issues.

At the IMPMs, a specific commission worked on issues in undergraduate psychology education. This commission met six times between 1994 and 1998. At the first meeting in Uruguay, the commission agreed on the need to define a common and minimal psychology curriculum for the Mercosur countries. By 1995, Latin American psychologists deemed it necessary to consensually define the basic (or “scientific”) cycle of undergraduate programs, a cycle that would necessarily include material on the biological, social, and psychological bases of behavior; research methodology; and psychology's history and theory. During the second meeting in 1995, the commission discarded the idea of defining a *common* psychology curriculum for Mercosur countries, and instead proposed designing “general principles for undergraduate education, of which we have historical antecedents in psychology education models proposed at Boulder in 1949 and at Bogotá in 1974” (Psychology Education Committee, 1995, p. 3). These principles had to secure a solid, general, plural, and socially relevant scientific and professional undergraduate education. At the third meeting in Uruguay in 1997, each country summarily defined their current situation regarding psychology curricula structure and content. What was found in most universities was an emphasis on professionalist or applied curricula, a remarkably low social relevance, and a tendency toward the hegemony of one single theory (usually psychoanalysis). As described in the next section, Argentina provided data gathered through AUAPsi's research project. General principles for regional undergraduate psychology education again insisted on the need to provide a plural and general training in multiple applied areas (not only psychotherapy) and in several theories. What was emphasized was the need for a “pluralism that dispels the conditions that made clinical psychology the dominant professional activity, thus ending psychoanalysis' dominance” (Federal Council of Psychology, 1997, p. 5). To this end, the commission recommended undergraduate systems, theories, and history courses to include *at least* three psychological systems: psychoanalysis, behaviorism, and humanism.

Argentina's delegates at the psychology education task force seemed particularly interested in securing a place for the history of psychology in undergraduate curricula. During those debates, Vilanova argued for the need of a socioprofessional historical perspective, in contrast with a purely conceptual historiography of psychological *ideas* traced back to Hellenistic philosophy. Content on the *social* history of psychology was of utmost importance for Argentinian undergraduates, given that

psychology, as a part of the superstructure, was not promoted in our continent by business groups, and its academic consolidation owes more to the States' efforts to improve their education, to balance their social conflicts and to reorient workforce than to capitalistic forces, as in the United States. (Vilanova, 1996, p. 202)

Given that Argentinian academic psychology was modeled under multiple social, institutional, and economic constraints, Vilanova argued that the appropriate curricular areas in which to locate and debate such constraints were those that included content on the social, institutional, and economic history of science. These areas were the “theoretical courses on conceptual integration [such as] history, epistemology and ethics” (Vilanova, 1995a, p. 668). Nevertheless, there was not a total agreement among historians of psychology on what kind of history should be taught to psychologists. According to Ricardo Ruiz (1995), professor of historical courses at the National University of La Plata, the social, cultural, and political historiography of psychology did not belong to history of psychology, or even to history of science, but rather to general history. At the same time, Vilanova's claim was debated by other Latin American historians of psychology. Contrasting with the emphasis placed by social historians on psychology's academic institutionalization and professionalization—a process that first took place in the United States—the aforementioned Rubén Ardila (1997), for example, argued that “psychology undergraduate programs begin with Wundt” (para. 4). The aforementioned cases of Vezzetti (1996) and Bortnik (1992) also departed from Vilanova's plea for a social historiography. Vezzetti (1996) claimed that the social history of psychology risked overemphasizing so-called “external factors” of science, thus considering “works, theoretical perspectives and disciplinary programs as a ‘reflex’ that directly expressed social and political conditions” (p. 88). Along with a social and cultural history of psychology, Vezzetti (2007) recognized the need for other historiographies, such as the history of psychological concepts and knowledge claims, the history of psychology's applications and uses, and a history of “professional” psychology. Vezzetti pleaded for a syncretic “intellectual history” of psychology by integrating the French historiographic ideas of Pierre Bourdieu, Georges Canguilhem, Gastón Bachelard, and Michel Foucault.

Against these claims, it was argued (Vilanova, 1995b) that between Boris Hessen's works in the 1930s and the 1990s, the social history of science had developed in novel ways that had superseded the linear, Marxist explanation that “internal” epistemic factors of science were a direct expression of “external” social and economic forces (Ash, 1993; Danziger, 1993, 1995, 2013; van Strien, 1993). Be that as it may, although the idea of a *social* or *sociological* historiography was discussed, the basic need for historical courses in undergraduate curricula was not a point of discussion in these interchanges, and passed through the IMPMs with little to no resistance.

In 1997, the IMPM insisted on the need to guarantee a “basic, pluralist, solid and generalist” education and to guarantee “a minimum common basic education for the recognition of psychologists in all Mercosur countries” (Di Doménico, 1999, p. 28). An essential pillar of the pluralist and generalist education sought by the “basic” curricular cycle was, once again, historiography. Thus, in the context of Latin American psychology education, the history of psychology was not conceived as part of the *advanced* cycle of psychology programs—that is, as a capstone course, as it usually is in United States, Canada, and England—but rather as a part of the “basic cycle” whose content should, in Vilanova's (1995a) words,

provide the unavoidable elements that define the scientific attitude, as it is distinguished from vulgar knowledge; [introduce the] concepts, problems and terminology of the discipline and [serve as a foundation for] professional exercise. The final purpose of this cycle is to train students for the production of new knowledge, the telic nucleus of any science. (p. 669)

The need for a pluralist and generalist education was developed at the commission's fourth meeting in 1997 in Chile, where 10 principles of Mercosur's psychology education were finally defined. The first two principles stated the need to offer a minimal and basic undergraduate education that included several subdisciplines and applied areas, and the need to guarantee a theoretical and methodological pluralism in psychology curricula. These principles were formalized at the sixth meeting in 1998 in Buenos Aires, where the consolidation of previously reached agreements resulted in a Psychology Education Protocol, which explicitly stated that the "history, theories and psychological systems" (Representatives of Psychology Departments of the Mercosur, 1998, p. 1) were part of psychologists' fundamental and conceptual education. Historical education was once again conceived as a way to palliate curricular biases and deficits:

Regardless of the titles and denominations of the [nonhistorical] courses' content and readings, which would suggest a plurality of curricular options, psychology education in Argentina has been almost entirely psychoanalytic. . . . Because of the professional and service-oriented bias of Argentinian psychology programs, there have not been sufficient curricular spaces granted to research, basic processes and even new professional areas. (Di Doménico, 1996, pp. 234–235)

The Mercosur debates pointed to the fact that, after 1983, Argentina witnessed the consolidation of "a psychology university education that was biased towards the professional and service-oriented branch of the discipline, generally through a mono-theoretical perspective greatly distanced from scientific practice" (Di Doménico, 1999, p. 26). Such university education necessarily constrains history courses' critical aims:

The history of psychology, as an undergraduate course, seems conceivable only in a psychology curriculum where a theoretical and methodological cycle and a clearly integrated professional cycle are defined. An exclusively applied, service-oriented and professionalistic education forcibly limits historiographical investigations and forces to improvise curricular spaces for a defined subject such as history of psychology. (Vilanova, 2000, p. 154)

In a sense, history seems to have been used by these scholars as a way to legitimize psychology's independence from other disciplines, and further, to cast a critical light on the reductive definitions of psychology as a clinical, or even "psychoanalytic", discipline, definitions which were structural to Argentinian psychology leading up to the 1990s. Historical reconstructions were viewed as a way to reassess psychology as a research-driven science, to recognize its inherent pluralism, and to educate psychologists with relativist, heterodox, and skeptic attitudes.

Argentina's proposals on undergraduate history courses during the 1990s seem to have been influenced by models and ideas from other regional and international experiences. Regarding regional influences, other Mercosur countries that were part of the IMPMs had already debated, or were in the course of debating, psychology undergraduate curricula. History of psychology courses were part of the basic undergraduate education in most of those countries (Di Doménico & Vilanova, 1999). Official proposals for undergraduate psychology education in countries including Chile, Venezuela, Paraguay, and Brazil recommended that psychology programs should offer mandatory undergraduate courses in historical and systematic psychology. Exceptionally, Uruguayan psychology curricula did not list history or systems-related courses.

Regarding proposals and models from outside Latin America, the Mercosur debates constantly sought out North American and European authors and ideas as guiding frameworks. The Education Commission at the IMPMs drew heavily on North American and European debates. For example, between 1995 and 1998, the Education Commission debated and considered the 1987 Utah Conference, noting the similarities between the conference's recommendations and the principles that were defined for psychology education by the Mercosur countries, especially regarding the need to define a minimal, core curriculum that reflected the diversity of contemporary psychology (Bickman, 1987).

Furthermore, Argentinian scholars relied on the Gregg et al. (1970) report on the place of psychology in an ideal university, and the Boulder report on the scientist-practitioner model, as cornerstones for local psychology curricula. As for European influences, the Education Commission at the IMPMs also drew on the Optimal Standards for Professional Training in Psychology defined by the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA, 1990). The IMPMs principles and the EFPA standards coincided on the definition of a minimal, core curriculum that should include several psychological theories and applications:

A variety of different theoretical models should be taught because no single model is able to cope satisfactorily with the range of problems that confront the professional psychologist. Theoretical models must be considered critically so that students are fully aware of their limitations as well as their advantages. (EFPA, 1990, para. 12)

Debates that had been taking place during the 1980s and 1990s in Spain regarding the restructuring of psychology education also influenced the Argentinian debates. Spanish psychology curricula included mandatory undergraduate history courses from their inception in the 1960s (Blanco & Botella, 1995). Curricular revisions in 1990 reinforced historical courses as part of "core" undergraduate content (Chisvert-Perales et al., 2016). Amalio Blanco was Chair of the Psychology Deans' Conference, and the Dean of the Psychology Department at the Autonomous University of Madrid from 1991 to 1998. Sponsored by the European Union's Organization of Ibero American States, Blanco (1995) devised a whole project for the improvement of Latin American psychology curricula, arguing for a scientifically accurate and socially relevant psychology education. Referencing numerous conferences on the matter, Blanco argued that undergraduate history courses should be elective courses at the advanced curricular cycle. This project had been espoused 2 years earlier at the 1993 Symposium described earlier (Blanco et al., 1993), where it had been considered by Argentinian representatives such as Di Doménico, who, at the same time, was Argentina's representative at the IMPMs and a member at the AUAPsi debates, a process which will be discussed later. Blanco's proposal was used in Argentina as a working document for curricular analyses and revisions between 1994 and 2001, although national debates defined history not as an advanced course, as was Blanco's intention, but as basic, introductory one. History was seen as a cornerstone for a plural education, aimed at "palliating mono-theoretical orientations that fatally developed into dogmatisms and which have been endemic illnesses in some of [Mercosur's] countries" (Di Doménico, 1999, p. 32).

Critical History at the Association of Academic Units of Psychology (1991–1999)

The AUAPsi was established in Rosario, Argentina, in 1991 for "promoting the interrelation between the different Argentinian psychology programs, with the permanent objective of improving undergraduate and graduate education, research and university extension" (AUAPsi, 1991, p. 1). AUAPsi was a collegiate body, bringing together delegates from eight Argentinian psychology programs (Buenos Aires, Rosario, Mar del Plata, Tucumán, Cordoba, La Plata, San Luis, and Belgrano) that worked through assemblies and committees.

Several psychologists-historians were involved in AUAPsi from its inception, and the association broadly shared aims and objectives with the IMPMs. Argentina's participation at the meetings was often officially endorsed by AUAPsi. One of AUAPsi's programs, the Training Program on Specialists in Curriculum Innovation (1996–1999), aimed to carry out a nationwide assessment of curricular content, human resources, and instructional practices at Argentinian psychology programs in state-run universities. The project was completed in 1997, and a diagnostic report was prepared in 1998 (AUAPsi, 1998) that was used as a base for official recommendations on improving psychology education (AUAPsi, 1999).

The AUAPsi diagnostic report on Argentinian undergraduate psychology education (AUAPsi, 1998) briefly mentioned historical aspects of psychology education in Argentina. The report stated that most psychology programs active in 1997 had been created by faculty with no training in curricular design, were heavily driven by applied, professional courses and content, had virtually no content on international advances that had been developed from the 1980s onward, and were mostly taught by faculty that did not carry out any kind of scientific research. Curricula were outdated and, in terms of theoretical orientations, were overtly applied, clinical, and psychoanalytical. AUAPsi argued that such a state was the result of five decades of a problematic professional history, embedded in a more general structural weakness regarding local scientific institutions and organizations, as well as the context of Argentina's chronic political instability—issues that had been thoroughly researched by historians of psychology (Dagfal, 1997; Klappenbach, 2003; Vilanova, 1995b). AUAPsi (1999) identified the history of psychology as an explanation for the “significant retardation of the academic development of psychology” (p. 3).

Regarding psychology curricula, the AUAPsi report found that “specific courses on history of psychology are scarce, but several courses include an historical introduction” (AUAPsi, 1998, p. 21). Only 3.3% of overall content of psychology programs was on the history of psychology. In this context, AUAPsi argued that historical courses allowed undergraduates

to develop a diachronic perspective through the context of psychology's constitution and its later developments, in light of the prevailing sociohistorical paradigms essential for an adequate understanding of the current state of the discipline (synchronic perspective), in its disciplinary and professional dimensions. (AUAPsi, 1999, p. 13)

AUAPsi (1999) recommended that historical undergraduate courses include content on

Psychology as a science. Philosophical roots. The problem of modernity and later developments. Rationalism and empiricism. The distinction between the concepts of soul, mind, psyche, person, personality, subject, consciousness, unconscious, organism, activity, conduct, behavior, and so forth Psychology as a profession. University education in Psychology. Different training models. Professional associations. (p. 13)

Hence, AUAPsi's report conceived the history of psychology as a subdiscipline in psychology, merging philosophical ideas as a background for psychology, metatheoretical frameworks (such as rationalism and empiricism), and socioprofessional, historiographic issues (such as the delimitation of “schools” or “theories” and the definition of history of psychology's subject). Considering Argentinian scholars' aforementioned concerns regarding pluralism, the extension of psychological theories must be highlighted.

According to AUAPsi, content on the philosophy of psychology should be offered in specific courses. The “philosophy and history of psychological thought” at the undergraduate level was meant as a ground for “reflecting on the history of the psychological discipline and its present state” without confusing or replacing psychology's history proper with its philosophical antecedents (AUAPsi, 1999, p. 14). Curricular descriptors on philosophical issues included “philosophical questions regarding man, the problem of knowledge, [and] the great currents of thought” (AUAPsi, 1999, p. 14). This indicated a definition of the history of psychology closely related with international historiographic trends that considered 19th-century philosophy as a general background but not as a *psychology* in the “modern” sense (Brock, 2014; Danziger, 1993, 1995, 2013; Sokal, 1984; cf. Ash, 2008; Sokal, 2006).

Several historians of psychology participated in gathering and analyzing data for AUAPsi's Training Program. Of the 28 scholars on the research team, nine were historians—or at least had a systematic interest in historical issues: Lucía Rossi (University of Buenos Aires), Alejandro Dagfal and Telma Piacente (National University of La Plata), Adelmo Manasseri

and Héctor Franch (National University of Rosario), Alberto Vilanova and Cristina Di Doménico (National University of Mar del Plata), Patricia Altamirano (National University of Córdoba), and Hugo Klappenbach (National University of San Luis). Several of them offered undergraduate history courses. Di Doménico and Vilanova, for example, were two of the association's founding members and were professors at Mar del Plata's Social History of Psychology course. Di Doménico was the Argentinian delegate at the IMPMs between 1994 and 2001, and had participated in the 1993 symposium. Excluding the National University of Tucuman, each psychology program that was part of the research team contributed at least one historian of psychology (AUAPsi, 1998).

Scholars such as Dagfal, Klappenbach, Vezzetti, and Vilanova were among the first in Argentina to adopt an explicitly critical historiographic framework, discussing international works and fields such as the sociology of psychological knowledge as developed by Kurt Danziger and Allan Buss. For instance, in 1993, Dagfal translated into Spanish Danziger's "Three Challenges for the History of Psychology" conference presentation that had been given at the American Psychological Association (APA) annual meeting in Toronto, Canada, that same year, which was then widely read and debated in Argentina. At that conference, Danziger sharply criticized the uncritical and celebratory role of undergraduate historical education. The paper was the basis of Danziger's famous 1994 discussion on the pedagogical role of historiography (Danziger, 1994). In 1996, Dagfal, together with Klappenbach and Keegan—the three of them instructors of undergraduate history courses—interviewed Danziger at the International Congress of Psychology of Montreal, Canada, further showing the systematic interest of local historians in international historiography (Dagfal, Klappenbach, & Keegan, 1996).

As in the IMPMs, international influences regarding the history of psychology can be perceived in AUAPsi's debates. Here again, Conant's Commission of Twelve, the 1949 Boulder Conference, and the APA-sponsored national conferences on psychology teaching and education between 1949 and 1991 were seen as milestones when discussing the type, content, and orientations of local curricula (Vilanova, 1993). More importantly, Argentinian historians (Klappenbach, 2003) approvingly cited the 1951 Cornell and 1960 Michigan conferences on undergraduate psychology, which explicitly recommended history courses be taught in undergraduate curricula (McGovern, 1992).

It could be concluded that from 1983 onward, the local reception process of the international, critical historiography of psychology often converged with official analyses of Argentinian psychology education and of the role of historical courses in that education. In this context, the *scientific* nature of psychology, and the need to base psychologists' knowledge claims and professional expertise on high-quality research, was constantly emphasized. Contrary to the United States and Spain—where the theoretical fragmentation and diversity in psychology education were seen as possible threats for the academic and professional unity of the discipline (Blanco, 1995; Ellis, 1992; McGovern, 1992), and where historiography was seen as a necessary critique of scientism and empiricist dogmas (Danziger, 1993, 1995; Smith, 2016)—Argentinian historiography was often conceived as a gateway toward pluralism and diverse, nonpsychoanalytical, research-based programs. Psychoanalysis—not scientism, positivism, or experimentalism—was mainstream Argentinian psychology. Thus, the struggle was "the development of a non-reactionary attitude towards the basic, scientific side of the discipline" (Vilanova, 1996, p. 208). History courses were then seen as a key element in that struggle.

The History of Psychology in Debates and Documents on the Accreditation of Argentinian Psychology Programs (2001–2013)

In November 2001, the Accreditation Commission of the IMPMs proposed several criteria for improving the quality of university psychology education by evaluating and accrediting psychology programs. Using the 1998 Psychology Education Protocol as a base, the 2001

proposal on accreditation criteria stipulated the need for curricula to make explicit their pedagogical purposes, and to define the graduate profile's attitudes, objectives, knowledge, and skills (Mercosur Psychologists' Accreditation Commission, 2001). Arguing that professional psychologists should have an integrative vision of psychology as a science and as a profession, the 2001 protocol identified "education in History, Psychological Systems and Epistemology of Psychology" (p. 2) as an axis of undergraduate education.

The same month, FePRA issued a note to the Argentinian Ministry of Science and Education requesting the inclusion of psychology programs in the list of state-regulated degrees. Specifically, FePRA requested to include psychology programs in the 43rd article of the LES. The LES was sanctioned in 1995 during a decade in which higher education in Latin America and Argentina became subject to multiple assessments in terms of its quality. This assessment took place in the wider context of the advancement of neoliberal policies in Argentina, which introduced the idea that university education should be funded and stimulated according to the necessities and demands of the public and private market. The LES' 43rd article establishes that university programs for professions whose exercises compromise citizens' *public interest* must be subjected to periodic evaluation and accreditations by the CONEAU (Di Doménico & Piacente, 2003). These evaluations were to be carried out using specific standards and criteria stipulated by the Ministry of Science regarding basic curricular content and training.

The official note issued by FePRA reflected "the clinical bias of Argentinian psychology education, since the petition was based in the intention of including psychology in the field of the health-related professions" (Di Doménico & Piacente, 2003, p. 43). In August 2002, the inclusion of psychology programs in the LES was debated in AUAPsi. This led AUAPsi to issue a note signed by five of the seven directors of psychology programs at the main state-run universities. The note broadened FePRA's request, stating that all professional fields, and not just psychotherapy, comprised citizens' well-being (Di Doménico & Risueño, 2013).

According to the procedures mandated by the LES, the evaluation and accreditation processes by the CONEAU were based on a peer-reviewed system that required a set of accreditation standards and criteria to assess each undergraduate program. When beginning to define the specific, operative standards for psychology programs, Argentinian psychologists used AUAPsi's (1999) recommendations as a starting point (Di Doménico & Piacente, 2003). As we have seen, within undergraduate core content, AUAPsi listed the "historical constitution and development of psychology as a science and as a profession" (p. 48). Psychologists also considered the 2001 IMPM's proposal on accreditation criteria for undergraduate psychology education as an antecedent, which recommended the inclusion of historical content and undergraduate courses in the accreditation standards.

In March 2004, the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology passed Resolution No. 136, which included psychology programs in the LES (Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia, & Tecnología, 2004, p. 4). The next step was to define evaluation parameters and criteria for the programs' peer-review processes. AUAPsi prepared and delivered to the Ministry of Education a document on basic, minimal curricular content to be used as criteria. However, the Ministry requested that the AUAPsi and the Union of Private run Psychology programs (UVAPsi) provide a joint and consensual definition of accreditation standards (Klappenbach, 2015).

After 4 years of debate, those standards were defined. In the criteria, the history of psychology was defined as a *mandatory* content, part of the second or third year, "basic education" curricular cycle, alongside other disciplinary areas such as research methodologies and human cognition and behavior. Consequently, history was conceived as one of the theoretical areas that "ensure the acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes that allow an adequate professional performance" (AUAPsi & UVAPsi, 2008, p. 6). More precisely, the joint document states that "historical and contemporary developments of psychology" constitute an autonomous, clearly delimited core like those of "psychopathological processes," "biopsychosocial processes," and "research methodologies in psychology" (p. 6).

According to the joint document, the “History” core of psychology curricula should include content on “the construction and development of psychology’s paradigms, theories and approaches from its origins, and its constitution as a science and as a profession” (AUAPsi & UVAPsi, 2008, p. 6). The brevity of such a statement impedes any in-depth analysis. Nevertheless, what must be underlined is the use of the term “paradigm,” which was likely to encompass a Kuhnian perspective on psychology. We have already shown that the debate on the existence of Kuhnian paradigms in psychology occupied a certain crucial moment in the history of Argentinian psychology. In this regard, local psychologists could benefit from considering both critiques of the applicability of Kuhnian philosophy to historiography (Driver-Linn, 2003) and non-Kuhnian historiographies (van Strien, 1993). The content of the “History” core once again differentiated between the history of psychology *as a science* and the history of psychology *as a profession*. Although the rationale behind this was implicit, it is likely that this broadly followed the distinction between psychological science and psychological professions raised in the AUAPsi documents (AUAPsi, 1998, 1999) and by local psychologists-historians (Klappenbach, 2003; Vezzetti, 1996, 2007; Vilanova, 1997a, 2000).

As a thematic core, the history of psychology was identified as the set of “historical developments that influenced the varied psychological currents that have arisen from different cultural sources” (AUAPsi & UVAPsi, 2008, p. 9). Cultural institutions and events were seen as a *moderating variable* on psychology’s development, that is, as *influential* over psychological currents and over regional, local or “native” psychologies. This was the first explicit mention of a sociological, externalist, or culturalist history of psychology in the official documents here analyzed. The mandatory and minimal content of the “History” core includes four items: “Historical origins of Psychology. Beginnings of scientific psychology. Development of contemporary psychological currents. Psychology in Argentina” (AUAPsi & UVAPsi, 2008, p. 9). Thus, the joint document distinguished the historical *origins* of psychology from the beginnings of psychology as a *scientific* discipline. Although the demarcation milestones between the two are not made explicit, those milestones could be socioprofessional factors, such as the academic institutionalization of psychology, or purely internal, conceptual, or theoretical factors.

The joint document by AUAPsi and UVAPsi was adopted *unchanged* by the Ministry of Education as the operative criteria for the accreditation processes. In September 2009, the Ministry passed Resolution No. 343, which incorporated the joint document’s recommendations and details of psychology’s basic curricular content, course loads, and the criteria of intensity as standards for evaluation and accreditation processes (Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia, & Tecnología, 2009). As Klappenbach (2015) pointed out, curricular specifications listed in the resolution “were not structured considering the graduate profile or the skills or competences or qualifications that the future graduate should possess, but was structured according to content or knowledge areas instead” (p. 27). As one of those knowledge areas, the history of psychology was again located in the “basic education area,” including the same four items listed in the joint AUAPsi and UVAPsi (2008) document. Therefore, the work of those two collegiate bodies contributed *directly* to the accreditation processes’ regulations. History was officially conceived as describing and explaining the discipline’s diverse and heterogeneous field, irreducible to a single theory, system, or technology. Thus, it constituted a key node in the acquisition of “knowledge about the theoretical and methodological foundations of the different psychological models that arise from different scientific worldviews” (Di Doménico & Risueño, 2013, p. 28).

The resolution, as well as the joint document, did not specify any specific authors, readings, or literature. The topics and themes of courses were stipulated broadly enough as to assure that each psychology department maintained its autonomy and resorted to its own best judgment when choosing *concrete* content for the syllabi. Hence, it is at least possible for undergraduate history courses to select content that while respecting the *structure* imposed by the resolution fail to consider or even distort or contradict the ideas and objectives of the analyzed debates.

In fact, according to recent analyses (Fierro et al., in press), courses sometimes do eschew the historical plurality of psychological systems and theories, exclusively centering on one theoretical or geopolitical perspective, as happened in certain Argentinian psychology curricula after 1983. At the same time, nothing in the Resolution No. 343 mandated the inclusion of historical scholarly research or historiographical advances in the field. All in all, these two issues were a setback for the critical contextualization of Argentinian psychology in the past and present state of regional and international psychology. Regarding History of Psychology as a subdiscipline, it should be up to historians of psychology to reflect on how to harmonize international developments in historical scholarship, local debates, and the concrete teaching of psychology.

Does Critical History Have a Future? On Current Concerns and Potential Threats

Three decades of debates led to the inclusion of historical content in Argentinian psychology programs, with the process concluding with the official regulations of the accreditation processes. Those debates were all, in a strict sense, democratic and collective. Although ideas on history courses were espoused and detailed by individual scholars with specific interests, the AUAPsi, IMPM, and the CONEAU all functioned as forums in which universities and institutions expressed their concerns and ideas through elected representatives, and in which resolutions were discussed and voted on before passed. Thus, it could be concluded that the idea that history should be a part of psychologists' education was a relatively shared aim. Nonetheless, the type, focus, and perspectives that concrete undergraduate history courses could or should adopt was (and still is) subject to debate. In any case, there was not any *explicit* resistance to the dominant model on history teaching and education conceived during the 1990s.

These findings indicate a generalized agreement on the *importance* of historical content in any psychology undergraduate curricula. This, however, does not permanently guarantee the mandatory nature of historical content in psychology curricula, thus presenting a first, serious potential challenge. Accreditation standards are to be revised after the revision of psychology programs. The Resolution No. 343 states,

The documents that are hereby approved [including the accreditation standards] are to be reviewed in order to introduce the necessary modifications in accordance to the progress made within both the scope of the Educative Mercosur and the strategic alliance between the European Union and the Latin American and Caribbean States Community. (Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia, & Tecnología, 2009, p. 3)

According to the current state of accreditation processes, this review process is imminent. CONEAU resolutions issued by December 2013 indicated that only 28 of a total 70 psychology programs that were reviewed were accredited, a relatively low proportion for a country with 60 years of academic psychology (Klappenbach, 2015). Most psychology programs offered by state-run universities were accredited for just 3 years; thus, those programs will be reviewed again in 2018. By August 2014, several of the 42 programs with negative evaluations requested to be reviewed again and continued functioning normally while recognizing the need for curricular revisions.

It has been recently stated (Fierro & Di Doménico, 2016) that the planned revision of accreditation standards could in fact affect the compulsory or mandatory nature of historical undergraduate courses. Moreover, the IMPM ceased to function over a decade ago, and the institutional meetings and debates like those that took place during the 1990s have become extremely rare. Thus, Argentina's own accreditation processes constitute a first force that could destabilize the mandatory, "core" nature of historical education. If history courses are currently basic mandatory content *because* of historians' constant debates on history's critical role in specific forums and debates, then those debates should be preserved and continued, especially given that the local landscape has changed since the 1990s.

Although the complete *removal* of historical content from the accreditation standards is unlikely, their demotion from mandatory or compulsory to optional or elective would constitute a noticeable setback to Argentinian historiography, as one of its main *local* forums is composed of students in history courses. If history courses become optional or elective, this will lead to a decrease in professorships and available positions for historians of psychology, widening the gap between undergraduate courses and historical scholarship. Besides, such a change would imply ignoring both the reasons that led to the inclusion of history of psychology as a basic curricular content in the first place, and international consensus regarding the core nature of the subdiscipline in university education (Rutherford & Pickren, 2015).

Another kind of potential threat that lies beyond the accreditation processes concerns the agents or forces that could resist psychology's historization at an undergraduate level. In regard to the possible impact of a truly *critical*, nonjustificationist historiography (Brock, 2016; Pettit & Davidson, 2014), these agents of resistance are the collective groups and forces that could have, and effectively have had, a serious conflict of interest with any *critical* historiography of their own traditions, movements, or theoretical allegiances. Psychoanalysis still composes most of the *mainstream* academic and professional psychology in Argentina (Dagfal, 2015). And because of their education, most Argentinian psychologists and psychoanalysts are still convinced of the absolute originality of the psychoanalytic movement, of the unique scientific character of psychoanalysis, and of the absolute, undeniable truth and superiority of Freudian and Lacanian theories and technologies. Even when authors sometimes pay lip service to the relative, conjectural, and limited character of psychoanalysis, most contemporary psychologists in Argentina probably still agree that psychoanalysis is the only *truly scientific* psychology, is the only psychology that has defined its theoretical objects, and that other psychologies are "mere ideologies" (Harari, 1973). This has been reinforced by the fact that a considerable portion of psychoanalytic historiography in Argentina has been, and still is, whiggish and hagiographic, assuming the true, ahistorical character of psychoanalysis as a starting point (Romero, 2009). The aforementioned national universities of Rosario and Tucumán, where the history of psychology is taught in a clear, explicit, and exclusive Lacanian key, are examples of the denial of a plural, critical, and scholarly historical education.

Of course, this resistance could potentially emerge from any other psychological perspectives in Argentina, such as the cognitive and behavioral–cognitive approaches. Argentinian experimental psychologists at the beginning of the 20th century also treated psychology's history in a positivistic, whiggish fashion (Vilanova & Di Doménico, 1999). The enthronement of a particular perspective such as cognitivism (or any other perspective, for that matter) as the "definitive" theoretical or praxeological perspective would necessarily lead to a narrow, whiggish historical education that would oppose the concerns in the debates here described. Nevertheless, it must be noted that nonpsychoanalytic perspectives are still truly *minimal* in the country, both in universities and in professional institutions, and currently have practically no impact in psychology education (Di Doménico & Piacente, 2011; Klappenbach, 2015). Thus, psychoanalytic hegemony still currently constitutes the main source of resistance to a plural and critical historical education.

Another source of resistance comes from Argentinian student centers at psychology departments. Although not opposed to undergraduate historical content in particular, most student centers in Argentina have strongly and publicly resisted the process of evaluation and accreditation. These highly politicized centers, often aligned with left-wing ideologies, have argued that the criteria for evaluating psychology programs are "economistic" and "foreign" to Argentina, that the state's influence on universities is inadequate, and that the overall accreditation process constitutes a threat to university independence in regard to undergraduate curricula content, an independence guaranteed by Argentina's Constitution. These arguments fail to see the fact that, as we have detailed here, *psychology graduates*—this is, *insiders*—are the peers that carry out psychology program reviews. More importantly, standards and criteria used in the accreditation processes were collectively debated and approved by *psychologists* and were not forcibly imposed by the state (or by "foreign" states). This resistance is relevant,

however, if we consider that local student centers have a great influence in university life: For example, those centers' resistance prevented two of the main psychology programs in Argentina from taking part in the debates between FePRA and AUAPsi in 2002, when psychologists asked to be represented in the 43rd article of the LES (Di Doménico & Piacente, 2003). This resistance thus constitutes an indirect threat for historical education by questioning the continuity of these processes.

Finally, the incipient status of the field's institutionalization and professionalization in Argentina should also be taken into account as a potential "destabilizing" factor in the future. As an empirical, research-based specialty, the history of psychology is still a marginal area in Argentina in a context in which psychological research *in its various subdisciplines* is still scarce, overshadowed by applied, clinical psychology. Historical research as a full-time activity is scarcely pursued, with few psychologists having doctoral degrees in historical topics.

All of these factors amount to an uneasy situation that echoes historians' moderately optimistic, but still cautious, perspective on the future of history courses in other countries. In the United States, Canada, Spain, England, and Ireland, for example, curricular revisions, generational changes in the subdiscipline, and a generally low perceived importance of historical content in psychology education seem to constitute the main challenges. In Argentina, the revision of accreditation processes, university politics, and a decades-long curricular struggle between an integral psychology education and an exclusively professionalist, applied, and psychoanalytically oriented training are the main concerns.

Given that the presence of historians in curricular debates during the last 30 years seems to have been a key element in assuring a place for history in undergraduate curricula, Argentinian historians of psychology should stimulate discussions and debates within research groups, professional institutions, associations, and undergraduate courses on the relevance of psychologists' historical education, especially in the context of the CONEAU and other accreditation-related institutions. Additionally, empirical research on the effective impact of the history of psychology teaching and education, and its communication at appropriate forums, would provide basic data for reinforcing the position of historical content in psychology curricula. Finally, and given that the principle of university autonomy grants Argentinian professors total freedom in syllabi design, a specific future debate should include history course faculty. This debate should center on the both general, and concrete and instructional ways to harmonize local curricula, perspectives, authors, and historiographical outlooks with the history of psychology's international debates and advances.

Conclusions

During the last three decades, the history of psychology has retained a central location in Argentinian debates on psychology undergraduate education. Historical issues have been repeatedly included as core content in the main international, regional, and national debates on psychology curricula. Historiography has been perceived as a gateway toward a pluralist and critical assessment of contemporary international and local psychology. Usually located in introductory or basic-cycle courses at psychology curricula, historical works and authors have been deemed as necessary inputs for a greater pluralism in Argentinian psychologists' education: an education which has been, and still is, largely reduced to the teaching of psychoanalysis. The history of science has thus been perceived as relevant content for basic scientific education as well as for advanced or applied training.

Considering the current status of accreditation processes and of Argentinian psychology at large, the challenge faced by psychologists-historians in the context of psychology curricula seems twofold. Regarding *undergraduate courses* in particular, historians should find ways to harmonize historical education in accordance with international advances in the subdiscipline and without any spurious or partisan use of academic freedom. Regarding psychology curricula in general, it will be necessary to carry out empirically based debates on the concrete

ways historical education contributes to psychologists' training and general education. Although these measures alone will not suffice to solve the aforementioned challenges, they appear as the next, logical steps for a rational, collective action toward guaranteeing a future for history of psychology in Argentina.

References

- Alonso, M., & Klinar, D. (2016, November). *Los Psicólogos en Argentina. Relevamiento 2015* [Psychologists in Argentina. Nationwide 2015 Census]. Paper presented at the 8th Psychology Congress, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- Alonso, M., & Nicenboim, E. (1997). La Psicología en la República Argentina [Psychology in Argentina]. Aspectos Académicos y Profesionales. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 67, 71–76.
- Anonymous. (1987). Opinión de los estudiantes [Students' Opinion]. *Actualidades en Psicología*, 12, 14.
- Ardila, R. (1978). I Conferencia Latinoamericana sobre Entrenamiento en Psicología [First Latin American Conference on Psychology Training and Education]. In R. Ardila (Ed.), *La Profesión del Psicólogo* (pp. 220–227). México D.F., Mexico: Trillas.
- Ardila, R. (1997, November 8). *Interview by A. Vilanova*. Mar del Plata, Argentina: National University of Mar del Plata.
- Ash, M. (1983). The Self-Presentation of a Discipline: History of Psychology In The United States Between Pedagogy and Scholarship. In L. Graham, W. Lepenies, & P. Weingart (Eds.), *Functions and uses of disciplinary histories* (pp. 143–189). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Reidel. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-7035-9_7
- Ash, M. (1993). Rhetoric, society, and the historiography of psychology. In H. van Rappard, P. van Strien, L. Mos, & W. Baker (Eds.), *Annals of theoretical psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 49–57). New York, NY: Plenum Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-2982-8_3
- Ash, M. (2008). Psychology thought and practice— Historical and interdisciplinary perspectives. In M. Ash & T. Sturm (Eds.), *Psychology's territories: Historical and contemporary perspectives from different disciplines* (pp. 1–27). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- AUAPsi. (1991). *Asociación de Unidades Académicas de Psicología* [Association of Academic Units of Psychology]. Rosario, Argentina: UNR.
- AUAPsi. (1998). *Informe Diagnóstico de la Situación Actual* [Diagnostic Report on the Current Situation of Argentinian Psychology Undergraduate Education]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: National University of Mar del Plata.
- AUAPsi. (1999). *Informe de la segunda etapa del programa de innovación curricular. Recomendaciones acerca de la formación universitaria* [Report of the Second Stage of the Curricular Innovation Program. Recommendations on University Education in Psychology]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: National University of Mar del Plata.
- AUAPsi & UVAPsi. (2008). *Acreditación de la Carrera de Psicología* [On the Accreditation of Psychology Programs]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: National University of Mar del Plata.
- Barnes, M., & Greer, S. (2014). Does the Future Have a History of Psychology? A report on teaching, research, and faculty positions in Canadian universities. *History of Psychology*, 17, 159–169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035335>
- Barnes, M. E., & Greer, S. (2016). The history specialist in psychology: From avocation to professionalization. *History of Psychology*, 19, 192–208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hop0000027>
- Bickman, L. (1987). Graduate education in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 42, 1041–1047. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.42.12.1041>
- Blanco, A. (1995). *Proyecto para la mejora de los currícula en las universidades de América Latina. Anteproyecto de Psicología* [Project for the Improvement on Latin America University Curricula. Working document on Psychology]. Madrid, Spain: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Blanco, A., & Botella, J. (1995). La enseñanza de la psicología en España a la luz de los nuevos planes de estudio [The Teaching of Psychology in Spain in the light of the new Curricula]. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 62, 29–47.
- Blanco, A., Di Doménico, C., & Pineda, G. (1993). La Recuperación del Modelo de Boulder [Recovering the Boulder Model]. In A. Blanco, M. Dembo, C. Di Doménico, G. Pineda, & M. Rojo, *La formación del psicólogo para el año 2000* (pp. 2–33). Santiago, Chile: 24th Inter-american Congress of Psychology.

- Bortnik, R. (1992). *Valor y sentido de una historización de la psicología en la Argentina* [The Value and Sense of an Historization of Psychology in Argentina]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Cátedra I de Historia de la Psicología de la UBA.
- Brock, A. C. (2014). Psychology in the modern sense. *Theory & Psychology, 24*, 717–722. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354314535513>
- Brock, A. C. (2016). The future of the history of psychology revisited. *History of Psychology, 19*, 175–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hop0000037>
- Brock, A., & Harvey, M. (2015). The status of the history of psychology course in British and Irish psychology departments. *European Yearbook of the History of Psychology, 1*, 13–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1484/J.EYHP.5.108400>
- Carpintero, H., Lafuente, E., Quintana, J., Ruiz, G., Sáiz, D., Sáiz, M., & Sánchez, N. (2010). Historiography of psychology in Spain: The last decade. *History of Psychology, 13*, 277–308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020354>
- Chisvert-Perales, M., Monteagudo-Soto, M. J., & Mestre, V. (2016). The history of psychology course in Spanish psychology curricula: Past, present, future. *History of Psychology, 19*, 154–168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hop0000024>
- Collins, A., & Bunn, G. (2016). The shackles of practice: History of psychology, research assessment, and the curriculum. In S. Klempe & R. Smith (Eds.), *Centrality of history for theory construction in psychology* (pp. 91–109). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42760-7_5
- Conte, C. (1994). ¿Un modelo para que el país imite? [A Model for the Country to Follow?] *Prensa Psicológica, 1*, 33–38.
- Dagfal, A. (1997). Discursos, instituciones y prácticas presentes en la etapa previa a la profesionalización de la disciplina psicológica en la Argentina (1945–1955) [Discourses, Institutions and Practices of Argentinian Pre-Professional Psychology (1945–1955)]. *Cuadernos Argentinos de Historia de la Psicología, 3*, 173–195.
- Dagfal, A. (2009). *Entre París y Buenos Aires: La invención del Psicólogo (1942–1966)* [Between Paris and Buenos Aires: The Invention of the Psychologist (1942–1966)]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Dagfal, A. (2015). La psychanalyse en Argentine: Histoire et perspectives [Psychoanalysis in Argentina. History and Perspectives]. *Nouvelle Revue de Psychosociologie, 20*, 57–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/nrp.020.0057>
- Dagfal, A., Klappenbach, H., & Keegan, E. (1996). An Interview with Kurt Danziger. *Cuadernos de Historia de la Psicología, 3*, 215–233.
- Danziger, K. (1984). Towards a conceptual framework for a critical history of psychology. *Revista de Historia de la Psicología, 5*, 99–107.
- Danziger, K. (1993). Psychological objects, practice, and history. In H. van Rappard (Ed.), *Annals of theoretical psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 15–47). New York, NY: Plenum Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-2982-8_2
- Danziger, K. (1994). Does the history of psychology have a future? *Theory and Psychology, 8*, 467–484. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354394044001>
- Danziger, K. (1995). The production of psychological knowledge by experts. *Cuadernos Argentinos de Historia de la Psicología, 1*, 259–273.
- Danziger, K. (2013). Psychology and its history. *Theory & Psychology, 23*, 829–839. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354313502746>
- Di Doménico, C. (1996). Psicología y Mercosur: Acerca de la armonización curricular [Psychology and the Mercosur: On Curricular Harmonization]. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina, 42*, 230–242.
- Di Doménico, C. (1999). Psicología y Mercosur: Revisión comparativa de los acuerdos sobre formación [Psychology and the Mercosur: A Comparative Revision on Resolutions regarding Psychology Training and Education]. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina, 45*, 24–33.
- Di Doménico, C., & Piacente, T. (2003). Acreditación de carreras de psicología en Argentina. Estado actual y perspectivas [Accreditation of Argentinian Psychology Programs. Current Status and Prospective]. In J. Villegas, P. Marassi, & J. Toro (Eds.), *Problemas centrales para la formación del psicólogo en las Américas* (Vol. 3, pp. 31–57). Santiago de Chile, Chile: Interamerican Society of Psychology.

- Di Doménico, C., & Piacente, T. (2011). Acreditación en Psicología en el Cono Sur de América [Psychology Programs' Accreditation Processes in America's Southern Cone]. *Psicolatina*, 22, 1–18.
- Di Doménico, C., & Risueño, A. (2013). Procesos de acreditación de carreras de Psicología en Argentina [Psychology Programs' Accreditation Processes in Argentina]. *Integración Académica en Psicología*, 1, 24–28.
- Di Doménico, C., & Vilanova, A. (Eds.). (1999). *Formación de Psicólogos en el Mercosur* [Psychologists' Training and Education in the Mercosur]. Mar del Plata, Buenos Aires: National University of Mar del Plata.
- Driver-Linn, E. (2003). Where is psychology going? Structural fault lines revealed by psychologists' use of Kuhn. *American Psychologist*, 58, 269–278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.58.4.269>
- Ellis, H. (1992). Graduate education in psychology: Past, present, and future. *American Psychologist*, 47, 570–576. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.47.4.570>
- Estudiantes y Docentes. (1973). La producción del psicoanálisis en Buenos Aires y la relación entre el psicoanalista y el psicólogo [The Production of Psychoanalysis in Buenos Aires and the Relation Between the Psychoanalyst and the Psychologist]. In S. Bricht (Ed.), *El Rol del Psicólogo* (pp. 27–46). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Nueva Visión.
- European Federation of Psychologists' Associations. (1990). *Optimal standards for professional training*. Luxemburg, Luxemburg: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.efpa.eu/professional-development/optimal-standards-for-professional-training-in-psychology>
- Federal Council of Psychology. (1997). *Proposal of the Brazilian Delegation at the IV Integrative Meeting of Psychologists of the Mercosur*. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
- Fernández-Álvarez, H. (2008). Integration in psychotherapy: An approach from Argentina. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 18, 79–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1053-0479.18.1.79>
- Fierro, C., & Di Doménico, C. (2016). Critical pluralism: History of science and debates on education in psychology. *Quaderns de Psicologia*, 18, 27–57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5565/rev/psicologia.1322>
- Fierro, C., Ostrovsky, A., & Di Doménico, C. (in press). Current state of history of psychology teaching and education in Argentina: An empirical bibliometric investigation. *Teaching of Psychology*.
- Fuchs, A. H., & Viney, W. (2002). The course in the history of psychology: Present status and future concerns. *History of Psychology*, 5, 3–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1093-4510.5.1.3>
- Furumoto, L. (1989). The new history of psychology. In I. Cohen (Ed.), *The G. Stanley Hall lecture series* (Vol. 9, pp. 5–34). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gallegos, M. (2010). A Primeira Conferência Latino-Americano Sobre Formação em Psicologia (1974): O Modelo Latino-Americano e seu Significado Histórico [The first Latin American Conference on Training In Psychology (1974): The Latin-American model and its historical significance]. *Psicología: Ciência e Profissão*, 30, 792–809. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1414-98932010000400010>
- Gallegos, M. (2012). *Historia de la Psicología y formación de psicólogos: Un análisis socio-histórico, bibliográfico y curricular de la Psicología en Rosario (1955–2005)* [History of Psychology and Psychology Education: A socio-historical, bibliographic and curricular analysis of Psychology in Rosario (1955–2005)] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National University of Rosario, Argentina.
- Gallegos, M. (2016). Historia de la psicología y formación en psicología en América Latina: Convergencias temáticas [History of Psychology and Psychology Education in Latin America: Thematic Convergences]. *Enseñanza e Investigación en Psicología*, 21, 319–335.
- Gregg, A., Barnard, C. I., Carmichael, L., French, T. M., Hunter, W. S., Thurstone, L. L., . . . Yerkes, R. M. (1970). The place of psychology in an ideal university: The report of the University Commission to advise on the future of psychology at Harvard. *American Psychologist*, 25, 391–410. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0029489>
- Harari, R. (1973). El objeto de la operación del psicólogo [The Object of Psychologists' Operations]. In S. Bricht (Ed.), *El Rol del Psicólogo* (pp. 153–216). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Nueva Visión.
- Hilgard, E., Kelly, E., Luckey, B., Sanford, R., Shaffer, F., & Shakow, D. (1947). Recommended graduate training program in clinical psychology. *American Psychologist*, 2, 539–558. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0058236>

- Keegan, E. (1986). Sobre la Posible Constitución de un Paradigma en Psicología [On the Possible Constitution of a Paradigm in Psychology]. *Espacios y Propuestas*, 6, 28–29.
- Kierbel, V. (2016). Los primeros tiempos de la organización gremial de los psicólogos en la Argentina: El caso de la Asociación de Psicólogos de La Plata (1960–1985) [The Beginnings of Psychologists' Unions in Argentina: The case of the La Plata Psychologists Association]. In A. Viguera (Ed.), *Historias de la psicología y el psicoanálisis en La Plata (1946–1990)* (pp. 57–72). La Plata, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
- Klappenbach, H. (1985). Dificultades epistemológicas en la Psicología [Epistemologic Difficulties in Psychology]. *Espacios y Propuestas*, 4, 8–9.
- Klappenbach, H. (1994). Diferentes tradiciones psicológicas del siglo XIX [Different psychological traditions in the XIX Century]. *Idea*, 14, 63–80.
- Klappenbach, H. (2003). La Globalización y la Enseñanza de la Psicología [Globalization and the Teaching of Psychology]. *Psicología em Estudo*, 8, 3–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-73722003000200002>
- Klappenbach, H. (2004). Psychology in Argentina. In D. Wedding, & M. Stevens (Eds.), *Handbook of international psychology* (pp. 129–150). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Klappenbach, H. (2006). Periodización de la psicología en Argentina [Periodization of Argentinian Psychology]. *Revista de Historia de la Psicología*, 27, 109–164.
- Klappenbach, H. (2007). Professional Psychologist degree in Argentina: From the beginnings to nowadays. In A. Columbus (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research* (Vol. 38, pp. 1–32). New York, NY: Nova Science.
- Klappenbach, H. (2015). La formación universitaria en Psicología en Argentina. Perspectivas actuales y desafíos a la luz de la historia [University Education in Psychology in Argentina: Current Perspectives and Challenges from History]. *Universitas Psychologica*, 14, 937–960. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy14-3.fupa>
- Klappenbach, H., & Jacó-Vilela, A. (2016). The future of the History of Psychology in Argentina and Brazil. *History of Psychology*, 19, 229–247. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hop0000030>
- Korman, G. P., Viotti, N., & Garay, C. J. (2015). The origins and professionalization of cognitive psychotherapy in Argentina. *History of Psychology*, 18, 205–214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038968>
- Krampen, G. (2016). Scientometric trend analyses of publications on the history of psychology: Is psychology becoming an unhistorical science? *Scientometrics*, 106, 1217–1238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-1834-4>
- McGovern, T. (1992). Evolution of undergraduate curricula in psychology, 1892–1992. In A. Puente, J. Matthews, & C. Brewer (Eds.), *Teaching psychology in America: A history* (pp. 13–38). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10120-001>
- Merced, M., Stutman, Z., & Mann, S. (2017). Teaching the history of psychology: A content analysis of course syllabi from doctor of psychology programs. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1475725717729909>
- Mercosur Psychologists' Accreditation Commission. (2001). *Protocolo de la Comisión de Acreditación de los Encuentros Integradores* [Protocol designed by the Accreditation Commission of the Integrative Meetings]. Montevideo, Uruguay: National University of Mar del Plata.
- Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia y Tecnología. (2004). *Resolución 136/04* [Resolution Number 136/04]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: MinCyT.
- Ministerio de Educación, Ciencia, y Tecnología. (2009). *Resolución 343/09* [Resolution Number 343/09]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: MinCyT.
- Pettit, M., & Davidson, I. (2014). Can the history of psychology have an impact? *Theory & Psychology*, 24, 709–716. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354314534005>
- Piacente, T. (1998). Psicoanálisis y formación académica en Psicología [Psychoanalysis and Psychology University Education]. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina*, 44, 278–284.
- Plotkin, M. (2003). El Psicoanálisis y sus Historias [Psychoanalysis and its Histories]. *Psicoanálisis: Revista de la asociación Psicoanalítica de Buenos Aires*, 25, 457–461.
- Psychology Education Committee. (1995). *Conclusions of the Committee on Psychology Education*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: National University of Mar del Plata.
- Rascovsky, A., & Rosenthal, L. (1947). Consideraciones sobre el Desarrollo del Movimiento Psicoanalítico en América Latina [Considerations on the Development of the Psychoanalytical Movement in Latin America]. *Revista de Psicoanálisis*, 4, 646–663.
- Representatives of Psychology Departments of the Mercosur. (1998). *Principios para la Formación de Psicólogos en los Países del Mercosur* [Principles for the Education of

- Psychologists in the Mercosur Countries]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: National University of Mar del Plata.
- Romero, E. (2009). Contribución a la Historia del Movimiento Psicoanalítico [Contribution to the History of the Psychoanalytical Movement]. *Actas del Encuentro Argentino de Historia de la Psiquiatría, la Psicología, y el Psicoanálisis*, 10, 305–312.
- Ruiz, R. (1995). Editorial. *Thésis*, 1, 9–16.
- Rutherford, A., & Pickren, W. (2015). Teaching the history of psychology: Aims, approaches, and debates. In D. Dunn (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of undergraduate psychology education* (pp. 521–532). London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Serroni-Copello, R. (1990). Las investigaciones psicológicas y la universidad desexualizada [Psychological researches and the de-sexualized university]. *Boletín Argentino de Psicología*, 3, 17–20.
- Smith, R. (2016). History of psychology: What for? In S. Klempe & R. Smith (Eds.), *Centrality of history for theory construction in psychology* (pp. 3–28). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42760-7_1
- Sokal, M. M. (1984). History of psychology and history of science: Reflections on two subdisciplines, their relationship, and their convergence. *Revista de Historia de la Psicología*, 5, 337–347.
- Sokal, M. M. (2006). The origins of the new psychology in the United States. *Physis; rivista internazionale di storia della scienza*, 43, 273–300.
- Talak, A. (2009, November). *La científicidad de la psicología reexaminada: Permanencia y problemas del positivismo* [The Scientificity of Psychology Revisited: Permanence and Problems of Positivism]. Paper presented at the II International Congress on Research in Psychology, La Plata, Argentina.
- van Strien, P. (1993). The historical practice of theory construction. In H. van Rappard, P. van Strien, L. Mos, & W. Baker (Eds.), *Annals of theoretical psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 149–227). New York, NY: Plenum Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-2982-8_11
- Ventura, M. (2015). Paradoxes in psychology and psychoanalysis during the dictatorship in Argentina. *Estudos e Pesquisas em Psicologia*, 15, 784–790.
- Vezzetti, H. (1996). Los estudios históricos de la Psicología en la Argentina [Historical Scholarship on Psychology in Argentina]. *Cuadernos de Argentinos de Historia de la Psicología*, 2, 79–93.
- Vezzetti, H. (1998a). *Informe sobre el campo de Psicología: Los posgrados* [Report on Argentinian Psychology Graduate Education]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: CONEAU.
- Vezzetti, H. (1998b). Las psicologías del fin de siglo a la luz de su historia [Psychologies at the end of the century in the light of their history]. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*, 51, 105–114.
- Vezzetti, H. (2007). Historia de la Psicología: Problemas, funciones y objetivos [History of Psychology: Problems, functions and aims]. *Revista de Historia de la Psicología*, 28, 147–166.
- Vilanova, A. (1985). Pluralidad, Desarrollo y Transformación [Plurality, development and transformation]. *Espacios y Propuestas*, 5, 9.
- Vilanova, A. (1987). La carrera de Psicología en la Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata [The Psychology Program at the National University of Mar del Plata]. *Actualidades en Psicología*, 12, 3.
- Vilanova, A. (2003). La psicología como ciencia y como profesión [Psychology as a science and as a profession]. In A. Vilanova (Ed.), *Discusión por la Psicología* (pp. 9–27). Mar del Plata, Argentina: National University of Mar del Plata. (Original work published 1987)
- Vilanova, A. R. (1993). La formación de psicólogos en Iberoamérica [Psychologists' Training and Education in Ibero America]. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina*, 39, 193–205.
- Vilanova, A. (1994). Recusación de lo inefable [Recusation of the ineffable]. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina*, 40, 9–10.
- Vilanova, A. (1995a). Pautas para un Perfil de Psicólogo Iberoamericano [Guidelines for Profiling an Ibero American Psychologist]. In G. Vidal, R. Alarcón, & F. Lolas-Stepke (Eds.), *Enciclopedia Iberoamericana de Psiquiatría* (pp. 666–673). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Panamericana.
- Vilanova, A. (1995b). El Dilema Olvidado de la Psicología Latinoamericana [The Forgotten Dilemma of Latin American Psychology]. *Cuadernos Argentinos de Historia de la Psicología*, 1, 83–99.
- Vilanova, A. (1996). Enseñanza de la Psicología: Historia y problemas fundamentales [The Teaching of Psychology: History and Fundamental Issues]. *Cuadernos Argentinos de Historia de la Psicología*, 2, 199–210.
- Vilanova, A. (1997a). La Historia de la Psicología y susentido curricular [History of Psychology and Its Curricular Function]. *Clepios*, 3, 18–23.
- Vilanova, A. (1997b). El mito del objeto de estudio [The Myth of Psychology's Subject]. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina*, 43, 67–71.

- Vilanova, A. (2000). Diez Problemas en la Historia de la Psicología como Curso de Grado [Ten Problems regarding History of Psychology as an Undergraduate Course]. In J. C. Ríos, R. Ruiz, J. C. Stagnaro, & P. Weissman (Eds.), *Psiquiatría, Psicología y Psicoanálisis. Historia y Memoria* (pp. 143–154). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Polemos.
- Vilanova, A., & Di Doménico, C. (1999). *La psicología en el Cono Sur. Datos para una Historia* [Psychology in the Southern Cone. Data for a History]. Mar del Plata, Argentina: Martín.

Received June 6, 2017

Revision received December 11, 2017

Accepted December 17, 2017 ■