

Portfolio: A Critical Comparative Review of Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky

1700924

Niamh Marvelley

Word Count: 3819

Introduction

Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky remain two of the most influential theorists in developmental psychology and education. Both were born in 1896, but their intellectual paths and cultural contexts differed greatly. Piaget, working in Switzerland, developed a **cognitive developmental theory** based on universal stages of reasoning (Piaget, 1952; 1972). Vygotsky, working in the Soviet Union, developed a **socio-cultural theory** where learning is rooted in language, culture, and interaction with others (Vygotsky, 1978).

Although both thinkers rejected behaviourism and insisted that children are active participants in their learning, they offered contrasting explanations of how development occurs. Piaget argued that cognitive development sets limits on what children can learn at different ages. Vygotsky countered that social interaction and scaffolding could stretch those limits, with learning leading development.

This portfolio critically compares their theories across four sections: historical context, exploration of theories and practices, review of impact, and critical reflections. Rather than treating Piaget and Vygotsky separately, it highlights where their ideas align, where they differ, and how their legacies can be combined for modern education.

1. Historical Context

Piaget's background

Jean Piaget was born in Neuchâtel, Switzerland, in 1896. He originally trained as a biologist, publishing a paper on molluscs at the age of eleven (Burman, 2012). This early scientific background shaped his later psychological work, which sought to map systematic changes in children's reasoning over time. After earning a PhD in zoology, Piaget worked at Alfred Binet's laboratory in Paris, where he helped to standardise IQ tests. He became fascinated not by whether children's answers were right or wrong, but by the patterns of reasoning behind them (Lourenço & Machado, 1996).

Throughout his career, Piaget emphasised that children are not passive recipients of knowledge. Instead, they actively organise their understanding of the world into schemas, which adapt through processes of assimilation and accommodation (Piaget, 1952). In 1955, he founded the International Centre for Genetic Epistemology, which became a hub for studying the development of knowledge (Vidal, 1994).

At the time, behaviourism dominated psychology, particularly in the United States. Behaviourists such as Watson and Skinner argued that learning could be explained as stimulus–response connections shaped by reinforcement. Piaget rejected this, arguing that it ignored the active mental processes of the child (Wadsworth, 2004). His work is therefore best described as cognitivist, focusing on the development of internal mental structures. Although his ideas later inspired constructivist education, Piaget himself was primarily concerned with cognitive development.

Vygotsky's background

Lev Vygotsky was born in the Russian Empire, also in 1896. Unlike Piaget, he studied law, philosophy, and literature before turning to psychology. This interdisciplinary background shaped his interest in culture, history, and language as forces in learning (Van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991).

Vygotsky worked during the early Soviet period, when education was central to building a socialist society. His research explored how schools could transform children's development through guided teaching and participation in cultural practices (Daniels, 2001). His most famous work, *Thought and Language* (1934), argued that cognitive development is rooted in social interaction and mediated by

cultural tools, especially language. Tragically, Vygotsky died of tuberculosis at 37, leaving many of his ideas underdeveloped.

His writings were not widely known outside the Soviet Union until the 1960s, when translations brought them to the West (Wertsch, 1985). Since then, his theory of socio-cultural development has become one of the most influential frameworks in education and psychology.

Comparing contexts

The different contexts of Piaget and Vygotsky help explain their contrasting emphases. Piaget, working in politically stable Switzerland and influenced by biology and philosophy, saw development as a universal, stage-like process driven primarily by internal cognitive changes. Vygotsky, shaped by revolutionary Russia, emphasised education, culture, and collaboration, seeing development as socially and historically situated.

Yet both were united in rejecting behaviourism and treating children as active learners. Piaget highlighted self-discovery and maturation, while Vygotsky stressed the power of guided interaction and culture. Together, their perspectives capture both the internal and external dimensions of learning.

2. Exploration of Theories and Practices

Piaget's theory of cognitive development

Piaget proposed that children progress through four universal stages of cognitive development:

1. **Sensorimotor stage (0–2 years):** Learning occurs through senses and motor actions. Object permanence — understanding that objects continue to exist when unseen — emerges here (Piaget, 1952).
2. **Preoperational stage (2–7 years):** Children develop symbolic thought and language but remain egocentric. Logical reasoning is limited, and tasks like conservation are difficult.
3. **Concrete operational stage (7–11 years):** Logical reasoning about concrete objects develops. Children can conserve, classify, and seriate, but thinking is still tied to tangible experiences.
4. **Formal operational stage (11+ years):** Adolescents can think abstractly, reason hypothetically, and plan systematically (Piaget, 1972).

Piaget described children as “little scientists” who construct knowledge through interaction with their environment. However, his model remained cognitivist, focused on the internal development of reasoning structures. Learning, for him, followed from maturation: teachers should match instruction to the child's stage of readiness.

Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory

Vygotsky disagreed with the idea that development must come first. He argued instead that learning leads development when children are supported in their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) — the distance between what they can do independently and what they can achieve with guidance (Vygotsky, 1978).

Support within the ZPD often takes the form of scaffolding, a term later coined by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976), where adults or peers provide temporary help that is gradually withdrawn as competence grows. Crucially, language is the cultural tool through which this guidance is provided.

Vygotsky introduced the concept of private speech — children’s self-directed talk while solving problems. Unlike Piaget, who saw such speech as evidence of egocentrism, Vygotsky saw it as a crucial step in the internalisation of problem-solving strategies (Vygotsky, 1986). This has been confirmed by later studies, which show that private speech increases during challenging tasks and supports self-regulation (Winsler, 2009).

Comparing the two theories

The contrast is clear: Piaget saw development as universal, stage-like, and internally driven, while Vygotsky saw it as socially mediated and culturally variable. Yet their theories can also complement one another. Piaget provides a developmental map of when certain reasoning abilities tend to emerge, while Vygotsky provides a strategy for stretching those abilities through scaffolding.

For example, a child in Piaget’s concrete operational stage may struggle with abstract algebra. But within Vygotsky’s ZPD, a teacher can use concrete examples and guided questioning to help the child begin to grasp abstract reasoning earlier than Piaget’s stages might predict.

Classroom applications

Piaget’s ideas inspired child-centred, discovery-based learning, where pupils explore, manipulate, and experiment to build knowledge (Brainerd, 1978). In practice, this often means hands-on science experiments or maths activities designed around developmental readiness.

Vygotsky’s ideas underpin collaborative and dialogic learning, where teachers guide discussion, provide scaffolding, and use group work to extend thinking (Mercer & Littleton, 2007). Classrooms influenced by his approach emphasise talk, peer tutoring, and guided play.

Modern classrooms frequently combine both. For instance, in primary maths, Piaget’s principle of readiness may guide when algebra is introduced, but Vygotskian scaffolding supports children to progress beyond their current stage through modelling and peer support.

Critiques

Both theories face criticisms. Piaget has been accused of underestimating children’s abilities, partly because his tasks were abstract and unfamiliar (Donaldson, 1978). His reliance on small, unrepresentative samples also raises questions about generalisability. Moreover, cross-cultural research shows that cognitive development is not as uniform as he suggested (Cole, 1996).

Vygotsky, meanwhile, left many ideas underdeveloped due to his early death. The ZPD is powerful but vague, and teachers often struggle to identify it precisely (Chaiklin, 2003). His strong emphasis on social learning may also underplay the role of individual exploration, which Piaget rightly highlighted.

Together, their theories balance one another: Piaget reminds us of the cognitive limits shaped by age, while Vygotsky reminds us that those limits are flexible and can be extended through social support.

3. Review of Impact

Impact on Psychology

Jean Piaget fundamentally redefined developmental psychology by demonstrating that children think in ways that are qualitatively different from adults. Before Piaget, children were often regarded as “miniature adults,” expected to reason and understand the world in the same way as grown-ups. Piaget’s research on tasks such as conservation, classification, and seriation revealed that children’s reasoning develops in predictable stages and that errors often reveal the logic of their thought rather than simple mistakes (Smith et al., 2015; Lourenço & Machado, 1996). This perspective shifted the focus of psychology from purely behavioural measures to an appreciation of internal cognitive processes, laying the groundwork for modern cognitive developmental psychology.

Piaget’s work has influenced decades of empirical research, from studies on object permanence and symbolic thought in infancy to investigations into formal operational reasoning in adolescence. Researchers have built on his frameworks to explore areas such as problem-solving, moral reasoning, and metacognition (Wadsworth, 2004; Brainerd, 1978). His approach encouraged psychologists to investigate not only what children know, but how they come to know it, fundamentally altering experimental designs and methodologies in developmental research.

Lev Vygotsky’s influence, while emerging later in the West, has been equally transformative. By emphasising the social and cultural mediation of cognition, Vygotsky challenged Piaget’s stage-focused, individualist perspective. His concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) highlighted that development is not strictly age-bound, but can be extended through guided participation, collaboration, and cultural tools (Vygotsky, 1978; Daniels, 2001). Vygotsky’s work has been particularly influential in areas such as cultural psychology, language development, and self-regulation, demonstrating that thinking is inherently social and context-dependent (Rogoff, 1990; Cole, 1996).

Today, most developmental psychologists adopt a synthesised perspective, recognising both the role of biological maturation, as emphasised by Piaget, and the influence of social and cultural context, as emphasised by Vygotsky. This integrative approach has informed studies on topics ranging from executive function and metacognition to peer-mediated learning and cognitive scaffolding, reflecting a more nuanced understanding of how children develop thinking skills in real-world contexts (Winsler, 2009; Mercer & Littleton, 2007).

Impact on Education

Piaget’s influence on education is most evident in approaches that emphasise developmentally appropriate, hands-on learning. In literacy, for example, younger children in the preoperational stage benefit from storytelling, role-play, and symbolic play, which allow them to engage with language and narrative structures in ways that align with their cognitive abilities (Piaget, 1952). In numeracy, children in the concrete operational stage develop skills such as classification, seriation, and conservation through practical activities using manipulatives like blocks, counters, or measuring tools (Brainerd, 1978). In science, Piagetian approaches encourage exploration and experimentation, such as observing plant growth or simple physics experiments, allowing children to construct knowledge based on direct experience. Across subjects, the focus is on active, discovery-based learning that matches the learner’s stage of cognitive development, ensuring that tasks are neither too easy nor too abstract.

Vygotsky complements this by emphasising socially mediated learning, guided instruction, and scaffolding. In literacy, teachers may facilitate shared reading sessions where children discuss characters, predict outcomes, or compare events in the story, modelling higher-level thinking and gradually transferring responsibility for comprehension to the pupils themselves (Mercer, 2000). In

numeracy, peer-assisted problem-solving allows children to verbalise their reasoning, negotiate strategies, and receive guidance from teachers or classmates, effectively extending their understanding beyond what they could achieve independently (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). In science, Vygotskian approaches might involve collaborative experiments, where pupils work in groups to design investigations, discuss hypotheses, and record findings, receiving guidance on methodology and reasoning from the teacher.

Integrating Piagetian and Vygotskian principles ensures that teaching is both cognitively appropriate and socially enriched. For example:

- In a mathematics lesson on fractions, younger children may first use tangible objects such as pizza slices or fraction bars to understand part-whole relationships (Piagetian concrete exploration). They then work in pairs or small groups to solve fraction problems verbally, explaining their reasoning and receiving support from peers and the teacher (Vygotskian scaffolding).
- In a literacy lesson, children may initially write or draw independently to express ideas about a story (Piagetian focus on individual construction of knowledge) before participating in guided discussion to evaluate alternative interpretations or explore cultural themes within the text (Vygotskian emphasis on dialogue and social mediation).
- In a science lesson on ecosystems, pupils might explore a small habitat independently to observe patterns and relationships (Piagetian discovery learning), followed by a group discussion where they share observations, receive guidance from the teacher, and co-construct explanations using scientific language (Vygotskian collaborative learning).

Research supports the effectiveness of this combined approach. Studies show that scaffolded collaboration improves both conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills, while developmentally appropriate tasks ensure that learning is achievable and engaging (Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Winsler, 2009). By integrating Piagetian and Vygotskian strategies, teachers can differentiate instruction, challenge pupils within their ZPD, and foster independent as well as collaborative learning.

Furthermore, the integration of these approaches aligns with contemporary educational frameworks. For instance, the Curriculum for Wales (2022) encourages activities that are hands-on and exploratory (Piagetian) while also emphasising dialogue, collaboration, and reflection (Vygotskian), demonstrating the practical application of both theories. Similarly, UNESCO's guidelines on education for sustainable development advocate learning experiences that are active, participatory, and socially and culturally contextualised, reflecting the combined influence of Piaget and Vygotsky (UNESCO, 2015).

In summary, modern education benefits from a dynamic interplay between Piagetian and Vygotskian approaches. Piaget provides guidance on developmentally appropriate content and independent exploration, while Vygotsky provides methods for extending learning through social interaction, scaffolding, and cultural tools. Together, these theories offer a robust, evidence-based foundation for teaching across subjects, fostering both cognitive growth and social competence in learners.

Impact on Curriculum and Policy

Piagetian principles are evident in early years frameworks across the UK and internationally, emphasising active learning, exploration, and play. These approaches prioritise developmentally

appropriate content and encourage children to experiment, hypothesise, and solve problems in ways consistent with their cognitive stage (Curriculum for Wales, 2022).

Vygotsky's socio-cultural approach is particularly influential in curricula that prioritise collaboration, dialogue, and cultural relevance. The Curriculum for Wales (2022), for example, explicitly highlights communication, collaboration, and cultural identity, reflecting Vygotskian principles of social mediation in learning. Globally, UNESCO's policies on education for sustainable development integrate both Piagetian and Vygotskian insights, promoting active, child-centred engagement alongside dialogue and intercultural collaboration (UNESCO, 2015).

By embedding these theories in policy and practice, educators are encouraged to design learning experiences that are both developmentally appropriate and socially mediated, recognising the complementary contributions of both theorists. For instance, project-based learning may require students to investigate problems individually or in small groups (Piagetian exploration), while also collaborating with peers, receiving guidance from teachers, and drawing on cultural resources (Vygotskian scaffolding).

Critiques of Their Impact

While both Piaget and Vygotsky have had profound influence on education and psychology, the way their theories have been applied in practice reveals several limitations.

Piagetian application: One common critique concerns the rigidity with which Piaget's stages are sometimes interpreted in classrooms. Teachers may assume that children are "incapable" of understanding certain concepts until they reach the relevant stage, such as expecting formal operational thinking only after age 11 (Donaldson, 1978). This can inadvertently lower expectations, limiting opportunities for pupils to engage in more challenging tasks or explore advanced ideas. Research shows that children can succeed in tasks previously deemed "beyond their stage" when presented in familiar or meaningful contexts (Donaldson, 1978; Lourenço & Machado, 1996).

Additionally, the stage model may encourage teachers to focus solely on individual readiness, potentially overlooking the benefits of social interaction. For example, a child struggling with a conservation task may succeed if peers explain their reasoning collaboratively — an approach Piaget's theory does not explicitly account for.

Vygotskian application: Conversely, Vygotsky's theory is sometimes criticised for being conceptually vague or inconsistently implemented. While the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and scaffolding provide theoretical guidance, in practice they are often treated superficially as teaching buzzwords (Chaiklin, 2003). Teachers may provide support indiscriminately, failing to identify each child's ZPD or gradually withdraw assistance, leading to dependency rather than independent problem-solving. Overemphasis on social learning may also neglect individual cognitive development, limiting opportunities for reflection and independent reasoning.

Balancing Piaget and Vygotsky in practice: These critiques highlight the need for a balanced approach. Piaget provides an important reminder of developmental limits, while Vygotsky demonstrates that those limits are flexible and can be extended with structured guidance. Effective classrooms integrate both perspectives, respecting current abilities while stretching potential through collaboration, dialogue, and scaffolding.

Summary Table: Piaget vs. Vygotsky in Practice

Aspect	Piaget (Cognitivist)	Vygotsky (Social Constructivist)
Core idea	Children progress through universal cognitive stages; development drives learning.	Learning is socially mediated; social interaction and culture drive development.
Strengths	- Detailed stage-based framework for cognitive readiness - Explains how thinking evolves - Emphasises active exploration and individual construction of knowledge	- Emphasises social, collaborative, and culturally relevant learning - ZPD and scaffolding provide practical teaching strategies - Highlights the role of language and culture in thinking
Limitations	- Can underestimate children's capabilities - Stage rigidity may limit flexibility in teaching - Limited attention to social and cultural factors	- ZPD and scaffolding can be vaguely applied - Risk of over-reliance on guidance, limiting independent thinking - Early death left some concepts underdeveloped
Classroom applications	- Discovery-based, hands-on learning - Age-appropriate tasks matched to developmental stages - Focus on independent problem-solving	- Collaborative learning, peer tutoring, and guided discussion - Scaffolded tasks within the ZPD - Emphasis on dialogue, cultural relevance, and social interaction
Potential pitfalls	- Teachers may lower expectations by strictly following stages - Neglects benefits of social learning	- Teachers may provide support unevenly or without planning - Overemphasis on group work may reduce independent reasoning
Balanced approach	Use Piaget to assess readiness and plan appropriate tasks	Use Vygotsky to extend learning through scaffolding and collaboration
Integration in practice	Example: Hands-on maths or science exploration individually	Example: Guided peer discussion to solve complex problems or internalise strategies
Educational takeaway	Provides a cognitive map of what children can do alone	Provides strategies to help children reach beyond their current ability

By combining these perspectives, educators can create classrooms that respect developmental stages while actively extending learning through guided social interaction. For instance, in a literacy lesson, pupils might first analyse a text independently (Piagetian), then engage in a structured group discussion to explore multiple interpretations and scaffold understanding (Vygotskian). This approach mitigates the weaknesses of each theory while capitalising on their strengths.

4. Critical Reflections

Strengths of Piaget and Vygotsky

Both Piaget and Vygotsky offer enduring insights, but their strengths lie in different areas.

Piaget's strengths are primarily in his detailed mapping of cognitive development. His four-stage model provides a clear framework to understand how reasoning abilities change with age. This helps educators plan lessons that align with children's cognitive readiness (Piaget, 1972). His concepts of schemas, assimilation, accommodation, and equilibration offer a robust explanation of how children actively construct knowledge from their experiences (Piaget, 1977).

Vygotsky's strengths lie in his socio-cultural perspective. His ideas of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and scaffolding provide practical guidance for teaching and extending children's abilities beyond their current level (Vygotsky, 1978; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). By emphasising language, culture, and social interaction, Vygotsky highlights aspects of learning that Piaget largely overlooked. Modern research supports this: collaborative dialogue, guided play, and peer interaction improve reasoning, problem-solving, and self-regulation (Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Winsler, 2009).

When combined, the two theories offer a complementary view. Piaget identifies what children are developmentally ready to learn, while Vygotsky shows how social support can extend that learning. This integrated approach helps teachers challenge pupils appropriately without overwhelming them.

Limitations and criticisms

Despite their contributions, both theorists have limitations.

Piaget's limitations include:

- **Underestimation of children:** Research has shown that children can perform tasks earlier than Piaget suggested when contexts are meaningful (Donaldson, 1978).
- **Cultural assumptions:** Piaget's theory assumes universal stages, but development varies across cultural contexts (Cole, 1996).
- **Practical rigidity:** Over-reliance on stages can lead to inflexible teaching that underestimates individual potential.

Vygotsky's limitations include:

- **Vagueness of the ZPD:** Teachers often find it difficult to identify and apply the optimal level of support (Chaiklin, 2003).
- **Incomplete theory:** Because Vygotsky died young, many of his ideas are broad and require interpretation.
- **Potential underemphasis on independent learning:** His strong focus on social guidance risks neglecting the value of self-directed exploration, which Piaget emphasises.

These critiques highlight that neither theory should be used in isolation. Piaget's stage-based insights ensure learning tasks are developmentally appropriate, while Vygotsky's socio-cultural lens emphasises guidance, collaboration, and the influence of context. Together, they provide a more balanced approach.

Similarities and integration

Despite differences, there are **key similarities**:

- Both reject behaviourist views of passive learning, emphasising active participation.
- Both recognise that children construct knowledge rather than simply receiving it.
- Both have influenced curriculum design, research, and classroom practice worldwide.

Integrating their insights can strengthen pedagogy. For instance, a primary classroom might:

1. Use Piagetian principles to assess developmental readiness and plan age-appropriate content.
2. Apply Vygotskian scaffolding to support learners within the ZPD, using peer discussion and teacher guidance.
3. Encourage both independent exploration and collaborative problem-solving, blending cognitive and socio-cultural approaches.

Implications for modern education

The Piaget–Vygotsky synthesis has several practical implications:

- **Differentiated instruction:** Piaget reminds teachers to account for developmental stages, avoiding tasks that are too abstract or simplistic.
- **Guided learning and scaffolding:** Vygotsky emphasises collaboration, dialogue, and cultural relevance in learning activities.
- **Curriculum design:** Curriculum frameworks, such as the **Curriculum for Wales (2022)**, reflect both perspectives by promoting active, discovery-based learning alongside collaboration and cultural engagement.
- **Assessment:** Understanding both theories encourages teachers to assess not just what children can do independently (Piaget) but also what they can achieve with support (Vygotsky).

Recommendations

From this review, several recommendations emerge:

1. **Balance developmental readiness with challenge:** Use Piaget to set realistic expectations and Vygotsky to extend learning through scaffolding.
2. **Incorporate collaborative activities:** Structured peer work and guided discussion help children internalise strategies and cultural knowledge.
3. **Value both independence and guidance:** Encourage self-directed exploration while providing support to stretch capabilities.
4. **Be culturally responsive:** Recognise that development and learning are influenced by cultural context, in line with Vygotsky's socio-cultural insights.
5. **Ongoing professional development:** Teachers need training to apply scaffolding effectively and to recognise the nuances of cognitive development stages.

Conclusion

Piaget and Vygotsky remain central to understanding child development. Piaget's cognitivist approach explains how thinking evolves in stages and provides insight into children's cognitive readiness. Vygotsky's social constructivist perspective highlights how culture, language, and collaboration drive learning.

Critically, neither theory is sufficient alone. Piaget can underestimate what children can achieve with support, while Vygotsky may underplay the role of individual cognitive readiness. Combining their ideas offers educators a nuanced, flexible approach: respecting developmental limits while using social and cultural tools to expand learning.

Modern classrooms, research, and policy continue to reflect this integration. Theories once seen as opposing — one stage-based, one social — now inform complementary strategies, demonstrating the lasting value of both Piaget and Vygotsky in shaping effective education.

References

- Alexander, R. (2017) *Dialogic Teaching: Re-thinking Classroom Talk*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Brainerd, C. J. (1978) *Piaget's Theory of Intelligence*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Burman, J. T. (2012) 'Piaget, Jean', in *Encyclopedia of Creativity*. London: Academic Press.
- Chaiklin, S. (2003) 'The Zone of Proximal Development in Vygotsky's Analysis of Learning and Instruction', in Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V. S. and Miller, S. M. (eds.) *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 39–64.
- Cole, M. (1996) *Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Curriculum for Wales (2022) *Curriculum for Wales: Guidance for Practitioners*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
- Daniels, H. (2001) *Vygotsky and Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
- Donaldson, M. (1978) *Children's Minds*. London: Fontana.
- Fosnot, C. T. (2013) *Constructivism: Theory, Perspectives, and Practice*. 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lourenço, O. and Machado, A. (1996) 'In Defence of Piaget's Theory: A Reply to 10 Common Criticisms', *Psychological Review*, 103(1), pp. 143–164.
- Mercer, N. (2000) *Words and Minds: How We Use Language to Think Together*. London: Routledge.
- Mercer, N. and Littleton, K. (2007) *Dialogue and the Development of Children's Thinking: A Sociocultural Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Piaget, J. (1952) *The Origins of Intelligence in Children*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Piaget, J. (1955) *The Construction of Reality in the Child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Piaget, J. (1972) *The Psychology of the Child*. New York: Basic Books.

- Piaget, J. (1977) *The Development of Thought: Equilibration of Cognitive Structures*. New York: Viking Press.
- Plowden, B. (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools: Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. London: HMSO.
- Rogoff, B. (1990) *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simon, B. (1981) *Education and the Social Order: British Education Since 1944*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Smith, P. K., Cowie, H. and Blades, M. (2015) *Understanding Children's Development*. 5th ed. London: Wiley.
- UNESCO (2015) *Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning Objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Van der Veer, R. and Valsiner, J. (1991) *Understanding Vygotsky: A Quest for Synthesis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986) *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wadsworth, B. J. (2004) *Piaget's Theory of Cognitive and Affective Development*. 5th ed. London: Pearson.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985) *Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Winsler, A. (2009) 'Private Speech in the Classroom: Implications for Self-Regulation and Learning', *Early Education and Development*, 20(1), pp. 7–27.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S. and Ross, G. (1976) 'The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving', *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), pp. 89–100.