



The body is a voice, but not in Physical Education: understandings about the body in teacher education¹

Daniella Rocha Bittencourt 
Pará State University, Belém, PA, Brazil

Lucélia de Moraes Braga Bassalo 
Pará State University, Belém, PA, Brazil

Abstract

The transit of senses and meanings that emerge from the understanding of Physical Education students about the body and, more specifically, about the body in the field of activity and training in Physical Education is what moves the fabric of this article. It is a qualitative reconstructive investigation that intended to outline the meanings of the body and, more specifically, about the body in the field of Physical Education in dialogue with Social Phenomenology. For the data collection, we opted for the Narrative Interview and Documentary Method. The research subjects were students, from a public university in the city of Belém, Pará, Brazil. The results denote a dispute of conceptions about the body that are outlined based on biological nature and social and cultural markers indicating weaknesses in the object of study of Physical Education, the body.

Keywords

Teacher education. Body. Physical Education.

O corpo é voz, mas na Educação Física não: compreensões sobre corpo na formação docente

Resumo

O trânsito de sentidos e significados que emergem dos entendimentos de estudantes de Educação de Física sobre o corpo e, mais especificamente, sobre o corpo no campo de atuação e formação na Educação Física é o que move a tessitura deste artigo. Trata-se de uma investigação qualitativa reconstrutiva que intencionou delinear os significados do corpo e, mais especificamente, sobre o corpo no campo da Educação Física dialogando com a Fenomenologia Social. Para a reunião de dados, optou-se pela Entrevista Narrativa e, para a análise, o Método Documentário. Os sujeitos da pesquisa foram estudantes de uma universidade pública do município de Belém, Pará. Os resultados denotam uma disputa de concepções sobre o corpo que se delineiam a partir da natureza biológica e de marcadores sociais e culturais, indicando fragilidades sobre o objeto de estudo da Educação Física, o corpo.

Palavras-chave

Formação de Professores/as. Corpo. Educação Física.

¹ Versão em inglês traduzida originalmente do inglês por Marina Lima Pompeu.

**El cuerpo es voz, pero no en Educación Física:
entendimientos sobre el cuerpo en la formación docente**

Resumen

El tránsito de los sentidos y los significados que surgen de la comprensión de los estudiantes de Educación Física sobre el cuerpo y, más específicamente, sobre el cuerpo en el campo de la actividad y el entrenamiento en Educación Física es lo que mueve el tejido de este artículo. Es una investigación reconstructiva cualitativa que pretende esbozar los significados del cuerpo y, más específicamente, sobre el cuerpo en el campo de la Educación Física en diálogo con la Fenomenología Social. Para la recolección de datos, se optó por la entrevista narrativa y, para el análisis, el método documental. Los sujetos de investigación fueron estudiantes de una universidad pública de la ciudad de Belém, Pará, Brasil. Los resultados denotan una disputa de concepciones sobre el cuerpo que se describen en función de la naturaleza biológica y los marcadores sociales y culturales que indican debilidades en el objeto de estudio de la Educación Física, el cuerpo.

Palabras clave

Formación del profesorado. Cuerpo. Educación Física.

1 Introduction

Education - specifically, higher education - is a field full of contradictions and disputes, because, while it can disseminate a classificatory and regulatory education, it can also work in the perspective to recognize the diversity of bodies and subjects. Physical Education, as part of this process, has also developed following these disputes.

Consequently, there is a conception that starts from an image of a universalized, idealized and mechanized body that disregards the multiplicity of bodies and forms of expression that demands a specific idealized body and movement considered envisioned by society. On the other hand, there is also a conception that aims to teach Physical Education using a plural and an emancipatory perspective that sees the subject as an active participant in the process of construction and assimilation of body practices and the meaning of the body.

Faced with this impasse, it becomes clear that the body isn't only a biological composition, it's also outlined in social structure, and it's built in and by history/culture. Taking post-structuralist theorists as inspiration, it can be said that the body is an element in the power relations and a permanent target of the disciplinarization process, because,

amid contradictions, it's strained at times towards mechanization and generalization, at times towards plurality and emancipation.

Regarding the training Physical Education teachers, they're constantly targets of regulations of power that intend to determine social places and ways of acting that hierarchize and designate which bodies are adequate and which are divergent, so that such decisions affect the students, their bodies, and their actions on other bodies at the end of graduation.

Based on the perception of this dynamic, the question about how Physical Education students perceive the body involved in Physical Education was a challenge to understanding in the research about gender relations in Physical Education teacher training. The investigation was turned towards the Amazon region of Pará, searching for the singularities that highlight the senses and meanings of what the body is and mainly of what the body is in Physical Education, from the perspectives of the students of a Physical Education course that has already existed for 50 years. Such fact denotes historicity, trajectory, and legitimation of training present in the different generations of teachers for the state and perhaps for the region. This article presents a part of these results and focuses on the way Physical Education students understand the body.

Thus, the flow of senses and meanings that emerge from the understanding of Physical Education students about the body, specifically about the body in the field of activity and training in Physical Education, is what this text is about.

2 Research path

The qualitative reconstructive approach was adopted as a methodological procedure, considering that the everyday experience, as stated by Bohnsack (2020, p. 34), “[...] is symbolically structured, it consists of symbolic constructions, even within the scope of routine actions, pre-theoretical or atheistic actions”, as well as the focus on Alfred Schütz's (1970) Social Phenomenology. The data collection was based on the Narrative Interview as proposed by Fritz Schütze (2013), and, for the analysis and interpretation of the narratives, the Documentary Method, proposed by Karl Mannheim and adapted by Ralf Bohnsack (BOHNSACK; WELLER, 2013).

Social Phenomenology allows to access, using the students' daily experiences about the body in Physical Education, a universe of senses and meanings, thus understanding the living world (Lebenswelt). Alfred Schütz, according to Weller and Zardo (2013), focuses on understanding what is the meaning of the world in the everyday life, on the way people interact daily, that is, Social Phenomenology turns to the world of common sense, the intersubjective world that the subject experiences in the course of their existence in the scenario of life and social action.

To achieve the students' understanding of the body and to see this phenomenon authentically, the data collection technique adopted was the Narrative Interview, as it allows access to the subjects in their trajectories and biographies and to understand the arrangements of the experiences promoted for teacher training in Physical Education concerning the body.

To interpret these narratives, the Documentary Method was chosen, as it allows access to the meanings elicited from the subjects' narratives and the meanings raised by their understandings about the body in Physical Education. The Documentary Method points out a path for the analysis and interpretation of the “[...] singularity of concrete experiences, which need a theoretical analysis” (WELLER et al., 2002, p. 378), in this case, is how students of a Physical Education undergrad course conceive the body and its nuances.

The method consists of different stages to achieve the reconstruction of the elements that guide the subjects' motivation and action, identifying the set of elements that make up an orientation model or the “frame of reference” (BOHNSACK; WELLER, 2013). To maintain the oral elements in the written text, the method uses a set of codes for transcription, as indicated by Weller (2005), replacing punctuation marks.

The stages allow the understanding to be provoked and envision the transition from the immanent sense to the documentary sense, what's called formulated interpretation and reflected interpretation, carried out as recommended by Weller and Otte (2014). The formulated interpretation started with the transcription and codification of all interviews, the identification of focus metaphors (SILVA, 2019) related to the research objectives, and the rewriting of oral data so that even those who aren't familiar with the context can understand it. At this point, comments, comparisons, or information unrelated to the speeches aren't made as a way to access the immanent meaning. The

next stage, the reflected interpretation, analyzed the content and elements present in the transcribed speeches, instigating a process of identification of positions or the way the body was treated or elaborated by the students, who make up the “frame of reference” that guides how they speak. The comprehension process at this stage makes use of both the empirical context, particularly in this investigation about university education, as well as the available theoretical knowledge.

After these two stages, a comparative analysis was carried out, to compare different subjects interviews looking for similarities, patterns, and particular aspects or “[...] to what extent the frames of reference that they guide how a given theme or problem was narrated have similarities or differences” (WELLER; OTTE, 2014, p. 329) and constitute the comparative tertius (WELLER, 2005), that is, it seeks to perceive contrasts between supposed similar cases.

Students enrolled in the seventh or eighth semester of the Physical Education Course at the State University of Pará (CEDF-UEPA) were the participants of this research, specifically students from Campus III, located in the capital of Pará, Belém. Thus, the corpus is composed of oral data obtained from eight students, four men and four women, at least one man, and one woman from each of the three shifts in which the undergrad course is offered (morning, afternoon, and night). This detail contributed significantly so that one could perceive possible contrasts between subjects from the same social environment.

The terms of the study and the ethical principles of research were presented and the participants signed the Free and Informed Consent Form. Because of the ethics that guide research with human beings, identities were kept confidential. As a resource for anonymity, the Documentary Method orientation of using the letters of the alphabet was adopted. The women are, therefore, identified by the letter “f” (female) and the men by the letter “m” (male), so that the positions of four women (Bf, Df, Ef, and Hf) and four men (Am, Cm, Fm, and Gm) are presented in this text who are Physical Education students and who form the orientation model called “binarism”.

3 Body, Physical Education and Teacher Training

The meanings of the body are produced and reproduced in different spaces and times. To think about the body is to think about it within a culture, with marks and signs of

belonging to a certain place. It can be said that the body goes beyond its biological functions, it's a construct of multiplicities and historical possibilities that guide the senses of what it is and how it should be.

To understand the body, according to Abreu, Sabóia, and Nobrega-Therrien (2019), it is necessary to consider the social reality in which it's inserted as well as the aspects that comprise education, politics, and culture, in addition to reflecting about this body surrounded by ethical and aesthetic issues that interrelate and dialogue. The social places and the positions that the subjects occupy, as stated by Louro (2018), express their bodies, because they are what they are due to culture and the way it's signified within a society.

According to Foucault (2014), these social positions are inscribed on bodies through a series of normative mechanisms designed to make one believe that they were born that way. There are several ways, techniques, and tactics that invest and subject the body to ceremonies that regulate the body to emanate constant signals that maintain the control of each body at the same level of mechanics, gestures, acts, movements.

The control of bodies is evident in Physical Education. At all times, the students' bodies are corrected, arranged according to a certain type and in a certain space, with precise, determined and institutionalized movements. According to Soares (2012, p. 7), “[...] Physical Education will become a valuable asset to discipline the will, of adapting [...] the gestures and attitudes necessary to maintain order. It will be organically linked to the biologized social”.

It is possible to notice that Physical Education and, coming from its standpoint, the rationalized body is seen only within its biological limits. The explanations about bodily practices are closely linked to biologized and biological explanations of the body with meticulously calculated techniques. These techniques, according to Yazbek (2015), are closely involved in the process of formation of the subject and their bodies and are applied as a form of detailed control of the body, which means that there are social practices imbued with power that inform and try to place effectively each subject in a certain place.

For Foucault (2014), this is the performance of the power that affects the body, as it involves improving and training the bodies of the subjects so that they become useful for the system, so the power works the body in its interior so that it can manipulate its

elements and produce desired behaviors. For this author, the body is immersed in a tight political field that imposes obligations and limitations. The body is imprisoned in a “system of subjection” that does not concern “[...] exactly the science of its functioning”, but of “[...] a control of its forces that is more than the capacity to overcome them” (FOUCAULT, 2014, p. 29-30).

In Foucault's theory, disciplining of bodies occurs mainly in institutions such as schools, hospitals, and in the military. In these places, people are enrolled and distributed according to a form and are constantly under the supervision of others and themselves so that they correspond to the expectations created around their bodies. In this sense, as stated by Louro, Felipe, and Goellner (2013, p. 7), “[...] spaces and social instances, teach ways of being in the world; [...] establish hierarchies, classify, approve and disapprove of bodies and appearances; sanction and penalize behaviors”.

In Physical Education, as stated by Louro (2014), students are, in most cases, arranged in rows and are made to perform repetitive movements to achieve perfect technical gestures, which denotes a strong relationship with constant examination and discipline of bodies. This means that bodies are built amid power relations, a set of truths that establish what is normal/abnormal, right/wrong, and excluding those who are judged negatively.

According to Goellner (2013), the production of the body is both individual and collective, as it's a practice inscribed in a historical and cultural context. On the other hand, it isn't inert to a time or way, it's always possible to react, either through acceptance or resistance. The fact is that, for the author, the body “[...] is a political field, because the body itself is a biopolitical unit” (GOELLNER, 2013, p. 41).

From the point of view of the collective production of the body, it's possible to perceive that it's a field of disputes that highlighted the meanings of what is considered appropriate for a given time and space. In this way, students of Physical Education, as future teachers, are undoubtedly involved in this process and assume an important place in the perspective of the production of speeches about the body and how Physical Education is taught in school.

For Ludorf (2009), Physical Education teachers can be considered as educators, because they have a social role in the formation and contribution of socio-cultural, subjective, and political values. Besides, Silva and Moreira (2021) point out that, when Physical Education teachers participate and get involved in the elaboration of the school project, the chances of meeting the expectations and interests of the school community can materialize in the pedagogical practice. This means that the active teacher in a school can hear, transfer and affect the interests of students, among which the demands related to the body and its manifestations, so that only Physical Education will be able to perceive the nuances involved with greater sensitivity.

This way, the conceptions of the body and the training of Physical Education teachers are interwoven, in such a way that they're present in the worldviews of students in an area in which the object of study and their practices are related to and with the body, reflecting about the body and its practices becomes a way to break with the imposed educational standards that delegitimize it as a means of learning and integral constitution of critical and democratic knowledge, as indicated by Rodrigues and Couto (2020).

4 The body is voice

As it already was pointed out, the orientation model called “binarism” resulted from the comparative tertius outlined from the interviews carried out with the students of the Physical Education undergrad course. The identified positions refer to how they understand the body both from a more general and a more specific point of view, related to the body in Physical Education.

It's interesting to emphasize that the question about how they understood the body - and more specifically the body in Physical Education -, among all the themes proposed in the interview (because the research also dealt with other themes), wasn't a simple request for the participants, so they pointed it out as the most complex. It's surprising that, even though the body is the aim of Physical Education, this has been such a poorly thought out topic (although it has been studied a lot), to the point that the graduates had difficulties in associating the body with their area of activity or their own lives.

4.1 The body

The comparison of how the participants understood the body made five positions emerge from the narrative interviews. The first position, called “the body is yours”, which from the narratives of Am and Df. In an attempt to explain the way they understand the body, Am says:

The body is personal the body (2) is the body you:: I think the body is personal we view the body as (.) It is: it is a conductor or something of the movement, some motor of the movement (.) but I think that the body is = is the person the person does with the body whatever they want (2) I believe that the body is yours be your own:: a refuge of yours something that you are sure is yours (2) this is it.

This student sees the body as “personal” and repeats the term “yours” four times, making it clear that he perceives the body as subjective and tracing this thought from an idea that puts the subject as the owner of himself, free to do what “want” since it's his “own”, that is, it is your property.

Similarly, Df states that:

The body (2) for me it :: isn't ... we are not going to say that it is an object but it is like (.) If it were ... it is as if it were your object that you could use it in any way you want for example: for dance there are people who :: in my case I prefer to use the part of my corporeality for dance and :: [...] for me the body is just a way for you to express yourself so much it doesn't matter if .. is: the biotype, but what you like to do with it, what you intend to do..

Initially, the student states that the body “isn't an object”, but goes back and says that it's “if it were”, using the possessive pronoun “yours” to express the body's belonging to the subject. Similar to student Am, student Df states that you can “use” the body in the “way” that you “want”. This expression presents the idea of freedoms and “preferences” in the use of the body that is independent of the physical structure or the biotype.

In both narratives, the idea of freedom linked to the body can be observed, in which the subject has a right over themselves and their body is configured as the way to express this right so that each person presents their preferences, tastes, and actions using their body. Thus, the narratives of Am and Df demonstrate their understanding that the body is something individual.

The second position on the meaning of body emanates from Bf's narrative, in which her understanding is linked to religiosity. This positioning was called "the body is a temple". She points out:

Look, for me at the body (2) let's say like this (.) It is an instrument, right It is what moves us when we are going to do things but going to other ways of thinking (2) is: if we look at it it, it isn't @nothing@ it's nothing because we are we die the body goes six feet under:: we turn to dust there is no way but it is :: the body in my view it's a temple of = do in my religion the temple of the holy spirit so everything I do like that everything I see I always look for ... Of course I'm not perfect right we are not perfect but it is :: to glorify God so to have a purpose right So ã :: ã you have to always have this ... this care, even passing it on to the student is :: what is the body's vision for them, right? the question of valorization [...] there are many people who sometimes get lost take care more than body the question of the object but they do not take care of the mind, right. Of your psychological and then it becomes just an object does not become something of value, right. As part of you ... it is :: of your life, right.

Stating that the body is an "instrument" and that it's what "moves us", it reflects the discourse on the mechanics of the body. However, one can perceive the relevance that "other views" have on the interviewee's understanding, as she starts to talk, from a religious perspective, that the body is "nothing". By using this term, it ensures an unholy view of the body, which has little or no meaning for religion, since it "goes six feet under" and "turns to dust". Because it's insignificant, the body must feed the values of religion, that is, be "temple", "glorify" and have "a purpose" that pleases God, making it worthy of "appreciation"; if the body is given priority, it loses its "value" and becomes an "object". You can see the definition of a body linked to religious conventions in this section, so the body cannot express its wishes or consider itself free, but only make a home of values and obedience to the divine will.

In the third position, called "from micro to macro", are the narratives of Cm and Ef, which point out that the body is more than anatomical aspects. Cm said the following:

The body would be an object of study for Physical Education but not only from the biological body when I think when we treat the body, but we also have to treat it from micro to macro, that is, at a physiological level at social levels, that is, you have to understand the body as a very complex being composed of several factors, many things will influence how this body will interact with itself and with others.

For this student, the body is the central axis of the Physical Education and uses the expression "not only" to ensure that his understanding is multifactorial, that the body is for the student both "at a physiological level" and at "social levels" and that the body is

“complex”. From Cm's speech, it can be identified that he perceives the body beyond anatomical and physiological aspects and sees it as a body that interacts “with itself and with others”. Similarly, Ef points out:

Well (.) the body for me nowadays, right with (2) the possibility that I had here within the course of learning from people who are references in talking about the body is that in addition to the physiological, you know, it is as way of expressing yourself as art, right and :: this is what I have nowadays, the body goes beyond the biological, we have to consider the thinking, the expression, the body as art, this is what I have today.

She ponders that the body is “beyond the physiological” and that it can be perceived differently, exemplifying that it can be “a way of expressing itself” and “as art”. In the narrative of this undergrad student, it can be inferred that the body is a possibility for communication and visible materialization of feelings.

The fourth position, entitled “the body is a machine”, comes from the narratives of Fm and Hf and unveils the understanding of the body linked to a biological perspective. Fm assumes the following: “It's a difficult question ... the body biologically arm leg limbs torso (.) But if it were to characterize the body it would be that”. In a very succinct way, he completes by stating that the body is “biologically” and “characterized” it as its parts. In saying that this is a “difficult question” and describing the body divided into parts, he demonstrates that possibly, even though this was her object of investigation in his professional training, he had never thought about it.

Similarly, Hf states: “@ Difficult this @ (4) ã :: body depending on the specific subject can be in a way a machine can be an instrument can be several things”. When starting her speech, the student recognizes, laughing, how difficult it is talking about the subject and, reflecting on the complexity of the question about how she understands the body, it takes about four seconds to then start her answer and state that the definition of the body it is subordinated to a “specific subject”, but that, in a way, it is a “machine” and can “be several things”, which shows the notion of the useful, functional and disciplined body to be used as a work tool, surveillance, and examination.

In both narratives, it's possible to see that the students understand the complexity of the theme. Both use the term “difficult” to characterize the question. When answering, they present the body as they see it immediately, including, during the interview, they

point to their own body and the interviewer's, that is, Fm presents the parts, which are the “members”, and Hf presents the whole as the “machine”, the “instrument”.

In the fifth position, entitled “the body is the voice”, in Gm's speech, in which the student brings the body as an expression:

The body for me for my practice the body is the voice (2) the body conveys what you are what you think what you are:: the way you dress the way you move the way you express yourself I think the body says a lot about who you are I think the body is your external image I usually say: 'your external appearance is a postcard' if you take care of your postcard you attract visitors (3) if you are a great person the visitors will want to come back if you are not they will see that it was just a postcard so I believe that:: you take care of yourself you take care of your body you pass it on you pass vita = vitality = and communicate with you with your body it is important even to attract the right people right in your life I think the body is not mere aesthetics, I think it says a lot of what you are and he can speak my art is to speak with the body so that's it that I think of the body.

Gm starts by appropriating the concept in a personal way by saying “for me”, “my practice”, “my art”, that is, he traces the understanding of the body from his experiences to define that the body “is a voice”, “Transmits “, “thinks”, “moves”, “takes care “, “says”, “expresses” and “is not mere aesthetics”. He uses all these terms to qualify the body as communicative, but he considers that the messages transmitted depend on the transmitter, as they can be “vital” or not, which, depending on who you are, attracts “right” people or not.

From these elements, it's possible to perceive that, among the five positions, the one that differs strongly is the one named “the body is a machine”, which refers to the body from a biological perspective. According to Soares (2012), this understanding is associated with the historical biologicism present in Physical Education, which aims to strengthen and discipline bodies so that they produce more and better.

The first position, “the body is yours”, deals with a notion that disagrees with the fourth position, “the body is a machine”, and presents the understanding of freedom and subjective of the body, in which the subject builds themselves and listens to their wishes. In Foucault (2014), freedom or freedom practices are a way of fighting and opposing the production of a subjectivity marked by control and discipline.

Similarly, the fifth position, “the body is a voice”, depicts the body as a way of expressing feelings, in which the movement has a deep connection with the subject, with what it wishes to pass on to those who see. This is related to the third position, in which

the body is understood as complex and formed by several factors, able, to use a Foucauldian term, to resist disciplinarization and, as Louro (2018) said, to cross borders and break with stereotypes.

The second position, “the body is a temple”, singles out the body when considering it as profane, reduced to a vessel for moral values, which doesn't have a voice. It's clear the influence of religious dogmas that affect the body to establish it as impure.

4.2 The body in Physical Education

We now start to grasp the students' understanding of the body in the specific field of Physical Education, in which two positions were outlined, resulting from the comparison process. The first deals with the body in the field of Physical Education from a biological and instrumentalist perspective; and the second sees it in its entirety, contrary to a fragmented view.

The first position, as “it's just a biological issue”, comes from the narratives of students Am, Gm, Hf, Df and Fm, which directly relate the understanding of the body as biological to Physical Education. Student Am said:

The body in the subjects more connected (2) a = with technique is a more motor body a more biological body is a body that we have to have to be able to make such movements certain movements h :: mm is a body that we have to take care to care yes it is :: it is to be healthy it is :: it is and I see this more body in this biological way, a body more connected to movement and all the benefits that movement brings to our body and :: (2) and linked very linked to health aspects at least I see here in the course.

At the end of this part of the narrative, the student states that his understanding is what he can perceive “in the course”, which denotes not having an opinion about the body outside the context of the teacher training or that the studies he carried out in the course meet his perception of the body. He also reiterates that this understanding of the course stems from the “subjects more connected to the technique”, that is, in the disciplines of the biological area, so that it conceptualizes the body in a “more biological” perspective and “linked to health aspects”. In this excerpt, it is possible to observe that the undergrad student presents a growing debate within the course, which is the link

between Physical Education or body practices in the field of health. Gm clarifies this point precisely:

Physical Education at schools (3) in :: today I think of the body as an essential tool because we are in the age of technology, children are often on social networks playing games and they end up not having moving their bodies and that we see the reflection so far in Physical Education people who have very little motor memory they cannot perform simple activities they have difficulties they stumble too much they fall too much and this is reflected even when you are old if you don't have an active life when you were new when you are old you will fall more, your body will weaken faster, understood [...] you have a = an experience at school with Physical Education is important precisely because in the urban environment we no longer have space they aren't playing on the street = there is no way to play on the street as we did before, so Physical Education becomes important to give these children and young people the essential motor memory that even .. .what they need to live better right to live healthy sleep better to learn better is: even walking better having posture is a matter of health for me na = in Physical Education for me the body is a matter of health and wellbeing to live well.

The student Gm explains what Am says he perceives in the course when he starts his speech, drawing attention to the problems that make up the “current”. He says that, because of “technology”, children don't “move their bodies”, that is, they don't do physical activities, which, for him, brings as “reflexes” not being able to “perform simple activities”. He explains that not moving the body causes poor health, that is, even if the individual doesn't have diseases, they aren't healthy, as they have “difficulties”, such as lack of motor skills, because “they stumble”, “fall”. Thus, for Gm, “the body is a matter of health”, “of wellbeing”, but it isn't a body that is social to which he refers, but a body in motion, that is, a body that has “motor memory”, which has been exposed to the practice of activities that are supposed be healthy, a biological body, which here is “an essential tool” of Physical Education.

About the body in Physical Education, Hf says: “I think that as an instrument is the one that best fits our area because with it we teach classes, we use in the classes, we receive classes, so I don't know if it was clear about the body but this is it at last”. For the grad student, the body is an “instrument” of Physical Education, because it opens up the possibility of teaching and learning for both the student and the teacher; the student argues that this is “basically the body”. Similarly, Df presents:

Considering the body the parents always say when the :: sexual part of the body always says 'oh look, girl, you can't do this, you can't use this because it will attract the attention of the boys or you can't use it because of the teachers' and I

always thought it was a @ a little .. silly like that @ because I think that in Physical Education classes like any other class (.) people have to learn to respect, even though Physical Education is where we use it the most our body as = as a material, so I think that's it.

The student highlights the eroticization of the body by raising the fact that they place the girls under surveillance so that they don't present behaviors that awaken the “sexual part of the body”. To counter this idea, Df uses a utilitarian argument, reducing the body to “a material”, so that it can be inferred that her understanding is that the body is an instrument in the Physical Education class.

About the body in Physical Education, Fm points out:

The body is very important in the area of Physical Education and:: first what I think doesn't matter the body I think I believe that:: that in here we are having the same training and the same content ... but society doesn't see it like that right [...] so the body interferes for me, it's just a biological issue, even a genetic issue doesn't interfere in the knowledge in teaching and learning by the teacher in any way [...]:: the question of the body, right in the Physical Education in class, not from the Physical Education teacher, it is very important, right, since we have a history concerning the cult of the cultured body of military Physical Education, so, unfortunately, today it isn't seen like that, right, a vision, so to speak (2)) is = it is more current, right, the body doesn't interfere in the pedagogy of the teacher's methodology [...] inside it is still very good = very good, still very debatable, there is no respect..

Despite starting the narrative by stating that the body “is very important” for Physical Education, the student says that “the body doesn't matter”, that is, although the body is relevant from the point of view of the movement, the biotype isn't the most important. He states that, even though in society there is an acceptable body standard for body practices, the body type is indifferent, as “it is only a biological issue” and “genetic”.

The second position, named “we are not machines”, comes from the narratives of three students, Bf, Cm and Ef, who point out that the body is more than biological. Student Bf says:

Look beyond it being:: a body like (2) made up of organs of = of = of é:: when we talk like that we have to be careful because I think of the body as an integral way that the body speaks globally especially within the course. After all, there was a lot of this debate, you know, before it was treated mainly when you took it to the more biological area 'oh the body is muscle = muscle by muscle is:: exercising for the exercise sake, right?' just as a physicist but the body also we see of = of = in a non-disintegrated way, right? that's what in the course we have this great 'power' right but only that we need to use it in our favor to be able to use the activities as well as for everything we need to concentrate.

The grad student starts with the word “beyond” to describe that the body in Physical Education is more than “organs”. She says that she thinks of the body in an “integral way”, “globally”, and that this is a position that differs from history, in which the body was considered “only as physical”. She states that these body concepts are discussed in the course, but that all “areas” can be worked on and that this is considered a “power”. On the debate about the conceptions of the body, Ef comments:

Well, is:: (8) so there are notions, right within Physical Education of what the body is, right, because it's like I had already said before it is also: an = a (2) Physical Education is still evolving, we have our thoughts on what the body is, right, from the biological only, right, to this question, right, to say 'no, the body is everything, right' the body is as I said before, how to express yourself is to dance is to learn is to teach, so I think that = that there are several ways to think what the body is within Physical Education now I can't tell you right what is wrong each person has a way to say right what is the body within Physical Education.

Student Ef says that there are “notions” “within the Physical Education of what is a body”. She ponders that the discussions around these views occur because Physical Education is still “evolving”. For this student, there are contradictory “thoughts” that sometimes tend to place the body as “only biological”, sometimes tend to place it as “everything”. However, she ponders that she can't say “what is right or wrong” because this thought is subjective. She points out that the body is a way of “expressing”, “learning”, “teaching”, bringing up the understanding of the body as a form of communication.

Still on the debate within the PE course about the body, Cm addresses:

A lot of times I think people are still:: influenced here in our training course to see a very fragmented body that sees a body only with physiological issues then afterward I only see the pathology there sometimes I just see the body from from the = the from anthropology I only see the subject's body from sociology but then sometimes we are not able to see the body from this set of all our = our areas all these disciplines that we are having and sometimes the people not so able to make this relationship to understand our student more this body that has is: several faces diverse influences.

He states that there is an influence on the training that makes them see the “very fragmented body”, which is in line with the positioning of Bf, who says that the body is being debated in the training, and with that of Ef, which indicates that there are visions about the body. But Cm ponders that these debates often fragment the understanding and that there is no “relationship” so that the student can be “understood”. He defends his

point of view at the end stating that the body has “several influences”. He continues and presents his opinion:

First of all, we have to think that we are working with different bodies = different bodies, whether in terms of gender or terms of disability or terms of social economics or terms of pathologies, so all bodies are different, that is to say, this difference that I will have to look for it: bring it to the classes I will have to take into account all these contexts of the different bodies within my class.

Physical Education. It's in the fact that people are different, what he calls “I” must base his “classes” because it's necessary to understand the “contexts” of these bodies. It can be inferred that the student perceives the bodies in different ways and that Physical Education classes need to take this into account.

It's interesting to note in this topic that students who defended the free body by reflecting only on the body reduce it to the biological dimension when their reflection turns to the field of Physical Education. The first position, “it is just a biological issue”, it's more linked to training and the course, in which the students point out that it is what they can perceive. In this position, the concept of health linked to Physical Education and the responsibility of subjects for their health only through the practice of physical activities emerges. About this, Soares (2012) ponders that historically Physical Education naturalizes a biological view of the subject that conveys an idea of individual effort for health so that it disciplines its wishes and gestures and maintains order.

The second position, “we are not machines”, shows an opposite position. The body presents itself as integral, as biological, yes, but also as social, as a means to communication. This position reveals the movement of ideological disputes about the conceptions of the body and demonstrates that there is intense mobility within the course.

5 Temporary considerations

The comparison process carried out using the Documentary Method allows listing some considerations about the senses and meanings that happen between the Physical Education undergrad students using the “binarism” orientation model. It can be observed that students have a different view between the meanings of body and body in Physical Education, which shows a dissociation and contradiction in the way the body is

understood and treated in teacher training. Besides, it's evident that the body is presented, in most disciplines, only by its biological bias, which fails to take into account the multiple aspects that involve the body, its historical and temporal character, and the power relations that they present and discuss.

Another element that emerged from the comparison refers to the contrast between positions that reveal critical approaches to the body, indicating the understanding of the diversity and the possibilities for teachings and those that demonstrate the understanding of the body only from a physiological and instrumental perspective. As a debate, it indicates a movement between the conservative strands of biologicism and those that suppose a break with this mode of understanding present in the area.

With this investigation, it was possible to demonstrate that the training courses at the university have an important role in the formation of understandings about the body, being urgent to reflect if the reinforcement of the dichotomization between body and society and the biological bias will be maintained or if the debate will be assumed. about body immersed in a socio, political, historical, and cultural context, about resistance to standards and norms, in defense of freedom.

Finally, it's expected that, within these nuances, this research will collaborate so that future or present teachers will deepen in what can be considered the object of study of Physical Education so that they can develop more in-depth debates and understandings about the body, about education and about the power relations that affect it.

6 References

ABREU, S. M. B.; SABÓIA, W. N.; NÓBREGA-TERRIEN, S. M. Formação docente em Educação Física: perspectivas de uma racionalidade pedagógica do corpo em movimento. *Educação e Formação*, Fortaleza, v. 4, n. 12, p. 191-206, 2019. Available at: <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/redufor/article/view/897/1317>. Accessed on: June 12th, 2021.

BOHNSACK, R. *Pesquisa social reconstrutiva: introdução aos métodos qualitativos*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2020.

BOHNSACK, R.; WELLER, W. O método documentário na análise de grupos de discussão. In: WELLER, W.; PFAFF, N. (org.). *Metodologias da pesquisa qualitativa*. 3. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013. p. 67-86.

FOUCAULT, M. *Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão*. 42. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014.

GOELLNER, S. A produção cultural do corpo. In: LOURO, G.; FELIPE, J.; GOELLNER, S. (org.). *Corpo, gênero e sexualidade: um debate contemporâneo*. 9. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013.

LOURO, G. *Gênero, sexualidade e educação: uma perspectiva pós-estruturalista*. 16. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014.

LOURO, G. *Um corpo estranho: ensaios sobre sexualidade e teoria queer*. 3. rev. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2018.

LOURO, G.; FELIPE, J.; GOELLNER, S. (org.). *Corpo, gênero e sexualidade: um debate contemporâneo*. 9. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013.

LUDORF, S. M. Corpo e formação de professores de Educação Física. *Interface: Comunicação, Saúde, Educação, Botucatu*, v. 13, n. 28, p. 99-110, 2009. Available at: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1414-32832009000100009&lng=en&nrm=iso. Accessed on: May 25th, 2020.

RODRIGUES, R. B.; COUTO, H. R. F. Corporeidade e prática docente na Educação do Campo na Amazônia Paraense. *Educação e Formação*, Fortaleza, v. 5, n. 13, p. 113-131, 2020. Available at: <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/redufor/article/view/1439/1908>. Accessed on: Jan. 16th, 2021.

SCHÜTZ, A. *Fenomenologia e relações sociais*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1970.

SCHÜTZE, F. Pesquisa biográfica e entrevista narrativa. In: WELLER, V.; PLAFF, N. (org.). *Metodologia da pesquisa qualitativa em educação: teoria e prática*. 3. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013. p. 210-223.

SILVA, C. M. Jovens homens que “saíram pelo meio do mundo”: sentidos do trabalho para cortadores de cana. *PerCursos*, Florianópolis, v. 20, n. 43, p. 143-166, 2019. Available in: <https://revistas.udesc.br/index.php/percursos/article/view/1984724620422019143>. Accessed on: June 18th, 2020.

SILVA, E. C.; MOREIRA, E. C. O plano de trabalho de professores de Educação Física ex-participantes do Pibid/FEF/UFMT. *Educação e Formação*, Fortaleza, v. 6, n. 1, e2081, 2021. Available at: <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/redufor/article/view/2081/3548>. Accessed on: Jan. 18th, 2021.

SOARES, C. L. *Educação Física: raízes europeias e Brasil*. 5. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2012.

WELLER, W. A contribuição de Karl Mannheim para a pesquisa qualitativa: aspectos teóricos e metodológicos. *Sociologias*, Porto Alegre, v. 7, n. 13, p. 260-300, 2005.

WELLER, W. *et al.* Karl Mannheim e o método documentário de interpretação: uma forma de análise das visões de mundo. *Sociedade e Estado*, Brasília, DF, v. 17, n. 2, p. 375-396, 2002.

WELLER, W.; OTTE, J. Análise de narrativas segundo o método documentário: exemplificação a partir de um estudo com gestoras de instituições públicas. *Civitas: Revista de Ciências Sociais*, Porto Alegre, v. 14, n. 2, p. 325-340, 2014.

WELLER, W.; ZARDO, S. Entrevista narrativa com especialistas: aportes metodológicos e exemplificação. *Revista Faeeba*, Educação e Contemporaneidade, Salvador, v. 22, n. 40, p. 131-143, 2013.

YAZBEK, A. C. *10 lições sobre Foucault*. 6. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2015.

Daniella Rocha Bittencourt, Pará State University, Graduate Program in Education

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2577-9033>

Masters in Education, specialist in Pedagogy of Corporal Culture and graduated in Physical Education - Universidade do Estado do Pará. Effective teacher of the public schools of Ananindeua, Pará.

Contributed with the and wrote the text.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3710078170355375>

E-mail: bittencourt@hotmail.com

Lucélia de Moraes Braga Bassalo, University of the State of Pará, Postgraduate Program in Education

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0412-6052>

PhD in Education - Universidade de Brasília, master in Brazilian Education - Universidade Federal do Ceará, and licensed in Pedagogy - União das Escolas Superiores do Pará. Professor of the Graduate Program in Education- Universidade do Estado do Pará, in the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences. Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6941089571024585>

E-mail: lbassalo@uol.com.br

Responsible editor: Lia Machado Fiuza Fialho

Ad hoc experts: Evandro Moreira and Bruno Araújo

How to cite this article (ABNT):

BITTENCOURT, Daniella Rocha; BASSALO, Lucélia de Moraes Braga. O corpo é voz, mas na Educação Física não: compreensões sobre corpo na formação docente. *Educ. Form.*, Fortaleza, v. 6, n. 2, e4091, 2021. Available at:

<https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/redufor/article/view/4091>



Received on September 25th, 2020.

Accepted on January 4th, 2021.

Published on March 29th, 2021.

