

Battle stage: formation and professional intervention in Physical Education in the 1980s and 1990s

ARTICLE

Júlio César Apolinário Maiaⁱ

Universidade Estadual de Goiás, Itumbiara, GO, Brasil

Rodrigo Roncato Marques Anesⁱⁱ

Universidade Estadual de Goiás, Inhumas, GO, Brasil

1

Abstract

This article aims to review the history of the field of formation and professional intervention in Physical Education throughout the 1980s and 1990s, justifying how the power relations, born from the clash between the constitutive groups of civil society in the area, configure a battle stage, which expresses the contradiction between a conception of formation and intervention oriented towards the socialization of corporal culture and another oriented towards its privatization. The first topic deals with the historical determinations for the first decade mentioned, understanding how teacher formation was invaded by the regulation of the profession. The second topic, for the historical determinations for the second decade mentioned, deals with the crowning of the regulation of the profession. The considerations show, based on the notion of uncertainty, the arrival point of the field studied for the aforementioned decades studied, as well as presenting some developments, observed in the new century.

Keywords: Teacher formation. Professional intervention. Physical Education. History.

Palco de batalha: formação e intervenção profissional em Educação Física nas décadas 1980 e 1990

Resumo

Este artigo pretende colocar em revista a história do campo da formação e intervenção profissional em Educação Física ao longo das décadas de 1980 e 1990, justificando como as relações de forças, nascidas do embate entre os grupos constitutivos da sociedade civil da área, configuram um palco de batalha, que imprime a contradição entre uma concepção de formação e intervenção orientada à socialização da cultura corporal e outra orientada a sua privatização. O primeiro tópico trata das determinações históricas para a primeira década mencionada, compreendendo como nela a formação de professores é invadida pelo tema da regulamentação da profissão. O segundo tópico trata das determinações históricas para a segunda década mencionada e do coroamento da regulamentação da profissão. As considerações definem, a partir da noção de incerteza, o ponto de chegada do campo estudado para essas décadas e apresentam alguns desdobramentos, observados no novo século.

Palavras-chave: Formação de professores. Intervenção profissional. Educação Física. História.

1 Introduction

2

It is appropriate for this article, as an introductory reflection, to recognize that, historically, the academic-professional field of Physical Education (PE) is linked to different areas of knowledge. Above all, it is worth understanding that the multidisciplinary given to the academic-professional field of this area, as noted by intellectuals associated with the discussion of professional training and intervention (Taffarel, 1993; Nozaki, 2004; Santos Júnior, 2005), accompanies the determinations of the productive forces by the relations of production, which in recent decades have been the mainstay of the bourgeois project of sociability.

The aim of this exhibition, alongside defending this thesis, is to review the history of the field of training and professional intervention in PE throughout the 1980s and 1990s, justifying how the relations of forces, born out of the clash between the constituent groups of civil society at different times in this history, set up a battleground, which imprints the contradiction between a conception of training and intervention oriented towards the socialization of body culture¹, assumed to be the object of study in this area (Taffarel, 1993), and its privatization.

The contradiction between the socialization and privatization of the area's object of study, in the history of the field of training and intervention in PE, is important for the perception of the groups, agents, bodies and associations representing civil society that play a leading role in this battle. What is at stake in this historic battle between socialization

¹ Term seized from the critical-supervisory trend of Brazilian PE, whose greatest representativeness is expressed in the work “Metodologia do Ensino de Educação Física”, signed by the Coletivo de Autores in 1992. The work supports the thesis that all forms of bodily expression (games, dances, fights, gymnastic exercises, sports, juggling, contortions, mimes, etc.) hold precious keys to reading reality: the trend thus understands that man's effort to become humanity, from his original condition (primitive man) to the moment of his greatest development (homo societatis), is expressed through the various elements of body culture, in other words, that the way subjects move reveals a certain project of sociability, a collective way of feeling, thinking and acting in the world (Soares *et al.*, 1992).

enthusiasts and privatists is the affirmation of their own conception of the world, a philosophy based on the form of social organization and the viability of the reproduction of life. It is important to understand how the specificity of the academic-professional field of PE understands, in its genesis, the duality of these conceptions, representative of the class struggle.

The path taken by the research is to follow the historical determinations related to the constitution of the conception of the world of both constituent groups of this battle stage, in topics respectively dedicated to the historical examination of teacher training and professional intervention in PE during the 1980s and 1990s. The first topic deals with the historical determinations for the first decade mentioned, understanding how teacher training was invaded by the issue of regulating the profession. The second topic, which deals with the historical determinations for the second decade mentioned, deals with the crowning of the regulation of the profession. However, it does not go into the particularities of the new century and the circumstances that imply the emergence of new determinations and impose new agents and strategies on the civil society of PE to defend different (and opposing) notions of training and professional intervention.

From a methodological point of view, the historical examination is supported by the foundations of the Theory of Knowledge, which makes it possible to credit this investigation with the comprehensive objective typology and the bibliographic typology by design, based on a qualitative approach (Ventura *et al.*, 2015). Critical-dialectical research understands its historicity as a constituent part of a given object. The representativeness contained in history is part of what essentially constitutes it, so historical examination takes the form of an important methodological tool.

2 Historical determinations for the 1980s: teacher training invaded by the issue of regulating the profession

In its formation, the academic-professional field of PE had a strong relationship with the health area, which was already showing signs of consolidation among the most

diverse segments of society (Scherer, 2005). With the arrival of the 1980s, the national education scenario began to incorporate this area, which gave it an influential role in human formation through the school component.

This incorporation into the school component comes from Resolution 69/69 and Opinion 894/69, documents in which the Federal Council of Education (CFE) restricted teacher training courses in PE to the aegis of a minimum curriculum, “[...] planned for three years, with a minimum workload of 1,800 hours and a reduction in basic subjects of scientific foundation” (Souza Neto *et al.*, 2004, p. 119), due to the incorporation of pedagogical subjects.

It is important to note, as Quelhas and Nozaki (2006) point out, that these documents foresaw an undergraduate degree that would confer the title of PE graduate. However, with the inclusion and approval of two other sports-related subjects, in addition to the basic, professional and pedagogical subjects, this professional would also receive the title of Sports Coach.

Souza Neto *et al.* (2004) mention that the results of this restriction were characterized by the diffusion of two types of knowledge concerning the academic-professional field of the area: those related to sports knowledge and those focused on didactic knowledge, restricted to teacher training. Respectively, this knowledge was linked to those with a sports background (PE degree and Sports Technician complementation) and those familiar with a teaching background, located on the school axis (PE degree).

As the training provided by these documents was consolidated, the 1980s saw a series of factors at national and international level which would lead to new changes in the academic-professional field of the area. Taffarel (2012) summarizes the conflicting chain of events that marked this decade:

[...] This decade saw the Washington Consensus, a meeting of international organizations that listed policies guided by the World Bank and the IMF to be employed by the imperialist countries. [...] In Brazil, this was the period in which the organization of the working class rose, with the birth of the Landless Workers' Movement (MST), the Central Workers' Union (CUT) and the Workers' Party (PT). The National Union of Students (UNE) is revived. International organizations evaluate, take stock and establish planetary policy to maintain the hegemony of capital (Taffarel, 2012, p. 99).

Among the measures adopted by the Washington Consensus, which corroborated the capitalist readjustment in the imperialist countries, the author notes: economic reliance on the laws of the market; reduction of state intervention, which now only manages the guarantee of profit to capitalists; economic openness with financial and commercial freedom; liberation of profit to international capital; mass consolidation of the privatization process; reduction of social spending and subsidies by the government; and deregulation of labour, in favour of reducing business costs, both from new forms of contracting and the consequent increase in the exploitation of the workforce via surplus value (Taffarel, 2012).

Quelhas and Nozaki (2006), in seeking to understand the reverberations of the measures adopted in 1980 in the field of training and professional intervention in PE, in the face of Opinion No. 894/69 and Resolution No. 69/69, which consolidated the academic-professional multidisciplinary of the area, as a result of sports knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, point out that, with the advent of measures that relieved the state from managing social conquests, such as the flexibilization of labor relations, the professional's work underwent a re-signification.

Scherer (2005) points out that, in line with the aforementioned re-signification, from the 1980s onwards the job market, which was then organized on the basis of professional regulations designed by the Ministry of Education, underwent changes as a result of the neoliberal policy promoted by international organizations. The changes concerned the readjustment of labour rules, in line with previous guidelines (financial freedom, mass privatization, labour deregulation, etc.).

Scherer (2005) goes on to say that there has been a constant increase in the process of outsourcing the work of these professionals, as well as the intensification of the unorganized labour market. Both factors characterize a scenario of intervention offered to PE professionals, on the verge of precariousness.

Quelhas and Nozaki (2006) identify a proliferation of gyms as a result of this outsourcing process, which expresses the attempt by various privatized groups to appropriate physical activities under the pretext of managing something that should

fundamentally be a state role. Contradictorily, these groups sought to build an aesthetic standard along the lines of productive interests, which resulted in a new market niche for the field.

During the 1980s, there were two demands that characterized the national PE scene: the first from privatist groups, eager to take over the growing market niche; the second from groups that defended the socialization of body culture elements for all layers of society, demanding a historical and human conception of PE.

This confrontation was fueled both by the newly formulated neoliberal labor demands and by the dichotomous process of affirmation of the knowledge that characterized the academic-professional field of the area (sports knowledge and/or didactic knowledge) (Souza Neto *et al.*, 2004). Even under the aegis of the organization, this process had been promoting divergences in the field of training and intervention by professionals at the time.

Obviously, with the process of disorganizing the work of these professionals, the concern with the divergence between knowledge gave way to the need to regulate the profession. However, it is important to consider that there was already a dichotomy between the knowledge characterizing the area even before Opinion 138/1987, a watershed in the field of professional training and intervention in PE.

This dispute, waged between privatist groups and advocates of the socialization of PE, promoted internal debates about the field of training and intervention in PE.

In this context, two movements took shape to guarantee the field of professional intervention of Physical Education teachers in society. The first was to build curricular guidelines for a new higher education course that would cover all the possibilities of the new demands created and that would enable Physical Education teachers to intervene in the various existing job markets [...]. The second movement was linked to the struggle to regulate Physical Education professionals in Brazil, which took place in the 1980s and 1990s and was confirmed by Federal Law 9696/98 (Scherer, 2005, p. 34).

With regard to the first movement mentioned in Scherer's (2005) quote, there were different positions on the social function, legitimacy and autonomy of PE as a result of the divergence between the demands made, as Bracht (1992) points out. These positions gave

support to Opinion 138/1987, the ultimate expression of the disputes in the field of training and intervention in the area during the 1980s.

This expression was consolidated in the 1980s on the basis of a number of needs that were not fully shared by the two opposing groups: “[...] the urgent need and importance for courses to free themselves from the ‘constraints’ imposed by the minimum curriculum; [...] the new demands of the job market [...]; [...] the need to think of physical education as a specific field of knowledge” (Souza Neto *et al.*, 2004, p. 120).

In addition to the last two needs, there was the indignation postulated by the Bachelor's degree training based on the minimum curriculum, which had been unable to keep up with the development of neoliberal productive forces. These three demands, via Resolution 03/87 of the former CFE, guided the reorganization of the field of PE training based on “Thematic Axes of Knowledge”, delimiting two new academic-professional areas: the Bachelor's Degree and the Degree in PE.

Quelhas and Nozaki (2006, p. 74) consider that this milestone was “[...] the first fragmenting attack on the physical education degree”, a point favorable to the advance of the privatist group to the detriment of the group defending the socialization of PE.

It is important to note, from the events of the 1980s, how much the country's re-democratization process strengthened the emergence of unions, associations and political movements in the field of PE (Nozaki, 2004). In dialog with Taffarel (2012), he refers to the 1980s as a double expressive rise. Alluding to the second movement mentioned in Scherer's (2005) quote, Nozaki (2004) highlights important events that are worth mentioning because of their influence on the 1987 resolution.

The first event highlighted by Nozaki (2004) concerns the reactivation, in 1984, of the Brazilian Federation of PE Teachers' Associations (FBAPEF). This reactivation is considered important due to the need, at that time, to consolidate the process of regulating the profession, which was suffering from the links established by some professionals with the unorganized job market.

The author also points out that, in the same period, a meeting took place between directors of PE schools, the agenda of which was the creation of a national organization

representing professionals in this area. Both events, together with two symbolic congresses held that same year, which strengthened the issue of regulation - the First Latin American Congress of Physical Education, Sport and Recreation and the Tenth National Congress of Physical Education Teachers - led to the appointment of the Association of Physical Education Teachers (APEF) as the state body representing the profession. This body, in subservience to the FBAPEF, was responsible for creating a code of ethics for the profession and delimiting the professional's field of work (Nozaki, 2004).

Nozaki (2004), in dialogue with Faria Junior's (2001) critique, points out that behind the regulation of the profession there was a project that favored the interests of privatist groups, rather than those who defended PE as human historical production. The creation of the FBAPEF and the state bodies was intended to “[...] present biased research without sample representativeness to argue that the role of the physical education teacher was no longer in the school” (Faria Junior, 2001, p. 22).

In line with the liberal and privatist perspective, this movement to reactivate the FBAPEF and the APEF in order to regulate the profession is described as follows by Nozaki (2004, p. 183): “[...] within the APEF movement, there were competing forces already aware of the changes in the work of physical education teachers, pointing to the liberal and precarious model of non-school work as a possible solution to the scrapping of the teaching profession, especially the public one.”

Another milestone highlighted by Nozaki (2004) was the II Congress of Sport for All, held shortly after the events highlighted, in the city of Belo Horizonte, in 1984. At this congress, the federal government's support for the reactivation of the FBAPEF became evident. This was the starting point for the first thesis, stipulated by Castellani Filho (1998a), about the professional regulation of PE, when he pointed out that this “[...] movement reflects the attempt by conservative sectors to regain political space [...]” (Castellani Filho, 1998a, p. 83). At this congress, a general assembly of the FBAPEF was held, at which “[...] a draft law on the creation of the Federal and Sectional Councils [...] was considered” (Nozaki, 2004, p. 184).

However, from the II Congress of Sport for All onwards, the balance of power remained negative for the sectors that sought to meet the liberal and privatist perspective of the regulation of the profession. This can be explained by the emergence of a movement to reject the reactivation of the FBAPEF. This rejection, linked to disagreements within the Federation's own leadership, led to a drop in demands from the liberal and privatist sectors (Castellani Filho, 1998a).

The Belo Horizonte Letter can be seen as the greatest example of the disagreements caused by the reactivation of the FBAPEF and the APEF, which reaffirms the II Congress of Sport for All as a milestone in the 1980s. This letter reveals the diversity of its twelve signatories, PE exponents selected by the federations' leaders because of the need to regulate the area.

This “[...] letter [...] contained within it the very dispute of positions, full of contradictory elements. In this way, the pressure exerted by the privatist group in drawing up this charter [had] [...] the clash of its opposing group” (Nozaki, 2004, p. 185). The pressure exerted by the second group, which called for the socialization of PE, prevented the privatist group from drawing up a manifesto.

Carla from Belo Horizonte reflects the dual nature of the discourse on PE regulation at the time. Therefore, she also represents the duality of meanings related to the function of FBAPEF and APEF. Nozaki (2004, p. 185) points out that, at the same time as the writing of this letter denounced aspects of the “[...] historical context [...] of physical education's subordination to dominant projects [...]” and, from this, a process of social demand based on critical awareness and reversal of this situation, it was also possible to find “[...] strategies for the liberalization of the profession [...]”, as presented by Faria Junior (2001):

[...] privatist efforts were concentrated on four strategies: supporting the ever-increasing number of private courses and schools for training physical education teachers; creating bachelor's degrees in physical education; proposing attempts to change the curriculum, via legislation, and regulating the profession by developing its corollaries - creating the Federal and Regional Councils of Physical Education and yet another code of professional ethics (Faria Junior, 2001, p. 27).

The Belo Horizonte Letter is thus a great example of the disagreements caused by the reactivation of the FBAPEF and the APEF, and by the proposal to regulate the

profession. The contradictions expressed in the text mirror both the ideological contradictions of its signatories and the contradictions faced by the PE field during the 1980s (Faria Junior, 2001).

On the one hand, there was the denunciation of the alienation of PE due to its lack of authenticity; the repudiation of its historical relationship with the interests of dominant groups; the rejection of discriminatory processes that allowed the area to be seen as a dissimulator of social inequality; a rejection of the presence and concession of the military as a professional category in the field; a disdain for commercialization strategies in teacher training courses; a refusal to use didactics in the field of pedagogical practice along the lines of conditioning students; and a complete disregard for the influence of private companies with privatist designs.

On the other hand, in addition to what was said by Faria Junior (2001), the letter also presented: interest in the privatization of the area's field of activity; affection for the possibility of accepting the area as a liberal profession; sympathy for the integration of PE into the construction of neoliberalism; appreciation for the allocation of public resources to private schools; and a propensity for the participation of private companies in segments of PE.

Castellani Filho (1998a) attests that the moment of disagreement strengthened a feeling of rejection of the Federations' board of directors, which in turn began to identify themselves as “[...] place[s] for organizing teachers in the field, disputing conceptions of physical education, organizing workers and building society” (Nozaki, 2004, p. 187). Some events make explicit this “new aspect”, expressed by Castellani Filho (1998a), given to the Federations, such as the VI National Meeting of Physical Education Students (ENEFF), held in João Pessoa in 1985, in which a group rebelled in resistance to the conservative sectors and the liberal demands adopted by the federations' board (Castellani Filho, 1998).

Another example of the “new aspect” adopted by the federations, based on the dispute over conceptions adopted by PE teachers, is the First Brazilian Congress of Physical Education of the FBAPEF, held in Tramandaí in 1986. At this congress, in addition to the issue of regulation, the issue of professional training emerged (Nozaki, 2004).

It is important to take the Tramandaí congress as an example of the federations' readjustment based on the differences between PE teachers in the field. This congress made it possible to understand how the regulation of the profession came to be “[...] mediated by changes in work and professional training in physical education, included in the context of the crisis of capital” (Nozaki, 2004, p. 188).

The emerging possibilities for working in the area, as well as the rise of the unorganized job market, meant that debates within the federations turned to conceptions of the role of PE in society. In this context, the range opened up by the unorganized job market, based on the proliferation of bodily practices in non-school environments, such as gyms, clubs, condominiums, etc., proved to be an alternative to teaching, a fact that culminated in a debate that led to the approval of the Bachelor's degree course, see CFE Resolution 3/87.

Scherer (2005) sees that, in its genesis, Resolution 3/87, as well as Opinion 138/1987, were strategies to help qualify professionals for the unorganized job market. Both, in the expectation that the professional linked to the non-organized (non-school) environment could be qualified in their training, foresaw the readjustment of their training based on a new curriculum structure. The discussion between the professional training of bachelors and graduates was enriched by arguments for and against, sometimes in favour of the privatist group's questioning, sometimes in defence of the group that defended the socialization of the area (Faria Junior, 1987).

Among the arguments of the privatist group, it is worth mentioning the problem of the place of work and the “pseudo-distinction” between pedagogical training and scientific training, which are not justified from Taffarel's point of view (1993). The first of these claimed that there was a distinction between the two types of training, considering the fields of activity to be different. Defenders of this argument believe that, since the field of activity is different, there should be different training conditions for professionals. The invalidity of this argument is revealed when it disregards “[...] the argument that it is not the place where one works that defines the profession, but rather the process of training to meet certain social needs or demands” (Taffarel, 1993, p. 37).

The second argument, which advocates that graduates should be given “pedagogical training” and bachelors “scientific training”, is also invalid. As Taffarel (1993) asks, how can we disregard the fact that pedagogical training does not depend on science, or vice versa? These are indispensable training courses which, because of this argument, foster the idea that “[...] in the scope of action of the Physical Education professional, within the school, scientific knowledge is not dealt with [...]” (Taffarel, 1993, p. 37).

Nozaki (2004) also highlights a third controversial argument. He makes it clear that the privatist groups, who defended a conception of PE aligned with the standardization of the non-organized field, relied on surveys without sample representativeness to highlight data that confirmed a greater number of hours worked per month by PE teachers linked to the non-school field. They also said, as Nozaki (2004) points out, that teachers' pay increased in the non-school field when compared to the pay of teachers linked to the teaching profession. Thus, the author refutes the misconception of these arguments:

However, what these analyses fail to take into account is that the non-school field is about precarious, deregulated and temporary work, a plus dimension of capital's current strategy to intensify the exploitation of the workforce. Therefore, what is a management strategy for the capital crisis becomes an attraction for the search for the workforce. The search for a new market for physical education teachers has obeyed the logic of adapting them to the model of worker for the society of precarious work and unemployment, in other words, with a view to training their employability, based on individual skills, in order to compete for slices of this market (Nozaki, 2004, p. 160).

Controversial arguments such as these did not prevent the advance of the privatist group, due to neoliberal political impositions on training and professional intervention, see Resolution 3/87. With this resolution, PE's content began to be linked to the so-called “Areas of Knowledge”², which, according to Benites, Souza Neto and Hunger (2008), made bachelor's and bachelor's degree courses more flexible.

These areas were structured based on a channeling of knowledge, segregated as follows: knowledge of the human being; knowledge of society; philosophical knowledge;

² The so-called “Areas of Knowledge” consisted of: i) the humanistic, considering philosophical knowledge, human beings and society and; ii) the technical, considering technical knowledge (Benites; Souza Neto; Hunger, 2008).

and technical knowledge. The resolution signaled the opening of a moment of conflict, as it conceived two conceptions of training perspectives, as well as two new frameworks for action, in other words, it projected the resizing of the PE job market, which until then had been based on a full degree model.

Quelhas and Nozaki (2006, p. 74) report on the de-characterization processes resulting from this resolution. They point out that the institution of the bachelor's degree “[...] pointed to [a] training [for] non-school fields of work, in a vain attempt to secure such fields for the physical education teacher”. This unsuccessful attempt is linked to the first process of de-characterization presented by these authors, which is: the de-characterization of the PE teacher linked to teaching as a salaried worker, in favour of a new characterization submitted to neoliberal work.

The second mischaracterization, according to the authors, refers to the epistemological field, since the object of the area is linked to teaching practice. At this point, “[...] the fragmentation into two qualifications presupposed that the epistemic object of the area was not taken into account, to the detriment of the centrality of the labor market as the epicenter of discussions on professional training” (Quelhas; Nozaki, 2006, p. 75).

Despite recognizing advances in professional training, such as the broadening of the areas of knowledge (philosophical, technical, social and human), the expansion of the workload and the monographic production at the end of the course, Quelhas and Nozaki (2006) are unable to sustain the same line of reasoning in relation to curricular reformulations, given that, in contrast to the idea of progress, these reformulations were characterized by the bloating of curricula and the investment of PE schools in a constant and exclusive focus on the new demands of the job market.

Souza Neto *et al.* (2004) emphasize that this restructuring, despite being seen by some authors as fundamental, based on the emphasis given, after this milestone, to the growing autonomy and flexibility of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) with the PE course, can also be understood as a principle characterizing the loss of an identifying core of the area. The area was linked to an “identity for training”, already supported by degree courses,

and another understood as an “identity for professionalization”, in which neoliberal political pragmatism came to be considered.

It is not intended to assimilate the dilemma “identity for professionalization” versus “identity for training” to the dilemma “bachelor's degree” versus “teaching degree”. Betti (1992) and Faria Junior (1987) have already demonstrated this misconception. The assimilation here is done in this way: the “identity for training” refers, above all, to the “generalist” training characteristic of that historical moment, that is, the “[...] professional trained from a humanistic perspective, with a full degree in physical education, able to work in both formal and non-formal educational systems” (Souza Neto *et al.*, 2004, p. 121).

On the other hand, the “identity for professionalization” is characterized by the growing fragmentation of PE faced in that context, which began to excite professionals familiar with the unorganized job market. The professional with a bachelor's degree identified with the perspective of specialist training, as he had “[...] a particular branch of physical education (sport, dance, recreation, etc.) to specialize in, within a pragmatic and technical training concept [...]” (Souza Neto *et al.*, 2004, p. 121). It's not a question of linking the bachelor's degree to “specialist” training, but of understanding that, in that historical context of a break with the concept of a full degree, the graduate qualified as such, in the same way that the graduate, based on a restricted concept of training, also appeared to be a “specialist”.

Opinion No. 138/87 and Resolution No. 3/87 were intended to help restructure the organization of the national curriculum so that it could give greater meaning to the job market linked to the areas of health and quality of life. Scherer (2005) mentions that, despite this intention, PE graduates were still able to work in any segment of the job market, which led to low demand and little use for the newly established bachelor's degree courses. “Even though the much-apologized for non-school fields seemed to put pressure on the opening up of bachelor's degrees in the area, what happened until the first half of the 1990s was that this qualification was little opened up in professional training” (Quelhas; Nozaki, 2006, p. 75). These authors also mention that, until 1994, only five higher education courses in

PE (equivalent to almost 4% of the total number of courses in this area) nationwide offered bachelor's degrees.

The issue of teacher training once again gave way to the issue of regulation. It is worth going back to the FBAPEF's work up until the early 1990s to understand the theses by Castellani Filho (1998a) and the article by Faria Junior *et al.* (1996) as texts denouncing the resumption of a political space by conservative sectors.

At the same time as the problem of regulating the profession began to give way to the discussion of professional training, discussions within the ENEEF also began to deal with pedagogical actions in PE. The VI ENEEF stood out as a milestone in the affirmation of a nucleus of resistance, on the part of a progressive movement, against the Apexian guidelines.

Castellani Filho (1998a) calls this group “Opposition to the FBAPEF”. This movement fostered the need to organize a movement of struggle for PE teachers, in relation to the political context that was directing the country towards neoliberal rationality. As a result, as Nozaki (2004) points out, the FBAPEF Opposition Group joined other political struggles, mainly linked to unions, political parties and social movements on the Brazilian left.

The expressiveness of this group, spawned by the resistance of the PE Student Movement, intensified the clash between the privatist agents, who defended regulation based on the sense of an “identity for professionalization” in PE, and the progressive agents, who demanded an “identity for training” in Physical Education, separate from regulation based on a market bias.

Castellani Filho (1998a) points out that, in the context of this dispute, which flared up in the second half of the 1980s, the FBAPEF Opposition Group managed to get itself elected to the board of Santa Catarina in 1989, following the ratification of Resolution 3/87.

After the election of the progressive group, a number of events are worth highlighting: the president's veto of the issue of regulation, as well as the FBAPEF's unification with the National Council of Education Workers (Castellani Filho, 1998a); the approval of the FBAPEF's participation in the Forum for the Unification of Entities linked to

the field of education; the internal split in the apefian movement; and the (momentary) outcome of the process of regulating the profession (Nozaki, 2004).

These factors culminated in the epilogue of this federation in the distant 1980s. All of them, added to the leading role taken in discussions about the role of PE, led to the FBAPEF's emptying, due to the disbelief of professionals linked to this federation in the new directions. This stampede characterized the FBAPEF during the transition between the 1980s and 1990s. Nozaki (2004) describes the reasons that led to the weakening of this federation:

For those in favor of regulating the profession, the very shift of the central discussion, previously based around that issue, to questions of a political nature, which were of little interest to teachers, who were generally not linked to political movements, was the reason for the emptying [...].

The other group, on the other hand, argued that the main reason for the departure of the Apefian movement was precisely the understanding of the need for a more collective struggle in the workers' sphere, in addition to the numerous general discussions such as the Law on Guidelines and Bases (LDB) and the Law on Sports Guidelines and Bases (LDBD), which had become central agendas, as well as the very construction of left-wing policies that had been victorious since the 1989 elections, or of the countryside [...] (Nozaki, 2004, p 194-195).

It is on the basis of these different (but complementary) reasons for the demise of the apefiano movement at the end of the 1980s, as well as the failure of bachelor's degree courses in the face of the affirmation of the full degree in PE, which still had a large majority of undergraduate courses in this area nationwide during the prelude to the 1990s, that a return to the discussion on the regulation of the profession is projected, which was once undermined by the debate on the conception of professional training in this area.

3 Historical determinations for the 1990s: the culmination of the issue of regulating the profession

Benites, Souza and Hunger (2008) point out that, from a political point of view, the transition between the 1980s and 1990s marked the intensification of the privatization of goods and ideological confrontations. This intensification, in the field of PE, supported by the context of managing the capital crisis, added to the need to consolidate the concept of

training this professional, the direction given by the unified struggle, as well as the emptying of APEF and FBAPEF, opened the door for conservative and corporatist projects to return to Brazilian politics and, consequently, the discussion on professional regulation resurfaced (Nozaki, 2004).

Castellani Filho (1998a, p. 86, emphasis added) points out that “[...] in this *void* [...] the conservative sectors once again closed ranks for political space”, causing the intense debate on the regulation of the area to resurface. The reoxygenation of the privatist and liberal group was based on the understanding that the profession's social recognition would be expanded by a law that regulated it, including it in the group of current professions (Benites; Souza; Hunger, 2008). In resistance, Faria Junior (1987) argued that any profession, including PE, needed to be based on its own process of historical constitution, and not on a set of laws that would give it regulatory status.

The balance of this confrontation can be seen in Castellani Filho's (1998a) presentation during the 8th Brazilian Congress of Physical Education:

In December 1994, at the *8th Brazilian Congress of Physical Education*, held in Brasília, DF, in a plenary session that was rather empty due to [the collapse of the APEF and FBAPEF, explained above] [...], it was decided *to launch the Regulatory Process Now!* Coupled with a timetable to be implemented by the *FBAPEF* Board elected at that event (Castellani Filho, 1998a, p. 86, emphasis added).

The issue of regulation was supported by some corporate segments of PE, under the jurisdiction that it would present “[...] strategic solutions for physical education workers in the context of the crisis of capital” (Nozaki, 2004, p. 196). On the other hand, the FBAPEF was committed to rescuing the existing APEFs in order to increase membership numbers. So it wasn't difficult for them to trigger the *Regulate Now!* process at the Brazilian Congress of Physical Education. Despite this, the board had pointed out that the content of the Congress' deliberations needed to be discussed, and that one of three measures would be taken: “[...] setting up a commission to draw up a draft project, [...] analysis of the project by all the - few - existing APEFs, [... or] holding an extraordinary congress to take up this issue again” (Nozaki, 2004, p. 197-198).

Proponents of regulation, especially those linked to the APEF in Rio de Janeiro, didn't wait for any of the three measures before setting up a process that would culminate in Law 9696/98. As a first step in the process, this group, a month after the Brasilia Congress, created the National Movement for the Regulation of Physical Education Professionals, in order to establish a communication network. The second step was the introduction of a Bill of Law (PL) in April 1995. This bill, numbered 330/95, dealt with the regulation of professionals and the creation of councils at federal and regional level.

Castellani Filho (1998a, p. 86, emphasis added) points out that “[...] in the middle of the first half of 1995, [the FBAPEF board] was surprised by the news that *PL 330/95* was being processed in the National Congress [...]”. This surprise, as Nozaki (2004) reveals, was due to the arbitrary action taken by the APEF in Rio de Janeiro to introduce this bill without discussing it with the other APEFs. The third step was to establish contact with PE teachers and students in an attempt to debate and reflect on the regulation and collect signatures in favor of the bill.

Supported [...] by the precarious conditions outside of work in schools (gyms, clubs, condominiums...), they used the discourse that this field had no owners, and that any layperson could take the place of the physical education professional (Nozaki, 2004, p. 200).

The last step took place at the end of 1995 and into 1996, when the debate on the issue of regulation was in a state of complete eruption. Positions for and against Bill 330/95 clashed.

The former sought to unveil the corporatist, privatist and neoliberal face of the bill. It is worth highlighting the article by Faria Junior *et al.* (1996, p. 269), the report by Palafox and Terra (1996) and the pressure exerted by the Physical Education Student Movement. Those in favour, on the other hand, were supported by the ideas of disqualifying lay professionals who had been filling vacancies in the unorganized job market. It is worth highlighting the petitions signed by those in favor of regulation (Nozaki, 2004).

The advocates of regulation were victorious. On the first day of September 1998, Law 9696/98, which regulated the profession through the creation of professional councils, was sanctioned by the President of the Republic.

Castellani Filho (1998b, p. 32), writing about the day after the approval of this law, points out: “The approval of PLS 33/98 [...] was, at the same time, a demonstration of the capacity for political articulation on the part of those in favor of regulation and another, unequivocal demonstration of the lack of concerted political action on the part of those who opposed it.” He also points out that, at that historic moment, FBAPEF's membership increased radically due to the choice of the first directors who would make up the Federal Council of Physical Education (CONFEF).

What we saw in the days following the passing of the law [9696/98] was a shameless sweetening of the pot by those who, having in the Councils the possibility of enforcing their intentions to reoccupy the lost ground within Physical Education, sought to take them under their wing. To this end, they did not shy away from creating and resurrecting from the ashes, overnight, a range of associations of Physical Education professionals (Castellani Filho, 1998b, p. 33).

Nozaki (2004) reveals that, from that moment on, the apefian movement did not cease to exist, but began to identify itself with the intensive actions of CONFEF and the Regional Councils of Physical Education (CREF), which were guaranteed their first board of directors in 1998. It is important to highlight the emergence of a Teachers' Organization Movement Against the Regulation of the Profession (MNCR).

The clash of positions adopted by these two movements was very much in line with the tension sewn up in the field of curriculum guidelines. At the same time as Law 9696/98 was passed, and under the normative influence of the new LDB (Law 9.394/96) (Andrade Filho, 2001), the Bachelor's degree guidelines were rediscussed, via Opinion No. 776/97, by a commission from the Ministry of Education (Scherer, 2005).

The position of different professors in the political-academic field of PE is in line with their interests in designing a training project for the curriculum guidelines. The tension is between two positions: one subsumed by capitalist logic, favorable and sensitive, in the political field, to the regulation of the area; and the other, linked to the critical-supervisory trend, which “[...] aims at a counter-internalization, which seeks training beyond capital” (Taffarel; Santos Júnior, 2010, p. 15), in favor of a socially underprivileged class and unfavorable, in the political-academic field, to Law No. 9696/98.

Scherer (2005, p. 35), when addressing the clash between professional training in PE through Opinion No. 776/97, points out that “[...] some institutions developed the idea that the teacher [...] is identified by his pedagogical intervention, regardless of the field of activity and indicating [...] training in a single course, others gestated the idea of specific training in differentiated areas [...]”.

Lemos *et al.* (2012) recalls that the Specialist Commission, tasked with rediscussing the PE curriculum guidelines, set out to improve Resolution No. 3/87, systematizing new guidelines that would overcome the contradictions present in this document, especially with regard to the fragmentation between bachelor's and teaching degrees. This proposal resulted in the document “New curricular guidelines for undergraduate courses in PE: justifications, propositions, arguments”, which was sent to the HEIs and later to the Higher Education Secretariat of the Ministry of Education and Culture, as well as to the National Education Council (CNE).

Andrade Filho (2001) points out that, initially, the Specialist Commission's proposals for readjusting the curriculum of PE degree courses were based on the contextualization of the institutionalization of the bachelor's degree, so that they could have

[...] a clearer picture of the paths taken, their conflicts and consequences. From this reading, it emerged that the creation of a bachelor's degree in the area was understood by the Commission as a response to criticism of the training of graduates, especially after the phenomenon of the sportification of society was observed, a fact that substantially altered the lifestyle habits of the world's population, particularly the Brazilian population, after the 1970s, diversifying and expanding the demand for and supply of non-school physical activities, especially in the sense of leisure and health. As a result, Physical Education courses were incorporating scientific, pedagogical and technical subjects, resulting in the specificity of the full degree curricula being de-characterized, while at the same time denying the specific skills for professional work outside of school (Andrade Filho, 2001, p. 27).

Based on the assumption of contextualization, an initial step taken by the Specialist Commission, it was suggested that PE training courses should be called undergraduate courses, and that the training of students linked to the courses should bring together “generalist knowledge” and “specialist knowledge”, a solid basic training complemented by an in-depth one, but restricted to the interest of improvement.

This measure was characterized by a supposed notion of overcoming the fragmentation of the area, which still focused on the degree-bachelor's degree dichotomy (Lemos *et al.*, 2012). By proposing two phases of training - one characterized by a common, basic bias, called Area-Identifying Knowledge, and the other by a specific bias, defining a professional depth, called Knowledge Identifying the Type of Deepening - this proposal to reformulate the guidelines failed to subordinate training to the job market, failing to overcome the (already remote) fragmentation and enabling, on the other hand, direct exploitation by the private sector.

4 Conclusions

The point of arrival, assumed by the movement in the field of training and professional intervention in PE during the 1980s and 1990s, can be characterized by uncertainty. Uncertainty about what could represent a privatist movement in relation to the process of regulating the profession, which had been underway since the first of the aforementioned decades, alongside an opinion drawn up by a Specialist Commission, and supported by a non-restricted conception of training and intervention in PE, which was still limited to the fragmentation of knowledge based on the dichotomization of the area.

The scenes in the following chapters of this story, the details of which could become the subject of another scientific investigation, can be summarized in consecutive moments in which the disputes between the privatist and progressive groups became evident. The first of these is observed after the promulgation of the National Curriculum Guidelines in 1999 by the CNE, as well as the ratification of Opinion No. 9/2001, which dealt with the National Curriculum Guidelines for the Training of Basic Education Teachers. These documents became conflicting from the commission's point of view, triggering the movement to draw up the Guidelines in 2004.

The second movement can be observed in the course of the historic struggle by intellectuals in the field to read and interpret the document that emerged in 2004 in order to affirm the intervention of PE teachers in school and non-school fields. And the third is

linked to events in the second decade of the new century to curb the interpretation of these intellectuals, such as the STJ decision in 2014, the promulgation of the National Curriculum Guidelines for the Training of Basic Education Teachers in 2015, and the non-compliance with the Draft for the elaboration of new Curriculum Guidelines for PE, also in 2015.

Fortunately, the obscurantism cultivated during the entire period when civil society's guard was down in PE, favored by the upsurge in democratic policies aimed at fulfilling constitutional duties since 2014, has been minimized since the resumption of a neo-developmental government policy in 2023. The favor found by the field of PE training and intervention for a new space for dialogue has enabled intellectuals to reaffirm the defense of expanded training and intervention in both fields of activity, school and non-school.

References

ANDRADE FILHO, Nelson Figueiredo de. Formação profissional em educação física brasileira: uma súpula da discussão dos anos de 1996 a 2000. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 22, n. 3, p. 23-37, maio 2001.

BENITES, Larissa Cerignoni; SOUZA NETO, Samuel de; HUNGER, Dagmar. O processo de constituição histórica das diretrizes curriculares na formação de professores de educação física. **Educação e Pesquisa**, v. 34, n. 2, p. 343-360, maio/ago. 2008.

BETTI, Mauro. Perspectivas na formação profissional. *In*: MOREIRA, Wagner Wey (Org.). **Educação física & esportes: perspectivas para o século XXI**. Campinas: Papirus, 1992. p. 239-254.

BRACHT, Valter. **Educação física e aprendizagem social**. Porto Alegre: Magister, 1992.
CASTELLANI FILHO, Lino. **Política educacional e educação física**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 1998a.

CASTELLANI FILHO, Lino. Regulamentação da profissão: the day after “2”. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 32-36, set. 1998b.

FARIA JUNIOR, Alfredo Gomes de. Professor de educação física: licenciado generalista. *In*: OLIVEIRA, Vitor Marinho de (Org.). **Fundamentos pedagógicos educação física**. Rio de Janeiro: Ao Livro Técnico, p. 15-34, 1987.

FARIA JUNIOR, Alfredo Gomes de. Reflexões sobre a educação física brasileira – a carta de belo horizonte. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 23, n. 1, p. 19-31, set. 2001.

FARIA JUNIOR, Alfredo Gomes de; CUNHA JÚNIOR, Carlos Fernando Ferreira da; NOZAKI, Hajime Takeuchi; MELO, Victor Andrade de. O velho problema da regulamentação – contribuições críticas à sua discussão. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 17, n. 3, p. 266-272, maio 1996.

LEMOS, Lovane Maria; VERONEZ, Luiz Fernando; MORSCHBACHER, Márcia; BOTH, Vilmar José. As contradições do processo de elaboração das diretrizes curriculares nacionais dos cursos de formação em Educação Física e os movimentos de resistência à submissão ao mercado. **Movimento**, v. 18, n. 3, p. 27-49, jul./set. 2012.

NOZAKI, Hajime Takeuchi. **Educação Física e reordenamento no mundo do trabalho: mediação da regulamentação da profissão**. Tese (Doutorado em Educação). Campinas: Universidade Federal Fluminense – Faculdade de Educação, UFF/FE, 2004.

PALAFIX, Gabriel Humberto Muñoz; TERRA, Dinah Vasconcellos. **Regulamentação da profissão de educação física: uma questão ideológica**. 1996. Disponível em: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3ZPQRKq9nOvVk9sNVZNUFAyME0/view>. Acesso em: 07 abr. 2024.

QUELHAS, Álvaro de Azeredo; NOZAKI, Hajime Takeuchi. A formação do professor de educação física e as novas diretrizes curriculares frente aos avanços do capital. **Motrivivência**, v. 23, n. 26, p. 69-87, jun. 2006.

SCHERER, Alexandre. Educação física e os mercados de trabalho no Brasil: quem somos, onde estamos e para onde vamos?. In: FIGUEIREDO, Zenólia Christina Campos (Org.). **Formação profissional em educação física e mundo do trabalho**. Vitória: Gráfica da Faculdade Salesiana, 2005. p. 31-47.

SANTOS JÚNIOR, Cláudio de Lira. **A formação de professores em educação física: a mediação dos parâmetros teórico-metodológicos**. Tese (Doutorado em Educação). Salvador: Universidade Federal da Bahia – Faculdade de Educação, UFBA/FACED, 2005.

SOARES, Carmen Lúcia; TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zülke; VARJAL, Elizabeth; CASTELLANI FILHO, Lino; ESCOBAR, Micheli Ortega; BRACHT, Valter. **Metodologia do Ensino de Educação Física**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1992.

SOUZA NETO, Samuel de; ALEGRE, Atilio de Nardi; HUNGER, Dagmar; PEREIRA, Juliana Martins. A formação do profissional de educação física no Brasil: uma história sob

a perspectiva da legislação federal no Século XX. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 25, n. 2, p. 113-128, jan. 2004.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zülke. **A formação do profissional da educação**: o processo de trabalho pedagógico e o trato com o conhecimento no curso de educação física. Tese (Doutorado em Educação). Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas – Faculdade de Educação, UNICAMP/FE, 1993.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zülke; SANTOS JÚNIOR, Cláudio de Lira. Formação humana e formação de professores de Educação Física: para além da falsa dicotomia licenciatura x bacharelado. *In*: TERRA, Dinah Vasconcellos; SOUZA JÚNIOR, Marcílio (Orgs.). **Formação em Educação Física & ciências do esporte**: políticas e cotidiano. São Paulo: Aderaldo & Rothschild; Goiânia: CBCE, 2010. p. 13-47.

TAFFAREL, Celi Zulke. Formação de professores de educação física: diretrizes para a formação unificada. **Kinesis**, v. 30, n. 1, jan./jun. 2012.

VENTURA, Paulo Roberto Veloso; BAPTISTA, Tadeu João Ribeiro; ANES, Rodrigo Roncato Marques; SCHIMIDT, Ademir. **Metodologia da investigação científica – um olhar a partir de pesquisadores da educação física**. Goiânia, p. 1-27, 2015.

ⁱ **Júlio César Apolinário Maia**, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7162-2136>.

Universidade Estadual de Goiás. Unidade Universitária de Itumbiara.

Doutor em Educação pela Universidade Federal de Goiás, 2024. Professor no curso de Educação Física da Universidade Estadual de Goiás – Unidade Universitária de Itumbiara. Integrante do Corpo e Mente – Grupo de estudos e pesquisas sobre Formação e Intervenção Profissional em Educação Física.

Authorship contribution: problematization and conceptualization, methodology, analysis and writing.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1566093335953705>.

E-mail: jcesarm@outlook.com.

ⁱⁱ **Rodrigo Roncato Marques Anes**, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6074-1845>.

Universidade Estadual de Goiás. Unidade Universitária de Inhumas. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação.

Doutor em Educação pela Universidade Federal de Goiás, 2018. Professor no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Estadual de Goiás – Unidade Universitária de Inhumas. Líder do Corpo e Mente – Grupo de estudos e pesquisas sobre Formação e Intervenção Profissional em Educação Física.

Authorship contribution: problematization and conceptualization, methodology, analysis and writing.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1524134785032887>.

E-mail: rodrigo.anes@ueg.br.

Responsible publisher: Genifer Andrade

Ad hoc expert: Cristiano Mezzaroba e Alexander Barreiros Cardoso Bomfim.

25

How to cite this article (ABNT):

MAIA, Júlio César Apolinário; ANES, Rodrigo Roncato Marques. Palco de batalha: formação e intervenção profissional em Educação Física nas décadas 1980 e 1990. **Rev. Pemo**, Fortaleza, v. 6, e13387, 2024. Available at: <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/revpemo/article/view/13387>

Received on June 26, 2024.

Accepted on July 24, 2024.

Published on September 17, 2024.