

Analysis of theoretical-methodological knowledge of CEFD/UFSM physical education Professors in relation to their pedagogical practice¹

Daniele de Vargas Michelotti *

Maristela da Silva Souza **

Abstract: This study is justified by its contributions to changes in the curriculum of the Physical Education (PE) course - Teaching Degree - Physical Education and Sports Center / Federal University of Santa Maria, in the sense of qualifying teaching methods for future PE Professors who will work in schools. It aims at analyzing whether CEFD Professors have clear theoretical-methodological knowledge to be used in the elaboration/development of their pedagogical practice. Structured interviews are used as per the paradigmatic scheme presented by Gamboa (2002), and the Professors' ontological assumptions are analyzed. Among other aspects, it was ascertained that they do not have clear theoretical-methodological knowledge to be used in their pedagogical action because there are incoherencies in conceptions that reflect directly on school PE.

Key Words: Physical Education. Teaching. Knowledge. Curriculum.

1INTRODUCTION

The concern in carrying out a study on the theoretical-methodological knowledge of Physical Education (PE) Professors at the Physical Education and Sports Center (CEFD) of the Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM) in relation to their pedagogical practices stemmed from interest in contributing towards changes in the curriculum for the PE-Teaching Degree course at CEFD/UFSM, as well as contributing towards the qualification of teaching methods in the formation of future PE Professors who will work in schools.

Over the past few decades in Brazil, PE has become the target of countless discussions and questions in an attempt to better understand its identity, its object of study and its social role. In an attempt to explain these aspects, among so many others, thus providing Professors with firmer foundations on which to carry out their work, many studies have emerged

¹ Paper presented as final evaluation of the Graduate Studies course in School Physical Education - CEFD/UFSM, as a requirement to receive a degree as specialist in School Physical Education

* Professor and specialist in School Physical Education - CEFD/UFSM. Santa Maria, RS, Brazil. E-mail: danielemichelotti@yahoo.com.br

** Assistant Professor at CEFD/UFSM, Santa Maria, RS, Brazil. Advisor. E-mail: souzamaris@bol.com.br

concerning teaching concepts, methodologies, paradigms and curriculum, even in higher learning for PE. According to Silva (1997), specifically in the case of PE and sports, there is no denying that over the past twenty years important changes have occurred that have contributed towards building a new epistemological profile for this area of knowledge, and these changes are the product and process of a broader context, the result of multiple historical-social determinants.

The curriculum of PE courses has been undergoing changes as it accompanies these transformations. According to Goellner (1992), the formulation of curricula in Professor courses and the consolidation of PE as a school discipline are dialectically interrelated issues. The author means “[...] at the same time that the curriculum determines school practice, it is also determined by it, through a succession of facts that constructed and reconstructed over history, which presupposes a dynamic view of society” (GOELLNER, 1992, p. 4), where the subjects have an active function in face of the modifications that occur in it. Along these lines, Ferreira (1995, p. 215) says “[...] rethinking PE curricula is to rethink its very social-pedagogical function.” That is why it is necessary, within the context of the CEFD, and together with curriculum reform, to rethink the theoretical-methodological knowledge its Professors present in relation to their pedagogical practice, because we understand that they are the direct agents for change through their classes; changes that will be directly reflected on the formation of future Professors who will work in the school PE context.

It is believed that the teaching process is influenced by the world view (here understood as the social perspective of the world), that is, “[...] an organic, articulated and structured set of values, representations, ideas and cognitive guidelines, internally unified by a certain *perspective*, by a certain socially conditioned *point of view*” (LÖWY, 1994, p. 13). That said, it is possible for us to affirm the same with regard to the methodological construction of the teaching process, since the view of the world, society, education, science, PE and the subject the Professor has, even if implicitly, also reflects on how that Professor teaches, how he/she deals with the knowledge in the classroom and in the teaching methodology employed.

Therefore, this study proposal is presented with the intention of contributing towards CEFD’s curriculum restructuring, seeking the systematization of knowledge to identify the modifications needed for an effective change in this curriculum, in the sense of contemplating

development of a formation truly geared towards a teaching degree, since the curriculum for the 2005 teaching degree, besides being explicitly geared towards the pedagogical practice of school PE, presents 405 classroom hours of curriculum practices distributed over 20 disciplines. That means students will have contact with the school throughout their entire learning process, thus needing pedagogical guidance for the moments of observation or intervention that will be performed. We agree with Dib (1994, p.42) when he says the formation process needs to occur through “[...] a constant dynamic of critical reflections on the theoretical bases, methodologies and experiences, seeking solid alternatives for educational impasses.”

Starting with these issues, this study aims at analyzing whether CEFD Professors have clear theoretical-methodological knowledge to be used in the elaboration/development of their pedagogical practice.

2 THE PATHS OF RESEARCH

According to Kosik, *apud* Gamboa (2002), the process of knowing reality is developed through the consolidation of the parts to the whole and the whole to the parts, of the phenomena to the essence and the essence to the phenomena, of the contradictions to the totality and the totality to the contradictions. Thus, all of the elements (facts, concepts, conceptions, techniques, methods, theories, scientific models, philosophical assumptions, etc.) find themselves in a reciprocal movement and mutually explain themselves, where this totality is explicitly or implicitly found in the diversity of elements articulated in this process. With the objective of elucidating these elements that are part of the totality of phenomena and understanding the articulations between these elements, calling attention to the study of models and epistemological paradigms, Gamboa (2002) proposes an analysis through which what he called the “paradigmatic scheme”, on which this study was based. The author proposes the establishment of some indicators used for analysis and that are expressed as levels, such as technical-instrumental, methodological, theoretical and epistemological, and in the form of assumptions, such as gnoseological and ontological. The characteristics found at the levels and assumptions demonstrate a certain logic, a certain dialectic, which according to Kopnin (1978) studies the movement of knowledge in the sense of unveiling its contradictions, heading towards the objective truth.

For a better understanding of theoretical-methodological knowledge based on pedagogical practices by CEFD Professors, we used the referred to paradigmatic scheme, more specifically employing ontological assumptions that refer to the concepts of Humans, Society, History and Education that mesh with each other in an implicit or explicit world view in all production of knowledge. However, we added the concepts of PE, Sports, Movement and Science to these assumptions. This research was conducted using a script for interviews that refers to these assumptions. During their analysis, the premise was to question the ontological assumptions of the CEFD Professors and through dialogue with some authors, reveal the incoherencies among the assumptions in the sense of understanding whether the CEFD Professors clearly understand the theoretical-methodological knowledge used to elaborate and develop their pedagogical practices.

Thus, our starting point for building this knowledge is CEFD's current moment, since it recently underwent a curriculum reform and now offers two courses: the Teaching Degree, geared towards pedagogical practices within the scope of the school and the Bachelor's Degree, geared towards pedagogical practice outside the scope of the school. Since our concern in this study is with the pedagogical practice of future Professors who will work at schools, this study will examine the pedagogical practices of CEFD Professors who work in the Teaching Degree program, understanding that the pedagogical action developed in the school, strongly reflects the pedagogical action developed in formation courses, among other aspects.

At the moment, CEFD has 24 Professors, distributed over three departments, and where three Professors are currently on leave from academic activities to pursue their PhD. Thus, a total of 15 Professors, who showed interest and availability to contribute towards its development, participated in this study.

Thus, with the CEFD's current context as a starting point, justified by the fact that we understand a study should begin at its most developed form (Kopnin, 1978), we first carried out an analysis related to its history, such as its first Professors, first curriculum and the context in which it developed. After all, Kopnin (1978) says "the reproduction of one or another phenomenon's essence is, at the same time, the discovery of that phenomenon's history" (p.185). Second, we analyzed the interviews according to the "paradigmatic scheme"

(described above) so we could summarize the study at the end, indicating problems and some possibilities for overcoming them.

3 SITUATING SOME HISTORICAL ISSUES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CEFD/UFSM

First we conducted a study on the history of the CEFD in order to get more in-depth knowledge regarding the context in which we developed the study, as well as its definitions and primary processes. For such, we used the book entitled “História do Centro de Educação Física e Desportos/ UFSM- 25 anos”, by Janice Zarpelon Mazo, 1997, as a primary reference.

Due to the maximum length restrictions in an article, we will now present some historical issues so the reader can learn a little about the CEFD construction process. However, knowledge from this historic research will be presented throughout this text.

CEFD was founded in the beginning of the 1970s, when, according to Mazo (1997), repression practices were present in the country due to the military takeover in 1964. At first, CEFD's faculty was comprised of six Professors who were selected from a public contest in 1970. With the growth of higher education in Brazil, the CEFD also grew and constituted its faculty, with an original majority having had experience in sports. This was because higher education PE curricula were basically comprised of practical disciplines, and the hour load given to sports was quite high, with great emphasis given to the technical aspects, striving for sports performance. CEFD's first curriculum was systematized, lasting 3 to 5 years, including basic subjects (anatomy, physiology, hygiene...), pedagogical formation (didactics, structure and functioning of High School, educational psychology...), professionalizing disciplines (rhythmic gymnastics, swimming, track and field, recreation, first aid) and complementary disciplines (sports training, refereeing, methodology, sports, internship, moral and civic education, organization). In 1977, a commission was gathered to elaborate a draft for a new curriculum, however the effort did not result in effective change, and it was only reformulated in 1990. This curriculum included disciplines of general, specific and elective (ACGs) disciplines, and the course lasted four years.

At present, in 2004, the CEFD's curriculum was once again reformulated and based on the Law of Guidelines and Bases that has been in effect since 1996, and which indicates the need for curriculum restructuring. Thus, the CEFD today has two new courses for PE

Professor formation, the Teaching Degree course, which began first semester of 2005, and the Bachelor's Degree, which began first semester of 2006, with some classes still following the "old" curriculum from 1990.

4 ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS: ONTOLOGICAL CONCEPTS OF CEFD/UFSM PROFESSORS

We begin the analysis of interviews creating a dialogue between what the teachers said and our theoretical references, starting from the conceptions of Society, Education and Subject, and in this dialogue, incorporating Science, PE, Sports and Movement. In relation to the conception of society, we encountered understandings within a critical vision, as in the case of Professor E, who understands it as: “[...] an organized arrangement of elements, comprised of people, governed by certain laws, guidelines, depending on social systems that we are referring to, you know, and these laws are in agreement with those subjects present in that society.” We also encountered discourse that indicates we should break some barriers so we can construct a more just society, indicating that current society is discriminatory. However, such discourse does not directly express that these problems are consequences of a certain economic model of society, as mentioned by Professor M:

[...] today our society is neoliberal; it is strongly capitalistic. (...), the outskirts of our cities, you know, our unemployment rates, low-income rates, income differences, you know, Brazil is still a record holder in income differences, many make a little, or, few make a lot, and many make hardly anything, you know.

Professor J also criticizes society, however, contrary to Professor M, he does not believe his problems are directly related to the economic model:

Look, I think there are very conflicting interests in the world we live in, but I don't think there are two groups in permanent combat. Perhaps because they are permeated by ideology, but the way I read it today, read society, to try and be objective and answer your question, is that we have several mechanisms for domination that are not essentially economic, but rather seduce a logic, a way of life, you know, a highly consumption-oriented, individualistic way of life and these concepts end up shaping our imagination, you see.

With that in mind, we can ask ourselves: doesn't a society that excludes and is individualistic reproduce the values of the current economic system in our society, capitalism? Demonstrating some incoherence in his answers, when Professor J reveals his concept of science, he answers:

[...] today, science is not disconnected from this economic interest, it's not, so it's complicated, there's good potential, but the thing is it's made by man, you know, I don't think the problem lies in science, the problem lies in the human issue that goes hand-in-hand with who does science, has that visibility, the fight for power, financial interests.

Despite the criticisms against current society made by CEFD Professors, a dialectic relationship between the subject and nature in the formation of the social context, where "Human-Nature interaction is a permanent process of mutual transformation: this is the production process of human existence" (ANDERY *et al*, 1996, p.10), is rarely presented in the conceptions of Professors at this center. The determining concept is a society based on positivist theory, which according to natural science assumptions sees society governed by natural, invariable laws, independent from human actions, where a harmonious and natural relationship exists. (LÖWY, 1994). This is clear in the following discourses:

I understand society as a group subject to certain rules that are not necessarily written, they can be rules, ah, traditional customs, in short, a group that lives together within a certain geographical space, [...] set of rules, [...], that guide behavior and how this group lives ..." (PROFESSOR C).

Society is a group of people, you know, of individuals who get together with the objective of a better life, organizing themselves in a structure that permits a functional organization that better qualifies and improves everyone's life (PROFESSOR B).

In relation to the conception of education, we can say, together with Saviani (2000) that education permits the appropriation of historically produced human culture, and this cultural knowledge is systematized by the school institution. This is seen in the words of Professor M:

[...] education would also be..., be a, a... conception that would also place this concept of culture, you know, in a practice, in a transformation, object of a transformation of this society and the elaboration of this knowledge we call scientific, of common sense, and which is not one or the other, which in

truth, in the end, is an understanding of how this scientific knowledge today can be transformed into this... this social being.

However, through the analysis of these interviews, we can infer that the perspective of education that predominates at the CEFD today, does not demonstrate a dialectic relationship between it and society, but rather a static space for assimilating knowledge that serves to adapt and shape the subject in the current context. This view can be seen in the words of the following Professors:

[...]education is process that from my point of view makes it possible for people to live well in this society, you know, live well with each other and with others in general. (PROFESSOR N).

Well, education is a transformation process, of change in the individual, you know, where you build values, principles! Knowledge that favors this individual to play an increasingly better role in this society. To be useful in this society [...]. (PROFESSOR B).

Education... I understand it as being a form to receive knowledge, see, [...], according to what is understood as being appropriate, it is a way, actually, a way for the individual to be inserted in society, through education, for him to acquire knowledge that permits him to operate in this society, so he can be accepted in this society, see! (PROFESSOR E).

Consequently, as a result of this predominant perspective of society and education, we have, while dominating, a view of PE that has the development of physical skills as its main objective, permitting the student to reach the maximum of his/her physical capacity (SOARES *et al.* 1992). Although the referred to work dates from 1992, more than a decade ago, we notice that this perspective of PE still dominates, as is clear in the CEFD context through the following discourses:

In reality it (EF) is a set of knowledge that qualifies the person to operate in society, valorizing..., working towards improvement, body prevention, physical, the most physical aspect. And also using the body, movement, the physical for the education process, of learning, see. So I think PE is a process of transformation of humankind itself, or from a PE view, we see education as a means to transform, modify this physique, this body, geared towards health, education. (PROFESSOR B).

[...] but PE is a..., it works, or it should work on concepts related to sports as well as movement, it inserts this entire context, everything related to physical and individual activity, I see it as being PE. (PROFESSOR E).

PE, to begin with, I'm very radical in certain aspects, I [...] a course that is not for everyone, I think we should actually go back to those motor function tests we used to have. The person could only take PE if approved in the motor function aptitude test, and then he/she could take the college board for PE [...]. (PROFESSOR L).

However, we also found some discourses that understand PE as a pedagogical practice, although they appear to be a considerable minority. We highlight the following:

Physical Education is definitely a pedagogical practice. [...]. It works with forms of expression that are very connected to the culture of movement, body culture, see, and I think that within these forms of expression we have games, gymnastics, dance, wrestling. (PROFESSOR G).

To me, the idea of physical education, when you speak of physical education to me, it is a pedagogical practice, linked to the school issue. (PROFESSOR A).

With regard to the conceptions of movement, we found different understandings. For Professor A, movement should be understood from the meanings the subject gives it, seen as an issue full of intentionality. Along these same lines, we consider it important to highlight Professor H: "PE, I don't think every movement is PE, it has to be intentional, it has to have an objective, and then we can begin to talk about human movement as a specificity within PE". Professor M understands movement as an element of culture. Others, like Professors E, F, N, L, say they believe movement has both biological and mechanical functions.

From the understandings of the professors regarding movement, we realize that the majority claim it is PE's function to work with human movement, although they do not specify what this movement is, which leads to an understanding that PE deals with any movement. Bracht (1999) considers that an error, because PE's function is to explain, understand and interpret the cultural objectives of human movement, an area that deals with the scope of movement's body culture. The author says it is necessary for PE professors to overcome the positivist view that movement is predominantly motor function behavior, and understand that movement is human, and since the human is fundamentally a social being, motor function is

no longer merely biological, but rather historical and social. Movement thus has repercussions in every dimension of the human being.

As a result of the CEFD professors' predominant conceptions, in the great majority of discourses, sports is not understood as a dimension of body culture, as PE content, as explained by Professor A:

Well, I think sports, like, it's our cultural asset, it's something we cannot deny, you know? But we also have to have a critical relation with it. And I think of sports more as content for PE classes, thinking of PE classes as a pedagogical practice, as content for these classes.

What predominantly appears is sports as something greater than PE. According to Bracht (2003), it is not sufficient for sports to be learned and practiced in school spaces. It is also necessary for school sports to contribute towards instrumentalizing the individual to understand the sports phenomenon. However, the sports found in schools today has determinations that are founded on the principles of efficiency and productivity.

I see sports as something more regimented, that needs certain laws, not necessarily institutionalized sports with very strict rules an all, but sports, there are certain characteristics, even if these characteristics are proposed by the students, there is an entire systematic that characterizes it as a simple game or a sports practice. (PROFESSOR E).

According to Soares *et al.* (1992) the relation between school PE and sports indicates PE's subordination to the codes of sports institutions where sport is understood as an extension of these, with their codes, which practically boil down to athletic performance, strict regulation and rationalization of technical means.

We ascertained that some incoherencies appeared in the professors' discourses, as in the case of Professor E who presented a critical view in his understanding of society and the subject, but when he presents his conception of science he seems to contradict himself, because he believes science is:

[...] all knowledge with a series of data and results obtained from using specific method, see. So science is used to discover more about certain obscure issues or to implement more specific, ah... let's say products, for example, medications, to advance more in research along those lines...

This understanding shows us a view of science based on the analytical empirical paradigm, because it restricts itself to deal with immediate needs. According to Löwy (1994),

along these lines, science is limited to observation and the explanation of phenomena in an objective and neutral manner, free of judging values or ideologies. Of course, we agree with professor E that discoveries and scientific explanations also act as determining factors in the production of new knowledge, however, we cannot disregard that science is the source of ideas produced by the subject to satisfy social needs, thus determined by them and resulting in them.

Some professors reveal coherence in their conceptions in what we could call a positivist view of the subject and society, reinforcing them with their conceptions of science. We also encountered understandings of science like:

[...] that which goes to the field, studies difficulties, identifies, ascertains problems and proposes solutions, so the science I judge can work with those principles we talked about earlier. It has to be a science that identifies and proposes knowledge that leads to reflection, that is critical, that identifies the problems, deficiencies, limitations, obstacles and that is propositional. (PROFESSOR D).

Badaró (2005, p. 29) believes it is necessary to “[...] deconstruct the belief that science is the only explanation for reality and is a certain and infallible knowledge”, which is in agreement with Professors A and J, who say science is not the only or even the most important type of knowledge.

Considering all the conceptions discussed thus far, we understand it to be important to underscore that most of the professors interviewed said they believe the conceptions of society, science, education, subject, PE, sports and movement directly influence their classes.

However, one of the issues that caught our attention, and in a way directly contributes towards our analysis is the knowledge of the professors in relation to the pedagogical proposals for teaching school PE. Only four professors presented knowledge about these, which led us to understand that the majority of the CEFD’s professors do not have great concern with the theoretical-methodological support for their pedagogical proposals. However, many professors underscore the importance of students having knowledge about them. With this in mind, we ask: How can these students have this knowledge if the majority of the professors does not? We believe it is fundamental to highlight some of the discourses along these lines. “In terms of theory, I cannot say I, ah, know proposals, mostly because this

pedagogical area is not, you know, my concern.” (PROFESSOR F). “I don’t know them! [...], so there’s a lot I read about, I hear, I listen to, I talk about, but I cannot say I know the the discussions, the proposals, otherwise I would be telling you a lie” (PROFESSOR C).

Nevertheless, in relation to the pedagogical proposals, we believe it is important to highlight Professor A:

What’s worse for me isn’t the conception, what’s worse is when the professor doesn’t know his conception, that’s what’s worse to me. When the professor doesn’t know, that’s it, it’s over, it’s worthless. What are you going to do? He would have to learn everything again. This is a problem we face, I think even here, at our university, CEFD. And look, often it’s not his fault, it’s the fault of the whole system that prepared him.

We agree with professor A, because we understand it becomes difficult for professors to be critics of the teaching process without a relationship between theory and practice. Gramsci (1986) says the subject who does not have a critical perception of the world but rather a spontaneous philosophy is not clear about his actions. They can even be a contradiction between his theoretical consciousness and his action, leading to extreme contradictions, that is, the immobilization of choice and of action in the moral and political sense.

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This moment of synthesis is not the result of a mere formal research process, restricted to closed and predetermined results. During the study, the syntheses began to develop, permitting a glimpse into the theoretical-methodological context of CEFD professors. We had no intention to label the professors, classifying them in certain paradigms. Our study aimed at explaining whether CEFD teachers have clear theoretical-methodological knowledge to be used in the elaboration and development of their classes. About this issue, we underscore that most CEFD professors did not demonstrate clarity regarding the knowledge on which their pedagogical practice is founded. This position is justified by the contradictions presented in their discourses, because in some moments there are critical conceptions and in others acritical conceptions², demonstrating a lack of articulation regarding the conceptions of Society, Education, PE/Sports/Movement that direct their pedagogical action. Besides this reality, there is a trend towards the development of pedagogical practices restricted to biological/motor

development. We understand that this formation process provides a strong contribution towards the development of a pedagogical practice that in the school context is based either on common sense, which for Saviani (2000, p.2) means “[...] a fragmented, incoherent, disarticulated, implicit, degraded, mechanical, passive and simplistic conceptino”, or is tied to essentials of natural sciences, without the necessary dialogue with social sciences, because, according to Ferreira (1995, p. 214):

After all, in human movement organic-physiological repercussions are indeed recorded, and this knowledge must be socialized; but historical-social signs also occur expressing relationships of political-economic hegemony in a certain society, and this too is a knowledge that needs to be socialized.

However, we also realize that the professors who entered CEFD most recently have greater concern with the relationship between theory and practice when elaborating and developing their classes, which permits us to work with the hypothesis that CEFD professors who graduated before the so-called PE crisis (1980s) are still a little tied to a technical/sports perspective of PE. We base this position on Mazon (1997), who through an analysis of CEFD history concluded that higher education PE curricula were basically comprised of practical disciplines, and the hour load given to sports was quite high, with great emphasis given to the technical aspects, striving for sports performance. The author believes these curricular characteristics guided the profile of PE professors, and are still imbedded today, with these professors seen as “[...] a good practitioner and performer, preferably with an athletic appearance and a past in sports” (MAZO, 1997, p. 39).

As a result of this reality found at CEFD, we also raise the following question: How are we going to become part of Brazilian intellectual production, which is considerably advanced with regard to some aspects (philosophical, anthropological, sociological...) if we do not have clear theoretical assumptions that guide our pedagogical practice? Of course, the mere presentation of these clear issues in and of itself does not guarantee a qualitatively elaborated pedagogical practice, but it is a good starting point. We understand that PE’s pedagogical context, specifically within the scope of preparing PE teachers, needs an everyday practice of body culture understanding and objectivity, established in a coherent manner

² According to Rays (1999), critical conception is more significant than acritical conception, since it characterizes a whole dimension and does not know the duality between theory (knowledge) and practice (action).

between theory and practice, breaking with PE's pragmatic and simplistic practice in dealing with its teaching content.

We believe there are possibilities for success in the sense of rethinking ways to consolidate the construction of this new teaching degree course. One of these assumes interdisciplinarity formation with the Pedagogical Political Project as a theoretical axis for the course, and that these actions become part of the department's policies, since as affirmed in the classic work by Vázquez (1968, p. 207):

Theory itself [...] does not transform the world. It can contribute towards its transformation, but for that it needs to sprout from itself and first of all it needs to be assimilated by those who through their effective actions will cause this transformation. Between the theory and the transforming practice there is a job of *educating consciences*, of organizing the material means and solid plans for action; all of this as an indispensable means to develop real and effective actions. Along these lines, a theory is practical as it materializes through a series of *mediations*, which before only existed as an ideal, as knowledge of reality or the ideal anticipation of its transformation.

Análise do conhecimento teórico-metodológico dos professores em educação física do CEFD/UFSM em relação à sua prática pedagógica

Resumo: Este estudo justifica-se por contribuir com modificações no currículo do curso de Educação Física (EF) -Licenciatura Plena – Centro de Educação Física e Desportos/ Universidade Federal de Santa Maria), no sentido da qualificação dos métodos de ensino dos futuros professores de EF que atuarão na escola. Objetiva analisar se professores do CEFD possuem clareza quanto ao conhecimento teórico-metodológico utilizado na elaboração/desenvolvimento de sua prática pedagógica. Utiliza-se entrevista estruturada no esquema paradigmático apresentado por Sanchez Gamboa (2002), e analisam-se os pressupostos ontológicos desses professores. Entre outros aspectos, constatou-se que eles não possuem clareza quanto ao conhecimento teórico-metodológico utilizado na sua ação pedagógica, por existirem incoerências nas concepções, o que, reflete diretamente na EF escolar.

Palavras chaves: Educação Física. Ensino. Conhecimento. Currículo.

Análisis del conocimiento teórico-metodológico de los profesores en educación física del CEFD/UFSM con relación a su práctica pedagógica³

Resumen: Este estudio se justifica por contribuir con modificaciones en el currículo del curso de Educación Física (EF) – Licenciatura Plena – Centro de Educación Física y Deportes / Universidad Federal de Santa María, en el sentido de la calificación de los métodos de enseñanza de los futuros profesores de EF que van a actuar en la escuela. Objetiva analizar si profesores del CEFD tienen claridad cuanto al conocimiento teórico-metodológico utilizado en la elaboración /desarrollo de su práctica pedagógica. Se utiliza una entrevista estructurada en el esquema paradigmático presentado por Gamboa (2002), y se analizan los presupuestos ontológicos de estos maestros. En medio a otros

³ Paper presented as final evaluation of the Graduate Studies course in School Physical Education - CEFD/UFSM, as a requirement to receive a degree as specialist in School Physical Education

aspectos, se constató que ellos no tienen claridad cuanto al conocimiento teórico-metodológico usado en su acción pedagógica, por existieren incoherencias en las concepciones, lo que, refleja directamente en la EF escolar.

Palabras-clave: Educación Física. Enseñanza. Conocimiento. Currículo.

REFERENCES

ANDERY ET ALL. **Para compreender a ciência:** uma perspectiva histórica. São Paulo: Espaço e Tempo, 1996a.

BRACHT, V. **Educação Física e ciência:** cenas de um casamento (in) feliz. Ijuí. Ed, UNIJUÍ, 1999.

BADARÓ, C. E. **Epistemologia e ciência:** reflexão e prática na sala de aula. Bauru: Edusc. São Paulo, 2005.

SOARES, Carmen *et al.*. **Metodologia de Ensino da Educação Física.** São Paulo: Cortez, 1992.

DIB, M, M. **Paradigma crítico das tendências pedagógicas em Educação Física na cidade de Londrina – Paraná.** 1994. Dissertação (Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria. 1994.

FERREIRA, M. G. **Teoria da Educação Física: Bases epistemológicas e propostas pedagógicas.** In As ciências do esporte no Brasil. Campinas: Autores Associados, 1995.

GOELLNER, S. V. **A evolução do pensamento pedagógico da Educação Física escolar Brasileira e sua relação com o movimento curricular dos cursos de Educação Física.** 1992. Monografia (Especialização). Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria, 1992.

GRAMSCI, A. **Concepção dialética da história.** Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1986.

KOPNIN, P. V. **A dialética como teoria e lógica do conhecimento.** Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1978.

LOWY, M. **As aventuras de Karl Marx contra o Barão de Muchhausen-Marxismo e positivismo na sociologia do conhecimento.** 5. ed.. São Paulo: Cortez, 1994.

MAZO, J. Z. **História do Centro de Educação Física e Desportos/ UFSM- 25 anos.** Santa Maria, 1997.

RAYS, O. A. Seleção e organização do saber escolar: concepções de processamento. *In:* RAYS, O. A. (org). **Trabalho Pedagógico.** Porto Alegre: Sulina, 1999.

SÁNCHEZ GAMBOA, S. A. Tendências epistemológicas: dos tecnicismos e outros “ismos” aos paradigmas científicos. *In:* SANTOS FILHO, José Camilo dos; SÁNCHEZ GAMBOA,

Sílvio Ancízar. **Pesquisa educacional:** Quantidade-Qualidade. 5. ed.. São Paulo. Cortez, 2002.

SAVIANI, D. **Educação:** do Senso Comum à Consciência Filosófica. 13. ed.. São Paulo: Autores Associados, 2000.

SILVA, R. V. de S. **Pesquisa em Educação Física:** determinações históricas e implicações epistemológicas. 1997. Tese de doutorado. Campinas. Unicamp, São Paulo. 1997.

VÁZQUEZ, A. S. **Filosofia da Práxis.** Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1968.

Received on: 9/4/2007

Approved on: 2/21/2008