



TEACHERS' VIEWS ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION TRAINING IN THE 1970s-1980s

*OLHARES DOCENTES SOBRE A FORMAÇÃO EM EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA
NOS ANOS 1970-1980* 

*MIRADAS DOCENTES SOBRE LA FORMACIÓN EN EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA
EN LOS AÑOS 1970-1980* 

 <https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.136530>

 **Guilherme Gonçalves Baptista*** <guilhermebaptista@eefd.ufrj.br>

 **Gustavo da Motta Silva*** <gustavomotta1990@hotmail.com>

 **Sílvia Maria Agatti Lüdorf*** <sagatti.rlk@terra.com.br>

* Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

Abstract: This study aimed at understanding the impact of tensions in Physical Education during the 1970s and 1980s on the perception of teachers at the Escola de Educação Física e Desportos / EEFD (School of Physical Education and Sports) of the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro about the purpose and conceptions in dispute in the area. Through the analysis of documents and oral sources, the results reveal that, although there was evidence of an education predominantly focused on motor, sporting, and physical fitness aspects at the EEFD, there were different competing representations of teaching identity at the institution.

Keywords: Physical Education. Teacher training. History of Education. Professionals knowledge.

Received on: Nov. 1, 2023
Approved on: July 11, 2024
Published in: Oct. 30, 2024



This is an article published
in open access under
the Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0)

1 INTRODUCTION¹

Teacher training in higher education is a fruitful stage for analyzing the diversity of theories, practices, and interests since it allows students to have different discussions and experiences in their field. Thus, the university is a fertile ground for debate and the construction of new perspectives on education and higher education (Raupp, 2022).

Regarding Physical Education formation, which is the focus of this study, historiography recognizes that the physical capacity of individuals was widely valued during the 20th century (Carmo Junior, 2011). However, this paradigm was criticized in the 1970s and, more intensely, in the 1980s, as the field incorporated debates on the cultural, historical, and social dimensions of bodily manifestations (Alvin; Taborda de Oliveira, 2006).

In this way, the teacher training process is an exciting environment in which to explore the tensions in the field. In fact, during the 1970s and 1980s, the growing epistemological debate in Physical Education questioned the objectives and functions of the area, which were traditionally associated with a technical-instrumental rather than a critical-formative nature (Oliveira, 1994). Medina (1990) even stated that a crisis was needed in the area to “search for its identity” (p. 35).

In this study, we chose to analyze teacher training at the Escola de Educação Física e Desportos / EEFD (School of Physical Education and Sports) of the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). The EEFD succeeded the pioneering Escola Nacional de Educação Física e Desportos of Universidade do Brasil, which played a fundamental role in the development of Physical Education in the country (Melo, 1996).

Despite the evidence of training predominantly based on motor, sporting, and physical fitness aspects at the EEFD, there was a process of curriculum reformulation underway during the 1970s and 1980s (Baptista, 2017). These years indicate possible changes in the field that could have an impact on teacher training. Therefore, it is crucial to analyze this training process to understand the implications of different conceptions of Physical Education.

These questions, even within a specific context, can support analyses of the tensions in the area and the educational field, especially during a period in which groups of intellectuals/teachers were fighting against what they considered to be a militaristic, hygienist, and sports-oriented hegemony in Physical Education (Bracht, 1999).

Therefore, this article sought to understand the impact of tensions in Physical Education during the 1970s and 1980s on the perception of teachers at the Escola de Educação Física e Desportos (EEFD), who were active during this period, about the purpose and conceptions in dispute in the field.

¹ The submitted article is an extension of the following work: BAPTISTA, Guilherme Gonçalves. **A formação de professores na Escola de Educação Física e Desportos de 1979 a 1985: a educação do corpo e os territórios de diálogo**. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Física). Escola de Educação Física e Desportos, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2015.

2 METHODS

This study adopted a combination of oral history and the analysis of documentary sources as its methodological approach. The former consists of interviews with individuals who participated in or witnessed past events or contexts (Alberti, 2011), helping to analyze the complexity of current issues and the unpredictability of the social circumstances in which the subjects acted (Silva; Lemos, 2013). As Portelli (1996) pointed out, remembering and telling already involves an exercise in interpretation.

As for oral sources, following a semi-structured script, statements from five EEFD teachers (Chart 1) were collected during the period under analysis. Although there was some direction, the interviewees were free to address different topics (Gaskell, 2003). The criteria for selecting the interviewees were: a) having availability to participate in the research; b) diversity of professional profiles and experience in different positions in the EEFD; and c) representativeness in the collegiate bodies.² They are referred to as P1, P2, P3, P4, and P5, where P means “teacher”.

Chart 1 – Characteristics of the interviewed teachers

Interview	Sex	Department	Year of admission ³
P1 ^{4,5}	Female	Running	1979
P2 ⁶	Male	Games	1970
P3 ⁷	Male	Gymnastics and Acrobatics	1970
P4 ⁸	Female	Running	1946
P5 ⁹	Male	Running	1977

Source: Prepared by the authors (2023).

The EEFD had five departments at the time: Games, Combat Sports, Gymnastics and Acrobatics, Running, and Body Art.¹⁰ However, there were limitations in locating teachers from various departments due to retirements, difficulties in contacting them, or the impossibility of knowing their whereabouts, as well as the death of some teachers due to the remoteness of the period under investigation.

Concerning documentary sources, more than two hundred documents from the period were analyzed, such as the EEFD/UFRJ Regulations (UFRJ, 1972), Minutes (of the Congregation and Departmental Council), and circular letters about

² The interviewees had different roles during the period analyzed. As reported, some participated in competition committees and events, some held senior positions and were frequent attendees at collegiate meetings, and others had discontinuous participation in these meetings. The data was obtained by reading the minutes of the Congregation and Departmental Council.

³ This concerns the year of the subject's entry as a faculty member at EEFD.

⁴ Both P1 and P5 also provided accounts of their experiences as students at EEFD, both in the 1970s.

⁵ P1. Interview with the author on December 1, 2011.

⁶ P2. Interview with the author on February 7, 2012.

⁷ P3. Interview with the author on December 13, 2010.

⁸ P4. Interview with the author on February 13, 2012.

⁹ P5. Interview with the author on November 22, 2012.

¹⁰ At the end of the 1980s, the Department of Biosciences in Physical Activity was created (Minutes of the Congregation of September 14, 1987).

the institution.¹¹ The comparison between different documents was fundamental to developing the analysis based on the intertwining of oral and written sources, thereby enabling their contextualization within their respective spheres of production and circulation (Lopes; Galvão, 2001).¹²

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 THE ROLE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION FORMATION AND TRAINING ON PAPER

Regarding the teachers' relationship with the Physical Education course at the EEFD, various representations and pedagogical trends were perceived around the area. On the one hand, the concept of Physical Education associated with a utilitarian character emerged, to promote health, although the concept of health was not, at first, the target of problematization:

One of my Sports Physical Education¹³ students said to me: 'Teacher, did you know that I work late hours?' and I replied: 'No, I'm just finding out now that you're telling me'. He said: 'Because I don't have time to do Sports Physical Education'. I said: 'But how can you not have time? There are various schedules that are compatible with each person's work hours, and it will be good for you so that you have energy for everything you work on. I'm not going to let you go.' (P4, p. 24).

[...] Physical education is interrelated [...] Just now I took a cab to come here, and I was chatting to the driver about the importance of cab drivers doing physical education because he sits there all the time, and going for a walk, you don't have to be an athlete, but a walk three times a week, stretching. (P2, p. 3).

However, the pedagogical discourse was not absent. Pedagogical concerns were recurrently mentioned in the teachers' statements, mainly to describe their practices. P4 and P2 highlighted these concerns in their conceptions:

[...] a student who can swim, you see, I've had several swimmers, great swimmers who would come in and say: 'You're going to let me go because I already swim and I'm a champion swimmer'. And I'd say: 'You're a champion swimmer, but your job isn't to be a champion, it's to teach' (P4, p. 20).

I think Physical Education must be essentially practical, with logical, pedagogical, and psychological content. [...] Nobody needs to be a volleyball player to be a good volleyball teacher, but they do need to go through a volleyball court, do the fundamentals, and do the tactics, even if it's just holding the ball. How are you going to set up a team? (P2, p. 2-3).

The teachers' perceptions in the excerpts above show some similarities, especially about the conflict over the best way to teach the content of the area. It is important to point out that, on several occasions, the notion of knowing how to teach was confused with the ability to know how to do things or even understand ways of perfecting the knowledge of how to do things (different tactics, positions, etc.) during

11 The documents were consulted at the Inezil Penna Marinho Memory Center (CeMe), located at the EEFD.

12 The ethical precepts for research with human beings were followed, with the approval of the Research Ethics Committee of the Instituto de Estudos em Saúde Coletiva (IESC/UFRJ).

13 Decree-Law 705/69 made Sports Physical Education compulsory in all university courses from 1969 to 1990 (Brasil, 1969).

this period. Above all because of the value placed on the directive model of teaching. This style of teaching, based on command and demonstration of movement, is linked to the idea that if a teacher knows how to perform the movement, they will also know how to teach it (Faria Junior, 1982).

When asked about the classes and disciplines she taught, teacher P4 illustrated the nature of this teaching model by saying: “I worked on everything I had a certain skill in, and I was predisposed to help my colleagues” (p. 17). P2 also emphasizes this model by praising certain teachers at the institution at the time, describing them as having an “innate pedagogical sense”, associated with the joy of teaching their subject and the ability to perform the movement to be taught:

The teachers were essentially practical but with an innate pedagogical sense. It was something that came from within because it was something they did with pleasure. There was the athletics teacher [...] it was remarkable to see the pleasure he got from being almost seventy years old on an athletics track, running and jumping. (p. 2)

Knowing how to do things was considered by certain teachers as an important pedagogical quality for being a good Physical Education teacher, especially in the disciplines treated as practical in the curriculum, notably sports. This practical nature, both as a teaching and assessment method and in the choice of discipline, has been identified in various studies that have looked at the process of training Physical Education teachers in Brazil, in different periods, such as: a) before the 1970s and 1980s (Bombassaro; Vaz, 2009; Bruschi *et al.*, 2017); b) during the 1970s and 1980s (Baptista; Baptista, 2017; 2019; Silva, 2013; Pinto, 2014); and c) after this period (Figueiredo, 2004; Paula *et al.*, 2018).

Although there are similarities with the speeches related to promoting health through physical exercise, P3 differed by presenting the educational aspect and citizen training as important elements of Physical Education, especially by valuing the role of sports in this scenario:

[...] Formative (gymnastic) exercises, giving them all the conditions for a better quality of life, for young people and children. And also teaching, giving them an initiation into sports through this gymnastic work and more connected to the game [...] I think that School has a predominant factor of importance in the formation of young people, because Physical Education complements the formation of these young people in its broadest sense of the word, to be a citizen. And we can't lose sight of that. (p. 4-5).

It should be noted that “citizen education” was widely associated with the sporting phenomenon in the period analyzed, especially when sport was recognized as an educational tool. Furthermore, Brazilian Physical Education was immersed in a broader debate about the moral values of society at that time, characterized by a syncretism between control/freedom and “humanism/technicism”, with sports seen as an element capable of symbolizing the world of competition, freedom, fighters, and winners, although other influences and representations around the use of sports also coexisted in the field (Taborda de Oliveira, 2004).

Despite the view of Physical Education as a promoter of health and the valorization of the sports paradigm with a pedagogical intent, these were not the only

focus of the interviewees' discourse. Different aspects were mentioned regarding teaching concerns, revealing the diversity of representations about teaching among the institution's educators.

One of the representations is associated with a concern for pedagogical knowledge in the training of teachers at the EEFD, apparently moving away from the model of directive teaching. This apprehension is not something new, but it was mentioned for the first time as a problem in training by the interviewees:

I don't think there was much talking about training here (Ilha do Fundão campus), training started to be thought of in Praia Vermelha¹⁴ but disconnected from here. [...] people didn't actually understand the importance of those subjects for their training because it seemed like something different [...] at that time, people identified very strongly with this physical work, with bodywork, the students liked it. It was like this: theory classes were boring, at first practical classes were always good, but there was just one problem. We took part as if that subject was for us and not for our training as future teachers. (P1, p. 9-10).

Despite not establishing an initial critical view of Physical Education, P1 problematizes teacher training at the EEFD regarding pedagogical aspects. Such concern was not exclusive to P1, but an issue that was more incisively present in the curricular debates at the EEFD in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Baptista, 2017).

Not surprisingly, the subsequent curriculum reformulation process resulted in pedagogical disciplines being emphasized, with the inclusion of three pedagogical disciplines linked only to Didactics in the curriculum (EEFD/UFRJ Curriculum, 1983).¹⁵ The speech given by the head of the Games Department at the time, Célio Cidade, at a meeting of the Departmental Council, emphasizes this concern on the part of both students and teachers:

Next, Professor Célio Cidade explained that, given the interest shown by a group of students in achieving a pedagogical supplement in the area affected by the Games Department, he was arranging for these supplementary courses to be offered in the current academic year. He had even consulted some teachers who had agreed to teach the necessary classes (UFRJ, March 23, 1976).

From the analysis of the above excerpt from P1's statement, it is evident that the concern with pedagogical training was directly linked to the legitimization of the teacher's actions. The teachers' narratives together show that different teaching models linked to the Physical Education teacher were in dispute and coexisted at the institution during this period. A certain group of faculty members defended the need for specific knowledge that would enable pedagogical action more in line with the demands and objectives of the area, which were also in dispute during this period.

It was not without reason that P1 mentioned the lack of training in dealing with younger children as a gap in her training. This expressed the demand for more pedagogical training to legitimize teaching in the educational field. After all, it was

¹⁴ The campus of UFRJ's Faculty of Education concentrated on the subjects seen as pedagogical.

¹⁵ For more information on the process of curriculum reformulation at the EEFD in 1970 and 1980, read Baptista (2017).

precisely the disputes surrounding the profession of Physical Education teacher that were in the background:

So, as a student, I thought our training was quite deficient. There was no talk of children. We had teachers who dealt with the training of future teachers, but it was always students from a higher age group, like junior high school students. From about 11, 12 years old upwards. I have always been very interested in children. Here, I didn't find anything to support me (P1, p. 5).

Psychomotricity gained ground in the field of Physical Education, especially regarding young children, at that time. Its contributions reoriented theoretical discussions in the area, with Le Boulch's influence on government materials directed at the area at that time standing out (Silva; Andrieu; Nóbrega, 2018).¹⁶ At the EEFD, this is evident in the student's request for a course in "Physical Education and Psychomotricity for Exceptional Children" (UFRJ, Dec. 11, 1980).

It should be noted that P1 was a student in the early 1970s and became a faculty member at the institution at the end of the same decade. It is therefore clear that pedagogical concerns were one of the issues that troubled her when she joined the teaching staff:

As soon as I joined Swimming, I was concerned about changing the program together with my colleagues in the Department. Many of my colleagues in the department felt the same way. We introduced, although not in the mandatory course - due to the curricular structure, this wasn't possible - but we managed to implement, at least in the course that was solely focused on lifesaving, a division of the 60-hour workload into 30 hours for the pedagogical part and 30 hours for lifesaving. It was only starting in 1980 that this actually came to exist, at least in the Swimming course (p. 5).

Some newly qualified teachers were likely influenced by anxieties and representations during their initial training, considering them important and/or deficient, while other older teachers may not have shared these concerns. In P1's case, despite the resistance and disputes over the teaching model, the teacher tried to introduce a part dedicated solely to pedagogical knowledge in the Swimming II discipline.¹⁷ In this way, her experience during the teacher training process was incorporated into her practice and had a direct impact on the educational process, influencing teaching methods, content selection, and curriculum changes.

P5 was another teacher who disagreed with some of the choices made during his teaching training at the time, especially in the discipline he would teach from 1977 onwards, Swimming I. For him, there was too much emphasis on technique for all students:

The Swimming I course was very similar to what Swimming Practice is today. Because our department has an ideology about this issue... our teachers, all of them, except me, think that all the students at the School should learn to swim, all the students who come here should know how to

¹⁶ Psychomotricity was, for example, the guiding principle of the Guidelines for the Implantation and Implementation of Physical Education in Pre-School Education and in First to Fourth Grade Education, drawn up by the Department of Physical Education and Sports / Ministry of Education and Culture (Brasil, 1982).

¹⁷ Swimming was divided into Swimming I and II, both with a practical focus. Despite the report of theoretical insertion in Swimming II, this subject was not compulsory (EEFD/UFRJ Regulations, 1972).

swim. I don't agree with that approach. I think that everyone who wants to work in swimming should learn to swim (p. 12).

Although he opposed the requirement for everyone, P5 did not disagree with the content and objective of the discipline: the technique of the four swimming styles (Crawl, Back, Breaststroke, and Butterfly). His disagreement concerned who would be required to use these techniques. He did not present a strong criticism of the concept of teacher training and the teaching model advocated at the time. In addition, the teacher noted that, despite the disagreement, he followed the objectives of the discipline.

3.2 THE "ESSENCE" OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION...

In addition to the different pedagogical thoughts and debates around teaching methods in teacher training, the discussions about the knowledge and practices of the PE teacher were also commented on by the interviewees. Some believed that Physical Education had a practical nature and, therefore, learning certain techniques, especially sporting ones, should predominate. Others defended the need to seek social legitimacy by incorporating theories from other fields into their training.

In the first group, P2 said that the Physical Education course was losing its essence as theory began to compete with practice in the curriculum during this period:

I think Physical Education went a bit out of its essence, it became very intellectualized [...] With this intellectualization, we even had a teacher of an essentially practical discipline, and he told the students to research, but he didn't give a practical lesson. [...] I think Physical Education has become very theoretical. [...] I think the disciplines can't lose their essence: athletics is athletics! Gymnastics is gymnastics! Volleyball is volleyball! Swimming is swimming! (P2, p. 2 and 4).

P3, on the other hand, recognized the importance of practice but stressed the need to seek theoretical grounding in the literature, especially through postgraduate courses, for Physical Education at that time. On the other hand, he believed that this movement ended up "sidelining" the practical part of the course, causing some damage to training:

[...] Over time, there was a need to look at theory for some information. With the master's courses, many masters and doctors were trained. There was a big gap in this because this practical part was a little sidelined, which was sometimes difficult for a teacher in the practical area. A person without proper training struggled to teach, they lacked leadership and experience in this. But now I think the course is in a middle ground. For some time now, it's been improving. Because there was a need to break away from that purely practical work. For the 'ogre' teachers, to be able to work in this direction (P3, p. 7).

The view that the theorization of the course has damaged or contributed to the loss of the essence of Physical Education. This shows, in a way, a lack of consensus regarding the process of expanding theoretical knowledge during the curriculum reformulation and, consequently, professional training. From another perspective, it could be a sign of the impact of the country's re-democratization process and the emerging discussions in the educational field, especially in the Humanities and Social

Sciences, within the EEFD. An example of this impact can be seen at a Congregation meeting where the possibility of forming mixed classes at the institution was discussed:

Then, the floor was granted to Teacher Armando Alves de Oliveira, who presented a petition signed by female students, in view of the denial by the Wrestling Department that they wished to take Handball in the afternoon (male class). The aforementioned teacher wanted to know if the departments have the autonomy to stipulate whether classes can be mixed or not. After several explanations, the Congregation decided that the petition should be sent to the School's Undergraduate Coordinator and then to the Games Department for a decision. (UFRJ, March 12, 1987a)

It should be noted that the main questions in the 1970s and 1980s were about the values and norms reproduced in the field (Oliveira, 1994). Previously, theorizing in Physical Education was carried out predominantly by intellectuals from other fields, such as doctors, the military, pedagogues, and political scientists. It was precisely in the 1960s and 1970s that the scientific community in Physical Education was strengthened (Góis Junior, 2006).

When asked about the value/relevance of specific disciplines in the curriculum, the teachers had different opinions. Some mentioned structural issues related to the distribution of disciplines, while others pointed out disciplines that they considered to be more impactful during the period. P4, for example, pointed out that the organization of disciplines was the role of the departments:

[...] the curriculum was made according to the departments [...] (which) checked year after year the changes that were made [...] From then on, the workload was a function of the teacher, the content of the discipline, and the most suitable teacher for that discipline, because sometime later the sectorized competition began, by discipline. You had to apply for that discipline (p. 20-21).

For P4, the teacher was valued more than the discipline itself, highlighting the teachers' autonomy. Teacher P2, on the other hand, said that he did not see a hierarchy of relevance between the disciplines, considering them all equally important: "I don't think so, nothing is more important than anything else, everything passes, you have to do your part well" (p. 22).

The other teachers presented disciplines that they thought had a higher status in the curriculum. P3 pointed out that the disciplines in the theoretical-practical group were, in a way, more valued:

All of them (the disciplines) are important in the formation of young people, of human beings. [...] but there was a great deal of importance at a certain time because in the past the course was eminently practical. More practice than theory. Theory was important too, but it came in as a supporting role (p. 6-7).

P1 and P5 readily answered the disciplines they considered to be most valued during this period:

[...] the disciplines related to sports, they were more privileged, OSPB (Social and Political Organization of Brazil)¹⁸ which became a compulsory

18 The OSPB subject was a complement and extension of the Moral and Civic Education subject in secondary schools. In higher education, this subject was called Studies of Brazilian Problems.

discipline in Higher Education [...] but very unqualified (OSPB), already within the University an unqualified discipline and I think the teachers tried to give it another focus. (P1, p. 9).

The medical disciplines always had a reasonable workload. For example, Anatomy had what it has today, 120 hours. We had two periods of Anatomy and Physiology. [...] I think there was a lot of practice, as there still is. I mean, I think we're obliged, because we're at a Physical Education School, to do all the sports. I don't know if Physical Education teachers should be trained in that way (P5, p. 14).

Despite the controversies regarding the theorization of the area, there is a clear theoretical foundation in the formation of the EEFD: biomedical and technical-sports knowledge, despite the latter occupying a certain hierarchical position about the others. However, in the various spheres of the EEFD, tensions arose between different conceptions, reflected, for example, in the attempt by certain groups to dissociate the image of the coach from the Physical Education teacher.

The interviewees repeatedly emphasized that the course's function was to train teachers, not athletes. This distinction was emphasized frequently, highlighting the impact of this issue on the perception of the training process at the time. P2 goes so far as to differentiate: "[...] a coach is different from a teacher, a teacher educates through physical activity and a coach trains, he should educate, but that's not what happens" (p. 10).

The disappearance of the nomenclature "Sports Technician" from the name of the course in 1983, which was renamed "Degree in Physical Education" (EEFD/UFRJ Circular Letter, 12/12/1984), also reflects these power relations. However, this supplement was not eliminated in the curriculum change but became part of the conditional disciplines.¹⁹ Therefore, there was a mismatch regarding the professional identity of the Physical Education teacher and the speeches of the interviewees show these tensions.

Curiously, the interviewees rarely mentioned teachers from the Humanities and Social Sciences, except in some disciplines identified as pedagogical,²⁰ despite there being a limited number of these disciplines in the curriculum.²¹ Only the discipline Studies of Brazilian Problems received attention from two interviewees, mainly because of its association with the values of the dictatorial regime and the fact that one of them had taught it.

As mentioned in some teachers' speeches, pedagogical knowledge was mentioned frequently, but mainly to highlight the lack of connection with professional

19 See the EEFD/UFRJ Curriculum (1983). The conditional subjects were mainly related to compulsory sports subjects and the student had to choose a pre-established set of subjects to take.

20 The pedagogical subjects were: Sociological Foundations of Education; Structure and Functioning of Primary Education; Psychology of Education I; Didactics of Physical Education I; Teaching Practice I; Philosophical Foundations of Education; Structure and Functioning of Secondary Education; Psychology of Education II; Didactics of Physical Education II; Teaching Practice II; Organization of Physical Education and Sports; and School Biometry (EEFD/UFRJ Regulations, 1972).

21 Some theoretical compulsory subjects treated as belonging to the Humanities and Social Sciences in this study were: Studies of Brazilian Problems I and II; Gymnastics and Sports Information; and General Psychology. There were also electives: Cultural Anthropology, General Sociology, and Psychology Applied to Physical Education and Sports (EEFD/UFRJ Regulations, 1972).

practice. Although they recognized the importance of pedagogy, some teachers had their understanding of pedagogical knowledge when describing their practices.

Regarding valuing certain types of knowledge at the institution, Silva (2013) asked whether the older teachers recognized a greater appreciation of biomedical disciplines and sports practices in the course. Some reports suggest that this has been naturalized. Whether by chance or not, P1 and P5, who were students during this period, were the only ones to readily mention the prominence of this knowledge at the EEFD.

4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the context of transformations in Physical Education in the 1970s and 1980s, teacher training was constantly debated in the face of the problems arising from the consolidation of a specific academic community in the area and the greater influence of knowledge from the Human and Social Sciences. The role of Physical Education in the EEFD was often related to health promotion, but the importance of the pedagogical aspect in teacher training and practice was also emphasized.

However, the concern with pedagogical aspects was plural: sometimes represented as a gift of the individual and, on the other hand, as knowledge to be learned throughout the Physical Education teacher's training and professional practices. These interpretations exposed the existence of different representations associated with the teacher's identity, which competed with each other. This dispute was expressed in the debate between the dichotomy between theory and practice. Although a possible lack of theory was questioned, this debate reflected more on the theoretical bases that would underpin Physical Education than the absence of theoretical references.

These discussions highlight the troubled context of Physical Education in the 1970s and 1980s. Not surprisingly, new approaches to the area proliferated during this period, portraying the conflict over the social role and identity of the Physical Education teacher.

REFERÊNCIAS

ALBERTI, Verena. Histórias dentro da História. *In*: PINSKY, Carla (org.). **Fontes Históricas**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2011. p. 155-202.

ALVIN, Cássia; TABORDA DE OLIVEIRA, Marcus Aurélio. Uma experiência de construção do currículo escolar para a Educação Física: das amarras da tradição à tentativa de reorientação. *In*: TABORDA DE OLIVEIRA, Marcus Aurélio (org). **Educação do corpo na escola brasileira**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2006. p. 195-209.

BAPTISTA, Guilherme Gonçalves. A reformulação curricular na EEFD/UFRJ-UFRJ (1979-1985): notas sobre os impactos no perfil profissional. *In*: ANACLETO, Francis Natally; SILVA, Gustavo da Motta; SANTOS, José Henrique dos (org.). **Educação Física e interfaces com a história, o currículo e a formação profissional**. Curitiba: Editora CRV, 2017. v. 33, p. 83-110.

BAPTISTA, Guilherme Gonçalves; BAPTISTA, Juliana Gonçalves. As representações sobre o professor de Educação Física nos anos 1970 no Brasil: do desejo à insegurança profissional. **Educación Física y Ciencia**, v. 21, n. 4, e105, out./dez. 2019.

BAPTISTA, Guilherme Gonçalves; BAPTISTA, Juliana Gonçalves. Os testes de aptidão física na Educação Física: da justiça como equidade ao direito à educação. **Pensar a Prática**, v. 20, n. 1, p. 205-215, jan./mar. 2017.

BOMBASSARO, Ticiane; VAZ, Alexandre. Sobre a formação de professores para a disciplina Educação Física em Santa Catarina (1937-1945): ciência, controle e ludicidade na educação dos corpos. **Educar em Revista**, n. 33, p. 111-128, 2009.

BRACHT, Valter. A constituição das teorias pedagógicas da educação física. **Cadernos Cedes**, ano XIX, n. 48, 1999.

BRASIL. **Decreto-Lei n. 705**, de 25 de julho de 1969. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Decreto-Lei/1965-1988/Del0705.htm. Access on: May 5, 2022.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação e Cultura. Secretaria de Educação Física e Desportos. **Diretrizes de implantação e implementação da Educação Física na educação pré-escolar e no ensino de primeira a quarta séries do primeiro grau**. Brasília, MEC/DDD. 1982.

BRUSCHI, Marcela *et al.* A formação docente na Escola de Educação Física do Espírito Santo: circulação de saberes e práticas na década de 1930. **Journal of Physical Education**, v. 28, e2802, 2017. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/jpe/a/GTqtyqRXwN9HnkqyKzmsCJL/?lang=pt>. Access on: Oct. 29, 2023.

CARMO JUNIOR, Wilson do. Educação Física e cultura da prática. **Motriz**, v. 17, n. 2, p. 361–371, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5016/1980-6574.2011v17n2p361>

FARIA JUNIOR, Alfredo. Reflexões sobre os estilos de ensino revelados por alunos-mestres durante as atividades de estágio supervisionado. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 3, n. 3, p. 83-90, 1982. Available at: <http://www.rbce.cbce.org.br/index.php/RBCE/issue/viewIssue/34/42>. Access on: Oct. 29, 2023.

FIGUEIREDO, Zenólia. Formação docente em Educação Física: experiências sociais e relação com o saber. **Movimento**, v. 10, n. 1, p. 89-111, 2004. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.2827>

GASKELL, George. Entrevistas individuais e grupais. In: BAUER, Martin; GASKELL, George (org.) **Pesquisa qualitativa com texto: imagem e som: um manual**. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003. p. 64 –98.

GÓIS JUNIOR, Edivaldo. Conhecimento positivista da educação física e esporte. In: DACOSTA, Lamartine (org.) **Atlas do Esporte no Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: CONEF, 2006.

LOPES, Eliane Marta Teixeira; GALVÃO, Ana Maria de Oliveira. Fontes e História da Educação. In: LOPES, Eliane Marta Teixeira; GALVÃO, Ana Maria de Oliveira. **História da Educação: o que você precisa saber sobre....** Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2001. p. 79 - 96

MEDINA, João Paulo. **A Educação Física cuida do corpo... e “mente”**: bases para a renovação e transformação da educação física. 15. ed. Campinas: Papirus Editora, 1990.

MELO, Víctor. **Escola Nacional de Educação Física e Desportos: uma possível história**. 1996. 199f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Física) – Faculdade de Educação Física, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 1996.

OLIVEIRA, Vitor Marinho. **Consenso e conflito da Educação Física brasileira**. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 1994.

PAULA, Sayonara *et al.* Avaliação da Educação Física na educação básica: diálogos com alunos de sete universidades federais. **Journal of Physical Education**, v. 29, e2957, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4025/jphyseduc.v29i1.2957>

PINTO, Joelcio. Memórias de professores/as de Educação Física das décadas de 1950, 1960 e 1970: esportivizações da escola e escolarizações do esporte. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 36, n. 2, supl., p. S563-S576, 2014. Available at: <http://revista.cbce.org.br/index.php/RBCE/article/viewFile/2153/1110>. Access on: Oct. 29, 2023.

PORTELLI, Alessandro. A filosofia e os fatos: narração, interpretação e significado na memória e nas fontes orais. **Tempo**, v.1, n. 2, p. 59-72, 1996. Available at: https://www.historia.uff.br/tempo/artigos_dossie/artg2-3.pdf. Access on: Oct. 29, 2023.

RAUPP, Bárbara. Trabalho docente no ensino superior e desafios educacionais no mundo contemporâneo: uma reflexão com base no pensamento complexo. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 27, p. e270043, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782022270043>

SILVA, Christyan; ANDRIEU, Bernard; NÓBREGA, Terezinha. A psicocinética de Jean Le Boulch e o conhecimento do corpo na Educação Física. **Movimento**, v. 24, n. 3, p. 1041–1054, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.85386>

SILVA, Gustavo da Motta. **A Escola de Educação Física e Desportos da UFRJ no período do governo militar (1968-1979)**: o curso de formação de professores e sua invenção. 2013. 161 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Faculdade de Educação/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro, 2013.

SILVA, José Cláudio; LEMOS, Daniel. A história da Educação e os desafios de investigar outros presentes: algumas aproximações. In: FERREIRA, Marcia; XAVIER, Libânia; CARVALHO, Fábio (org.). **História do Currículo e História da Educação**: interfaces e diálogos. Rio de Janeiro: Quartet/FAPERJ, v. 1, 2013. p. 61-86.

TABORDA DE OLIVEIRA, Marcus Aurélio. Educação Física escolar e ditadura militar no Brasil (1968-1984): entre a adesão e a resistência. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 25, n. 2, p. 9-20, 2004. Available at: <http://revista.cbce.org.br/index.php/RBCE/article/view/223>. Access on: Oct. 29, 2023.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO (UFRJ). **Regimento Da EEFD/UFRJ**. Escola de Educação Física e Desportos. Gráfica Industrial da Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 1972.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO (EEFD/UFRJ). **Minutes of the Congregation**. Inezil Penna Marinho Memory Center (EEFD/UFRJ) file, March 12, 1987a.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO (EEFD/UFRJ). **Minutes of the Congregation**. Inezil Penna Marinho Memory Center (EEFD/UFRJ) file, September 14b.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO (EEFD/UFRJ). **Minutes of the Departmental Council**. Inezil Penna Marinho Memory Center (EEFD/UFRJ) file, March 23, 1976.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO (EEFD/UFRJ). **Minutes of the Departmental Council**. Inezil Penna Marinho Memory Center (EEFD/UFRJ) file, March 23, 1980.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO (UFRJ). **Minutes of the Departmental Council**. Inezil Penna Marinho Memory Center (EEFD/UFRJ) file, March 23, 1983.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO (EEFD/UFRJ). **Minutes of the Departmental Council**. Inezil Penna Marinho Memory Center (EEFD/UFRJ) file, March 23, 1984.

Resumo: Este estudo buscou compreender o impacto das tensões na Educação Física durante as décadas de 1970 e 1980 na percepção dos docentes da Escola de Educação Física e Desportos (EEFD) da Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro em relação à finalidade e às concepções em disputa na área. Através da análise de documentos e fontes orais, os resultados revelam que, embora houvesse indícios de uma formação predominantemente focada em aspectos motores, esportivos e de aptidão física na EEFD, havia diferentes representações concorrentes da identidade docente na instituição.

Palavras-chave: Educação Física. Formação de professores. História da Educação. Saberes profissionais.

Resumen: El objetivo del artículo fue comprender el impacto de las tensiones en el campo de la Educación Física durante las décadas de 1970 y 1980 en la percepción de los docentes de la Escola de Educação Física e Desportos (EEFD) de la Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro en relación con la finalidad y las concepciones en disputa en el área. A través del análisis de documentos y fuentes orales, los resultados sugieren que, a pesar de los indicios de una formación predominantemente orientada a aspectos motores, deportivos y de aptitud física en la EEFD, existían diferentes representaciones en competencia de la identidad docente en la institución.

Palabras clave: Educación Física. Formación de profesores. Historia de la Educación. Saberes profesionales.

USE LICENSE

This article is published as Open Access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license, which allows its use, distribution and reproduction in any medium as long as the original work is properly cited. More information at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare that this work involves no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Guilherme Gonçalves Baptista: Conceptualization of the work, data collection and analysis, funding acquisition, writing of the first version of the article.

Gustavo da Motta Silva: Data collection and analysis, work monitoring, consulting and critical review of the manuscript.

Sílvia Maria Agatti Lüdorf: Project administration, work supervision, consulting and critical review of the manuscript.

FUNDING

This research received financial support from Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia do Rio de Janeiro (IFRJ) and the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001

RESEARCH ETHICS

The research was approved by the Research Ethics Committee (CEP) of the Institute of Studies in Public Health (IESC/UFRJ). Process no. 26/2011, supported by document 107/2011.

HOW TO CITE

BAPTISTA, Guilherme Gonçalves; SILVA, Gustavo da Motta; LÜDORF, Sílvia Maria Agatti. Teachers' views on Physical Education training in the 1970s-1980s. **Movimento**, v. 30, p. e30038, Jan./Dec. 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.136530>

EDITORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Alex Branco Fraga*, André Luiz dos Santos Silva*, Elisandro Schultz Wittizorecki*, Mauro Myskiw*, Raquel da Silveira*

*Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Escola de Educação Física, Fisioterapia e Dança, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.