

Theorizations about the child's Play and Movement: implications for the pedagogical practice of Physical Education in Early Childhood Education and other problematizations^{1 2 3}

Teorizações sobre o Brincar e o Se-movimentar da criança: implicações para a prática pedagógica da Educação Física na Educação Infantil e outras problematizações

Teorizaciones sobre Jugar y Moverse de los niños y niñas: implicaciones para la práctica pedagógica de la Educación Física en la Educación Infantil y otras problematizaciones

Rocha, Maria Celeste⁽ⁱ⁾

Almeida, Felipe Quintão⁽ⁱⁱ⁾

Moreno, Alberto⁽ⁱⁱⁱ⁾

⁽ⁱ⁾ Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo – UFES, Centro de Educação Física e Desportos – CEFD, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação Física – PPGEF; Prefeitura Municipal de Vitória, Secretaria Municipal de Educação, Gerência de Formação e Desenvolvimento em Educação. Vitória, ES, Brasil. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2572-9098>, mcrocha@prof.edu.vitoria.es.gov.br

⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo – UFES, Centro de Educação Física e Desportos – CEFD, Departamento de Ginástica, Vitória, ES, Brasil. <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4056-5159>, fqalmeida@hotmail.com

⁽ⁱⁱⁱ⁾ Universidad de Valparaíso, Facultad de Medicina, Escuela de Educación Parvularia, Viña del Mar, Chile. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4277-0535>, alberto.moreno@uv.cl

¹ Responsible editor: Carmen Lúcia Soares - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4347-1924>

² References correction and bibliographic normalization services: Vera Lúcia Fator Gouvêa Bonilha - verah.bonilha@gmail.com

³ English version: Viviane Ramos - vivianeramos@gmail.com

Abstract

This article analyzes the theorization that has been undertaken about "playing and movement" and that can be considered as a possibility to support the intervention of Physical Education with Early Childhood Education. In methodological terms, it operates with some keys of reading and interpretation, attempting to understand childhood concepts; of body and movement which dialogue with "playing and moving", as well as identifying the definition of what would be the object of teaching Physical Education in Early Childhood Education and the definition of the teacher's role in this context. Then, it makes some considerations regarding the potentials, limits, and challenges of this theorization for Physical Education in Early Childhood Education.

Keywords: Physical Education, Childhood Education, Play and Move

Resumo

Este artigo analisa a teorização que vem sendo empreendida sobre "brincar e se-movimentar" e que pode ser considerada como uma das possibilidades de fundamentar a intervenção da Educação Física com a Educação Infantil. Em termos metodológicos, opera com algumas chaves de leitura e interpretação, na tentativa de compreender as concepções de infância; de corpo e movimento com as quais o "brincar e se-movimentar" dialogam, assim como, identificar a definição do que seria o objeto de ensino da Educação Física na Educação Infantil e qual o papel do professor nesse contexto. Em seguida, tece algumas considerações a respeito das potencialidades, dos limites e dos desafios dessa teorização para a Educação Física na Educação Infantil.

Palavras-chaves: Educação Física, Educação Infantil, Brincar e Se-movimentar

Resumen

Este artículo analiza la teorización que se ha emprendido sobre "jugar y moverse" y que se puede considerar como una de las posibilidades para sustentar la intervención de la Educación Física con la Educación Infantil. En términos metodológicos, opera con algunas claves de lectura e interpretación, en un intento por comprender los conceptos de la infancia; de cuerpo y movimiento con los que dialogar "jugar y moverse", así como identificar la definición de cuál sería el objeto de la enseñanza de la Educación Física en Educación Infantil y la definición del rol del docente en este contexto. Luego, hace algunas consideraciones sobre las potencialidades, límites y desafíos de esta teorización de Educación Física en Educación Infantil.

Palabras Clave: Educación física, Educación infantil, Jugar y moverse

1. Introduction

In the Brazilian context, the reflection on Physical Education (P.E.) in Childhood Education is permeated by extremely challenging questions, mainly when we consider the specificity of this educational segment. Rocha (2011) argues that we cannot ignore the existing tensions when discussing the legitimacy of a "school subject", conducted by a specialist teacher in Childhood Education. In other words, we would like to call attention to the existing implications when a curricular component such as Physical education, as a subject responsible for a piece of specific knowledge, becomes part of the curriculum of a segment of K-12 education, which is not organized by specific subjects or knowledge but by fields of experience.

If, on one hand, these issues were strongly present in the academic debates in the area, on the other, the fact that P.E. is already established as a practice in many contexts of Brazilian Childhood Education, including the work of a specialist teacher, has potentialized the progress of discussions. In this direction, it is possible to follow a considerable increase of studies and publications in the area to reflect on their articulation with this educational segment. Thus, they show the need and the possibilities to build an integrated work, not fragmented, which considers children's specificities and new concepts of Childhood Education.

The exercise of analyzing the academic production about P.E. in Childhood Education has indicated that some theoretic-methodological perspectives have been built to think of pedagogical interventions for children from 0 to 5 years old. Thus, in this article, we have chosen to present, discuss, and problematize the efforts of the theorization about early childhood education that has been conducted in the field of Physical education from the dialogue with the Human Self-Movement Theory (HSMT) and phenomenology itself.

The option to analyze such theorization, in particular, comes from the fact that this exercise of thinking about the contributions of P.E. in Childhood education has taken place from reasoning and dialogue as knowledge accumulated and produced by the field of Physical Education itself. Its main author is Elenor Kunz, author of *Abordagem Crítico-emancipatória* and disseminator of HSMT in Brazil.

In methodological terms, this study is a theoretical study focused on the analysis of Kunz's texts and those co-written by him with his master's and doctorate students. About this production, we highlight that there is no specific text about HSMT with a theoretical-

methodological perspective for P.E. in Childhood Education. However, there is a group of texts on issues inherent to P.E. in Childhood education, children's play, and movement.

Nevertheless, though it is not a clearly systematized proposal, it is possible to perceive the indication that HSMT works, which establishes a theorization about "Playing and Self-movement" that could eventually have a *status* of a propositional framework for action perspectives on P.E. teachers' work in Childhood Education. In other words, from the counter position of a certain type of intervention, the studies analyzed indicate another *modus operandi* for teachers, providing didactic-pedagogical elements that help teachers assume play as an element of P.E. and how to work with them. Thus, in a sense, we understand that this production indicates which formative dimension play should have in children's lives.

With that said, our first criterion to select texts was based on an analysis of the titles of bibliographic works in Kunz' Lattes curriculum. We have then selected those that mentioned in the title the terms: "play and move", "children/childhood" and/or "childhood education". When we had doubts, the reading of the abstract provided a second criterion. In this way, we have identified books, book chapters, articles, and complete articles published in congresses. However, we have excluded the texts from congresses because we understand that they were similar to book chapters and articles already published and which were part of the sample.

In total, we selected 25 productions divided among the organization of a book, the writing of 13 book chapters, and the publication of 12 articles (see the table in the appendix). These productions were concentrated between the years 2005 and 2019, showing, therefore, that they were current publications and, in a way, recurrent in the production of the author in this time framework, corresponding to 12% of all his article production and 33% of his publication of book chapters. Besides this, these publications are mostly from collaborations with masters and Ph.D. students. Only 2 book chapters were individually published by Kunz. We have also seen that the main arguments of the co-authors' texts derive from the authors' individual productions, published in 2005 and 2007.

Regarding the method of analysis, we were based on Bardin (2011) to analyze content and propose the creation of categories that allow us to identify and group common elements in the analyzed texts and that, to a certain measure, can be seen in the ensemble of productions that intend to guide pedagogical practices. Therefore, we read the texts based on the identification of some important categories to understand this proposal, such as conceptions of

childhood, body, and movement with which they dialogue; the definition of the teaching object/specificity of P.E. in Childhood education; and the definition of teachers' roles in this context.

These analytical categories emerge from a double movement: first, our gaze does not start from a specific perspective or model of proposition for P.E. in Childhood Education but, as said, part of more general aspects that we believe are pertinent. Second, we consider the elements and the arguments present in the analyzed sources.

Therefore, we organize our dialogue with the selected production intending to understand the effort made by the authors and create a synthesis of the practices of P.E. in Childhood Education to, later, present our analyses on these studies. The text is structured into two topics, followed by the final remarks. The first topic refers to the proposal of "playing and moving" from the previously described reading keys. After, we write some considerations on the potentials, limits, and challenges of this proposal for P.E. in Childhood Education.

2. From the Human Self-Movement Theory to “Play and Move”: fundamentals for Physical Education in Childhood Education

In the 1990s, based on the works of Trebels, Elenor Kunz presented HSMT as a possibility to ground pedagogical theory for Physical Education. Though the author had already been discussing the concepts of children's "play and move" since 1991, it was only in 2005 that we find publications in which he thinks specifically about the issue of P.E. in Childhood Education. Besides his publications, Kunz has been conducting studies on this topic with his master's and doctorate students. Before presenting the theorization exercise, we should conceptualize one of the key concepts of his work, also used to think about education in early childhood.

Kunz defends an understanding of human movement from its dialogic potential because, for him, it manifests itself through sensibility, perception, and human intuition. Summing up, this conception considers not only the biomechanical movement of the subject but the human being that moves (Kunz, 2005). The expression “self-movement” characterizes

the relation of the sense and meaning that human beings establish with the world to move (Kunz, 2005). This “self-movement” refers to an expression translated from German focusing on the "self", i.e., the subject of the movement.

The pedagogical proposal developed by Kunz for P.E. is called Critical-Emancipatory. According to the author, "[...] Physical Education should contribute to developing certain competencies that cannot be summed up in the objective competence of know-how but include the social, linguistic, and creative competence" (Kunz, 2005, p.16). Therefore, Kunz considers students' formation to transcend technical and instrumental formation. In the proposal of Self-movement Theory, grounding the pedagogical practice of Physical Education, the author operates with some concepts of phenomenology, especially the “Phenomenology of Perception” developed by Merleau-Ponty (Almeida et al., 2013).

When analyzing these concepts and phenomenological ideas that compose the HSMT framework and discussing their use in Brazilian Physical education, Almeida et al. (2013) recognize its importance but problematize the fact that in his works Kunz did not give the due attention to the reviews produced by Merleau-Ponty. This means that “Kunz continues to operate, in the scope of HSMT, with theses revised by Merleau-Ponty himself” (Ghidetti et al., 2014, p.329).

Some problematization on the appropriation of Merleau-Ponty's works by Kunz in the field of P.E. can be found in the works of Ghidetti (2012), Almeida et al. (2013), and Guidetti et al. (2014). For them, by basing himself mainly on the “Phenomenology of perception”, Kunz disregards that Merleau-Ponty himself reviewed his thoughts affecting the theses presented in the 1945 book. From the perspective of these authors, it means saying that HSMT is "stuck" to some ambiguities of Merleau-Ponty's thought.

This can be seen by the fact that HSMT affirms that “the production of senses and meanings without explaining the connection between perception and language” (Ghidetti et al., 2014, p.329). In other words, contrary to what was problematized by Merleau-Ponty himself, HSMT still operates with the idea of a pre-reflexive contact of the perceptive awareness with oneself as previous to language. As an example, we can cite Kunz's focus on sensitiveness, spontaneity, and childhood as possibilities to contrapose the instrumental logic of play and human movement.

The child before thinking and perceiving the world around perceives exactly this world before being reflected by our thought (...) this process that starts in the world previous to reflection (pre-reflexive world) is what provides the arguments for us to understand the process of awareness. (Surdi & Kunz, 2010, pp. 264-265)

The authors also highlight that the body, understood as a body-subject,

moves itself intending to perceive things by living them. We could say that this living and free movement is an expressive act, meaningful, and unique. The expression can be enacted through our bodies. It can reveal the meaning of our pure experiences (Surdi & Kunz, 2010, p. 274)

As argued by Ghidetti et al. (2014), it is not clear how the meaning of our pure experiences articulates with language that, in this case, would continue to be conceived as a result of an original awareness. In other words, the passage from the perceptive scope to the meaning referring to language, from behavior to thematization, is not clear in HSMT framework. We highlight these questions because we identify that, in the scope of Physical Education in Childhood Education, HSMT has also been used as an important foundation using these same phenomenological concepts and ideas that were problematized in the field of Physical Education. However, besides HSMT and Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology, we could perceive that the theorization about early childhood education proposed by Kunz and collaborators has interfaces, in practically all their texts, with the references of Humberto Maturana and Gerda Verden-Zöller (2004), mainly the work *Amar e brincar: fundamentos esquecidos do humano*, as well as Violet Oaklander (1980) and Honoré (2009). In the more recent texts, mainly after 2016, we have also seen a dialogue with childhood phenomenology, disseminated and discussed by Machado (2010, 2013).

Thus, regarding HSMT and Physical Education in Childhood Education, we have perceived that Kunz has incorporated in the concept of self-movement other discussions and presented the "Playing and Moving" as a theoretical perspective that can ground the work with small children. Reading the texts written by Kunz and his collaborators allows us to say that, in general, these theories have been thematized as "playing and moving", articulating it to the discussions about being-child, the importance of playing and moving freely and spontaneously, and the questions of time, creativity, art, and imagination. We have also noticed that the proposition of "playing and moving" continues to be grounded in some criticisms of science and rationalization, the logic of schooling and formal education, the didactic play, the adult-centric perspective, and the impositions and the controls to which children are submitted. Kunz

(2007), before presenting the concepts of childhood with which he dialogues, criticizes the studies that treat childhood as a scientific category in social, anthropological, and educational sciences, arguing that these studies say little about children as a subject. Therefore, grounded on the work *Child Psychology and Pedagogy: The Sorbonne Lectures 1949-1952* by Merleau-Ponty (2006), the author writes about the complexes children go through, emphasizing those he considers important to be considered in the context of Childhood Education, such as the Weaning Complex or Disruption, as well as talking about Perception in Children⁴.

Considering this, we can affirm that the concept of childhood present in the theorization of "play and self-movement" takes place through a phenomenological perspective. The child is understood as a being-in-the-world and recognized by what she is, by how she expresses and presents herself in the world. In other words, children are considered by their childhood nature and as a subject that have world perceptions different than the ones of adults, thus, one should value imagination, fantasy, and emotions (Stavisk et al., 2013).

Though we have not identified a punctual definition of the concepts of body and movement with which they operate, it is possible to infer from his writings about "Playing and Moving" a dialogue with the ideas of the body itself and the relational body of Merleau-Ponty. In this case, there is an understanding of the body as a child that experiences it or the understanding of the body through its expressivity and totality. Such a way to understand the body is directly associated with the dialogic concept of movement (Costa et al., 2018; Gomes-Da-Silva, 2007).

In this perspective, playing and moving freely and spontaneously are emphasized as what characterizes the specificity of Physical Education in Childhood Education. In our opinion, considering propositional terms, they can be characterized as a teaching object of Physical Education for early childhood. Besides this, according to Costa et al. (2016):

Physical Education should open and broaden a valuable and ample field of teaching and research and could, maybe in the future, become one of the most important and valued areas in the field of Education because it teaches children, i.e., the human being in its early age, 'the art of knowing how to live better' [original highlight] (p. 51)

⁴ For more details, see Kunz (2007).

Though we do not find a clear definition of what would be this “art of living better”, when analyzing the texts written by Kunz and his students, we perceive a certain connection between this expression with the possibility of playing freely and spontaneously. By understanding children in their "being-in-the-world" and their need to fully live the present, the authors, dialoguing with Oaklander (1980) and Maturana and Verden-Zoller (2004), consider playing a valid activity in itself, manifested in children’s spontaneous action, in what they are, feel, and experience during its enactment, that is, in the present and with no foreign purposes and interference (Costa et al., 2016).

With that said, we have identified that free and spontaneous playing and movement, understood as an object of teaching or specificity of Physical Education in Childhood Education, comes from the understanding that “playing is established as a type of communication and dialogue of children with the world and with themselves” (Kunz, 2015, p.10) and that it only happens through movement. However, given the centrality that the concepts "free and spontaneous" have in the texts analyzed, we still have doubts about their meaning in the context of pedagogical practice in Childhood Education, because the lack of a greater explanation gives space for some problematizations, mainly, about teacher’s role in this play that, as stated, should not suffer any external influence.

We could see that Kunz (2005) uses the concept of 'life world' to criticize the use of rationality/science in the references to the movement presented to the children, as well as to reaffirm the importance of building references to movement and experiences that are inherent to the subject, in these cases, free and spontaneous. In this direction, the author continues "the sensibility, the perceptions, and human intuition develop more openly and intensely, the greater are the degrees and life opportunities and experiences with activities established by a spontaneous, autonomous and free self-movement" (p.20).

Thus, based on these concepts, Kunz (2007) understands that the specialization of knowledge can fragment children’s experiences in Childhood Education. In Kunz's (2005) perspective, the experiences provided to children should not always start from an external reference to themselves or be used without their respective authorization because, to him, all that is external hinders children to discover the world, others, and themselves through their resources and conditions.

Amidst the defense of the importance of children's free, autonomous, and creative play and movement, Kunz (2007) distinguishes spontaneous play and didactic play. With assertive arguments, he affirms that play is spontaneous by nature, however, adults, aiming to prepare children for the future, have given it a didactic dimension. For the author, the latter would represent a play with specific educational ends, which is interested in the future of the child from the perspective and gaze of the adult and has been greatly used in Childhood Education.

Kunz (2007) argues that didactic playing, much covered in the literature even with elements of interpretation and practical application, has been transforming the "play and moving" into activities empty of meaning for the children and full of adult impositions with activities recognized and accepted by the latter. As an example, the author states that, in literature, this type of play is represented under different names, such as motor-skill learning, psychomotricity, motricity, and game, among others, concluding that

the didactic play is more concerned with content and the use of play than with the child who plays. As in the theories of Human Movement in Physical education which focus more on the possibilities of copying and imitating already created movements than on the child, the being that moves. (p.20)

Though established the relationship between the world of life and the experience of free, autonomous, and spontaneous movement, when taken as a teaching object of Physical Education in Childhood Education, and the ways they are approached in the texts, the concept of free and spontaneous play and movement deserves more attention and explanation from the authors, on how they are daily supported in educational institutions, at the risk of being confused with a certain spontaneity. We have observed that, by emphasizing this free and spontaneous play and movement of children with no clear articulation of its meaning with the pedagogical proposals and practices that compose Childhood Education, the texts leave doubts about the role of teachers in this process. This can be seen in a citation present in the texts of Costa et al. (2016) and Surdi et al. (2016) affirming that "children, in general, develop normally, we do not have to do anything special for this. We simply have to like them, what happens effortlessly most of the time" (retrieved from Verden-Zöller, 2004, p. 237).

Besides this, we found in other texts:

This way, becoming sensitive to children's wishes and recognizing their needs, *without depriving them of their right to live what they want, is a way* for teachers not to deny them [our highlight]. (Staviski et al., 2013, p.123)

The educational process demands dedication of time and attention to plays and variations developed by the children, *non-guided activities, but chosen by them* to dialogue with the world, with others, and with themselves [our highlight]. (Simon & Kunz, 2014, p.384)

What we perceive nowadays is a strong concern for children, adding to that an imposition of precocious obligations (Kunz & Costa, 2015). *These obligations include several activities that, often, do not result from the children's wishes* [our highlight]. (Castro & Kunz, 2015, p. 48)

Based on these excerpts, we have problems understanding what would be the teachers' role in the educational process of children in Childhood Education considering that these arguments, besides pointing out an excessive autonomy of children, seem to place their desires and wishes as fundamental determinants for any pedagogical work. Before continuing, we should say that we are not questioning the importance of hearing children and considering their needs and specificities in the context of pedagogical practices of Childhood Education. However, we think that this is different from "the right to live what they want", or contemplate only activities chosen by them, that is, that answer to their wills. Or even, the fact that believing that there is no need to do anything, as children will develop normally, can lead to the idea or interpretation that teachers' role is dispensable.

Nonetheless, in other texts, such as those of Gomes-da-Silva et al. (2010), Simon and Kunz (2014), and Kunz and Costa (2015), it is possible to identify arguments different from those previously described. In these texts, the authors affirm that it is up to the teacher to integrate the planning and to create adequate conditions for children's discovery and learning. The texts also preconize that the adult/teacher should be sometimes an interlocutor and not a mediator, according to Gomes-da-Silva et al. (2010)⁵, while in other times an active helper in the experiences of children's lives, as said by Kunz and Costa (2015). However, even with such appointments, it is also not clear what would be the teachers' role because, in the attempt to

⁵ In her dissertation, Gomes-da-Silva (2010) deepens the theme and reflects on teachers' role from the semiotics of Charles Peirce; however, in the article co-written with Kunz, these elements are just mentioned.

explain the meaning of this active help, the authors only affirm that “an active help does not mean to be a conductor or guide of the activities that child does” (p.32).

Faced with this, the category that aims to understand teachers' roles, following the theories of play and self-movement, showed itself as the weakest category and even a little confusing, hard to define. From our perspective, it is not clear to say that teachers of Physical Education in Childhood Education should potentialize and help free and spontaneous play and self-movement, nor that they should help children "in the struggle to survive as children in a world that wants to quickly transform them in a miniature adult" (Kunz, 2007, p.14).

In this context, though we agree that a great part of the criticisms towards adult-centric perspectives, it seems that, in the texts analyzed, they are, in some moments, exaggerated. When operating with the criticism of the process of formal schooling and extending it to Childhood Education, Kunz and Costa (2015) propose an “active and intelligent follow-up of the general and full development of the child” (p. 32). Despite not giving further explanations about what this would be, the authors argue that this follow-up is more adequate than the schooling process. Therefore, we identified that a great part of the criticism of this process is because the authors consider that in Childhood Education "children are educated with purposes and objectives formulated by adults" (p.33). It seems that adults' presence and role in the educational process of children are always considered from a problematic viewpoint. In our perspective, this can create a polarization between adults and children, as they attribute a negative characteristic to adults' actions and, it seems to us, an excessive autonomy to children.

Considering this, we wish to highlight two points. First, amidst the many criticisms made by Kunz and his collaborators towards Childhood education, few consider the specificity of this educational segment as, some of them, seem to ignore the debate that already takes place in the sphere of the education of young children and the proposals of Childhood Education curriculum documents. We understand that this might show some fragilities of these criticisms, mainly, because of the current debates on the education of young children in Brazil, as well as some assumptions of curriculum documents that have been based on studies of Childhood Sociology and Pedagogy. That is, the current perspectives of Childhood Education have indicated a refusal of the adult-centric perspective. They consider play as a central and fundamental axis in the educational process of children, defending a pedagogical practice that considers children and their interests, and aiming to overcome the understanding of children as

a "beings-to-be", to see them as a "beings-that-are" (Sarmiento, 2013). Therefore, though starting from different references, when we think about the context of pedagogical practice in Childhood Education, we have identified some similarities in the discourses present in the theorization of "Play and Self-movement", which do not sustain part of the criticisms presented.

The second point to be highlighted refers to the polarization between adults/teachers and children that emerge from the criticism of the adult-centric perspective, as well as the strong valuing and idealization granted to children's autonomy, even proposing that they decide about what they want to experience in the context of Childhood Education. In this case, the way they criticize adults does not seem to distinguish well authority and authoritarianism⁶. Therefore, we have doubts if the search for childhood autonomy can, in fact, be established from a project of emancipation and liberation of children from what is "imposed" by adults, mainly if we believe that they are beings under formation and, thus, need adults' care and protection (Arendt, 1990).

Arendt (1990) consider absurd the ideas that treat children as an oppressed minority by the dictates of rationality and the "world" of adults, from which they need to free themselves. In her line of thought, abolishing adults' authority would be leaving children to their own luck, having to deal with a greater tyranny, the one of the majority. Besides this, supposing children's autonomy would be transferring our responsibilities to this generation (Arendt, 1990). Furthermore, based on this author, it is wrong to think children's education by emancipating them from adult authority or even to think of the existence of a specific world for children and another for adults. According to Arendt (1990), there is only a world shared by all, that is, children and adults.

In this sense, we could say that it is up to the teachers to present the world to children. Therefore, in the context of P.E. in Childhood education, we see no problem in the fact that teachers organize the activities, guide the process to elaborate knowledge that circulates in the institutions, and propose experiences and plays to present children with different body practices that are part of the body movement culture. This does not mean silencing children or thinking education according to an adult-centric model!

⁶ To better understand the discussion on these concepts, see Arendt (1990).

3. Playing and moving: other problematizations

When analyzing the writings that outline the concept of playing and self-movement as a theoretical-methodological perspective for Physical Education in Childhood education, we have observed that some ideas and arguments are often repeated. Be it in the sense of presenting the conception of children and the concepts with which they operate, be it in the perspective of making some criticisms towards formal school, rationality, and science to reaffirm such concepts.

Therefore, we can say, more precisely, that the proposal for Physical Education in Childhood Education undertaken by Kunz and his collaborators suppose rescuing play and self-movement, understood by the authors as natural elements inherent to children, counterposing what is called the "adult world". In this direction, Kunz (2007) argues that his understanding of play as a natural element comes from the understanding of human beings as beings born to be free and creative. In other words, the author says that freedom, recognized as the power and the desire to decide its accomplishments, and creativity, understood as the possibility of building senses and meanings from what happens, can only be manifested in the exercise of play (Kunz, 2007).

Though we consider the contributions of the theorization "Play and Self-movement" for the work context in Physical Education with Childhood Education and that we also agree with part of the criticism of "didactic" play, we believe that some arguments are too emphatic and leave room to some questions, such as the understanding of play and self-movement as natural and inherent to children, or, play as the only form, original, and authentic of children learning. Therefore, some statements require prudence and care in their use because the way the arguments appear in the texts may show some dichotomies that can be problematic.

For instance, when defending children's freedom to play and move freely, autonomously, and spontaneously, Kunz and co-authors frequently consider playing in opposition to rationality. Or, in other moments, besides establishing a hierarchical relationship, consider that the dimensions of human sensitivities, freedom and human creativity precede rationality. Thus, Costa et al. affirm in 2015 (p.27) and in 2018 (pp.204-205) that:

Part of human problems, we deduce, emerges from the lack of "outlet" for creative impulses, because the rational, functional logic of our way of thinking, has a "dehumanizing effect" and trivializes the human, as it disrespects intuitive intelligence, present in childhood when playing or drawing. Intuitive intelligence, which leads to creation, originates from imagination and fantasy. Therefore, it emerges in the moments the person is completely passive or when the conditions of the environment allow a free and spontaneous expression, such as in plays and games, in general [our highlights].

If we take as a reference the reflection of Vaz (1995), we could question if this theorization about "Play and Self-movement", when considering children's education, would not be operating with a perspective that outlines a type of reduction to sensations and perceptions. As they defend sensitivity as a condition for children's freedom and, as something that precedes rationality, would they not be forgetting language mediation? Would devaluing rationality be a more promising pathway in the educational process with children?

Though we understand that the dialogue with Maturana allows the Theory of Play and Self-movement to understand emotion as something that precedes reason in the sense that it gives direction or freedom and spontaneity as something that can potentialize rational development, we identify that the emphatic way they operate the criticisms to rationality seems to disregard this relation between emotion, sensibility, and reason. Highlighting only the negative aspects of rationality, or not clearly explaining how they think this relation and the issue of language in this context, could be a big gap in this theorization.

Although we understand that the theme of language is not deeply developed in the analyzed texts, we could thematize here a ponderation already created by Almeida et al. (2013, p.12), about how this expressive sense, which precedes meaning, is related to language. In this direction, citing Sérgio (1987), the authors argue that the "transit from perception to concept, the zone of pre-constitution to constitution" (p.94) can be seen as something that Merleau-Ponty could not explain.

Vaz (1995) believes that the passage from the sensitive to the intelligible implies the practical mediation of language and emphasizes that overcoming the dichotomy of body-thought has been one of the concerns in the field of Physical Education. When we think about the propositions for Physical Education in Childhood Education proposed by Kuns and collaborators, we identify that the criticism of reason and scientific rationality arises from the understanding that human reality would be better understood through sensitivity, a similar idea to Santin (1994).

However, Vaz (1995) highlights exactly the opposite. It is through the work of the concept, that is, "through the possibility that human being to place himself as the one who understands the regularity of nature (his own and the surrounding one), and over which he can place his humanity, is how freedom can be built" (p. 21). Furthermore, "[...] the criticism to instrumental reason is necessary and pertinent, but we cannot forget that one can only reach it through the work of reason" (p.21).

Despite recognizing the importance of the sensitive, ludic, and play dimension in the context of children's education, we should question the way they have been approached. We have identified that opposition between the terms 'ludic and play' against 'rationality/logic' has been discussed and problematized in the field of Physical Education on the studies about leisure (Bracht, 2019). According to Bracht (2019), it is common to use the term ludic in opposition to logic/rationality, giving ludic a subversive and/or utopic character, constantly associated with corporality.

Thus, similarly to what Bracht (2019) identifies in the studies of leisure and Santin's (1994) work, we perceive that free and spontaneous play is always understood through its eminently positive, pleasant, interesting, and autonomous characteristics. More specifically, the theorization of "Play and Self-movement", by attributing those positive characteristics to free and spontaneous play, thematizes the 'didactic' play, or rationality elements present in the education of children from very negative aspects. This theorization makes explicit a notion of play in opposition to scientific rationality and rational logic. Quoting Bracht (2019), we could also say that, in Kunz's writings, there is

a connotation that assuming ludic is, in a way, denying the mechanism and the objectification of humans typical of scientific rationality, for example, in the mechanical conception of the human body that strongly grounded the intervention of Physical Education. Affirming the ludic would be affirming the humanity of men, highlighting extremely desirable characteristics, such as freedom, autonomy, creativity, and pleasure. (p. 72)

However, we have doubts about if the suspension/denial of didactic play and rationality could not lead to an idea that the human dimension only takes place in play because, for Kunz and collaborators, reason "dehumanizes". In this sense, we agree with Bracht (2019), when affirming that the victimization of ludic play, having reason as an executioner, is extremely problematic. According to the author, the aesthetic and sensitive dimension cannot have its

rational dimension subtracted, as well as cannot dispense nature. Or better, in a certain sense, it is related to widening our understanding of rationality, understanding it in the direction of the body, the ludic, the sensitive, the intensities, and affections.

It is interesting to think of this question, based on the analogy Bracht (2019) makes about aporia present in Adorno's Aesthetic Theory (AT). When criticizing this Theory, Bracht (2019) highlights the ambiguity in the relation between arts and rationality and argues that they are not opposed but complementary. When operating a criticism towards rationality, this is not done to subtract it. Or even, based on Adorno, Bracht (2019) states that art is defined as a form of knowledge, it is also rational. In the relation between reason and body, the author argues that

aporia would be connected to the fact that reason that believes to have a body, that transfers the "mimetic impulse" for the rationality that objectifies the body (or propose its total control through instrumental reason) indicates at the same time a return to nature (to game, to magic), and this is what prescribes the law of movement (of body practices)– an aporia or ambiguity that cannot be overcome. We could even question if this attachment to the nature of the body, to the mimetic moment of the game (of movement), for example, could be considered a reaction to the bad irrationality of the ration world as managed, Would that be the reason for the appeal to a (romantic) rescue of ludic in Physical Education? [original highlight]. (p.159)

Therefore, Bracht (2019) speculates about the experiences of movement and play and their relation with nature. In another moment, Bracht (2000) argued that the counter position to the hegemony of instrumental reason should not take place only through the affirmation of its opposite. For the author, we should prioritize sensitivity, or play, as an attempt to return to a "primordial unit (nature/man; world/man)" (p. XVII). An overcoming of instrumental reason should take place through mediation and "through the recognition of the ambiguity of our being in the world and being the world", therefore, not only through a "return to the original sensitivity" (p. XVII).

With this, we want to emphasize that thinking about children's educational process in Childhood Education institutions is also to have in mind some ambiguities and contradictions present in the relations between free and spontaneous play and didactic play, between sensitiveness and rationality, and between the relationships of adults/teachers with children. Besides spontaneity and freedom, play can also be experienced from intentionality, that is, we cannot eliminate all the contradictions and ambiguities of the educational process but think of them based on a dialogic process.

One of the justifications presented by texts about "Play and Self-Movement" in the defense of free and spontaneous play refers to the recognition of play as a natural need, as a possibility of direct dialogue with the world, as well as of human nature that is implicit in children. We believe that these texts miss some considerations on the relation between culture and nature, and the mediation of language. The emphasis given to the rescue of human nature in children's education, associated with criticisms of rationality, seems to disregard the role culture plays in the mediation between human beings and nature. Or even, they leave doubts about what that direct dialogue with the world would be if language is also established based on culture.

Paraphrasing Bracht (2019), we consider the need to think about play not in the sense of original purity, as its potential should not be only in the freely and spontaneously play and the denial of what composes rationality and the didactic play proposed by the adult. Children are not only nature. They are born and inserted into a universe of culture. This is even shown by the appeal of the cultural industry for a "natural" interest of children in games and play (Bracht, 2019).

The risks of denying teachers' intervention, or some didactic plays in Childhood education, can create the false illusion of freedom and spontaneity, as in a context under the influence of cultural interest, the appeal to children's natural interest to play might take place, as warned by Bracht (2019), from a logic that, when resignifying this understanding, consider children much more as an object than the protagonist of a greater game. Thus, the author continues, children's cultural contexts are often inserted in the universe of plays through the offering of certain fantasies, objects, and delimitations of time and space.

4. Final remarks

The theorization about "Play and Self-movement" establishes another way of thinking about the pedagogical work with the body and children's movement in Childhood Education. Thus, instead of 'didactic' plays, or activities indicated by adults, the proposal is for children's free and spontaneous play and self-movement. Besides that, even if it might have some assumptions closer to those of Childhood Sociology and Pedagogy, such as the rupture with an

adult-centric education and the valuing of children's creative and participative potentialities, these perspectives differ in their understanding of the body.

If on one hand, as affirmed by Sarmento in an interview with Richter et al. (2015), Childhood sociology, by emphasizing the social and historic dimensions of childhood, understood children's bodies as guided only by cultural practices, ignoring that the child is also body and nature. On the other hand, it seems that Kunz and collaborators, when criticizing rationality, propose a return to this lost nature of children, to perception, and sensitiveness. Faced with this, we have identified that the dilemma nature and culture which has been broadly discussed in the field of Physical education can also encompass the discussions on childhood and its education regarding the body, the movement, and children's expressions.

In the specific case of the field of Physical Education, Bracht and Almeida (2019) argue that the dilemma between nature and culture is an “articulation problem”. Thus, the process of articulation and mediation between the ‘sayable’ and the ‘unsayable’, between reason and emotion, between ‘thought’ and ‘movement’”[original highlights] (Bracht & Almeida, 2019, p.12) has been one of the main challenges in the production of knowledge in Physical Education, mainly in the sphere of critical perspectives in the area.

We could also extend this issue of articulation, as a challenge to be faced, through the theorization of play and self-movement. In the direction of what was argued by Bracht and Almeida (2019), thinking this process of articulation in the scope of children's education in Childhood Education would mean softening or even filling some gaps between nature and culture, sensitiveness and rationality, play and reason, body and language, adult and child. In their discussions, Bracht and Almeida (2019) point out that we should “talk about an interaction between the lived situation, our pre-reflexive experience, our individual articulation, and the cultural repertoire of interpretative standards” (p. 10). Thus, we understand that it is exactly in this “sphere that new meanings (new understandings of movement) can be produced because they are articulated” (p. 10).

Before finishing, we should highlight that, despite choosing an analytical cut that privileged elements we consider problematic in the theorization in question, the writings about "Play and Self-movement" also offered important contributions to the debate about Physical Education in Childhood Education. The keys of reading/interpretation with which we operated show some fundamental aspects of the context of Childhood Education, contemplated by such theorization.

In this sense, we highlight the understanding, the value, and recognition of children for what they are in the present; the idea of an education that intends to be integral and not fragmented; the thematization of the game as a central axis in the process of children's learning and full development; the recognition of children's protagonism; the value of knowledge produced by children; and, a conception of body and movement that, understood as language, also contemplates the possibilities of children's communication and expression.

To conclude, we end this text by reiterating that, despite the contributions identified, we cannot deny that the theorization about playing and moving can risk certain inflections regarding the relationship between body, rationality, and language in children's educational process. Thus, we should ask if there is not something positive in reason, in the process of humanization, or the proposal of educational activities proposed by adults in Childhood Education. We also stress the importance and the need for the theory of "Play and Self-movement" to dialogue more with the specificity and assumptions of Childhood education, showing how the concepts presented are supported in the scope of the professional intervention of Physical Education in Childhood Education.

References

- Almeida, F. Q., Ghidetti, F. F., & Bracht, V. (2013). A presença da fenomenologia na/da Teoria do Se-movimentar Humano (TSMH) brasileira. *Pensar a Prática*, 16(3), 886-902. <https://www.revistas.ufg.br/feff/article/download/19554/15257/> Doi: 10.5216/rpp.v16i3.19554
- Arendt, H. (1990). *Entre o passado e o futuro*. (M. W. Barbosa, Trans.). Perspectiva, 1990.
- Bardin, L. (2020). *Análise de conteúdo*. 5a ed. São Paulo: Edições 70.
- Bracht, V. (2019). *A Educação Física Escolar no Brasil o que ela vem sendo e o que pode ser: Elementos de uma teoria pedagógica para a Educação Física*. Ed. Unijuí.
- Bracht, V. (2000). Esporte na escola e esporte de rendimento. *Revista Movimento*, 1(12), XIV-XXIV.

- Bracht, V., & Almeida, F. Q. (2019). Pedagogia Crítica da Educação Física: dilemas e desafios na atualidade. *Movimento*, 25(25001), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.96196>
- Castro, F. B., & Kunz, E. (2015) O controle da subjetividade e das experiências corporais sensíveis: implicações para o brincar e se-movimentar da criança. *Motrivivência*, 27(45), 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8042.2015v27n45p44>
- Costa, A. R., Barros, T. E. S., & Kunz, E. (2018). O brincar como construção racional nas aulas de Educação Física. *Motrivivência*, 30(53), 196-208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-8042.2018v30n53p196>.
- Costa, A. R., Souza, M. F., Miranda, D., & Kunz, E. (2016) Brincar e se-movimentar da criança: a imprescindível necessidade humana em extinção? *Corpoconsciência*, 19(3), 45-52. <https://periodicoscientificos.ufmt.br/ojs/index.php/corpoconsciencia/article/view/4148>
- Gomes-da-Silva, E. (2007). *Educação (Física) Infantil: se-movimentar e significação*. [Master's dissertation, Centro de Desportos]. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC. <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/90344/240545.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Gomes-da-Silva, E., Kunz, E., & Sant'Agostino, L. H. F. (2010). Educação (física) infantil: território de relações comunicativas. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte*, 32(2-4), 29-42.
- Ghidetti, F. F. (2012). *A teoria do "se-movimentar" humano (TSMH) em questão: limites e possibilidades para uma teoria da educação física*. [Master's dissertation in Physical Education, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação Física]. Universidade Federal do Espírito-Santo, Vitória.
- Ghidetti, F. F., Almeida, F. Q., & Bracht, V. (2014, jul./dez.). Merleau-Ponty, Linguagem e Fenomenologia na Educação Física. *P O I É S I S – Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação*, 8(14), 318-333. <http://www.portaldeperiodicos.unisul.br/index.php/Poiesis/article/view/2316> Doi <http://dx.doi.org/10.19177/prppge.v8e142014318-333>

Honoré, C. (2009). *Sob pressão*. Record.

Kunz, E. (Org.). (2005). *Didática da Educação Física 2* (3a ed.). Ed. Unijuí.

Kunz, E. (2007). Educação Física a questão da Educação Infantil. In Grunennvaldt, J.T., Schneider, O., Kuhn, R., & Ribeiro, S. D. D. (Eds.), *Educação Física, Esporte e Sociedade: temas emergentes* (Vol. 1, pp. p. 105-117). Universidade Federal de Sergipe, Departamento de Educação Física.

Kunz, E. (Org.). (2015). *Brincar & Se-Movimentar: tempos e espaços de vida da criança*. Unijuí.

Kunz, E., & Costa, A. R. (2015). A imprescindível e vital necessidade da criança: brincar e se-movimentar. In E. Kunz (Ed.), *Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança* (pp. 13-37). Unijuí,

Machado, M. M. (2010). *Merleau-Ponty & a Educação*. Autêntica.

Machado, M. M. (2013). Fenomenologia e Infância: o direito da criança a ser o que ela é. *Revista Educação Pública*, 22(49), 249-264. <https://periodicoscientificos.ufmt.br/ojs/index.php/educacaopublica/article/view/913>. Doi: 10.29286/rep.v22i49/1.913

Maturana, H., & Verden-Zoller, G. (2004). *Amar e brincar: fundamentos esquecidos do humano*. Palas Athena.

Oaklander, V. (1980). *Descobrendo crianças: a abordagem gestáltica com crianças e adolescentes* (5a ed.). Summus.

Richter, A. C., Bassani, J., & Vaz, A. F. (2015). Entrevista com Manuel Jacinto Sarmento: infância, corpo e educação física. Florianópolis, *Cadernos de Formação da RBCE*, 6(2), 11-37. <http://revista.cbce.org.br/index.php/cadernos/article/view/2182>

Rocha, M. C. (2011). *Forma escolar, educação física e educação infantil: (im)pertinência*. [Master's dissertation, Centro de Educação Física e Desportos]. Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, ES. <http://www.educacao fisica.ufes.br/pt-br/pos-graduacao/PPGEF/detalhes-da-tese?id=5117>

Santin, S. (1994). *Educação física: da alegria do lúdico à opressão do rendimento*. EST/ESEF-UFRGS.

- Sarmento, M. J. (2013). A sociologia da infância e a sociedade contemporânea: desafios conceituais e praxeológicos. In R. T. Ens, & M. C. Garanhani (Orgs.), *Sociologia da infância e a formação de professores* (pp. 13-46). Champagnat.
- Simon, H. S., & Kunz, E. (2014). O brincar como diálogo/Pergunta e não como resposta à prática pedagógica. *Movimento*, 20(1), 75-94.
<https://seer.ufrgs.br/Movimento/article/view/39749>,
<https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.39749>
- Stavisk, G., Surdi, A., & Kunz, E. (2013). Sem tempo de ser criança: a pressa no contexto da educação de crianças e implicações nas aulas de Educação Física. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte*, 35(1), 113-128.
https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0101-32892013000100010
- Surdi, A. G., & Kunz, E. (2010). Fenomenologia, movimento humano e a educação física. *Revista Movimento*, Porto Alegre, 16(4), 263-290. <https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.16075>
- Surdi, A. C., Melo, J. P., & Kunz, E. (2016). O brincar e o se-movimentar da criança como manifestação artística. *Licere*, 19(3), 225-252.
<http://docs.bvsalud.org/biblioref/2020/05/847529/1293-texto-do-artigo-4522-1-10-20160824.pdf>
- Vaz, A. F. (1995). A filosofia na educação física: soltando as amarras e a capacidade de ser negatividade. In A. Ferreira Neto, S. V. Goelner, & V. Bracht. (Orgs.), *As Ciências do Esporte no Brasil* (pp. 165-191). Autores Associados.

Appendix

Table 1: Studies that are part of the theorization exercise on “Play and move”

Titles	Authors	Type of production	Year
Práticas didáticas para um “conhecimento de si” de crianças e jovens na Educação Física	Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Didática da Educação Física 2</i>	2005
Educação Física a questão da Educação Infantil	Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Educação Física, Esporte e Sociedade: temas emergentes – Vol. 1.</i>	2007
Brincar e se-movimentar.	Kunz, E.; Santos, L.M.E	Book chapter: <i>Física: Conhecimento e Saber Escolar</i>	2009
A liberdade no brincar e se-movimentar da criança com uma perspectiva teórica para a educação (física) infantil	Kunz, E.; Kuhn, R.; Santos, V. B.	Book chapter: <i>Educação Física, Esporte e Sociedade: Temas Emergentes – Vol. 3</i>	2009,
Educação (Física) Infantil: Território de Relações Comunicativas.	Gomes-da-Silva, E.; Kunz, E.; Sant'agostinho, L. H.	Article: <i>RBCE</i> , v. 32, pp. 29-41.	2010
Fenomenologia, movimento humano e a educação física. 2010.	KUNZ, E; SURDI, A. G.	Article: <i>Movimento</i> , v. 16, n. 4, p. 263-290.	2010
Crianças não são adultos em Miniatura	Kunz, E.; Müller, U.; Costa, A.R.	Book chapter: <i>Didática da Educação Física 2</i>	2012
Sem tempo de ser criança: a pressa no contexto da educação de crianças e implicações nas aulas de Educação Física	Stavisk, G.; Surdi, A. C.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>RBCE</i> , v. 35, pp. 113-128.	2013
Relações Comunicativas como Processo Pedagógico na Educação (Física) Infantil	Gomes-da-Silva, E.; Kunz, E.; Santagostinho, L. H. F.	Book chapter: <i>Educação Física Escolar: Pesquisas e Reflexões</i>	2014
O brincar como diálogo/Pergunta e não como resposta à prática pedagógica	Simon, H. S.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Movimento</i> , v. 20, pp. 375-394.	2014
Apresentação e organização do Livro	Kunz, E.	Book: <i>Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança</i>	2015
A imprescindível e vital necessidade da criança: brincar e se-movimentar	Kunz, E.; Costa, A. R.	Book chapter: <i>Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança</i>	2015

Sem tempo de Ser Criança	Stavisk, G.; Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança</i>	2015
Criança e o brincar como obra de arte: O sentido de um esclarecimento	Cunha, A. C.; Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança</i>	2015
A sensibilidade na Educação Infantil.	Surdi, A. C.; Pereira, D. A.; Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança</i>	2015
A Curiosidade da criança: quem fomenta?	Souza, C. A.; Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança</i>	2015
O fazer da experiência do ser-criança: entre o estímulo e a descoberta	Castro, F. B.; Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Brincar & Se-Movimentar: Tempos e Espaços de vida da criança</i>	2015
Brincar e se-movimentar da criança: a imprescindível necessidade humana em extinção?	Costa, A.R.; Souza, M. F; Miranda, D.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Corpoconsciência</i> , v. 19, pp. 45-52, 2015.	2015
O controle da subjetividade e das experiências corporais sensíveis: implicações para o brincar e se-movimentar da criança.	Castro, F.B.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Motrivivência</i> , v. 27, pp. 44-57.	2015
Autonomia nas Aulas de Educação Física: para pensar a prática pedagógica com crianças	Souza, C. A.; Kunz, E.	Book chapter: <i>Iniciação à Docência, Reflexões e Produção do Conhecimento: PIBID Educação Física no CEFD/UFSM</i>	2016
O brincar e o se-movimentar da criança como manifestação artística	Surdi, A.C.; Melo, J. P.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Licere</i> , v. 19, pp. 225-252.	2016
O brincar e o se-movimentar nas aulas de educação física infantil: realidades e possibilidades	Surdi, A.C.; Melo, J.P.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Movimento</i> , v. 22, pp. 1-16.	2016
Sobre como tolhemos a curiosidade das crianças	De Souza, C.A.; Donadel, T. B.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Motrivivência</i> , v. 29, pp. 192-204.	2017
Elementos da fenomenologia como uma das possibilidades de compreender o jogo como um movimento humano significativo	Cunha, A.C.T.N; Surdi, A. C.; Marques, D.A.P; Kunz, E.; Moreira, E	Article: <i>Revista Portuguesa de Educação</i> , v. 31, pp. 54-67.	2018
As relações do brinquedo industrializado com o brincar e se-movimentar: uma reflexão na Educação Física	Burckardt, E.V.; Costa, L.C.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Motrivivência</i> , v. 30, pp. 278-294.	2018

O brincar como construção racional nas aulas de Educação Física	Costa, A. R.; Barros, T.E.S.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Motrivivência</i> , v. 30, pp. 196-208.	2018
Educação e sensibilidade: o brincar e o se-movimentar da criança pequena na escola	Surdi, A. C.; Rodrigues, W. C. M. F.; Freire, E. J.S.M.; Kunz, E.	Article: <i>Motrivivência</i> , v. 31, pp. 1-22.	2019

Submission data:

Submitted to evaluation November 9, 2020; revised May 17, 2021; approved for publication October 13, 2021.

Corresponding author:

María Celeste Rocha - Rua Dr. Arlindo Sodré, 512 – Itararé, Vitória, ES, 29047-500, Brasil.

Authors' contributions:

Rocha, María Celeste: *Conceptualization (Equal), Data curation (Leader), Formal Analysis (Equal), Grant demand (Equal), Investigation (Equal), Methodology (Equal), Project Management (Equal), Resources (Equal), Software (Equal), Supervision (Equal), Validation (Equal), Visualization (Equal), Writing-original draft (Leader), Writing-review and edition (Leader).*

Almeida, Felipe Quintão: *Conceptualization (Equal), Data curation (Equal), Formal Analysis (Equal), Grant demand (Equal), Investigation (Equal), Methodology (Equal), Project Management (Equal), Resources (Equal), Software (Equal), Supervision (Equal), Validation (Equal), Visualization (Equal), Writing-original draft (Equal), Writing-review and edition (Equal).*

Moreno, Alberto: *Conceptualization (Equal), Data curation (Support), Formal Analysis (Equal), Grant demand (Equal), Investigation (Equal), Methodology (Equal), Project Management (Equal), Resources (Equal), Software (Equal), Supervision (Equal), Validation (Equal), Visualization (Equal), Writing-original draft (Support), Writing-review and edition (Equal).*