

## Inclusion and exclusion in the context of physical education at school<sup>1</sup>

José Francisco Chicon<sup>\*</sup>

**Abstract:** This article carries out the main historical events related to the path ran by the Physical Education in the school ambit, analyzing the aspects correspondent to the inclusion/exclusion axle which led Physical Education to this social-historical trajectory. This dialogue with the past does not imply the present enlightenment, does not assume that teaching happens the way it should have been taught, it only reports what it really was and shows that the events do not happen in an arbitrary way, but there is a relation among them. The study reveals, in the Physical Education history, the amount of disable students who were excluded from the teaching-learning process and it gives some hints to overcome this exclusion.

---

<sup>1</sup>The article results from the construction of the theoretical matrix that supported the analyses and discussions developed in the author's Doctors' degree dissertation: **Inclusão na Educação Física escolar: construindo caminhos [Inclusion in School Physical Education: constructing paths]**. 2005. 420 f. Dissertation (Doctor in Education) – Post-graduation Program in Education/School of Education of USP, São Paulo, 2005.

· Assistant Professor of the Department of Gymnastics. Member of the Laboratory of Studies on Physical Education of the Federal University of Espírito Santo, Vitória, ES, Brazil. E-mail: [chiconjf@yahoo.com.br](mailto:chiconjf@yahoo.com.br)

**Keywords:** Physical Education. History. Disabled persons.

## **1 Introduction**

In this article we refer to the main historical events that situate the path run by Physical Education in the school context, analyzing aspects related to the inclusion/exclusion axis that crossed it in its social and historical trajectory.

This brief dialogue with the past does not intend to clarify the present, does not have the intention of teaching how it should have been. It describes what happened and shows that things do not happen in an arbitrary way, but there is a relationship between them. Also, looking back at the past, it will maybe be possible to understand the present in relation to the old aspects that still persist. Although, it is important to know that the phases and periods when the historical events happened cannot be defined in a stagnate way.

Along human history physical activity, considered in a broad way or even in a Physical Education way, is always present to a higher or lesser extent, with more or less institutionalization. However, disconsidering Ancient Greece, it was in the last decades of the XVIII century, and specially during the XIX century that Physical Education experimented a decisive impulse towards its systematization and institutionalization as a form of education in the western world. Europe was the epicenter of this growth, where gymnastic systems (German, Swedish and French gymnastics) were

developed, and England with the sports movement, from where it spreaded to the world. This process happened in a historical moment of important political, economic and social changes, and is related to those, also receiving the influence from the new pedagogical thinking from the XVIII century, with the arrival of the so called naturalist and philanthropic teachers.

In Soares *et al.* (1992), we find that along the XVIII century the worry of including physical activities in the school was already present. Although, it was only in the XIX century, that this worry was materialized, being the creation of Gymnastics schools in the form of free associations, a decisive factor. With the implementation of these schools and their world diffusion, physical exercises were greatly developed, making the importance of body practices more and more recognized. However, this practice had not entered the limits of school context. The pressure to make this happen, comes from the development of the Gymnastics Schools, that start demanding the presence of gymnastics in the formal school.

This way, there is the need to systematize this knowledge, the body practices, the physical activities, according to the peculiar characteristics of the school as an institution, since the proposals elaborated until then referred to other contexts other than the school one.

Arise this way, according to Soares *et al* (1992), the first systematizations about physical exercises, called gymnastic methods, having as best known authors the Swedish Ling, the French Amoro and the German Spiess, with contributions having come from physiologists as Demeny and Marey, medical doctors, as Tissíe and also music teachers as Dalcroze.

These mentioned authors had the merit of coupling the development of gymnastics or Physical Education at school to the guarantee of a space of respect and consideration for the area in relation to the other currículo components. This way, Physical Education taught at schools started to be seen as an important instrument for the physical improvement of individuals who “strengthened” by the body exercise, which generates health, would be better able to contribute to the growth of the rising industry, the army and also with the prosperity of the nation.

Develop and strengthen the individuals physically and morally was one of the objectives of Physical Education in the educational system and one of the aspects by which it was identified. Another aspect by which it was characterized was the scientific one, based on the reference coming from biological sciences, which supported its teaching content and the gymnastic methods, composed of series of exercises elaborated based on strict criteria belonging to those sciences.

These gymnastic methods, when put into practice by the instructor (teacher), treated all the session participants the same way (as a homogeneous group), stereotyped, with the same intensity, having the students to repeat the teachers mechanical gestures, disconsidering individual differences and needs. “The teaching process of the Physical Education lessons demanded from the instructor oral exposition and detailed demonstration, and from the students, precise imitation” (FERREIRA NETO, 1999, p. 63-64). So, there was no space-time to accomodate the differences.

Nogueira (1990, p. 170) highlights that, in Europe, the influence of the military institutions was decisive in the origin of

the Physical Education schools, because there the exercises were already very well systematized. This way, “[...] it was seen, during the XIX century, almost a superposition [...] of the school gymnastics and the military practices; a phenomenon in relation to which the worries about the installation of a school order were probably not indifferent [...]”.

Ferreira Neto (1999) also follows towards this direction. For him, Brazil, in the period of 1850-1930, was making an effort to give to a broader fraction of the population access to the european developments in the field of economy, industry, basic sanitation, health, education, in other words, the individual and collective liberties. The possession of these developments would allow the country to overcome the agro-exporter model and insert itself in the urban-industrial model, for which a national project was demanded, where the constitution of a “new brazilian man” was part, and Physical Education was a coadjuvant, through the help of medical doctors/hygienists and, in a systematic way, the militaries.

Castellani Filho (1988, p. 38-39) corroborates this affirmation, declaring the following according to his understanding:

[...] what led to the association of Physical Education to the education of the body and the body health was not only a contribution from the militaries. To the militaries, in this understanding also joined the medical doctors, that towards an action supported by the principles of a hygienist social medicine, took the task of dictating to society, through the

family institution, the fundamentals inherent to the process of reorganizing that social cell. Proceeding this way, at the same time that they pointed out the bad aspects of the colonial time family structure, they declared themselves as the most competent of the professional categories to redefine the standards of physical, moral and intellectual behavior of the 'new' brazilian family.

Hygiene, race and moral punctuated the pedagogical and legal proposals that contemplated Physical Education at school in its first initiatives.

In 1882, the project 224, "Remodel of the Elementary School and Several Complementary Institutions from Public Instruction" received an opinion from Rui Barbosa that points out its mandatory character and recommends the establishment of a special gymnastics session in regular schools, the mandatory extension of gymnastics for both boys and girls, also for the qualification of the teachers and in elementary schools of all grades – preserving, though, to the women, their roles in society, as "wife/mother", creator of the nation sons. Gymnastics destined to women, should then emphasize her feminine form, and this way compose the bourgeoisie collection of ideas about the differences between women and men: insertion of gymnastics in school programs as a subject of study and bring the gymnastics teachers both in category and authority to the same level of the teachers of all the other subjects (BARBOSA, 1952, *apud* BETTI, 1991).

The elements pointed out by Rui Barbosa express the worries of the Brazilian upper class with race regeneration, reproduction, physical health of both men and women, understood as soldiers of the nation. Physical Education in the context of these worries, arrives as an ideal tool to form useful and healthy individuals, ready to occupy specific production functions.

## **2 Discussing the inclusion/exclusion process in Physical Education**

Deeply moralist, the ideas about gymnastic benefits come from the medical-hygienist thinking and from a “medicalized” view of the human being. This normative thinking, imposing discipline and moral had an important role on the first systematizations about gymnastics, about the “physical education” of the individuals. Also, it influenced in a decisive way the concept that people with special education needs (SEN) were considered sick, that needed to be cured, qualified and prepared, to just then participate of life in society, being meanwhile subjected to be attended at segregating institutions, as the Association for Parents and Friends of People with Special Needs (APAEs in Portuguese), educational institutions for the deaf-mute and blind, among others, characterizing the medical model of deficiency which until

today assigns the idea of subnormality to people with deficiencies.

According to Soares (1994), in practice, the effective implementation of Physical Education was restricted until the first years of the 1930's to schools in Rio de Janeiro, which was the city of the Empire and capital of the Republic, and to the Military Schools, being then accessible only to a few privileged ones.

This author, when approaching the subject "Physical Education and Eugenics: some ideas from Fernando de Azevedo" writes that "The medical hygienist thinking, on its eugenic aspect, crosses the pedagogical thinking and strongly influences the construction and structuration of Physical Education in Brazil" (SOARES, 1994, p. 142).

This way, looking for support in Kehl, Soares (1994) reveals the eugenic conception from that time. For Kehl the only solution to avoid the further weakening and degeneration of people was the application of the eugenic laws. He declared to be necessary:

[...] to restrict the proliferation of "infra-human beings", semi-alienated and mentally impaired, through the hygiene of the body and spirit [...] [besides] making stronger, more balanced, intelligent and beautiful people have more children, so that the average number of people like that [...] would progressively increase. (SOARES, 1994, p. 144-145).

Betti (1991) collaborates with this discussion stating that the Army Physical Education school was the main advertiser of this eugenic role of Physical Education, which was frequently mistaken as having the role of preparing people for the war and patriotic actions.

Being the Army Physical Education school the main source for qualification of Physical Education teachers at that time, we conclude that the teachers qualified under this conception, during their practice at the schools did not accept SEN students, leaving aside those less skilled or adept. This kind of behavior can still be seen nowadays.

If on the one hand this search contributed to confer credibility and acceptance for Physical Education, in or outside the school context, on the other hand, it served as the basis for the elaboration of a “biologicist and medicalized” conception of Physical Education, having therefore as the object of work a biological body lacking historicity.

For Fernando de Azevedo (*apud* Soares, 1994), Physical Education classes could not happen without the presence of a medical doctor. His concordance to the presence of the medical doctor at school and specially as the advisor of the activities to be developed in Physical Education, finds support in formulations voted during the International Conference of Physical Education, in Paris, in 1913, which are here transcribed:

1º - before being submitted to Physical Education, all boys and girls will be examined by the doctor-inspector, who will classify them as normal or retarded;

2º - normal boys (or, the physical regulars) will be handed to the physical education teacher under effective doctor-inspector vigilance

(underlined by the author)

3º - **among the retarded**, the ones for whom a kinesic treatment was recommended, will be referred to the specialist kinesiotherapist (p. 155, highlighted by us).

This formulations confirm the idea that Physical Education at school, for Fernando de Azevedo, was rather a medical matter and not pedagogical, to the extent that it was the medical doctor who defined the content and “allowed” the children to participate or not of class. The teacher had a secondary role, was a direct assistant, the one who executed tasks which were defined and fiscalized by the medical doctor.

According to Ferreira Neto (1999, p.122), “Physical Education as a curriculum component in the work of Azevedo,

considers that: a) all students, before getting involved with such practice, need to be examined by a medical doctor; b) **in case of physical impairment, the student has to be prohibited from practicing it** (highlighted by us)

From these pieces of information about the inclusion of SEN people in the school context of that time, it is possible to conclude that in the practice of Physical Education for these people, in regular school environment, in a systematized way, this inclusion did not happen and even nowadays, during the XXI century, a lot needs to be done, to make it happen in a satisfying way.

Under this “biologist” conception of Physical Education, based on the positivist scientific approach and on its method of observation and comparison of results, the selection of students for that school subject should also follow biological criteria, as “[...] the criterium of physical equivalence, considering age, robustness coefficient, toracic perimeter and constitutional conformation of each one”. (SOARES, 1994, p. 157).

School, mainly the elementary one, became the place for homogenization, based on results obtained from medical and pedagogical records, psychological tests and school level. The results obtained from this big number of records and tests classified children as mentally impaired, intelligent or retarded, placing them in pre-determined social spaces, both at school and society.

According to this medical, organic model of society, based on eugenic ideals of race and health development, SEN people had little or no space in society. When they had it, the

spaces were segregated, as the schools for blind and deaf students, created in Rio de Janeiro during the Imperial period in Brazil, in the XIX century. Nowadays, in the beginning of the XXI century, this model is still the predominant one in the social practices related to these people, although it is in a process of transition to the social model of deficiency.<sup>2</sup>

Soares (1994, p. 161) strongly criticizes the Physical Education developed in the studied period (1850-1930) and questions “[...] if the media appeals to the frenetic ways of taking care of the body would not be a new disguise for a post-modern hygienism and eugenics.”

This question makes us think that in nowadays society, there is still a super valorization of the robust, perfect, beautiful, athletic body, that with the influence from the media gets to be adored (“corpolatría in portuguese”, body adoration)<sup>3</sup>, reproving those bodies considered imperfect, ugly, degenerate, as the deficient ones, obese, damaged by the hard work, misery or any other organic and social cause.

In June 30th 1931, the Ordinance no. 70, from the Minister Francisco Campos, recommended for Physical Education the adoption of rules and proceedings from the Army Physical Education Center, based on the french method, adopted by the Brazilian Armed Forces since 1921. This would be the method officially adopted in Brazilian schools, lasting, according to Betti (1991) until around 1960. For each school

---

<sup>2</sup> Model in which the society is alerted for the fact that it creates obstacles to the inclusion of SEN people and therefore needs to be changed to accommodate the interests and needs of these citizens, and not the opposite.

<sup>3</sup> CODO, Wanderley; SENNE, Wilson A. **What is body (adoration)?** [Title in Portuguese: “O que é corpo (latría)?”] São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1985.

grade, specific objectives were established, almost all of physiological character.

In 1940, according to the report from the Division of Physical Education (DEF in portuguese), mentioned by Betti (1991, p. 71), Physical Education in the country was better structured and working only in high school. For other school levels, it was not solid and not always existed.

For Ferreira Neto (1999), the process of taking Physical Education to Brazilian schools was consolidated, during the XX century, especially with the beginning of the New State (1937-1945)

According to what Betti wrote (1991, p.89),

Physical Education was not the object of deep theoretical interest; it was first of all an activity considered objectively useful by the State, always treated apart in school curriculum. The eugenics, the hygiene/health, the military preparation and the nationalism were the nuclei of convergence for the groups interested in the implementation of Physical Education.

In the period from 1946 to 1968, according to Betti (1991), Brazilian Physical Education received strong influences from the method created by the France National Institute, called “Generalized Sportive Physical Education”. The method was advertised in Brazil by Professor Augusto Listello, being known as “Generalized Sportive Method”. In a nutshell, it tried to

incorporate the sportive content into the Physical Education Methods, giving emphasis to the ludic aspects.

According to Listello (1957, *apud* BETTI, 1991, p. 89) the Generalized Sportive Method has as its objectives: “a) initiate students in different sports; b) guide for specializations through the development and improvement of attitudes and gestures; c) develop the appreciation for the beautiful, for the effort and performance; and d) promote hygiene necessities”.

Soares et al. (1992, p. 54) understands that the importance of sports in the school system was of such great magnitude that we then have “[...] not the sports **from** school but the sports **at** school (highlighted by us)”. To this authors it indicated

[...] the subordination of physical education to the codes/meaning of the sportive institution, characterizing sports at school as an extension of this institution: olympic sports, national and international sportive system. These codes can be summarized as: principles of athletic/sportive results, competition, comparison of results and records, strict regulation, success in sports as a synonym of victory, rationalization of means and techniques etc.

Sports determine this way, the teaching content of Physical Education, the teacher-student relationship, that evolves from the teacher seen as an instructor and the student as a recruit, to the teacher being a coach and the student an athlete,

and the orientation following principles of rationality, efficiency and productivity, principles which are also defended by Technicist Pedagogy, very well disseminated in Brazil in the 1970's.

Based on what has been presented so far, it is possible to realize that the teaching methods used in Physical Education (gymnastic method and of sport performance), all approaching predominantly the "action" as a conception of man/body, devoted to the race eugenization, in a biological perspective, non-historical and non-critical, following principles of rationalism, efficiency and productivity, did not favor the inclusion of those that showed little motor coordination skills and the ones that demonstrated any kind of inability/deficiency.

Besides that, according to the data presented at the "Diagnosis of Physical Education and Sports" published in 1971, Physical Education barely existed in elementary school and professional qualification was not adequate.

### 3 Education, Adapted Physical Education and inclusion

Physical Education starts caring about physical activity and sports for SEN people, only approximately in the end of the 50's and the initial approach for the practice of this activities was the medical doctor. The programs were called medical gymnastics and had the objective of preventing diseases, using to this end corrective and preventive exercises, in other words, they were related to rehabilitation (COSTA; SOUSA, 2004).

For a better understanding of Adapted Physical Education history, we tried to find its conceptual origin. We can say that this expression "Adapted Physical Education", had its

origin in the 50's and was defined by the American Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD), according to the translation of Pedrinelli (1994) as:

A diversified program of developmental activities, games and rhythms adequate to the interests, abilities and limitations of deficient students that cannot engage irrestrictly, safely and successfully in vigorous activities of a general Physical Education Program (PEDRINELLI, 1994, *apud* COSTA; SOUSA, 2004, p. 29)

In other words, we can say that the general Physical Education Program was not able to approach the specificities of SEN people, and so Adapted Physical Education came to fill out this gap, having its action in parallel with general Physical Education, developing programs to attend SEN people in segregated environments and in different time and space that was used for the non-SEN people.

Would it be because Physical Education had to deal with imperfect, mutilate, non-productive bodies, at the same place where there were bodies considered beautiful, perfect, healthy that its history was crossed for the biologicist conception of Eugenics?

In December 20th, 1961, the Law number 4024 [Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional – LDB] of Basic Tenets and Guidelines of National Education (in Portuguese,

LDB) became effective, showing as the main happening for the area, the determination of mandatory Physical Education for elementary and high school courses, until the students were 18 years old. This measure definitively consolidated the introduction of Physical Education in the Brazilian school system in elementary and high school courses.

Regarding the rights of SEN people in Brazil, according to Jannuzzi (1989), it is in this law that the first reference to these individuals in legislative text is found. This law describes in the article 88 that “[...] the education of SEN people should, always when possible fit the general education system, aiming at integrating the student in society” (BRASIL, 1961, p. 248).

Since then, the legal achievements of SEN people is broadening, towards giving them better chances of living in an environment that is the least restrictive possible and also integrating them into society.

For Special Education, the 1980's, especially 1981 were marked by the United Nations announcement of the International Year of Deficient People, which led to the creation of specific sectors to take care of this matter in public ministries of several countries.

As a result of this process, the Brazilian Federal Constitution, promulgated in February 5th, 1988, which registered the public right of education of all Brazilians, including SEN ones, preferentially at the regular school system, the actions of public politics destined to this issue became more present in different spaces of educational legislation in the Union, States and Cities. The new State Constitutions and the

city organic laws reproduced and amplified the referentes to Special Education.

The Law number 7.853, from October 24th, 1989, which disposes of SEN people, reassured the mandatory nature of the availability of Special Education in public schools; the “[...] mandatory enrollment acceptance in regular courses both in public and private schools of SEN people able to integrate well into the regular school system”; and defined as a crime the act of “[...] refusing, suspending, procrastinating, cancelling or making stop, without fair justification, the enrollment of students in any teaching establishment of any course or level, public or private, based on their special needs”.

The Decree that regulates the Law, published ten years later (Decree-Law number 3.298 from 12/20/1999), makes it clear that the services of Special Education will be offered both in public or private schools:

[...] by means of support programs for the students integrated in the regular school system, or in specialized schools, exclusively when the education in regular schools is not able to attend the students educational or social needs or when it is necessary for the student's well-being (Decree..., 1999, p. 5)

This way, the students then had the right of enrollment in regular schools, in regular groups, receiving educational attention from all the professionals that worked with the

respective groups. This new situation for education professionals started being a challenge and a problem at the same time. A challenge regarding the search for means of educating all indistinctively at the same time and in the same space. A problem when considering the lack of information, lack of structure at the schools, bad professional qualification of the teachers, for not having studied the issue at University and all of a sudden be in the position of teaching children with such peculiar characteristics.

The struggle to guarantee that SEN students receive the same educational conditions as the rest of the population, has as a reference, among others the Human Rights Declaration, from 1948, where it is assured that “[...] every man has the right to have access to education (article XXVI). This right was reassured with the proclamation of the Declaration of Deficient People Rights (1975), the International Convention of Children Rights (1989), the Children and Teenager Statute (1990) and the World Declaration of Education for All (1990).

The Salamanca Declaration, resulting from the World Conference on Special Educational Needs: access and quality, held from June 7 to 10th, 1994 in Spain, clarifies “[...] the principle of [inclusion]” and approaches “[...] the recognition of the needs for action to achieve this ‘school for all’, meaning, institutions that include everybody, observe the differences, promote learning and attend everyone’s necessities.

In Brazil, the homologation of the Law of Rules and Bases (LDB in portuguese) number 9.394, from December 24th, 1996, strongly influenced by the World Declaration of Education for All (1990) and by the recommendations from the

Salamanca Declaration (1994), started an ample changing process in the educational system, in its different teaching levels and modalities. One of the changes was the implementation of the practice of inclusion of SEN people in regular schools, modifying the systematics of service adopted until then, which segregated these people in specialized institutions and special groups.

With the approval of this law and with the agreement made in Salamanca, the inclusive education proposal was consolidated, according to which, SEN people should participate equally in the educational process in regular schools, together with other people. The school, of any level or modality is from then on the same for everybody, without any kind of discrimination, defines the law.

Later, other documents complementary to the Law 9394/96 were published. Among those we mention: the National Education Plan, Law number 10.172, from January 9th, 2001; the Opinion number 17, from July 3rd, 2001, a document that gives fundamentals to the Resolution 2/01; the CNE/CEB number 2 Resolution, from September 11th, 2001, which establishes the National Rules for Special Education at Basic Education level; the National Curricular Parameters (PCNs in portuguese): Curriculum adaptations, strategies for the education of students with special education needs (1999); and the PCNs (2002) related to Physical Education from 5th to 8th grade.

Even having all these documents to rely on, according to Prieto (2003), we are far from reaching all the students and the best social quality to attend those with SEN. Citing Odeh (2000) the author guarantees that “[...] in the best case scenario, the

percentage of this population that goes to school is not higher than 10%” (PRIETO, 2003, p. 3).

Having all that into account, the movements for inclusive education have been generating reactions in the educational world: doubts, questions, debates, professionals demonstrating despair and eager for orientation and information. What to do? How to do it? These are the main questions.

This inclusivist tendency in the Brazilian political scenario, has been confusing educators upon the obligation of working, at the same time and space with children from a wide range of abilities, capacitations, behaviors and history of life. The ideals of universal equality among humans starts to signalize exhaustion and a new speech starts to become hegemonic. We are talking about concrete differences between people, differences that always existed, although were denied or not considered by the big majority of educators (CARMO, 2002).

This situation affects teachers indistinctively. In the case of Physical Education teachers that is not different. Researches show that the improper professional qualification and the lack of information are indicated by the big majority of education professionals as the reason for the lack of educational assistance to the SEN students which attend regular school.

Based on that, there is now a strong movement for the initial and continued qualification of educators with the objective of preparing them to assist the diversity found at school.

In the school context, the inclusion of SEN students in Physical Education classes, on our opinion, seems to be

predominantly related to attitudes and proceedings. The first refers to professional qualification, the conception of man that one wants to generate, the attitude of acceptance and promotion of human diversity. The second refers to the means used to achieve these objectives, in other words, the choice of the teaching methodology and proceedings.

In this regard, agreeing with Landim (2003) we consider that a proposal for Physical Education has to respect human diversity in any of its expressions: gender, biotype, color, race, deficiency, ethnicity, sexuality, accepting and electing individual differences as a factor of cultural enrichment. This way, it will be provided to all children at school the opportunity of learning, interacting with their social and cultural environment and a rich and positive coexistence with all the students.

So, we understand that including Physical Education is not only adapting it in a way that a SEN student can take the classes, but it is also adopting an educational perspective whose objectives, contents and methods value the human diversity, being compromised with the construction of an inclusive society.

Considering that, the qualification of Physical Education teachers to deal with SEN in Portugal, according to Rodrigues (2005) is not adequate and we can say that the same happens in Brazil.

Based on the analysis of the programs in six qualification schools in Portugal, the author verified the the initial qualification is general, and rarely related to concrete aspects of inclusion in Physical Education. It was observed that:

There are several programmatic itens related to the characterization of the deficiency and also with institutional aspects, but few related to good practices and methodologies that make integration and inclusion easier. In other cases, contents related to adapted sports, contents that will rarely be applied in inclusion cases are approached. (RODRIGUES, 2005, p. 8).

In Brazil, only after the Opinion number 215, from March 11th, 1987, from the Education Federal Council, the discipline Adapted Physical Education was listed, among others, as a suggestion to compose the new curriculum of the Undergraduate Programs in Physical Education, which should start in the beginning of the 90's. It considers the work of the Physical Education teacher with SEN students. For us, it is one of the reasons why many Physical Education teachers, that work in schools nowadays did not receive proper qualification regarding adapted Physical Education or inclusion.

It is important to highlight, that until the end of the 80's, deficient people or those being obese or having low performance in motor activities were not accepted in undergraduate Physical Education Programs, because of the the physical aptitude test, that was part of the process of student selection. Only after the elimination of the physical aptitude test, in the beginning of the 90's, these people had the possibility of joining Physical Education Programs at the University with the same acceptance conditions as the other students.

Based on that, the Physical Education Undergraduate Programs were predominantly available to students that had

athletic and robust bodies. The emphasis was on the action rather than on the critical, reflexive thinking. The understanding was that only those who were able to demonstrate the activity could become a Physical Education teacher.

This way, influenced by the information they received, they developed discriminating attitudes, since the work was more concerned with the most talented and skilled. Those that could not have the expected performance were left aside, which is still possible to verify, in the XXI century, in several school practices in Brazil.

Besides that, agreeing with Ribeiro and Araújo (2004), we have to recognize that not always the students identify themselves as future Adapted Physical Education teachers for several reasons.

Here we can say that one of the possible reasons is the difficulty in working with differences, with the non-perfect body, incapable of performing the way one is used to in 'normal' situations. This constitutes, probably, influences from a Technicist Physical Education, or the fact that the qualification of Physical Education teachers is obtained in Undergraduate Programs which still have this characteristics. (RIBEIRO; ARAÚJO, 2004, p. 20-21)

Aiming at showing this reality present in undergraduate programs, Tani (2000, p. 87) declares that “[...] the undergraduate programs, with rare exceptions, provide a very

technical qualification where learning how to perform the action prevails upon the theoretical knowledge involved”.

In his studies, Rodrigues (2005) shows to have found in Physical Education a double origin of reasons that can lead to exclusion and we completely agree with that. On the one side, Physical Education happens in a school environment that is marked by a culture that allows the exclusion of all of those who do not fit somehow, as we can observe by the high rates of school drop and failure. On the other side, the competitive sportive culture, which is dominant in the Physical Education curriculum, generates an additional obstacle to the inclusion of students that are initially considered less capable of having a good performance (for several reasons), in a competition.

Costa and Sousa (2004) corroborate this discussion showing that the contributions brought by Adapted Physical Education as a field of study and practice of physical and sportive activity by SEN people are irrefutable, although they also made clear their segregation character, which is evident since they are only experienced by groups that have SEN.

The cited authors verified that the integration<sup>4</sup> of people with SEN could become reality due to the practice of sports and physical activity in national and international events, culminating with the Paralympic games.<sup>5</sup> They also emphasize that this integration, although concrete, is only for a minority

---

<sup>4</sup> Proposal that people with SEN **have to be** prepared to be included in the social context. This proposal had its development in the 70's and 80's, now in transition to the inclusivist proposal.

<sup>5</sup> According to Alencar, mentioned by Costa and Sousa (2004), Brazil participates in Paraolympic Games since 1972.

group, considering that either for the ones had as “normals” in the Olympics or for the SEN people in the Paralympics, the effective participation is of a minority group.

We also have to consider that Physical Education for integration could visualize the potentials, value the differences, overcome the view of imperfect, mutilate body, adapting sports and physical activities so that people with SEN could practice them. This way, those who had access to the sports achieved a reasonable level in terms of access, participation and sportive physical development. However, we agree with Carmo (2002), when he states that Physical Education is not prepared to treat the regular and the diverse simultaneously, as points out the inclusion proposal. Their contents are stagnate in time, which makes us use adaptations.

We do not deny the historical importance of Physical Education and of the adapted sports for SEN people, but we just understand that the diversity and bilaterality between SEN people and those without it have to be part of the same coexisting space and time, so that we reach the inclusion principles.

In this regard, Physical Education can be seen in different ways. According to Sousa (2002, p. 37), “[...] on the one side, it can deal with biologicist ideals, which care about aesthetics or the physical and technical performance of the individuals and, on the other side, it can work emphasizing the social and historical aspects of the individuals”. Depending on the way one understands Physical Education, it is not easy to legitimate the exclusion of students from determined activities, either presenting SEN or not. We have already observed several

times the disguised exclusion of the less skilled, the slightly fat, the slow ones, in other words, of those that do not fit the preestablished standard.

#### **4 Final Considerations**

The area of Physical Education and sports targeting people with SEN showed in the last two decades of the XX century and beginning of the XXI century, considerable progress. It is worth mentioning the foundation of the Brazilian Society of Adapted Motor Activity (SOBAMA in portuguese), the creation of a work group in the Conferences of the National Association of Researchers in Education (ANPED in portuguese) and of the Brazilian Society of Sports Sciences (CBCE in portuguese), the inclusion of Adapted Physical Education in the curriculum of the undergraduate programs in Physical Education and the establishment of several research lines in Graduate Programs in Brazil both for Education and Physical Education and the strengthening of the Brazilian Paralympics Committee. The great achievements of the athletes in the last paralympics in Sydney, Australia and in Athens, Greece exemplify these affirmations.

But, besides the advances, we cannot deny that the existence of Physical Education classes separating the students in groups, based on their gender and the motor skill level, is still present at schools, clearly demonstrating the historical, cultural, social and educational influences that surround us.

Several times, these principles strongly contribute to the process of school exclusion for these students. This way, when we exclude, we miss the chance of learning and living together with the different.

Excluding SEN students, they miss the chance of development, while society misses the opportunity and the possibility of learning from a significant number of the elements that compose it, represented by the 'different' and the segregated. We all lose in knowledge, behavior and consequently in possibility of transformation (ARANHA *apud* CRUZ, 1996, p. 12)

Considering the new Special Education directions for the XXI century, which is the perspective of inclusion, we cannot think about Special Education apart from general education, the same happening to Adapted Physical Education, that cannot be separated from general Physical Education.

Rodrigues (2005) points out some suggestions that will eventually allow some advances for the proposal of inclusive Physical Education at school:

a) the study of the body culture of movement promoted by curricular Physical Education is a right. It is not a disposable option. As it is a right, we have to consider that all students have access to it.

b) The initial and continued qualification has to follow isomorphic models, in other words, the future professional has to be taught and qualified to know and apply contents related to what one wants him to be as a professional. If the future professionals are taught to induce competition, look for homogeneous groups, to give more value to the individual work, how can we expect this professional to induce cooperation, respect and value differences and solidarity?

c) The area of Physical Education can, with rigorous command and investment, become a key area to make education more inclusive and can even be a privileged field of experimentation, innovation and improvement of the pedagogical quality at school.

Towards this direction, we understand, as Costa and Sousa (2004), that it is needed to break the current school organicity, find new philosophical principles as rules for Education/Physical Education, trying to understand that humans are different and that it is in the difference that we learn about limits and possibilities. It is necessary to redimension the time and space of the school work, flexibilize contents, stop with the knowledge compartmentalization, and still **learn how to deal with the individual and the diverse at the same time**, which is in our understanding, the greatest challenge for Education/Physical Education in the XXI century.

### **Inclusion and exclusion in the context of physical education at school**

**Abstract:** This article carries out the main historical events related to the path ran by the Physical Education in the school ambit, analyzing the aspects correspondent to the inclusion/exclusion axle which led Physical Education to this social-historical trajectory. This dialogue with the past does not imply the present enlightenment, does not assume that teaching happens the way it should have been taught, it only reports what it really was and shows that the events do not happen in an arbitrary way, but there is a relation among them. The study reveals, in the Physical Education history, the amount of disable students who were excluded from the teaching-learning process and it gives some hints to overcome this exclusion.

**Keywords:** Physical Education. History. Disabled persons.

### **Inclusión y exclusión en el contexto de la educación física escolar**

**Resumen:** Este artículo apunta los principales acontecimientos históricos con relación al camino recorrido por la Educación Física en el ámbito escolar, analizando aspectos relacionados con el eje inclusión/exclusión que acompañó a la Educación Física a lo largo de esta trayectoria sociohistórica. Ese diálogo con el pasado no implica que él aclare el presente, no supone que él enseñe como debería haber sido; solamente relata lo que fue y muestra que

los acontecimientos no se dan de forma arbitraria, pero existe una relación entre ellos. El estudio revela, mientras en la historia de la Educación Física los alumnos con discapacidad fueron excluidos del proceso enseñanza aprendizaje y deja pistas para la superación de esa exclusión.  
**Palabras-clave:** Educación Física. Historia. Personas con discapacidad.

## REFERENCES

BETTI, Mauro. **Educação Física e sociedade:** a educação física na escola brasileira de 1º e 2º graus. São Paulo: Movimento, 1991.

BRASIL. Constituição (1988). **Constituição [da] República Federativa do Brasil.** Brasília: Senado Federal, 1988.

BRASIL. Decreto-lei nº 3.298, de 20 de dezembro de 1999. Estatuto das Pessoas com Deficiência. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil.** Brasília, 21 dez. 1999.

BRASIL. Lei n. 4.024/61 de 20 de dezembro de 1961. Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. *In:* BREJON, Moysés (Org.) **Estrutura e funcionamento do ensino de 1º e 2º graus.** 20. ed. São Paulo: Pioneira, 1988. p. 243-251.

BRASIL. Lei nº 10.098, de 19 de dezembro de 2000. Estabelece normas gerais e critérios básicos para a promoção da acessibilidade das pessoas portadoras de deficiência ou com mobilidade reduzida. Disponível em: <  
<http://www.pgj.ce.gov.br/centros/caogsdat/lei1098.doc>>.  
Acesso em: 2 jul. 2004.

BRASIL. Lei nº 10.172, de 9 de janeiro de 2001. Dispõe sobre o Plano Nacional de Educação. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, 10 jan. 2001.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 7.853, de 24 de outubro de 1989**. Dispõe sobre o apoio às pessoas portadoras de deficiência, sua integração social, sobre a Coordenadoria Nacional para Integração da Pessoa Portadora de Deficiência. Brasília: CORDE, 1994.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 8.069, de 13 de julho de 1990**. Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente. Vitória: DIO, 1990.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 9.394, de 24 de dezembro de 1996**. Dispõe sobre as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional (LDB). Brasília: Gabinete do Senador Darcy Ribeiro, 1997.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação/Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. **Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais**: terceiro e quarto ciclos do ensino fundamental — Educação Física. (5ª a 8ª série). 3. ed. Brasília: MEC/SEF, 2002.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. Secretaria de Educação Especial. **Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais**: adaptações curriculares — estratégias

para a educação de alunos com necessidades educativas especiais. Brasília: MEC/SEF/SEESP, 1999.

BRASIL. **Portaria Ministerial nº 1.793, de 27 de dezembro de 1994**. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, 27 dez. 1994.

CARMO, Apolônio Abadio do. Inclusão escolar e a educação física: que movimentos são estes? **Revista Integração**, Brasília, v. 14, p. 6-13, mar. 2002. (Edição especial: Educação Física Adaptada).

CASTELLANI FILHO, Lino. **Educação física no Brasil: a história que não se conta**. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 1988.

CODO, Wanderley; SENNE, Wilson A. **O que é corpo (latria)?** São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1985.

BRASIL. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO/CÂMARA DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA. Resolução nº 2, de 11 de setembro de 2001: Institui as Diretrizes Nacionais para a Educação Especial na Educação Básica. **Diário [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, 14 set. 2001.

BRASIL. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO. CÂMARA DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA. **Parecer nº. 17, de 03 de julho de 2001**. Brasília, SEESP/MEC, 2001.

CONVENÇÃO Sobre os direitos da Criança. Adotado em Assembléia Geral das Nações Unidas em 20 de novembro de 1989: Carta Magna Para as Crianças de Todo o Mundo. Disponível em: <<http://www.unicef.org/brazil/dir-cr.htm>>. Acesso em: 2 ago. 2004.

COSTA, Alberto Martins; SOUSA, Sônia Bertoni. Educação física e esporte adaptado: história, avanços e retrocessos em relação aos princípios da integração/inclusão e perspectivas para o século XXI. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 25, n. 3, p. 27-42, 2004.

CRUZ, Gilmar de Carvalho. **Classe especial e regular no contexto da educação física**: segregar ou integrar? 1996. 80 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) — Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 1996.

DECLARAÇÃO de Salamanca e linha de ação sobre necessidades educativas especiais. Brasília: CORDE, 1994.

DECLARAÇÃO dos Direitos das Pessoas Deficientes. **Resolução aprovada pela Assembléia Geral das Nações Unidas em 9 de dezembro de 1975**. Disponível em: <<http://www.infojus.com.br/area3/ant%f4niosilveira.htm>>. Acesso em: 2 ago. 2004.

DECLARAÇÃO Mundial Sobre Educação Para Todos. Plano de Ação Para Satisfazer as Necessidades Básicas de Aprendizagem. Brasília: CORDE, 1990.

DECLARAÇÃO Universal dos Direitos Humanos. Adotada e proclamada pela Resolução nº 217 A (III) da Assembléia Geral das Nações Unidas, de 10 de dezembro de 1948. Brasília: Secretaria Nacional dos Direitos Humanos do Ministério da Justiça, 1998.

FERREIRA NETO, Amarílio. **A pedagogia no exército e na escola: a educação física brasileira (1880-1950)**. Aracruz, ES: FACHA, 1999.

JANNUZZI, Gilberta. Por uma Lei de Diretrizes e Bases que propicie a educação escolar aos intitulados deficientes mentais. **Cadernos CEDES**, São Paulo, n. 23, p. 17-28, 1989.

NOGUEIRA, Maria Alice. **Educação, saber, produção em Marx e Engels**. São Paulo: Cortez/Autores Associados, 1990.

PRIETO, Rosângela Gavioli. Políticas de melhoria da escola pública para todos: tensões atuais. *In*: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE PESQUISADORES DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM EDUCAÇÃO, 26., 2003. Poços de Caldas, MG. **Anais...** Poços de Caldas, MG: ANPED, 2003. 1 CD-ROM. GT 15.

RIBEIRO, Sonia Maria; ARAÚJO, Paulo Ferreira de. A formação acadêmica refletindo na expansão do desporto adaptado: uma abordagem brasileira. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 25, n. 3, p. 57-69, maio 2004.

RODRIGUES, David. **A educação física perante a educação inclusiva: reflexões conceituais e metodológicas**. Publicado no boletim da Sociedade Portuguesa de Educação Física, 24/25, p. 73-81. Disponível em: <  
<http://www.rc.unesp.br/ib/efisica/sobama/sobamaorg/inicio.htm>  
>. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2005.

SOARES, Carmem Lúcia *et al.* **Metodologia do ensino da educação física**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1992.

SOARES, Carmem Lúcia. **Educação Física**: raízes européias e Brasil. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 1994. (Coleção educação contemporânea).

SOUSA, Sônia Bertoni. Educação Física inclusiva: um grande desafio para o século XXI. **Revista Integração**, Brasília, v. 14, p. 35-38, mar. 2002.

TANI, Go. Os desafios da pós-graduação em educação física. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 22, n. 1, p. 79-89, set. 2000.

Received on: 27/05/2007

Approved on: 05/10/2007