LUMEN ET VIRTUS

Relational aspects coordinator and teacher: Playfulness as an approach in continuing education

https://doi.org/10.56238/levv15n38-082

Claudia Urpia Rosa[1]
Dídima Maria de Mello Andrade[2]

ABSTRACT

Playfulness has been a theme that has been strongly discussed in Brazil for 12 years, although the first records were found in the Greek and Roman peoples (fifth and sixth centuries B.C.), associated with the term game, and in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries A.D., with an emphasis on the child. Important studies address playfulness, but it is in Luckesi (1998, 2004, 2018) and Andrade (2013) that the understanding of playfulness rests to reflect the place of playfulness in the performance of the function and in the formation of the pedagogical co-ordinator, in facing the difficulties to develop his work. In the conception of these authors, playfulness is a state of mind that expresses a feeling of surrender, wholeness, full experience, a founding aspect in the relationships between teacher and coordinator. This study made it possible to understand that the ludic training for the coordinator, especially because it is a dialogical and dialectical training, is crucial to interconnect sensitivity and knowledge in the school environment.

Keywords: Training, Pedagogical coordinator, Teacher, Playfulness.

INTRODUCTION

The debate on the interfaces between playfulness and education can follow several paths, mainly because the concept of playfulness is polysemic and is closely associated with playful activities, that is, games, plays, or recreational and fun actions. It is important to highlight that playfulness, despite not being a recent theme, was forgotten for a long time and, over the years, definitions from the sociological, psychological, and educational perspective have been attributed to it, causing some confusion between the phenomenon and the social act.

[1] Master in Education and Contemporaneity UNEB - State University of Bahia
Faculty of Education - Graduate Program in Education and Contemporaneity – PPGeduc
Member of the Research Group ELUFOTEC – Education, Playfulness, Training and Technological Processes.
LATTES: http://lattes.cnpq.br/0312063239481226
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8412-1421
[2] Doctor in Education and Contemporaneity UNEB - State University of Bahia
Faculty of Education - Graduate Program in Education and Contemporaneity – PPGeduc
Leader of the ELUFOTEC Research Group – Education, Playfulness, Training and Technological Processes.
LATTES: http://lattes.cnpq.br/9162199161573453
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4467-2442

We understand that playfulness can be a way of mediation in the constitutive processes of relationships, with regard to overcoming the technical conception that reproduces managerialism, now imposed by the rationality of the functioning of school organizations, curricular policies, education systems and educational innovations to which teachers and coordinators are subjected.

This article aims to reflect on the place of playfulness in the performance of the function and in the training of pedagogical coordinators, in facing the difficulties to develop their work, considering the accumulation of tasks that is imposed on them in the school environment, since it is visible that this professional is overloaded by the urgencies, emergencies and needs of the school's daily life, not only of your work environment but also of your surroundings.

Luckesi (2018, p. 6) presents playfulness as a state of consciousness, where an experience in a state of plenitude takes place, of the internal state of the subject who experiences the playful experience. Thus, we believe that a playful attitude, in the face of the challenges that affect schools, enables the resumption of the pleasure of doing, the pleasure of being and being in the profession. A feeling that leverages more clarity and creative sense to envision multiple possibilities for facing adversity and strengthening bonds in the relationship between coordinator and teacher in schools.

FOR STARTERS

The literature tells us that, in order to work in coordination, according to the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, LDBEN No. 9394/96, it is necessary to have initial training at a higher level in pedagogy or post-graduation. Thus, as a fundamental prerequisite for the exercise of the function, according to article 67, sole paragraph of the aforementioned law, teaching experience is necessary to act as pedagogical coordinator (BRASIL, 1996).

In this sense, the contextual and critical analysis of the coordinators' performance, marked by pluralism, sociocultural movements, learning from digital cultures and expanded regulation policies, indicates to us, among other aspects, that initial and continuing education has not been able to respond to the demands of these professionals in contemporary times.

In addition, they play their role due to the knowledge that sustains their school experience, first as teachers, who had coordinators in their trajectory, and then, in their own performance, pressed by the urgencies of practice and oppressed by the deficiencies of their training, they find themselves facing the immediate tasks of a school that, most of the time, walks without projects, without structure, just improvising short-term solutions, in order to survive in the face of bureaucratic demands.

Continuing education, the object of major studies and characterized as a privileged space for pondering on pedagogical action beyond the classroom, often comes to meet, according to Ball (2005), skills and competencies for the performance of a new managerialism, based on productivity,

arising from a utilitarian and efficient conception in meeting the fulfillment of pre-established goals and control systems.

A conception, perhaps the result of technical rationality, which sometimes obliterates personal relationships, annihilates collective construction, produces individualization and suppresses reflection and solidarity, aspects that are so important for the foundation of the pedagogical processes experienced in the school.

Certainly, in order to work with the dynamics of the pedagogical processes of a school, a professional needs to understand the complexity of the processes and the relationships established. Power and production relations that intend pedagogical coordination as an articulator and manager who, together with their peers, must promote, in the school, a convergence between the roles of the principal, parents, teachers in conducting the educational process, in addition to articulating and mediating the conflicts that may occur in the school and demand their function.

In addition to conferring a competent technical-mechanical qualification to the coordinating pedagogue, it is not enough for continuous training to be based only on courses of substitution and/or updating of emergency contents that arise in schools. The coordinator, according to Franco (2008), produces the critical articulation between teachers and their context, between educational theory and educational practice, that is, he establishes with the teacher a relationship of knowledge, understanding, but also of humility and joint construction, because neither one nor the other holds a single truth in the pedagogical processes dimensioned in the school.

In order to clarify, the importance of continuing education in playfulness for the pedagogical coordinator is considered here, believing in a dialectical perspective, since the coordinator is a function performed by a teacher/pedagogue and he, at the time he graduates, enables the training of teachers in his life.

THE PRECEPTS OF THE LEGISLATION FOR PEDAGOGICAL COORDINATION

In the 1920s, the pedagogical coordinator emerged as a category, motivated by the creation of the Brazilian Association of Education. In 1924, these professionals, who previously did not have their professions recognized as such, took a stance in favor of the collective valorization of their functions. To this end, specific bodies were created for the technical treatment of professional matters that were previously the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs.

Faced with this need, the State of Pernambuco was the first to observe the technical and administrative part of education separately from the other areas, with the emergence of the professional "educational supervisor" separate from the principal, who would take care of the bureaucratic part of the school and the inspector.

However, it was only later, in another of the vicissitudes in the history of pedagogy, based on Opinion No. 252/1969, which complemented Decree-Law No. 1,190, of April 4, 1939, that the discipline in school administration was instituted in the composition of the full curriculum of the bachelor's degree in pedagogy, thus giving rise to a specific approach in the preparation of the function of coordinator (SAVIANI, 2014).

Thus, it has been verified, since then, that technicians or specialists in education are essentially necessary; Among them is the figure of the school supervisor. Today, under another name – pedagogical coordinator – this professional works in the school's management team.

The process of restructuring education in Brazil moved from the early 1930s to the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB) enacted in 1961. Thus, it began to obey a state organization, with the creation of the Ministry of Education and the State Secretariats of Education, making it necessary to qualify professionals who would act as agents to operate in these new educational molds. A concern arises, then, with pedagogy courses. It is important to emphasize that these "specialists", brought by Saviani (2002), can be justified by the breadth of the pedagogy course, which trains educators to work in various areas of the school. However, this formation can be interpreted as doubtful; After all, currently, pedagogy courses have been undergoing major changes and their students have faced challenges due to the numerous qualifications of the course, which have the same nomenclature throughout the country, but bring in their scope different qualifications in each institution.

The training of the professional pedagogical coordinator, therefore, takes place, basically, in the graduation in pedagogy courses, according to what is ensured by the National Curriculum Guidelines for the Pedagogy Course, established in Resolution CNE/CP No. 1/2006, in its article 4, based on CNE/CP Opinions No. 5/2005 and No. 3/2006, applicable national rule:

> [...] the training of teachers to perform teaching functions in Early Childhood Education and in the early years of Elementary School, in High School courses, in the Normal modality, in Professional Education in the area of school services and support and in other areas in which pedagogical knowledge is foreseen.
> Sole Paragraph. Teaching activities also include participation in the organization and management of educational systems and institutions, including:
> I - planning, execution, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of tasks proper to the Education sector;
> II - planning, execution, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of non-school educational projects and experiences;
> III - production and dissemination of scientific-technological knowledge in the educational field in school and non-school contexts. (BRAZIL, 2006).

This training also takes place in postgraduate courses aimed at the specialty of the pedagogical coordination profession.

Conforme Libâneo,

> [...] The Pedagogy course aims to train specialists in education, covering several areas of professional education: pedagogical coordination of schools, school management, educational planning and evaluation. (LIBÂNEO, 2000, p. 241).

However, it is necessary that the professional in question be aware of his continuing education, as he is responsible for the continuing education of his teachers.

Pimenta and Lima (2004) advocate that the greatest challenge of educational institutions consists in the exchange, during the training process, between what is theorized and what is practiced, whose core is research. In the National Curriculum Guidelines for the pedagogy course (BRASIL, 2006), there is the conception that, when interning, the student must perform, with safety and quality, the roles for which he or she is intended, in addition to producing knowledge as a teacher, researcher and/or manager of educational processes in school and non-school institutions.

We note that government policies related to the training of teaching professionals have been defining the different levels of formal education in Brazil, since, in the school routine, the teaching-learning process has been suffering the consequences of these policies, which is reflected in the quality of the education offered. Thus, the difficulties of this school routine fall mainly on the figure of the regent teacher, who has been blamed for the poor quality of teaching, without considering the conditions of his training and the social relations established by him and the community

By analyzing the pedagogical practices that occur in schools, we found that teacher training is seen as one of the fundamental factors that influence the quality of teaching. This analysis leads to an understanding of the relationship between teacher training and the development of the teaching and learning process, glimpsing the reasons that lead governments and the State to prioritize teacher training policies guided by a productivist or economistic conception of teaching. Demo (2002), when discussing the training of the professionals in question, shows us that this is a strategic issue , in the sense of decisively conditioning the opportunities for development of society and the economy. This author leads us to understand that the quality of education, deeply linked to professional valorization, occupies the position of a development strategy.

Also according to Demo (2002), the problem of quality invariably points to the human factor as a specific generator of quality and teacher training will be the most decisive factor of basic educational quality. The teacher thus becomes the main trainer of the capacity for development in society and in the economy, being more connected to what he calls the products of knowledge, than to the process of building knowledge competence. In this perspective, the quality of teaching is defined by the quality of teacher training and this, in turn, contributes to the development of society, the context where educational policies are generated.

It is within the pedagogy course, as exposed above, in the curricular guidelines that, in addition to the training of pedagogical teachers, the training of the professional pedagogical coordinator takes place. However, it is worth mentioning that, despite having curricular matrices that

are still very diverse, the undergraduate courses in pedagogy are responsible for the training of pedagogical coordinator professionals, since in many other undergraduate courses we do not have access to the pedagogical theories necessary for the practices of this professional. It is in the pedagogy course that we can have a more general view of the performance of this professional, as well as analyze and understand their practices at school.

For this to actually happen, it is necessary to have a professional responsible for coordinating activities that help students and teachers in the search for success in the teaching and learning process, and this is where the pedagogical coordinator comes in, aware of the importance of his role as a motivator for his and his team's continuing education. in addition to maintaining the partnership between parents, students, teachers and management.

Thinking in this way, we note that this professional becomes a founding piece for quality education and for the success of the school as a whole, despite facing numerous difficulties and obstacles, as he is considered "without tradition" in the school structure, often having his function poorly understood by the school community in general.

The professional in question must have theoretical knowledge, because, in order to follow the pedagogical work of an educational institution and stimulate the teachers who work in it, it is necessary to activate knowledge, have the ability to observe, identify and assist students and teachers in their difficulties, always keep up to date, seeking to keep up with changes and reflecting on their practice, constantly, in a democratic and responsible manner, contributing to the pedagogical practice of the teacher.

THE PLACE OF PLAYFULNESS IN THE WORK RELATIONS BETWEEN COORDINATOR AND TEACHER

A quick look at the guidelines for the training of the coordinator, especially for the initial classes of basic education in the public network, already allows us to see how far we are from an initial training that encompasses the complexity of their function and that favors overcoming repetitive and mechanical actions.

We know that in the integral formation of the subjects, and here teachers, coordinators and students are inserted, the cognitive, affective, attitudinal and socio-emotional dimensions are involved, aspects that are mixed with their own identity as a person. It is in this sense that we think that coordinators and teachers can collaborate with each other to develop a dynamic of continuous training based on the prerogatives fostered by playfulness.

The term playfulness appears associated with the term game in the sixteenth century and has been gaining new spaces over the centuries, especially in the nineteenth century, with the pedagogical innovations coming from the ideas of the French Revolution.

The polysemy around the concept of playfulness has more common meanings and is intended for more singular interpretations when we refer to games, play, recreation; but, resorting to the psychological, sociological, and anthropological meanings, we find other meanings very well defined by theorists such as Brougère (2002), Huizinga (1996), Winnicott (1975), among others.

Regarding the relationship between coordinator and teacher in the exercise of their functions, we turn to Luckesi (1998, 2004, 2018) as a theoretical reference for our reflections, without, however, failing to allude to playing, playing and recreation, as this way we will consider the complexity involved in these relationships in the face of the challenges of contemporaneity without disregarding the external acts and objects that also make sense in the work processes.

We propose playfulness as a state of internal consciousness, which translates plenitude. For this author,

> [...] When we are defining playfulness as a state of consciousness, where an experience takes place in a state of plenitude, we are not talking in itself about objective activities that can be described sociologically and culturally as playful activity, such as games or something similar. We are, rather, talking about the internal state of the subject who experiences the playful experience. Even when the subject is experiencing this experience with others, the playfulness is internal [...]. (LUCKESI, 2004, p. 6).

In this sense, the concept of playfulness is attributed to the idea of pleasure, but internal pleasure, in what one does. And it is from this place that we perceive the articulation of the coordinator with the potential to highlight the reform and constitution of the pillars of support for his own continuing education and that of his teachers to contemplate learning processes that consolidate changes in the course of the teaching and learning process within the school.

This figure of articulation, if sustained, not only by technical knowledge obtained in its initial training, but endowed with structuring meanings of the human being, play and love can bring to the fore actions of simplicity in dealing with the exchange of experiences between peers, reconstruct practices already developed by evaluating successes and failures to replan, with meaning, new elements and knowledge to the group of teachers. As it is an internal feeling, Luckesi emphasizes that

> [...] sharing and coexistence can and certainly do offer a feeling of the pleasure of living together, but even so, this feeling is internal to each one, even if the group can harmonize with this common feeling; but a group, as a group, does not feel, but adds and encompasses a feeling that becomes common; but ultimately, the one who feels it is the subject. (LUCKESI, 2004, p. 6).

Thus, what we maintain is that, although playfulness is proper to the subject, it allows the diffusion of the feeling of pleasure in sharing difficult and challenging situations within the school, in the sense of breaking perverse relations of authoritarianism imposed by technical and materialist rationality.

According to Andrade (2013), "[...] education must enable the subject to travel in which he walks as a founding element [...]", consummating his humanity in everything he does. We are in line with this thought at the same time that we add the idea of protagonism, creative possibilities for the continuity of their education from themselves and, it is worth emphasizing, always unfinished. As human beings, we are incomplete and in living together we perceive the possibility of complementation in the confrontations and unveiling of the world.

From this perspective, the coordinator, when playful, exercises the dialectic, understands the cause, does not lose sight of the objective, but respects the elaboration processes in the broadening of the view of the other subjects. He gives himself fully at every moment to experiences, allows himself to create and let himself be creative, which favors the possibility of freeing himself from the stereotypes attributed to the teacher: owner of absolute knowledge and, therefore, not allowing himself to be in the place of not knowing, which hinders his continuing education and reflection on his practice, or even the culprit of the ills of the world.

The change in posture that annihilates the plurisensory capacities to which this author refers, based on Assmann (2004), is presented as a potentiator of the fruition of thinking, to give way to the connection of sensitivity and knowledge in the relationships between coordinator, teachers and other instances in favor of the exercise of educational/pedagogical practice.

The concept of playfulness, for Luckesi (2004), rests on the subjectivity of the subject. The author preaches a focused state of consciousness and an expanded state of consciousness. Both are important and necessary throughout life. However, he emphasizes that the exclusive maintenance in one or the other makes it impossible for the subject to develop in a healthy way. The focused state of consciousness portrays the correctness of things and leads to the fragmented and closed way of life. The expanded state of consciousness, on the other hand, allows for clarity and multiple possibilities.

Doing education means developing sensitivity and creativity to move away from modeling recipes, curb dogmas, circumvent the tricks of positivism that have so impregnated actions. In the exercise of coordination, clarity and accuracy go hand in hand to enable teachers to expose their knowledge, to associate ideas, to include new ways of operating, creating, recreating and building a lighter and more pleasurable daily life.

A PLAYFUL APPROACH IN THE CONTINUING EDUCATION OF THE TEACHER/COORDINATOR

The training of teachers/pedagogues should not be far from the political interests of a country. Among the many reasons that trigger the statement, it is possible to assert the importance of the teacher conceiving himself as a social actor and the importance of the educational process for society. Questions about the integral formation of the individual have been emphatically

disseminated, and therefore the teacher cannot be reduced only to a formal, technicist curriculum. Thinking about the subject as a whole means understanding its emotional, social and bodily aspects, turning the gaze to playfulness as a promoter of this understanding.

Considering the relevance of playfulness in the field of the curriculum, it is understood that it is intrinsic in the act of educating and intertwined in the social, affective and cognitive aspects of all members of the school. Therefore, it is essential to reflect on pedagogical coordination, making a relationship with theory and practice (CUNHA, 1998, p. 83), to break with technicist traditionalism and understand the function in the face of a more complex view, being humble and methodological in appropriating the subject-knowledge relationship and enabling human action, playful from a local space-time, not being imprisoned by prescriptions, laws and rules in order to perceive the dynamics of life.

Based on the assumption of a pedagogical praxis and the humility of knowing that we are unfinished and incomplete beings and, therefore, we are not the holders of knowledge, Freire explains that

> [...] We cannot put ourselves in the position of the superior being who teaches a group of ignorant people, but in the humble position of those who communicate a relative knowledge to others who have another relative knowledge. (It is necessary to know how to recognize when teachers know more and make them know more with humility). (FREIRE, 2011, p. 35-36).

For this, the training of the coordinator must be implied from a curricular praxis based on the political project, on the reflection on their practice, on the knowledge of themselves and the world, involved with educational issues.

It is necessary, above all, to understand that knowledge is constituted in interactive contexts and stems from the concerns of the social context. There is no way to build new knowledge without it coming from the expectations and needs of the sociocultural contexts experienced by the subjects, and from the interaction and conviviality between these subjects. This, however, is one of the challenges of the coordinator: to develop his function totally intertwined with the experiential context of his teachers and school community. This understanding certainly permeates the discussions and maturation of ideas between coordinator and teachers, emerging in the emerging paradigm, "[...] a way of conceiving knowledge as a conceptual space, as a contradictory product of social, historical, cultural and psychological processes [...]" (CUNHA, 1998, p. 10) of contemporary education and developing inventive praxis and creative curricula that allow the "inseparable" intertwining between teaching, research and extension.

The coordinator's practice, generated in these terms, will allow/enable the continuous formation of reflective, critical, autonomous, creative and supportive subjects (of themselves and of the teachers). It is also necessary to bear in mind that confrontations and conflicts generated in the

intertwining with the other sectors of the school considerably enrich this emerging form of knowledge production, as it articulates the pressing singularity of each individual and the cultural-technological context of each subject, with the collectivity and the needs inherent to the sociocultural context of this collectivity. The subject, in this sense, becomes an active participant, as he is always going to meet, producing and proposing creative alternatives, changing the perverse logic of the definitions of roles between coordinator and teacher.

Understanding pedagogical coordination and its relationship with playfulness implies *a priori* unveiling the concepts of playfulness; it is said to unveil because the concept of playfulness that is understood most of the time is presented in a reductionist way. The importance and place of knowledge in the sense of advancing in the construction of knowledge itself is not yet understood. Such knowledge contributes to strengthening the understanding of the concept of playfulness; and, for them to happen in a playful way, it is necessary for the subject to be in tune with himself, with the information and knowledge he has, to connect with the other who, invariably, has different knowledge, information and knowledge. This is achieved through contrast, comparison and reflection. This interactive process will result in the advancement of personal and collective knowledge. There are the intersections of structures of thought.

It can be inferred, based on Campos (1986), that playfulness is a facilitating and mediating element in personal and professional relationships, however, for this to happen, it is understood the need for the coordinator to think, rethink and question himself; This question concerns their learning in their training, as well as in the exercise of pedagogical practice. At this point, it is worth asking: How is the field of playfulness present in the curricula of the pedagogy course? It is not intended, at this moment, to answer the question, but to risk saying that, with a greater prominence than other professions, the training of the coordinator imposes itself in a very incisive way for those who intend to exercise it. The desire to improve their knowledge and skills, fear, uncertainty and insecurity seem to have always been attributes of those who embark on pedagogical coordination.

In this sense, acting with playfulness in daily, pedagogical and bureaucratic activities raises other questions about playfulness: Why can't one play with laws, rules and deadlines without losing the rigor that they require? Why is the mistake or difficulties of a teacher or coordinator not seen as constructive? Why can't the coordinator and teacher play during the elaboration/understanding of their work? Why, in educational institutions, are desire and pleasure dissociated from work? How to achieve playfulness contemplate pedagogical purposes without professionals being able to carry them out?

In view of the questions, it is good to remember Luckesi, when he says:

> [...] The speeches and debates, which have developed around what is playful, have tended to define the playful activity as that which provides the "fullness of experience". It is commonly thought that a playful activity is a fun activity. It may or may not be. What most characterizes

> playfulness is the experience of plenitude that it allows to those who experience it in their acts. (LUCKESI, 1998, p. 9-25).

These questions refer to the need to introduce a new pillar at the base of the curricular structure of educator training: playful training, as Negrini asserts (*apud* SANTOS, 1997b, p. 13). Playfulness is a lever of education for the third millennium; In addition to theoretical-pedagogical training, the third pillar to be added would be playful training, as it is a dynamic element that generates creativity, sensitivity and the construction of knowledge from various angles, both for the coordinator, teacher, student and others involved.

With this thought, it is ratified that the training of education professionals is gaining more and more importance. It is worth pointing out the formative practices and the human aspects of the teaching work. It is with this view that one perceives the importance of considering not only the technical, political and professional aspects, but also of considering the complexity of human nature, as Nóvoa asserts:

> Today we know that it is not possible to separate the personal self from the professional self, especially in a profession strongly impregnated with values and ideals that are very demanding from the point of view of the commitment to human relationships. There was a time when the possibility of studying teaching beyond the subjectivity of the teacher was considered a scientific success and an essential step towards a science of education. But rationalist utopias have not been able to put in parentheses the irreducible specificity of each teacher's action, in an obvious relationship with personal characteristics and professional experiences, as Jennifer Nias writes: The teacher is a person; And an important part of that person is the teacher. (NÓVOA, 1996, p. 7).

In this identity process, the coordinator deals with his or her processes and those of the teachers and other management components; Therefore, it is understood that it is necessary to know oneself in order to learn to "coordinate" people. This is what Tardif (2002) calls teaching knowledge, composed of other knowledge (from disciplinary and curricular experience) from other sources in a space where "[...] the motivation, encouragement and creation of specific learning situations enable the construction and modification of concepts" and continuous training processes.

This, in Paulo Freire's view, means contributing to finding adequate solutions for situations of class regency, thus deriving to teacher regency, since it attributes great importance to the pedagogical moment, but by different means such as social *praxis*, as the construction of a reflected world of which the whole school is a part. For Paulo Freire (1978), dialogue is the key element for the promotion of active subjects. Once the dialogue is established, awareness will be raised and a partnership will be built in the achievement of horizontality, equality in which everyone seeks to think and act critically about their doing, their knowledge without the shadow of hierarchical coercion or the fear of making mistakes.

For Freire (1978), dialogue is based on the common language that expresses thought, which is always thinking from a concrete reality, which must be lived in school as everyone's responsibility.

The common language is captured in the very environment where its pedagogical action will be carried out:

a) it is based on love that seeks the synthesis of the reflections and actions of the elite versus the people and not the conquest, the domination of one by the other;
b) it requires humility, placing the elite on an equal footing with the people to learn and teach, because it realizes that all the subjects of the dialogue always know and ignore, without ever reaching the point of absolute knowledge, as they are never in absolute ignorance;
c) it translates faith in the historicity of all men as builders of the world;
d) it implies the hope that in this pedagogical meeting ways will be glimpsed to make tomorrow better for all, which presupposes patience to mature with the people, so that reflection and action are really syntheses elaborated with the people.

From this articulation a group of knowledges is born and as such they cannot be dichotomized. They consist of the organization and monitoring of a group of professionals and the work processes of this collective, where the affective and emotional aspects rest, making it necessary to think about the playful.

The plurality and importance of teaching knowledge in the training of the coordinator in the construction of professional identity is considered, which will make it possible to think about the importance of the professional as a subject who produces knowledge. It is understood that school knowledge is not only something transmitted through generations, based on the exposure of culture; Everything happens in the midst of contradictions and challenges.

To know, we agree with D'Ávila (2006, p. 6), when he states: "[...] teaching practice is a *locus* of training and production of knowledge". It is a practice that manifests itself in a set of knowledge, ideals, values, convictions, techniques, resources, artifacts, procedures, affections and reinvention, where the coordinator is immersed.

For a better understanding of professional knowledge, it is observed how Pimenta (2002) identifies the types of knowledge:

a) experience, which would be the one learned by the teacher, since he was a student, with the teachers; in this case, learned by the coordinator, when he was a teacher, in contact with his coordinators, where he repeats what he has learned;
b) knowledge, which covers the review of the school's role in the transmission of knowledge and its specialties in a contemporary context;
c) pedagogical knowledge, which encompasses the issue of knowledge together with the knowledge of experience and specific contents and which will be built from real pedagogical needs.

It is proposed that the fragmentation between different types of knowledge be overcome, considering social practice as a central objective, thus enabling a re-signification of knowledge in teacher training. Tardif (2002) cites, as characteristics of teachers' professional knowledge:

a) temporality, which means the provisionality and historical construction of knowledge, constituted in the trajectory or itinerancy of each one. This itinerancy includes, of course, the life stories of the professionals, their experiences also as students they were, in addition to referring to the professional cycle;
b) the plurality of knowledge, in the sense that it comes from different sources: personal culture, school culture and academic training, among others. One can mention, for example, the authors who were read and about whom the didactic-pedagogical knowledge was studied. They are also heterogeneous knowledges, since teachers/coordinators do not work with a single pedagogical theory; they mix them according to the various objectives they have;
c) the personalization and contextualization of knowledge: it is knowledge that is born in different socio-political contexts and comes from human beings loaded with personal, cultural and subjective marks, which defines the profile, the identity of each one in the classroom;
d) the work with human beings, which requires knowledge of oneself and of the interactions that take place in the school game, which definitely marks the work of the coordinator and the teacher, based on studies of psychology and psychopedagogy.

When mentioning the knowledge necessary for the training of the coordinating professional, it is clear that this is an inconclusive process, which is not restricted to graduation, and here it is necessary to pay attention to the first contact with the profession and with the experiences triggered in other spaces.

In this way, working on initial training particularly, based on research, will tend to lead to a critical attitude, which will trigger an educational innovation, through a dialectical view between theory and practice. Thus, the coordinator and the teacher will not be trained to adjust to the educational system, but to acquire skills, to problematize, research and work within the school context in constant mediation with each other.

BEING NECESSARY, IN SOME WAY, TO CONCLUDE

Teaching has never been an easy task. With the massification of education, new problems arose, namely: the heterogeneity of most classes in terms of race, culture, material living conditions, interest and learning rhythms. Opting for a teaching career, today, can only be considered a true *act of courage* or a true choice... Maybe? The teaching career is, however, a real challenge, considering the new demands added to the teacher's work in contemporary society. Coordinating teachers and

students in the face of these challenges and diversity is even more tiring due to the dynamics required.

In the exercise of their function, the coordinators are subjected to many trainings, whose contents occupy a prominent place. We agree with Libâneo (1996, p. 39), when he says: "The function of pedagogy [of contents] [...] it is taking a step forward in the transformative role of the school [...]", and taking a step forward means that encyclopedic teaching must give way to meaningful learning. The coordinator and the teacher, although different from the child, are people who assimilate information, think, cry, laugh, have pain and pleasure, have a story, a story that is transformed into knowledge. The way in which this knowledge will be worked depends on the intensity of how it was constructed throughout their initial and continuing education.

Thus, playfulness is understood as an element of sensitive knowledge, which is the foundation of the coordinator's education, considering it as a need that every human being has to live in a group with integrity, in a pleasant way, as well as to get to know oneself, in order to get to know the other. This will provide a new awareness, as stated by Laville and Dionne (2005, p. 113), to understand the pleasures and sufferings that "being a teacher" represents. It is believed that, in order to better understand such "delights and pains" of "being a teacher", a playful education is necessary, and its meaning will only be guaranteed if the coordinator is prepared to work with a deep knowledge about its fundamentals.

REFERENCES

Andrade, D. M. de M. (2013). Contribuições teóricas do campo da ludicidade no currículo de formação do pedagogo (Doctoral dissertation). Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Salvador. Available at http://www.cdi.uneb.br. Accessed August 12, 2018.

Assmann, H. (2004). Reencantar a educação: rumo à sociedade aprendente (8th ed.). Vozes.

Ball, S. J. (2005). Performatividade, gerencialismo e performatividade. Cadernos de Pesquisa, 35(126), 539-564.

Brasil. Congresso Nacional. (1996). Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF.

Brasil. (2006). Resolução CNE/CP Nº 1, de 15 de maio de 2006. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Curso de Graduação em Pedagogia, licenciatura. Brasília, DF. Available at http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/rcp01_06.pdf. Accessed December 1, 2009.

Brougère, G. (2002). A criança e a cultura lúdica. In T. Kishimoto (Org.), O brincar e suas teorias (pp. 19-22). Pioneira Thomson.

Campos, D. M. de S. (1986). Psicologia da aprendizagem. Vozes.

Cunha, M. I. (1998). O professor universitário na transição de paradigmas. JM Editora.

D'Ávila, C. M. (2006). Eclipse do lúdico. Educação e Contemporaneidade: Revista da FAEEBA, 15(25), 15-25.

Demo, P. (2002). Educar pela pesquisa (2nd ed.). Autores Associados.

Franco, M. A. S. (2008). Coordenação pedagógica: Uma práxis em busca de sua identidade. Revista Múltiplas Leituras, 1(1), 117-131.

Freire, P. (1978). Educação como prática da liberdade. Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (2011). Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa (43rd ed.). Paz e Terra.

Huizinga, J. (1996). Homo Ludens. Perspectiva.

Laville, C., & Dionne, J. (2005). A construção do saber: Manual da metodologia da pesquisa em ciências humanas. Artes Médicas.

Libâneo, J. C. (1996). Que destino os educadores darão à Pedagogia? In S. G. Pimenta (Org.), Pedagogia, Ciência da Educação? (pp. 107-134). Cortez.

Libâneo, J. C. (2000). Democratização da escola pública: A pedagogia crítico-social dos conteúdos. Loyola.

Lima, M. do S. L. (2008). O estágio e a metáfora de árvore. In M. do S. L. Lima (Ed.), Encontro de Prática e Estágio da UNEB. Editora da Universidade do Estado da Bahia (EDUNEB).

Luckesi, C. C. (1998). Desenvolvimento dos estados de consciência e ludicidade. Interfaces da Educação, Cadernos de Pesquisa do Núcleo de Filosofia e História da Educação, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da UFBA, 2(1), 9-25.

Luckesi, C. C. (2004). Estados de consciência e atividades lúdicas. In B. de S. Porto (Org.), Educação e Ludicidade (pp. 11-20). GEPEL/FACED/UFBA.

Luckesi, C. C. (n.d.). Ludicidade e atividades lúdicas: Uma abordagem a partir da experiência interna. Available at www.luckesi.com.br. Accessed April 13, 2018.

Nóvoa, A. (1996). Os professores e suas histórias de vida. Porto.

Pimenta, S. G. (2002). De professores, pesquisa e didática. Papirus.

Pimenta, S. G., & Lima, M. S. L. (2004). Estágio e Docência. Cortez.

Santos, S. M. P. (1997). O lúdico na formação do educador. Vozes.

Saviani, D. (2002). Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica: Primeiras aproximações (8th ed.). Autores Associados.

Saviani, D. (2014). O Lunar de Sepé: Paixão, dilemas e perspectivas na educação. Autores Associados.

Tardif, M. (2002). Saberes docentes e formação profissional. Vozes.

Winnicott, D. W. (1975). O brincar e a realidade (J. O. e A. Abreu & V. Nobre, Trans.). Imago.