

Body, Gestures, and Movement at BNCC: comparisons with italian pedagogy

Rubens de Sousa Bravalheri¹

¹Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR), Curitiba/PR – Brazil

ABSTRACT – Body, Gestures, and Movement at BNCC: comparisons with the italian pedagogy. With the assumption that the BNCC Fields of Experience were inspired by Italian pedagogy, the article aims to compare the Field of Experience *Body and movement* contained in the Italian Decree of June 3, 1991, and the Field of Experience *Body, Gestures and Movement* at BNCC. A comparison was made between the aforementioned documents and as a theoretical support for conceptual investigations, books, theses, dissertations, and articles available on Google Scholar and the Virtual Library of the Federal University of Paraná were used. As a result, proximity was observed between the fields, with similar nomenclatures, but the terminologies used to explain the field of experience need to be reviewed.

Keywords: Education. BNCC. Body. Movement. Child.

RESUMO – Corpo, Gestos e Movimento na BNCC: comparações com a pedagogia italiana. Com o pressuposto de que os Campos de Experiência da BNCC tenham sido inspirados na pedagogia italiana, o objetivo do artigo é comparar o Campo de Experiência *o corpo e o movimento* contido no Decreto Italiano de 3 de junho de 1991 e o Campo de Experiência *Corpo, Gestos e Movimento* da BNCC. Foi realizada uma comparação entre os documentos supracitados, e, como suporte teórico para investigações conceituais, utilizou-se livros, teses, dissertações e artigos disponíveis no Google Acadêmico e na Biblioteca Virtual da Universidade Federal do Paraná. Como resultado, observou-se proximidades entre os campos, com nomenclaturas semelhantes, porém as terminologias utilizadas para explicar o campo de experiência necessitam de revisão.

Palavras-chave: Educação. BNCC. Corpo. Movimento. Criança.

Introduction

The historicity and influences of the laws that govern the Brazilian educational system must be rescued so we can reflect on the events and seek explanations for the moment in which we live. About Early Childhood Education in Brazil, it is known that the debates were accentuated in the 1990s, a time when Italian pedagogy gained prominence through the pedagogue Loris Malaguzzi (1920-1994)¹, mainly responsible for the approach of municipal schools for children in Reggio Emilia, Italy.

In this sense, this text aims to contribute to the approximations already made by other authors/researchers between Italian and Brazilian legislation regarding Early Childhood Education. More specifically, I choose to enter the Field of Experiences that brings the *body* into its centrality. As a basis for the survey of the discussion, the publication *As Novas Orientações para a Nova Escola da Infância* de 1991² contained in the Cedes Notebook number 37, entitled *Grandes Políticas para os Pequenos* (Faria, 1995), was used. The original version, in Italian, with the Decree of June 3, 1991, published by the Ministry of Public Instruction (Italy, 1991), was also used to compare the Brazilian text.

To be able to carry out a confrontation with the Brazilian normative, two documents were used: the National Curricular Guidelines for Early Childhood Education (DCNEI), published in 2009, which aims to “[...] guide the organization, articulation, development, and evaluation of the pedagogical proposals of all Brazilian education networks” (Brasil, 2013, p. 4) and the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC), which brings the standards and defines the essential learning in Brazilian Basic Education (Brasil, 2017). To clarify the relationship between these two documents, it is important to emphasize that the guidelines are mandatory; even though the BNCC was published in 2017, does not replace the Guidelines and is subordinate to them (Pereira, 2020).

As a theoretical support to deepen the conceptual issues, a search was performed on research sites such as Google Scholar, the Library of the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), and articles and books used for the elaboration of the thesis. The use of these sites was an option of the author due to the greater familiarity and permissibility of the documents. Initially, documents that established a relationship between the aforementioned legislations were sought. For the conceptual deepening, referenced authors of the field of *the body, gestures, and movement* were used. In addition, I mention the importance of the discussions held in the research group EDUCAMOVIMENTO of the Center for Studies and Research in Childhood and Early Childhood Education of the Federal University of Paraná (Nepie/UFPR), which were fundamental for the structuring of ideas and conceptual discussions about the child body in movement.

It is known that the curricular organization of Early Childhood Education at BNCC is structured in five Fields of Experiences that de-

fine the learning and development objectives, considering “[...] as structuring axes interactions and play, assuring them the rights to co-exist, play, participate, explore, express themselves and know themselves” (Brasil, 2017, p. 40). In this sense, we must know each of these five fields to be able to provide children with a quality Early Childhood Education that respects their rights to teaching.

Of the five Fields of Experiences proposed, for this research, it is important to observe the indications regarding the child's body. The BNCC states that the body of children in Early Childhood Education “[...] gains centrality because he is the privileged participant of the pedagogical practices of physical care, oriented to emancipation and freedom, and not to submission” (Brasil, 2017, p. 41).

Therefore, there is the Field of Experience entitled *Body, gestures, and movement* available at the Base. “The Field of Experience Body, gestures and movements recognizes the children's body as a privileged member for integration and play in the pedagogical practices of Brazilian Early Childhood Education institutions” (Zambonato, 2020, p. 63).

Thus, it is important to know about the historicity of these documents and to reflect on this Field of Experience that puts the child's body in evidence.

Legislation

The debates related to Early Childhood Education have always been important for the creation of documents that regulate this stage of teaching. An important milestone that gave rise to the interest in pedagogies practiced abroad was the publication of the Cedes Notebook number 37, entitled *Grandes Políticas para os Pequenos*, in 1995. It contained different curricular proposals from countries such as Italy, Sweden, and Japan. In addition, it brought *As Novas Orientações para a Nova Escola da Infância* (Italy, [1991] 1995), in which the curriculum of Italian pedagogy from preschool was mentioned (Finco; Robinson; Faria, 2015). Another important point that aroused the interest in international pedagogies was the publication of the American magazine *Newsweek* in 1991, which showed the ten best schools in the world with emphasis on the schools of Reggio Emilia, Italy (Pereira, 2020).

According to the Pedagogical Proposals and Curriculum in Early Childhood Education (Brasil, 1996), in December 1994, the General Coordination of Early Childhood Education of the Ministry of Education constituted a work team to develop a methodology for the analysis of pedagogical/curricular proposals in force in the education secretariats of the states and municipalities of the Brazilian capitals. A total of 45 sets of documents were analyzed, 25 from the state systems and 20 from the municipalities and capitals. Five federation units were also visited, one per region, where it was sought to evaluate the implementation of the proposals by the state agencies and the municipalities of the capitals.

For Stemmer (2012) it was in the 1990s that a more accentuated concern arose in the search for a pedagogy for early childhood education and the studies of Ana Lúcia Goulart de Faria and Eloísa Candal Rocha were the precursors of this trend, which bring influences of Italian pedagogy in their works.

It was during this period that important documents (Law of Guidelines and Bases – LDB, National Curricular References of Early Childhood Education – RCNEI, National Curriculum Guidelines for Early Childhood Education – DCNEI) were elaborated to define the scope of Early Childhood Education in Brazil with discussions centered on the establishment of the relationship of the child with the school institution (Barbosa; Richter, 2015). For this reason, we believe that it is important to mention the BNCC and the DCNEI when we talk about the Brazilian legislation compared to the Italian one.

Despite the concomitance between the elaboration of the DCNEI and the already existing Italian legislation for early childhood education, we did not observe in the former a curricular proposal based on fields of experience, but only a mention in article 9 (Brasil, 2013). The same document proposes that the curriculum be centered on interactions and play, “[...] recommending that the proposals made by the teachers be based on the careful observation of these same interactions and games” (Silva, 2021, p. 94), and the teacher is responsible for the task of observation, “[...] listening, researching, recording to be able to propose new interactions and games and, thus, promote the integral development of children” (Silva, 2021, p. 94).

[...] this curricular proposal is based on the Pedagogy of Listening, as highlighted by the author Andrea Pagano (2017). This approach is defended by the Pedagogy of Childhood from the experiences and theorizations carried out in the city of Reggio Emilia, Italy, since the second half of the twentieth century. We have to go beyond the interests, cultures, and desires of children to promote full development. The curriculum does not come from outside, it is not solved with the adoption of a primer, with the purchase of a method, or with the elaboration of a list of competencies; nor is it based on pre-established generative themes or commemorative dates, which make little sense to children (Silva, 2021, p. 94).

Carvalho (2015) brings other contributions and approximations between the DCNEI and Italian pedagogy. The author explains that the first promotes the rupture of an assistentialist approach and facilitates the child-child, child-adult, and child-to-child relations with himself, and adds that

[...] in the guidelines, words such as class, student, teaching, school, and content are forbidden in the curricular vocabulary, because they are understood by specialists in the area (whose studies are based on the Sociology of Childhood and Italian Pedagogy) as part of a schooling conception of childhood (Carvalho, 2015, p. 467).

At the time of the debates about the DCNEI and in the elaboration of the opinions that helped in its construction, Italy had an education for children from 3 to 6 years old based on Fields of Experience that contemplated five fields: 1) the self and the other, 2) the body and the movement, 3) images, sounds, and colors, 4) the speeches and the words, 5) knowledge of the world (Barbosa; Richter, 2015).

In Brazil, the most recent document that establishes the curricular bases for Basic Education is the BNCC, which had its final version published in 2017. The BNCC was created from the DCNEI, and the two documents should be considered in a complementary way. Pereira (2020) explains that the guidelines are mandatory, while the BNCC, even though it was published in 2017, does not replace the guidelines and is subordinate to them.

In this sense, the BNCC emerged to operationalize the guidelines, with guidelines for teachers, respecting the various dimensions of childhood and children's rights (Campos; Barbosa, 2015). Regarding its applicability, in an article published by Barbosa and Silveira (2019), the authors explain that the BNCC cannot and should not be considered as a curriculum, however, after the creation of the Implementation Program of the National Common Curricular Base (ProBNCC) by the Ministry of Education and Culture in 2018, “[...] what was supposed to be a reference, became a curricular prescription – tending to the homogenization of contents and organization of early childhood education in Brazil –, contrary to the autonomy guaranteed in the LDB of 1996” (Barbosa; Silveira, 2019, p. 82). Thus, it is understood that the debate on the curriculum in Early Childhood Education is necessary. And this discussion is quite broad and escapes the purpose of this article, which is to compare the fields of experience, with greater attention to the body, gestures, and movements.

At BNCC, the curriculum in Early Childhood Education was divided into five Fields of Experiences. They are: 1) the self, the other, and the we, 2) body, gestures, and movements, 3) traces, sounds, colors, and shapes, 4) listening, speaking, thinking, and imagination, 5) spaces, times, quantities, relationships and transformations.

It is important to highlight that the concern with educational experiences was present in the DCNEI, and then was resumed and reaffirmed in the BNCC “[...] with the proposition of the organization of early childhood education from fields of experience and not from areas of knowledge” (Padini-Simiano; Buss-Simon, 2016, p. 81). The authors explain that the multiple possibilities of expansion and diversification of experiences, knowledge, and culture that children can experience within Early Childhood Education should be promoted by a series of practices that articulate children's knowledge and actions with the knowledge already systematized by humanity. Thus, the BNCC for Early Childhood Education proposes “[...] the organization through Fields of Experiences to contemplate and detail, in these Fields of Experiences, specificities of the education of children since infants, expressed in each of the items of Art. 9 of the DCNEI” (Buss-Simão, 2016, p. 186).

This proposal for the curricular organization of Early Childhood Education by fields of experience is inspired by the Italian Pedagogy that, as Faria (1995, p. 81) informs us, indicates “the various spheres of the child’s doing and acting” that are based on specific and individual competencies from which children confer meanings, develop learning, and create formative goals developed within established limits and with active and constant involvement. The fields of experience as a curriculum for Early Childhood Education organize learning and present the objectives, methodological paths, and evaluative indicators.

Thus, a relationship is made between the quantity and the nomenclature used to name the Fields of Experiences at BNCC, in which a strong influence of the one established by the Italian legislation and translated in the text: *The New Guidelines for a New School of Childhood*, of 1991, is perceived.

It should be noted that Early Childhood Education in Brazil is intended for children from zero to 5 years old and the Italian Decree is intended for children from 3 to 6 years old, therefore, some considerations in the BNCC that focus on children from 0 to 2 years old, were not amenable to comparison, apart from pre-existing skills that the Italian document mentions.

Approximations and Comparisons

Before we delve into the specific Field of Experiences of this discussion, it is important to show how the documents define this term.

In the Italian Decree, the term Fields of Experience indicates

[...] the different spheres of the child’s doing and acting and, therefore, the specific and individual sectors of competence in which the child gives meaning to his multiple activities, develops his learning, acquires the linguistic and procedural instruments, and pursues his formative objectives, in the concreteness of an experience that develops within the established borders and with the constant of his active involvement (Italy, 1991, p. 19)³.

At BNCC, the Fields of Experiences “[...] constitute a curricular arrangement that welcomes the situations and concrete experiences of children’s daily life and their knowledge, intertwining them with the knowledge that is part of the cultural heritage” (Brasil, 2017, p. 40).

In general, as Ariosi (2019) reminds us, the Fields of Experience in Italian legislation are focused on people and their relationships, while in BNCC the concern revolves around the organization of content and curriculum.

We do not find the nomenclature Fields of Experiences in the DNCEIs, however, when the document mentions the curricular organization, it establishes that it “[...] must be structured in axes, centers, *fields* or *modules of experiences* that must be articulated around the principles, conditions, and objectives proposed in this guideline” (Brasil, 2013, p. 95, my emphasis). In addition, the BNCC states that the DNCEIs contributed to the definition and denomination of the fields of experience “[...] about the fundamental knowledge and

knowledge to be provided to children and associated with their experiences” (Brasil, 2017, p. 40).

For this analysis, and the proximity to the studies related to my Ph.D. in progress, I chose the Field of Experiences number 2 of BNCC: “Body, gestures and movement” to compare it with the one proposed by *The New Guidelines for a New School of Childhood* (Italy, [1991] 1995), which brought, as the first Field of Experience, *the body and movement*.

The importance of the body in school is highlighted by Milstein and Mendes (2010) when they state that “[...] the work with students always implies a work *with* and *in* the body – more or less explicit – and that this work is the basis and condition of the other learning” (Milstein; Mendes, 2010, p. 25, emphasis added). Thus, the relationship established between adult-child, and child-child at school takes place, firstly, through the body and therefore it becomes important to know it and understand its possibilities.

For purposes of comparison and understanding of the laws and strategies outlined for Early Childhood Education, it is also necessary to understand the definition of child adopted by the documents.

The BNCC relies on the definition established by the DCNEIs, which clarifies:

[...] historical and rights subject, who, in the interactions, relationships, and daily practices he experiences, constructs his personal and collective identity, plays, imagines, fantasizes, desires, learns, observes, experiences, narrates, questions and constructs meanings about nature and society, producing culture (Brasil, 2009⁴ *apud* Brasil, 2017, p. 37).

The Italian document does not provide a clear definition but mentions that the child is a subject of rights. These rights are “[...] inalienable to life, education, instruction and respect for individual, ethnic, linguistic, cultural and religious identity, on which a new quality of life is based, understood as the great educational purpose of the present term” (Italy, [1991] 1995, p. 71).

In the original document in Italian, the text brings complementation to the one described above: “[...] the child's personality must also be considered in its being and in its duty to be, according to an integral vision that aims at the development of the inseparable unity of mind and body” (Italy, 1991, p. 16, my translation⁵). About the child at school, the text adds:

[...] the treatments that define and structure the children's school in the multiplicity of its pedagogical dimensions (relational, curricular, didactic, functional and institutional) are placed as other elements of affirmation and satisfaction of all these demands and all these rights (Italy, 1991, p. 16, my translation)⁶.

It is perceived that the two documents establish that the child is a subject of rights and that the culture in which the children are in-

served must be respected. Your identity must also be stimulated through the integral development formed by the ⁷*mind and body*.

About the nomenclatures used for the Field of Experiences, we noticed that the BNCC promotes the separation of two words that bring embedded in themselves different concepts: *movement* and *gesture*. About the first term used in the title of the Field of Experiences, we understand that the concept of the body can have different meanings depending on the science that explains it. For example, Le Breton, a French anthropologist, makes several contributions in this regard. “The body is the semantic vector by which the evidence of the relationship with the world is constructed” (Le Breton, 2012, p. 7), “it is a symbolic construction” (Le Breton, 2012, p. 33), “[...] transmits meanings through manifestations impregnated with ambiguity” (Le Breton, 2012, p. 53). In a work that deals with the body in school, Milstein and Mendes (2010, p. 28-29) argue that “[...] the human body is the result of society and history” and that “there is a productive work of society in the body which consists in producing human nature, society.” For the French philosopher Merleau-Ponty, there is “[...] the subject as body and consciousness incarnated in the body, to overcome Cartesian dualism” and “[...] it is through the body that the world is known and the world is incorporated into the body by the experiences lived in an esthesiological relationship” (Mendes; Araujo; Days; Melo, 2014, p. 1590).

It is known that we cannot think of an education for the child that is sedimented and that we must seek a human development that is inserted in a culture and that is part of it. Therefore, it is necessary to signify and place the role of the child's body as a central theme. As Garanhani (2005, p. 83) explains, Henri Wallon (1879-1962) understands that an integration “⁸[...] between the organism and the socio-cultural environment and an integration between the different sets or functional domains” for human development. The researcher comments that by functional domains, Wallon exemplifies affectivity, knowledge, cognition, movement, motor act, and the person who integrates all the others.

About movement, Wallon associates it with affectivity and emotions, linking movement to muscle activity through kinetic functions (contraction and relaxation) and postural or tonic. Wallon also states that “[...] the first function of movement in child development is affective” (Galvão, 1995, p. 70). In another analysis, Merleau-Ponty divides movement into concrete and abstract which find a place in the dimension of behavior, acting through the body in the world (Dentz, 2008). Following the same perspective of Merleau-Ponty, Nóbrega (2016) explains that movement can modify sensations and reorganize the whole organism, still considering the mind-body unity.

Sayão (2002) published a text on the body and movement and in that describes the gestures, movements, and expressions as possibilities of our bodies. Thus, we perceive that the field of movement is not restricted to itself but opens possibilities of exploration that allow a

greater significance of its context. It is in this interaction with the environment that the gestures will appear, which according to Garanhani (2005, p. 85) happens when “[...] bodily movements are performed from an intention and are made with significance.” In addition, “Mauss (1974) considered gestures and body movements as techniques created by culture, capable of transmission through generations and imbued with specific meanings” (Daolio, 1995, p. 38).

In this sense, we perceive care, in terms of nomenclature, between what is presented in the Italian legislation mentioned above and the BNCC. Remarkably, movement is a bodily characteristic, but the signification of it through gestures brings us other possibilities, which allow a signification of movement. This interweaving of body-movement-culture allows for better interaction with the world through its *corporeality*⁹.

Let us then analyze the content brought in the texts to explain the Field of Experiences under discussion.

In the Italian document of 1991, we find the first paragraph that describes *the body and movement*:

The field of experience of *corporeality* and *motor* skills contributes to the growth and integral maturation of the child, promoting awareness of the value of the body understood as one of the expressions of personality and as a functional, cognitive, communicative, and relationship condition, to be developed in all plans of formative care (Italy, 1991, p. 82-83, emphasis added).

The terms evidenced above: *corporeality* and *motricity*, used to explain the *body and movement*, stand out.

We understand the need for a conceptual distinction on “[...] body, corporeality, body-object, body-subject, movement, motricity, among other concepts,” which consolidated “[...] the socio-philosophical, cultural and pedagogical subarea” in Education as a whole (Melo, 2016, p. 8).

We searched for information on the term *corporeality* in the Brazilian literature and found the article by Scorsolini-Comin and Amorim (2008), who sought to find the same explanation. The authors found the explicit definition in only one text. The other texts researched dialogued with the term but did not define it.

As more than the materiality of the body, than the sum of its parts; it is that contained in all human dimensions; it is not something objective, ready and finished, but a continuous process of redefinitions; it is the rescue of the body, it is letting it flow, talking, living, listening, allowing the body to be the main actor, it is seeing it in its truly human dimension. Corporeality is existence, it is mine, yours, it is our history (Polak, 1997¹⁰ *apud* Scorsolini-Comin; Amorim, 2008, p. 208).

In addition to the above, we observe Le Breton (2012), who uses the sociology of the body to establish a relationship with corporeality and explains that it only happens in the relationship with the other and has influences of culture and society in the relationship with the

body, without ignoring the adaptability of the actor to integrate into another society and define a new model. He adds, “[...] If corporeality is a matter of symbol, it is not a fatality that man must assume and whose manifestations occur without him being able to do anything. On the contrary, the body is the object of social and cultural construction” (Le Breton, 2012, p. 65). In a published book based on the works of Merleau-Ponty, Nóbrega (2016) explains that we are a body formed by a multitude of sensorimotor possibilities, immersed in multiple contexts and that cognition depends on the experience obtained in bodily action, linking to the sensory-motor capacities involved in the biopsychocultural context.¹¹

Referring to the original language of the term, the Italian Mezzetti (2012) defines corporeity (*corporeità*) as being an entity constituted by the integration of four different dimensions: biological, energetic, cultural, and playful. Based on phenomenology, Tozzi (2012) explains that corporeality expresses the human and inter-human character of the body and comprises subjectivity and human behavior.

Bus-Simão (2012, p. 23, my emphasis), in his doctoral thesis, also promotes a debate on the subject and explains

The concept of body has received some differentiated denominations such as *corporeality*, which in a broad definition refers to an abstract idea of body, of being corporeal; *corporality*, which in French and Spanish have minimal distinctions from the term corporeity, but which in the Portuguese language does not differ, that is, it means the quality of being body or of being material and; body that has a predominant conception in the history of Philosophy as an instrument of the soul.

The author draws on the studies of Bryan Turner to explain corporeality through a socio-anthropological bias. In this way, corporeality brings a body that is both natural and cultural.

In summary, it is noted that the definition of the body brings an interaction between body-body and body-environment, that is, it establishes that, in bodily relations with oneself, with others, and with the world, one has corporeality, and that this relationship is based on phenomenology. It would also be necessary to make a sociological study on emotions so that we could approach a more appropriate terminology since the body inserted in a culture is also a receiver and transmitter of emotions. But what about motor skills?

Generally, the term motricity is related to psychology, such as psychomotricity, for example. In the Italian language, the term *motricità* is related to motor skill or ability. Picq and Vayer (2002, p. 23, my translation¹²) cite examples of skills and/or capacities that are part of the concept of motricity, such as “[...] the perception of one's own body and organization of the body scheme, balance and increased sense of security, release of the waists (scapular and pelvic), spatial organization” among others. Concluding what Jean Piaget and Henri Wallon published on motor skills, Aucouturier (1995, p. 11, my translation¹³) states that “[...] tone and motor skills contain in their devel-

opment the first outlines of emotional and affective reactions, contributing to the progressive organization of consciousness”.

Sisrgio (2022, p. 19) dissociates movement from motricity and explains that

The passage from the physical to the motricity that is not confused with movement only (instead of some scholars), arises as the change of place of the human body, in a determined space and time, with the characteristics of an objective process. I try to ground human motricity in phenomenology, or rather: in intentionality and the world of life.

Nóbrega (2016) relies on Merleau-Ponty to explain motricity, in which the movement of the body indicates a possibility and states that motricity “[...] it is a form of language that reiterates the meanings of acts of expression and increases the summary power of words in ensuring experience” (Nóbrega, 2016, p. 46) and that the use of language produces meanings.

In this sense, analyzing the nomenclatures used (*corporeality* and *motricity*), we understand that they were named to establish a relationship with the name of the Italian Field of Experience the *body, and the movement*. The word *corporeality* also appears in the explanation of the Field of Experiences *body, gestures, and movement in the BNCC*, as we observed in the citation below, and the DCNEIs, do not appear connected to Early Childhood Education.

With the body (through the senses, gestures, impulsive or intentional movements, coordinated or spontaneous), children, from an early age, explore the world, space, and the objects of their surroundings, establish relationships, express themselves, play, and produce knowledge about themselves, about the other, about the social and cultural universe, becoming progressively aware of this *corporeality* (Brasil, 2017, pp. 40-41, emphasis added).

The same is not true of the word *motricity*. In addition, in the DCNEIs, although the document does not bring a clear separation between the Fields of Experiences, in item 9, the text says that Early Childhood Education should promote:

Activities that develop *motor expression* and ways of perceiving their own body, as well as those that enable them to build, create, and draw using different materials and techniques, expand the child’s sensitivity to music, dance, theatrical language, open rich possibilities of experiences and development for children (Brasil, 2013, p. 94, my emphasis).

Another passage that draws our attention to Italian law is the following: “The evolutionary stages stem from the domain *of the body experienced* to the prevalence of perceptual discrimination and the mental representation of the static and moving body itself” (Italy, 1991, p. 19, emphasis added).¹⁴

Conceiving that a correspondence of the text is not found in the BNCC, there is a fragment that complements this idea and brings a

broader concept about the static and moving body, transporting to the field of potentialities based on the child's gesture and movement.

Children know and recognize the sensations and functions of their body and, with their gestures and movements, identify their potentialities and their limits, developing, at the same time, awareness about what is safe and what can be a risk to their physical integrity (Brasil, 2017, p. 41).

Regarding the learning objectives, the texts converge on the idea that the proposed activities should have a playful character and promote socialization. The BNCC states that the child must “[...] discover various modes of occupation and use of space with the body” (Brasil, 2017, p. 41) while Italian law establishes that the child must “[...] to know and experience all practicable forms of motor content play” (Italy, 1991, p. 82).

Another point that seems to be somewhat in conversation with the BNCC is: “To this field are also linked contents of a semiological nature whose alphabets are indispensable for subjective expression and interpersonal and intercultural communication” (¹⁵Italy, 1991, p. 81). At BNCC we find: “Through different languages, such as music, dance, theater, make-believe games, they communicate and express themselves in the intertwining between body, emotion and language” (Brasil, 2017, p. 41). We believe that here there is a harmony of ideas between *subjective* expression and communication with *communication and expression using body, emotion, and language*. Maturana (1998, p. 92) explains that “[...] emotions are bodily dynamics that specify the domains of action in which we move” and adds, “[...] human living takes place in a continuous interweaving of emotions and language as a flow of consensual coordination of actions and emotions.” The author calls these consensual coordinations to talk and further explains that “[...] we live in different networks of conversations that intersect in their realization of our bodily individuality” (Maturana, 1998, p. 92, my emphasis). In this explanation, we understand that emotion enables human action and that the *different languages* are directly connected to *subjective expression and interpersonal and intercultural communication*.

Regarding biological maturation, it is important to note that Italian law establishes these parameters for children over 3 years of age, while the BNCC creates the document and the Fields of Experiences for children from zero to 5 years of age. Thus, we perceive in both texts that the expectations about motor activities diverge.

As an example, the BNCC presents that the child should use his body to explore the environment and its possibilities through the “[...] sitting with support, crawling, slipping, walking leaning on cots, tables and ropes, jumping, climbing, balancing, running, somersaulting, stretching, etc.” (Brazil, 2017, p. 41), while the Italian document states that the child must “[...] acquire the ability to discriminate the perceptual properties of objects and to control the basic dynamic and posture schemes (walking, running, jumping, playing, staying in balance, etc.)”.

Finally, in the curriculum proposal brought at BNCC, they find the learning and development objectives for the stages that constitute Early Childhood Education. About the field of the body, gestures, and movement, the text (Brasil, 2017) says:

Figure 1 – Learning objectives and development of the field of experience body, gestures, and movement

LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND DEVELOPMENT		
Babies (zero to 1 year and 6 months)	Very young children (1 year and 7 months to 3 years and 11 months)	Young children (4 years to 5 years and 11 months)
(EI01CG01) Move body parts to bodily express emotions, needs, and desires.	(EI02CG01) Appropriate gestures and movements from your culture in self-care and games.	(EI03CG01) Create with your body diverse ways of expressing feelings, sensations, and emotions, both in everyday situations and in games, dance, theater, and music.
(EI01CG02) Experience bodily possibilities in games and interactions in welcoming and challenging environments.	(EI02CG02) Move your body in space, guided by notions such as forward, behind, above, below, inside, outside, etc., when engaging in games and activities of different natures.	(EI03CG02) Demonstrate control and appropriate use of your body in games, listening to and retelling stories, and artistic activities, among other possibilities.
(EI01CG03) Imitate gestures and movements of other children, adults, and animals.	(EI02CG03) Explore ways of moving through space (jumping, jumping, dancing), combining movements, and following directions.	(EI03CG03) Create movements, gestures, looks, and mimes in games, games, and artistic activities such as dance, theater, and music.
(EI01CG04) Participate in caring for your body and promoting your well-being.	(EI02CG04) Demonstrate progressive independence in caring for your body.	(EI03CG04) Adopt self-care habits related to hygiene, nutrition, comfort, and appearance.
(EI01CG05) Use grasping, fitting, and throwing movements, expanding your possibilities for handling different materials and objects.	(EI02CG05) Progressively develop manual skills, acquiring control to draw, paint, tear, and leaflet, among others.	(EI03CG05) Coordinate your manual skills to meet your interests and needs in different situations.

Source: Adapted from Brasil (2017, p. 47).

The BNCC text explains that the learning and development objectives comprise behaviors, skills, knowledge, and experiences that must be achieved through interactions and games and that despite being subdivided by age groups, it is important to observe the rhythm of the learning and development of each child (Brasil, 2017). On the other hand, the Italian legislation establishes that the objectives must be achieved through the development of sensory and perceptual capacities, in addition to the basic postural schemes such as walking, running, jumping, etc., and mentions the progressive acquisition of motor coordination in the interaction with the environment (Italy, 1991) and does not establish a division by age groups as in the BNCC¹⁶.

Final Considerations

The BNCC emerged in the national scenario to operationalize the DCNEIs and not impose a curriculum, however, what we perceive is that it imposes a curricular prescription contrary to the autonomy guaranteed in the LDB. In addition, we highlight that the BNCC for Early Childhood Education brings the essential learning that must be developed, and about the fields of experience, we perceive proximity to Italian pedagogy.

Although significant evidence of Italian pedagogy is found in the Field of Experience “Body, gestures and movements”, we perceive that its content is differentiated. One hypothesis for such a discrepancy is about the target audience of each text, and the BNCC is aimed at the curriculum to children from 0 to 5 years old, while the Italian document researched targets children of a different age group, that is, 3 to 6 years old. Thus, it is understood that these points of convergence and divergence may result from economic, and social factors and the biological and cultural development of children.

The similarity of nomenclature between the Fields of Experiences established by the BNCC and those indicated by Decree I of 1991 stands out. Although there is no reference to the document in the BNCC itself, it can be stated that the names attributed to the Fields of Experiences are quite like those found in the 1991 Decree.

About the Field of Experience “Body, gestures and movements”, there is a generalist approach by the BNCC in its description and a division by age groups when it establishes the learning and development objectives, however, the text does not elaborate important concepts for the field of studies of the body in movement. From this perspective, we propose a reflection on the time in which the texts were published. The Italian Decree I of 1991 appeared amid Italian cultural conformations where early childhood education schools ceased to have a welfare characteristic and began to have a pedagogical objective, permeated by contributions from Italian scholars and educators. On the other hand, it is observed that in 2017, the year in which the BNCC was published, Brazil already had numerous study groups based on the movement of the child's body. Thus, being the central

body in the education of the young child, it is understood that the text brought in the field of “Body, gestures and movements” could have received more influences from these researchers.

Another consideration about the documents used is that the translation made in the Cedes Notebook of 1995, mentioned earlier in this text, leaves gaps. Added to this is the need for discussion of some translated terms, such as the one mentioned earlier in the text, “semi-ology” rather than “signs”.

Finally, this article intended to instigate more debates about the text brought in the Field of Experience “Body, gestures and movements” and to seek concepts and terminologies that are closely connected with the studies of the child's body in movement.

Received January 30, 2023

Approved on February 27, 2023

Notes

- ¹ Loris Malaguzzi was an Italian pedagogue and psychologist, mainly responsible for the pedagogy used in municipal children's schools in Reggio Emilia, aimed at children from 3 months to 6 years of age. After a stint as a child psychologist, Loris Malaguzzi He also worked as a pedagogue for municipal schools, but it was through the creation of his own space that he was able to put into practice his innovative ideas centered on the creativity and spontaneity of children (Rossi, 2018). Malaguzzi based education on three pillars: school, child, and family.
- ² Italian legislation published in 1991 concerning children's schools had been in the works since 1914.
- ³ From the original: “I diversi ambiti del fare e dell'agire del bambino e quindi i settori specifici ed individuabili di competenza nei quali il bambino conferisce significato alle sue molteplici attività, sviluppa il suo apprendimento, acquisendo anche le strumentazioni linguistiche e procedurali, e persegue i suoi traguardi formativi, nel concreto di una esperienza che si svolge entro confini definiti e con il costante suo attivo coinvolgimento.”
- ⁴ BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Câmara de Educação Básica. Resolução nº 5, de 17 de dezembro de 2009. Fixa as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Educação Infantil. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, 2009.
- ⁵ From the original: “La personalità infantile va inoltre considerata nel suo dover essere, secondo una visione integrale che miri allo sviluppo dell'unità inscindibile di mente e corpo.”
- ⁶ From the original: “I Tratti che definiscono e strutturano la scuola dell'infanzia nella molteplicità delle sue dimensioni pedagogiche (relazionali, curricolari, didattiche, funzionali ed istituzionali) si pongono come altrettanti elementi di affermazione e di soddisfazione di tutte queste esigenze e di tutti questi diritti.”
- ⁷ The term subject of rights is also used in the Sociology of Childhood. “The figure of the child as a subject of rights is expressed in research that questions the place of the child in the configuration of the legal order, with special emphasis on the confluences and contradictions between rights of participation, provision, and participation (Fernandes, 2009; Tomás, 2012), or in the international assessment of the state of application of children's rights (Tomás; Fernandes, 2012; Araujo; Fernandes, 2016)” (Sarmiento, 2018, p. 390).

- ⁸ Henri Wallon was a French philosopher, physician, and psychologist who devoted much of his life to the study of children and education.
- ⁹ The differences between corporeality and corporeality will be treated later in the text.
- ¹⁰ POLAK, Ymiracy de Souza. O Corpo como Mediador da Relação Homem/Mundo. *Texto & Contexto em Enfermagem*, Florianópolis, v. 6, n. 3, p. 29-43, 1997.
- ¹¹ In this context, cognition is expressed in the understanding of perception as movement and not as information processing.
- ¹² From the original: “percezione del proprio corpo e organizzazione dello schema corporeo, equilibrabazione and aumento del senso di sicurezza, liberazione dei cinti (scapolare e pelvico), organizzazione Spaciale.”
- ¹³ From the original: “Il tono e la motricità contengono nel loro sviluppo i primi lineamenti delle reazioni emozionali e affettive contribuendo all'organizzazione progressiva della conoscenza”.
- ¹⁴ Comparing the text published in Caderno Cedes nº 37 and the Italian Law in its original language, we perceive a difference in translation. That is why we opted for the direct translation of the document into Italian.
- ¹⁵ In the original document, the text is: “[...] contenuti di natura *Segnica* i cui alfabeti sono indispensabili per l'espressione soggettiva e la comunicazione interpersonale ed interculturale” (Italia, [1991] 1995, p. 19, emphasis my). We see that in the original text appears the word *Segnica*, which derives etymologically from the word *Segno* and means, *sign*. However, it is noticed that in the translation the author preferred to use the word semiological, which derives from the word semiology. For Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913), semiology means “[...] a science that studies the life of signs within social life” (Bento, 2006, p. 410, my emphasis).
- ¹⁶ I chose to use the original document in Italian since the translation differs from the original. In the text published by Ana Lúcia Goulart de Faria, the objectives were divided into psychomotor profile and sociomotor plan (Italy, [1991] 1995).

References

- ARIOSI, Cinthia Magda Fernandes. A Base Nacional Comum Curricular para Educação Infantil e os campos de experiência: reflexões conceituais entre Brasil e Itália. *Humanidades & Inovação*, Palmas, v. 6, n. 15, p. 241-256, 2019. Disponível em: <https://revista.unitins.br/index.php/humanidadeseinovacao/article/view/1486>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.
- AUCOUTURIER, Bernard. **La Pratica Psicomotoria**: rieducazione e terapia. Roma: Armando Editore, 1995.
- BARBOSA, Ivone Garcia; SILVEIRA, Telma Aparecida Teles Martins; SOARES, Marcos Antônio. A BNCC da Educação Infantil e suas Contradições: regulação versus autonomia. *Retratos da Escola*, Brasília, v. 13, n. 25, p. 77-90, 2019. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.22420/rde.v13i25.979>. Acesso em: 26 fev. 2023.
- BARBOSA, Maria Carmen Silveira; RICHTER, Sandra Regina Simonis. Campos de Experiência: uma possibilidade para interrogar o currículo. In: FINCO, Daniela; BARBOSA, Maria Carmen; FARIA, Ana Lúcia Goulart de (Org.). **Campos de Experiências na Escola da Infância**: contribuições italianas para inventar

um currículo de educação infantil brasileiro. Campinas: Edições Leitura Crítica, 2015.

BENTO, Victor Eduardo Silva. Seria a Semiologia de Saussure Fundamento e Justificativa para o Método de Pesquisa de Revisão de Literatura em Psicanálise? **Estudos de Psicologia**, Campinas, v. 23, p. 407-423, 2006. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/estpsi/a/DtMDBcKHxRPm5MLrrXywsbj/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Acesso em: 28 dez. 2022.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação e do Desporto. Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. Departamento da Política de Educação Fundamental. Coordenação-Geral de Educação Infantil. **Proposta Pedagógica e Currículo em Educação Infantil: um diagnóstico e a construção de uma metodologia de análise**. Brasília: MEC; SEF; DPEF; COEDI, 1996.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Básica. Secretaria de Educação Continuada, Alfabetização, Diversidade e Inclusão. Secretaria de Educação Profissional e Tecnológica. Conselho Nacional da Educação. Câmara Nacional de Educação Básica. **Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais Gerais da Educação Básica**. Brasília: MEC; SEB; DICEI, 2013.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular: Educação é a base**. Brasília: MEC, 2017.

BUSS-SIMÃO, Márcia. **Relações Sociais em um Contexto de Educação Infantil: um olhar sobre a dimensão corporal na perspectiva de crianças pequenas**. 2012. 312 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2012.

BUSS-SIMÃO, Márcia. Experiências Sensoriais, Expressivas, Corporais e de Movimento nos Campos de Experiências da Base Nacional Comum Curricular para Educação Infantil. **Debates em Educação**, Maceió, v. 8, n. 16, p. 184-184, 2016. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.28998/2175-6600.2016v8n16p184>. Acesso em: 10 jan. 2023.

CAMPOS, Rosânia; BARBOSA, Maria Carmen Silveira. BNC e Educação Infantil – Quais as possibilidades? **Retratos da Escola**, Brasília, v. 9, n. 17, 2015. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.22420/rde.v9i17.585>. Acesso em: 26 fev. 2023.

CARVALHO, Rodrigo Saballa de. Análise do Discurso das Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais de Educação Infantil: currículo como campo de disputas. **Educação**, Belo Horizonte, v. 38, n. 3, p. 466-476, 2015.

DAOLIO, Jocimar. **Da Cultura do Corpo**. Campinas: Papirus, 1995.

DENTZ, René Armand. Corporeidade e Subjetividade em Merleau-Ponty. **Intuitio**, Porto Alegre, v. 1, n. 2, p. 296-307, 2008. Disponível em: <https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/index.php/iberoamericana/N%C3%83%C6%92O%20https://www.scimagojr.com/index.php/intuitio/article/view/4238>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.

FARIA, Ana Lúcia Goulart de. Grandes Políticas para os Pequenos. **Cadernos Cedex**, Campinas, Papirus, n. 37, 1995.

FINCO, Daniela; BARBOSA, Maria Carmen; FARIA, Ana Lúcia Goulart. Conversações de Ponta-Cabeça sobre Crianças Pequenas para além da Escola. In: FINCO, Daniela; BARBOSA, Maria Carmen; FARIA, Ana Lúcia Goulart de (Org.). **Campos de Experiências na Escola da Infância: contribuições italianas para inventar um currículo de educação infantil brasileiro**. Campinas: Edições Leitura Crítica, 2015.

GALVÃO, Izabel. **Henri Wallon: uma concepção dialética do desenvolvimento infantil**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1995.

GARANHANI, Marynelma Camargo. O Movimento da Criança no Contexto da Educação Infantil: reflexões com base nos estudos de Wallon. **Contrapontos**, Itajaí, v. 5, n. 1, p. 81-93, 2005. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.univali.br/index.php/rc/article/view/807>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.

ITÁLIA. Decreto Ministeriale 3 giugno 1991. Orientamenti dell'attività educativa nelle scuole materne statali. **Gazzetta Ufficiale della Repubblica Italiana**, Roma, anno 132, n. 139, 15 giu. 1991. Disponível em: <https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/gu/1991/06/15/139/sg/pdf>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.

ITÁLIA. Ministério da Instrução Pública. As Novas Orientações para uma Nova Escola da Infância. [1991]. In: FARIA, Ana Lúcia Goulart (Org.). **Grandes Políticas para os Pequenos. Cadernos Cedex**, Campinas, Papirus, n. 37, p. 68-100, 1995.

LE BRETON, David. **A Sociologia do Corpo**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.

MATURANA, Humberto. **Emoções e Linguagem na Educação e na Política**. Belo Horizonte: Ed. UFMG, 1998.

MELO, José Pereira de Prefácio. In: NÓBREGA, Terezinha Petrucia da. **Corporeidades: inspirações merleau-pontianas**. Natal: IFRN, 2016.

MENDES, Maria Izabel Brandão de Souza; ARAÚJO, Allyson Carvalho; DIAS, Maria Aparecida; MELO, José Pereira de. Reflexões sobre Corpo, Saúde e Doença em Merleau-Ponty: implicações para práticas inclusivas. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 20, n. 4, p. 1587-1609, 2014. Disponível em: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1153/115332898016.pdf>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.

MEZZETTI, Romano. **Corporeità e Gioco**. Roma: Edizioni Nuova Cultura, 2012.

MILSTEIN, Diana; MENDES, Héctor. **Escola, Corpo e Cotidiano Escolar**. Tradução de Ana Lúcia Silva Ratto. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010.

NÓBREGA, Terezinha Petrucia da. **Corporeidades: inspirações merleau-pontianas**. Natal: IFRN, 2016.

PADINI-SIMIANO, Luciane; BUSS-SIMÃO, Márcia. Base Nacional Comum Curricular para a Educação Infantil: entre desafios e possibilidades dos campos de experiência educativa. **Revista Científica**, São Paulo, n. 41, p. 77-90, set./dez. 2016.

PEREIRA, Fábio Hoffmann. Campos de Experiências e a BNCC: um olhar crítico. **Zero-a-seis**, Maceió, UFAL, v. 22, n. 41, p. 73-89, 2020. Disponível em: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7529482>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.

PICQ, Louis; VAYER, Pierre. **Educazione Psicomotoria e Ritardo Mentale**. Roma: Armando Editore, 2002.

ROSSI, Lino. **Loris Malaguzzi: l'uomo che inventò le scuole dell'infanzia più belle del mondo**. Reggio Emilia: Compagnia Editoriale Aliberti, 2018.

SARMENTO, Manuel. A Sociologia da Infância Portuguesa e o seu Contributo para o Campo dos Estudos Sociais da Infância. **Contemporânea**, São Carlos, UFSCAR, v. 8, n. 2, p. 385-405, jul./dez. 2018.

SAYÃO, Deborah Tomé. Corpo e Movimento: notas para problematizar algumas questões relacionadas à educação infantil e à educação física. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, v. 23, n. 2, 2002. Disponível em:

<http://www.rbce.cbce.org.br/index.php/RBCE/article/view/270/253>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.

SCORSOLINI-COMIN, Fabio; AMORIM, Katia de Souza. Corporeidade: uma revisão crítica da literatura científica. **Psicologia em Revista**, Belo Horizonte, v. 14, n. 1, p. 189-214, 2008. Disponível em: <http://periodicos.pucminas.br/index.php/psicologiaemrevista/article/view/295>. Acesso em: 17 jan. 2023.

SÉRGIO, Manuel. Motricidade humana: o itinerário de um conceito. **Motricidades: Revista da Sociedade de Pesquisa Qualitativa em Motricidade Humana**, São Carlos, UFSCAR, v. 6, n. 1, p. 15-25, 2022.

SILVA, Marcelo Oliveira da. Currículo na Educação Infantil: aproximações da pedagogia da infância. **Pindorama**, Eunápolis, v. 12, n. 1, 2021.

STEMMER, Márcia Regina Goulart. Educação Infantil: gênese e perspectivas. In: ARCE, Alessandra; JACOMELLI, Mara Regina Martins. **Entre a (des) Escolarização e a Precarização do Trabalho Pedagógico nas Salas de Aula**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2012.

TOZZI, Angela Anna. **La Corporeità in Dialogo**. Romagnano al Monte: Boksprint, 2012.

ZAMBONATO, Catia Francziak. **Campos de Experiências na Base Nacional Comum Curricular: reflexões, desafios e probabilidades para a educação infantil a partir do diálogo com a abordagem Reggio Emilia/Itália**. 2020. 262 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciências Humanas) – Programa de Pós-Graduação Interdisciplinar em Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal da Fronteira Sul, Erechim, 2020.

Rubens de Sousa Bravalheri graduated in Physical Education, Specialist in Nutrition and Physical Conditioning and School Physical Education. He holds a master's degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences and a PhD in Education at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR).

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7650-5230>

Email: rubens.bravalheri@gmail.com

Availability of research data: the dataset supporting the results of this study is published in this article.

Editor in charge: Lodenir Karnopp

