

# Football as a tool to understand the struggle for hegemony: Approximations between the historical-critical pedagogy and the critical surpassing conception in a Physical Education class experience

## El fútbol como herramienta para entender la lucha por la hegemonía. Aproximaciones entre la pedagogía histórico-crítica y la concepción crítico-superadora en una experiencia de Educación Física

---

**BILLY GRAEFF**

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande. Campus Carreiros. Av. Itália, km 8. Bairro Carreiros. Rio Grande do Sul. Brasil.

(Loughborough University. Loughborough, Leicestershire. UK)

[billygraeff@gmail.com](mailto:billygraeff@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8114-7829>

Recibido: 21-05-17. Aceptado: 28-07-17

Cómo citar / Citation: Graeff, B. (2017). Football as a tool to understand the struggle for hegemony: Approximations between the historical-critical pedagogy and the critical surpassing conception in a Physical Education class experience. *Ágora para la Educación Física y el Deporte* 19(2-3), 177-192.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24197/aefd.2-3.2017.177-192>

**Abstract.** This paper describes a discussion about a pedagogical task regarding the content *football* to be carried out in Physical Education classes. Besides, this pedagogical experience questions the way the society has been organized and how such organization has been reproduced. The theoretical framework is based on the historical-critical pedagogy and on the critical-surpassing conception in Physical Education. An idea for a lesson plan is proposed for the task under investigation; reflections on practical experiences which were previously carried out are also presented. Conclusions lead to the understanding of tasks which question hegemonic ideas as being potentially liberating, individually and collectively.

**Keywords:** Physical Education; football; didactics; sport teaching.

**Resumen.** Este artículo describe un debate en torno a una tarea pedagógica en relación con el fútbol, en cuanto contenido de la Educación Física. A partir de dicha experiencia pedagógica, la organización y la reproducción social emergen como asuntos problemáticos. El marco teórico se basa en la pedagogía histórico-crítica y en la concepción crítico-superadora en la Educación Física. Para desarrollar la tarea objeto de investigación, se propone una idea del plan de lección; asimismo, se

reflexiona sobre las experiencias prácticas que se llevaron previamente a cabo. Se concluye que el proceso seguido incrementó la comprensión de un planteamiento del trabajo que cuestiona las ideas hegemónicas y, en tal sentido, es potencialmente liberador, tanto individual como colectivamente.

**Palabras clave:** Educación Física; fútbol; didáctica; enseñanza de deportes.

---

## INTRODUCTION

This paper proposes a discussion about a pedagogical task regarding the content *football* to be carried out in Physical Education classes. In addition, a given school environment is supposed to be developed, the task would be to imagine that the proposed football game would help to understand society and how it works. Besides, such pedagogical experience questions pedagogically the way the society has been organized and how such organization has been reproduced. The theoretical framework is based on the historical-critical pedagogy and on the critical-surpassing conception in Physical Education, which are going to be visited later. An idea for a lesson plan is proposed for the task under investigation, as well as reflections on practical experiences which were previously carried out. But, in order to better understand the foundational grounds of the experience, it is necessary to clarify the meaning of the concept of hegemony within the proposal.

### 1. THE CONCEPT OF HEGEMONY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE EXPERIENCE UNDER DEBATE

According to Gramsci (1978a; 1978b), the conquest of hegemony requires the fundamental class to introduce itself to the others as the one which represents and meets the interests and values of the whole society from the perspective of consent and spontaneous agreement, thus, ensuring social unity which may not be homogeneous but is kept mostly articulate and cohesive. It means that the hegemonic class must involve the whole society in a historical project and be able to take over the claims of allied classes as if they were its own, with clear distinction between hegemony and corporatism. When Gramsci (1978a; 1978b) refers to the hegemony of the proletariat, he highlights that the proletariat may develop the role of manager if it has the spirit of sacrifice and can be set completely free from the residue of reformist or union corporatism.

When he states that the hegemonic class must take over the claims of the other classes, Gramsci (1978a; 1978b) shows that there is a close relation between hegemony and economics. Since the will, interests and needs of the allied classes are actually concrete demonstrations of economic needs generated by a certain mode of production, the hegemonic class must take these needs into account when it develops its economic project. However, it cannot deprive its fundamental class project of its characteristics.

The same process happens in Education. The hegemonic class must account for answers to the needs of other classes in society in the context of Education, when there is one (Simionatto & Costa, 2014). However, such educational project must do it but must not allow the hegemony to be questioned. This is the perspective of the hegemonic class. Since the other classes are non-hegemonic ones (Simionatto, 2009), they can only understand Education as a space of dispute. Even though the importance of the debate about Education as a space of dispute for hegemony and opposition to ideology has been acknowledged, I can invest neither more time nor more space to develop this issue in this text. Basically, this paper exists because I have believed in it.

Therefore, in this study, hegemony means a set of practices and expectations of the totality of life (Zientarski, Santos de Oliveira, & Menezes Pereira, 2010): perspectives of ourselves and the world we live in. It is a system of meanings and values –constitutive and constitutor ones– which seem to confirm each other when they are experienced in practice. Thus, it constitutes the sense of reality for most people, the sense of absolute reality, because it is experienced. Otherwise, for most members of society, it would be very hard to handle most areas in their lives. However, hegemony also means a position. It means to occupy a specific space in a certain society which enables this position to be revealed in practices, meanings and values that will be the dominant ones in that society.

## **2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTIONS WHICH GUIDE THE EXPERIENCE UNDER DEBATE**

I have begun this section with Marx's classical statement (1978) which proposes a method of reality analysis, known as historical-dialectical materialism.

When we consider a given country politically-economically, we begin with its population, its distribution among classes, town, countryside, coast, different branches of production, export and import, annual production and consumption, commodity prices, etc. It seems to be correct to begin with the real and concrete, with the real precondition; thus, to begin, in economics, with e.g., the population, which is the foundation and the subject of the entire social act of production. However, on closer examination, this proves false. The population is an abstraction if I leave out, for example, the classes of which it is composed. These classes in turn are an empty phrase if I am not familiar with the elements on which they rest, e.g. wage labour, capital, etc. These latter in turn presuppose exchange, division of labour, prices, etc. For example, capital is nothing without wage labour, without value, money, price etc. Thus, if I were to begin with the population, this would be a chaotic conception of the whole, and I would then, by means of further determination, move analytically towards ever more simple concepts, from the imagined concrete towards ever thinner abstractions until I had arrived at the simplest determinations. From there, the journey would have to be retraced until I had finally arrived at the population again, but this time not as the chaotic conception of a whole, but as a rich totality of many determinations and relations (Marx, 1978, 116).

The starting point of this method is the understanding of the immediate reality, i.e., the initial representation of the whole, which, if converted into an object of analysis by processes of abstraction, results in superior understanding expressed by the concrete thought. However, it is not the final step of the process, since interpretative categories, the analytical structures that constitute the thought concrete, are opposed to the initial object, which is now understood in its concrete totality, rather than in its immediacy. This methodological procedure may be synthesized as follows: it starts from the empirical basis (apparent concreteness), proceeds to the analytical exegesis (abstract mediations) and goes back to the concrete, i.e., to the complexity of the concreteness which could only be captured by processes of abstraction. Therefore, I believe that this method, in its practice, always points out the historical sense, besides the diagnosis and what is judicative in the scientific process, thus, highlighting the teleological feature of the pedagogical and scientific practice (Coletivo de Autores<sup>1</sup>, 1992, 15).

---

<sup>1</sup> These authors preferred not to identify themselves in the authorship of this work. However, all of them followed the academic life in the period following the publication of the work.

Regarding educational principles, this experience takes place in the context of the Historical-critical Pedagogy which connects theory and practice from the perspective of the praxis and aims at the transcendence of the immediate view of phenomena and the way they show themselves.

Education is understood as the act of producing, directly and intentionally, in each singular individual, the humanity which is historically and collectively produced by all human beings (Saviani, 2007, 420).

To be more specific, the Historical-critical Pedagogy aims at “...the passage from synchresis to synthesis mediated by analysis” (Saviani, 1991, 142). The issue of the synchresis will be approached below. However, it should be mentioned that, in some cases, I may refer to it as ‘common sense’.

Much more could be written about the Historical-critical Pedagogy and, in fact, much has been published in the context of the proposal. However, I would like to emphasize its association with the popular classes of the society. This pedagogical proposal would not make sense if it were not carried out from the perspective of social transformation. This aspect is very important to the internal coherence of the Historical-critical Pedagogy, as well as to the experience under debate.

[...] The bond between popular interests and Education is explicit. The advocates of the proposal wish the transformation of the society. If this feature is not involved, it is not about the Historical-critical Pedagogy [...] the proposal of the socialization of elaborated knowledge is the pedagogical application of the most general principle of the socialization of the modes of production. In other words, from the pedagogical perspective, it is also about socializing elaborated knowledge since it is a mode of production (Saviani, 1991, 83).

### **3. PEDAGOGICAL OBJECTIVES AND DIDACTIC PARTICULARITIES OF THE EXPERIENCE UNDER DEBATE**

I should mention that I aim at bringing contributions so that my lesson experience may help overcome Gramsci’s statement: “all human

---

Their texts can be found by their names: C. L. Soares, C. Taffarel, E. Varjal, L. Castellani Filho, M. Ortega Escobar and V. Bracht.

beings are intellectuals... but not all human beings play the role of intellectuals in the society” (Gramsci, 1978b, 10). Therefore, the objective of my lesson is to make the groups of students participate, discuss and to construct different ways of approaching the issue so that the pedagogical process may lead to discussions, debates, understandings and, above all, to knowledge confrontation and divergence regarding the theme *football and society*, in the search for an elaborated synthesis. It would happen in the way pointed out by Taffarel (1997, 44):

...by comparing the theoretical basis and the reality and by gathering facts of the context which expresses the strengthening of class conflicts and the process of destruction of peoples, which has been currently accentuated.

Such attitude towards reality and didactic-pedagogical issues may be summarized by a proposal known in the Brazilian Physical Education as a Critical-surpassing one, based on the book “Teaching Methodology in Physical Education”, published by the Coletivo de Autores (1992). This proposal defends that the object of the area of knowledge called Physical Education is the body culture which becomes concrete through its different themes (Bracht, 1999, 7) and that its objective in school is “to promote reality analysis” (Coletivo de Autores, 1992, 43). Besides, it advocates that “historical interests of the working class have been expressed through struggle and political will in order to take hold of society and construct popular hegemony” (Coletivo de Autores, 1992, 14). My lesson proposal is in the context which has been called “school football” (Damo, 2003, 8), i.e., football constructed to meet school objectives, rather than the ones of the sports institution. I understand that, as an educational principle, regarding human movement and body culture, “knowledge must be expressed in a language which is close to the one used by students” (Almeida, 2007, 46). Hence, the idea of intertwining football and the organization of society in a topic of study.

I would like to briefly mention the discussion which has been happening in the context of the Brazilian Physical Education about didactic transposition and new debates about didactics (or what has been called ‘special didactics in Physical Education’). I have found that Caparroz and Bracht (2007) have brought new ideas about the issue. However, since my objective is not to deepen this discussion, I have referred to another author who has tried to outline the current debate in more general terms. Almeida

(2007) introduced Philippe Perrenoud's idea that the essence of teaching is "the action of producing knowledge in an artisanal way, making them teachable, exercisable" (Almeida, 2007, 9). Therefore, I should mention that it is an attractive idea to think that a teacher's actual role is to "contextualize", "translate" the most relevant events and knowledge in the society and in history so that students can take possession of them. In regard to it, the author states that "contextualization is the most faithful friend of transposition. It is contextualization that ensures that contents may be analyzed in their complexity" (Almeida, 2007, 39). However, I believe that such debate gets empty if it is not followed by a deeper discussion about the role of the school in the context of capitalism. Therefore, this study attempts to contribute to make the knowledge addressed and constructed in Physical Education keep problematizing and including the participants of the pedagogical process in discussions so that capitalism may be overcome.

#### **4. THE EXPERIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL-CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND OF CRITICAL-SURPASSING CONCEPTION**

The method I have adopted in my experiences has been widely known in Brazilian Education as 'the five steps of Historical-critical Pedagogy'. It has brought the Marxist method of reality analysis to pedagogical experiences. However, further discussions led some authors to call these steps "moments", since their way is not linear and, unlike steps, students may go through them in different order. The first moment is the Social Practice, i.e., the initial social practice of contents. It is based on the teacher's and students' previous knowledge about certain theme. The teacher uses his/her theoretical knowledge and similar previous experiences. Students may have less theoretical knowledge about certain theme and may have gone through fewer similar experiences. Thus, the teacher starts with a synthesis, but it may be precarious because s/he does not have data on the subjects with whom s/he must deal with. Besides, the students have identified neither the knowledge in an organized way nor theses and antitheses, their knowledge is syncretic. The second moment is called Problematization, i.e., the main problems concerning the social phenomenon under study are outlined. The teacher may pose questions to his/her group of students so that fundamental problems can be acknowledged and debated. The third moment is called Instrumentalization. The teacher's role is fundamental so that, based on the problematization, students may get the

tools they need to overcome the problems they have faced. The teacher must provide a theoretical and practical basis so that students can present plausible and transformative solutions to problems they have identified. The fourth moment is called Catharsis, i. e., a new way to understand the praxis. It results from the confrontation and divergence between previous and new knowledge. The thesis (previous knowledge) is questioned and confronted with new knowledge (problematization & instrumentalization should have triggered this process), the antithesis. The understanding of the new reality in which previous knowledge does not live alone anymore in the kingdom of explanations about certain social phenomenon must lead to uneasiness and questioning. The tension must then give way to the synthesis, to higher and more elaborated knowledge. Knowledge is now organized, the result of multiple determinations and conditionings; it is yielded so that it may also be questioned by new problematization in the future. In its construction process, the pedagogical work also supplied students with intellectual tools that can be used to question different aspects of the social life. This process goes on in its fifth moment, the Social Practice, i.e., a qualitatively improved and superior social practice (Saviani, 1988).

My lesson starts when the teacher asks the students to organize themselves to play football<sup>2</sup>. It enables the teacher to find out what students know about the issue. The starting point of the educational practice is the students' social practice (Saviani, 1988) regarding the football game. At this moment, the teacher can just carry out a precarious synthesis of what s/he will teach because s/he masters the content and his/her pedagogical action plan (that is why it is a synthesis) but knows neither his/her students deeply nor their knowledge (that is why it is precarious). On the other hand, students' understanding of the theme under study is syncretic, since their comprehension is related to the empirical phenomenon (the apparent concreteness). They cannot see contradictions which are inherent to the phenomenon, the antitheses. At this point it is important to point out that the teacher needs to be aware of what the Coletivo de Autores (1992) called adaptation to the socio-cognitive possibilities of the students. It is the task of the teacher to adapt the activity to the different groups, so that the content is apprehensible on the part of the students. At the second moment, the teacher provokes

---

<sup>2</sup> I will refer to real experiences which I have carried out along the last decades to show real possibilities of experiences.



students to create a football game that ‘imitates’<sup>3</sup> the society. It corresponds to what Saviani (1988, 80) called “problematization”, the moment in which students identify the issues that must be solved in the dimension of the social practice. The group has to find ways to do it. However, my experience has shown that students find it hard to get references to carry out the game and to identify the most significant problems in the context of a certain social phenomenon. It may happen due to the fact that sport tends to absorb people and has a typical feature of separating the game from reality. Therefore, the teacher must provide elements (instruments, tools) that enable students to understand and criticize the reality they live in, the same they would do with any other object of study. After that, the teacher may let the students restart the game; what happened several times in my experience is that the game did not change at all. The third moment proposed by Saviani – Instrumentalization– would then start.

I believe that a good strategy to start with would be the discussion about universal goods (material and cultural ones) and the number of people in the different groups whose organization may be based in such findings. In general, students mention percentages of 99% and 1%. In order to carry on the experience, the teacher proposes 80% and 20%. Teams are then defined. At some moments of the game, it is easy for the “majority” to beat the “minority”. In order to restart the dialogue and the instrumentalization to reach Catharsis (the fourth moment), which is, according to Saviani (1988, 81), “effective incorporation of cultural tools, now transformed into active elements of social transformation”, the teacher may address the issue of the social trajectory of legislators (lawyers and politicians), the origin of their families and whether they belong to the majority or the minority. After the discussion and comprehension, s/he may propose that the minority (based on the debate) adjusts the rules to the interest of their team. It is true representation of the role the minority has played in our society, in opposition to what Gramsci (1978a; 1978b) has stated and to what I mentioned at the beginning of the text, regarding the hegemony that the working class must search for. In this stage, the game is as close as it can be to the social situation of people living in the capitalist society. Some succeed and use all their potential whereas others are prevented from doing it by the law, by how wealth is distributed and by the

---

<sup>3</sup> It may be concomitantly carried out with studies of the same theme in History or Sociology classes, for instance, when teachers of several disciplines interact.

ideological and repressive apparatus. At this moment, the teacher may debate about the happenings that took place during the lesson and find ways to go back to the Social Practice, which has now been transformed into a synthetically organic experience for the teacher and his/her students (the fifth moment of Historical-critical Pedagogy). An idea of a lesson plan has been described below.

### Lesson plan

#### Theme of the Pedagogical Unit: Football and Society

Lesson Plan - theme: football as a tool for understanding the struggle for hegemony.  
Place: court/football field/indoors football court or any space adapted to the practice.  
Material: football/indoors football ball(s) (or adapted ones) and colored vests to identify the teams (if necessary and/or possible).

1st Moment/Social Practice: The teacher may ask how his/her group would play football. S/he may suggest that the students should play or may hand them the ball and wait to see how they organize themselves. The teacher must observe significant aspects of this practice. 10/15 min.

2nd Moment/Problematization: Based on his/her observations, the teacher must question the group about how they are playing. Some questions may be: 'Who is having more fun?' 'Why girls don't touch the ball?' 'Why some students keep the ball longer?' This discussion certainly brings up some issues but does not necessarily mean there will be changes in the way they play. 5/10 min.

3rd Moment/Instrumentalization: The teacher may start this moment by questioning why the practice has not changed as soon as some problems were identified. It may lead the students to acknowledge the problems they have raised. However, the teacher's role is to realize that such problems should be collectively analyzed. Therefore, my suggestion is that the teacher should ask 'how about playing a football game which imitates the society?' The second and the third moments may intertwine between game time and discussion time. At first, the games may not change, i. e., students do not tend to problematize society and game naturally. The teacher may then interrupt the game at certain moments and several times to question students: 'How does society organize itself in terms of access to cultural and material goods?', 'Could we separate into two large groups, then?', 'Why does the majority is having more fun if, according to our discussion, the minority has more fun?', 'Who creates the rules in society?', 'In order to better imitate society, could we give the minority the power to create and change rules?' At a certain moment, the game becomes unfeasible since most students lose interest. Even some conflicts may arise. I believe that it is a good moment to develop a deep discussion. 25 min.

4th Moment/Catharsis: A moment to discuss and reflect upon some issues, such as the way the society organizes itself, how the process of production and reproduction of social organization happens, what a fair society would be like, what we can do to reach such society. 10 min.

5th Moment/Social Practice: The experience is expected to lead to an environment in which the transformation of the initial game happens quietly. Therefore, the experience is expected to make the game re-start in the spirit of an activity which may promote fruition to all participants.

## 5. REMARKS OF EXPERIENCES

I heard on TV the other day that ‘true science is not very different from magic’. I paid attention and listened to a very simple explanation given by a street artist to a child: he said that nothing changes with magic, nor with science. It is we who change. On the other hand, everything changes. The magician explained that his tricks were, and were not, magic. They were performed for the ones who believed in them, rather than for the ones who did not want to believe. In the case of science and education, I think that it is not enough to believe or not to believe, to want to believe or not, or that that is not enough for our debate. It is about clarifying, studying, understanding explaining and transforming. Even so, there is some space for ‘enchantment’, at least when we discuss this experience. It is about the ‘magic’ of having two moments in one (the first and the fifth moments previously described). But this magic trick can be undone: they are apparently the same moment but they are qualitatively different. They are, and are not, the same. They are in the context of the same phenomenon, the same social practice, so, they are the same thing. However, from the perspective of all participants’ comprehension, the fifth moment is very different because it carries significant learning, i.e., qualitative transformation. The starting point and the end point of the experience described along the text are apparently the same: a football game. However, I should point out that they are not the same. In the second opportunity, at the fifth moment, the game and the players are expected to have changed qualitatively. What does it mean? Some notes regarding practical experiences which were based on the idea of this lesson<sup>4</sup> follow.

---

<sup>4</sup> The idea of this lesson was created with Marcelo Eder Lamb, a teacher at the *Projeto Criança Cidadã-Citizen Child Program* in the PE Center at the Universidade Federal de Santa Maria in 1999. The supervisor was Maristela Silva e Souza. We presented this idea at the FIEP Congress held in Foz do Iguaçu in 2000. After that, I repeated the lesson in several opportunities. Marcelo may also have done so. In 2004, 2005 and 2006, when I started to teach at the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, I could teach it to student-teachers there and they could then teach it in different places. As a result, they often contributed with particularities that had happened in their classes. The same took place when I taught at the União de Ensino do Sudoeste do Paraná (2007-2009), in Dois Vizinhos and at the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande-Federal University of Rio Grande (2009-present). I can think of some students and friends who helped me complexify the lesson: E. Pergher, E. Bopsin, P. Rubleski, L. Trapaga Abib, S. Pinto Nishimura and G. Bernardi. I would like to thank them all.

Whatever the level of schooling in Brazil (this class was taught in at least seven Brazilian states in different levels), in the United Kingdom and in Spain, when a teacher says “let’s play football” to his/her students, even to freshmen pursuing teaching degrees, in workshops and meetings, it has usually meant the same to me and to other teachers who taught this class: the group is divided into two teams and they play against each other. The result is that the most experienced or skillful students play and have fun whereas the others (the least skillful ones, the physically weak ones, the women, etc.) are in court but do not actually participate, or may participate little.

To give the possibility of “studying” the “society we live in” by playing football always leads to two different reactions: “Oh, no! How boring!” and “That’s OK!” The latter is followed by doubt in students’ facial expressions. After the teacher clarifies that they do not have to quit playing football to carry out that “study”, s/he usually conquers the students who resist the idea. In fact, without instrumentalization, restarting the game usually means no changes.

To problematize and to provide tools, by asking relevant and challenging questions, may be very revealing and even fun. Students represented the so-called class conflict in creative ways. They often bring very funny examples of everyday events to the debate in order to illustrate the scientific concepts of society organization presented by the teacher. If the teacher is attentive, it may result in the application of the principle of content adequacy to students’ socio-cognitive possibilities (Coletivo de Autores, 1992). This principle defends that the teacher must have the “competence to adapt the content to the students’ cognitive capacity and their social practice, to his/her own knowledge and to his/her possibilities as a historical subject” (p. 31) It is an important mission since “confrontation between popular knowledge (common sense) and universal scientific knowledge selected by the school is, from the methodological perspective, fundamental to pedagogical reflection” (p. 32).

Even though there is a large bibliography about the themes social organization, class conflict, society in classes and other issues, it may be predicted that, to every experience, students bring new ways to represent the consequences of such social organization, of the class conflict and of its place in the social space. “Picking” particularities of each group, place and students’ reflections and questions may mean a shortcut to understand the most complex processes in society. Questions, such as

‘Who has more fun in our society: the majority or the minority?’ and ‘Who has access to better health and Education: the majority or the minority?’ may lead to better results that answers to questions that have not been asked yet.

I taught this class for the first time in 1999 and the students chose to divide their group into “the rich” and “the poor”. At first, the consequences of this choice did not seem serious. However, as time went by, I listened to students talking about the class and making jokes about rich and poor people, rather than talking about something I thought was important in the experience. Although “sometimes less is more”, I learned that “sometimes less is really less”, i.e., attempts to simplify may impoverish the experience.

Finally, I would like to report what I think is more complicated and complex in this experience. Throughout the lesson, students may get impatient because some are used to fulfill their expectation when they play the game – even if they overestimate their skills –, some feel uncomfortable when they lose and some need a certain level of concentration and understanding, although they may neither be prepared to face it in Physical Education classes nor expect it in these classes. However, I believe that one of the most relevant moments is the decision that is taken at the end of the game, right before going back to the social practice (fifth moment). After the power of taking decisions changes hands, considering the meanings of majority and minority and experiencing the power of the majority, we may enable the majority to exert some kind of revenge on the minority. The teacher gets the hard task of keeping a dialogue with the group so that the class conflict may end, rather than the dominance of a class over the others (or a team over the other one).

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Saviani (1980) corroborates the understanding that all relations mediated by hegemonic ideas are pedagogical relations (Gramsci, 1978a). In our lives, we go through several moments in which hegemonic ideas are transmitted and assimilated. The experience I have described seems to highlight two elements which should be mentioned in this item. Firstly, the creation, or signification, of a teaching-learning space –where hegemonic ideas are questioned and the way the bourgeoisie conquered and keeps the hegemonic position is analyzed– may be an important element that can contribute to the liberation of each of the individuals

involved in the experience. Secondly, consequences of this kind of activities may agglutinate collective actions regarding politicization and struggle for hegemony.

If the environment in which the hegemonic power has extremely strong tools, such as mass communication media, the dominance of school structures and formal power, offers students an activity that enables them to question the status quo –the game, for instance–, they may develop their critical spirit and let it question their place and objective in the world. They may even be able to question the place and the objective that dominant ideas have for them, and, who knows, imagine something different. It seems that the most experienced ones – in this case, the teachers – are in charge of leading the social transformation and of overcoming a society of classes, at least in relation to the lesson presented.

Besides, if the individual articulates with his/her peers or in school, s/he may change the school culture (the dominant one) collectively. If this activity is included in a whole set of activities that aim at transforming the society, the process may trigger a dispute in which common sense may be problematized and the status quo may be questioned. In other words,

...if, on one hand, common sense represents a collection of fragmentary and disaggregated conceptions, the product of old philosophical conceptions, the conservative and irrational conditions of past lives [...], on the other hand, it arises as a flexible and mobile way of thinking which is open to continuous transformation and enrichment (Simionatto, 2009, 43)

Therefore, I end this paper hoping that this proposal may be debated and used in different spaces to strengthen the discussion about the transformation of the society based on elements found in the school environment.

## REFERENCES

- Almeida, G. P. de (2007). *Transposição didática: por onde começar*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Bracht, V. (1999). A constituição das teorias pedagógicas da educação física. *Cadernos CEDES*, 19(48), 69-88.

- Caparroz, F. & Bracht, V. (2007). O tempo e o lugar de uma didática da educação física. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte*, 28(2), 21-37. Retrieved from <http://www.rbceonline.org.br/revista/index.php/RBCE/article/view/53/61>, 27-01-2012.
- Coletivo de Autores. (1992). *Metodologia do ensino da educação física*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Damo, A. S. (2003). Monopólio estético e diversidade configuracional no futebol brasileiro. *Revista Movimento*, 9(2), 129-156. Retrieved 15-09-2015 from: <http://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/Movimento/article/view/2807/1422>. doi: 10.22456/1982-8918.2807
- Gramsci, A. (1978a). *Concepção dialética da história* (2nd ed.) Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- Gramsci, A. (1978b). *Os intelectuais e a organização da cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- Marx, K. (1978). *Manuscritos econômico-filosóficos e outros textos escolhidos* (Coleção Os pensadores). São Paulo: Abril Cultural.
- Nosella, P. & Neves de Azevedo, M. L. (2012). A educação em Gramsci. *Rev. Teoria e Prática da Educação*, 15(2), 25-33. Retrieved 15-09-2015 from: <http://www.periodicos.uem.br/ojs/index.php/TeorPratEduc/article/view/20180>
- Saviani, D. (1980). *Educação: Do senso Comum à Consciência filosófica*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- Saviani, D. (1991). *Pedagogia histórico-crítica primeiras aproximações*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- Saviani, D. (1993). *Escola e democracia* (27 ed.). São Paulo: Cortez/Autores Associados.
- Saviani, D. (2007). *História das ideias pedagógicas no Brasil*. Campinas: Autores Associados.
- Simionatto, I. (2009). Classes subalternas, lutas de classe e hegemonia: uma abordagem gramsciana. *Revista Katálysis*, 12(1), 41-49. Retrieved 28-10-

2015 from: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3001548>. doi: 10.1590/S1414-49802009000100006

Simionatto, I. & Rodrigues Costa, C. (2014). Estado E Políticas Sociais: A Hegemonia Burguesa e as Formas Contemporâneas De Dominação. *Revista Katálysis*, 17(1), 68-76. Retrieved 15, June, 2015, from: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/katalysis/article/view/S1414-49802014000100007/26860>. doi: 10.1590/S1414-49802014000100007

Taffarel, C. N. Z. (1997). Currículo, formação profissional na educação física & esporte e campos de trabalho em expansão: antagonismos e contradições da prática social. *Revista Movimento*, 4(7), 43-51. Retrieved 27-01-2012 from: <http://www.seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/Movimento/article/view/2366>. doi: 10.22456/1982-8918.2366

Zientarski, C., Santos de Oliveira, O. & Menezes, S. (2010). A educação e a escola brasileira: dialogando com Freire e Gramsci. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación / Revista Ibero-americana de Educação*, 53(5). Retrieved 27-01-2012 from: <http://www.rieoei.org/deloslectores/3201Santos.pdf>.