

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN THE NACIONAL COMMON CURRICULAR BASE: ADVANCES AND SETBACKS

Raquel Firmino Magalhães Barbosa
Colégio Pedro II,
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

Rodrigo Lema Del Rio Martins
Universidade Federal do Tocantis,
Palmas, TO, Brasil

André da Silva Mello
Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo,
Vitória, ES, Brasil

ABSTRACT

The essay analyzes the unfolding of the National Common Curricular Base for Early Childhood Education. At first, it produces a historical synthesis of the documents that guided the Basic Education in Brazil and, later, it signals the advances and setbacks of the Base for Early Childhood Education. It is concluded that the document is ambiguous, since, at the same time as it presents advances for Early Childhood Education, especially, regarding the conception of childhood and the curricular organization, it brings backslides in its unfolding to the pedagogical practice, characterizing itself as a prescriptive document, which reduces the autonomy and authorship of teachers and children in curricular productions.

Key-words: National Common Curricular Base. Early Childhood Education. Curriculum.

Introduction

A little more than a year after its homologation,¹ the National Curricular Common Base (BNCC) still constitutes a controversial document, the focus of several criticisms and far from materializing in the daily life of Brazilian Basic Education. Among the several controversial points of the document, it highlights its intention to establish a curricular unit, through externally oriented prescriptions, for the

¹ The final version of the National Curricular Common Base for Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education was approved on December 20, 2017. The document referred to High School, only in 2018.

plural and diversified educational contexts, marked by complexity and by numerous sociocultural, political and economic differences.

During the process of elaboration of the BNCC (BRAZIL, 2017), which is also criticized, because in the course of its different stages it was losing its collective character, the National Association of Postgraduate and Research in Education (ANPED) “Here we have a resume: what do we create in school?”. The signatories of this campaign defended and still defend the idea that schools produce curricula in their daily lives. And that external prescriptions that do not dialogue with local realities are inadequate to face the problems and needs that affect each specific school culture, in addition to restricting the autonomy of everyday practitioners, be they teachers, students and the school community, in the creation and re-signification of curricular practices (MELLO et al., 2016).

Without denying the importance of more general orientations, which offer theoretical and epistemological support for thinking about the conception of education, children, curriculum, evaluation, among other central elements for pedagogical actions, BNCC is quite prescriptive and leaves teachers and students to decide on the curricular practices in which they are inserted. Unlike the documents that preceded it, such as the Benchmarks, Parameters, and Guidelines, the Foundation determines what should be taught, how, and how to evaluate. For Arroyo (2016, p.16), the BNCC contributes to an “extremely negative, disqualified view of teachers: it gives them the ready intellectual menu and reduces their function to reheat the kettle”.

Given this complex and challenging scenario, this essay discusses BNCC's proposals for Early Childhood Education, the first stage of Basic Education in Brazil. To do so, we ask: what are the advances and setbacks that BNCC brings to Early Childhood Education? What are the conceptions of childhood, curricular dynamics and games/play that underlie this document? Then, the article will

cover the following itinerary to answer these questions. Initially, we present a historical synthesis of the proposals that aimed to establish a curricular unit for the Brazilian educational system. Later, we discuss some of the assumptions contained in the Base that, in our understanding, bring advances in the conception of childhood and curricular organization about previous documents. Moreover, finally, we criticize the unfolding of these presuppositions for the pedagogical practices in Early Childhood Education, which present themselves in a directive and utilitarian way, even entailing contradictions with their theoretical and epistemological presuppositions.

2. Historical synthesis of pedagogical proposals of national scope

The intention to produce documents of national scope, to guide curricular practices in Basic Education, is not new in Brazil. This intention has been perceived since the imperial period when Dom Pedro I resolves to establish, in 1827, what should be taught by teachers in all primary education units, in all cities, villages and considered, at the time, “populous places” (SILVA; SOUZA, 2011).

Throughout the imperial period, other attempts to articulate a national education policy followed, especially the 1854 Couto Ferraz Reform, which, among other issues, explicitly delimited educational programs for all Brazilian schools (ROCHA, 2010). Already in 1879, Leôncio de Carvalho proposes a new educational reform, defining a curricular matrix with positivist characteristics (ZOTTI, 2004).

With the advent of the Republic, attempts to reorganize education in the country were being tried, without escaping from the logic of establishing policies that would help strengthen national unity. In this context, the Organic Law of Primary Education was formulated in 1946, a law that laid out very detailed guidelines on

the curriculum for children attending official educational establishments, from 7 to 12 years old (ZOTTI, 2004). That same year, a new Constitution was promulgated in Brazil, which pointed out the need for the Union to establish guidelines and bases for national education. This intention materialized only in 1961, with the approval of the first LDB² (ZOTTI, 2004). The military government, which assumed command of the country in 1964, sanctioned Law No. 5,692/1971, establishing other guidelines and bases for the 1st and 2nd grades. Among the changes made in the current curricula, we highlight the one that removed the disciplines of Philosophy and Sociology from the teaching programs, being replaced by Moral and Civic Education and Brazilian Social and Political Organization, along with Artistic Education and Physical Education, with a mandatory character, as stated in Article 7.

In the 1980s, with the intense debates about the Federal Constitution, we observed another significant advance in the systematization of Early Childhood Education as a social right, since it was from this that the State was held accountable for the care of children in school institutions for not only to be “cared for”, but also to be “educated”. This fact has led to the migration of day care centres from the Social Welfare Secretariats to the Secretariats of Education. However, as highlighted by Kuhlmann Jr. (2000), this migration did not necessarily mean overcoming the welfare conception that marks historically Early Childhood Education.³

In the Magna Carta, fundamental principles are established for the entire

² Law of Directives and Bases of Education, nº 4.024/1961.

³ A charitable nature characterizes the history of Early Childhood Education in Brazil, linked mainly to the creation of spaces for the care of children from the most impoverished strata of our society (KUHLMANN, 2000). Factors such as malnutrition, infant mortality, high rates of domestic accidents, and the need for industrial capitalism that emerged in the early twentieth century to seize women as labour, encouraged social mobilization to house children in their primary care (KUHLMANN, 2000).

curricular organization that we have seen in the years and decades that follow. According to Leite Filho and Nunes (2013, p. 70), the education of children, until that moment was understood as assistance, “[...] came to appear as a right of the citizen and duty of the State, from an educational perspective in response to social movements in defense of children's rights”. This perspective is taken into account in the legal-pedagogical order, published since then.

In the wake of this debate, the Ministry of Education, in 1994, formulates the National Policy on Early Childhood Education. He pointed out pedagogical guidelines for the institutions of this stage of Basic Education, since the publication of “[...] a series of scientific documents about of the commitment of nurseries and preschools with the defense of the citizenship of children from 0 to 6 years” (OLIVEIRA, ANDRADE, ANDRADE, 2008, p.6). In this set of academic-scientific productions, the inseparability of caring and educating is affirmed, and the child is understood as a complete human being, social and historical subject. According to the authors, this fact “[...] constitutes a differentiated view of childhood, in comparison to the view underlying previous policies, in which the child was considered as ‘incapable’, a ‘citizen of the future’, a ‘lacking’ or ‘becoming’”(OLIVEIRA; ANDRADE, 2008, p.6).

In 1996 the second LDB of National Education was promulgated, which prevails until the present day (Law nº 9394/96). This law gained strength in the Brazilian scenario, as it constituted a reform in the educational system that took place in the context of redemocratization. The debates of its formulation begin in this period and incorporate the aspects mentioned in the Federal Constitution of 1988. With outstanding leadership of the educator Darcy Ribeiro, LDB is published in the 1990s and already proclaims the need for the future definition of a National Curricular Common Base.

Also in the 1990s, after the publication of the LDB, the Ministry of Education was

responsible for mobilizing the intellectual class, in line with the public policies developed by the then President of the Republic, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, to elaborate broader guidelines for curricula to be practiced in all educational institutions in Brazil (ARELARO, 2000). The constitution of this document took into account already existing curricular proposals in States and Municipalities, in addition to comparing with official curricula adopted in other countries. It is in this context that the well-known and still widely used National Curricular Parameters (PCNs), which regulate Elementary School I, from 1997 onwards, Elementary Education II, as of 1998, and of 2000.

The PCNs translate a curriculum format inspired by a psychological model developed by César Coll in the Spanish educational reform (MOREIRA, 1997). It is a proposal based on four levels of information:

(a) those relating to what to teach - the contents (concepts, explanatory systems, skills, norms, values, etc.) and the objectives (the processes of growth that one wishes to provoke, favour or facilitate through teaching); (b) those relating to when to teach - ways of ordering and sequencing content and objectives; (c) how to teach - how to structure teaching / learning activities; and (d) those that guide decisions about what, how and when to evaluate (MOREIRA, 1997, p. 97, emphasis added).

In this phase of national curriculum development triggered by Article 9, item IV, LDB (1996) required the Union some duties. In collaboration with the States, Federal District and Municipalities were established "[...] competencies and guidelines for early childhood education, basic education and secondary education, which will guide curricula and their minimum contents, in order to ensure basic common education". This way, the Brazilian government, by legal force, also mobilized to think about curricular parameters related to Early Childhood Education, which, beginning in 1996, it officially became the first stage of Basic Education. In 1998, the National Curriculum Frameworks for Early Childhood Education, a systematized document in three volumes, was published, which sought to guarantee an organization of the pedagogical work developed

with children enrolled in kindergartens and pre-schools.

With the turn of the century and millennium, we are faced with new curricular reformulations produced by the Brazilian government, to accompany economic, political, cultural and social transformations and of incorporating advances in the theoretical-educational field. The Early Childhood Education, which already had a National Curricular Directive approved since April 1999,⁴ which was reformulated in 2009, Elementary School in 2010 and High School in 2011, now have National Curricular Guidelines which, like the previous proposals, have the same objective, that is, to guide school practices legally and pedagogically.

There is a change of nomenclature: from Parameters / Referential to Guidelines. Also, what does that mean in the semantic and practical fields? According to Araújo (2015), one of the differences lies in the legal and therefore deterministic support of both. The Parameters and Referential constitute “recommendations”, less arbitrary in their execution. They are as an essential reference for the construction of the curriculum matrices of the teacher, separated by disciplines. The guidelines, in turn, are characterized as stricter “norms” in their applicability to schools and education professionals. They are like a set of definitions about the principles, the bases and the methodologies to be employed. However, in practice, both Parameters/References and Guidelines become a fundamental element of the pedagogical work for the education systems, schools and teachers that, as a rule, begin to structure their actions by the official proposal in force.

It must be admitted that, although these documents have repercussions on the day-to-day practice of systems, schools and teachers, there are considerable distances between the prescribed curriculum and the lived experience, which

⁴ Resolution 01/99 of the Basic Education Chamber of the National Education Council (CNE), which establishes the National Curricular Guidelines for Early Childhood Education. Approved on April 7, 1999.

sometimes call into question the effectiveness of these proposals. The subjects who operate with these orientations do not behave passively and, through tactical actions, in the sense of the term Cerulean, cheat, resist and re-signify the cultural goods offered in function of the contextual needs arising from the daily life in which they are inserted (CERTEAU, 1994).

In this historical synthesis that we present, it is possible to perceive that the government initiatives of organizing the country's educational system, to strengthen the national federative unit, is changing with time and being specified, each time, by the age segment. Thus, the proposals for curricular standardization focused on Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and Secondary Education, especially after the LDB of 1996. In this recent historical period, with the advent of the Curricular Guidelines, official proposals were formulated, not only for the stages of Basic Education, but also for the following teaching modalities: Special Education, Youth and Adult Education, Technical Professional Education, Field Education, Indigenous School Education, Quilombola School Education, Education for Young People and Adults in situations of deprivation of freedom (BRAZIL, 2013).

Due to the variety of modalities of provision of education in the country, which permeate the three stages of Basic Education, we sought to systematize the curriculum through a document that articulates all this plurality. Then, in 2013, the Curriculum Guidelines for Basic Education (DCNEBs) are published (BRAZIL, 2013). The DCNEBs, to articulating the stages and modalities, was in charge of updating them from the legislation that was, gradually, modifying the LDB. An example of this is the 9-year Primary School, which, according to the LDB, provided for the mandatory training course for children and adolescents aged 7 to 14 in eight grades (grades 1-8). The Elementary School based on Law nº. 11.274/2006, incorporates the children of 6 years of age, hitherto allocated to Early Childhood Education.

Beginning in 2015, the Brazilian Government begins the process of building the National Curricular Common Base (BNCC), mobilizing various sectors of organized civil society, especially those related to education. These sectors discussed the pertinence of this document since it forms a pedagogical proposal that, among other things, seeks to guarantee unity to Basic Education throughout the national territory, a requirement outlined in the Federal Constitution of 1988 and reinforced in the LDB of 1996. Theoretical, ideological and political disputes marked this process of construction. In the context of these disputes, the impeachment of President Dilma Rousseff takes place, a fact that paralyzes the progress of formulation of the BNCC, which, at the time (April 2016), was already in its second version, moving to the third and last. The last version was published by the government that takes over the country, under the leadership of Michel Temer, in the year 2017, bringing changes in its final text that disfigured much of what had been built until the second version. The third version was initially to incorporate the criticisms that the document received in its previous version when it was presented in the numerous seminars held by the Ministry of Education and Brazilian Universities in all States of the Federation. However, the final version was oblivious to this strategy of qualifying its content and was reformulated without the participation of the actors who were in charge of debating it (RIBEIRO, CRAVEIRO, 2017).

On the contrary, it is the result of political pressures and arrangements made under the new composition of the Ministry of Education. It also is perceived in dialogue with the business sector (Lemann Foundation), non-governmental organizations (All for Education) and part of the political class, in particular deputies and senators who had interests in themes such as gender diversity and religious education, and positions contrary to the advances achieved between the

years 2003 and 2016.⁵

The BNCC, which initially intended to articulate the three stages of Basic Education, in its final version, excludes High School since the Temer Government had already approved in the National Congress an exclusive reform for this last stage of Basic Education. Differently, from BNCC, the National Curriculum Framework for Early Childhood Education (RCNEI) (BRAZIL, 1998) and the National Curriculum Guidelines for Early Childhood Education (DCNEIs) (BRAZIL, 2009) were configured as specific legal/pedagogical documents of the first stage of Education Basic.

3. Early Childhood Education and BNCC: advances and setbacks

“[...] The child has
a hundred languages
(And one hundred, hundred, hundred more)
however, they steal 99.
School and culture
by separating the head from the body.
They tell him:
to think without hands
headless
to listen and not talk
to understand without joy
to love and marvel
only at Easter and Christmas.
They tell him:
to discover the world that is already there
so, one hundred
they steal 99 [...]”

⁵ To mention some: National Fund for the Development of Basic Education (Fundeb); University for All Program (ProUni); Brazil Affectionate; National Pact for Literacy in the Right Age (PNAIC); expansion of compulsory primary schooling for 4 to 17 years; Law of the National Salary Floor of the Magisterium.

(Loris Malaguzzi, "The One Hundred Languages of Children")

This epigraph causes us to think and dialogue about the hundred and more children's languages that children construct in their social interactions and which are mediated, above all, by their play culture. Through games and play, children's creative capacity and creative actions are potentialized in a universe filled with imagination and fantasy, in which they become subjects capable of thinking and acting upon themselves. We recognize the different forms of children's languages and curricula that value the production of meanings by children, as opposed to a schooling view of Early Childhood Education, which prioritizes and emphasizes a particular type of language, to the detriment of the plurality of forms of expression and production cultural.

In 2017, the third and final version of the National Curricular Common Base for Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education was presented. The purpose of this document is to guide curricular practices in Basic Education throughout the country, in order to reduce inequalities in the education of children, defining what should be taught in their schooling processes (BRAZIL, 2017).

Previous documents, such as the RCNEI and the DCNEIs, presented guidelines and guidelines for the elaboration of school curricula. However, with the BNCC, the directives and content of the curriculum became more pronounced, leaving little room for the institutions and subjects present, especially children and teachers, to express their authorship and cultural productions in curricular practices.

In the specific case of Early Childhood Education, we perceive ambiguities in the final version of the document. At the same time as the Foundation advances in the conception of childhood, overcoming the vision of passivity of children in their education and socialization processes, on the other hand, in its unfolding for

pedagogical practice, the document presents itself in a very prescriptive way. It was based on universal models of development, opposing the perspective of children as historical and social subjects.

In order to deepen the discussions about Early Childhood Education and the curriculum at the BNCC, we start with the following question: How can we think of multiple childhood languages amid schooling disputes in the first stage of Basic Education?

Mello et al. (2016) analyzed the second version of the Base and identified advances about the documents that preceded them, specifically, to the conception of children, curricular organization, body/movement and game/play. Regarding the conception of childhood, the present vision of the BNCC, which was already in the DCNEIs, migrates from anchored assumptions in Developmental Psychology. It occurs mainly in the Piagetian and developmental matrices of a maturational and universal character, to a perspective based on the Sociology of Childhood, in which the child is seen as an active and authorial subject in his processes of socialization and development.

Regarding curricular organization, while the RCNEI is focused on the idea of learning axes and the DCNEIs in the different languages, the BNCC values the fields of children's experiences, whose focus shifts from who teaches to those who learn, that is, interests understand what children do, through their experiences, with the learning that is offered to them. Such learning occurs with different languages; therefore, it does not rule out but incorporates the idea contained in DCNEIs.

In this sense, the curricular organization, in this third version of BNCC, brings some points that are the subject of analyzes. For example, the subdivision of Early Childhood Education into three groups by age group: infants (0 to 18

months); very young children (19 months to 3 years and 11 months) and small children (4 years to 5 years and 11 months), as well as pedagogical planning based on the fields of experience and learning and development objectives. However, some studies point to the debate about whether or not there is a consensus about advances in BNCC curriculum organization in Early Childhood Education.

The question of the subdivision of Early Childhood Education by age group led to discussions about this separation of behavioural psychology, with criticism about child development being classified in stages of development (ARELARO, 2017). However, the BNCC text considers that this division was necessary to consider the specificities of each age group and considers that these age groups should not be “[...] considered rigidly, since there are differences in rhythm in learning and in the development of children who need to be considered in pedagogical practice” (BRAZIL, 2017, p. 46).

Concerning curricular organization, Buss-Simão (2016) emphasizes that, in order to ensure that pedagogical practices cover and enable educational experiences, it is necessary to overcome the conception of the child and the body as nature. To conceive of these two factors as nature is to homogenize the actions of the subjects and disregard the influence of other spheres such as culture, society and the historical moment, for example. For the author, “[...] the human being must be considered in its biocultural integrity (...), in other words, in the human being, the biological is constituted by culture” (BUSS-SIMÃO, 2016, p.187). In such a way that these aspects determine the ways of living and educating the body, that takes place in the interweaving between nature and culture. According to the author, in order to welcome and enable educational experiences in this sense, the planning needs to encompass, in an indissociable way, the fields of experience proposed by the BNCC, contemplating the everyday knowledge

experienced in Early Childhood Education, that is, different from the transmission of disciplinary contents and of disinterest in children's cultures.

Regarding learning and development rights, Aquino and Menezes (2016) affirm that the BNCC, in setting the educational goals and transforming them into learning and development objectives, shifts the subject's focus towards “[...] education that prepares subjects for life and citizenship pre-established to the detriment of education that enhances the life and participation of the subjects in the concrete reality” (AQUINO, MENEZES, 2016, p.32). In contrast, the BNCC, in its text, presents the learning and development objectives as essential knowledge that are linked to the fields of experience, corresponding to the possibilities of learning and the characteristics of children's development. Through these objectives, children can play an active role in consolidating their learning and development rights in the daily life of Early Childhood Education.

In this way, they are welcoming and enabling educational experiences, about the sensorial, expressive, corporal, movement and care aspects contained in the curricular organization, signal to an education that values constructions of meanings and challenging environments for the children, attending to their different specificities.

When considering the fields of experiences in curricular organization, learning must be directed towards the child, their experiences and their contexts, inciting a sensitive look and listening for the knowledge to be offered to them. Thus, by placing the curriculum in the spaces of children's experiences, the way of seeing the curriculum and content is modified, providing a dynamic movement of thinking, interpreting and creating, justifying the importance of the permanence of the term fields of experience in the BNCC. However, despite the power of the experimental fields, Mello et al. (2016, p.137) warn that:

[...] institutionalization and systematization of experience in thematic fields can affect the very potency of this 'phenomenon' because the experience is not given a priori, but, on the contrary, it emerges from the unpredictability of daily life and in creativity/inventiveness of the subjects that belong to it.

About the body/movement, the RCNEI presents an instrumental perspective, conceiving the body and movement as a means to achieve specific learning. The DCNEIs see the body/movement as languages, as a form of expression of the children. The Base, based on the idea of the child as a subject capable of thinking and acting on itself, conceives the body/movement as dimensions of behaviour related to the construction of senses by children. Finally, the RCNEI deals with play and play as methodological strategies for teaching, the DCNEIs as an object of learning, as the capital of children's play culture. The Base, in turn, treats games and games as a right to learning for children in Early Childhood Education.

The rights of children are materialized in the rights of learning and development, from the six verbs that are present in the last version of BNCC. According to the document, children's educational institutions, in order to provide active learning for children, should offer time and space for them to live, play, participate, explore, express themselves and know each other (BRAZIL, 2017). Thus, they have the right to live together collectively and diversely in the school, exercising their right to play, fundamental so that all of them can socialize and learn to play. However, this right is related to the didactic-pedagogical choice of the teacher, with the elaboration of curricula and pedagogical projects, considering the specificities of each child in their social context, justifying the diversified part of the BNCC.

Marques, Pegoraro and Silva (2018) point out that the BNCC versions were based on political and didactic-pedagogical ideas from the DCNEIs, with emphasis on the integral formation of children, recognizing their protagonism and their experiences, shifting the focus of learning contents, thus differing from the RCNEI. When dealing with points that affect daily school life, advances are

perceived in the third version of the BNCC, as the vision of integral education, through more active and practical and less expositive learning.

In an interview with Census Magazine, in May 2018, Maria Carmen Silveira Barbosa, who participated in the elaboration and systematization of the three versions of the BNCC, spoke about the advances of this document, such as children's rights, understanding their integral development and the fields of experience. Regarding the idea of understanding the integral development of children, the document focuses on ethical, political and aesthetic aspects, as a living space and human formation. In this sense, the ethical principle would be related to the right to live together, with the possibility of learning to know oneself, evidencing the otherness and the socialization of the children. As far as the political aspect is concerned, children participating in different groups and expressing their opinions and wishes would be acting democratically. So, concerning the aesthetic aspect, children would exercise this right by exploring the world and inventing their games.

Despite the advances, the unfolding of the final version of the Base (BRAZIL, 2017) for pedagogical practices presented a lean text on the first stage of Basic Education, which deals with teaching and learning and the acquisition of knowledge in a practical way (BARBOSA et al., 2019). Gonçalves and Peixoto (2016) indicate that the BNCC is a document that aims to universalize and point out knowledge and practices that are the same for all, with a curriculum perspective that consolidates the linearity of the learning processes. Thus, externally imposed prescriptive referrals such as parameters set by learning and development rights for “infants”, “very small children” and “small children”, involve a model of how to teach, with a detailed description of the skills to be developed.

The third and last version of the BNCC, analyzed in this text, differs from the previous editions that were marked by the participative and collective dynamics

of its formulation. On the contrary, the final version of the Base incorporated, “in the erasing of the lights”, presuppositions of didactic-methodological nature proposed by groups and private institutions of education (Lemann Foundation, Ayrton Senna Institute, All for Education, among others). This formulation, when presented in a very prescriptive way regarding the contents, ways of teaching, when teaching and evaluating, ended up “plastering” the curricular productions of practitioners of daily life and, to a great extent, opposing the epistemological and theoretical frameworks that support the BNCC in Early Childhood Education. According to Dourado and Oliveira (2018, p. 41),

In this way, the BNCC presents itself as an ally in the implementation of proposals and curricular dynamics that contribute to curricular standardization and reductionism, with a strong emphasis on Portuguese Language and Mathematics, deeply articulated to the standardized evaluation, disregarding the national reality, national curricular guidelines levels of Basic Education and the singularities of the stages and educational modalities.

One of the main criticisms of the definitive version of the Base, in the chapter dealing with Early Childhood Education, focuses on the emphasis placed on literacy processes, centred mainly on reading and writing. This emphasis anticipates models of schooling present in the later stages, neglecting or significantly reducing other experiences and experiences related to “one hundred languages [and one hundred more] of children”.

Without disregarding the importance of systematized language through reading and writing, a language that gives materiality to school forms, we consider that the internalization and development of this language should not occur in a disjointed way of other languages, nor assume a predominance of such order create hierarchies among the different bits of knowledge. As Tizuko Kishimoto (2003), based on Paulo Freire, the reading of the world precedes the reading of the word. The development of other languages, which enhance the appropriation and experimentation of the world, are fundamental for the integral development of children. Before systematizing reality through the codes and signs given by the

articulated verbal language, it is necessary to experience it and to experiment it, so that this systematization does not become a “dead letter”, that is, a language devoid of meanings by its enunciators.

In the perspective of articulation between different languages, play, inalienable right of the child, should not be seen as something contradictory to learning, not to reinforce a dichotomization between body and mind, as if the child body was the “other of reason”. In this case, the risk lies in the emphasis of directive processes of “teaching”, in which the child is seen only as a “student”. Childhood, in turn, as the “residue of a time that is ending”, so that, first, children study – fulfil their committed institutional task – and play in the time that remains (SIROTA, 2001).

In our understanding, we defend the play as a universal language of childhood that must be present in their different learning and the relationships, they establish with different knowledge. Through their playful experiences, children internalize and produce cultures, becoming agents of themselves and perpetrators of their own lives. Therefore, we understand that the emphasis placed on literacy processes should not deprive the children of their childhood, on the grounds of anticipating later school demands. The image of Francesco Tonucci (2005), shown below, criticizes the models of schooling that aim to accelerate the learning considered important for later stages and that neglect the right to play and to be a child of infants:



Picture 1 - Do not push! I'm in no hurry to grow up! Source: Tonucci (2005, p 197).

This image raises questions about the kind of education that the BNCC should prioritize in Early Childhood Education: Is it that children are doomed to turn to literacy and not to the imagination and its playful elements? Are the children prepared for it? The first stage of Basic Education would not be for children to discover and discover the world through play activities? In this sense, would the centrality of education in early childhood education be in play or literacy? Are playing and literacy dimensions contradictory and irreconcilable?

Thus, physical education studies highlight the experiences of children, with emphasis on their protagonism and their bragging practices, revealing knowledge formed in the experiences that children establish with play activities and with their peers, essential to be considered in organizations (SAYÃO, 1999; GASPAR, RICHTER; VAZ, 2015; BARBOSA, MARTINS; MELLO, 2017).

In addition to the impact on the children, externally oriented curricular proposals that prescribe pedagogical practices for teachers, remove the professional autonomy of the teacher, leaving him to replicate, mechanically, a knowledge that was conceived by others and that little dialogue with the demands of their specific

school culture. In this case, teachers are not considered as authors of their practices, but as reproducers of a universally established knowledge.

Final Thoughts

It is important to stress that the changes proposed by the third version of BNCC should be implemented by the year 2020. It implies observing and discussing the changes contained in this document that will influence the routine of the institutions of Early Childhood Education. Understanding the BNCC is not as a curriculum, but as an orientation, based on the discussions about child conception, curricular organization, body/movement and game/play that are contained in the BNCC in the stage of Early Childhood Education, that we identify some aspects about the discussion of BNCC.

We emphasize that BNCC does not annul previous documents (RCNEI and DCNEI), however, it proposes a set of guidelines for curriculum development, as well as the fact that the third version of BNCC maintains the structural axes of interaction and play, fields of experience and learning objectives, makes it possible to focus on pedagogical and playful work with children.

We also highlight the relevance of the guarantee of learning rights (live, play, participate, explore, express and get to know one another) by children in Early Childhood Education so that they can experience “achievements, advances, possibilities and learning” (BRAZIL, 2017, p.41).

Although there is no consensus on advances in the area of Early Childhood Education through the BNCC, especially in scientific production, we indicate the need to guarantee a diversity of experiences for children and to enhance their languages.

In this way, the Foundation, while incorporating theoretical-conceptual advances about childhood and the curricular organization of Early Childhood Education, limits the curricula in their unfolding to pedagogical practices, characterizing itself as a prescribed document. When compared to the other stages of Basic Education, the Child Education document is still more flexible and less directive, because this stage is not centred in disciplinary contents. However, the guidelines for the materialization of curricula in school every day take on the characteristics of externally oriented prescriptions, disqualifying the teaching action regarding their autonomy and authorship in their pedagogical practices.

Despite the opening of the BNCC to a diversified part of the curriculum, which considers local diversities, the “what to work” and “how to” direction in each phase of daycare and preschool ends up restricting the curricular productions of day-to-day practitioners. It is also observed, in many respects, in contrast to the conception of childhood and curricular organization, centred in the experiences of the children, underlying the document.

It must be considered that subjects do not passively absorb the cultural goods offered to them (CERTEAU, 1994) since there is always an aesthetic of reception, in which daily practitioners tactically and subversively⁶ re-signify these cultural goods, printing in them their identity marks. Therefore, as Arroyo said in the introduction to this text, “delivering the ready intellectual menu” and expecting teachers to reproduce it in their daily lives is a misleading and anachronistic reading of what academic-scientific production shows about curricular productions, which points to the urgent need for dialogue between the prescribed curriculum and what is practised. Guidelines, guidelines, referrals are always welcome to the teaching systems and to the subjects that are part of them since they bring accumulated reflections on the processes of education of the children.

⁶ The tactic is the art of the weakest, which manifests itself cunningly in asymmetrical relations of power.

However, to offer teachers and schools, a “closed pedagogical package” means to negate the creative potential of teachers and their pedagogical autonomy.

Moreover, in many prescriptions of pedagogical practices, one can observe maturational and universal perspectives of child development, based on taxonomies that do not consider the socio-cultural and contextual dimensions of this development. Without neglecting the importance of biological aspects in the process of child development, neglecting influences from other dimensions is reinforcing the dichotomy between nature and culture, which various fields of knowledge try to overcome, including BNCC itself.

In a country of continental dimensions such as Brazil, with different political interests and varied theoretical and pedagogical understandings, the BNCC becomes a space of disputes. Universalizing curricula, withdrawing the autonomy of schools and teachers can represent limitations and setbacks to pedagogical practices in Early Childhood Education. However, we cannot fail to reaffirm that the document does not “give up” to have a diversified part, which corresponds to the specifics of each region, school and social context. It may be a possibility to provide the curricula with other interpretations, practices and adjustments to local contingencies.

Finally, there is no way to disregard the loss of the participatory and democratic character of the final version of BNCC. If in the first and second versions this character confers precise representativeness and legitimacy to the document, especially for the participation of different sectors of organized civil society. The other hand, in the third and final version the changes presented by sectors and private groups of education in the final formulation of the document generated negative interpretations, putting in check the intentions that are behind this action. After all, what interests is the Base linked?

REFERENCES

AQUINO, Ligia Maria Motta Leão de; MENEZES, Flávia Maria de. Base Nacional Comum Curricular: tramas e enredos para a infância brasileira. **Debates em Educação**, v. 8, n. 16, p. 29-45, jul./dez. 2016.

ARAÚJO, Tháric de Freitas. **Diferenças Entre Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais e Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais**. 2015. Disponível em: <<https://www.ebah.com.br/content/ABAAAhFjEAL/diferencas-entre-diretrizes-curriculares-nacionais-parametros-curriculares-nacionais>>. Acesso em: 23 mar. 2018.

ARELARO, Lisete Regina Gomes. Avaliação das políticas de educação infantil no Brasil: avanços e retrocessos. **Revista Zero-a-seis**, v. 19, n. 36, p. 206-222, jul./dez. 2017.

ARELARO, Lisete Regina Gomes. Resistência e Submissão: a reforma educacional na década de 1990. In: KRAWCZYK, Nora; CAMPOS, Maria Malta; HADDAD, Sérgio (Org.). **O cenário educacional latinoamericano no limiar do século XXI: reformas em debate**. Campinas/SP: Autores Associados, 2000. p. 95-116.

ARROYO, Miguel Gonzalez. Corpos resistentes produtores de culturas corporais. Haverá lugar na Base Nacional Comum? **Motrivivência**, v. 28, n. 48, p. 15-31, set/2016.

BARBOSA, Ivone Garcia *et al.* **A BNCC e a Regulação da Educação Infantil: Perspectiva Crítica**. CONAPE 2018. Disponível em: http://www.fnpe.com.br/docs/apresentacao-trabalhos/eixo-01/IVONE_GARCIA_BARBOSA.pdf. Acesso em: 23 abr. 2019.

BARBOSA, Maria Carmen Silveira. A BNCC e os direitos das crianças: Educação Infantil em evidência. **Revista Com Censo: estudos educacionais do Distrito Federal, Brasília**, v. 5, n. 2, p. 9-13, maio, 2018.

BARBOSA, Raquel Firmino Magalhães; MARTINS, Rodrigo Lema Del Rio; MELLO, André da Silva. Brincadeiras lúdico-agressivas: Tensões e possibilidades no cotidiano na Educação Infantil. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, p. 159-170, mar. 2017.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Básica. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**. Brasília, DF: MEC/SEB, 2017.

BRASIL. **Referencial Curricular Nacional para a Educação infantil**. Brasília: MEC/ SEF, 1998.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. **Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Educação infantil**. Brasília/DF, 2009.

CERTEAU, Michel de. **A invenção do cotidiano: artes do fazer**. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes, 1994.

DOURADO, Luiz Fernandes; OLIVEIRA, João Ferreira de. Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC) e os impactos nas políticas de regulação e avaliação da educação superior. *In*: AGUIAR, Márcia Angela da Silva; DOURADO, Luiz Fernandes (Org.). **A BNCC na contramão do PNE 2014-2024: avaliações e perspectivas**. Recife: Biblioteca ANPAE, 2018. p. 38-43.

GASPAR, Bárbara dos Santos; RICHTER, Ana Cristina; VAZ, Alexandre Fernandez. Das práticas pedagógicas para a educação física infantil de 0 a 3 anos no município de Florianópolis. **Currículo sem Fronteiras**, v. 15, n. 1, p. 231-251, jan./abr. 2015.

GONÇALVES, Rafael Marques; PEIXOTO, Leonardo Ferreira. Em defesa dos currículos praticados pensados nos cotidianos escolares. *In*: REUNIÃO CIENTÍFICA ANPED NORTE, 1., 2016, Belém. **Anais**. Belém: Anped, 2016, p. 2009-2021. Disponível em: http://ppgedufpa.com.br/anpednorte/ANAIS_ANPED_NORTE_compressed.pdf. Acesso em: 23 abr. 2019.

KISHIMOTO, Tizuko Morchida. **O jogo e a educação infantil**. São Paulo: Pioneira Thomson Learning, 2003.

KUHLMANN JÚNIOR, Moysés. História da Educação Brasileira. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 14, p. 5-18, maio/ago. 2000.

LEITE FILHO, Aristeo Gonçalves; NUNES, Maria Fernandes. Direitos da criança à Educação Infantil: reflexões sobre a história e a política. *In*: KRAMER, Sônia; NUNES, Maria Fernanda; CARVALHO, Maria Cristina (Org.). **Educação Infantil: formação e responsabilidade**. Campinas: Papirus, 2013. p. 67-88.

MALAGUZZI, Loris. Histórias ideias e filosofia básica. *In*: EDWARDS, Carolyn; GANDINI, Lella; FORMAN, George. (Org.). **As cem linguagens da criança**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médica, p. 06-21, 1999.

MARQUES, Circe Mara; PEGORARO, Ludimar; DA SILVA, Ezequiel Theodoro. Do assistencialismo à Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC): movimentos legais e políticos na Educação Infantil. **Revista Linhas**, Florianópolis, v. 20, n. 42, p. 255-280, jan./abr. 2019.

MELLO, André da Silva *et al.* Educação infantil e a base nacional comum curricular: interfaces com a educação física. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 28, n. 48, p. 130-149, set. 2016.

MOREIRA, Antonio Flávio Barbosa. A psicologia e o resto: o currículo segundo César Coll. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, n. 100, p. 93-107, mar. 1997.

OLIVEIRA, Cirlene Aparecida Hilário da Silva; ANDRADE, Lucimary Bernabé Pedroda de; ANDRADE, Maria Ângela Rodrigues Alves de. A política de atendimento à infância no Brasil e a atuação dos assistentes sociais nas creches. **Educação em Revista**, Marília, v. 9, n. 2, p. 1-20, jul./dez. 2008.

RIBEIRO, William de Goes; CRAVEIRO, Clarissa Bastos. Precisamos de uma Base Nacional Comum Curricular? **Linhas críticas**, Brasília, v. 23, n. 50, p. 51-69, fev./maio 2017.

ROCHA, Marlos Bessa Mendes da. O ensino elementar no decreto Leônicio de Carvalho: “visão de mundo” herdada pelo tempo republicano? **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 15, n. 43, p. 126-200, jan./abr. 2010.

SAYÃO, Deborah Thomé. Educação Física na Educação infantil: riscos, conflitos e controvérsias. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, n. 13, p. 221-238, nov. 1999.

SILVA, Adailton Soares da; SOUZA, Aneilton de Oliveira. Política educacional no Brasil: do império à República. **Rios Eletrônica: Revista Científica da FASETE**, n. 5, p. 68-78, dez. 2011.

SIROTA, Régine. Emergência de uma nova sociologia da infância: evolução do objeto e do olhar. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, n. 112, p. 7-31, mar. 2001.

TONUCCI, Francesco. **Quando as crianças dizem**: Agora chega! Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2005.

ZOTTI, Solange Aparecida. **Sociedade, educação e currículo no Brasil**: dos jesuítas aos anos de 1980. Campinas: Autores Associados; Brasília: Editora Plano, 2004.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

RAQUEL FIRMINO MAGALHÃES BARBOSA é doutora em Educação Física pela Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES). Professora de Ensino Básico, Técnico e Tecnológico do Colégio Pedro II.

E-mail: kekelfla@yahoo.com.br

RODRIGO LEMA DEL RIO MARTINS é doutor em Educação Física pela Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES)-2018). Professor do Curso de Licenciatura em Educação Física da Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

E-mail: rodrigoefrural@hotmail.com

ANDRÉ DA SILVA MELLO é doutorado em Educação Física pela Universidade Gama Filho (UGF). Professor do Centro de Educação Física e Desportos da Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES),

E-mail: andremellovix@gmail.com

Recebido em: 10.05.2019

Aceito em: 19.06.2019