



UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUPERVISED CURRICULAR INTERNSHIP: A STUDY ON WELCOME INDICATORS

LICENCIANDOS DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA NO CONTEXTO DO ESTÁGIO CURRICULAR SUPERVISIONADO: UM ESTUDO SOBRE INDICADORES DE ACOLHIMENTO

LICENCIADOS EN EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA EN EL CONTEXTO DE PRÁCTICAS CURRICULARES SUPERVISADAS: UN ESTUDIO SOBRE INDICADORES DE RECEPCIÓN

1

Diane Mota Lima¹
Miguel Ataíde Pinto da Costa²
José Henrique dos Santos³

Abstract: The objective of this research was to raise indicators of the model of receptivity to the intern of Physical Education carried out in schools, by the Supervisory Teachers (ST), during the Supervised Curricular Internship activity. The research used the qualitative method, through case studies, from the perspective of a descriptive analytical model. The participants were a Physical Education Supervisor Professor and his intern. The data collected by the instruments of Field Notes, Semi-Structured Interviews and Document of the Trainee's Final Report were submitted to the Content Analysis technique. The results of this investigation revealed that the model adopted by the ST was that of Reception. The ST authorized the beginning of the internship, but without the proper reception and guidance needed by the intern.

Keywords: Welcoming in the internship. Teacher formation. Supervised internship. Physical education.

Resumo: O objetivo desta pesquisa foi levantar indicadores do modelo de receptividade ao estagiário de Educação Física realizados nas escolas, pelos Professores Supervisores (PS), durante a atividade de Estágio Curricular Supervisionado. A pesquisa recorreu ao método qualitativo, por meio de estudo de casos, a partir de uma perspectiva de modelo analítico descritivo. Os participantes foram um Professor Supervisor de Educação Física e de seu estagiário. Os dados coletados pelos instrumentos de Notas de Campo, Entrevistas Semi-Estruturadas e Documento do Relatório Final do estagiário foram submetidos à técnica de Análise de Conteúdo. Os resultados dessa investigação revelaram que o modelo adotado pelo PS foi de Recepção. O PS autorizou o início do estágio, porém sem o devido acolhimento e orientação necessários a estagiária.

Palavras-chave: Acolhimento no estágio. Formação de professores. Estágio curricular supervisionado. Educação física.

¹ Master's in the Postgraduate Program in Physical Education. São Paulo State University (UNESP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7933-2777>. E-mail: dianemotalima@gmail.com.

² PhD in Epidemiology in Public Health. National School of Health (FIOCRUZ). Professor with exclusive dedication at Colégio Pedro II. Realengo Campus. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6498-3435>. E-mail: miguelcosta.ef@gmail.com.

³ PhD in Educational Sciences from the Technical University of Lisbon. Rural Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2159-6611>. E-mail: henriquejoe@hotmail.com



Resumen: El objetivo de esta investigación fue recopilar indicadores del modelo de receptividad al pasante de Educación Física realizados en las escuelas, por los Profesores Supervisores (PS), a lo largo de la actividad de Práctica Curricular Tutelada. La investigación sucedió por el método cualitativo, por medio de estudio de casos, desde una perspectiva de modelo analítico descriptivo. Los participantes fueron un Profesor Supervisor de Educación Física y de su pasante. Los datos recopilados por los instrumentos de Notas de Campo, Entrevistas Semi-Estructuradas y Documentos del Informe Final de la práctica fueron sometidos a la técnica de Análisis de Contenido. Los resultados de esa investigación revelaron que el modelo adoptado por el PS fue de Recepción. EL PS autorizó el inicio de la práctica, pero sin el debido acogimiento y orientación necesario a la pasante.

Palabras-clave: Acogimiento en la práctica. Formación del profesorado. Práctica curricular tutelada. Educación física.

Submetido 20/02/2021

Aceito 18/05/2020

Publicado 21/05/2021



Introduction

The supervised curricular internship is an important stage in the initial formation of teachers in order to anticipate school experiences and situations for trainees. “The internship as a curricular component and the central axis of teacher formation courses, presents aspects that are essential to the construction of the teaching professional regarding the construction of identity, knowledge and necessary practices” (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2019, p. 29, our translation).

The internship allows the future teacher to build skills and competencies inherent to the profession of teacher under the guidance of more experienced supervising teachers. Thus, there is a need to think of the supervised curricular internship that is beneficial and concerned with the formation of the intern, so that the intern has opportunities for diversified experiences that enable the construction of teaching experiential knowledge (SARTI, 2009).

All school actors must participate and feel responsible for the formation of the undergraduate teaching degree student in the school unit, but the role of accompanying the trainee is the responsibility of the supervising teacher (a teacher from the basic education network who guides the trainee in the school environment) (BENITES, 2012).

The authors Benites, Cyrino and Neto (2012, p. 567, our translation) have dedicated themselves to research on the role of the collaborating teacher (in this research, the term Supervisor Professor and its problems were adopted):

After all, who is this teacher-collaborator? First of all, he is a teacher. Someone who was forged by his constitution, who adds knowledge, competence and experiences related to a professional and personal universe. This teacher-collaborator is formed to teach basic education students and receives trainees in compulsory internship situations in schools but does not receive specific formation to become a teacher educator.

According to Opinion CNE / CP 28/2001, the school is considered a “receptive institution” and the university a “formative institution” (BRASIL, 2001). This function of welcoming the intern involves all school participants, in particular, the supervising teacher who must welcome the intern in his classes and in his school routine.



Receptivity Models

These are actions and attitudes adopted by the supervising professor with his intern throughout the period of the Supervised Curricular Internship. The Reception, the Formative Reception, and the Model Reception will be considered here (ARAUJO, 2014; BUENO; SOUZA, 2012; CARVALHO, 2000).

4

Reception

The concept of “reception” adopted by Araújo (2014), being the most initial and simple condition of the intern's arrival process in the school environment. It is the authorization to enter and remain in the school physical space for the purpose of observing classes or possible practical interventions in classes without the proper guidance of the supervising teacher.

Therefore, the intern resigns himself to comply with the workload required by law and places himself passively with the supervising teacher, who in turn, took a neutral position, without any relationship or showing any interest in the formation of the intern (ARAUJO, 2014).

Model Reception and the “Mastering” Relationship

In the model reception, the supervising teacher uses dialogue with the intern as a means of interaction, but its objective is to “transmit a teaching performance model, which he himself is assumed as a representative” (ARAUJO, 2014, p. 153, our translation). This relationship established between the supervising professor and the intern is called “mastering” (ARAUJO, 2014).

The supervising teacher assumes the role of “master of craft”, with actions of transmitting the art of being a teacher to the intern and expects imitation of him to be developed as an “apprentice of craft” (ARAUJO, 2014, p. 153, our translation). The highlighted point to be evaluated by the supervising teacher is the result of the practice in class, that is, if the intern learned and performed the techniques well taught.

The teaching-learning process of the intern is based on the execution of tasks previously observed in the classes of the supervising teacher and, repeatedly, imitated as a form of models (CARVALHO, 2000).

Formative Reception

The involved and participative profile of the supervising teacher in the trainee's professional formation is related to the contemporary pedagogical model, which highlights invisibility as an important point in the reception (BUENO; SOUZA, 2012), as it stimulates reflection on their own practices as sources of references and not in other people as a model.

It is hoped that “in the context of this formative work articulated with the university, teachers will share impressions, thoughts, knowledge, doubts and practices related to everyday teaching with students and receive them as professional colleagues” (SARTI, 2009, p. 136, our translation).

Thus, according to Araújo (2014), the availability of the supervising teacher to welcome the intern with his questions and natural anxieties from the initial period of contact with the teaching culture is related to the concept of professional socialization, as he understands the idea of welcoming in the act of inserting the intern in the culture of being a teacher.

Research context

Among some problematic situations that have been punctuated in the research on Supervised Internship, the conduct of reception and orientation of the intern by the supervising teacher in schools has gained prominence. The functions exercised by the interns, the moments destined to guidance and feedbacks, possibilities of assisted pedagogical intervention and reflection on the teaching practice gained prominence in this study as they are important for the full development of this student's curricular activity.

These situations influence the process of welcoming and accompanying the intern by his supervising teacher, as well as the little formation of the supervising teacher to exercise this function of guiding the intern (BENITES, 2012). Thus, this research sought to understand how the Physical Education trainee from a Federal Higher Education Institution (IFES) is welcomed into the school environment by the Supervisor Professor, in a perspective closer to the reality of these participants.

The welcome received by the intern and all the factors involved in the intern's orientation process at school are related to the successful Supervised Curricular Internship (ARAÚJO, 2014).



Given these facts, the central question of this study was: what are the indicators of receptivity models offered by the supervising professor to his trainee in the Physical Education degree course in the school environment?

Methodological Paths

This study adopted the qualitative, documentary method, of the case study type, using the procedures of the descriptive analytical model. The instruments used were semi-structured interviews (initial and final), on-site observations with field notes and the institutional document Final Internship Report.

Participated in this research a Supervisor Professor of the basic education network and his Intern, student of the Physical Education Teaching Degree course of the Higher Education Institution (HEI) researched, located in the lowlands of Rio de Janeiro, duly enrolled in the internship activity, being ST Alan and his trainee Alice (fictitious names). The selection was made because it is a model school in the city and has an administrative link with the researched IFES.

Data collection took place over a period of two months and each school unit was held on different days. At the school, eight days of visits took place, from 1 pm to 3:30 pm (Tuesdays), totaling 20 hours of observation.

The semi-structured interviews were carried out individually, one at the beginning and the other at the end of the two-month internship period, with the supervising professor and the intern, in order to better understand the demands of the internship in times of absence of the researcher. The on-site observations were carried out with the objective of witnessing the moments of relationship between the supervising teacher and his intern and experiencing the daily demands of the school. For purposes of greater accuracy in data analysis, Alice's Final Internship Reports were also used as instruments, in printed format and oral presentation, where the conformation of the internship carried out was analyzed.

Content Analysis was used to treat the collected data (BARDIN, 1977). This analysis technique aims to analyze the manifest content and the latent content of the participants, without interference from the researcher, that is, everything that has been said and/or that has been implied in a symbolic way.



Results and Discussion

The Indicator Categories are the actions and behaviors present in the Receptivity Models of the trainee at school that emerged during data analysis to facilitate and guide. They are: Arrival, Presentation of Pedagogical Instruments (school/teacher), Availability of Communication and Demonstration of Interest in the Formation of the Intern, Expectations with the Intern, Participation of the Intern, Professional Socialization of the Intern, Orientation and Feedback, Relationship between ST and Intern and Reflection on Teaching Practice and Career.

According to the data collected and the observed relationships of the supervising professor Alan and the intern Alice, it was possible to observe a welcoming with more indicators of the Reception model.

Data Discussion

Trainee arrival

Trainee Alice had the management team's attention to sign the internship documents and some important information about the school. The schedules of the supervising professors were presented, and the intern was able to choose the timetable that suited her academic disciplines.

The presentation of the physical space of the school was carried out by the supervising professor Alan, but the areas that the intern would attend most were limited, such as: the covered court, outside area (patio) and some classrooms. The teachers' room and other teachers' socializing environments were not introduced to the intern, which contributed to make the intern feel less belonging and welcomed into the school environment by the supervising professor and other teachers/school staff.

According to Araújo (2014), Reception is when the intern has only the authorization to enter the school to fulfill her internship, but does not evolve to a internship of greater acceptance and monitoring of the student with her supervising teacher.

The internship schedule must be agreed between the intern and the school management, so that the class schedule at the university is properly preserved.

The role that the intern is destined to fulfill during her workload at school deserves to be highlighted, since the future Physical Education teacher must develop activities related to

her teaching degree course and under the supervision of a duly qualified professional. In other words, the intern should not be placed to take classes without supervision and/or perform activities that are consistent with other functions within the school (SARTI, 2009).

Presentation of Pedagogical Instruments (school/teacher)

Upon receiving the intern, the supervising professor Alan was concerned with her interest and willingness to carry out that internship and also made it clear that he would not require planning of the classes that the intern would teach. The intern showed interest in sharing the lesson plans made by her, but Professor Alan repeatedly insisted that it was not necessary, by insisting only on a conversation about what would be given.

Professor Alan did not present any planning or bimonthly organization of the school to the intern, so that she had more information about that school environment, where she fulfilled her supervised curricular internship. The ST also did not present an annual or bimonthly plan about his classes to the intern, always claiming that he pointed out the theme and the intern was completely free to research.

In day-to-day practice, the supervising teacher did not seem to follow a plan, he let the children play freely in an open space, always claiming that elementary school children I would not need to use the school's official court and should play while exploring the spaces.

According to Araújo (2014), it is part of a reception interested in the formation of the trainee that the school and/or supervising teacher present the planning documents to the trainee, as these professors will be the ones that will provide the basis for the trainee to understand the reality of the school and propose activities that address the specific demands of those students.

One of the elements of receptivity that denote that the supervised curricular internship did not develop beyond the Reception, is that the supervising professor does not show interest in sharing his organizational plans with his intern and/or participate in the preparation of the intern's lesson plans (ARAÚJO, 2014).



Availability of Communication and Expression of Interest of the ST in the Formation of the Intern

The supervising professor Alan made his personal cell phone number (WhatsApp) available to Alice from the beginning of the internship, so that both could communicate when necessary.

However, this communication tool was not used effectively and productively, since twice (which were accompanied during the research visits) the intern went to school and was surprised by the suspension of classes in those days, without prior notice. These situations were due to the lack of water supply to the school, which caused the suspension of the afternoon classes, and the absence of the ST of the school unit due to personal problems that demanded his attention.

In a report on these situations, the ST said that he forgot to notify the intern that the classes were suspended and justified that, when he is alone, he does not need to remember to notify anything to anyone, but that in classes with the presence of interns, he needs to dedicate a little bit more to remember to give feedback.

About participating in the formation of the intern, the teacher did not seem to know exactly what to develop in the orientation of a trainee and did not show much interest in the activities or demands of the trainee in class.

According to Araújo (2014), the supervising teacher who shows interest in the formation of the trainee is available and accessible for a partnership relationship inside and outside the school walls. These means of communication strengthen ties and bring the ST closer to his intern, facilitating the removal of doubts, orientations and conversations about the teaching environment.

At the Reception, the intern has little or no opportunity to access the supervising teacher, motivated by the ST's lack of interest or ignorance, about the act of welcoming and guiding an intern. In such cases, the trainee tends to have a distant and impersonal relationship with her supervising teacher, not having much space for further guidance and discussions. Under these motivations too, at the Reception, the ST does not show much interest in participating in the formation process of the internship, many times, considering that authorizing the intern's stay



in his classes and signing the internship documents would be an effective participation (ARAÚJO, 2014).

Expectations of the Supervising Teacher with the Intern

The supervising professor Alan reported that the first thing he does when an intern arrives at his class is to ask the real intentions with that internship and with the career as a Physical Education teacher. He also added that he explains all the difficulties of the teaching career and the day-to-day problems of a school.

The expectation of the supervising professor Alan with his intern is that he will be involved with his internship and that he will have a respectable professional attitude during this time that he will be in school. The ST believes that the intern must show interest and commitment to his own professional formation and that he seeks to evaluate this dedication when welcoming the trainees.

The supervising professor Alan believes that his performance and dedication to the internship depends on the interest showed by the intern in the internship and the profession, as he believes that the more dedication the intern has, the more involvement he will have with the internship.

According to Araújo (2014), at the Reception, the supervising teacher does not have any expectations with his intern, as he has no interest in participating and assisting in the formation of the trainee. In these cases, the ST is not dedicated to motivating and encouraging the trainee, who can often ignore the teaching routine and feel insecure (BUENO; SOUZA, 2012).

The supervising professor Alan, in relation to the expectations of his trainee Alice, presented elements of a Model Reception, that is, the ST expressed the expectation that the trainee would be interested and look for him in order to learn what he has to teach (CARVALHO, 2000).

Participation of the intern in the school routine

The intern's intervention plans were not discussed with the ST, as he deemed this type of demand not necessary during the internship and her interventions were carried out without any supervision from the supervising professor Alan. The ST defended the opinion that the intern needed space and autonomy and that she would only intervene in class if something went



wrong. Alan added that he did not inform the students of anything and let them be natural, so that the intern could experience the school reality.

The intern developed her participation in the classes autonomously, based on her interest in experiencing that new teaching experience. The intern's performance was limited to classes taught in the court/courtyard environment and she did not have the opportunity to experience other school environments and/or pedagogical events.

According to Araujo (2014), one of the elements that converge with the Reception ideals is the non-integration of the intern by the ST into the school day-to-day, such as participation in classes under his supervision, planning and culmination of school events.

To the intern, the ST must grant the opportunity to carry out interventions in the classes and assume the role of the activities, however always duly supervised by a formed professional. Thus, the intern should not assume the position of effective teacher of classes with the objective of replacing a shortage of teachers in the school and/or being used to “rest” the supervising teacher, these positions are against the law that regulates the supervised internship in undergraduate teaching degree courses. In addition, with these actions, the school and/or supervising teacher demonstrate a disinterest in the trainee's quality professional formation (ARAÚJO, 2014).

Professional Socialization of the Intern

The professional socialization of intern Alice took place in a very limited way, which caused some moments of frustration and discouragement to the intern. The supervising professor Alan presented only a few spaces at the school, in particular the court, the open space (courtyard) that held most of his classes and materials room. However, other important spaces, such as the teachers' rooms, the direction and coordination of the school unit were not presented by him. Trainee Alice did not experience informal conversations or important debates that routinely take place in a teachers' room, due to the lack of an invitation from the ST to socialize in these spaces.

There were no invitations by the ST to participate in planning and/or executing events at the school, as well as participating in educational meetings (parents' meeting, class council and others). Trainee Alice, too, did not have the opportunity to live with other teachers and



school staff, having only socialized with the professionals who signed her internship documents and/or at the request of the ST to resolve something (the request for sports equipment or the communication of a message).

When the intern has the opportunity to socialize professionally, she accesses the symbols and habits inherent in daily school life and this allows her to reflect on the knowledge inherent in her anticipatory socialization (family, friends and his own school life). When returning to school as a future teacher, the intern needs to re-frame her school socialization and, therefore, face a new challenge of “paying attention to the phenomena of the classroom about which he has strong expectations or representations” (TARDIF, 2012, p. 70, our translation).

For Araújo (2014), the professional socialization useful to the intern allows the experience of moments of professional construction and the understanding, in advance, of their future workplace. Therefore, when this professional socialization is not prioritized in the internship, the intern needs important moments of interaction with other agents and school events.

Guidance and *Feedbacks*

The moments destined for guidance and feedback from the supervising professor Alan to intern Alice, about her interventions, were very limited, which caused dissatisfaction to the intern. The ST did not show interest in building and analyzing the planning of the intervention classes with the intern, not even in view of the lesson plans presented by Alice. In addition, he participated very few times in the classes taught by the intern, staying away from the classroom frequently.

The ST guidelines were limited to small considerations about the adequacy of the students' age group to the activity proposed by the intern or some information about the dynamics of the class, causing a problem to the school. The ST guidelines on issues inherent to the school world were brief and, sometimes, with discouraging phrases to the intern. In the interviews, the intern recalled that Alan asked her, at the beginning of the internship, if she had not yet given up the profession of Physical Education teacher. The intern commented that she was very uncomfortable with the comment, mainly because it was from her supervising professor.



The feedbacks are evaluations that the ST provides to his intern, in order to analyze and contribute to a reflective teaching practice (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2019). On this idea, the supervising professor Alan was not in the habit of evaluating and discussing the actions taken by the intern and made comments only in the mandatory completion of the internship document.

In the Reception indicators (ARAÚJO, 2014), regarding guidance and feedbacks to the intern, the supervising professor does not show the concern to integrate moments intended for reflective conversations with the intern about the teaching practice and dynamics. In other words, the intern fulfills her workload of internship at school, but she is not provided with moments of discussion and learning about the experiences experienced in the internship.

According to Araújo (2014), the supervising professor must always be attentive and participative in the monitoring of his intern, observing her questions and actions in class, so that he can provide guidance and feedback relevant to the intern's future professional life.

Relationship between Supervising Teacher and Intern

The relationship between the ST and the intern Alice developed in a distant and not very attentive way on the part of Alan. The supervising professor did not show much interest and/or knowledge in guiding and accompanying the intern in her internship process, not providing guidance and reflections on the practices that were being experienced. When he was absent from the intervention moments of the intern Alice, the ST made her more insecure about the class and did not witness important situations in the classes to discuss and dialogue with the intern later.

The supervising professor Alan did not offer moments of experience in other school spaces to the intern, who waited for the ST on the court between classes. Even though Alice made her contact available via WhatsApp, the ST did not use the tool for guidance and information, sometimes forgetting to notify the trainee of the days that classes had been suspended.

According to Araújo (2014), in Reception, the supervising professor remains distant from his intern, showing no interest in participating in the intern's professional formation process, in a relationship of little partnership and companionship. When the internship does not evolve beyond the Reception, the ST does not offer supervision of the intern's intervention



moments, leaving the space to resolve other professional and/or personal issues. As a result, he does not build enough elements for a critical analysis for feedbacks with his intern.

For Araújo (2014), the intern should not carry out her period of curricular internship at a school that does not have supervision from a professional qualified for this and, under no circumstances, should assume the classes alone for any reason or necessity of the school.

Reflection on teaching practice in school daily life

During Alice's curricular internship period under the supervision of Professor Alan, there were not many moments for reflection on teaching practice.

Professor Alan did not provide moments with his intern to reflect on the pedagogical experiences in the internship or important situations that were witnessed during classes.

Discussions about everyday life and problematic teaching issues, also, were not widely discussed between ST Alan and his intern. The ST even commented on some difficulties in the life of a teacher but did not address this subject from the perspective of reflecting and/or encouraging the intern, but rather presenting the difficulties of the teaching routine.

The intern reports in her final interview that ST Alan received her asking if she had not yet given up the profession. This attitude made her very upset and unhappy with the posture of the supervising professor of internship.

According to Araújo (2014), in the Formative reception (BUENO; SOUZA, 2012), the supervising teacher must provide moments of reflection under the concept of invisibility. In other words, the trainee does not imitate his ST, he experiences and reflects with his ST on the teaching dynamics and builds his teaching identity from reflections and experienced discussions.

In Reception (ARAÚJO, 2014) the intern is limited to the authorization to remain for the hours of the internship, but there is no integration with the school environment and greater attention to the professional formation of this future teacher, with no time for guidance and reflection about teaching practice.



Final considerations

From the developed research, it was observed that in the case study, the supervising professor Alan did not show interest in the internship and did not provide the intern Alice with moments of guidance and important professional experiences for her formation.

However, this research showed that the researched professor did not have any academic formation or instruction from the participating university to guide the interns, and also did not present a systematic organization and/or actions to carry out supervision of an intern, acting freely, based on in the common sense of what they consider right or wrong for an adequate orientation to the trainee.

When welcoming the intern without the necessary formation, the supervising teacher adopts strategies that he considers to be the most correct, using learning by mistakes and successes, which the master transmits the practice of the craft to his disciples. The supervising teacher often perceives the reception of an intern in his classes as a favor and, without proper instruction, exercises his guidance based on common sense (BENITES, 2012).

This research does not consider it prudent to judge the conduct of supervising teachers, as there are several factors that influence their teaching practices. Therefore, it is important to deepen the discussion about the supervised internship and the supervising teacher so that there is greater reflection on the true needs of the teacher when receiving an intern in their classes, as well as their postures and behaviors.

For Benites (2012), the supervised curricular internship has legislation that governs its entire workload, insurance and documentation, as well as the role of the school (grantor) in receiving and welcoming the intern in its educational space, but not regulates and/or clarifies the functions that the supervising professor must perform when receiving an intern in his classes. The author adds that the supervising professor, in his formation in undergraduate courses, does not develop knowledge about “how to form another professional”, that is, he learns to teach to students, but not to guide an intern.

Thus, it is necessary to reflect on the fruitful formation of these supervising teachers, so that there is greater awareness and intention in the choices and attitudes adopted when receiving an intern, providing opportunities for welcoming and reflecting on the future teaching life.



References

- ARAÚJO, S. **Acolhimento no estágio: entre modelos e possibilidades de formação docente.** 2014. 202 f. Dissertação (Mestre em Educação) – Instituto de Biociências, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Rio Claro, 2014.
- BARDIN, L. **Análise de conteúdo.** Lisboa: Edições 70, 1977.
- BENITES, L. C.; CYRINO, M.; SOUZA NETO, S. A prática de ensino como possibilidade de reflexão: concepções dos professores-colaboradores. *In: LEITE, Y. U. F. et al. (Org.). Políticas de formação inicial e continuada de professores.* Araraquara: Junqueira & Marin Editores, 2012. v. 2, p. 563-574.
- BENITES, L. **O professor-colaborador no estágio curricular supervisionado em Educação Física: perfil, papel e potencialidades.** 2012. 180 f. Tese (Doutorado) – Instituto de Biociências, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Rio Claro, 2012.
- BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Parecer CNE/CP 28/2001, de 2 de outubro de 2001. Dá nova redação ao Parecer CNE/CP 21/2001, que estabelece a duração e a carga horária dos cursos de Formação de Professores da Educação Básica, em nível superior, curso de licenciatura, de graduação plena. **Diário Oficial da União:** Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 31, 18 jan. 2002. Available: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/028.pdf>. Access: 10 Jan. 2021.
- BUENO, B.; SOUZA, D. Pedagogia contemporânea e formação de professores em serviço: lógicas e dispositivos de um modelo em expansão. *In: BITTAR, M. Formação de professores.* São Paulo: Edufscar, 2012.
- CARVALHO, M. M. C. Modernidade pedagógica e modelos de formação docente. **São Paulo em Perspectiva**, São Paulo, v. 14, n. 1, p. 111-120, jan./mar. 2000. ISSN: 1806-9452. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-88392000000100013>
- MOTA, D. **Licenciandos de Educação Física no contexto do Estágio Curricular Supervisionado: um estudo sobre indicadores de acolhimento.** 2020. 176 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Física) – Universidade Estadual Paulista, Presidente Prudente, 2020.
- PIMENTA, S.; LIMA, M. **Estágio e docência.** Ed. São Paulo: Cortez: São Paulo, 2019.
- SARTI, F. M. Parceria intergeracional e formação docente. **Educação em Revista**, Belo Horizonte, v. 25, n. 2, p. 133-152, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-46982009000200006>
- TARDIF, M. **Saberes docentes e formação profissional.** Trad. Francisco Pereira. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: To CAPES, as this work was carried out with the support of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel - Brazil (CAPES) - Financing Code 001.



Research that resulted in a dissertation presented to the Professional Master's Program in Physical Education in the National Network - ProEFdo Institute of Biosciences at São Paulo State University - UNESP, Physical education undergraduates in the context of supervised curricular internship: a study on reception indicators (MOTA, 2020).

Diane Mota Lima¹

Master's in Physical Education from São Paulo State University (UNESP), campus Presidente Prudente. Physical Education teacher of the basic education network of the city hall (SME) and state (SEEDUC) of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Participant in the Research Group "Pedagogy in Physical Education and Sport" (GPPEFE/ UFRRJ) ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7933-2777>.

E-mail: dianemotalima@gmail.com

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/7703034874993693>

17

Miguel Ataíde Pinto da Costa²

PhD in Epidemiology in Public Health by the National School of Public Health Sérgio Arouca (FIOCRUZ). Professor in a regime of exclusive dedication at Pedro II High School. Realengo Campus, Brazil. Participant in the Research Group Research and Extension Laboratory in Physical Education and Society (LAPEEFS).

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6106-9229>.

E-mail: miguelcosta.ef@gmail.com

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/0888841150856549>

José Henrique dos Santos³

PhD in Educational Sciences from the Technical University of Lisbon. Professor in a regime of exclusive dedication in the Postgraduate Program in Education and in the Undergraduate Physical Education course at the Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ), Brazil. Leader of the Research Group "Pedagogy in Physical Education and Sport" (GPPEFE/ UFRRJ).

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2159-6611>.

E-mail: henriquejoe@hotmail.com

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3330684865751520>