

Field, *habitus* and *illusio* – Pierre Bourdieu’s conceptual triad in the exercise of investigating the constitution of an academic subfield (media and technologies) in Brazilian Physical Education¹

Campo, habitus e illusio – a tríade conceitual de Pierre Bourdieu no exercício de investigar a constituição de um subcampo acadêmico (das mídias e tecnologias) na Educação Física brasileira

Cristiano Mezzaroba*
Jaison José Bassani**

ABSTRACT

This article presents a research characterized as a historical sociology of the subfield of media and technologies (M&T) within the field of Brazilian Physical Education (PE), with the Bourdieusian concepts of field, *habitus* and *illusio*, seeking to inventory and analyze the constitution and consolidation of this movement in PE. Methodologically, it was configured as a qualitative research, of the case study type, seeking to understand this field and its conditions of possibilities. We presented and analyzed the interviews with nine agents of the aforementioned social space, who occupied/occupy structures of power within the subfield, coordinating the Communication and Media Thematic Working Group of the Brazilian School of Sport Sciences. It was possible to organize five interpretative axes, strongly related to the three concepts that epistemologically supported the research: (1) The subfield of M&T in the field of Brazilian PE: origin, conflicts, contemporaneity; (2) The social and academic legitimacy of PE; (3) Cultural formation and interdisciplinary aspects: the *habitus* and the implications in the university and in school; (4)

Translated by: Marina Gabriela Fachini Cavilha Senem. E-mail: cavilha.marina@gmail.com

* Federal University of Sergipe (UFS). São Cristóvão, Sergipe, Brazil. E-mail: cristiano_mezzaroba@yahoo.com.br - <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4214-0629>

** Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil. E-mail: jaisonbassani@uol.com.br - <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2769-8747>

¹The text was supported by Public Notice no. 06/2022/PPGED/PROAP/UFS - Support Program for Researcher at the Graduate Program in Education at the University Federal of Sergipe.

Cultural sociodynamics and implications in the university and school; (5) Affect as a disinterested interest: decoding *illusio*'s mechanisms. We conclude that every effort to capitalize on this “scientific game” carried out by the agents (as a network of sociability) is giving prominence to the subfield, as a strategy and collective effort to intensely pursue the objective of increasing the academic, scientific and social legitimacy of Brazilian PE, now with contributions from the social sciences and humanities.

Keywords: Historical sociology. Physical Education Field. Media and technologies. Legitimation. *Habitus. Illusio.*

RESUMO

O artigo apresenta uma pesquisa caracterizada como uma sociologia histórica do subcampo das mídias e tecnologias (M&T) no interior do campo da Educação Física (EF) brasileira, com os conceitos bourdieusianos de campo, *habitus* e *illusio*, procurando inventariar e analisar a constituição e consolidação desse movimento na EF. Metodologicamente, configurou-se como uma pesquisa qualitativa, do tipo estudo de caso, procurando compreender esse campo e suas condições de possibilidades. Apresentamos e analisamos as entrevistas com nove agentes do referido espaço social, que ocuparam/ocupam estruturas de poder no interior do subcampo, coordenando o Grupo de Trabalho Temático Comunicação e Mídia do Colégio Brasileiro de Ciências do Esporte. Foi possível organizar cinco eixos interpretativos, fortemente relacionados aos três conceitos que sustentaram epistemologicamente a pesquisa: (1) O subcampo das M&T no campo da EF brasileira: origem, conflitos, contemporaneidade; (2) A legitimidade social e acadêmica da EF; (3) Formação cultural e aspectos interdisciplinares: o *habitus* e as implicações na universidade e na escola; (4) Sociodinâmica cultural e implicações na universidade e na escola; (5) Afeto como interesse desinteressado: decodificação de mecanismos da *illusio*. Concluímos que todo esforço de capitalização desse “jogo científico” realizado pelos agentes (enquanto rede de sociabilidades) vai dando destaque ao subcampo, como estratégia e esforço coletivo de seguir de maneira intensa o objetivo de aumentar a legitimidade acadêmica, científica e social da EF brasileira, agora com as contribuições das ciências sociais e humanas.

Palavras-chaves: Sociologia histórica. Campo da Educação Física. Mídias e tecnologias. Legitimação. *Habitus. Illusio.*

Initial considerations: research contextualization

As we learned from Bourdieu (2005, p.15), “Understanding is, first of all, understanding the field in which we made ourselves and against which we made ourselves”. In this sense, this text is the synthesis of a doctoral research in Education (MEZZAROBA, 2018), which sought to investigate and understand, from a perspective of the sociology of knowledge, the interior of an academic subfield (of media and technologies – M&T) in Brazilian Physical Education (PE), understanding it as a microcosm of a scientific field.

For this purpose, the theoretical construct of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu was activated, with the concepts of field, *habitus* and *illusio*, which allowed verifying new knowledge that spread through the PE field, that is, which go beyond the historical influence of the biological sciences. In that sense, the participation of the social and human sciences (HMSA – Humanities and Social Sciences) in this field was evident. As a result, specific themes have gained visibility in recent decades, boosting the production and dissemination of knowledge that seems to indicate, by the quantitative leap identified, a certain specific autonomy of each of these themes within PE, although this has not yet been converted due to the academic, scholastic and social legitimacy of PE.

Thus, in this specific case investigated, we consider a determinate microcosm as a subfield, that is, of the agents who have been addressing M&T issues in the PE field. For this, we seek to understand the contours of this subfield, the practices of its agents, the configurations and movements that occur in this interior as a dialectical relationship between subfield-field, as well as, to better understand the purposes of these practices (in the scientific field, in the training of teachers, in school contexts), in which our hypothesis launched, as a possible answer, the incessant search for PE's scientific legitimacy.

The general goal of the research was to inventory and analyze the constitution and consolidation of this movement in Brazilian PE, which has been approaching and relating to a set of knowledge, practices and investigations that have the media and technologies as their focus of interest and intervention (generating what has been called '*media-education in PE*'), as well as to analyze the role of agents (and the *habitus* that is being produced and incorporated) that are considered precursors and maintainers of this specific knowledge production, identifying and understanding mechanisms of how they go on "playing the game" (the *illusio*).

With Bourdieu's concept of *field* (2004a), we learn that we are facing an objective and social structuring, defined as a space of relational struggles between agents who share the same practices, knowledge and discourses, having as an element of dispute the symbolic power that such agents produce and attribute their value/recognition. This symbolic power can be converted into economic capital, or cultural capital, or even scientific capital, in the case of the scientific field. Bourdieu (2004b, p.20) defines "field" as follows: "[...] the universe in which the agents and institutions that produce, reproduce or disseminate art, literature or science are inserted. [...] The notion of field is there to designate this relatively autonomous space, this microcosm endowed with its own laws."

To access, act and participate in a *field*, it is necessary to be introduced to its codes, internal dynamics and practices. All these elements can be considered forms of incorporation of structures of perception arising from social spaces, that is, we have in these examples the *notion of habitus*, which, according to Bourdieu (2001a, p.61), is a

hexis and “[...] indicates the incorporated disposition, almost postural [...] of an agent in action”, something that is being internalized by the subjects, by the incorporation of schemas: “[...] the mental structures through which they [the agents] apprehend the social world” (BOURDIEU, 2004a, p.158).

In this relationship between field and *habitus*, between social space and agent, one must consider the concept of *illusio*, which is the notion of being and constituting oneself in the game, “playing the game”, in order to legitimize these practices and interests, at the same time that it capitalizes on this field in the exchanges it makes happen. According to Bourdieu (1996b), *illusio* is a *libido*, an interest that provides an enormous “pleasure of playing” within the context of a field according to the *habitus* already incorporated. It is the *illusio* itself that allows the maintenance of the field to strengthen and gain autonomy, aiming at its consolidation and legitimacy, because when the symbolic power of a certain group is expanded, that of the field is expanded as well.

Thus, our interest was to articulate how the social construction of this subfield of M&T occurs within the field of PE, because, with this social space, there is the possibility of social trajectories being materialized from other forms of knowledge, no longer through the matrix of biological sciences, but by the ‘contamination’ of the HMSA.

If the knowledge around what was initially called “media education” (BELLONI, 2001) and which we are now calling “media-education” (FANTIN, 2006) has its origins in the 1960s in Europe, and in Brazil around the 1980s, it is important to consider that this movement of approximation and thematization of M&T, when thought of by PE, began in the mid-1990s of the 20th century (CARVALHO; HATJE, 1996; BETTI, 1998; PIRES, 2002), therefore, it is something quite recent.

After these years, around two decades, we see a group of agents investigating possibilities regarding M&T in relation to PE content, such as the “Thematic Working Group (TWG) on Communication and Media of the Brazilian College of Sports Sciences (BCSS)²”. It was from the 9 (nine) coordinators of this scientific space, between 1997 and 2017, that we selected the research subjects and conducted, with them, semi-structured interviews to analyze this scientific microcosm of PE.

Due to the spatial limitation for the accomplishment of this article, the text was organized in order to present a panoramic and comprehensive view of the research as a whole, trying to expose the results obtained in the 5 (five) analytical axes constituted by crossing the research objectives, the theoretical questions and part of the empirical

² The BCSS, created in 1978, is one of the main scientific entities of Brazilian PE with a focus on PE/Sport Sciences, and brings together professors and researchers from State Departments and 13 Thematic Working Groups (TWG): Physical Activity and Health; Communication and Media; Body and Culture; Epistemology; School; Professional training and work; Genre; Inclusion and Difference; Leisure and Society; Memories of PE and Sport; Social movements; Public policies; Sports Training.

material produced through the interviews. Therefore, after describing the methodological procedures applied, we present and analyze these interpretative axes, and then return to central aspects of the analysis in the final considerations.

Methodological procedures

Within a perspective of the sociology of knowledge (BERGER; LUCKMANN, 2014), the study undertook a historical sociology (VALLE, 2018; BOURDIEU, 1996a) of the field of Brazilian PE, more specifically of agents who have been dedicated to researching it to from the sociocultural and pedagogical aspects, thinking about academic and school implications in relation to M&T in PE. Thus, there was an “inside perspective” (VELHO, 2003), in which the authors proposed a “conversion of the gaze”, questioning and denaturalizing the field of which they belong, in the dialectic between familiarity and strangeness.

The microcosm in this case study were professors/researchers who exercised a coordinating mandate at the TWG on Communication and Media³ within the BCSS, from its inception, in 1997, until the time we carried out the investigation (end of 2017).

From the election of the agents who would be the subjects of the research (9 former coordinators of the TWG, prominent position in this social space), a mapping of their scientific production was made, which, as a whole, allowed a document analysis, inserted in this paper as a “subfield genealogy”⁴. Based on the analysis of this set of documentary sources, an interview script was systematized, consisting of two blocks of questions, the first one was to identify and characterize the research subjects and their relationships with PE, M&T and sport (with 7 questions), and the second block focused on specific issues regarding media-education and PE, possibilities, perspectives and inflections (with 11 questions).

The interviews took place individually, having their audios recorded. Then, they were transcribed and returned to the subjects for adjustments and corrections. They resulted in about 20 hours of recordings, generating 350 pages of transcribed material,

³ The referred group works in relation to studies which deal with communication, media and documentation, notably the media (newspaper, magazine, TV, radio, internet and cinema) in the scope of Sport Sciences/PE. Furthermore, as stated in its program, it seeks to carry out a critical analysis and interpretation of the processes of production, dissemination and reception of information, of media and of communication technologies and their political, economic, cultural and pedagogical implications.

⁴ Publications by agents of this scientific field were analyzed over 20 years (1996-2016), totaling 13 texts. Due to prioritizing the data related to the interviews, we will not bring this discussion in this text. We suggest seeing MEZZAROBA (2020) to understand the genealogical analysis of the academic production of these subjects.

in addition to the sources that made up the document analysis stage (but which, as said, will not be the detailed object of this article).

Data presentation and analysis: the five interpretative axes

Bourdieu (1996a, p.292) considers that “Every social trajectory must be understood as a unique way of traveling through the social space, where the dispositions of the *habitus* are expressed”. Thus, the 9 (nine) research subjects⁵ were selected because they were researchers who, in their trajectories, fed this subfield of M&T, at the same time as they were products of this social structure in Brazilian PE. Next, we present the empirical material, organized into 5 (five) interpretative axes, an operation carried out from the interpretations arising from agglutination, recurrence and regularity of the testimonies of the research subjects.

The subfield of M&T in the field of Brazilian PE: origin, conflicts, contemporaneity

We bring here a relationship between the context of the historical emergence of what we have called the subfield of M&T in PE, the **internal dynamics of the field/subfield itself** – and then its splits and conflicts, one of the main premises of the Bourdieusian field concept –, and two other important questions that emerge in this historical course and that were pointed out and explained by the research subjects, that is, the concern with the **endogeny and inflections** that take place in the subfield itself, and the emergence of what we call “generations” or “lineages” in the development of the subfield.

We observed in the speeches of the research subjects the identification of a locus of origin⁶ of this movement within the Brazilian PE regarding the M&T theme, that is, mentioned researchers – such as Sérgio Carvalho, Mauro Betti, Giovani Pires and Alfredo Feres Neto – transited through the state from São Paulo, carrying out their postgraduate studies at institutions such as USP and UNICAMP, in the early 1990s.

⁵ To ensure anonymity, we will use the abbreviation of their names. We thus have the following subjects: GI, AL, MA, CE, TA, GU, FE, ON, DO. By observing and analyzing their trajectories and scientific capital, we noticed that there is a diversity in their trajectories, as well as in the way they deal with academic practices and their interests. All of them demonstrate their **involvement with the academic-scientific game**, exposing *habitus* and implications in universities and schools.

⁶ The PE field is in continuous transformation: initially supported by medical/biological models and under various influences (military, sports, pedagogical), today it is also influenced by the HMSA. Two moments are usually recognized as historical markers of PE: the 1930s (engineering of the field) and the 1980s (with the ‘contamination’ of social elements and the humanities). (PAIVA, 2004)

After such a historic moment, these researchers returned to their institutions of origin (such as UFSM and UFSC), and began their academic work by articulating media, communication and technologies with PE.

It was observed, in the speeches, that there is a self-referential discourse, a self-image that the (sub)field makes of itself, that is, the agents report, contextualize, justify their actions always from certain social/historical structures of the field itself, in which they moved or move, being determined by and determining formative possibilities of M&T issues with PE, evidencing the dialectic field/*habitus* that Bourdieu (2001a, p.62) expressed regarding the cognitive structures being homologous to the field structure itself.

It is possible to verify in the interviews that these first initiatives took place during the 1990s⁷, with the Santa Maria/RS Group⁸, followed by the creation of the TWG on Communication and Media at BCSS⁹, in parallel with the creation of the TWG on Communication and Sport by the Brazilian Society for Interdisciplinary Communication Studies.

From the Bourdieusian theory about the field and the work of its agents, we can infer that these professors, throughout their trajectories, raised a type of *scientific capital* that in the field of PE allowed a type of *recognition* of the other agents that followed this (sub)field, based on what Bourdieu (2001a, p.53) considered in terms of scientific capital as being a “[...] particular kind of symbolic capital”.

At the same time, this subfield of M&T in PE is often also called *media-PE* or *media-(Physical) Education* or even *media-education in PE* – which, in the terminology itself, reveals possible internal disputes in the subfield, such as we will see below – and as we observe in the analysis of publications by agents of the subfield (MEZZAROBA, 2020), there has been a large quantitative increase and transformations in qualitative approaches, although its agents continue to consider that there is still a lack of transposition of this knowledge to pedagogical practices of school PE.

Belonging to the leadership of research groups, becoming a member of scientific entities, such as the BCSS itself, acting on the scientific committee of thematic working groups, as was/is the case of the investigated subjects, guarantees them conditions of differentiated possibilities, whether it is in the political decisions of both the TWG and the BCSS itself, or as invitations to events, publication possibilities etc. – evidencing a work that drives the agents and, at the same time, moves and structures the subfield.

⁷ This data is also corroborated in the aforementioned genealogical analysis of the academic production of the research subjects/field agents (MEZZAROBA, 2020).

⁸ Information about the Santa Maria Group is mentioned in the GI and MA interviews.

⁹ As mentioned in the AL and FE interview. The latter, in turn, commented: “[...] I participate in the TWG for the first time in 1997 [...] So, I think the field starts [...] there in the early 1990s, but it begins to consolidate with the 1997 CONBRACE [...]” (FE, 2017, p.26-27)

Internal conflicts and splits appeared very frequently in the interviewees' reports, corroborating the writings of Hallal and Melo (2017, p.325), that PE is a "[...] very fragmented area, composed of diverse subareas that barely interact". The simple act of naming moments, configurations and theoretical movements already makes explicit a conflict within the field (M&T, communication and media, education for/with the media/means, media-education, etc.), as well as the delimitation of the objects of investigation (body culture, movement culture, body culture of movement, physical activity etc.). Curriculum disputes show greater divisions, especially regarding the training of teachers with a licentiate degree and bachelor degree.

In summary, the field is configured as heterogeneous (in terms of origins, formations, theoretical affiliations, professional activities, research interests, etc.) and this heterogeneity, at the same time, can lean towards something positive, in the sense that the field embraces thematic diversities (and expand the boundaries of PE itself), but also for something negative, interpreted as a field of difficult interlocution and dialogue in the face of so many differences.

One of the conflicts¹⁰ appears in the disputes about PE belonging to the natural sciences versus HMSA, or even when considering the sedimentation of the HMSA in these PE knowledge and the conflicts that are generated as a result of this, which also has resonance in the discourses related to the divisions of formation in PE¹¹, that is, between the licentiate versus the bachelor degree.

Another type of conflict within the field occurs in the proposals of graduate programs, as, according to Manoel and Carvalho (2011, p.400), these "[...] also result from internal and external struggles for academic hegemony", even because it is at this level

¹⁰ FE (2017, p.48): "[...] we have two fields, which do not dialogue, as if they were two different things!". TA (2017, p.16), questioned: "[...] which PE field is this, why do I need to study biology and why do I need to study anatomy and why do I need to study philosophy and study psychology". In the interview with ON (2017, p.11), it is again made explicit: "[...] what knowledge is PE about... where does the matrix come from? If I am more affiliated with the humanities, right, I have a series of answers... if I am more affiliated with any other, if we think about, for example, the subareas in graduate studies [...] they are these three: sociocultural, pedagogical and biodynamic." In the interview with MA (2017, p.9) these conflicts are exposed: "[...] it is an extremely heterogeneous field... I have difficulty defining what is happening..." and "PE deals with something that is simultaneously biological and cultural!" (MA, 2017, p.24).

¹¹ According to Mezzaroba and Zoboli (2013), licentiate and bachelor's degrees would be one of the implications of an 'unsuccessful marriage' between Physical Education and science, configuring two perspectives of academic formation at the undergraduate level that have tenuous limits of epistemological conceptualization, crossed by relationships and power games driven by tensions generated by ideological and praxiological foundations subjected to the labor market. And this conflict in the division of the professional formation in PE was mentioned explicitly in the interviews of GI (2017, p.7-8), GU (2017, p.8), TA (2017, p.14) and ON (2017, p. 10).

of education – the postgraduate level – that the “game” is played with more intensity by the agents, by the political dispute through the scientific practices of production/reproduction of the field (domination/subordination).

Evidence of conflicts can also be observed in the theoretical-epistemological differences of those investigated, which are expressed both in their ‘preferences’ as to a way of seeing the world, of thinking about PE or even human formation, as well as in the theoretical-conceptual bases that they declare to adopt, possibly implying heterogeneous modes of action.

According to Bourdieu (2001a, p.89), this tension of agents within the scientific fields is made explicit because they are confronted “[...] within this game that is the field, in a struggle to make recognized a way to know (an object and a method), contributing to conserve or transform the field of forces.” Specifically in relation to epistemological disputes, Bourdieu (2001a, p.90) will state that what is at stake in epistemological wars “[...] is always the valorization of a kind of scientific capital”. In this sense, questioning how the subfield denominates (itself) is part of this dispute. Throughout the interviews – as it is also possible to observe in the analysis of the academic production of the subfield in question (MEZZAROBA, 2020) – several denominations regarding this subfield are explained: education for/with the media (BELLONI, 2001), media-education (FANTIN, 2006), media-(Physical) Education, media-PE, media-education in PE.

Within this first interpretative axis, which focuses on the engendering of the M&T subfield in the field of Brazilian PE, we still need to highlight the interviewees’ concern with the endogeny, the inflections on the field itself, as well as the issue of generations/lineages.

Being involved in/with the field allows each one of the agents to work in a network of interactions that expands over time, mainly through the network of contacts and the immersion in the M&T object in relation to PE. The field (and the subfield) are also produced by reproduction, after all, all socialization processes take place through the reproduction of strategies, actions, *habitus*. There is an opening in relation to the processes of reflection, criticism and academic-scientific production that must always be present due to the growth, strengthening and consolidation of any field, in short, considering that *heterodoxy* involves the possibility of oxygenating what the field produces, circulates and reproduces.

In this sense, endogeny is considered a problem that exists in the field of Brazilian PE and that must be problematized and avoided. Endogeny, academically, would be practices of continuous and often unreflected production, maintenance and reproduction, within a social space, which are dedicated to operating a circularity of a specific production that feeds itself and does not dialogue, nor receives criticism, nor questions from an external community, in order to “unbalance” criteria of truth created by this community.

Bourdieu, Chamboredon and Passeron (2015, p.96) consider the indispensability

of criticism when the production of knowledge is at stake, considering that “[...] the scientific effectiveness of criticism depends on the form and structure of exchanges by which it takes place [...]”.

In the interviews, we often used terms such as ‘ghetto’ (ON, 2017, p.30), ‘backyards’ (DO, 2017, p.21), ‘double-edged sword’ (MA, 2017, p.35), ‘very enclosed’ spaces (TA, 2017, p.14) etc., that is, mentions that point to possible endogenous practices in the subfield/field. Although Hallal and Melo (2017, p.325) do not explicitly address the term, when exposing data and arguments regarding the quantitative growth of Brazilian PE academic production, they consider that in parallel “[...] the burning conflicts were dramatized”, as spaces of coexistence that were weakened and devalued in relation to exchanges in the production/circulation of knowledge in PE.

It is noticed that the issue of endogeny is addressed in the field of PE, although with some “unease”, that is, its existence is known, it is believed that it is something that should be put in the debate, problematized, fought against, avoided, but it is not a subject that deserves more than brief comments¹² when it appears in publications, after all, the field usually consecrates and explains only elements that it considers as being ‘positive’, so its internal ‘problems’ should not be exposed. But the way out for this practice is, according to Bourdieu (2001a, p.127), in reflexivity as a sociological critique of all for all, based on what the aforementioned sociologist warned about the need for “sociologically armed epistemological surveillance”.

To end the discussions within this first interpretative axis referring to the subfield of media and technologies in the field of Brazilian PE, we lack the discussion regarding **generations** or **lineages**. These were terms that appeared in the interviews themselves, with ‘generations’ being mentioned by CE (2017, p.19) and ‘lineages’ being mentioned by FE (2017, p.37). Expressions similar or close in meaning also appeared, such as ‘lineage organization’ (FE, 2017, p.37-38) and “branches” (TA, 2017, p.34). Such denominations indicate that, based on a certain theoretical/conceptual/methodological matrix, there is a convergence of individual and also collective work, via the incorporation of perception schemes (the *habitus*), whose academic formation takes place on a generational scale, in the face of academic hierarchies and ways of “playing the game” (the *illusio*).

They allow the development of work in collectives that feed the field/subfield, which, under a certain analysis, is configured as something ambiguous, because, at the same time that it involves a strengthening and consolidation of these experiences, it can also be a strategy that weakens this space, in the sense that these practices lead to the dangers of endogeny and lack of oxygenation of discussions/research/practices, due to the ‘obligation’ that some new researchers may feel in their relationships with former advisors.

¹² As, for example, in Molina Neto *et al.* (2006).

These subfield reproduction and conservation strategies occur via socialization processes, as shown by Bourdieu (2004a, p.95). The term “generations” is understood here not in relation to a specific age group, but to the observed ways of visualizing the engendering of academic-scientific frameworks that behave as if they were from the same ‘family’ (theoretical/methodological affiliation, geographically located, with objects of common interest), which branch out. As Bourdieu (2004a) describes, social space defines proximities and affinities, and this same social space produces, in some contexts, lineages that are reproduced, either to conserve the field or to bring new possibilities to it (this is the struggle for volume of scientific capital).

This process of formation of specific lineages is also related, from the Bourdieusian perspective, to the attraction that one capital has over another, in this case, occupying a prominent position in the field, with the power to distribute this symbolic capital (belonging to the framework of programs of post-graduation, the best example in this case), allows ‘passing on’ theoretical-conceptual legacies to those who intend to inherit this scientific capital, initially conserving the field, from their insertion and performance in this same field – from the Bourdieusian perspective, we have the possibility of thinking the field through positions and dispositions.

The indeterminacy in the production and reproduction processes of ‘generations’ or ‘lineages’ can allow that in the generational successions there is space for heterodoxy, for the new, for the different from what has been done due to the processes of reproduction of the field, which mostly tend to conserve it, avoiding any form of ‘revolution’.

The social and academic legitimacy of PE

Repeatedly, the investigated subjects pointed out the issue of PE legitimacy when they report the work on a theme or a set of knowledge to which they are dedicated, that is, the effort made ‘adds’ to the strategies of researchers, professors and field agents of PE as a whole, in the sense of striving for greater legitimacy. This, as we know, comes from social recognition, an incessant and conscious search for all those who dedicate themselves to PE, and, of course, also aim for academic-scientific prestige.

According to Berger and Luckmann (2014), legitimation involves a process of objectification, sedimentation and accumulation of knowledge. For these authors, it is this process of ‘explanation’ and justification in the transmission to a new generation, which implies values, but also knowledge: “Legitimation does not only tell the individual why he *must* perform an action and not another; it also tells you *why* things are the way they are. [...] ‘knowledge’ precedes ‘values’ in the legitimation of institutions.” (BERGER; LUCKMANN, 2014, p.124).

The BCSS is repeatedly mentioned by the interviewees as an institution responsible for allowing an agglutination of themes and conceptions that, from an epistemological point of view, expanded the field of Brazilian PE, that is, the institutionalization of

this M&T theme takes place from the emergence of the TWG on Communication and Media in 1997 (and in parallel, with the creation of the same thematic space in the field of social communication, at INTERCOM).

Perhaps the BCSS is cited as the institution whose *social space* allows for the agglutination of collectivities in order to follow the attempt to socially legitimize PE in Brazil, especially the one related to the sociocultural and pedagogical area. According to Molina Neto *et al.* (2006, p.150), this scientific institution “[...] constitutes a privileged forum for the certification of the scientific quality of research developed in the PE/CE field of knowledge”, acting as a “legitimizing body of knowledge” (p.160).

We can also consider that it is through the TWG on Communication and Media of this scientific entity that the main way of ‘entering’ the field is ‘legitimized’, because even if there are several entries for the subfield, it is the aforementioned TWG that organizes and allows to ‘play’ this game with M&T in the Brazilian PE. The role of the BCSS as an institution that promotes “other and new Physical Education” can be analyzed from what Berger and Luckmann (2014, p.77) comment on the institutionalizing instances that produce the knowledge of society, implying “[...] historicity and control”.

It is possible to identify in the interviews aspects related to the difficulty in the search for legitimacy for Brazilian PE, since, on the one hand, there are considerations that depend on characteristics that confirm the difficulty of attributing importance to this field (the “stigmatized look” – TA, 2017, p.9) who is “from PE”, the scarcity of educational policies and research promotion, opinions that consider that “PE has not advanced” (GU, 2017, p.7), the non-repercussion of the production of the knowledge in the field of intervention, as well as the strength of “tradition” (GU, 2017, p.20). On the other hand, the examples also explain elements that indicate a trajectory of legitimation to PE: when they mention the “visibility of good practices” (GI, 2017, p.29, p.57), when they consider the increase in production (AL, 2017). , p.28) and dissemination of this knowledge, as well as using their own actions (ON, 2017, p.29) to show what each one has done to “prove” the importance of this field in Brazil (CE, 2017, p.16).

We have an important paradox here: if we consider only the quantitative aspects, because the agents point out that there has been a great quantitative growth in the production of Brazilian PE knowledge, it is possible to speak of consolidation and, therefore, of legitimation. But this movement occurs in relation to academic production, without generating direct implications and in the same proportion in the school context. In this particular case, within the PE field, what Hallal and Melo (2017) identified as a paradoxical process regarding the quantitative growth of production does not generate a qualitative increase around its consolidation and, therefore, the legitimacy of the PE field.

Therefore, the search for legitimation is configured as a constitutive element of the idea of field in Brazilian PE, and the subjects (1) point out reflections and problems around this issue both for PE, in general, (2) and for those dedicated to M&T, as well

as (3) call attention to the need to approach the school context and reverberate there this knowledge, mentioning the distance between university and school. One of the ways to handle this task involves the continuous exercise of inventorying and evaluating this production, something constant within the BCSS (MOLINA NETO *et al.*, 2006).

In the same direction, Pires and Pereira (2016) argue that consolidation (in the investigated subfield) is related to the media-education movement itself in Brazil, understood as a space for pedagogical action and that PE, in this context, also contributes to the challenges of the mediatised culture regarding the issues of the body culture of movement. These authors expose limitations related to the consolidation of the subfield: (1) reduced number of researches and intervention proposals; (2) difficulties of insertion in the curricula of training courses; (3) concentration of studies on media/ means products.

As Berger and Luckmann (2014, p.143) tell us, “[...] the material from which the legitimations of conservation of the universe are made is mainly a later elaboration, at a higher level of theoretical integration, of the legitimations of the various institutions.” Observing and analyzing all these movements, actions, strategies and disputes that are taking place, it is possible to consider that, although it is difficult to affirm that the field of PE is consolidated, there is no doubt that such agents who are dedicated to the theme of M&T, even if they represent a small portion within the great field of PE, they intensively and incessantly use the most diverse strategies to scientifically capitalize such field.

Cultural formation and interdisciplinary aspects: the habitus and the implications in the university and in the school

Understanding cultural formation as something more comprehensive, in its even erudite sense, which allows the subject to carry out a critical reading of the world, in line with what Bourdieu calls *cultural capital*; and considering that interdisciplinary aspects refer to the permeable and necessary transit of different areas of knowledge, as a kind of “miscegenation” that creates a dispute and tension at the same time and that allows subjects to have another (broad/complex) posture in relation to its objects of knowledge, this interpretative axis deals with the incorporation of perception schemes of agents (*habitus*) who work and dedicate themselves to the PE field, explaining implications both in academic training and in pedagogical practices that occur in the school context.

Observing the trajectory of the subjects allowed us to identify particularities in each one of them, especially regarding their broader cultural formations, generally with interdisciplinary elements in their formations and performances. It is about reflecting upon the circumscribed and constructive trajectory of a social field, with the incorporation of schemes of thought and actions, in the sense as Bourdieu (2001a, p.66) proposes regarding the concept of *habitus*: “[...] *habitus*, as I have repeated many

times, is not a destiny [...] it continually manifests itself in oral exams, in presentations at seminars, in contacts with others and, more simply, in the physical aspect, a manner, a posture, which it is its most directly visible transcript.”

The fact that the research subjects stand out within the PE field, tracing new directions and possibilities (with the potentiality of M&T), is undoubtedly due to the fact that they are agents who, in their singular formations, were somehow in contact with other fields, such as social communication (GI's case), sociology (MA's case), anthropology (FE's case), the arts (TA's case), philosophy (AL's case), semiotics (MA's case), economics (DO's case), pedagogy (CE's case), observable in their responses, in their publications, extension projects, in the programs and pedagogical handling of the subjects they teach, in the guidelines etc.

This set of knowledge from the HMSA gives rise to a particularity in the field of Brazilian PE that is manifested in the complexity of thinking about it beyond its traditional aspects, historically linked to biomedical knowledge (which still predominates in the field) and to sports technicity. These interdisciplinary issues impact the way of “playing the game”, in accessing and acting – via *illusio* – in the construction, maintenance and dynamics of the subfield, as can be seen in the interview by MA (2017, p.29): “[...] I don't see a theoretical problem that is only in the field, in PE and the media, even because it is a field that is interdisciplinary, a field crossed by others”. Thus, interdisciplinarity can be understood as intercomplementarity, in which one specialty becomes necessary to the other, and this union “[...] of one area enhances the actions of another(s)”. (AUTH, 2005, p.244)

In the field of academic training, it was possible to identify, from the interviews, some strategies of the field agents, regarding the attempts to include in PE formation aspects that were once disregarded, such as sociological approaches (MA, EF), anthropological (FE), philosophical (TA), pedagogical (DO), artistic (ON) and aesthetic (TA), and, of course, relations with M&T (appearing unanimously among all research subjects), in the sense of promoting access to the instrumentality of these artifacts, but mainly, critical, reflective and creative approaches.

Bourdieu (1996b) considers that the collective work of agents who occupy certain positions in social spaces is carried out from the awareness of a function and intentionality in the sense of conserving or transforming a field: “[...] if the social world, with its divisions, is something that social agents have to do, to build [...] these constructions do not take place in the social void” (BOURDIEU, 1996b, p.27). The investigated agents certainly have this notion, because, being in the game, they are aware of the formative web in which they participated and were socialized. Therefore, now, as “mentors”, they know the importance of these “differentiated” cultural practices in the training context, that is, the conscious attempt to generate and guarantee the transmission of *habitus*, which, as Bourdieu (1996b, p.21-22) explained, are “[...] principles that generate distinct and distinctive practices [...].”

As an implication of this formative context that envisions expanding possibilities for PE, now from the conjunction with the HMSA, the researched subjects report the need to dialogue with the school field¹³ when they comment on their interests, actions and motivations.

It is possible to identify in the statements of the research subjects/field agents ways in which they seek to carry out transfers of their interdisciplinary formative trajectories, in the sense of generating implications for the formation of new teachers, evidencing the dialectic between agents and field (BOURDIEU, 1996b, 2001a).

In summary, we can consider that PE is not confined to one field, and there is only the possibility of a subfield, that of M&T, for example, due to the interdisciplinary aspects and the cultural formation of these agents.

In the discussion that we operate here from the empirical point of view, cultural capital is being understood as the cultural formation of agents, that is, the incorporation of various knowledge along a trajectory – continuous, incessant, accumulating –, which allows them to understand the reality, the world, the formations, in short, about their practices, which also implies occupying certain positions in the field/subfield to the point of, in the sequence, carrying out their interventions with a more sociocultural and pedagogical facet, mainly, in how to activate all this diversity of knowledge in an arsenal of propositions in the school field (with research projects, extension projects, continuous training etc.).

Cultural sociodynamics and implications in the PE field

We call “cultural sociodynamics” a phenomenon that is revealed by the dynamism of the social and cultural transformations that modern society produces and is affected by, causing different modes of action and reflection in continuous and incessant activity of social interactions, as with the implications of social interactions, which are emerging and transforming human relationships, socializing new generations and impacting our ways of life.

It is noticeable in the considerations of the investigated subjects that the studies that articulate media, communication and technology in the field of Brazilian PE have been following a sociodynamics of how the technologies themselves get configured and, in a certain way, “dictate” patterns of behavior, knowledge, access to information and human interactions, that is, there is constantly an emerging need to treat as an investigative agenda (in relation to form, content and its objects) what the present moment brings as the most attractive to issues that affect knowledge relevant to the PE field as a scientific practice (object of study) and as a pedagogical practice (forms of intervention).

Thus, in a first moment of configuration of this subfield in Brazilian PE, studies that have focused on the printed media appeared. Subsequently, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, television became the hegemonic means of communication. Then comes

¹³ Absolutely all interviewees mentioned school issues.

the internet, with all its advances and possibilities, and in its historical wake, we now see social networks stand out in the most diverse devices, such as the mobile ones, for example. Currently, we could expand this media set from the understanding of digital culture as something intrinsically linked to the daily life and all its dimensions.

The way in which this cultural sociodynamics affects and is captured by the investigative dimension expressed by the research subjects reveals the importance of being attentive to these transformations and to what is circulated in the media sphere, because they have implications on how PE is done (body and sport, for example) and should be unveiled, understood, criticized. It also reveals a wealth and diversification of methodological ways to account for these cultural dynamics.

At the same time, we can also observe that, when describing these perspectives and these methodologies, the research subjects again demonstrate that they are self-referential to the subfield itself, reporting and exemplifying their practices within a certain structuring made possible by the subfield, of which they are builders and maintainers, making it clear, thus, that M&T are presented as new ways of following their *illusio* in the field of PE, expanding the boundaries of the field of PE with M&T and the knowledge of the HMSA.

It means to say, based on Bourdieusian assumptions regarding the notion of field, that the autonomy of PE is relative, it is not separated or isolated from a larger context of society itself, in which the media, for example, is one of those elements that affect, as well as official government documents or even curricular parameters that affect forms of pedagogical approaches in the school context, as well as scientific entities and professional representations, or even the sports field (due to its legitimacy and economic power that it has acquired in recent decades in the world). After all, as Bourdieu (2004b) reminds us, the degree of autonomy of a science depends on economic resources.

At the end of this axis, we emphasize that these social and cultural dynamics within society imply ways of rethinking PE, expanding, complexifying and bringing new questions (either as an investigative object, or as implications for professional formation and school PE pedagogical practices), In which new *habitus* are needed to constitute the *illusio* of this field.

Affection as disinterested interest: decoding illusio mechanisms

When we listen to the agents of this subfield, the issue of the network of affective relationships is repeatedly emphasized (appearing here as an element that reveals the relationships around what is said about the scientific game, in the figure of a symbolic capital that is reconverted into academic-scientific capital), which have established themselves in the academic universe and which have been nurtured over the years, having the object of study (M&T) as the agglutinator of these relationships that are maintained and consolidated, in addition, of course, to the bets of these agents of the field.

We can consider, then, that the mention of affections that are limited to those who circulate in the subfield, bringing their research and publicly discussing, proposing partnerships in different projects, or even maintaining affective interpersonal relationships within the subfield is a way of “playing the game” (or, therefore, following *illusio*). They would highlight, in the foreground, a supposedly disinterested character (BOURDIEU, 1996b), although there is clearly an interest in scientific capital and power structures and in what all this implies for the agent in the subfield in which he participates/acts, that is, the “exchanges”.

According to Bourdieu (2001b, p.123-124), *illusio* “[...] is part of the action, the routine, the things that are done and that are done because they are done and in fact it has always been done that way. All those engaged in the field, defenders of orthodoxy or heterodoxy, share a tacit adherence to the same *doxa* that makes competition between them possible”. Being involved in this “game” generates a sense of belonging in relation to the need to be constantly creating *interests*. According to Bourdieu (1996b, p.140), “Every social field [such as the scientific field] [...] tends to obtain from those who enter it this relationship with the field that I call *illusio*.”

As “collective adherence to the game” (BOURDIEU, 1996a), *illusio* produces a dispute, which is veiled, not necessarily a clash, and thus agents recognize themselves as part of a social locus from a circularity, both of scientific capital and of scientific capital as of acceptance in the microcosm, and accessing positions of power and recognition from it, affection being a mode of circulation of this capital that would function as a “bargaining currency” (a reciprocity).

Observing the configuration of the subfield and the mentions of the research subjects, the *interest* in the M&T object is what gave a *sense of game* in the PE field to those who dedicated themselves to the theme, “[...] because they were imposed and put in their minds, in their bodies, in the form of what we call the sense of play.” (BOURDIEU, 1996b, p.140).

Thus, *being involved in the game*¹⁴ is what allows us to observe all these elements

¹⁴ Due to the spatial limitation, we bring some examples of the interviews that explain how the subjects showed their “disinterested interest”: FE commented that the constitution of the subfield occurred “because of the correlations of personal relationships, [...] of actors that decide to fund things together”, and that his last participation in events was “more for festive reasons than academic”, to “see friends”. GI commented that s/he vibrates “when someone comes from other areas to compose in TWG”. AL spoke about his admiration and affection for a professor in the group: “not just a colleague, but a master [...] a person who accompanied me, accompanies me”. GU mentioned that he was “joining” and “staying in the game”, as “ways of interaction, of establishing networks, communities”. TA listed contact networks and connections, in addition to citing his enchantment with the participants of the TWG. ON considered “being very well received at the TWG”, using expressions such as “deep admiration”, “a very dear person for me”, “respect”, “I like him/her very much”, in short, it exposes the “exchanges”. DO also exposes his interest in the *game*, by “getting involved” with the media discussion “also because of this group relationship”.

presented so far: the possibility of, from a specific theme (M&T), relating dynamics (cultural sociodynamics) in the scientific/professional/school universe of the field of PE, with the incorporation of specific *habitus*, which allow to continue with certain interests at stake, in search of the always pursued consolidation of PE.

The *collective belief* in the game is what allows the subfield to be capitalized, allowing groups to form (including with the dangers of endogeny), for events to happen (and in them, the scientific and affective exchanges), for more research to be done, that new researchers and professors are formed from a certain epistemological framework (what we identified earlier as *generations* or *lineages*), it is by accepting to *play the game* that each one gets *involved in this game* and with that this mechanism becomes *taken seriously*, maintaining the constancy of the production and reproduction of the subfield.

When we consider the investigated agents as outstanding researchers in the subfield, both because they engendered it, but mainly because they feed/capitalize it, they become, as TWG coordinators and members of a scientific committee, *well-adjusted agents to the game*, because they know *the meaning of the game* (BOURDIEU, 1996b).

As we observe the interviews, they repeatedly comment on aspects of interpersonal and affective relationships in their ways of listing their trajectories and acting in the subfield. We visualize, then, *affection* being placed as a disinterested form that demonstrates the interest in continuing to play, betting¹⁵, following the collective belief of the game, because affective relationships are configured as part of the fundamental adherence to the game. In the “pleasure of playing”, with its theories, methodologies, research and orientations, there is the pleasure of the clash of theoretical objects, discussions and divergences, and there is the pleasure of reunion and affective exchanges.

Continuing to be interested and betting on the game, therefore, becomes a necessity that the field itself, as an “attraction”, awakens in its agents. Seeking perspectives beyond what has already been accomplished, beyond what has been considered as “consolidated knowledge”, is only possible for those who, being in certain positions of power, have the possibility of *foreseeing* due to their presence within this social structure (the scientific field) and due to the *habitus* already incorporated along a trajectory.

Affection, in this case, may be the subtle way of showing selfless interest, because the current times of scientific work demand that its agents be productive researchers, who build their networks, their small scientific communities, carry out the greatest

¹⁵ How do these “bets” or this “will to keep playing” appear? Briefly: We observed movements regarding the *new interests* of these agents, both in relation to partnerships with researchers abroad (Portugal, Spain, New Zealand, USA), explaining a desire for internationalization to give circularity and visibility to these “unique” practices of Brazilian PE, as well as the continuation of academic production, acting in undergraduate and graduate courses; political role of research groups; experiments in the school context and the desire to work in graduate studies.

possible number of exchanges between agents or between their groups, accessing positions of power and accumulating symbolic capital in the form of scientific capital. This can be seen, for example, in the number of publications, as well as in competitions in funding public notices for research, in grants, in attractions for new researchers to access the theme and make the “cycle” repeat: the field produces certain *habitus*, which are the drivers of *illusio*, this invisible and powerful way of following the game while being stuck in it.

Perhaps the most incredible and potent *habitus* that a field is able to produce and reproduce is *illusio*: wanting to be in the game and play it, for the pleasure of playing it. Identifying *illusio* mechanisms demands constant questioning in relation to the most common things that practices and interactions may appear as an externality, because “obviousness” is only possible to those who are immersed in the field and who, even practicing *illusio*, sharpen and broaden their perspective to their own field, which is not an easy exercise.

Furthermore, the attempt to understand the *interests* of agents, that is, to explain why they do what they do and the way they do it, puts, once again, in question the alleged neutrality of the construction of the so-called scientific knowledge, because where there are human beings, there will be objectivity, there will be rationality, but there will also be principles of affective exchanges that cause approximations and distances (in terms of common objects and objectives), in addition, of course, to constant tensions of all kinds, since the field is a permanent competitive space of disputes for positions, being *illusio* the fuel of it all.

Final Considerations

The theoretical-practical diversity, the wealth of reported experiences, the impetus to seek to articulate other knowledge and practices in the face of PE themes/contents/practices, the search for a basis in the HMSA, the need to produce and disseminate knowledge, in short, all these actions that are presented in the set of empirical data of this investigation lead us to believe that the work to consolidate this subfield is an uninterrupted collective work and that increasingly seeks to gain volume. It is a search for recognition that involves both the individual and the collective dimension, which implies greater issues of the field itself.

The strategies and actions of the agents are possible because this social space, this “field of possibilities” came to exist, which broke a certain tradition in PE. The field has allowed, although with differentiated prestige and recognition, that other knowledge is placed/discussed, no longer colored by biomedical knowledge, but by the knowledge of the humanities and communication. And the agents who dedicate themselves to the subfield of M&T pointed out a series of ruptures, possibilities, characteristics and

inflections, explaining their own way of “playing”, mobilizing their *illusio* from the *habitus* which has already been incorporated.

The contribution of Bourdieusian concepts – field, *habitus* and *illusio* – allowed to unveil and enhance analyzes in relation to the understanding of this social space as being of human production, from the socialization of social agents (social trajectory in/through the **field**), which, being subjectivized by these knowledge and knowledge/practices of this field (with the incorporation of these *habitus*), fight for it, demonstrate their interests and participate in the “social game” (the *illusio*), envisioning strategies, disputes and new actions, which, with a certain degree of awareness, explain their reasons for prestige and recognition from the scientific capital (and with that, consolidate and socially legitimize these social spaces).

How such future configurations will take place between field/subfield was not the purpose of this investigation to indicate, because it is neither up to sociology, nor to history, to operate “futurologies”. From the perspective of a **historical sociology**, we can point out that the PE field, despite all its limitations and problems, revealed, some time ago, a space of possibilities with M&T and HMSA that deserves to be expanded and deepened, due to its scientific and praxeological wealth which the current level of academic production already shows.

REFERENCES

- AUTH, Milton Antonio. Interdisciplinaridade. In: GONZÁLEZ, Fernando J.; FENSTERSEIFER, Paulo E. *Dicionário crítico de EF*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2005, p. 243-245.
- BELLONI, Maria Luíza. *O que é mídia-educação*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2001.
- BERGER, Peter L.; LUCKMANN, Thomas. *A construção social da realidade: tratado de sociologia do conhecimento*. 36ª ed. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes, 2014.
- BETTI, Mauro. *A janela de vidro: esporte, televisão e EF*. Campinas/SP: Papyrus, 1998.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *As regras da arte: gênese e estrutura do campo literário*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1996a.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Razões práticas: sobre a teoria da ação*. 11ª ed. Campinas: Papyrus, 1996b.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Para uma sociologia da ciência*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2001a.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Meditações pascalianas*. Rio de Janeiro/RJ: Bertrand Brasil, 2001b.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Coisas ditas*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2004a.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico*. São Paulo: Editora da Unesp, 2004b.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre; CHAMBOREDON, Jean-Claude; PASSERON, Jean-Claude. *Ofício de*

sociólogo: metodologia da pesquisa na sociologia. 8ª ed. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes, 2015.

CARVALHO, Sérgio; HATJE, Marli. Proposta de desenvolvimento de um novo conhecimento na e para a EF e a Comunicação Social no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte*, v. 17, n. 3, p. 260- 265, 1996. Disponível em: <http://revista.cbce.org.br/index.php/RBCE/article/view/858>. Acesso em: 22 jul. 2022.

FANTIN, Monica. *Mídia-educação: conceitos, experiências, diálogos Brasil-Itália*. Florianópolis: Cidade Futura, 2006.

HALLAL, Pedro C.; MELO, Victor Andrade de. Crescendo e enfraquecendo: um olhar sobre os rumos da EF no Brasil. *Rev. Bras. Ciências Esporte*, n. 39, v.3, 2017, p. 322-327. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbce.2016.07.002>. Acesso em: 23 jul. 2022.

MANOEL, Edison de J.; CARVALHO, Yara Maria de. Pós-graduação na EF brasileira: a atração (fatal) para a biodinâmica. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v.37, n.2, p.389-406, . 2011. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1517-97022011000200012>. Acesso em: 06 jul. 2022.

MEZZAROBA, Cristiano. *A formação e constituição de um subcampo acadêmico: a mídia-educação na Educação Física – configurações, perspectivas e inflexões*. 2018. 493f. Tese (Doutorado) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2018.

MEZZAROBA, Cristiano. A mídia, as tecnologias e a Educação Física no Brasil: uma descrição genealógica. *Revista Tempos e Espaços em Educação*, v.13, n.32, p.1-12, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.20952/revtee.v13i32.13065>

MEZZAROBA, Cristiano; ZOBOLI, Fabio. Reflexões e problematizações sobre a pesquisa em Educação Física: perspectivas para os “filhos do casamento (in)feliz?”. *Kinesis*, Santa Maria/RS, v.31, n.1, p.107-124, 2013. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/kinesis/article/view/10077>. Acesso em: 01 abr. 2018.

MOLINA NETO, Vicente *et al.* Reflexões sobre a produção do conhecimento em EF e Ciências do Esporte. *Rev. Bras. Ciências Esporte*, Campinas, v.28, n.1, p.145-165, 2006. Disponível em: <http://revista.cbce.org.br/index.php/RBCE/article/view/44/52>. Acesso em: 13 jul. 2022.

PAIVA, Fernanda. Notas para pensar a EF a partir do conceito de campo. *Perspectiva*, Florianópolis, v. 22, número especial, p. 51-82, 2004. Disponível em: http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-54732004000300004&lng=en&nrm=iso. Acesso em: 18 jul. 2022.

PIRES, Giovanni De Lorenzi. *Educação Física e o discurso midiático: abordagem crítico-emancipatória*. Ijuí/RS: Unijuí, 2002.

PIRES, Giovanni De Lorenzi; PEREIRA, Rogério Santos. Educação Física, esporte, lazer e TICs: trajetória, demandas e perspectivas para a docência e a pesquisa no Século XXI. In: MOREIRA, W.W.; Wagner Wey, et al. NISTA-PICCOLO, V.L. *EF e esporte no Século XXI*. Campinas: Papyrus, 2016, p.235-266.

VALLE, Ione Ribeiro. Sociologia histórica ou história sociológica? Diálogos a partir de Pierre

Bourdieu. *Tempos e Espaços em Educação*, v.11, n.25, p.49-60, 2018. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.20952/revtee.v11i25.7502>. Acesso em: 18 jul. 2022.

VELHO, Gilberto. O desafio da proximidade. In: VELHO, Gilberto.; KUSCHNIR, Karina. *Pesquisas urbanas: desafios do trabalho antropológico*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2003, p. 11-19.

Text received on 05/13/2022

Text approved on 08/28/2022