



Education Quarterly Reviews

Moukachar, Merie B., and Santos, Regina Rosa L. dos. (2020), Toy library: Possibilities of Actions in the Education of Pedagogues. In: Education Quarterly Reviews, Vol.3, No.3, 398-410.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.03.03.148

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

Toy library: Possibilities of Actions in the Education of Pedagogues

Merie B. Moukachar¹, Regina Rosa L. dos Santos²

¹ Center for Studies and Research in Educational Psychology and Psychopedagogy, Faculty of Education of Minas Gerais State University, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil

² Center for Studies and Research in Educational Psychology and Psychopedagogy, Faculty of Education of Minas Gerais State University, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil

Correspondence: Merie B. Moukachar, Center for Studies and Research in Educational Psychology and Psychopedagogy (NEPEPp), Faculty of Education, Minas Gerais State University. Address: Rua Paraíba, 29, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil. Phone: 55 31 99978-3213. E-mail: merie.moukachar@uemg.br

Abstract

The present article displays a research designed to investigate the role of the toy library as a research laboratory focusing on plays and educational processes in Pedagogy courses. It is a theme of relevance, as it is necessary to deepen the conception of the toy library as a scientific space for learning, aiming at the improvement of the education of pedagogues. This qualitative action research was carried out at a Faculty of Education, having as subjects, the students and teachers of the faculty who accepted to participate. A Study Group was initially created with these students, aiming to develop a deeper theoretical knowledge on the theme and experimental activities in the toy library domain through workshops and recreational activities. Along the research, the teachers also participated answering a questionnaire, which investigated possibilities of actions in the toy library, linked to the course subjects. Several theoretical arguments were found, which were also detected in the answers to the questionnaire, supporting the idea of the toy library as an important laboratory in the educator's education, contributing, despite some remaining weaknesses, to a well-qualified education enabling pedagogues to face the challenges of today's world.

Keywords: Games, Playing, Pedagogy, Plays, Teacher's Education, Toy Library

1. Introduction

A toy library has been widely discussed and referred to as a potential space for children's and teenager's learning and development. However, there is still very little research and discussion on its legitimation as a training space within the higher education levels, as in pedagogues' training courses, due to the fact that it is still considered only as a potential learning space for children and adolescents, a presumption that stirred us towards the development

of a research. The present article will display procedures and results from that research, aiming to investigate the importance of toy libraries in higher education in Pedagogy.

We consider this study duly required for both, to point out the importance of a toy library as well as to make its use clearer, better delineated enhancing the importance of toy libraries in higher education courses. Furthermore, it is highly important to point out the Brazilian 1988 Federal Constitution, the 1990 Statute of the Child and Adolescent, the 1996 Law of Directives and Bases of the National Education and the 2008 PL 11.274 proposing to expand school education from 4 to 17 years old, which leads to the importance of exploring the toy library as a laboratory that enables the improvement of the concept of playing activities, toys and games in the training of pedagogues to work in Early Childhood Education and Elementary School.

For the purpose of this research, several questions were raised previously in our own practice, as teachers in the Pedagogy Course, but one was outlined as a central problem: What theoretical relationships can we establish between studies already developed in relation to playing activities, toys and games, and the educational processes and, in such a way, create methodologies that take hold of the space of the toy library, so as to contribute to the training of educators?

In general, the objective of this research was to investigate the toy library at a Faculty of Education of a Brazilian public university, accepting it as a scientific space, comprising playing activities and games linked to educational processes, considering its importance in the training of pedagogues in that faculty. Initially, in order to achieve this objective, it was necessary to define, conceptually and historically, the toy library as space and time for playing and learning, recognizing the learning processes interconnected with toy resources, games and playing activities. In addition, it was necessary to identify possibilities for actions in the toy library of the Pedagogy course and its importance for the education of pedagogues and, further, to deepen studies in the area of pedagogues' ludic training based on readings, workshops and playful activities.

These objectives are in line with our interests in our daily work, because, as teachers linked to the Center for Studies and Research in Educational Psychology and Psychopedagogy (NEPEPp) of the Faculty of Education, which holds the space of the toy library, our eyes are turned at this object of study, under the theoretical perspectives with which we work, which makes this investigation and its procedures more alive and present, a fundamental component for the development of researches.

It is worth mentioning that, even knowing the different fields and contexts in which a toy library can have numerous functions, in this research we focused on the context of higher education, more precisely, on its assignment as a training instrument in the Pedagogy course.

It is in such a sense that the research was based on different theoretical contributions that circulate within the areas of Education, Psychology, Psychoanalysis and Philosophy, in an attempt to establish a relationship with the socio-historical and cultural dimension. We also emphasize theoretical studies about teaching methodologies, which use ludic activities, games and plays in educational processes.

Next, the methodological path outlined and followed in the research that originated this article will be described in detail and the results achieved will also be presented and discussed.

2. Theoretical-methodological aspects of the research

This research was developed within the assumptions of a qualitative research, because here, it was necessary to work with a methodology that can "face reality as something in permanent movement and the phenomenon as something that is built in that movement" (Bock, 2001, p. 33). We find in Minayo and Sanches (1993) some arguments for the use of quantitative and qualitative research and, in Minayo's words, the qualitative approach is one that asserts itself in the field of subjectivity and symbolism. For this author,

The understanding of human relationships and activities with the meanings that enliven them is radically different from the grouping of phenomena under generic concepts and/or categories given by observations and experiments and by the discovery of laws that would order the social.

The qualitative approach establishes a fundamental and intimate approach between subject and object, since both are of the same nature: it empathizes with the motives, intentions, projects of the actors, based on which the actions, structures and the relationships become significant (p. 244).

For this qualitative research, the methodology we used was action- research, because according to Pimenta (2005, p. 523) “Action- research has the assumption that the subjects involved in it make up a group with common goals and objectives, interested in a problem that emerges in a given context in which they act playing different roles: university researchers and researchers (teachers in the case of a school).”

We consider the application of action-research as a practice that requires a lot of methodological severity, considering that, according to Miranda and Resende (2006), it is necessary to be alert so that we do not fall into the mistakes of practicicism, the temptation to have the resolution of immediate problems, whereas, in education, according to the authors, it is necessary to go beyond punctual and emergency solutions and the educational research requires theoretical, historical, political, social and cultural mediations.

The authors therefore define action-research as

a research that articulates the relationship between theory and practice in the very process of constructing knowledge, that is, the dimension of practice - which is constitutive of education - would be a privileged source and place for research. In addition, the investigation itself would be converted into action, into social intervention, enabling the researcher to act effectively on the studied reality. Reflection and practice, action and thought, extremities previously opposed, would now be welcomed in a research modality that considers social intervention in practice as its beginning and its ultimate end. (Miranda & Resende, 2006, p.511)

As a first step of the research, and aiming to answer the specific objective of the research that means to know the learning processes linked to the resources of toys, games and playing activities, a survey of these resources was carried out by the researchers, mapping all the playful material and permanent material found at the toy library of the Faculty of Education, a space defined as the location of this present research.

As a second stage of the investigation, activities such as study group, literature review and research were created and developed focusing on the latest theoretical and scientific productions related to ludicity and university toy libraries. This action was planned by us researchers, who, when starting to study the texts that would theoretically support our investigation, realized that we could add value to the activity, as we also had other participants in the group, which was consistent with the research methodology of an action-research.. This activity took place throughout 2019, from May to November and led us into a revision of the literature investigated in this research, and induced us to define conceptually and historically the toy library as a space and time for playing and learning, the essential objective of our study.

As a third stage of the research, we started the field research, which occurred at the same time the study group carried out the reading process and theoretical studies. Thus, in order to deepen our studies about the pedagogues' ludic training based on practical activities, several experimental actions were developed through workshops and playing activities, in the space of the toy library so as to advance, from a practical point of view, studies about the toy library within the pedagogues' ludic educational training.

Finally, to complement our field research, a fourth stage of the research was necessary, which consisted of the application of an online questionnaire answered by the teachers, in order to investigate, more directly, the possibilities teachers and students from the Pedagogy course had to develop activities at the toy library, which could enrich educators' training at the studied faculty.

For the stage targeting the analysis of the obtained material and the experienced material coherent with the action-research, we worked on the analysis of texts, the experiences and the answers to the questionnaires, in an attempt to “decipher” this material based on the Discourse Analysis (DA). This is because this type of analysis is the one that enabled us to work on both, the archive corpus, which is found in sources, such as documents, legislation,

books, articles and so on, as well as the empirical corpus, that is, the one produced by the research itself, experimentally and empirically, resulting from the experiments, workshops and events and from the performance and analysis of the questionnaire. In addition, this type of analysis has enabled us to understand the meanings and effects of what we found, analyzing the information from a social, historical and ideological point of view (Caregnato & Mutti, 2006).

The results of this methodological path will be pointed out and discussed below, in topics, so as to better explain the fulfillment of each of the foreseen specific objectives, and the first four topics summarize the bibliographic review carried out during the course of the research.

3. Results and Discussion: what do theorists say?

To discuss the toy library as a space for teacher's training, it was necessary, initially, to review some authors' reflections who present the game, the toy and playing activities interrelating them, although considering its ludic role and its educational role, which can be dealt with in multiple spaces.

First of all, we briefly checked what classical theorists brought us in different approaches. We realized that, for Psychoanalysis, in Bettelheim (1988), playing is so important for children's development, that in its absence, the intellect would not develop, considering that playing has a cognitive function and also a pulsional function. From the point of view of Psychogenetic theories we find both Piaget (1987) who demonstrates how children's intelligence develops in stages translated in the games they play, and Vygotsky (1984), for whom the game facilitates the development of imagination and creativity. We also revisited researchers from the cultural approach, such as Brougère (1995) who states that the idea of games varies according to the theorists and their time, as well as their use and the reasons for their use. And, further, Huizinga (1985) for whom the existence of the game is undeniable, but it is difficult to point out all the activities that the word evokes in different languages and cultures. Kishimoto (2005) also states that a conduct can be a game or not, in different cultures and this will depend on the meaning attributed to it.

Then we will discuss some elements that emerged from the readings of contemporary authors, which also helped us to answer our research questions theoretically.

3.1 The toy library as a teaching-learning space or a ludic space: a counterpoint?

Ludicity, considered in this text as an authentic and spontaneous manifestation, often dominated by uncertainty and chance, takes place aiming at satisfaction. On the other hand, it may also come through to escape from everyday life, by using imagination and make-believe.

Even taking into account that the main characteristics of the ludic is in the presumption of freedom and in the preference for action, in Luchesi (2018) we find that what matters to define what ludic is and what ludicity is "to be aware of what happens internally with each one in their relationship with the world and with people." (p.141) However, this characterization of game and ludicity seems to have been overwhelmed by a series of other understandings, especially when we go into the educational sphere, although, we understand that this characterization could be experienced in another way, for example, in toy libraries.

Toy libraries are becoming more and more popular and they have been gaining multiple meanings as well as the appropriation of multiple spaces, not only in schools and hospitals, but also in indigenous communities, settlements and universities, the latter being the focus of attention in this article (Paula, 2014).

We emphasize here, therefore, our interest in discussing the toy library in school areas, but specifically, in higher education schools driven to the training of pedagogues.

Several authors discuss the possible polarization between the ludic function and the educational function of games and play. We have the conception of Oliveira (2010)ⁱ mentioned by Rau and Lara (2017) who argues that playing should be developed only as playing and that the educational act distorts the possibility of spontaneity in playing. Kishimoto (2005) approaches the use of the ludic in education and in the teaching-learning processes in a different way, stating that the toy has two functions: educational and ludic, and points out that in "1. the ludic function the toy provides fun, pleasure and even displeasure, when chosen voluntarily and, 2. educational function, the toy teaches anything that completes the individual in his/her knowledge and apprehension of the world." (Kishimoto, 2005, p. 37).

In this sense, reinforcing the importance of playing in the educational processes Rau and Lara (2017) direct the discussion towards the adequate training of the adult who educates the child, indicating the toy library in the university as a space for this, stating that

In this perspective, the adult assumes an educational position when he is committed to the learning of the other. Playing is to interrelate, to bond, to identify great possibilities of meeting with the child and with oneself. Therefore, the work with proposals for the implantation of university toy libraries can significantly contribute to the understanding about playing in the learning process, considering that there will be continuous training aimed at theoretical studies and practical experiences, in which the teacher in training can confront the common sense with scientific knowledge. (Rau & Lara, 2017, p. 24441)

We agree with Piassa and Montagnini (2013) when they mention that Brazil has advanced considerably concerning the understanding of the importance of the toy library in the educators' training, as the Brazilian legislation itself started to demand the presence of toy libraries in higher education schools, more specifically in the teachers' education courses. Furthermore, they highlight that currently in the Higher Education Assessment Systems, there is the demand for the existence of these spaces as laboratories for teacher training courses to work in Childhood Education.

However, in their texts, the authors, who aim to make a critical interpretation of the space of toy libraries in the context of the capitalist society, place us against another contradiction, pointing out that the toy library, despite being bourgeoisie space concession to refrain social pressures, it is also the materialization of the child's right to play and an important laboratory for pedagogue-teachers, when contributing to a more balanced child development and to a hegemony counter-culture (Piassa & Montagnini, 2013).

Therefore, pointing out the contradiction that we are discussing at the moment, Piassa and Montagnini (2013) also quote Galindo et al (2010)ⁱⁱ who state that toy libraries represent the recognition of the right to play, but at the same time, they represent control and institutionalization of childhood, therefore, it is a space of contradiction, which legitimizes it even more as a space for research and training, which we second herein.

3.2 Play, its relationship with culture and toy libraries

In the research presented here, we have as a central point the interest in games, toys and playing activities, development and learning, in short, in the culture of childhood in the various spaces in which it can be lived, and here, fundamentally, our interest is in the space of toy libraries in the universities. Besides that

It is assumed that playing activities is fundamental for the children, as it is the way in which they take hold of the world around them. Children begin to understand their culture, values, habits, desires, dislikes, relationships, when playing. In short, playing they experience their environmental context. (Cotonhoto & Rossetti, 2016, p. 347)

Thus, we found that toys and plays, social practices that are part of the context that surrounds children, keep a dialogue with constant social changes and cultural practices that, when they change, end up causing changes in the contents and forms of ludic activities that are different, at each period.

Silva, Andrade, Torres and Amorim (2017) corroborate this idea of the relationship between the cultural and the ludic context, pointing out that, through the games they practice, “children identify characteristics that are specific to their culture and society, since they have specific traits that contribute to the development of children's relationships between child / child, child / adult and children / society.” (p. 63), which in turn contributes to changing their playful practices as well, as cultural practices change.

For this reason, at this point in the text we emphasize our agreement with some authors whom we consider nostalgic, who criticize the thinking of adults who claim that children today do not play anymore and are not interested in games and plays.

According to Moukachar (2004) in her research on games, toys and playing activities and the representations of childhood, it is clear the need to return to traditional plays and all their contributions to the child development and everything else they provide. However, reaffirming the strong relationship between culture and recreational activities, the author points out “(...) it is impossible to play in contemporary society, in the same way as in the past: the world has been transformed, children have changed and, mainly, their wishes followed these transformations.” (Moukachar, 2004, p. 210).

However, still based on Moukachar (2004), it would not be necessary and imperative to work to keep a *ludic culture* because there are the ludic cultures, whether from previous generations or the most recent ones, in which ludic practices as social and cultural practices are always being done and redone and “All of them have a unique and proper value, a manifestation of the creative and recreational potential of children of all periods” (p. 210).

Thus, when discussing the theme of plays from a historical point of view, we always observe this dichotomy between yesterday's plays and the contemporaneous ones. Here we want to avoid this dichotomous position, because we observe that toys, plays influence, and are influenced by the cultural world around them, and all of this ends up altering significantly the content and form of the ludic activities.

Therefore, the discussion about traditional plays and electronic games in the scenario experienced by children today is essential. Some authors claim that children today do not show interest in playing. But, Cotonhoto and Rossetti (2016, p. 347) question these statements, problematizing about “Who guarantees that the best way for children aged four and five to develop fully would be through traditional plays and games? Do children become passive and mere viewers of life when they play video games? Do electronic games inhibit children's creativity?” They go against the negative argument that the relationship between the child and the internet is a relationship of domination. They understand that through electronic games and / or internet, children interfere in the situations brought by these games, as active subjects they are, as we formerly pointed out when approaching childhood and culture.

Silva et al (2017, pp.65-66), corroborate to these ideas by stating, through their researches, that

The contact with electronic means allows the child to develop fine motor coordination, while having to direct commands to the machine to perform playing activities, in addition to developing reading, since for the machine commands, there are specific keys, and so, the child needs to master certain codes. Logical reasoning is also widely practiced in these games, as children must create certain logics to achieve goals. Electronic games also enable the development of attention and concentration, while children focus on a certain activity and dedicate themselves to it until they get tired, discovering in this process a particular inner fulfilment.

In addition, Cotonhoto and Rossetti (2016) also highlight other advantages of the practices of virtual electronic games, affecting children's development and learning in addition to favoring socialization, such as the development of autonomy and morality, acceptance of rules, limits and frustrations, creativity, imagination and other skills these children's future lives will demand.

As in this research study, our emphasis is on discussing the toy library, we can think that in these spaces we can also, with electronic games, develop the ludic, artistic, dynamic, interactive and virtual language that is part of the

daily life of school children and adolescents. Furthermore, in the toy library, electronic games, as well as traditional ones, can also assist in the development of strategies to overcome their stages and objectives, anticipating future actions.

We saw, therefore, the importance of training the teacher not only for the ludic field, but also in the updates demanded in the direction of the culture currently experienced by the children. Keeping that in mind, theoretical notes on this specific topic, which came into light throughout the research, will be presented next.

3.3 Training in Pedagogy: where are the toy libraries?

At this point in our studies, we directed our inquiries to the research central question, that is, the role of the toy library in teachers' education. However, we found that a previous question had to be answered: how does an educator become a playful being. Would it be possible to train teachers to become able to play?

In Fortuna (2018, p.19) we find that "an educator is not born an educator, or 'becomes' an educator unexpectedly after going through a specific training for that". The author states that educators become educators through their school, professional and personal experience. Teaching situations make up a part of that training. And, if so, in this study we complete that it is in this specific training that we must also emphasize the teacher's training as playful being.

And for that, according to Fortuna (2018), there are several types of knowledge involved in the educator's initial and onward training. The ludic knowledge that interests us here "is an informal knowledge, based on good experiences from playing in childhood and episodes of ludic learning at elementary school and initial training." (p. 23). However, in teachers' initial training at universities, this knowledge does not usually receive systematic training, being approached just in the practical scope. For the author "... the ludic knowledge is essentially experiential and the university training is essentially theoretical" (Fortuna, 2018, p. 23), but the author argues that the ludic knowledge could not do without the theoretical and conceptual contributions, in a continuous dialogue between experiential and ludic situations with the theory from the field of studies in Game and Education.

In article 61 of the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education LDB n° 9.394 / 96 (Brasil, 1996), it is determined, as essential, this desired association between theory and practice, not only in continuing education, but also in the initial training studied herein. This same legislation, which embeds Early Childhood training in Elementary Education, also includes playing activities as one of the languages of early childhood training. In addition, in the National Syllabus References for Early Childhood Education (2009) we find that "(...) playing favors children's self-esteem, helping them to progressively overcome their acquisitions in a creative way" (Brasil, 2009, p. 4), and, all of this leads to a more appropriate teacher training to work with children.

This research emphasizes precisely this discussion, as we suggest that these living situations be developed in the space of toy libraries within the university and in the pedagogues' initial training, as

the toy library in teachers and pedagogues' training courses is justified as it favors transformations in knowledge and conceptions about ludic activities and provides theoretical support for a reflexive, critical and autonomous performance about playing in the teaching and learning process at school. (Rau & Lara, 2017, p. 24438)

In order to further emphasize the importance of the toy library in the educator's training, Fortuna (2018) states that educators are not born knowing how to play, either, this ability may be built in their educational experience. Our studies showed that toy libraries are currently present in different contexts and are part of the daily life not only of large urban centers, but also of rural areas and even indigenous communities. Each of them has its specificity and its common aspects and we see them not only in Early Childhood and Elementary schools, but also in hospitals, indigenous communities and settlements. (Paula, 2014). We emphasize here that this expansion undoubtedly points to a greater interest in the constitution of these premises.

However, we observed that this greater interest in toy libraries has not reflected proportionately in Pedagogy and Teaching License courses. Therefore, our argument in the research was that these spaces need to be presented, discussed, studied and more than that, experienced in educators' training who wish to work with children.

We underline that the theoretical contributions discussed so far make up the results of this research, fulfilling our goal to define conceptually and historically a toy library as a space and time for playing and learning. The study developed throughout the entire process, receiving contribution from several students who participated in the study groups. More specifically, the results and discussion from the field work research will be presented next.

4. Results and Discussion: what do the teachers in the investigated field say?

4.1 The learning processes linked to the resources of playing activities toys and games. What resources can we count on in the investigated toy library?

This initial phase, in some way, indicated that the toy library is not yet a space, in fact, for actions for the learning of our Pedagogy students, as we found that its use is still fragile in comparison with all its potential in teacher education that we see from the readings carried out.

As for the survey of the material, we list below what was computed in the playroom space. As permanent material, we find: twelve (12) mattresses; twelve (12) cushions; four (04) sets of children's tables and chairs; one (01) TV (32 inches); fifteen (15) large blue plug-in plates; thirteen (13) small plates of different colors; and two (02) tire made puffs. The ludic, pedagogical material found could be classified into three categories and were counted as follows: twenty-six (26) boxes with ten (10) literacy games each; one hundred and three (103) children's literature books; and, fifteen (15) educational games.

In our discussions about this constant material in the research space, we found that there is still much to do and we are even proposing new partnerships and acquisition of new materials, both permanent and ludic-pedagogical, even if it is through a donation campaign carried out in the academic community, an idea that emerged among the students who attended the study group.

4.2 Ludic training in Pedagogy: an experience with reading groups, workshops and ludic activities

In the volunteering Group of Studies and Readings established, we could see how much the students' individual and spontaneous action, looking for themes of their core interest can actually contribute to meaningful learning, so that each one who was there, attending our meetings, was able to assign a particular meaning to each text they read, to each discussion they developed, and to each concept they learned then.

It was also evident the need for more dense content about the ludic, as well as the requirement for changes in the pedagogical practices developed in our students' training, in the perspective of training an educator, but also and even more so, aiming at training a playful educator, fundamental for working in Early Childhood Education.

It was also clear, as a result of our research that, as the group came through, the production was more guaranteed and expanded, expressed in the manifest desires of other and more readings.

Based on this experience, other ideas for more practical activities emerged, fulfilling another stage of the research. We had playful experiences in the toy library, such as: meditation workshop for the Pedagogy teachers, experiencing something that, in the future, they could use with their future students in child education; b) Commented Cinema based on a special section of the film "Invisible Children", namely "João and Bilo"; c) Commented Cinema, with the film "Between worlds: Helena Antipoff: 's life and work", which would be launched in March 2020, with the participation of Guilherme Reis, director of the film, and members of the Helena Antipoff Foundation, who were able to bring the innovative and the use of ludicity and spontaneity in the teaching-learning process, a practice already constant in the psychologist and educator's work back in the 1950s, in our country.

These activities showed that the ludic format favors our undergraduate students' learning and development, which reaffirms the theoretical notes found, for example, in Kishimoto (2005) defending the idea that playing has two functions, namely, educational and ludic. Agreeing with the author, we saw that both are equally important, considering that, when fulfilling its ludic function, the activities we carried out in this research with the groups, provided pleasure and fun and were even spontaneously chosen by the students, while, on the other hand, they accomplished their educational function as they taught, and we can affirm, they complemented the knowledge and the ability to apprehend the world of our participants, towards their qualification, so that, in the future, they can also provide qualified training.

4.3 Possibilities of actions in the toy library of the Pedagogy course and its importance for the training of pedagogues

Based on the information obtained through the questionnaires applied to the FaE/CBH/UEMG teachers, we found that there is still a great demand for different uses, of a greater number of ludic activities and space such as our toy library, which can also prepare teachers to be more ludic.

No more than eighteen (18) out of the eighty-five (85) faculty teachers volunteered to answer the research questionnaire about the toy library, which is made up of our (4) questions that could be answered online in a *Google* form that was sent to everyone via email and *whatsapp*. This showed us a previous extent of the interest in the subject among our undergraduate course teachers.

The quantitative results of the questionnaires showed that 61.1% of the FaE teachers who answered the questionnaire already knew about the toy library, but 38.9% did not know about it, which is a question to be considered, since it seemed to us that, in our faculty, this space is not properly considered as a laboratory for the Pedagogy course, which is a mandatory item prescribed by the legislation, as we mentioned earlier. One of the respondent teachers in his/her comment, at the end of the questionnaire, even states "I would like to know how I get access to the toy library to use the resources in my classes", showing evidence of ignorance concerning the toy library as a space for teaching and learning for Pedagogy students' training. Yet another responder points out that

I believe that this space should be more used. I speak based on my own experience, as I have not been able to take my students there to carry out activities. It was not out of unwillingness, but because it was not possible get hold of the key or authorization to go into the toy library.

This is an important testimony, which shows how little this laboratory is divulged among us in the course, and makes it evident the urgent need to increase not only the access to the space, but, also, we add, the organization and enrichment of materials and a greater dissemination of its potential for a better use in the training of our students.

This is also reasserted by another responder to our questionnaire, who thinks, "that the availability of the toy library space for teachers who can include ludic experiences in their classes, can enrich and bring great contributions to the pedagogues' training.

In the question about the possible interrelation between the responding teacher's discipline with activities in the toy library, most teachers (72.2%) answered affirmatively, which indicates that the toy library would actually be a laboratory of the Pedagogy course, since it would benefit all these disciplines confirmed by the teachers themselves. Only 11.1% of the teachers completely disagreed with this statement, which indicates that the disciplines of this group of teachers do not have any element that could be discussed and that they could benefit from the ludic space of the toy library. Based on the type of instrument and questions answered, the reason for these responses was not clear, but we saw that it would be important to set more light to this fact. The other teachers partially agreed with the statement, which places us, before another group of subjects and teachers (16.7%) who would use - even partially - the toy library. We can even ask whether this partial (im)possibility of dialogue between the discipline and the toy library would not be due to the difficulties that, even now makes it difficult the access to the toy library, a process that is still being organized.

In the third and last objective question, the entire group of participating teachers (100%), agreed with the statement that, as teachers in the Pedagogy course, they understand that the toy library can favor the pedagogue's training. So, we hear from one of them that

In the pedagogy training, it is not enough to learn to develop ludic activities; it is necessary to learn to be ludic. I think that the toy library offers this possibility of trans(forming) into a ludic being.

It is important to highlight how this responder's statement can be directly addressed to what we discussed earlier in this text, in the theoretical part, about what we studied in Fortuna (2018) that educators are not born ludic, as this capacity can and should be built up during their training at the universities.

Therefore, we see the articulation between practical and theoretical knowledge as fundamental, as it was pointed out in our theoretical framework, and it is necessary to break off with the dichotomy that places the ludic knowledge on one side as experiential and practical knowledge, and, the university education with its essentially theoretical knowledge on the opposite side, (Fortuna, 2018). Thus, we used the voice of one of the faculty members who responded to our questionnaire, reaffirming this idea by saying that

The use of the toy library is one of the ways to provide a theoretical-practical training for the undergraduate in pedagogy on ludic learning. In addition, the presence of the toy library in an higher education institution pictures one of the indicators of the quality of education as determined in the assessment instruments of the pedagogy courses.

This also helps us to reaffirm the legal requirement for this theoretical-practical interconnection of knowledge given by the Syllabus References. Furthermore, to contribute to this interconnection and measure the importance of the toy library that was evidenced in our research, here we use the argument from another teacher who points out that for the Pedagogy course, the use of the toy library is as important as the use of the library, as "playing is part of the school universe as well as children's literature books".

In order to analyze more specifically the possibility of actions in the toy library and its importance in the education of the pedagogue, we highlight the testimony of one of the subjects who answered the questionnaire, who reports on the little use he/she made of the toy library having been only in one integrated class, claiming that it was "**just** to use a different space for the production of group activities" (emphasis added). For this research, however, this brief use already points to possible actions in the toy library that we believe to contribute substantially to education in Pedagogy, by encouraging spaces other than the classroom, which should also be considered "classrooms" with a possible greater potential to produce knowledge. The same teacher confirms this when she/he argues that, "In the case of Special and Inclusive Education, it is essential to use distinguished spaces, to rethink resources and ludic activities as a manner of intervention."

Another testimony towards the same direction caught our attention because it contributes greatly to new ideas for actions that was one of our goals in the research. The responder suggests that

the toy library could take toys as cultural artifacts that bear the marks of different historical moments and different cultures; the plays could also be considered as cultural heritage, because through them we can recognize ourselves and be recognized by others.

The subject adds that he/she carried out a workshop with a student in which students in the class compared the possibilities of development and learning from handmade toys with those provided by current industrial toys and used the soap bubble play for this experience, which produced a fruitful debate on this topic.

Therefore, in this item, it was evident both, in speakers' statements who answered the questionnaire, as well as in the discussions that we stirred from these speeches and from the other information we obtained in the groups and workshops developed in our research trajectory, the importance and the urgent need to use it by creating and increasing actions in the toy library that we know are actually effective in teacher's training.

5. Final considerations

We begin these final words, reaffirming what we described throughout the research in this article: the ludic training in the toy libraries in the universities and especially in the Pedagogy faculties, ought to be part of the undergraduate

students' training, as pedagogical theories as well as pedagogical practices involving laying, contribute to breaking off with this spontaneous-like conception about the ludic and its place in the child learning process.

However, it is up to us here, to focus on the information obtained, not only from the research phase of literature review, but also from the answers from our research subjects, which have become fundamental in our investigation. We realized that, regarding the material contained in the research realm, there is still much to be done and we are even proposing new partnerships and the acquisition of new materials, both permanent and educational.

We have also seen that the ludic format favors our undergraduate students' learning and development, which seconds the theoretical notes we found, bearing in mind the idea that playing has its two functions, the educational and the ludic. Fulfilling their ludic function, the activities that we developed in this research with the groups, provided pleasure and fun, as they were spontaneously chosen by the students. They fulfilled their educational function because they taught and we can state that they completed the knowledge and our participants' capacity to apprehend the world, towards a qualified training, which will allow to train with quality in the future.

We discussed the toy library as a space of contradiction, because at the same time that it recognizes the child's right to play, it also establishes controls and institutionalizes playing activities, proving to be, a space for researching and training which corroborates our research hypothesis. This contradiction is also expressed in the discussion approaching electronic and traditional games, but we found that, in the toy library, both, traditional and electronic games, can help as strategies to promote the development of children and adolescents because ludic practices are social and cultural practices and are always being created and recreated by those who are active and not compliant with the impositions of a society.

Thus, we realized that in the teachers' training, the interrelation between theory and practice, the interconnection of experiences and theoretical contributions to these experiences, the interrelation between the ludic knowledge and the theoretical knowledge about ludic activities is essential, confirming our hypothesis that the toy library space is the space par excellence where all this can come true.

In addition to all these arguments, brought into light from the readings, in favor of the toy library in the Pedagogy graduation, we could realize that the same arguments were present in our teachers' answers to the research questionnaire, even finding several weaknesses in the implementation of practices that can actually, legitimize this space in teachers' training.

Finally, we could detect from the research that: it will still be necessary a lot of work in teaching, research and extension at the investigated faculty, which aims to: help in an organization that can lead everyone, teachers and students, to move around and benefit from the toy library; reach a greater quantitative and qualitative interconnection between the disciplines and possible actions in the toy library, a laboratory regulated by law, to form the future educator; transform into legitimate practices what this research still showed us as legitimate ideas, present in our academic community, that the toy library can, in fact, favor the pedagogues' training. Therefore, we realized that, in the Pedagogy course it is extremely important to go on **playing, so as to learn pedagogical practices, from playing!!!**

References

- Bettelheim, B. (1988). *Uma vida para seu filho: pais bons o bastante*[*A life for your child: parents good enough*]. São Paulo: Summus.
- Bock, A. M. B., Gonçalves, M. G. M., Furtado, O. (Orgs). (2001). *Psicologia Sócio-Histórica (Uma perspectiva crítica em Psicologia)*[*Social-Historical Psychology (A critical perspective in Psychology)*]. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Brasil. (1988). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil: promulgada em 5 de outubro de 1988.*[*Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil: issued on October 5th, 1988*] Brasília/ Federal District.

- Brasil. (1990, julho) [July, 1990]. Lei no 8.069. *Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente (ECA)* [Law no.8.069. Statute of Children and Adolescents]. Brasília, DF. Available at : http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/LEIS/L8069.htm#art266>.
- Brasil. (1996). Lei 9394/96. *Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. (LDBEN)*. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. [Law of Directives and Bases of National Education. Establishes the directives and bases of national education] Brasília, DF, Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/lei9394_ldbn1.pdf
- Brasil. (2009). *Referencial Curricular Nacional da Educação Infantil (RCNEI)*. [Child Education National Syllabus Reference] Ministério da Educação e do Desporto, Secretaria de Educação Fundamental.[Ministry of Education and Sports, Secretariat of Elementary Education]. Brasília: MEC/SEF.
- Brougère, Giles. (1995). *Brinquedo e Cultura. [Toy and Culture]*. São Paulo: Cortez,
- Caregnato, R. C. A. & Mutti, R. (2006 Out-Dez) Pesquisa qualitativa: análise de discurso versus análise de conteúdo.[Qualitative Research: discourse analysis versus content analysis]. *Texto Contexto Enfermagem [Text Context Nursing]*, Florianópolis, 15(4), 679-84.
- Cotonhoto, L. A. & Rossetti, C. B. (2016). Prática de Jogos Eletrônicos para crianças pequenas: o que dizem as pesquisas recentes? Electronic Games Practice for young children: what do the researchers say? *Revista Psicopedagogia [Psychopedagogic Journal]*, 33(102), 346-57.
- Fortuna, T. R. (2018) Formação lúdica docente: como os professores que brincam se tornam o que são.[Ludic training for teachers: how teachers who play turn into what they are]. In D'Avila, C. & Fortuna, T. R. *Ludicidade, Cultura Lúdica e Formação de Professores.[Ludicity, Ludic Culture and Education]* Curitiba, CRV.
- Huizinga, J. (2001). *Homo Ludens: o jogo como elemento da cultura. [Homo Ludens: the game as an element of culture]* 5ª Ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Kishimoto (2005). O jogo e a Educação Infantil. [The game and Child Education] In Kishimoto, T. M. (org) *Jogo, brinquedo, brincadeira e Educação.[Game, toy, plays and Education]* São Paulo: Cortez.
- Luchesi, C. C. (2018). Brincadeiras, jogos e Lucidicidade. [Plays, games and Ludicity] In D'Avila, C. & Fortuna, T. R. *Ludicidade, Cultura Lúdica e Formação de Professores.[Ludicity, Ludic Culture and Teachers' Education]* Curitiba, CRV.
- Minayo, M. C.de S. & Sanches, O. (Julho/setembro, 1993).[July/September, 1993] Qualitativo-quantitativo: Oposição ou Complementaridade? [Qualitative/quantitative: Opposition or Complementariness?] *Cadernos de Saúde Pública. [Public Health Notebooks]* Rio de Janeiro: v.9. n. 3.
- Miranda, M. G. de & Resende, A. C. A. (Set/dez. 2006). Sobre a pesquisa-ação na educação e as armadilhas do praticismo. [On the action-research in education and practicisim traps]. *Revista Brasileira de Educação [Brazilian Journal for Education]* v. 11 n. 33.
- Moukachar, M. B. *Representações da Infância em jogos, brinquedos e brincadeiras.* (2004). [Childhood Representations in games, toys and plays]. Belo Horizonte, Editora Newton Paiva.
- Paula, E. T. de. (Julho/dezembro 2014). A brinquedoteca em diferentes contextos: perspectivas contemporâneas para a formação de educadores. [The toy library in different contexts: contemporaneous perspectives for educators' training] *Revista Educação e Emancipação.[Education and Emancipation Journal]* São Luís, v. 7, n. 2.
- Piaget, J. (1987). *A Psicologia da Criança.[Child Psychology]* Rio de Janeiro: Diefel.
- Piassa, Z. A. C. & Montagnini, R. C. (2013). Brinquedoteca: uma interpretação crítica deste espaço no contexto da sociedade capitalista. [Toy library: a critical interpretation of this space in the capitalista society contexto] *XI Congresso Nacional de Educação/Educere. [XI National Congresso of Education]* Curitiba: Pontificia Universidade Católica do Paraná. [Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná.
- Pimenta, S. G. (2005, set./dez.). Pesquisa-ação crítico-colaborativa: construindo seu significado a partir de experiências com a formação docente. [Critical colaborative action-research: building up its meaning based on experiences with teachers' training] *Educação e Pesquisa, [Education and Research]*. São Paulo, v. 31, n. 3, p. 521-539.
- Rau, M. C. T. & Lara, S. M. de. (2017) Brinquedoteca Universitária: a formação de professores pedagogos para o brincar e o brincar para aprender. [University Toy library: the training of pedagogue teachers for playing and playing for learning.] *XIII Congresso Nacional de Educação/Educere. [XIII National Congress on Education]* Curitiba: Pontificia Universidade Católica do Para.[Pontifical Catholic University of Pará]

- Silva, M. F. dos S., Andrade A. P. de, Torres, M. F. de P. & Amorim, G. C. C. (2017). As brincadeiras das crianças de ontem e de hoje no contexto sociocultural. [Children's yesterday and today's plays in the social cultural context] *HOLOS*, Ano 33, Vol. 03. [*HOLOS*, Year 33, Vol. 03].
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1984). *A formação social da mente. [The social formation of the mind]* São Paulo, Martins Fontes.

¹Nota 1: Oliveira, Paulo Sales. (2010). *O que é brinquedo? [What is a toy?]* São Paulo: Brasiliense.

²Note 2: Galindo, D.; Souza, L. L. de; Moura, M. e Rodrigues, V. (2010). Algumas reflexões sobre as relações entre crianças, cidades e brinquedotecas. [Some reflections on relationship between children, cities and toy libraries] *Estud. pesqui. psicol. [online]*. vol.10, n.3 [citado 2012-07-29], pp. 781 - 799. Available at: <http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S18084281201000030009&lng=pt&nrm=iso>. ISSN 1808-4281

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).
