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Masculine / Feminine relation
In the patriarchal order the feminine is considered as a place marked by the masculine symbolic, meaning a lack of symmetry in the masculine/feminine relation. In this sphere, the woman is always considered as the other of the relationship. Even though she is the progenitor and people talk about feminine freedom or liberation, she keeps on being the enigma, the unknown being, dangerous, unequal; but also the object of desire, which is modeled and built according to the masculine values. The sexual difference in the contemporary world is notorious, however, this category is also marked, hold up to, stuck to or for the masculine symbolic. In this way, our work intends to speculate the difference between both worlds and show the divergence of the feminine symbolic that portrays such category concerning the sexual difference thought.

The sexual difference neither means gender diversity, nor inquires the women disadvantage in relation to men and does not speculate policy equality contents.

However, we emphasize that the world is only one and the sex is two. And in this sense, the experience of living the feminine sexed body is different from the experience of living the masculine sexed body. We also state that the sexual difference focus used here does not correspond to the thesis that biology is destiny, but identifies the distance between men and women as a consequence of the patriarchal order. Following the logic of this order the women were reduced to the disorders of the rival relationships mediated by the masculine desire and then they were excluded from the social hierarchies, built based on the masculine sexuality is one of Luce Irigaray. Concerning the gender paradigm, for example, the femininity emancipation and liberation are implicit based on a vision of repressed sex. Such point of view treats the woman as victim and/or the fragile sex, adapting her, consequently, to the masculine model. If the women keep on acting in the sense of this order, the feminine sexual difference is subordinated and assimilated, and won’t mean the feminine freedom and authority. Because of this, the desire to be in the world can work as a support of the feminine meaning and of the sexual difference, but it is only possible through the transgression of the rule and through the transposition to the existent order.

To go beyond this order the woman must be in the middle of the actions that make clear and undo the lack of symmetry between the masculine / feminine, making the desire to be stronger. We highlight that the emancipation paradigm was important for the women, though we state that the gender look in the singular, even if the sexes are two, absorbs and imprisons the feminine sex, as it places the women matter in the socio-cultural construction modeled and determined in the patriarchal society. According to the investigator’s analyses Garretas (1994, p.80) and the investigator’s analyses Garretas (1994, p.80): “...gender and relationship are two inseparable analytical domains: two analytical domains and two concepts that build each other, which ones neither have life, nor independent senses”. When displacing the sex, hence, there is a denial of the signifier, which carries the “sexed-body”, feminine and masculine; a body that entwines the biological, psychological and cultural meanings. The knowledge passes through the bodies sexualization and, in this way, the experience of living in the feminine sexed body neither can be silenced, nor can be reduced to the socially constructed categories. However, the analysis category of the patriarchal system, that was elaborated mainly by the radical feminists, was essential for us to be able to understand the sense of what being woman in the patriarchal society means and the opening to the women awareness, but it is not enough for the advancement of being in the feminine world. The historian Garretas (1994, p.78-79) makes an analysis about the gender concept highlighting: “What some feminists discovered after that great original discovery, is that the gender concept helped us to understand, but, somehow, left us naked”. The gender perspective put in evidence a facet of the women and men existencial truth: showing the part symbolically built by the social stereotypes. Although keeping the critique concerning just the gender logic in the singular, the feminine sex is not allowed to leave the stereotype of victim inside the patriarchal logic. Reflecting on the gender perspective requires a question about the equality policy between men and women, and questioning what symbolic order is behind this perspective. “As the same as whom?” This is one of Luís Filipe’s essential questions, that leads us to the following order: Who is this being who the women would like to be similar to? Such question instigated the emergency of the themes concerning the feminism and the relationship between the sexes. Based on these judiciousness, the equality of opportunities between the sexes and its contribution to the confusion between theory and practice is verified, as it places the sexual difference and the race, cultural and ethnic differences at the same level. Although the women are inside a time and a culture, they are not a race, neither a culture, nor an ethnic group. They are and they always were one of the sexes. These statements are similar to Pérez de Lara’s words (Pérez de Lara, 2002, p.207-208) when he says that:

“the sexual difference is the fundamental human difference. It is the one that makes possible the great richness of diversity and, at the same time, the great pettiness which is treated. It is from the sexual difference that the sentence that says that we, the human beings, are all equally different because we are men and women, white men and women, mixed race men and women, black men and women, becomes right. And this is the first difference that was denied, dominated, placed in a hierarchy. The one that has changed itself and created the symbolic order that we spread to all the other differences of the human diversity.”

That’s why the feminine and masculine sexual difference is the original one, essential for the discussion we are born woman or men. And it can’t be identified with any other difference from the diversity of the human experiences. In this sense, it can be said that the feminine sexual difference opens, hence, to a knowledge and to an experience, which ones are converted to a specific pedagogy of the women, derived from the constitutive possibility of being two, of generating, taking care, respecting and sustaining the life.

The sexual difference pedagogy
This pedagogy develops a critique to the mixed school, warning that it does not change itself with the presence of the feminine students, because this kind of school has been incorporating the girls in the masculine world, including the organizational system, the cultural and the didactic world. The way that the mixed school is worked on, in most of the cases, reinforces the segregation. Besides, this way doesn’t assure that the sexism can be overcome, neither the subjective feminine advancement, nor the contribution to the subjective masculine reality.

Above all, the sexual difference pedagogy is a political practice which abandons the voluntary attitude of modifying the reality and the school since its outside, with reforming programs. It is a knowledge about the denied and not expressed life they are not named and in many cases, taken by the men. The sexual difference pedagogy acts through practices based on “self reforming” (in the free sense of the sexual difference), trying to give a social shape to the relationships between the
women for them to achieve the feminine freedom, not in the sense of the ghetto, but in the direction of the self-esteem.

Understanding the approach of this pedagogy as the essential base of the women policy, the educative relation opens to the feminine symbolic space in a vertical reality, which origin is feminine and political, a dimension of the future, without which it is not possible to conceive the education. It can't be acceptable that the symbolic space of this vertical reality is incarnated by the men, by the authority and by the masculine model, because inside this reality the women, taken one by one, lost themselves. This thought places the relations inside the school, which changes the school itself, as it modifies the established order. Jourdan (1998) points out that the sexual difference pedagogy introduced to school the benefits of the women policy concerning two questions: 1) relation between whom? and 2) what relation? The author answers the following: the relationship is between the teachers - men and women - and the students - boys and girls - namely, between women and men in a certain context, and the relationship is not the same, between living beings that are not the same, but similar and different. Considering the critiques and the discussions pointed out so far, we based ourselves on the sexual difference focus to analyze the relationship between the feminine symbolic world and the masculine symbolic world. We observed the masculine construction during the Physical Education classes investigating the teachers' influences on the (re)production of these values, ignoring and at the same time devaluing the feminine.

Methodology
This study was developed coexisting with a high-school group, first and second year B, at Júlio Mesquita State School, during two years, in the city of Curitiba, Paraná. Our method was based on the qualitative focus, which gave support to the class observations, to the interviews given by the students and finally to the interviews with the responsible teachers. We focused on the relationship between the boys themselves and inside the mixed groups; the activities that were developed; the preferences and the busy spaces during the classes. The research was based on the case study Stake (1998) and on the qualitative analyses Eisner (1998); Taylor, Bogdan, (1996) with the purpose of noticing the teachers’ perspectives while facing the teaching complex situations, as it is a way in which the teachers' point of view can be communicated more properly. Besides, the case study can reveal the types of cultural myths that are present in the teachers’ formation.

The sexual difference that marks the difference in the classes
In the Physical Education classes we noticed the masculine predominance in the participation. The boys were more active, focusing on the competition, using the aggressiveness and force. On the other hand, during the feminine practice the recreation was the most important part, showing the relationship between them; the taste for game; representing the feminine expression at school. In this case, such practice became a polarization, and this happened because it was given more value to one of the elements of the corporal culture to the detriment of the other. In this way, the sport, as the content with the highest value, is in the boys' recreation activities, and the importance given to the recreation is to the girls. The essential point of the sexual differences of the sexes in contrast to the both sexes education, namely, co-education. In this context, most of the girls, and the boys that do not like soccer may incorporate the feeling of deficit concerning the sport practice. Due to the girls and women's socialization in the patriarchal culture, as the only universal culture, they arrive at school with a lack of symbolic maternal forms, as psychological and cognitive structures, because the mother is not the primary source of positive adaptation in the world anymore.

The feminine mediation, which is from one “the same” or from one symbolic root, is essential for the girls to get into the world attended by the social authority of their sex, assuming as signifier the clear notion of 'feminine sexual difference'. The teachers taught adopting the masculine model in the content, in the didactic, language etc., contributing to the girls neutralization, which opens to the boys the time and space for the desirable and the free game at school. The teacher's way of acting in this situation, influenced the students to give different values to the activities, which made the activities considered feminine, as the recreation, be assimilated as secondary. Without luck, the girls created activities by themselves, in out side, related to the ones that represented recreational models learned in their daily routine. Such activities, although full of meanings for the girls, were never considered by school and, consequently, by the teachers.

Concerning the adherence to the activities, we noticed that the boys resisted adopting the activities considered feminine. To maintain the control over the class the teachers accepted the masculine desires and left the girls, because they are controlled easier. The teachers, with the desire to give the same attention to both sexes, used survival strategies, which showed their accommodation to the activities directly related to the interest of the majority of the boys. This androcentric way of dealing with the knowledge perpetuates from generation to generation, through the History, because according to Garretas (1994), what we know as feminine inside the patriarchal society is not what the women really were or are in the past, but what the men built for them and named what they are. To modify this, it is necessary to appreciate the feminine again at school, because according to Fiusi (1998) the sexual difference is not a content difference, but it is a quality of the feminine relation with the world.

Declaring the difficulty of working with the girls, the teachers showed the desire to teach in separated classes, divided by the sexes, because in them they could develop more specific activities, such as, the gym for the girls, fights and soccer for the boys. This is the sexual difference pedagogy essential point, namely, giving space to the girls in the middle of the classes for them to be able to learn and, as a consequence, take part in the Physical Education classes. However, in the teachers' speech there is a stereotyped image pointing out what is proper for the girls and what is proper for the boys, not making possible the choice of both sexes.

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that the difficulty of working in mixed groups comes from the sexes unequal socialization, since the boys are usually raised with more “freedom”, while the girls are more passive, emphasizing the exercise of teaching; basically, one of the same time restating the difference redistribution, not allowing the femininity as recreation at school. The teacher’s way of acting in this situation, influenced the students to give different values to the activities, which made the activities considered feminine, as the recreation, be assimilated as secondary. Without luck, the girls created activities by themselves, in out side, related to the ones that represented recreational models learned in their daily routine. Such activities, although full of meanings for the girls, were never considered by school and, consequently, by the teachers.

Concerning the adherence to the activities, we noticed that the boys resisted adopting the activities considered feminine. To maintain the control over the class the teachers accepted the masculine desires and left the girls, because they are controlled easier. The teachers, with the desire to give the same attention to both sexes, used survival strategies, which showed their accommodation to the activities directly related to the interest of the majority of the boys. This androcentric way of dealing with the knowledge perpetuates from generation to generation, through the History, because according to Garretas (1994), what we know as feminine inside the patriarchal society is not what the women really were or are in the past, but what the men built for them and named what they are. To modify this, it is necessary to appreciate the feminine again at school, because according to Fiusi (1998) the sexual difference is not a content difference, but it is a quality of the feminine relation with the world.

Declaring the difficulty of working with the girls, the teachers showed the desire to teach in separated classes, divided by the sexes, because in them they could develop more specific activities, such as, the gym for the girls, fights and soccer for the boys. This is the sexual difference pedagogy essential point, namely, giving space to the girls in the middle of the classes for them to be able to learn and, as a consequence, take part in the Physical Education classes. However, in the teachers' speech there is a stereotyped image pointing out what is proper for the girls and what is proper for the boys, not making possible the choice of both sexes.

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that the difficulty of working in mixed groups comes from the sexes unequal socialization, since the boys are usually raised with more “freedom”, while the girls are more passive, emphasizing the exercise of teaching; basically, one of the same time restating the difference redistribution, not allowing the femininity as recreation at school. The teacher’s way of acting in this situation, influenced the students to give different values to the activities, which made the activities considered feminine, as the recreation, be assimilated as secondary. Without luck, the girls created activities by themselves, in out side, related to the ones that represented recreational models learned in their daily routine. Such activities, although full of meanings for the girls, were never considered by school and, consequently, by the teachers.

Concerning the adherence to the activities, we noticed that the boys resisted adopting the activities considered feminine. To maintain the control over the class the teachers accepted the masculine desires and left the girls, because they are controlled easier. The teachers, with the desire to give the same attention to both sexes, used survival strategies, which showed their accommodation to the activities directly related to the interest of the majority of the boys. This androcentric way of dealing with the knowledge perpetuates from generation to generation, through the History, because according to Garretas (1994), what we know as feminine inside the patriarchal society is not what the women really were or are in the past, but what the men built for them and named what they are. To modify this, it is necessary to appreciate the feminine again at school, because according to Fiusi (1998) the sexual difference is not a content difference, but it is a quality of the feminine relation with the world.

Declaring the difficulty of working with the girls, the teachers showed the desire to teach in separated classes, divided by the sexes, because in them they could develop more specific activities, such as, the gym for the girls, fights and soccer for the boys. This is the sexual difference pedagogy essential point, namely, giving space to the girls in the middle of the classes for them to be able to learn and, as a consequence, take part in the Physical Education classes. However, in the teachers' speech there is a stereotyped image pointing out what is proper for the girls and what is proper for the boys, not making possible the choice of both sexes.

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that the difficulty of working in mixed groups comes from the sexes unequal socialization, since the boys are usually raised with more “freedom”, while the girls are more passive, emphasizing the exercise of teaching; basically, one of the same time restating the difference redistribution, not allowing the femininity as recreation at school. The teacher’s way of acting in this situation, influenced the students to give different values to the activities, which made the activities considered feminine, as the recreation, be assimilated as secondary. Without luck, the girls created activities by themselves, in out side, related to the ones that represented recreational models learned in their daily routine. Such activities, although full of meanings for the girls, were never considered by school and, consequently, by the teachers.
rules can be modified. Besides, the variation of the activities can motivate all the students to participate.

There were participations in the mixed groups, specially while the teams formation. When the boys were absent, they formed the teams also with girls. But there were rejections from the boys: “no way for the girls to play soccer”. When there was a feminine soccer game, the boys acted as goal keepers. Even though there were soccer games for boys and girls, the boys spent more time in the courts, as well as in the mixed games, in which the greatest number of participants were masculine. The observed behaviors showed a masculine dominance during the space occupation, in the number of the participants and in the shots. The presence and the permanence in the central court is an ability indicator, so in this sense, the skillful students were there more frequently: they stayed in this court almost all the time of the classes. On the contrary, the girls and the boys that did not like soccer often used the lateral of the court or sat down on the stairs as spectators or talking about other matters.

When they seldom practiced tennis with shuttlecocks, games such as tic-tac-toe, frescobol, “queimada”, indian wrestling, among other kinds of games, the manhood was constant watched by the students; not only during the activities proposed by the boys, but also during the ones proposed by the girls. The frescobol called the attention because it was the most polemical activity among the students, as many of them refused to play arguing that it was a game only for the girls “...I am going to throw the ball against the face of who forces me to play”; “Playing frescobol? You are making jokes at me...”. We have to consider that the activities themselves are neither feminine nor masculine; the activities are named by the socially built values, as feminine or masculine stereotypes. The frescobol was considered a discriminatory activity concerning the masculinity, “a gay’s game”, because who is man takes part in activities that use the force and aggressiveness. Miedzian (1995) explains that people keeps on educating the boys with the fear that maybe they won’t be tough or “men” enough. In addition to this situation, any action that is considered far from a man’s behavior is not accepted, with the threat to their sexuality, which generates the fear of being excluded from the group of the “strong” and receive a nasty label.

The asymmetry does not exist only among the sexes, but it also predominates in the girls’ games when they are lead by the masculine symbolic. For example: a skilful student (girl) was never well treated by her colleagues. This student told the teacher asking for some help: “They only scratch me, pinch me and kick me”. The teacher’s answer neglected the educative relation: “Team sports are like this”. It means that the teacher’s intervention does not go beyond the masculine symbolic universe, because they consider the sport abilities as masculine, a quality exclusively masculine and prowess to be developed. If the girls desire to develop such prowess they must adapt themselves to the way of being in the masculine symbolic. It is not by chance that this student, in many situations, heard her friends and colleagues’ gossips, in which she was called as “the tough boy”. After all, to be skilful as the boys one should incorporate as well the masculine expressions in their movements, way of walking, speaking etc.

Therefore, we emphasize that the practices considered as feminine and masculine, associated to the body, are the center of the masculinity and femininity construction. In this case, we deduce that the wrongdoing behavior achieved the sexual identity, so this analysis is mandatory to review the social imaginary. Learning physical activity is being dealing with the sexual condition imposed by the social rules and, at the same time, with the ghosts that the society itself establishes in relation to such conditions. Thinking about the consequences of these acts, not only for the girls but also for the boys, we state that the reflection exercise is a must, with the purpose of touching the teachers in relation to the formation commitment of both sexes, based on the education seen in relation to the thought that not only recognizes the other sex, but also authorizes the girls in their condition, expressiveness, desire and, chiefly, in the sense of the feminine symbolic. In short, to educate with masculine and feminine models highlighting the differences in a clear way.

**Final Considerations**

After the analysis of the interventions, we state that the mixed school, seeking for the equality, starts treating boys and girls in the same way, placing them at the same level by the androcentric point of view. Furthermore, it makes possible for the girls and for the boys the equality of access, however, it does not make possible the equality of attention and of learning opportunities. Boys and girls were prejudiced with the implantation of this masculine model, but the girls were more prejudiced in their desire to learn and participate. Through this analysis, based on the sexual difference, we evidence that the masculinity is assimilated For example: a male student (girl) was never well treated by her colleagues. This student told the teacher asking for some help: “They only scratch me, pinch me and kick me”. The teacher’s answer neglected the educative relation: “Team sports are like this”. It means that the teacher’s intervention does not go beyond the masculine symbolic universe, because they consider the sport abilities as masculine, a quality exclusively masculine and prowess to be developed. If the girls desire to develop such prowess they must adapt themselves to the way of being in the masculine symbolic. It is not by chance that this student, in many situations, heard her friends and colleagues’ gossips, in which she was called as “the tough boy”. After all, to be skilful as the boys one should incorporate as well the masculine expressions in their movements, way of walking, speaking etc.
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MASCUINE/FÉMININE RELATION IN THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASSES

Summary:
Plural gender is the reference of the following study, under the perspective of the sexual difference. Aware of the masculine/feminine determination in the society we analyse the masculine/feminine construction in the Physical Education classes. Methodologically we based ourselves on Stake (1998), concerning the study of the qualitative case. We observed a high school class at Júlio Mesquita State School, in the city of Curitiba, Paraná. We focused on the teachers’ interventions, on the contents, on the spaces filled by both sexes, on the relationship between boys and girls, among themselves and in mixed groups. The results showed that the teachers acted inside restrictive models in the masculine symbolic world, contributing to the unilateral education of the patriarchal perspective. In short, we have understood that the mixed classes, in the studied case, didn’t provide activities and spaces that motivated the feminine in the classes. The pedagogical references didn’t permit the feminine recreation in the school atmosphere as well as restricted the masculine expressions in the Physical Education classes.

Key Words  Physical Education, masculine / feminine relation

RELATION MASCULIN/FÉMININ PENDANT LES COURS D’EDUCATION PHYSIQUE

Résumé
Cette étude porte sur le genre au pluriel, dans la perspective de la différence sexuelle. En nous appuyant méthodologiquement sur Stake (1998), nous avons envisagé les déterminants féminin/masculin qui s’inscrivent dans la société et, depuis ces référents, nous avons examiné la construction du masculin et du féminin pendant les cours d’Education Physique dans une classe d’enseignement secondaire (lycée) au Collégio Estadual Júlio Mesquita, dans la ville de Curitiba, PR. Nous avons posé le regard sur l’activité des professeurs, les contenus des cours, les espaces occupés par les deux sexes, dans les relations entre garçons et filles, entre eux et envers leurs camarades du sexe opposé, dans les groupes mixtes. Les résultats montrent que les enseignants ont agi dans les moules restrictifs du monde symbolique masculin, contribuant ainsi à une éducation unilatérale depuis la perspective patriarcale. Nous avons observé que les classes mixtes, dans le cas étudié, n’ont pas pourvu d’espaces ou activités pour encourager le féminin pendant le cours. Les éléments pédagogiques ont rendu impossible la re-invention du féminin dans l’espace scolaire, en même temps qu’ils ont limité les possibilités d’expression du masculin dans les cours d’Education Physique.

Mots clés : Education Physique, relation masculin-féminin.

RELACION MASCULINO/FEMENINO EN LAS CLASES DE EDUCACION FÍSICA

Resumen:
Género plural es el referencial del presente estudio basado en la perspectiva de la diferencia sexual. Concientes de las determinaciones femenino/masculino en la sociedad analizamos la construcción del masculino y del femenino en las clases de Educación Física. Metodológicamente apoyamos en Stake (1998) en lo que conciernes al estudio de casos cualitativo. Observamos una clase del ensenanza media del Collégio Estadual Júlio Mesquita, en la ciudad de Curitiba-PR. Direccionamos nuestra mirada en las intervenciones docentes, en los contenidos, en el espacio ocupado por los sexos, en los relacionamientos de los/as chicos/as entre sí y en los grupos mixtos. Los resultados demostraron que las maestras atuaron con modelos restrictivos del mundo simbólico masculino contribuyendo así a la educación unilateral de la perspectiva patriarcal. En el caso estudiado, las clases mixtas no proporcionaron actividades y espacios que involucrasen al femenino en el aula. Los referentes pedagógicos imposibilitaron la reinvención del femenino en el espacio escolar así como delimitaron las posibilidades de expresión del masculino en las clases de Educación Física.

Mots clés : Educación Física, relación masculino-feminino.

RELAÇÃO MASCULINO/FEMININO NAS AULAS DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA

Resumo:
Gênero plural é o referencial do presente estudo baseado na perspectiva da diferença sexual. Conscientes das determinações feminino/masculino na sociedade analisamos a construção do masculino e do feminino nas aulas de Educação Física. Metodologicamente apoiamos em Stake (1998) no que concerne ao estudo de caso qualitativo. Observamos uma turma do ensino médio do Collégio Estadual Júlio Mesquita, na cidade de Curitiba-PR. Enfocamos nosso olhar nas intervenções docentes, nos conteúdos, espaços ocupados por ambos os sexos, nos relacionamentos dos/as meninos/as entre si e nos grupos mistos. Os resultados demonstraram que as professoras atuaram dentro modelos restritivos do mundo simbólico masculino contribuindo à educação unilateral da perspectiva patriarcal. Em síntese, deflagramos que as aulas mistas, no caso estudado, não proporcionaram atividades e espaços que incentivassem o feminino nas aulas. Os referentes pedagógicos impossibilitaram a re-invenção do feminino no espaço escolar assim como delimitaram as possibilidades de expressão do masculino nas aulas de Educação Física.

Palavras chaves: Educação Física, relação masculino, feminino.