

Physical Education in the National Textbook and Didactic Material Program: an analysis of the implementation¹

*A Educação Física no Programa Nacional de Livro e Material Didático:
uma análise da implementação*

*Educación Física en el Programa Nacional de Libros y Material Didáctico:
un análisis de la implementación*

Fernando Garcez de Melo²
Universidade do Estado de Mato Grosso

Shirley Cláudia da Silva e Souza³
Universidade do Estado de Mato Grosso

Evando Carlos Moreira⁴
Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso

Abstract: This study analyzes the inclusion of Physical Education in the National Textbook and Didactic Material Program (PNLD) and the implementation of this policy in municipal schools in Cuiabá (MT), starting in 2017. The qualitative research was based on interviews with teachers conducted in 2019 and on discursive textual analysis. The results reveal difficulties in the material selection process, with communication failures between administrators and teachers, as well as limitations in the adaptation and use of the approved didactic collections. Although teachers use the materials – especially for planning –, their more consistent use remains a challenge. The study concludes that, despite the PNLD's potential to contribute to the democratization of knowledge in Physical Education, its effective implementation depends on greater teacher involvement and adjustments in the material selection and usage process.

Keywords: Physical Education; Textbook; Public policy.

Resumo: Este estudo analisa a inserção da Educação Física no Programa Nacional do Livro e do Material Didático (PNLD) e a implementação dessa política nas escolas municipais de Cuiabá (MT), a partir de 2017. A pesquisa, de natureza qualitativa, baseou-se em entrevistas com docentes realizadas em 2019 e na análise textual discursiva. Os resultados revelam dificuldades no processo de escolha dos materiais, com falhas na comunicação entre gestores e professores/as, além de limitações na

¹ Tradução - Luiz Fabiano Braga dos Santos Secretaria Municipal de Educação de Goiânia E-mail: luizfabiano@egresso.ufg.br.

² PhD in Education from the Federal University of Mato Grosso. State University of Mato Grosso (UNEMAT), Cáceres, Mato Grosso, (MT) Brazil. E-mail: garcez@unemat.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1410326097497883>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9634-0568>.

³ PhD in Education from the Federal University of Mato Grosso. State University of Mato Grosso (UNEMAT), Cáceres, Mato Grosso, (MT) Brazil. E-mail: shirley.souza@unemat.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6346776255610516>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3932-8655>.

⁴ Doctor of Physical Education from the State University of Campinas. (UNICAMP). Federal University of Mato Grosso, Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, (MT) Brazil. E-mail: ecmmoreira@uol.com.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/4561814544149415>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5407-7930>.

adaptação e no uso das coleções didáticas aprovadas. Embora os professores/as utilizem os materiais –sobretudo para planejamento –, o emprego mais consistente dos livros ainda representa um desafio. O estudo conclui que, apesar do potencial do PNLD para contribuir com a democratização do conhecimento na Educação Física, sua implementação efetiva depende de maior envolvimento docente e de ajustes no processo de escolha e uso dos materiais.

Palavras-chave: Educação Física; Livro Didático; Política Pública.

Resumen: Este estudio analiza la inclusión de la Educación Física en el Programa Nacional del Libro y del Material Didáctico (PNLD) y la implementación de dicha política en las escuelas municipales de Cuiabá (MT), a partir de 2017. La investigación, de naturaleza cualitativa, se basó en entrevistas con docentes realizadas en 2019 y en el análisis textual discursivo. Los resultados revelan dificultades en el proceso de selección de los materiales, con fallas en la comunicación entre gestores y profesores, además de limitaciones en la adaptación y uso de las colecciones didácticas aprobadas. Aunque los profesores utilizan los materiales –especialmente para la planificación –, un uso más consistente de los libros aún representa un desafío. El estudio concluye que, a pesar del potencial del PNLD para contribuir a la democratización del conocimiento en la Educación Física, su implementación efectiva depende de una mayor participación docente y de ajustes en el proceso de selección y uso de los materiales.

Palabras clave: Educación Física; Libro de Texto; Política Pública.

Received: October 24, 2024

Accepted: October 1, 2025

Introduction

The Brazilian textbook policy dates back to the late 19th century (Bittencourt, 2008), with more structured actions taking place from the 1930s onward, following the creation of the National Book Institute and the implementation of the Textbook Program. Studies such as those by Munakata (1997), Filgueiras (2011), and Bragança (2009) show how this policy has undergone successive transformations over the decades (and continues to change), including its execution through different programs. A key milestone was the creation of the National Textbook Program (PNLD) in 1985. Since then, the textbook policy has been continuously implemented through this program, despite significant changes over time. One of these occurred in 2017 with Decree No. 9,099/2017, when the PNLD expanded its scope and incorporated actions previously carried out by other programs, leading to its new designation as the *National Program for Textbooks and Didactic Materials* (still under the same acronym, PNLD).

One particular change that drew attention in this study was the inclusion of Physical Education as a curricular component – that is, the subject began to be covered by specific textbook collections. Its inclusion in the PNLD took place in 2017, with the publication in the *Official Gazette of the Union* of the Call for Submissions governing the registration and evaluation of works for PNLD/2019: Call for Submissions No. 01/2017 from the *National Fund for the Development of Education* (FNDE, 2017). This inclusion, when observed in light of national education laws and guidelines, aimed to fulfill the establishment of competencies and guidelines for basic education that would guide curricula and their minimum contents, ensuring a common basic education, as stated in Article 9, item IV (Brazil, 1996). The educational legislation reiterates the need for general guidelines, given “the urgency of updating educational policies that embody every Brazilian citizen’s right to human and civic education and to professional training through experiences in educational environments” (Brazil, 2013).

It was within this same argumentative and political framework that the *National Common Curricular Base* (BNCC) was developed and approved—namely, to define “the organic and progressive set of essential learning experiences that all students must develop throughout the stages and modalities of Basic Education” (Brazil, 2017a, p. 7). The PNLD aligns with this perspective of common formation, as Decree No. 9,099/2017 states that the program’s objectives include improving teaching and learning processes in public basic education schools and democratizing access to sources of information and culture, as well as “Art. 2, item VI: supporting the implementation of the National Common Curricular Base” (Brazil, 2017b).

As a mandatory curricular component of basic education, Physical Education requires the most relevant and effective means to address bodily practices in their diverse forms of social coding and meaning, as indicated by the BNCC. Furthermore, since 2010, an increasing number of studies on textbooks in Physical Education have emerged, highlighting their potential as valuable resources for the dissemination of knowledge (Melo; Moreira, 2019). Within this context – where national legislation calls for common elements in students’ basic education and the exploration of textbooks in Physical Education is expanding, though still emerging – the inclusion of this component in the PNLD took place.

Given this, evaluating the implementation of these materials for Physical Education in schools represents a challenge for the academic and professional community, in order to identify and assess the actions that promote the dissemination of bodily practices and the obstacles within the program that may hinder the realization of the BNCC’s goals. Thus, the

purpose of this paper is to analyze the inclusion of Physical Education in the PNLD and the implementation of this policy – initiated in 2017 – in municipal schools of Cuiabá (MT). The guiding question is how the different stages of implementation, from the production of textbook collections to their selection and use by Physical Education teachers, influenced the effectiveness of these didactic collections in schools.

Given the historical and normative background that culminated in the inclusion of Physical Education in the PNLD, it becomes essential to assess how this policy has been materialized in school practice. To analyze this implementation process – which involves a complex network of actors and stages – this article adopts the *policy cycle model* (Secchi, Coelho & Pires, 2019) as its analytical framework. This heuristic model, by unfolding policy into distinct phases, has proven particularly suitable for investigating the paths taken from the publication of the call for submissions to the actual use of the material in classrooms.

1. The Analytical Perspective

To analyze the implementation of Physical Education within the PNLD, as contextualized above, this study understands the program as a public policy of educational nature, designed to solve problems and meet specific demands in the educational field. In this sense, public policies consist of state actions aimed at addressing collective issues, and their analysis and evaluation are of great importance for the improvement of the State and democracy. The purpose of such analyses is to verify the alignment of these policies with governmental objectives, the fulfillment of their declared goals, and, above all, their effectiveness in solving or mitigating the problems they were designed to address. To operationalize this analysis, the heuristic approach that conceives policy as a cycle proved to be appropriate (Secchi, Coelho & Pires, 2019).

This framework proposes analyzing the processes that make up the policy cycle: (i) problem identification, (ii) agenda setting, (iii) formulation of alternatives, (iv) decision-making, (v) implementation, (vi) evaluation, and (vii) termination. Considering public policy as a cycle implies recognizing its procedural and revisable nature. That is, the way it is carried out in one period may differ from its execution in another, so that the cycle—from its initial stage to its conclusion—can repeat itself several times.

However, there is no consensus in the literature regarding the definition of the initial and final moments of a public policy, which results in different characterizations concerning how many and which phases it includes. Therefore, it is essential to consider that the policy cycle approach constitutes a heuristic tool that helps organize and interpret information and relationships. In this study, the focus is directed toward the implementation process—the stage in which decisions, principles, and intentions are put into practice, as highlighted by Secchi, Coelho, and Pires (2019). The study of implementation proves fundamental, as it is the stage where political decisions are transformed into concrete actions that directly affect the intended results and impacts.

Understanding this process makes it possible to identify barriers and facilitators that influence the efficacy and efficiency of policies, contributing to reducing the gap between theoretical formulation and practical application. Analyzing this stage is crucial for adjusting actions in response to emerging challenges, enabling the continuous improvement of public policies based on practical evidence. Moreover, implementation involves a complex network of actors whose interactions and dynamics must be understood to strengthen cooperation and commitment among those involved.

To analyze this implementation process, one of the methodological strategies adopted was field research using focused interviews with Physical Education teachers from the municipal school system of Cuiabá, Mato Grosso. The fieldwork was conducted between September and November 2019. The purpose, at the time, was to understand how the implementation of the PNLD occurred in schools, specifically during the first year in which Physical Education was included as a curricular component in the program.

It is worth noting an important innovation introduced by the PNLD. Until then, the textbook selection process was carried out by each school individually, but since Decree No. 9,099 of July 18, 2017, education departments have had the option of making selections by region. In this case, the *Municipal Department of Education* (SME) of Cuiabá, the research locus, chose the regional selection model. Thus, each of its four regions (north, south, west, and east) received the same textbook collection (note: this regional classification is defined by each department). At the time, the SME comprised 73 schools. The research team decided to interview four teachers from each region, totaling 16 participants.

Since the study involved human subjects, it complied with current legislation (Resolutions 466/2012 and 510/2016 of the *National Commission for Research Ethics* – CONEP) and was submitted to the *Research Ethics Committee* (CEP) of the *Federal University of Mato*

Grosso, which issued approval under protocol No. 3,319,402. The interviews were conducted between October and December 2019. To preserve the anonymity of participants, their names were replaced with pseudonyms in the presentation of the data.

The study also employed *Discursive Textual Analysis* (Moraes & Galiazzi, 2020), a qualitative approach that integrates content analysis—focused on the manifest text—and discourse analysis—centered on the construction of meanings. This method allows the examination of a variety of documents, from interview transcripts to public records and legislation. According to the authors, the analysis follows three stages:

1. Text dismantling: immersion in the corpus through in-depth reading, fragmenting the documents into units of analysis for the process of unitarization;
2. Establishing relationships: comparing units to identify convergences, divergences, or complementarities, enabling grouping into categories based on shared meanings;
3. Capturing the emergent: synthesizing the understandings obtained, expressed through a metatext grounded in the established units and categories.

The following section presents the categories that resulted from applying this method to the research data.

2. Implementation Phase

What are the stages and actions that constitute the implementation phase? Following Secchi, Coelho, and Pires (2019, p. 70), the implementation phase comprises the moment that “follows decision-making and precedes the first evaluative efforts.” Specifically, in the PNLD, we identify this phase as beginning with the publication of the public call and extending through the use of the distributed materials in schools. Within this phase, we highlight three constitutive and decisive moments for the concretization of the Program: the production phase, the selection process, and the use of the collections.

2.1 The Production Phase of the Collections

The publication of the public call (FNDE, 2017) marks the formal beginning of the production phase of the didactic collections. It should be noted that, although publishing houses carry out prior planning, each call includes specific requirements defining the

mandatory elements to be met in the production of the program's core objects — such as works and collections. The call also sets critical deadlines, since it is expected that the collections reach schools before the start of the school year for which they are intended. This explains why the call for PNLD 2019 was published in 2017.

Between the publication of the call and the arrival of materials at schools, only a short period is allotted for production. In this case, the production window for the Physical Education collections extended from July 31, 2017 (the date of publication) to January 25, 2018 (for the submission of the work intended for grades 1 and 2) and February 5, 2018 (for the submission of the work intended for grades 3 to 5). In summary, publishers had five months to produce the teacher's collection (no student book was produced), with a maximum of 320 pages: one book for grades 1 and 2 (120 pages) and another for grades 3 to 5 (200 pages) — thus, two books per collection.

Considering other calls, this timeframe is usual. However, it must be noted that while other curricular components had already been included in previous editions, allowing publishers to gain experience or expertise in production, for Physical Education this was an entirely new process. At most, there may have been an expectation of its inclusion due to the publication of a draft version of the call (one month earlier). Broadly speaking, we can say that the development of the Physical Education collections started from scratch — without prior experience, unlike the other components.

A reflection of this situation can be seen in the number of approved collections. Physical Education had four approved works. The other curricular components had the following numbers: Art (5), Science (14), Geography (12), History (15), Portuguese Language (13), and Mathematics (16). Except for Art, which does not have a long-standing presence in the PNLD, the other curricular components succeeded in approving a significantly higher number of didactic collections — three to four times more than Physical Education.

In our analysis, the reduced number of approved works can be associated with the lack of consolidated expertise within the field in producing this specific type of material. It is plausible to infer that the Physical Education community, at that inaugural moment, lacked familiarity with the technical criteria and demands of the PNLD and the BNCC for textbook production. In addition, other concurrent factors may have influenced this outcome, such as: a cautious publishing market hesitant to invest heavily in a newly included curricular component; the short development timeframe — common to the PNLD but more problematic for a field without tradition in this format; and the possible existence

of internal debates within the area about the relevance and nature of the textbook itself, which could have discouraged submissions.

2.2 The Selection Process

The textbook selection process within the PNLD is considered of utmost importance, as it guarantees teachers' professional autonomy. For this purpose, the policy's implementation framework provides a specific period for teachers to evaluate the works, discuss them with their peers, and finally register their first and second choices. Several actions and mechanisms were established to assist and support this process. Notably, the Textbook Guide – a material prepared by the team responsible for evaluating the collections – was made available on the FNDE website. In addition, unlike previous editions, the entire didactic collection is now made available for teachers to consult during the evaluation stage. Previously, teachers had access only to the Guide as a reference for their choice.

The initial intention when conducting the interviews was to understand the selection process: time available for analyzing the material and the Guide, dissemination and clarification for teachers, criteria and justifications for the choice, discussion meetings, and so forth. The results revealed a troubling situation: of the 16 teachers interviewed, 14 did not participate in the process. The reasons given were as follows: lack of information (eight cases); leave for training or qualification (two cases); not employed in the municipal network at the time (two cases); refusal to participate (one case); and nonexistence of the process in a newly opened school (one case).

This immediately exposed a problematic situation: the Program's guideline regarding the pluralism of ideas and pedagogical conceptions, as well as the prerogative of collective teacher choice, was widely disregarded. In the municipality investigated, participation was recorded in only two regional divisions (South and North – one teacher each), while in the East and West regions there were no records of participation.

There are different causes for this issue, showing that it is not merely a matter of PNLD organization. One cause is teacher turnover — whether due to leave for qualification or arrival of new teachers. While new school openings or long-term leaves are less common, hiring new teachers tends to be frequent given the delays in public hiring processes. In these cases, newly hired teachers simply use the available textbooks without having participated in the selection.

The main cause indicated by teachers was lack of information or dissemination of the selection process. In this context, responsibility lay primarily with the Municipal Education Secretariat of Cuiabá/MT, which should have disseminated information through bulletins or training courses, both to classroom teachers and to school management teams (principals and coordinators). Some teachers reported being surprised by the arrival of Physical Education textbooks, since in this subject area it was not traditionally part of teachers' routine to perform such evaluative tasks.

Although most of the Physical Education teachers interviewed did not participate in the selection, someone did make the choice. Strictly speaking, this situation should not have occurred, as the choice must be recorded in the meeting minutes by the teachers of the school who participated – something reported only once. In the Didactic Materials Control System (Simad), all schools appear as having made a choice and received the collections, although six interviewees reported not receiving the PNLD 2019 collection.

Non-participation in the selection process did not prevent interviewees from expressing opinions and evaluations. As exemplified by Valdeir:

“Regarding this book selection, I’ll be very clear. I did not take part in choosing the book. The secretariat just informed me that I needed to sign [the record]. I signed it, but I don’t even know the content of the book. It would’ve been nice if they had consulted me, if I’d seen the book.”

Eliane, in turn, stated: “I felt wronged – not because the book didn’t arrive, but because I wasn’t consulted.” These statements reveal a critical attitude from the teachers regarding the situation, not passive acceptance of what was made available to them.

Some of the problems identified had already been mentioned in earlier research, such as the non-arrival of books in schools (Lajolo, 1996; Batista, 2001). However, more recent publications updating this information were not found. The lack of teacher consultation, as shown by Zambon and Terrazzan (2013), appears as a recurrent issue even across other curricular areas.

Another significant aspect concerns the time allocated for selection. For PNLD 2019, teachers had from August 23 to September 12, 2018 – a total of 21 days, 14 of which were working days. Within this period, teachers were expected to evaluate the four available collections (approximately 1,280 pages) and discuss their impressions with colleagues within their school and region. In practice, this meant about five working days of available time, as the selection period coincided with “activity hours,” which are also used for lesson planning, grading, and other tasks. This description reflects the

official procedure – the best-case scenario – which already exposes the inherent difficulty of conducting a well-founded selection requiring careful reading.

Thus, even in cases where the process was carried out, issues persisted – particularly the shortage of time – and limited access to information. For instance, Luciano reported that teachers were unaware of the Guide and that their choice was limited to the two physical copies available in schools. This situation represents an additional problem, as the lack of access to the Guide tends to favor materials from publishers with greater financial power for in-school promotion. Such circumstances, as shown by Cassiano (2007), allow economic factors to interfere with the selection process, to the detriment of pedagogical and technical criteria.

2.3 The Use of Didactic Collections

A decisive element for the success of PNLD implementation lies in the effective use of the didactic collections – more specifically, their proper use. A program that produces materials for teachers but sees them discarded or ignored is equivalent to a housing program that builds houses no one inhabits. Even if the collections are rigorously produced, evaluated, and distributed on time, the program only materializes through the actual use of the materials. Therefore, in analyzing implementation, it is essential to assess not only teachers' use of the collections but also their own evaluation of these materials.

We chose the term “use” instead of “reading,” following Munakata (1997) and Bittencourt (2008), to refer to how teachers relate to textbooks. This distinction is justified by the fact that reading these materials differs from reading literary, philosophical, or scientific works. Teachers tend to *appropriate* the material according to their needs — using it partially, adapting it, or recontextualizing it in various ways.

Methodologically, it is important to emphasize that teachers were active participants in this implementation analysis. Thus, no direct classroom observation or evaluation of pedagogical practice was conducted; instead, teachers' perspectives on the materials were collected. Considering Physical Education's limited familiarity with this type of resource, we first investigated whether teachers had ever used textbooks in their professional careers. Excluding two teachers in their first year of teaching, seven out of the remaining 14 reported using textbooks.

Discussions about the use or non-use of the materials led to a broader debate about the relevance of textbooks in Physical Education. The perception of usefulness (or lack thereof) directly influences adoption. Rodrigues (2009) had already pointed to this

issue, relating it to the very nature of the field. The debate centers on a conception of Physical Education tied fundamentally to practice and the moving body. From this perspective, textbooks would have limited usefulness, as they emphasize conceptual content rather than bodily exploration and movement. Another problematic aspect is that the textbook “while being a cultural good, is also regarded as a superfluous cultural good” (Melo, 2021, p. 190) in academic literature.

Another issue raised concerns the quality of the textbooks: many professionals expressed doubts about their ability to make meaningful contributions. There is notable *a priori skepticism*, a mistrust not stemming from an evaluation of the PNLD 2019 collections specifically, but toward textbooks in general. This stance echoes critiques in the field’s literature, such as Alves (2006), who argues that textbooks are inherently counterproductive. According to this view, textbooks convey inferior content and should ideally be abandoned.

This perspective was reflected in participant statements, for example:

Dioneia: “In my view, it [the textbook] needs many changes; it still contains many of the mistakes I remember from my childhood. These errors persist, especially in Physical Education... the contents the textbook presents, both about Physical Education and education in general, are very little, very poor compared to the diversity we have in the school context. I use these guidelines [textbooks] as a basis for discussions when I meet with the Physical Education group to discuss the network’s proposal. But I don’t work with it directly – my view is broader, considering the diversity of bodies. And these guidelines are very boxed in.”

Eliane: “I find it extremely unnecessary because all the knowledge we need to teach classes I already got in my undergraduate and postgraduate studies. If it were a professional development suggestion with new content, then yes. Otherwise, nothing has changed — the history of basketball hasn’t changed at all.”

These were the participants who presented the most forceful criticisms of textbooks. It is important to note that such critiques are *a priori*, since neither participated in the selection process nor received the materials at their schools – both were on leave (one for health reasons, the other for qualification). Even so, these circumstances did not prevent them from questioning the PNLD Physical Education collections.

Highlighting these general comments is relevant because the *preexisting imaginaries* surrounding textbooks directly influence the reception and, consequently, the use of PNLD materials. Conversely, there were reports of prior textbook use before the PNLD distribution, though the definition of “textbook” used by participants was

quite broad, encompassing materials not strictly fitting the category. Thus, the challenge lies in fostering a productive relationship with the specific textbook format provided by the PNLD.

Having made these considerations, we now turn to reports concerning the use of PNLD 2019 collections:

Érico: “It’s a material that really helps in lesson planning, even though I didn’t participate in the selection. It includes practices from the BNCC, like dance, cultural dance, Indigenous dance. Even if you’re not familiar with the topic, it gives you a starting point — an introduction to the subject and how to work with it. So it’s a useful material.”

Cláudio: “I use it to help with lesson planning. There are some divergences in the content, but it helps with didactics, as a guide. It helps a lot in the didactic part, but not much in terms of content, games, or activities — it lacks that.”

Jhonatan: “Every Monday, during our planning hour, we sit with the coordinator to plan the week. We use the book because it has activities that can be done jointly with classroom teachers. She always asks for collaborative activities with Art and Physical Education.”

Maria: “I use it for planning. I think it made things more laborious, especially with the municipal secretariat requiring us to include BNCC competencies and skills in the forms.”

Mory: “I think this material adds value, especially with the BNCC, since teachers have many doubts about how to organize or apply it. I use some activities for planning. But it’s still very limited; there could be more activities and adaptations, since we constantly have to adapt due to lack of materials or space.”

Sandro: “I read and use some activities. It’s interesting, but some things don’t fit the children’s reality. This school serves low-income children, so we need to work differently, even from what’s suggested here.”

Roberto: “Yes, I use it for planning. It helps, but I think there could be more reference materials.”

From these reports – which constitute data in a nearly raw state (the “nearly” justified by prior selection of excerpts) – several interpretations and discussions can emerge. From our perspective, three main points stand out:

First, there is use of the material. Although not universal, it occurs. Second, this use is diverse – teachers imprint their own views and conceptions on the textbook, rather than being shaped by it. This supports Munakata (1997) and Bittencourt (2008), who argue that teachers appropriate the works instead of being instrumentalized by them, countering analyses like those of Alves (2006) and Novaes et al. (2023). For

example, as Mory noted, attempting to use 100% of the book would be impossible given material shortages in schools. Thus, deterministic notions of schools as merely reproductive institutions are weakened.

Third, teachers emphasize that what is most useful in the collections is the didactic dimension. They distinguish clearly between “didactics” and “content.” Cláudio’s statement shows that the collection mainly assists with didactic aspects, such as lesson planning, rather than providing detailed content descriptions. In this sense, teachers demonstrate critical and selective use: while they employ the material, they also identify weaknesses, limits of applicability, and contextual adaptations required by their school’s reality.

These three analytical axes suggest that interpretations like those of Novaes et al. (2023) are not supported by teaching practice. Those authors infer, based merely on the label “manual,” that the works are inherently of low quality, concluding there is a structural problem in the PNLD. Such a perspective assumes that textbooks exert a determining force over teachers’ work. However, when we compare these claims with teachers’ testimonies, it becomes clear that the implementation of a public policy is subject to multiple mediations. Even the material precariousness of schools prevents collections from rigidly defining classroom dynamics. Under such conditions, it is teachers who effectively lead the teaching process – a finding that, though seemingly obvious, is often neglected by uncritical, reproductive approaches.

Would you like me to prepare a polished version formatted for academic publication (APA style, with fluent cohesion and vocabulary adapted for English-speaking readers)? It would sound more natural and publishable in an international journal.

Final Considerations

This study aimed to analyze the inclusion of Physical Education in the PNLD (National Textbook Program) and the implementation of this policy in the municipal schools of Cuiabá (MT), highlighting the challenges faced by teachers during the selection and use of the didactic collections. We found that the PNLD contributes to the implementation of the BNCC (National Common Curricular Base), and that the inclusion of Physical Education in the Program not only strengthens the realization of its pedagogical guidelines but also broadens the dissemination and democratization of knowledge in this curricular component.

Regarding the purpose of democratizing bodily practices, it is important to emphasize that this is a federative and therefore collaborative action among the different

government levels – the Union, states, and municipalities. Although the PNLD is under the responsibility of the federal government, through the FNDE (National Fund for Educational Development), the role of states and municipalities in its implementation should not be disregarded or minimized. Thus, any problems or difficulties encountered in the process, as well as limited results, should be analyzed in light of these different institutional spheres.

In relation to the implementation process, we identified significant shortcomings. The first concerns the timeframe for producing the collections, given that the inclusion of Physical Education in the PNLD was a novelty. The second and even more serious issue occurred during the selection process: the lack of awareness among most professionals about this stage revealed failures in dissemination and communication on the part of the municipal administration. As a result, teachers' evaluations were disregarded, which may have compromised the Program's adherence.

These problems, however, should be weighed against the use of the collections by teachers. It should be noted that, despite the difficulties, the collections are indeed used, indicating recognition of their usefulness. This use does not imply literal reading or mere reproduction, but a discerning appropriation of what benefits the teaching process and the diffusion of bodily movement culture. The indication is that, even when collections not chosen by the schools are received, valuable aspects can still be explored — evidently, the effectiveness of such use depends on the initial and continuing education received by teachers.

Another relevant aspect identified was teachers' perceptions of the didactic collections. For many, the textbook is viewed with skepticism, considered a resource of little utility in a curricular component of a practical nature. However, it was observed that, when used, the material mainly contributes to lesson planning, offering didactic support, even though it still requires greater adaptation to the diverse realities of schools, both in terms of infrastructure and social context.

The lack of greater consonance between the collections and teachers' perspectives depends, in our assessment, on the Physical Education community increasing its participation in the PNLD. It does not seem productive to expect a single comprehensive work; rather, it is the diversity of options that will allow for more appropriate choices. For this, it is essential to resolve the issue of the selection process by significantly improving dissemination, including the topic in continuing education programs, and ensuring adequate time for the evaluation of materials.

The contributions of this study highlight the importance of a more inclusive and participatory selection process, as well as the need for reflection on the role of the textbook in Physical Education, considering the specificity of the component and the practical demands of teachers. The continuity of this policy requires adjustments that ensure not only the production of suitable materials but also the training and active involvement of teachers.

We understand that expanding research on the reception and impact of these materials in everyday school life can contribute to improving teaching practices and public policies in the field. This study, therefore, sheds light on crucial aspects of the implementation of Physical Education within the PNLD, paving the way for new discussions and improvements in the field of educational policies.

Moreover, PNLD 2019 marks only the beginning of this inclusion. Effective participation, with materials suited to the needs of the field and of schools, will require engagement and persistence. The reception by the community remains an open question, but the indication from this research — based on the accounts of teachers who experienced the implementation — is that “the PNLD itself appears as a promising initiative, since, as a public policy, it promotes and encourages the production of this type of didactic material — material that, without such support, receives little attention and investigation.” (Melo, 2021, p. 239).

In summary, the findings indicate that the potential of the PNLD transcends the material itself. The Program is consolidated as a strategic promoter for the field, as it stimulates the production of a resource that, without public incentive, would hardly receive similar investment. The challenge, therefore, is not merely to use the books but to engage critically with the policy, participating actively in its construction so that it may truly fulfill its purpose of democratizing knowledge of bodily culture.

To overcome the identified limitations and fulfill the objectives of the PNLD, we suggest several coordinated actions. For educational managers (FNDE and Education Secretariats): structure dissemination and training processes that ensure the effective participation of all teachers — including those hired later — and invest in specific continuing education on the use of textbooks in Physical Education. For the Physical Education community: it is crucial to engage in debate and knowledge production about the textbook, both to improve the quality of available materials and to incorporate this discussion into teacher education — initial and continuing — thus overcoming preconceived notions and building repertoires for more meaningful use.

References

- ALVES, Gilberto Luiz. *A produção da escola pública contemporânea*. 4. ed. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2006.
- BATISTA, Antônio Augusto Gomes. *Recomendações para uma política pública de livros didáticos*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Fundamental, 2001.
- BITTENCOURT, Circe. *Livro didático e saber escolar (1810-1910)*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2008.
- BRAGANÇA, Aníbal. As políticas públicas para o livro e a leitura no Brasil: o Instituto Nacional do Livro (1937-1967). *Matrizes*, v. 2, n. 2, 2009. p. 221-246
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Brasília, DF, 2017a. Disponível em: <http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/>. Acesso em: 20 nov. 2023.
- BRASIL. *Decreto n.º 9.099, de 18 de julho de 2017*. Dispõe sobre o Programa Nacional do Livro e do Material Didático. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 19 jul. 2017b.
- BRASIL. *Lei n.º 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996*. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 23 dez. 1996.
- BRASIL. *Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais Gerais da Educação Básica*, de 7 de fevereiro de 2013. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 8 fev. 2013.
- CASSIANO, Célia Cristina de Figueiredo. *O mercado de livros didáticos no Brasil: da criação do Programa Nacional do Livro Didático (PNLD) à entrada do capital internacional espanhol (1985-2007)*. Tese (Doutorado em Educação: História, Política e Sociedade), Faculdade de Educação, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2007.
- FILGUEIRAS, Juliana Miranda. *Os processos de avaliação de livros didáticos no Brasil (1938-1984)*. São Paulo: PUCSP, 2011. 252f. Tese (doutorado em Educação). Programa de Estudos Pós-Graduados em Educação, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo. 2011.
- FNDE. Edital de convocação nº 1/2017 CGPLI. Diário Oficial da União. Seção 3. Brasília, DF, n. 145, p. 37, 31 jul. 2017.
- LAJOLO, Marisa. Livros didáticos: um (quase) manual de usuário. *Em Aberto*, v. 16, n. 69, 1996.
- MELO, Fernando Garcez de. *A educação física e o livro didático: para democratizar a cultura corporal*. 2021. 257 f. Tese (doutorado) - Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Cuiabá, 2021.
- MELO, Fernando Garcez de.; MOREIRA, Evando Carlos. O livro didático de educação física: uma leitura da produção acadêmica. *Revista de Educação PUC-Campinas*, v.24, n.3, p.445-462, 2019.
- MORAES, Roque; GALIAZZI, Maria do C. *Análise Textual Discursiva*. 3. ed. rev. e ampl. Ijuí: Editora Unijuí, 2020.

MUNAKATA, Kazumi. *Produzindo livros didáticos e paradidáticos*. 1997. 218 f. Tese de doutorado em História e Filosofia da Educação. São Paulo: Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, 1997.

NOVAES, R. C. et al. Os manuais do professor de educação física no plano nacional do livro didático. *Educação em Revista*, v. 39, p. e38185, 2023.

RODRIGUES, Heitor de Andrade. *Basquetebol na escola: construção, avaliação e aplicabilidade de um livro didático*. 2009. 183 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciência da Motricidade) - Universidade Estadual Paulista, Rio Claro, 2009.

SECCHI, Leonardo; COELHO, Fernando de S.; PIRES, Valdemir. *Políticas Públicas: Conceitos, Casos Práticos, Questões de Concursos*. 3^o edição. São Paulo, SP: Cengage Learning Brasil, 2019.

ZAMBON; Luciana Bagolin; TERRAZZAN; Eduardo Adolfo. Políticas de material didático no Brasil: organização dos processos de escolha de livros didáticos em escolas públicas de educação básica. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, Brasília, v. 94, n. 237, 2013. p. 585-602