Playing Shelter: The Reproduction of Institutional Routine in Structured Situation

Camila Lima Filocreão
Federal University of Pará
Graduate Program of Theory and Research of Bahaviour
Belém-Pará
Brasil

Celina Maria Colino Magalhães
Federal University of Pará
Researcher on Productivity at CNPq
Belém-Pará
Brasil

Luana Carramillo-Going
Metropolitan University of Santos
São Paulo-Santos
Brasil

Abstract

By playing, children represent roles, activities and elements that are part of their immediate environment and its sociocultural context. This qualitative study aims to analyze the symbolic game about a shelter in structured situation. Four children aged from five to seven years in institutional care participated in the study. During the playful sessions, a representative model of the shelter, dolls and toys were used. Overall, four 30-minute sessions were performed with each participant. "Playing shelter" was defined as the main category, whose subcategories are: "recognition of people and spaces", "representation of routine" and "relationships". The structured situation has been successful in stimulating the playful representation of institutional life, which was presented through a collective routine and rigid in timetables.

Keywords: Institutional Host, games and children

The Institutional Host

Defined by the article no 101 of the Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente (Brazilian's Child and Youth Rights - ECA) (1990) as a measure of protection of temporary and exceptional character, the institutional or family foster care is applied when children and adolescents are threatened or violated as regards their physical integrity or their essential rights. Currently, a large number of young people face this measure in Brazil. A survey of childcare nationwide accounted for more than 30,000 children and adolescents found themselves under a restraining order in welcoming families, houses homes, shelters or halfway houses. Providing that in most of the times, this measure was related to simultaneous occurrence of more than one risk factor for the development (Prosecution Office, 2013). Among the reasons that trigger institutional hosting, this study listed as the most recurrent: child neglect and chemical dependency of parents or guardians (present in more than 80% of cases), the abandonment (70%), domestic violence (60%) and sexual abuse (45%).

When the child or adolescent is away from his family as a restraining order, the provision of necessary conditions for healthy development must be ensured by the institutions. Since the promulgation of the ECA (1990), principles were proposed to be followed by the host institutions to ensure the welfare of their assisted. However, many researches have revealed that these principles were not respected and that life in an institution could bring sequels due to the following characteristics listed: depersonalized assistance, little loving and unstable relationships between hosted and educators, the long duration of family separation and, finally, the isolation of children and adolescents of community life (Cavalcante, Magalhães & Pontes, 2007; Parreira & Justo, 2005; Rizzini & Rizzini, 2004; Silva, 1997).

Given this picture, in 2006 was drafted the manual "Technical Guidance: Hosting Service for Children and Adolescents" in order to regulate, offer operating parameters and reinforce the principles already highlighted by the Statute. Among the guidelines, the preservation of family bonds is emphasized, through not breaking-up groups of brothers, in addition to the thoughtful and affective performance by the educators and the promotion of individuality and autonomy of children and teenagers embraced. The need to spare efforts is supported so that the servisse can focus on individual demands instead of having a collectivist approach. Therefor, the manual holds that the institutions should shelter small groups of children or teenagers, have similar aspects and functioning to a residence, provide private spaces, personal objects, including photographic records and personal life history and development of each child and adolescente. (CONANDA [Brazilian Council of Child and Adolescents]/CNAS[Brazilian Council of Casework], 2006).

Despite respecting or not the criteria, when the child or adolescent lives in an institution, it get to compose the development context. That is, for a period of time, she starts to materialize the actual conditions under which the person interacts and from which develops: the new learning, activities that exercise, the performance of social roles and relationships that builds (Carvalho, 2002; Cavalcante, Silva & Magalhães, 2010; Siqueira & Dell'Aglio, 2006). As a way to meet and thus offer proposals for improvement of services, research has been carried out in order to understand different aspects of this peculiar context. Currently, investigations have been undertaken not only to describe objective issues that constitute the living in the shelters, but also with the intention of achieving the subjective perspectives of people who experience the host (Rossetti-Ferreira, Solano & Almeida, 2011).

As Bronfenbrenner (2011) points out, people don't interact with an environment as it is, but they do interact with the environment as they conceive it. However, to access the perceptions of children through research, some methodological care should be taken. Children are in a peculiar development phase, in which their communicative ability and cognitive capacity are still in formation process. Moreover, the differences in size and power among these participants and the researchers may interfere with the stage of data collection, including the possibility of embarrassing the child. Then, using conventional methods such as interviews and questionnaires may not be effective for producing reliable data (Corsaro, 2005; Rocha, 2008). A possibility of avoiding these limitations was made explicit by Punch (2002), by stating that the researcher should use media that are familiar to those participants – thus the use of playful resources (or a combination with traditional methods) have been the best strategy to reach the child subjectivity. They make the child feel more uninhibited and facilitates the creation of a trust relationship with the researcher, which more often is an unknown adult.

Following this line, Barth et al. (2012) through playful activities directed to children and teenagers, were able to understand the conflicts existing in the host institution and intervened in those conflicting situations. Successfully, the authors made the verbal expression of the participants possible, identified emotional problems and promoted closer ties between peers, brothers and between the young hosted and their educators. With similar findings, Trivallato, Carvalho and Vectore (2013), through the games and children's literature mediated activities, managed to obtain the expression of unique content for children in shelter and with the wire, proceeded therapeutically.

In addition to mediated research, other studies had as its objective the analysis of representations and experiences through games. Malik and Szymanski (2004) observed the games in natural situation to access the meanings that children in shelters attributed to family. As a result, the kids brought the family settings that are both a result of participation in the cultural world, as, representations of situations already experienced by them. The playful content combined institutional routine reproductions with the domestic routine and, in particular, expressed the desire of having a harmonious family, a source of love and affection. Giacomello and Melo (2011) with therapeutic toy sessions, obtained the expression of feelings, fantasies, wishes and criticism of the environment where they live, in addition to the emergence of innovative ICT-based content relating to the routine and the interpersonal relationships at the shelter. The observation of games proved to be an effective technique to investigate the subjectivity of children weakened by abuse, neglect and ill-treatment, found in protective measures.

The Games

There are great reasons for researchers to make use of games as object, and as a research tool. The relationship between the child and the game is so intense, that represents a virtually indissoluble dyad (Pontes & Magalhães, 2003).

Playing is a natural act for the child, something that happens spontaneously, with no time and locations defined. It only takes motivation and then, the fun happens, it doesn't matter if the environment is structured for this activity or not, if the player is alone or with a third party (Santos & Bichara, 2005).

Even though the act of playing is universal, the games are strongly related to the context in which they happen. The rules of a same game may vary by the group of players, the roles played are the same spread in the culture, the toys tend to be built with materials available in the environment or acquired as the economic power. Thus, it is fair to say that games acquire regional specificities in the numerous sociocultural environments in which they occur and throughout human history (Carvalho & Pontes, 2003; Santos & Bichara, 2005).

The toy itself cannot be considered a neutral element. It is a social symbol that conveys a message and makes specific references to attitudes and cultural practices. On the one hand, it influences the direction of the game, communicates explicit meanings and inspires values. On the other, it is a tool of expression for the child's imagination – that has freedom to take ownership of the contents conveyed, to transform them and even to deny them (Bomtempo, 2012; Conti & Sperb, 2001; Gosso, Morais & Otta, 2006). Thus, a doll that simulates a full-size baby can lead to mother and child's play, but can also be used to represent a giant monster that destroys a village, if this is the theme that the child wishes to play, for example.

Among the different playful modalities, the transmission and assimilation of culture can be most clearly noted in the symbolic games (or make-believe), since it is in this way that the child shows how to understand the elements of the world the surrounds her, expresses opinions and values of their culture, designing openly personal and collective meanings (Moraes & Carvalho, 1994). The make-believe is characterized by the act of giving new meanings and functions to objects, by the adoption of and varying social roles and representation by the initiative to suggest themes and scenarios for the games (Bomtempo, 2012). In it, children create an imaginary story to justify and explain the actions within the games. What children pretend to be in this narrative is strongly related to real experiences in their environment. For example, western children like to play family, schools or media figures (Jarvis, 2011).

However, Corsaro (2002, 2009) notes that the dramatization of roles is not an imitation of the adult models. In the games, the kids have experience and appropriate information of the adult world as their willingness and interest. They externalize their understanding of the roles and social events at the same time as they fill it with new social meanings and incorporate new elements. Children are active agents of culture and its development, and by playing, they not only assist in the transmission, but also on cultural change.

It is for this feature of playing roles and cultural symbols that research has been carried out to analyze how the games reflect environmental elements in different contexts: riverine communities (Pontes, Magalhães & Marin, 2008; Teixeira & Alves, 2007), streets, in the case of homeless children (Cerqueira & Koller, 2003); indigenous villages (Bichara, 2003; Morais & Otta, 2003); beach communities (Gosso, Morais & Otta, 2006; Seixas, Becker & Bichara, 2012), and others. These studies have found that the games bring realistic themes related to daily experience, as domestic activities, parental occupation, religious symbols, transport means and tools. In the fantasy, children reflect what they experience in they physical and sociocultural environment.

Beyond the macrocultural perspective, the immediate environment interferes directly on the games. To span the contextual variables that influence the game, Morais and Otta (2003) defined the concept of "leisure zone". According to the concept, economic activity and the way of life of the region of residence, toys to which they have access, family relationships, peers of the toy group, the physical environment itself, and others, are aspects that must be taken into consideration in the relation game-context.

Thus, environmental and cultural elements that children in institutional care represent in symbolic games are questioned. These kids are inserted into an urban reality, however, their daily life is structured differently from the domestic life. When considering that the game is intrinsically related to the child development, being a mean capable of expressing their conceptions of everyday life experienced and, at the same time, tension relief valve and emotional conflicts, we highlight the importance of investigating their games.

The searches that have aimed to understand the experiences of children in temporary foster care spaces by means of recreational resources are still scarce.

Thus, on the assumption that: 1) playful scene, children interpret creatively and construct meanings about the surrounding world (Corsaro, 2009) and that the toys present in the game environment can show an intentional message and spur the reproduction of scenes of everyday life (Bomtempo, 2012), this study set out to answer the following question: in a playful zone handled with toys and elements that report the interim host environment, which aspects of everyday life are institutional reproduced?

As a way of contributing to the study of games and their relations with the context (in this case, a children's shelter), for this qualitative and exploratory study it was necessary the participant observation in symbolic play with children in institutional care to promote representations about life in the shelter, in a playful structured situation with elements that they referred to the environment and the institutional routine.

Method

Participants

The selection of participants occurred for convenience: all children between the ages of five to eight years and under the restraining order in the institution were invited to participate. It was performed playful session lasting 30 minutes to evaluate the children's verbal fluency, being excluded those whose language was difficult to understand. Of the sixteen children admitted at the institution, 10 participated in the study and for this work there are four participants. Of those four children, half are female and a possessed brothers welcomed at the same institution (see table 1).

Table 1: Age and Institutional Information

Name	Age	Reason of the host	On-call time	Brother in the institution	Dorm
Annie	6 years	Sexual abuse	1 year and 5 months	Yes, one sister	D7
Fernanda	7 years	Sexual abuse	7 months ago	No	D7
Marlon	7 years	Family neglect, abandonment, domestic violence and drug-abuser parents	3 years and 6 months	No	D7
Fábio	5 years	Family neglect and parents with psychological disorders	5 months ago	No	D6

Note . We used fictitious names to preserve the privacy of participants.

The Host Institution

Named Espaço de Acolhimento Provisório Infantil ([Temporary Childcare Home] - EAPI), the institution here studied assists children between the ages of zero to seven years, both female and male. The average attendance is 75 children per month, proceeds from the capital of Pará and other municipalities. Located in the metropolitan area of Belém, the shelter has a wide physical structure, similar to public schools in the region. It is composed of several rooms, including technical fields (Directors Office, nursing rooms, educators, psychological and social assistance, and others). In the institution, the more frequented spaces by children are: the block of bedrooms and bathrooms for children (fig. 1), the refectory, the playroom, the TV room, the educational reinforcement lounge and external areas of recreation. Among the latest, the covered area called "Shed", where relatives visits take place, besides games, parties and leisure activities (fig. 2).

Fig. 1. Block views of dormitories and playgrounds. Fig. 2. views of the "Shed".

About the functioning of the EAPI, it it emphasized that, when admitted, children are received in one of the seven children's dormitories, as determined by age group. Each dorm has a schedule grid for meals, baths and leisure activities, so as not to overwhelm the ability of spaces. Soon, the most intense interaction occurs between peers of the same dormitory and their educators. However, all children of the EAPI have opportunity to interact with each other during free activities or involving the whole institution (e.g. holidays). Normally, is respected the timetable for each activity under the leadership and supervision of the educator in charge. About 100 educators take turns to cover the 24 hours.

Instruments and Materials

For the sócio-demographic and institutional characterization, it was used an adapted version of the Characterization Form created by Cavalcante (2008), composed of 69 items relating the hosting process, child health, family data, and other information. For playful interaction, there were used two models representing the block of bedrooms and the courtyard named "Shed" (Figure 3).

Fig. 3. Models arranged in the research room, the largest is representative of the dormitories and the lowest block represents the "Shed".

The choice of environments represented by the model reflect the results of the research conducted in this institution that revealed the Shed as one of the preferred environments for children (Monteiro, 2010) and the dorms as one of the most frequented (Filocreão & Magalhães, 2011). Miniatures of everyday objects (chairs, bedding, cookware, car and etc.) and human figures dolls also composed the playful scenario.

Procedure

Initially, a judicial authorization was obtained from the Brazilian Juvenile Court. Then, the research project was submitted and approved by an Ethics Committee (with registration number 155/CEP-ICS 11/UFPA). A second moment was reserved for meeting with management and technical sector of the institution, in order to obtain consent to carry out the investigation. Later on, the research team stepped in, observed the institutional routine and held the characterization of participants, so that finally could start the phase of the symbolic game.

Each playful interaction session featured the participation of a child and two researchers. One took the responsibility to control the video camera and record the interaction while the other assumed the function of interacting with the child through questions, commands, and participation in the game.

At first contact, when someone accepted the invitation to play, the child was taken to a room that was provided by the manager for the collection. Inside that room, the participating researcher would investigate what meaning the child would give the model through the questions "what do you think of this object?" or "what do you think this object represents?". The adult used the answer given, showed the toys available and explained that they had 30 minutes to play, but that the child could stop the activity at any time they wanted to.

The game was started and the researcher encouraged the child to lead it. Therefor, he asked that the kid chose the dolls, asked for the definition of the name of the characters, asked what activities would be carried out and what would the imaginary scenario. Normally, questions were made about the activities that were being carried out and about the characters in order to scrutinize the playful content. It is relevant to note that, in the participant condition – inevitably – the researchers also lead the games, because they created characters with their own actions and lines. In the totality, 16 sessions were held, four sessions for each participant, with the average of 30 minutes per session.

The footage was organized by participants, watched and transcribed with details, such as handling of toys, facial expressions and tone of voice. Once thetranscripts were ready, a content analysis was made with the creation of thematic categories.

Results and Discussion

In a comprehensive analysis of the footage, it was observed that besides the institutional theme, other themes came up in the make-believe game and even other types of game. However, in order to satisfy the aim listed, it will be presented only the results that composed the main category "playing shelter". It is consisted of the games in which there were simulated spaces and everyday institutional aspects, in addition to containing characters representing the persons residing or attending that environment. Next, there will be presented the following subcategories "people's Recognition and institutional spaces," "representation of routine" and "relationships".

Recognition of People and Institutional Spaces

Of the ten initial participants, more than half identified the model as a representation of host organization in the screen. This identification was crucial for the content of the games treated about aspects of the institutional experience – no child who titled the model as a miniature model of another environment (a house, for example), reproduced in their games, activities and characters directly related to the shelter. On the other hand, there was a variation in the number of times and the quality with which the participants would represent this environment.

All of the four participants, described here, played shelter in more than two sessions and through the reproduction of different activities.

Overall, from the moment of recognition of models, the children often verbalized about other spaces frequented, as illustrated in the Episode 1 and 2. It was common for participants pointing and naming the rooms of the model in the same sequence in which they are allocated space at the shelter. The researcher, along with toys and dolls raised the allusion to employees and other children from the shelter and the scenarios of everyday life.

Episode 1. Recognition of shelter spaces by Marlon.

Researcher: *Marlon* – researcher points to the model – *What do you think is it?*
Marlon: *Ah ... It's the shelter.*
Researcher: *Um ... You said it is the shelter. And then?*
Marlon: *Here is the shed!* – the boy points to the object referenced.
Researcher: *the shed ... Where do you stay in there?*
Marlon: *In D7.*
Researcher: *Which one is it?*
Marlon*: Right here!-H*e points at a tiny door in the dormitory block.

Researcher: *look: I ... I'll show you some people ... So we can play right now, okay? -* The researcher takes a bag of mini human models and shows the boy – *who are you in here?-* the boy picks up a doll- *Oh, this one will be Marlon! And this one, who is this?* – and shows a doll.

Marlon: *Apollo. (*Apollo shares the dormitory D7 with Marlon. Besides them, the participant points up four more children from their dormitory, another from dorm room D6 and the educator Éder.

Episode 2. Recognition of shelter spaces by Fernanda.

After recognizing the wooden structure as "shelter" and naming the units of the model as "Shed" and "sleeping dormitories", Fernanda points the researcher other spaces that make up the institution of provisional reception.

Fernanda: *There is the lunch thing.There's the kitchen ...-* verbalizes after staring at the toy coffee table.
Researcher: *What else is there?*
Fernanda: *It has the milk dispenser.*
Researcher: W*hat is the milk dispenser?*
Fernanda: It's *where we get porridge.*
Researcher: *andwhat else?*
Fernanda: *There's a thing that has a lot of things ... Then, there is the porridge stuff, lunch stuff ... All things!* – *(*The child probably refers to the stockroom).
Researcher: (then the child focuses attention on a toy cart, starts manipulating it)
Fernanda: Says "*That is the van takes us to school, that takes us for a ride and to the doctor"*
When asked to name the dolls, Fernanda uses the name of children with whom she shares the dormitory, in addition to name others who are now out of the shelter.

Representation of Routine

Many times, children reproduced scenes that make up the everyday life of the shelter, like meals, play time, sleep, excursions, and others. These activities always have the presence of a group of children and only on a few occasions, they were accompanied by adults (see Episodes 3, 4 and 5).

Episode 3. Meals.

After conducting several types of games, the characters have reported fatigue. Marlon then decides to hold a pause so that the characters can have a snack.

Marlon: *now it's time to eat* – comments the boy.

Researcher: *are we going to eat? It's time to eat, I guess ... Hey, Marlon!Gather everyone there. Come sit ... Who will cater here?* – The boy doesn't answer and researcher, interpreting Éder, keep talking – *Children, today we made a new thing ...*

Marlon: *thank God...* – the child points that before meals they must pray.

Researcher: *Really? So here we go. Children...* – the researcher, without knowing how the prayer should be, look at Marlon and he leads it.
Marlon: *Heavenly...*
Researcher: *Heavenly...*
Marlon*: Father ...*
Researcher: *Father ...*
Marlon: *thank you for this food. For us.*

Episode 4. Bet time

As soon as the dinner ends, the child says it is bedtime and explains that the educator Éder goes to their home and that the educator Leo will be in the dorm D6 at night.
Fabio*: Boys, it's late! Let's go sleep! Everyone sitting on your bed* – says Léo.
Researcher*: do they stay sit on bed? Doing what?* - he asks.
Fabio: *The prayer* – the child repeats the previous prayer.
Researcher: *but that's not at night? They're not eating ...*– questionsafter hearing and notice that the effectual fervent prayer was linked to the representations of meals in the institution.
Fabio: *but aunt Leo will bring the food* – the boy enters the dolls in the dorm.
Researcher*: and how does Aunt Leo put them to sleep?*
Fabio: *she gives us chocolate milk and turn off the lights.*

Episode 5. Bath time supervised by educator.

After waking up, the children bathe before breakfast.
Fabio: *the breakfast is done in the kitchen. Children wake up early to eat* – the boy puts the dishes in the fictitious kitchen and turns back to the bath- *this one took the towel and brush and went to the bathroom.*
Researcher: *Ah, I will take a shower, but the water's cold!* -says the character Isabelle of D6. Fabio put the doll in the bathroom and the researcher asks- *who's taking a bath?*
Fabio: *Tales and Isabelle...* – The child turn back to the bathroom and interprets the interaction between educator Léo and the boys who are in the bathroom – *Pass the soap... Okay! Turn off the bathroom light. Okay!*

In the episodes, it can be observed that the activities are carried out with references to time ("time to eat" or "it's too late! Let's go sleep!"). This is a reflection of institutional dynamics in which all the activities are performed in compliance with the timetable and agenda collectively. On the one hand, the routine can provide a sense of stability and encourage children's adaptation to the new environment. However, on the other, it is observed that the rigidity in the timetables and how daily life is conducted distances fairly from a family routine configuration (where the environment has a small group of people, the attendance tends to consider and take into account of the individual demands and children can participate or observe the execution of domestic activities). Soon, the games portray what literature has pointed to as unfavourable aspects of childcare: impersonal and massive (Cavalcante, Magalhães & Pontes, 2007; Filocreão & Magalhães, 2011; Rizzini & Rizzin, 2004). Azor and Vectori (2008) state that the rigidity of institutional rules may affect the development of autonomy and the maintainance of a looking forward and thinking "I".

It is worth pointing out that there is a multiplicity of ways the participants can portray the same institution. Some children tend to reproduce the routine and the spaces more alike than these really are. However, others represent the same phenomenon differently. For example, most of the time, for the characters to rest, the children simply communicated that the night had come and, with dormitories block, they placed the dolls in various rooms. After a few seconds, they claimed that there morning had come and took the dolls out. In Episode 4, however, Fábio presents bed time in detail, mentioning the shift of educators (which occurs around 7:00 pm), the supper that happens inside the dormitories followed by the lights being switched off.

In another moment, Marlon represented games and moments of rest in the shelter next to educators and children. The fantasy of these representations were evident because he played the hero Diamondhead ("Ben 10" cartoon) as one of the children who lived in the EAPI, with the ability to fly and differentiate by sleeping on the roof, while colleagues were sleeping in their rooms. Of course, to a lesser or greater degree, all participants added imaginary tones to interact with the model.

The make-believe is a prime activity for the child to give vent to her imagination, grant wishes, control anguish and make possible actions that are unlikely in real life (Bomtempo, 2012;Vygotsky, 2007; Winnicot, 1975). So, by "being" Diamond Head, Marlon could accomplish, in the game, the desire to be strong, swift, admired and unbeatable as the desired hero.

Relationships

In the playful representation of institutional life, the way in which the characters interacted has a lot to say about their perceptions about the roles and relationships they experience in the shelter. Unlike games about family that, besides the domestic experience, they may have the family model as a reference published by media; the institutional theme isn't usually part of the child universe and probably only became part of the experience of the participants from their admission in the EAPI. Then, it is expected that the main parameters for these games be children's own experience in the shelter.

Overall, when it is possible to identify that the names of the characters were references to the real people of the institution, it is observed that children (especially those of the same dormitory that the participants) are the most recurrent characters of the games of shelter. At the same time, it was found that the adults (educators and other professionals), with the exception of Éder, seldom participated the imaginary scenario, and when emerged, it was to handle everyday situations in na emotionally distant way. As indicate Carvalho (2002), Alexandre and Vieira (2004) and Martins and Szymanski (2004), in the host institution, the pairs are more stable and accessible figures in these institutions and thus viable alternatives for affective binding. However, a worrying fact was realizing that the mention of brothers was low, given that they were in other dorms. This seems to indicate that the distribution to dorms by age-based criteria and different timetables damages the interaction between brothers inside the shelter.

What draws attentions is that, in a universe with more than 100 educators, the most represented was the only man who carries out this function. "Mr Éder", as it was called by the children, was present at all sessions of Fabio and Marlon. Implicitly, it was possible to perceive the existence of a positive bond between the educator and these children. He was present in the daily activities (meals, prayers, baths), checkups in the doctor, in addition to the leisure time (games and excursions). This suggests that this employee can exercise with responsiveness the role of caregiver and stands out as a significant figure to these kids.

In addition to the functions of coordinating the activities of hygiene, sleep, feeding, as has been shown in previous episodes, educators are professionals who interfere in conflicts between children, which punish inappropriate behaviors (Episode 6), which control the kids by warning them when they're doing a dangerous action or by being the person to whom they are requesting permission to play outside.

*Episode 6. C*onflict between peers and educator's intervention

The children were playing hide-and-seek in the shed. Then, suddenly, Apollo (played by Annie) starts beating Isabelle (played by the researcher). Given this, Isabelle reacts.
Researcher: *Ouch, why are you hitting me?! Help! Mrs, mrs! Where's mrs?* – Annie get a doll to interpret the Mrs, then Isabelle complains – *Mrs! He hit me!*
Annie: *why you were beating her?!* – Mrs responds in authoritarian tone, then Annie plays the boy's response with a tearful tone – *Because I told her to set the clothes in order... She didn't!*
Researcher: *That's a lie! Didn't say anything about clothes...*
Annie says that she was grounding the boy, puts him away from the shed and put him sit in the corner of the room.
Researcher: *we're not playing anymore?*
Annie: *No, you're grounded!* – responds Mrs - *All because of you!* – claims the boy, angry. After a few seconds, Mrs also put Isabelle grounded with Apollo- *You too!*

On relationship between children, besides being presented conflict situations for toys by Annie and Fábio, also shown by Marlon, Fernanda and Fabio, scenes in which there was sharing of toys and conflict resolution without the inclusion of adults. When children live and play intensely, they have opportunity to learn to share, respect the will of another and to handle conflict situations (Jarvis, 2011). In episode 9, Marlon that is more than three years at the institution, shares toys and presents a conduct for collectivity, verbalizing the lines that adults of institution use to handle disputes.

Episode 7: Toy Sharing

Marlon's character, represented by the child himself, uses the car toy as a skateboard and perform radical maneuvers on the roof of the model. Two colleagues, Alice and Fernanda, gaze at him. On the way down to the floor, they run towards him, requesting their turn to play with the toy.

Researcher: *My turn! My turn! My turn!* – say the two girls.

Marlon ensures that each child can use the toy, without need of turmoil.

Marlon: *you don't have to fight... You don't have to fight!* -The girls take the object and Marlon asks organization-*line, line!*

Researcher: *Line? Okay, but I'm going first* – Alice climbs on the car.

Marlon takes control of the dolls and makes each one have the opportunity to ride the toy.

Final Considerations

The manipulation of the playful zone through the inclusion of artifacts that made reference to the shelter has been satisfactory in stimulating the emergence of plots revealing the routine and institutional relationships. However, the lack of a direction so that the theme was solely about the shelter, gave room for children to exhaust the other imaginary scenarios: schools, Family, *et cetera*. Thus, it is suggested that future research in which the playful representation of experience in total care institutions is the only objective, offer specific and explicit commands. In the manner of Giacomello and Mello (2008), may start collecting with the guiding question "are we going to play a child who lives in a shelter?". Also, like Pereira, Lira and Pedrosa (2011), to investigate perceptions about family and structure the playful collection environment, previously asked the first the participants about which toys should compose a game on family, one can inquire the opinion of potential participants about objects that should be part of a "game of shelter" and include them in the filming room in order to stimulate and enrich the playful representations. Children's choice for the role of partners, rather than the researcher himself, would probably result in different data – besides permiting analysis of the interaction between pairs.

On the reproduction of life in playful institution, it is stated that the presentation of a collective and rigid routine in timetables, which disregards the personal needs of children is consistent with the way that the activities are conducted in the EAPI, beyond restating the characteristics which literature has described about the child in institutional moulds reception, especially when this occurs in large institutions (Carvalho, 2002; Silva, 1997). Although with the unauthorized documentation, "Technical Guidelines: Host service for children and adolescents", this data shows that there are still shelters that resist in work with settings that seek to imitate the most of family life and thus offer a personalized treatment that promotes the autonomy and freedom of the admitted.

The little participation of educators or the absence of nomination seems to indicate that, in the perception of children, they form a generic mass – whose aim is to watch them, discipline them, take care of your safety and maintain order in the functioning of routine activities. A generic mass of "Mr's" and "Mrs's", however, is not fertile for the creation and maintenance of bonds of attachment. The outstanding feature of this type of bond is precisely the reciprocity and the election of a singular figure – which differs from the set of people in the environment – who sought proximity and protection (Bowlby, 1990).

In an environment with of a large number of adults turnover, where children are cared for by different people every day and, every three months, educators to whom they got used to, had been relocated to other dormitories are used (when not themselves) – which can get them used to a shallow standard of relationship with adults. As a form of adaptation and emotional survival, any adult without distinction would meet their basic needs and would not make much difference who asks lap or help. Thus,even researchers or newcomers at the institution receive hugs and requests for lap, even if they are unknown. This behaviour should not be considered the best alternative to social and emotional development of the child.

On the other hand, two boys named the educators and elected one as favorite, by whom they were taken care of with whom they performed leisure activities. Apparently this educator was able to build a relationship of trust and affection with these children, becoming significant and differentiated between the set of adults with whom they live daily. Therefore, when it is observed that he is the only man in the profession of EAPI educator, once again, it is made sure of the importance of valuing the male gender in the caring and educating funciton, and enhance its presence in the host institutions. (Corrêa & Cavalcante, 2012).

It is believed that more important than the fact of being man or woman, whether running a proper selection process of educators, to assess as the appropriate profile and also the offer of training and continuing education to deal with a peculiar audience, weakened by disruptions and violence.

References

Alexandre, D. T., & Vieira, M. L. (2004). Relação de apego entre crianças institucionalizadas que vivem em situação de abrigo. *Psicol. estud*, *9*(2), 207-217.

Barth, L. F. B., Mroginski, L. I., Rezende, B. P., Cervieri, D., Damaceno, J. S., & Peres, K. R. L. (2012). O brincar como espaço de prevenção e intervenção psicológicas em crianças e adolescentes. *Barbarói*, 2(37), 235-250.

Bichara, I. D. (2003). Nas águas do velho Chico. In A. M. A. Carvalho, C. M. C. Magalhães, F. A. R. Pontes, & I. D. Bichara (Eds). *Brincadeiras e cultura: viajando pelo Brasil que brinca (p.89-107)*. São Paulo. Casa do Psicólogo.

Bomtempo, E. (2012). Brincadeira simbólica: imaginação e criatividade. In E. Bomtempo & L. C. Going (Eds.), *Felizes e brincalhões: uma reflexão sobre o lúdico na educação* (pp. 21-35). Rio de Janeiro: Wak editora.

Bowlby, J. (1990). *Apego: a natureza do vínculo - Volume 1 da trilogia apego e perda*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2011). O espaço lewiano e a substância ecológica. In U. Bronfenbrenner (Ed.), *Bioecologia do desenvolvimento humano: tornando os seres humanos mais humanos.* Porto Alegre: Artmed.

Brasil (1990). *Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente*. Diário Oficial da União. Lei Federal nº.8.069, 13 de julho de 1990. Brasília, DF.

Carvalho, A. M. (2002). Crianças institucionalizadas e desenvolvimento: possibilidades e desafios. In E. R. Lordelo, A. M. A. Carvalho & S. H. Koller (Eds.), *Infância brasileira e contextos de desenvolvimento* (pp. 19-44). São Paulo: Casa do psicólogo, Salvador, BA: Editora da Universidade Federal da Bahia.

Carvalho, A. M. A., & Pontes, F. A. R. (2003) Brincadeira é cultura. In A. M. A. Carvalho, C. M. C. Magalhães, F. A. R. Pontes, & I. D. Bichara (Eds). *Brincadeiras e cultura: viajando pelo Brasil que brinca* (pp.15-30). São Paulo. Casa do Psicólogo.

Cavalcante, L. I. C. (2008). *Ecologia do Cuidado: Interações entre a criança, o ambiente, os adultos e seus pares em Instituição de Abrigo* (Tese de Doutorado, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Teoria e Pesquisa do Comportamento).   Acessada em:http://www.ufpa.br/ppgtpc/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=54&Itemid =98

Cavalcante, L. I. C., Magalhães, C. M. C., & Pontes, F. A. R. (2007) Abrigo para crianças de 0 a 6 anos: Um olhar sobre as diferentes concepções e suas interfaces. *Revista mal-estar e subjetividade.7*(2). 329-352.

Cavalcante, L. I. C., Magalhães, C. M. C., & Pontes, F. A. R. (2007). Institucionalização precoce e prolongada de crianças: discutindo aspectos decisivos para o desenvolvimento. *Alethéia, 25*(1), 20-34.

Cavalcante, L. I. C., Silva, S. S. C., & Magalhães, C. M. C. (2010). Institucionalização e reinserção familiar de crianças e adolescentes. *Revista Mal-estar e Subjetividade*. *10* (4). 1147-1172.

Cerqueira, E. S., & Koller, S. H. (2003). Brincando na rua. In A. M. A. Carvalho, C. M. C. Magalhães, F. A. R. Pontes, & I. D. Bichara (Eds). *Brincadeiras e cultura: viajando pelo Brasil que brinca (p.187-206)*. São Paulo. Casa do Psicólogo.

CONANDA (Conselho Nacional dos Direitos da Criança e do Adolescente) & CNAS (Conselho Nacional de Assistência Social). (2009). *Orientações técnicas: serviços de acolhimento para crianças e adolescentes*. Brasília, DF.

Corsaro, W. A. (2002). A reprodução interpretativa do brincar. *Educação, Sociedade e Culturas, 17*, 113-134.

Corsaro, W. A. (2005). Entrada no campo, aceitação e natureza da participação nos estudos etnográficos com crianças pequenas. Educação e Sociedade. *Educação e Sociedade, 26*(91), 443-464.

Corsaro, W. A. (2009). Reprodução interpretativa e cultura de pares. In F. Müller & A. M. A. Carvalho (Eds.), *Teoria e Prática na pesquisa com crianças: diálogos com Willian Corsaro* (pp.31-50). São Paulo: Cortez.

Cruz, S. H. (2008). Apresentação. In: S. H. Cruz (Ed.), *A criança fala - a escuta de crianças em pesquisa* (pp. 11-34). São Paulo: Cortez.

De Conti, L., & Sperb, T. M. (2001). O brinquedo de pré-escolares: um espaço de ressignificação cultural. *Psicologia: Teoria e pesquisa*, *17*(1), 059-067.

Filocreão, C. L., & Magalhães, C. M. C. (2011). Limites e possibilidades da utilização da Escala ITERS na avaliação da qualidade de uma instituição de acolhimento provisória. In C. M. C. Magalhães, L. I. C. Cavalcante, F. A.Pontes, S. S. C. Silva & L. S. Corrêa (Eds.),*Contextos ecológicos de desenvolvimento humano* (93-115).Belém: Paka-Tatu.

Filocreão, C. L. (2010). *Estudo exploratório da aplicação da Escala de Avaliação de Ambiente Coletivos de Cuidado para Crianças em um abrigo infantil* (Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso não publicado). Universidade Federal do Pará. Belém, Pará.

Giacomello, K. J., & Melo, L. L. (2011). Do faz de conta à realidade: compreendendo o brincar de crianças institucionalizadas vítimas de violência por meio do brinquedo terapêutico. *Ciência e Saúde Coletiva, 16*(1), 1571-1580.

Gosso, Y., Morais, M. L. S., & Otta, E. (2006). Pivôs utilizados nas brincadeiras de faz-de-conta de crianças brasileiras de cinco grupos culturais. *Estudos de Psicologia, 11*(1), 17-24.

Jarvis, P. (2011). A utilidade da brincadeira. In B. Avril, S. Dodds, P. Jarvis & Y. Olusoga (Eds.), *Brincar: Aprendizagem para a vida* (pp. 25-36). Porto Alegre: Penso.

Magalhães, C. M. C., Pontes, F. A. R., & Marin, W. L. B. (2008). Preferências de crianças no brinquedo de miriti: a influência do gênero e composição da díade. *Revista Brasileira de Desenvolvimento Humano*, *18*(2), 170-178.

Mayan, M. J. (2001). An introduction to qualitative methods: a training module for students and professionals. *International Institute for Methodology.*

Martins, E., & Szymanski, H. (2004). Brincando de casinha: Significado de família para crianças institucionalizadas. *Estudos de Psicologia, 9*(1), 177-187.

Monteiro, L. C. (2012). *Percepção de Crianças de Abrigo: os ambientes e as formas relacionais* (Relatório de pesquisa de Iniciação Pesquisa não publicado. Universidade Federal do Pará. Belém, Pará.

Moraes, M. D. L. S., & Carvalho, A. M. A. (1994). Faz-de-conta: temas, papéis e regras na brincadeira de crianças de quatro anos. *Boletim de psicologia,44*(100/101), 21-30.

Morais, M. L. S., & Otta, E. (2003). Entre a serra e o mar. In A. M. A. Carvalho, C. M. C. Magalhães, F. A. R. Pontes, & I. D. Bichara (Eds.), *Brincadeiras e cultura: viajando pelo Brasil que brinca* (pp.127-156). São Paulo. Casa do Psicólogo.

Parreira, S. M. C. P., & Justo, J. S. (2005). A criança abrigada: considerações acerca do sentido da filiação. *Psicologia em Estudo*, *2*, 175-180.

Pereira, M. C., Lira, P. P., & Pedrosa, M. I. (2011). Observando brincadeiras e conversando com crianças sobre família. In L. V. Moreira, & E. P. Rabinovich (Eds.), *Família e parentalidade: olhares da psicologia e da história* (pp. 41-62). Curitiba: Juruá.

Pontes, F. A. R., & Magalhães, C. M. C. (2003). A transmissão da cultura da brincadeira: algumas possibilidades de investigação. Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica, 16(1), 117-124.

Punch, S. (2002). Research with children: the same or different from research with adults? *Childhood, 9*(3), 321-341.

Rizzini, I., & Rizzini, I. (2004). A Institucionalização de crianças no Brasil: percurso histórico e desafios presentes. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC-Rio; UNICEF; CIESPI.

Rocha, E. A. C. (2008). Porque ouvir crianças? Algumas questões para um debate científico multidisciplinar. In S. H. Cruz (Ed.), *A criança fala: a escuta da criança em pesquisas* (pp. 43-51). São Paulo: Cortez.

Rossetti-Ferreira, M. C., Serrano, S. A., & Almeida, I. G. (2011). A criança e o adolescente como sujeito ativo e de direitos no processo de acolhimento institucional: uma longa história ainda inacabada. In M. C. Rosseti-Ferreira, S. A. Serrano, & I. G. Almeida (Eds.), *O acolhimento institucional na perspectiva da criança* (pp. 29-59). São Paulo: Hucitec.

Santos, A. K. & Bichara, I. D. (2005). Brincadeiras e contextos: alguns pressupostos para o estudo dessa relação. In F. A. R. Pontes, C. M. C. Magalhães, R. C. S. Brito, & W. L. B. Martin (Eds.), *Temas pertinentes à psicologia contemporânea* (pp. 278-297). Belém, PA: EDUFPA.

Seixas, A. A. C., Becker, B., & Bichara, I. D. (2012). Reprodução Interpretativa e Cultura de Pares nos Grupos de Brincadeira da Ilha dos Frades/BA. *Psico*, *43*(4).

Silva, R. (1997). *Os filhos do governo: A formação da identidade criminosa em crianças órfãs e abandonadas*. São Paulo: Ática.

Siqueira, A. C., & Dell'Aglio, D. D. (2006). O impacto da institucionalização na infância e na adolescência: uma revisão de literatura. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, *18*(1), 71-80.

Teixeira, S. R. S. & Alves, J. M. (2007) O Contexto das Brincadeiras das Crianças Ribeirinhas da Ilha do Combu. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica, 21*(3), 374-382.

Trivellato, A. J., Carvalho, C., & Vectore, C. (2013). Escuta afetiva: possibilidades de uso em contextos de acolhimento infantil. *Revista Semestral da Associação Brasileira de Psicologia Escolar e Educacional. 17* (2), 299-307.

Vygotsky, L. S. (2010). *A formação social da mente: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos superiores.* São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Winnicott, D. W. (1975). *O brincar & a realidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago Editora.