INTERCLASS GAMES IN UPPER SECONDARY EDUCATION: MOTIVATION, INCLUSION, EXCLUSION, AND RIVALRY BETWEEN CLASSES

https://doi.org/10.63330/aurumpub.073-012

Larissa Barros Rodrigues de Souza Farias[1], Fernanda Sousa Rabelo[2], Jacquelane Maria Andrade Carvalho[3], Caio dos Santos Silva[4], Edinalva Pereira Campos[5], Francisca Maria Isidorio dos Santos[6], Idelfonso Alves da Costa[7], Izael da Cunha Santiago[8], Jocilma Xavier Sampaio[9] and Shirley Sampaio Andrade[10]

Abstract

Interclass games occupy a prominent place on school calendars, but the literature on their educational effects in upper secondary education remains limited and fragmented. Adopting a qualitative approach, this article conducts a narrative review to examine what the selected sources allow us to discuss regarding motivation and participation, inclusion and exclusion, rivalry and coexistence, and pedagogical

[1] Teaching Degree in Physical Education
Universidade Federal do Piauí – UFPI
E-mail: issabarro@hotmail.com
[2] Master's Student in Philosophy
Faculdade Católica do Maranhão – MINTER/FACMA/PUCRS
Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul - PUCRS / FAPEMA Scholarship Recipient.
E-mail: fernanda7158@hotmail.com
[3] Master's Student in Education
Universidad Autónoma de Assunción
E-mail: jackigor@outlook.com
[4] Teaching Degree in Chemistry
Instituto Federal do Piauí - IFPI
E-mail: caiosantosifpi@gmail.com
[5] Degree in Pedagogy
Universidade Estadual do Piauí – UESPI
E-mail: nalvaina2@gmail.com
[6] Degree in Pedagogy
Faculdade Superior De Ensino Programus - ISEPRO
E-mail: franciscamariaisidorio@gmail.com
[7] Degree in Geography
Universidade Estadual do Piauí – UESPI
E-mail: idelfonsoalvesdacosta69@gmail.com
[8] Teaching Degree in Physical Education
Universidade Estadual do Piauí – UESPI
E-mail: izaelrabico@gmail.com
[9] Bachelor's Degree in Social Work
Faculdade do Médio Parnaíba – FAMEP
E-mail: jocilma2017.xavier@gmail.com
[10] Degree in Pedagogy
Universidade Estadual do Piauí - UESPI
E-mail: Shirleyandrade0505@gmail.com

organization and student agency. The analysis brings together studies directly related to interclass games, research conducted in related contexts, theoretical works, and normative documents, distinguishing among direct evidence, indirect evidence, and conceptual contributions. Evidence situated specifically in upper secondary education is limited, which precludes generalizations. Studies on motivation suggest that perceived competence may influence the decision to participate, while research on gender, disability, and hierarchies among students helps formulate questions about access to teams and continued marginalization. Rivalry between classes has received little direct investigation. As a working hypothesis, the article argues that educational value depends on participation rules, event organization, and teacher mediation. The proposals presented are pedagogical possibilities to be evaluated, not solutions whose effectiveness has already been demonstrated.

Keywords: Inclusion and exclusion, Interclass games, Motivation and participation, School Physical Education, Student agency, Upper secondary education.

INTRODUCTION

Interclass games are sporting events contested by different classes within the same school. In upper secondary education, they may foster coexistence and identification with the group, but they can also make differences in ability, popularity, and access to teams more visible. Physical Education is a curricular component of basic education (Brasil, 1996), and the National Common Curricular Base (Base Nacional Comum Curricular – BNCC) places bodily practices within the area of Languages and Their Technologies (Brasil, 2018). This curricular position, however, does not make every tournament educational.

Upper secondary education serves young people, and how schools understand them is relevant to this topic. Dayrell (2003) proposes understanding young people as social subjects who construct their own ways of experiencing youth and criticizes the tendency within schools to view them in terms of what they are not yet. In the context of interclass games, this perspective entails treating students as

participants in decisions about the event, rather than merely as its recipients. This is a conceptual argument that informs the sections on student agency.

The literature on school sports is broader than the body of research devoted specifically to interclass games in upper secondary education. Nazario, Santos, and Ferreira Neto (2023) study the development and implementation of these games at an upper secondary school; Oliveira (2024) examines intramural games planned with students at this educational level; Cavalcante et al. (2021) investigate students' motivation in interclass games; Costa (2011) addresses intramural games at a technical school; and Serpa, Oliveira, and Borges (2016) relate interclass games to continuing teacher education. Other studies contribute to the interpretation of motivation, inclusion, gender, and hierarchies among students without taking the event itself as their object of study. The central challenge is to connect these sources without attributing to studies from related contexts findings they did not investigate.

There is also a broader debate about what it means to compete at school. Since the 1990s, Brazilian authors have distinguished performance sport from a form of school sport that prioritizes participation and learning (Kunz, 1994; Vago, 1996; Reverdito et al., 2008). In dialogue with Valter Bracht, Vago (1996) formulated the distinction between "sport of the school" and "sport in the school," that is, between a practice whose meaning is reframed by the school and one that is merely installed within the school setting. This distinction informs the interpretation of interclass games in this article.

Participation is the central issue. Students differ in ability, experience, and interest, and when an event prioritizes performance, less experienced students may have few opportunities to play. Exclusion does not always take the form of an explicit prohibition: it may manifest as restrictive selection, unequal playing time, or an almost exclusive emphasis on the score. Rivalry between classes, in turn, may strengthen a sense of belonging or encourage taunting and disrespect. Distinguishing between these outcomes is both a pedagogical and an analytical task.

The question guiding this study is: What does the academic literature allow us to state about the relationships among motivation, inclusion and exclusion, rivalry between classes, and educational

possibilities in interclass games in upper secondary education? The general objective is to answer this question through a narrative review. The specific objectives are to distinguish what the literature states directly about interclass games from what is inferred from related contexts; examine how motivation, ability, gender, disability, and rivalry are addressed; and propose pedagogical possibilities and a research agenda.

As a working hypothesis, the article argues that the educational value of interclass games depends on their organization and on teacher mediation, rather than solely on the event format. This proposition has not yet been comparatively tested by the studies reviewed. The article's contribution lies in defining the scope of the available evidence and proposing pedagogical possibilities whose effectiveness still needs to be investigated.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section presents the concepts used as lenses through which the studies are interpreted. They are not treated as ready-made explanations of interclass games; rather, they help formulate questions and distinguish empirical findings from interpretation. Each subsection addresses one area: the educational meaning of competition, motivation, intergroup relations, and inclusion. The data from the selected studies are presented in Section 4.

SCHOOL COMPETITION AND THE EDUCATIONAL MEANING OF SPORT

Kunz (1994) advocates a didactic and pedagogical transformation of sport in schools so that sporting practices do not automatically reproduce the logic of high performance. Reverdito et al. (2008) take a similar position in their discussion of school competitions that prioritize participation and learning. By distinguishing "sport of the school" from "sport in the school," Vago (1996) helps us consider whether the institution reframes competition according to educational objectives or merely reproduces external

models. These authors do not, in themselves, demonstrate the effects of interclass games; rather, they provide criteria for examining how the event is organized and which experiences it makes possible.

Studies directly related to interclass games show that organizing the event can be treated as part of the pedagogical work. Nazario, Santos, and Ferreira Neto (2023) discuss youth agency in the development and implementation of the games; Oliveira (2024) addresses the challenges involved in producing intramural games with students; and Serpa, Oliveira, and Borges (2016) situate interclass games within school planning and teacher education. In dialogue with Kunz (1994) and Reverdito et al. (2008), these studies make it possible to shift the focus from the mere outcomes of the matches to the conditions under which students participate, learn, and make decisions. Their specific contexts do not support the claim that any particular format will be effective in every school.

Legislation and curricular documents define educational responsibilities but do not prescribe a single format for interclass games. The National Education Guidelines and Framework Law includes Physical Education in the basic education curriculum (Brasil, 1996), while the BNCC proposes that, within the area of Languages and Their Technologies, students critically analyze prejudices, stereotypes, and power relations in bodily practices (Brasil, 2018). These documents provide references for planning, but merely holding a tournament does not guarantee that these objectives will be achieved. Their achievement depends on pedagogical choices, participation rules, and students' concrete experiences.

Two dimensions of the event need to be distinguished. Agency in its organization, which involves publicity, officiating, and logistics, and effective participation in the competitions are related but not equivalent: a student may perform important roles without playing, and the reverse may also occur. Evaluating an interclass event requires examining both dimensions; one cannot replace the other. This distinction reappears in the following sections because it makes it possible to identify when participation in organizational activities obscures a lack of opportunities to play.

MOTIVATION FOR SPORTS PARTICIPATION

Self-Determination Theory associates autonomous motivation with the satisfaction of psychological needs such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci; Ryan, 2000). When used as an interpretive lens, this perspective helps us ask whether students have opportunities to experience progress, make decisions, and feel that they are part of the event. However, the satisfaction of these needs should not be inferred merely because a student registers or displays enthusiasm during a match; the student's experience and the concrete conditions of participation would also need to be investigated.

The studies of sports motivation considered in this review do not cover all students at a school to the same extent. Cavalcante et al. (2021) examine factors associated with participation in interclass games, whereas Grubertt et al. (2019) investigate the motives of young school athletes. Drawing connections between these studies is useful, but their participants and contexts are not identical. Therefore, convergence regarding a particular motive should not be turned into a general rule applicable to all upper secondary students.

One important gap concerns those who do not participate. The motivation reported by those already involved does not, in itself, explain why other students do not register, are not selected, or prefer to remain outside the competitions. Understanding this dimension requires examining selection rules, actual playing time, and the accounts of those who participate only as supporters or organizers. This distinction informs the analysis of the four thematic areas and prevents low participation from being attributed to a lack of individual interest without supporting evidence.

RIVALRY AND COEXISTENCE BETWEEN CLASSES

A class can serve as a source of belonging while simultaneously functioning as a symbolic boundary separating its members from others. In interclass games, this opposition is publicly marked by the score, the teams, and their supporters. In his study of intramural games at a technical school, Costa (2011) investigated how the pedagogical model was related to relationships among students. This context-

specific case does not support the conclusion that competition invariably improves or worsens coexistence, but it provides an empirical basis for treating organization as a relevant variable.

Crochík et al. (2018) analyze school hierarchies associated with performance and popularity. Although their study does not focus on interclass games, its discussion allows a relevant question to be formulated: Can the recognition given to the most highly skilled students reinforce hierarchies already present among peers? This possibility must be investigated within each school context, without assuming that popularity, sporting performance, and leadership positions coincide in every group.

In this article, competition refers to a contest organized according to rules; rivalry refers to symbolic or practical opposition between groups; and conflict refers to a situation in which interests or expectations clash. These categories are used to guide the analysis, not as findings already demonstrated for all interclass games. Enthusiastic support is not, in itself, equivalent to hostility. Discriminatory taunts, humiliation, and threats, by contrast, should not be normalized as an inevitable part of the competitive spirit. Schools are responsible for establishing understandable rules, discussing them with students, and intervening when competition compromises someone's integrity or participation.

INCLUSION, GENDER, AND THE NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

In the field of gender, Sousa and Altmann (1999) analyze bodily expectations directed at boys and girls and their implications for school Physical Education. Grubertt et al. (2019) also identify differences in the motives reported by young school athletes, although their study does not directly examine interclass games. Taken together, these sources provide grounds for asking who chooses the sports, who is encouraged to compete, and who occupies the court. They do not, however, demonstrate that any specific pattern of exclusion is present in every school or at every event.

The BNCC for upper secondary education contains points of connection with this topic. Under Specific Competency 5 in the area of Languages, skills EM13LGG501 to EM13LGG503 address, respectively, using movement to establish respectful relationships in bodily practices, critically analyzing

the prejudices, stereotypes, and power relations present in them, and experiencing such practices while giving them meaning within one's life project (Brasil, 2018). As the authors' own interpretation, rather than a prescription contained in the document, this article proposes that a well-conducted interclass event can provide a context in which these three areas are addressed.

Educational legislation and the BNCC provide references for pedagogical planning but do not replace an analysis of the school context. The Brazilian Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities Act guarantees access to education on equal terms, including participation in sporting and recreational activities (Brasil, 2015), while the BNCC calls for a critical analysis of prejudices and power relations in bodily practices (Brasil, 2018). In this article, these documents are treated as normative frameworks for formulating questions about accessibility and participation, not as proof that these conditions are already ensured in interclass games.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a qualitative, exploratory-descriptive narrative literature review. The heterogeneity of the material, comprising case studies, questionnaire-based research, dissertations, reviews, and theoretical texts, calls for an interpretive synthesis rather than an effect estimate. The six SANRA criteria guided transparency in the presentation (Baethge; Goldbeck-Wood; Mertens, 2019), but they were not used to assign scores to the studies; nor was a formal instrument for assessing methodological quality applied. The analysis considered the design, context, and limitations reported in each publication.

The initial searches were conducted in successive stages beginning in 2025 using Google Scholar, SciELO, and the CAPES Journal Portal, and were supplemented by searches of institutional repositories, journal websites, and the reference lists of relevant studies. Because the exact search strings used in the initial searches were not recorded at the time, it is not possible to reconstruct that stage in full without creating a level of documentary precision that did not exist. To strengthen verification prior to submission, targeted searches were conducted using the following expressions in Portuguese: *"jogos*

interclasses" "ensino médio" pesquisa; "jogos internos" "ensino médio" Educação Física estudantes; "motivação" "jogos interclasse" escola Fortaleza; "inclusão" "jogos escolares" "Educação Física" escola; and "protagonismo estudantil" interclasses Educação Física. This supplementary verification does not turn the review into a systematic review or support the claim that all available records were retrieved.

Priority was given to sources that directly address interclass games, intramural games, or their pedagogical organization. Studies from related contexts were also retained when they made an identifiable contribution to discussions of motivation, participation, gender, disability, peer hierarchies, or pedagogical models of sport. Normative documents and theoretical texts were used as framing material, not as empirical research. The final selection retained 20 references distributed across the four thematic areas, without any claim to exhaustiveness. Relevance was assessed according to each source's connection to the research question and its specific contribution.

Verification of institutional records made it possible to confirm the bibliographic information for the dissertations by Oliveira (2024) and Nascimento (2026). The former investigates intramural games with upper secondary students. The latter examines students in the eighth and ninth grades of lower secondary education and therefore contributes to the discussion of student agency but does not constitute evidence specific to upper secondary education. The sources were not treated as equivalent: when the analysis is based on an abstract or institutional record, the claim remains limited to the content presented there, without attributing to the work a full reading that was not actually conducted.

The analysis was organized into four thematic areas: motivation and participation; inclusion and exclusion; rivalry and coexistence; and pedagogical organization and student agency. Within each area, direct evidence from studies of interclass or intramural games themselves was distinguished from indirect evidence drawn from related contexts and from theoretical or normative contributions. This classification indicates how closely a source aligns with the research question, rather than constituting a quality scale.

The selection was interpretive rather than systematic; the results represent a critical analysis of the assembled corpus, not an exhaustive survey of all Brazilian scholarship.

The everyday observation that motivated the research question was not treated as empirical data because the article did not collect data from participants. Nor did the review apply a formal instrument for assessing methodological quality or count every record retrieved. These choices are compatible with its narrative nature but limit the full reproducibility of the search and require caution when interpreting the scope of the results. To mitigate this limitation without simulating a systematic protocol, the supplementary verification process and its search expressions were explicitly reported in the methodology.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

OVERVIEW OF THE CORPUS AND SCOPE OF THE EVIDENCE

The evidence most directly related to interclass games in upper secondary education is concentrated in Nazario, Santos, and Ferreira Neto (2023), who examine the development and implementation of the games at this educational level, and Oliveira (2024), who investigates the production of intramural games with upper secondary students. The remaining sources answer different questions or address related contexts. Cavalcante et al. (2021) study the motivation of students in the final years of lower secondary education; Grubertt et al. (2019) investigate young school athletes; Costa (2011) analyzes games at a technical school; and Serpa, Oliveira, and Borges (2016) discuss pedagogical interclass games in the context of teacher education. These differences in participants, objectives, and contexts prevent their findings from being treated as equivalent.

The contribution of this body of literature lies in the possibility of bringing together dimensions that rarely appear in a single investigation. Studies of organization help illuminate decision-making and student participation; research on motivation provides elements for examining students' reported reasons for engaging in sports; and works on gender, disability, and school hierarchies make it possible to

formulate questions about barriers and opportunities. The theoretical texts, in turn, provide concepts for interpreting competition as a practice whose meaning can be reframed pedagogically. This combination broadens the scope of the analysis but does not compensate for the lack of direct research on all four thematic areas in upper secondary education.

It is therefore important to distinguish among three levels. The first corresponds to findings reported by studies that investigated interclass or intramural games themselves. The second comprises cautious inferences drawn from research conducted in related contexts. The third encompasses theoretical interpretations and organizational proposals that still need to be evaluated. This distinction does not establish an overall classification of source quality; it merely makes explicit how closely each source aligns with the research question of this article. Rivalry between classes, in particular, remains less directly investigated than organization and motivation.

MOTIVATION, ACCESS, AND EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION

Cavalcante et al. (2021) identified technical competence as a prominent motivational factor among students participating in interclass games. Grubertt et al. (2019), in a study of young school athletes, likewise found technical competence to be prominent and identified differences in the motives reported by girls and boys. The similarity between these findings suggests that students' perceptions of their own abilities may be relevant to sports participation. However, the groups and contexts investigated are not identical, and these findings do not support the assertion that the same hierarchy of motives applies to all upper secondary students.

Self-Determination Theory provides a lens through which to interpret this issue because it relates motivation to the satisfaction of needs such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci; Ryan, 2000). From the perspective of this theoretical framework, feeling capable may be an important dimension of the sporting experience. Nevertheless, the findings of the studies must be distinguished from the interpretation proposed here: the cited studies do not, in themselves, demonstrate that students with

lower levels of technical proficiency refrain from participating because they do not feel competent, or that a particular form of event organization increases their motivation.

The central distinction is among wanting to participate, having an opportunity to join a team, and experiencing effective participation. A student may show interest in the event but not be selected; may participate as a supporter or organizer without playing; or may be registered but receive few opportunities during the matches. These situations are analytical possibilities, not findings attributed to the schools investigated. They nevertheless demonstrate why absence from the competitions should not automatically be interpreted as a lack of interest and why registration alone is insufficient to assess participation.

Oliveira (2024) contributes to the discussion by examining the construction of intramural games with upper secondary students. The study draws attention to student participation in planning, but it should not be interpreted as proof that merely consulting students expands access to the matches. Evaluating this relationship would require determining which decisions were shared, who was able to influence them, and whether organizational choices changed concrete opportunities to play. Motivation and participation must therefore be analyzed together, without reducing the latter to the former.

INCLUSION, EXCLUSION, AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF OPPORTUNITIES

Crochík et al. (2018) examine school hierarchies related to performance and popularity, while Sousa and Altmann (1999) discuss bodily expectations and gender relations in school Physical Education. Although these studies do not directly examine interclass games, they help raise the question of whether recognition of the most highly skilled students and socially constructed expectations influence the distribution of opportunities. This relationship remains a hypothesis to be investigated in the context of the games, rather than a finding that can be attributed indiscriminately to schools.

Inclusion can be examined across different dimensions: initial access to the event, the possibility of joining a team, the amount of time and conditions of participation during matches, and the experience of being welcomed. These dimensions are not equivalent. Open registration does not, in itself, ensure an

opportunity to play; similarly, entering the court does not guarantee that a student has appropriate conditions in which to participate. This distinction helps prevent inclusion from being treated merely as a stated intention or as physical presence at the event.

Team formation criteria illustrate this problem. Selection based on ability may produce evenly matched games and recognize performance, but it may also concentrate opportunities among students who already have greater experience. Random allocation may distribute skill levels among teams, but it does not guarantee playing time, accessibility, or participation in decision-making. The body of evidence analyzed does not provide a sufficient basis for declaring a single procedure superior in every situation. The choice should consider the pedagogical purpose, the sport, safety, material conditions, and the possibility of evaluating the effects on participation.

With regard to gender, Sousa and Altmann (1999) provide elements for understanding how socially constructed bodily expectations may influence experiences in Physical Education, while Grubertt et al. (2019) report differences in the motives described by young school athletes. These sources provide grounds for investigating who is encouraged to choose each sport, how teams are formed, and who receives opportunities to play. They do not, however, allow the conclusion that all girls or all boys experience interclass games in the same way. The discussion of race, social class, sexual orientation, and other inequalities likewise requires specific research; their relevance as research questions does not amount to evidence of effects within the corpus examined.

With respect to disability, Chicon (2008) problematizes processes of inclusion and exclusion in school Physical Education, while Basso-Braz et al. (2024), in a systematic review, discuss inclusion strategies such as collaborative support, communication, adaptations, and material resources. These works do not directly investigate interclass games, but they provide categories for examining the accessibility of the event. Accessible instructions, adaptations to equipment and rules, and collaborative support can be considered during planning; however, their specific effectiveness in interclass games in upper secondary education has not been demonstrated by the sources reviewed here. The Brazilian Inclusion of Persons

with Disabilities Act guarantees participation on equal terms (Brasil, 2015), but the existence of a normative guarantee does not prove that it is fully realized at every event.

PEDAGOGICAL ORGANIZATION AND STUDENT AGENCY

Nazario, Santos, and Ferreira Neto (2023) discuss the development and implementation of interclass games in upper secondary education as part of an experience involving youth agency. Oliveira (2024), in turn, examines the challenges involved in producing intramural games with students at this educational level. Serpa, Oliveira, and Borges (2016) situate pedagogical interclass games within the debate on continuing teacher education. In dialogue with Dayrell (2003), these works make it possible to view students as subjects capable of interpreting school life and participating in decisions about its organization. However, the specific contexts of these studies do not support the conclusion that every form of student involvement automatically produces greater inclusion or better coexistence.

The performance of tasks must be distinguished from effective participation in decision-making. Publicizing the event, organizing equipment, officiating, and assisting with logistics can constitute educational experiences; nevertheless, these activities do not demonstrate that students influenced the selection of sports, the rules, team composition criteria, or the distribution of opportunities to play. Student agency should be examined in terms of the actual decision-making power afforded to students, rather than merely the number of duties they perform.

Participation in organization must also be distinguished from participation in sports. A student may make a meaningful contribution to the event without wishing to play; another may want to compete but find no place on a team. Neither situation should be presumed to constitute a problem in itself. The analytical issue is whether the available forms of participation correspond to students' interests and whether those who wish to play find effective opportunities to do so. An appropriate evaluation must consider both dimensions without using one as a substitute for the other.

Pedagogical organization also involves explicitly stating the objectives of the event and establishing understandable participation criteria. The BNCC proposes critically analyzing prejudices, stereotypes, and power relations in bodily practices (Brasil, 2018), but it does not prescribe a single format for interclass games. Based on this framework and on studies of sports pedagogy, possible measures include discussing the rules with classes, communicating registration criteria, monitoring the distribution of playing time, ensuring accessibility, and conducting a collective evaluation after the event (Kunz, 1994; Reverdito et al., 2008). These measures are planning possibilities whose suitability and effects need to be examined within each school context.

Student participation in planning should not be treated as a guarantee of equity. A decision may be shared and still leave certain groups without access to the competitions; likewise, a rule intended to balance the teams may produce different effects depending on the sport and the school's circumstances. In addition to asking who participated in organizing the event, it is therefore important to examine who defined the criteria, which voices were considered, and what consequences the decisions had for opportunities to play.

RIVALRY BETWEEN CLASSES, COEXISTENCE, AND CONFLICT

Rivalry is the dimension for which the selected sources offer the least direct evidence. Costa (2011) studied school games at a technical school and investigated relationships among students within the school environment. The study contributes to the discussion of the relationship between the pedagogical model and coexistence in that context, but it does not support the conclusion that competition invariably improves or undermines relationships among students. Although Crochík et al. (2018) do not investigate rivalry between classes, their work helps formulate questions about the possible relationship among performance, popularity, and school hierarchies.

To interpret this phenomenon, it is useful to distinguish identification with one's own class from the disparagement of opponents. Collective identification may be part of the experience of the event,

whereas discriminatory taunts, humiliation, and threats may compromise students' participation and integrity. The presence of supporters, enthusiasm, or intense competition does not, in itself, prove hostility; nor does the score establish that integration occurred. An analysis of coexistence requires attention to interactions and to how the school addresses instances of disrespect.

One pedagogical possibility is to discuss rules of coexistence beforehand, agree on forms of intervention, and involve students in evaluating situations that occurred. This proposal is consistent with the emphasis on pedagogical organization found in Nazario, Santos, and Ferreira Neto (2023) and Serpa, Oliveira, and Borges (2016), but it is not an intervention whose effectiveness has been demonstrated by comparative studies in the corpus. Schools need not eliminate all competitive identification among classes; they need to establish clear limits so that competition is not used as a justification for discriminating against, intimidating, or restricting the participation of any student.

The lack of direct studies also limits the recommendations that can be made regarding evaluation. To understand rivalry in specific contexts, future research could consult students who play, those who support the teams, those who organize the event, and those who do not participate in the competitions, as well as observing how conflicts and taunts are addressed. This proposal does not describe procedures conducted in the present article; it indicates a possible line of investigation capable of clarifying experiences that the available corpus does not yet allow us to characterize with confidence.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG MOTIVATION, INCLUSION, RIVALRY, AND STUDENT PARTICIPATION

A combined analysis of the four thematic areas shows that motivation, inclusion, rivalry, and student agency should not be treated as independent outcomes. Decisions regarding registration, team composition, playing time, selection of sports, and participation in planning establish the conditions for the experiences available to students. These conditions can be investigated in relation to interest in competing, effective access to matches, relationships among classes, and students' influence over the

event. This connection is an interpretation constructed from the body of sources, not a causal relationship demonstrated by the studies reviewed.

The analysis also shows that the event's most visible indicators are insufficient for evaluating its educational scope. The number of students registered, the presence of supporters, the balance of the score, or the distribution of organizational duties may provide partial information, but individually they do not reveal who had opportunities to play, who participated in decision-making, or how students evaluated the experience. A more robust evaluation would need to combine information on organization and participation with accounts from the different groups involved. This is a methodological recommendation for future research and school-based evaluation, not a finding from empirical data collected in this article.

In response to the research question, the sources support the propositions that motivation to compete does not ensure equal access to the competitions; that selection criteria, accessibility conditions, and peer relationships deserve examination as potential barriers; that organizational agency is not necessarily equivalent to decision-making power or sports participation; and that rivalry cannot be classified as beneficial or harmful without analyzing concrete interactions. The evidence is uneven across the thematic areas, particularly regarding rivalry and exclusion in interclass games in upper secondary education. The review's principal finding is therefore the delineation of questions and analytical possibilities, without turning pedagogical hypotheses into effects that have already been demonstrated.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This article examined what the selected literature allows us to state about motivation and participation, inclusion and exclusion, rivalry between classes, and the pedagogical organization of interclass games in upper secondary education. Sources directly related to this educational level are limited, with particular emphasis on Nazario, Santos, and Ferreira Neto (2023) and Oliveira (2024). The remaining studies contribute in different ways: some investigate sports motivation or games in other educational segments, while others provide theoretical or normative frameworks or categories for

examining inclusion and school relationships. These contributions broaden the interpretation but do not replace research specifically addressing interclass games in upper secondary education.

The analysis indicates that motivation, access, and effective participation need to be distinguished. An interest in competing does not guarantee an opportunity to join a team, just as participation in organization does not, in itself, demonstrate that students influenced decisions about the event. Similarly, selection criteria, accessibility, and peer relationships are relevant dimensions in the investigation of inclusion, but their effects must be verified within each context. Regarding rivalry, the corpus does not allow the conclusion that interclass games, in themselves, improve coexistence or cause conflict.

The review's contribution consists of connecting these dimensions and making the limitations of the available evidence explicit. The references included do not all constitute empirical studies of the same object, and the initial search followed neither a systematic protocol nor a complete record of the search expressions used. The supplementary verification described in the methodology does not eliminate these limitations or support a claim of exhaustiveness. The pedagogical proposals presented should therefore be understood as possibilities to be adapted and evaluated, rather than as interventions of demonstrated effectiveness.

Future research may follow the organization of interclass games at upper secondary schools and separately consult students who play, students who participate in organizing the event, and students who remain outside the competitions. Studies of accessibility, gender, other inequalities, and experiences of rivalry are also needed. Investigations comparing forms of organization and recording access criteria, playing time, shared decisions, and participants' perceptions may clarify the conditions under which interclass games expand opportunities for participation and the difficulties that persist. Until more direct evidence is available, any assessment of their educational value should remain tied to the concrete conditions of organization and to students' experiences.

REFERENCES

Baethge, Christopher; Goldbeck-Wood, Sandra; Mertens, Stephan. SANRA – a scale for the quality assessment of narrative review articles. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, v. 4, art. 5, 2019. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0064-8.

Basso-Braz, Aline; Gatti, Melina Radaelli; Van Munster, Mey de Abreu; Costa, Maria da Piedade Resende da. Estratégias para a inclusão de estudantes com deficiências na Educação Física escolar: uma revisão sistemática [Strategies for the inclusion of students with disabilities in school Physical Education: a systematic review]. *Movimento*, Porto Alegre, v. 30, e30021, 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.124293.

Brasil. *Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996* [Law No. 9,394 of December 20, 1996]. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional [Establishes the guidelines and framework for national education]. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1996. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm. Accessed on: 27 Oct. 2026.

Brasil. *Lei nº 13.146, de 6 de julho de 2015* [Law No. 13,146 of July 6, 2015]. Institui a Lei Brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência (Estatuto da Pessoa com Deficiência) [Establishes the Brazilian Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities Act (Statute of Persons with Disabilities)]. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2015. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/l13146.htm. Accessed on: 27 Oct. 2026.

Brasil. Ministério da Educação. Base Nacional Comum Curricular [National Common Curricular Base]. Brasília, DF: *MEC*, 2018. Available at: http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/. Accessed on: 27 Oct. 2026.

Cavalcante, Vitória Correia Queiroz; Braz, Letícia Maria Alves; Santos, Ana Luisa Batista; Oliveira, Antônio Ricardo Catunda de. Avaliação da motivação de escolares à participação de jogos interclasse de escola pública municipal em Fortaleza – CE [Assessment of students' motivation to

participate in interclass games at a municipal public school in Fortaleza, Ceará]. *Revista de Instrumentos, Modelos e Políticas em Avaliação Educacional*, Fortaleza, v. 2, n. 2, e021009, 2021. DOI: https://doi.org/10.51281/impa.e021009.

Chicon, José Francisco. Inclusão e exclusão no contexto da Educação Física escolar [Inclusion and exclusion in the context of school Physical Education]. *Movimento*, Porto Alegre, v. 14, n. 1, p. 13–38, 2008. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.3760.

Costa, Romário Cardoso. O modelo pedagógico dos jogos escolares da CEDAF/UFV e sua influência nas relações entre os discentes no ambiente escolar [The pedagogical model of the CEDAF/UFV school games and its influence on relationships among students in the school environment]. 2011. 135 f. Dissertation (Master's Degree in Agricultural Education) – *Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro*, Seropédica, 2011. Available at: https://rima.ufrrj.br/jspui/handle/20.500.14407/12112. Accessed on: 27 Oct. 2026.

Crochík, José Leon; DIAS, Marian Ávila de Lima; Freller, Cintia Copit; Correa, Alex Sandro; Correia, Rodrigo Nuno Peiró. Hierarquias escolares: desempenho e popularidade [School hierarchies: performance and popularity]. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 44, e167836, 2018. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634201710167836.

Dayrell, Juarez. O jovem como sujeito social [Young people as social subjects]. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 24, p. 40–52, Sep./Dec. 2003. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782003000300004.

Deci, Edward L.; Ryan, Richard M. The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, v. 11, n. 4, p. 227–268, 2000. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.

Grubertt, Guilherme Alves; Cavazzotto, Timothy Gustavo; Vaz Junior, Arnaldo; Mouad, Mariana; Serassuelo Junior, Helio. "Quero ser um atleta rico e famoso": motivos para a prática esportiva de jovens atletas escolares ["I want to be a rich and famous athlete": young school athletes' reasons

for participating in sports]. *Motrivivência*, Florianópolis, v. 31, n. 60, p. 1–14, 2019. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8042.2019e58373.

Kunz, Elenor. *Transformação didático-pedagógica do esporte* [Didactic and pedagogical transformation of sport]. Ijuí: Unijuí, 1994.

Nascimento, José Wellerson do. Jogos interclasses como espaço de protagonismo estudantil numa escola de tempo integral do município de Fortaleza [Interclass games as a space for student agency at a full-time school in the municipality of Fortaleza]. 2026. Dissertation (Professional Master's Degree in Physical Education) – Programa de Mestrado Profissional em Educação Física em Rede Nacional, *Universidade Federal do Ceará*, Fortaleza, 2026. Available at: https://repositorio.ufc.br/handle/riufc/85637. Accessed on: 27 Oct. 2026.

Nazario, Murilo Eduardo dos Santos; Santos, Wagner dos; Ferreira Neto, Amarílio. Protagonismo juvenil no ensino médio: reflexões acerca da elaboração e implementação dos jogos interclasses [Youth agency in upper secondary education: reflections on the development and implementation of interclass games]. *Pro-Posições*, Campinas, v. 34, e20210132, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-6248-2021-0132.

Oliveira, Ana Carla Araújo de Lima. Jogos internos no ensino médio: os desafios de uma produção com estudantes de uma escola regular de Fortaleza/CE [Intramural games in upper secondary education: the challenges of producing an event with students at a regular school in Fortaleza, Ceará]. 2024. 187 f. Dissertation (Professional Master's Degree in Physical Education in the National Network) – *Universidade Federal do Ceará*, Fortaleza, 2024. Available at: https://repositorio.ufc.br/handle/riufc/77096. Accessed on: 27 Oct. 2026.

Reverdito, Riller Silva; Scaglia, Alcides José; Silva, Sidney Aparecido Dias da; Gomes, Thales Marcel Ribeiro; Pesuto, Claudinei de Lima; Baccarelli, Walter. Competições escolares: reflexão e ação em pedagogia do esporte para fazer a diferença na escola [School competitions: reflection and action

in sports pedagogy to make a difference at school]. *Pensar a Prática*, Goiânia, v. 11, n. 1, p. 37–45, 2008. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5216/rpp.v11i1.1207.

Serpa, Aila Oliveira; Oliveira, Lara Cristina Faria de; Borges, Zilma Maria Santana. A formação continuada e os jogos interclasses pedagógicos [Continuing teacher education and pedagogical interclass games]. *Revista da Faculdade de Educação*, Cáceres, v. 26, n. 2, p. 15–29, 2016. Available at: https://periodicos.unemat.br/ppgedu/pt_BR/article/view/3928. Accessed on: 27 Oct. 2026.

Sousa, Eustáquia Salvadora de; Altmann, Helena. Meninos e meninas: expectativas corporais e implicações na educação física escolar [Boys and girls: bodily expectations and implications for school Physical Education]. *Cadernos CEDES*, Campinas, v. 19, n. 48, p. 52–68, 1999. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-32621999000100004.

Vago, Tarcísio Mauro. O "esporte na escola" e o "esporte da escola": da negação radical para uma relação de tensão permanente: um diálogo com Valter Bracht ["Sport in the school" and "sport of the school": from radical rejection to a relationship of permanent tension: a dialogue with Valter Bracht]. *Movimento*, Porto Alegre, v. 3, n. 5, p. 4–17, 1996.