

POTENCIÁL HETEROGENITY VE VÝUCE TĚLESNÉ VÝCHOVY: ROLE PARTICIPACE A ORGANIZACE VÝUKY

THE POTENTIAL OF HETEROGENEITY IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION: THE ROLE OF PARTICIPATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANI- ZATION

K. Jasanská

Univerzita Karlova, Fakulta tělesné výchovy a sportu, Katedra společenskovedního základu v kinanthropologii

Abstract

Heterogeneity is a structural characteristic of contemporary physical education and shapes students' opportunities for meaningful participation. This conceptual-theoretical study examines the relationship between heterogeneity, participation, and instructional organization by synthesizing literature from inclusive pedagogy, sport pedagogy, and physical education didactics. The analysis focuses on performance-related, participatory, socio-cultural, interactional, and self-perception-related forms of heterogeneity and on organizational responses including differentiation, adaptive teaching, cooperative learning, nonlinear pedagogy, and models-based practice. The synthesis suggests that heterogeneity should not be understood merely as a set of individual student differences, but as a condition of participation mediated through instructional organization. Particular attention is paid to the risk of an "illusion of inclusion", in which students are formally present in shared activities while opportunities for meaningful engagement, recognition, and learning remain unevenly distributed. The paper argues that inclusive physical education requires not only adaptation to student diversity, but also critical examination of how participation opportunities are organized, distributed, and recognized within learning environments.

Keywords: heterogeneity; inclusive physical education; participation; instructional organization; adaptive teaching; sport pedagogy

Souhrn

Heterogenita představuje významnou charakteristiku současné tělesné výchovy a ovlivňuje možnosti žáků aktivně se zapojovat do výuky. Cílem studie je objasnit vztah mezi heterogenitou, participací a organizací výuky a ukázat, jak různé didaktické přístupy přispívají k vytváření inkluzivního prostředí. Studie vychází z konceptuálně-teoretické syntézy odborné literatury z oblasti inkluzivní pedagogiky, sportovní pedagogiky a didaktiky tělesné výchovy. Analýza ukazuje, že heterogenitu nelze redukovat na individuální rozdíly mezi žáky, ale je třeba ji chápat jako podmínku participace utvářenou organizačními a didaktickými rozhodnutími učitele. Zvláštní pozornost je věnována výkonnostní, participační a sociokulturní heterogenitě a přístupům, jako jsou diferenciacce, adaptivní výuka, kooperativní učení, nelineární pedagogika či modelově orientovaná výuka. Studie představuje koncept „iluze inkluze“, který označuje situace, kdy jsou žáci formálně zapojeni do společných aktivit, avšak jejich skutečné příležitosti ke smysluplné participaci zůstávají nerovnoměrně rozdělené. Závěrem studie zdůrazňuje, že inkluzivní tělesná výchova závisí nejen na přizpůsobování výuky rozmanitosti žáků, ale také na promyšlené organizaci a spravedlivém rozdělování příležitostí k participaci.

Klíčová slova: inkluzivní vzdělávání; adaptivní výuka; diferenciacce výuky; výukové strategie; zapojení žáků; učební prostředí

Introduction

Contemporary school environments are increasingly characterized by student heterogeneity, including differences in prior experiences, physical abilities, motivation, social background, and participation patterns. In educational research, such diversity is no longer understood as an exceptional condition but as a structural characteristic of contemporary schooling that fundamentally shapes teaching and learning processes (Prengel, 2002).

In physical education, heterogeneity becomes particularly visible because differences among students are expressed not only cognitively or socially, but also physically through movement competence, bodily confidence, participation preferences, and previous sport experiences. At the same time, physical education is often described as a subject with significant inclusive potential due to its emphasis on interaction, cooperation, and shared movement experiences (Neuber & Gebken, 2009).

Current discussions in inclusive pedagogy therefore increasingly emphasize the need to create learning environments that enable the meaningful participation of all students. Existing approaches in sport pedagogy have focused particularly on differentiation, adaptive teaching, models-based practice, and nonlinear pedagogy as strategies for responding to heterogeneous learning conditions (Casey & Goodyear, 2015; Chow et al., 2016; Tiemann, 2015).

However, despite this growing attention to inclusion and heterogeneity, less attention has been devoted to how instructional organization itself shapes participation opportunities within physical education. Existing literature frequently conceptualizes heterogeneity primarily as student diversity requiring pedagogical adaptation, while less emphasis is placed on how organizational structures, task arrangements, and implicit performance norms may reproduce unequal participation even within formally inclusive instructional settings. As a result, inclusion in physical education may remain limited to formal access to common activities while actual opportunities for participation continue to be distributed unevenly. This creates what may be described as an “illusion of inclusion”, in which students are physically present within shared instruction but do not participate equally in meaningful learning processes.

The present study therefore approaches heterogeneity not primarily as an individual characteristic of students, but as a condition of participation shaped through instructional organization and didactic decision-making. Drawing on inclusive pedagogy and sport didactics, the paper develops a conceptual synthesis of literature focused on the relationship between forms of heterogeneity, participation conditions, and organizational approaches in physical education.

The aim of the study is to analyze the pedagogical potential of heterogeneity in physical education and to explain how instructional organization and didactic approaches may either support or constrain equitable student participation.

Theoretical Framework

Heterogeneity and Participation in Education

Contemporary educational research increasingly conceptualizes heterogeneity not as an exceptional condition of schooling, but as a structural characteristic of educational environments (Prengel, 2002). Differences among students are understood to include not only cognitive abilities and academic performance, but also social background, cultural experiences, motivation, language, bodily dispositions, and diverse forms of participation in learning processes.

Within inclusive pedagogy, heterogeneity is not primarily interpreted as a pedagogical problem to be eliminated, but as a condition requiring educational environments capable of supporting diverse learners (Tiemann & Hofmann, 2010). From this perspective, the key pedagogical issue is not whether students differ, but how instructional settings respond to such differences and how participation opportunities are distributed within learning environments.

Current discussions therefore increasingly emphasize participation as a central dimension of inclusive education. Participation refers not only to students’ formal presence within instruction, but also to their opportunities for meaningful engagement, interaction, recognition, and involvement in learning processes. Educational inclusion is thus closely connected to the organization of participation opportunities rather than solely to physical access to common educational settings. At the same time, research suggests that participation is shaped not only by individual student characteristics, but also by implicit norms and organizational structures embedded within instructional practice. Learning environments

may privilege certain forms of behavior, communication, or performance while marginalizing others. Heterogeneity therefore emerges not simply as a characteristic of students, but also as a relational and pedagogically mediated phenomenon.

Heterogeneity in Physical Education

In physical education, heterogeneity becomes particularly visible because learning processes are directly connected to bodily performance, movement competence, and public participation in shared activities. Differences among students are therefore often highly observable and socially evaluated within instructional situations (Kirk, 2010).

Research in sport pedagogy indicates that heterogeneity in physical education cannot be reduced solely to differences in motor abilities or physical fitness. Students also differ in movement experiences, confidence, motivation, social interaction patterns, and attitudes toward physical activity (Cwierdzinski & Fahlenbock, 2004). These factors significantly influence how students engage in instructional situations and how they perceive their own participation within physical education.

Importantly, contemporary approaches emphasize that participation in physical education is shaped not only by student characteristics, but also by the organizational structure of instruction itself. The selection of activities, the arrangement of tasks, the structure of interaction, and dominant performance expectations influence which forms of participation become recognized and valued within learning situations (Tiemann, 2016).

This perspective shifts attention away from understanding heterogeneity merely as a challenge of managing student differences. Instead, heterogeneity becomes closely connected to the organization of participation opportunities and to the pedagogical conditions under which students can meaningfully engage in movement activities.

Inclusive and Adaptive Approaches in Physical Education

Inclusive approaches in physical education emphasize the importance of instructional organization that enables diverse forms of participation within shared learning environments. Rather than focusing exclusively on standardized performance outcomes, contemporary sport pedagogy increasingly highlights adaptive teaching, differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, and open-ended movement tasks as ways of responding to heterogeneous learning conditions.

Differentiation represents one of the most common strategies for adapting instruction to diverse student needs. This may involve modifications of task difficulty, equipment, movement requirements, or instructional conditions. However, research suggests that differentiation alone does not automatically ensure equitable participation, particularly when instructional organization remains strongly oriented toward dominant performance norms (Tiemann, 2015).

Broader adaptive approaches therefore seek to reorganize learning situations themselves rather than merely modifying isolated tasks. Nonlinear pedagogy, for example, conceptualizes learning as an adaptive process emerging through interactions between learners and their environment (Chow et al., 2016). Similarly, models-based practice emphasizes the diversification of participation roles, cooperation, and student engagement through pedagogical models such as Cooperative Learning or Sport Education (Casey & Goodyear, 2015). Across these approaches, a common principle emerges: meaningful inclusion in physical education depends not only on accommodating student differences, but also on how participation opportunities are pedagogically organized and socially recognized within instructional settings.

Methodological Approach

This study adopts a conceptual-theoretical literature synthesis approach focused on the relationship between heterogeneity, participation, and instructional organization in physical education. The aim of the study is not to produce a systematic review or meta-analysis, but to synthesize and interpret theoretical and empirical literature in order to identify key pedagogical patterns and conceptual relationships relevant to inclusive physical education.

The study draws on literature from the fields of inclusive pedagogy, sport pedagogy, and physical education didactics published primarily between 2000 and 2024. The literature search focused on academic publications addressing heterogeneity, participation, adaptive teaching, differentiation, and inclusive approaches in physical education.

Relevant literature was identified through searches in academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar using combinations of keywords such as “heterogeneity”, “inclusive physical education”, “adaptive teaching”, “differentiated instruction”, “participation”, and “sport pedagogy”. The selection process focused on publications that: (a) addressed heterogeneity within physical education or sport pedagogy, (b) discussed participation conditions or inclusive instructional organization, (c) examined didactic approaches related to adaptive teaching or differentiation, or (d) contributed conceptually to discussions of inclusive pedagogy in physical education.

Both theoretical and empirical studies were included in the analysis in order to capture diverse perspectives on heterogeneity and participation. Preference was given to peer-reviewed academic publications that substantially contributed to contemporary discussions of inclusive physical education.

The analytical process was based on iterative conceptual comparison across the selected literature. Rather than coding empirical data in a formal thematic-analysis procedure, the analysis focused on identifying recurring conceptual relationships concerning:

- forms of heterogeneity,
- conditions of participation,
- organizational patterns of instruction,
- and didactic responses to diverse learning conditions.

Through this process, the literature was organized into broader analytical categories that structure the Results section of the paper. Particular attention was devoted to tensions between formal inclusion and actual participation opportunities within instructional settings.

The resulting synthesis does not aim to provide exhaustive coverage of all literature on inclusion in physical education. Instead, the study seeks to develop a conceptual interpretation of heterogeneity as a pedagogically and organizationally mediated condition of participation.

Analytical Synthesis: Heterogeneity, Participation, and Instructional Organization

Heterogeneity as a Condition of Participation

Within physical education, heterogeneity becomes pedagogically relevant when differences among students translate into unequal participation opportunities. From this perspective, heterogeneity should not be understood merely as a collection of individual characteristics, but as a condition shaped through the interaction between student diversity and the organization of instructional situations.

In educational practice, heterogeneity is often associated primarily with differences in motor competence, physical fitness, or previous movement experience. These forms of performance-related heterogeneity are highly visible because movement performance is publicly displayed, continuously compared, and socially evaluated during instruction. Yet performance differences alone do not automatically determine participation. Their significance depends largely on how learning environments are structured and which forms of competence become recognized within instructional practice (Tiemann, 2016).

Problems emerge particularly in instructional settings organized around uniform expectations and narrowly defined performance standards. Students with lower levels of movement competence may gradually withdraw from participation, avoid engagement, or occupy peripheral positions within learning situations. By contrast, instructional environments that allow multiple forms of task engagement and diverse movement solutions reduce the dominance of direct performance comparison and broaden opportunities for participation (Chow et al., 2016).

Not all participation inequalities are immediately visible. Some students remain physically present within instructional activities while participating only minimally in meaningful learning processes. Participatory heterogeneity therefore concerns differences in the quality and intensity of engagement rather than observable performance alone. Participation in physical education cannot be reduced to attendance or task completion, but also includes opportunities for interaction, cooperation, recognition, and active involvement within shared learning situations.

Participation patterns are further shaped by social and cultural dimensions of heterogeneity. Previous sport experiences, gendered expectations, cultural understandings of movement, and socially valued forms of physical competence influence how students position themselves within instructional environments and how they are recognized by teachers and peers (Flintoff & Scraton, 2006; Hills &

Croston, 2012). Certain movement activities may implicitly privilege students with established sport backgrounds while limiting the accessibility of participation for others.

In practice, these dimensions frequently overlap. Performance-related, participatory, and socio-cultural forms of heterogeneity intersect within instructional situations and may reinforce one another. Participation opportunities consequently become unevenly distributed despite formally shared instructional conditions. Heterogeneity thus emerges not solely from student characteristics, but from the relationship between diversity and the organizational structure of instruction itself.

This perspective shifts attention away from viewing heterogeneity primarily as a pedagogical problem of managing student differences. Instead, heterogeneity becomes a question of how participation opportunities are organized, distributed, and recognized within physical education.

Organizational Responses to Heterogeneity

Responses to heterogeneity in physical education differ not only in teaching methods, but also in how participation itself is organized. Didactic approaches therefore represent broader organizational strategies that shape access to learning opportunities within instructional situations.

The most widespread response to heterogeneity remains task differentiation. Teachers modify rules, equipment, movement requirements, or levels of task difficulty in order to accommodate diverse student abilities while maintaining common instructional activities. Such adaptations may reduce visible performance disparities and create more accessible learning conditions for some students. They do not necessarily alter the underlying logic of participation, however. When instructional organization continues to prioritize dominant forms of movement competence, differentiation may simply redistribute students within existing hierarchies rather than expand meaningful participation opportunities (Tiemann, 2015).

Contemporary sport pedagogy increasingly emphasizes approaches that reorganize learning situations more fundamentally. Nonlinear pedagogy conceptualizes learning as an adaptive process emerging through interactions between students and their environment (Chow et al., 2016). Rather than prescribing uniform movement solutions, instructional situations are designed to support multiple pathways of engagement and exploration. Through modifications of constraints, rules, and task conditions, students can participate at different levels while pursuing shared learning objectives.

Tabulka 1./ Table 1.

Vztahy mezi formami heterogenity, podmínkami participace a organizačními reakcemi v tělesné výchově./ Relationships between forms of heterogeneity, participation conditions, and organizational responses in physical education.

Form of heterogeneity	Participation condition	Organizational risk	Inclusive organizational response	Risk of illusion of inclusion
Performance-related heterogeneity	Unequal access to movement success and visible participation	Dominance of standardized performance expectations and public comparison	Open-ended movement tasks, adaptive task design, multiple performance pathways	Formal inclusion masks peripheral participation roles
Participatory heterogeneity	Differences in the quality and intensity of engagement	Hidden non-participation masked by physical presence or task completion	Cooperative learning structures, active redistribution of participation roles, reflective instructional guidance	Formal participation is mistaken for meaningful engagement
Socio-cultural and gender-conditioned heterogeneity	Unequal recognition of movement experiences and activity preferences	Privileging dominant sport cultures, gender norms, or prior sport socialization	Diversification of movement cultures, inclusive activity selection, shared participation formats	Students are included organizationally but excluded symbolically or socially
Heterogeneity of movement confidence and self-perception	Unequal willingness to engage publicly in movement activities	Fear of failure, embarrassment, or negative peer comparison	Supportive learning climate, non-comparative assessment, flexible participation pathways	Students appear involved while minimizing authentic participation
Interactional and social heterogeneity	Unequal positioning within peer interactions and group dynamics	Informal hierarchies reproduced through team organization or role allocation	Rotating roles, structured cooperation, teacher-mediated participation balance	Cooperative settings reproduce exclusionary interaction patterns

A comparable shift can be observed in models-based practice. Pedagogical models such as Cooperative Learning, Sport Education, and Teaching Games for Understanding reorganize participation by expanding the range of legitimate student roles within instructional situations (Casey & Goodyear, 2015). Participation is no longer limited to direct movement execution, but also includes tactical thinking, communication, organization, cooperation, and responsibility for shared learning processes.

The social organization of instruction plays an equally important role. Cooperative structures may reduce the dominance of competitive comparison and create conditions for interaction among students with diverse experiences and abilities. At the same time, cooperation alone does not automatically produce equitable participation. Existing social hierarchies and exclusionary dynamics may persist even within formally collaborative learning environments if participation structures remain insufficiently reflected pedagogically.

Across these approaches, a common principle emerges: effective work with heterogeneity depends less on isolated instructional modifications and more on how participation opportunities are structured within learning situations. Inclusive instructional organization therefore requires environments that support multiple forms of engagement instead of privileging a single model of performance or competence.

From this perspective, heterogeneity challenges not only the selection of teaching methods, but the broader pedagogical logic through which participation is organized in physical education. The central issue is therefore not whether differentiation is present, but whether instructional organization genuinely expands access to meaningful participation for diverse groups of students. The relationships identified across the reviewed literature are summarized in Table 1.

The analytical categories summarized above illustrate that heterogeneity in physical education is closely connected to the organization of participation opportunities within instructional situations. Across different forms of heterogeneity, the reviewed literature points to a recurring tension between formal inclusion and meaningful participation. The concept of the illusion of inclusion therefore emerges not as an isolated phenomenon, but as a structural risk accompanying instructional approaches that expand access without transforming underlying participation conditions.

The Illusion of Inclusion in Physical Education

Formal inclusion does not automatically produce meaningful participation.

The concept of the “illusion of inclusion” describes situations in which instructional organization appears inclusive while continuing to reproduce unequal participation conditions. Students may be physically present within shared learning situations and formally involved in common activities, yet their opportunities for engagement, recognition, movement exploration, or decision-making remain significantly limited.

This phenomenon emerges particularly in performance-oriented instructional environments. Participation is often implicitly linked to dominant norms of movement competence, competitiveness, speed, or previous sport experience (Kirk, 2010; Tiemann, 2016). Students who do not meet these expectations may formally participate in activities while simultaneously occupying marginal positions within instructional processes.

The problem becomes especially visible when differentiation operates only at the level of task adaptation without transforming broader participation structures. Simplified tasks may reduce visible performance inequalities, but they do not necessarily redistribute learning opportunities. In some cases, differentiated instruction may unintentionally stabilize existing hierarchies by assigning peripheral or less meaningful forms of participation to students perceived as less competent. Participation thus becomes formally accessible while remaining pedagogically unequal.

Hidden forms of non-participation may also emerge within apparently cooperative and inclusive instructional settings. Some students minimize movement engagement, avoid interaction, or withdraw socially while still fulfilling the formal requirements of instruction. Their presence within instructional situations can therefore obscure the fact that meaningful participation opportunities remain unevenly distributed.

The illusion of inclusion highlights a central tension within inclusive physical education: the distinction between organizational access and genuine pedagogical participation. Inclusion cannot be reduced to the placement of all students within common activities or shared instructional spaces. It

depends on whether instructional environments enable diverse forms of engagement without positioning students within implicit hierarchies of competence and recognition.

Approaches such as open-ended movement tasks, cooperative learning structures, nonlinear pedagogy, and models-based practice appear particularly relevant because they broaden the range of legitimate participation pathways (Casey & Goodyear, 2015; Chow et al., 2016). These approaches shift attention away from uniform performance expectations and toward the creation of learning environments that recognize diverse movement experiences and forms of engagement.

From this perspective, heterogeneity is not primarily a problem of student difference, but a pedagogical challenge concerning how participation opportunities are organized and distributed within instruction. The concept of the illusion of inclusion therefore provides a framework for critically examining whether inclusive practices in physical education genuinely expand participation opportunities or merely reproduce exclusion in less visible forms.

Discussion

The present study examined heterogeneity in physical education through the perspective of participation and instructional organization. Rather than conceptualizing heterogeneity primarily as a collection of individual student differences, the analysis approached heterogeneity as a condition shaped through the organization and distribution of participation opportunities within instructional settings. This shift in perspective represents the central contribution of the paper.

Current discussions in inclusive pedagogy and sport didactics have extensively emphasized differentiation, adaptive teaching, and inclusive instructional models as responses to heterogeneous learning conditions (Tiemann, 2015; Casey & Goodyear, 2015). The present analysis does not challenge the importance of these approaches. Instead, it highlights a limitation that appears across parts of the existing literature: inclusion is often discussed at the level of pedagogical intention, while less attention is devoted to how organizational structures themselves shape unequal participation opportunities.

The findings complicate the assumption that formal inclusion automatically produces equitable participation. Students may remain physically present within common instructional activities while still occupying marginal positions in learning processes. Participation inequalities therefore emerge not only through direct exclusion, but also through organizational arrangements that privilege particular forms of movement competence, competitiveness, or prior sport experience.

The concept of the “illusion of inclusion” is particularly relevant in this regard. The present paper uses this concept to describe situations in which instructional settings appear inclusive at the organizational level while participation opportunities remain unevenly distributed in practice. This issue becomes especially visible in performance-oriented instructional environments where participation is implicitly tied to dominant norms of competence and successful performance.

Importantly, the present analysis does not suggest that differentiation is ineffective. Rather, it highlights the risk that differentiation may remain organizationally superficial when underlying participation structures remain unchanged. Adaptations of task difficulty or instructional conditions may reduce visible performance disparities without necessarily transforming how recognition, engagement, and participation are distributed within learning situations. Under such conditions, students may receive formally differentiated access to activities while continuing to experience limited opportunities for meaningful participation.

This interpretation expands existing discussions within inclusive sport pedagogy by emphasizing participation as an organizational and relational phenomenon rather than solely a matter of accommodating student diversity. Inclusion therefore depends not only on adapting instruction to student diversity, but also on critically examining how instructional environments themselves produce, stabilize, or redistribute participation opportunities.

The analysis further suggests that approaches such as nonlinear pedagogy, models-based practice, cooperative learning, and open-ended movement tasks may contribute to more inclusive participation structures because they broaden the range of legitimate ways in which students can engage in instruction (Chow et al., 2016; Casey & Goodyear, 2015). These approaches reduce the dominance of uniform performance expectations and allow participation to emerge through multiple forms of engagement, including cooperation, tactical thinking, communication, organization, and shared problem-solving.

At the same time, the study points to persistent tensions within inclusive physical education. Organizational structures designed to support participation may unintentionally reproduce exclusionary dynamics if they fail to address broader hierarchies embedded within instructional culture. Cooperative learning, for example, does not automatically ensure equitable participation. Without reflective pedagogical guidance, dominant students may continue to occupy central roles while less confident students remain positioned at the margins of interaction.

This issue is particularly significant in physical education because bodily performance is continuously visible, evaluated, and socially interpreted during instruction. As a result, instructional organization cannot be treated as a neutral framework for learning. It functions as an active pedagogical mechanism shaping recognition, participation, and students' experiences of inclusion.

The present study also positions itself in relation to existing review literature on inclusive physical education. Reviews such as Reuker et al. (2016) provide important overviews of international research concerning inclusion in physical education. The present paper complements this body of work by focusing more specifically on the relationship between heterogeneity, participation conditions, and instructional organization. Rather than attempting a comprehensive mapping of inclusive physical education research, the study develops a conceptual interpretation of how organizational structures shape participation opportunities within heterogeneous learning environments.

Several limitations of the study should nevertheless be acknowledged. First, the paper is conceptual and theoretical in nature and does not include empirical observation of instructional practice. The proposed interpretations therefore require empirical verification within specific educational contexts. The study does not aim to provide exhaustive coverage of all literature concerning inclusive physical education and therefore reflects an interpretive rather than systematic synthesis of selected conceptual and empirical sources. Second, the analysis draws predominantly on European literature in inclusive pedagogy and sport didactics, particularly German-language scholarship, which may limit the transferability of some conclusions to other educational traditions. Third, although both theoretical and empirical publications were included, the study focused primarily on conceptual relationships rather than systematic comparison of empirical findings.

Future research should therefore examine how participation opportunities are organized and experienced within everyday physical education practice. Particular attention should be devoted to hidden forms of non-participation, the distribution of participation roles, and the organizational mechanisms through which inclusion and exclusion are reproduced during instruction. Empirical studies exploring coeducational physical education, adaptive instructional models, and students' experiences of participation may further contribute to understanding the pedagogical potential and limitations of heterogeneity in physical education.

Conclusion

This study examined heterogeneity in physical education through the perspective of participation and instructional organization. The analysis suggests that heterogeneity should not be understood merely as a set of individual student differences, but as a condition shaping access to meaningful participation within instructional situations.

The reviewed literature indicates that participation opportunities are significantly influenced by the organizational structure of instruction, including the selection of activities, task arrangements, and socially recognized forms of movement competence. From this perspective, inclusive physical education cannot be reduced to the formal inclusion of all students within shared activities.

A central contribution of the paper lies in the concept of the "illusion of inclusion", which highlights the tension between formal access to instruction and genuine participation in learning processes. The study therefore argues that inclusive physical education depends not only on differentiation or adaptive teaching, but also on the critical organization and distribution of participation opportunities within learning environments.

Inclusive physical education therefore depends not only on accommodating student diversity, but on critically transforming the organizational conditions through which participation itself is produced.

Use of AI Tools

The authors used AI-assisted language tools exclusively for structural revision, language editing, and stylistic refinement of the manuscript. All conceptual interpretations, analytical arguments, and final editorial decisions were critically reviewed and approved by the authors.

References

- Casey, A., & Goodyear, V. A. (2015). *Using models-based practice to improve physical education*. Routledge.
- Chow, J. Y., Davids, K., Button, C., & Renshaw, I. (2016). *Nonlinear pedagogy in skill acquisition: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Cwierzdzinski, P., & Fahlenbock, M. (2004). Heterogene Schülervoraussetzungen als pädagogische Herausforderung. In Wuppertaler Arbeitsgruppe (Ed.), *Schulsport in den Klassen 5–10* (pp. 58–71). Hofmann.
- Flintoff, A., & Scraton, S. (2006). Girls and physical education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O’Sullivan (Eds.), *The handbook of physical education* (pp. 767–783). Sage.
- Friedrich, G., Gräfe, S., Pögl, B., & Scheid, V. (2017). Lehrerbildung für einen inklusiven Sportunterricht: Konzeptentwicklung unter Berücksichtigung empirischer Befunde. *Zeitschrift für sportpädagogische Forschung*, (2), 5–24.
- Hills, L. A., & Croston, A. (2012). “It should be better all together”: Exploring strategies for “undoing” gender in coeducational physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17(5), 591–605.
- Heymann, H. (2010). Binnendifferenzierung – eine Utopie? Pädagogischer Anspruch, didaktisches Handwerk, Realisierungschance. *Pädagogik*, 62(11), 6–11.
- Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical education futures*. Routledge.
- Neuber, N., & Gebken, U. (2009). Anerkennung als sportpädagogischer Begriff. In U. Gebken & N. Neuber (Eds.), *Anerkennung als sportpädagogischer Begriff* (pp. 7–18). Schneider Verlag Hohengarten.
- Pfützner, M., & Neuber, N. (2012). Individuelle Förderung: Fachdidaktische Konzepte, Bedingungen und didaktische Empfehlungen. *Sportpädagogik*, 36(5), 2–8.
- Prenzel, A. (2002). „Ohne Angst verschieden zu sein?“ Mehrperspektivische Anerkennung von Schulleistungen in einer Pädagogik der Vielfalt. In B. Hafenecker, P. Henkenborg, & A. Scherr (Eds.), *Pädagogik der Anerkennung: Grundlagen, Konzepte, Praxisfelder* (pp. 203–221). Wochenschau Verlag.
- Reuter, S., Rischke, A., Kämpfe, A., Schmitz, B., Teuber, H., Thisse, A., & Wiethäuper, H. (2016). Inklusion im Sportunterricht: Ein Überblick über internationale Forschungsergebnisse aus den Jahren 2005 bis 2014. *Sportwissenschaft*, 46(2), 88–101.
- Rischke, A., Heim, C., & Gröben, B. (2017). Nur eine Frage der Haltung? Lehrkräfte und inklusiver Sportunterricht. *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research*, 47(4), 149–160.
- Tiemann, H. (2013). Inklusiver Sportunterricht: Ansätze und Modelle. *Sportpädagogik*, 37(6), 47–50.
- Tiemann, H. (2015). Didaktische Konzepte für einen inklusiven Sportunterricht. In S. Meier & S. Ruin (Eds.), *Inklusion als Herausforderung: Aufgabe und Chance für den Schulsport* (pp. 53–66). Logos.
- Tiemann, H. (2016). Konzepte, Modelle und Strategien für den inklusiven Sportunterricht – internationale und nationale Entwicklungen und Zusammenhänge. *Zeitschrift für Inklusion*, 10(3).

Mgr. Kateřina Jasanská

Charles University

Faculty of Physical Education and Sport

José Martího 269/31

162 52 Praha 6 - Veleslavín

katerina.jasanska@ftvs.cuni.cz