Pedagogy Review | 2026, Vol. 9, No.1, 50 – 66 | ISSN Online: 3028-1040 | ISSN Print: 3028-1059
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.9.1.SC-0526-023

OPEN ACCESS

Senior High School Physical Education Teachers' Lived Experiences in Teaching Dance Through Blended Learning

Article History:

Initial submission:	30 May 2026
First decision:	08 June 2026
Revision received:	20 October 2026
Accepted for publication:	28 October 2026
Online release:	04 November 2026

Jackielyn G. Pascual[1], ORCID No. 0009-0002-6675-0552
Lorna A. Espeso[2], PhD, ORCID No. 0000-0002-2024-2440

[1]SHS Teacher VI, Norzagaray National High School, Norzagaray, Bulacan, Philippines
[2]Faculty, Graduate School, Adamson University, 900 San Marcelino Street, Ermita, Manila, Philippines

Abstract

Teaching dance through blended learning requires teachers to preserve embodied demonstration, artistic expression, cultural meaning, and pedagogical connection across face-to-face and digitally mediated environments. This study explored the lived experiences of Senior High School Physical Education teachers in teaching dance through blended learning in public schools in Bulacan, Philippines. Guided by Van Manen's phenomenology of practice, the study employed an interpretive phenomenological design involving 15 purposively selected teachers. The study collected data through semi-structured interviews and analyzed them using adapted steps from Colaizzi's method, including transcript familiarization, identification of significant statements, formulation of meanings, thematic clustering, development of an exhaustive description, and articulation of the experience's fundamental structure. The findings revealed that blended learning extended opportunities for self-paced rehearsal, repeated access to demonstrations, creative choreography, and reflective performance review. However, unstable connectivity, unequal access to devices, constrained home spaces, limited visibility of movement, delayed corrective feedback, and reduced teacher–student interaction disrupted the embodied, spatial, and relational dimensions of dance instruction. Teachers responded by producing short, low-data demonstration videos; modifying movements to fit available space; integrating asynchronous preparation with face-to-face refinement; and using rubrics, video evidence, self-assessment, and peer feedback. The experience's essential structure was continuous pedagogical negotiation under conditions of partial presence, in which teachers reconstructed embodiment, feedback, interaction, and cultural expression across unevenly connected learning environments. The findings underscore the need for equitable access to technology, safe practice options, context-responsive instructional resources, protected preparation time, and professional development in blended dance pedagogy.

Keywords: blended learning, dance pedagogy, embodied learning, interpretive phenomenology, Physical Education teachers, phenomenology of practice

Copyright @ 2026. The Author/s. Published by VMC Analytiks Multidisciplinary Journal News Publishing Services. Senior High School Physical Education Teachers' Lived Experiences in Teaching Dance Through Blended Learning © 2026 by Jackielyn G. Pascual and Lorna A. Espeso is an open access article licensed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0). This permits the copying, redistribution, remixing, transforming, and building upon the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially, provided that appropriate credit is given to the copyright owner/s through proper and standard citation.

INTRODUCTION

Blended learning has evolved from an emergency response during the COVID-19 pandemic into a continuing instructional approach that combines face-to-face and technology-mediated learning. Its effectiveness depends not merely on access to digital platforms but on purposefully aligning learning outcomes, activities, interaction, assessment, and learner support across instructional environments (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Rasheed et al., 2020). Technology can expand access, flexibility, and practice opportunities; however, its educational value depends on equitable access, teacher preparation, appropriate instructional design, and sustained human interaction (UNESCO, 2023). These considerations matter especially in Physical Education, where learning happens through movement, observation, practice, feedback, and bodily interaction. Teachers must evaluate technique, coordination, rhythm, spatial awareness, safety, and effort, which digital platforms cannot always capture accurately. Blended Physical Education therefore requires

teachers to decide which competencies they can introduce or reinforce online and which require direct demonstration, observation, and correction. The difficulty is greater in dance because it combines technical execution with expression, creativity, rhythm, spatial awareness, interaction, and cultural meaning. Recorded demonstrations let students pause, replay, and practice movement sequences, while video submissions support reflection and repeated review of performance. Nevertheless, cameras reduce three-dimensional movement to a limited visual frame. Poor camera angles, unstable connectivity, limited home space, and delayed feedback can prevent teachers from seeing the learner's full movement and responding immediately to technical or safety concerns.

Blended learning may also affect dance's relational and communal qualities. Shared rhythm, group formations, partnering, and spontaneous teacher–student interaction are difficult to reproduce when learners participate from separate locations. Technology can extend instructional presence through recordings, messaging apps, and online consultations, but it cannot fully replace the embodied, interpersonal experience of learning in a shared physical space. Dance instruction in the Philippine context also carries a cultural responsibility. Filipino dances communicate histories, identities, community practices, musical traditions, and social values. Teaching these dances therefore involves more than reproducing steps. Teachers must communicate cultural origin, formation, gesture, music, attire, expression, and communal meaning. When digitally mediated instruction is reduced to watching and copying recorded movements, students may reproduce the technical sequence without understanding its cultural significance. These challenges intensify due to differences in connectivity, device ownership, household resources, privacy, and available movement space. Therefore, researchers must examine the educational use of technology in relation to relevance, equity, teacher preparation, and the conditions in which students participate (UNESCO, 2023). Philippine evidence similarly indicates that flexible or blended Physical Education can improve accessibility while creating difficulties in technological provision, assessment, learner monitoring, and equitable participation (Mata & Marasigan, 2024).

Bulacan provides an appropriate setting for examining these conditions because its public schools serve urban, semi-urban, and rural communities with varied technological and spatial resources. Teachers may simultaneously support students with stable internet connections and personal devices and those who rely on shared devices, mobile data, printed materials, or intermittent access. This diversity requires teachers to provide alternative instructional pathways while maintaining common curricular expectations. Despite the continued use of blended learning, limited evidence explains how public Senior High School Physical Education teachers in Bulacan experience teaching dance across unequal technological, spatial, and socioeconomic conditions. Existing research has largely emphasized student perceptions, motivation, satisfaction, technology use, and measurable outcomes. Comparatively less attention has focused on how teachers preserve embodied participation, provide corrective feedback, assess digitally mediated performances, adapt movement to limited spaces, address inequitable access, and sustain dance's expressive and cultural dimensions. This study therefore sought to explore and interpret the lived experiences of Senior High School Physical Education teachers teaching dance through blended learning in public schools in Bulacan. Specifically, it addressed the following questions:

1. How do Senior High School Physical Education teachers experience the opportunities created by teaching dance through blended learning?

2. How do teachers experience the technological, spatial, relational, assessment-related, and socioeconomic constraints of blended dance instruction?

3. How do teachers adapt their pedagogy to sustain embodied, engaging, and culturally responsive dance learning?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Blended Learning in Education. Blended learning purposefully integrates face-to-face and technology-mediated instruction. Its value lies in distributing learning activities across environments according to their pedagogical functions rather than merely adding digital materials to conventional teaching (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004). It can support flexible pacing, repeated access to resources, learner autonomy, and extended communication, but inadequate technology, limited digital competence, weak self-regulation, and insufficient institutional support can constrain implementation (Rasheed et al., 2020). Equity is particularly important because access to a device does not necessarily ensure meaningful participation. Connectivity, device quality, privacy, household responsibilities, digital competence, and teacher support influence how learners benefit from technology. UNESCO (2023) therefore emphasized that educational technology should support learner needs and human interaction rather than replace teachers.

Blended Learning in Physical Education. Physical Education presents distinctive challenges because its outcomes involve bodily performance, movement competence, safety, and interaction. A systematic review by Wang et al. (2023) found that blended Physical Education may support flexibility, learner autonomy, access to resources, motivation, and learning outcomes. However, instructional design, technological competence, self-regulation, isolation, and beliefs about online learning remain significant concerns. Wang et al. (2023) also found that research has concentrated largely on undergraduate students, perceptions, motivation, satisfaction, and measurable outcomes. Comparatively less attention has been given to K–12 teachers and institutions. This imbalance limits understanding of how schoolteachers experience and manage the practical demands of blended movement instruction. In the Philippines, Mata and Marasigan (2024) found that HyFlex Physical Education increased accessibility and scheduling flexibility but created difficulties in technological provision, assessment, monitoring, and equitable participation.

Dance Pedagogy in Blended Environments. Dance is an embodied, expressive, relational, and culturally situated form of learning. It requires teachers to observe posture, timing, weight transfer, coordination, use of space, rhythm, and expression. Recorded demonstrations can support repetition and self-paced practice, but they cannot fully replicate direct observation, immediate correction, ensemble interaction, and the energy of shared performance. Digital recordings also provide incomplete evidence of movement. Camera angles, lighting, frame size, sound quality, editing, and available space can influence what teachers observe. Thus, video-based performance assessment must distinguish students' dance competence from device quality, connectivity, recording conditions, and home environments. Blended dance instruction requires teachers to assign appropriate functions to each modality. Digital environments may support historical context, conceptual preparation, recorded demonstrations, individual rehearsal, and reflection. Face-to-face sessions remain important for movement correction, formations, partnering, safety monitoring, musicality, and expressive refinement. In Philippine dance education, blended instruction must also preserve cultural meaning. Digital materials should connect movement with cultural origin, music, values, attire, formation, and community significance.

Teachers' Pedagogical Adaptations. Teachers determine how digital and face-to-face components are connected. Their work may include recording demonstrations, compressing video files, preparing printed alternatives, adapting choreography for limited spaces, responding through multiple

communication platforms, and reviewing individual performance submissions. These responsibilities can encourage creativity but may also increase workload and personal expenditure. Teachers also adapt assessment by combining performance videos, scoring rubrics, progress recordings, reflections, self-assessment, peer feedback, and face-to-face verification. Such practices can produce more comprehensive evidence, provided that technological quality does not become an unintended basis for grading. These adaptations show that blended dance teaching is not simply about using technology. It involves ongoing pedagogical judgment about access, safety, feedback, cultural meaning, and each modality's instructional purpose.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework. This study is grounded in Van Manen's phenomenology of practice, which examines meaning within lived professional experience (van Manen, 1990, 2016). This perspective fits because blended dance teaching is not merely a technical combination of online and face-to-face activities; it is experienced through the body, space, time, relationships, and material conditions of practice. Lived body concerns demonstration, observation, correction, expression, and safety. Lived space concerns classrooms, studios, digital platforms, and home environments that enable or restrict movement. Lived time encompasses repetition, interrupted instruction, asynchronous participation, and delayed feedback. Lived relation concerns teacher–student connection, peer interaction, and pedagogical presence, while lived materiality concerns devices, connectivity, recordings, music, printed resources, and movement spaces. These dimensions served as interpretive guides rather than predetermined themes. The conceptual framework proposes that contextual conditions shape teachers' experienced opportunities and constraints, which in turn inform adaptive pedagogical practices and the reconstruction of dance teaching. Connectivity, device availability, household resources, movement space, curriculum requirements, teacher readiness, student diversity, and institutional support influence what teachers and learners can accomplish. Supportive conditions can extend practice, creativity, and reflection; inadequate conditions can disrupt instruction, limit visibility and participation, delay feedback, and weaken interaction. Teachers respond through low-data demonstrations, offline alternatives, space-responsive choreography, purposeful sequencing of asynchronous and face-to-face activities, and multimodal assessment. These adaptations extend pedagogical presence while preserving face-to-face instruction for direct observation, spatial coordination, shared rhythm, correction, and interpersonal interaction. The relationship is cyclical: teachers experience conditions, interpret their consequences, adapt instruction, and use the outcomes to refine subsequent practice. At the center is preserving embodied, expressive, relational, equitable, and culturally responsive dance learning.

METHODS

Research Design. This study employed an interpretive phenomenological design grounded in Van Manen's phenomenology of practice to understand how Senior High School Physical Education teachers experienced and interpreted teaching dance through blended learning. Van Manen provided the study's primary philosophical and interpretive orientation. At the same time, Colaizzi's procedures guided the systematic identification of significant statements, the formulation of meanings and themes, and the phenomenon's essential structure (Colaizzi, 1978; van Manen, 2016).

Respondents. The study employed criterion-based purposive sampling to select 15 Senior High School Physical Education teachers from public schools under the Schools Division of Bulacan. Participants were eligible if they had directly taught dance through blended learning, had at least one year of experience integrating digital technologies into instruction, and consented to a recorded interview and participant validation. Teachers without direct

experience of the phenomenon or those outside the identified setting were excluded. Purposive sampling ensured the selection of information-rich participants whose experiences aligned with the study's phenomenological purpose (Campbell et al., 2020). The selection captured variations in connectivity, digital resources, movement spaces, and blended-learning implementation. Sample adequacy was determined by the depth, relevance, and recurrence of meanings across the interviews rather than statistical representativeness.

Research Instrument. The study used a researcher-developed semi-structured interview guide to elicit detailed accounts of teachers' lived experiences in teaching dance through blended learning. The guide was aligned with the research questions, theoretical framework, and literature on blended Physical Education and dance pedagogy. It examined the opportunities and constraints teachers experienced and the pedagogical adaptations they employed to sustain embodied, engaging, equitable, and culturally responsive dance learning. Open-ended questions invited participants to describe specific experiences involving movement demonstration and correction, student engagement, teacher–student interaction, performance assessment, technological access, and the expressive and cultural dimensions of dance. Neutral probes clarified responses and explored the meaning of significant experiences without directing participants toward predetermined answers. Three experts with complementary expertise in qualitative and phenomenological research, Physical Education and dance pedagogy, and educational technology and blended learning reviewed the guide. The experts assessed its clarity, relevance, coherence, ethical sensitivity, alignment with the research questions, and capacity to elicit lived experiences. Their recommendations informed refinements to ambiguous and overlapping questions, prompt sequencing, and coverage of embodied instruction, access, assessment, cultural responsiveness, and pedagogical adaptation. The researcher used the guide flexibly and reflexively, varying follow-up questions according to each participant's account while addressing all principal areas of inquiry.

Research Data Collection. Data collection began after securing institutional authorization. Eligible teachers received an individual invitation describing the study and interview requirements. After documenting consent, researchers scheduled face-to-face interviews in private, mutually agreed settings and conducted them using the expert-reviewed semi-structured guide. Neutral probes elicited concrete experiences without directing responses. Each interview lasted approximately 30–40 minutes and was audio-recorded with permission. Recordings were transcribed verbatim and checked against the audio. We retained responses in Filipino and English and checked translated quotations against the original wording. De-identified, verified transcripts constituted the dataset for phenomenological analysis. Participants later received a concise interpretive summary and could clarify, correct, or add information before the findings were finalized.

Ethical Considerations. The Adamson University Ethics Review Committee approved the study under Protocol Code 2026-081-(PHY-04) through expedited review on May 7, 2026; the clearance is valid until May 7, 2027. Participation was voluntary, and we obtained written informed consent and separate recording permission before each interview. Participants could decline questions or withdraw without penalty. We removed or generalized names, schools, municipalities, and other identifiers; we used participant codes in reporting, and we kept research records in password-protected files accessible only to authorized research personnel. Data handling followed the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012. The authors used Grammarly and generative artificial intelligence tools only to support language editing, clarity, organization, and initial drafting during manuscript preparation. No identifiable participant information, audio recordings, or unredacted transcripts were entered into public AI systems. The author checked all AI-assisted text against the original data and source

materials and retained responsibility for the analysis, interpretations, citations, and final manuscript.

Data Analysis. Interview data were analyzed using adapted procedures from Colaizzi and interpreted through Van Manen's phenomenology of practice. Colaizzi's method structured the progression from significant statements to formulated meanings, subthemes, major themes, an exhaustive description, and the phenomenon's essential structure, while Van Manen guided interpretation of the meanings embedded in teachers' professional experiences (Colaizzi, 1978; van Manen, 1990, 2016). The researcher repeatedly listened to the recordings and read the transcripts to understand each account as a whole. Relevant statements were extracted and linked to participant codes and transcript locations. The researcher developed meanings from these statements, compared them across accounts, and grouped them into subthemes and major themes related to opportunities, constraints, and pedagogical adaptations. Divergent accounts were retained when they revealed meaningful variations in the experience. An analytical matrix documented the progression from participant quotations to significant statements, formulated meanings, subthemes, and major themes. The developing themes were reviewed against the complete transcripts to ensure conceptual distinction, evidential support, and representation of participants' experiences. Van Manen's lifeworld dimensions, lived body, space, time, relation, and materiality, served as interpretive guides rather than predetermined coding categories. The researcher integrated the refined themes into an exhaustive description and condensed them into the phenomenon's essential structure: continuous pedagogical negotiation under conditions of partial presence. A concise summary of the preliminary themes and interpretive structure was returned to participants for validation. Their clarifications were documented and incorporated where appropriate. Throughout the analysis, the researcher maintained reflexive notes and an audit trail of interpretive decisions, theme revisions, and supporting evidence.

RESULTS

The analysis identified three major thematic domains aligned with the research questions: extending dance learning beyond the physical classroom, teaching an embodied practice under conditions of partial access and presence, and reconstructing dance pedagogy across physical and digital environments. Across these domains, teachers experienced blended dance instruction as an ongoing negotiation between technology's opportunities and dance's bodily, spatial, relational, and cultural requirements.

Table 1

Summary of Major Themes and Subthemes

Research question	Major theme	Subthemes	Central experiential meaning
Opportunities created by blended dance instruction	Extending dance learning beyond the physical classroom	Flexible and repeatable practice; private rehearsal and participation; creative digital choreography; extended instructional presence; revisitable performance and feedback	Technology extended the time, place, and forms through which dance could be practiced, created, and reviewed.
Constraints experienced in blended dance instruction	Teaching an embodied practice under conditions of partial access and presence	Interrupted technological flow; constrained movement spaces and safety; weakened relational presence; incomplete visibility and delayed correction; unequal participation	Teachers attempted to teach a three-dimensional, relational practice under uneven, incomplete technological conditions.
Pedagogical adaptations employed by teachers	Reconstructing embodied, engaging, and culturally responsive dance pedagogy	Purposeful sequencing of modalities; accessible demonstrations and materials; spatial differentiation; multimodal assessment and feedback; interactive and creative participation; emerging cultural contextualization	Teachers redesigned instruction by assigning complementary functions to online, asynchronous, and face-to-face learning.

Opportunities Created by Blended Dance Instruction. The first research question examined how teachers experienced the opportunities created by teaching dance through blended learning. The accounts showed that blended learning extended dance instruction beyond scheduled classroom time, offered some learners a lower-pressure environment for participation, expanded opportunities for creativity, and provided teachers with records that could be reviewed repeatedly.

RQ1. Opportunities Created by Blended Dance Instruction. The first research question examined how teachers experienced the opportunities created by teaching dance through blended learning. The accounts showed

that blended learning extended dance instruction beyond scheduled classroom time, offered some learners a lower-pressure environment for participation, expanded opportunities for creativity, and provided teachers with records that could be reviewed repeatedly.

Table 2
Themes on the Opportunities Experienced in Blended Dance Instruction

Subtheme	Participants represented	Representative quotation
Flexible and repeatable practice	12	"Students appreciated being able to pause, rewind, and practice repeatedly." (T15)
Private rehearsal and increased willingness to participate	7	"Some who were shy in face-to-face classes became more active and expressive in video submissions." (T12)
Creative digital choreography and learner ownership	14	"Students created their own short dance routines using a combination of online tutorials and face-to-face practice." (T4)
Extended instructional presence through digital resources	8	"I uploaded tutorial videos so students could learn even without daily face-to-face classes." (T1)
Revisitable performance, monitoring, and feedback	5	"Student video submissions… allowed me to give personalized feedback and track their progress more closely." (T15)

Flexible and Repeatable Practice. Teachers experienced blended learning as an expansion of instructional time. Recorded demonstrations let students pause, replay, and repeat dance sequences at their own pace. Instead of relying solely on a scheduled classroom demonstration, students could return to the material while preparing for later face-to-face sessions. T1 described a flipped arrangement during a folk-dance unit:

"I uploaded tutorial videos of basic 'tinikling' steps… During face-to-face sessions, students already knew the footwork, so we focused on timing with music and partnering."

The opportunity was not limited to convenience. Repeated access changed how they used instructional time. Students could familiarize themselves and rehearse individually before the classroom meeting, allowing physical sessions to focus on correction, timing, formation, expression, and coordination. T14 similarly explained that students learned a dance phrase through an instructional video and practiced at home before using face-to-face sessions to refine "technique and expression."

Teachers also saw independent practice as a way to build confidence. T7 observed that students could "practice at their own pace and build confidence before submitting their outputs," while T10 noted that recorded tasks allowed students to "record, review, and re-record" their routines. Blended learning thus gave students more time to prepare before teachers or classmates saw their performances.

Private Rehearsal and Increased Willingness to Participate. A second opportunity concerned students who were reluctant to perform publicly. Several teachers observed that practicing or recording at home reduced the immediate pressure of performing in front of classmates. T3 described how students who were ordinarily reserved "blossomed on screen," while T12 reported:

"Some who were shy in face-to-face classes became more active and expressive in video submissions."

The home environment gave some students greater control over when and how they performed. T10 explained that learners who hesitated to dance in front of peers sometimes performed better in a space where they could regulate their surroundings and repeat the recording. T1 also observed that students entered face-to-face meetings more confidently because they had first practiced the movements privately.

This opportunity was not experienced uniformly. Private rehearsal supported participation for some students, but later findings showed that home environments could also restrict movement, safety, connectivity, and privacy. The opportunity to participate more comfortably was therefore conditional on the learner's available resources and physical environment.

Creative Digital Choreography and Learner Ownership. Blended learning encouraged teachers to redesign activities rather than reproduce conventional classroom instruction online. Participants described slow-motion demonstrations, split-screen videos, themed choreography, virtual dance collages, dance-remix projects, and activities involving household objects. T1 explained:

"It forced me to be creative because the traditional 'just follow me' approach could not work for the whole period. I explored CapCut for slow-motion tutorials… and split-screen videos so students could see the demonstration and foot guide at the same time."

Teachers also gave learners greater responsibility for choreographic decisions. Students selected music, designed short routines, edited their performances, and added individual interpretations. T4 observed that learners became "more independent" through creating and recording their own choreography, while T8 described student-led projects followed by peer feedback as opportunities to build "skills, confidence, and ownership."

For teachers, creativity emerged partly from instructional constraint. The inability to depend continuously on live demonstration required clearer visual explanations, shorter instructional segments, and alternative forms of artistic production. For students, the resulting activities created opportunities to make decisions and present personal interpretations instead of merely copying movement.

Extended Instructional Presence Through Digital Resources. Teachers used recorded demonstrations and online materials to remain instructionally available beyond the physical classroom. T2 stated that recorded choreography let students review lessons anytime, while T6 used prerecorded technique tutorials to support ongoing learning. T12 similarly reported that demonstration videos allowed students to revisit the steps when needed.

Digital resources did not replace the teacher. Instead, the resources extended the teacher's guidance into periods when direct interaction was unavailable. T9 explained that video tutorials made basic dance steps easier to follow at home, while T7 used step-by-step demonstrations to support students who needed repeated guidance.

This extension of instructional presence also increased preparation demands. Teachers had to demonstrate movements, record and edit videos, prepare alternative resources, and anticipate points of confusion before students practiced independently. Thus, expanded access for students depended on additional design work by teachers.

Revisitable Performance, Monitoring, and Feedback. Recorded performances gave teachers evidence they could examine repeatedly. Unlike a live performance that passed quickly, video submissions let teachers revisit specific moments, track development across submissions, and provide individualized comments. T15 explained:

"Student video submissions… allowed me to give personalized feedback and track their progress more closely."

T1 used recurring progress clips to monitor improvement between face-to-face sessions. T8 incorporated video-reflection journals so students could review their own development, while T10 described shifting toward analyzing recorded evidence. This revisitable record supported detailed feedback and reflection. However, recorded performance also had limitations. The same video that enabled repeated review could also obscure footwork, posture, spatial use, or the conditions under which the performance occurred. Video evidence therefore expanded monitoring but did not fully replace direct embodied observation.

RQ2. Constraints Experienced in Blended Dance Instruction. The second research question examined the technological, spatial, relational, assessment-related, and socioeconomic

constraints teachers experienced. These constraints did not operate independently. Connectivity affected instructional rhythm; inadequate space affected movement and safety; limited visibility affected assessment; and unequal resources influenced who could participate fully.

Table 3
Themes on the Constraints Experienced in Blended Dance Instruction

Subtheme	Number of participants	Representative quotation
Interrupted technological flow	14	"The biggest challenges were lag during live demonstrations [and] camera angles not showing footwork." (T1)
Constrained movement spaces and safety risks	12	"Students [were] dancing in cramped areas near cabinets." (T1)
Weakened relational presence and engagement	12	"There was a definite 'emotional lag.'" (T10)
Incomplete visibility and delayed correction	11	"Dance is three-dimensional, but the camera is two-dimensional." (T1)
Socioeconomic inequality in participation	3	"Most of these are financial and social factors and challenges." (T13)

Interrupted Technological Flow. Unstable internet connections were the most widely shared technological constraint. Participants described lag, interrupted audio, frozen video, failed uploads, and inconsistent access to synchronous sessions. These difficulties affected dance instruction more directly than they might affect a text-based lesson because rhythm, musical timing, counting, and visual continuity were central to the task. T1 identified "lag during live demonstrations" as a primary concern. T2 said unstable connectivity slowed students' progress, while T3 linked unstable Wi-Fi to digital fatigue.

Teachers could not assume that students observed a movement sequence in the same rhythm or order in which it was demonstrated. Live instruction frequently required repetition, clarification through messages, or conversion into asynchronous materials. Technological disruptions also fragmented teachers' work. Teachers shifted between learning-management systems, messaging applications, video platforms, printed modules, and offline resources. T13 described internet stability as a constant challenge, particularly when students were unresponsive. Teachers' instructional flow was therefore interrupted by conditions they could not directly control.

Constrained Movement Spaces and Safety Risks. Students' physical environments shaped which movements teachers could assign and how safely students could perform them. Participants described learners dancing near cabinets, furniture, and other household obstructions. Some students lacked appropriate flooring, mirrors, or sufficient distance to perform traveling movements and full-body sequences. T1 reported seeing students practice "in cramped areas near cabinets," while T11 identified the absence of proper flooring and mirrors. T10 characterized the problem as involving both a "physicality gap" and safety risks. Teachers were expected to teach movement while having limited control over the environment in which students practiced.

`

The constraint was not simply the smallness of the space. It concerned teachers' inability to fully inspect the environment, intervene immediately, or ensure movements suited the learner's surroundings. Students' homes functioned as temporary movement spaces without the predictable conditions of a classroom, gymnasium, or studio. Teachers consequently reduced traveling sequences, altered formations, or designed stationary versions of tasks.

Weakened Relational Presence and Engagement. Participants reported difficulty sustaining interaction when students were less visible or responsive online. Cameras were sometimes turned off, messages were delayed, and verbal instructions had to be repeated. T10 described a distinct "emotional lag," while T3 referred to the loss of the immediate "vibe" normally present in dance instruction. T7 explained that communication became less immediate and more difficult. T9 similarly felt less connected because teachers could not correct movements as they happened. Several teachers responded by increasing check-ins, restructuring instructions, or providing more detailed demonstrations. Nevertheless, online

contact did not consistently reproduce the collective energy, spontaneous exchange, and shared rhythm present in face-to-face dance learning. Participants' accounts also showed an important variation. Some hesitant students participated more actively through private video submissions, yet sustaining broader engagement during online sessions was difficult. Blended learning could therefore reduce participation pressure for some students while weakening shared engagement across the class.

Incomplete Visibility and Delayed Correction. Teachers experienced camera-mediated observation as incomplete. Footwork could fall outside the frame, body alignment could be obscured, and camera angles could prevent teachers from evaluating spatial use. T1 summarized the limitation directly:

"Assessment was the hardest part because dance is three-dimensional, but the camera is two-dimensional."

T8 reported difficulty fully observing technique, posture, and timing, while T11 stated that the online environment limited the ability to observe technique. In live online sessions, unstable video further reduced visibility. In asynchronous submissions, teachers could repeatedly review performance but could not correct movement in the moment. This changed the nature of feedback. Direct instruction ordinarily allowed the teacher to identify an error, demonstrate an adjustment, and observe the learner's immediate response. In blended environments, correction often occurred after students completed or repeatedly practiced the movement. Teachers therefore moved from immediate bodily correction toward delayed analysis of recorded evidence. Assessment was similarly affected. Video quality, camera placement, available space, and recording conditions influenced what was visible. Teachers could not always distinguish a movement error from a recording limitation.

Socioeconomic Inequality in Participation. Unequal access to devices, connectivity, data, and appropriate learning spaces shaped students' capacity to participate. T8 identified uneven access to technology, while T5 referred to limited resources at home. T13 summarized the difficulty as involving financial and social factors. Teachers responded by preparing downloadable files, low-data videos, printed step guides, offline copies, or modified deadlines. However, providing alternatives did not remove the underlying inequalities. Students with reliable devices, stable connectivity, sufficient data, and appropriate movement spaces could access more features of blended instruction than students who depended on shared devices, mobile data, or printed materials. Teachers consequently became mediators of unequal participation. Equity therefore required redesigning tasks and materials rather than merely giving every learner the same online activity.

RQ3. Pedagogical Adaptations for Sustaining Meaningful Dance Learning. The third research question examined the adaptations teachers employed to sustain embodied, engaging, and culturally responsive dance learning.

Table 4

Pedagogical Adaptations Reported by Participants

Subtheme	Reported practice	Representative quotation
Purposeful sequencing of modalities	Teachers introduced concepts and movement through online or asynchronous activities; they used face-to-face sessions for correction, coordination, and refinement.	"Online sessions were used for theory, history, and individual practice." (T11)
Accessible and replayable demonstrations	Teachers produced short, counted, slow-motion, mirrored, downloadable, or step-by-step materials.	"I created step-by-step dance videos with counts so students could easily follow even at home." (T9)
Spatial differentiation and alternative pathways	Teachers adjusted movement range, choreography, deadlines, file size, and delivery format.	"I give three versions of choreography: small space, medium, [and] stage ready." (T1)
Multimodal assessment and feedback	Teachers used video submissions, rubrics, self-assessment, peer feedback, progress clips, and reflective tasks.	"I used video submissions, self-assessment checklists, and peer feedback." (T4)
Interactive and creative participation	Teachers used student-led choreography, themed challenges, group tasks, peer response, and virtual productions.	"Student-led choreography projects… followed by peer feedback… build skills, confidence, and ownership." (T8)
Emerging cultural contextualization	Selected teachers integrated cultural documentation and used face-to-face sessions to refine expression.	"One creative adaptation I made was integrating cultural dance documentation projects." (T14)

Analysis distinguished between practices participants reported using and changes participants recommended for future implementation. The themes below are based

primarily on demonstrated practices. Proposed technologies, facilities, and institutional programs are reported separately because recommendations should not be presented as already implemented strategies.

Purposeful Sequencing of Modalities. The most consistent adaptation involved assigning different instructional functions to different modes of learning. Teachers used recorded or online materials for conceptual explanations, dance history, initial demonstrations, individual rehearsal, and basic skill familiarization. Teachers then used face-to-face sessions for correction, formations, partnering, musical timing, expression, and performance refinement. T11 explained that online sessions were used for "theory, history, and individual practice," while in-person meetings addressed technique, correction, and formation. T15 similarly used digital sessions for preparatory work and face-to-face sessions for refinement. T1 described a distribution in which skill introduction and drills occurred online before students attended in-person sessions for polishing. The adaptation was not an equal division of time between modalities. Instead, teachers used each environment for the pedagogical function it supported best. This sequencing reduced the need to spend limited face-to-face time introducing basic steps that students could first encounter through recorded demonstrations.

Accessible and Replayable Demonstrations. Teachers redesigned demonstrations to support independent viewing. Participants reported breaking sequences into short clips, showing movements slowly, adding counts, presenting mirrored demonstrations, and providing side-by-side examples of correct and incorrect execution. T9 stated:

"I created step-by-step dance videos with counts so students could easily follow even at home."

T1 used slow-motion and split-screen demonstrations, while T11 produced comparison videos that presented both correct and incorrect execution. T10 recommended very short clips focused on specific footwork or hand movements because lengthy live-streamed demonstrations were vulnerable to lag. Accessibility also concerned file size and delivery. Teachers provided downloadable or low-data videos, offline copies, printed step guides, and materials distributed through messaging applications. Spatial Differentiation and Alternative Learning Pathways. Teachers altered movement tasks in response to differences in space and access. T1 developed three choreographic versions for small, medium, and stage-sized spaces. T10 used stationary choreography for students with restricted movement areas, while T2 simplified routines and provided offline video copies. T9 combined printed modules containing images with modified movements.

These practices showed that differentiated instruction extended beyond a dance sequence's difficulty. Teachers differentiated the spatial range, delivery format, technological demand, pacing, and evidence required from students. Teachers did not simply give a learner without stable connectivity or sufficient space more time; they modified the instructional task itself. Teachers also used deadlines and sequencing flexibly. T3 adjusted movement requirements and submission schedules according to learners' home conditions. Multimodal Assessment and Feedback. Because no single source of digital evidence fully represented dance competence, participants combined several assessment approaches. They used video submissions with performance rubrics, self-assessment checklists, peer feedback, progress recordings, reflective journals, and live or face-to-face demonstrations. T4 reported:

"I used video submissions, self-assessment checklists, and peer feedback."

T1 requested before-and-after clips and used rubrics adapted to video evidence. T8 combined recorded tasks, rubrics, and live demonstration, while T14 incorporated self-assessment and reflection journals. Several teachers expanded

assessment beyond technical precision to include effort, rhythm, creativity, musicality, improvement, and execution. Using multiple forms of evidence allowed teachers to consider both process and final performance.

Interactive and Creative Participation. Teachers attempted to restore active participation through choreography challenges, collaborative tasks, peer feedback, virtual collages, recorded group outputs, and student-led performance projects. T8 described student-created choreography followed by peer feedback, while T6 developed a virtual dance collage. T4 transformed a conventional group activity into a virtual group performance. The adaptations shifted students from passive viewers of demonstrations to creators of movement. Teachers asked learners to select music, respond to themes, use available objects, edit videos, and explain or reflect on choreographic choices. T10's "found-object choreography" activity, for example, used household materials as elements of movement creation. These practices sustained participation by connecting technical learning to creativity and ownership.

Emerging Cultural Contextualization. Evidence of culturally responsive adaptation appeared in fewer accounts than evidence concerning flexibility, technology, or assessment. T14 explicitly described integrating cultural dance-documentation projects, while T1's flipped tinikling unit connected recorded footwork preparation with face-to-face timing, music, and partnering. These accounts suggest that cultural preservation was clearest when teachers connected digital preparation with contextual explanation and embodied refinement. However, the dataset contained less detailed evidence about the systematic teaching of dance history, community meaning, attire, cultural protocols, or the involvement of culture bearers.

Fundamental Structure of the Lived Experience. Across the three research questions, the essential structure of teaching dance through blended learning was continuous pedagogical negotiation under conditions of partial presence. Teachers worked between the reach of digital resources and the continuing need for shared bodily, spatial, and relational experience. Recorded demonstrations, online platforms, messaging applications, and video submissions extended instruction beyond the classroom, but these technologies carried only partial representations of movement and interaction. Teachers continuously negotiated between flexibility and unequal access, private rehearsal and shared participation, revisitable video evidence and incomplete bodily visibility, technological creativity and increased workload, and digital expansion and the need to preserve dance as an embodied and culturally meaningful practice. Their adaptations did not eliminate blended learning's limitations. Instead, teachers reconstructed their presence through resources, feedback, differentiated tasks, and purposeful face-to-face encounters. The phenomenon was therefore not experienced as the simple adoption of technology.

DISCUSSION

This study examined how Senior High School Physical Education teachers experienced teaching dance through blended learning in public schools in Bulacan. The findings show that blended learning did not simply transfer dance instruction from the classroom to digital platforms. Instead, it redistributed teaching across physical and digital environments, requiring teachers to decide which elements could be prepared asynchronously and which depended on direct bodily interaction. The experience's central meaning was continuous pedagogical negotiation under conditions of partial presence. Teachers extended instruction through recordings, online communication, and video feedback but still relied on face-to-face interaction for movement correction, spatial coordination, safety, expression, and ensemble performance.

Reconfiguring Instructional Time and Teacher Presence. Blended learning primarily reorganized when and how students learned dance. Recorded demonstrations let students

pause, replay, and rehearse at their own pace, while face-to-face sessions could focus on technique, timing, formations, and expressive refinement. This finding supports the argument that blended learning becomes educationally meaningful when physical and digital environments perform complementary functions rather than reproduce identical activities (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004). This finding also aligns with Wang et al. (2023), whose systematic review identified flexibility, learner autonomy, access to resources, and technology-supported learning as key affordances of blended Physical Education. However, that review found that much of the literature concentrated on university students, perceptions, motivation, and learning outcomes. The current study extends this literature by demonstrating how public Senior High School teachers operationalized flexibility through replayable demonstrations, preparatory practice, differentiated

learning materials, and face-to-face refinement. From Van Manen's perspective, recorded demonstrations altered both lived time and lived relation. Students no longer had to grasp a movement within a single classroom demonstration, while teachers remained instructionally present through materials students could revisit. This extended presence was valuable, but it also increased teachers' preparation and feedback responsibilities. Teachers became video producers, resource designers, technical troubleshooters, and assessors of recorded evidence in addition to their established pedagogical roles. Private rehearsal also supported some students who were hesitant to perform before classmates. The opportunity to repeat a routine before submitting it gave these learners greater control over how visible their performance was. This finding qualifies the assumption that digital mediation necessarily weakens participation.

The Limits of Digitally Mediated Embodiment. The teachers' difficulties with camera framing, delayed correction, and incomplete visibility of movement reveal a fundamental limitation of digitally mediated dance instruction. Dance is experienced and assessed through the body, yet a camera presents only a selected two-dimensional view. Footwork, posture, weight transfer, direction, and use of space may occur outside the frame or become obscured by poor video quality. The problem was consequently not only technological but phenomenological: the teacher and learner no longer occupied the same bodily and spatial field. This interpretation is consistent with Varea and González-Calvo (2021), who described online Physical Education as involving "absent bodies" and reduced direct contact, conditions that may weaken the subject's embodied identity. The present study extends this argument to dance by showing how bodily absence affected demonstration, correction, rhythm, spatial formation, safety, and expressive quality. The finding also supports Philippine evidence reported by Aguinaldo (2021), in which Physical Education teachers identified inconsistent connectivity, insufficient space and equipment, low participation, and difficulty correcting movement as major online teaching constraints. In the current study, these concerns were intensified by dance-specific requirements such as musical timing, full-body visibility, formation, partnering, and coordinated movement. These findings explain why recorded performances should not be treated as complete representations of dance competence. Video supports repeated review, but technical quality, camera position, available space, and recording conditions affect the evidence it presents.

Equity as a Condition of Blended Participation. The study shows that access to blended dance instruction involved more than possessing a device. Meaningful participation also depended on internet stability, mobile data, privacy, safe movement space, recording capacity, and the learner's ability to upload performance files. Students with stronger technological and spatial resources could participate more fully, while others depended on shared devices, low-data materials, printed guides, or modified tasks. This finding aligns with UNESCO's position that educational technology must be evaluated in relation to access, equity,

relevance, governance, and teacher preparation. Technology may expand educational opportunities, but it may also reproduce inequalities when the material conditions of participation are overlooked (UNESCO, 2023). This also supports D'Agostino et al. (2021), who emphasized usability, accessibility, equitability, and assessment capacity as essential features of virtual Physical Education tools. In dance education, these requirements extend to movement safety and adequate visual representation. An accessible activity must be realistic for the learner's device, data allocation, household space, and physical surroundings. Teachers responded to inequality by preparing lower-data videos, printed alternatives, downloadable materials, modified routines, and flexible submission arrangements.

These responses show that equity did not mean giving every student an identical task. It required preserving common learning intentions while differentiating how students accessed instruction, practiced movement, and demonstrated learning.

Reconstructing Dance Pedagogy Across Modalities. Teachers' adaptations show that effective blended dance instruction depends on purposeful sequencing of modalities. Digital and asynchronous environments were suited to conceptual preparation, dance history, recorded demonstrations, individual rehearsal, and reflection. Face-to-face sessions better supported movement correction, formations, partnering, spatial orientation, safety monitoring, musicality, and expression. This division avoided treating blended learning as an equal allocation of online and classroom time. This finding aligns with Mata and Marasigan (2024), who reported that HyFlex Physical Education provided flexibility and accessibility but required teachers to address technological resources, monitoring, assessment, and differences in learners' needs. This study adds a dance-specific interpretation by identifying the instructional functions teachers assigned to each modality. Teachers also reconstructed demonstrations by producing shorter, replayable, counted, slow-motion, or mirrored materials. These resources were effective because they addressed specific learning barriers rather than using technology for its own sake. A short demonstration focused on footwork could reduce data use and improve visual clarity. At the same time, face-to-face instruction could verify whether the student translated the visual model into accurate bodily performance. Assessment was similarly reconstructed through multiple forms of evidence. Video submissions, rubrics, progress recordings, self-assessment, reflection, peer feedback, and direct performance each revealed different aspects of learning. This approach reduced dependence on a single final video and recognized improvement, creativity, musicality, execution, and reflective understanding. However, the findings also indicate that teachers should verify recorded performance through direct observation when video cannot adequately assess technique, safety, formation, or expressive quality. These adaptations should not be interpreted as evidence that technological mediation can reproduce every quality of in-person dance learning. Instead, they show teachers' capacity to redesign practice around each environment's limitations and affordances. Technology was most useful when it extended preparation, access, reflection, and feedback, while physical co-presence remained necessary for the dimensions of dance grounded in shared bodily and spatial experience.

Sustaining Interaction, Creativity, and Cultural Meaning. Collaborative choreography, themed activities, peer feedback, virtual productions, and student-created performances helped reconnect individual practice with social and artistic participation. Students became creators rather than passive recipients of demonstrations. This reflects the creative and reflective character of dance pedagogy, in which bodily experience, interpretation, and artistic decision-making are interconnected. Recent research by Schwender et al. (2025) similarly positions educational dance as an embodied reflective practice in which movement design, sensory awareness, interpersonal connection,

and reflection interact. The present findings suggest that blended activities can support such reflection when learners create, review, explain, and revise movement rather than merely imitate recorded steps. However, cultural contextualization appeared less consistently developed than technological and instructional adaptation. Some teachers connected dance performance with cultural documentation, music, interpretation, and face-to-face refinement. Still, the data offered limited evidence that all teachers systematically addressed cultural origin, attire, values, community meaning, or appropriate representation. This finding should not be overstated as a fully established strength of the blended approach. Instead, it identifies an area

requiring deliberate development. Digitally accessible demonstrations can preserve and distribute dance resources, but cultural learning weakens when instruction focuses only on reproducing visible steps. Teachers need resources that connect movement with history, music, formation, meaning, and community context.

Phenomenological Meaning of the Experience. The study's principal contribution is its interpretation of blended dance teaching as continuous pedagogical negotiation under conditions of partial presence. Teachers neither adopted technology nor tried to restore conventional instruction unchanged. They repeatedly negotiated between flexibility and inequality, repeated viewing and incomplete visibility, private confidence and weakened collective participation, technological creativity and increased workload, and digital reach and the need for bodily co-presence. This essence reflects Van Manen's (1990, 2016) view that professional experience is understood through the relationships among body, space, time, others, and material things. The teachers' accounts show that technology did not merely add new instructional tools. It changed how teachers could see students, how quickly they could respond, where dance could occur, how performance became available for assessment, and how teacher presence was experienced. The phrase partial presence does not indicate a total absence of teaching or interaction. Teachers remained present through instructional videos, messages, consultations, rubrics, feedback, and differentiated materials. However, that presence was incomplete whenever technology could not convey three-dimensional movement, shared rhythm, spatial awareness, immediate correction, ensemble energy, and culturally situated performance. Teachers reconstructed these dimensions where possible and recognized when face-to-face interaction remained indispensable.

Recommendations and Proposed Improvements. Participants' accounts indicate that blended dance instruction requires coordinated technological, spatial, professional, and organizational support. Schools and the Schools Division of Bulacan should improve internet access, provide loanable devices and recording equipment, maintain low-bandwidth and offline resources, and designate safe movement spaces for practice. Digital systems should support structured peer feedback, virtual showcases, and accessible video review, while performance-analysis tools should be used only when they are affordable, privacy-conscious, and pedagogically necessary. Professional development should address video editing, blended lesson design, culturally responsive dance pedagogy, online performance assessment, and safe movement adaptation for limited space. Institutions should also provide technical assistance, shared resource libraries, manageable class sizes, and protected preparation time so that blended provision does not depend solely on teachers' personal resources and uncompensated labor.

Limitations. The findings are bounded by the accounts of 15 public Senior High School Physical Education teachers in the Schools Division of Bulacan. Reliance on self-reported interviews may introduce recall and social-desirability bias, and the lack of student, administrator, classroom-observation, and instructional-artifact data limits comparisons across perspectives and data sources.

Conclusion. Senior High School Physical Education teachers experienced blended dance teaching as continuous pedagogical negotiation under conditions of partial presence. Digital and asynchronous activities extended preparation, repetition, creativity, performance review, and reflection, while face-to-face interaction remained necessary for correction, spatial coordination, safety, partnering, expression, and performance verification. Effective blended dance pedagogy therefore depends on assigning complementary functions to each modality rather than reproducing identical activities across settings. Teachers sustained participation through accessible demonstrations, space-responsive movement, differentiated pathways, and multiple forms of assessment, but individual adaptation could not eliminate unequal access or increased workload. The study contributes a context-sensitive account of how technology reshapes lived body, space, time, relation, and materiality in dance teaching. Technology is most valuable when it extends, rather than replaces, the embodied, relational, equitable, expressive, and cultural qualities of dance education.

DISCLOSURES

Author contributions. Jackielyn G. Pascual contributed to the conceptualization and design of the study, development of the methodology, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, drafting and writing of the manuscript, and revision of the final paper. She also served as the primary researcher responsible for the overall conduct of the study | Lorna A. Espeso provided supervision and scholarly guidance throughout the research process, including validation of the research framework and methodology, review of data analysis and interpretation, critical revision of the manuscript, and approval of the final version for publication. She also ensured the academic quality and integrity of the study.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding source. This research received no external funding.

Artificial intelligence use. AI-assisted language editing and drafting support were utilized in the preparation of this manuscript through the use of OpenAI's ChatGPT. The AI tool was used to assist in grammar refinement, organization of ideas, and improvement of academic language. All generated content was carefully reviewed, revised, and validated by and, who remain fully responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and final content of the manuscript. AI tools were not involved in data collection, data analysis, interpretation of findings, or authorship attribution.

Ethics approval statement. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Adamson University Ethics Review Committee prior to the conduct of data collection. The study adhered to established ethical principles for research involving human participants, including voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and the protection of participants' rights and welfare.

Data availability statement. All essential data and findings supporting the conclusions of this research are included within the manuscript.

Acknowledgement. (Not available)

Publisher's disclaimer. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the publisher. The publisher disclaims any responsibility for errors or omissions.

REFERENCES

Aguinaldo, J. C. (2021). Challenges encountered by Physical Education teachers in online learning. In *Proceedings of the DLSU Research Congress 2021*. De La Salle University. https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conferences/research-congress-proceedings/2021/LLI-13.pdf

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 25*(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Colaizzi, P. F. (1978). Psychological research as the phenomenologist views it. In R. S. Valle and M. King (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological alternatives for psychology* (pp. 48–71). Oxford University Press.

D'Agostino, E. M., Urtel, M., Webster, C. A., McMullen, J., & Culp, B. (2021). Virtual Physical Education during COVID-19: Exploring future directions for equitable online learning tools. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living, 3*, 716566. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2021.716566

Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 7*(2), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001

Mata, L. P., & Marasigan, A. C. (2024). Physical Education curriculum implementation using HyFlex learning modality in the new normal. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education, 13*(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.32674/jtave768

Rasheed, R. A., Kamsin, A., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review. *Computers & Education, 144*, 103701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701

Schwender, T. M., Rudi, H., & Stortz, S. (2025). Creating, framing, reflecting: Dance as embodied reflective practice in professional development for Physical Education teachers. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1542371. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1542371

UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education: A tool on whose terms?* https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. State University of New York Press.

van Manen, M. (2016). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315422657

Varea, V., & González-Calvo, G. (2021). Touchless classes and absent bodies: Teaching Physical Education in times of COVID-19. *Sport, Education and Society, 26*(8), 831–845. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2020.1791814

Wang, C., Omar Dev, R. D., Soh, K. G., Mohd Nasiruddin, N. J., Yuan, Y., & Ji, X. (2023). Blended learning in Physical Education: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Public Health, 11*, 1073423. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1073423