

<https://doi.org/10.16926/eat.2026.15.17.en>

eLocator/Article ID: eat-2026-np-02

Marek SIWICKI

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5467-1991>

The Maria Grzegorzewska University, Warsaw, Poland

e-mail: msiwicki@aps.edu.pl

Between the Pole and the Triple Jump: Metaphors of Imagination, Transgression, and Agency in Pedagogical Thinking about the Human Being

How to cite [jak cytować]: Siwicki, M. (2026). Between the Pole and the Triple Jump: Metaphors of Imagination, Transgression, and Agency in Pedagogical Thinking about the Human Being. *Edukacyjna Analiza Transakcyjna*, 15, Article eat-2026-np-02. <https://doi.org/10.16926/eat.2026.15.17.en>

Abstract

In this article, I juxtapose Ryszard Maciej Łukaszewicz's existing metaphor of the "person with a pole" with my own interpretive proposal, the figure of the Triple Jumper. The analysis is theoretical and interpretive, with a conceptual and comparative focus. I develop the reconstruction of the former figure into my own interpretation of anticipatory-transgressive agency, while constructing the latter as a metaphor of processual-responsive agency. The juxtaposition of the two figures leads to the concept of two grammars of agency: "beyond the boundary" and "towards consequences." Their complementarity makes it possible to understand education as creating conditions in which a person can imagine going beyond what is given, undertake an attempt of their own, and take responsibility for its consequences. At the same time, I critically examine the risks inherent in sports metaphors: the cult of performance, the imperative of self-transgression, unequal conditions for agency, ableism, and the reduction of development to a logic of "higher and farther."

Keywords: education, pedagogical metaphor, agency, "person with a pole", Triple Jumper

Introduction

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (2003) argue that metaphors help structure experience by enabling us to understand abstract domains through patterns rooted in concrete, often embodied, experience. Struggle, climbing, and jumping are therefore not equivalent ways of speaking about education; each of these images brings different relations into view. The jump directs attention to the run-up, take-off, leaving the ground, the boundary, and the landing. This does not mean that education "is" a jump. In Paul Ricoeur's (1975/2003) account of living metaphor, its value lies not in substituting one expression for another, but in opening up a new way of seeing the phenomenon under consideration. The question guiding the analysis is therefore not, "What is education like?", but rather, "What becomes visible in education when we begin to think through the structure of a jump?" Anna Sfard (1998) likewise warns against granting any single metaphor a monopoly over the interpretation of a complex phenomenon. I therefore do not seek an overarching metaphor of education. Instead, I juxtapose two

figures so that they may correct one another: the “person with a pole” brings into view what is less visible in the Triple Jumper, and vice versa.

Also important for this analysis is the classical anthropological impulse associated with, among others, Wilhelm von Humboldt, as reconstructed in contemporary sport pedagogy by Wibowo et al. (2023). From this perspective, education cannot be reduced to the accumulation of knowledge or skills; it concerns the formation of the ways in which a person relates to the self, the world, and others. Contemporary approaches to *Bildung* in sport pedagogy emphasise the active and reflective character of self-formation across cognitive, bodily, emotional, social, and aesthetic dimensions. A sporting attempt thus acquires significance not only in terms of whether a person succeeds in crossing a particular boundary, but also in terms of who that person becomes through the experience of the attempt.

Malte Brinkmann and Martin Giese (2025) draw attention to the formative potential of practice, in which repetition, uncertainty, error, disruption, and the experience of “not-knowing-how” acquire particular significance. Not every mistake is merely a deviation from optimal performance; it may become an experience that transforms a person’s relationship with the self and the world.

This allows us to distinguish between two questions: transgression asks what a person can transcend; *Bildung* asks who the person becomes through the experience of crossing boundaries, failure, and renewed attempts. I therefore ask a further question: what models of the human being, agency, and education emerge from the pedagogical development of the metaphors of the “person with a pole” and the Triple Jumper? My argument is that the pole enables us to think about going beyond the world as given, whereas the triple jump enables us to think about moving responsibly towards change. Education remains the common point of reference, while the central problem concerns how to open up possibilities for action without taking over the authorship of another person’s life; how to make tools available without imposing direction; and how to cultivate the courage to make an attempt together with the capacity to take responsibility for its consequences. On this account, the task of education is to help create the conditions for self-directed action and support reflection on its consequences.

Methodological Approach

I adopt a theoretical and interpretive approach with a conceptual and comparative focus. The analysis examines the pedagogical meanings of two figures: the “person with a pole” and the Triple Jumper. Its aim is to identify which aspects of the human being, agency, and education each figure foregrounds or obscures, and under what conditions the two may complement one another. In this way, I develop the question formulated in the introduction. The comparison is asymmetrical: I reconstruct the first figure from Łukaszewicz’s text and then extend it interpretively, while constructing the second as my own proposal.

Source selection is purposive and guided by the problem under consideration. Łukaszewicz’s text and the inspiration from Bronowski identified in it provide the basis for reconstructing the figure of the “person with a pole.” Works on metaphor frame its interpretation, while studies of *Bildung* and sport pedagogy provide the pedagogical context. I use biomechanical research and competition rules to establish the sporting point of departure for the analogy, and literature on *healthism* and ableism to identify the risks of its application. Sources are selected for their relevance to reconstructing, comparing, or critically assessing the two figures; the article is not a systematic literature review.

The analysis proceeds through the reconstruction of the existing figure, the identification of features of the triple jump relevant to the proposed analogy, pedagogical interpretation, and comparison and critique of the two metaphors. I construct the comparative categories by juxtaposing the meanings of the reconstructed figure with the features of the triple-jump sequence in relation to the question of agency. These categories comprise the direction of action, the relationship to the future, time, resources and embodiment, boundaries, risk, and consequences. They are not categories for empirical coding. I distinguish the findings and arguments of the cited authors from my own interpretations, the

proposal of two grammars of agency, and analogies inspired by the structure of the event. The Triple Jumper has the status of an interpretive tool, not an empirically validated model of development or a model of the able body. I assess its usefulness in terms of coherence, its capacity to bring pedagogical problems into view, and recognition of the limits of the analogy. Biomechanical findings do not constitute evidence for the validity of pedagogical conclusions.

“The Person with a Pole”

The figure of the “person with a pole” appears in Ryszard Maciej Łukaszewicz’s work as a metaphorical culmination of his reflection on possibility, autonomy, and education open to the future. Its direct inspiration comes from Jacob Bronowski’s *The Ascent of Man* (Polish edition: *Potęga wyobraźni*), where the image of the pole vaulter reveals a distinctively human conjunction of embodiment, imagination, anticipation, and the use of tools. Łukaszewicz develops this image pedagogically: the pole vaulter becomes the “person with a pole,” whose thought reaches towards the future before the body undertakes the attempt to clear the bar (Bronowski, 1973/1988; Łukaszewicz, 2020, p. 111).

On the basis of this reconstruction, I propose the term “anticipatory-transgressive grammar of agency.” It is a category developed for my analysis, not a term borrowed from Łukaszewicz. A person does not merely respond to the world as given, but is capable of placing, between the present and action, an image of a state that does not yet exist. Agency therefore begins before observable action – at the moment when the existing order ceases to be treated as the only possible one. Łukaszewicz develops this figure further. The “person with a pole” combines the capacity to dream with the capacity to devise ways of realising an intention: the person chooses their own path, creates, undertakes tasks requiring cooperation, and moves beyond the horizon of the “here and now” (Łukaszewicz, 2020, pp. 111–113). Imagination here does not mean an escape from reality, but the capacity to recognise that reality does not exhaust the future.

In developing this interpretation, I consider the distinction between prediction and imagination pedagogically important. Prediction asks what kind of world is likely to come. Imagination makes it possible to ask: what kind of world is worth co-creating? Education limited to preparing a person for the most probable future can easily become an instrument of adaptation. Education that makes room for imagination preserves the possibility of critically going beyond what is given.

The simplest interpretation would identify the pole with education: the person would be the jumper, while education would be the instrument that carries them beyond the boundary. Łukaszewicz, however, explicitly rejects such a simplification. He stresses that education “is not that pole,” although without education there would be neither the pole nor the kind of thought capable of running ahead of action (Łukaszewicz, 2020, p. 114). This qualification opens an important field of interpretation. I propose reading the pole as a resource mediating between human possibility and the boundary of action: knowledge, language, technology, the experience of predecessors, a relationship, or an institution. A person does not create their own agency from scratch. They draw on resources produced socially and culturally, yet may make them part of their own attempt. Understood in this way, the pole challenges the identification of autonomy with self-sufficiency. Autonomy does not mean the absence of dependence, but the capacity to transform available resources into elements of one’s own action. For education, this means making tools available without taking control over the direction in which they are used.

Łukaszewicz consistently employs the language of going beyond the horizon of what is given and, in this context, refers to Józef Koźielecki’s psychotransgressionism (Łukaszewicz, 2020, p. 113). In the interpretive development I propose, it is worth considering a property of the sporting crossbar that its social equivalents often lack: it is clearly visible. In life, boundaries may arise both from real limitations and from fear, stereotypes, or the expectations of others. The pedagogical development of the metaphor therefore requires a question to which I will return in the critical section: who set the bar? The mere possibility of crossing a boundary does not yet determine the value of doing so. Łukaszewicz

describes the “person with a pole” as a provocateur of potential reality. Such action involves uncertainty, risk, success, and failure, while the future itself may be co-created through action (Łukaszewicz, 2020, pp. 112–114). From the perspective of education, what matters more than eliminating all risk is learning to recognise it and creating conditions in which the failure of an attempt is not equated with the failure of the person.

Although the image of the jumper may suggest a solitary hero, Łukaszewicz’s figure is not radically individualistic. The “person with a pole” undertakes supra-individual tasks, cooperates, inspires others, and participates in creating the beginnings of the new within the old world (Łukaszewicz, 2020, pp. 113–114). Crossing a boundary may therefore expand not only an individual range of action, but also the horizon of possibilities available to others. The most important pedagogical consequence of this metaphor, however, lies in a paradox: education helps create the conditions of agency, yet it cannot become the owner of another person’s act of crossing. This intuition can be developed through an element that I do not attribute to Łukaszewicz, but derive from the technical structure of the jump itself: there comes a moment when the jumper must let go of the pole. Pedagogically, this becomes an image of the limits of support. Assistance that does not change its form may turn into control.

In the reading adopted here, the selectivity of the metaphor of the “person with a pole” becomes apparent. It vividly reveals imagination directed towards the future, the resource that enables action, and the moment of crossing a boundary. It is less suited to showing the interdependence of successive phases, adjustment during action, and the significance of landing. The pole therefore allows us to ask: how can a person move beyond the boundary of what is given? If we also want to ask, with equal force, how a person carries action through time and where they actually land, we need a second figure – the Triple Jumper.

The Triple Jumper

The Triple Jumper has a different status from the “person with a pole.” I do not reconstruct this figure from an existing pedagogical concept; rather, I propose it as an original interpretive tool. I do not mechanically assign specific competencies or stages of development to the individual phases of the triple jump. What interests me is the structure of a single attempt unfolding over time. The technical point of departure is straightforward: the run-up is followed by three successive phases – *hop*, *step*, and *jump* – and the sequence ends with a landing in the sandpit. In the *hop*, the athlete takes off and lands on the same foot; in the *step*, they land on the opposite foot, from which the final jump is performed (World Athletics, 2026). These phases are not three separate jumps. The triple jump forms a single sequence of interrelated phases. Eissa’s (2014) biomechanical analysis of a single female athlete indicates the importance of maintaining horizontal velocity across successive take-offs. The simulation study by Allen et al. (2016), in turn, suggests that optimal phase proportions depend on the athlete’s approach velocity and strength. These findings concern sporting performance. The rhythm of action, its bodily conditions, and responsibility for its consequences are categories of my pedagogical interpretation of this structure.

For me, the pedagogical meaning of this structure begins with the proposition: the next phase does not begin from zero. A person acts from the place to which earlier decisions, experiences, relationships, contingencies, and mistakes have brought them. They are not completely determined by these, but neither can they erase them. The first take-off does not determine the entire attempt, yet it changes the conditions of the next phase. In this sense, the Triple Jumper becomes a figure of temporal and biographical agency: a person may change direction, make adjustments, and reinterpret earlier experience, but always does so from a particular place within their own history. Education should therefore help a person not so much to “start over” as to start differently – with a new understanding of what has already happened and with an awareness of the possibilities that remain open. A significant feature of the metaphor is rhythm. In the triple jump, performance is not reducible to maximising one phase. What matters is the relationship between the phases, and simulation results suggest a relationship between optimal phase proportions and the athlete’s approach velocity and strength (Allen et al., 2016).

I do not transfer this finding directly into education or treat it as empirical confirmation of pedagogical claims. I use it to formulate an analogy and a question: does good action have to mean maximum effort at every moment? Pedagogical language can easily absorb the imperative to fulfil one's potential, develop continuously, and increase effectiveness. The Triple Jumper suggests an important correction: what matters is not only the intensity of a single effort, but also the preservation of the capacity for further movement. A person needs the ability to mobilise their strength, but also to distribute, protect, and renew it. In the pedagogical account proposed here, rhythm means preserving the relationship between successive phases of action, rather than tempo alone. It may involve acceleration, slowing down, a pause, or a change in the manner of continuing. A pause and a change of goal, however, go beyond the technical structure of a triple jump in progress; they extend the metaphor to human action. Education that respects rhythm does not ask only how quickly a person is developing, but whether they are able to act in ways that do not undermine the conditions of their continued presence, relationships, and responsibility.

In the figure of the "person with a pole," the tool is especially visible. In the Triple Jumper, the body comes to the foreground. Successive phases require the body to absorb loads, maintain balance, and manage energy, while the conditions produced in one take-off carry over into the next (Eissa, 2014). At the level of pedagogical interpretation, I read this interdependence as a reminder that agency is not a pure act of will. A person acts as an embodied being – with a particular level of energy, a particular state of health, an age, a history of experience, and limits. One may know what one wants and yet lack the strength required to act; one may also achieve a goal at a cost that the original project failed to anticipate.

The body is not an adversary to be subordinated to will and intention, but a mode of human presence in the world. The Triple Jumper does not establish a model of the able body. It is a metaphor of the processual character of agency, not a norm of what it means to be human. Another feature of the figure becomes visible once action is already underway. After the first take-off, the same attempt cannot simply be stopped and restarted under identical conditions. The next phase must respond to a situation that has already been produced. I see here an analogy with adjustment in the course of human action. I do not, however, equate the regulation of movement in sport with a reflective change of intention or goal. New information emerges during action, the consequences of earlier choices become visible gradually, and one's own capacities sometimes turn out to be different from what was anticipated. Reflectivity therefore cannot mean deliberation before action alone. It must also include the capacity to reassess the situation while action is already unfolding.

It is here that I locate the significance of responsiveness. An agentic person is not someone who remains faithful to the initial plan at all costs. They retain authorship of their action even when they modify it in response to reality. Changing a decision need not signify weakness, just as persistence is not automatically evidence of maturity.

The pedagogically most important element of the metaphor, however, is the landing. The triple jump does not end at the moment of decision, nor in the most spectacular phase of flight. The entire sequence leads to an actual encounter with the ground. In pedagogical terms, landing signifies the meeting of intention and consequence. A person may act from good motives and consistently pursue a goal, yet still bring about consequences different from those anticipated. They may also achieve the intended result at the cost of relationships, their own health, or the well-being of others. Responsibility therefore does not end at the moment of decision. It requires returning to one's own action and asking: Where did I actually land? What came into being as a result of my action? Who was affected by its consequences? Does anything require adjustment or repair?

In this reading, landing signifies the confrontation of a project for action with its actual consequences. Landing does not necessarily signify an ending. The outcome becomes new information about the world and about oneself; it may therefore inform a new act of recognition and prepare the next run-up. The Triple Jumper ultimately leads towards an understanding of agency as a capacity for responsible continuation, whose fundamental qualities are continuity, rhythm, responsiveness, and responsibility for the landing. On this account, education can help create the conditions for the attempt,

support the recognition of rhythm, allow for adjustment, and assist in interpreting consequences, while leaving authorship of the action with the person. The Triple Jumper nevertheless remains a metaphor of agency, not a norm of development – and the limits of this image require a separate critical examination.

Two Grammars of Agency

The juxtaposition of the “person with a pole” and the Triple Jumper does not lead us to choose one figure as more adequate than the other. Each organises experience differently and can therefore correct the other. I conceptualise the outcome of this comparison in my own proposal of two grammars of agency: anticipatory-transgressive and processual-responsive. These terms organise the readings of the two figures adopted here; they do not designate empirically identified types of agency. Here, “grammar” refers to a way of organising the relations among the person, time, boundary, resource, risk, and the consequences of action.

The first difference concerns direction. In the figure of the “person with a pole,” the dominant movement is beyond – towards crossing the horizon of what is given. Łukaszewicz’s metaphor protects education from being reduced to adaptation: a person need not merely prepare for a world that has already been arranged. The Triple Jumper introduces a movement towards – towards the next phase, the landing, and consequences.

The first grammar opens up possibility; the second asks how that possibility is to be realised. Without the movement “beyond,” education may reproduce the world as given; without the movement “towards consequences,” it may become captivated by transgression itself.

The second difference concerns the relationship to the future and to reality. The “person with a pole” foregrounds anticipation – the capacity to imagine a state that does not yet exist. The Triple Jumper foregrounds responsiveness – the capacity to respond to a reality already altered by one’s own action. On the account proposed here, mature agency requires both dispositions: the courage to project a future and the readiness to adjust when reality challenges earlier assumptions.

The third difference concerns time. The pole metaphor contains a moment of culmination – clearing the bar. The triple jump shifts attention to a sequence of mutually dependent phases. These correspond to two ways of understanding biographical change: as a breakthrough and as a process. The first foregrounds decision and the crossing of an earlier pattern; the second foregrounds sustaining direction, renewing attempts, and making adjustments. From the perspective of *Bildung*, change may occur both through a boundary event and through a long-term transformation of one’s relationship with the self and the world.

The fourth difference concerns the medium of agency. The “person with a pole” foregrounds the cultural mediation of action: a person draws on knowledge, language, technology, institutions, and the experience of others. The Triple Jumper directs attention towards embodiment – agency is enacted through a body with its own energy, history, and limits.

In the interpretation adopted here, both figures therefore challenge an individualistic understanding of autonomy. A person is the author of their own action, but not the author of all the conditions of their agency. The different status of the boundary becomes particularly clear here. The crossbar is set in order to be crossed. The take-off line in the triple jump, by contrast, marks a boundary governing the validity of the attempt (World Athletics, 2026). Its pedagogical meaning as a boundary that protects something of value is an analogy proposed here, not a property derived from the rules of the sport. This gives rise to a question: which boundaries should be crossed, and which should be protected? Mature agency does not consist in maximising one’s capacity to cross boundaries, but in recognising their character. Education should therefore develop both the readiness to overcome limitations and the capacity to recognise boundaries that ought to be respected.

The two grammars also place different emphases on risk. In the first, risk concerns primarily undertaking an attempt without any guarantee of success. The Triple Jumper directs attention to-

wards the necessity of responding to the consequences of an action already underway. Two forms of courage emerge: the courage to begin despite uncertainty and the courage to revise when reality contradicts one's earlier intention. A person remains the author of their action even when they question their own project.

Both metaphors nevertheless lead towards a similar understanding of education. The "person with a pole" foregrounds the provision of resources and the opening of imagination. The Triple Jumper foregrounds accompaniment through a process, the recognition of rhythm, openness to adjustment, and the interpretation of consequences.

In both cases, however, the same boundary applies: education creates the conditions for the attempt, but does not take over authorship of the attempt. It can support and provide resources, but it should also be capable of changing the form of its own presence. Otherwise, concern for agency turns into directing another person's life. The sporting image of an individual jumper may suggest individualism, yet neither of the figures analysed here exists apart from a shared world. The pole is the product of knowledge and technology, while the run-up, take-off board, training, and safety of the attempt are socially organised. Similarly, a person acts through a language they did not create, draws on the knowledge of previous generations, and makes decisions whose consequences affect others. People also do not begin from identical run-ups – they differ in access to resources, in the security available for repeated attempts, and in the costs of failure.

In the account proposed here, agency is therefore personal, but its conditions remain relational and social. The "person with a pole" and the Triple Jumper do not form a single overarching metaphor of education. They remain distinct because each reveals what the other foregrounds less clearly. The first directs attention towards imagination, the future, resources, and crossing; the second towards time, embodiment, rhythm, adjustment, and the consequences of action. Their complementarity makes it possible to formulate a double task for education: to open up imagination so that the existing order can be questioned, and to develop the capacity for reflective engagement with the consequences of one's own action.

Critically Examining the Metaphors

Treating a metaphor as a literal description or a norm of development entails pedagogical risks. Pole vaulting and the triple jump make it possible to think about imagination, agency, rhythm, and responsibility, but they also carry into the language of education notions of performance, records, fitness, and the logic of continual improvement. We must therefore ask what would happen if the sporting imperatives of "higher" and "farther" became a hidden norm of human development.

In sport, a record exists in order to be broken. In education, a similar logic can transform the possibility of development into an obligation of permanent self-transgression. Every achievement then becomes merely a starting point for the next one. The possibility of development cannot mean an obligation to keep increasing one's own parameters.

The critique of *healthism* shows how health, fitness, and self-control may become linked to moral judgements of the individual and to the conviction that outcomes depend primarily on personal discipline and responsibility (Kirk & Colquhoun, 1989). As an interpretive extension of this critique, I propose considering a similar risk in educational discourse surrounding the "full realisation of potential." An unrealised possibility, however, is not automatically an educational failure. The assessment of development should therefore not be reduced to the degree to which performance has been optimised.

The metaphor of transgression directs attention towards the person who crosses a boundary, but it can easily obscure a prior question: who established that boundary? A sporting crossbar is visible and belongs to an explicitly accepted logic of competition. In life, its equivalents may arise from the expectations of family, school, the labour market, cultures of success, stereotypes, or social norms that a person gradually comes to experience as their own. One may therefore cross, with great determination, bars that one never chose in the first place. Education oriented towards agency cannot be re-

duced to asking how to achieve a goal. It should also cultivate the capacity to recognise the origin, value, and costs of that goal. Autonomy may reveal itself both in making the jump and in saying: I do not recognise this bar as mine. Sporting results readily individualise achievement. What remains in the results table is a name and a number, while the conditions of the attempt become less visible: access to knowledge, training, time, safety, and support. People do not begin from identical positions, nor do they bear equal costs of failure. Agency therefore cannot be reduced to motivation and willpower.

The same applies to the body. Sports metaphors operate through images of bodies that are fit, trained, and capable of exceptional effort. If transferred without critical correction, such imagery can equate subjectivity with mobility, endurance, and the capacity to exceed one's own parameters. Research on ableism in physical education shows that adopting a single model of the "normal" and able participant may marginalise persons with disabilities and their ways of participating (Alves et al., 2024).

A body that is ill, ageing, tired, or living with disability is not an inferior version of the human subject. Physical ability is not a measure of humanity. The Triple Jumper must therefore remain a metaphor for the processual character of action, not a model of the ideal body. A critique of transgression also requires distinguishing between a boundary that constrains unjustly and one that protects something of value. Here, the triple jump offers an important correction: alongside the distance to be covered, there is also a take-off board whose violation does not enhance the attempt but invalidates it. This distinction limits the normative application of both metaphors: crossing a boundary alone does not determine the value of an action.

Alongside the question "can I?", there must also be the questions "is it worth it?" and "should I?"

I propose calling the most far-reaching consequence of this critique the right not to jump. If the "person with a pole" and the Triple Jumper are to remain metaphors of agency rather than normative models of the human being, they must preserve the possibility of refusal. A person may not wish to clear a particular bar, may interrupt the run-up, change the goal, or decide that what is needed is rest rather than further mobilisation. Stopping, withdrawing, or accepting dependence on others are not automatically opposites of agency. At times, they may constitute its reflective and responsible form. Nor can every worthwhile life be adequately described through the metaphor of a jump. For some experiences, the language of care, rootedness, waiting, return, endurance, or accompaniment may be more appropriate. The metaphor of the jump retains its value only as long as it does not claim the right to describe the whole of human experience. Acknowledging these limits guards against turning the metaphor into a prescribed model of life. This critical examination therefore does not lead to rejecting either figure, but to specifying the conditions of their usefulness. We need the "person with a pole" because education without the imagination of crossing can easily be reduced to adaptation. We need the Triple Jumper because transgression alone is insufficient for describing responsible action over time. What we do not need is a cult of records, an obligation of permanent self-improvement, or an anthropology in which performance and ability become measures of a person's worth.

The most important educational question is therefore not: how can we teach a person to jump ever higher and farther? Rather, it is: how can we create conditions in which a person can recognise the possibility of crossing a boundary, decide responsibly whether to undertake the attempt, and take responsibility for its consequences, while retaining the right to recognise that not every boundary is theirs and not every jump should be made? Agency understood in this way includes both undertaking action and making a justified decision to refrain from it.

Conclusion

The pedagogical meaning of the metaphor of the jump begins where sporting performance ceases to be sufficient. Sport measures height and distance. Education must also ask what happens to a person before the boundary, in the experience of crossing it, and on the other side.

The "person with a pole" reminds us that the world as given is not the final world. The Triple Jumper reminds us that once action has begun, it moves towards consequences for which one must take re-

sponsibility. The first figure protects education from being reduced to adaptation; the second protects it from becoming captivated by transgression itself. A symbolic complement is provided by the Olympic motto. In 2021, *Communiter* (“Together”) was added to *Citius, Altius, Fortius* (“Faster, Higher, Stronger”) (International Olympic Committee, 2021). This single word does not negate the striving to go beyond one’s own possibilities, but situates that striving within a world of relations. A person does not create, by themselves, the language with which they name the future. They are not the author of all the resources on which they draw, nor of all the conditions of their own run-up. Their landing, too, takes place in a world shared with others. In the reading proposed here, *Communiter* emphasises the social conditions of agency and the shared nature of its consequences. This does not weaken personal responsibility. On the contrary – since a person acts through the resources of a shared world and leaves the consequences of their actions within it, the question of agency must also be a question of relation. It is not enough to know that one can jump higher or farther. One must also ask: why, with whom, thanks to whom, at whose cost, and towards what? Education unfolds between these two truths: the possibility of going beyond what is given and responsibility for the world of consequences. It does not make the jump for the person. It can, however, help create the run-up, make available the language and tools of possibility, protect the space for the attempt, and help the person interpret where they land – in a shared world.

Use of AI tools

During the preparation of this manuscript, ChatGPT (OpenAI) was used to support language editing, stylistic condensation, English translation, and consistency checking. The author reviewed and approved all AI-assisted changes and remains fully responsible for the argumentation, source selection, factual accuracy, and final wording of the manuscript.

References

- Allen, S. J., King, M. A., & Yeadon, M. R. (2016). Optimisation of phase ratio in the triple jump using computer simulation. *Human Movement Science*, 46, 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2015.12.012>
- Alves, M. L. T., van Munster, M. A., Alves, I. D. S., & de Souza, J. V. (2024). The “normal” physical education classes: The ableism facing the inclusion of disabled students. *Disability & Society*, 39(2), 469–484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2022.2071679>
- Brinkmann, M., & Giese, M. (2025). Practising the practice: Towards a theory of practising in physical education from a Bildung-theoretical perspective. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 30(1), 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2023.2167968>
- Bronowski, J. (1988). *Potęga wyobraźni* [The ascent of man] (S. Amsterdamski, Trans.). Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy. (Original work published 1973)
- Eissa, A. (2014). Biomechanical evaluation of the phases of the triple jump take-off in a top female athlete. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 40, 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.2478/hukin-2014-0004>
- International Olympic Committee. (2021, July 20). “Faster, higher, stronger – together”: IOC Session approves historic change in Olympic motto. <https://www.olympics.com/ioc/news/-faster-higher-stronger-together-ioc-session-approves-historic-change-in-olympic-motto>
- Kirk, D., & Colquhoun, D. (1989). Healthism and physical education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 10(4), 417–434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569890100403>
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by* (Updated ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Łukaszewicz, R. M. (2020). Edukacja wobec kryzysu zaufania, wspólnotowości i autonomii – która edukacja i jaka? [Education in the face of a crisis of trust, community, and autonomy – which education and what kind?]. In: J. Madalińska-Michalak & A. Wiłkomirska (Eds.), *Pedagogika i edukacja wobec*

- kryzysu zaufania, wspólnotowości i autonomii* [Pedagogy and education in the face of a crisis of trust, community, and autonomy] (pp. 98–115). Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323542957.pp.98-115>
- Ricoeur, P. (2003). *The rule of metaphor: The creation of meaning in language* (R. Czerny, K. McLaughlin, & J. Costello, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1975)
- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 4–13. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X027002004>
- Wibowo, J., Krieger, C., Gaum, C., & Dyson, B. (2023). Bildung: A German student-centered approach to health and physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 29(2), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X221133060>
- World Athletics. (2026). *Competition and technical rules – 2026 edition*. <https://worldathletics.org/about-iaaf/documents/book-of-rules>