

2

3           **Using a design-based research approach to develop a**  
4           **technology-supported physical education course to increase**  
5           **the physical activity levels of university students: Study**  
6           **protocol paper**

7

8 **Kuston Sultoni<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Louisa Peralta<sup>1</sup>, and Wayne Cotton<sup>1</sup>**

9 <sup>1</sup> Sydney School of Education and Social Works, Faculty of Arts and Social Science, the University of  
10 Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, 2006 Australia.

11 <sup>2</sup> Faculty of Sport and Health Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Jawa Barat,  
12 Indonesia.

13 \*Correspondence author: [ksul5404@uni.sydney.edu.au](mailto:ksul5404@uni.sydney.edu.au); Tel: +6281586261988

14 **Abstract**

15 **Background.** Promoting physical activity (PA) for university students is essential as PA levels  
16 decrease during the transition from secondary to higher education. Providing technology-supported  
17 university courses targeting students' PA levels may be a viable option to combat the problem.  
18 However, it is still unclear how and what technologies should be implemented in university courses to  
19 promote PA. This study aims to create a series of design principles for technology-supported physical  
20 education courses that aim to increase university students' PA knowledge, motivation and levels.

21 **Method.** The proposed methodology underpinning the research program is a seven-phase design-  
22 based research (DBR) approach, with the seven phases encompassed in four sequential studies. These  
23 four studies are a systematic review, a qualitative focus group study, a pilot study, and a randomised  
24 controlled trial (RCT) study. The protocol paper aims to detail the plan for conducting the four studies  
25 in a comprehensive and transparent manner, thus contributing to the methodological evidence base in  
26 this field.

27 **Discussion.** Design principles generated from this project will contribute to the growing evidence  
28 focusing on effective design and implementation features. Future practitioners can also use these to  
29 develop physical education courses that aim to promote university students' physical activity levels,  
30 knowledge, and motivation.

31 **Ethical consideration.** This project has obtained ethical approval from the University of Sydney  
32 Human Research Ethics Committee (Project No. 2021/071; Project No. 2021/935). The randomised  
33 controlled trial protocol is registered at the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry  
34 (ANZCTR).

35 **Trial registration:** the RCT registry number: ACTRN12622000712707, 18/05/2022

36 **Keywords**

37 Course-based intervention, DBR, Physical activity, Physical Education, Technology, University  
38 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 1 Background

2 Interventions focusing on increasing physical activity levels among various age groups, from early  
3 childhood to the elderly, have been growing over the last five years[1-4]. These studies have  
4 suggested that targeting physical activity at different time points across the lifespan is essential,  
5 especially when there is a transition related to educational events[5] (e.g., the transition from  
6 preschool to primary school [6-8], from primary to high school[9-12], and from high school to college  
7 or university[13, 14]). Yet, the last opportunity to intervene before adulthood is the transition into  
8 post-secondary studies. Therefore, this period is ultimately the most important for establishing  
9 lifelong actions such as personal, psychosocial, and movement behaviours for those who have not yet  
10 established them[15-17]. Physical activity tends to significantly decrease when graduating from high  
11 school and enrolling in universities[18] and among first-year university students[15, 19], with 80% of  
12 university students not meeting physical activity recommendations during this transition[14]. These  
13 studies show that promoting physical activity among university students is essential.

14 Providing university courses that improve student's physical activity levels may be a viable option,  
15 as universities can provide students with access to a range of sports facilities, highly educated  
16 facilitators, and appropriate technologies[20]. Furthermore, establishing and maintaining quality  
17 physical activity university courses has been a concern. As such, a guideline developed in the US and  
18 China[21-23] suggests that administration/support, assessment, instructional strategies,  
19 professionalism, learning environment, program staffing, and curriculum are essential facets that  
20 promote quality. Previous studies also suggest that providing strategies for administration and  
21 directors[24, 25], modelling the development and support for course instructors[26], and utilising  
22 technology[27-29] can be viable strategies for increasing the quality of university courses that aim to  
23 improve the physical activity levels of university students.

24 There are various factors that influence physical activity behaviour in young adults[30]. Gaining  
25 knowledge of physical activity is considered one of the principle determining factors of physical  
26 activity in university-age students[31]. A cross-sectional study involving 258 adults in Hong Kong  
27 found that physical activity knowledge had a positive correlation with levels of physical activity, with  
28 this correlation strongest among the university student participants[32]. This finding is also supported  
29 by a Chinese cross-sectional study recruiting 9826 university students[33], with this study finding that  
30 knowledge of the physical activity guidelines was correlated with higher physical activity levels.  
31 Thus, physical activity knowledge should be considered as one of the learning outcomes of university  
32 courses that promote physical activity in a university setting.

33 Another important factor that is widely known to be associated with physical activity is motivation  
34 [34, 35]. Exercise motivation plays an important role in long-term physical activity behaviour[36].  
35 Systematic reviews examine relationships between motivation and physical activity[37] and examine  
36 the effects of physical activity interventions underpinned by motivational principles[38] show that  
37 motivation significantly increases physical activity levels[37, 38]. Furthermore, a cross-sectional  
38 study involving 1079 participants aged 24±9 years showed that motivation for physical activity and  
39 exercise is associated with frequency, intensity, and duration of exercise[39]. This finding is  
40 supported by an observational study using a web-based survey involving 320 wearable activity  
41 monitor users, where motivational regulation was correlated with moderate to vigorous physical  
42 activity[40]. Hence, having motivational content and outcomes as part of a university course that  
43 promotes physical activity in university settings should also be considered.

44 Research focusing on technologies that promote university students' physical activity levels is  
45 gaining more attention. The most common strategy utilised in previous studies has been internet  
46 websites[41-49]. Seven out of nine (78%) studies utilising internet websites have been successful in  
47 increasing physical activity levels[43-49]. Another common form of technology utilised to enhance

1 university students' physical activity levels are wearable devices. These have ranged from  
2 pedometers[50-53] to activity trackers (Misfit, Jawbone UP, Polar M400, Fitbit, and MyWellness  
3 Key)[54-58]. Two of four (50%) studies that utilised a pedometer successfully increased participants  
4 mean steps per day[53, 59]. Two of five (40%) studies using activity trackers also increased student's  
5 physical activity levels[55, 58]. Social media, smartphone applications or mobile apps have also  
6 become prominent as a technology to enhance the physical activity levels of university students[60-  
7 66]. Three of seven (43%) studies using mobile phone apps have successfully increased students'  
8 physical activity levels[62, 63, 65]. However, it is important to highlight that most of the studies (19  
9 of 25 (76%)) utilising technology (internet website, wearable device, mobile phone apps) that aim to  
10 increase student's physical activity levels in university settings were non-course-based interventions.  
11 That means only six of 25 (24%) studies were course-based interventions, with four of these six  
12 studies significantly increasing students' physical activity levels. Nevertheless, it is still unclear what  
13 design principles and features of technology are the most effective to support the implementation of  
14 these course-based interventions to increase students' physical activity knowledge, motivation and  
15 levels. There is also far too little attention paid to creating a set of design principles that can direct  
16 future improvement endeavours in this space [67]. Hence, research that focuses on development goals  
17 is needed to incorporate technology into courses at universities that aim to increase students' physical  
18 activity knowledge, motivation and levels.

19 The aim of this project is to create a series of design principles for technology-supported university  
20 courses that aim to increase student's physical activity knowledge, motivation and levels. The purpose  
21 of a design-based research approach is to create a design principle, develop an intervention based on  
22 the design principle and measure the impact [67-69]. The success of the impact will be measured  
23 through an increase in physical activity levels, knowledge, and motivation. Therefore, the purpose of  
24 this protocol paper is to detail the plan for conducting a design-based research approach to develop a  
25 technology-supported physical activity course for increasing university students' physical activity  
26 knowledge, motivation and levels in a comprehensive, transparent manner, contributing to the  
27 methodological evidence base in this field.

## 28 **Aims and objectives**

29 The primary purpose of this research project is to create a series of design principles which can guide  
30 the development of a technology-supported physical activity course to increase university student's  
31 physical activity knowledge, motivation and levels.

## 32 **Methods**

### 33 *Study Design*

34 The research methodology for the study was guided by the Design-Based Research model[67],  
35 which simplifies collaboration with practitioners by integrating known and hypothetical design  
36 principles with technological affordances to render plausible solutions to these problems. Design-  
37 based research was heralded as a practical research methodology that could effectively bridge the  
38 chasm between research and practice in formal education[70], including physical education[71].  
39 Design-based research can also be used as an alternate model for enquiry in the field of educational  
40 technology to make future progress in improving teaching and learning through technology[72]. The  
41 original Reeves design-based research model contains four steps (see Figure 1). However, in this  
42 study, the four steps will be represented in seven phases to accommodate the cyclic nature of design-  
43 based research (see

1 Figure 2). This adaptation has been made because the nature of design-based research is the  
2 flexibility of the process that still have some principles[73]. McKenney and Reeves [73] have  
3 highlighted that design-based research use: 1) scientific knowledge to ground design work; 2) produce  
4 scientific knowledge; 3) three main phases (analysis, design, and evaluation phase); and 4)  
5 development of both interventions in practise and reusable knowledge. Therefore, the seven phases in  
6 this study are: 1) needs analysis and creation of initial design principles from a systematic literature  
7 review and focus group discussions; 2) development of a prototype technology-supported physical  
8 education course based on initial design principles; 3) evaluation and testing of prototype technology-  
9 supported physical education course (pilot study); 4) revision of initial design principles; 5)  
10 modification of the prototype technology-supported physical education course based on revised  
11 design principles; 6) evaluation and testing of modified prototype technology-based physical  
12 education course (randomised controlled trial); and 7) the final design principles. These seven phases  
13 will be housed in four sequential studies. These are a: 1) systematic review; 2) qualitative focus group  
14 study; 3) pilot study, and 4) randomised controlled trial study.


### 15 *Location and setting*

16 This study will be conducted at the Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (Indonesia University of  
17 Education) located in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia ([www.upi.edu](http://www.upi.edu)). The physical activity education  
18 course of interest is offered to first year and second-year undergraduate students as required  
19 (mandatory) learning or as an elective. To clarify, there is also university courses called Physical  
20 Education Teacher Education (PETE) programs that aim to educate preservice physical education  
21 teachers to prepare them to become beginning teachers in school settings. However, the physical  
22 activity education course (herein now called physical education course) in this study is unit of study  
23 with the main outcome is to promote active lifestyles or lifelong physical activity for all  
24 undergraduate students. Based on the higher education system in Indonesia, the workload used in the  
25 physical education course is a semester credit unit. In this system, one credit is equivalent to 48  
26 hours/semester, 16 meetings, and 3 hours for each meeting consisting of scheduled lecture activities,  
27 structured, and independent assignments. The credit system is different from European Credit  
28 Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) which has a workload of 25 hours of study or 2.5 hours  
29 for 10 meetings per semester. When the credit system is changed to the ECTS, the students' workloads  
30 for this course is  $48:25 \times 2 \text{ credits} = 3.84 \text{ ECTS}$ .

### 31 *Phase 1. Needs analysis and creation of initial design principles*


32 The purpose of Phase 1 is the creation of the initial design principles from the systematic literature  
33 review and needs analysis with key stakeholders. In addition, this phase will also identify appropriate  
34 technologies that will facilitate the implementation of a physical education course for increasing  
35 university students' physical activity knowledge, motivation and levels.

36



1

Figure 1. Reeves' Original Design-Based Research Model (2000)



2

3

4

Figure 2. Diagrammatic overview of how design-based research methodology informed this research project (n.b. the four studies are identified in italics)

5

6

7

8

## 1 *Systematic review (Study 1)*

### 2 *Purpose*

3 This systematic review aims to form initial design principles focusing on implementing a physical  
4 education course for university settings to improve university students' physical activity knowledge,  
5 motivation and levels.

### 6 *Setting*

7 The first study in this project is systematic literature review aims to identify, critically appraise, and  
8 summarise the best available evidence regarding the effectiveness of technology-supported university  
9 courses for increasing the physical activity knowledge, motivation and levels of university students.  
10 This systematic review will follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-  
11 Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines[74]. The protocol of the study will be registered with PROSPERO  
12 (ID: CRD42020210327). The process will involve planning a review, searching, and selecting studies,  
13 data collection, risk of bias assessment, analysis, and interpreting results. The PICO (Population,  
14 Intervention, Comparator, and Outcome) formula is used in this study to limit the question. The  
15 population is a university student or college students, or students who enrol in higher institution.  
16 Intervention is technology-based physical education or course-based intervention using technology.  
17 Technology is limited to online delivery, learning management system, website, wearable device,  
18 mobile application, activity tracker, and blended learning using technology. Comparison is studies  
19 with a control group including RCT or Non-RCT or quasi-experimental study describing interventions  
20 using technology-supported university courses targeting physical activity among university students.  
21 The primary outcome will be physical activity levels. Eight electronic bibliographic databases will be  
22 sought including CINAHL, ERIC, MEDLINE, ProQuest, PsycINFO, Scopus, SPORTDiscus, and  
23 Web of Science from 1st January 2010 to 31st December 2020. 10 item quality assessment scale  
24 derived from Van Sluijs and colleagues [75] will be used to measure the quality of selected studies.

25

## 26 *Qualitative focus group study (Study 2)*

### 27 *Purpose*

28 The purpose of this study is to confirm and add to the initial series of design principles to inform  
29 the design of Phase 2.

### 30 *Setting access and recruitment*

31 There will be three focus group discussions with key stakeholders. These stakeholders will include  
32 administrators and directors, course instructors/lecturers and students. The first discussion is with key  
33 stakeholders such as the curriculum development team, course coordinator and the Dean of the  
34 Faculty of Sport and Health Education. The discussion will be guided by a form to confirm that the  
35 content of the initial design principles is appropriate considering the learning outcomes and current  
36 technologies provided and supported by the university. The second focus group discussion is with  
37 lecturers who teach the physical education course. This discussion will be guided with lecturers being  
38 asked to answer questions focusing on the system and content of the course. The third focus group  
39 discussion will be with students who have previously enrolled in and completed the physical  
40 education course with questions focusing on the best technologies for their learning. The semi-  
41 structured focus group discussion guidelines are attached as additional files [see Additional file 1].

42 Participation in these focus groups is voluntary. All participants will be invited using email and  
43 will be given the Participant Information Statements. A signed Participant Consent Form will be  
44 needed to participate in the focus group discussion.

## 1 *Sampling*

2 There will be three focus group discussions. In the first focus group discussion, four key  
3 stakeholders or policy makers will be invited to participate: 1) a physical education course lecturer; 2)  
4 the course coordinator; 3) a member of university curriculum development team; and 4) the Dean of  
5 the Faculty of Sport and Health Education. The second focus group discussion will involve six  
6 randomly selected lecturers from 30 lecturers who currently implement the physical education course.  
7 The third focus group discussion will involve 12 undergraduate students who have enrolled in the  
8 physical education course previously. The size of sample in the focus group discussion 1, 2 and 3 will  
9 enable data saturation.

## 10 *Data Analysis*

11 Qualitative data from the focus group discussions will be analysed using the thematic analysis[76].  
12 The analysis will involve transcribing the data before coding individual comments into categories  
13 determined by the research question. Each category will then be sub-coded and investigated in more  
14 detail. This method will enable issues and themes in the data to emerge and from these issues and  
15 themes, conclusions will be able to be made to reinforce the initial design principles derived from the  
16 systematic review.

## 17 *Phase 2. Development of a prototype technology-supported physical education course based on* 18 *initial design principles*

19 The purpose of Phase 2 is to develop a prototype based on the initial design principles from Phase 1.  
20 The design includes content and technical development. Content design will be reviewed by three  
21 physical education experts. Content development will produce a paper-based prototype of the  
22 technology that will show how the technology aligned with the initial design principles. While  
23 technical development will produce the design of a Learning Management System (LMS) and mobile  
24 application (App). Technical design includes User Experience (UX) represented by the flow chart of  
25 how LMS and App work and User Interface (UI) represented by a series of visual design on how  
26 LMS and App looks like. The next step is producing the LMS, and App based on technical  
27 development by IT developers to create a prototype for the technology-based physical education  
28 course.

## 29 *Phase 3. Evaluation and testing of prototype technology-supported physical education course*

30 The purpose of Phase 3 is to test and evaluate the prototype from Phase 2. In this phase, a pilot study  
31 will be conducted to implement and test the prototype from the previous phases to examine the  
32 feasibility and acceptability of a randomised controlled trial that will be conducted in Phase 6.

## 33 *Pilot study (Study 3)*

### 34 *Purpose*

35 The pilot study aims to test the prototype with a small sample size to examine the feasibility and  
36 acceptability of the intervention.

### 37 *Setting access and recruitment*

38 The pilot study will include two classes of a semester physical education course. One of the classes  
39 will be the intervention group, and the other will be the control group. The intervention group will  
40 receive a course incorporated with the prototype for the technology-supported physical education  
41 course. The control group will receive the usual physical education course. Three outcomes will be  
42 measured pre- and post-intervention. This phase also includes developing the research instruments to  
43 determine validity and reliability.

1 There are two recruitment processes in this pilot study including the lecturer and students. In the  
 2 lecturer recruitment step, the researcher will invite a lecturer who participated in the focus group  
 3 discussion in Phase 1. The lecturer will be included in the pilot study if he/she meets the following  
 4 inclusion criteria: 1) run two classes of the physical education course; 2) willing to take part in  
 5 lecturer training before the physical education course class begins; and 3) willing to invite their  
 6 students to take part in the pilot study.

7 The lecturer will invite their students to participate in the pilot study in the first week of the physical  
 8 education course. Participation in this pilot study is voluntary, and all participants will be given  
 9 Participant Information Statements and invited to sign a Participant Consent Form to participate.  
 10 Participation or non-participation in this study will not affect students' scores in physical education  
 11 courses. The number of students in each class varies from 20-50 students. Students will be included in  
 12 the pilot study if they meet the following inclusion criteria: 1) students enrolled in a physical  
 13 education course with a lecturer who will participate in the pilot study; 2) voluntarily participate in the  
 14 pilot study; and 3) owns an android smartphone.

#### 15 *Intervention*

16 The intervention group will receive 16 weeks of the physical education course incorporated with the  
 17 prototype of technology-supported physical education course implemented by their lecturer. The  
 18 intervention and control group will have the same content (See Table 1); however, the intervention  
 19 group will have access to the prototype of technology. The prototype will be developed in Phase 2  
 20 using the initial design principles generated from the focus group discussions and systematic review  
 21 in Phase 1.

22 Table 1. Course content for intervention and control group

<b>Week</b>	<b>Intervention Group</b>	<b>Control Group</b>
1	Course Introduction	Course Introduction
2	Physical activity, Healthy and active lifestyle knowledge	Physical activity, Healthy and active lifestyle knowledge
3	Health-related physical fitness knowledge	Health-related physical fitness knowledge
4	Goal setting in Physical activity and fitness	Goal setting in Physical activity and fitness
5	Body composition	Body composition
6	Aerobic fitness	Aerobic fitness
7	Muscular fitness and flexibility	Muscular fitness and flexibility
8	Midsemester exam	Midsemester exam
9	Nutrition: Healthy eating	Nutrition: Healthy eating
10	Aerobic activity- aerobic dance	Aerobic activity- aerobic dance
11	Aerobic activity- GPS-Based activity	Aerobic activity- GPS-Based activity
12	Muscular strengthening	Muscular strengthening
13	Flexibility training	Flexibility training
14	Create an individual fitness training	Create an individual fitness training
15	Overcome physical activity barrier	Overcome physical activity barrier
16	Final exam	Final exam

23

#### 24 *Instruments*

25 Data will be collected on student's physical activity knowledge, motivation and levels, since the  
 26 outcome of the course is changing student physical activity behaviour, knowledge and motivation to  
 27 encourage long-life physical activity. Students' physical activity level will be measured by using



1 International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) short form. Students' physical activity  
2 knowledge will be measured by a questionnaire that will be developed in the pilot study based on  
3 literature [32, 33, 77]. A physical education expert will confirm content validity of the questionnaire and a  
4 reliability test of the instrument will be conducted in the pilot study. Students' motivation for physical  
5 activity and exercise will be measured using The Behavioural Regulation in Exercise Questionnaire-2  
6 (BREQ-2) [78]. The BREQ-2 consists of a 19-item questionnaire of 5 subscales (amotivation, external  
7 regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and intrinsic regulation) to assess motivation  
8 to exercise. Construct validity studies showed that the BREQ-2 is valid for measuring exercise  
9 motivation among university students [79]. Validity and reliability of an Indonesian version of the  
10 BREQ-2 will be conducted in this pilot study.

11

#### 12 *Statistics and data analysis*

13 Data will also be gathered from class observations and interviews with the lecturers and students. The  
14 class observation will use a semi-structured observation protocol based on ISO 9126 evaluation model  
15 for e-learning[80], focusing on functionality, reliability, efficiency, usability, maintainability, and  
16 portability of the prototypes that will be analysed for refining design principles.

17 Descriptive statistics will be presented (mean and standard deviation) for each group separately.  
18 Changes in physical activity level (MET: Metabolic Equivalent of Task), Physical activity knowledge  
19 and motivation from pre-test and post-test will be assessed using an ANCOVA. As this is a pilot  
20 study, the study will be underpowered; therefore, quantitative outcomes will be interpreted only as  
21 feasibility and acceptability measures.

#### 22 *Phase 4. Revise of initial design principles.*

23 The purpose of Phase 4 is to modify the initial design principles from Phase 1 based on data gathered  
24 from Phase 3 (pilot study, observation, measurement and feedback from lecturer and students). In this  
25 phase, the initial design principles will be revised to guide the prototype for technology-based  
26 physical education courses to determine the revised set of design principles.

#### 27 *Phase 5. Modification of prototype technology-supported physical education based on revised design* 28 *principles.*

29 The purpose of Phase 5 is to modify the prototype based on Phase 4's revised design principles. The  
30 revised design principles in the previous phase will be a foundation to redesign and build the  
31 technology-based physical education course. The next step is an expert review to find problems and  
32 recommendations for the technology. The final step in this phase is the refinement and modification  
33 of the technology prototype.

#### 34 *Phase 6. Evaluation and testing of modified prototype technology-supported physical education* 35 *(Randomised controlled trial).*

36 In this phase, the refined and modified prototype will be tested and evaluated. The randomised  
37 controlled trial will be conducted to examine the effectiveness of a technology-supported physical  
38 education course on increasing university students' physical activity levels, knowledge, and  
39 motivation.

40

## 1 *Randomised controlled trial study (Study 4)*

2 This is a two-arm parallel, randomised controlled trial of a technology-supported physical education  
3 course intervention for students enrolled in an elective unit of study. The randomised controlled trial  
4 protocol is registered at the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR). The RCT  
5 request number is ACTRN12622000712707, 18/05/2022. The RCT adheres to SPIRIT guidelines for  
6 reporting clinical trial study protocols [see Additional file 2]. The SPIRIT schedule can be seen in the  
7 Figure 3.

### 8 *Purpose*

9 The randomised controlled trial aims to test and evaluate the modified prototype with a larger sample  
10 size.

### 11 *Hypothesis*

12 A technology-supported physical education course intervention will increase university student's  
13 physical activity levels, knowledge and motivation more effectively than a non-technology-supported  
14 physical education courses.

### 15 *Setting access and participants*

16 The randomised controlled trial will include six lecturers and six classes (20 to 50 students each  
17 class). The recruitment process and intervention in the randomised controlled trial will be the  
18 modified version of the intervention from the pilot study. The six lecturers who agree to participate  
19 will be randomly assigned to intervention or control. The lecturer will invite their students to  
20 participate in the RCT in the first week of the physical education course. The decision for students  
21 who the comparator groups are (the control group) is based on their enrolment teacher. Participation  
22 in this randomised controlled trial is voluntary, and all lecturers and students will be given Participant  
23 Information Statements and be invited to sign a Participant Consent Form to participate.

### 24 *Sample size including power calculation*

25 The sample size calculation is based on the difference in change in the primary outcome (physical  
26 activity) from pre- to post-intervention in both groups (intervention and control group). Based on  
27 previous studies of technology-based physical activity interventions among university students, mean  
28 effect sizes of around  $d = 0.5$  are expected in analyses[47, 81]. To detect such intervention effects in  
29 two-sided significance testing ( $\alpha = .05$ ) with a power of 80%, a sample size of 128 participants is  
30 required. Considering an expected study drop-out of about 20% and response rates of about 50%, 300  
31 participants will be included in the study.

### 32 *Number of Participants*

33  $N=6$  physical education course lecturers

34 (a)  $n=3$  will be assigned to the intervention group,

35 (b)  $n=3$  will be assigned to the control group.

36  $n=300$  students will be randomised 1:1 to either an intervention arm

37 (a)  $n=150$  a technology-supported physical education course (intervention group)

38 (b)  $n=150$  non-technology-supported physical education course (control group).

### 39 *Teacher training*

40 The lecturers in the intervention group will have teacher training for two days on how to deliver the  
41 technology-based physical education course prior to the intervention.

42

1

TIMEPOINT**	STUDY PERIOD							
	Enrolment	Allocation	Post-allocation					Close-out
	$-t_1$ (August 2022)	0	Baseline (September 2022)	$t_2$	$t_3$	$t_4$	etc.	Follow Up (January 2023)
<b>ENROLMENT:</b>								
Eligibility screen	X							
Informed consent	X							
Teacher training		X						
Allocation		X						
<b>INTERVENTIONS:</b>								
<i>Technology-supported PE Course</i>			X					X
<i>PE Course Active Control</i>			X					X
<b>ASSESSMENTS:</b>								
<i>IPAQ-SF</i>			X					X
<i>BREQ-2</i>			X					X
<i>Physical activity knowledge quiz</i>			X					X
<i>Fidelity Check</i>			←—————→					
<i>Students FGD</i>								X

2 Figure 3. The SPIRIT schedule of enrolment, interventions, and assessments for the technology-  
3 supported physical education course.

4

## 1 *Intervention*

2 The intervention group will receive 16 weeks of the physical education course incorporated with  
3 modified prototype from the pilot study in Phase 3.

## 4 *Instrument*

5 Data will be gathered using valid and reliable instruments developed from the pilot study and fidelity  
6 check and interviews to accommodate the final design principles.

## 7 *Phase 7. Final Design Principles.*

8 This is the final phase of the study involving the entire data collected from Phases 1 to 6 to create a  
9 final series of design principles to aid future practitioners who will design, implement, and evaluate  
10 technology-supported physical education courses for university students.

## 11 **Discussion**

12 This paper describes the design-based research approach for a study focusing on developing a  
13 technology-supported physical education course for university students. This study sought to address  
14 research on what design principles and features of technology are the most effective to support  
15 university course-based interventions aiming to increase students' physical activity knowledge,  
16 motivation and levels. The design-based research approach aims to create design principles, develop  
17 an intervention, and measure the impact of the technology-supported tools. This project will  
18 systematically create a series of design principles using the literature and focus group discussions with  
19 key stakeholders and then supported and modified through cycles of robust research testing. Design  
20 principles generated from this project will contribute to future practitioners designing, implementing,  
21 and evaluating university physical education courses that aim to enhance university students' physical  
22 activity knowledge, motivation and levels. However, this project has limitations. The most important  
23 limitation lies in the fact that this project will be conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, where  
24 face-to-face activities in focus groups, as well as the pilot study and randomised controlled trial, will  
25 be restricted. In addition, the pandemic will also limit the use of objective measures of physical  
26 activity (i.e., accelerometer) as this instrument requires a face-to-face setting and application. Hence,  
27 only subjective measures of physical activity levels will be used in this study.

28 The systematic review study of this project has been completed and published [82]. Four design  
29 principles generated from the review will be confirmed and enhanced in the series of focus group  
30 discussions with key stakeholders before the prototype is built from the initial design principles. The  
31 prototype will be tested and evaluated in the small sample pilot study to ensure prototype feasibility  
32 and validity. Then modifications will be performed based on the pilot study findings with the  
33 modified prototype tested and evaluated in a large randomised controlled trial study. Lastly, the final  
34 design principles will be created to aid future research and practitioners who will design, implement,  
35 and evaluate university physical education courses.

## 36 **List of Abbreviations**

37 PA: Physical Activity; DBR: Design-Based Research; PETE: Physical Education Teacher Education;  
38 ECTS: European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System; PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for  
39 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; PICO: Population, Intervention, Comparator, and Outcome;  
40 RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; LMS: Learning Management System; UX: User Experience; UI:

- 1 User Interface; IPAQ: International Physical Activity Questionnaire; BREQ-2: Behavioural  
2 Regulation in Exercise Questionnaire-2; MET: Metabolic Equivalent of Task

## 3 **Declarations**

### 4 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

5 This project has obtained ethics approval from the University of Sydney Human Research Ethics  
6 Committee (Project No. 2021/071; Project No. 2021/935). Written informed consent was obtained  
7 from all participants before the study commenced.

### 8 *Consent for publication*

9 Not applicable.

### 10 *Availability of data and materials*

11 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding  
12 author upon reasonable request

### 13 *Competing interests*

14 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### 15 *Funding*

16 The primary author (KS) is supported by the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education Scholarship  
17 (LPDP RI) under a doctoral degree scholarship (202001222015860). LPDP RI have no authority in  
18 study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and  
19 the decision to submit the report for publication.

### 20 *Authors' contributions*

21 KS, LP and WC conceived the research idea. KS wrote the manuscript with support from LP and  
22 WC. WC and LP supervised the project. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of  
23 the manuscript.

### 24 *Acknowledgments*

25 Not applicable

## 26 **References**

- 27 1. Wilson B, Barnett LM. Physical activity interventions to improve the health of children  
28 and adolescents in out of home care – A systematic review of the literature. Children and  
29 Youth Services Review. 2020;110:104765. doi:  
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104765>.
- 31 2. Oliveira JS, Sherrington C, Zheng ER, Franco MR, Tiedemann A. Effect of interventions  
32 using physical activity trackers on physical activity in people aged 60 years and over: a  
33 systematic review and meta-analysis. British journal of sports medicine. 2019;bjsports-  
34 2018-100324.
- 35 3. Hnatiuk J, Brown H, Downing K, Hinkley T, Salmon J, Hesketh K. Interventions to  
36 increase physical activity in children 0–5 years old: a systematic review, meta-analysis  
37 and realist synthesis. Obesity reviews. 2019;20(1):75-87.

- 1 4. Kwan RYC, Salihu D, Lee PH, Tse M, Cheung DSK, Roopsawang I, et al. The effect of  
2 e-health interventions promoting physical activity in older people: a systematic review  
3 and meta-analysis. *European Review of Aging and Physical Activity*. 2020;17:1-17.
- 4 5. Gropper H, John JM, Sudeck G, Thiel A. The impact of life events and transitions on  
5 physical activity: A scoping review. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(6):e0234794. doi:  
6 10.1371/journal.pone.0234794.
- 7 6. Oja L, Jürimäe T. Tracking of motor abilities, physical activity, and elementary motor  
8 skills during transition from pre-school to school. *Acta Kinesiol Univ Tartuensis*.  
9 2001;6:91-101.
- 10 7. Sigmund E, Sigmundová D, Ansari WE. Changes in physical activity in pre-schoolers  
11 and first-grade children: longitudinal study in the Czech Republic. *Child: care, health and  
12 development*. 2009;35(3):376-82.
- 13 8. Jáuregui A, Villalpando S, Rangel-Baltazar E, Castro-Hernández J, Lara-Zamudio Y,  
14 Méndez-Gómez-Humarán I. The physical activity level of Mexican children decreases  
15 upon entry to elementary school. *salud pública de méxico*. 2011;53(3):228-36.
- 16 9. Garcia AW, Pender NJ, Antonakos CL, Ronis DL. Changes in physical activity beliefs  
17 and behaviors of boys and girls across the transition to junior high school. *Journal of  
18 adolescent health*. 1998;22(5):394-402.
- 19 10. Chong KH, Parrish A-M, Cliff DP, Kemp BJ, Zhang Z, Okely AD. Changes in physical  
20 activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep across the transition from primary to secondary  
21 school: A systematic review. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*. 2020;23(5):498-  
22 505.
- 23 11. Feu S, de la Cruz Sánchez E. Rural-urban differences in physical activity levels during  
24 the transition from primary education to high school. *Revista Espanola de Salud Publica*.  
25 2020;94.
- 26 12. Shull ER, Dowda M, Saunders RP, McIver K, Pate RR. Sport participation, physical  
27 activity and sedentary behavior in the transition from middle school to high school.  
28 *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*. 2020;23(4):385-9.
- 29 13. Wengreen HJ, Moncur C. Change in diet, physical activity, and body weight among  
30 young-adults during the transition from high school to college. *Nutrition journal*.  
31 2009;8(1):32.
- 32 14. Owens CS, Crone D, De Ste Croix MBA, Gidlow CJ, James DVB. Physical activity and  
33 screen time in adolescents transitioning out of compulsory education: a prospective  
34 longitudinal study. *Journal of Public Health*. 2013;36(4):599-607. doi:  
35 10.1093/pubmed/fdt123.
- 36 15. Bray SR, Born HA. Transition to university and vigorous physical activity: implications  
37 for health and psychological well-being. *J Am Coll Health*. 2004;52(4):181-8. Epub  
38 2004/03/17. doi: 10.3200/JACH.52.4.181-188. PubMed PMID: 15018429.
- 39 16. Hussey T, Smith P. Transitions in higher education. *Innovations in Education and  
40 Teaching International*. 2010;47(2):155-64. doi: 10.1080/14703291003718893.
- 41 17. Terenzini PT, Rendon LI, Upcraft ML, Millar SB, Allison KW, Gregg PL, et al. THE  
42 TRANSITION TO COLLEGE: Diverse Students, Diverse Stories. *Research in Higher  
43 Education*. 1994;35(7).
- 44 18. Curry J, Jenkins JM, Weatherford J. Focus on Freshman: Basic Instruction Programs  
45 Enhancing Physical Activity. *The Physical Educator*. 2015;72(4). doi: 10.18666/tp-  
46 2015-v72-i4-6472.
- 47 19. Kimball J, Jenkins J, Wallhead T. Influence of high school physical education on  
48 university students' physical activity. *European Physical Education Review*.  
49 2009;15(2):249-67.

- 1 20. Plotnikoff RC, Costigan SA, Williams RL, Hutchesson MJ, Kennedy SG, Robards SL, et  
2 al. Effectiveness of interventions targeting physical activity, nutrition and healthy weight  
3 for university and college students: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Behav*  
4 *Nutr Phys Act.* 2015;12(1):45. Epub 2015/04/19. doi: 10.1186/s12966-015-0203-7.  
5 PubMed PMID: 25890337; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4393577.
- 6 21. National Association for Sport Physical Education N. Appropriate instructional practice  
7 guidelines for higher education physical activity programs. Author. Reston, VA; 2009.
- 8 22. Stapleton D, Bulger SM. Adherence to appropriate instructional practice guidelines in  
9 US colleges' and universities' physical activity programs. *Journal of Physical Education*  
10 *and Sport Management.* 2015;6(7):47-59.
- 11 23. Li J. Discussion on Chinese Ordinary University Sports Teaching Pattern in the New  
12 Period. *Cross-Cultural Communication.* 2012;8(6):75-8.
- 13 24. Brock SJ, Russell JA, Cosgrove B, Richards J. Administrative Strategies for Delivering  
14 High-Quality Instruction in a University-Based Physical Activity and Wellness Program.  
15 *Kinesiology Review.* 2018;7(4):345-9. doi: 10.1123/kr.2018-0040.
- 16 25. Melton BF, Sampson Moore C, Hoffman B. Strategies for College and University  
17 Instructional Physical Activity Programs (IPAP) Directors. *International Journal of*  
18 *Higher Education.* 2016;5(1). doi: 10.5430/ijhe.v5n1p292.
- 19 26. Russell JA. Graduate Teaching-Assistant Development in College and University  
20 Instructional Physical Activity Programs. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation &*  
21 *Dance.* 2011;82(4):22-32. doi: 10.1080/07303084.2011.10598610.
- 22 27. Bice MR, Ball JW, Hollman A, Adkins M. Health Technology Use: Implications for  
23 Physical Activity Behaviors Among College Students. *International Journal of*  
24 *Kinesiology in Higher Education.* 2019;3(1):23-34. doi:  
25 10.1080/24711616.2018.1516524.
- 26 28. Cox DG, Krause JM, Smith MA. Technology in University Physical Activity Courses: A  
27 Mini-Ethnographic Case Study. *The Qualitative Report.* 2019;24(10):2554-74. PubMed  
28 PMID: 2309242791.
- 29 29. Melton BF, Burdette T. Utilizing Technology to Improve the Administration of  
30 Instructional Physical Activity Programs in Higher Education. *Journal of Physical*  
31 *Education, Recreation & Dance.* 2011;82(4):27-32. doi:  
32 10.1080/07303084.2011.10598611.
- 33 30. Nahas MV, Goldfine B, Collins MA. Determinants of physical activity in adolescents  
34 and young adults: The basis for high school and college physical education to promote  
35 active lifestyles. *Physical Educator.* 2003;60(1):42. PubMed PMID: 233004273.
- 36 31. Sallis JF, Owen N. *Physical activity & behavioral medicine.* Thousand Oaks, Calif. ;:  
37 Sage; 1999.
- 38 32. Hui SS-C, Hui GP-S, Xie YJ. Association between physical activity knowledge and  
39 levels of physical activity in chinese adults with type 2 diabetes. *PloS one.*  
40 2014;9(12):e115098.
- 41 33. Abula K, Gröpel P, Chen K, Beckmann J. Does knowledge of physical activity  
42 recommendations increase physical activity among Chinese college students? Empirical  
43 investigations based on the transtheoretical model. *Journal of Sport and Health Science.*  
44 2018;7(1):77-82.
- 45 34. Bauman AE, Reis RS, Sallis JF, Wells JC, Loos RJ, Martin BW, et al. Correlates of  
46 physical activity: why are some people physically active and others not? *The lancet.*  
47 2012;380(9838):258-71.
- 48 35. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation,  
49 social development, and well-being. *American psychologist.* 2000;55(1):68.

- 1 36. Richard M, Christina MF, Deborah LS, Rubio N, Kennon MS. Intrinsic motivation and  
2 exercise adherence. *Int J Sport Psychol.* 1997;28(4):335-54.
- 3 37. Teixeira PJ, Carraça EV, Markland D, Silva MN, Ryan RM. Exercise, physical activity,  
4 and self-determination theory: a systematic review. *The international journal of*  
5 *behavioral nutrition and physical activity.* 2012;9(1):78-. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-9-78.
- 6 38. Knittle K, Nurmi J, Crutzen R, Hankonen N, Beattie M, Dombrowski SU. How can  
7 interventions increase motivation for physical activity? A systematic review and meta-  
8 analysis. *Health psychology review.* 2018;12(3):211-30. doi:  
9 10.1080/17437199.2018.1435299.
- 10 39. Duncan LR, Hall CR, Wilson PM, Jenny O. Exercise motivation: a cross-sectional  
11 analysis examining its relationships with frequency, intensity, and duration of exercise.  
12 *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity.* 2010;7(1):7.
- 13 40. Friel CP, Garber CE. An Examination of the Relationship Between Motivation, Physical  
14 Activity, and Wearable Activity Monitor Use. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology.*  
15 2020;1(aop):1-8.
- 16 41. Hastie PA, Sinelnikov OA. The use of web-based portfolios in college physical  
17 education activity courses. *Physical Educator.* 2007;64(1):21.
- 18 42. Skar S, Sniehotta FF, Molloy GJ, Prestwich A, Araujo-Soares V. Do brief online  
19 planning interventions increase physical activity amongst university students? A  
20 randomised controlled trial. *Psychol Health.* 2011;26(4):399-417. Epub 2010/09/11. doi:  
21 10.1080/08870440903456877. PubMed PMID: 20830646.
- 22 43. Magoc D, Tomaka J, Bridges-Arzaga A. Using the web to increase physical activity in  
23 college students. *Am J Health Behav.* 2011;35(2):142-54. Epub 2011/01/06. doi:  
24 10.5993/ajhb.35.2.2. PubMed PMID: 21204677.
- 25 44. Greene, White AA, Hoerr SL, Lohse B, Schembre SM, Riebe D, et al. Impact of an  
26 online healthful eating and physical activity program for college students. *Am J Health*  
27 *Promot.* 2012;27(2):e47-58. Epub 2012/11/02. doi: 10.4278/ajhp.110606-QUAN-239.  
28 PubMed PMID: 23113786.
- 29 45. Hager R, George JD, LeCheminant JD, Bailey BW, Vincent WJ. Evaluation of a  
30 university general education health and wellness course delivered by lecture or online.  
31 *American Journal of Health Promotion.* 2012;26(5):263-9. Epub 2012/05/03. doi:  
32 10.4278/ajhp.101020-QUAN-344. PubMed PMID: 22548420.
- 33 46. Everhart K, Dimon C. The impact of course delivery format on wellness patterns of  
34 university students. *Education.* 2013;133(3):310-8.
- 35 47. Sriramatr S, Berry TR, Spence JC. An Internet-based intervention for promoting and  
36 maintaining physical activity: a randomized controlled trial. *American journal of health*  
37 *behavior.* 2014;38(3):430-9.
- 38 48. Kattelman KK, White AA, Greene, Byrd-Bredbenner C, Hoerr SL, Horacek TM, et al.  
39 Development of Young Adults Eating and Active for Health (YEAH) internet-based  
40 intervention via a community-based participatory research model. *J Nutr Educ Behav.*  
41 2014;46(2):S10-25. Epub 2014/01/25. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2013.11.006. PubMed PMID:  
42 24456834.
- 43 49. Duan YP, Wienert J, Hu C, Si GY, Lippke S. Web-based intervention for physical  
44 activity and fruit and vegetable intake among Chinese university students: a randomized  
45 controlled trial. *Journal of medical Internet research.* 2017;19(4):e106.
- 46 50. Perkins J. Baseline comparison and the effects of education and pedometer use on  
47 physical activity in undergraduate students in psychology and personal health courses.  
48 Ann Arbor: Central Michigan University; 2006.
- 49 51. LeCheminant JD, Smith JD, Covington NK, Hardin-Renschen T, Heden T. Pedometer  
50 use in university freshmen: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Am J Health Behav.*



- 1 2011;35(6):777-84. Epub 2012/01/19. doi: 10.5993/ajhb.35.6.13. PubMed PMID:  
2 22251768.
- 3 52. Sharp P, Caperchione C. The effects of a pedometer-based intervention on first-year  
4 university students: A randomized control trial. *J Am Coll Health*. 2016;64(8):630-8.  
5 Epub 2016/10/30. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2016.1217538. PubMed PMID: 27471879.
- 6 53. Miragall M, Dominguez-Rodriguez A, Navarro J, Cebolla A, Banos RM. Increasing  
7 physical activity through an Internet-based motivational intervention supported by  
8 pedometers in a sample of sedentary students: A randomised controlled trial. *Psychol*  
9 *Health*. 2018;33(4):465-82. Epub 2017/09/08. doi: 10.1080/08870446.2017.1368511.  
10 PubMed PMID: 28880576.
- 11 54. Melton BF, Buman MP, Vogel RL, Harris BS, Bigham LE. Wearable devices to improve  
12 physical activity and sleep: a randomized controlled trial of college-aged African  
13 American women. *Journal of Black Studies*. 2016;47(6):610-25.
- 14 55. Rote AE. Physical activity intervention using Fitbits in an introductory college health  
15 course. *Health Education Journal*. 2017;76(3):337-48. doi: 10.1177/0017896916674505.
- 16 56. Maselli M, Gobbi E, Carraro A. Effectiveness of individual counseling and activity  
17 monitors to promote physical activity among university students. *The Journal of sports*  
18 *medicine and physical fitness*. 2017;59(1):132-40.
- 19 57. Kim Y, Lumpkin A, Lochbaum M, Stegemeier S, Kitten K. Promoting physical activity  
20 using a wearable activity tracker in college students: A cluster randomized controlled  
21 trial. *J Sports Sci*. 2018;36(16):1889-96. Epub 2018/01/11. doi:  
22 10.1080/02640414.2018.1423886. PubMed PMID: 29318916.
- 23 58. Pope ZC, Barr-Anderson DJ, Lewis BA, Pereira MA, Gao Z. Use of Wearable  
24 Technology and Social Media to Improve Physical Activity and Dietary Behaviors  
25 among College Students: A 12-Week Randomized Pilot Study. *International Journal of*  
26 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019;16(19):3579. PubMed PMID:  
27 doi:10.3390/ijerph16193579.
- 28 59. Ornes L, Ransdell LB. Web-based physical activity intervention for college-aged  
29 women. *International Electronic Journal of Health Education*. 2007;10:126-37.
- 30 60. Melton BF, Bland H, Harris B, Kelly D, Chandler K. Evaluating a Physical Activity App  
31 in the Classroom: A Mixed Methodological Approach Among University Students. *The*  
32 *Physical Educator*. 2015;72(4). doi: 10.18666/tpe-2015-v72-i4-7139.
- 33 61. Bruening M, Van Woerden I, Todd M, Brennhofer S, Laska MN, Dunton G. A mobile  
34 ecological momentary assessment tool (devilSPARC) for nutrition and physical activity  
35 behaviors in college students: a validation study. *Journal of medical Internet research*.  
36 2016;18(7):e209.
- 37 62. Tong HL, Coiera E, Tong W, Wang Y, Quiroz JC, Martin P, et al. Efficacy of a Mobile  
38 Social Networking Intervention in Promoting Physical Activity: Quasi-Experimental  
39 Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2019;7(3):e12181. Epub 2019/03/29. doi: 10.2196/12181.  
40 PubMed PMID: 30920379; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6458538.
- 41 63. Pentakota N, Ramaswamy G, Thekkur P, Nair D, Chinnakali P, Kumar Saya G. Is a  
42 smartphone application effective in improving physical activity among medical school  
43 students? Results from a quasi-experimental study. *Int J Adolesc Med Health*. 2019:1-8.  
44 Epub 2019/03/29. doi: 10.1515/ijamh-2018-0192. PubMed PMID: 30920953.
- 45 64. Edney SM, Olds TS, Ryan JC, Vandelanotte C, Plotnikoff RC, Curtis RG, et al. A Social  
46 Networking and Gamified App to Increase Physical Activity: Cluster RCT. *Am J Prev*  
47 *Med*. 2020;58(2):e51-e62. Epub 2020/01/22. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2019.09.009.  
48 PubMed PMID: 31959326.
- 49 65. Wang M, Guo Y, Zhang Y, Xie S, Yu Z, Luo J, et al. Promoting healthy lifestyle in  
50 Chinese college students: evaluation of a social media-based intervention applying the

- 1 RE-AIM framework. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2020;75(2):335-44. doi:  
2 10.1038/s41430-020-0643-2.
- 3 66. Krzyzanowski MC, Kizakevich PN, Duren-Winfield V, Eckhoff R, Hampton J, Carr  
4 LTB, et al. Rams Have Heart, a Mobile App Tracking Activity and Fruit and Vegetable  
5 Consumption to Support the Cardiovascular Health of College Students: Development  
6 and Usability Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2020;8(8):e15156.
- 7 67. Reeves TC. Enhancing the worth of instructional technology research through “design  
8 experiments” and other development research strategies. *International perspectives on  
9 instructional technology research for the 21st century*. 2000;27:1-15.
- 10 68. Amiel T, Reeves TC. Design-based research and educational technology: Rethinking  
11 technology and the research agenda. *Journal of educational technology & society*.  
12 2008;11(4):29-40.
- 13 69. Wang F, Hannafin MJ. Design-based research and technology-enhanced learning  
14 environments. *Educational technology research and development*. 2005;53(4):5-23.
- 15 70. Anderson T, Shattuck J. Design-Based Research: A Decade of Progress in Education  
16 Research? *Educational Researcher*. 2012;41:16-25. doi: 10.3102/0013189X11428813.
- 17 71. Cotton W, Lockyer L, Brickell G, editors. A journey through a design-based research  
18 project2009 2009: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education  
19 (AACE).
- 20 72. Barab S, Squire K. Design-based research: Putting a stake in the ground. *The journal of  
21 the learning sciences*. 2004;13(1):1-14.
- 22 73. McKenney S, Reeves TC. Educational design research. *Handbook of research on  
23 educational communications and technology*: Springer; 2014. p. 131-40.
- 24 74. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for  
25 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS medicine*.  
26 2009;6(7):e1000097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.
- 27 75. Van Sluijs EM, McMinn AM, Griffin SJ. Effectiveness of interventions to promote  
28 physical activity in children and adolescents: systematic review of controlled trials. *Bmj*.  
29 2007;335(7622):703. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39320.843947.BE.
- 30 76. Braun V, Clarke V. *Thematic analysis*. 2012.
- 31 77. Morrow JR, Krzewinski-Malone JA, Jackson AW, Bungum TJ, Fitzgerald SJ. American  
32 Adults' Knowledge of Exercise Recommendations. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and  
33 Sport*. 2004;75(3):231-7. doi: 10.1080/02701367.2004.10609156.
- 34 78. Markland D, Tobin V. A modification to the behavioural regulation in exercise  
35 questionnaire to include an assessment of amotivation. *Journal of Sport and Exercise  
36 Psychology*. 2004;26(2):191-6.
- 37 79. D'Abundo ML, Sidman CL, Milroy J, Orsini M, Fiala K. Construct validity of college  
38 students' responses to the behavioral regulation in exercise questionnaire (BREQ-2).  
39 *Recreational Sports Journal*. 2014;38(1):40-9.
- 40 80. Chua BB, Dyson LE, editors. Applying the ISO 9126 model to the evaluation of an e-  
41 learning system. *Proc of ASCILITE*; 2004.
- 42 81. Okazaki K, Okano S, Haga S, Seki A, Suzuki H, Takahashi K. Development and its  
43 Evaluation of the Distance and Interactive Proper System for College Students that  
44 Promotes Physical Activity through the Internet. *Educational technology research*.  
45 2010;33(1-2):85-93.
- 46 82. Sultoni K, Peralta L, Cotton W. Technology-Supported University Courses for  
47 Increasing University Students' Physical Activity Levels: A Systematic Review and Set  
48 of Design Principles for Future Practice. *International Journal of Environmental  
49 Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(11). doi: 10.3390/ijerph18115947.



Figure 3. The schedule of enrolment, interventions, and assessments for the technology-supported physical education course.

TIMEPOINT**	STUDY PERIOD							
	Enrolment	Allocation	Post-allocation				Close-out	
	$-t_1$ (August 2022)	0	Baseline (September 2022)	$t_2$	$t_3$	$t_4$	etc.	Follow Up (January 2023)
<b>ENROLMENT:</b>								
Eligibility screen	X							
Informed consent	X							
Teacher training		X						
Allocation		X						
<b>INTERVENTIONS:</b>								
Technology-supported PE Course			X					X
PE Course Active Control			X					X
<b>ASSESSMENTS:</b>								
IPAQ-SF			X					X
BREQ-2			X					X
Physical activity knowledge quiz			X					X
Fidelity Check			←—————→					
Students FGD								X

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.30.22275769>; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

\*Recommended content can be displayed using various schematic formats. See SPIRIT 2013 Explanation and Elaboration for examples from protocols.

\*\*List specific timepoints in this row.