

**Full title:** Relation between motor competence and academic achievement: the mediating role of fitness and cognition in boys and girls

**Short title:** Motor competence and academic achievement: the mediating role of fitness and cognition

Antonio Fernández-Sánchez<sup>1,2</sup>, Abel Ruiz-Hermosa<sup>1,3\*</sup>, Andrés Redondo-Tébar<sup>1,4</sup>, Ana Díez-Fernández<sup>1,5</sup>, Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno<sup>1,6</sup>, María Eugenia Visier-Alfonso<sup>1,5</sup>, Mairena Sánchez-López<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Social and Health Research Center, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Cuenca, Spain.

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Education, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain.

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Sport Sciences, ACAFYDE, Universidad de Extremadura, Cáceres, Spain.

<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Nursing, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain

<sup>5</sup> Faculty of Nursing, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Cuenca, Spain

<sup>6</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences, Autonomous University of Chile, Talca, Chile.

#### E-mail addresses and ORCID:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <a href="mailto:antonioj.fernandez@uclm.es">antonioj.fernandez@uclm.es</a> (A. Fernández-Sánchez)  | ORCID: 0000-0001-8171-3560   |
| <a href="mailto:mairena.sanchez@uclm.es">mairena.sanchez@uclm.es</a> (M. Sánchez-López)            | ORCID: <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0217-0623">0000-0002-0217-0623</a> |
| <a href="mailto:abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es">abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es</a> (A. Ruiz-Hermosa)           | ORCID: 0000-0002-5127-0591   |
| <a href="mailto:andres.redondo@uclm.es">andres.redondo@uclm.es</a> (A. Redondo-Tébar)              | ORCID: 0000-0001-5920-6159   |
| <a href="mailto:ana.diez@uclm.es">ana.diez@uclm.es</a> (A. Díez-Fernández)                         | ORCID: 0000-0002-7673-986X   |
| <a href="mailto:mariaeugenia.visier@uclm.es">mariaeugenia.visier@uclm.es</a> (M.E. Visier-Alfonso) | ORCID: 0000-0003-0364-8032   |
| <a href="mailto:vicente.martinez@uclm.es">vicente.martinez@uclm.es</a> (V. Martínez-Vizcaíno)      | ORCID: 0000-0001-6121-7893   |

\*Corresponding author: Abel Ruiz-Hermosa PhD.

E-mail: [abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es](mailto:abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es)

**Authors' contributions.** Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno was the principal investigator and obtained the funding. Antonio Fernández-Sánchez was the person who wrote the first draft of the manuscript with the support of Mairena Sánchez-López and Abel Ruiz-Hermosa. Andrés Redondo-Tébar, Ana Díez-Fernández, Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno and María Eugenia Visier-Alfonso gave statistical and epidemiological support. All authors listed on the manuscript have revised and approved the submission of this version of the manuscript and take full responsibility for the manuscript.

**Word count for manuscript:** 4672 words.

**Word count for abstract:** 300 words.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## ABSTRACT

**Introduction.** Good motor competence is linked to better academic achievement in schoolchildren, potentially mediated by fitness and cognition. However, the relative impact of these factors and whether they differ by sex remains unclear. The aim of the present study was to assess the mediating role of fitness components and executive function on this relationship, with a particular focus on sex differences.

**Methods.** This cross-sectional study included 562 schoolchildren (9-11 years, 293 girls) from Cuenca, Spain. We assessed gross motor competence (MABC-2 battery), fitness components (ALPHA battery), executive function (Toolbox battery), academic achievement (mean of language and mathematics grades), weight, height, and sociodemographic variables. Serial multiple mediation models between gross motor competence to AA through fitness and cognition were conducted using the Hayes' PROCESS SPSS macro, both for the total sample and by sex.

**Results.** Both fitness and executive function partially mediated the relationship between gross motor competence and AA. In the total sample, the direct effect explained most of the total effect (51.22% to 72.68%), followed by the cognitive path (19.51% to 30.73%), fitness path (10.84% to 19.02%), and multiple path (4.43% to 9.27%). In boys, only the cognitive path mediated the relationship (56.35% to 68.91%), while in girls, the fitness path (for cardiorespiratory fitness and speed/agility, 19.08% and 20.27%), the cognitive path (limited to upper body strength, 14.92%), and the multiple path (for cardiorespiratory fitness, speed/agility, and lower body strength, 4.93%, 8.31% and 9.43%) were partial mediators.

**Conclusions.** Our results suggest that part of the effect found between gross motor competence and academic achievement in children occurs from improvements in fitness

and executive function. These findings emphasize the need for motor competence programs that target both fitness (especially cardiorespiratory fitness and speed/agility) and executive function to boost academic achievement in children aged 9-11. Additionally, interventions should consider sex-specific differences.

*Keywords:* motor competence, academic achievement, executive function, physical fitness, serial mediation model, schoolchildren.

*Abbreviations:* MC motor competence; GMC, gross motor competence; EF, executive function; CRF, cardiorespiratory fitness; S/A, speed/agility; UBS, upper body strength; LBS, lower body strength; AA, academic achievement; IE, indirect effect.

## INTRODUCTION

Motor competence (MC) can be defined as a person's ability to execute different motor acts, including coordination of fine and gross motor skills that are necessary to manage everyday tasks [1]. There is a growing body of evidence suggesting a positive association between MC and physical health outcomes, including physical fitness and weight status [2]. In addition, MC has been widely recognized as a potential predictor of academic achievement (AA) [3,4]. However, the underlying mechanisms that drive this relationship have not been sufficiently elucidated.

Cognitive processes have been suggested as potential mediators between MC and AA [5]. This association may be attributed to be shared neural pathways and cognitive demands between motor skills and executive function (EF) [6,7]. This is because the same brain regions are partially responsible for the development of MC and EF in childhood [8]. Despite this, few studies have examined the mediating role of EF in this relationship, suggesting that MC exerts a positive influence on AA indirectly through EF [5,9]. However, the evidence on sex differences remains inconclusive. Since one study reported no significant sex differences [10], another found that EF mediated the relationship exclusively in boys [11].

Given the well-established relationship between MC and physical fitness [12], as well as the documented positive association between fitness, cognitive function, and AA [3], it is reasonable to hypothesize that physical fitness could serve as a mediating variable in the relationship between MC and AA. However, to the best of our knowledge, only one study has directly examined this hypothesis, reporting no significant effect [13]. Moreover, while physical fitness is generally positively associated with AA [14], this relationship varies depending on the specific fitness component. Cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF) and speed/agility (S/A) have consistently proven to have a positive effect on AA

[15–17], but the role of muscular strength remains unclear [14,15]. Thus, it is reasonable to posit that the mediating effect of fitness on the MC-AA relationship may differ across fitness components.

It thus appears possible to elucidate the association between MC and AA through two principal paths: the cognitive and the fitness path. Furthermore, a third path may be proposed, termed the ‘multiple path’, which suggests that improvements in MC may result in enhancements in physical fitness, which could, in turn, enhance cognitive function and AA. This multiple path will be analyzed for the first time in this study, thereby providing a new and original viewpoint on the relationship between MC and AA.

Finally, research indicates that boys and girls exhibit distinct trajectories in physical and cognitive development [18], as well as in brain activation during cognitive tasks [19]. Such differences could affect the relationship between MC and its connection to fitness, cognitive functions, and AA [20]. Despite these distinctions, there are no studies specifically analyzing the mediating role of fitness and EF by sex.

It is therefore necessary to conduct further in-depth research into the relationships between MC, fitness components, cognitive abilities, and AA, with a particular focus on potential sex differences. The objective of this study was to examine whether fitness and EF act as mediators in the relationship between gross motor competence (GMC) and AA, and to identify potential differences between boys and girls.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Study design and participants**

The present study is a cross-sectional analysis of the baseline data from a cluster-randomized controlled trial (NCT03236337) to assess the effectiveness of a physical activity intervention program (MOVI-daFit!) on reducing fat mass and cardiovascular

risk and improving physical fitness, EF, and AA among schoolchildren. Ten schools from ten towns in the province of Cuenca, Spain, participated in the study. In all schools, all children belonging to the fourth and fifth grades of primary school (9–11 years old) were invited to participate. The study design, sampling procedures and methods have been fully described elsewhere [21].

The study protocol was approved by The Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the ‘Virgen de la Luz’ Hospital in Cuenca (REG: 2016/PI021). The approval of the principal and the board of governors was sought from each school. The children were informed about the study's objectives and gave their verbal consent to participate, with the principal, researchers, and their peers as witnesses. Additionally, the parents or legal guardians of all participants provided written informed consent.

#### **Instruments and study variables**

The recruitment period for this study began on September 11, 2017, and ended on October 26, 2017. The measurements were conducted by researchers who were trained in advance to standardize the procedures and were blinded to the participants' group assignments.

#### ***Gross motor competence***

Gross motor competence refers to the degree of skilled performance in a wide range of motor tasks as well as the movement coordination and control underlying a particular motor outcome which involves the larger muscle groups [22] and is a prerequisite for child physical activity participation and also for engagement in learning and social activities, including sports and games [23]. To assess GMC, two dimensions (aiming-catching and balance skills) of the validated Spanish version of the Movement Assessment Battery for Children-Second Edition (MABC-2) were used [1] for the age ranges 2 (7-10 years) and 3 (11-16 years). The tasks performed were: 1) Aiming-catching

1 (catching): The child had to throw a tennis ball against the wall and catch it with both hands (9-10 years); The child had to throw a tennis ball against the wall and then catch it using only one hand (11 years). 2) Aiming-catching 2 (throwing): The child had to aim a beanbag into a red circle on a mat (9-10 years); The child had to throw a tennis ball into a red circle on the wall (11 years). 3) Balance 1 (static): Single-board balance - The child had to balance on one foot on the balance board (9-10 years); Two-board balance - The child had to balance on the balance board, ensuring that the heel of one foot and the toes of the other foot touch (11 years). 4) Balance 2 (dynamic): Heel to toe - The child had to walk along a line while the heel of one foot touches the toes of the other foot. (9-10 years); Walking backwards heel to toe - The child had to walk backwards along a line, making sure that the toes of one foot touch the heel of the other (11 years). 5) Balance 3 (dynamic): Hopscotch - The child had to jump forward on one leg from mat to mat starting from a standing position (9-10 years); Zigzag hopping - The child had to jump diagonally from one mat to another on one leg (11 years) [24]. Each test received a raw score (number of catches, number of hits on target, seconds on one leg, number of steps on the line and number of right jumps, respectively) where a higher score indicated a better GMC. The resulting variable, *GMC Total Score*, was calculated as the sum of the z-scores for aiming-catching, static balance, and dynamic balance.

### ***Fitness variables***

Fitness is defined as a set of attributes related to a person's ability to perform physical activities that require aerobic capacity, endurance, strength, or flexibility and is determined mostly by a combination of regular activity and genetically inherited ability [25]. The evidence-based ALPHA-Fitness test battery [26] was used, including the following tests:

*Cardiorespiratory fitness*, using the 20-metre shuttle run test, a valid test to estimate aerobic capacity in children. The children were required to run 20 meters between two lines while keeping pace with the rhythm marked by acoustic signals. The initial speed of 8.5 km/h was increased by 0.5 km/h for each stage (one stage equals one minute). The last half stage completed by the child was considered an indicator of CRF. Maximal oxygen intake (VO<sub>2</sub>max) was estimated by applying the Léger formula [27].

*Speed-agility*, using the 4×10 meter shuttle run test. Children were required to run and turn (shuttle) 10 meters twice at maximum speed (4x10m). Two parallel lines were drawn on the floor. When the start was given, the children ran as fast as possible to the other line and returned to the starting line twice, crossing both lines with both feet. Two attempts were made, with an interval of five minutes between attempts, and the best score was recorded in seconds. A lower score indicated a better S/A.

*Upper Body strength* (UBS), through the handgrip strength test, determined in kilograms using a digital dynamometer with adjustable grip TKK 5401 Grip-DW (Takeya, Tokyo, Japan). The handgrip strength test has high-to-very high construct validity with total muscle strength in healthy children, among other parameters [28]. The test was performed twice with each hand and the arithmetic mean of the four measurements was computed. Handgrip data was normalized by dividing absolute handgrip strength (kg) by body weight (kg).

*Lower Body strength* (LBS), using the standing broad jump test, which measures explosive LBS. The children jumped horizontally to achieve the maximum distance and the best of three attempts was recorded in centimeters.

### ***Executive functions***

Executive functions refer to a family of mental processes that have been categorized in three core functions: inhibitory control (the ability to selectively attend, focusing on



what we choose and suppressing attention to other stimuli), cognitive flexibility (the ability to change perspectives) and working memory (the ability to hold information in mind and mentally working with it) [29]. Three EFs, using the NIH Toolbox software (NIH Toolbox in Spanish, v. 1.8) [30] were assessed. All tests were performed individually in a quiet classroom using a tablet (iPad Pro, Apple, Inc., California, USA). The evaluation tests included in the NIH Toolbox for each cognitive domain are listed as follows:

*Inhibitory control*, using an adaptation of the Flanker test [31]. Participants had to indicate the left-right direction of a centrally shown stimulus while inhibiting their attention to the potentially incongruent stimuli around it. In some trials, the orientation of the flanking stimuli was congruent with the orientation of the central stimulus (> > > > or < < < <,) while in other trials, this orientation was incongruent (> > < > or < < > < <). The NIH Toolbox contained a practice block of trials. If participants passed it, a 20-trial block was presented. These trials consisted of a succession of congruent and incongruent combination of arrows. Using a two-vector method that included both reaction time and accuracy, a final score was calculated for school children who reached a high level of accuracy (>80%), which was as follows:  $(0.25 \times \text{number of correct responses}) + 5 - \log_{10} [(\text{congruent reaction time} + \text{incongruent reaction time}) / 2]$ . A total score considering accuracy was determined for children who scored less than 80%.

*Cognitive flexibility*, using the Dimension Change Card Sort (DCCS) [31]. Participants were shown two target cards and asked to order a group of bivalent test cards, first according to one dimension and then according to the other dimension. After a four-trial practice, children were given a 30-trial block with both ‘shape’ and ‘color’ requirements. Using reaction time and accuracy percentage on preswitch and postswitch, a raw score was determined. Using a two-vector method that integrated both accuracy

and reaction time, a final score was calculated for children who reached a high level of accuracy (>80%) as follows:  $(0.167 \times \text{number of correct responses}) + 5 - \log_{10} [(\text{congruent reaction time} + \text{incongruent reaction time}) / 2]$ . For participants scoring <80%, a total outcome considering accuracy was determined.

*Working memory*, using the List Sorting Working Memory Test [32]. Children were given a group of pictures, and items were presented both auditorily and visually. Then, they were required to repeat the names of the items observed in order of size, from smallest to biggest. The number of items shown in each trial increased by one for each series. This test was made up of two parts. In the first one, all the items belonged to the same category (animals or food items). In the second one, the items from both categories (food items and animals) were presented together, and children had to repeat the items by category and size. The List Sorting “Total Score” was composed of final scores based upon a sum of the total correct trials across the two lists.

The resulting variable, *EF Total Score*, was calculated as the sum of the z-scores for inhibitory control, cognitive flexibility, and working memory.

### ***Academic achievement***

The final grades in language and mathematics, provided by the school administration, were used to determine AA. These subjects were selected because, in Spain, they are considered instrumental subjects, as they serve as a foundation for learning other subjects and help in everyday life and activities. The children’s final grades from the previous academic year were used (range from 1 to 10 score, with 10 being the best grade). The arithmetic mean of the grades in language and mathematics was used in the analysis. In Spain, final grades represent the student’s work across a complete academic year.

### ***Anthropometry***

Weight was measured using a scale (Seca 861, Vogel and Halke, Hamburg, Germany) with the child in light clothing and barefoot. For height, a wall stadiometer (Seca 222, Vogel and Halke) was used with children barefoot and standing upright with their sagittal midline in contact with the backboard. Both weight and height were measured twice, and their arithmetic mean was considered for the analysis. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight (kg) / height (m<sup>2</sup>).

### ***Sociodemographic data***

The age, sex and mother's education level were gathered using a questionnaire administered to the parents. Data on mother's education level as the maximum level of education attained by the children's mothers gathered the validated scale proposed by the Spanish Society of Epidemiology [33] to measure socioeconomic status. This questionnaire includes an item referred to mother's education with six response options: i) no literacy skills; ii) no studies; iii) elementary studies; iv) secondary studies; v) high school; and vi) university studies. In our study, these six categories were collapsed into three, due to the small number of individuals in the lower and upper categories: lower/lower middle (no literacy skills, no studies, and elementary studies), middle (secondary studies) and upper middle/upper (high school and university studies). The mother's education level was used as covariate in the mediation models (as an interval variable), because it has been shown to be a strong predictor of children's AA [34].

### ***Statistical analysis***

Interval variables were summarized as means and standard deviations. The mother's education level was expressed as counts and frequencies. Both statistical (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) and graphical procedures (normal probability plots) were used to evaluate the goodness of fit of variables to a normal distribution and all variables

fitted to a normal distribution. Differences in all variables between boys and girls were tested using Student's t-tests.

Pearson correlation coefficients were estimated to examine the relationship between GMC, CRF, S/A, UBS, LBS, EF Total Score, and AA for the total sample and by sex. Values below 0.1 were defined as trivial, weak in the range 0.1–0.29, moderate in the interval 0.3–0.49, and large when greater than 0.5 [35].

The mediation effect of different fitness components (CRF, S/A, UBS, and LBS) and EF on the relationship between GMC and AA for the total sample and by sex was tested using the PROCESS SPSS Macro, version 4.2, selecting model 6 (serial multiple mediation analysis) and 10,000 bias-corrected bootstrap samples [36]. For this analysis, GMC was entered in the model as the independent variable, the proposed mediators were, consecutively, fitness variables and EF, and AA was included as the dependent variable. Each fitness component was individually entered in a different model: model a, CRF; model b, S/A; model c, UBS; and model d, LBS. In the mediation model, the total (c), and direct effects ( $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ ,  $d_{12}$  and  $c'$ ) were estimated. Additionally, this model examines three indirect effects (IEs) (fitness path, cognitive path, and multiple path) that indicate the change in AA for each unit change in GMC that is mediated by each fitness variable and EF. The IEs were considered significant when the 95% confidence interval did not include zero.

The IE is represented by the path from GMC to AA via mediators (paths a, b, and d). The fitness path ( $a_1$ - $b_1$ ), from GMC to AA via fitness variables (a, CRF; b, S/A; c, UBS; and d, LBS). The cognitive path ( $a_2$ - $b_2$ ), from GMC to AA via EF. Finally, the multiple path ( $d_{12}$ ), from GMC to AA via fitness variables (a, CRF; b, S/A; c, UBS; and d, LBS) and EF. Proposed cut points to quantify effect size were 0.14, 0.36, and 0.51 for small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively [37]. The percentages of mediation

( $P_M$ ) were calculated as (IE/total effect) x 100 to estimate the percentage of the total effect explained by the mediation paths. All analyses were adjusted by age, BMI, and mother's education level.

Data analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 28.0 (IBM® SPSS®, Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.), and the level of significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

## RESULTS

The characteristics of the total sample, as well as by sex, are presented in **Table 1**. Of the 562 schoolchildren involved in the study, 293 were girls (52.14%), with a mean age of 10.02 years ( $SD = \pm 0.71$ ). Boys scored significantly higher on aiming-catching ( $p < 0.001$ ), CRF ( $p < 0.001$ ), S/A ( $p = 0.006$ ), UBS ( $p = 0.004$ ), and LBS ( $p < 0.001$ ) while girls scored significantly higher on static and dynamic balance ( $p < 0.001$ ), and cognitive flexibility ( $p = 0.014$ ).

Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample by sex.

|   | Total Sample<br>(n=562) | Boys<br>(n=269) | Girls<br>(n=293) | p-value |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Sample Characteristics</b>                   |                         |                 |                  |         |
| Age (years)                                     | 10.02 (0.71)            | 10.01 (0.71)    | 10.04 (0.71)     | 0.291   |
| Weight (kg)                                     | 36.55 (9.77)            | 36.62 (9.72)    | 36.48 (9.84)     | 0.433   |
| Height (cm)                                     | 140.91 (7.33)           | 140.99 (7.07)   | 140.84 (7.56)    | 0.407   |
| Body Mass Index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )            | 18.22 (3.78)            | 18.25 (3.86)    | 18.19 (3.72)     | 0.423   |
| <b>Mother's Education Level [n (%)]</b>         |                         |                 |                  |         |
| Lower/lower middle                              | 62 (12.38)              | 28 (11.76)      | 34 (12.93)       | 0.641   |
| Middle  | 221 (44.11)             | 102 (42.86)     | 119 (45.25)      | 0.492   |
| Upper middle/upper                              | 218 (43.51)             | 108 (45.38)     | 110 (41.82)      | 0.548   |
| <b>Gross Motor Competence (GMC)</b>             |                         |                 |                  |         |
| Aiming-Catching (n)                             | 7.13 (1.78)             | 7.76 (1.67)     | 6.55 (1.68)      | < 0.001 |
| Static Balance (s)*                             | 18.47 (8.97)            | 16.80 (8.87)    | 20.02 (8.80)     | < 0.001 |
| Dynamic Balance (p)                             | 9.30 (1.68)             | 8.99 (1.99)     | 9.58 (1.27)      | < 0.001 |
| GMC Total Score <sup>Z</sup>                    | 0.3880 (1.89)           | 0.4123 (2.00)   | 0.3656 (1.79)    | 0.385   |
| <b>Fitness</b>                                  |                         |                 |                  |         |
| Cardiorespiratory Fitness (VO <sub>2</sub> max) | 45.97 (4.61)            | 47.41 (4.98)    | 44.66 (3.81)     | < 0.001 |
| Speed/Agility (s)**                             | 13.71 (1.36)            | 13.56 (1.40)    | 13.85 (1.32)     | 0.006   |
| Upper Body Strength (kg)                        | 12.39 (3.49)            | 12.80 (3.77)    | 12.01 (3.17)     | 0.004   |
| Lower Body Strength (cm)                        | 116.66 (20.71)          | 121.55 (21.41)  | 112.23 (19.04)   | < 0.001 |
| <b>Executive Function (EF)</b>                  |                         |                 |                  |         |
| Inhibitory Control (FT) <sup>‡</sup>            | 19.66 (1.35)            | 19.61 (1.36)    | 19.70 (1.33)     | 0.172   |
| Cognitive Flexibility (DCCS) <sup>§</sup>       | 28.17(3.10)             | 27.87 (3.10)    | 28.44 (3.08)     | 0.014   |
| Working Memory (LSWM)                           | 14.25 (3.18)            | 14.45 (3.31)    | 14.06 (3.04)     | 0.077   |
| EF Total Score <sup>Z</sup>                     | 0.0037 (1.91)           | -0.0030 (1.96)  | 0.0099 (1.88)    | 0.469   |
| <b>Academic Achievement (AA)</b>                |                         |                 |                  |         |

| Language-Mathematics <sup>Δ</sup> | 7.04 (1.73) | 7.01 (1.74) | 7.07 (1.73) | 0.336 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|

Values are mean ± standard deviation, except for mother's education level, which are shown as number and percentages [n (%)]. Abbreviations. GMC = gross motor competence; Test scores: n = number of right attempts; s = seconds; p = punctuation. EF = executive function; FT = flanker task; DCCS = dimensional change card sort test; LSWM = list shorting working memory test. In bold (p-values), statistical signification (p < 0.05).  
<sup>Δ</sup>GMC Total score was calculated from z scores of aiming-catching, static balance and dynamic balance.  
<sup>Σ</sup>EF Total score was calculated from z total scores of inhibitory control, cognitive flexibility and working memory.  
<sup>\*</sup>In Static Balance (seconds), more time indicates better score. <sup>\*\*</sup>In Speed/Agility (seconds), more time indicates worse score.  
<sup>‡</sup>Total score was calculated using a two-vector method that incorporates both accuracy and reaction time. Total score = (0.25 x number correct responses) + 5 - log<sub>10</sub> [(congruent reaction time + incongruent reaction time)/2].  
<sup>§</sup>Total score was calculated using a two-vector method that incorporates both accuracy and reaction time. Total score = (0.167 x number correct responses) + 5 - log<sub>10</sub> [(congruent reaction time + incongruent reaction time)/2].  
<sup>Δ</sup>Mean of the grades in language and mathematics.

The Pearson's correlation coefficients for the total sample, as well as by sex, are shown in **Table 2**. For the total sample, all the fitness variables showed a significant correlation with AA and EF (r values between 0.131 and 0.249, p < 0.01), except between UBS and EF. By sex, all the fitness variables show a significant correlation with AA and EF except between UBS and EF for both sexes, between UBS and AA for girls, and between LBS and AA for boys. In all the fitness variables, the correlation coefficient with both EF and AA was consistently higher in girls compared to boys. Specifically, S/A stands out as the fitness variable with the strongest correlation with EF (r = -0.217 in boys and r = -0.269 in girls; p < 0.01), while CRF exhibits the highest correlation with AA (r = 0.219 in boys and r = 0.317 in girls; p < 0.01). Most of the mentioned associations show weak correlation strength. However, notable moderate strength correlations are observed between CRF and AA (r = 0.317; p < 0.01), as well as between LBS and EF (r = 0.312; p < 0.01), both exclusively in girls.

Table 2. Bivariate correlation coefficients among the study variables for the total sample and by sex.

|                            |       | GMC      | CRF      | Speed/<br>Agility | Upper<br>Body<br>Strength | Lower<br>Body<br>Strength | Executive<br>Function<br>Total Score |
|----------------------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| CRF                        | Total | 0.278**  |          |                   |                           |                           |                                      |
|                            | Boys  | 0.270**  |          |                   |                           |                           |                                      |
|                            | Girls | 0.313**  |          |                   |                           |                           |                                      |
| Speed/Agility <sup>T</sup> | Total | -0.410** | -0.490** |                   |                           |                           |                                      |
|                            | Boys  | -0.441** | -0.487** |                   |                           |                           |                                      |
|                            | Girls | -0.380** | -0.483** |                   |                           |                           |                                      |

|                                   |       |         |         |          |          |         |
|-----------------------------------|-------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|
| Upper Body Strength               | Total | 0.127** | 0.003   | -0.138** |          |         |
|                                   | Boys  | 0.185** | 0.013   | -0.204** |          |         |
|                                   | Girls | 0.055   | -0.095  | -0.042   |          |         |
| Lower Body Strength               | Total | 0.333** | 0.469** | -0.544** | 0.214**  |         |
|                                   | Boys  | 0.354** | 0.497** | -0.620** | 0.311**  |         |
|                                   | Girls | 0.367** | 0.473** | -0.556** | 0.144*   |         |
| Executive Function Total Score    | Total | 0.229** | 0.181** | -0.241** | 0.064    | 0.249** |
|                                   | Boys  | 0.262** | 0.161*  | -0.217** | 0.049    | 0.177** |
|                                   | Girls | 0.194** | 0.233** | -0.269** | 0.083    | 0.312** |
| Academic Achievement <sup>Δ</sup> | Total | 0.225** | 0.246** | -0.237** | -0.113** | 0.131** |
|                                   | Boys  | 0.171** | 0.219** | -0.201** | -0.142*  | 0.061   |
|                                   | Girls | 0.282** | 0.317** | -0.278** | -0.079   | 0.209** |


Abbreviations: GMC = Gross motor competence; CRF = Cardiorespiratory fitness.

<sup>†</sup>In Speed/Agility, lower scores indicate better results (time variable).

<sup>Δ</sup>Mean of the grades in language and mathematics.

\*p < 0.05; \*\*p < 0.01


Multiple mediation models for the total sample indicated a consistent association between GMC and AA across all models, with unstandardized coefficients ranging from 0.203 to 0.205 (p<0.001). Most of this effect was explained by the direct association, with coefficients between 0.105 and 0.149 (p<0.05). Additionally, all three indirect paths (fitness, cognitive, and multiple) were significant for all fitness variables, except for the fitness path in UBS and LBS, and the multiple path in S/A and UBS (**Fig 1**).



Among boys (**Fig 2**) the total effect of GMC on AA was significantly lower, with coefficients ranging from 0.119 to 0.130 (p<0.05) highlighting no direct association between GMC and AA for any of the variables studied. Instead, improvements in AA through GMC consistently occurred via EF (cognitive path). In contrast, among girls, the total effects were significantly higher (0.295 to 0.304, p<0.001), with most of the effect explained by the direct association between GMC and AA, which was significant across



all models, with coefficients ranging from 0.200 to 0.252 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Additionally, for CRF and S/A, both the fitness and multiple paths were significant, while only the cognitive path was significant for UBS, and only the multiple path was significant for LBS.



The total, direct, and IEs of the different paths from the serial multiple mediation analyses, along with the mediation percentages for direct and IEs, are summarized in **Table 3**. Across all models examined, a positive association between GMC and AA was observed. For the total sample, most of the total effect was accounted for the direct effect (51.22% to 72.68%), followed by the IEs of the cognitive path (19.51% to 30.73%), fitness path (10.84% to 19.02%), and multiple path (4.43% to 9.27%). In boys, more than half of the total effect was explained by the IE of the cognitive path (56.35% to 68.91%). In contrast, in girls, the majority of the total effect was attributed to the direct effect of GMC on AA (66.45% to 85.42%), followed by the IEs of the fitness path (19.08% to 20.27%), cognitive path (for UBS only, 14.92%), and multiple path (4.93% to 9.43%).

397



**Table 3.** Total, direct, and indirect effects of the different paths from the serial multiple mediation analyses, investigating fitness and executive functions as mediators between gross motor competence and academic achievement, controlling for age, body mass index, and mother’s education level.

|       |                           | Indirect Effects |                    |                    |                 |        |       |                    |                 |        |       |                    |                 |        |       |                    |
|-------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|--------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|--------|-------|--------------------|
|       | Fitness Mediator Variable | Total Effect (c) | Direct Effect (c') |                    | FITNESS PATH    |        |       |                    | COGNITIVE PATH  |        |       |                    | MULTIPLE PATH   |        |       |                    |
|       |                           |                  | Direct Effect (c') | P <sub>M</sub> (%) | Indirect Effect | 95% CI |       | P <sub>M</sub> (%) | Indirect Effect | 95% CI |       | P <sub>M</sub> (%) | Indirect Effect | 95% CI |       | P <sub>M</sub> (%) |
|       |                           |                  |                    |                    |                 | Lower  | Upper |                    |                 | Lower  | Upper |                    |                 | Lower  | Upper |                    |
| Total | CRF                       | 0.203 (0.038)**  | 0.117 (0.038)*     | 57.64              | 0.022 (0.012)*  | 0.001  | 0.047 | 10.84              | 0.055 (0.017)** | 0.023  | 0.088 | 27.09              | 0.009 (0.005)*  | 0.001  | 0.02  | 4.43               |
|       | S/A                       | 0.205 (0.038)**  | 0.105 (0.039)*     | 51.22              | 0.039 (0.016)*  | 0.008  | 0.072 | 19.02              | 0.040 (0.016)*  | 0.009  | 0.073 | 19.51              |                 |        |       |                    |
|       | UBS                       | 0.205 (0.038)**  | 0.149 (0.036)**    | 72.68              |                 |        |       |                    | 0.063 (0.016)** | 0.032  | 0.097 | 30.73              |                 |        |       |                    |
|       | LBS                       | 0.205 (0.038)**  | 0.141 (0.038)**    | 68.78              |                 |        |       |                    | 0.046 (0.016)*  | 0.016  | 0.079 | 22.44              | 0.019 (0.006)** | 0.009  | 0.033 | 9.27               |
| Boys  | CRF                       | 0.119 (0.054)*   |                    |                    |                 |        |       |                    | 0.082 (0.027)*  | 0.029  | 0.137 | 68.91              |                 |        |       |                    |
|       | S/A                       | 0.126 (0.054)*   |                    |                    |                 |        |       |                    | 0.071 (0.029)*  | 0.018  | 0.130 | 56.35              |                 |        |       |                    |
|       | UBS                       | 0.131 (0.053)*   |                    |                    |                 |        |       |                    | 0.085 (0.027)*  | 0.035  | 0.141 | 64.89              |                 |        |       |                    |
|       | LBS                       | 0.130 (0.054)*   |                    |                    |                 |        |       |                    | 0.080 (0.027)*  | 0.030  | 0.135 | 61.54              |                 |        |       |                    |
| Girls | CRF                       | 0.304 (0.054)**  | 0.204 (0.056)**    | 67.11              | 0.058 (0.027)*  | 0.008  | 0.114 | 19.08              |                 |        |       |                    | 0.015 (0.008)*  | 0.003  | 0.035 | 4.93               |
|       | S/A                       | 0.301 (0.054)**  | 0.200 (0.057)*     | 66.45              | 0.061 (0.025)*  | 0.015  | 0.115 | 20.27              |                 |        |       |                    | 0.025 (0.010)** | 0.008  | 0.047 | 8.31               |
|       | UBS                       | 0.295 (0.055)**  | 0.252 (0.053)**    | 85.42              |                 |        |       |                    | 0.044 (0.020)*  | 0.009  | 0.088 | 14.92              |                 |        |       |                    |
|       | LBS                       | 0.297 (0.054)**  | 0.237 (0.057)**    | 79.80              |                 |        |       |                    |                 |        |       |                    | 0.028 (0.010)** | 0.011  | 0.05  | 9.43               |

Results showed unstandardized coefficients (standard error) and bootstraps confidence 95% confidence interval (CI) on 10000 bootstraps.  
 CRF, cardiorespiratory fitness; S/A, speed/agility; UBS, upper body strength; LBS, lower body strength; P<sub>M</sub>, percentage of mediation. \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.001.

## DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first study to use multiple mediation models to examine the influence of physical fitness components and EF on the relationship between GMC and AA. Our analyses indicate that the fitness path (for CRF and S/A), the cognitive path (across all fitness components), and the multiple path (for CRF and LBS) partially mediated the relationship between GMC and AA in primary schoolchildren even after controlling for age, BMI and mother's education level. Moreover, significant sex differences were also found, with EF being the only mediator of this relationship in boys, whereas fitness variables, particularly CRF and S/A, were found to be the main mediators in girls.

Compared to previous studies, our findings agree with those obtained by Schmidt et al. [9], who reported that motor ability predicted AA fully mediated through EF performance in a longitudinal study with children aged 10 to 12 years using structural equation models, and with a previous study by our group that found that different domains of EF acted as a partial mediator in this relationship [11]. Similarly, findings by Cadoret et al. [5], support a mediation model in which the relationship between motor proficiency and AA is mediated by cognitive ability in 7-year-old children.

To our knowledge, only one study [13] has investigated the mediating role of CRF between MC and AA in Finnish schoolchildren, which limits the comparability of our results. This study examined whether parent-reported MC at 8 years, predicts AA (grades) via CRF (cycle ergometer test) at 16 years. In contrast to our data, this study found that CRF did not mediate this relationship. These differences could be explained by the different instruments and predictive methodologies used to evaluate CRF, MC, and AA, as well as changes in educational level and the transformations that occur during puberty.

However, further studies are needed to gain a deeper understanding of the mediating role of fitness in the MC-AA relationship.

Our findings also suggest that improvements in GMC lead to increased physical fitness, which, in turn, enhances EF, ultimately improving AA in schoolchildren. This multiple mediation path showed that improving AA through fitness and EF was effective for CRF and LBS in the total sample, and for CRF, S/A, and LBS in girls. These findings highlight the importance of designing motor activities/games that improve both the components of physical fitness (especially CRF and S/A) and the mental skills of EF in programs focused on GMC to improve AA in children aged 9-11 years.

Our study found distinct sex differences in the relationship between GMC and AA. For girls, this relationship is complex, with direct links and several mediating paths through fitness (CRF and S/A), cognition (UBS), and multiple path (CRF, S/A, and LBS). In boys, however, the relationship is solely mediated by the cognitive path, supporting prior research by Fernández-Sánchez et al. [11], but contrasting with findings by Lopes et al. [10], which reported no significant sex differences. The direct association between GMC and AA in girls, along with the mediation via physical fitness, might suggests a more integrated development of physical and cognitive domains in females compared to males. These differences could be based in biological and sociocultural factors that influence the development of motor skills and cognitive functions in boys and girls [38], such as the different rates of biological maturation [39] and brain development [40,41], as well as gender biases in activities performed [42]. Another possible explanation for these sex differences could be due to the fact that boys and girls use different circuits and molecular mechanisms to solve the same cognitive problems. Consequently, although general ability may be the same, it is unlikely that the strategies used by boys and girls

rely on identical neurobiological mechanisms [43]. Nevertheless, given the scarcity of studies with a particular focus on sex differences, more research is needed.

With evidence that the fitness path, cognitive path, and multiple path all act as mediators on the relationship between GMC and AA, the question arises as to which of these three paths is the most influential mediator of this relationship. In the total sample, the cognitive path is the predominant mediator, followed by the fitness path and the multiple path. When analyzed by sex, for boys, only the cognitive path mediates this relationship, whereas for girls, the fitness path is the most predominant mediator, followed by the cognitive path and the multiple path. Our findings suggest the existence of a greater preponderance of the cardiovascular hypothesis [44] in the mediating mechanisms in girls, while the cognitive hypothesis [45,46] better explains these mechanisms in boys. This could be due to significant sex differences previously mentioned, especially at 9-10 years, an age at which these differences are more pronounced [47]. These different underlying mechanisms suggest that the impact of GMC on enhancing AA may vary depending on the type of physical activity, specifically whether it is cognitively engaging versus oriented towards fitness.

Finally, our results suggest that CRF and S/A act as significant mediators of cognitive benefits, while the role of muscular strength remains unclear. This could be due to different biological and neurological mechanisms described in the literature. Specifically, CRF is associated with angiogenesis in the motor cortex and increased cerebral blood flow, which enhances brain vascularization and could positively impact cognitive performance [48]. Improvements in S/A could enhance attention [49] and speed nerve impulse conduction, influencing brain processing speed [15]. These factors may improve the spinal cord function, causing synaptogenesis, increasing the BDNF and the reorganization of movement representations within the motor cortex [50]. This combined

set of neural changes could positively impact on cognition [50] and, subsequently, on AA [15]. However, the relationship between muscle strength and cognition and AA remains equivocal. While some studies report positive correlations [51,52], others find no significant relationship [53,54]. Therefore, further research is needed to clarify the influence of physical fitness components on cognitive and academic outcomes.

## Limitations

The present study has some limitations to be described. First, its cross-sectional design limits our ability to infer causality. Longitudinal studies are needed to establish causal relationships and to understand the developmental trajectories of these variables. Nevertheless, the temporality proposed in our models is consistent with the current knowledge about the relationship between GMC, fitness, EF, and AA [5,9,11,55,56]. Second, the reliance on school-based assessments of AA may not capture the full spectrum of academic skills. Although mathematics and language in primary education are key cross-curricular areas for the remaining subjects and other academic competences. Third, the study does not consider potential behavior-related confounders, moderators, or mediators such as physical activity or sleep. Finally, even though the analysis in this study was controlled for some potential confounders, neither visual acuity nor adiposity was controlled for, and both are known to be health conditions affecting the performance in motor skills tests [57–59].

## Conclusions

Our results suggest that a significant proportion of the effect found between GMC and AA in children is due to improvements in fitness (CRF and S/A) and EF. These findings highlight the need for motor skills programs that target both fitness (particularly CRF and S/A) and EF to improve AA. Furthermore, the sex differences observed in the

mediation pathways highlight the need for sex-sensitive approaches in interventions. Boys may benefit from engaging in activities that combine physical activity with high cognitive demands, such as perceptual-motor tasks. Conversely, girls may benefit from prioritizing activities that focus on improving physical fitness.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the schools, families, and children for their enthusiastic participation in the study. We thank all membership of the Cuenca Study Group, who helped to make this study possible: Carlos Berlanga-Macías, Blanca Notario-Pacheco, María Jesús Pardo-Guijarro, Celia Álvarez-Bueno, Marta Nieto-López, Alberto González-García, Jorge Cañete García-Prieto, Ana Torres-Costoso, Antonio García-Hermoso, Caterina Pesce, and Ricardo Cuevas-Campos.

## REFERENCES

1. Henderson SE, Sugden D, Barnett AL. Movement Assessment Battery for Children-2. London, UK: The Psychological Corporation; 2007 [cited 2023 Jan 23]. Available from: <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/t55281-000>
2. Barnett LM, Webster EK, Hulteen RM, De Meester A, Valentini NC, Lenoir M, et al. Through the Looking Glass: A Systematic Review of Longitudinal Evidence, Providing New Insight for Motor Competence and Health. *Sports Med.* 2022 Apr 1;52(4):875–920.
3. Haapala EA. Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Motor Skills in Relation to Cognition and Academic Performance in Children – A Review. *J Hum Kinet.* 2013 Mar 28;36:55–68.
4. Syväoja HJ, Joensuu L, Kallio J, Hakonen H, Hillman CH, Tammelin TH. The Longitudinal Associations of Fitness and Motor Skills with Academic Achievement. Kankaanpää A, editor. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2019 Oct;51(10):2050–7.
5. Cadoret G, Bigras N, Duval S, Lemay L, Tremblay T, Lemire J. The mediating role of cognitive ability on the relationship between motor proficiency and early academic achievement in children. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2018 Feb;57:149–57.
6. Best JR. Effects of Physical Activity on Children's Executive Function: Contributions of Experimental Research on Aerobic Exercise. *Dev Rev DR.* 2010 Dec;30(4):331–551.
7. Ridler K, Veijola JM, Tanskanen P, Miettunen J, Chitnis X, Suckling J, et al. Fronto-cerebellar systems are associated with infant motor and adult executive functions in healthy adults but not in schizophrenia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2006 Oct 17;103(42):15651–6.

8. Diamond A. Close Interrelation of Motor Development and Cognitive Development and of the Cerebellum and Prefrontal Cortex. *Child Dev.* 2000;71(1):44–56.
9. Schmidt M, Egger F, Benzing V, Jäger K, Conzelmann A, Roebbers CM, et al. Disentangling the relationship between children’s motor ability, executive function and academic achievement. *PloS One.* 2017;12(8):e0182845.
10. Lopes L, Santos R, Pereira B, Lopes VP. Associations between gross motor coordination and academic achievement in elementary school children. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2013 Feb;32(1):9–20.
11. Fernández-Sánchez A, Redondo-Tébar A, Sánchez-López M, Visier-Alfonso ME, Muñoz-Rodríguez JR, Martínez-Vizcaíno V. Sex differences on the relation among gross motor competence, cognition, and academic achievement in children. *Scand J Psychol.* 2022;63(5):504–12.
12. Haga M. The relationship between physical fitness and motor competence in children. *Child Care Health Dev.* 2008;34(3):329–34.
13. Kantomaa MT, Stamatakis E, Kankaanpää A, Kaakinen M, Rodriguez A, Taanila A, et al. Physical activity and obesity mediate the association between childhood motor function and adolescents’ academic achievement. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2013 Jan 29;110(5):1917–22.
14. Santana CCA, Azevedo LB, Cattuzzo MT, Hill JO, Andrade LP, Prado WL. Physical fitness and academic performance in youth: A systematic review. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2017;27(6):579–603.
15. Esteban-Cornejo I, Tejero-González CM, Martínez-Gómez D, del-Campo J, González-Galo A, Padilla-Moledo C, et al. Independent and Combined Influence of the Components of Physical Fitness on Academic Performance in Youth. *J Pediatr.* 2014 Aug 1;165(2):306–312.e2.
16. Ruiz-Ariza A, Grao-Cruces A, de Loureiro NEM, Martínez-López EJ. Influence of physical fitness on cognitive and academic performance in adolescents: A systematic review from 2005–2015. *Int Rev Sport Exerc Psychol.* 2017 Jan 1;10(1):108–33.
17. Sardinha LB, Marques A, Minderico C, Palmeira A, Martins S, Santos D, et al. Longitudinal relationship between cardiorespiratory fitness and academic achievement. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016 May;48(5):839–44.
18. Miller DI, Halpern DF. The new science of cognitive sex differences. *Trends Cogn Sci.* 2014 Jan;18(1):37–45.
19. Bell EC, Willson MC, Wilman AH, Dave S, Silverstone PH. Males and females differ in brain activation during cognitive tasks. *NeuroImage.* 2006 Apr 1;30(2):529–38.
20. Zayed K, Jansen P. Gender Differences and the Relationship of Motor, Cognitive and Academic Achievement in Omani Primary School-Aged Children. *Front Psychol [Internet].* 2018 [cited 2024 Jan 8];9. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02477>
21. Martínez-Vizcaíno V, Álvarez-Bueno C, Cavero-Redondo I, Pozuelo-Carrascosa DP, Garrido-Miguel M, Martínez-Hortelano JA, et al. MOVI-daFIT! Intervention: Rationale and design of a cluster randomized controlled trial testing the effects on improving adiposity, cognition, and subclinical atherosclerosis by increasing cardiorespiratory fitness in children. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2019 Mar;98(9):e14737.




- 573 22. D'Hondt E, Deforche B, Gentier I, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Vaeyens R, Philippaerts R, et al. A  
574 longitudinal analysis of gross motor coordination in overweight and obese children versus  
575 normal-weight peers. *Int J Obes* 2005. 2013 Jan;37(1):61–7.
- 576 23. Cameron CE, Cottone EA, Murrah WM, Grissmer DW. How Are Motor Skills Linked to  
577 Children's School Performance and Academic Achievement? *Child Dev Perspect*.  
578 2016;10(2):93–8.
- 579 24. Movement Assessment Battery for Children 2nd Edition. [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Jan  
580 24]. Available from: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_FucZyMY\\_ug](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_FucZyMY_ug)
- 581 25. Ortega FB, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Lee D chul, Ruiz JR, Blair SN, Sui X. Fitness and Fatness  
582 as Health Markers through the Lifespan: An Overview of Current Knowledge. *Prog Prev*  
583 *Med*. 2018 Apr;3(2):e0013.
- 584 26. Ruiz JR, Castro-Piñero J, España-Romero V, Artero EG, Ortega FB, Cuenca MM, et al.  
585 Field-based fitness assessment in young people: the ALPHA health-related fitness test  
586 battery for children and adolescents. *Br J Sports Med*. 2011 May 1;45(6):518–24.
- 587 27. Léger LA, Mercier D, Gadoury C, Lambert J. The multistage 20 metre shuttle run test for  
588 aerobic fitness. *J Sports Sci*. 1988 Jun 1;6(2):93–101.
- 589 28. Wind AE, Takken T, Helders PJM, Engelbert RHH. Is grip strength a predictor for total  
590 muscle strength in healthy children, adolescents, and young adults? *Eur J Pediatr*. 2010  
591 Mar;169(3):281–7.
- 592 29. Diamond A. Executive functions. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2013;64:135–68.
- 593 30. Weintraub S, Bauer PJ, Zelazo PD, Wallner-Allen K, Dikmen SS, Heaton RK, et al. I. NIH  
594 Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB): introduction and pediatric data. *Monogr Soc Res Child*  
595 *Dev*. 2013 Aug;78(4):1–15.
- 596 31. Zelazo PD, Anderson JE, Richler J, Wallner-Allen K, Beaumont JL, Weintraub S. II. NIH  
597 Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB): measuring executive function and attention. *Monogr Soc*  
598 *Res Child Dev*. 2013 Aug;78(4):16–33.
- 599 32. Tulsky DS, Carlozzi NE, Chevalier N, Espy KA, Beaumont JL, Mungas D. V. NIH  
600 Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB): measuring working memory. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev*.  
601 2013 Aug;78(4):70–87.
- 602 33. Domingo-Salvany A, Regidor E, Alonso J, Alvarez-Dardet C. [Proposal for a social class  
603 measure. Working Group of the Spanish Society of Epidemiology and the Spanish Society  
604 of Family and Community Medicine]. *Aten Primaria*. 2000 Mar 31;25(5):350–63.
- 605 34. Crede J, Wirthwein L, McElvany N, Steinmayr R. Adolescents' academic achievement and  
606 life satisfaction: the role of parents' education. *Front Psychol*. 2015;6:52.
- 607 35. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. Lawrence Erlbaum  
608 Associates Publishers; 1988.
- 609 36. Hayes AF. *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: a*  
610 *regression-based approach*. Second edition. New York: Guilford Press; 2018. 692 p.  
611 (Methodology in the social sciences).
- 612 37. Cheung MWL. Comparison of methods for constructing confidence intervals of  
613 standardized indirect effects. *Behav Res Methods*. 2009 May 1;41(2):425–38.




38. Riva D. Sex and gender difference in cognitive and behavioral studies in developmental age: An introduction. *J Neurosci Res*. 2023;101(5):543–52.
39. Machado-Rodrigues AMM, Silva MJC e, Mota J, Cumming SP, Sherar LB, Neville H, et al. Confounding Effect of Biologic Maturation on Sex Differences in Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior in Adolescents. 2010 Aug 1 [cited 2024 Nov 1]; Available from: <https://journals.humankinetics.com/view/journals/pes/22/3/article-p442.xml>
40. De Bellis MD, Keshavan MS, Beers SR, Hall J, Frustaci K, Masalehdan A, et al. Sex Differences in Brain Maturation during Childhood and Adolescence. *Cereb Cortex*. 2001 Jun 1;11(6):552–7.
41. Lenroot RK, Giedd JN. Sex differences in the adolescent brain. *Brain Cogn*. 2010 Feb 1;72(1):46–55.
42. Abel T, Graf N, Niemann S. Gender bias in the assessment of physical activity in population studies. *Soz- Präventivmedizin*. 2001 Jul 1;46(4):268–72.
43. Grissom, Reyes. Let’s call the whole thing off: evaluating gender and sex differences in executive function. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2019 Jan;44(1):86–96.
44. de Greeff JW, Bosker RJ, Oosterlaan J, Visscher C, Hartman E. Effects of physical activity on executive functions, attention and academic performance in preadolescent children: a meta-analysis. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2018 May 1;21(5):501–7.
45. Diamond AB. The Cognitive Benefits of Exercise in Youth. *Curr Sports Med Rep*. 2015;14(4):320–6.
46. Howie EK, Pate RR. Physical activity and academic achievement in children: A historical perspective. *J Sport Health Sci*. 2012 Dec 1;1(3):160–9.
47. Butterfield SA, Angell RM, Mason CA. Age and Sex Differences in Object Control Skills by Children Ages 5 to 14. *Percept Mot Skills* [Internet]. 2012 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Jun 22]; Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.2466/10.11.25.PMS.114.1.261-274>
48. Hillman CH, Erickson KI, Kramer AF. Be smart, exercise your heart: exercise effects on brain and cognition. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2008 Jan;9(1):58–65.
49. Budde H, Voelcker-Rehage C, Pietraßyk-Kendziorra S, Ribeiro P, Tidow G. Acute coordinative exercise improves attentional performance in adolescents. *Neurosci Lett*. 2008 Aug 22;441(2):219–23.
50. Adkins DL, Boychuk J, Remple MS, Kleim JA. Motor training induces experience-specific patterns of plasticity across motor cortex and spinal cord. *J Appl Physiol Bethesda Md* 1985. 2006 Dec;101(6):1776–82.
51. Coe DP, Peterson T, Blair C, Schutten MC, Peddie H. Physical Fitness, Academic Achievement, and Socioeconomic Status in School-Aged Youth. *J Sch Health*. 2013;83(7):500–7.
52. Van Dusen DP, Kelder SH, Kohl III HW, Ranjit N, Perry CL. Associations of Physical Fitness and Academic Performance Among Schoolchildren\*. *J Sch Health*. 2011;81(12):733–40.

53. Castelli DM, Hillman CH, Buck SM, Erwin HE. Physical Fitness and Academic Achievement in Third- and Fifth-Grade Students. *J Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2007 Apr 1;29(2):239–52.
54. Chen LJ, Fox KR, Ku PW, Taun CY. Fitness change and subsequent academic performance in adolescents. *J Sch Health*. 2013 Sep;83(9):631–8.
55. Aadland KN, Moe VF, Aadland E, Anderssen SA, Resaland GK, Ommundsen Y. Relationships between physical activity, sedentary time, aerobic fitness, motor skills and executive function and academic performance in children. *Ment Health Phys Act*. 2017 Mar 1;12:10–8.
56. Álvarez-Bueno C, Pesce C, Cavero-Redondo I, Sánchez-López M, Martínez-Hortelano JA, Martínez-Vizcaíno V. The Effect of Physical Activity Interventions on Children's Cognition and Metacognition: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2017 Sep 1;56(9):729–38.
57. Bakke HA, Cavalcante WA, Oliveira IS de, Sarinho SW, Cattuzzo MT. Assessment of Motor Skills in Children With Visual Impairment: A Systematic and Integrative Review. *Clin Med Insights Pediatr*. 2019 Jan 1;13:1179556519838287.
58. Cheng J, East P, Blanco E, Sim EK, Castillo M, Lozoff B, et al. Obesity leads to declines in motor skills across childhood. *Child Care Health Dev*. 2016;42(3):343–50.
59. Houwen S, Visscher C, Hartman E, Lemmink KAPM. Gross Motor Skills and Sports Participation of Children With Visual Impairments. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. 2007 Mar 1;78(2):16–23.


## a) Cardiorespiratory Fitness (CRF)




## b) Speed/Agility (S/A)



## c) Upper Body Strength (UBS)



## d) Lower Body Strength (LBS)





Figure



# BOYS

# GIRLS



## a) Cardiorespiratory Fitness (CRF)





## b) Speed/Agility (S/A)



## c) Upper Body Strength (UBS)



## d) Lower Body Strength (LBS)



Figure