

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14

15

16 **E-mail addresses and ORCID:**

17

18 [antonioj.fernandez@uclm.es](mailto:antonioj.fernandez@uclm.es) (A. Fernández-Sánchez) ORCID: 0000-0001-8171-3560

19 [mairena.sanchez@uclm.es](mailto:mairena.sanchez@uclm.es) (M. Sánchez-López) ORCID: [0000-0002-0217-0623](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0217-0623)

20 [abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es](mailto:abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es) (A. Ruiz-Hermosa) ORCID: 0000-0002-5127-0591

21 [andres.redondo@uclm.es](mailto:andres.redondo@uclm.es) (A. Redondo-Tébar) ORCID: 0000-0001-5920-6159

22 [ana.diez@uclm.es](mailto:ana.diez@uclm.es) (A. Díez-Fernández) ORCID: 0000-0002-7673-986X

23 [mariaeugenia.visier@uclm.es](mailto:mariaeugenia.visier@uclm.es) (M.E. Visier-Alfonso) ORCID: 0000-0003-0364-8032

24 [vicente.martinez@uclm.es](mailto:vicente.martinez@uclm.es) (V. Martínez-Vizcaíno) ORCID: 0000-0001-6121-7893

25

26

27 *\*Corresponding author: Abel Ruiz-Hermosa PhD.*

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

29

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

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

38 ***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.

39 **ABSTRACT**

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

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

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

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

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

67

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

70

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

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

## 84 INTRODUCTION

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

92 Cognitive processes have been suggested as potential mediators between MC and  
93 AA [5]. This association may be attributed to be shared neural pathways and cognitive  
94 demands between motor skills and executive function (EF) [6,7]. This is because the same  
95 brain regions are partially responsible for the development of MC and EF in childhood  
96 [8]. Despite this, few studies have examined the mediating role of EF in this relationship,  
97 suggesting that MC exerts a positive influence on AA indirectly through EF [5,9].  
98 However, the evidence on sex differences remains inconclusive. Since one study reported  
99 no significant sex differences [10], another found that EF mediated the relationship  
100 exclusively in boys [11].

101 Given the well-established relationship between MC and physical fitness [12], as  
102 well as the documented positive association between fitness, cognitive function, and AA  
103 [3], it is reasonable to hypothesize that physical fitness could serve as a mediating variable  
104 in the relationship between MC and AA. However, to the best of our knowledge, only  
105 one study has directly examined this hypothesis, reporting no significant effect [13].  
106 Moreover, while physical fitness is generally positively associated with AA [14], this  
107 relationship varies depending on the specific fitness component. Cardiorespiratory fitness  
108 (CRF) and speed/agility (S/A) have consistently proven to have a positive effect on AA

109 [15–17], but the role of muscular strength remains unclear [14,15]. Thus, it is reasonable  
110 to posit that the mediating effect of fitness on the MC-AA relationship may differ across  
111 fitness components.

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

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

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

## 128 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 129 **Study design and participants**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

158 1 (*catching*): The child had to throw a tennis ball against the wall and catch it with both  
159 hands (9-10 years); The child had to throw a tennis ball against the wall and then catch it  
160 using only one hand (11 years). 2) Aiming-catching 2 (*throwing*): The child had to aim a  
161 beanbag into a red circle on a mat (9-10 years); The child had to throw a tennis ball into  
162 a red circle on the wall (11 years). 3) Balance 1 (*static*): Single-board balance - The child  
163 had to balance on one foot on the balance board (9-10 years); Two-board balance - The  
164 child had to balance on the balance board, ensuring that the heel of one foot and the toes  
165 of the other foot touch (11 years). 4) Balance 2 (*dynamic*): Heel to toe - The child had to  
166 walk along a line while the heel of one foot touches the toes of the other foot. (9-10 years);  
167 Walking backwards heel to toe - The child had to walk backwards along a line, making  
168 sure that the toes of one foot touch the heel of the other (11 years). 5) Balance 3 (*dynamic*):  
169 Hopscotch - The child had to jump forward on one leg from mat to mat starting from a  
170 standing position (9-10 years); Zigzag hopping - The child had to jump diagonally from  
171 one mat to another on one leg (11 years) [24]. Each test received a raw score (number of  
172 catches, number of hits on target, seconds on one leg, number of steps on the line and  
173 number of right jumps, respectively) where a higher score indicated a better GMC. The  
174 resulting variable, *GMC Total Score*, was calculated as the sum of the z-scores for aiming-  
175 catching, static balance, and dynamic balance.

### 176 ***Fitness variables***

177 Fitness is defined as a set of attributes related to a person's ability to perform  
178 physical activities that require aerobic capacity, endurance, strength, or flexibility and is  
179 determined mostly by a combination of regular activity and genetically inherited ability  
180 [25]. The evidence-based ALPHA-Fitness test battery [26] was used, including the  
181 following tests:

182 *Cardiorespiratory fitness*, using the 20-metre shuttle run test, a valid test to estimate  
183 aerobic capacity in children. The children were required to run 20 meters between two  
184 lines while keeping pace with the rhythm marked by acoustic signals. The initial speed of  
185 8.5 km/h was increased by 0.5 km/h for each stage (one stage equals one minute). The  
186 last half stage completed by the child was considered an indicator of CRF. Maximal  
187 oxygen intake ( $VO_2\text{max}$ ) was estimated by applying the Léger formula [27].

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

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

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

#### 204 ***Executive functions***

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



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

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

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

232 and reaction time, a final score was calculated for children who reached a high level of  
233 accuracy (>80%) as follows:  $(0.167 \times \text{number of correct responses}) + 5 - \log_{10}$   
234  $[(\text{congruent reaction time} + \text{incongruent reaction time}) / 2]$ . For participants scoring  
235 <80%, a total outcome considering accuracy was determined.

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

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

#### 247 *Academic achievement*

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

#### 256 *Anthropometry*

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

### 263 ***Sociodemographic data***

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

### 276 **Statistical analysis**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 311 RESULTS

312 The characteristics of the total sample, as well as by sex, are presented in **Table**  
 313 **1**. Of the 562 schoolchildren involved in the study, 293 were girls (52.14%), with a mean  
 314 age of 10.02 years (SD = ± 0.71). Boys scored significantly higher on aiming-catching ( $p$   
 315 < 0.001), CRF ( $p < 0.001$ ), S/A ( $p = 0.006$ ), UBS ( $p = 0.004$ ), and LBS ( $p < 0.001$ ) while  
 316 girls scored significantly higher on static and dynamic balance ( $p < 0.001$ ), and cognitive  
 317 flexibility ( $p = 0.014$ ).

318 Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample by sex.

	Total Sample (n=562)	Boys (n=269)	Girls (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)	< <b>0.001</b>
Static Balance (s)*	18.47 (8.97)	16.80 (8.87)	20.02 (8.80)	< <b>0.001</b>
Dynamic Balance (p)	9.30 (1.68)	8.99 (1.99)	9.58 (1.27)	< <b>0.001</b>
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)	< <b>0.001</b>
Speed/Agility (s)**	13.71 (1.36)	13.56 (1.40)	13.85 (1.32)	<b>0.006</b>
Upper Body Strength (kg)	12.39 (3.49)	12.80 (3.77)	12.01 (3.17)	<b>0.004</b>
Lower Body Strength (cm)	116.66 (20.71)	121.55 (21.41)	112.23 (19.04)	< <b>0.001</b>
<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)	<b>0.014</b>
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
-----------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------

319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332

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>Z</sup>GMC Total score was calculated from z scores of aiming-catching, static balance and dynamic balance.  
<sup>Z</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.

333           The Pearson's correlation coefficients for the total sample, as well as by sex, are  
334 shown in **Table 2**. For the total sample, all the fitness variables showed a significant  
335 correlation with AA and EF (r values between 0.131 and 0.249, p < 0.01), except between  
336 UBS and EF. By sex, all the fitness variables show a significant correlation with AA and  
337 EF except between UBS and EF for both sexes, between UBS and AA for girls, and  
338 between LBS and AA for boys. In all the fitness variables, the correlation coefficient with  
339 both EF and AA was consistently higher in girls compared to boys. Specifically, S/A  
340 stands out as the fitness variable with the strongest correlation with EF (r = -0.217 in boys  
341 and r = -0.269 in girls; p < 0.01), while CRF exhibits the highest correlation with AA (r  
342 = 0.219 in boys and r = 0.317 in girls; p < 0.01). Most of the mentioned associations show  
343 weak correlation strength. However, notable moderate strength correlations are observed  
344 between CRF and AA (r = 0.317; p < 0.01), as well as between LBS and EF (r = 0.312; p  
345 < 0.01), both exclusively in girls.

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

		GMC	CRF	Speed/ Agility	Upper Body Strength	Lower Body Strength	Executive Function 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**	0.417**
	Boys	0.171**	0.219**	-0.201**	-0.142*	0.061	0.506**
	Girls	0.282**	0.317**	-0.278**	-0.079	0.209**	0.331**

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

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

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

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

351

352 Multiple mediation models for the total sample indicated a consistent association  
 353 between GMC and AA across all models, with unstandardized coefficients ranging from  
 354 0.203 to 0.205 (p<0.001). Most of this effect was explained by the direct association, with  
 355 coefficients between 0.105 and 0.149 (p<0.05). Additionally, all three indirect paths  
 356 (fitness, cognitive, and multiple) were significant for all fitness variables, except for the  
 357 fitness path in UBS and LBS, and the multiple path in S/A and UBS (**Fig 1**).


358  
 359 — Significant effect  
 360 - - - Non-significant effect  
 361 \*p < 0.05; \*\*p < 0.001  
 362 Fitness path  
 363 Cognitive path  
 364 Multiple path  
 365  
 366  
 367

**Fig 1. Serial multiple mediation model (total sample).** Association between gross motor competence (independent variable) and academic achievement (dependent variable), with different fitness components (CRF, S/A, UBS and LBS) and executive functions as mediators, controlling for age, body mass index and mother's education level. Values for the a<sub>1</sub>, a<sub>2</sub>, b<sub>1</sub>, b<sub>2</sub> and d<sub>12</sub> paths are expressed as the unstandardized regression coefficients (standard error). Values c and c' express total and direct effect, respectively. GMC gross motor competence, CRF cardiorespiratory fitness, S/A speed/agility, UBS upper body strength, LBS lower body strength, EF executive function, AA academic achievement.

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

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

377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385



**Fig 2. Serial multiple mediation model (boys and girls).** Association between gross motor competence (independent variable) and academic achievement (dependent variable), with different fitness components (CRF, S/A, UBS and LBS) and executive functions as mediators, controlling for age, body mass index and mother's education level. Values for the  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and  $d_{12}$  paths are expressed as the unstandardized regression coefficients (standard error). Values  $c$  and  $c'$  express total and direct effect, respectively. GMC gross motor competence, CRF cardiorespiratory fitness, S/A speed/agility, UBS upper body strength, LBS lower body strength, EF executive function, AA academic achievement.

386  
387

The total, direct, and IEs of the different paths from the serial multiple mediation  
388 analyses, along with the mediation percentages for direct and IEs, are summarized in  
389 **Table 3**. Across all models examined, a positive association between GMC and AA was  
390 observed. For the total sample, most of the total effect was accounted for the direct effect  
391 (51.22% to 72.68%), followed by the IEs of the cognitive path (19.51% to 30.73%),  
392 fitness path (10.84% to 19.02%), and multiple path (4.43% to 9.27%). In boys, more than  
393 half of the total effect was explained by the IE of the cognitive path (56.35% to 68.91%).  
394 In contrast, in girls, the majority of the total effect was attributed to the direct effect of  
395 GMC on AA (66.45% to 85.42%), followed by the IEs of the fitness path (19.08% to  
396 20.27%), cognitive path (for UBS only, 14.92%), and multiple path (4.93% to 9.43%).

397



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

Fitness Mediator Variable	Total Effect (c)	Indirect Effects														
		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		
<b>Total</b>	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
<b>Boys</b>	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				
<b>Girls</b>	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

400 Results showed unstandardized coefficients (standard error) and bootstraps confidence 95% confidence interval (CI) on 10000 bootstraps.  
 401 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.

## 402 **DISCUSSION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

475 set of neural changes could positively impact on cognition [50] and, subsequently, on AA  
476 [15]. However, the relationship between muscle strength and cognition and AA remains  
477 equivocal. While some studies report positive correlations [51,52], others find no  
478 significant relationship [53,54]. Therefore, further research is needed to clarify the  
479 influence of physical fitness components on cognitive and academic outcomes.

## 480 **Limitations**

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

## 494 **Conclusions**

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

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

### 503 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

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

### 510 **REFERENCES**

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

- 530 8. Diamond A. Close Interrelation of Motor Development and Cognitive Development and of  
531 the Cerebellum and Prefrontal Cortex. *Child Dev.* 2000;71(1):44–56.
- 532 9. Schmidt M, Egger F, Benzing V, Jäger K, Conzelmann A, Roebers CM, et al.  
533 Disentangling the relationship between children’s motor ability, executive function and  
534 academic achievement. *PloS One.* 2017;12(8):e0182845.
- 535 10. Lopes L, Santos R, Pereira B, Lopes VP. Associations between gross motor coordination  
536 and academic achievement in elementary school children. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2013  
537 Feb;32(1):9–20.
- 538 11. Fernández-Sánchez A, Redondo-Tébar A, Sánchez-López M, Visier-Alfonso ME, Muñoz-  
539 Rodríguez JR, Martínez-Vizcaíno V. Sex differences on the relation among gross motor  
540 competence, cognition, and academic achievement in children. *Scand J Psychol.*  
541 2022;63(5):504–12.
- 542 12. Haga M. The relationship between physical fitness and motor competence in children.  
543 *Child Care Health Dev.* 2008;34(3):329–34.
- 544 13. Kantomaa MT, Stamatakis E, Kankaanpää A, Kaakinen M, Rodriguez A, Taanila A, et al.  
545 Physical activity and obesity mediate the association between childhood motor function and  
546 adolescents’ academic achievement. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2013 Jan 29;110(5):1917–22.
- 547 14. Santana CCA, Azevedo LB, Cattuzzo MT, Hill JO, Andrade LP, Prado WL. Physical  
548 fitness and academic performance in youth: A systematic review. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.*  
549 2017;27(6):579–603.
- 550 15. Esteban-Cornejo I, Tejero-González CM, Martínez-Gómez D, del-Campo J, González-Galo  
551 A, Padilla-Moledo C, et al. Independent and Combined Influence of the Components of  
552 Physical Fitness on Academic Performance in Youth. *J Pediatr.* 2014 Aug 1;165(2):306-  
553 312.e2.
- 554 16. Ruiz-Ariza A, Grao-Cruces A, de Loureiro NEM, Martínez-López EJ. Influence of physical  
555 fitness on cognitive and academic performance in adolescents: A systematic review from  
556 2005–2015. *Int Rev Sport Exerc Psychol.* 2017 Jan 1;10(1):108–33.
- 557 17. Sardinha LB, Marques A, Minderico C, Palmeira A, Martins S, Santos D, et al.  
558 Longitudinal relationship between cardiorespiratory fitness and academic achievement.  
559 *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016 May;48(5):839–44.
- 560 18. Miller DI, Halpern DF. The new science of cognitive sex differences. *Trends Cogn Sci.*  
561 2014 Jan;18(1):37–45.
- 562 19. Bell EC, Willson MC, Wilman AH, Dave S, Silverstone PH. Males and females differ in  
563 brain activation during cognitive tasks. *NeuroImage.* 2006 Apr 1;30(2):529–38.
- 564 20. Zayed K, Jansen P. Gender Differences and the Relationship of Motor, Cognitive and  
565 Academic Achievement in Omani Primary School-Aged Children. *Front Psychol [Internet].*  
566 2018 [cited 2024 Jan 8];9. Available from:  
567 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02477>
- 568 21. Martínez-Vizcaíno V, Álvarez-Bueno C, Cavero-Redondo I, Pozuelo-Carrascosa DP,  
569 Garrido-Miguel M, Martínez-Hortelano JA, et al. MOVI-daFIT! Intervention: Rationale  
570 and design of a cluster randomized controlled trial testing the effects on improving  
571 adiposity, cognition, and subclinical atherosclerosis by increasing cardiorespiratory fitness  
572 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. Tulskey 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.




- 614 38. Riva D. Sex and gender difference in cognitive and behavioral studies in developmental  
615 age: An introduction. *J Neurosci Res*. 2023;101(5):543–52.
- 616 39. Machado-Rodrigues AMM, Silva MJC e, Mota J, Cumming SP, Sherar LB, Neville H, et  
617 al. Confounding Effect of Biologic Maturation on Sex Differences in Physical Activity and  
618 Sedentary Behavior in Adolescents. 2010 Aug 1 [cited 2024 Nov 1]; Available from:  
619 <https://journals.humankinetics.com/view/journals/pes/22/3/article-p442.xml>
- 620 40. De Bellis MD, Keshavan MS, Beers SR, Hall J, Frustaci K, Masalehdan A, et al. Sex  
621 Differences in Brain Maturation during Childhood and Adolescence. *Cereb Cortex*. 2001  
622 Jun 1;11(6):552–7.
- 623 41. Lenroot RK, Giedd JN. Sex differences in the adolescent brain. *Brain Cogn*. 2010 Feb  
624 1;72(1):46–55.
- 625 42. Abel T, Graf N, Niemann S. Gender bias in the assessment of physical activity in  
626 population studies. *Soz- Präventivmedizin*. 2001 Jul 1;46(4):268–72.
- 627 43. Grissom, Reyes. Let’s call the whole thing off: evaluating gender and sex differences in  
628 executive function. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2019 Jan;44(1):86–96.
- 629 44. de Greeff JW, Bosker RJ, Oosterlaan J, Visscher C, Hartman E. Effects of physical activity  
630 on executive functions, attention and academic performance in preadolescent children: a  
631 meta-analysis. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2018 May 1;21(5):501–7.
- 632 45. Diamond AB. The Cognitive Benefits of Exercise in Youth. *Curr Sports Med Rep*.  
633 2015;14(4):320–6.
- 634 46. Howie EK, Pate RR. Physical activity and academic achievement in children: A historical  
635 perspective. *J Sport Health Sci*. 2012 Dec 1;1(3):160–9.
- 636 47. Butterfield SA, Angell RM, Mason CA. Age and Sex Differences in Object Control Skills  
637 by Children Ages 5 to 14. *Percept Mot Skills* [Internet]. 2012 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Jun 22];  
638 Available from: [https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.2466/10.11.25.PMS.114.1.261-](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.2466/10.11.25.PMS.114.1.261-274)  
639 274
- 640 48. Hillman CH, Erickson KI, Kramer AF. Be smart, exercise your heart: exercise effects on  
641 brain and cognition. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2008 Jan;9(1):58–65.
- 642 49. Budde H, Voelcker-Rehage C, Pietraßyk-Kendziorra S, Ribeiro P, Tidow G. Acute  
643 coordinative exercise improves attentional performance in adolescents. *Neurosci Lett*. 2008  
644 Aug 22;441(2):219–23.
- 645 50. Adkins DL, Boychuk J, Remple MS, Kleim JA. Motor training induces experience-specific  
646 patterns of plasticity across motor cortex and spinal cord. *J Appl Physiol Bethesda Md*  
647 1985. 2006 Dec;101(6):1776–82.
- 648 51. Coe DP, Peterson T, Blair C, Schutten MC, Peddie H. Physical Fitness, Academic  
649 Achievement, and Socioeconomic Status in School-Aged Youth. *J Sch Health*.  
650 2013;83(7):500–7.
- 651 52. Van Dusen DP, Kelder SH, Kohl III HW, Ranjit N, Perry CL. Associations of Physical  
652 Fitness and Academic Performance Among Schoolchildren\*. *J Sch Health*.  
653 2011;81(12):733–40.

- 654 53. Castelli DM, Hillman CH, Buck SM, Erwin HE. Physical Fitness and Academic  
655 Achievement in Third- and Fifth-Grade Students. *J Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2007 Apr  
656 1;29(2):239–52.
- 657 54. Chen LJ, Fox KR, Ku PW, Taun CY. Fitness change and subsequent academic performance  
658 in adolescents. *J Sch Health*. 2013 Sep;83(9):631–8.
- 659 55. Aadland KN, Moe VF, Aadland E, Anderssen SA, Resaland GK, Ommundsen Y.  
660 Relationships between physical activity, sedentary time, aerobic fitness, motor skills and  
661 executive function and academic performance in children. *Ment Health Phys Act*. 2017 Mar  
662 1;12:10–8.
- 663 56. Álvarez-Bueno C, Pesce C, Cervero-Redondo I, Sánchez-López M, Martínez-Hortelano JA,  
664 Martínez-Vizcaíno V. The Effect of Physical Activity Interventions on Children's  
665 Cognition and Metacognition: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Acad Child  
666 Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2017 Sep 1;56(9):729–38.
- 667 57. Bakke HA, Cavalcante WA, Oliveira IS de, Sarinho SW, Cattuzzo MT. Assessment of  
668 Motor Skills in Children With Visual Impairment: A Systematic and Integrative Review.  
669 *Clin Med Insights Pediatr*. 2019 Jan 1;13:1179556519838287.
- 670 58. Cheng J, East P, Blanco E, Sim EK, Castillo M, Lozoff B, et al. Obesity leads to declines in  
671 motor skills across childhood. *Child Care Health Dev*. 2016;42(3):343–50.
- 672 59. Houwen S, Visscher C, Hartman E, Lemmink KAPM. Gross Motor Skills and Sports  
673 Participation of Children With Visual Impairments. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. 2007 Mar  
674 1;78(2):16–23.
- 675


### 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)**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317694>; this version posted November 22, 2024. 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/).

Figure