

1
2
3 **Title: Indoor school environments, physical activity, sitting behaviour,**
4
5 **pedagogy: scoping review.**
6
7
8
9

10 **Abstract**

11 **Background:** Regular participation in physical activity and limited sitting are
12 beneficial for children's health. However, physical activity levels in children are low
13 and sitting time high. Children spend a large proportion of their time at school. Whilst
14 some aspects of school buildings, their layout and furniture may influence children's
15 physical activity and sitting, these effects could be intertwined with pedagogical
16 approaches. Literature on these aspects has not been collated.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Aim:** To scope the literature on the influence of the indoor school environment on
25 pedagogical approaches and on physical activity and sitting.
26
27

28
29 **Methods:** Upon agreement of search terms and inclusion/exclusion criteria, potential
30 papers were first identified via a search platform (OvidSD) and specific journals, and
31 suitable ones selected for review.
32
33
34

35 **Results:** In primary schools, physical activity can be integrated into lessons with
36 some benefits on academic behaviour and possibly academic performance. The role
37 of the indoor built environment is poorly investigated, although a handful of studies
38 suggest that a radical change in primary school classroom environments may
39 increase physical activity and that stand-biased desks may be promising.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Conclusion:** A dearth of research was found, especially on sitting, accompanied by
47 a lack of relevant conceptual frameworks on the indoor school environment.
48
49

50
51
52
53 **Keywords:** schools, active design, education, built environment, physical activity,
54 sedentary behaviour, sitting, pedagogy.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 **List of Abbreviations**
6

7 **CSPAP:** Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programme
8

9
10 **LPA:** Light-Intensity Physical Activity
11

12 **MVPA:** Moderate to Vigorous Physical Activity
13

14 **PA:** Physical Activity
15

16 **PE:** Physical Education
17

18 **SB:** Sedentary Behaviour
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **1.0 Introduction**
26

27 The benefits of regular participation in physical activity (PA) (defined as “any bodily
28 movement produced by skeletal muscle that results in energy expenditure”,
29 Caspersen 1989) are well document in young people (5-17 years old), as
30 acknowledged by the World Health Organisation (2011). PA may benefit the health
31 of young people by aiding in the prevention of non-communicable disease risk
32 factors (Strong et al. 2005). Moreover, PA may benefit psychological health by aiding
33 in the reduction of anxiety and depression and contributing to the improvement of
34 self-esteem (WHO, *ibid.*). Evidence also exists that PA may have a positive impact
35 on academic performance, including academic achievement, cognitive skills and
36 attitudes to school work (Rasberry et al, 2011). It is recommended that young people
37 accumulate at least 60 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA;
38 e.g., brisk walking) daily. Vigorous intensity activities (e.g. swimming, running, etc.),
39 including those that strengthen muscle and bone, should be incorporated at least
40 three times per week (WHO, *ibid.*). There is increasing evidence that, independent of
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 PA, sedentary behaviours (SB) (i.e. sitting) are associated with negative health
4
5 outcomes, suggesting that reducing sitting may be associated with lower health
6
7 risks in young people. For example, research shows that daily viewing of television in
8
9
10 excess of two hours is associated with reduced physical and psychosocial health
11
12 (Tremblay et al, 2011). Whilst there is some controversy as to whether sitting time is
13
14 independently associated with adiposity in children (Chaput et al., 2012; Tanaka et
15
16 al., 2014), evidence of the co-occurrence of the low levels of PA and high levels of
17
18 sitting (TV viewing time in this case) suggests that public health strategies targeting
19
20 both might be necessary (Anderson et al., 2008). Despite the key health benefits of
21
22 PA and of low levels of sitting, research shows that young people are more inactive
23
24 than recommended in several countries including the UK (Griffiths et al., 2013) and
25
26 the US (CDC, 2014). Furthermore, a review of intervention studies aimed at
27
28
29 increasing overall PA levels in children concluded that such interventions have had
30
31 only a small effect (Metcalf et al., 2012).
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 During term-time, school-aged children spend a large proportion of their time in
39
40 school and hence schools can be considered an obvious target for increasing PA
41
42 and reducing sitting in children. However, a study based in England found that
43
44 primary school children's (aged 9-10 years) levels of PA are lower when pupils are at
45
46 school (Smith et al., 2012). Other research on primary school children (aged 8-11
47
48 years) showed that only a small percentage met PA guidelines during physical
49
50 education (PE). Furthermore, girls accumulated less MVPA and more sitting than
51
52 boys throughout the school day, including recess and lunch. During class time, girls
53
54 accumulated less MVPA, less light PA (LPA) and more sitting than boys. That study
55
56 concluded that schools should complement PE with PA models that increase PA
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 opportunities across the school day (Nettlefold et al., 2011). It is thus important to
4
5 consider whether effective strategies can be found to 'nudge' school children into
6
7 being more active, whereby the physical environment often plays an important role
8
9 into 'choice architecture' approaches to changing population health behaviour
10
11 (Hollands et al, 2013). More broadly, there is a growing body of research-based
12
13 evidence on the importance of 'active design', i.e. designing the built environment to
14
15 promote or at least facilitate PA - complemented by the need for access to healthy
16
17 foods (NYC DCC, 2010). With respect to the impact of the built environment on SB,
18
19 research is still in its infancy.
20
21
22
23
24

25 Within the context of PA research, the role of the environment - both social and
26
27 physical - has been increasingly investigated, often against the background of the
28
29 obesity challenge. With respect to the physical environment, Harrison and Jones
30
31 (2012) reviewed the evidence for associations between the physical school
32
33 environment and diet, PA and adiposity. The study also developed a conceptual
34
35 framework for understanding these associations, starting from an energy balance
36
37 approach, where food represents 'energy in' and 'energy out' is represented by
38
39 physical activity (light, moderate and vigorous PA). The framework considers, for
40
41 each of these factors (PA, and food accessibility/availability), the links with the
42
43 physical school environment at three scales: 1) the 'neighbourhood': facilities and
44
45 properties of the environment beyond but around the school; 2) 'school grounds and
46
47 design': the design of the school building and its grounds; 3) 'school facilities': both
48
49 larger scale more permanent facilities such as obstacle courses or vegetable
50
51 gardens, and smaller-scale, less permanent features such as games equipment,
52
53 playground markings and vending machines. Overall the review paper shows that
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the presence, size and design aspects of school grounds and facilities influence PA
4 of school children. The paper also highlights that “*modifications to the physical*
5 *environment are likely to be more effective when coupled with supportive social and*
6 *educational changes*” (Harrison and Jones, 2012, p.10). Whilst the framework is a
7
8
9
10
11
12 useful starting point, it does not specifically address SB nor it sufficiently clarify
13
14 whether ‘class PA’ primarily or solely refers to PE or also includes regular class time.
15
16
17

18
19 It is important to highlight that within the school setting, PA can be accumulated
20
21 during PE classes, recess or break times (for example through adult-led or ‘free’ play
22
23 in the courtyard) and during class where there might be the potential for light-
24
25 intensity PA (LPA), such as standing or stretching. Conversely, lessons have the
26
27 greatest potential for sedentary behaviour, although this might also occur at break
28
29 times and lunch. However, the majority of research on PA in schools has so far
30
31 concentrated on MVPA and its determinants, with a particular focus on PE and break
32
33 times. There is however a growing awareness that PA should not solely be framed
34
35 as MVPA, and that it might also be desirable to foster a culture of accumulating
36
37
38
39 activity across the whole spectrum of PA levels, and reducing sedentary time
40
41 throughout the day (Story et al., 2009). The *Comprehensive School Physical Activity*
42 *Programme (CSPAP)*, developed by the *US Centers for Disease Control and*
43 *Prevention (CDC)* - partly reflects this model: it is a multi-component approach by
44
45 which school districts and schools use all opportunities for students to be physically
46
47
48
49
50 active, meet the recommended 60 minutes of MVPA, and develop the knowledge,
51
52 skills and confidence to be physically active throughout their lifetime (CDC, 2013).
53
54 The programme advocates going beyond PE during school to meet the daily 60
55
56 minutes. It highlights that students can participate in PA during recess, integrated
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 into classroom lessons, breaks in and outside the classroom, and lunchtime clubs or
4
5 intramural programs. It appears however that the focus is primarily on MVPA.
6
7 Nonetheless, the CSPAP suggests examples of PA breaks in the classroom
8
9
10 (including a five-minute stretch break, a form of light PA) and cites successful
11
12 programmes that have integrated PA into classroom lessons. For example the
13
14 *Take10! Programme* (www.take10.net/) is designed for primary schools and aims to
15
16 help children understand the importance of PA (as well as of other healthy
17
18 behaviours, such as healthy eating), whilst reducing SB, improving attention, and
19
20 promoting structured PA breaks. Each grade-specific kit is divided by academic
21
22 content area: e.g. math, social studies, etc. Studies concluded that the *Take10!*
23
24 *programme* demonstrates that integrating movement with academic sessions in
25
26 primary school classrooms is feasible, helps student focus on learning, and enables
27
28 them to realise improved PA levels (Kibbe, 2011). With respect to the physical
29
30 environment requirements, the programme website states that the *Take10!* approach
31
32 requires no special equipment or tools, and allows students to be active within the
33
34 space limitations of a standard-size classroom (LSIResearch Foundation, 2012).
35
36
37 Hence, in this case the physical environment appears to be framed as neutral,
38
39 neither enabling nor inhibiting PA.
40
41
42
43
44

45 In summary, the benefits of regular PA and of limiting SB on health are fairly well-
46
47 established. Some research exists on the role of the physical environment in
48
49 facilitating or encouraging active behaviours of children at school, with the focus
50
51 primarily on MVPA within PE lessons or break times. There is now growing
52
53 awareness that increasing PA and discouraging SB at school may also have a
54
55 positive effect on academic performance. Whilst some pedagogical approaches have
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 been developed to facilitate the integration of PA into the curriculum and more
4
5 broadly into the whole school day, it is unclear to what extent the built environment
6
7 plays a neutral, facilitating or inhibiting role. Thus the question arises as to whether
8
9 the links between the indoor school environment, PA/SB and pedagogy have been
10
11 adequately investigated. This scoping review brings together a cross-disciplinary
12
13 team of education, built environment and physical activity experts to review
14
15 published evidence in each disciplinary domain to identify the impact of the built
16
17 environment on pedagogical approaches, PA and SB of children during school times,
18
19 focussing on aspects of the indoor environment not solely or mainly dedicated to PE
20
21 and/or MVPA.
22
23
24
25

26 27 **2.0 Methods**

28 29 **2.1 General Framework for Scoping Review and Initial Search Criteria**

30
31 This study adopted a scoping review approach. Although no universal definition
32
33 exists for this review type, generally it is applied to 'mapping' a research field (Levac,
34
35 2010). The team largely followed the main stages for a scoping review discussed in
36
37 Levac (ibid.): 1) Identifying the research question; 2) Identifying relevant studies; 3)
38
39 Study selection; 4) Charting the data; 4) Collating, summarising and reporting the
40
41 results; 6) Stakeholder consultation, (optional and not carried out in this review).
42
43 Given the broad scope of this study, it was agreed only to review abstracts rather
44
45 than full papers. Accordingly, a suitably broad research question was firstly
46
47 identified, accompanied by a clear scope of enquiry, which informed the selection of
48
49 the initial inclusion/exclusion criteria and keywords for electronic searches. The
50
51 broad research question initially selected was: "*What is the impact of the built*
52
53 *environment and of pedagogical approaches on the levels of physical activity and*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *sedentary behaviour of children during school times, especially during lessons and*
4
5 *breaks?”.*
6
7
8
9

10 In order to identify relevant studies, search criteria were established. While the focus
11 was primarily on lessons and breaks, the initial inclusion/exclusion criteria were
12 broad in order to allow for a more in-depth consideration of the literature. These
13 covered: 1) Age-group: 2-11 and 11-16 years old; 2) Date of publication: anytime; 3)
14 Geography and Research language: any geographical location; papers written in
15 English; 4) Format and types of publication: research reports, guidelines, review
16 articles, research articles, doctoral dissertations and other online sources as
17 appropriate. Exclusion criteria were: further education, breakfast clubs, after-school
18 classes, holiday, summer, Sunday schools. Accordingly, Inclusion search terms
19 were: built environment, school design, pre-school, physical activity, movement,
20 sedentary behaviour, school, classroom, teaching, learning, pedagogy and exercise.
21 The study utilised OvidSP as a primary source, and discipline specific journals as a
22 secondary source. OvidSP is an online database from OVID, which holds over 1300
23 peer reviewed journals, 4,500 e-books and 100 databases in the field of medicine,
24 nursing and health professions, behavioural sciences, basic sciences, and
25 humanities & technologies (OvidSP 2014). Additionally, a number of journals was
26 identified for each discipline as a secondary, complementary source to ensure that
27 relevant articles were not missed (Table 1). [insert Table 1]
28
29

30 To identify literature covering the overlap of the three disciplines (built environment,
31 pedagogy and PA/SB), four ‘themes’ were identified (Fig 1) and employed for both
32 the OvidSP database search and the discipline-specific journal search: built
33 environment and physical activity (BE_PA), built environment and pedagogy
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(BE_PED), physical activity and pedagogy (PA_PED), and built environment, physical activity and pedagogy (BE_PA_PED). Note: the PA themes also include SB.

2.2 Preliminary Search Results

The search involved a preliminary identification of papers, both in OvidSP and in the journals, followed by an initial pruning primarily based on assessing the papers' titles. Searches were performed with keyword combinations covering the four themes. A total of 4,818 articles were initially identified: 2,445 articles in BE_PA from 16 search combinations; 204 articles in BE_PED from 14 search combinations; 1,960 articles in PA_PED from 17 search combinations; 209 articles in BE_PA_PED from 29 search combinations. After an initial title-based was carried out to remove articles that were not deemed relevant, a total of 639 papers were identified, to be further assessed for inclusion in the study (Table 2). [insert Table 2]

A separate keyword search covering built environment, physical activity and pedagogy was employed on each disciplinary journal, generating a total of 3,979 papers to which an initial title-based pruning was applied, resulting in 85 articles selected for further assessment. These 85 papers were cross-referenced with the 639 OVIDSP results and it was found that only two records were a repeat, hence overall a total of 83 papers (Table 3) from the journal searches were brought forward to the next assessment stage. [insert Table 3]

2.3 Refinement of Search Criteria and Selection of Papers for Review

The previous stage identified a total of 722 papers (639 + 83) generated via OvidSP and journal searches. These papers were further assessed for inclusion in this review. For each of the themes (see Fig 1), relevant academics evaluated the abstracts (first independently and then together) and selected those that were

1
2
3 deemed most relevant. As recommended by Levac et al (2010), this was an iterative
4
5 process whose purpose was also to refine the study selection criteria, following
6
7 practical considerations alongside disciplinary and methodological ones. Given the
8
9 large amount of literature available on PE, MVPA, and school playgrounds, and
10
11 considering that the main focus of this review is primarily PA/SB during class and
12
13 breaks, the team agreed to add further exclusion criteria: play, playground, outside
14
15 education and field trips. This also gave the opportunity to define more fully those
16
17 aspects of the school built environment and PA/SB under consideration. Hence, the
18
19 school built environment was defined as “*Aspects of the man-made indoor
20
21 environment within the school boundaries, excluding those solely dedicated to play
22
23 or physical education. This includes the building (e.g. structure, envelope, interior
24
25 layout etc); the furniture (fixed and not) and fixtures such as artwork and fixed
26
27
28 blackboards; but excludes playgrounds and any play-related equipment/facilities,
29
30 and ICT equipment*”. For PA/SB, we focused on specific aspects of physical activity
31
32 and sedentary behaviour, namely: “*any walking occurring as a result of pupils
33
34 moving to/from destinations within the indoor school environment; sitting, standing
35
36 and ‘moving around’ within the classroom environment or any other indoor space
37
38 within the school besides those explicitly/solely dedicated to play or physical
39
40 education*”.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Table 4 summarises the final number of articles selected for review. No studies were
48
49 found that explicitly addressed all three aspects - built environment, PA/SB and
50
51 pedagogy - as defined in our inclusion/exclusion criteria and relevant definitions.
52

53
54 [insert Table 4]
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The next section discusses the results of the abstracts' review, by theme. When
4 reviewing the abstracts, the main aim was to map existing knowledge and thus
5 identify knowledge gaps, as opposed to assess quality or extract data. Table 5
6
7 systematically maps relevant aspects of each study on the links between PA/SB and
8 pedagogy and built environmentⁱ. Note that in many cases the abstracts did not
9 cover all the relevant information and hence a scan of the full paper was required.
10
11 [insert Table 5]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **3.0 Pedagogy and the built environment**

22 Research literature on the relationship between the built environment and pedagogy
23 is concentrated largely in built environment publications and in journals devoted to
24 environmental psychology and behaviour. There is little in education or social
25 science journals (journals where one would expect a focus on pedagogy) that
26 is concerned with the relationship.
27
28
29

30 *Making Space: architecture and design for children and young people* (2011), a
31 publication by Children in Scotland, sets out several key themes that are taken up in
32
33 other research literature. These include the flexibility and autonomy afforded to
34 children and their teachers by well-designed spaces (Eviston et al., 2010; Parnell
35 and Procter, 2011); the effect of light and space on learning and well-being; the
36 effect of design on motivation (Hargreaves, 2004; Higgins et al., 2005); the
37 importance of local environments for learning (Ernst, 2007); and the impact of the
38
39 built environment on the imagination. The relationship between space and behaviour
40 is fundamental to psychological studies in this area (Moore, 1986).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 An emphasis on well-being of the learner is particularly evident in these papers.
4
5 Studies concentrate on the moderation of noise annoyance in school environments
6
7 (Boman and Enmarker, 2004); the positive impact of limited-visibility leafy
8
9 environments for aiding concentration, attention, emotional states, behaviour and
10
11 personal health and well-being (Han, 2009); the positive impact of personalisation of
12
13 the immediate environment on behaviour performance and academic achievement
14
15 (Maxwell and Chmielewski, 2008); an ecological understanding of the relationship
16
17 between space and learning (Moore, 1986); and the effect on health and pupils'
18
19 performance of specific environmental aspects of lighting (Winterbottom and Wilkins,
20
21 2009) and air quality (Chatzidiakou, Mumovic and Dockrell, 2013).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Attributing outcomes such as cognitive advancement or academic performance of pupils to a causal relationship between the built environment and the outcome is notoriously tenuous. Generally, we have avoided such claims, preferring to focus on the impact of the built environment on pedagogical dimensions of the built school and classroom environment. One example of a study that attempts to relate school design (and the condition of the building) to attendance and academic attainment is that by Duran-Narucki (2008) which accepts that "little is known about how the condition of school facilities affects academic outcomes". There are more such studies on primary schools (ages 5 to 11) than on pre-school/kindergartens (ages 2-5) or secondary/high schools (ages 11-18). This may be the result of the more organic, integrated approach to the curriculum in primary schools and the emphasis on the learner rather than on the subject/discipline, thus leading to a consideration of the way the environment helps or hinders well-being and learning.

1
2
3 At pre-school level, Read, Sugawara and Brandt (1999) investigated the changes
4 that differentiated space (e.g. changes in ceiling height or wall colour) have on
5 children's cooperative behaviour. Interpersonal relationships amongst children
6
7
8
9
10 between 21 months and 36 months were the focus of a study that looked at the
11 deployment of furniture as obstacles or facilitators of peer relations (Legendre,
12 1999). It concluded that such arrangements did not facilitate better peer relations
13 where the relations were already weak or poor, but did improve matters for those
14 who already had good relations. They concluded that the immediate physical
15 environment *enhances* rather than radically changes such relations. Kantrowitz and
16 Evans (2004) noticed that the number of children engaged in activity areas had an
17 impact on their well-being and motivation.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Studies on the relationship between the built environment and pedagogy in primary
schools are numerous. Generally, they do not consider pedagogy *per se*, but rather
assess the impact of the environment on well-being and attention. In case studies of
six primary schools in Ireland, Darmody, Smith and Doherty (2010) explore indoor
space in relation to the use of new technologies, the relative size of classrooms and
the schools themselves. Schools built to current design guidelines are seen more
positively than older schools in terms of classroom size, accessibility, lighting,
heating, ventilation and storage. Other studies covering these factors were reported
by Barrett et al. (2013) and Wall, Dockrell and Peacey (2008). 'Ownership' of space
by pupils results from the mounting of pupils' work as a permanent feature of the
built environment (Killeen et al, 2003). From the pupils' point of view, ownership
reaches beyond the display of artwork to the actual learning spaces themselves,
though not to 'hard' spaces like corridors and stairs (Barrett et al, 2011; Barrett and
Zhang, 2012). Maxwell and Chmielewski (2008) explore how young children's self-

1
2
3 esteem is affected by the built environment, and found positive effects for first-
4 graders on the two measures of self-esteem that were deployed, but that for
5 kindergarten children the positive effect was seen in only one measure.
6
7
8

9
10
11 Secondary school studies are more concerned with multi-disciplinarity. Gislason
12 (2009) points out that a school with an environmental studies focus found its open-
13 plan architecture complemented the teaching of the curriculum, as well as
14 contributing to a more positive and productive social climate. However, Cotterell
15 (1984) found that open plan design at secondary level created more pupil and
16 teacher anxiety, as there was more time devoted to transitions from one activity to
17 another, and more off-task behaviour. In a multi-level analysis (Rowan, Raudenbush
18 and Kang, 1991), it was suggested that teachers from different subject as well as
19 from different social backgrounds perceive the structures of schooling differently,
20 including the physical structures of the built environment. These disparate studies in
21 the built environment and secondary education suggest there is more work to be
22 done particularly in the wake of the *Making Space* report by Children in Scotland
23 (2011) report on school design and learning.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40
41 Across all school levels, there is a small body of research literature on the impact of
42 the built environment on children with learning difficulties. Studies of children who
43 are partially or completely deaf (Martins and Gaudiot, 2012), and of those with a
44 diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder (McAllister and Maguire, 2012) are significant
45 exceptions. The more general issue of inclusion or exclusion from mainstream
46 classes of children with learning difficulties (Holt 2003) is important for building
47 design, an issue also explored by Pivik (2010).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.0 Physical activity, sedentary behaviour and pedagogy

Of the 19 papers on this topic first identified through title and abstract review (Table 4), four were excluded after reviewing the full-text (necessary owing to incomplete information in the abstract). Of the 15 remaining papers that were included, 14 are intervention studies and one is an informational book providing guidance on how to incorporate movement in teaching. Sample populations range from kindergarten to secondary school with most studies based in primary school populations. The majority of papers are peer-reviewed journal articles with one book (Lengel & Kuczala, 2010) and three dissertation theses (Darian, 2013; Goffedra, 2011; Hammett, 2009). Most studies were conducted in the United States (eight studies), with six conducted in Europe and one in Australia.

Most of the interventions explored the impact of integrating PA into classroom-based lessons by either incorporating short PA breaks into the lesson plan or using PA teaching techniques incorporated as a key component of the learning experience (e.g. using a hopscotch grid to map out vocabulary; Lucht & Heidig, 2013). This scoping review has identified some preliminary evidence that classroom-based PA is both feasible (Finn et al. 2011; Schetzina et al., 2009) and effective in increasing students' PA (Whitt-Glover, Ham, & Yancey, 2011; Goffedra, 2011; Schetzina et al., 2009). In addition, an on-going US-based study suggests that schools are supportive of such an initiative, as long-term retention of participating schools in the study was high (DuBose et al. 2008). Lengel and Kuczala's 2010 book entitled *The Kinesthetic Classroom* (Lengel & Kuczala, 2010) provides a general overview of techniques used for classroom-based PA and suggested that the practice has a positive

1
2
3 influence on academic learning in addition to aiding classroom management and
4
5 benefiting students' physical wellbeing. Other studies identified in the review also
6
7 draw on these outcomes.

8
9
10
11 Four studies that investigated the effect of classroom-based PA on academic
12
13 learning, reported mixed results. Using PA as a teaching technique for language
14
15 acquisition in primary school pupils was found to increase vocabulary learning in
16
17 students exposed to the *Active Read-Aloud Strategy* intervention (Hammett, 2009)
18
19 but there was no advantage of the 'hopscotch learning game' compared with
20
21 traditional teacher-centred learning in Lucht and Heidig's 2013 study. Similarly, while
22
23 incorporating PA into the school day had a positive effect on academic performance
24
25 in students aged 7-17 years old (Vanhels et al, 2012), elsewhere it had no effect on
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
mathematic and literacy skills in children attending kindergarten to secondary school
(Goffedra, 2011). Mixed findings may be attributable partly to differences in
intervention duration and the precise academic outcomes that were included,
however more research is needed to draw reliable conclusions. Comprehensive
reporting of intervention components (e.g. design, setting, compliance) will aid
synthesis as the evidence base grows.

More consistent effects of classroom-based PA were found for behavioural
outcomes, with more available research to support findings. Specifically, classroom-
based PA was found to enhance classroom management and control, across ages
(Lucht & Heidig, 2013; Whitt-Glover, Ham, & Yancey, 2011, Goffedra, 2011;
Vanhelst et al, 2012) and increase students' attention and focus on the task - both
when PA was used as a teaching tool and when it was incorporated into the lesson

1
2
3 through short activity breaks (Vazou et al, 2012; Whitt-Glover, Ham, & Yancey, 2011;
4
5 Grieco, Jowers, & Bartholomew, 2009). Moreover, one study found that increases in
6
7 attention and focus extended beyond the active period of the lesson, preparing the
8
9 student for later, sedentary, academic working (Darian, 2012). Interestingly, Grieco,
10
11 Jowers and Bartholomew's study (2009) suggested that overweight primary school
12
13 students benefitted preferentially from classroom-based PA compared with healthy
14
15 weight students, perhaps paving the way for more research investigating the effects
16
17 of tailored interventions (Grieco, Jowers, & Bartholomew, 2009). Finally, there was
18
19 also preliminary quantitative and qualitative evidence that classroom-based PA was
20
21 positively related to student motivation and interest in the academic subject and that
22
23 students preferred PA-based teaching techniques (Lucht & Heidig, 2013; Darian,
24
25 2012; Hammett, 2009).

26
27
28
29
30
31
32 Several other studies related classroom PA to health-related outcomes
33
34 demonstrating mixed effects. One study showed that embedding a weight change
35
36 intervention into the curriculum had no effect on BMI, but showed a reduction in
37
38 waist circumference in 945 children (Brandstetter et al., 2012). Another study
39
40 showed a favourable effect on BMI in the intervention group in a four year trial of an
41
42 educational pedagogy PA and lifestyle programme (Llargues et al. 2012). Increasing
43
44 school-time PA led to no differences in cardiovascular health and a mixed effect on
45
46 BMI in other studies. (Okely et al., 2012; Vanhelst et al, 2012).

47
48
49
50
51
52 There was a gap in research examining SB and pedagogy. Although several papers
53
54 note that children sit too much, studies generally seek an increase in PA rather than
55
56 a reduction in SB. Additionally, there were no observational studies.

5.0 Physical activity, sedentary behaviour and the built environment

For this theme, originally 14 papers arising from the initial searches (Table 4) and six papers derived from references within relevant papers were selected for review.

However, in many cases it was not clear from the abstract whether terms such as 'environment' referred to physical environments or whether terms such as 'physical'

or 'built' environment included aspects of the indoor built environment not solely or mainly dedicated to PE (and/or and MPVA). Hence in most cases the full paper was

screened to assess whether it met our definitions and inclusion criteria. After this screening process, six papers were found to be relevant and one paper (Harrison

and Jones, 2012) was considered more suitable for the Introduction section as it contained a review and conceptual framework of those school-level built

environment factors excluded through our criteria.

Of the six papers, three were intervention studies investigating standing-height desks

within primary schools, in terms of their acceptability, and impacts on SB,

musculoskeletal discomfort, posture, and calorie expenditure. A controlled trial in two

primary schools in Auckland, New Zealand, with participants from third and fourth

grade found that children spoke enthusiastically of the standing workstations and

school staff members were supportive of the standing workstations because they

offered "flexibility in learning". Children in the intervention group sat less, stood

longer and engaged in fewer transitions from sitting to standing compared to the

control group. Effect size ranged from small to large. The study concluded that

standing workstations can be successfully integrated in classroom environments and

appear to decrease overall sedentariness (Hinckson, 2013). A quasi-experimental

1
2
3 pilot study of standing height desks was conducted in five first-grade classrooms in a
4
5 Texas primary school, with two control classrooms, two treatment classrooms, and
6
7 one classroom that was a control in the fall term and treatment in the spring (to allow
8
9 within-group comparisons). The intervention proved to be effective in significantly
10
11 increasing caloric expenditure (Blake 2012). Another paper more specifically focused
12
13 on the assessment of time spent in sub-optimal postures and self-reported
14
15 discomfort of students during the use of traditional seated and stand-biased desks.
16
17 The posture of 42 primary school students was assessed as they worked at their
18
19 desks that included 15 standing type and 27 seated type. Student body part
20
21 discomfort surveys were also used to assess discomfort of students. No significant
22
23 difference was found between the two groups and time spent in non-preferred
24
25 postures and body discomfort, however children using stand-biased workstations
26
27 reported less discomfort overall. The paper highlighted that a study containing a
28
29 larger sample and older children that includes postural observation throughout the
30
31 school day is needed (Benden, 2013).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 A study in Turkey investigated fifth, sixth and seventh grade students in three private
40
41 primary schools to understand their place preferences between indoor and outdoor
42
43 non-classroom spaces during recess and their activity patterns in these spaces. The
44
45 study concluded that students are good sources of information in the design and
46
47 planning of the environments they occupy. Whilst the study did ask questions
48
49 pertaining to activities relevant to PA and SB (e.g. sit, wander around, etc.), it is not
50
51 immediately clear how the data can be interpreted with respect to the impact of built
52
53 environment features on PA and SB (Kasali 2010).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The remaining two studies examined the impact on PA and SB of an activity-
4 permissive classroom environment for primary school children. A US-based study
5 tested the hypothesis that primary school-age children will be more physically active
6 while attending school in a novel, activity-permissive school environment compared
7 to a traditional school environment. The students attended school in three different
8 environments: traditional school with chairs and desks, an activity-permissive
9 environment, and finally their traditional school with desks which encouraged
10 standing. The activity-permissive environment was designed specifically to
11 encourage an active learning environment. The actual “classroom” was a plasticized
12 hockey rink which also included standing desks and vertical, mobile white-boards, as
13 well as miniature golf, basketball hoops, indoor soccer, climbing mazes, and activity
14 promoting games. The children used wireless laptop computers and portable video
15 display units to facilitate mobile learning and children were allowed to move around
16 during lesson. Accelerometer data from the school children were compared with
17 another group of age-matched children whose physical activity was monitored during
18 summer vacation. On average the children attending school in the activity-permissive
19 environment moved significantly more (mean +/- s.d: 115 +/- 3 m/s²) compared to
20 those in either the traditional environment (71 +/- 0.4 m/s) or in the traditional school
21 with standing desks (71 +/- 0.7 m/s²). The children in the activity-permissive
22 environment were as active as children on summer vacation. The study concluded
23 that children will move more in an activity-permissive environment and that strategies
24 to increase the activity of school children may involve re-designing the school itself
25 (Lanningham-Foster 2008). A study in Germany evaluated differences in classroom
26 sitting habits of 8-year-old children between the “Moving school” and a traditional
27 school. 22 children, involved in the project for one and a half years were compared
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to 25 children in a traditional school. The study used the Portable Ergonomic
4
5 Observation (PEO) method, and found that children from a traditional school spent
6
7 an average of 97% of the lesson time sitting statically, with the trunk bent over 45°
8
9
10 angle for one third of that time. In the “Moving school” this posture was replaced by
11
12 dynamic sitting (53% of the lesson time), standing (31%) and walking around (10%),
13
14 while trunk flexion over 45° was scarcely observed at all. Accelerometer data
15
16 showed significantly more physical activity in lessons within the “Moving school” and
17
18 overall results showed that sitting habits are more favourable in a “Moving school”. It
19
20 should be highlighted that the focus of the study was primarily on ‘healthy backs’ and
21
22 posture rather than explicitly on PA or SB. Unfortunately the paper does not provide
23
24 detailed information on built environment aspects of the “Moving school” concept,
25
26 although it does mention, for example, that the classroom was equipped with
27
28
29 ergonomic furniture. However, there is also a reference to ‘behavioural influences’ in
30
31 the “Moving school” concept, therefore it is unclear to what extent the effects
32
33 observed in the study can be attributed, solely or partly, to built environment aspects
34
35 (Cardon 2004).
36

37 38 39 40 41 **6.0 Discussion**

42
43 This study adopted a scoping review approach to identify evidence and knowledge
44
45 gaps on the links between aspects of the indoor school built environment, PA and
46
47 SB of children at school, and pedagogy. The review identifies a few studies,
48
49 especially in the primary schools settings, but found an overall lack of research
50
51 addressing all three aspects.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Given the wide ranging nature of the research question, a balance had to be found
4 between comprehensiveness and depth, which was translated into the
5 inclusion/exclusion criteria and search terms. As pointed out by Levac et al. (2010),
6
7 the iterative nature of the selection process must be highlighted, whereby additional
8 exclusion criteria were added mid-process, for example to exclude outdoor school
9 environments and play or PE. This reduced the number of abstracts for review to a
10 manageable level while ensuring a more precise focus. Following the addition of
11 further exclusion criteria, no changes were made to the keywords utilised for the
12 searches, since these were considered sufficiently broad to capture the phenomena
13 we wished to investigate. However it is possible that some specific search terms
14 might have revealed relevant studies, although a preliminary investigation of the
15 keyword 'furniture', for example, did not provide such additional results. On the other
16 hand search terms such as 'posture' and 'ergonomics' might have produced further
17 results, although the link with PA/SB may have not been very clear. Given the
18 prominence of play-focused activities in the pre-school setting, the exclusion of 'play'
19 might have affected our results.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Given the heterogeneity of the three disciplinary fields involved, the selection of
42 suitable search terms applicable across these disciplines can be problematic. For
43 example, whilst in lay terms 'physical activity' may be intended as synonymous of
44 'movement' or 'lack of inactivity', within a specific research field the term is often
45 used as synonymous of MVPA - thus mainly pertaining PE and breaks in the school
46 setting. On the other hand, terms such as 'physical environment' or 'built
47 environment' - which conceptually can encompass a large variety of factors - are
48 often used as 'umbrella terms' while actually referring only to a specific aspect of the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 built environment. For example, Bassett et al (2013) carried out a study which aimed
4 to “*quantify the increase in energy expenditure associated with school-based policies*
5 *and built environment changes*” (Basset et al, 2013, abstract). However, for built
6
7
8
9
10 environment changes pertaining the school grounds (as opposed to neighbourhood
11 level aspects), the study solely focused on modifications to the playgrounds. The
12 study did not provide a clear framework or explanation for this specific interpretation
13 of the school built environment, although presumably this is partly due to availability
14 of suitable studies. It is also worthwhile reporting here the study’s conclusions: of the
15 various policies and built environment changes examined, the largest effects were
16 seen with mandatory PE, classroom activity breaks, and active commuting to school.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

‘Modified playgrounds’, for example, resulted in additional 6 average minutes of MVPA gained per school day, whilst ‘mandatory PE’ resulted in 23 minutes and ‘classroom activity breaks’ in 19 minutes. The paper highlighted that whilst changes to the built environment might not result in large PA or metabolic gains, they could still form part of a multi-faceted strategy aimed at increasing PA levels and reducing SB throughout the school day.

The heterogeneity of the research fields underpinning the research question also meant that whilst OvidSP - a widely-used search platform - was utilised as the primary information source, a parallel search of discipline-specific journals revealed several additional papers. This highlights the methodological difficulties associated with such broad multi-disciplinary questions and suggests that further studies may need to use more than one search platform. The strength of the OvidSP database is its depth. Applying a generic search such as built environment or physical activity yields over 300,000 results in OVID whilst the same search in ‘Environment and

1
2
3 Behaviour' yields 247. A more specific search such as built environment and
4
5 physical activity yields 2,947 results in OVID. In 'Environment and Behaviour', this
6
7 drops to 48. For practical reason, OVID is more suitable to use specific keywords
8
9
10 with more variations whilst discipline specific journals yielding much less results are
11
12 more suitable with generic search terms. An example is the article entitled, *Impact of*
13
14 *Space and Color in the Physical Environment on Preschool Children's Cooperative*
15
16 *Behavior* (Read et al., 1999). This article can be found in 'Environment and
17
18 Behaviour' using the basic keywords combination of school and learning that yields
19
20 214 results. In OVID 530,540 results were identified.
21
22
23
24

25 With respect to the topic investigated here, it must be emphasised that the research
26
27 question could be usefully framed in terms of its what/where/when aspects. Overall
28
29 the review revealed that many studies were not particularly clear about the '*what*'
30
31 aspects (i.e. which levels of PA and/or aspects of SB), nor explicitly identify *where*
32
33 these do or should take place, for example in the playground or classroom, or *when*
34
35 they occur whether during lessons and/or throughout a typical school day. This lack
36
37 of clarity makes it difficult to form a comprehensive assessment of the PA/SB
38
39 potentials of various factors within schools. With reference to the definitions of indoor
40
41 school built environment and PA/SB utilised in this study, one needs to consider that
42
43 the amount of walking between school destinations (in turn affected by their
44
45 respective distance) is likely to be limited in pre-schools and possibly in primary
46
47
48 schools, where children are generally neither permitted nor encouraged to move
49
50 around the school. In some countries or school systems, secondary school children
51
52 are mainly based in one classroom even at break times, while in others they change
53
54 classroom according to the discipline of the lesson hence offering scope for
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 accumulating light PA during classroom changes and breaks. In such cases the
4 location and distribution of rooms, as well as the overall size of the school building,
5 may be important however no research on this aspect was identified.
6
7

8
9
10
11 The 'triadic' nature of the topic investigated allowed an examination of studies
12 addressing all three aspects (built environment, PA/SB, pedagogy) as well as studies
13 investigating pairs of the three aspects. Whilst this had the advantage of framing the
14 issue(s) in broad terms, it also resulted in very wide themes which we do not claim to
15 have investigated exhaustively but rather to have addressed within the aims of our
16 review and constraints of time and method. The theme "Pedagogy and the built
17 environment" for example is a very broad topic which could be the subject of a
18 separate scoping review.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 29 30 31 32 **7.0 Conclusions**

33
34 This review brought together a cross-disciplinary team of education, built
35 environment and physical activity experts to carry out a scoping review of published
36
37
38 abstracts, in order to identify the impact of the built environment on pedagogical
39 approaches and levels of PA and SB of children during school times. The review
40 included aspects of the indoor built environment not solely or mainly dedicated to PE
41 and/or MVPA. It should be highlighted that, whilst this review mainly considered
42
43 abstracts, on several occasions full papers were screened to assess their suitability
44
45 and/or capture some aspects which were not clear in the abstract – thus ensuring a
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 suitable degree of clarity in the review process.

1
2
3 The review highlighted that the built environment is likely to impact on pedagogy and
4 academic performance in a variety of ways, including the size of the school; the
5 distance between buildings and classrooms; the pedagogic approach (active or
6
7
8
9
10 passive); and the interior design of the classroom, as well as associated
11
12 environmental parameters including indoor air quality, temperature, light and noise.
13
14 Most studies on the links between PA and pedagogy have been carried out in
15
16 primary schools, and focus on the impact of incorporating PA into classroom-based
17
18 lessons. Such studies show that these approaches are generally feasible and
19
20 successful at increasing PA levels, although there is mixed evidence on their impact
21
22 on academic performance. More consistent effects of classroom-based PA were
23
24 found for behavioural outcomes (e.g. student attention and focus on the task), with
25
26 more available research to support findings. Very limited research exists on SB and
27
28
29
30 pedagogy.

31
32
33
34 A small number of studies were identified on the relationship in primary schools
35
36 between PA/SB outcomes and aspects of the indoor school built environment not
37
38
39 mainly or solely dedicated to PE or MVPA. A few intervention studies on standing-
40
41 biased desks within primary schools point towards promising results in terms of their
42
43 acceptability, impacts on PA/SB, musculoskeletal discomfort, posture, and calorie
44
45 expenditure – but further research is needed with larger sample sizes, longer
46
47 timescales, and inclusion of the impacts on academic performance. One intervention
48
49
50 study was found suggesting that children will move more in an activity-permissive,
51
52 specially-designed environment and that strategies to increase the activity of school
53
54 children may involve re-designing the school itself (Lanningham-Foster 2008).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, it is debatable whether the specific design measures investigated in the
4
5 study are repeatable on a larger scale.
6
7
8
9

10 Overall this review found a lack of studies explicitly addressing the interrelationships
11
12 between the indoor school built environment, pedagogical approaches and/or
13
14 academic performance, and PA and/or SB outcomes. Secondary schools are
15
16 especially under-investigated. As for pre-schools, a lack of research is also apparent,
17
18 although the exclusion of 'play' may have partly limited our identification of suitable
19
20 studies on this school type. The review found a lack of comprehensive
21
22 multidisciplinary understanding of what constitutes the 'school built environment'. We
23
24 therefore suggest that a conceptual framework of the school built environment
25
26 should be developed, mapping out its various aspects and identifying those elements
27
28
29
30 of interest to different practitioners and researchers.
31
32

33
34 Given the solid evidence base that regular participation in PA and limited sitting are
35
36 beneficial for children's health, and that PA levels in children are low while sitting
37
38
39 time is high, more knowledge is needed on how the indoor school environment and
40
41 pedagogy might interact and impact upon PA and SB of school children. Pre-school
42
43 and secondary schools particularly need further study.
44
45

46
47 **References, Background** (*for papers included in the scoping review, see next*
48
49 *section*)
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Anderson SE, Economos CD, Must A, (2008), Active play and screen time in US
4 children aged 4 to 11 years in relation to sociodemographic and weight status
5 characteristics: a nationally representative cross-sectional analysis, *BMC Public*
6 *Health*, 8: 366.

7
8 Bassett DR, Fitzhugh EC, Heath GW, Erwin PC, Frederick GM, Wolff DL, Welch WA,
9 Stout AB, (2013), Estimated Energy Expenditures for School-Based Policies and
10 Active Living, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 44(2): 108-113.

11
12 Caspersen CJ, (1989), Physical activity epidemiology: concepts, methods, and
13 applications to exercise science, *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 17: 423-
14 473.

15
16 CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), 2014, *Physical Activity Facts*,
17 <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/physicalactivity/facts.htm>, accessed: 11 Sept 2014.

18
19 CDC (National Center for Disease Control and Prevention), (2013), *Comprehensive*
20 *Schools Physical Activity Programmes: A guide for schools*, Atlanta, GA: US
21 Department of Health and Human Services.

22
23 Chaput JP, Lambert M, Mathieu ME, Tremblay MS, Loughlin J, Tremblay A, (2012),
24 Physical activity vs. sedentary time: independent associations with adiposity in
25 children, *Pediatric Obesity*, 7(3):251-8. doi: 10.1111/j.2047-6310.2011.00028.x

26
27 Griffiths L, Cortina-Borja M, Sera F, Pouliou T, Geraci M, Rich C, Cole TJ, Law C,
28 Joshi H, Ness AR, Jebb SA, Dezaux C, (2013), How active are our children?
29 Findings from the Millennium Cohort Study, *BMJ Open*, doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-
30 002893

31
32 Hollands G, Shemilt I, Marteau T, Jebb S, Kelly M, Nakamura R, Suhrcke M, Ogilvie
33 D, (2013), Altering micro-environments to change population health behaviour:
34 towards an evidence base for choice architecture interventions, *BMC Public Health*,
35 13, 1218

36
37 LSIRResearch Foundation, (2012), *Physical Activity + Learning*,
38 <http://www.take10.net/physicalactivitylearning>, accessed: 11 Sept 2014.

39
40 Metcalf B, Henley W, Wilkin T, (2012), Effectiveness of intervention on physical
41 activity of children: systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled trials with
42 objectively measured outcomes, *BMJ*2012;345:e5888

43
44 Nettlefold L, McKay HA, Warburton DE, McGuire KA, Bredin SS, Naylor PJ, (2011),
45 The challenge of low physical activity during the school day: at recess, lunch and in
46 physical education, *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 45(10):813-9. doi:
47 10.1136/bjism.2009.068072

48
49 NYC DCC (New City Department of Design and Construction), (2010), *Active Design*
50 *Guidelines*, New York: City of New York,
51 http://www.nyc.gov/html/ddc/html/design/active_design.shtml, accessed 11 Sept
52 2014.

1
2
3 Ovid, 2014. OvidSP. OvidSP Website Accessed on May 2014
4 [http://www.ovid.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/content_landing_OvidSP_13051_-](http://www.ovid.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/content_landing_OvidSP_13051_-1_13151)
5 [1_13151](http://www.ovid.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/content_landing_OvidSP_13051_-1_13151)
6

7 Rasberry C, Lee S, Robin L, Laris B, Russell L, Coyle K, Nihiser A, (2011), The
8 association between school-based physical activity, including physical education,
9 and academic performance: A systematic review of the literature, *Preventive*
10 *Medicine*, 52 Supplement, S10-S20.
11

12 Smith L, Sahlqvist S, Ogilvie D, Jones A, Griffin S, van Sluijs E, (2012), Is active
13 travel to non-school destinations associated with physical activity in primary school
14 children?, *Preventive Medicine*, 54(3-4): 224-228.

15 Story M, Nannery M, Schwartz M, (2009), Schools and Obesity Prevention: Creating
16 School Environments and Policies to Promote Healthy Eating and Physical Activity,
17 *The Milbank Quarterly*, 87(1): 71-100.
18

19 Strong WB, Malina RM, Blimkie CJ, Daniels SR, Dishman RK, Gutin B,
20 Hergenroeder AC, Must A, Nixon PA, Pivarnik JM, Rowland T, Trost S, Trudeau F,
21 (2005), Evidence based physical activity for school-age youth, *The Journal of*
22 *Pediatrics*, 146(6): 732-737.
23

24 Tanaka C, Reilly JJ, Huang WY, (2014), Longitudinal changes in objectively
25 measured sedentary behaviour and their relationship with adiposity in children and
26 adolescents: systematic review and evidence appraisal, *Obesity Reviews*, 15(10);
27 791-803.
28

29 Tremblay M, LeBlanc A, Kho M, Saunders T, Larouche R, Colley R, Goldfield G,
30 Gorber S, 2011, Systematic review of sedentary behaviours and health indicators in
31 school-aged children and youth, *International Journal of Behavioural Nutrition and*
32 *Physical Activity*, 8:98.
33

34 World Health Organisation (WHO), 2011, Global recommendations on physical
35 activity for health – 5-17 years old, [http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/physical-](http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/physical-activity-recommendations-5-17years.pdf?ua=1)
36 [activity-recommendations-5-17years.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/physical-activity-recommendations-5-17years.pdf?ua=1)
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

References, Papers in Scoping Review

- Barrett, P., & Zhang, Y. (2012). Teachers' views on the designs of their primary schools. *Intelligent Buildings International*, 4, 89-110. doi: 10.1080/17508975.2012.672305
- Barrett, P., Zhang, Y., & Barrett, L. (2011). A child's eye view of primary school built environments. *Intelligent Buildings International*, 3, 107-123. doi: 10.1080/17508975.2011.582315
- Barrett, P., Zhang, Y., Moffat, J., & Kobbacy, K. (2013). A holistic, multi-level analysis identifying the impact of classroom design on pupils' learning. *Building and Environment*, 59, 678-689. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2012.09.016>
- Benden, M., Pickens, A., Shipp, E., Perry, J., & Schneider, D. (2013). Evaluating a school based childhood obesity intervention for posture and comfort. *Health*, 5, 6. doi: 10.4236/health.2013.58A3008.
- Blake, JJ, Benden ME, Wendel ML, (2012), Using Stand/Sit Workstations in Classrooms: Lessons Learned From a Pilot Study in Texas, *Journal of Public Health Management & Practice*, 18(5): 412-415
- Boman, E., & Enmarker, I. (2004). Factors Affecting Pupils' Noise Annoyance in Schools: The Building and Testing of Models. *Environment and Behavior*, 36, 207-228. doi: 10.1177/0013916503256644
- Brandstetter, S., Klenk, J., Berg, S., Galm, C., Fritz, M., Peter, R., ... Wabitsch, M. (2012). Overweight prevention implemented by primary school teachers: a randomised controlled trial. *Obesity Facts*, 5, 1-11. doi: 10.1159/000336255
- Cardon, G., De Clercq, D., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., & Breithecker, D. (2004). Sitting habits in elementary schoolchildren: a traditional versus a "Moving school". *Patient Education and Counseling*, 54, 133-142. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991\(03\)00215-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991(03)00215-5)
- Chatzidiakou, L., Mumovic, D., & Dockrell, J. (2013). *The Effects of Thermal Conditions and Indoor Air Quality on Health, Comfort and Cognitive Performance of Students*. London: IOE-UCL.
- Children in Scotland (2011). *Making Space Architecture and design for Children and Young People*. United Kingdom: Children in Scotland.
- Cotterell, J. L. (1984). Effects of School Architectural Design on Student and Teacher Anxiety. *Environment and Behavior*, 16, 455-479. doi: 10.1177/0013916584164003
- Darian, A. (2012). *Taking action! movement-based learning for the kindergarten through grade three learner a case study of a Waldorf education early childhood program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Arizona State University, United States.
- Darmody, M., Smyth, E., & Doherty, C. (2010). *Designing primary schools for the future*. The Economics and Research Institute: Ireland.
- DuBose, K. D., Mayo, M. S., Gibson, C. A., Green, J. L., Hill, J. O., Jacobsen, D. J., ... Donnelly, J. E. (2008). Physical activity across the curriculum (PAAC): rationale and design. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, 29, 83-93. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2007.05.004

1
2
3 Durán-Narucki, V. (2008). School building condition, school attendance, and
4 academic achievement in New York City public schools: A mediation model. *Journal*
5 *of Environmental Psychology*, 28, 278-286. doi:
6 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.02.008>

7
8 Ernst, J. (2007). Factors Associated With K-12 Teachers' Use of Environment-Based
9 Education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 38, 15-32. doi:
10 [10.3200/JOEE.38.3.15-32](https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEE.38.3.15-32)

11
12 Eviston, J., & et al. (2010). Built environment (educational buildings, modern
13 methods of construction, the free school debate, recycled modular buildings). Local
14 Government News. 32(9) Oct 2010.

15 Finn, K., Boudreau, M., Perry, C., Bottinger, L., Turgiss, J., & McInnis, K. (2011).
16 Incorporating Movement And Technology Into Academic Lessons To Improve
17 Physical Activity And Reduce Childhood Obesity: 634: Board #2 8:00 AM - 10:00
18 AM. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 43, 32 doi:
19

20 Gislason, N. (2009). Mapping School Design: A Qualitative Study of the Relations

21
22 Among Facilities Design, Curriculum Delivery, and School Climate. *The Journal of*
23 *Environmental Education*, 40, 17-34. doi: [10.3200/JOEE.40.4.17-34](https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEE.40.4.17-34)

24 Goffreda, C. T. (2011). *Linking Energizers to Academic Performance in rural*
25 *elementary schools (Project LEAP)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Penn State
26 University, United States.

27
28 Grieco, L. A., Jowers, E. M., & Bartholomew, J. B. (2009). Physically active
29 academic lessons and time on task: the moderating effect of body mass index.
30 *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 41, 1921-1926. doi:
31 [10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181a61495](https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181a61495)

32
33 Hammett, C. T. (2009). *The Effects of Physical Movement During Story Time on*
34 *Vocabulary Acquisition of Primary Students in Grades K-1: An Exploratory*
35 *Investigation in One School Location* (Unpublished dissertation). Lewis & Clark
36 College, United States.

37
38 Han, K.-T. (2009). Influence of Limitedly Visible Leafy Indoor Plants on the
39 Psychology, Behavior, and Health of Students at a Junior High School in Taiwan.
40 *Environment and Behavior*, 41, 658-692. doi: [10.1177/0013916508314476](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916508314476)

41
42 Hargreaves, D. H. (2004). *Learning for life: the foundations for lifelong learning*.
43 United Kingdom: The Policy Press.

44 Higgins, S., Hall, E., Wall, K., Woolner, P., & McCaughey, C. (2005). The Impact of
45 School Environments: A literature review. *The Centre for Learning and Teaching,*
46 *School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, University of*
47 *Newcastle*. doi: [128.240.233.197](https://doi.org/10.240.233.197)

48
49 Hinckson, E. A., Aminian, S., Ikeda, E., Stewart, T., Oliver, M., Duncan, S., &
50 Schofield, G. (2013). Acceptability of standing workstations in elementary schools: A
51 pilot study. *Preventive Medicine*, 56, 82-85. doi:
52 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.10.014>

53 Holt, L. (2003). (Dis)abling children in primary school micro-spaces: geographies of
54 inclusion and exclusion. *Health & Place*, 9, 119-128. doi:
55

56
57 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8292\(02\)00066-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8292(02)00066-7)

1
2
3 Kantrowitz, E. J., & Evans, G. W. (2004). The Relation between the Ratio of Children
4 Per Activity Area and Off-Task Behavior and Type of Play in Day Care Centers.
5 *Environment and Behavior*, 36, 541-557. doi: 10.1177/0013916503255613
6

7 Kasalı, A., & Doğan, F. (2010). Fifth-, sixth-, and seventh- grade students' use of
8 non-classroom spaces during recess: The case of three private schools in Izmir,
9 Turkey. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30, 518-532. doi:
10 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.03.008
11

12 Killeen, J. P., Evans, G. W., & Danko, S. (2003). The Role Of Permanent Student
13 Artwork In Students' Sense Of Ownership In An Elementary School. *Environment*
14 *and Behavior*, 35, 250-263. doi: 10.1177/0013916502250133
15

16 Lanningham-Foster, L., Foster, R. C., McCrady, S. K., Manohar, C. U., Jensen, T.
17 B., Mitre, N. G., Hill, J, Levine, J. A. (2008). Changing the School Environment to
18 Increase Physical Activity in Children. *Obesity*, 16, 1849-1853. doi:
19 10.1038/oby.2008.282
20

21 Legendre, A. (1999). Interindividual Relationships in Groups of Young Children and
22 Susceptibility to an Environmental Constraint. *Environment and Behavior*, 31, 463-
23 486. doi: 10.1177/00139169921972191
24

25 Lengel, T. L., & Kuczala, M. S. (2010). *The Kinesthetic Classroom: Teaching and*
26 *Learning Through Movement*. Corwin.

27 Llargués, E., Recasens, A., Franco, R., Nadal, A., Vila, M., Pérez, M. J., ... Castell,
28 C. (2012). Medium-term evaluation of an educational intervention on dietary and
29 physical exercise habits in schoolchildren: The Avall 2 study. *Endocrinología y*
30 *Nutrición (English Edition)*, 59, 288-295. doi:
31 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.endoen.2012.06.004
32

33 Lucht, M., & Heidig, S. (2013). Applying HOPSCOTCH as an exer-learning game in
34 English lessons: two exploratory studies. *Educational Technology Research and*
35 *Development*, 61, 767-792. doi: 10.1007/s11423-013-9308-3
36

37 Martins, L. B., & Gaudiot, D. M. (2012). The deaf and the classroom design: a
38 contribution of the built environmental ergonomics for the accessibility. *Work*, 41,
39 3663-3668. doi: 10.3233/wor-2012-0007-3663
40

41 Maxwell, L. E., & Chmielewski, E. J. (2008). Environmental personalization and
42 elementary school children's self-esteem. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28,
43 143-153. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.10.009
44

45 McAllister, K., & Maguire, B. (2012). A design model: the Autism Spectrum Disorder
46 Classroom Design Kit. *British Journal of Special Education*, 39, 201-208. doi:
47 10.1111/1467-8578.12006
48

49 Moore, G. T. (1986). Effects of the spatial definition of behavior settings on children's
50 behavior: A quasi-experimental field study. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 6,
51 205-231. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(86)80023-8
52

53 Okely, T., Hardy, L., Pearson, P., McKeen, K., & Batterham, M. (2012), Promoting
54 physical activity, cardiorespiratory fitness, and motor development in low-income,
55 culturally diverse schools: Three-year outcomes from the Physical Activity in
56 Linguistically Diverse Communities cluster randomised randomized trial. *Journal of*
57 *Science and Medicine in Sport*, 15, S62. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2012.11.149
58
59
60

1
2
3 Pivik, J. R. (2010). The perspective of children and youth: How different stakeholders
4 identify architectural barriers for inclusion in schools. *Journal of Environmental*
5 *Psychology, 30*, 510-517. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.02.005>
6

7 Read, M. A., Sugawara, A. I., & Brandt, J. A. (1999). Impact of Space and Color in
8 the Physical Environment on Preschool Children's Cooperative Behavior.
9 *Environment and Behavior, 31*, 413-428. doi: 10.1177/00139169921972173
10

11 Rowan, B., Raudenbush, S. W., & Kang, S. J. (1991). Organizational design in high
12 schools: A multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Education, 99*, 28.

13 Schetzina, K. E., Dalton, W. T., 3rd, Lowe, E. F., Azzazy, N., VonWerssowetz, K. M.,
14 Givens, C., ... Stern, H. P. (2009). A coordinated school health approach to obesity
15 prevention among Appalachian youth: the Winning with Wellness Pilot Project.
16 *Family & Community Health, 32*, 271-285. doi: 10.1097/FCH.0b013e3181ab3c57
17

18 Vanhelst, J., Beghin, L., Fardy, P., Bui-Xuan, G., & Mikulovic, J. (2012). A conative
19 educational model for an intervention program in obese youth. *BMC public health,*
20 *12*, 416. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-416
21

22 Vazou, S., Gavrilou, P., Mamalaki, E., Papanastasiou, A., & Sioumalas, N. (2012).
23 Does integrating physical activity in the elementary school classroom influence
24 academic motivation? *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10*,
25 251-263. doi: 10.1080/1612197X.2012.682368
26

27 Wall, K., Dockrell, J., Peacey, N. (2008). The Cambridge Primary Review: Primary
28 Schools: The Built Environment. University of Cambridge. Faculty of Education.
29 Primary Review. Cambridge.
30

31 Whitt-Glover, M. C., Ham, S. A., & Yancey, A. K. (2011). Instant Recess(R): a
32 practical tool for increasing physical activity during the school day. *Progress in*
33 *Community Health Partnerships, 5*, 289-297. doi: 10.1353/cpr.2011.0031
34

35 Winterbottom, M., & Wilkins, A. (2009). Lighting and discomfort in the classroom.
36 *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 29*, 63-75. doi:
37 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.11.007>
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Tables**
4
5
6
7
8
9

Disciplines	Journals
Built Environment	Health and Places, Journal of Environmental Psychology, Environment and Behavior, Indoor and Built Environment, Building Research and information, Journal of Environmental Education, Journal of Occupation Science and Intelligent Building International
Physical Activity	International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, Pediatrics and Journal of Physical Activity and h Health
Pedagogy	Cambridge Journal of Education, Oxford Review of Education, British Journal of Education Studies, Education 3-13, International Journal of Early Years Education and Pedagogies

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 **Table 1.** Discipline Specific Journals used to identify papers.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theme	Initial Search Results	Selection After Preliminary Assessment
BE_PA	2445	262
BE_PED	204	50
PA_PED	1960	286
BE_PA_PED	209	41
Grand Total	4818	639

Table 2: Initial OVIDSP search results and preliminary selection (based on assessment of papers' titles) of papers, for further assessment.

Theme	Initial Search Results	Selection After Preliminary Assessment
Built Environment Journals	2490	78
PA/SB Journals	857	1
Pedagogy Journals	632	4
Grand Total	3979	83

Table 3: Initial journal search results and preliminary selection (based on assessment of papers' titles) of papers, for further assessment.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theme	Selected for Inclusion
BE_PA	14 (6)*
BE_PED	37
PA_PED	19 (15)*
BE_PA_PED	0
Grand Total	70 (58)*

Table 4. Abstracts selected for inclusion in the final review. *Note that some abstracts were lacking in some key descriptions and required a review of the whole paper. This resulted in the subsequent exclusion of a small number of papers. Final numbers selected are shown in brackets.

Table 5: Overview of key aspects of reviewed studies on the links between physical activity/sedentary behaviour and pedagogy or built environment

Physical Activity/Sedentary Behaviour and Pedagogy							
First Author & Date	Country	Study Type	Age or School Type	Overall Study Objective	Relevant Measure	Relevant Outcome	Relevant Finding
Brandstetter, 2012	Germany	Intervention study	2 nd Grade	Impact of integrating 2 short daily exercise blocks into curriculum with additional focus on TV viewing and soft drink consumption	BMI, waist circumference and skinfold thickness	BMI	No difference on BMI, waist circumference and skinfold thickness
Darian, 2013	USA	Intervention study	Kindergarten-3 rd Grade	Impact of program promoting PA-integrated lessons	Physical and academic development, teacher-led movements and using movement to aid cognitive learning and prepare	Eagerness to participate, recall, focus and attention	Increased eagerness to participate, recall, extending focus and attention

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

					for sedentary work and focus/attenti on		
DuBose, 2008	USA	Randomise d control intervention study	Elementary	Protocol of 3- year program of PA- integrated lessons compared with traditional lessons	BMI	BMI	After two years 21/22 school remain in the study
Finn, 2011	USA	Intervention study	5 th -6 th Grade	Feasibility of integrating PA into science curriculum over 8 lessons	Digital monitoring on heart rate, calories and light PA, qualitative assessment of interest/eng agement and classroom time manageme	Light PA, interest/engage ment and classroom time management	Digital monitoring devices were used as an engaging way to effectively increase school-based PA

					nt		
Goffreda, 2011	USA	Intervention study	K12	Impact of classroom-based PA program	School-based steps, behavioural outcomes, literacy and mathematic skills	School-based PA, behaviour and academic outcomes	Increased school-based steps and associated with positive behavioural outcomes. No effect on literacy or mathematic skills
Grieco, 2009	USA	Intervention study	Elementary	Impact of PA-integrated lessons compared with traditional lessons	Directly observed momentary time sampling of time on-task from before to after the lesson	Time on-task	Time on-task decreased for traditional lessons, with a greater decrease in overweight students. Time-on task remained the same for PA-integrated lesson.
Hammett, 2010	USA	Controlled intervention study	Kindergarten-1 st Grade	Impact of 10-week program of PA-integrated read-aloud sessions compared with control	Acquisition of targeted vocabulary words	Vocabulary acquisition	Increased gains in vocabulary and student preference for read-aloud session

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Llargues, 2012	Spain	Randomised control intervention study	Primary	Impact of 4-year program promoting healthy diets and increasing PA through educational pedagogy	Overweight and obesity over 4 years	Body mass index (BMI)	Larger increases in prevalence of both overweight and obesity in the control group. Differences were maintained over time.
Lucht, 2013	Germany	Controlled intervention study	Elementary	Impact of digital game combining playing, learning and PA compared with teacher-centred lesson	Memory and spelling of new vocabulary and attitudes towards English	Acquisition of factual knowledge and attitudes towards English as a second language	Memory and spelling of new vocabulary did not increase. Attitudes were improved
Okely, 2012	Australia	Controlled intervention study	Primary	Feasibility and efficacy of 3-year program to target and structure of PE, modifying physical and social environment and developing links with home and local community	Cardiorespiratory endurance and BMI	Cardiorespiratory endurance and BMI	Small but non-significant increase in cardiorespiratory endurance and decrease in BMI

				compared with control			
Schetzina, 2009	USA	Intervention study		Impact of program promoting healthy eating and PA	Nutrition offerings, PA, acceptability and implementation	Nutrition, PA, implementation, effectiveness, feasibility and sustainability	Improved nutrition offerings and increased PA during school day. Program was acceptable, successfully implemented and sustained
Vanhelst, 2012	France	Intervention study	7-17 Years	Impact of 1-year program on PA and health education in obese students	BMI, classroom behaviour and academic performance	BMI, classroom behaviour and academic performance	Decreased BMI and improved academic performance. Interactions between BMI and academic performance and classroom behaviour
Vazou, 2012	Greece	Intervention study	6 th Grade	Impact of program of PA-integrated lessons compared with traditional lessons over 6 lessons	Intrinsic Motivation Inventory to assess interest/enjoyment, perceived competence, effort, perceived value of lesson and	Academic motivation	Interest/enjoyment, perceived competence and effort increased. There were no differences in perceived value of lesson and pressure.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

					pressure		
Whitt-Glover, 2011	USA	Randomised control intervention study	Elementary 2 nd -5 th Grade	Impact of 10-minute PA breaks in classrooms compared with control	Directly observed PA	Classroom-based PA and on-task behaviour	Increased light and moderate PA and time spent in on-task behaviour
Physical Activity/Sedentary Behaviour and Built Environment							
Benden 2013	Texas, US	Controlled intervention study	Second grade, elementary school	Assess impact of stand-biased workstation on posture and discomfort	Stand-biased workstations	Posture and discomfort	Stand-biased desks presented no additional ergonomic issues
Blake 2012	Texas, US	Controlled quasi-experimental	First grade, elementary school	Pilot study of standing height desks	Standing height desks	Caloric expenditure	Standing height desks increase caloric expenditure and potential behavioural effects of standing
Cardon 2004	Germany	Intervention	8-year-old children	Assessing sitting habits of 'moving' school' vs traditional school	'Moving school' (built environment details unclear)	Accelerometer data and ergonomic observations	Sitting habits are more favourable in a "Moving school".
Hinckson,	Auckland, New	Controlled	Third and fourth grade,	Assess acceptability,	Standing	SB/PA outcomes,	Standing workstations can be successfully integrated

2013	Zealand	trial	Elementary school	musculoskeletal discomfort and impact on SB/PA outcomes of standing workstations	workstation	acceptability, musculoskeletal discomfort	in classroom environments and appear to decrease overall sedentariness.
Kasali, 2010	Turkey	Cross-sectional	fifth, sixth and seventh grade, elementary school	Assessment of students' place preferences between indoor and non-classroom spaces during recess and their activity patterns in these spaces	Indoor and outdoor spaces	% of location-specific activities based on self-reported preferences and observations	Students are aware of spatial features and make choices accordingly, preferring places which offer variety and large to avoid congestion. Students good source of info for school designers
Lanningham-Foster 2008	US	Intervention	4 th , 5 th grade elementary	Impact on PA of activity permissive classroom, vs traditional classroom and classroom with desks encouraging standing	Activity-permissive specially designed classroom	Accelerometer data	Children will move more in an activity-permissive environment. Re-designing the school itself may be useful/needed

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

1
2
3
4
5 **Figure Captions**
6



7
8 **Fig 1:** Identification of research themes
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ⁱ Note that the papers on built environment and pedagogy were considered too heterogeneous to be summarised into a useful table, hence Table 5 covers the paper in the BE-PA/SB and (PA_PED) themes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Identification of research themes
133x101mm (96 x 96 DPI)