

Bond University  
Research Repository



## Promoting learning of biomechanical concepts with game-based activities

Keogh, Justin W L; Moro, Christian; Knudson, Duane

*Published in:*  
Sports Biomechanics

*DOI:*  
[10.1080/14763141.2020.1845470](https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2020.1845470)

*Licence:*  
CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

*Recommended citation(APA):*  
Keogh, J. W. L., Moro, C., & Knudson, D. (2021). Promoting learning of biomechanical concepts with game-based activities. *Sports Biomechanics*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2020.1845470>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

# Promoting Learning of Biomechanical Concepts with Game-Based Activities

Editorial

Justin W. L. Keogh<sup>a,b,c,d,\*</sup>, Christian Moro<sup>a</sup> and Duane Knudson<sup>e</sup>

*<sup>a</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University, Gold Coast, Australia; <sup>b</sup>Sports Performance Research Institute New Zealand (SPRINZ), AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand; <sup>c</sup>Cluster for Health Improvement, Faculty of Science, Health, Education and Engineering, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sunshine Coast, Australia; <sup>d</sup>Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India <sup>e</sup>Health and Human Performance, Texas State University, USA*

Corresponding author

Justin Keogh

Tel: +61 75595 4487

Email: [jkeogh@bond.edu.au](mailto:jkeogh@bond.edu.au)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9851-1068

**Keywords:** Gamify, gamification, serious games, biomechanics, health education, video games, computer games.

# 1 **Promoting Learning of Biomechanical Concepts with Game-Based Activities**

## 2 **Background**

3 Many students avoid or withdraw/drop out of science, technology, engineering and  
4 mathematics (STEM) majors (including biomechanics) due to anxiety about science and  
5 mathematics. Physics education research has documented that many students fear and dislike  
6 university physics and these negative perceptions persist even after the course is completed  
7 (Docktor & Mestre, 2014; McDermott, 1991). This parallels the anxiety and negative perception  
8 of biomechanics held by many kinesiology/sport and exercise science majors (Hamill, 2007;  
9 Wallace & Kernozek, 2017) often resulting in poor student mastery of concepts and high  
10 dropout, fail, and withdrawal rates for the course. To address this anxiety and improve their  
11 academic performance, extensive physics education research has been conducted, with large  
12 improvements in learning reported for active learning approaches compared to traditional lecture  
13 (Bao & Koenig, 2019; Beichner et al., 2007; Hake, 1998). The evidence for the greater university  
14 student engagement and effectiveness of active learning across many fields of education and  
15 science is compelling (Freeman et al., 2014; Prince, 2004; Springer et al., 1999; Driessen et al.,  
16 2020) and evidence for the efficacy and utility of specific active learning techniques has been  
17 summarised in a systematic review (McConnell et al., 2017).

18 Sports biomechanics scholars have consistently reported 15-48% greater mean student  
19 learning of sport and exercise biomechanics concepts with active learning approaches compared  
20 to traditional lecture alone (Knudson, 2019; Knudson & Wallace, 2019; Riskowski, 2015). There  
21 is also evidence that these benefits to learning can be obtained from both low-tech and high-tech  
22 approaches (Knudson, 2019; Knudson & Wallace, 2019; Soneral & Wyse, 2017). There is one

23 area, however, where potential improvements in student engagement and learning of  
24 biomechanics has not been explored. This area is the use of game-based learning activities.  
25 Game-based learning activities are another way to provide interactive and engaging learning  
26 activities that sports science university students enrolled in biomechanics courses feel would  
27 improve their learning, especially when taught in a blended learning environment (Keogh,  
28 Gowthorp & McLean, 2017). This editorial summarises the research on game-based learning for  
29 university students and recommends university-level biomechanics educators try these methods  
30 and document their effects on improving student learning.

31

## 32 **Game-based learning**

33 In biomechanics, students often require the ability to integrate a number of mathematics,  
34 physics, anatomy and analytical skills to fully comprehend the concepts (Abraham et al., 2018)  
35 before they can apply this knowledge to sports. As suggested, these skills include creating and  
36 reading graphs, applying physical equations and mechanical concepts, and forming hypotheses  
37 (Riskowski, 2015). Even if a student is strong in most of these skills, if they experience even  
38 some difficulty in just one skill, their overall ability to integrate the concepts into a workable  
39 model and performance in assessments may be compromised. Utilising game-based learning  
40 during classes presents a range of options for students to work through problems, answer  
41 questions, and assess their learning during real-time lectures and presentations as well as during  
42 their self-directed study.

43 Game-based learning involves the use of ‘serious games’ in teaching and learning, where  
44 the games are primarily focused on education rather than recreation (Moro et al., 2020b). This

45 practice can also be referred to as using gamification, games for good, alternative purpose  
46 games, or serious gaming, although these terms are not necessarily well-defined (Gentry et al.,  
47 2018). Game-based learning can present content and assess learning in multiple formats  
48 including graphics, achievement levels and competition. Perhaps due to the diversity of game-  
49 based learning options, a recent systematic review demonstrates aspects of its implementation  
50 has strong support from both educators and students in higher education (Subhash and Cudney,  
51 2018).

52         Within the wider field of adult education research, the implementation of game-based  
53 learning has been observed to result in a range of benefits across a variety of disciplines. These  
54 benefits have included fostering student enthusiasm and motivation (Sailer and Homner, 2020,  
55 Zainuddin et al., 2020), providing learners with an ability for their skills to be recognised (Bai et  
56 al., 2020) and enhancing student enjoyment when studying challenging concepts such as physics  
57 (Asiksoy, 2018; Forndran and Zacharias, 2019; Malahito and Quimbo, 2020; Shute et al., 2019).  
58 There is also some evidence to support enhancements to overall student performance across  
59 disciplines such as biotechnology (Bonde et al., 2014), information literacy (Knautz et al., 2014)  
60 and computer science (Ibáñez et al., 2014). Further, game-based learning may provide educators  
61 more in-class feedback on students' progression and comprehension of session content as well as  
62 improve students' attitudes about concepts and courses they otherwise perceive as challenging,  
63 such as mathematics and statistics (Smith, 2017). This may be particularly important for students  
64 who are initially apprehensive or fearful regarding aspects of biomechanics courses such as the  
65 physics and mathematics content.

66 For educators wishing to employ game-based approaches into their instruction (Figure 1),  
67 some recommendations are listed below based on extensive research in other areas of higher  
68 education.

69

70 Please insert Figure 1 about here

71

### 72 ***In-class polling and quizzing***

73 The use of live quizzing during sessions is being increasingly adopted by educators  
74 worldwide, where students can use their mobile phones or tablets to answer questions in real-  
75 time during a class. Prior to the session, educators compile the quiz using a variety of software  
76 including: PollEv; Kahoot!; Qualtrics; TurningPoint; iSpring Quizmaker; ClassMarker; Poll  
77 Maker; Straw Poll; Quiz Works; Articulate Studio or even Microsoft PowerPoint for the Web  
78 (using the normal PowerPoint functionality to create polls that can be accessed online). Some of  
79 the online services offer free, yet basic, functionality for limited online responses, such as Poll  
80 Maker. These quizzes can be simple to create, but after polling the students, it is up to the  
81 educator to incorporate their own leaderboards, recognitions of achievement (i.e. prizes, awards  
82 or titles [“student of the hour”]), which the students can then display on their own class profiles  
83 if they wish to do so. Other online software, such as Kahoot!, has more powerful features to  
84 completely gamify the experience using sounds, graphics, response countdowns, badges and  
85 leaderboards (Moro and Stromberga, 2020). Overall test results do not appear to be influenced  
86 whether the quizzes are interspersed throughout the lesson or accumulated at the end of the class  
87 (Weinstein et al., 2016). However, utilising these games at the end of specific content

88 topics/modules may better enhance student motivation and engagement and be an effective time  
89 to incorporate gamified quizzing in general. One additional benefit of online quizzing is that it  
90 can be utilised by students during face-to-face lessons (via their phones or laptops) and by those  
91 learning online. This makes it a feasible option for multi-modal classes, where some students are  
92 present and others attending remotely.

93

#### 94 *Adventure quests*

95 A quest is a mission with an objective. Students can work independently or in teams to  
96 solve a problem or work through a scenario. Common biomechanics questions can be reformed  
97 into an integrative “CSI-style investigation” or “what when wrong cases” (e.g. the football was  
98 not kicked far enough or with sufficient accuracy). This could be gamified by adding a timer,  
99 ‘levels’ that students’ progress through, and even a ‘boss scenario at the end’ which incorporates  
100 additional concepts, equations or considerations. This type of quest works well in groups or  
101 could even be structured as a single-person option for self-study, with the most popular genres  
102 for these types of games being either simulation or role-playing (Boyle et al., 2016). The delivery  
103 platform can be through quest triggers (or problems) displayed on PowerPoint slides, or even  
104 structured in an adventure role-playing game, such as *The Kings Request: Anatomy and*  
105 *Physiology revision game*, which guides students through revision concepts (Moro et al., 2020a).  
106 There remains no best way to embed a quest-oriented gamified session within a lesson (Welbers  
107 et al., 2019), but the practice does allow educators the freedom to implement an engaging,  
108 interactive and innovative method to deliver content and promote student self-directed learning.

109

## 110 *Gamifying content using virtual, mixed or augmented reality*

111 As anatomical structures and organ systems can be provided to students in full 3D virtual,  
112 augmented and mixed reality environments, a number of game-based learning activities could be  
113 incorporated into these environments (Birt et al., 2018; Moro et al., 2017a). Using virtual reality,  
114 the human body can be displayed and animated in a way not possible using plastic or silicone  
115 models or through the use of traditional anatomical resources such as cadavers (Kuehn, 2018).  
116 This virtual reality environment may assist the students to better understand the 3D location of  
117 anatomical structures such as bones, ligaments, muscles and tendons and how real-time changes  
118 to monoarticular and biarticular muscle lengths may influence human movement. This  
119 technology is still relatively new, and with the upcoming commercial releases of new devices  
120 such as the Microsoft HoloLens, this space will likely present increasing opportunities for using  
121 technology in future biomechanical, including game-based curricula. In addition, virtual reality-  
122 based applications can now run on mobile phones with an attached head-mounted-display (Moro  
123 et al., 2017b), which may greatly increase the accessibility of this technology and its scalability  
124 to large cohorts of students in the future.

125

## 126 *Achievements and badges*

127 One of the most common and accessible forms of gamifying curricula includes the  
128 provision of digital ‘rewards’ such as badges. As competencies are met, learners are awarded  
129 digital badges to acknowledge their achievements. Students may have fun collecting the badges,  
130 with each student having the option to publicly display these on a learning management software  
131 suite or a class website. The incorporation of digital badges into science and health professional

132 programs can increase student knowledge, content retention and overall motivation to learn  
133 (Noyes et al., 2020; Vermeir et al., 2020).

134

### 135 ***Potential limitations of incorporating a gamified curriculum***

136 There can be a novelty effect, where a great interest may be obtained in digital badges  
137 and fun gamified activities at the start, yet then drop off over the course of a semester (Garnett  
138 and Button, 2018). A relative lack of impact may also occur if the students had previously  
139 enrolled in another heavily gamified course or degree, where they may find future iterations of  
140 the same activities less engaging and interesting. Further, the excessive use of gamification in  
141 university level education for adult-aged biomechanics students may increase the dependency of  
142 the students on the educator, an outcome that will not transfer well to their future careers  
143 (Knowles, 1977).

144 Not all learners find game-based curricula enticing. Potential reasons for this may include  
145 a perception that it does not bring additional utility, that it causes anxiety or jealousy (Bai et al.,  
146 2020), or that some students simply consider themselves “not gamers” and so do not wish to  
147 fully engage with this delivery mode (Moro et al., 2020a). Game-based learning also requires an  
148 effective delivery method and underlying rationale. Gamifying content without any plan as to  
149 why it could be beneficial is likely to have no positive impact on overall engagement and  
150 learning. In some cases, the provision of gamified curricula, such as badges, has not led to any  
151 improvements with either motivation or performance (Kyewski and Krämer, 2018). This  
152 potential lack of increased motivation may reflect a wider discussion of whether games may be

153 considered a more relevant pedagogical approach that has less relevance to andragogy e.g,  
154 university level education (Pew, 2007).

155         There are also limitations to current research, with a paucity of proper controls and  
156 theoretical foundations in published literature (Zainuddin et al., 2020). There is also a complete  
157 lack of studies on the impact of game-based learning in biomechanics, let alone sport  
158 biomechanics, from the perspective of either the educators or students. As a result of this lack of  
159 research in the discipline of sports biomechanics, it is unclear if our students would necessarily  
160 obtain the same engagement and learning benefits that has been described in the wider literature  
161 (Ibáñez et al., 2014; Malahito and Quimbo, 2020; Sailer and Homner, 2020). However, as many  
162 sports biomechanics students appear to be quite competitive and have a strong affinity for games  
163 and sports, the many similarities that exist between games and sports would suggest that many of  
164 our students would likely enjoy and benefit from the inclusion of more game-based learning  
165 activities.

166

## 167 **Recommendations**

168         Given these well documented benefits and limitations of game-based learning in  
169 promoting learning in higher education, we propose several recommendations to readers of  
170 *Sports Biomechanics*. First, we recommend that biomechanics educators consider  
171 implementation of specific game-based learning activities that fit their course, students and  
172 infrastructure (Figure 1). Many students' fear and difficulty with biomechanics might be reduced  
173 if game-based learning is utilised intelligently so that some elements of the course can be made  
174 more engaging and provide students more opportunities to demonstrate their understanding of

175 key biomechanical concepts. The most accessible of these is to incorporate badges, leaderboards  
176 and achievements into relevant teaching settings, that could include lectures, tutorials and/or  
177 practical laboratory classes. Simple game-based learning activities including crossword puzzles,  
178 Biomechanics Cluedo or Jeopardy, could be used as fun review activities especially at the end of  
179 semester when students may be feeling fatigued but still need to prepare for their exams. For  
180 more technology-savvy educators, live online polling through interactive websites, such as using  
181 Kahoot! can incorporate a degree of participant engagement. For important concepts that warrant  
182 more time spent on them, the introduction of ‘quests’ will likely be well-received by the  
183 students. While developing these quests may take some planning on behalf of the educator, they  
184 may assist the students better focus their attention on specific tasks and result in enhanced  
185 learning.

186         Second, biomechanics educators that do choose to implement games-based learning  
187 activities should consider simultaneously conducting collaborative research with other  
188 biomechanics educators on this active learning approach. Such research could focus on the  
189 student perceptions around game-based learning as well as its effect on student learning  
190 outcomes and overall course results. Although correlated, learning (change scores) and  
191 achievement (course grade) are not the same. This simultaneous inclusion of game-based  
192 learning in biomechanics andragogy and research regarding student perceptions and learning  
193 outcomes will hopefully enhance student engagement and learning.

194

195 **Summary**

196 Many students fear and dislike introductory biomechanics, which can add to the  
197 difficulties educators may have in assisting their students' learning. There is strong evidence that  
198 active learning approaches create large improvements in student engagement and mastery of  
199 biomechanics concepts in the required introductory course, however it appears that the benefits  
200 of game-based learning seen in other disciplines has not been widely used or researched in  
201 biomechanics. As game-based learning has been shown to significantly improve student  
202 engagement and learning in a wide variety of other related disciplines, this editorial recommends  
203 that biomechanics educators consider appropriate implementation of game-based instructional  
204 activities and simultaneously conduct research on its effectiveness and limitations. Advances in  
205 sports biomechanics instruction benefit both the field and the application of our knowledge in  
206 professional practice.

207

## 208 **Disclosure statement**

209 No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

210

## 211 **References**

212 Abraham, L., Bird, M., Johnson, J., Knudson, D., Russell, P., Smith, D., & Strohmeyer, S.  
213 (2018). *Guidelines for Undergraduate Biomechanics* 4<sup>th</sup> ed. [Guidance Document] SHAPE  
214 America. [https://www.shapeamerica.org/uploads/pdfs/2018/guidelines/Guidelines-for-UG-](https://www.shapeamerica.org/uploads/pdfs/2018/guidelines/Guidelines-for-UG-Biomechanics.pdf)  
215 [Biomechanics.pdf](https://www.shapeamerica.org/uploads/pdfs/2018/guidelines/Guidelines-for-UG-Biomechanics.pdf)

216 Asiksoy, G. (2018). The effects of the gamified flipped classroom environment (GFCE) on  
217 students' motivation, learning achievements and perception in a physics course. *Quality &*  
218 *Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, 52, 129-145. [doi:10.1007/s11135-017-0597-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0597-1)

219 Bai, S., Hew, K. F., & Huang, B. (2020). Does gamification improve student learning outcome?  
220 Evidence from a meta-analysis and synthesis of qualitative data in educational contexts.  
221 *Educational Research Review*, 30, 100322. [doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100322](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100322)

222 Bao, L., & Koenig, K. (2019). Physics education research for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning. *Disciplinary*  
223 *and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research*, 1, Ar2. [doi:10.1186/s43031-019-0007-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-019-0007-8)

224 Beichner, R. J., Saul, J. M., Abbott, D. S., Morse, J. J., Deardorff, D. L., Allain, R. J., Bonhmam,  
225 S. W., Dancy, M. H., & Risley, J. S. (2007). The student-centered activities for large enrollment  
226 programs (SCALE-UP) project. *Reviews in Physics Education Research*, 1,  
227 [https://www.compadre.org/per/per\\_reviews/volume1.cfm?#Cite](https://www.compadre.org/per/per_reviews/volume1.cfm?#Cite)

228 Birt, J., Stromberga, Z., Cowling, M. & Moro, C. (2018). Mobile mixed reality for experiential  
229 learning and simulation in medical and health sciences education. *Information*, 9(2), 31.  
230 [doi:10.3390/info9020031](https://doi.org/10.3390/info9020031)

231 Bonde, M. T., Makransky, G., Wandall, J., Larsen, M. V., Morsing, M., Jarmer, H. & Sommer,  
232 M. O. (2014). Improving biotech education through gamified laboratory simulations. *Nature*  
233 *Biotechnology*, 32, 694-697. [doi:10.1038/nbt.2955](https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2955)

234 Boyle, E. A., Hainey, T., Connolly, T. M., Gray, G., Earp, J., Ott, M., Lim, T., Ninaus, M.,  
235 Riberio, C. & Pereira, J. (2016). An update to the systematic literature review of empirical  
236 evidence of the impacts and outcomes of computer games and serious games. *Computers &*  
237 *Education*, 94, 178-192. [doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.003)

238 Docktor, J. L., & Mestre, J. P. (2014). Synthesis of discipline-based education research. *Physical*  
239 *Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research*, *10*, 020119.  
240 [doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.10.020119](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.10.020119)

241 Driessen, E. P., Knight, J. K., Smith, M. K., Ballen, C. J. (2020). Demystifying the meaning of  
242 active learning in postsecondary biology education. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *19*, ar52.  
243 [doi:10.1187/cbe.20-04-0068](https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.20-04-0068)

244 Forndran, F., & Zacharias, C. R. (2019). Gamified experimental physics classes: a promising  
245 active learning methodology for higher education. *European Journal of Physics*, *40*, 045702.  
246 [doi:10.1088/1361-6404/ab215e](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6404/ab215e)

247 Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M.K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth,  
248 M.P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering and  
249 mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, *111*(23), 8410–8415.  
250 [doi:10.1073/pnas.1319030111](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111)

251 Garnett, T., & Button, D. (2018). The use of digital badges by undergraduate nursing students: A  
252 three-year study. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *32*, 1-8. [doi:10.1016/j.nepr.2018.06.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2018.06.013)

253 Gentry, S., L'estrade Ehrstrom, B., Gauthier, A., Alvarez, J., Wortley, D., Van Rijswijk, J., Car,  
254 J., Lilienthal, A., Tudor Car, L., Nikolaou, C. K. & Zary, N. (2018). Serious gaming and  
255 gamification interventions for health professional education. *The Cochrane Database of*  
256 *Systematic Reviews*, CD012209. [doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012209](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012209)

257 Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: a six thousand student  
258 survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics. *American Journal of Physics*, *66*, 64-74.  
259 [doi:10.1119/1.18809](https://doi.org/10.1119/1.18809)

260 Hamill, J. (2007). Biomechanics curriculum: Its content and relevance to movement sciences.  
261 *Quest*, 59, 25–33. [doi:10.1080/00336297.2007.10483533](https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2007.10483533)

262 Ibanez, M., Di-Serio, Á. & Delgado-Kloos, C. (2014). Gamification for engaging computer  
263 science students in learning activities: A case study. *IEEE Transactions on Learning*  
264 *Technologies*, 7, 291-301. [doi:10.1109/TLT.2014.2329293](https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2014.2329293)

265 Keogh, J. W., Gowthorp, L., & McLean, M. (2017). Perceptions of sport science students on the  
266 potential applications and limitations of blended learning in their education: a qualitative study.  
267 *Sports Biomechanics*, 16(3), 297-312. [doi:10.1080/14763141.2017.1305439](https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2017.1305439)

268 Knautz, K., Wintermeyer, A., Orszulok, L. & Soubusta, S. (2014). From know that to know how  
269 – providing new learning strategies for information literacy instruction. In: Kurbanoglu S.,  
270 Špiranec S., Grassian E., Mizrachi D., Catts R. (Eds.) *Information Literacy. Lifelong*  
271 *Learning and Digital Citizenship in the 21st Century. ECIL 2014. Communications in*  
272 *Computer and Information Science*, 492, 417-426. Springer. [doi:10.1007/978-3-319-14136-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14136-7_44)  
273 [7\\_44](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14136-7_44)

274 Knowles, M. (1977). Adult learning processes: pedagogy and andragogy. *Religious Education*,  
275 72(2): 201-211. [doi:10.1080/0034408770720210](https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408770720210)

276 Knudson, D. (2019). Do low-tech active learning exercises influence biomechanics student's  
277 epistemology of learning? *Sports Biomechanics*, [doi:10.1080/14763141.2019.1682650](https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2019.1682650)

278 Knudson, D., & Wallace, B. (2019). Student perceptions of low-tech active learning and mastery  
279 of introductory biomechanics concepts. *Sports Biomechanics*,  
280 [doi:10.1080/14763141.2019.1570322](https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2019.1570322)

281 Kuehn, B. M. (2018). Virtual and augmented reality put a twist on medical education. *JAMA*,  
282 *319*, 756-758. [doi:10.1001/jama.2017.20800](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.20800)

283 Kyewski, E. & Krämer, N. C. (2018). To gamify or not to gamify? An experimental field study  
284 of the influence of badges on motivation, activity, and performance in an online learning course.  
285 *Computers & Education*, *118*, 25-37. [doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2017.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.11.006)

286 Malahito, J. A. I. & Quimbo, M. A. T. (2020). Creating G-Class: A gamified learning  
287 environment for freshman students. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, *17*, 94-110.  
288 [doi:10.1177/2042753019899805](https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753019899805)

289 McConnell, D. A., Chapman, L., Czajka, C. D., Jones, J. P., Ryker, K. D., & Wiggen, J. (2017).  
290 Instructional utility and learning efficacy of common active learning strategies. *Journal of*  
291 *Geoscience Education*, *85*, 604–625. [doi:10.5408/17-249.1](https://doi.org/10.5408/17-249.1)

292 McDermott, L. C. (1991). Millikan lecture 1990: what we teach and what is learned—closing the  
293 gap. *American Journal of Physics*, *59*, 301-315. [doi:10.1119/1.16539](https://doi.org/10.1119/1.16539)

294 Moro, C., Phelps, C. & Stromberga, Z. (2020a). Utilizing serious games for physiology and  
295 anatomy learning and revision. *Advanced Physiology Education*, *44*, 505-507.  
296 [doi:10.1152/advan.00074.2020](https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00074.2020)

297 Moro, C., & Stromberga, Z. (2020). Enhancing variety through gamified, interactive learning  
298 experiences. *Medical Education*. [doi:10.1111/medu.14251](https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14251)

299 Moro, C., Stromberga, Z. & Birt, J. (2020b). Technology considerations in health professions  
300 and clinical education. In: Nestel, D., Reedy, G., Mckenna, L. & Gough, S. (eds.) *Clinical*

301 *Education for the Health Professions: Theory and Practice*. Springer. [doi:10.1007/978-981-13-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6106-7_118-1)  
302 [6106-7\\_118-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6106-7_118-1)

303 Moro, C., Stromberga, Z., Raikos, A. & Stirling, A. (2017a). The effectiveness of virtual and  
304 augmented reality in health sciences and medical anatomy. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 10,  
305 549-559. [doi:10.1002/ase.1696](https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.1696)

306 Moro, C., Stromberga, Z. & Stirling, A. (2017b). Virtualisation devices for student learning:  
307 comparison between desktop-based (Oculus Rift) and mobile-based (Gear VR) virtual reality in  
308 medical and health science education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 33, 1-  
309 10. [doi:10.14742/ajet.3840](https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3840)

310 Noyes, J. A., Welch, P. M., Johnson, J. W. & Carbonneau, K. J. (2020). A systematic review of  
311 digital badges in health care education. *Medical Education*, 54, 600-615.  
312 [doi:10.1111/medu.14060](https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14060)

313 Pew, S. (2007). Andragogy and pedagogy as foundational theory for student motivation in higher  
314 education. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 2, 14-25.

315 Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the literature. *Journal of Engineering*  
316 *Education*, 93, 223-231. [doi:10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x)

317 Riskowski, J. L. (2015). Teaching undergraduate biomechanics with just-in-time teaching. *Sports*  
318 *Biomechanics*, 14, 168-179. [doi:10.1080/14763141.2015.1030686](https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2015.1030686)

319 Sailer, M. & Homner, L. (2020). The gamification of learning: a meta-analysis. *Educational*  
320 *Psychology Review*, 32, 77-112. [doi:10.1007/s10648-019-09498-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09498-w)

321 Shute, V., Rahimi, S. & Smith, G. (2019). Game-based learning analytics in physics playground.  
322 *In: Tlili, A. & Chang, M. (Eds.) Data Analytics Approaches in Educational Games and*  
323 *Gamification Systems*. Singapore: Springer Singapore.

324 Smith, T. (2017). gamified modules for an introductory statistics course and their impact on  
325 attitudes and learning. *Simulation & Gaming*, 48, 832-854. [doi:10.1177/1046878117731888](https://doi.org/10.1177/1046878117731888)

326 Soneral, P.A.G. & Wyse, S.A. (2017). A SCALE-UP mock-up: Comparison of learning gains in  
327 high- and low-tech active-learning environments. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 16, 12.  
328 [doi:10.1187/cbe.16-07-0228](https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.16-07-0228)

329 Springer, L., Stanne, M.E., & Donovan, S.S. (1999). Effects of small-group learning on  
330 undergraduates in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology: A meta-analysis. *Review*  
331 *of Educational Research*, 69, 21-51. [doi:10.3102/00346543069001021](https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543069001021)

332 Subhash, S., & Cudney, E. A. (2018). Gamified learning in higher education: A systematic  
333 review of literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 87, 192-206. [doi:10.1016/j.chb.2018.05.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.05.028)

334 Vermeir, J. F., White, M. J., Johnson, D., Crombez, G. & Van Ryckeghem, D. M. L. (2020). The  
335 effects of gamification on computerized cognitive training: systematic review and meta-analysis.  
336 *JMIR Serious Games*, 8, e18644. [doi:10.2196/18644](https://doi.org/10.2196/18644)

337 Wallace, B., & Kernozek, T. (2017). Self-efficacy theory applied to undergraduate biomechanics  
338 instruction. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports and Tourism Education*, 20, 10–15.  
339 [doi:10.1016/j.jhlste.2016.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2016.11.001).

340 Weinstein, Y., Nunes, L. D. & Karpicke, J. D. (2016). On the placement of practice questions  
341 during study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 22, 72-84. [doi:10.1037/xap0000071](https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000071)

342 Welbers, K., Konijn, E. A., Burgers, C., De Vaate, A. B., Eden, A. & Brugman, B. C. (2019).  
343 Gamification as a tool for engaging student learning: A field experiment with a gamified app. *E-  
344 Learning and Digital Media*, 16, 92-109. [doi:/10.1177/2042753018818342](https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753018818342)

345 Zainuddin, Z., Chu, S. K. W., Shujahat, M., & Perera, C. J. (2020). The impact of gamification  
346 on learning and instruction: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Educational Research  
347 Review*, 30, 100326. [doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100326](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100326)

348

349

350 **Figure legend**

351 Figure 1: (Left) Author's recommendations regarding the accessibility, difficulty and time  
352 investment required for each of the game-based learning modes based on experience. (Right) A  
353 science student completes an interactive online quiz during an anatomical laboratory.

354

355

356

Justin W.L. Keogh

357

Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University

358

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9851-1068>

359

360

Christian Moro

361

Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University

362

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2190-8301>

363

364

Duane Knudson

365

Health & Human Performance, Texas State University

366

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0809-7970>

367

Game-based approach	Accessibility to Educators and students	Difficulty to implement	Educator's time investment to implement
Online Quizzing (i.e. Kahoot!)	High	Low	Medium
Adventure quests	Low	High	High
Virtual, Mixed and Augmented reality	Low	High	High
Badges / Achievements	High	Low	Low
Leaderboards	Medium	Medium	Low



Figure 1: (Left) Author's recommendations, based on personal experience and peer-reviewed evidence regarding the accessibility, difficulty and time investment required for each of the game-based learning modes based on experience. (Right) A student enrolled in Health Sciences completes a Kahoot! quiz during an anatomy class.