Pacific International Journal, Vol. 9(2); 2026
ISSN (Print) 2663-8991, ISSN (Online) 2616-4825[1]
DOI: 10.55014/pij.v9i2.996
https://rclss.com/index.php/pij

Integrating Technology and Physical Education: Current Practices and Emerging Trends

Nan Zhang

University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Las Piñas City, Philippines
Email:1850472832@qq.com

Abstract: This article examines how digital technologies are reshaping physical education (PE) and asks a question that is increasingly central to the field: under what pedagogical and institutional conditions does technology strengthen PE's educational purposes, and under what conditions does it risk narrowing them? To address that question, the article adopts a structured narrative review of scholarship on virtual and augmented reality, motion-tracking systems, wearable sensors, video feedback, online learning platforms, mobile applications, gamification, smart devices, and computer-vision-based analytics. The review is organized around four analytical concerns: the main technological domains currently entering PE, the kinds of educational value most often associated with them, the constraints and risks that limit their contribution in practice, and the tensions shaping future development. The evidence suggests that technology can enrich PE by supporting tactical visualization, movement feedback, formative assessment, engagement, and continuity of learning beyond the gymnasium. However, the literature also shows that these benefits are conditional rather than automatic. Educational gains are strongest when tools are embedded in clear pedagogical purposes, teacher-guided feedback, inclusive design, and workable school routines. By contrast, the evidence becomes less convincing when technology is treated as a novelty, when claims about effectiveness rest mainly on short-term motivational outcomes, or when PE is reduced to data capture, screen interaction, or performance metrics alone. The review therefore argues that technology should amplify good teaching rather than substitute for the embodied, social, and educational core of PE. Implications are drawn for curriculum planning, teacher development, governance, and future research.
Keywords: physical education, educational technology, virtual reality, wearable devices, motion tracking, gamification

I. Introduction

Digital transformation has altered the conditions under which teaching and learning occur across educational settings, and physical education is no longer insulated from that change. Once regarded as one of the least technologized areas of schooling because of its emphasis on movement, demonstration, and direct social interaction, PE now draws on a growing range of digital tools, including immersive simulations, wearable sensors, motion-analysis systems, video feedback, mobile applications, and online learning environments [35], [36], [44]-[46]. These technologies are used not only to display content, but also to track performance, structure practice, personalize feedback, and connect school-based activity with students' everyday health behaviors.

The expansion of technology in PE reflects broader shifts in education. Schools are under pressure to make learning more flexible, data-informed, and responsive to learner difference; students increasingly encounter digital media as the default environment for communication and self-expression; and concerns about sedentary lifestyles and uneven participation have encouraged educators to seek new ways of sustaining motivation and activity inside and beyond school [24]-[27], [44], [46]. Technology therefore appears attractive because it promises more engaging lessons, more precise feedback, and stronger links between instruction, self-monitoring, and lifelong physical activity.

Yet the central question is not whether technology belongs in PE, but what kind of PE it produces. PE is not merely a site for skill acquisition or exercise prescription. It is also concerned with embodiment, cooperation, enjoyment, tactical understanding, confidence, and the development of durable dispositions toward movement [30], [32]. For that reason, technology cannot be judged only by novelty or technical sophistication. A tool may generate precise data and still be educationally weak if it distracts from movement, narrows learning to measurable outputs, or displaces the social and affective dimensions of participation. Conversely, a comparatively simple technology may be highly valuable if it improves demonstration, supports reflection, or helps teachers differentiate instruction in ways that preserve the subject's embodied core.

This article argues that technology contributes meaningfully to PE only when it amplifies good teaching rather than attempting to replace it. The aim is therefore not simply to catalogue tools, but to evaluate the pedagogical and institutional conditions under which technological integration strengthens PE's core educational goals and the conditions under which it risks undermining them. To do so, the article develops a structured narrative review with three objectives: first, to identify the major technologies currently entering PE and clarify their principal educational functions; second, to

[Received 13 February 2026; Accepted 14 April 2026; Published (online) 20, April, 2026]

evaluate how these technologies influence learning, assessment, and teacher practice; and third, to analyze the constraints, unresolved tensions, and future directions that should shape more critical use of technology in PE.

II. Review Design and Analytical Approach

A. Review scope and search strategy

This study adopts a structured narrative review. The design is interpretive rather than exhaustive: it seeks to synthesize representative scholarship, clarify major lines of argument, and evaluate the conditions of effective use across a heterogeneous field. A narrative design is appropriate because research on technology in PE spans different methodologies, educational levels, devices, and outcome measures. The aim of the review is therefore not to aggregate effect sizes, but to bring conceptual order to a rapidly expanding literature and to identify what kinds of educational claims the existing evidence can and cannot support.

To improve methodological transparency, the review was built through targeted searches of widely used education and sport-related databases, including Web of Science, Scopus, ERIC, SPORTDiscus, and Google Scholar. Search strings combined the core term "physical education" with technology-related terms such as "virtual reality," "augmented reality," "mixed reality," "wearable," "motion tracking," "computer vision," "video feedback," "mobile learning," "gamification," "online learning," and "digital pedagogy." Backward and forward reference checking was used to identify additional studies that were widely cited or conceptually foundational.

The review prioritizes English-language peer-reviewed journal articles and major scholarly books or chapters directly relevant to PE. Where necessary, selected studies from adjacent fields such as rehabilitation, movement analysis, and sport coaching were retained when they illuminated mechanisms that are clearly transferable to educational practice, for example movement feedback, rehearsal, or sensor-based assessment. Studies were excluded when they focused exclusively on elite sport performance without clear pedagogical relevance, when they described technologies without discussing educational use, or when they duplicated points already well represented in stronger reviews. Recent review articles were used to establish the current direction of the field, while earlier seminal studies were retained to clarify the conceptual or technical basis of particular tools [42]–[46].

B. Selection criteria and synthesis logic

Synthesis proceeded in three stages. First, the literature was grouped into major technological domains: immersive environments; motion tracking and wearables; video, mobile, and online platforms; and gamified or AI-assisted systems. Second, studies within each domain were compared in terms of the educational outcomes they most often reported, such as engagement, feedback, formative assessment, tactical understanding, or self-regulation. Third, the literature was read critically for recurring tensions, including weak pedagogical alignment, measurement bias, inequitable access, privacy concerns, and overextended claims about effectiveness. The resulting analysis is organized around four questions: What technologies are entering PE? What educational value do they most plausibly offer? What conditions limit or distort that value? And what tensions should guide future development?

Because the evidence base is diverse and uneven, the claims advanced in this review are intentionally calibrated. The article does not assume that all technologies are equally mature, equally accessible, or equally well supported by empirical evidence. Instead, it distinguishes between domains where evidence is relatively consistent, such as the use of video and digital feedback for short-cycle reflection, and domains where the literature remains promising but less settled, such as immersive environments, data-intensive personalization, and AI-supported analytics in ordinary school PE.

III. Current Technological Applications in Physical Education

Immersive Technologies: Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality, and Mixed Reality

Immersive technologies have become one of the most visible symbols of innovation in PE. Virtual reality (VR) can place learners in simulated game situations, controlled practice environments, or structured movement tasks that would be difficult to reproduce safely or consistently in ordinary class settings. Foundational work on presence suggests that immersion can intensify perceptual realism and involvement [1]. In adjacent domains such as rehabilitation and motor training, VR has been used to provide repeatable, low-risk environments in which learners rehearse balance, coordination, and movement execution [2]–[4]. These features make VR educationally attractive because they can support repeated exposure, controlled complexity, and enhanced visualization of movement problems.

In PE terms, immersive systems are most promising when they support specific learning problems rather than serving as generic entertainment. They can help students rehearse tactical perception under changing conditions, repeat difficult tasks with immediate visual support, and reduce the fear of failure that often limits participation in unfamiliar activities [5], [6]. Recent reviews indicate that VR, AR, and mixed reality can improve motivation, motor learning, physical fitness, and confidence, particularly when tasks are well structured and clearly linked to intended learning outcomes [43]. These findings suggest that immersive tools may be useful in introductory skill learning, tactical rehearsal, and adapted or scaffolded participation.

At the same time, the evidence requires caution. A substantial portion of the positive literature comes from short-term interventions, highly controlled settings, or adjacent domains rather than everyday school PE. This means that claims about broad effectiveness should be treated as provisional rather than settled. Immersive tools may be strongest where they make invisible situations visible or reduce performance anxiety, but weaker where PE depends on direct social interaction, authentic gameplay, or open-ended movement exploration. In addition, high cost, technical setup, and uneven access remain practical obstacles. Immersion alone is not a pedagogy.

AR and mixed reality occupy a somewhat different pedagogical niche. Instead of replacing the real environment, AR overlays digital cues on physical space, which can help teachers preserve authentic movement while still enriching practice with prompts, targets, trajectories, or informational layers [21]-[23]. That makes AR potentially more adaptable to ordinary school environments than full VR. Its value is greatest when overlays clarify spatial orientation or decision points; its value declines when the digital layer distracts from the movement task itself.

Motion Tracking, Wearables, and Biomechanical Feedback

If immersive technologies reshape the learning environment, motion-tracking systems reshape the visibility of movement. These systems use sensors, cameras, inertial devices, or vision-based platforms to monitor posture, trajectory, speed, timing, and other biomechanical variables in real time. In rehabilitation and sport contexts, motion analysis has long been valued for making technique visible and for supporting fine-grained feedback [7]-[10]. In PE, its promise lies in helping teachers and students move beyond impressionistic judgment toward more specific, reviewable, and actionable feedback.

Wearable and motion-tracking technologies can support at least four recurring educational tasks. First, they allow real-time monitoring of movement quality and activity level, which can help teachers identify common technical errors or uneven participation [7], [8], [14]. Second, they support action comparison, enabling learners to compare current performance with a model or with prior attempts [10], [15]. Third, they can inform individualized practice by generating evidence about workload, progress, and recurring areas of difficulty [11]-[13]. Fourth, they can enrich formative assessment by supplementing teacher observation with records of rhythm, angle, timing, or acceleration [11]-[15], [42].

However, this domain also illustrates one of the major tensions in technology-enhanced PE: the difference between measurement and educational value. Wearables can generate abundant data, but data do not teach on their own. Numbers become educationally meaningful only when they are interpreted in relation to learning goals, developmental stage, context, and teacher judgment. Current reviews suggest that school-based implementation remains uneven and methodologically immature [42]. Moreover, the variables that are easiest to measure are not always the most educationally important. A system may track steps, load, or joint angle effectively while saying very little about tactical understanding, enjoyment, cooperation, or confidence. Motion-tracking tools are therefore most useful when they support feedback and reflection, not when they become a substitute for pedagogical judgment.

Online Platforms, Mobile Applications, Gamification, and Video Feedback

A third cluster of technologies extends PE beyond the immediate lesson through online platforms, mobile tools, video systems, and game-based design. Online environments can distribute demonstrations, practice tasks, reflection prompts, and performance records, thereby extending learning across time and space [20], [37], [38]. Mobile devices allow teachers to collect or share movement evidence, provide just-in-time cues, and connect classroom tasks with out-of-class activity habits [28], [31]. Especially in contexts where blended learning or lesson continuity matters, these tools may provide more realistic and scalable value than expensive immersive systems.

Video-based instruction deserves particular emphasis because it remains one of the most practical and influential technologies available to PE teachers. Video can improve demonstration quality, preserve exemplary performance, support replay and slow-motion review, and help students link movement execution with verbal explanation [37]. Its power lies not in technological sophistication, but in pedagogical versatility. Students may watch a demonstration before class, perform the task during class, and then review their own movement afterward, turning demonstration into a reflective cycle rather than a one-time teacher act. In under-resourced schools, video and mobile feedback may therefore offer the highest educational return for the lowest institutional burden.

Gamification represents a related but distinct development. Rather than introducing a single device, gamification applies design principles such as goals, progression, challenge, badges, or leaderboards to educational activity [16]-[20]. In PE, such systems can make effort more visible and practice more purposeful, and review-based research suggests that they may improve participation and perceived enjoyment when aligned with task structure [16]-[19]. Yet this is also a domain in which claims are often overstated. Gamified participation is not automatically deep learning. Poorly designed systems may overemphasize external rewards, trivialize movement tasks, or intensify competition in ways that discourage rather than support participation. Their strongest educational use is therefore likely to be in supporting challenge, feedback, and self-monitoring, not in replacing curricular purpose with reward accumulation.

Across these domains, a common pattern emerges: technologies are most useful when they reduce barriers to understanding, provide timely and interpretable feedback, and connect practice to broader habits of reflection and participation. They are least useful when they redirect attention away from movement and toward device management, superficial metrics, or motivational effects that fade once novelty disappears.

Table I. Comparative Pedagogical Profile of Major Technology Domains in PE

Domain	Strongest pedagogical contribution	What the literature most consistently shows	Main risk or limitation
VR / MR	Rehearsal, tactical visualization, scaffolded confidence	Most promising for structured practice and short-cycle motivation when tasks are well designed	High cost, uneven access, uncertain transfer to ordinary class settings
AR	Spatial cues in authentic movement environments	Useful when overlays clarify positioning, sequence, or tactical awareness without replacing real movement	Limited value when the digital layer distracts from the task
Motion tracking and wearables	Immediate feedback and formative assessment support	Helpful for making movement visible and documentable, especially for technique review	Can privilege measurable variables over broader educational goals; data require interpretation
Video / mobile / online learning	Demonstration, replay, reflection, continuity beyond class	Often the most practical and scalable route to meaningful integration in school PE	Can become passive or fragmented without strong instructional framing
Gamified platforms	Goal visibility, challenge, participation support, self-monitoring	Can enhance enjoyment and persistence when linked to clear task design	May overemphasize extrinsic rewards, competition, or novelty

IV. Pedagogical Implications for Learning and Teaching

Student Engagement, Motivation, and Learning Experience

One of the most common claims in the literature is that technology increases engagement. This claim has some support, but it needs careful qualification. Engagement is not equivalent to novelty or excitement; it includes behavioral participation, cognitive investment, and emotional involvement [24]. Digital environments may improve engagement when they make movement tasks more understandable, interactive, and personally meaningful. Simulation-based practice can reduce fear of failure by allowing repeated attempts in controlled conditions, while gamified systems can make effort and progress more visible [16]-[20], [43], [44].

The strongest motivational argument is not that technology is inherently attractive, but that it can support competence, autonomy, and relatedness - dimensions central to self-determination theory [26]. Students are more likely to persist when feedback is timely, goals are clear, and improvement is visible. Video replay, motion analysis, mobile review, and AR cues can all contribute to these conditions [21]-[23], [28]. Even so, current evidence suggests that motivational gains are often strongest when technology is embedded in active, constructivist pedagogies rather than inserted into otherwise unchanged lessons [44], [46]. This matters because it suggests that technology amplifies an existing pedagogical design; it does not compensate for the absence of one.

A further caution concerns the level of evidence. Many studies report short-term increases in motivation or perceived enjoyment, but far fewer demonstrate durable changes in movement competence, transfer of learning, or sustained participation over time. Engagement is therefore an important outcome, but it should not be mistaken for the whole educational case.

Motor Learning, Assessment, and Feedback

PE has always depended on feedback, but traditional feedback is constrained by time, teacher attention, and the difficulty of observing multiple students simultaneously. Digital tools can expand the quantity, speed, and specificity of feedback. Motion-analysis systems can reveal kinematic features that are difficult to capture through observation alone [7]-[10], [14], [15]. Video-supported instruction can replay performance and slow movement down, enabling students to connect verbal cues with visible evidence [37]. VR-based systems can support structured repetitions in relatively safe and controllable environments [2]-[4], [43].

Yet digital feedback should be understood as complementary rather than superior to teacher feedback. Teachers still decide which feedback matters, when it should be given, and how it should be translated into cues that students can actually use [30], [32], [34]. The educational value of technology lies in augmenting instructional judgment, not in automating it. This is especially important in assessment. Wearables and tracking systems can strengthen formative assessment by documenting participation intensity, movement quality, and improvement trajectories [11]-[15], [42]. However, once assessment becomes data-rich, questions of fairness become more rather than less important. Systems that appear objective may still reproduce inequity if they ignore developmental differences, disability, context, or uneven access.

The literature therefore supports a cautious conclusion: technology can make feedback and assessment more immediate, visible, and documentable, but it does not remove the need for pedagogical interpretation. Indeed, the more data a system generates, the more important it becomes to ask whether those data are educationally meaningful.

Changing Roles of Teachers

Technology does not simply add tools to PE; it changes what teachers do. In digitally enriched environments, the teacher becomes not only an instructor and organizer of movement, but also a curator of resources, interpreter of data, designer of multimodal tasks, and mediator between digital feedback and embodied learning [28], [29], [35], [44], [45]. This shift has consequences for professional identity, workload, and competence. Teachers must decide when technology is necessary, which tool fits a particular learning objective, and how to preserve movement time rather than allowing lessons to drift toward passive screen use.

Research on technological pedagogical content knowledge is especially relevant here [35]. In PE, the integration challenge is acute because the subject is highly practical, context-dependent, and logistically complex. Teachers manage space, safety, transitions, equipment, social interaction, and movement quality simultaneously. If digital tools complicate rather than support those routines, adoption is unlikely to be sustained [33]-[36]. Teacher beliefs matter as well. Educators who view technology primarily as a monitoring device may use it for compliance, while those who view it as a reflective tool may use it to expand agency and self-assessment. The pedagogical consequences of technology therefore depend as much on instructional philosophy as on the device itself.

Inclusion, Reflection, and Lifelong Physical Activity

Technology can also diversify access to participation when it offers multiple routes into learning. Students who are hesitant in large-group performance contexts may benefit from individual replay, scaffolded progressions, or simulated rehearsal. Learners with different physical abilities may benefit from adaptable pacing, multimodal feedback, and multiple forms of representation [4], [21], [43]. These possibilities do not automatically produce inclusion, but they do suggest that inclusive PE can be strengthened when technology is treated as a design resource rather than a prestige tool.

A related contribution lies in reflection and self-regulation. When students can review their own movement, track effort over time, or connect in-class goals with out-of-class activity, they may come to see PE as an ongoing learning process rather than a sequence of isolated tasks [20], [38], [42]. This matters because the long-term mission of PE extends beyond lesson performance. The subject is also about confidence, physical literacy, and habits that support active living. Digital tools can contribute to that mission when they help students interpret feedback, set realistic goals, and take ownership of practice. Their value declines when self-monitoring turns into surveillance or when activity is framed as an individual responsibility detached from social and environmental context.

V. Constraints, Risks, and Unresolved Problems

Although the literature often foregrounds innovation, implementation barriers remain substantial. Infrastructure is the most obvious constraint. Many schools lack stable internet access, sufficient devices, technical support, or time within short PE lessons to manage setup and troubleshooting [33]-[36], [44]. Teacher readiness is another major issue. PE teachers may be highly capable movement educators while having limited preparation in data interpretation, sensor integration, immersive media, or platform design. Without sustained professional development, technology can produce anxiety, fragmented use, or dependence on superficial routines [29], [35], [44]-[46].

Pedagogical alignment is an equally important challenge. PE is not simply a context in which any innovation becomes educational by being inserted into a lesson. Tools need to fit concrete aims such as motor learning, tactical understanding, health literacy, enjoyment of movement, teamwork, and lifelong participation. If a technology produces data that teachers cannot use instructionally, or if it narrows learning to isolated metrics, its educational value remains weak [30], [32]-[34]. This is why technocentrism is so problematic in PE. The subject is embodied, social, and affective; technology should strengthen those dimensions rather than displace them.

Privacy and governance concerns are also increasingly important. Wearables, mobile platforms, and computer-vision systems may collect sensitive information about movement, health behavior, or performance. When such tools are used with children and adolescents, questions of consent, data ownership, storage, retention, and secondary use become unavoidable [31], [34], [42]. The more data-rich PE becomes, the stronger the case for explicit governance frameworks.

A further unresolved problem concerns the quality of the evidence base itself. Many studies are small, short in duration, and highly context-specific. Positive findings often emphasize motivation, satisfaction, or usability rather than robust measures of transfer, inclusion, long-term participation, or durable learning. Novelty effects are difficult to separate from lasting benefit, and outcome measures vary widely across studies. This does not invalidate the field, but it does mean that broad claims about effectiveness should be tempered. Stronger comparative, longitudinal, and practice-based studies are still needed.

Equity deserves special emphasis. Digital innovation often enters PE through pilots or well-resourced institutions, which creates a gap between what research imagines and what ordinary schools can sustain. If future PE becomes dependent on devices that many learners or schools cannot access, technology may widen rather than reduce inequality. A useful principle is proportionality: the more central a technology becomes to assessment or participation, the stronger the case must be for universal access, accessibility, and institutional support.

Table II. Major Implementation Challenges and Practical Responses

Challenge	Why it matters in PE	Practical response
Infrastructure	Short lesson time, device shortages, unreliable connectivity, and limited technical support can consume movement time	Prioritize scalable tools, dependable routines, and phased procurement rather than prestige purchases
Teacher readiness	Low confidence in data use or platform integration weakens pedagogical uptake	Provide sustained professional development focused on pedagogy, not only tool operation
Pedagogical misalignment	Technology may be adopted for novelty without clear learning value	Select tools through curricular aims and task-centered lesson design
Privacy and governance	Movement, health, and performance data from minors require careful handling	Use clear consent, data minimization, storage, and security protocols
Equity and accessibility	Resource gaps between schools or inaccessible interfaces can widen inequality	Apply universal design principles and avoid making core participation depend on unequal access
Research validity	Short-term and novelty-driven studies can overstate effectiveness	Favour longitudinal, comparative, and practice-based evaluation

VI. Emerging Trends and Future Directions

Convergent Systems and AI-Supported Analytics

The next phase of technology integration in PE is likely to be characterized less by single devices and more by convergence. Motion sensors, wearables, mobile applications, cloud platforms, and AI-assisted analytics are increasingly being linked into integrated systems [40], [41], [45]. This could make feedback more continuous and coordination across lessons easier. Yet convergence also raises an educational question: does a more integrated data system necessarily produce better PE? Not always. When analytics become the dominant logic, there is a risk that what is most easily measured will crowd out what is more difficult but equally important, such as confidence, tactical reasoning, cooperation, and enjoyment of movement. Future systems will therefore need to show that they improve educational judgment rather than merely increasing measurable outputs.

Immersive and Extended-Reality Pedagogy

VR, AR, and mixed reality are likely to remain visible frontiers of innovation [43]. Their potential lies in scaffolding complex movements, supporting adapted participation, and making tactical situations more legible. Their risk lies in detaching PE from authentic interaction if immersion is treated as an end in itself. The key issue is not whether immersive tools are impressive, but whether they support forms of perception, decision making, and confidence that transfer back into real movement settings. Future work should therefore compare immersive and non-immersive approaches not only on motivation, but also on transfer, inclusion, teacher workload, and curriculum fit.

Personalized and Self-Regulated PE

Personalized and self-regulated PE is another likely direction. Wearables, mobile systems, and digital portfolios increasingly allow students to monitor activity, review performance evidence, and set goals across school and non-school contexts [38], [42], [45]. This could strengthen autonomy and help PE connect more directly to lifelong activity habits. At the same time, personalization carries a tension that should be addressed more explicitly in the field. PE is not only individual; it is also social, collective, and public. Excessive individualization may encourage students to understand activity only through personal metrics, dashboards, or optimization logics. In that sense, personalization can become datafication. Future models of self-regulated PE must therefore support autonomy without isolating learners from the social, cooperative, and contextual dimensions of movement.

Evidence, Ethics, and Educational Purpose

The field is also likely to move toward more explicit debates about ethics, evidence, and educational purpose. Recent reviews already emphasize that technology in PE should be judged not only by adoption rates or innovation rhetoric, but by its contribution to meaningful engagement, motor competence, equity, and well-being [44]–[46]. That shift is welcome. The most important question for future PE is not how many tools can be added, but which forms of technology genuinely improve educational quality. This requires stronger evidence, clearer theories of learning, and governance frameworks that are proportionate to the kinds of data schools now collect.

Adapted and Inclusive PE

Adapted and inclusive PE may prove to be one of the most educationally important areas for future innovation. Because digital systems can scaffold tasks, adjust information load, and offer alternative forms of demonstration or feedback, they may be especially useful for supporting students with diverse needs. However, technological sophistication should not be confused with accessibility. Inclusive design must be intentional, and evidence on sustained use, accessibility features, and the social experience of participation remains comparatively limited. Future research should therefore examine not only what technologies can do in principle, but how they shape belonging, dignity, and participation over time.

VII. Implications for Practice and Policy

Several implications follow from this review. First, technology planning in PE should begin with curricular aims rather than device procurement. Schools should ask whether a tool helps students understand movement, improve technique, increase participation, support tactical awareness, or develop self-regulation. If the educational purpose is unclear, adoption should be reconsidered.

Second, teacher development should focus on pedagogical integration rather than technical operation alone. Teachers need support in selecting appropriate tools, interpreting data, managing transitions, protecting student well-being, and preserving movement-rich instruction [35], [44]-[46]. Third, schools should adopt staged implementation models. In many contexts, lower-cost tools such as video feedback, replay, or simple activity tracking may offer stronger educational returns than expensive systems introduced without reliable support.

Fourth, institutions need explicit governance policies for privacy, consent, data minimization, storage, and ethical use, especially when working with minors. Fifth, researchers should move beyond short-term novelty effects and study transfer, inclusion, teacher workload, and long-term participation outcomes. Comparative work across educational levels, resource settings, and student populations is also needed if the field is to develop claims that are both stronger and more equitable.

For policymakers, the broader lesson is that technology in PE should be treated as a pedagogical and equity issue rather than a purely technical one. Investment in infrastructure matters, but so do teacher preparation, curriculum guidance, and evaluation frameworks that recognize the embodied and social character of PE. Technology is most likely to succeed when it is embedded within wider efforts to improve teaching quality and student health.

VIII. Conclusion

This review has examined the main ways in which technology is entering PE and has argued that its educational value is conditional rather than automatic. Immersive environments can support rehearsal and tactical visualization; motion-tracking and wearable systems can strengthen feedback and formative assessment; and online, mobile, video-based, and gamified platforms can extend learning beyond the immediate lesson. These developments help explain why technology has become an increasingly important topic in PE scholarship.

At the same time, the evidence does not justify a simple narrative of technological progress. Cost, infrastructure, teacher readiness, privacy, methodological weakness, and inequitable access remain major barriers. More fundamentally, PE should not be reduced to screens, metrics, or digital surveillance. Its educational core still lies in movement, embodiment, health, cooperation, confidence, and lifelong participation.

The strongest future for PE therefore lies in thoughtful integration. Technology should amplify good teaching, not substitute for it. When digital tools are aligned with clear educational goals, inclusive design, teacher judgment, and workable school conditions, they can enrich PE in meaningful ways. When they are adopted uncritically, they risk narrowing the very subject they are meant to enhance.

References

[1] M. Slater and S. Wilbur, "A framework for immersive virtual environments (FIVE): Speculations on the role of presence in virtual environments," Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 603-616, 1997.

[2] M. K. Holden, "Virtual environments for motor rehabilitation: Review," CyberPsychology & Behavior, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 187-211, 2005.

[3] J. Kim, J. Lee, and Y. Park, "Effects of virtual reality immersion on executive function and central nervous system arousal: A randomized, controlled trial," Computers in Human Behavior, vol. 93, pp. 256-261, 2019.

[4] B. Lange, C. Y. Chang, E. Suma, B. Newman, A. S. Rizzo, and M. Bolas, "Development and evaluation of low cost game-based balance rehabilitation tool using the Microsoft Kinect sensor," in Proc. Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. (EMBC), 2011, pp. 1831-1834.

[5] I. Renshaw, D. Araújo, C. Button, J. Y. Chow, K. Davids, and B. Moy, "Why the constraints-led approach is not teaching games for understanding: A clarification," Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 459-480, 2016.

[6] J. G. Webster and D. P. Swain, "Evaluating the usability of a virtual reality based simulator for sports training," in Proc. Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc. (EMBC), 2002, pp. 1714-1717.

[7] M. A. Gomez, J. Varona, A. Gomez, and M. Alcaniz, "Development of a kinematic feedback system based on the integration of complementary wearable and vision-based sensors: Application to the rehabilitation of the shoulder complex," Sensors, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 11756-11781, 2014.

[8] J. Kim and B. Etnyre, "Application of wearable inertial sensors in stroke rehabilitation: A systematic review," Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 3, 2015.

[9] L. Seifert, C. Button, and K. Davids, "Key properties of expert movement systems in sport: An ecological dynamics perspective," Sports Medicine, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 167-178, 2013.

[10] S. Kudo, H. Kinoshita, and G. Obinata, "A computer-aided sports coaching system based on the analysis of human motions," Procedia Computer Science, vol. 159, pp. 763-772, 2019.

[11] C. Balsalobre-Fernandez, C. M. Tejero-Gonzalez, J. del Campo-Vecino, and D. Alonso-Curiel, "The concurrent validity and reliability of a low-cost, high-speed camera-based method for measuring the flight time of vertical jumps," Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 528-533, 2014.

[12] J. Duchene and L. Collard, "Smart coaching framework: A framework to improve physical performance," in Proc. IEEE 17th Annu. Consumer Communications & Networking Conf. (CCNC), 2020, pp. 1-6.

[13] Y. Hu, F. Wang, and L. Su, "A study on the design and implementation of personalized sports training platform based on motion capture technology," Cluster Computing, vol. 22, suppl. 1, pp. 457-463, 2019.
[14] J. Kim and S. Cho, "Development of a real-time motion analysis system for sports training," International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing-Green Technology, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 605-612, 2018.
[15] K. S. Lee and J. H. Lee, "Development of a sports skill analysis system using motion capture data," International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing-Green Technology, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 405-413, 2019.
[16] S. Muller, N. Stockmann, A. Krause, and M. Reichelt, "Gamification in education and business: Cross-sectional evidence from Germany," Computers in Human Behavior, vol. 101, pp. 254-261, 2019.
[17] A. Chen and M. Shih, "A review of empirical evidence on gamification in education: An overview of major themes, common practices, and future directions," in Serious Games and Edutainment Applications, M. Ma, A. Oikonomou, and L. C. Jain, Eds. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018, pp. 25-48.
[18] J. Hamari, J. Koivisto, and H. Sarsa, "Does gamification work? A literature review of empirical studies on gamification," in Proc. 47th Hawaii Int. Conf. System Sciences, 2014, pp. 3025-3034.
[19] K. Kiili, "Digital game-based learning: Towards an experiential gaming model," Internet and Higher Education, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 13-24, 2005.
[20] F. Wang and M. J. Hannafin, "Design-based research and technology-enhanced learning environments," Educational Technology Research and Development, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 5-23, 2005.
[21] M. Billinghurst and A. Duenser, "Augmented reality in the classroom," Computer, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 56-63, 2012.
[22] D. Gavilan, A. Echeverria, and C. Rodriguez, "The potential of augmented reality for teaching physical education: An approach based on self-determination theory," International Journal of Human Movement and Sports Sciences, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 59-65, 2017.
[23] M. Billinghurst, A. Clark, and G. Lee, "A survey of augmented reality," Foundations and Trends in Human-Computer Interaction, vol. 8, nos. 2-3, pp. 73-272, 2015.
[24] J. A. Fredricks, P. C. Blumenfeld, and A. H. Paris, "School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence," Review of Educational Research, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 59-109, 2004.
[25] D. Jonassen and S. Land, Theoretical Foundations of Learning Environments. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2012.
[26] E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, "Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains," Canadian Psychology, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 14-23, 2008.
[27] M. Papastergiou, "Digital game-based learning in high school computer science education: Impact on educational effectiveness and student motivation," Computers & Education, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 1-12, 2009.
[28] M. Hamilton and M. Papastergiou, "Using mobile devices in teaching and learning: Experiences and perceptions of teachers and students," in Mobile Learning: Transforming the Delivery of Education and Training, M. Ally, Ed. Edmonton, AB, Canada: Athabasca Univ. Press, 2009, pp. 191-207.
[29] M. Hamilton and M. Pivec, "Virtual reality and augmented reality in teacher education and professional development," in Proc. Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education Int. Conf., 2018, pp. 20-27.
[30] R. S. Kretchmar, Practical Philosophy of Sport and Physical Activity. Champaign, IL, USA: Human Kinetics, 2005.
[31] J. Gikas and M. M. Grant, "Mobile computing devices in higher education: Student perspectives on learning with cellphones, smartphones and social media," Internet and Higher Education, vol. 19, pp. 18-26, 2013.
[32] M. W. Metzler, Instructional Models for Physical Education, 3rd ed. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2017.
[33] S. Gray, "The use of technology in physical education," in The Handbook of Physical Education, D. Kirk and D. MacDonald, Eds. London, U.K.: SAGE, 2018, pp. 401-414.
[34] H. Crompton, D. Burke, and K. H. Gregory, "The use of mobile learning in PK-12 physical education: A systematic review," Computers & Education, vol. 110, pp. 51-63, 2017.
[35] C. S. Chai, J. H. L. Koh, and C. C. Tsai, "A review of technological pedagogical content knowledge," Educational Technology & Society, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 31-51, 2013.
[36] C. P. Lim and C. S. Chai, "Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and their planning and conduct of computer-mediated classroom lessons," British Journal of Educational Technology, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 807-828, 2008.
[37] E. Webster and M. A. Clements, "What did we do before YouTube? An investigation of how video technology can be used to enhance students' understanding of practical skills in physical education," Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 419-436, 2008.
[38] S. Chen and C. Wu, "Development and evaluation of a mobile learning system for developing basketball skills," Educational Technology & Society, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 208-222, 2015.
[39] D. Araujo, K. Davids, and P. Passos, "Ecological validity, representative design, and correspondence between experimental task constraints and behavioral setting," Ecological Psychology, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 69-78, 2007.
[40] Y. H. Joo, T. S. Shin, and Y. Kim, "Application of smart devices for assessing sports performance and preventing sports injuries: A systematic review," Applied Sciences, vol. 8, no. 6, p. 974, 2018.
[41] M. Bielik and I. Dolezel, "Measurement of spatial movement parameters in sport using computer vision techniques," Measurement Science Review, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 277-286, 2016.
[42] A. C. Sousa, M. M. Mota, J. R. Pereira, A. M. Gomes, M. S. Cid, and P. Bezerra, "The use of wearable technologies in the assessment of physical activity in preschool- and school-age youth: Systematic review," International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, vol. 20, no. 4, p. 3402, 2023.

[43] S. Perez-Munoz, S. M. Gomez-Marquez, A. Sanchez-Migallon, and P. T. Morales-Campo, "A systematic review of the use and effect of virtual reality, augmented reality and mixed reality in physical education," Information, vol. 15, no. 9, p. 582, 2024.
[44] A. Martin-Rodriguez and R. Madrigal-Cerezo, "Technology-enhanced pedagogy in physical education: Bridging engagement, learning, and lifelong activity," Education Sciences, vol. 15, no. 4, p. 409, 2025.
[45] D. I. Tohanean, A. M. Vulpe, R. Mijaica, and D. I. Alexe, "Embedding digital technologies (AI and ICT) into physical education: A systematic review of innovations, pedagogical impact, and challenges," Applied Sciences, vol. 15, no. 17, p. 9826, 2025.
[46] A. Rodriguez-Cayetano, S. Perez-Munoz, D. Neila-Simon, and P. T. Morales-Campo, "Effect of the use of new technologies on mental health in physical education students: A systematic review," Education Sciences, vol. 15, no. 10, p. 1282, 2025.