

**Development, construct validity, and test-retest reliability of a field-based wheelchair mobility performance test for wheelchair basketball**

*athletic performance – wheelchairs – task performance and analysis – para athletics*

ANNEMARIE M.H. DE WITTE<sup>1,2</sup>, MARCO J.M. HOOZEMANS<sup>2</sup>, MONIQUE A.M. BERGER<sup>1</sup>, RIENK M.A. VAN DER SLIKKE<sup>1,3</sup>, LUCAS H.V. VAN DER WOUDE<sup>4,5</sup> & DIRKJAN (H.E.J) VEEGER<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Hague University of Applied Sciences, The Hague, the Netherlands, <sup>2</sup>Department of Human Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, MOVE Research Institute, the Netherlands, <sup>3</sup>Department of Biomechanical Engineering, University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands, <sup>4</sup>Centre for Human Movement Sciences and <sup>5</sup>Centre for Rehabilitation, University Medical Centre Groningen, University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Correspondence: A.M.H. de Witte, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, Faculty Health, Nutrition and Sport, Laan van Poot 363, 2566DA, The Hague, the Netherlands.

E-mail: [a.m.h.dewitte@hhs.nl](mailto:a.m.h.dewitte@hhs.nl)

**Corresponding author**

*Full name:* A.M.H. (Annemarie) de Witte  
*Affiliations:* -Faculty Health, Nutrition & Sport, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands  
-Department of Human Movement Sciences, Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, MOVE Research Institute Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
*Postal address:* Laan van Poot 363, 2566DA Den Haag, the Netherlands  
*Telephone number:* 0031 6 21691636 / 0031 70 4458758  
*Email address:* a.m.h.dewitte@hhs.nl

**Co-authors**

*Full name:* M.J.M. (Marco) Hoozemans  
*Affiliation:* Department of Human Movement Sciences, Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, MOVE Research Institute Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
*Postal address:* Van der Boechorststraat 9, 1081 BT Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
*Telephone number:* 0031 20 59 88561  
*Email address:* m.j.m.hoozemans@vu.nl

*Full name:* M.A.M. (Monique) Berger  
*Affiliation:* Faculty Health, Nutrition & Sport, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands  
*Postal address:* Johanna Westerdijkplein 75, 2521 EN Den Haag, the Netherlands  
*Telephone number:* 0031 70 4458348  
*Email address:* m.a.m.berger@hhs.nl

*Full name:* R.M.A. (Rienk) van der Slikke  
*Affiliation:* - Faculty Health, Nutrition & Sport, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands  
- Department of Biomechanical Engineering, University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands  
*Postal address:* Johanna Westerdijkplein 75, 2521 EN Den Haag, the Netherlands  
*Telephone number:* 0031 70 4458348  
*Email address:* r.m.a.vanderslikke@hhs.nl

*Full name:* L.H.V. (Lucas) van der Woude  
*Affiliation:* -Centre for Human Movement Sciences, University Medical Centre Groningen, University of Groningen, the Netherlands  
-Centre for Rehabilitation, University Medical Centre Groningen, University of Groningen, the Netherlands  
*Postal address:* Antonius Deusinglaan 1, 9713 AV Groningen, the Netherlands  
*Telephone number:* 0031 50 363 9053  
*Email address:* l.h.v.van.der.woude@umcg.nl

*Full name:* H.E.J. (DirkJan) Veeger  
*Affiliation:* -Department of Biomechanical Engineering, University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands

- Department of Human Movement Sciences, Faculty of Behavioural  
and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, MOVE  
Research Institute Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
*Postal address:* Van der Boechorststraat 9, 1081 BT Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
*Telephone number:* 0031 20 59 88480  
*Email address:* h.e.j.veeger@vu.nl

**Word count**

Abstract: 199

Words: 3984

Tables: 7

Figures: 1

Appendix: 1

**Disclosure statement:** The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

**Acknowledgement:** This work was supported by Taskforce for Applied Research (part of Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research).

## **Abstract**

The aim of this study was to develop and describe a wheelchair mobility performance test in wheelchair basketball and to assess its construct validity and reliability. To mimic mobility performance of wheelchair basketball matches in a standardized manner, a test was designed based on observation of wheelchair basketball matches and expert judgment.

Forty-six players performed the test to determine its validity and 23 players performed the test twice for reliability. Independent samples *t*-tests were used to assess whether the times needed to complete the test were different for classifications, playing standards and sex. Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICC) were calculated to quantify reliability of performance times.

Males performed better than females ( $p<0.001$ , Effect Size (ES)=-1.26) and international men performed better than national men ( $p<0.001$ , ES=-1.62). Performance time of low ( $\leq 2.5$ ) and high ( $\geq 3.0$ ) classification players was borderline not significant with a moderate ES ( $p=0.06$ , ES=0.58). The reliability was excellent for overall performance time (ICC=0.95).

These results show that the test can be used as a standardized mobility performance test to validly and reliably assess the capacity in mobility performance of wheelchair basketball athletes. Furthermore, the described methodology of development is recommended for use in other sports to develop sport-specific tests.

**Keywords:** *athletic performance – wheelchairs – task performance and analysis – para athletics*



## **Introduction**

In wheelchair court sports, the athlete, the wheelchair and the environment determine performance. All the activities an athlete does (or can do) with a wheelchair, the wheelchair-athlete activities, can be defined as mobility performance. Key determinants of mobility performance are the abilities of the athlete to accelerate, sprint, brake and turn with the wheelchair (de Witte, Hoozemans, Berger, Veeger, & van der Woude, 2016; Mason, Porcellato, van der Woude, & Goosey-Tolfrey, 2010). The actual mobility performance in wheelchair court sports should be assessed during a match, preferably by systematic (video) observation combined with the use of (inertial) sensors (Bloxham, Bell, Bhambhani, & Steadward, 2001; de Witte et al., 2016; Rhodes, Mason, Perrat, Smith, & Goosey-Tolfrey, 2014; Van der Slikke, Berger, Bregman, & Veeger, 2015). These observations and measurements during wheelchair basketball result in, for example, findings that players move across the field with light or no arm strokes for 24% (SD 7) of the time (Bloxham et al., 2001) and that national standard players drive relatively more forward, while international standard players perform more rotational movements during a match (de Witte et al., 2016). Assessing mobility performance is a fundamental requirement for trainers and coaches to, for example, develop training schemes, to discuss and improve the athlete's level of performance, to detect strength and weaknesses of mobility performance and to develop optimal wheelchair configurations. The use of systematic observation and/or sensor technology during matches can thus provide useful information about mobility performance. However, systematic observation is very time-consuming and results of both methods are influenced by the continuously changing environment when participating in a match of wheelchair basketball. Each match has unique circumstances depending on, for example, the opponent, injuries or team composition.

In order to repeatedly monitor athletes mobility performance, athlete performance on a standardized field-based test is assigned to be informative and helpful (Goosey-Tolfrey & Leicht, 2013; Vanlandewijck, Daly, & Theisen, 1999). Currently there is no generally accepted validated mobility performance test available for wheelchair court sports in general, and for wheelchair basketball specifically. To assess and monitor mobility performance in a controllable setting, the mobility performance during a match must be simulated. A simulation or test that is based on field activities – i.e. the match – will result in meaningful information for coaches, players and (embedded) scientists. Field-based tests are generally acknowledged as a feasible way to get an indication of the performance standard of athletes (De Groot, Balvers, Kouwenhoven, & Janssen, 2012). Field-based tests exist for wheelchair court sports, but they assess mainly other aspects of performance, such as game performance (ball skills) and athlete performance (e.g. maximal heart rate or oxygen consumption) and only some parts of mobility performance (Barfield & Malone, 2012; Byrnes & Hedrick, 1994; De Groot et al., 2012; de Groot, Valent, Fickert, Pluim, & Houdijk, 2016; Yilla & Sherrill, 1998).

Extensive systematic observation and analyses of mobility performance during wheelchair basketball matches has recently been done for wheelchair basketball (de Witte et al., 2016; Van der Slikke et al., 2015). These data were used to develop a standardized and worldwide-accepted wheelchair mobility performance test. Feasibility is a precondition in the development process and the test should be easy to take without advanced equipment. To further ensure a high external validity, the test should be performed by wheelchair basketball players in their own sports wheelchair and on a regular wheelchair basketball court. Furthermore, the test should discriminate between different categories of athletes (e.g. sex, playing standard) which it is known from the

literature that they differ in mobility performance (de Witte et al., 2016; Gomez, Perez, Molik, Szyman, & Sampaio, 2014; Van der Slikke, Berger, Bregman, Lagerberg, & Veeger, 2015; Van der Slikke et al., 2015; Vanlandewijck, Daly, Spaepen, Theisen, & Pétré, 1999). Besides valid results, the test should give reliable data to monitor the actual capacity in mobility performance of athletes.

In this context, the goal of the present study was 1) to describe the development of a field-based wheelchair test that assesses mobility performance capacity and which closely mimics the wheelchair mobility skills required in real wheelchair basketball matches, 2) to define the developed field-based test and 3) to assess the construct validity and test-retest reliability of the newly developed field-based wheelchair mobility performance test for wheelchair basketball.

## **Methods**

### ***Test development***

The development process had a stepwise character: 1) examine match mobility performance, 2) determine practical test requirements and 3) organizing expert meetings to verify the test design.

To examine mobility performance in matches, coaches were interviewed to describe and define wheelchair-athlete activities during wheelchair basketball. The wheelchair activities were assessed by systematic observation of video footage of matches (de Witte et al., 2016). Time-motion analysis was used for determining the frequency and duration of these athlete and wheelchair activities (de Witte et al., 2016). Based on the results, wheelchair basketball mobility performance was defined in various dominant game-related wheelchair activities (table I). In order to make a translation from match data to test design, the output was organized into three main categories: separate activities, combined activities and activities with ball possession. For each of these categories the most common wheelchair-athlete activities and distances were determined with inertial sensors (Van der Slikke, Berger, Bregman, Lagerberg, & Veeger, 2016).

In addition, practical test requirements were formulated for the wheelchair mobility performance test (WMP test) based on interviews with coaches and experts: 1) The WMP test should be easy to use without advanced equipment; 2) The WMP test should take place in a realistic environment common to wheelchair basketball, e.g. athletes performed the test in their own sports wheelchairs and on a regular wheelchair basketball court. 3) Fatigue should not be a limiting factor for performance. The observed activities and the requirements were used to draft the first test setup.

An expert meeting with coaches, players and researchers was organized to discuss the first version of the WMP test to increase its content validity, after which

“specific skills” were added as a fourth main group. The four main groups contained a total of 15 different wheelchair-athlete activities (table II).

### ***Construct validity and test-retest reliability***

To evaluate the construct validity and reliability of the newly developed WMP test, experienced wheelchair basketball players were included in different field-based standardised experimental sessions.

### ***Participants***

For the validity study, 46 players - competing at different playing standards - were included, and for the reliability study, 23 players - competing at a national playing standard (Dutch first division competition) - participated. In the validity group, a distinction was made between men and women competing at an international standard, players competing at a national standard, and a distinction was made between low classification ( $\leq 2.5$  points) and high classification ( $\geq 3.0$  points) players. The International Wheelchair Basketball Federation uses a classification system based on the players' functional potential to execute fundamental basketball movements (International Wheelchair Basketball Federation, 2014). All players are scaled from 1 (minimal functional potential) to 4.5 points (maximal functional potential) on an ordinal functional level scale. The characteristics (classification, basketball experience and age) of the validity and reliability study groups are shown in table III. Players were informed about the procedures before giving their written informed consent. This study was approved by the Ethical Committee of the Department of Human Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

### *Procedure*

Prior to all tests, procedures were explained and the test protocol was demonstrated using a video shown to all participants. Players were asked to refrain from smoking, drinking caffeine or alcohol at least 2 hours prior to the WMP test. Before performing the WMP test, players carried out a self-selected warm up. All players performed the WMP test in their own sports wheelchairs, with their own configurations and tires were inflated to 7 bar.

Participants of the validity study performed the WMP test once on the same synthetic soft-top basketball court. Participants were measured while being involved in training sessions and in the Euro Cup 4 tournament (April 2015, the Netherlands).

Participants of the test-retest reliability study performed the same test twice. Participants were tested during their training sessions, on the basketball courts where the teams trained, on two separate days at the same time of the day, with one week in between (October/November 2015).

### *Data acquisition and analyses*

The WMP test simulated the 15 most common wheelchair-athlete activities during wheelchair basketball (table II). All the standardized activities were carried out in succession, separated by standardized rest periods to avoid fatigue. The outcome of the WMP test is time (s), which was manually recorded from video analysis (Kinovea 0.8.15, France). These analyses resulted in 16 performance time values, one for each of the 15 wheelchair-athlete activities (*time activity no. 1 - 15*) and the *overall performance time*, which is the sum of the performance times of the 15 separate activities.

### *Statistical analyses*

All statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS statistics version 22 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, New York, USA). Descriptive statistics for the *time activities no. 1-15* and the *overall performance time* were presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. The assumptions of normality were checked with the Shapiro-Wilk test, as well as z-values of the skewness and kurtosis. Also, histograms, boxplots and q-q plots of the data were visually inspected. The assumption of normality was not violated.

### *Construct validity*

To determine the construct validity of the WMP test, three hypotheses were formulated and tested. Hypothesis 1) Players with a high classification ( $\geq 3.0$  points) are expected to perform better than players with a low classification ( $\leq 2.5$  points) (Van der Slikke et al., 2015; Vanlandewijck et al., 1999). Hypothesis 2) Players playing at an international standard are expected to perform better than players at a national standard (de Witte et al., 2016; Van der Slikke, Berger, Bregman, & Veeger, 2015). Hypothesis 3) Men are expected to perform better than women because of sex differences in upper body strength and trunk stability as key determinants of mobility performance (Gomez et al., 2014).

To assess potential differences in the 16 performance time outcomes between classification categories, playing standards and sex, independent samples *t*-tests were used. The means  $\pm$  standard deviations were completed with mean differences, 95% confidence intervals of the difference and *p*-values. Differences with *p*-values  $< 0.05$  were considered statistically significant. In addition, Cohen's *d* effect sizes (ES) were calculated for main effects as outlined by Cohen, 1992. The (absolute) magnitude of the ES was classified as large ( $\geq 0.80$ ), moderate (0.50-0.79) or small ( $< 0.50$ ) (Cohen, 1988).

### *Test-retest reliability*

Test-retest reliability of the 16 time performance outcomes was evaluated with Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICC(3,1)), Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) and Limits of Agreement (LoA). ICC(3,1) is a two-way mixed single measure of absolute agreement (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). ICC scores  $\geq 0.70$  are indicated as satisfactory, values  $\geq 0.75$  are considered as good, and values  $\geq 0.90$  are categorised as excellent reliability (Atkinson & Nevill, 1998). The SEM for agreement was calculated with equation 1.

$$\text{Equation 1: } SEM_{agreement} = \sqrt{Var_o + Var_{residual}}$$

Variance components were obtained from variance component analyses and two components were estimated, variance attributable to observers ( $Var_o$ ) and residual error ( $Var_{residual}$ ).

The Bland-Altman method was used to examine differences between the first and second WMP test for the whole group, including the calculation of the mean difference between the first and second WMP test, the standard deviation of the difference and the 95% LoA (Bland & Altman, 1986). The LoA95 was calculated with equation 2.

$$\text{Equation 2: } LOA95 = \text{mean difference} \pm 1.96 * SD \text{ difference}$$

The differences for the overall performance times were visualized in a Bland-Altman plot, where the individual differences between the two WMP tests are plotted against the mean of the two WMP tests.



## **Results**

### ***Design of the wheelchair mobility performance test***

The final version of the WMP test for wheelchair basketball consisted of 15 activities with a standardized period of rest between the activities. The WMP test is divided into four main groups. Group 1) Separate activities containing a 12 meter sprint, a rotation with a curve (circumference) of 12 meter (left/right) and a turn on the spot (left/right); Group 2) Combined activities containing the same activities as group 1, combined with starts and stops in between; Group 3) Specific skills consisting of a tik-tak box, which means performance of short movements forward and backward alternated with collisions against a stationary object. Group 4) a 12 meter sprint and rotation (left/right) with a curve (circumference) of 12 meter performed with ball possession (dribble). For the total WMP test protocol and the sequence of the activities, see Supplementary material I.

### ***Construct validity and test-retest reliability***

Time scores of the tik-tak box (activity no. 1) of the WMP test were not included in both the reliability and construct validity study. The start and stop times of this activity were not clearly visible at the video-analysis, and because of this, the data are not presented and included.

### ***Construct validity***

To determine the construct validity of the WMP test, three hypotheses were formulated and tested.

*Hypothesis 1) Players with a high classification are expected to perform better than players with a low classification.* The overall performance time was borderline non-significant between high and low classifications ( $p=0.06$ ,  $ES=0.58$ ) but the

magnitude of the effect size can be interpreted as moderate (Table IV). For time scores on the individual activities, the classification analyses showed significant differences for driving forward movements and turn on the spots, in which high classification players performed the activities faster than low classification players. The 12 meter sprint ( $4.8 \pm 0.3$  vs.  $5.1 \pm 0.4$ s; ES=0.92) and 3-3-6m sprint ( $6.6 \pm 0.6$  vs.  $7.2 \pm 0.8$ s; ES=0.81) showed significant differences between high and low classifications respectively. However, for nearly all activities related to rotation (7 out of 10) there was no difference between classification categories.

*Hypothesis 2) Players playing at an international standard are expected to perform better than players at a national standard.* The WMP test showed a significant difference for playing standard for the overall performance time ( $p < 0.001$ , ES=-1.62). International men performed the WMP test on average 8.11 sec faster than the national men (table V). The WMP test showed a significant difference between international men and national men for 13 of the 16 outcomes and showed that international men were faster on all the activities (moderate/large ES: 0.81-1.72). The WMP test showed no differences for three of the four activities that measured turn on the spot (no. 2, 6 and 10) (moderate/small ES: 0.71 – 0.22).

*Hypothesis 3) Men are expected to perform better than women, both competing at the same playing standard.* There was a significant difference between men and women on the overall performance time ( $p < 0.001$ , ES=-1.26). International men performed the WMP test faster than international women (Table VI). In addition, the WMP test showed differences between international men and international women on all activities with the exception of the activities that measured turn on the spot and 12 meter dribble. A striking detail is that international women performed the rotation on the spot activities almost as fast as the international men (small ES: 0.02-0.44).

### *Test-retest reliability*

The test-retest reliability analyses results are summarized in table VII. The ICC value for the overall performance time was excellent (ICC=0.95). The LoA95 show that an improvement of 4.20s (5.1%) can be detected as a real improvement on the WMP test. The Bland-Altman plot for test-retest agreement of the overall performance time is shown in figure 1. The mean difference between WMP test 1 and 2 for the overall performance time was 0.57s ( $\pm 2.14$ ). The variability of the differences between the two measurements seems to be constant over the range of the (mean) performance time scores. The ICC values for the individual activities ranged from 0.25 for the 180° turn on the spot (left) (no. 2) to 0.92 for the combination (no. 15). The four activities that measured turn on the spot (no. 2, 6, 10 and 14) show a low reliability (ICC $\leq$ 0.62) while the LoA95 for these activities were high (at least 0.3s, 22.0%).

## **Discussion**

This study describes the development of a new field-based wheelchair mobility performance test (WMP test) to assess the capacity of mobility performance and its construct validity and test-retest reliability. To examine the construct validity, we hypothesized that classification, playing standard and sex will influence the scored on the test. The construct validity tests showed that the WMP test distinguishes sex and playing standards, but did not show differences between low and high classifications on the overall performance time. The test-retest reliability for the overall performance time was excellent and an improvement of 4.2s (5.1%) can be detected relative to the overall performance time. However, the reliability for the activities related with rotation on the spot and the 12 meter sprint is low.

### ***Test development***

The WMP test which is introduced in this paper is a simulation of mobility performance during matches specific to wheelchair basketball. The WMP test can easily be used by trainers, coaches and scientists to gain insight into the capacity of mobility performance of players. The developed WMP test meets the requirements which have been reported in previous studies of wheelchair court sports (Goosey-Tolfrey & Leicht, 2013; Mason, Van der Woude, & Goosey-Tolfrey, 2013; Vanlandewijck, Theisen, & Daly, 2001). The WMP test is based on the most common aspects of mobility performance, the players are tested in their natural environment and they are tested with their own wheelchair configuration. However, mobility performance may change when essential aspects of the sport change, e.g. changes in the basketball rulings or wheelchair regulations. In the case of such changes, the mobility performance needs to be redefined.

### ***Construct validity***

Players with a high classification ( $\geq 3.0$  points) are expected to perform better than players with a low classification ( $\leq 2.5$  points) (Van der Slikke et al., 2015; Vanlandewijck et al., 1999). The key determinants of the classification system are the ability to have active stability and rotation possibilities of the trunk (International Wheelchair Basketball Federation, 2014). Previous research shows that trunk impairment had impact on wheelchair propulsion, especially in accelerating from standstill (Chow et al., 2009; Vanlandewijck et al., 2001). The overall performance time of the WMP test showed a borderline non-significant difference ( $p=0.06$ ) and a moderate effect size in capacity of mobility performance between low and high classifications. There were significant differences between classification levels on the separate activities related to driving forward movements (no. 3,7 and 15). In contrast, almost all activities related to rotational movements of the wheelchair showed no significant differences, which could mean that classification (trunk impairment) has less influence on rotational movements. Furthermore, the used cut-off point for dichotomizing classification in this study is debatable. Other studies showed differences between classification 1 (and 1.5) point players compared to the other classifications (Molik & Kosmol, 2001; Vanlandewijck, Spaepen, & Lysens, 1995; Vanlandewijck et al., 2003). Currently, there is not a clear relationship between classification and mobility performance. The impact and content of the classification system should be further investigated in future research.

The second hypothesis was that players competing at an international playing standard perform better than players at a national standard. This hypothesis proved to be true for the overall performance time and for 12 of the 15 separate activities with moderate to large effect sizes (0.81-1.72). Except three activities related with turn on

the spot, players at an international standard perform all the activities faster than national standard players. The difference between national and international playing standard on the overall performance time was 8.11s, which is significantly more than the limits of agreement calculated in the reliability study (4.20s). The activities, which showed no differences between playing standards were again related with turn on the spot. These activities are, in addition to low reliability, not distinctive for playing standard. Turns on the spot are frequent elements of performance during matches and therefore, important to include in the WMP test. However, time appears not to be a reliable outcome measure for these activities. In order to optimize the test, these activities must be further examined. At the moment, the WMP test is also analysed with data from inertial sensors using the method of Van der Slikke et al. (2015) with outcome measures such as velocity and acceleration.

The third hypothesis was that men perform better at the WMP test than women of the same playing standard. Except, again, for the activities related with turn on the spot, the hypothesis proved true. Men did perform all activities faster than women, except for the 12 meter sprint with ball possession. The hypothesis is based on differences in upper body strength and trunk stability between men and women (Gomez et al., 2014). However, in this activity ball-handling skills played an important role. For the rotational movement combined with ball possession the hypothesis was proven. It may be possible that there is a difference in training focus between the international men and women in ball handling. Women have better ball skills and with this, they compensate for their slower performance on the 12 meter sprint.

### ***Reliability***

The ICC values of the separate activities of the WMP test ranged between 0.25 and 0.95 and five of the fifteen outcome measures showed low reliability ( $<0.70$ ). The ICC of

four activities that included a turn on the spot ranged between 0.25 and 0.62. The performance time of these activities is very short compared to the other activities. For example, the average duration for a turn of the spot (left) is 0.90s with a SEM of 0.1s. The reason for these lower ICC values could be that the measurement error of these activities is relatively high due to the short performance times. Because of this, performance time may not be an adequate outcome parameter in these four activities. In this study, the reliability between WMP test 1 and 2 on the 12 meter sprint time was also low (ICC=0.62). Previous research showed that time over a 15 meter sprint cannot be used to assess wheelchair specific capacity (Van der Scheer, de Groot, Vegter, Veeger, & Van der Woude, 2014). In contrast, de Groot et al. (2012) reported a good reliability score (ICC 0.80 – 0.84) for a 5 meter sprint test. These differences in reliability could be explained by the differences in handling the timing of deceleration to stop. In our study the players had to stand still at the end of the 12 meter while in the study of de Groot et al. (2012) the players were allowed to drive over. The potential large variation between and within participants in timing of starting to decelerate and the level of braking (hand) forces needed to stand still at 12 meter may have resulted in a relatively large variation of performance time and thus a low reliability score. However, the design of the 12 meter sprint as part of the WMP test, including the acceleration and deceleration phases, is in our opinion an essential element of mobility performance, also considering the results of the observations of wheelchair basketball matches (de Witte et al., 2016).

#### *Conclusion and practical implications*

It can be concluded that the construct validity and reliability of the WMP test was good for the overall performance time score. The test can be used as a standardized mobility performance test to assess the capacity of mobility performance of wheelchair athletes

in wheelchair basketball. The overall outcome of the WMP test is reliable. However, the activities related with turn on the spot (no. 2,6,10 & 14) show low reliability and construct validity.

The WMP test can be easily used to periodically monitor the capacity of wheelchair basketball players in mobility performance. The test results can be used to detect strengths and weaknesses of players and to develop specific training schemes. In addition, the test can be used to monitor the progress in mobility performance, to detect talented athletes and to examine whether an athlete is sufficiently recovered from an injury. For research purposes, we aim to use this WMP test to examine the impact of different wheelchair configurations on mobility performance, as recommended by Mason et al. (2013).



## References

- Atkinson, G., & Nevill, A. M. (1998). Statistical methods for assessing measurement error (reliability) in variables relevant to sports medicine. *Sports Medicine*, 26(4), 217-238.
- Barfield, J., & Malone, L. A. (2012). Performance test differences and paralympic team selection: Pilot study of the united states national wheelchair rugby team. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 7(4), 715-720.
- Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. (1986). Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *The Lancet*, 327(8476), 307-310.
- Bloxham, L. A., Bell, G. J., Bhambhani, Y., & Steadward, R. D. (2001). Time motion analysis and physiological profile of canadian world cup wheelchair basketball players. *Sports Medicine, Training and Rehabilitation*, 10, 183-198.
- Byrnes, D., & Hedrick, B. (1994). Comprehensive basketball grading system. In B. Hedrick, D. Byrnes & L. Shaver (Eds.), *Wheelchair basketball* (pp. 79). Washington: Paralyzed Veterans of America.
- Chow, J. W., Millikan, T. A., Carlton, L. G., Chae, W., Lim, Y., & Morse, M. I. (2009). Kinematic and electromyographic analysis of wheelchair propulsion on ramps of different slopes for young men with paraplegia. *Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, 90(2), 271-278.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed. ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1(3), 98-101.
- De Groot, S., Balvers, I. J. M., Kouwenhoven, S. M., & Janssen, T. W. J. (2012). Validity and reliability of tests determining performance-related components of wheelchair basketball. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 30(9), 879-887.
- de Groot, S., Valent, L. J., Fickert, R., Pluim, B., & Houdijk, H. (2016). An incremental shuttle wheel test for wheelchair tennis players. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2015-0598
- de Witte, A. M., Hoozemans, M. J., Berger, M. A., Veeger, D. (E. J.), van der Woude, Lucas HV, & van der Woude, Lucas HV. (2016). Do field position and playing standard influence athlete performance in wheelchair basketball? *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 34(9), 811-820.
- Gomez, M. A., Perez, J., Molik, B., Szyman, R. J., & Sampaio, J. (2014). Performance analysis of elite men's and women's wheelchair basketball teams. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(11), 1066-1075.
- Goosey-Tolfrey, V., & Leicht, C. (2013). Field-based physiological testing of wheelchair athletes. *Sports Medicine*, 43(2), 77-91.
- International Wheelchair Basketball Federation. (2014). *Official wheelchair basketball rules 2014*. Incheon, Korea: International Wheelchair Basketball Federation.
- Mason, B., Porcellato, L., van der Woude, Luc HV, & Goosey-Tolfrey, V. L. (2010). A qualitative examination of wheelchair configuration for optimal mobility

- performance in wheelchair sports: A pilot study. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 42(2), 141-149.
- Mason, B., Van der Woude, L., & Goosey-Tolfrey, V. (2013). The ergonomics of wheelchair configuration for optimal performance in the wheelchair court sports. *Sports Medicine*, 43(1), 23-38.
- Molik, B., & Kosmol, A. (2001). In search of objective criteria in wheelchair basketball player classification. *Vista*, 99, 355-368.
- Rhodes, J., Mason, B., Perrat, B., Smith, M., & Goosey-Tolfrey, V. (2014). The validity and reliability of a novel indoor player tracking system for use within wheelchair court sports. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(17), 1639-1647.
- Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(2), 420-428.
- Van der Scheer, Jan W, de Groot, S., Vegter, R. J., Veeger, D. H., & Van der Woude, Lucas HV. (2014). Can a 15m-overground wheelchair sprint be used to assess wheelchair-specific anaerobic work capacity? *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 36(4), 432-438.
- Van Der Slikke, R., Berger, M., Bregman, D., Lagerberg, A., & Veeger, H. (2015). Opportunities for measuring wheelchair kinematics in match settings; reliability of a three inertial sensor configuration. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 48(12), 3398-3405.
- Van der Slikke, R., Berger, M., Bregman, D., & Veeger, H. (2015). Estimated athlete's basketball match performance based on measurement of wheelchair kinematics using inertial sensors. *International Society of Biomechanics*, Glasgow, UK.

Van der Slikke, R.M.A., Berger, M.A.M., Bregman, D.J.J., Lagerberg, A.H., & Veeger, H.E.J. (2016). From big data to rich data, the key kinematics of wheelchair mobility performance. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Vanlandewijck, Y., Theisen, D., & Daly, D. (2001). Wheelchair propulsion biomechanics: Implications for wheelchair sports. *Sports Medicine*, 31(5), 339-367.

Vanlandewijck, Y., Daly, D., Spaepen, A., Theisen, D., & Pétré, L. (1999). Biomechanics in handrim wheelchair propulsion:-Wheelchair-user interface adjustment for basketball. *Education, Physical Training, Sport*, 33(4), 50-53.

Vanlandewijck, Y., Daly, D., & Theisen, D. (1999). Field test evaluation of aerobic, anaerobic, and wheelchair basketball skill performances. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 20(8), 548-554.

Vanlandewijck, Y. C., Evangelinou, C., Daly, D. D., van Houtte, S., Verellen, J., Aspeslagh, V., . . . Zwakhoven, B. (2003). Proportionality in wheelchair basketball classification. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 20(4), 369-380.

Vanlandewijck, Y. C., Spaepen, A. J., & Lysens, R. J. (1995). Relationship between the level of physical impairment and sports performance in elite wheelchair.. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 12(2), 139-150.

Yilla, A. B., & Sherrill, C. (1998). Validating the beck battery of quad rugby skill tests. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 15, 155-167.

**Table I** Overview of the relative duration ( $\pm$ SD) as a percentage of wheelchair-athlete activities during matches, complemented with information from data of inertial sensors.

Wheelchair activities	Relative duration % ( $\pm$ SD)	Relative duration during ball possession % ( $\pm$ SD)	Outcome inertial sensors
Standing still	19 (6)	26 (16)	--
Driving forward	45 (6)	42 (12)	Most common: 3 m Maximal: 12 meter
Driving backward	2 (1)	1 (1)	--
Rotate	29 (8)	28 (12)	Most common: radius 1.5-2.5m
Brake	3 (2)	2 (2)	--

**Table II** Set-up test protocol based on observed wheelchair-athlete activities and distances. For the total test protocol see Supplementary material I.

Main group	Activity	Distance	Direction
Separate activities	Driving forward	12 meter	--
	Rotation	Radius 1.9m (total circumference of 12 meter)	Clockwise/ Counterclockwise
	Rotation on the spot		Clockwise/ Counterclockwise
Combined activities	Driving forward with 2 stops	3, 3 and 6m = 12 meter	--
	Rotation with 2 stops	90° (3m), 90° (3m), 180° (6m) = 12 meter	Clockwise/ Counterclockwise
	Rotation on the spot with stop	90°, 90°	Clockwise/ Counterclockwise
	Combined activities		--
Specific skills	Tik-Tak Box		--
Activities with ball possession	Driving forward	12 meter	--
	Rotation	Radius 1.9m (total circumference of 12 meter)	Clockwise/ Counterclockwise

**Table III** General characteristics of the participants included in the construct validity and test-retest reliability analyses for classification 1-4.5.

	Classification	n	Experience in years ( $\pm$ SD)	Age in years ( $\pm$ SD)	International men (n)	International women (n)	National (n)
Validity study	1-1.5	8	7.2 (4.8)	28.3 (7.1)	3	3	2
	2-2.5	11	12.9 (6.9)	28.9 (9.3)	6	3	2
	3-3.5	8	9.1 (3.3)	26.7 (10.0)	5	3	-
	4-4.5	19	8.4 (5.2)	24.7 (8.3)	7	4	8
Reliability study	1-1.5	2	4.0 (0.7)	21.0 (4.2)	-	-	2
	2-2.5	1	9.0	21.0	-	-	1
	3-3.5	5	6.4 (1.9)	16.8 (5.1)	-	-	5
	4-4.5	15	6.5 (6.4)	22.8 (10.8)	-	-	15

**Table IV** Mean ( $\pm$ SD) performance times for each activity and overall performance time of the wheelchair mobility performance test for classification (classification  $\leq 2.5$  points and classification  $> 2.5$  points) complemented with the mean difference between the groups, 95% confidence intervals of the differences and Cohen's d effect sizes.

		Classification $\leq 2.5$ points (n=19)	Classification $> 2.5$ points (n=27)	Mean difference	Standard Error difference	95% Confidence Interval of the difference		p-values	Effect Size
		Mean ( $\pm$ SD)	Mean ( $\pm$ SD)			Lower	Upper		
Activity 1	Tik-Tak box	-	-					-	-
Activity 2	180° Turn on the spot (left)	0.93 (0.09)	0.84 (0.08)	0.09	0.02	0.04	0.14	0.00*	1.04
Activity 3	12 meter sprint	5.12 (0.42)	4.80 (0.28)	0.32	0.10	0.11	0.53	0.00*	0.92
Activity 4	12 meter rotation (right)	5.97 (0.41)	5.90 (0.40)	0.07	0.12	-0.17	0.31	0.57	0.17
Activity 5	12 meter rotation (left)	5.95 (0.47)	5.89 (0.39)	0.06	0.13	-0.19	0.32	0.62	0.15
Activity 6	180° Turn on the spot (right)	0.95 (0.13)	0.89 (0.12)	0.06	0.04	-0.01	0.14	0.10	0.50
Activity 7	3-3-6m sprint	7.19 (0.77)	6.64 (0.61)	0.55	0.20	0.14	0.96	0.01*	0.81
Activity 8	3-3-6m rotation (left)	7.66 (0.84)	7.33 (0.61)	0.33	0.21	-0.10	0.76	0.13	0.47
Activity 9	3-3-6m rotation (right)	7.58 (0.80)	7.23 (0.61)	0.36	0.21	-0.06	0.78	0.09	0.51
Activity 10	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (left)	1.54 (0.19)	1.38 (0.17)	0.16	0.05	0.05	0.27	0.01*	0.87
Activity 11	12 meter dribble	6.03 (0.70)	5.80 (0.68)	0.24	0.21	-0.18	0.65	0.26	0.34
Activity 12	12 meter rotation dribble (right)	7.38 (0.91)	7.17 (0.87)	0.22	0.26	-0.31	0.75	0.41	0.25
Activity 13	12 meter rotation dribble (left)	7.42 (0.97)	7.27 (0.68)	0.15	0.24	-0.34	0.64	0.54	0.19
Activity 14	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (right)	1.41 (0.17)	1.31 (0.15)	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.19	0.05*	0.61
Activity 15	Combination	13.95 (0.95)	13.42 (0.67)	0.53	0.24	0.04	1.02	0.03*	0.67
<b>Overall performance time</b> (Sum activities 2 to 15)		79.25 (6.56)	75.95 (4.97)	3.30	1.72	-0.17	6.77	0.06	0.58

\*Significant effect of classification ( $p < 0.05$ ).



**Table V** Mean ( $\pm$ SD) performance times for each activity and overall performance time of the wheelchair mobility performance test for differences in playing standard (international men & national men) complemented with the mean difference between the groups, 95% confidence intervals of the differences and Cohen's d effect sizes.

		International men (n=21)	National men (n=12)	Mean difference	Standard Error difference	95% Confidence Interval of the difference		<i>p</i> -values	Effect Size
		Mean ( $\pm$ SD)	Mean ( $\pm$ SD)			Lower	Upper		
Activity 1	Tik-Tak box	-	-					-	-
Activity 2	180° Turn on the spot (left)	0.87 (0.09)	0.89 (0.12)	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.05	0.54	-0.22
Activity 3	12 meter sprint	4.76 (0.34)	5.08 (0.45)	-0.32	0.14	-0.60	-0.03	0.03*	-0.84
Activity 4	12 meter rotation (right)	5.72 (0.42)	6.16 (0.37)	-0.43	0.15	-0.73	-0.14	0.01*	-1.08
Activity 5	12 meter rotation (left)	5.67 (0.38)	6.17 (0.38)	-0.51	0.14	-0.79	-0.23	0.00*	-1.33
Activity 6	180° Turn on the spot (right)	0.90 (0.15)	0.95 (0.15)	-0.05	0.05	-0.16	0.06	0.38	-0.32
Activity 7	3-3-6m sprint	6.57 (0.75)	7.17 (0.73)	-0.60	0.27	-1.15	-0.06	0.03*	-0.81
Activity 8	3-3-6m rotation (left)	7.01 (0.71)	7.88 (0.52)	-0.86	0.24	-1.34	-0.38	0.00*	-1.32
Activity 9	3-3-6m rotation (right)	6.91 (0.56)	7.89 (0.60)	-0.99	0.21	-1.41	-0.56	0.00*	-1.72
Activity 10	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (left)	1.41 (0.21)	1.55 (0.18)	-0.14	0.07	-0.29	0.01	0.06	-0.71
Activity 11	12 meter dribble	5.66 (0.63)	6.25 (0.67)	-0.59	0.23	-1.07	-0.12	0.02*	-0.92
Activity 12	12 meter rotation dribble (right)	6.77 (0.69)	7.91 (0.77)	-1.13	0.26	-1.67	-0.60	0.00*	-1.57
Activity 13	12 meter rotation dribble (left)	6.88 (0.73)	7.99 (0.72)	-1.10	0.26	-1.64	-0.57	0.00*	-1.52
Activity 14	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (right)	1.28 (0.15)	1.49 (0.17)	-0.21	0.06	-0.32	-0.09	0.00*	-1.34
Activity 15	Combination	13.15 (0.70)	14.17 (0.86)	-1.02	0.28	-1.59	-0.45	0.00*	-1.34
<b>Overall performance time (Sum activities 2 to 15)</b>		73.44 (4.95)	81.55 (5.08)	-8.11	1.83	-11.84	-4.37	0.00*	-1.62

\*Significant effect of playing standard ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table VI** Mean ( $\pm$ SD) performance times for each activity and overall performance time of the wheelchair mobility performance test for differences in sex (international men & international women) complemented with the mean difference between the groups, 95% confidence intervals of the differences and Cohen's d effect sizes.

		International men (n=21)	International women (n=13)	Mean difference	Standard Error difference	95% Confidence Interval of the difference		<i>p</i> -values	Effect Size
		Mean ( $\pm$ SD)	Mean ( $\pm$ SD)			Lower	Upper		
Activity 1	Tik-Tak box	-	-					-	
Activity 2	180° Turn on the spot (left)	0.87 (0.09)	0.89 (0.07)	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	0.58	-0.20
Activity 3	12 meter sprint	4.76 (0.34)	5.04 (0.27)	-0.28	0.11	-0.50	-0.05	0.02*	-0.90
Activity 4	12 meter rotation (right)	5.72 (0.42)	6.07 (0.21)	-0.35	0.12	-0.60	-0.09	0.01*	-0.98
Activity 5	12 meter rotation (left)	5.67 (0.38)	6.07 (0.29)	-0.40	0.12	-0.65	-0.15	0.00*	-1.15
Activity 6	180° Turn on the spot (right)	0.90 (0.15)	0.90 (0.07)	0.00	0.04	-0.09	0.09	0.95	0.02
Activity 7	3-3-6m sprint	6.57 (0.75)	7.06 (0.52)	-0.49	0.24	-0.97	-0.01	0.05*	-0.73
Activity 8	3-3-6m rotation (left)	7.01 (0.71)	7.83 (0.45)	-0.81	0.22	-1.27	-0.36	0.00*	-1.30
Activity 9	3-3-6m rotation (right)	6.91 (0.56)	7.65 (0.56)	-0.74	0.20	-1.14	-0.34	0.00*	-1.33
Activity 10	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (left)	1.41 (0.21)	1.40 (0.14)	0.01	0.07	-0.14	0.15	0.93	0.03
Activity 11	12 meter dribble	5.66 (0.63)	5.95 (0.70)	-0.30	0.23	-0.77	0.17	0.21	-0.45
Activity 12	12 meter rotation dribble (right)	6.77 (0.69)	7.44 (0.84)	-0.67	0.26	-1.20	-0.13	0.02*	-0.89
Activity 13	12 meter rotation dribble (left)	6.88 (0.73)	7.47 (0.51)	-0.58	0.23	-1.06	-0.11	0.02*	-0.89
Activity 14	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (right)	1.28 (0.15)	1.34 (0.10)	-0.06	0.05	-0.15	0.04	0.22	-0.44
Activity 15	Combination	13.15 (0.70)	13.88 (0.55)	-0.73	0.23	-1.20	-0.26	0.00*	-1.12
<b>Overall performance time</b> (Sum activities 2 to 15)		73.44 (4.95)	79.21 (3.88)	-5.76	1.63	-9.08	-2.44	0.00*	-1.26

\*Significant effect of sex ( $p<0.05$ ).

**Table VII** Descriptive values (mean  $\pm$ SD) and mean differences for the test-retest complemented with reliability statistics (s): Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC3,1) absolute agreement, standard error of measurement (SEM) and 95%limits of agreement.

		Test 1	Test 2	Mean difference	ICC	SEM	Limits of
		Mean ( $\pm$ SD)	Mean ( $\pm$ SD)	( $\pm$ SD)	agreement	agreement	agreement
Test1	Tik-Tak box	-	-	-	-	-	-
Test2	180° Turn on the spot (left)	0.90 (0.15)	0.90 (0.10)	0.00 (0.15)	0.25	0.10	0.30
Test3	12 meter sprint	5.02 (0.36)	5.13 (0.42)	-0.10 (0.34)	0.62	0.24	0.66
Test4	12 meter rotation (right)	6.33 (0.56)	6.33 (0.49)	0.00 (0.23)	0.91	0.16	0.45
Test5	12 meter rotation (left)	6.33 (0.54)	6.40 (0.56)	-0.08 (0.31)	0.84	0.22	0.61
Test6	180° Turn on the spot (right)	0.93 (0.16)	0.90 (0.13)	0.03 (0.14)	0.55	0.10	0.26
Test7	3-3-6m sprint	7.11 (0.61)	6.98 (0.62)	0.14 (0.38)	0.80	0.28	0.75
Test8	3-3-6m rotation (left)	8.05 (0.74)	7.92 (0.81)	0.13 (0.36)	0.88	0.26	0.70
Test9	3-3-6m rotation (right)	8.06 (0.88)	7.82 (0.72)	0.24 (0.48)	0.79	0.37	0.94
Test10	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (left)	1.49 (0.26)	1.40 (0.18)	0.09 (0.19)	0.62	0.14	0.37
Test11	12 meter dribble	6.23 (0.68)	6.19 (0.60)	0.04 (0.45)	0.76	0.31	0.88
Test12	12 meter rotation dribble (right)	8.29 (1.31)	8.34 (1.20)	-0.05 (0.81)	0.80	0.56	1.58
Test13	12 meter rotation dribble (left)	8.30 (1.06)	8.24 (1.04)	0.06 (0.74)	0.76	0.51	1.44
Test14	90°- 90° turn on the spot with stop (right)	1.40 (0.20)	1.36 (0.16)	0.04 (0.16)	0.62	0.11	0.31
Test15	Combination	14.44 (1.30)	14.41 (1.13)	0.04 (0.49)	0.92	0.34	0.96
<b>Overall performance time</b> (Sum activities 2 to 15)		82.88 (7.22)	82.31 (6.41)	0.57 (2.14)	0.95	1.53	4.20

[ FIGURE 1]

**Figure 1** Bland–Altman graph for overall performance time on the wheelchair mobility performance test (n=23). The solid line represents the mean difference between test 1 and test 2. The dashed lines represents the 95% limits of agreement for the performance times (mean difference  $\pm 1.96SD$ ).