



**HAL**  
open science

**Motor assessment of preschool aged children: a preliminary investigation of the validity of the Bruininks – Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency- Short Form**

Venetsanou Fotini, Kambas Antonis, Aggeloussis Nickos, Fatouros Ioannis, Taxildaris Kyriakos

► **To cite this version:**

Venetsanou Fotini, Kambas Antonis, Aggeloussis Nickos, Fatouros Ioannis, Taxildaris Kyriakos. Motor assessment of preschool aged children: a preliminary investigation of the validity of the Bruininks – Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency- Short Form. *Human Movement Science*, 2009, 28 (4), pp.543. 10.1016/j.humov.2009.03.002 . hal-00557316

**HAL Id: hal-00557316**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00557316>**

Submitted on 19 Jan 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.


## Accepted Manuscript

Motor assessment of preschool aged children: a preliminary investigation of the validity of the Bruininks – Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency- Short Form

Venetsanou Fotini, Kambas Antonis, Aggeloussis Nickos, Fatouros Ioannis, Taxildaris Kyriakos

PII: S0167-9457(09)00040-2  
DOI: [10.1016/j.humov.2009.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2009.03.002)  
Reference: HUMOV 1149

To appear in: *Human Movement Science*



Please cite this article as: Fotini, V., Antonis, K., Nickos, A., Ioannis, F., Kyriakos, T., Motor assessment of preschool aged children: a preliminary investigation of the validity of the Bruininks – Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency- Short Form, *Human Movement Science* (2009), doi: [10.1016/j.humov.2009.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2009.03.002)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 **Title:** Motor assessment of preschool aged children: a preliminary  
2 investigation of the validity of the Bruininks - Oseretsky Test of Motor  
3 Proficiency- Short Form.

4

5 **Venetsanou Fotini** PhD, Physical educator

6 **Kambas Antonis** PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education  
7 and Sport Science, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

8 **Aggeloussis Nickos** PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Physical  
9 Education and Sport Science, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

10 **Fatouros Ioannis** PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education  
11 and Sport Science, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

12 **Taxildaris Kyriakos** PhD, Professor, Department of Physical Education and  
13 Sport Science, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## 1 Summary

2 The aim of this study was to examine the validity of the Bruininks-Oseretsky  
3 Test of Motor Proficiency - Short Form (BOTMP-SF) (Bruininks, 1978) for the  
4 assessment of preschool aged children. Three hundred and eighteen children  
5 48-71 months old ( $M = 58.97$  months,  $SD = 6.73$ ) participated in the study. For  
6 the data analysis both an ANOVA and a MANOVA were applied with the  
7 total battery score and the 14 item scores being the dependent variables,  
8 respectively. Age was found to have a significant effect on both children's  
9 total battery score ( $F(3, 314) = 110.65, p < .001, \eta^2 = .68$ ) and 13 item scores  
10 (minimum  $F(3, 314) = 8.75, p < .001, \text{minimum } \eta^2 = .145$ ). Although the  
11 aforementioned results represent an evidence for the validity of the BOTMP-  
12 SF, a closer study on the score of each item revealed a high percentage of zero  
13 scores on four items. Task difficulty has caused a floor effect, constituting a  
14 threat to the validity of the preschoolers' motor assessment with the above  
15 battery. A modification of the battery items is suggested, so that the BOTMP-  
16 SF will give valid results for children 4-6 years old.

17

18 **Key words:** *preschool age, motor assessment, BOTMP-SF, validity.*

19

20

21

22

23

24

## 1 **1. Introduction**

2 Motor assessment of preschool - aged children is thought to be both  
3 necessary and valuable (Payne & Isaacs, 1998; Zimmer, 2004) for three major  
4 reasons. To begin with, during infancy and preschool age, movement is an  
5 integral part of children's life. In that period, children use movement in order  
6 to discover themselves and the world (Zimmer, 2004). Consequently, the  
7 study of a child's motor development is a prerequisite for the full  
8 understanding of his or her whole development (Payne & Isaacs, 1998).  
9 Moreover, planning, implementation, and evaluation of developmentally  
10 adequate movement programs depend on proper and sound diagnosis of the  
11 child's level of motor development (Zimmer & Circus, 1993). Finally, the  
12 identification of children that may have developmental delays is the first step  
13 to impede later difficulties. An intervention in preschool years is both cheaper  
14 and more effective than a therapy in older age, narrowing (and in some cases  
15 minimizing) problems that associate with developmental delays (Berk &  
16 DeGangri, 1979; McIntosh, Gibney, Quinn, & Kundert, 2000).

17 Many instruments are available for children's motor assessment. The  
18 Bruininks - Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency (BOTMP) (Bruninks, 1978) is  
19 one of the most popular batteries for children between 4½ and 14½ years old  
20 (Burton & Miller, 1998; Miles, Nierengarten, & Nearing, 1988). The complete  
21 form of the battery (BOTMP-LF) consists of 46 items that are grouped into 8  
22 subtests, and according to Bruininks (1978), "provides a comprehensive index  
23 of motor proficiency as well as separate measures of both gross and fine

1 motor skills" (p. 11). Nevertheless, when the examinee is very young the  
2 battery should be administered in two sessions of about 20 to 30 minutes  
3 each. In addition to the long form there is a short form of the battery (BOTMP-  
4 SF) that consists of 14 items (selected from the BOTMP-LF) and provides a  
5 brief survey of the motor proficiency.

6 The use of the SF is recommended for the occasions in which a brief,  
7 screening picture of motor proficiency is required (Bruininks, 1978; Payne &  
8 Isaaks, 1998), and it has been widely used in typical school environments  
9 (Hay & Missiuna, 1998; Plimpton & Regimbal, 1992; Reeves, Broeder,  
10 Kennedy-Honeycutt, & East, 1999), with mentally retarded children  
11 (Broadhead & Church, 1984), with mildly handicapped children (Roswal &  
12 Frith, 1983), and with deaf children (Brunt & Broadhead, 1983). Furthermore,  
13 Hattie and Edwards (1987) recommend the SF for the motor assessment of  
14 children with attention deficit problems. According to the relevant research  
15 findings, the SF is valid enough to differentiate various age groups and it  
16 provides satisfactory information about the motor proficiency of children  
17 (Beitel & Mead, 1980; 1982; Broadhead & Bruininks, 1982; Hassan, 2001;  
18 Kambas & Aggeloussis, 2006).

19 Nevertheless, only a few researchers have examined the suitability of  
20 BOTMP-SF for preschool aged children exclusively and their findings do not  
21 provide sufficient evidence for the technical adequacy of the battery for that  
22 particular age. Specifically, Moore, Reeve, and Boan (1981) investigated the  
23 reliability of the BOTMP-SF with 32 5-year-old children and concluded that

1 many of the 14 items of the BOTMP-SF lack reliability. Venetsanou, Kambas,  
2 Aggeloussis, Serbezis, and Taxildaris (2007) also compared the consistency of  
3 the SF and LF of the BOTMP in identifying 5-year-old children with motor  
4 impairment, using the scores of 144 children. According to their results the  
5 BOTMP-SF does not appear to be a valid test of the aforementioned purpose  
6 of motor assessment, as it displays low sensitivity and negative predictive  
7 value in identifying motor impairment, compared to the BOTMP-LF. The only  
8 study that gives support to the suitability of BOTMP-SF for preschoolers is  
9 that of Beitel and Mead (1980, 1982), in which the BOTMP-SF was  
10 administered to children aged 3-5 years and it was found viable for that age.  
11 However, those findings can hardly be generalized, because of the very small  
12 sample ( $n = 24$ ).

13 Taking into consideration the importance of preschool age for the human  
14 motor development (Gallahue & Ozmun, 1998), a focus on the validity of the  
15 BOTMP-SF for that particular age is worthwhile. The aim of the present  
16 research was the preliminary study of the validity of the BOTMP-SF for the  
17 assessment of children 4-6 years old, examining the effect of age on the  
18 children's BOTMP- SF scores.

## 19 20 **2. Methods**

### 21 *2.1. Participants*

22 Three hundred and eighteen children (158 boys and 160 girls) 4-6 years old ( $M$   
23  $= 59.09$  months,  $SD = 6.64$ ) without an identified neurological, sensory, or

1 motor problem, attending kindergartens in Greece, participated in the study.  
2 The children were divided in four age-groups [48-54 months ( $n = 70$ ), 54-59  
3 months ( $n = 88$ ), 60-65 months ( $n = 84$ ) and 66-71 months ( $n = 76$ )]. Although,  
4 the BOTMP is designed for the assessment of children 4½ - 14½ years old,  
5 according to Beitel and Mead's findings (1980, 1982), BOTMP-SF is a viable  
6 measure of motor proficiency in children 3 to 5 years of age. Taking into  
7 consideration both the aforementioned findings and the fact that kindergarten  
8 students in most European countries are younger than 4½ years, children  
9 aged 48-53 months were included in the sample of the present study.

10 The method of stratified sampling was used to select the participants of  
11 the study from a number of randomly selected public schools, using sex and  
12 nationality as the stratification variables. All the participants were required to  
13 bring a consent form written and signed from their parents prior to their  
14 participation in the study. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee  
15 of the Department of Physical Education and Sport Science, Democritus  
16 University of Thrace, Greece. Twelve children of the initial sample ( $n = 330$ )  
17 were not allowed by their parents to be tested, leading to a 96.4% response  
18 rate.

## 19 2.2. Measures

21 The BOTMP-SF (Bruininks, 1978) was used for the motor assessment of  
22 children. The battery consists of the following 14 items, drawn from the eight  
23 subtests of the BOTMP-LF: *Running speed and agility*, *Standing on preferred leg*



1 on balance beam, Walking forward heel-to-toe on balance beam, Tapping feet  
2 alternately while making circles, Jumping up and clapping hands, Standing broad  
3 jump, Catching a tossed ball with both hands, Throwing a ball to a target, Response  
4 speed, Drawing a line through a straight path, Copying a circle, Copying overlapping  
5 pencils, Sorting cards and Making dots. The administration of the battery takes  
6 approximately 15-20 minutes.

7 A child's performance on the BOTMP - SF can be scored in several ways.  
8 Raw scores, such as the number of seconds taken to complete a task, the  
9 number of dots made, etc. are noted. These raw scores are then converted into  
10 a numerical point score that compile the total battery composite. Normative  
11 data on children from 4½ to 14½ yeas of age is provided in the manual and  
12 composite scores can be expressed in the form of percentile rank, z-score, T-  
13 score, stanine, and age-equivalent. For the purposes of this study, both the  
14 total point battery score and the raw scores of the 14 items were used.

15 As far as the suitability of the BOTMP- SF for the preschool aged children is  
16 regarded, Beitel and Mead's study supports (1980, 1982) its validity.  
17 However, Moore et al. (1986) found that many of the 14 items of the BOTMP-  
18 SF lack reliability, while Venetsanou et al. (2007) raise concerns about the  
19 validity of the above battery to identify motor impairment in 5-year-old  
20 children.

21

### 22 2.3. Procedure

23 The children were individually assessed in an indoor facility, according to  
24 the test guidelines (Bruininks, 1978). The duration for the administration of

1 the test was 15-20 minutes per child. The examiner was a doctoral student  
2 experienced with BOTMP administration and familiar with motor assessment  
3 in general. Intra-rater reliability had been examined before the study.  
4 Videotapes were made of 35 children, aged 54-60 months, while they were  
5 tested. With an interval of one month, these videotapes were scored again by  
6 the same examiner. Intraclass correlation coefficient (3.1) were used for  
7 statistical analysis and found to be excellent ( $r = .91$ ).

8 In order to facilitate the administration of the test, the translated  
9 datasheets and guidelines from Kambas and Aggeloussis's study (2006) were  
10 used. The translation had been from English to Greek and the precision and  
11 the reliability of the translation had been tested by three examiners.

12

#### 13 *2.4. Statistical analyses*

14 First, an ANOVA was employed to test the effect of age on the total  
15 battery score. As the BOTMP manual does not provide norms for children  
16 aged 48-53 months, the total point score of the participants was used for the  
17 analysis. Then a MANOVA, with the raw scores of the 14 BOTMP-SF items  
18 being the dependent variables, was applied. Post hoc comparisons were made  
19 using the Bonferroni test, with alpha set at .05.

20 In addition to  $p$  values, effect sizes as measured by Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ ) values  
21 were also used for data interpretation. According to Cohen (1988), only  $\eta^2$  of  $\geq$   
22 .14 are considered sufficiently large to be of any consequence.

23

1

2

3 **3. Results**

4 The results of the ANOVA showed that age had a significant effect on the  
5 total battery scores ( $F(3, 314) = 110.65, p < .001, \eta^2 = .68$ ). According to the  
6 results of the Bonferroni test, the mean total short form score of the group  
7 aged 66-71 months was significantly greater than the total scores of all the  
8 younger groups. Moreover, the group of 60-65 months had a significantly  
9 higher mean total short form score than the groups of 48-53 and 54-59 months.  
10 Conversely, the performance of the 54-59 months group was not significantly  
11 different to the performance of the 48-53 months group, even though it was  
12 higher (Table 1).

13

14

Table 1, approximately here

15

16 The MANOVA also revealed a significant effect of age (Wilks' Lambda = .097,  $p$   
17  $< .001, \eta^2 = .54$ ). When the 14 item scores were examined individually, age  
18 had a significant effect on 13 items (minimum  $F(3, 314) = 8.75, p < .001,$   
19 minimum  $\eta^2 = .145$  for the item *Throwing a ball to a target*). The only item in  
20 which age groups did not have significantly different scores was *Tapping feet*  
21 *alternately while making circles* ( $F(3, 314) = 2.18, p = .092$ ).

22

23

Table 2, approximately here

24

1 The rate of differences between age groups was not consistent for all items  
2 as indicated by the group means. Namely, on some items younger age groups  
3 did better than older ones [e.g.. on *Sorting cards*, 60-65 months group had a  
4 higher mean than the 66-71 months group (mean = 17.87 and mean = 17.84  
5 respectively)]. Nevertheless, according to Bonferroni's results, in those cases  
6 the differences between the groups were not statistically significant (Table 2).

7 However, a detailed examination of the participants' scores revealed  
8 marked floor effects on four test items (Table 3).

9 -----  
10 Table 3, approximately here  
11 -----

12 The most difficult item was found to be *Tapping feet alternately while making*  
13 *circles*. Only four children of the 66-71 months group managed to have a  
14 "pass" score on that item, while the children of the other three age groups had  
15 a 100% shortfall. A high percentage of total failure was also revealed on  
16 *Copying overlapping pencils*. Ninety four percent of the 48-53 months age group  
17 could not copy those particular shapes, while older children had a slightly  
18 better performance (89% failure for 54-59 months group, 83% and 60% for 60-  
19 65 months and 66-71 months, respectively). *Catching a tossed ball with both*  
20 *hands* was difficult for the two younger groups too. Ninety four percent of the  
21 48-53 months group and 50% of the 54-59 months group did not manage to  
22 catch the ball even once. Finally, 89% of 48-53 months group, 75% of the 54-59  
23 months group and 60% of the 60-65 months group, failed to walk forward  
24 heel-to-toe on balance beam.

1

2

3 **4. Discussion**

4 In this study, the validity of BOTMP-SF for the motor assessment of  
5 children 4-6 years old was investigated. Even though the battery is designed  
6 for children older than 53 months, preschoolers aged 48-53 months were  
7 included in the sample, in order to examine the applicability of Beitel and  
8 Mead's (1980, 1982) findings, according to which, BOTMP-SF is a viable  
9 measure for children aged 3-5 years old.

10 The ANOVA that was applied to the total battery score showed a  
11 significant effect of age on children's total score with  $\eta^2 = .68$  meeting Cohen's  
12 (1988) criteria for acceptability. Additionally, the MANOVA, in which the 14  
13 item scores were used as depended variables, showed a significant effect of  
14 age on children's performance too. In most cases, the effect size exceeded .14  
15 qualifying for Cohen's (1988) acceptability criteria. The only exception was  
16 the item *Tapping feet alternately while making circles* in which no significant  
17 differences among age groups were registered. The aforementioned results  
18 indicated positive and statistically significant differences across age groups.  
19 That finding is consistent among researches that regard either preschool aged  
20 children (Atwater & Wilmore, 1982; Beitel & Mead, 1980, 1982; Lam, Ip, Lui, &  
21 Koong, 2003; Morris Williams, Oja & Jurimäe, 1997; Toriola & Igbokwe, 1986)  
22 or a wider age range (Broadhead & Bruininks, 1982; Hassan, 2001; Kambas &

1 Aggeloussis, 2006) and suggests that the BOTMP-SF is valid enough to  
2 differentiate the age groups of 4 to 6 years.

3 However, examining the descriptive statistics of the 14 test items, it was  
4 noted that performance of four items was very close to the floor, especially for  
5 the 48-53 and 54-59 months age groups. Regarding the youngest age group,  
6 almost all children had a zero score on *Walking forward heel-to-toe on balance*  
7 *beam*, *Tapping feet alternately while making circles*, *Catching a tossed ball with both*  
8 *hands*, and *Copying overlapping pencils*. That finding is in contrast with the  
9 conclusion of Beitel and Mead (1980, 1982) that BOTMP-SF is a viable measure  
10 for children aged 3 to 5 years. As four of the fourteen test items of the  
11 BOTMP-SF do not provide any information about the performance of 48-53  
12 months age group, concerns arise about the validity of that battery for the  
13 assessment of that particular group. In Beitel and Mead's study only the total  
14 SF- and the subtests LF- scores were examined. Consequently, in that study  
15 the floor effects may have been overshadowed by the total point score that  
16 was used.

17 In the present study, children aged 54-71 months had a high percentage of  
18 zero scores too. *Tapping feet alternately while making circles* was found to be the  
19 most difficult task with a failure rate exceeding 95%, followed by *Copying*  
20 *overlapping pencils* (75% -65% failure). On *Walking forward heel-to-toe on balance*  
21 *beam* item also, many children aged 54-65 months were not able to achieve  
22 any correct step and half of the 54-59 months children did not manage to  
23 catch the tossed tennis ball. Examining the descriptive statistics of previous

1 studies in which five and six year old children performed the BOTMP-SF  
2 (Broadhead & Bruininks, 1982; Kambas & Aggeloussis, 2006; Moore, Reeve, &  
3 Boan, 1986), low mean values of those age groups on the four aforementioned  
4 items were registered. It is possible that those low mean values represent a  
5 high percentage of children with zero scores. As has already been noted, one  
6 issue to be considered in this context is the failure of these tasks to give valid  
7 information about the motor performance of preschool aged children.

8 The BOTMP-SF in its current form may meet the need for the motor  
9 assessment of a wide age range. However, those items that are the same for  
10 the broad range from 4½ to 14½ years do not seem to give valid information  
11 for younger children. *Copying overlapping pencils*, for example, is undoubtedly  
12 easy for a 14 year old child, but a difficult task for a 5 year old child.

13 Therefore, it is suggested that the authors of the BOTMP-SF should create  
14 an alternative form of the instrument, with several adjustments to the test  
15 items, in order to improve its validity for the assessment of preschool aged  
16 children. The use of a bean bag instead of the tennis ball, for example, may  
17 improve younger children's scores on *Catching a tossed ball* item and *Walking*  
18 *on a balance beam* could be replaced by *Walking along a line*.

19 Another important issue to be discussed is the BOTMP-SF's ecological  
20 validity. According to Bailey and Wolery (1989), the unique characteristics of  
21 the preschool child indicate that a motor assessment should be ecologically  
22 valid. The instrument should be sensitive to the child's testing environment  
23 and level of comfort. Ecological validity is maximized by using familiar

1 materials and collecting data in familiar environments. Attending to these key  
2 features ensures that more accurate information regarding functional skill  
3 level is collected (Bricker, 1989). The measurements in the present study were  
4 conducted in municipal gymnasiums, because a 16.4 meter straight line is  
5 required for the administration of the battery. Most of the kindergartens, not  
6 only in Greece but in many European countries as well, are located in the  
7 ground floors of apartment buildings and do not have adequate space either  
8 inside or outside, rendering measurement at the schools impossible. Taking  
9 into consideration that the absence of space required for the BOTMP-SF's  
10 administration is common for kindergartens, it is concluded that, in many  
11 countries, it is particularly difficult to apply the battery at kindergartens.

12 In conclusion, BOTMP-SF does not seem to be valid enough to test the  
13 motor proficiency in 4-6 years old children. In spite of the significant effect of  
14 age on both the total battery score and on 13 of the 14 test items, a fact that  
15 represents an evidence for the validity of a developmental assessment tool, a  
16 closer study on the score of each item gave a different picture, revealing that  
17 on four items children had a zero score. Item difficulty has caused a floor  
18 effect, constituting a threat for the validity of the preschoolers' motor  
19 assessment with the above battery. Moreover, a threat for the ecological  
20 validity of the battery arises as the measurement cannot take place in the  
21 familiarity of the school environment, due to the absence of sufficient  
22 measurement conditions in most kindergartens.



1       When adding to the present results the findings of our previous study  
2       according to which BOTMP-SF does not appear to constitute a valid test for  
3       the identification of MI in 5-year-old children (Venetsanou et al., 2007), it is  
4       concluded that the suitability of the aforementioned battery for preschool age  
5       is questionable.

6       However, validation process should not be limited to one approach.  
7       Evidence of validity should be provided by using multiple techniques and  
8       evidence to argue the appropriateness of a decision (Yun & Ulrich, 2002).  
9       Further research, both in Greece and all other countries where the test of  
10      interest is utilized, including a larger sample of preschool aged children, is  
11      required, in order to accumulate sound evidence about the validity of the  
12      BOTMP- SF for the motor assessment of children in that important stage of  
13      human life.

14

1 **References**

- 2 Bailey, D. B., & Wolery, M. (1989) *Assessing infants and preschoolers with*  
3 *handicaps*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- 4 Beitel, P., & Mead, B. (1982). Bruininks- Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency:  
5 Further verification with 3- to 5- yr.- old children. *Perceptual and Motor*  
6 *Skills, 54*, 268-270.
- 7 Beitel, P. & Mead, B. (1980). Bruininks - Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency:  
8 A viable measure for 3- to 5-yr- old children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*,  
9 *51*, 919-923.
- 10 Berk, R. A., & DeGangri, C. A. (1979). Technical considerations in the  
11 evaluation of pediatric motor scales. *American Journal of Occupational*  
12 *Therapy, 33*, 240-244.
- 13 Bricker, D. (1989). *Early intervention for at-risk and handicapped infants, toddlers,*  
14 *and preschool children* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Palo Alto, CA: VORT.
- 15 Broadhead, G. & Bruininks, R. (1982). Childhood motor performance traits on  
16 the Short Form Bruininks - Oseretsky Test. *Physical Educator, 39*, 149-  
17 155.
- 18 Broadhead, G. & Church, G. (1984). Influence of test selection on physical  
19 education placement of mentally retarded children. *Adapted Physical*  
20 *Activity Quarterly, 1*, 112-117.
- 21 Bruininks, R. (1978). *Bruininks- Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency: Examiners*  
22 *manual*. Circle Pines, MN.

- 1 Brunt, D., & Broadhead, G. D. (1982). Motor proficiency traits of deaf children.  
2 *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 53, 236-238.
- 3 Burton, A. W., & Miller, D. E. (1998). *Movement skill assessment*. Champaign,  
4 IL: Human Kinetics.
- 5 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.).  
6 Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 7 Gallahue, D. & Ozmun, J. (1998). *Understanding motor development: infants,*  
8 *children, adolescents, adults*. Singapore : Mc Graw Hill.
- 9 Hassan, M. (2001). Validity and reliability of the Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of  
10 Motor Proficiency -Short Form as applied in the United Arab Emirates  
11 culture. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 92, 157-166.
- 12 Hattie, J., & Edwards, H. (1987). A review of the Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of  
13 Motor Proficiency. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 57, 104-113.
- 14 Hay, J., & Missiuna, C.(1998). Motor proficiency in children reporting low  
15 levels of participation in physical activity. *Canadian Journal of*  
16 *Occupational Therapy*, 65, 64-71.
- 17 Kambas, A., & Aggeloussis, N. (2006). Construct validity of the Bruininks-  
18 Oseretsky test of Motor Proficiency - Short Form for a sample of Greek  
19 preschool and primary school children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 102,  
20 65-72.

- 1 Lam, M. Y., Ip, M. H., Lui, P. K. & Koong, M. K. (2003). How teachers can  
2 assess kindergarten children's motor performance in Hong Kong. *Early*  
3 *Child Development and Care*, 173, 109-118.
- 4 McIntosh, D., Gibney, L., Quinn, K. & Kundert, D. (2000). Concurrent validity  
5 of the early screening profiles and the differential ability scales with an  
6 at-risk preschool sample. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37, 201-207.
- 7 Miles, B., Nierengarten, M., & Nearing, R. (1988). A review of the eleven most  
8 often-cited assessment instruments used in adapted physical  
9 education. *Clinical Kinesiology*, 42, 33-41.
- 10 Moore, J., Reeve, G., & Boan, T. (1986). Reliability of the Short Form of the  
11 Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency with five-year-old  
12 children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 62, 223-226.
- 13 Morris, A., Williams, J., Atwater, A. & Wilmore, J. (1982). Age and sex  
14 differences in motor performance of 3 through 6 year old children.  
15 *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 53, 214-221.
- 16 Oja, L., & Jurimäe, T. (1997). Assessment of motor ability of 4- and 5- year old  
17 children. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 9, 659-664.
- 18 Payne, G. & Isaacs, L. (1998). *Human motor development: A lifespan approach*.  
19 California: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- 20 Plimpton, C. E., & Regimbal, C. (1992). Differences in motor proficiency  
21 according to gender and race. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 74, 399-402.

- 1 Reeves, L., Broeder, C, Kennedy-Honeycutt, L. & East, C. (1999). Relationship  
2 of fitness and gross motor skills for five-to six-yr.-old children.  
3 *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 89, 739-747.
- 4 Roswal, G., & Frith, G. (1983). The effect of a developmental play program on  
5 the motor proficiency of mildly handicapped children. *American*  
6 *Corrective Therapy Journal*, 37, 105-108.
- 7 Toriola, A. & Igbokwe, N. (1986). Age and sex differences in motor  
8 performance of pre-school Nigerian children. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 4,  
9 219-227.
- 10 Venetsanou F., Kambas A., Aggeloussis N., Serbezis V., & Taxildaris K. (2007).  
11 Use of the Bruininks-Osetetsky Test of Motor Proficiency for  
12 identifying children with motor impairment. *Developmental Medicine &*  
13 *Child Neurology*, 49, 846-848.
- 14 Yun, J., & Ulrich, D. A. (2002). Estimating measurement validity: A tutorial.  
15 *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 19, 32-47.
- 16 Zimmer, R. (2004). *Handbuch der Bewegungserziehung*. Freiburg: Herber.
- 17 Zimmer, R., & Cicurs, H. (1993). *Psychomotoric*. Schorndorf: Hofmann Verla

## Tables

**Table 1.** Means, Standard Deviations and F Ratios for total score and each item of BOTMP-SF by age group

Battery items	Age groups								Univariate $F_{3,314}$
	48-53 months (n = 70)		54-59 months (n=88)		60-65 months (n = 84)		66-71 months (n = 76)		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Total point score	18.03	4.22	18.21	6.13	27.00	4.46	36.97	4.49	110.65
Running speed & agility (time)	11.20	1.46	11.13	1.69	9.80	0.92	8.93	0.68	29.17
Standing on preferred leg on balance beam (time)	1.95	1.87	2.87	2.49	5.75	2.97	8.94	2.69	57.51
Walking forward heel-to-toe on balance beam (number of correct steps)	0.20	0.71	0.72	1.56	1.14	1.63	2.86	1.64	23.44
Tapping feet alternately while making circles (pass/fail)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.005	0.22	2.18
Jumping up and clapping hands (pass/fail)	0.97	0.29	1.04	0.42	1.14	0.41	1.78	0.41	34.07
Standing broad jump (distance)	3.25	0.95	3.25	1.48	4.52	1.17	6.10	0.89	52.00
Catching a tossed ball with both hands (correct catches)	0.79	1.51	1.19	1.54	2.22	1.55	3.10	0.72	22.60
Throwing a ball to a target (correct throws)	0.77	1.00	0.90	0.98	1.07	1.11	1.94	1.29	8.75
Response speed (response speed stick number)	1.65	1.23	2.13	1.21	2.90	1.03	4.18	0.86	38.09
Drawing a line through a straight path (number of errors)	4.31	2.36	3.40	1.80	2.16	1.51	1.89	2.32	12.64
Copying a circle (points)	1.35	0.89	1.68	0.60	1.88	0.45	1.86	0.34	25.81
Copying overlapping pencils (points)	0.005	0.23	0.11	0.32	0.21	0.52	0.68	0.90	10.10
Sorting cards (number of cards)	3.97	5.41	8.88	4.26	9.92	3.76	11.55	2.92	22.33
Making dots (number of dots)	10.40	4.47	14.52	3.11	17.88	3.56	17.84	4.82	28.99

\*  $p < .001$  for all variables except *Tapping feet alternately while making circles* ( $p = .092$ )



**Table 3.** Items with high percentage of zero raw-scores.

Battery items	Age groups							
	48-53 months		54-59 months		60-65 months		66-71 months	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Walking forward heel-to-toe on balance beam	62	89	66	75	52	62	12	16
Tapping feet alternately while making circles	70	100	88	100	84	100	72	95
Catching a tossed ball with both hands	66	94	44	50	20	24	-	-
Copying overlapping pencils	66	94	78	89	70	83	46	60