# COMPARISON OF VERTICAL JUMP PERFORMANCE ASSESSED SIMULATIOUSLY VIA ELECTRONIC MAT AND JUMP REACH METHOD

## INTRODUCTION

- The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between vertical jump performance assessed simultaneously via electronic mat and jump reach methods.
- Participants were Division II, NCAA male basketball athletes.

### METHODS

- N = 15, male collegiate basketball athletes
- $21 \pm 2$  y, ht. =  $186.5 \pm 10.2$  cm, wt. =  $85.6 \pm$ 13.1 kg
- Electronic & Jump-Reach recorded simultaneously
- 2 vertical jump attempts



Langford<sup>1</sup>, Robert L. Herron<sup>1</sup>



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT EXERCISE & NUTRITION SCIENCE

## **Data from Reach Vertical Jumps** & Mat Vertical Jumps Should Not **Be Used Interchangeably**

Vertec vs. Mat





# Crystal L. Williams<sup>1</sup>, Brad Bowen<sup>1,2,</sup> Stacy H. Bishop<sup>1</sup>, Shawn M. Mitchell<sup>1</sup>, Curtis Fennell<sup>1</sup>, Emily L. <sup>1</sup>University of Montevallo, Montevallo, AL, <sup>2</sup>The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL

### UNIVERSITY of MONTEVALLO

Individual	Differences
90	
85	
80	
75	
70	
65	
60	
55	
50	
45	
40	

- Cohen's *d* for effect size

Mean ± SD (c

Effect Size Cohe

Paired-Sample

**Pearson Correl** 

## PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

RESULTS

Mean differences were investigated via paired-samples *t*-test (VJ vs. eVJ;  $\alpha = 0.05$ )

Pearson's correlations to investigate the relationship between assessment styles

	Electronic Jump Mat	Jump-Reach
cm)	69.8 ± 8.7	66.3 ± 9.0
en's d	0.40	
t-Test	<i>p</i> < 0.001	
lation	r = 0.91	

 Coaches, Sport Scientists, & Researchers should not use these data interchangeably

• Data can be useful within their method/mode-specific context