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Common technique flaws identified by the tuck jump assessment in elite female soccer players

Although injury rates between elite female and male players are comparable, female players are more likely to sustain an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury. The common mechanism of ACL injury is non-contact trauma sustained when landing from a jump. The reliability of the Tuck Jump Assessment (TJA) has been challenged. The aim of this study was to identify commonly occurring technique flaws during the TJA and to determine inter-rater agreement and internal consistency. Sixty elite female soccer players were recruited (mean (SD): age = 20.27 ± 3.44yrs). Four raters independently assessed each participant post hoc. Six hundred and sixty-five technique flaws were recorded. Criterion 2 ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ (N=147/665) and criterion 1 ‘Knee valgus on landing’ (N=80/665) were the most common. The most common fault category was ‘Knee and thigh motion’ (N=234/720, 32.5%). Clinically acceptable levels of agreement were reached for ‘Lower extremity valgus at landing’ k = .83 (95% CI, .72 – .93); ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ k = .84 (95% CI, .74 - .94); ‘Thighs not equal side to side’ k = .86 (95% CI, .75 - .96). The level of agreement for the composite score of all 10 criteria ranged from kw = .62 (95% CI, .48 – .76) to kw = .80 (95% CI, .70 – .90) suggesting a ‘fair-to-very good’ level of inter-rater agreement. Internal consistency results suggest that the TJA is not unidimensional. We recommend the ‘knee and thigh’ motion category of the TJA for screening elite female soccer players.
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ABSTRACT

Although injury rates between elite female and male players are comparable, female players are more likely to sustain an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury. The common mechanism of ACL injury is non-contact trauma sustained when landing from a jump. The reliability of the Tuck Jump Assessment (TJA) has been challenged. The aim of this study was to identify commonly occurring technique flaws during the TJA and to determine inter-rater agreement and internal consistency. Sixty elite female football players were recruited (mean (SD): age = 20.27 ± 3.44yrs). Four raters independently assessed each participant post hoc. Six hundred and sixty-five technique flaws were recorded. Criterion 2 ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ (N=147/665) and criterion 1 ‘Knee valgus on landing’ (N=80/665) were the most common. The most common fault category was ‘Knee and thigh motion’ (N=234/720, 32.5%). Clinically acceptable levels of agreement were reached for ‘Lower extremity valgus at landing’ k = .83 (95% CI, .72 – .93); ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ k = .84 (95% CI, .74 - .94); ‘Thighs not equal side to side’ k = .86 (95% CI, .75 - .96). The level of agreement for the composite score of all 10 criteria ranged from kw = .62 (95% CI, .48 – .76) to kw = .80 (95% CI, .70 – .90) suggesting a ‘fair-to-very good’ level of inter-rater agreement. Internal consistency results suggest that the TJA is not unidimensional. We recommend the ‘knee and thigh’ motion category of the TJA for screening elite female football players.
INTRODUCTION

The advent of professionalism and the exponential rise in the number of UEFA registered female football players has corresponded with a significant increase in the reported incidence of injury. The estimated incidence of injury for female players is between 12.6 and 24.0 injuries per 1000 hours of match play and between 1.2 and 7.0 injuries per 1000 hours of training (Giza, Mithofer, Farrell, Zarins, & Gill, 2005; Le Gall, Carling, & Reilly, 2008; Nilstad, Andersen, Bahr, Holme, & Steffen, 2014). Although injury rates between elite female and male players are comparable per se (Hagglund, Walden, & Atroshi, 2009), female players are more likely to sustain an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury of the knee than their male counterparts (Walden, Hagglund, Magnusson, & Ekstrand, 2011). ACL injury in female players is more likely to occur at an earlier age (Renstrom et al., 2008) and a previous history of ACL injury is considered to be a significant risk factor for reinjury (Faude, Junge, Kindermann, & Dvorak, 2006). The most common mechanism of ACL injury is an acute non-contact trauma sustained during rapid decelerating movements, for example when landing from a jump and changes of direction when running (Walden et al., 2011).

Observational screening tools are commonly used to identify faulty movement patterns during key athletic tasks (Frohm, Heijne, Kowalski, Svensson, & Myklebust, 2012; Kiesel, Plisky, & Voight, 2007). Reduced neuromuscular control during landing may result in increased knee valgus angles (ligament dominance) and increase the likelihood of an individual sustaining an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury (Hewett, Myer, Ford, et
al., 2005). Screening tools used to assess jump landing tasks include the Landing Error Scoring System (LESS) (Padua et al., 2009), the Drop Jump test (Barber-Westin, Smith, Campbell, & Noyes, 2010) and the Tuck Jump Assessment (TJA) (Myer, Ford, & Hewett, 2008).

Performance during the TJA is scored using a 10 criterion screening tool to identify technique flaws associated with the jump landing action for knee and thigh motion, foot position during landing and plyometric technique (Herrington, Myer, & Munro, 2013; Myer et al., 2008). The TJA involves repetitive jumps over a set period of time and the potential effects of fatigue may be observed. Practitioners use a TJA composite score of ≥6 to instigate interventions to correct technique flaws, although there is a lack of empirical evidence to support the choice of this cut-off point (Klugman, Brent, Myer, Ford, & Hewett, 2011; Myer et al., 2008; Myer, Ford, Khoury, Succop, & Hewett, 2011). Moreover, there has been limited research on inter-rater reliability of the TJA in athletic populations (Dudley et al., 2013; Herrington et al., 2013; Read, Oliver, de Ste Croix, Myer, & Lloyd, 2016). Herrington et al. (2013) found that the level of inter-rater level of agreement was ‘very good/excellent’, although the sample size was small with two Raters scoring five female and five male university sports science students. In contrast, Dudley et al. (2013) used five Raters to score 40 recreationally active university students not involved in college athletics and found that the level of inter-rater agreement was ‘poor’. They concluded that existing protocols were inadequate to ensure consistent TJA scoring. Recently, Read et al.
(2016) suggested that the knee valgus criterion of the TJA was a reliable measure of landing performance but that the composite TJA score was not.

To date, there have been no studies that have investigated technique flaws associated with the TJA in elite female football players. The primary aim of this study was to identify the most commonly occurring technique flaws in a large sample of elite female football players. The secondary aim was to determine the inter-rater reliability and degree of internal consistency of the TJA.
METHOD

Design

An inter-rater reliability study conducted in the U.K.

Participants

A convenience sample of two physiotherapists (PT) and two strength and conditioning coaches (SC) were approached, and agreed to take part in the study. Study participation involved the rating (scoring) of routinely collected TJA video data. Characteristics of these Raters were:

- **PT1** - Itinerant member of staff for the Women’s Football Association (FA) with 5 years of experience in elite female football; 10 years post qualifying experience (Health & Care Professions Council registered Physiotherapist)

- **PT2** - Head Physiotherapist for a women’s super league team with 3 years of experience at an FA girls centre of excellence; 11 years post qualifying experience (Health & Care Professions Council registered Physiotherapist)

- **SC1** - Head Strength and Conditioning Coach for the Women’s FA with 8 years of experience in elite football; 11 years post qualifying experience (United Kingdom Strength & Conditioning Association accredited)

- **SC2** - Strength and Conditioning Coach for a university who had worked with multi-sport elite athletes and had 1 year post qualifying experience with football players of a national standard (United Kingdom Strength & Conditioning Association accredited)
In total the four Raters had 17 years post qualifying experience working with female football players at national and international standard.

There were 60 elite international female football players that were required to undertake one TJA as part of their team's mandatory physiological screening. All players were briefed about the study and invited to take part. This involved a video of their TJA to be recorded and subsequently scored by the four Raters. All players agreed to participate in the study, were passed medically fit and completed the TJA (mean ± SD: age = 20.27 ± 3.44yrs; height = 168.02 ± 5.26cm; mass = 62.54 ± 6.33kg).

Ethical approval was granted by Sheffield Hallam University, and each player and rater provided signed informed consent to take part in the study.

**Procedures**

Each international female football player undertook one TJA facilitated by the principal investigator before a regular training session. The TJA was conducted on an indoor artificial 4G playing surface. Ambient temperature and humidity were not controlled during testing. Standardised verbal instructions and a demonstration of the TJA was given to each participant immediately prior to the TJA by the Principal Investigator. A video recording of individual tuck jumps from the sagittal and coronal was made using two Sony PJ410 High Definition cameras on tripods. The TJA was identical to previously published protocols ((Dudley et al., 2013; Herrington et al., 2013; Myer et al., 2008). Two strips of 2.5cm tape were placed 20cm apart and
aligned parallel to each other. Participants were instructed to stand with one foot on each tape strip and to perform repeated tuck jumps, lifting their knees to be level with the hips in the horizontal plane, and to return to the start position for 10 seconds. Participants were encouraged to use a high level of effort. No feedback was given to participants during the assessment.

Independent scoring of the TJA videos was conducted post-test by four raters. Raters were instructed to view each video in real time and to view each video no more than 3 times prior to scoring. Each rater was required to score each tuck jump across 10 criterion (Dudley et al., 2013; Herrington et al., 2013; Myer et al., 2008). A score of 0 was assigned if the participant met the individual criterion. A score of 1 was assigned if the participant failed to meet an individual criterion on any occasion during the test. A composite score was calculated for each participant with a higher composite score indicative of reduced performance on the TJA.

Data Analysis

Raw data was screened for anomalies including data inputted incorrectly. The minimum number of participants required to detect a kappa coefficient as statistically significant when the value of kappa (K) was set at $k = .00$ (with 80% power) was $n=39$ (Sim & Wright, 2005).

Fleiss Kappa (an extension of the Cohen’s kappa coefficient (k) for two raters) was utilised to assess multiple inter-rater agreement for each TJA criterion with standard error of measurement (SEM) and 95% confidence
intervals (CI). The significance level was set at p <0.05. Microsoft Office Excel 2010 was used to compute Fleiss Kappa.

A weighted kappa ($K_w$) was performed on the composite score to calculate the degree of disagreement. The interpretation of Cohen’s kappa coefficient utilised the theoretical values set by Fleiss et al. (2003) as < 0.40 poor, 0.41 – 0.75 fair to good and 0.75 – 1.00 very good, with > 0.75 used as a cut off for clinically acceptable measure of inter-rater agreement (Sim & Wright, 2005).

Internal consistency associated with the scores derived from TJA composite score was assessed by Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient. With no widely acknowledged lower limit to the coefficient the following rules of thumb were applied: > .9 – Excellent, > .8 – Good, > .7 – Acceptable, > .6 – Questionable, > .5 – Poor, and < .5 – Unacceptable (George & Mallory, 2003). Cronbach’s alpha analysis was performed using SPSS version 21.
RESULTS

Frequency of technique flaws

A total of 665 technique flaws were identified by the four raters for all criteria contained within the TJA (Table 1). The most frequent technique flaw was Criterion 2 ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ (N=147/665, 22%), the second most frequent technique flaw was criterion 1 ‘Knee valgus on landing’ (N=80/665, 12%) and the least frequent technique flaw was Criterion 9 ‘Pause between jumps’ (N=23/665, 4%).

[Insert Table 1 here: Frequency counts and relative percentages of TJA technique flaws]

A one-variable $\chi^2$ test was conducted to measure the association between the observed and expected frequencies of flaws recorded for TJA. The $\chi^2$ value of 152.1, DF=9 was found to have an associated probability value of 0.0001. Thus we can accept that there is a significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies (Table 2).

[Insert Table 2 here: one variable $\chi^2$ observed and expected frequencies of TJA technique flaws]

The frequency of technique flaws within the three respective categories of the TJA (‘Knee and thigh motion’; ‘Foot position during landing’; ‘Foot position during landing’) were then analysed relative to the maximum
possible number of technique flaws possible using the following calculation:
60 participants x 4 raters=240 multiplied by the number of criteria. ‘Knee and
thigh motion’ (N=234/720 (32.5%) from 3 criteria); ‘Foot position during
landing’ (N=307/1200 (46%) from 5 criteria) and ‘Plyometric technique’
(N=64/480, from 2 criteria).

**Inter-rater agreement**
The Fleiss kappa coefficient values used to determine inter-rater agreement
ranged from ‘fair-to-good’, $k = .46$ (95% CI, .35 – .56) to ‘very good’ $k = .86$
(95% CI, .74 – .94). Raters reached substantial agreement for ‘Lower
extremity valgus at landing’ $k = .83$ (95% CI, .72 – .93); ‘Thighs do not reach
parallel (peak of jump)’ $k = .84$ (95% CI, .74 – .94); ‘Thighs not equal side to
side’ $k = .86$ (95% CI, .75 – .96). A descending order of inter-rater agreement
from criterion 1 to criterion 10 was observed in the results.

[Insert Table 2 here: Fleiss Kappa Inter-rater agreement of TJA criterion]

Weighted kappa ($k_w$) coefficient values used to determine inter-rater
agreement of the composite score ranged from $k_w = .62$ (95% CI, .48 – .76)
to $k_w = .80$ (95% CI, .70 – .90) (Table 3) suggesting a ‘fair-to-very good’ level
of inter-rater agreement.

[Insert Table 3 here: Weighted Kappa Inter-rater agreement of TJA criterion]

**Internal Consistency**
Low alpha values were detected across all four Raters for the entire TJA scale. Internal consistency was reassessed with items 9 and 10 removed (plyometric technique) as the repeated plyometric nature of the TJA over a 10 second period differentiates it from previous tests such as the Landing Error Scoring System (Padua et al. 2015). As an 8 item scale there were negligible alterations in internal consistency (range $\alpha = .091 - .161$, Table 4). Internal consistency results suggest that the TJA scale and sub items are not unidimensional

[Insert Table 4 here: internal consistency]
DISCUSSION

Statement of principal findings

This is the first study to investigate technique flaws associated with the TJA in elite female football players. The TJA was designed for use with athletic populations to detect technique flaws in jump landing tasks (Myer et al., 2008). In our study four raters identified 665 technique flaws in 60 participants. The most frequent flaws were ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ (criterion 2) and ‘Knee valgus on landing’ (criterion 1), which are 2 of 3 criteria contained within the ‘Knee and thigh’ motion category of the TJA. The least frequent technique flaws were criterion 9 ‘Pause between jumps’ and criterion 10 ‘Technique declines prior to 10 seconds’. These criteria form the ‘Plyometric technique’ category of the TJA. The inter-rater level of agreement for the composite score of the TJA was ‘fair-to-very good’ ranging from $K_w = 0.62$ (95% CI, 0.48 – 0.76) to $K_w = 0.80$ (95% CI, 0.70 – 0.90). All three ‘Knee and thigh motion’ criteria reached clinically acceptable levels of agreement; ‘Knee valgus on landing’ ($\kappa = .83$, 95% CI, .72 – .93); ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ ($\kappa = .84$, 95% CI, .74 - .94) and ‘Thighs not equal side to side’ ($\kappa = .86$, 95% CI, .75 - .96). Low alpha values for internal consistency suggest that the TJA and the individual criteria contained within the assessment are not unidimensional.

Meaning of the study findings

Previous studies investigating the TJA have not clearly identified the frequency of individual technique flaws and this limits our ability to compare between studies. In our study criterion 2 ‘Thighs do not reach parallel’ was
the most frequently identified technique flaw and ‘Pause between jumps’ was the least frequently identified technique flaw. Dudley et al. (2013) also reported criterion 2 as the most frequently identified technique flaw but did not report the rank of other TJA criteria.

Herrington et al. (2013) reported the inter-rater level of agreement for the composite score of the TJA using 2 Raters to be very good/excellent ($K=0.88$) in a sample of ten athletes. The inter-rater percentage of exact agreement between raters across all ten criteria was 93% (range 80%-100%, i.e. high). Interestingly, Dudley et al. (2013) reported the inter-rater level of agreement using 5 Raters to be poor in 40 recreationally active university students (ICC=0.47, 95% CI 0.33-0.62). Read et al. (2016) used a test-retest design to investigate intersession reliability of the TJA in 50 elite male youth football players. Although reliability was found to be strong (ICC=0.88) the authors suggested caution in interpreting the composite score of the TJA due to high within-subject variation in a number of individual criterion.

The difference in the reported levels of agreement may in part be explained by the statistical test selected by investigators. Sample sizes of at least 50 are recommended when using percentage of exact agreement (Birkimer & Brown, 1979). Therefore results from studies containing smaller sample sizes are quite probably the result of chance agreement and should be considered with caution. Each of the TJA criteria is scored in a dichotomous manner i.e. flaw occurred or no flaw occurred and the data is therefore characterised as nominal. Kappa coefficients are recommend for use as the
preferred statistical test to determine the inter-rater level of agreement for nominal data (Hallgren, 2012). We utilised Fleiss Kappa to determine inter-rater agreement for individual TJA criteria and a weighted Kappa to determine inter-rater agreement for the composite score. Despite the proposed dichotomous nature of the score, differences in the interpretation of the occurrence of a technique flaw exist. Dudley et al. (2013) suggests that current TJA instructions are unclear as to whether a flaw should be scored by the rater if observed only on a single occasion or whether it needs to occur repeatedly and consistently throughout the assessment, leading to inconsistency of reporting between assessors. Furthermore, there is variability in the cut-points for ‘clinical acceptance’ of reliability scores in literature with scores greater than 0.70 regarded as acceptable whereas Sim and Wright (2005) suggest that inter-rater agreement should be greater than 0.75.

Read et al. (2016) concluded that only the knee valgus criterion may be reliably used to screen elite youth male football players. A prospective study by (Hewett, Myer, Ford, et al., 2005) found increased knee abduction angles (knee valgus) during a plyometric activity to be a significant predictor of ACL injury. ‘Knee valgus on landing' was the second most identified technique flaw in our study and reached clinically acceptable levels of agreement. Although no empirical evidence exists to support the premise that a TJA composite score ≥6 increases an individual’s risk of sustaining an ACL injury, inadequate neuromuscular control of the trunk and hip is a contributor and predictor of high-risk knee mechanics (Ford et al., 2006). Female athletes
have been found to have significantly higher hip flexion angles on initial
ground contact (Boden, Torg, Knowles, & Hewett, 2009) and increased trunk
flexion and lateral tilt (Zazulak, Hewett, Reeves, Goldberg, & Cholewicki,
2007) when performing jump landing tasks. ACL strain from valgus knee
loading has been confirmed through cadaver, in vivo and 3-dimensional
motion analysis methods (Fukuda et al., 2003; Kanamori et al., 2000; Markolf
et al., 1995). Increased internal hip rotation, coupled with increased external
rotation of the tibia (dynamic knee valgus) has been found in female football
players during jump landing and these have been used to predict ACL injury
(Alentorn-Geli et al., 2009; Barber-Westin et al., 2010). Female athletes have
been found to preferentially rely on increased quadriceps recruitment relative
to hamstring recruitment during incremental vertical jump test using surface
electromyography (Myer, Brent, Ford, & Hewett, 2011). In addition, a
quadriceps dominant landing strategy may increase the risk of sustaining an

Cronbach's alpha is considered to infer the degree to which the criteria
measures a single unidimensional construct. Our internal consistency
statistics raise concern about the construct validity of the TJA suggesting
redundancy of TJA criteria. Analysis with the 'Plyometric technique' category
removed to determine if the psychometric properties of the test would be
improved as an 8 item measure found that unidimensionality remained
violated. Thus, neither 10 nor 8 item TJA criteria appear to be measuring a
specific construct i.e. jump landing tasks.
Myer et al. (2008) recommend interventions to address landing errors and the risk of injury for individuals with a TJA sum score of 6 or more. A sum score that is derived from multiple items is said to be a test of the same latent variable and measurements of a latent variable are assumed to have the same properties as measurements of observed variables (DeVellis, 2012). Based on results from the present study, the meaning of the TJA sum score is unclear because the items are not interrelated and the evidence that suggests a sum score of 6 or more increases injury risk is based on expert opinion rather than empirical data. The findings of our study suggest that TJA items are not internally consistent and do not have a coherent empirical structure.

**Implications**

There is a paucity of studies evaluating the psychometric properties of the TJA. The findings of previous inter and intra-reliability studies were inconsistent (Dudley et al., 2013; Herrington et al., 2013; Read et al., 2016) so our finding that TJA criteria are not measuring the same underlying construct i.e. jump landing task is important. Elite female football players are 4-6 times more likely to sustain an ACL injury than their male counterparts (Alentorn-Geli et al., 2009; Myer, Brent, et al., 2011). The TJA was intended for use in elite athletes and we present the first study of its use in a large sample of elite female football players. Our inter-rater reliability data was gathered using raters from different professional backgrounds (physiotherapy & strength and conditioning) improving generalisability.
Limitations of the study

Our finding that there was a descending trend of item frequencies and kappa scores through items 1 to 10 suggests that item order impacts on recall rates. Cronbach’s alpha is considered a crude measure of reliability (coefficient of reliability) and can be unduly influenced by the number of scale items and redundant items (DeVellis, 2012). Exploratory factor analysis would have provided a more in-depth assessment of the factor structure and dimensionality of the TJA. However, with such low internal consistency scores pursuing exploratory factor analysis at this stage may not have provided any further meaningful information.

Future research

There is a need to determine whether reliability and validity is improved by changing the item order or improving the clarity of instructions to assessors for the TJA. Factor analysis may help to determine whether certain items should be removed from the scale. Identifying intra-rater reliability would help to identify whether rater bias has any influential effect on the scale and if formal training in TJA administration would improve reliability of the TJA. Factor analysis techniques have been employed for measuring test validation in similar observational screening tools used in the clinical sports setting.

Conclusion

This study assessing tuck jump in elite female football players found that the inter-rater level of agreement for the composite score was ‘fair-to-very good’,
although caution should be applied in interpreting the composite score due to poor internal consistency. Nevertheless, elements of the TJA may provide useful information about knee mechanics and potential risk factors for knee injury. Previous literature suggests that ‘Knee valgus on landing’ may be a time efficient measure for risk factors in male youth football players and we found that ‘Knee and thigh motion’ reached clinically acceptable levels of agreement in a sample of elite female football players. Therefore, we recommend the use of the ‘Knee and thigh motion’ criteria of the TJA for screening athletic populations particularly elite football players of either gender.
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Table 1: Frequency response of each TJA criterion listed within respective TJA categories; ‘knee & thigh motion’; ‘foot position during landing’; ‘plyometric technique’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TJA Criterion</th>
<th>Frequency response</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total flaws</td>
<td>% of total flaws available</td>
<td>% of relative flaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knee &amp; thigh motion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower extremity valgus at landing</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thighs do not reach parallel</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thighs not equal side to side</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foot position during landing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot placement not shoulder width apart</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot placement not parallel</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot contact timing not equal</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive landing noise</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not land in the same footprint</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plyometric technique</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause between jumps</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique declines prior to 10seconds</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Fleiss Kappa Inter-rater agreement of TJA criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TJA criteria</th>
<th>Fleiss Kappa (k) Inter-rater agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower extremity valgus at landing</td>
<td>$\kappa = .83$ (95% CI, .72 – .93), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thighs do not reach parallel (peak of jump)</td>
<td>$\kappa = .84$ (95% CI, .74 - .94), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thighs not equal side to side</td>
<td>$\kappa = .86$ (95% CI, .75 - .96), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot placement not shoulder width apart</td>
<td>$\kappa = .75$ (95% CI, .65 - .85), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot placement not parallel (front and back)</td>
<td>$\kappa = .73$ (95% CI, .62 - .82), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot contact timing not equal</td>
<td>$\kappa = .70$ (95% CI, .60 - .81), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not land in the same footprint</td>
<td>$\kappa = .60$ (95% CI, .50 - .71), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive landing noise</td>
<td>$\kappa = .63$ (95% CI, .53 - .73), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause between jumps</td>
<td>$\kappa = .60$ (95% CI, .49 - .69), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique declines prior to 10seconds</td>
<td>$\kappa = .46$ (95% CI, .35 - .56), $p &lt; .000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Weighted Kappa Inter-rater agreement of TJA criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired raters</th>
<th>Weighted Kappa ($K_w$) Inter-rater agreement (Sum score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;: PT&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$K_w = .65$ (95% CI, .51 – .79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;: SC&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$K_w = .80$ (95% CI, .70 – .90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;: SC&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$K_w = .67$ (95% CI, .54 – .80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;: SC&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$K_w = .70$ (95% CI, .54 – .84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;: SC&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$K_w = .79$ (95% CI, .69 – .88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;: SC&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$K_w = .62$ (95% CI, .48 – .76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: TJA: tuck jump assessment, PT: physiotherapist, SC: strength & conditioning coach
Table 4: Internal consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</th>
<th>Rater 1 (PT₁)</th>
<th>Rater 2 (PT₂)</th>
<th>Rater 3 (SC₁)</th>
<th>Rater 4 (SC₂)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire scale</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TJA categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee &amp; Thigh motion</td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>-.720</td>
<td>-.653</td>
<td>-.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot position during landing</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plyometric technique</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With items 9 &amp; 10 removed</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: TJA: tuck jump assessment, PT: physiotherapist, SC: strength & conditioning coach