



LEEDS  
BECKETT  
UNIVERSITY

---

Citation:

Morley, D and Till, KA and Ogilvie, P and Turner, G (2015) Influences of gender and socioeconomic status on motor Proficiency of Primary School Children in the UK. Human movement science. ISSN 0167-9457 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2015.08.022>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/2455/>

Document Version:

Article (Accepted Version)

---

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on [openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

*Title:*

Influences of gender and socioeconomic status on the motor proficiency of children in the UK

*Corresponding author:*

Professor David Morley

Liverpool John Moores University, IM Marsh Campus, Barkhill Road, Aigburth, Liverpool, L17 6BD, UK. Tel.: +44 (0)151 2315201 Email: D.M.Morley@ljmu.ac.uk

*Authors:*

(1) David Morley (d.m.morley@ljmu.ac.uk)

School of Education, Leisure and Sport Studies, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

(2) Kevin Till (k.till@leedsbeckett.ac.uk)

School of Sport, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK

(3) Paul Ogilvie (p.ogilvie@leedsbeckett.ac.uk)

School of Sport, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK,

(4) Graham Turner (g.turner@leedstrinity.ac.uk)

Department of Sport, Health and Nutrition, Leeds Trinity University, Leeds, UK

*Word count:* 3690

*Abstract:* 197 words

*No. of tables:* 3

**Abstract**

As the development of movement skills are so crucial to a child's involvement in lifelong physical activity and sport, the purpose of this study was to assess the motor proficiency of children aged 4-7 years (range= 4.3-7.2 years), while considering gender and socioeconomic status. 369 children (176 females, 193 males, aged =  $5.96 \pm 0.57$  years) were assessed for Fine Motor Precision, Fine Motor Integration, Manual Dexterity, Bilateral Co-ordination, Balance, Speed and Agility, Upper-Limb Co-ordination and Strength. The average standard score for all participants was  $44.4 \pm 8.9$ , classifying the participants towards the lower end of the average score. Multivariate analysis of covariance identified significant effects for gender ( $p < 0.001$ ) and socioeconomic status ( $p < 0.001$ ). Females outperformed males for fine motor skills and boys outperformed girls for catch and dribble gross motor skills. High socioeconomic status significantly outperformed middle and / or low socioeconomic status for total, fine and gross motor proficiency. Current motor proficiency of primary children aged 4-7 years in the UK is just below average with differences evident between gender and socioeconomic status. Teachers and sport coaches working with primary aged children should concentrate on the development of movement skills, while considering differences between genders and socioeconomic status.

**Keywords:** motor proficiency, children, gender, socioeconomic status

## 1. Introduction

Children's ability to perform movement skills develops at a prolific rate in the early years as they begin to acquire, refine and develop a range of gross and fine movement skills (Gallahue, Ozmun & Goodway, 2012). The appropriate development of movement skills is regarded as a crucial platform for a child's participation in lifelong physical activity (Barnett et al., 2009), although the exact nature of this relationship has been contested (Lai et al., 2014). Furthermore, Seefeldt (1980) hypothesised that failure to develop a certain level of movement competence could result in a motor proficiency barrier, leading to a child's exclusion from a range of physical activities.

The development of reliable and validated tools that assess motor proficiency (the specific abilities upon which performance is built, e.g. agility, balance, co-ordination, running speed) has formed a cornerstone of motor development research for many decades. In most cases, motor proficiency assessment has involved the completion of tasks by participants and assessed in comparison to norm-referenced (compared to a normative group) quantifiable scores, or criterion-referenced against a set of pre-determined criteria (Cools et al., 2008). Motor proficiency assessments are predominantly developed and validated for assessing children with motor impairments, suggesting that such assessments are of motor deficiency, rather than proficiency (Haywood & Getchell, 2005). Such assessments are also used as a way of measuring the impact of an intervention, predominantly involving a focus on improving children's movement competence and/or physical activity, on children's motor proficiency (Kirk & Rhodes, 2011).

The effect of gender on motor proficiency has been raised, with studies suggesting that girls develop fine motor skills at a faster rate than boys, and boys acquire certain gross motor skills earlier than girls (Bala & Katić, 2009). In research using the same assessment

methods as used in this study, South African boys demonstrated overall motor proficiency superior to that of the girls and outperformed girls significantly in the upper limb and strength skills sub-items (Pienaar & Kemp, 2012). Paradoxically, other studies have reported no gender differences in motor proficiency (Milanese et al., 2010), particularly in relation to younger children (Du Toit & Pienaar, 2002; Shala, 2009; Venetsanou & Kambas, 2011).

What is less commonly reported in the research literature is the relationship between motor proficiency and socioeconomic status (SES). A range of factors can be used to determine the SES of children. For example, the UK uses Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) to measure SES within an area by postcode in terms of income, employment, health and disability, education, skills and training, barriers to housing and services and the living environment (Noble et al., 2007). Studies in Australia have used similar indices of SES to explore FMS development of children in low-income communities, suggesting that such children start school developmentally delayed in FMS development (Okely & Booth, 2004), with early identification and targeted intervention seen as crucial in these environments if children are to be given the chance to catch up (Roeber et al., 2012). Other studies in Australia (Booth et al., 1999; Hardy et al., 2012) have also highlighted an association between low movement competency and low SES, suggesting that Grade 2 (aged 7-8) and Grade 4 (aged 9-10) children had not mastered FMS expected at their stage of development. Whilst colleagues have presented some interesting findings from other Countries, this study adds further to our understanding of the field in that participants are younger, aged 4-7 years, and reside in a different country with its own social, political and cultural influences. Moreover, there is a general tendency to explore the relationship between motor proficiency and physical activity (Cohen et al., 2014) in understanding the influence of SES, rather than motor proficiency itself. This is not without cause as SES has been identified as a determinant

of physical activity that can predispose, enable or reinforce physical activity behavior (Inchley et al., 2005).

There is a general shortage of research exploring motor proficiency of children in Europe, particularly within early years environments and this leads to a lack of normative data for cross-cultural uses of motor proficiency assessments (Cools et al., 2008). Furthermore, an understanding of how the development of motor proficiency is different for different children is even less understood. It is often assumed within schools that children have the prerequisite mastery of movement skills to be able to participate in organized and informal activities (Lubans et al., 2010). However, with findings suggesting that organized physical activity within an institution such as a school is the most effective way to develop movement (Logan et al., 2012), it is essential that we understand more about children's motor proficiency within this specific environment.

In the UK, there is a paucity of research that assesses the motor proficiency of children and determines the influences of gender and SES. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess children's motor proficiency across a number of primary schools (children aged 4-7 years) in the UK and to subsequently compare children's motor proficiency with gender and SES. Such findings would have serious implications for ensuring every child has access to lifelong pathways for participation in physical activity, as well as providing teachers and coaches appropriate information to be able to differentiate their practice effectively.

## **2. Methods**

The research formed part of the 'Start to Move' research project (Youth Sport Trust (YST)/ Bupa, 2014) and was funded by the YST/Bupa. The funding organizations played no role in

any aspect of the research process and did not have the right to approve or disapprove of the publication.

### *2.1 Participants*

Participants consisted of children (n=369; females, n= 176; males, n= 193; aged  $5.96 \pm 0.57$  years) from 14 primary schools in the North of England. Schools were randomly invited from a 'Start to Move' (Youth Sport Trust (YST)/ Bupa, 2014) course delegate list, with 100% response rate. The ethics committee at Leeds Beckett University granted ethical approval. The Head teacher, teachers and parents provided consent, with informed assent provided by participants.

### *2.2 Procedure*

Motor proficiency was assessed using the Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency, Second Edition Brief Form (BOT-2 BF). All data collection was conducted during scheduled physical education classes, providing as naturalistic a setting as possible, in each of the participating schools. Gender, classified as male or female, and date of birth was collected for each participant. In addition, SES was calculated for each participating school by collecting United Kingdom's Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). Each school's IMD was classified as low = below 10,894, medium = 10,895-21,788 and high as above 21,789. Therefore, 'low' IMD represented a lower SES than medium or high IMD. In the absence of individual participant postcode data, the IMD of the school provided the 'next-best' source of a participant's SES as a result of the use of 'catchment areas'. Catchment areas are determined by a number of factors including distance from home to school and are predominantly used to allocate places in oversubscribed schools. It can be assumed, given the existing population explosion at this age range (Department for Education (DfE), 2014a), that the majority of school places will be allocated to children within their catchment area (DfE, 2014b).

### *2.3 Measures*

The BOT-2 BF was selected for its suitability to assess children with and without motor problems and strong test-retest reliability (Yoon et al., 2006), as well as being a validated assessment instrument for motor proficiency for participants aged between 4-21 years of age (Bruininks & Oseretsky, 2010). The BOT-2 BF consisted of 12 measures of motor proficiency, which are categorized into sub-tests to assess fine motor precision, fine motor integration, manual dexterity, bilateral co-ordination, balance, speed and agility, upper-limb co-ordination and strength.

All the test items and sub-tests originated from the full assessment and were selected for “clinical utility, content coverage, and ease of administration” (Bruininks & Oseretsky, 2010). Test stations were established to allow multiple participant assessments, simultaneously. The child, guided by the examiner, determined whether a full or knee push-up was the most appropriate assessment of strength based on the pupil's performance in other areas, as per the BOT-2 BF manual (Bruininks & Oseretsky, 2010). A research team was collectively trained to administer the test, primarily through jointly observing participant performance of each element of the test. This training process was repeated until an analysis of the inter-observer reliability produced an interclass correlation coefficient of 1.00 ( $n = 27$ ; 95% CI = 0.99–0.1.00), indicating excellent agreement between the responder's observations.

### *2.4 BOT-2 BF scoring*

The standard score for each pupil was reached by converting the total points score (max = 72) to the standard score, using the gender-specific norms provided (Bruininks & Oseretsky, 2010). This took the child's age, gender and choice of strength assessment (push-up: full/knee) into account when assessing their performance. Standard scores were classified as  $> 70$  = well above average, 60-69 = above average, 41-59 = average, 31-40 = below average, and



<30 = well below average. Individual fine motor proficiency (items 1-7) and sub-section items (totals for fine motor precision/ integration (items 1-4) and bilateral co-ordination (items 5-7)), and gross motor proficiency (items 8-12) were also calculated in relation to their raw score.

### *2.5 Statistical analysis*

Data are presented as means and standard deviation (SD). Initial descriptive scores were calculated for the BOT-2 standard score and subsequent descriptive category. To compare the motor proficiency between gender and SES, mean and standard deviation scores were calculated for all elements of the BOT-2 motor proficiency assessment. A multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) test, with chronological age applied as the covariate, was used for comparisons between gender and SES. Chronological age was applied as a covariate to control for the relationships between age and motor proficiency and progress on the standardised scoring of the BOT-2, which doesn't class chronological age as a continuous variable and this was included within individual and sub-section scores.

Bonferroni pairwise comparisons were conducted to examine univariate effects between each dependent variable. All analyses were conducted with SPSS version 21.0 with significance levels set at  $p < 0.05$ . Effect sizes using partial eta squared ( $\eta^2$ ) were calculated and interpreted as 0.01 = small, 0.06 = medium and 0.14 = large according to Cohen (1988).

## **3. Results**

Table 1 shows the mean standard scores obtained in the BOT-2-BF and when classified into descriptive categories by gender and SES. The standard score for all participants was  $44.4 \pm 8.9$  classifying the participants towards the lower end of the average group. On an individual level, most of the participants were classified in the average ( $n=241$ ;

65.3%) or below average (n=95; 25.7%) categories. Of the remaining 33 participants, 18 scored well below average and 15 above average.

\*\*\*Insert Table 1 here\*\*\*

Table 2 shows the gender differences in motor proficiency. MANCOVA demonstrated significant effects of chronological age ( $F_{14,349} = 18.53, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.46$ ) and gender ( $F_{14,349} = 3.86, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.14$ ). Using chronological age as a covariate, age was related to every element of the BOT-2 BF. When controlling for age, significant gender differences were identified for star, line, circle, precision total, touch nose, fine motor total, catch and dribble. Females outperformed males for all fine motor skills, while males outperformed females for catching and dribbling ability. Effect sizes for all variables were trivial to small except for the star, which were moderate.

\*\*\*Insert Table 2 here\*\*\*

Table 3 shows the differences in motor proficiency ability between high, middle and low SES children. MANCOVA demonstrated significant effects of SES ( $F_{30, 698} = 10.2, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.314$ ). In relation to total score a significant large difference was identified with high and middle SES outperforming low SES. For fine motor skills, when controlling for age, significant differences between SES groups were identified for line, circle, precision total, manual dexterity and fine motor total. High SES significantly outperformed middle and / or low SES for each variable where significant differences were found. Low SES only significantly outperformed middle SES for line ability. Effect sizes demonstrated a large effect for line and manual dexterity with a moderate effect shown for fine motor total. For gross motor skills, when controlling for age, significant differences between high and low

SES were identified for speed and agility, dribble, push up and gross total. High and middle SES outperformed low SES for speed and agility, push up and gross total with high and low outperforming middle SES for dribble performance. Large effect sizes were only identified for speed and agility.

\*\*\*Insert Table 3 here\*\*\*

#### **4. Discussion**

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the motor proficiency of primary school (4-7 years) children in the North of England, with a secondary purpose of subsequently comparing children's motor proficiency according to gender and SES. To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the motor proficiency of children aged 4-7 years, exploring the effect of gender and SES, in the UK. Overall, findings demonstrated that UK children performed below average to average on the BOT-2 BF motor proficiency assessment. When compared by gender, females outperformed males for fine motor skills, while males outperformed females for the gross motor skills of catching and dribbling. When SES was compared, high and middle SES significantly outperformed low SES for total, fine and gross motor skills.

The average standard score of this cohort (44.9) was on the average to below average boundary with 89.6% of participants' scores falling within this range. This potentially raises some concern as it indicates that approximately a quarter of 4-7 year olds in the current study score below average for motor proficiency. What is even more worrying about the low average score of participants is that the BOT-2 BF motor proficiency assessment tool is designed to assess motor deficiencies and therefore consists of basic tasks. These findings coincide with previous research findings worldwide that typically demonstrate average or

below average motor proficiency in children (Okely & Booth, 2004 and Sigmunson & Rostoft, 2003), with few exceptions (Chow et al., 2001).

Variation in motor proficiency of children from different countries has been previously reported (Adolph et al., 2010), with influencing factors ranging from family expectations to the quality of stimulation at home (Hills et al., 2011). Children's decline in motor proficiency has been supported elsewhere, although the impact of the general living environment has been evidenced as less important than changes in lifestyle activities on the movement behavior of children (Kretschmer, 2014). In light of the reported variations in children's motor proficiency between different countries and evidence of the decline in the motor proficiency of children, it is important to understand reasons that may be impacting upon the motor proficiency of 4-7 year olds within the UK. One potential explanation for the low level of children's motor proficiency in this study is the recent shift in government policy with the dismantling of School Sport Partnerships and withdrawal of funding for the Physical Education and Sport Strategy in the UK (DfES, 2003; Bardens et al., 2012). Another reason could be the inadequate preparation of Primary school teachers to teach PE, with reports that a lack of specialist Physical Education subject knowledge remains a major weakness affecting the quality of Primary school provision (Ofsted, 2013). Whilst the impact of more recently introduced initiatives (DfE/ Education Funding Agency, 2014) for Primary school Physical Education and sport are yet to be fully understood it remains imperative that teachers and coaches who are responsible for introducing young children to sport have an understanding of how to provide an environment where developing movement patterns and sequences can be nurtured and improved (Malina, 2012).

Given the limited research within this age-range of participants, previous research has highlighted the need to identify skill-specific differences in the mastery of movement skills, in order to adequately inform subsequent interventions and promote children's movement

development effectively (Cools et al., 2008). In this vein, females in this study outperformed males for all fine motor skills, whilst males outperformed females for the elements of gross motor skills involving catching and dribbling, as reported elsewhere (Sigmundson & Rostoft, 2003; Bala & Katić, 2009) These differences could be attributed to stereotyped practices both within the school and home environments that support physical activity and play practices that facilitate the development of certain movement skills. This could relate, for instance, to gender influence on the selection of toys for play (Weisgram et al., 2014), with toys traditionally associated with boys being more likely to include sports equipment, whereas toys traditionally associated with girls were more likely to include dolls, fictional characters, and furniture, among other items (Pomerleau et al., 1990). Gender-biased play preferences might also contribute to the differences in motor proficiency, with boys playing more physical games than girls (Lindsey & Mize, 2001).

Interestingly, in the current study, effect sizes between genders demonstrated trivial to small differences in motor proficiency with results from the vast majority of subsets suggesting that the significant differences found in other studies were less prevalent within this age group, most notably strength (Pienaar & Kemp, 2014). In one of the rare UK studies, albeit with 7-10 year olds, a study by Duncan et al. (2013) reported no gender differences in motor proficiency when considered as total scores, but girls outperformed boys on the hurdle step and straight leg raise with boys outperforming girls on the trunk stability push-up. Other studies have reported varying and often conflicting perspectives on the significance of gender in motor proficiency when studying preschool children (Bala & Katić, 2009). Considering the trivial to small significance of gender differences, our results go some way to support the notion that the significance of the gender effect becomes more prominent as children age and biological diversity becomes pronounced (Barnett et al., 2009).

Empirical research has demonstrated a positive association between SES and FMS mastery (Cohen et al., 2014). Furthermore, the use of an ecological systems theory approach to understanding motor proficiency has yielded some interesting correlations between the child, family and environment, suggesting that early motor development is influenced by parental support and the child's immediate surroundings (Barnett et al., 2013). Perhaps the most striking finding from this study is the strength of the relationship between SES and motor proficiency, with socially disadvantaged children having significantly lower motor proficiency than socially advantaged children. Specifically, socially disadvantaged children significantly underperformed, in comparison to socially advantaged children, on the majority of gross motor skill subsets apart from two (balance and catch). Other authors have reported similar general findings in their studies of children the same age as this study in other countries (McPhillips & Jordan- Black, 2007). Furthermore, the authors also established a correlation between motor deficit and reading attainment, suggesting that motor deficiency has more wide-ranging impact than solely inhibiting children in their full involvement in physical activity. As gross motor skill proficiency is a likely determinant of children's subsequent physical activity patterns, these findings suggest that this prevalence of motor deficiency could lead to a life of exclusion from physical activity for socially disadvantaged children.

## **5. Conclusions**

Strengths of this study relate to the exploration of the large sample size drawn from a range of schools and the use of children from the UK as participants. Whilst other measurement instruments may have been deemed more suitable to assess typical motor development of the specific age range of participants in an educational setting, the breadth of skills coverage and number of detailed sub-elements deemed the BOT-2 BF the most appropriate measurement tool.

Whilst the relationship between the mastery of FMS and participation in physical activity remains inconclusive (Lai et al., 2014), there is sufficient evidence from longitudinal studies (Jaakkola & Washington, 2013) to suspect a relationship that consequently heightens the importance of movement in children's ability to access a range of physical activity experiences. The current findings suggest that teachers, sports coaches and physical activity specialists need to concentrate on movement-based approaches in their delivery and differentiate practice for different genders, particularly in the development of gross motor skills. Those responsible for the development of interventions in related fields need to be mindful of the motor deficits evidenced within this study and ensure they provide targeted and differentiated programs for socially disadvantaged children and female participants. Researchers have also suggested the need to further understand the movement ability of children in the wider constructs of the assessment of physical literacy within schools (Gublin et al., 2014) and involve teachers in the assessment of children's motor proficiency (Cools et al., 2008). Although this study has started to do this with UK primary school children, future developments are crucial if motor proficiency assessment is going to have a subsequent positive affect on the appropriate development of children's movement, over and beyond the relatively small-scale, cross-sectional, studies that currently exist.

### **Acknowledgements**

Thank you to the staff and students responsible for the data capture and other members of the Start to Move project team for their thoughts and comments on initial thoughts around this manuscript. The Youth Sport Trust and Bupa funded this research.

## References

- Adolph, K.E., Karasik, L.B., & Tamis-LeMonda, C.S. (2010). Motor skills. In H. Marc, & T. Bornstein (Eds.) *Handbook of cross-cultural developmental science* (pp.61-88). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Bala, G., & Katić, R. (2009). Sex Differences in Anthropometric Characteristics, Motor and Cognitive Functioning in Preschool Children at the Time of School Enrolment. *Coll Antropol*, 33, 1071–1078.
- Barnett, L., Hinkley, T., Okely, A., et al. (2013). Child, family and environmental correlates of children's motor skill proficiency. *J Sci Med Sport*, 16, 332-336.
- Barnett, L.M., Van Beurden, E., Morgan, P.J., et al. (2009). Childhood Motor Skill Proficiency as a Predictor of Adolescent Physical Activity. *J Adolesc Health*, 44, 252–259.
- Booth, M. L., Okely, T., McLellan, L., Phongsavan, P., Macaskill, P., Patterson, J., Wright, J., & Holland, B. (1999). Mastery of Fundamental Motor Skills among New South Wales School Students: Prevalence and Sociodemographic Distribution. *J Sci Med Sport*, 2, 93-105.
- Bruininks, R.H., & Oseretsky, B.D. (2010). *Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency, Second Edition, Brief Form*. Bloomington: PsychCorp.
- Chow, S.M.K., Henderson, S.E., & Barnett, A.L. (2001). The movement assessment battery for children: A Comparison of 4-year-old to 6-year-old children from Hong Kong and the United States. *Am J Occup Ther*, 55, 55-61.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences, 2nd ed.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.



Cohen, K.E., Morgan, P., Plotnikoff, R.C., et al. (2014). Fundamental movement skills and physical activity among children living in low-income communities: a cross-sectional study.

*Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 11, 58-74.

Cools, W., De Martelaer, K., Samaey, C., et al. (2008). Movement skill assessment of typically developing preschool children: A review of seven movement skill assessment tools.

*J Sports Sci Med*, 8, 154-168.

Department for Education/ Education Funding Agency. (2014). Guidance: PE and sport premium for primary schools. London: Department for Education.

Department for Education. (2014a). *National Pupil Projections - Future Trends in Pupil Numbers: July 2014*. London: Department for Education.

Department for Education. (2014b). *School Admissions Code: Statutory guidance for admission authorities, governing bodies, local authorities, schools adjudicators and admission appeals panels*. London: Department for Education.

Du Toit, D., & Pienaar, A.E. (2002). Gender differences in gross motor skills of 3-6-year-old children in Potchefstroom, South Africa. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 8, 346-358.

Duncan, M., Stanley, J M., & Leddington-Wright, S. (2013). The association between functional movement and overweight and obesity in British primary school children. *Sports Sci Med Rehab*, 15, 11.

Gallahue, D.L., Ozmun, J.C., Goodway, J. (2012) *Understanding Motor Development: Infants, Children, Adolescents, Adults (7th ed.)*. Boston: Mass McGraw-Hill.

Goodway, J.D., & Branta, C.F. (2003). Influence of a motor skill intervention on fundamental motor skill development of disadvantaged preschool children. *Res Q Exerc Sport*, 74, 36–46.

Gublin, S., Collins, D. & Button, C. (2014). Physical Literacy: Importance, Assessment and Future Directions. *Sport Med*, 44, 1177–1184.

Hardy, L., Reinten-Reynolds, T., Espinel, P., Zask, A., & Okely, A. D. (2012). Prevalence and Correlates of Low Fundamental Movement Skill Competency in Children. *Pediatrics*, 130, 390-398.

Haywood, K.M., & Getchell, N. (2005). *Life span motor development, 4th edition*.

Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hills, A.P., Anderson L.B., & Byrne, N.M. (2011). Physical activity and obesity. *Br J Sports Med*, 45, 866-870.

Inchley, J.C., Currie, D.B., Todd, J.M., et al. (2005). Persistent socio-demographic differences in physical activity among Scottish schoolchildren 1990-2002. *Eur J Public Health*, 15, 386-388.

Jaakkola, T., & Washington, T. (2013). The relationship between fundamental movement skills and self-reported physical activity during Finnish junior high school. *Phys Educ Sport Pedagog*, 18, 492-505.

Kirk, M.A., & Rhodes, R.E. (2011). Motor Skill Interventions to Improve Fundamental Movement Skills of Preschoolers With Developmental Delay, *Adapt Phys Activ Q*, 28, 210-232.

Kretschmer, J., Saunders, J., Bressan, E., et al. (2014). The relationship of motor ability to some selected 'living and moving' variables: Findings from a case study of 8 and 9 Year old

primary school children in Hamburg, Melbourne and Cape Town. *Int Sports Studies*, 36, 31-50.

Lai, S.K., Costigan, S.A., Morgan, P.J., et al. (2014). Do School-Based Interventions Focusing on Physical Activity, Fitness, or Fundamental Movement Skill Competency Produce a Sustained Impact in These Outcomes in Children and Adolescents? A Systematic Review of Follow-Up Studies. *Sports Med*, 44, 67–79.

Logan, S.W., Robinson, L.E., Wilson, A.E., et al. (2012). Getting the fundamentals of movement: a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of motor skill interventions in children. *Child Care Health Dev*, 38, 305-316.

Lindsey, E.W.& Mize, J. (2001). Contextual Differences in Parent-Child Play: Implications for Children's Gender Role Development. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 44

Lubans, D.R., Morgan, P.J., & Cliff, D.P. (2010). Review of the benefits associated with fundamental movement skill competency in youth. *Sports Med*, 40, 1019–1035.

McPhillips, M., & Jordan-Black, J.A. (2007). The effect of social disadvantage on motor development in young children: a comparative study. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*, 48, 1214-1222.

Milanese, C.; Bortolami, O.; Bertucco, M.; Verlato, G. & Zancanaro, C. (2010). Anthropometry and motor fitness in children aged 6-12 years. *J Hum Sport Ex*, 5, 265-279.

Noble, M., McLennan, D., Wilkinson, K. et al. (2007). *The English Indices of Deprivation, 2007*. Social Disadvantage Research Centre, Oxford: University of Oxford.

- Okely, A.D., & Booth, M.L. (2004). Mastery of fundamental movement skills among children in New South Wales: prevalence and sociodemographic distribution. *J Sci Med Sport*, 7, 358–72.
- Pomerleau, A., Bolduc, D., Malcuit, G., & Cossette, L. (1990). Pink or blue: Environmental gender stereotypes in the first two years of life. *Sex Roles*, 22, 359-367.
- Pienaar AE, Kemp C. (2014). South African Journal for Research in Sport, *Phys Ed Rec*, 36, 167-182.
- Roeber, B.J., Tober, C.L., Bolt, D.M., et al. (2012). Gross motor development in children adopted from orphanage settings. *Dev Med Child Neurol*, 54, 527-531.
- Seefeldt, V. (1980). Developmental motor patterns: Implications for elementary school physical education. In C. Nadeau, W Holliwell, K. Newell, et al. (Eds.). *Psychology of motor behavior and sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Shala, M. (2009). Assessing gross motor skills of Kosovar preschool children. *Early Child Development and Care*, 179, 969-976.
- Sigmundsson, H., & Rostoft, M.S. (2003). Motor Development: exploring the motor competence of 4-year-old Norwegian children. *Scand J Educ Res*, 47, 451-459.
- Venetsanou, F. & Kambas, A. (2011). The effects of age and gender on balance skills in preschool children. *Phys Ed Sport*, 9, 81-90.
- Weisgram, E.S., Fulcher, M., & Dinella, L.M. (2014). Pink gives girls permission: Exploring the roles of explicit gender labels and gender-typed colors on preschool children's toy preferences. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 35, 401–409.

Youth Sport Trust / Bupa (2014). Bupa Start to Move: a new approach to teaching PE to 4-7 year olds, to help them stay active for life. Available at: <http://www.starttomovezone.com>

[Accessed Mar 2015]

Yoon, D., Scott, K., & Hill, M. (2006). Review of three tests of motor proficiency in children. *Percept Mot Skills*, 102, 543- 551.

1 Table 1. Standard Score for BOT-2-BF According to Gender and SES

		Well above Average	Above Avg 60-	Average 41-59	Below Avg 31-40	Well below Average
		>70	69 (%)	(%)	(%)	<30 (%)
		(%)				
<b>Gender</b>						
Males	193	44.9 ± 9.2	0	10	130 (67.4)	43
			(0)	(5.2)		(22.2)
Females	176	43.8 ± 8.6	0	5	111	52
			(0)	(2.8)	(63.0)	(29.6)
						(4.6)
<b>SES</b>						
Low	108	43.4 ±	0	3	60	41
		10.7	(0)	(2.8)	(55.6)	(40.0)
Medium	134	46.4 ± 7.4	0	4	102	26
			(0)	(3.0)	(76.1)	(19.4)
High	127	43.1 ± 8.3	0	8	79	28
			(0)	(6.3)	(62.2)	(22.0)
						(9.4)

2

3

4

1 Table 2. Differences in Motor Proficiency by Gender

	Male Mean $\pm$ SD	Female Mean $\pm$ SD	Covariate Age	P	$\eta^2$
<b>Fine Motor</b>					
Star	1.9 $\pm$ 0.5	2.1 $\pm$ 0.4	*	***	0.06
Line	1.7 $\pm$ 1.5	2.1 $\pm$ 1.7	***	*	0.01
Circle	4.0 $\pm$ 1.7	4.5 $\pm$ 1.5	**	**	0.02
Diamond	3.1 $\pm$ 1.7	3.0 $\pm$ 1.9	***	NS	0.00
Precision Total	10.7 $\pm$ 3.6	11.7 $\pm$ 3.6	***	**	0.02
Manual Dexterity	2.7 $\pm$ 1.3	2.9 $\pm$ 1.2	***	NS	0.01
Touch Nose	3.2 $\pm$ 1.2	3.5 $\pm$ 1.0	***	*	0.01
Thumbs & Finger	1.4 $\pm$ 1.2	1.6 $\pm$ 1.3	***	NS	0.00
Bilateral Dexterity Total	4.8 $\pm$ 1.8	5.1 $\pm$ 1.8	***	NS	0.01
Fine Motor Total	18.2 $\pm$ 5.0	19.8 $\pm$ 5.0	**	**	0.03
<b>Gross Motor</b>					
Balance	2.5 $\pm$ 1.6	2.7 $\pm$ 1.5	***	NS	0.01
Speed & Agility	2.3 $\pm$ 1.8	2.5 $\pm$ 1.8	***	NS	0.00
Catch	0.5 $\pm$ 1.0	0.2 $\pm$ 0.6	**	**	0.02
Dribble	1.9 $\pm$ 1.4	1.6 $\pm$ 1.4	***	**	0.02
Strength	2.2 $\pm$ 1.9	2.0 $\pm$ 1.9	***	NS	0.00

---

Gross Total	9.3 ± 4.9	8.9 ± 4.3	***	NS	0.00
Total	30.1 ± 11.7	31.8 ± 11.1	***	NS	0.01

---

1 \*P<0.05; \*\*P<0.01; \*\*\*P<0.001

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14



1

2 Table 3. Differences in Motor Proficiency by SES

	High (n=106)	Middle (n=127)	Low (n=134)	P	$\eta^2$	Pairwise
<b>Fine Motor</b>						
Star	2.0 ± 0.4	2.0 ± 0.4	1.9 ± 0.6	NS	0.01	
Line	2.6 ± 1.6	1.1 ± 1.2	2.0 ± 1.8	***	0.10	H>L>M
Circle	4.5 ± 1.5	4.4 ± 1.8	4.0 ± 1.6	*	0.02	H>L
Diamond	3.2 ± 1.7	3.1 ± 2.0	2.9 ± 1.5	NS	0.01	
Precision Total	12.4 ± 3.6	10.6 ± 3.4	10.8 ± 3.7	**	0.03	H>M,L
Manual Dexterity	3.5 ± 1.2	2.8 ± 1.1	2.3 ± 1.1	***	0.16	H>M>L
Touch Nose	3.3 ± 1.0	3.2 ± 1.2	3.4 ± 1.2	NS	0.01	
Thumbs & Finger	1.6 ± 1.2	1.6 ± 1.3	1.4 ± 1.3	NS	0.01	
Bilateral Dexterity Total	4.9 ± 1.6	5.2 ± 1.9	4.8 ± 1.8	NS	0.02	
Fine Motor Total	20.8 ± 5.0	18.6 ± 4.6	17.9 ± 5.1	***	0.06	H>L
<b>Gross Motor</b>						
Balance	2.7 ± 1.5	2.6 ± 1.5	2.5 ± 1.5	NS	0.01	
Speed & Agility	2.7 ± 2.0	2.9 ± 1.7	1.7 ± 1.5	***	0.13	H,M>L
Catch	0.4 ± 0.9	0.4 ± 0.8	0.3 ± 0.8	NS	0.00	
Dribble	2.0 ± 1.7	1.3 ± 1.0	2.0 ± 1.6	**	0.03	H,L>M

Strength	2.3 ± 1.8	2.2 ± 2.0	1.8 ± 1.6	**	0.02	H,M>L
Gross Total	10.0 ± 5.0	9.4 ± 4.4	8.3 ± 4.4	**	0.04	H,M>L
Total	34.8 ± 13.8	32.7 ± 10.5	26.2 ± 8.2	***	0.16	H,M>L

1 \*P<0.05; \*\* P<0.01; \*\*\*P<0.001

2

3