

2015

The perceived effect of load carriage on marksmanship in the tactical athlete.

D Poke

Bond University

Rob Orr

Bond University, rorr@bond.edu.au

Michael Stierli

New South Wales Police

Ben Hinton

New South Wales Police

Follow this and additional works at: http://epublications.bond.edu.au/tru_conf

 Part of the [Military Studies Commons](#), [Sports Medicine Commons](#), and the [Sports Sciences Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#).

Recommended Citation

D Poke, Rob Orr, Michael Stierli, and Ben Hinton. (2015) "The perceived effect of load carriage on marksmanship in the tactical athlete." The Asics Sports Medicine Conference, 21-24 October 2015, Gold Coast, Australia..Jan. 2015.

http://epublications.bond.edu.au/tru_conf/6

The perceived effect of load carriage on marksmanship in tactical athletes




Poke D¹, Orr RM¹, Stierli M², Hinton, B³

1 Tactical Research Unit, Bond University, Gold Coast

2 NSW Police Force





Introduction

- Tactical operators required to carry heavy loads (Carbone et al., 2014)
- Mobility & marksmanship must not be negatively affected
- Inconsistent reports on impacts of load carriage on marksmanship accuracy (Knapik et al., 1991; Rice et al., 1999; Carbone et al., 2014)
- Australian Army soldiers perceive negative impacts (Orr et al., 2013)
- How do SWAT perceive the impacts? Are they accurate?







Methods

- Six men – Police Tactical Operations Unit (SWAT)
- Fatigues Only (FO)
- Tactically Loaded (TL)
- Short move & mobility task with Primary & Secondary weapon





Methods

- Distance to centre of target
 - DCOT
- Horizontal shot spread
 - X-Dispersion
- Vertical shot spread
 - Y-Dispersion






Image Source: Carbone et al., 2014





Methods:


- Visual Analogue Scale (VAS)
- Scaled & measured


Subject Number

How do you think tactical load impacts on your marksmanship with the pistol when compared to carrying no load:



How do you think tactical load impacts on your marksmanship with the rifle when compared to carrying no load:





Methods

- Statistics
 - Paired-samples t -tests
 - Pearson's correlation coefficients
 - Alpha levels set at 0.05
- Ethics approval – BUHREC R01585B



Results

- No significant difference when TL

Table 1. Primary weapon marksmanship results from all four conditions


Task & Loading Condition	DCOT (mm)	X-Dispersion (mm)	Y-Dispersion (mm)
Short Forward Movement			
Fatigues Only	75.93 ± 17.97	112.50 ± 31.35	143.58 ± 44.88
Tactically Loaded	70.48 ± 19.57	76.42 ± 46.99	168.42 ± 50.39
Mobility Task			
Fatigues Only	74.83 ± 36.95	116.67 ± 70.05	173.25 ± 139.65
Tactically Loaded	100.10 ± 20.14	112.50 ± 51.59	213.67 ± 70.99


Data are mean ± standard deviation

Table 2. Secondary weapon marksmanship results from all four conditions

Task & Loading Condition	DCOT (mm)	X-Dispersion (mm)	Y-Dispersion (mm)
Short Forward Movement			
Fatigues Only	107.35 ± 37.68	178.33 ± 81.62	206.33 ± 85.87
Tactically Loaded	112.60 ± 44.37	128.83 ± 59.55	188.25 ± 60.23
Mobility Task			
Fatigues Only	128.23 ± 33.20	157.00 ± 70.43	274.08 ± 176.61
Tactically Loaded	108.70 ± 52.48	176.25 ± 70.13	212.08 ± 131.60

Data are mean ± standard deviation





Results

- Perceived significant improvement in marksmanship when TL
 - Primary – VAS $+3.00 \pm 2.53$ ($p = 0.016$)
 - Secondary – VAS $+2.83 \pm 2.93$, ($p = 0.039$)
- Did not perceive either weapon affected by TL differently



Results

- Moderate negative correlation (negative = improved performance)
 - VAS Primary – MobP-XDisp ($p = 0.247$)


Table 4. Correlation between variables for tactically loaded primary weapon marksmanship

Variable	VAS Primary	ShP-DCOT	MoP-DCOT	ShP-XDisp	MoP-XDisp	ShP-YDisp	MoP-YDisp
VAS Primary	1.000	-0.347	-0.401	-0.288	-0.561	0.190	-0.294
ShP-DCOT	-0.347	1.000	-0.483	0.874*	-0.457	0.394	-0.570
MoP-DCOT	-0.401	-0.483	1.000	-0.210	0.960**	-0.925**	0.817*
ShP-XDisp	-0.288	0.874*	-0.210	1.000	-0.242	0.002	-0.410
MoP-XDisp	-0.561	-0.457	0.960**	-0.242	1.000	-0.806	0.866*
ShP-YDisp	0.190	0.394	-0.925**	0.002	-0.806	1.000	-0.636
MoP-YDisp	-0.294	-0.570	0.817*	-0.410	0.866*	-0.636	1.000

ShP-DCOT = Short move primary weapon DCOT; MoP-DCOT = Mobility task primary weapon DCOT; ShP-XDisp = Short move primary weapon X-dispersion; MoP-XDisp = Mobility task primary weapon X-dispersion; ShP-YDisp = Short move primary weapon Y-dispersion; MoP-YDisp = Mobility task primary weapon Y-dispersion

* Correlations significant at $p < 0.05$

** Correlations significant at $p < 0.01$



Results - Correlations



- Moderate negative correlations
 - VAS Secondary – ShS-DCOT ($p = 0.179$)
 - VAS Secondary – ShS-XDisp ($p = 0.275$)
- High negative correlation
 - VAS Secondary – ShS-YDisp ($p = 0.082$)



Table 5. Correlation between variables for tactically loaded secondary weapon marksmanship

Variable	VAS Secondary	ShS-DCOT	MoS-DCOT	ShS-XDisp	MoS-XDisp	ShS-YDisp	MoS-YDisp
VAS Secondary	1.000	-0.631	-0.306	-0.534	-0.472	-0.756	-0.301
ShS-DCOT	-0.631	1.000	0.238	0.666	0.640	0.524	-0.014
MoS-DCOT	-0.306	0.238	1.000	-0.483	0.604	-0.196	-0.615
ShS-XDisp	-0.534	0.666	-0.483	1.000	0.135	0.804	0.587
MoS-XDisp	-0.472	0.640	0.604	0.135	1.000	0.427	0.032
ShS-YDisp	-0.756	0.524	-0.196	0.804	0.427	1.000	0.778
MoS-YDisp	-0.301	-0.014	-0.615	0.587	0.032	0.778	1.000



ShS-DCOT = Short move secondary weapon DCOT; MoS-DCOT = Mobility task secondary weapon DCOT; ShS-XDisp = Short move secondary weapon X-dispersion; MoS-XDisp = Mobility task secondary weapon X-dispersion; ShS-YDisp = Short move secondary weapon Y-dispersion; MoS-YDisp = Mobility task secondary weapon Y-dispersion



Discussion


- Tactical police perceive improvement in marksmanship when TL
 - In contrast to Orr et al. (2013)
 - ARA soldiers carry heavier loads over greater distances
 - Familiarity & operational requirement increases positive perception
- X-dispersion decreased during TL short move
 - Consistent with Carbone et al., 2014
 - Body armour splint torso & generate low-level muscle activity at shoulder
- Primary weapon DCOT increased during TL mobility task
 - Rifle interaction with torso
 - Increased respiratory rate & vertical chest displacement (Carbone et al. 2014)






Conclusion

- Tactical police officers perceive marksmanship improves when TL
- Trend towards objective marksmanship measures supporting belief
- Key reason and difference to military populations is constant marksmanship while loaded



Practical Applications

- Direction for training tactical operators
 - Marksmanship training in TL condition Carbone et al. 2014
- Monitor perception of load carriage impacts
 - Prevent over-confidence
 - Provide feedback on relationship to performance



References

- Carbone, P. D., Carlton, S. D., Stierli, M., & Orr, R. M. (2014). The impact of load carriage on the marksmanship of the tactical police officer: A pilot study. *Journal of Australian Strength and Conditioning*, 22(2), 50-57
- Knapik, J., Staab, J., Bahrke, M., Reynolds, K., Vogel, J., & O'Connor, J. (1991). Soldier performance and mood states following a strenuous road march. *Military medicine*
- Nieuwenhuys, A., & Oudejans, R. R. (2012). Anxiety and perceptual-motor performance: toward an integrated model of concepts, mechanisms, and processes. *Psychological research*, 76(6), 747-759
- Orr, R. M., Pope, R., Johnston, V., & Coyle, J. (2013). Soldier self-reported reductions in task performance associated with operational load carriage. *Journal of Australian Strength and Conditioning*, 21(3), 39-46
- Rice, V. J., Sharp, M. A., Tharion, W. J., & Williamson, T. (1999). Effects of a Shoulder Harness on Litter Carriage Performance and Post-Carry Fatigue of Men and Women (No. USARIEM-T-00-7). Army Research Inst of Environmental Medicine, Natick, MA.

