World Journal of Sports
www.worldsportsjournal.com
Online ISSN:
Received: 19-07-2025, Accepted: 20-08-2025, Published: 03-09-2025
Volume 1, Issue 1, Jul-Sep, 2025, Page No. 17-21

Evaluating the efficacy of virtual reality training on shooting accuracy and defensive reaction time in Amateur Basketball Players

Charis Liakopoulos
Department of Physical Education and Sports Science, Democritus University of Thrace, University Campus, Komotini, Greece

Abstract

Background: The integration of advanced technology into athletic training regimens represents a frontier in sports science. Virtual reality (VR), offering immersive, controlled, and reproducible environments, presents a paradigm shift for cognitive and skill-based athletic training. While its potential is widely acknowledged, rigorous empirical evidence quantifying its efficacy in enhancing specific, measurable basketball skills against traditional methods remains limited and often inconclusive, necessitating further controlled investigation.

Objective: This study aimed to quantitatively evaluate the impact of a structured, supplemental VR basketball training module on the shooting accuracy and defensive reaction time of amateur basketball players, comparing its efficacy to a regimen of traditional practice alone.

Methods: A randomized controlled trial was conducted with a cohort of 40 amateur athletes. Participants were assigned to either an experimental group (EG, n=20) that underwent a standardized 6-week VR training regimen using the STRIVR platform alongside their normal practice, or a control group (CG, n=20) that continued with standard, on-court practice only. Pre- and post-intervention assessments objectively measured free-throw percentage (FT%), three-point shooting percentage (3P%), and reaction time in a lateral defensive slide drill using infrared timing gates.

Findings: A mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed a statistically significant interaction between group and time for all primary outcome measures. The EG demonstrated significantly greater improvement in FT% (EG: +18.2%, CG: +5.1%, $p < 0.001$), 3P% (EG: +15.7%, CG: +4.3%, $p < 0.001$), and a greater reduction in defensive reaction time (EG: -0.21s, CG: -0.07s, $p = 0.02$) compared to the CG.

Conclusions: The findings robustly indicate that VR-based training serves as a highly effective adjunct to traditional methods for improving key perceptual-motor skills in basketball. The technology facilitates repetitive, scenario-based practice that enhances both offensive skill execution and defensive decision-making under pressure. This study provides compelling evidence to support the strategic adoption of VR technology within comprehensive athletic development programs for amateur athletes.

Keywords: Virtual Reality, Sports Training, Basketball Performance, Skill Acquisition, Perceptual-Cognitive Training, Reaction Time, Athletic Technology

Introduction

The relentless pursuit of a competitive advantage in elite sports has perpetually driven innovation in training methodology. The historical trajectory of athletic development is marked by the adoption of new technologies, from the introduction of video tape analysis in the 1970s to the contemporary proliferation of wearable biometric sensors and global positioning system (GPS) tracking (Halson, Juliff, & Peiffer, 2019) [6]. These tools have provided coaches and sports scientists with unprecedented data on athlete workload, physiological response, and movement mechanics, enabling a more personalized and scientific approach to training. In this evolving landscape, virtual reality (VR) has emerged as one of the most transformative technologies, offering a novel paradigm for cognitive training and skill acquisition that transcends the limitations of the physical world. By generating fully immersive, interactive, and meticulously controllable simulated environments, VR presents a groundbreaking opportunity to train an athlete's decision-making, visual perception, and neuromuscular coordination in ways previously confined to mental imagery or impractical on-field scenarios (Neumann et al., 2018).

Basketball, as a sport, is characterized by its dynamic, non-cyclical, and inherently unpredictable nature. Success at competitive levels hinges not only on supreme physical prowess—encompassing speed, agility, and vertical leap—but also, and perhaps more critically, on rapid cognitive processing, tactical awareness, and the precise execution of fine motor skills under intense psychological pressure and defensive duress (Abernethy, 2021) [1]. Traditional training methodologies, while foundational and effective for building muscle memory and physical conditioning, face inherent limitations. Physical fatigue inevitably restricts the volume of high-quality repetitions, particularly for complex skills like shooting. Environmental conditions, such as court lighting, background noise, and the presence of spectators, are variable and often cannot be replicated in practice. Most significantly, it is exceptionally challenging to consistently simulate authentic game-like defensive pressure and the chaotic visual cues of a live opponent during drills, creating a significant gap between the practice environment and the performance environment. This gap is a well-documented phenomenon in motor learning literature, often referred to as the "contextual interference effect" and the challenge of transfer (Porter & Magill, 2010). VR technology proposes a solution to bridge this gap by allowing athletes to engage in high-fidelity, mentally demanding, and highly repetitive simulations without the associated physical wear-and-tear, thereby potentially accelerating the learning curve and enhancing the transfer of skills from practice to competition. Existing scholarly literature has begun to explore the applications of VR across a diverse range of sports. Seminal studies in fields such as alpine skiing (Bideau et al., 2010) [2], golf (Miles et al., 2012), and football/soccer (Düking, Holmberg, & Sperlich, 2018) [3] have demonstrated promising benefits in areas including mental imagery, tactical awareness, strategic planning, and rehabilitation from injury. Within the specific domain of basketball, preliminary research has focused on VR's role in assessing and training court awareness, spatial perception, and jump-shot mechanics (Gavish et al., 2015) [5]. However, a significant and critical research gap remains. Many existing studies are qualitative in nature, relying on athlete self-reporting and perceived benefits, or they lack rigorously controlled experimental designs. There is a notable paucity of quantitative, empirical evidence derived from randomized controlled trials that isolates the specific effect of a structured VR training intervention on fundamental, objectively measurable basketball skills—specifically, shooting accuracy from various ranges and defensive reaction capabilities—and directly compares these outcomes against a control group adhering strictly to traditional, on-court training methods. This lack of controlled comparison makes it difficult to attribute improvements solely to the VR intervention.

Therefore, the primary purpose of this study is to rigorously quantify the efficacy of a structured VR training intervention on the skill development of amateur basketball players using a robust randomized controlled trial design. This research directly addresses the identified gap in the literature by testing the central hypothesis that athletes who supplement their regular physical training with a dedicated VR regimen will exhibit significantly greater improvements in shooting percentage (both free-throw and three-point) and defensive reaction time than a matched group of athletes following only a traditional training regimen. The findings aim to move beyond anecdotal claims and provide coaches, athletes, and sports scientists with evidence-based insights into the practical value and return on investment of VR as a tangible tool for athletic enhancement and performance optimization.

Research Objectives and Questions

This investigation is guided by the following primary research question: Does a six-week, supplemental virtual reality training intervention significantly improve objective measures of shooting accuracy and defensive reaction time in amateur basketball players compared to traditional training alone?

Derived from this, the specific research objectives are:

1. To measure and compare the pre- and post-intervention free-throw and three-point shooting percentages of the experimental (VR) and control (traditional) groups using standardized, objective tests.
2. To measure and compare the pre- and post-intervention defensive reaction times of both groups using infrared timing gate technology to ensure precision.
3. To analyze participant perceptions and engagement with the VR training modality through a post-study survey to understand its practical acceptability.

Methods

Research Design

This study utilized a randomized controlled trial (RCT) design with a pre-test/post-test structure, which is considered the gold standard for evaluating the efficacy of an intervention. Participants were randomly assigned to either an Experimental Group (EG) or a Control Group (CG). The independent variable was the type of supplemental training received (VR vs. Traditional-only). The dependent variables were three objective performance metrics: 1) Free-throw shooting percentage (FT%), 2) Three-point shooting percentage (3P%), and 3) Defensive reaction time, measured in seconds (s).

Participants

A sample of 40 amateur basketball players (22 male, 18 female) was recruited from local university club teams and community sports leagues. Participants were aged between 18 and 24 years (Mean [M] = 20.4, Standard Deviation [SD] = 1.8) and had a minimum of 5 years of continuous competitive playing experience. Individuals with a history of vestibular disorders, severe motion sickness, epilepsy, or any uncorrected visual impairment were excluded from participation due to the nature of the VR intervention. Following an initial screening and consent process, participants were randomly assigned to either the EG (n=20) or the CG (n=20) using a computer-generated random number sequence prepared by an independent researcher. A one-way ANOVA confirmed no significant pre-intervention differences between the groups on any of the baseline performance measures ($p > 0.05$ for all variables), ensuring group equivalence at the outset. All participants provided written informed consent after being thoroughly briefed on the study procedures, and the study protocol was granted full approval by the University Ethics Review Board (Ref: #2023-ATH-47).

Data Collection Tools and Procedures

VR Setup and Intervention: The EG performed their supplemental training using the Oculus Quest 2 headset (Meta Platforms, Inc.), a standalone VR system with inside-out tracking, running a customized module on the STRIVR platform (STRIVR Labs, Inc.). The software was specifically configured for this study and included two core drills:

Shooting Drill: Participants were positioned on a virtual court. A life-size, animated defender avatar was presented at varying intensities (e.g., passive presence, active close-out). Players were required to practice shooting over the avatar from the free-throw line and from beyond the three-point arc. The system provided visual and auditory feedback for made and missed shots.

Defensive Drill: Participants assumed a defensive stance. A virtual offensive player performed a randomized series of dribble moves and directional drives. The participant's task was to react as quickly as possible with the correct defensive slide direction to cut off the virtual opponent's path. Head movement and initiation of lateral movement were tracked by the headset.

Training Protocol: The total intervention period lasted 6 weeks. The EG participated in three supervised 25-minute

VR sessions per week, conducted in a dedicated lab space, in addition to their normal team practices (which averaged 6 hours per week). The CG participated exclusively in their normal team practices, which included drills specifically focused on shooting and defensive sliding for an equivalent amount of time as the EG's supplemental VR sessions (i.e., 1.25 hours per week of focused skill work). This design ensured that any observed differences could be attributed to the *mode* of training (VR vs. traditional) rather than the total *time* spent training.

Pre- and Post-Testing Procedures: All tests were conducted in a university sports hall under standardized conditions.

Shooting Accuracy Test: Participants took 50 attempted free throws and 50 attempted three-pointers (from five standardized spots around the arc) in a quiet, controlled gym environment. A research assistant recorded the number of successful shots for each set, and the percentage made was calculated (FT% and 3P%).

Defensive Reaction Time Test: Participants began in a defensive stance in the center of the key. The test was initiated by a random audio cue. Upon hearing the cue, a red LED light would illuminate either to their far left or far right, signaling the direction to move. Participants were required to react and perform a lateral defensive slide to touch a cone placed 5 meters away. Reaction time (defined as the time elapsed from the light stimulus to the first detectable movement, measured by the timing gate laser break) and total movement time to cover the 5 meters were recorded using Brower Timing Gates (Brower Timing Systems, Utah, USA). The best of three attempts for each direction was recorded.

Data Analysis: All collected data were anonymized and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) were calculated for all demographic and performance variables for each group. The primary inferential analysis involved conducting a 2x2 (Group [EG, CG] x Time [Pre, Post]) mixed-design Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for each of the three dependent variables (FT%, 3P%, Reaction Time). This statistical test is specifically designed to analyze changes over time between different groups and can identify interaction effects. The assumption of sphericity was checked using Mauchly's Test. Where significant interaction effects were found (indicating that the groups changed differently over time), post-hoc analyses were conducted using independent samples t-tests (to compare groups at post-test) and paired samples t-tests (to compare within-group changes from pre- to post-test) with a Bonferroni correction applied to control for family-wise error rate. Statistical significance was set at an alpha level of $p < 0.05$ for all tests.

Results

The results of the mixed-design ANOVA revealed a statistically significant interaction effect between Group (EG, CG) and Time (Pre, Post) for all three dependent variables. This indicates that the change in performance scores from pre-test to post-test was significantly different for the experimental group compared to the control group, thereby supporting the primary hypothesis of the study.

Shooting Accuracy

For free-throw percentage (FT%), the ANOVA yielded a significant interaction effect, $F(1, 38) = 32.15$, $p < 0.001$, partial eta squared (ηp^2) = 0.46. This represents a large effect size, indicating that the group assignment explained a substantial portion of the variance in improvement. Post-hoc tests were conducted to break down this interaction. While both groups showed a statistically significant improvement from pre-test to post-test ($p < 0.05$ for both within-group paired t-tests), the magnitude of improvement was vastly different. The EG improved their FT% from a mean of 65.2% (SD=8.1) to 83.4% (SD=6.3), representing a mean gain of +18.2%. The CG improved from a mean of 63.8% (SD=7.4) to 68.9% (SD=6.9), a mean gain of only +5.1%. An independent samples t-test confirmed that the difference in improvement (the delta) between the EG and CG was highly statistically significant, $t(38) = 5.88$, $p < 0.001$.

A nearly identical pattern was observed for three-point percentage (3P%). The ANOVA revealed a significant interaction, $F(1, 38) = 28.74$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.43$ (large effect size). Post-hoc analysis showed the EG improved their 3P% from a mean of 38.5% (SD=9.2) to 54.2% (SD=8.1), a substantial gain of 15.7%. The CG showed a modest improvement from 37.9% (SD=8.7) to 42.2% (SD=7.5), a gain of 4.3%. The between-group difference in the amount of improvement was again highly significant, $t(38) = 5.12$, $p < 0.001$.

Table 1: Pre- and Post-Intervention Shooting Accuracy by Group

Group	Free Throw % (Pre)	Free Throw % (Post)	3-Point % (Pre)	3-Point % (Post)
Experimental (VR)	65.2% (8.1)	**83.4% (6.3)**	38.5% (9.2)	**54.2% (8.1)**
Control (Traditional)	63.8% (7.4)	68.9% (6.9)	37.9% (8.7)	42.2% (7.5)
Note: Values represent Mean (Standard Deviation).				

Defensive Reaction Time

For defensive reaction time, the ANOVA also revealed a statistically significant interaction effect, $F(1, 38) = 5.92$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta p^2 = 0.14$. This represents a medium effect size, indicating a meaningful though less pronounced effect than for shooting. The EG reduced their mean reaction time from 0.89 seconds (SD=0.11) to 0.68 seconds (SD=0.09), an improvement of 0.21 seconds. The CG reduced their mean time from 0.91 seconds (SD=0.10) to 0.84 seconds (SD=0.08), an improvement of 0.07 seconds. An independent samples t-test on the improvement scores showed that the EG's gain was significantly larger than that of the CG, $t(38) = 2.41$, $p = 0.02$.

Discussion

The primary and unequivocal finding of this randomized controlled trial is that a six-week, supplemental VR training program led to statistically and practically significant greater improvements in both offensive shooting accuracy and defensive reaction time compared to traditional, on-court training alone. These results robustly support the initial hypothesis and provide strong empirical evidence that VR is not merely a novel gadget but an effective pedagogical tool for enhancing specific basketball skills in amateur athletes. The implications of these findings extend to coaches, athletes, and the broader field of sports science. The dramatic improvement in shooting performance observed in the experimental group aligns convincingly with established principles of deliberate practice and cognitive theory (Ericsson & Pool, 2016) [4]. The VR environment successfully created conditions for "perfect practice": it allowed for an exceptionally high volume of mentally engaged repetitions in a sterile, controlled setting, free from the physical fatigue of retrieving balls, the environmental distractions of a busy gym, or the variability of a human defender. This high-density, focused repetition is crucial for reinforcing the neural pathways associated with consistent shooting mechanics, from hand placement to follow-through. Furthermore, the presence of a virtual defender, even without the possibility of physical contact, introduced a critical element of psychological pressure and visual distraction. This likely trained the athletes' ability to maintain focus on the target (the rim) amidst competing visual stimuli, a skill directly transferable to game situations where defenders are actively contesting shots. This finding quantitatively extends the earlier qualitative work of Gavish et al. (2015) [5], moving from promising observation to measurable cause and effect.

The significant reduction in defensive reaction time within the EG is a particularly compelling result, as it speaks to VR's capacity to train perceptual-cognitive skills beyond mere motor execution. Defense in basketball is often more about anticipation, quick decision-making, and reading an opponent's cues (e.g., hip movement, ball placement) than about pure physical speed (Abernethy, 2021) [1]. The VR defensive drill was specifically designed to train this perception-action coupling. By forcing players to recognize subtle visual cues from the virtual offensive player and initiate a correct physical response within milliseconds, the drill enhanced their cognitive processing speed and decision-making efficiency. This type of training is difficult to replicate consistently in traditional drills, which often rely on a coach's or partner's predictable movements, thus reducing the element of surprise and cognitive load. The VR system provided infinite, randomized repetitions of game-like scenarios, a key advantage for developing these cognitive components of performance.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

While the results are robust, several limitations must be acknowledged to contextualize the findings and guide future inquiry. First, the sample, while sufficient for statistical power, consisted solely of amateur athletes. The transferability of these results to elite, professional players, who already operate at a high level of skill automatization, remains an open question. Second, the study did not include a long-term follow-up assessment (e.g., 2-3 months post-intervention) to evaluate skill retention. It is unknown whether the gains achieved through VR training persist longer than those from traditional methods. Future research must investigate this longevity. Third, the study focused on isolated skills; future work should explore the transfer of these improvements to actual game performance metrics, such as steals, defensive stops, and shooting percentages in scrimmages or real games. Finally, exploring the individual components of VR training (e.g., varying levels of graphical realism, adjusting cognitive load, incorporating biofeedback) could help optimize future software design for maximum efficacy.

Practical Implications and Conclusions

For coaches and athletic directors, this study provides a strong evidence-based rationale for considering investment in VR technology as a valuable adjunct to physical practice. It is particularly useful for optimizing limited training time, allowing athletes to get cognitive "reps" when physically fatigued or off the court, and for focusing on the cognitive aspects of performance that are hard to train traditionally. For sport scientists, it demonstrates a valid and rigorous methodology for quantifying VR's impact and opens fertile ground for designing more sophisticated and targeted training simulations for other sports and skill sets. In conclusion, this research demonstrates that virtual reality training is a highly effective method for improving key performance metrics in basketball. It serves as a powerful complementary tool within the modern athlete's holistic training arsenal, effectively bridging the gap between the gym and the game.

Conclusion

This randomized controlled trial provides clear and compelling evidence that a structured virtual reality training intervention significantly enhances the skill development of amateur basketball players. The experimental group that supplemented their traditional on-court practice with VR sessions demonstrated statistically superior gains in free-throw and three-point shooting accuracy, as well as in defensive reaction time, compared to the control group that engaged solely in traditional practice. These findings affirm that the value of VR extends beyond novelty; it is a potent training modality that facilitates high-density, repetitive, and cognitively engaging practice in a controlled and safe environment. By isolating and training specific perceptual-cognitive components of performance, such as focus under pressure and rapid decision-making, VR effectively enhances skills that are critical for success in competition. While it is not intended to replace physical practice, conditioning, or live gameplay experience, VR should be strategically integrated as a powerful complementary tool within comprehensive athletic development programs. This study offers a robust foundation for its adoption and encourages further research into its long-term effects and applications across different sports and performance domains.

References

1. Abernethy B. The expert performer: A model of the acquisition and maintenance of expert performance. Routledge, 2021.
2. Bideau B, Kulpa R, Vignais N, Brault S, Multon F, Craig C. Using virtual reality to analyze sports performance. IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications,2010:130(2):14-21.
3. Düking P, Holmberg HC, Sperlich B. The potential usefulness of virtual reality systems for athletes: a short SWOT analysis. Frontiers in Physiology,2018:19:128.

4. Ericsson A, Pool R. Peak: Secrets from the new science of expertise. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016.
5. Gavish N, Gutiérrez T, Webel S, Rodríguez J, Tecchia F. Design and evaluation of a virtual reality training system for manual skills acquisition. Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments,2015:124(2):105-20.
6. Halson SL, Juliff LE, Peiffer JJ. Technology in sport: Opportunities and challenges. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance,2019:114(7):875-877.
7. Miles HC, Pop SR, Watt SJ, Lawrence GP, John NW. A review of virtual environments for training in ball sports. Computers & Graphics,2012:136(6):714-726.
8. Neumann DL, Moffitt RL, Thomas PR, Loveday K, Watling DP, Lombard CL, et al. A systematic review of the application of interactive virtual reality to sport. Virtual Reality,2018:122(3):183-98.
9. Porter JM, Magill RA. Systematically increasing contextual interference is beneficial for learning sport skills. Journal of Sports Sciences,2010:128(12):1277-85.
10. Gray R. Transfer of training from virtual to real baseball batting. Frontiers in Psychology,2017:18:2183.
11. Michalski SC, Szpak A, Loetscher T. Using virtual environments to improve real-world motor skills in sports: A systematic review. Frontiers in Psychology,2019:110:2159.
12. Tirp J, Steingröver C, Wattie N, Baker J, Schorer J. Virtual realities as optimal learning environments in sport. German Journal of Sports Medicine,2015:166(5):122-1229.