

1 Pizzera et al. (2017). European journal of Sport Science

2

3

### Abstract

4 In sport visual feedback is often used to enhance performance, mostly neglecting the auditory  
5 modality. However, athletes produce natural sounds when they move (acoustic reafferences)  
6 which they perceive and use to control their movements. We examined the short- and long-  
7 term effects of a training intervention on a complex movement by using acoustic reafferences.  
8 Natural step sounds produced during hurdling were recorded and played back to the  
9 participants immediately before each trial, with an increase (fast group), decrease (slow  
10 group), or no manipulation (control group) in the tempo. All groups increased their hurdling  
11 performance regarding overall running time, with the slow group showing the best  
12 performance development. After a 10-week retention, the fast and slow group further  
13 increased performance, whereas the control group declined. The repeated experience with  
14 acoustic information associated with the rhythmic pattern of hurdling may have helped  
15 developing a cognitive representation of that movement, especially regarding long-term  
16 effects.

17

18 Keywords: auditory, intrinsic, feedback, hurdling, perception

19

## 1 Training with acoustic reafferences

2 “Did you hear that? That was a good take-off”, the coach says to his athlete after yet another  
3 long jump attempt during training. Statements such as this are quite regularly heard on the  
4 field or in the gym during training. Providing feedback is considered one of the most  
5 important aspects for learning and optimizing motor skills (Schmidt & Lee, 2011). However,  
6 feedback typically focuses on the visual sense and is provided by an external source. This  
7 extrinsic or augmented feedback (for an overview on studies in this area, see Sigrist, Rauter,  
8 Riener, & Wolf, 2013) provides information in addition to the sensory-perceptual information  
9 which in turn is based on exteroceptors and interoceptors of the human body, also called  
10 intrinsic feedback (Schmidt & Lee, 2011). For movement calibration, the actual sensory  
11 feedback as a consequence of motor action is compared to predicted feedback through internal  
12 models simulating the consequences of an action. This process is also referred to as the  
13 reafference principle (Blakemore, Wolpert, & Frith, 2000; Desmurget & Grafton, 2000;  
14 Wolpert & Flanagan, 2001). Although such intrinsic feedback including visual, acoustic, and  
15 tactile information accompanies every movement, the focus of performers and of coaches is  
16 usually on the visual sense using augmented feedback. Much less is known about the acoustic  
17 sense and what role it plays in linking perception and motor performance as part of internal  
18 feedback. Considering that rhythm is a basic principle of many actions and this can be  
19 optimally represented via acoustic information, the aim of the current study was to examine  
20 whether acoustic reafferences can be used to optimize movements on a short- and long-term  
21 basis.

22 Mostly research has addressed the link between motor perception and motor execution  
23 by focusing on augmented feedback, specifically with respect to the visual sense. However,  
24 just recently, a review by Sors, Murgia, Santoro, and Agostini (2015) provided an overview of  
25 audio-based interventions, concluding that future studies should focus on the type of  
26 intervention and the auditory stimuli used as well as the implementation of such interventions

1 into applied sporting contexts. Taking into account auditory information of complex sporting  
2 movements, Pizzera and Hohmann (2015) provide an overview of the current literature on this  
3 topic. The authors distinguish three dimensions regarding the use of auditory information.  
4 First, authorship describes the discrimination between one's own and other movement sounds.  
5 Second, timing refers to action-perception processes running either concurrently (online) or  
6 temporally separated (offline). Taking the example from above, the athlete may hear the take-  
7 off sounds while performing the take-off itself (online) or receive feedback on the take-off  
8 sounds after his or her performance from the coach (offline). Third, the type of feedback  
9 characterizes whether athletes use their own internal feedback system or external sources of  
10 information for optimizing performance. With respect to external acoustic information,  
11 athletes can receive help by the sonification technique. Physical and/or kinematic parameters  
12 of the movement are converted into a synthetic sound, supplying meaningful information of  
13 parameter variation (Dubus & Bresin, 2013). Studies have revealed a positive effect of the use  
14 of sonification during the motor learning process on motor performance (for an overview, see  
15 Effenberg, 2005). However, Pizzera and Hohmann concluded that only a few studies  
16 addressed how natural as opposed to artificial sounds occurring as a byproduct of movement  
17 contribute to the control and learning of complex whole-body movements.

18         One study with golfers addressed the tight link between action and auditory perception  
19 of complex whole-body movements. The results revealed that athletes were able to  
20 discriminate sound recordings of their self-generated movement from recordings of another's  
21 movements (Murgia, Hohmann, Galmonte, Raab, & Agostini, 2012). In a study using  
22 basketball movements, athletes were even able to predict the final running direction of  
23 opponents from their natural sounds alone (Camponogara, Rodger, Craig, & Cesari, P. (2017)).  
24 The authors suggested that the athletes picked up and used the relevant kinematic features of  
25 deceptive movements to guide their own movements for successful interception. And not only  
26 movement sounds of the opponent can be used, but also the sounds of balls while hitting

1 them, to gain valuable information for the own appropriate motor response. For instance,  
2 volleyball athletes showed to be quite accurate in discriminating shot power of smashes based  
3 on auditory information (Sors et al., 2017). Accuracy was also higher compared to the use of  
4 visual information. This difference was not found for the estimation of shot power of penalty  
5 kicks. In an attempt to compare discrimination performance between own and other sounds,  
6 hurdlers showed to be able to discriminate identical and different sound pairs, independent of  
7 the agent, and identified their own movement sounds significantly better than strangers'  
8 sounds (Kennel, Hohmann, & Raab, 2014; Kennel et al., 2014). The results suggest that  
9 athletes are experts for their own movements and seem to perceive them somehow during  
10 movement execution. Therefore, athletes should also be able to discriminate expert from  
11 novice sounds with the aim to use expert sounds for movement enhancement. Referring to the  
12 above-described timing of action-perception processes, auditory perception can influence  
13 action momentarily (online) but can also exert long-term effects (offline) expressed through  
14 the development of controlling motor skills, also known as motor learning.

15 On a behavioral level, auditory perception was shown to influence the control of  
16 bodily movements. Specifically, the walking speed and gait period of participants changed  
17 systematically when auditory feedback was delayed (Menzer et al., 2010). Similarly, in a  
18 study with hurdlers, participants were instructed to clear four hurdles with a three-step rhythm  
19 between the hurdles (Kennel et al., 2015). The authors invented a feedback apparatus that  
20 participants wore as a belt around the waist; the device recorded the participants' step sounds  
21 and immediately gave auditory feedback. The delayed feedback condition (180-ms delay)  
22 significantly reduced overall running time and changed kinematic parameters, whereas white  
23 noise showed no effects. To sum up, auditory information appears to have an effect on an  
24 internal level and to disrupt performance on an external level, if this information does not  
25 match the expected feedback.

1           Regarding long-term effects, researchers have also examined whether acoustic  
2 information might even support motor learning. The only study so far conducted with natural  
3 movement sounds showed that hammer throwers optimized their performance via training  
4 with auditory feedback (Agostini, Righi, Galmonte, & Bruno, 2004). The sounds were  
5 generated by recording the movement of the hammer flying through the air. These natural  
6 movement sounds were then played back as auditory feedback to the participants while  
7 training. Training consisted of a single training session of 10 trials, during which participants  
8 listened to their best personal throw five times before each throw. As a result, all athletes  
9 improved and standardized their performance. A limitation of the study is the small size of  
10 five expert athletes and the fact that athletes performed only one training session. However,  
11 this is, to the best to our knowledge, the only study conducted with complex natural  
12 movement sounds for training purposes, providing a good basis for further investigations in  
13 this area.

14           Our study aimed at overcoming these limitations and extending investigations on  
15 training with acoustic reafferences, specifically examining offline effects of acoustic  
16 perception on action, to achieve long-term effects. Using the reafference principle as a basis  
17 for understanding the contribution of natural acoustic feedback for training and optimizing  
18 complex movements, we chose the task of hurdling, as it represents a typical rhythmic  
19 structure that can be nicely depicted through sound (MacPherson, Collins, & Obhi, 2009).  
20 Considering that the technique of top-level hurdlers is characterized by a stable and structured  
21 running pattern based on temporal structure, whereas that of unpracticed hurdlers shows  
22 problems of spatiotemporal adaptation and regulation on approaching hurdles (Hay &  
23 Schöbel, 1990), we assumed that a focus on audition during skill acquisition should be  
24 beneficial.

25           On the basis of the law of practice, we predicted that all athletes would increase their  
26 short-term hurdling performance independent of experimental group, due to training or

1 practice (Guadagnoli & Lee, 2004; Schmidt & Lee, 2011). In addition, referring to the study  
2 by Agostini et al. (2004), we hypothesized that optimized acoustic feedback (own best  
3 practice, because humans are experts of their own movement sounds) would lead to greater  
4 hurdling performance increases and positive long-term effects (retention after break). Since  
5 the ultimate goal in hurdling is to decrease overall running time, a faster tempo of the same  
6 rhythmic structure displayed through acoustic feedback was predicted to lead to better  
7 performance (as shown by a decrease in overall running time). We hypothesized that the  
8 faster tempo would lead to a more expert-like representation and therefore enhance overall  
9 performance. In addition, shorter overall running time can only be achieved by improving  
10 movement technique, as depicted by spatiotemporal parameters (Hay & Schoebel, 1990).  
11 Specifically, to reduce overall time, both ground and air times should be as short as possible,  
12 which can be achieved by proper body-segment positioning before and after the hurdle (Mann  
13 & Herman, 1985). Due to the relation between distance and time, a shorter flight time over  
14 the hurdle is the result of shorter flight distance and flight height. Taking into account the link  
15 between spatiotemporal parameters and rhythm, we predicted an improvement in movement  
16 technique due to optimized acoustic feedback, as depicted by different kinematic parameters.

17 On the basis of the hurdles study by Kennel et al. (2015), in which a delayed online  
18 feedback condition significantly increased overall running time and changed kinematic  
19 parameters, we further sought to test whether such effects also account for offline acoustic  
20 perception and action links.

21

22

## Methods

23

### Participants

24

We recruited 39 sports students (18 women, 21 men;  $M_{\text{age}} = 22.30$  years,  $SD = 5.46$ ) with

25

hurdling experience gained through university courses in track and field or training sessions

26

as part of their sport. Participants were randomly assigned to three groups. Because all

1 participants were active athletes, some suffered injuries and were not able to complete the  
2 study. This led to an uneven distribution of participants in the different groups. Hurdling  
3 experience and gender, however, were matched across groups. The fast group ( $n = 12$ ; seven  
4 women, five men) received acoustic feedback during training that depicted a faster running  
5 velocity than that recorded at the pretest; the slow group ( $n = 12$ ; five women, seven men)  
6 trained with slower running velocity sounds; and the control group ( $n = 15$ ; six women, nine  
7 men) trained with their original sounds, recorded at pretest. All participants provided written  
8 informed consent prior to the study and they were not informed about the experimental  
9 hypotheses. After completion of the study they were debriefed about the experimental  
10 hypotheses and the group they had belonged to. Additionally they received €10 per  
11 participation hour. The study was approved by the local university's ethics committee.

## 12 **Task**

13         The participants were asked to clear four hurdles with the normal hurdle rhythm of  
14 four steps between hurdles and seven to nine steps to the first hurdle. The distance from the  
15 start (out of a starting block) was 11.50 m for women and 12.80 m for men, and the distance  
16 between hurdles was 7.60 m (women) and 8.30 m (men). The height of the hurdles (Erhard  
17 Sport, Geslau, Germany) was 84 cm for women and 91.4 cm for men. These dimensions  
18 (slightly lower than the official competition norms for 100/110-m hurdles of the International  
19 Association of Athletics Federations) turned out to be optimal for novice to intermediate  
20 hurdlers in a pilot study as well as in previous studies (Kennel, Hohmann, & Raab, 2014;  
21 Kennel et al., 2014, 2015). After one or two warm-up trials, we recorded five valid attempts  
22 (correct number of steps) of every participant with no acoustic start signal so that participants  
23 could start whenever they were ready.

## 24 **Materials**

25         Time and kinematic data served as performance measures of the movement task.  
26 Overall time was measured by double light barriers (SPORTRONIC Double Infrared

1 Photoelectric Barriers, DLS/F03) with the first light barrier placed at the starting point (5 m  
2 after the starting block to disregard individual reaction time) and the second at 40 m (directly  
3 after the fourth hurdle). Two-dimensional kinematic data were collected at the third hurdle,  
4 assuming peak velocity based on analysis of the 100-m and 110-m hurdling races at the track  
5 and field World Championship 2010 (Graubner & Nixdorf, 2011). A high-speed camera  
6 (Casio EX-FH100) was used with 120 frames/s recording speed, a resolution of  $640 \times 480$   
7 pixels, and a  $2 \times 2$  calibration square. The camera was placed 5.50 m away and orthogonal to  
8 the movement plane.

9         The auditory data were collected on a Tartan track at the local university. Movement  
10 sounds were recorded binaurally with Soundman OKM classic in-ear microphones  
11 (sensitivity:  $5 \text{ mV Pa}^{-1} \pm 3 \text{ dB}$ ). An A3 adapter (input impedance =  $1 \text{ k}\Omega$ ; output impedance =  
12  $47 \text{ k}\Omega$ ) was plugged in between the microphones and the recording equipment (Zoom H1  
13 Handy Recorder; 24 bit/96 kHz/320 kbps) to obtain a low noise floor. To protect the  
14 microphones against rustling noises while the athletes were running, we used an acrylic  
15 windshield.

16         To develop the acoustic feedback stimuli, we used the audio editor Audacity 2.0.3.  
17 (Audacity Team, 2014). We cut the movement sounds so that each stimulus contained the full  
18 run (first step from the starting block to the flight phase over the last hurdle). Depending on  
19 the group, we either kept the original sound (control group) or manipulated the tempo of the  
20 run while retaining the rhythm (intervention groups). For the fast group, we increased the  
21 tempo by 10%, 15%, and 20% by cutting 10%, 15%, and 20% off the flight phase for each  
22 individual step, respectively. For the slow group we added 10%, 15%, and 20%, respectively.  
23 Tempo was gradually increased or decreased after two training sessions, so that participants  
24 would not suspect any experimental manipulations. Participants therefore always trained with  
25 the new tempo for two training sessions. In addition, we added a short verbal instruction at the  
26 beginning of the audio file: “Following this instruction, you will hear two movement sounds.

1 Please listen carefully and concentrate well on the sound.” As stated in the verbal instruction,  
2 the acoustic feedback stimulus was then played two times.

### 3 **Procedure**

4 **Recording sessions.** In total, participants had to complete a pretest, six training  
5 sessions, a posttest, and 10 weeks later, a retention test (see Figure 1). The trainings sessions  
6 were completed within two to three weeks, with two/three training sessions each week. We  
7 assessed the participants’ time and kinematic data four times: At the beginning of the  
8 experiment (pretest), halfway through the training phase after three training sessions  
9 (midtest), at the end of the training phase (posttest), and after the posttest (retention test).  
10 During each test, participants performed five trials.

11

12 \*\*\* Figure 1 near here\*\*\*

13

14 **Training sessions.** The participants completed 30 trials altogether during the training  
15 intervention, with six training sessions of five trials each. For organizational reasons and to  
16 keep a tight protocol, participants trained in groups of three. Groups were formed based on  
17 time availability of the participants, leading to a random distribution regarding their  
18 experimental condition. During each training session, participants first listened to their  
19 individual audio file via headphones and then immediately stepped into the starting block and  
20 ran the 40-m hurdles track as described in the task. One minute after Participant 1, the second  
21 participant started with listening to the audio file and again 1 min later, Participant 3. This  
22 procedure was repeated five times and ensured that participants each had a pause of 3 min  
23 between trials to reduce possible effects of different training protocols.

### 24 **Analyses**

25 For both time and kinematic data, we took the best three trials (out of five) of each test  
26 and calculated the mean, since some participants did not successfully clear all four hurdles in

1 all five trials. The kinematic data were analyzed using the movement analysis software utilius  
2 easyINSPECT (CCC Software, Markkleeberg, Germany). Selected parameters for movement  
3 quality include distances (meters = m) and time (seconds = s): distance of the last step to the  
4 hurdle (distance before hurdle), vertical distance between hurdle and trochanter (vertical  
5 distance), distance from the hurdle to the landing leg (distance after hurdle), distance between  
6 takeoff and landing (stride length), foot–ground contact time before and after the hurdle  
7 (takeoff step duration and landing step duration), and flight time (Čoh, 2002; Čoh & Iskra,  
8 2012). Outlier correction was performed for 2.5% outliers in total, using the Winsorizing  
9 method, by replacing each outlier with the next highest score of the group in the respective  
10 condition (Field, 2013).

11 To examine the effect of the training intervention on hurdling performance, we  
12 performed separate  $4 \times 3$  (Test  $\times$  Group) repeated-measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs)  
13 for each of the individual dependent variables, with test (pre, mid, post, retention) as within-  
14 group variable and group (fast, slow, control) as between-group variable. Movement time and  
15 the above-described seven movement quality measures served as the dependent variables.  
16 This procedure was chosen because there was a mix of positively correlated and uncorrelated  
17 dependent variables, which is not recommended for applying a multivariate ANOVA and  
18 because our hypotheses were not strictly multivariate in nature (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). In  
19 addition, one-way ANOVAs for each variable confirmed that there was no significant  
20 difference between the groups in the pretest. To control for the family-wise Type I error, we  
21 applied the Holm’s correction (Knudson, 2009). When the sphericity assumption was  
22 violated, the Greenhouse–Geisser correction was used. Effect sizes were calculated as partial  
23 eta-squared values ( $\eta_p^2$ ) and are reported only for  $F > 1$ . A significance criterion of  $p = .05$   
24 was established for all results reported.

25

26

## Results

### 1 **Time data**

2 All participants decreased their overall running time from pretest to retention test (fast group:  
3 by 189 ms, slow group: by 383 ms, control group: by 55 ms), as shown by a significant main  
4 effect of Test,  $F(2.49, 89.76) = 15.71, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .30$ . Figure 2 shows that this was mainly  
5 due to the two intervention groups, who also further increased their performance from posttest  
6 to retention test, whereas the performance of the control group declined, as indicated by an  
7 interaction effect,  $F(4.99, 89.76) = 2.69, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .13$ . However, after applying Holm's  
8 correction, the  $p$  value stayed above the adjusted critical  $p$  value of .006. There was no main  
9 effect of group.

10

11

\*\*\* Figure 2 near here\*\*\*

12

### 13 **Kinematic data**

14 For the kinematic data, all participants showed significant decreases with regard to vertical  
15 distance,  $F(2.37, 85.16) = 28.51, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .44$ , distance after hurdle,  $F(3, 108) = 6.39, p =$   
16  $.001, \eta_p^2 = .15$ , and landing step duration,  $F(3, 108) = 9.48, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .21$ , after applying  
17 the Holm's correction. In addition, there was a Test  $\times$  Group interaction effect for distance  
18 after hurdle,  $F(6, 108) = 2.22, p = .046, \eta_p^2 = .11$ , and stride length,  $F(4.85, 87.36) = 4.17, p =$   
19  $.002, \eta_p^2 = .19$ , reflecting the different learning curves between the two intervention groups  
20 and the control group (Figure 2). However, after applying the Holm's correction, only the  
21 latter stayed under the adjusted critical  $p$  value. There was no significant main effect of group  
22 for any of the kinematic data. For an overview of the means and standard deviations of the  
23 time and kinematic data, see Table 1.

24

25

\*\*\* Table 1 near here\*\*\*

26



1           With regard to the refference principle (Blakemore et al., 2000; Desmurget &  
2 Grafton, 2000; Wolpert & Flanagan, 2011), it is speculated that acoustic feedback is used  
3 together with internal models to predict action consequences and compare them to actual  
4 feedback while running. Hence, the fast group tried to adjust their tempo to the faster tempo  
5 they had heard immediately before running, while the slow group somehow subconsciously  
6 perceived the tempo to be slower and tried to be even faster. This was partly reflected in the  
7 comments of the participants during the debriefing in post-experimental interviews. When  
8 asked if they had noticed anything with regard to their individual audio file, most of the  
9 participants reported that they had not noticed anything. Some of the participants of the slow  
10 group reported that they had perceived the sound to be slower, which in turn motivated them  
11 to try to run even faster during the next trial. This motivational aspect was not examined in  
12 this study but could be added in a follow-up study. Another aspect might be that rhythm,  
13 which is quite important for this movement, may have become more apparent and clear to the  
14 participants, similar to effects found for using slow motion for visual feedback (Scully &  
15 Carnegie, 1998; Ste-Marie et al., 2012).

16           Second, our prediction that all participants would show an increase in movement  
17 technique was partly confirmed. In four of the seven kinematic parameters participants  
18 showed a significant decrease, representing enhanced performance. Again, this was  
19 independent of the group, except for stride length. However, Figure 2 nicely shows how the  
20 learning curves of the two intervention groups are mostly similar, while the control group  
21 differs. Therefore, it seems that the participants used the manipulated acoustic feedback for  
22 their movement execution/control, which confirms earlier studies that have revealed effects of  
23 natural acoustic feedback on movement control (Kennel et al., 2015; Menzer et al., 2010) and  
24 optimization through short-term training (Agostini et al., 2004). Still, although general effects  
25 were found, these are in contrast to the direction of the effect found in previous studies.  
26 Namely, delayed acoustic feedback during movement execution was shown to disturb the

1 control of movements, as indicated by a decrease in walking speed (Menzer et al., 2010) and  
2 running time in hurdling (Kennel et al., 2015). In the current study, slower and faster acoustic  
3 feedback showed similar effects, which might be because an offline paradigm for training  
4 purposes was used, as opposed to manipulating acoustic feedback during movement  
5 execution.

6 One methodological limitation of the current study was the lack of a real control group  
7 that received no feedback. In our study the control group trained for the same length of time  
8 as the other two groups while also listening to their own movement sounds. The only  
9 difference was that they listened to their original sounds that were not manipulated. Although  
10 we believe that this kind of group is also necessary to rule out any general acoustic feedback  
11 effects, an additional training group without any feedback needs to be added as well in future  
12 studies to rule out increased motivation and attention due to new training methods. In  
13 addition, sample size was quite small and reliable effects need replications with larger power.  
14 However, with such a complex study design and injury dropouts due to the participants' main  
15 sports throughout the intervention phase, it was quite difficult to maintain equal and high  
16 numbers of participants per group.

17 From a practical point of view, this study poses some new implications. The  
18 participants, especially in the two intervention groups, were able to increase their hurdling  
19 performance after six weeks of training with acoustic feedback and only five trials per  
20 training session and maintain or even further improve their performance after a 10-week  
21 break. This improvement of up to 383 ms is quite astonishing especially when considering  
22 that this was achieved for a distance of only 35 m. In addition, most of the participants were  
23 low-level hurdlers and received no other feedback (visual or verbal) during the training  
24 intervention. The recording apparatus is also easily usable, consisting of an mp3 player, in-ear  
25 microphones, and an acrylic windshield. Overall, we would encourage practitioners, besides  
26 visually recording motor performance, to also acoustically record motor performance in order

1 to use a multisensory approach for feedback and training purposes. This can be done in two  
2 ways, either by using artificial sound for variables of motor performance that do not make any  
3 noise (method of sonification, which is different from using acoustic reafferences; see  
4 Effenberg, 2004 or Schaffert, 2011) or to use natural movement sounds as we have done in  
5 the current study.

6 To the best of our knowledge, no study so far has examined the effects of natural  
7 acoustic feedback on a complex continuous movement, also taking into account long-term  
8 effects. The current study revealed that a manipulation of the tempo of the hurdling rhythm  
9 can lead to positive short-term as well as long-term effects with respect to overall running  
10 time and kinematic data. Training to optimize movement should therefore include more than  
11 the visual sense, in that the acoustic sense might help unravel hidden movement concepts or  
12 rhythmic information for such complex movement techniques as those used in hurdling.

**References**

- 1  
2 Agostini, T., Righi, G., Galmonte, A., & Bruno, P. (2004). The relevance of auditory  
3 information in optimizing hammer throwers performance. In P. B. Pascolo (Ed.),  
4 *Biomechanics and sports* (pp. 67-74). Vienna, Austria: Springer.
- 5 Audacity Team. (2014). Audacity (Version 2.0.3) [Computer software]. Available from  
6 <http://audacity.sourceforge.net/download/>
- 7 Blakemore, S. J., Wolpert, D., & Frith, C. (2000). Why can't you tickle yourself?  
8 *Neuroreport*, *11*, 11-16. doi:10.1097/00001756-200008030-00002
- 9 Camponogara, I., Rodger, M., Craig, C., & Cesari, P. (2017). Expert players accurately detect  
10 an opponent's movement intentions through sound alone. *Journal of Experimental*  
11 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *43*(2), 348–359.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1037/xhp0000316>
- 13 CCC-Software GmbH (2012). Utilius easyINSPECT (Version 2.0.7) [Computer software].  
14 Markkleeberg, Germany. Available from [http://www.ccc-software.de/en/sport/service-](http://www.ccc-software.de/en/sport/service-und-support/downloads.php)  
15 [und-support/downloads.php](http://www.ccc-software.de/en/sport/service-und-support/downloads.php)
- 16 Čoh, M. (2002). Kinematische und dynamische Analyse der Technik der Hürdenüberquerung.  
17 *Leistungssport*, *4*, 43-46.
- 18 Čoh, M., & Iskra, J. (2012). Biomechanical studies of 100m hurdle clearance technique. *Sport*  
19 *Science*, *5*, 10-14.
- 20 Desmurget, M., & Grafton, S. T. (2000). Forward modeling allows feedback control for fast  
21 reaching movements. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, *4*, 423-431. doi:10.1016/  
22 [S1364-6613\(00\)01537-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01537-0)
- 23
- 24 Dubus, G., & Bresin, R. (2013). A systematic review of mapping strategies for the  
25 sonification of physical quantities. *PLOS ONE*, *8*, 1–28.

- 1 Effenberg, A. O. (2005). Movement Sonification: Effects on Perception and Action. *IEEE*  
2 *Multimedia*, 12(2), 53-59.
- 3 Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). London, England:  
4 Sage.
- 5 Graubner, R. & Nixdorf, E. (2011). Biomechanical analysis of the sprint and hurdles events at  
6 the 2009 IAAF World Championships in athletics. *New Studies in Athletics*, 26(1/2),  
7 19-53.
- 8 Guadagnoli, M. A., & Lee, T. D. (2004). Challenge point: A framework for conceptualizing  
9 the effects of various practice conditions in motor learning. *Journal of Motor*  
10 *Behavior*, 36(2), 212-224.
- 11 Hay, L., & Schoebel, P. (1990). Spatio-temporal invariants in hurdle racing patterns. *Human*  
12 *Movement Science*, 9, 37-54.
- 13 Kennel, C., Hohmann, T., & Raab, M. (2014). Action perception via auditory information:  
14 Agent identification and discrimination with complex movement sounds. *Journal of*  
15 *Cognitive Psychology*, 26, 157-165.
- 16 Kennel, C., Pizzera, A., Hohmann, T., Schubotz, R. I., Murgia, M., Agostini, T., & Raab, M.  
17 (2014). The perception of natural and modulated movement sounds. *Perception*, 43,  
18 796-804.
- 19 Kennel, C., Streese, L., Pizzera, A., Justen, C., Hohmann, T., & Raab, M. (2015). Auditory  
20 reafferences: The influence of real-time feedback on movement control. *Frontiers in*  
21 *Psychology*, 6(69), 1-6.
- 22 Knudson, D. (2009). Significant and meaningful effects in sports biomechanics research.  
23 *Sport Biomechanics*, 8, 96-104.
- 24 MacPherson, A. C., Collins, D., & Obhi, S. S. (2009). The importance of temporal structure  
25 and rhythm for the optimum performance of motor skills: A new focus for practitioners  
26 of sport psychology. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21, 48-61.

- 1 Mann, R., & Herman, J. (1985). Kinematic analysis of Olympic hurdle performance:  
2 Women's 100 meters. *International Journal of Sport Biomechanics*, *1*, 163-173.
- 3 Menzer, F., Brooks, A., Halje, P., Faller, C., Vetterli, M., & Blanke, O. (2010). Feeling in  
4 control of your footsteps: Conscious gait monitoring and the auditory consequences of  
5 footsteps. *Cognitive Neuroscience*, *1*, 184-192.
- 6 Murgia, M., Hohmann, T., Galmonte, A., Raab, M., & Agostini, T. (2012). Recognising one's  
7 own motor actions through sound: The role of temporal factors. *Perception*, *41*, 976-  
8 987.
- 9 Pizzera, A., & Hohmann, T. (2015). Acoustic information during motor control and action  
10 perception: A review. *The Open Psychology Journal* *8*(3), 183-191.
- 11 Schaffert, N., Mattes, K., & Effenberg, A. (2011). An investigation of online acoustic  
12 information for elite rowers in on-water training conditions. *Journal of Human Sport  
13 & Exercise*, *6*(2), 392-405.
- 14 Schmidt, R. A., & Lee, T. D. (2011). *Motor control and learning: A behavioral emphasis* (5th  
15 ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 16 Scully, D., & Carnegie, E. (1998). Observational learning in motor skill acquisition: A look at  
17 demonstrations. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, *19*, 472-485. doi:  
18 10.1080/03033910.1998.10558208
- 19 Sigrist, R., Rauter, G., Riener, R., Wolf, P. (2013). Augmented visual, auditory, and  
20 multimodal feedback in motor learning: A review. *Psychonomic Bulletin*, *20*, 21-53.  
21 doi: 10.3758/s13423-012-0333-8
- 22 Sors, F., Murgia, M., Santoro, I., & Agostini, T. (2015). Audio-based interventions in sport.  
23 *The Open Psychology Journal*, *8*(1), 212-219.  
24 doi.org/10.2174/1874350101508010212
- 25 Sors, F., Murgia, M., Santoro, I., Prpic, V., Galmonte, A., & Agostini, T. (2017). The  
26 contribution of early auditory and visual information to the discrimination of shot

- 1 power in ball sports. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 31, 44–51.  
2 doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.04.005
- 3 Ste-Marie, D., Law, B., Rymal, A. M., Jenny, O., Hall, C., & McCullagh, P. (2012).  
4 Observation intervention for motor skill learning and performance: An applied model  
5 for the use of observation. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 5,  
6 145-176.
- 7 Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Pearson  
8 Education.
- 9 Wolpert, D. M., & Flanagan, J. R. (2001). Motor prediction. *Current Biology*, 11, 729-732.  
10 doi:10.1016/S0960-9822(01)00432-8