

Bond University  
Research Repository



## Long-term effects of school barefoot running program on sprinting biomechanics in children: A case-control study

Mizushima, Jun; Keogh, Justin W.L.; Maeda, Kei; Shibata, Atsushi; Kaneko, Jun; Ohyama-Byun, Keigo; Ogata, Mitsugi

*Published in:*  
Gait and Posture

*DOI:*  
[10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.09.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.09.026)

*Licence:*  
CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

*Recommended citation(APA):*  
Mizushima, J., Keogh, J. W. L., Maeda, K., Shibata, A., Kaneko, J., Ohyama-Byun, K., & Ogata, M. (2021). Long-term effects of school barefoot running program on sprinting biomechanics in children: A case-control study. *Gait and Posture*, 83, 9-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.09.026>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

## **Long-term Effects of School Barefoot Running Program on Sprinting Biomechanics in Children: a Case-Control Study**

### **Highlights**

- Habitual barefoot running children had shorter contact times and longer flight times.
- Habitual barefoot running children used a more anterior FSP in shod sprinting.
- Habitual barefoot running children jumped higher with shorter contact time.
- Longitudinal research is required to confirm the optimal dosage of barefoot running.

Title page

# **Long-term Effects of School Barefoot Running Program on Sprinting Biomechanics in Children: a Case-Control Study**

Jun Mizushima<sup>1</sup>, Justin W.L. Keogh<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, Kei Maeda<sup>6</sup>, Atsushi Shibata<sup>1</sup>, Jun Kaneko<sup>7</sup>, Keigo Ohyama-Byun<sup>8</sup> and Mitsugi Ogata<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Graduate School of Comprehensive Human Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University, Gold Coast, Australia

<sup>3</sup> Sports Performance Research Centre New Zealand, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

<sup>4</sup> Cluster for Health Improvement, Faculty of Science, Health, Education and Engineering, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sunshine Coast, Australia

<sup>5</sup> Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India

<sup>6</sup> Center for Faculty Development, Kyoto University of Advanced Science, Kyoto, Japan

<sup>7</sup> School of Health and Sport Sciences, Chukyo University, Aichi, Japan

<sup>8</sup> Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

Corresponding Author:

Jun Mizushima<sup>1</sup>

1-1-1 Tennodai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8574, Japan

Email address: [d50h60@gmail.com](mailto:d50h60@gmail.com)

Acknowledgement:

We would like to thank the participants and the teachers who helped to collect the data.

# Long-term Effects of School Barefoot Running Program on Sprinting Biomechanics in Children: a Case-Control Study

## Abstract

**Background:** The acute changes of running biomechanics in habitually shod children when running barefoot have been demonstrated. However, the long-term effects of barefoot running on sprinting biomechanics in children is not well understood.

**Research question:** How does four years of participation in a daily school barefoot running program influence sprint biomechanics and stretch-shortening cycle jump ability in children?

**Methods:** One hundred and one children from barefoot education school (age,  $11.2 \pm 0.7$  years-old) and 93 children from a control school (age,  $11.1 \pm 0.7$  years-old) performed 50 m maximal shod and barefoot sprints and counter movement jump and five repeated-rebound jumping. To analyse sprint kinematics, a high-speed camera (240 fps) was used. In addition, foot strike patterns were evaluated by using three high-speed cameras (300 fps). Jump heights for both jump types and the contact times for the rebound jump were measured using a contact mat system. Two-way mixed ANOVA was used to examine the effect of school factor (barefoot education school vs control school) and footwear factor (barefoot vs shod) on the sprinting biomechanics.

**Results:** Sprinting biomechanics in barefoot education school children was characterised by significantly shorter contact times ( $p = 0.003$ ) and longer flight times ( $p = 0.005$ ) compared to control school children regardless of footwear condition. In shod sprinting, a greater proportion of barefoot education school children sprinted with a fore-foot or mid-foot strike compared to control school children ( $p < 0.001$ ). Barefoot education school children also had a significantly

1  
2  
3  
4 higher rebound jump height ( $p = 0.002$ ) and shorter contact time than control school children ( $p$   
5  
6  
7 = 0.001).

8  
9 **Significance:** The results suggest that school-based barefoot running programs may improve  
10 aspects of sprint biomechanics and develop the fast stretch-shortening cycle ability in children.  
11  
12 In order to confirm this viewpoint, adequately powered randomised controlled trials should be  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 conducted.

18  
19 **Key words:** barefoot; children; foot strike pattern; sprinting  
20  
21  
22

## 23 24 **1. Introduction**

25  
26  
27 Running, in particular sprinting is a fundamental high-intensity human movement that is  
28  
29 important in the motor development of children. Sprinting is also a motor skill that is required  
30  
31 for high level performance in a range of recreational, sporting and occupational activities.  
32

33  
34 Children are believed to develop motor skills as a result of the interactions between the  
35  
36 neuromuscular system and environment influenced by multiple internal and external factors [19].  
37

38  
39 Footwear choice is one of the external factors which have potential to affect human running  
40  
41 biomechanics, as the plantar surface of the foot is the only part of the body to encounter the  
42  
43 ground during bipedal locomotion [9, 28].  
44

45  
46 Multiple studies have identified acute changes in running biomechanics in habitually  
47  
48 shod children when running barefoot, such as having a higher step frequency, shorter step length  
49  
50 and shorter contact times, and shifting their foot strike pattern from a rear-foot strike (RFS)  
51  
52 towards mid-foot strike (MFS) or fore-foot strike (FFS) [11, 15, 16, 21]. These biomechanical  
53  
54 alterations, especially the use of a more anterior foot strike pattern may lead to chronic changes  
55  
56 in sprint technique [16, 21] and fast stretch-shortening cycle (SSC) performance as required in  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 sprinting and jumping [21]. Barefoot running programs of 8 to 12 weeks duration may alter  
5  
6 average vertical ground reaction forces, loading rates and stiffness characteristics of the lower  
7  
8 limb during running, with less research investigating whether these changes are also found while  
9  
10 jumping [10, 30]. Further, only limited knowledge exists for the influence of habitual barefoot  
11  
12 running on running and jumping biomechanics in children [8, 17, 25, 32]. Another limitation of  
13  
14 the literature for children is that the majority of the previous studies have utilised submaximal  
15  
16 running speeds, with the only one study that investigated sprinting biomechanics focused on foot  
17  
18 strike patterns [8].  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Therefore, the primary aim of this case-control study was to compare sprinting  
25  
26 biomechanics in children who have grown up in the same region but who differ with respect to  
27  
28 their experience of barefoot running. We examined spatio-temporal variables, foot strike patterns  
29  
30 and SSC jump ability to provide greater insight into the potential mechanisms underlying any of  
31  
32 the differences in sprinting performance observed between the two groups.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 **2. Methods**

### 39 **2.1. Study design**

40  
41  
42  
43 A case-control study design was used to gain some insight into potential differences of sprint  
44  
45 biomechanics in children who attended a barefoot education school (BS group) compared to a  
46  
47 control school (CS group) in the same city of Japan. The barefoot education school was selected  
48  
49 as they have provided a unique daily school physical activity program involved barefoot running  
50  
51 for 10 minutes at their chosen speed on the surface of a hard dirt outdoors track every morning of  
52  
53 every school day. The control school was selected as the physical activity program they offer  
54  
55 was identical to the barefoot education school in the same city, with the exception that the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 children completed these activities while wearing shoes. The Ethics Committee of the Faculty of  
5  
6 Health and Sports Sciences at the University of Tsukuba approved this study (IRB ID: 30-110).  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 2.2. Participants 12 13

14 Inclusion criteria that potential participants needed to meet included: 1) aged between 10 to 12  
15 years; and 2) participation in the BS or CS running program for a minimum period of 4 years.  
16  
17

18 Individuals who had any lower extremity injuries or illnesses on the testing dates that may  
19 influence sprinting performance were ineligible to participate. Of the 203 eligible children  
20 attending the BS or CS, 101 children of BS group (54% boys and 46% girls; age,  $11.2 \pm 0.7$   
21 years-old; height,  $1.45 \pm 0.06$  m; weight,  $37.0 \pm 6.9$  kg; shoe mass,  $0.19 \pm 0.03$  kg) and 93  
22 children of CS group (52% boys, 48% girls; age,  $11.1 \pm 0.7$  years-old; height,  $1.46 \pm 0.07$  m;  
23 weight,  $37.8 \pm 7.2$  kg; shoe mass,  $0.20 \pm 0.04$  kg) were included in this study (response rate  
24 96%). After gaining approval from each school director and their physical education teachers,  
25 written informed assent and consent were obtained from all participants and their parents  
26 respectively.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

## 43 2.3. Sprinting test 44 45

46 After a 20-minute warming up that included static and dynamic stretching of the lower limb  
47 musculature, submaximal running drills and submaximal-effort 30 m running, the participants  
48 performed one trial of maximal-effort 50 m sprints from a standing position in both shod and  
49 barefoot conditions on the hard dirt outdoors track with ~15 minutes rest between each footwear  
50 condition. Running conditions were randomised for each child in order to minimise any learning  
51 or fatigue effect. In order to maintain ecological validity, the participants used their self-selected  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 footwear normally sport shoes so as not to change their regular gait patterns. Performance in the  
5  
6 sprinting test was quantified using a range of spatio-temporal variables and their foot strike  
7  
8 patterns (explained below).  
9

10  
11 Figure 1 shows the experimental setup. To record sprint movement, a high-speed panning  
12  
13 camera (LUMIX FZ200, Panasonic, Tokyo, Japan, frame rate - 240 fps, shutter speed - 1/1000)  
14  
15 was placed 20 m from the right side of the runway at the midpoint (25 m) of the 50 m sprint.  
16  
17 This position of the high-speed camera was selected so that its optical axis was perpendicular to  
18  
19 the plane of movement at the 25 m mark. Reference markers were set on both sides of the  
20  
21 runway at two-meter intervals between 20–30 m so to allow the reconstruction of 2-D  
22  
23 coordinates of the body joints [24].  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Please insert Figure 1 here  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Twenty-three anatomical landmarks and centre of joints (3rd metacarpal head of hands,  
37  
38 styloid process of ulnas, elbows, shoulders (glenohumeral joints), 1st toes, head of 5th metatarsal  
39  
40 bones, tip of heels, ankles (talocrural joints), knees, greater trochanters, vertex, antilobium, and  
41  
42 upper end of sternum) and the closest four reference markers on the runway (forward and  
43  
44 backward on both sides) were manually digitised. This digitisation process was performed over  
45  
46 two steps (from the left foot touchdown to the next touchdown of the same foot around the 25 m  
47  
48 mark) at 120 Hz with a motion analysis system (Frame-DIAS IV, DKH Inc., Tokyo, Japan).  
49  
50  
51

52 From the digitised data, 2-D coordinates (x and y) were reconstructed using a method  
53  
54 previously used in sprint biomechanics research [24]. The typical error for digitising the  
55  
56 coordinates ranged 0.001 m to 0.005 m. The 2-D coordinates of the anatomical landmarks and  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 centre of joints were smoothed with a Butterworth low-pass digital filter at optimal cut-off  
5  
6 frequencies (5.0–10.0 Hz), determined by residual analysis [29]. Fourteen segments were then  
7  
8 defined in Japanese children comprising hands, forearms, upper arms, feet, shanks, thighs, head  
9  
10 and trunk, with their respective centres of gravity calculated using the smoothed coordinates  
11  
12 [31]. To evaluate the test-retest intra-rater reliability of 2-D centre of gravity measurements via  
13  
14 this method, the same researcher reassessed these positions over 10 sprints, with the coefficient  
15  
16 of variation being below 3%, a result comparable to that of the literature [20].  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 All of these spatio-temporal parameters were averaged across two consecutive steps at  
22  
23 the 25 m mark, using previously reported techniques for sprinting studies [13, 20, 21].  
24  
25 Specifically, stance phase was defined as the period when either the left or right foot was in  
26  
27 contact with the ground, and flight phase as the period when neither foot was in contact with the  
28  
29 ground. Step frequency was defined as the reciprocal of the duration of the stance phase for one  
30  
31 step, with step length as the horizontal distance the whole body's centre of gravity moved for  
32  
33 each step. Sprint speed was defined as the mean horizontal velocity of the whole body's centre  
34  
35 of gravity for one step.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 In addition, foot strike patterns at the 25 m mark were captured from three angles using  
42  
43 three high-speed cameras (EX-F1, CASIO, Tokyo, Japan, frame rate - 300 fps, shutter speed -  
44  
45 1/1000) placed on rightward, forward diagonal and backward diagonal direction. All images of  
46  
47 foot landing were captured on the hard disk drive of a MacBook Pro (Apple Inc., Cupertino,  
48  
49 CA, USA) and processed (QuickTime Player 7 Pro for Mac, Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA, USA).  
50  
51 Visually classification of foot strike patterns (Fig. 2): RFS (a landing in which the heel landed  
52  
53 before the ball of the foot), MFS (a simultaneous landing of the heel and ball of the foot), and  
54  
55 FFS (a landing in which the ball of the foot landed before the heel) were performed  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 independently by two experienced reviewers blinded to each other's measures. The inter-rater  
5  
6 reliability of the assessments of participants' foot strike patterns was excellent (linear weighted  
7  
8 kappa = 0.946), with a third experienced reviewer used for consensus when required [6, 8, 22]  
9  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 Please insert Figure 2 here  
15  
16  
17

#### 18 19 2.4. Stretch-shortening cycle (SSC) jump tests 20 21

22 After performing the sprinting test, the participants were given at least 10 minutes rest before  
23  
24 performing two SSC jump tests i.e. counter movement jump (CMJ) and five repeated-rebound  
25  
26 jumping (RJ), while wearing the same footwear that they used for the shod condition of the  
27  
28 sprinting test. Prior to these jumps being performed, the participants performed a number of  
29  
30 submaximal repetitions as a form of familiarisation with the required techniques. All jumps were  
31  
32 performed without arm-swing, with both hands positioned on the hips throughout the tests.  
33  
34

35  
36 These two jump tests were performed with three minutes rest between each jump  
37  
38 modality [4, 23], as these jump tasks were selected as appropriate field-based measures to  
39  
40 provide some insight into the potential between-group differences in sprint biomechanics [4, 27].  
41  
42 These jump tests were easy to perform, and useful to assess the force-power-velocity  
43  
44 characteristics of the lower limb as RJ requires a fast SSC with a greater involvement of planter  
45  
46 flexor muscle compared to slow SSC for the CMJ [1, 4].  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 The jump heights for both jump types and the contact time for the RJ were measured  
52  
53 using a contact mat system (Multi Jump Tester; DKH Co., Tokyo, Japan), using standard  
54  
55 procedures [14, 18]. This electronic switch mat system read the ON and OFF signals during foot  
56  
57 contact on the ground and the flight of the body in milliseconds, with this demonstrated to have  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 high levels of validity and reliability in the assessment of contact times, flight times and jump  
5  
6 height [14, 18]. Jump height was calculated based on the acquired flight time using the following  
7  
8 equation [2].  
9

$$\text{Jump height (m)} = (9.81 \text{ m/s}^2 \times \text{flight time}^2) \div 8$$

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 The CMJ requested to the participants to perform two trials of one repetition with one minute of  
20  
21 rest between jumps, and the trial with the highest jump height used for the statistical analysis.  
22

23  
24 During the CMJ, the participants were instructed to jump as high as possible and land in the  
25  
26 same position as they were at takeoff. The RJ required the participants to perform one set of five  
27  
28 repeated jumps, whereby they were instructed to jump as high as possible and push against the  
29  
30 ground as quickly as possible. The jump with the highest reactive strength index (RSI); i.e., the  
31  
32 ratio of the jump height (m) divided by the contact time (s) [3, 4, 18, 23], excluding the first and  
33  
34 last jumps, was chosen for statistical analysis. We conducted a pilot study to assess the test-retest  
35  
36 intra-rater reliability of the jump tests among 22 children with a mean age of 11 years and the  
37  
38 intraclass correlation coefficients for the jump test variables ranged from 0.932 to 0.965.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 2.5. Statistical analysis

46  
47  
48 Results were presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) as the assumptions of normality were  
49  
50 met according to the results of Shapiro Wilk test. Two-way mixed ANOVA was used as the  
51  
52 primary statistical test to examine the effect of between participants factor of group (BS group  
53  
54 and CS group) and within participants factor of footwear condition (shod condition and barefoot  
55  
56 condition). The Bonferroni post hoc test was undertaken for any interaction effects. McNemar's  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 test was used to examine the difference in foot strike patterns between shod and barefoot  
5  
6 conditions for each group, and Chi-square test was used to examine the difference in foot strike  
7  
8 patterns between BS group and CS group for each condition. An independent sample t-test was  
9  
10 used to examine the difference in physical characteristics, shoe mass and SSC ability between  
11  
12 BS group and CS group, with 95% confidence intervals (CI) reported. All statistical procedures  
13  
14 were conducted using the statistical package SPSS for Mac version 25 (SPSS Inc., USA) with  
15  
16 statistical significance set at  $p < 0.05$ .  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **3. Results**

#### 24 **3.1. Physical characteristics and shoe mass**

25  
26 Table 1 demonstrates physical characteristics and shoe mass for the entire sample. There was no  
27  
28 significant difference in age ( $p = 0.635$ ), height ( $p = 0.258$ ), body mass ( $p = 0.473$ ) and shoe  
29  
30 mass ( $p = 0.346$ ) between BS and CS groups.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Please insert Table 1 here  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **3.2. Spatio-temporal variables**

45  
46 Table 2 demonstrates spatio-temporal variables for the entire sample. There was a significant  
47  
48 interaction between group and footwear condition for sprint speed ( $p < 0.001$ ) and step length ( $p$   
49  
50  $< 0.001$ ). Sprint speed in the BS group was significantly higher in the barefoot than in shod  
51  
52 condition ( $p < 0.001$ ) and sprint speed in the barefoot condition was significantly higher in the  
53  
54 BS than in CS group ( $p = 0.015$ ). Post hoc tests showed that the CS group's step length was  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 significantly shorter in the barefoot than in shod condition ( $p < 0.001$ ) and step length in the  
5  
6 barefoot condition was significantly longer for the BS than in CS group ( $p = 0.032$ ).  
7  
8

9           There were significant main effects of group on contact times ( $p = 0.003$ ) and flight times  
10 ( $p = 0.005$ ), with significantly shorter contact times and longer flight times in the BS than in CS  
11 group. There were significant main effects of footwear condition on step frequency ( $p < 0.001$ )  
12 and contact times ( $p < 0.001$ ), with significantly higher step frequency and shorter contact times  
13 in the barefoot than shod condition.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Please insert Table 2 here  
25  
26  
27

### 28           3.3. Foot strike patterns 29 30

31  
32 Table 3 demonstrates a summary of the foot strike patterns. Chi-square test indicated there was a  
33 significant effect of group on foot strike patterns in the shod condition ( $X^2 (2, N = 194) =$   
34  $16.108, p < 0.001$ ) with a lower percentage of RFS in the BS than CS group. In contrast, no  
35 significant differences were found in foot strike patterns for the barefoot condition ( $X^2 (2, N =$   
36  $194) = 5.088, p = 0.079$ ). Significant effects of footwear condition on foot strike patterns were  
37 observed, demonstrating a greater percentage of RFS in the shod condition, whereas this  
38 decreased in the barefoot condition for both BS ( $p < 0.001$ ) and CS ( $p < 0.001$ ) groups.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Please insert Table 3 here  
52  
53  
54  
55

### 56           3.4. Stretch-shortening-cycle jump ability 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1  
2  
3  
4 Table 4 demonstrates SSC jump ability for the entire sample. RJ height was significantly greater  
5  
6 (p = 0.002), contact times significantly shorter (p = 0.001) and RSI significantly higher (p <  
7  
8 0.001) in the BS than CS group. No significant differences in CMJ height were found between  
9  
10 BS and CS groups (p = 0.492).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Please insert Table 4 here  
17  
18  
19  
20

#### 21 **4. Discussion**

22  
23

24 The major finding of this study was that characteristics of sprinting biomechanics and fast SSC  
25  
26 ability differ between children who have grown up in the same region but who differ with respect  
27  
28 to their experience of barefoot running. Children in the BS group, who completed 10 minutes of  
29  
30 barefoot running every school day for a minimum of four years, were observed to sprint with a  
31  
32 shorter contact time and longer flight time and a use a more anterior foot strike pattern, while  
33  
34 also having greater fast SSC ability than children in the CS group.  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 A higher probability of a RFS pattern in habitually barefoot than shod children in both  
40  
41 shod and barefoot conditions has been reported at what was defined as maximal running speeds  
42  
43 (3.70–3.98 m/s) [8]. On the contrary, our results showed that the BS group tended to have a  
44  
45 reduced probability of a RFS for the shod and no difference in their foot strike patterns for the  
46  
47 barefoot condition. There are several possible explanations for these between-study differences  
48  
49 in foot strike patterns. Although both Hollander et al. [8] and the current study asked their  
50  
51 participants to run or sprint maximally, sprint speed was relatively slower in habitually barefoot  
52  
53 children examined [8] compared to the BS group in the current study (6.09 compared to 6.33  
54  
55 m/s), whereby foot strike pattern can be altered at running speed above 5 m/s in adult runners  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 [5]. Furthermore, the between-study differences in sprint speed might be due to differences in the  
5  
6 age of the participants (mean age of 12.1 years ranging from 6 to 18 years in Hollander et al [8]  
7  
8 compared to mean age of 11.2 years ranging from 10 to 12 years in the current study). Another  
9  
10 factor to consider is the difference of habituation level between both studies. Hollander et al. [8]  
11  
12 investigated habitually barefoot children from South Africa who spend approximately one half of  
13  
14 their time barefoot at school and during sports, while also being barefoot at home based on the  
15  
16 result of a barefoot questionnaire [12]. Although the BS group in the current study had  
17  
18 participated in a school barefoot running program for 10 minutes every school day for a  
19  
20 minimum of four years (around 130 hours in total), this is obviously substantially less than what  
21  
22 would have been achieved by the South African children [8]. Nevertheless, significant changes  
23  
24 in foot strike patterns have been observed in training studies lasting only 8 to 12 weeks that  
25  
26 would have likely involved less than the minimum of 130 hours of barefoot running performed  
27  
28 in the current study [10, 30]. Therefore, what constitutes the minimal dosage of barefoot running  
29  
30 required to produce significant changes in sprinting biomechanical characteristics including foot  
31  
32 strike patterns, spatio-temporal parameters and overall SSC ability still remains somewhat  
33  
34 unclear.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43       Regardless of these similarities and differences in the results of the present study and that  
44  
45 of Hollander et al. [8], the differences observed in both groups of children sprinting shod  
46  
47 compared to barefoot were similar to that reported in the literature. Specifically, when sprinting  
48  
49 barefoot compared to shod, there was a relative shift from RFS to MFS or FFS, a shorter contact  
50  
51 time and a higher step frequency in the BS and CS groups. These results are consistent with  
52  
53 those previously reported by Mizushima et al. [21] in 94 habitually shod children at sprinting  
54  
55 speeds (5.48–5.60 m/s). However, the results of the current study indicated that the BS group  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 could run faster in barefoot condition compared to the shod condition, while still maintaining  
5  
6 their step length. It was also observed that the CS group was significantly slower than the BS  
7  
8 group when running barefoot, with this perhaps a result of the CS group's reduced step length  
9  
10 when running barefoot.  
11

12  
13  
14 The greater running speed of the BS group during the barefoot condition may be  
15  
16 explained by the impulse-momentum relationship. Specifically, the impulse-momentum  
17  
18 relationship states that an impulse (force multiplied by time) is required to produce a change in  
19  
20 momentum (mass multiplied by velocity) of the system. As the BS group achieved similar or  
21  
22 greater sprinting speeds with shorter contact times than the CS group, the BS group's impulse  
23  
24 would have to be characterised by a larger ground reaction force and/or had a greater rate of  
25  
26 force development than the CS group during ground contact. This assumption that long-term  
27  
28 participation in the school barefoot running program for the BS group may have made them  
29  
30 more efficient in transmitting and/or receiving force toward/from the ground in barefoot  
31  
32 sprinting could be reflective of a series of adaptations in SSC ability and/or the musculoskeletal  
33  
34 system [10]. Such a view is consistent with our findings whereby the BS group had a  
35  
36 significantly higher RJ height, RSI and shorter contact time than the CS group, although no  
37  
38 significant difference in CMJ height was observed. As the RJ requires a fast SSC compared to  
39  
40 slow SSC for the CMJ [1, 4], the school-based barefoot running program might have selectively  
41  
42 contributed to the improvements in the BS children's fast SSC ability. Considering that children  
43  
44 often utilise a MFS or FFS landing when running barefoot, it could suggest barefoot running for  
45  
46 extended periods of time may act as a stimulus to improve fast SSC performance as it enhances  
47  
48 the force-power-velocity characteristics of the lower limb (especially plantar flexor muscles) [1,  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000



1  
2  
3  
4 Based on our results and the emerging literature, physical education teachers or sports  
5 coaches may wish to include some proportion of barefoot running in every physical education  
6 class and sporting programs in children to improve a fast SSC ability. It is also known that such  
7 habitual barefoot running can contribute to a range of morphological adaptations in the foot  
8 characteristics such as foot arch, hallux angles and foot pliability [7], perhaps as a result of the  
9 greater loading of these structures [10, 26]. Future research would need to confirm the  
10 minimum/optimal dosage of barefoot running to improve sprinting and SSC ability and/or to  
11 produce beneficial morphological adaptations in children of different ages and activity levels and  
12 how this can be progressed.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 There were still a number of limitations to the study's design. As each child used their  
27 own footwear in the shod condition, results for the shod condition may have been affected by  
28 between-participant differences in footwear properties such as cushioning, flexibility and heel-  
29 to-toe drop between the groups. Moreover, we didn't use a barefoot running questionnaire [12] to  
30 determine habituation level of the participants in this study. Further, timing lights were not  
31 available to assess sprinting time over the entire 50 m course.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

## 43 **5. Conclusion**

44  
45  
46 In conclusion, the results of this study demonstrate the long-term effects of participation in a  
47 school-based barefoot running program on children's sprinting biomechanics and jumping  
48 ability. Specifically, the BS group adopted a more anterior foot strike patterns and had a greater  
49 fast stretch-shortening cycle ability, as indicated by their reduced ground contact times and faster  
50 running speeds in the barefoot sprinting condition and their greater RJ performance. There is  
51 clearly a need to better understand the positive chronic adaptation and potential risks of habitual  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 barefoot running and sprinting in children and to quantify how best to begin and progress  
5  
6 barefoot running in this population. Longitudinal research involving cohort or randomised  
7  
8 controlled trial designs would be useful to provide more information about the potential positive  
9  
10 outcomes and injury risk of barefoot running and how best to progress this in children of  
11  
12 different ages and levels of physical activity.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

20 The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship,  
21  
22 and/or publication of this article.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Reference**

- 29 [1] Bobbert MF, Mackay M, Schinkelshoek D, Huijing PA, van Ingen Schenau GJ,  
30 Biomechanical analysis of drop and countermovement jumps. *Eur. J. Appl. Physiol. Occup.*  
31 *Physiol.*, 54 (1986) 566–573. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00943342>.  
32  
33 [2] Bosco C, Luhtanen P, Komi PV, A simple method for measurement of mechanical power in  
34 jumping. *Eur. J. Appl. Physiol. Occup. Physiol.*, 50 (1983) 273–282.  
35 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00422166>.  
36  
37 [3] Douglas J, Pearson S, Ross A, McGuigan M, Kinetic Determinants of Reactive Strength in  
38 Highly Trained Sprint Athletes. *J. Strength Cond. Res.*, 32 (2018) 1562–1570.  
39 <http://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002245>.  
40  
41 [4] Endo T, Tauchi K, Ogata M, Development of running and footwork abilities from a  
42 viewpoint of jumping ability characteristics. *Int. J. Sport Health Sci.*, 6 (2007) 120–127.  
43  
44 [5] Forrester SE, Townend J, The effect of running velocity on footstrike angle—A curve-  
45 clustering approach. *Gait Posture*, 41 (2015) 26–32.  
46 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.08.004>  
47  
48 [6] Hoenig T, Rolvien T, Hollander K, Foot strike patterns in runners: concepts, classifications,  
49 techniques, and implications for running-related injuries. *Dtsch Z Sportmed.*, 71 (2020) 55–  
50 61. <http://doi.org/10.5960/dzsm.2020.424>.  
51  
52 [7] Hollander K, De Villiers JE, Sehner S, Wegscheider K, Braumann KM, Venter R, Zech A,  
53 Growing-up (habitually) barefoot influences the development of foot and arch morphology  
54 in children and adolescents. *Sci. rep.*, 7 (2017) 1–9. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07868-4>.  
55  
56 [8] Hollander K, de Villiers JE, Venter R, Sehner S, Wegscheider K, Braumann KM, Zech A,  
57 Foot Strike Patterns Differ Between Children and Adolescents Growing up Barefoot vs.  
58 Shod. *Int. J. Sports Med.*, 39 (2018) 97–103. <http://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-120344>.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65


- 1  
2  
3  
4 [9] Hollander K, Heidt C, Van Der Zwaard BC, Braumann KM, Zech A, Long-term effects of  
5 habitual barefoot running and walking: a systematic review. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.*, 49  
6 (2017) 752–762. <http://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000001141>.  
7  
8 [10] Hollander K, Liebl D, Meining S, Mattes K, Willwacher S, Zech A, Adaptation of running  
9 biomechanics to repeated barefoot running: a randomized controlled study. *Am. J. Sport*  
10 *Med.*, 47 (2019) 1975–1983. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546519849920>.  
11  
12 [11] Hollander K, Riebe D, Campe S, Braumann KM, Zech A, Effect of footwear on treadmill  
13 running biomechanics in preadolescent. *Gait Posture*, 40 (2014) 381–385.  
14 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.05.006>.  
15  
16 [12] Hollander K, van der Zwaard BC, de Villiers JE, Braumann KM, Venter R, Zech A, The  
17 effects of being habitually barefoot on foot mechanics and motor performance in children  
18 and adolescents aged 6–18 years: Study protocol for a multicenter cross-sectional study  
19 (Barefoot LIFE project). *J. Foot Ankle Res.* (2016) 9–36. [http://doi.org/10.1186/s13047-](http://doi.org/10.1186/s13047-016-0166-1)  
20 [016-0166-1](http://doi.org/10.1186/s13047-016-0166-1).  
21  
22 [13] Hunter JP, Marshall RN, McNair P, Reliability of biomechanical variables of sprint running.  
23 *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.*, 36 (2004) 850–861.  
24 <http://doi.org/10.1249/01.mss.0000126467.58091.38>.  
25  
26 [14] Kenny IC, Cairealláin AÓ, Comyns TM, Validation of an Electronic Jump Mat to Assess  
27 Stretch-Shortening Cycle Function. *J. Strength Cond. Res.*, 26 (2012) 1601–1608.  
28 <http://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0b013e318234ebb8>.  
29  
30 [15] Latorre-Román PÁ, Balboa FR, García-Pinillos F, Foot strike pattern in children during  
31 shod-unshod running. *Gait Posture*, 58 (2017) 220–222.  
32 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2017.07.121>.  
33  
34 [16] Latorre-Román PÁ, Párraga-Montilla JA, Guardia-Montegudo I, and García-Pinillos F,  
35 Foot strike pattern in preschool children during running: sex and shod–unshod differences.  
36 *Eur. J. Sport Sci.*, 18 (2018) 1–8. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2017.1422545>.  
37  
38 [17] Lieberman DE, Venkadesan M, Werbel WA, Daoud AI, D’Andrea S, Davis IS, Mang’Eni  
39 RO, Pitsiladis Y, Foot strike patterns and collision forces in habitually barefoot versus shod  
40 runners. *Nature*, 463 (2010) 531–535. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature08723>.  
41  
42 [18] Lloyd RS, Oliver JL, Hughes MG, Williams CA, Reliability and validity of field-based  
43 measures of leg stiffness and reactive strength index in youths. *J. Sports Sci.*, 27  
44 (2009) 1565–1573. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02640410903311572>.  
45  
46 [19] Malina RM, Bouchard C, Bar-Or O, Growth, maturation, and physical activity. Champaign,  
47 IL: Human Kinetics, 2004.  
48  
49 [20] Miyamoto A, Takeshita T, Yanagiya T, Differences in sprinting performance and  
50 kinematics between preadolescent boys who are fore/mid and rear foot strikers. *PLoS One*,  
51 13 (2018) e0205906. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0205906>.  
52  
53 [21] Mizushima J, Seki K, Keogh JW, Maeda K, Shibata A, Koyama H, Ohyama-Byun K,  
54 Kinematic characteristics of barefoot sprinting in habitually shod children. *PeerJ*, 6 (2018)  
55 e5188. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5188>.  
56  
57 [22] Murray L, Beaven CM, Hébert-Losier K, Reliability of Overground Running Measures  
58 from 2D Video Analyses in a Field Environment. *Sports (Basel)*, 7 (2018) 8.  
59 <https://doi.org/10.3390/sports7010008>.  
60  
61 [23] Nagahara R, Naito H, Miyashiro K, Morin JB, Zushi K, Traditional and ankle-specific  
62 vertical jump as strength-power indicators for maximal sprint acceleration. *J. Sports Med.*  
63 *Phys. Fitness*, 54 (2014) 691–699.  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 [24] Nagahara R, Naito H, Morin JB, Zushi K, Association of acceleration with spatiotemporal  
5 variables in maximal sprinting. *Int. J. Sports Med.*, 35 (2014) 755–761.  
6 <http://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1363252>.  
7  
8 [25] Pontzer H, Suchman K, Raichlen DA, Wood BM, Mabulla AZP, Marlowe FW, Foot strike  
9 patterns and hind limb joint angles during running in Hadza hunter-gatherers. *J. Sport*  
10 *Health Sci.*, 3 (2014) 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2014.03.010>.  
11  
12 [26] Smith G, Lake M, Lees A, Metatarsophalangeal joint function during sprinting: a  
13 comparison of barefoot and sprint spike shod foot conditions. *J. Appl. Biomech.*, 30 (2014)  
14 206–212. <http://doi.org/10.1123/jab.2013-0072>.  
15  
16 [27] Swinton PA, Lloyd R, Keogh JW, Agouris I, Stewart AD, Regression models of sprint,  
17 vertical jump, and change of direction performance. *J. Strength. Cond. Res.*, 28 (2014)  
18 1839–1848. <http://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000000348>.  
19  
20 [28] Wegener C, Hunt AE, Vanwanseele B, Burns J, Smith RM, Effect of children’s shoes on  
21 gait: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Foot Ankle Res.*, 4 (2011) 3.  
22 <http://doi.org/10.1186/1757-1146-4-3>.  
23  
24 [29] Wells RP, Winter DA, Assessment of signal and noise in the kinematics normal, pathological  
25 and sporting gaits. *Human Locomotion I* (1980) 92–93.  
26  
27 [30] Yang Y, Zhang X, Luo Z, Wang X, Ye D, Fu W, Alterations in Running Biomechanics after  
28 12 Week Gait Retraining with Minimalist Shoes. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 17  
29 (2020) 818. <http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17030818>.  
30  
31 [31] Yokoi T, Shibukawa K, Ae M, Body segment parameters of Japanese children. *Japan J.*  
32 *Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci.*, 31 (1986) 53–66.  
33 <https://doi.org/10.5432/jjpehss.KJ00003392242>.  
34  
35 [32] Zech A, Venter R, de Villiers JE, Sehner S, Wegscheider K, Hollander K, Motor Skills of  
36 Children and Adolescents Are Influenced by Growing up Barefoot or Shod. *Front. Pediatr.*,  
37 6 (2018) 115. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2018.00115>.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Figure 1. Experimental setup.

Figure 2. Definitions of foot strike patterns. (A) Rear-foot strike (RFS); (B) Mid-foot strike (MFS); (C) Fore-foot strike (FFS).

Figure



# Figure



(A) Rear-foot strike (RFS)



(B) Mid-foot strike (MFS)



(C) Fore-foot strike (FFS)

Table 1. A summary of the physical characteristics and shoe mass for both groups.

	BS group (n =101)	CS group (n = 93)	t-value	95% CI
Age (years)	11.2 ± 0.7	11.1 ± 0.7	-1.135	-0.155 to 0.253
Height (m)	1.45 ± 0.06	1.46 ± 0.07	-0.719	-3.086 to 0.831
Body mass (kg)	37.1 ± 6.9	37.8 ± 7.2	0.476	-2.716 to 1.265
Shoes mass (kg)	0.19 ± 0.03	0.20 ± 0.04	-0.945	-0.015 to 0.005

CI: Confidence interval

BS group: Children from barefoot education school, CS group: Children from control school



Table 2. A summary of the key spatiotemporal variables for both groups across both footwear conditions.

		Shod condition	Barefoot condition	F-value
Sprint velocity (m/s)	BS group	6.09 ± 0.60	6.33 ± 0.56 <sup>††‡</sup>	Fa = 18.205**
	CS group	6.14 ± 0.55	6.14 ± 0.57	Fb = 0.950
				Fc = 21.449**
Step frequency (Hz)	BS group	3.91 ± 0.30	4.10 ± 0.30	Fa = 115.925**
	CS group	3.91 ± 0.30	4.08 ± 0.32	Fb = 0.068
				Fc = 0.402
Step length (m)	BS group	1.56 ± 0.14	1.55 ± 0.12 <sup>‡</sup>	Fa = 26.924**
	CS group	1.57 ± 0.12 <sup>††</sup>	1.51 ± 0.14	Fb = 0.634

				Fc = 12.802**
Contact time (s)	BS group	0.138 ± 0.017	0.128 ± 0.015	Fa = 181.564**
	CS group	0.143 ± 0.017	0.133 ± 0.015	Fb = 6.201**
				Fc = 0.059
Flight time (s)	BS group	0.119 ± 0.013	0.117 ± 0.012	Fa = 0.607
	CS group	0.113 ± 0.014	0.113 ± 0.014	Fb = 7.972**
				Fc = 0.928

Fa: Main effect of footwear condition, Fb: Main effect of group, Fc: Interaction effect, \*\*: p < 0.01

Shoes condition vs Barefoot condition, ††: p < 0.01

BS group vs CS group, ‡:  $p < 0.05$

BS group: Children from barefoot education school, CS group: Children from control school

Table 3. A summary of the foot strike pattern for both groups across both conditions.

		Foot strike pattern (%)		
		RFS	MFS	FFS
BS group	Shod condition	57.4	30.7	11.9
	Barefoot condition	23.8	38.6	37.6**
CS group	Shod condition	81.7 <sup>††</sup>	8.6	9.7
	Barefoot condition	34.4	41.9	23.7**

Main effect of footwear condition, \*\*:  $p < 0.01$

Main effect of group, <sup>††</sup>:  $p < 0.01$

BS group: Children from barefoot education school, CS group: Children from control school

RFS: Rear-foot strike, MFS: Mid-foot strike, FFS: Fore-foot strike

Table 4. A summary of the stretch-shortening cycle exercise (SSC) ability for both groups.

	BS group	CS group	t-value	95% CI
RJ RSI	1.31 ± 0.36**	1.13 ± 0.34	3.775	0.090 to 0.287
RJ height (m)	0.23 ± 0.04**	0.21 ± 0.04	3.077	0.006 to 0.028
RJ contact time (s)	0.178 ± 0.028**	0.192 ± 0.031	-3.377	-0.022 to -0.060
CMJ height (m)	0.25 ± 0.04	0.24 ± 0.04	0.689	-0.076 to 0.016

\*\* : p < 0.01

CI: Confidence interval

BS group: Children from barefoot education school, CS group: Children from control school

RJ: Five repeated-rebound jumping, RSI: Reactive strength index, CMJ: Counter movement jump