A 4-week home study investigating the effects of movement sonification on body perception to support adherence to physical activity in real-life contexts 厉

Judith Ley Flores¹, Laia Turmo-Vidal¹, Frédéric Bevilacqua², Ana Tajadura-Jiménez^{1,3}

¹ DEI Interactive Systems Group, Department of Computer Science, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Madrid, Spain; ² Science & Technology for Music and Sound Lab, IRCAM, Sorbonne Université, Paris, France; ³ UCL Interaction Centre (UCLIC), University College London, London, United Kingdom.

i_mBODY lab



The work has received funding from the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación (PID2019-105579RB-I00/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and Programa I3) and the European Research Council Grant (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 101002711).



BODYinTRANSIT

MAGIC

ntroduction

- Physical inactivity is the fourth risk factor in health and mortality.
- □ Need to consider psychological and emotional barriers related to the perception of one's body to overcome physical inactivity [1], [2].
- Many currents technologies help users to become more aware of their problems, but they cannot solve this problem by themselves. [3]

Approach:

- Metaphorical movement sonification (real-time) auditory feedback of body movement) [9].
- Exploits bottom-up multisensory mechanisms related to body perceptions (BP) to ultimately support physical activity (PA) [4]–[7].

Aim: to examine the impact of movement sonifications on body perception and PA in everyday contexts, while also exploring the evolution of these effects and the potential maintenance of PA adherence over time through repeated exposure.

Exercises C

00000

Fig 2. Band with movement

sensors (accelerometer &

gyroscope).



Fig 1. Fig 1. (Left) Examples of how participants used the SoniBand prototype in squats and back stretching exercises. (Right) Photos taken by a participant filling out the diary and body maps at home.

Experimental design

Methods and Materials

- 4 weeks home study
- 30 participants (Age: Mean=26.68, years, SD=9.47, Range=20-59; 10 male, 19 female, 1 Prefer not to say).
 - 86 screened: IPAQ low or moderate-low & 2hrs max of PA [8].

Apparatus

- SoniBand: a wearable self-locking band equipped with a hand-sewn cloth pocket [9], Fig 2.
- Raspberry Pi Zero + Web application

Exercise + Sound

- Squats (Strength): Wind sound vs No Sound
- Back stretch (flexibility) exercise: Water sound vs No Sound

Measures

Diary (Fig 1-Rigth), with:

Results

- Affective experiences, SAM [12]
- Body/movement feelings, Contextual body maps + 15 items (7-point Likert-type) [4]



- **Physical measures** -> dynamometer and goniometer [11]
 - Semi-structured interviews (analysis in progress)
 - **Movement behaviour** -> acc/deceleration, velocity, time, angles (analysis in progress)



Squats & Back stretch

Analyses per movement

Physical measures, non-parametric ANOVAs on ART Affective experiences and body feelings, 2x2 ANOVA data: (one for each exercise) on aligned rank transform (ART)

 Condition (Base, Sound, No sound) • Order (1 & 2) Squats: n.s. main effect or interaction

Affective experiences & Body feelings

For **back stretch** there were significant differences: **Valence** (F(1,28) = 5.570, p=0.024, $\eta 2 = 0.168$), **Dominance** (F(1,28)= 4.451, p=0.043, η 2 = 0.091),

Physical measures

Back stretch 200

data:

- **Condition** (Sound: (Squats: Wind), (Back stretch: Water), vs No sound)
- **Order** (1 & 2)

An additional ANOVA to see the effects over time: Week (1 to 4)

- Order*Condition with squats: n.s. main effect or interaction

- Order with back stretch: n.s. main effect or interaction



• Back stretch: (F (1,28)=5.424, p=0.027, η 2 = 0.162)

An additional ANOVA to see the effects over time: • Week:

• Squats (F (4,116)=2.914, p=0.024, η2 = 0.913) • Back stretch (F (4,116)=9.000, pz0.001, $\eta 2 = 0.236$)

Physical measures

Squats (F (2,56)=3.751, p=0.0295, η2 = 0.118) Baseline vs No sound



Baseline No sound Sound

heaviness (F(3,1449)=0.304, p<0.001, η 2 = 0.194),

Valence Dominance

Water

No sound



Back stretch (F(2,56)= 10.548, p< 0.001, η 2 = 0.273), **Baseline** vs **No sound** (t(56) = -2.324, p = 0.061) **Baseline** vs **Sound** (t(56) = -4.593, p < 0.001) **No sound** vs **sound** (t(56) = -2.268, p = 0.068)



Water



No sound

In body feelings, there were significant differences: heaviness (F(1,28)= 10.535, p=0.003, η 2 = 0.273), **Strength** (F(1,28)=9.429, p=0.004, η 2 = 0.251), **Agility** (F(1,28)=8.635, p=0.006, η2 = 0.235), **Flexibility** (F(1,28)=4.895, p=0.035, η2 = 0.148), **Speed** (F(1,28)=4.305, p=0.047, η2 = 0.133), **Difficulty** (F(1,28)=4.883, p=0.035, η 2 = 0.148), **Fluidity** (F(1,28)=5.509, p=0.026, η 2 = 0.164), **Motivation** (F(1,28)=7.738, p=0.009, η2 = 0.216).

Discussion

Contribution

U

• A 4-week home study using movement sonification to investigate the

Affective experiences:

Conclusion

• Results provide the first quantitative evidence that

- effects of metaphorical sound on Affective experiences, body Perception and physical changes.
- Two experiments investigating the effects of metaphorical sounds (Wind and Water) on squats and back stretch movement, affective experiences, body and movement feelings, physical adherence muscle strength and stretching.

Most significant results

We found effects of sounds movement sonification on Back stretch exercise using Water sound on affective experiences (Valence and Dominance), body feelings (Heaviness, Flexibility, Agility, speed, Fluidity), endurance to perform exercise (Difficulty, Strength), Motivation, as well as on physical changes, that is stretching angle with back stretch using Water sound.

Body feelings:

Wind sound

 Participants started feeling heavier, tired but feeling more capable of performing the exercise and it seems when their condition change in 3rd week, they felt heavier, tired again.

Muscle strength :

• Wind sound (vs No sound) showed a difference when participants' muscles were working compared when their baseline.

• Participants felt happier, in control of the technology with the Water sound (vs No sound).

Body feelings:

Water sound

• Participants felt with the water sound (vs No sound) lighter, stronger, agile, flexible, more motivated, faster, easier, and their movement fluid more Stretching:

Participants stretched their backs more when their movement was done with Water sound (vs No sound).

metaphorical sounds affect affective experiences, body feelings, and physical condition in a longterm study and that they could be used in every day contexts to change body perceptions and increase physical activity.

• The observed effects in subjective feelings related to the body, emotional state, and physical condition open opportunities for exercise; and have implications for the design of sound-based applications supporting physical activity, rehabilitation, and movement expression.

- Matthew Botvinick and Jonathan Cohen. 1998. Rubber hands 'feel' touch that eyes see. Nature 391, 6669: 756-756.https://doi.org/10.1038/35784 U
 - Ana Tajadura-Jiménez, Maria Basia, Ophelia Deroy, Merle Fairhurst, Nicolai Marquardt, and Nadia Bianchi- Berthouze. 2015. As Light as your Footsteps: Altering Walking Sounds to Change Perceived Body Weight, Emotional State and Gait. In Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM
 - Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems CHI '15, 2943–2952. https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702374
- Judith Ley-Flores, Frederic Bevilacqua, Nadia Bianchi-Berthouze, and Ana Taiadura-Jimenez. 2019. Altering body perception and emotion in physically inactive people through movement sonification. In 2019 8th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACII.2019.8925432 efe
 - Ana Tajadura-Jiménez, Maria Vakali, Merle T. Fairhurst, Alisa Mandrigin, Nadia Bianchi-Berthouze, and Ophelia Deroy. 2017. Contingent sounds change the mental representation of one's finger length. Scientific Reports 7, 1: 5748. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-05870-4
- Deroy, O., Fernandez-Prieto, I., Navarra, J., & Spence, C. (2018). Unraveling the Paradox of Spatial Pitch. In T. L. Hubbard (Ed.), Spatial Biases in Perception and Cognition (pp. 77–93). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/9781316651247.006 Ω Nanette Mutrie and Avril Blamey. 2008. Thinking about becoming more active? . 24
- Bourdin, P., Martini, M. & Sanchez-Vives, M. V. Altered visual feedback from an embodied avatar unconsciously influences movement amplitude and muscle activity. Sci. Rep. 9, 19747 (2019)
 - Maria Hagströmer, Pekka Oja, and Michael Sjöström. 2006. The International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ): a study of concurrent and construct validity. Public Health Nutrition 9, 06. https://doi.org/10.1079/PHN2005898
- Judith Ley-Flores, Laia Turmo, Vidal Nadia Bianchi Berthouze, Aneesha Singh, Frederic Bevilacqua, and Ana Tajadura-Jimenez. 2021. Soniband: Understanding the efects of metaphorical movement sonifications on body perception and physical activity. CHI- Proceedings (5 2021).https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445558
- Newman-Beinart, N. A., Norton, S., Dowling, D., Gavriloff, D., Vari, C., Weinman, J. A., & Godfrey, E. L. (2017). The development and initial psychometric evaluation of a measure assessing adherence to prescribed exercise: the Exercise Adherence Rating Scale (EARS). Physiotherapy, 103(2), 180–185.
- 11. Mentiplay BF, Perraton LG, Bower KJ, Adair B, Pua YH, Williams GP, et al. Assessment of lower limb muscle strength and power using hand-held and fixed dynamometry: a reliability and validity study. PLoS One. 2015;10(10): e0140822.
- 12. M. M. Bradley and P. J. Lang, "Measuring emotion: The self-assessment manikin and the semantic differential," J. Behav. Ther. Exp. Psychiatry, vol. 25, 49–59, 1994.

Contact: jley@inf.uc3m.es

atajadur@inf.uc3m.es

https://magicoutfit.com/

https://bodyintransit.eu/

https://imbodylab.com/