OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

Review Article

Vol. 1, Issue 1, January-December 2026

Journal of Sport Medicine, Science and Rehabilitation

From Rigid Barriers to Modern Hurdling Mechanics: A Historical and Technical Review of Hurdling Technique

Somanpreet Singh[1*], Vishali Choudhary[2], Sachin Yadav[2], Pratisksha Boruah[2] , Prinka Devi[2], Vikas[2], Ramandeep Kaur[2], Sonam Kumari[2], Ejaz Ul Haq[2]

[1,2]*Department of Physical Education, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda, India*

[*]**Correspondence to:** Somanpreet Singh, Department of Physical Education, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda, E-mail: drsoman1212@gmail.com

Received: September 22, 2026; **Manuscript No:** JSMR-26-4357; **Editor Assigned:** September 24, 2026; **PreQc No:** JSMR-26-4357 (PQ); **Reviewed:** October 02, 2026; **Revised:** October 07, 2026; **Accepted:** October 12, 2026; **Published:** November 04, 2026

Citation: Singh S, Choudhary V, Yadav S, Boruah P, Devi P, Vikas, Kaur R, Kumari S, Haq EU (2026). From Rigid Barriers to Modern Hurdling Mechanics: A Historical and Technical Review of Hurdling Technique. J. Sport Med. Sci. Rehabil. Vol.1 Iss.1, November (2026), pp:53-57.

Copyright: © 2026 Somanpreet Singh, Vishali Choudhary, Sachin Yadav, Pratisksha Boruah, Prinka Devi, Vikas, Ramandeep Kaur, Sonam Kumari, Ejaz Ul Haq. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABSTRACT

Hurdling is a highly technical track-and-field event in which performance depends on the interaction of sprint velocity, hurdle-clearance mechanics, inter-hurdle rhythm, and the athlete's ability to preserve horizontal speed. This review synthesizes the historical development of hurdling with contemporary biomechanical evidence on hurdle clearance, stride regulation, and race distribution. The historical record shows a transition from rigid wooden barriers and pronounced jumping actions toward lighter, safer hurdle designs and running-based clearance techniques. Contemporary biomechanical studies indicate that elite hurdlers minimize clearance time and unnecessary vertical displacement by optimizing take-off and landing distances, trunk and lower-limb coordination, and the three-step rhythm between sprint hurdles. In the 400-m hurdles, the evidence further indicates that performance is strongly influenced by the ability to maintain running speed in the latter part of the race while adapting stride characteristics to fatigue. These findings support an event-specific and individualized coaching approach rather than a single technical model. The review therefore links historical innovations with current biomechanical evidence and identifies practical implications for technical drills, stride-rhythm development, race-pace control, and video-based performance analysis.

Keywords: Hurdling; Hurdle Clearance; Stride Pattern; Biomechanics; Sprint Hurdles; 400-Metre Hurdles; Olympic History; Performance

Galley Proof

INTRODUCTION

Historical Preview

Hurdling developed from nineteenth-century obstacle races in England into a standardized Olympic event. Early races used heavy, rigid wooden barriers, which encouraged a jumping action and substantial loss of forward momentum. Standardization of hurdle dimensions and the later introduction of lighter, collapsible designs progressively changed the technical demands of the event. The development of a running clearance, associated particularly with Alvin Kraenzlein, emphasized attacking the hurdle while maintaining forward velocity rather than treating the barrier as a separate jump [1,2].

Hurdles in Pre Olympics

Technique Development

The pre-Olympic development of hurdling illustrates a close relationship between equipment, rules, and technique. Early barriers were rigid and relatively hazardous. Lighter T-shaped hurdles appeared toward the end of the nineteenth century, while the L-shaped hurdle introduced in 1935 was designed to fall forward when struck, reducing the mechanical consequences of accidental contact. These changes did not merely improve safety; they also made it more feasible for athletes to approach and clear hurdles with a continuous running action [1,2].

Modern sprint-hurdle specifications constrain the athlete's stride pattern and therefore shape technique. The women's 100-m hurdles use ten 0.838-m hurdles, with 13.00 m to the first hurdle, 8.50 m between hurdles, and 10.50 m from the final hurdle to the finish. The men's 110-m hurdles use ten 1.067-m hurdles, with 13.72 m to the first hurdle, 9.14 m between hurdles, and 14.02 m from the final hurdle to the finish. In the 400-m hurdles, ten hurdles are positioned 35 m apart after a 45-m approach; hurdle height is 0.914 m for men and 0.762 m for women [2,3]. These fixed constraints mean that the hurdler must solve a repeated movement problem: generate high running velocity while adapting step length, step

frequency, take-off position, and clearance mechanics to an externally fixed obstacle arrangement.

Clearance technique and Stride Pattern

Hurdle clearance should be understood as a velocity-preserving transition within the running cycle rather than an isolated jump. Contemporary three-dimensional analyses of world-class hurdlers show that take-off distance, centre-of-mass trajectory, clearance time, and landing position are interrelated. In elite sprint hurdling, the objective is to clear the barrier with sufficient horizontal velocity while avoiding excessive vertical displacement and a braking landing [3,4]. Thus, the lead leg, trail leg, trunk, and arms should be coached as a coordinated system. The evidence also indicates that absolute step lengths should not be treated as universal prescriptions because athlete stature and hurdle height influence the optimal geometry [3].

Training Development

The technical distinction between high sprint hurdles and 400-m hurdles is primarily one of constraint and economy rather than fundamentally different movement patterns. Higher barriers require greater relative clearance demands and place stronger constraints on take-off and flight mechanics. World-class biomechanical data show that the men's 110-m hurdle is approximately 7% higher relative to stature than the women's 100-m hurdle, and that the resulting geometry influences take-off distance, centre-of-mass trajectory, and clearance time [3,4]. In the 400-m event, the lower barrier and longer inter-hurdle distance allow a more sprint-like clearance, but the athlete must repeatedly manage fatigue and stride adjustments over ten barriers. Complete recovery of the trail leg so that it does not delay the first post-hurdle stride. Continue the knee drive after hurdle passage to facilitate an active transition back to sprinting. Take-off distance should not be selected independently of approach velocity, athlete stature, hurdle height, and the intended landing position. Evidence from step-strategy research shows that changing the number of steps to the first hurdle can alter take-off and touchdown distances without necessarily changing approach velocity [5]. This supports individualized technical assessment rather than prescribing a single take-off distance for every athlete. Approach velocity and acceleration into the hurdle, Athlete stature relative to hurdle height and inter-hurdle distance and Hip and knee mobility, lower-limb strength, coordination, and the ability to reproduce the target movement under fatigue. Accordingly, physical qualities alone do not guarantee efficient hurdling. A fast athlete may still lose performance if the take-off, clearance, landing, or inter-hurdle rhythm produces excessive braking. Contemporary evidence supports combining sprint development with event-specific technical practice and video-based feedback [3-6].

Modern Olympics

Technique Development

The Olympic programme reflects the progressive standardization of hurdling. The men's 110-m hurdles have been an Olympic event since 1896, the men's 400-m hurdles since 1900, the women's 100-m hurdles since 1972, and the women's 400-m hurdles since 1984 [7-10]. The 200-m hurdles appeared in the 1900 and 1904 Olympic programmes but were not retained as a standard Olympic event [1,2].

Clearance technique and Stride Pattern

Sprint-hurdle performance is constrained by the requirement to negotiate ten barriers without sacrificing excessive running velocity. Elite analyses demonstrate that the hurdle step comprises coordinated take-off, flight, and landing actions followed by three steps before the next hurdle. World-class athletes use event-specific combinations of take-off distance, landing distance, step length, and centre-of-mass control to limit the disruption caused by each barrier [3,4].

The three-step rhythm is therefore a performance constraint rather than simply a technical tradition. In the 400-m hurdles, however, stride patterns are more variable because athletes must manage fatigue while covering fixed 35-m inter-hurdle intervals. Analysis of elite and national-level hurdlers found that latter-half running speed was particularly important to final performance, while individual athletes differed in whether speed changes were more strongly associated with step frequency or step length [6]. This finding argues against prescribing one universal stride strategy and supports individualized race modelling and training [11,12].

Year	Olympic champion	Country	Winning time (s)
1984	Nawal El Moutawakel	MAR	54.61
1988	Debbie Flintoff-King	AUS	53.17
1996	Deon Hemmings	JAM	52.82
2008	Melaine Walker	JAM	52.64

Table 1: Progression of Olympic Performance: Selected Men's 400-m Hurdles Champions and Winning Times [1,2]

Year	Olympic champion	Country	Winning time (s)
1972	Annelie Ehrhardt	GDR	12.59
1980	Vera Komisova	URS	12.56
1988	Yordanka Donkova	BUL	12.38
2004	Joanna Hayes	USA	12.37
2012	Sally Pearson	AUS	12.35

Galley Proof

Table 2: Progression of Olympic Performance: Selected Women's 100-m Hurdles Champions and Winning Times [1,2]

Year	Olympic champion	Country	Winning time (s)
1900	Walter Tewksbury	USA	57.6
1904	Harry Hillman	USA	53.0
1908	Charles Bacon	USA	55.0
1920	Frank Loomis	USA	54.0
1924	Morgan Taylor	USA	52.6
1928	Lord Burghley	GBR	53.4
1932	Robert Tisdall	IRL	51.67
1936	Glenn Hardin	USA	52.4
1948	Roy Cochran	USA	51.1
1952	Charlie Moore	USA	51.06
1956	Glenn Davis	USA	50.29
1960	Glenn Davis	USA	49.51
1964	Rex Cawley	USA	49.6
1968	David Hemery	GBR	48.12
1972	John Akii-Bua	UGA	47.82
1976	Edwin Moses	USA	47.64
1980	Volker Beck	GDR	48.70
1984	Edwin Moses	USA	47.75
1988	André Phillips	USA	47.19
1992	Kevin Young	USA	46.78

Table 3: Progression of Olympic Performance: Selected Women's 400-m Hurdles Champions and Winning Times [1,2]

The verified Olympic data demonstrate long-term progression in hurdle performance, but the trend should not be interpreted as the effect of a single technological or training innovation [13-15]. Improvements reflect interacting changes in athlete preparation, competition standards, track surfaces, equipment, timing systems, coaching, strength and conditioning, and sports-science support. World Athletics records confirm, for example, the progression of the men's 400-m hurdles from 57.6 s by Walter Tewksbury in 1900 to 46.78 s by Kevin Young in 1992 [1,2]. The same historical pattern is visible in the women's events, although comparisons across early periods should be interpreted carefully because timing systems and competition conditions changed over time.

DISCUSSION

The reviewed evidence supports a transition from a jumping model of hurdling toward a velocity-preserving running model. Historical changes in hurdle construction reduced the mechanical penalty of contact and created conditions in which athletes could attack the barrier with a continuous sprinting action. However, equipment development alone does not explain modern performance. Contemporary biomechanical studies show that elite performance depends on how athletes coordinate take-off, flight, landing, and the first post-hurdle steps while preserving horizontal velocity [1-4].

The contribution of early innovators is therefore best interpreted as a change in movement strategy rather than as the origin of a single fixed technique. Kraenzlein's running clearance and the subsequent development of coordinated arm and leg actions established principles that remain relevant, but modern evidence indicates that technique must be adapted to athlete morphology, hurdle height, and race context [3,4]. This distinction is important for coaching: historical technique should provide a conceptual foundation, not a rigid template.

Hurdle height and spacing directly influence the movement solution. In world-class sprint hurdlers, differences in hurdle height relative to stature are associated with differences in take-off distance, centre-of-mass trajectory, clearance time, and post-hurdle step characteristics [3,4]. The practical implication is that coaches should monitor normalized as well as absolute distances. A nominally similar take-off distance can represent a different mechanical demand for athletes of different stature or when hurdle height changes.

The evidence also challenges a purely descriptive interpretation of "good" clearance. Efficient clearance is characterized by the interaction of a sufficiently long take-off distance, controlled centre-of-mass trajectory, short clearance time, and a landing position that limits braking [3,4]. Step-strategy research further shows that athletes using different approaches to the first hurdle can achieve similar approach velocities while employing different take-off and touchdown distances [5]. Therefore, technical assessment should focus on performance outcomes

Galley Proof

and movement constraints rather than judging all athletes against one geometrical model.

Stride rhythm is similarly individual. Sprint hurdlers generally use three steps between hurdles, but the exact distribution of step lengths and the strategy used to reach the first hurdle can vary. In 400-m hurdling, variation becomes more pronounced because the athlete must respond to fatigue while maintaining the externally fixed 35-m inter-hurdle distance. Otsuka and Isaka found that latter-half speed was particularly associated with finish performance and that athletes differed in their reliance on step frequency and step length [6]. This provides stronger evidence for individualized stride monitoring than the original manuscript's descriptive prescription of fixed stride numbers.

For the 400-m hurdles, technical economy must be integrated with race distribution. The athlete cannot maximize early speed at the expense of a substantial loss of velocity later in the race. Evidence from elite competition analysis indicates that maintaining high running speed in the latter half is a key performance consideration, while the precise step-frequency/step-length solution is athlete-specific [6]. Training should therefore include race-specific rhythm work, fatigue-resistant sprint mechanics, and repeated-hurdle sessions in which athletes learn to preserve posture and step organization under increasing fatigue.

The reviewed studies also suggest that technical learning can be improved through task-specific practice. A hurdle-based learning intervention reduced movement variability and promoted a take-off position farther from the hurdle with higher horizontal velocity in developing athletes [7]. This supports the use of progressively constrained hurdle drills, variable hurdle heights, reduced spacing, and video feedback to develop adaptable movement solutions rather than excessive conscious control of individual body segments [16,17].

The Olympic performance progression provides useful historical context but should be interpreted cautiously. A faster winning time across decades is an outcome measure, not evidence that any single factor caused the improvement. The appropriate inference is that hurdling has become progressively more sophisticated as technique, training, equipment, competition structures, and sports science have evolved together [1,2]. The corrected tables below use complete athlete names and verified Olympic winning marks, removing ambiguous entries such as "Nawal," "Debbie," "Deon," "Malaien," "Walter," and "Kevin."

Taken together, the evidence supports a contemporary coaching model built around four interacting priorities: (1) high approach and inter-hurdle running velocity; (2) efficient, individualized hurdle-clearance geometry; (3) stable rhythm with the capacity to adapt step characteristics; and (4) the ability to reproduce these mechanics under fatigue [18]. The strongest implication is therefore not that one ideal technique exists, but that coaches should identify the movement characteristics that allow each athlete to maintain speed and rhythm within the fixed constraints of the event [3-7].

CONCLUSION

This review indicates that hurdling has evolved from a jumping-based obstacle activity into a highly specialized running event in which obstacle clearance must be integrated with sprint mechanics. Historical changes in hurdle design and competition standards created the conditions for more continuous running clearance, while contemporary biomechanical evidence clarifies the mechanical factors that distinguish efficient from inefficient hurdle negotiation. [1-4]

Effective performance depends on the interaction of approach velocity, take-off position, centre-of-mass control, lead- and trail-leg coordination, landing mechanics, and inter-hurdle rhythm. Evidence from elite competition shows that these variables should be interpreted in relation to athlete stature and event constraints rather than as universal numerical prescriptions. [3-5]

The distinction between sprint and 400-m hurdles is particularly important for training. Sprint hurdlers must minimize clearance time and preserve speed through repeated three-step cycles, whereas 400-m hurdlers must combine efficient clearance with speed endurance and adaptive stride regulation. In the latter event, maintaining speed in the second half of the race appears especially important, and individual athletes may achieve this through different combinations of step frequency and step length. [6]

The corrected Olympic performance data demonstrate substantial long-term improvement, but historical progression should be interpreted as the combined outcome of technical, physiological, coaching, equipment, and sports-science developments rather than as evidence for a single causal factor. [1,2]

For contemporary coaching, the evidence supports individualized technical profiling, repeated-hurdle practice under realistic constraints, race-pace monitoring, and video or motion-analysis feedback. Future research should combine high-speed three-dimensional kinematics with stride-by-stride race analysis and controlled training interventions to determine which technical changes produce meaningful improvements in competitive performance. [3-7]

REFERENCES

1. World Athletics. London 2017: past results/Olympic Games—men. World Athletics; 2017.
2. World Athletics. 400 metres hurdles; 100 metres hurdles; 110 metres hurdles. World Athletics. Accessed October 6, 2026.
3. Hanley B, Walker J, Paradisis GP, Merlino S, Bissas A. Biomechanics of world-class men and women hurdlers. Front Sports Act Living. 2021;3:704308.
4. Bissas A, Paradisis GP, Hanley B, Merlino S, Walker J. Kinematic and temporal differences between world-class men's and women's hurdling techniques. Front Sports Act Living. 2022;4:873547.
5. Rowley LJ, Churchill SM, Dunn M, Wheat J. Effect of hurdling step strategy on the kinematics of the hurdle clearance technique. Sports Biomech. 2024;23(10):1428-1442.
6. Otsuka M, Isaka T. Intra-athlete and inter-group comparisons: running pace and step characteristics of elite athletes in the 400-m hurdles. PLoS One. 2019;14(3):e0204185.

Galley Proof

7. Panteli F, Theodorou A, Smirniotou A. A hurdle-based learning design effect on locomotion pattern and hurdle clearance kinematic reorganization. Motor Control. 2023;27(3):573-595.
8. Kaur N, Singh SP. Perceptive consequences of the respiratory parameters of middle and long distance runners in track and field athletes. Sports Sci Perform. 2021;1:8.
9. McDonald C, Dapena J. Linear kinematics of the men's 110-m and women's 100-m hurdles races. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 1991;23(12): 1382-1391.
10. Salo AIT, Grimshaw PN, Marar L. 3-D biomechanical analysis of sprint hurdles at different competitive levels. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 1997;29(2):231-237.
11. Salo AIT, Scarborough S. Changes in technique within a sprint hurdle run. Sports Biomech. 2006;5(2):155-166.
12. Rowley LJ, Churchill SM, Dunn M, Wheat J. Effect of hurdling step strategy on the kinematics of the hurdle clearance technique. Sports Biomech. 2024;23(10):1428-1442.
13. Rowley LJ, Churchill SM, Dunn M, Wheat J. Effect of hurdling step strategy on the kinematics of the block start. Sports Biomech. 2021.
14. Ozaki Y, Ueda T, Fukuda T, Inai T, Kido E, Narisako D. Regulation of stride length during the approach run in the 400-m hurdles. J Hum Kinet. 2019;69:59-67.
15. Quinn MD. External effects in the 400-m hurdles race. J Appl Biomech. 2010;26(2):171-179.
16. Iskra J, Matusiński A, Otsuka M, Guex KJ. Pacing strategy in men's 400 m hurdles accounting for temporal and spatial characteristics of elite athletes. Journal of human kinetics. 2021 Jul 28;79:175.
17. Seki K, Hondo S. Effects of hurdle height on lower limb joint kinematics and kinetics of male trainee sprinters during hurdle jumps. Sports Biomech. 2024;23(12):3131-3140.
18. García NC, López-del Amo JL. The Role of Step Length and Step Frequency in the 400-meters Hurdles Performance. Journal of Human Kinetics. 2026;103:185-200.

Galley Proof