Relationship of Club Handle Twist Velocity to selected Biomechanical Characteristics of the Golf Drive

> Phil Cheetham PhD Dissertation Defense Arizona State University June 26, 2014

Interesting to See What World Class Golfers Do During the Downswing

- They:
 - Maintain a Fixed Wrist Angle and,
 - Release the Wrist Angle Late,
 - Then Roll Arms and Twist Club Handle, to
 - Square the Club Face into Impact
- Some Twist the Handle Slowly
 - Low Handle Twist Velocity
 - As Low as ~600 °/s
- Some Twist the Handle Fast
 - High Handle Twist Velocity
 - As High as ~2400 °/s
- Which is Better?
- What are the Biomechanical Characteristics?

Define Mechanical Factors using a Deterministic Model

Dr. James Hay Hay and Reid (1988)

How Does Handle Twist Velocity Affect the Outcome?

Final Ball Resting Position



Model from Club Handle to **Ball Landing Ball Displacement** at Landing (Carry) Drag from Lift from **Relative Height** Acceleration of Ball at Air Resistance Air Resistance due to Gravity Launch Ball Ball Velocity at Launch Ball Spin at Launch Characteristics Clubhead Clubhead Initial Ball Ball and Clubhead Velocity at Impact Position at Impact Velocity Mechanical Characteristics Attack Angle Dvnamic Loft (Zero) CoR, Friction, Mass, etc. Face Angle Club Path Contact Point Club Speed Clubhead Clubhead Angular Velocity Linear Velocity Clubhead Closing Clubhead Swing Plane Velocity Velocity Club Handle Club Clubhead & Shaft Club Handle Club Handle Club Position at Inertial Handle Swing Plane Shaft Linear Velocity Flexibility Characteristics Impact Velocity Twist Velocity

Club Handle Twist Velocity

Angular velocity about the long axis of the handle

Literature Review

2D Pendulum Models





Double Pendulum

- Williams (1967)
- Cochran and Stobbs (1968)
 - Search for the Perfect Swing
- Lampsa (1975)
- Budney and Bellow (1979)
- Campbell and Reid (1985)
- Milne and Davis (1992)
- Jorgensen (1999)
 - The Physics of Golf
- Pickering and Vickers (1999)



Triple Pendulum

- Sprigings and Neal (2000)
- Sprigings and Mackenzie (2002)

3D Models



Nesbit (2007)

- Commissioned by the USGA
- Full-Body 15 Segment Model
- Club Shaft can rotate in all 3-axes
- Alpha, Beta, Gamma
- Gamma is Handle Twist
- Can add 1.5m/s to Swing Speed

Image from:

Nesbit, S. M. (2007). Development of a full-body biomechanical model of the golf swing. International Journal of Modelling and Simulation. 27(4), 392-404



MacKenzie and Sprigings (2009)

- Six Segment Model
- Arm can Rotate around Long Axis
- Allows the face to square up at impact

Image from:

MacKenzie, S. J., & Sprigings, E. J. (2009b). Understanding the role of shaft stiffness in the golf swing. *Sports Engineering*, *12*(1), 13-19. Cochran and Stobbs (1968), Search for the Perfect Swing Rollers, Squares and Pushers



Roller Method

- High HTV
- Open Faced



Pusher Method

- Low HTV
- Closed Faced

Images from: Cochran, A., & Stobbs, J. (1968). Search for the perfect swing (5th ed.). Chicago: Triumph Books

Suttie (2011)

Open Face Method

- High HTV
- Rollers





Closed Face Method – Low HTV – Pushers





Images from: Suttie, J. (2011). The fine art of club control. In D. DeNunzio (Ed.), *The Best Driving Instruction Book Ever!* (pp. 90-101). New York: Time Home Entertainment Inc.

Methods

System and Software







Capture, Calculations and Display

Protocol, Database and Reports

AMM3D Electromagnetic



- Polhemus, Inc.
 - Liberty Hardware
- Transmitter
 - Stationary 4" Cube
 - 3 Orthogonal Coils
 - Global Coordinate System
- Sensors
 - On Body and Club
 - Wired Moving ½" Cubes
 - 3 Orthogonal Coils
 - Local Coordinate Systems





- Advantages
 - 12 Sensor Full-Body Model
 - Fast 240 Hz
 - Real-Time
 - 6 DOF (x, y, z, pitch, yaw, roll)
 - Accurate Anatomical Alignment

- Disadvantages
 - Don't have clubhead directly
 - Compute it from rigid shaft model

Anatomical Alignment

- Local coordinate systems created in every body segment and club
 - Digitizing at least 3 bony landmarks on each segment and the club.
 - Medial/Lateral, Anterior/Posterior and Superior/Inferior axes in each segment
 - Using the Cross Product Method
- Shin is an easy example





Full Body 3D Avatar



Analysis Layout for Our Study



Comparison Table and Database

Data Demo	\square	Pro2	Y	Po	ositions	\mathbf{v} \subset	97.8 C to 83	.4 C .	- X
Parameter	Units	Adr	HB	Тор	HD	Imp	HF	Fin	-
Pelvis Rotation (Open-Closed)	deg	2.5 O	17.5 C	55.8 C	30.4 O	41.4 O	50.6 O	113.2 0	
Pelvis Bend (Fwd-Back)	deg	23.8 F	21.4 F	17.2 F	14.3 F	10.0 F	10.4 F	14.5 F	
Pelvis Side Bend (Trail-Lead)	deg	0.3 L	3.7 L	8.5 L	11.7 T	12.0 T	10.4 T	7.7 T	
Thorax Rotation (Open-Closed)	deg	13.3 O	29.8 C	100.0 C	3.5 O	23.5 O	55.6 O	150.6 O	
Thorax Bend (Fwd-Back)	deg	36.3 F	35.7 F	6.6 B	34.3 F	24.1 F	2.5 F	36.5 B	
Thorax Side Bend (Trail-Lead)	deg	16.0 T	13.5 L	40.8 L	12.6 T	27.0 T	48.2 T	9.7 T	
Pelvis Sway (To-Away)	in	0.0	1.6 A	0.8 A	2.4 T	2.5 T	3.4 T	8.4 T	
Pelvis Thrust (Fwd-Back)	in	0.0	0.5 B	1.8 F	2.1 F	2.8 F	3.3 F	2.9 F	
Pelvis Lift (Up-Down)	in	0.0	0.0	1.8 D	1.1 U	1.5 U	1.3 U	0.2 U	
Thorax Sway (To-Away)	in	0.0	1.4 A	1.2 A	0.0	2.0 A	4.5 A	5.8 T	
Thorax Thrust (Fwd-Back)	in	0.0	0.1 F	2.4 F	0.5 B	0.9 B	0.6 B	2.5 F	
Thorax Lift (Up-Down)	in	0.0	0.8 D	2.3 D	1.7 U	2.2 U	0.9 U	1.3 U	
Spine Rotation (Open-Closed)	deg	11.2 0	13.9 C	47.9 C	27.9 C	20.5 C	5.8 C	31.5 O	
Spine (Flex-Ext)	deg	12.5 F	14.3 F	23.8 E	20.0 F	14.1 F	7.9 E	51.0 E	
Spine Side Bend (Trail-Lead)	deg	16.3 T	9.8 L	32.3 L	1.0 T	15.0 T	37.8 T	2.0 T	
Head Rotation (Open-Closed)	deg	3.7 C	13.7 C	19.5 C	4.5 C	0.6 C	3.8 O	77.4 0	
Head Bend (Fwd-Back)	deg	46.3 F	42.3 F	33.2 F	49.1 F	52.0 F	49.8 F	8.8 B	
Head Side Bend (Trail-Lead)	deg	1.0 L	9.7 L	10.0 L	6.9 T	8.6 T	11.0 T	29.7 T	
Head Sway (To-Away)	in	0.1 T	2.8 A	3.7 A	2.1 A	3.1 A	4.6 A	12.3 T	
Head Thrust (Fwd-Back)	in	0.0	0.2 B	0.8 F	0.2 B	0.7 B	0.7 B	2.6 B	
Head Lift (Up-Down)	in	0.0	0.5 D	0.2 D	0.5 D	0.3 D	0.7 D	8.2 U	
Neck Rotation (Open-Closed)	deg	18.1 C	15.7 O	80.7 O	10.8 C	28.5 C	56.0 C	71.3 C	
Neck (Flex-Ext)	deg	10.0 E	6.7 E	39.8 E	14.7 E	27.8 E	47.3 E	27.8 E	
Neck Side Bend (Trail-Lead)	deg	17.1 T	3.8 L	30.8 L	5.7 T	18.5 T	37.2 T	20.0 L	-
Rng: PGA-Driver Prj: Full Body 12R TPI 7-14-04									

Databases of Swings

- Swings Captured at TPI in Oceanside, CA
 - 94 Male Professional Golfers from European and PGA Tour
 - 70 PGA Tour Professionals with
 Driving Statistics from www.pgatour.com
 - Two groups of 32, Lo-HTV and Hi-HTV
 - Also have 52 PGA Tour Winners

Statistics

- Correlations
 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations on full groups
 - 70 for Driving Accuracy Test
 - 94 for All other Selected Parameters
 - With Handle Twist Velocity
- Analysis of Variance
 - Two groups of 32 golfers from the 70 and 94 groups
 - Lo-HTV and Hi-HTV
 - Compare means of Hi-HTV and Lo-HTV groups for each parameter using single factor ANOVAs
 - Family-wise significance level of p < .05
 - Bonferroni corrected for the number of tests done in each study to avoid Type 1 Errors

Limitations

• AMM3D measures club handle not clubhead

- Two Assumptions
 - Handle Twist Velocity is highly correlated with Clubhead Closing Speed
 - Rigid Clubhead Speed is highly correlated with Actual Clubhead Speed

Clubhead Closing Velocity

- CCV > HTV for Driver
 - Combination of both
 HTV and SPV
- Vertical Shaft
 - All HTV
 - Like Putting
- Horizontal Shaft
 - All SPV
 - Like Baseball



CCV = HTV sin (θ) + SPV cos (θ) where θ is the Lie Angle e.g. 58° for a driver

Handle Twist Velocity and Clubhead Closing Velocity



P. Wood, personal communication, May 16, 2014

- ENSO Motion Analysis
 System at Ping
- 150 players, 5 swings each
- CCV/HTV = 1.6
- CCV is faster than HTV
- Strongly Correlated
 - r = 0.95
 - $R^2 = 0.89$

Clubhead Speed - Rigid v Actual



P. Wood, personal communication, May 16, 2014

- ENSO Motion Analysis System at Ping
- 150 players, 5 swings each
- 52 mph to 120 mph
- Actual > Rigid
- 2.7 ± 1.43 mph
- Strongly Correlated
- *r* = 0.99
- $R^2 = 0.99$

Data from Pre-Captured Swings at TPI

- Human Subjects Exemption
- By Independent Review Board at ASU
- Data Already in Existence
- No Subject Identification Divulged



Definitions

Clubhead Speed at Impact

- Magnitude of the linear clubhead velocity
- How fast in m/s or mph of the clubhead is traveling

Driving Accuracy

- Percent of drives off the tee that come to rest in the fairway
- Found for each golfer on www.pgatour.com

Study1: HYPOTHESES

Clubhead Speed at Impact

Golfers with high HTV will have higher clubhead speed at impact

Driving Accuracy Golfers with low HTV have better driving accuracy

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations with HTV

	n	Mean	SD	r	R ²	Strength
Clubhead Speed (m/s)	94	48.4	2.5	0.14	0.02	Weak
Driving Accuracy (%)	70	62.8	6.4	-0.14	0.02	Weak



ANOVAs with Hi-HTV v Lo-HTV

	Hi-HTV		Lo-HTV				Sig at
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F[1,62]	р	<i>p</i> < .025
Clubhead Speed (m/s)	48.9	2.5	48.0	2.0	2.80	0.100	No
Driving Accuracy (%)	62.2	6.3	63.9	7.0	0.98	0.320	No

- Single Factor ANOVA Results (*p* < .025)
- No significant difference between groups for either:

Clubhead Speed or Driving Accuracy

Clubhead Speed Hypothesis

A weak positive correlation was found (*r* = 0.14) And Hi-HTV group mean was faster than Lo-HTV group 48.9 m/s to 48.0 m/s

But not enough to produce a significant difference between groups



Golfers with high HTV **DO NOT** have significantly higher clubhead speed at impact than low HTV golfers

Strength of Correlation as per Dancey and Reidy (2004)

HTV and Clubhead Speed Discussion

- Possible speed gain
 - $-v = \omega r$
 - Contact point is separated from rotation axis
- Nesbit (2005)
 - High gamma velocity of shaft can add 1.5m/s to the linear velocity of the clubhead at impact
- Cochran and Stobbs (1968)
 - Low HTV is a weaker swing because of the loss of the "screwdriver action"
- Hi-HTV group did have mean velocity 0.9m/s higher than the Lo-HTV group.
- But not enough for significance

Driving Accuracy Hypothesis

A weak negative correlation was found (*r* = -0.14) And Lo-HTV group had slightly higher mean accuracy than Lo-HTV group 63.9% to 62.2%

But not enough to produce a significant difference between groups



Golfers with low HTV **DO NOT** have significantly better driving accuracy than high HTV golfers

Strength of Correlation as per Dancey and Reidy (2004)

HTV and Driving Accuracy Discussion

- Cochran and Stobbs (1968) and Suttie (2011)
 - Both say high HTV less accurate due to greater chance of miss-timing contact
 - Their comments were only anecdotal; no data
- Our Results Disagree
 - We found both Hi-HTV and Lo-HTV produce similar driving accuracy

Practical Application

 Instructors can teach either high or low HTV method with confidence that they both give acceptable results

 But must be consistent in body and arm actions as will be seen in Studies 2 and 3



Definitions

Velocities at Impact

- Lead Wrist Supination Velocity
 - Rolling of forearm and wrist
- Lead Wrist Extension Velocity
 - Extension of lead wrist

Velocities at Maximum

- Lead Wrist Ulnar Deviation Velocity
 - Lateral motion of the wrist
- Lead Wrist Release Velocity
 - Angle between forearm and club shaft
- Trail Elbow Extension Velocity
 - Back elbow extending



From: Mark Papas, www.revolutionarytennis.com



Lead Wrist Set Angle

Lead Wrist Set Angle



Lead Wrist Release Velocity



Lead Wrist Angle 3DOF Components



Supination

Pronated

Lead Wrist Release 3DOF Component Velocities



- Ulnar Velocity Peaks Before Impact
- Extension Velocity At Impact
- Supination Velocity is Largest at Impact

Study 2: HYPOTHESES



Lead Wrist Supination Velocity at Impact

Will show positive correlation with HTV and Hi-HTV group will be significantly faster than Lo-HTV group

Lead Wrist Extension Velocity at Impact Hi-HTV group will be significantly faster than Lo-HTV group



Lead Wrist Ulnar Deviation Velocity at Maximum Lead Wrist Release Velocity at Maximum Trail Elbow Extension Velocity at Maximum Will show no significant difference between groups

Descriptive Statistics and Correlation with HTV

Angular Velocity	Mean (°/s)	SD (°/s)	r	R ²	Strength
Lead Wrist Supination (Imp)	1569	338	0.68	0.46	Moderate





Lead Wrist Supination Velocity at Impact

Does show a moderate positive correlation with HTV

Strength of Correlation as per Dancey and Reidy (2004)

ANOVAs with Hi-HTV v Lo-HTV

Wrist/Elbow	Hi-HTV (°/s)		Lo-HTV (°/s)				Sig at
Angular Velocities	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F[1,62]	p	<i>p</i> < .01
Lead Wrist Supination (Imp)	1811	286	1295	256	58.1	0.000	Yes
Lead Wrist Extension (Imp)	433	195	446	228	0.1	0.813	No
Lead Wrist Ulnar Dev. (Max)	922	126	859	180	2.6	0.109	No
Lead Wrist Release (Max)	1249	138	1186	180	2.5	0.119	No
Trail Elbow Extension (Max)	931	190	851	156	3.4	0.070	No

- Single Factor ANOVA Results (*p* < .01)
- Significant difference for Lead Wrist Supination with Hi-HTV > Lo-HTV
- No Significant difference for all the other tested velocities

Study 2: Additional Hypothesis Results

With the second state of t



Lead Wrist Extension Velocity at Impact

Hi-HTV group IS NOT significantly faster than Lo-HTV group

Hypotheses are Supported Lead Wrist Ulnar Deviation Velocity at Maximum Lead Wrist Release Velocity at Maximum Trail Elbow Extension Velocity at Maximum Do show NO significant difference between groups

Lead Wrist Supination Velocity at Impact Discussion

- Cochran and Stobbs (1968)
- MacKenzie and Sprigings (2009)
 - Both research groups state that it is the arm roll that twists the club handle and squares club face for impact
- Our data suggests this is true
 - Moderate Correlation between
 Lead Wrist Supination Velocity and HTV
 - Mean Hi-HTV Group 40% faster than Lo-HTV Group 1811°/s v 1295°/s, certainly significant

Lead Wrist Extension Velocity

- Hi-HTV Group not significantly faster
- 446°/s to 433°/s
- Interesting that these velocities are positive
- Means that Lead Wrist is Extending at Impact
- 92 of the 94 golfers in our database show this characteristic

Lead Wrist Flexion-Extension



At Impact:

The lead wrist is in a **flexed position** but has an **extending action**

Study 3 Handle Twist Velocity **Relationship to** Pelvis and Thorax **Rotation and Side Bend**

Definitions

Pelvis and Thorax Rotation at Impact





Pelvis and Thorax Side Bend at Impact

What we Have Seen from 3D

 Low Handle Twist Velocity

High Handle
 Twist Velocity



Study 3: HYPOTHESES



Pelvis and Thorax Rotation at Impact

- Will show negative correlation with HTV and Lo-HTV group will be significantly more rotated open than Hi-HTV group
- Pelvis and Thorax Side Bend at Impact Will show negative correlation with HTV and Lo-HTV group will be significantly more side bent to trail side than Hi-HTV group

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations with HTV

	Mean (°)	SD (°)	r	R ²	Strength
Thorax Rotation (Open)	27	9	-0.40	0.16	Moderate
Thorax Side Bend (Trail)	31	5	-0.50	0.25	Moderate
Pelvis Rotation (Open)	41	9	-0.36	0.13	Weak
Pelvis Side Bend (Trail)	9	4	-0.28	0.08	Weak









Study 3: Hypotheses are Supported



Thorax Rotation and Side Bend at Impact Do show a moderate negative correlation with HTV



Pelvis Rotation and Side Bend at Impact Do show a weak negative correlation with HTV

Strength of Correlation as per Dancey and Reidy (2004)

ANOVAs with Hi-HTV v Lo-HTV

Pelvis and Thorax Angles at Impact	Hi-HTV (°)		Lo-HTV (°)				Sig at
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F[1,62]	p	<i>p</i> < .0125
Thorax Rotation (Open)	23	7	31	9	15.9	0.000	Yes
Pelvis Rotation (Open)	37	6	43	7	9.7	0.003	Yes
Thorax Side Bend (Trail)	28	5	34	5	27.1	0.000	Yes
Pelvis Side Bend (Trail)	8	3	11	4	10.2	0.002	Yes

- Single Factor ANOVA Results (*p* < .0125)
- Significant difference for all body angles with Lo-HTV > Hi-HTV

Study 3: Hypotheses are Supported



Pelvis and Thorax Rotation at Impact

Lo-HTV group is significantly more rotated open than Hi-HTV group

Pelvis and Thorax Side Bend at Impact

Lo-HTV group is significantly more side bent to trail side than Hi-HTV group

HTV with Rotation and Side Bend Discussion



Instructional Literature

Cochran and Stobbs (1968)

- Rollers
 - Use Arms More
 - Roll Club Rapidly
 - Less Body Action
- Pushers
 - Less Arm Action
 - Use Body More
 - Rotate Body Faster

Suttie (2011)

- Open-Face Method
 - Active Closing of Club Face
 - "Handsy" Swing
 - Medium to Slow Hip Speed
- Closed-Face Method
 - Less Twist of the Club needed
 - Faster Hips Needed
 - More Open at Impact

Hi-HTV

Lo-HTV

Other Studies - Rotation Values

Rotation Angle	Туре	Pelvis	Thorax	Skill Level
Cheetham	Hi-HTV	37°	23°	Tour Pro
	Lo-HTV	43°	31°	Tour Pro
McTeigue et al.	PGA Male	32°	26°	Tour Pro
	PGA Senior	34°	28°	Senior Pro
	Amateur	35°	27°	Amateur
Myers et al.	Hi Vel	38°	25°	Amateur
	Med Vel	35°	23°	Amateur
	Lo Vel	29°	20°	Amateur
Horan et al.	Male	44°	26°	Skilled
	Female	50°	29°	Skilled

- All are open at impact with both pelvis and thorax
- Pelvis is more open than thorax
- None are close to square at impact. So definitely not same as at address

Practical Applications

New Instructional Information

- Valuable to know what the elite players do
- Both handle twist techniques can be successful
- Rolling the arms more in the downswing will increase handle twist velocity and clubhead closing velocity
- Lead wrist is extending at impact
- Important to be consistent in teaching the wrist and body characteristics that match
 - Don't force a high HTV golfer to be more open and side bent at impact
 - Unless you also change their arm and club twist action

New High Quality Databases

- Now have several high quality databases of the best golfers in the world with full-body motion capture data
 - 94 PGA and European Tour Golfers
 - 32 High HTV PGA and European Tour Golfers
 - 32 Low HTV PGA and European Tour Golfers
 - 51 PGA Tour Winners
- Quality data for future studies and education

Acknowledgments

Dr. Rick Hinrichs Dr. Shannon Ringenbach Dr. Debbie Crews Dr. Natalia Dounskaia

> Dr. Greg Rose Mr. Dave Phillips

Dr. Paul Wood Dr. Erik Henrikson

Thank You

Thank You