

2016

A preliminary investigation of trunk and wrist kinematics when using drivers with different shaft properties

C Joyce

University of Notre Dame Australia, chris.joyce@nd.edu.au

A Burnett

J Cochrane

A Reyes

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/health_article



Part of the [Life Sciences Commons](#), and the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

This article was originally published as:

Joyce, C., Burnett, A., Cochrane, J., & Reyes, A. (2016). A preliminary investigation of trunk and wrist kinematics when using drivers with different shaft properties. *Sports Biomechanics*, 15(1), 61-75.

Original article available here:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14763141.2015.1123764>

This article is posted on ResearchOnline@ND at https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/health_article/150. For more information, please contact researchonline@nd.edu.au.



This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Sports Biomechanics* on 14 April 2016, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14763141.2015.1123764>

1 **A preliminary investigation of trunk and wrist kinematics when using drivers**
2 **with different shaft properties**

3
4
5 Christopher Joyce ^{1,2}

6 Angus Burnett ^{1,3}

7 Jodie Cochrane ¹

8 Alvaro Reyes ¹

9
10 ¹ School of Exercise and Health Science, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Western Australia

11 ² School of Health Sciences, Notre Dame University, Fremantle, Western Australia

12 ³ ASPETAR Orthopaedic and Sports Medicine Hospital, Doha, Qatar

13
14 *Running Title: Between-driver differences in golf swing kinematics*

15 *Key Words: golf, 3D, kinematics, kick point, clubhead speed*

16 *Word Count: 4,603 (not including references)*

17 *Author Contact: chris.joyce@nd.edu.au [+61 8 (9)4330224]*

18 *Funding: No funding or grants were obtained for this study*

19

20

21 **ABSTRACT**

22 It is unknown whether skilled golfers will modify their kinematics when using drivers of different
23 shaft properties. This study aimed to firstly, determine if golf swing kinematics and swing
24 parameters and related launch conditions differed when using modified drivers, then secondly,
25 determine which kinematics were associated with clubhead speed. Twenty high level amateur male
26 golfers (Mean \pm SD: handicap = 1.9 ± 1.9 score) had their three-dimensional trunk and wrist
27 kinematics collected for two driver trials. Swing parameters and related launch conditions were
28 collected using a launch monitor. A one-way repeated measures ANOVA revealed significant (p
29 ≤ 0.003) between-driver differences; specifically, faster trunk axial rotation velocity and an early
30 wrist release for the low kick point driver. Launch angle was shown to be 2° lower for the high
31 kick point driver. Regression models for both drivers explained a significant amount of variance
32 (60 – 67%) in clubhead speed. Wrist kinematics were most associated with clubhead speed,
33 indicating the importance of the wrists in producing clubhead speed regardless of driver shaft
34 properties.

35 **INTRODUCTION**

36 A golfer who is able to generate faster clubhead speeds can increase hitting distance off the tee
37 (Fletcher & Hartwell, 2004) and this may help reduce the number of shots per round if driving
38 accuracy can be maintained (Wiseman & Chatterjee, 2006). Factors relating to an individual's
39 technique as well as equipment factors (the club they hit with) can be modified in an attempt to
40 improve driving distance. In an attempt to understand driving outcome measures of the ball,
41 previous investigations have modified properties of the driver's shaft such as, shaft length (Lacy,
42 Yu, Axe, & Luczak, 2012), shaft mass (Haeufle, Worobets, Wright, Haeufle, & Stefanyshyn,
43 2012) and shaft stiffness (Betzler, 2010).

44

45 Shaft stiffness has typically been graded using a qualitative rating such as ladies, regular, stiff and
46 extra-stiff (Betzler, 2010). However, shaft stiffness can be more precisely defined using flexural
47 rigidity (EI) testing. This approach gives a quantitative grading of stiffness by examining the
48 'bending stiffness' at multiple locations along the shaft, rather than its general shape of the shaft
49 under static load (Figure 1) (Brouillette, 2002; Joyce, Burnett, & Matthews, 2013b). This gives a
50 more precise estimate of a shaft's complete bending profile from the bottom of the grip to the
51 shaft's tip. Experimentally, swing kinematics of highly skilled golfers do not differ when hitting
52 with drivers fitted with shafts of modifiable stiffness (Betzler, 2010; Betzler et al., 2011). This may
53 possibly be due to the amount of movement variability in kinematics, which have shown to be
54 highly variable between highly skilled golfers when optimising ball velocity (Tucker, Anderson,
55 & Kenny, 2013).

56

57 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

58

59 Another modifiable shaft property, the kick point, is usually determined in a static manner and is
60 considered to be the maximum bend point from a line joining the two ends of a loaded shaft
61 (Wishon, 2011). A shaft with a high kick point will have a maximum bend point closer to the grip,
62 while a shaft with a low kick point will have its point of maximum bend closer to the clubhead.
63 Recent research has found that kick point location can affect swing parameters and related launch
64 conditions (Joyce, Burnett, Reyes, & Herbert, 2014), specifically, with a high kick point shaft
65 providing a lower launch angle of the ball and more spin than a low kick point shaft (Cheong,
66 Kang, & Jeong, 2006; Joyce et al., 2014).

67

68 Modifiable shaft properties are available to assist in producing desired swing parameters and
69 related launch conditions for golfers of varied skill levels (Worobets & Stefanyshyn, 2007; Cheong
70 et al., 2006; Wishon, 2011; Haeufle et al., 2012). Research undertaken to understand how highly
71 skilled golfers influence swing parameters and related launch conditions such as clubhead speed,
72 and the effect this has on shaft performance has largely been inconclusive. However, it is thought
73 to be related to manipulations of upper body kinematics (Betzler, 2010; MacKenzie & Sprigings,
74 2009; Suzuki, Hoshino, & Kobayashi, 2009; Worobets & Stefanyshyn, 2007). Previous
75 experimental studies have examined trunk kinematics of low handicap golfers and their effect on
76 clubhead speed (Chu, Sell, & Lephart, 2010; Joyce, Burnett, Cochrane, & Ball, 2013a).
77 Maximising angular displacement between the pelvis and shoulders at the top of the backswing
78 (X-factor), and the associated countermovement of the pelvis at the start of the downswing (X-
79 factor stretch) for example, has been shown to contribute to greater clubhead speed (Cheetham,
80 Martin, & Mottram, 2001; Chu et al., 2010). Further three-dimensional methods used to analyse

81 X-factor have allowed the trunk to be modelled as multiple segments (Joyce, Burnett, & Ball,
82 2010), revealing significant associations between the lower trunk relative to pelvis angular
83 displacement with clubhead speed in homogenous cohorts (Joyce et al., 2013a).

84

85 In addition to the trunk kinematics, the involvement of the ‘leading’ arm (i.e. the left arm for right
86 handed golfers) has also been shown to be an important factor in influencing clubhead speed
87 (Sprigings & Neal, 2000; Teu, Kim, Fuss, & Tan, 2006). Highly skilled golfers are known to
88 exhibit a relatively late release of the wrists (i.e. a more delayed movement of the wrists from a
89 radially deviated wrist position) in an attempt to maximise clubhead speed at ball impact (Betzler,
90 2010; Sprigings & Neal, 2000). In fact a delayed wrist release may result in increases in clubhead
91 speed of between 9-46% (Milburn, 1982; Sprigings & Neal, 2000). Given the importance of wrist
92 kinematics in contributing to the generation of high clubhead speeds, it would be of value to golfers
93 and golf coaches to investigate upper body kinematics when using drivers with differing kick
94 points. Although previous research has identified between-club differences in body kinematics,
95 and their association with fast clubhead speeds, this has yet to be examined when using the same
96 club (driver) fitted with shafts of differing kick point locations.

97

98 Based on the investigations that describe the interaction between golfer and club, it was
99 hypothesised that a difference in golf swing kinematics would be seen for highly skilled golfers
100 hitting with drivers of modifiable shaft properties. Therefore, the first aim of the study was to
101 determine whether trunk and wrist kinematics, and swing parameters and related launch conditions
102 differed when using drivers fitted with shafts of differing properties, i.e. kick point location (low
103 and high), flexural rigidity profile and mass (56 g and 78 g). The second aim of the study was to

104 determine if trunk and wrist kinematics were associated with clubhead speed for each of these
105 drivers.

106

107

108 **METHODS**

109 PARTICIPANTS

110 Participants recruited for this study included 20 right handed, high level amateur male golfers
111 (Mean \pm SD: age = 24.6 ± 5.6 years, registered golfing handicap = 1.9 ± 1.9 score). At the time of
112 testing, participants had a registered golfing handicap of 5 or lower, were aged between 18 and 35
113 years, and had no back pain in the previous 12 months prior to testing (as assessed by a modified
114 Nordic Low Back Pain questionnaire). Ethical approval to conduct the study was provided by the
115 Edith Cowan University Institutional Human Research Ethics Committee.

116

117 EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOL

118 A repeated-measures design was utilised for this study, with each participant hitting five shots
119 each with two drivers (i.e. 10 shots). The two drivers were fitted with shafts with differing kick
120 point location and flexural rigidity profile (Figure 2). A 56 g ‘stiff’ shaft known to have a low kick
121 point, and a 78 g ‘stiff’ shaft known to have a high kick point (Joyce et al., 2013b) were used in
122 this study. This between-shaft approach to investigate differences in golf swing kinematics and
123 swing parameters and related launch conditions has been used in previous research studies
124 (Betzler, 2010). Isolating the effect of a single club parameter can have its difficulties in golf
125 research (Haeufle et al., 2012) and in this study it was not feasible to change kick point location
126 without having the shaft mass also modified. The driver lengths, grips and clubhead were identical.

127 The decision of what driver clubhead and shaft selection was made in consultation with an AAA-
128 rated Australian Professional Golfers Association teaching professional, who determined which
129 drivers were typically used by elite level male golfers. The properties of each driver are shown in
130 Table 1, with the flexural rigidity (quantitative stiffness) of each driver shown in Figure 2. The
131 procedures relating to the collation of these driver properties are reported elsewhere (Joyce et al.,
132 2014). All properties in Table 1 were considered when explaining the between-club differences in
133 golf swing kinematics and regression equations in the discussion.

134

135 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

136 INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

137

138 Testing for each participant was conducted on two days with players using a different driver on
139 each day. The order of testing for each driver was randomised and the two sessions were separated
140 by 24-48 hours. It has been suggested that experienced golfers need time to familiarise themselves
141 with a new club (Kenny, Wallace, & Otto, 2008). Therefore, prior to testing on each day,
142 participants completed two familiarisation sessions, i.e. an outdoor session and then an indoor
143 session prior to the actual laboratory testing session. These sessions were always completed in this
144 order and they were conducted within one hour of each other. The outdoor session was conducted
145 at a driving range located at a golf course located nearby to the Biomechanics laboratory where
146 testing took place. This session was performed first so each participant had the opportunity to
147 receive visual feedback via the ball's trajectory and its final landing position. Participants then
148 completed the indoor familiarisation session at the laboratory prior to data collection. The
149 familiarisation protocol was the same for each session with all participants hitting 10-20 shots each

150 time. The exact number of shots was determined by the participant deciding when they felt
151 sufficiently familiar with the driver. Total time required for the indoor familiarisation and testing
152 was approximately 90 minutes on each day.

153

154 DATA COLLECTION

155 A 10-camera MX-F20 Vicon-Peak Motion Analysis system (Oxford Metrics, Oxford, UK)
156 operating at 500 Hz was used to capture all 3D kinematics. During testing, participants wore
157 bicycle shorts and golf shoes only and a total of twenty one retro-reflective markers were attached
158 to them during static trials. The six lower arm and hand ‘anatomical’ markers were then removed
159 for dynamic trials. A further two markers were attached to the shaft of the driver during the
160 dynamic trials to identify top of the backswing, and a piece of retro-reflective tape was attached to
161 the ball to identify ball impact (Table 2). These markers were used to provide 3D golf swing
162 kinematics of the body, create a multi-segment trunk model (Joyce et al., 2010) as well as a model
163 of the leading arm that being; the left arm for right-handed golfers (Betzler, 2010; Sweeney, Mills,
164 Mankad, Elliott, & Alderson, 2012). These models were developed using Vicon BodyBuilder
165 V.3.6.1 and the complete model was then used in Vicon Nexus V.1.7.1 (Oxford, UK) to obtain all
166 kinematic variables (as described below).

167

168 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

169

170 The multi-segment trunk model consisted of three segments: trunk, lower trunk and pelvis. Table
171 2 shows the markers which define each reference frame from which each segment was created.
172 Cardan angles were reported for the trunk (shoulders – pelvis reference frames) and lower trunk

173 (lower trunk – pelvis reference frames) were reported using a ZYX (lateral bending,
174 flexion/extension and axial rotation respectively) order of rotation (Joyce et al., 2010). Positive
175 values indicated trunk extension, right lateral bending and left axial rotation and negative values
176 indicating trunk flexion, left lateral bending and right axial rotation.

177
178 The wrist joint was modeled using three-marker clusters placed on the forearm and the hand and
179 these were positioned along with the six anatomical markers on the forearm and hand during the
180 static calibration trials. The anatomical markers were removed and produced virtual anatomical
181 markers for dynamic trials, as not to impede the natural movement of the wrist in each participant's
182 golf swing (Cappozzo, Catani, Leardini, Benedetti, & Croce, 1996). Cardan angles for the wrist
183 were also reported using a XYZ order of rotation (Betzler, 2010). With previous investigations
184 suggesting ulnar/radial deviation at the wrist joint is important for increasing clubhead speed
185 (Sprigings & Neal., 2000; Teu et al., 2006), it was the wrist movement which was of interest for
186 this study. Positive values indicated radial deviation and negative values indicated ulnar deviation.

187
188 DATA ANALYSIS

189 Two critical events in the golf swing were used in this study; top of backswing and ball impact.
190 Top of the backswing was identified as the frame where the two club markers changed direction
191 to initiate the downswing (Joyce et al., 2013a; Myers et al., 2008). Ball impact was defined as the
192 frame immediately before when the ball (fitted with a piece of retro-reflective tape) was first seen
193 to move after contact (Joyce et al., 2013b). Maximal trunk and lower trunk rotation was determined
194 to be the peak value shortly after the top of the backswing. This variable (also known as 'x-factor
195 stretch') was obtained due to the pelvis counter-rotating to commence the downswing while the

196 shoulders remained relatively still which increases the separation angle (Cheetham et al., 2001).
197 Wrist release was defined as a rate of change threshold point of greater than 5%, from that of the
198 previous data point for wrist angular displacement. The point of wrist release was defined as a
199 percentage value during the downswing from top of the backswing (0 %) to ball impact (100 %)

200

201 Initially, 28 variables relating to trunk and wrist kinematics were collected however, after
202 examination of correlation matrices, a high degree of multicollinearity was seen to exist between
203 some of these variables. Consequently, a reduced total of 20 variables were included in the final
204 analysis (see Table 3). A further four variables were quantified relating to swing parameters and
205 related launch conditions (see Table 4).

206

207 From the five trials recorded for each driver, three were chosen for analysis based on maximal
208 clubhead speed, the ball landing within a predicted 37 m wide fairway (from the launch monitor
209 described below), and had minimal marker drop out. All trials were smoothed using a Woltring
210 filter with a mean square error of 20mm² (Woltring, 1986). Ensemble averages for the trunk and
211 lower trunk angular displacement data, as well as wrist ulnar/radial deviation between top of
212 backswing and ball impact were created. In preparation for the ensemble average process, all data
213 were time normalised (0-100%) using cubic spline interpolation

214

215 A real-time launch monitor (PureLaunch™, Zelosity, USA) was used to measure four swing
216 parameters (clubhead speed at ball impact and attack angle of the clubface) and their related launch
217 conditions (ball velocity and launch angle).

218

219 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

220 For the first aim of the study, i.e. to determine whether between-driver differences existed for all
221 trunk and wrist kinematics examined in this study, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was
222 used. Data from each of the three trials per driver was used. For the trunk and wrist kinematic
223 variables there were 20 between-club comparisons conducted so a Bonferroni adjustment of the p-
224 value ($p \leq 0.003$) was made to correct the family wise error rate. For the four swing parameters
225 and their related launch conditions, the critical p-value value was adjusted to $p \leq 0.013$. Intra-class
226 correlation coefficient (ICC) and standard error of mean (SEM) statistics were used to determine
227 the within-trial reliability of all variables listed in Table 3. According to Fleiss (1986), ICC values
228 greater than 0.75 were considered as excellent, ICC values between 0.40 and 0.75 were considered
229 as fair to good, and ICC values less than 0.4 were considered as poor. As Fleiss' fair to good values
230 spanned a large range, reliability for the purposes of this study was considered to be good when
231 ICC values ranged from 0.60 to 0.74 (Gstoettner et al., 2007).

232

233 Relating to the second aim of the study, stepwise linear regression models were generated for each
234 driver, in which swing kinematics were the independent variables, and the clubhead speed of each
235 driver was the dependent variable. Again, all three trials per driver were used in each of these
236 models. All assumptions relating to these models were met. All statistical analyses were
237 undertaken using STATA V9.1 (Stata Corp. Texas, USA).

238

239 **RESULTS**

240 Ensemble average data of the angular displacement and velocity of the trunk, lower trunk and wrist
241 for the two drivers from the top of the backswing (0 %) to ball impact (100 %) are shown in Figures

242 3 and 4 respectively. While the descriptive data relating to trunk and wrist kinematics for both
243 drivers are reported in Table 3. There was excellent reliability for kinematic variables for both
244 drivers (ICC = 0.859 – 0.996, SEM = 0.4 – 44.7) (Table 3). Results from the one-way repeated
245 measures ANOVA revealed that there were four significant ($p \leq 0.003$) between-driver differences.
246 With respect to the trunk, a larger amount of left lateral bending was reported at the top of the
247 backswing, as well as there being faster axial rotation velocity being evident at ball impact for the
248 driver fitted with the low kick point shaft. Further, the lower trunk segment showed a larger amount
249 of maximum axial rotation for the driver fitted with the high kick point shaft. Finally, the wrists
250 were released 4.3 % later (which translates to 0.044 s) in the downswing, for the driver fitted with
251 the high kick point shaft when compared to the driver fitted with the low kick point shaft. **Prior to**
252 **the 5% rate of change threshold point, the percentage change was less than 4% for all data, and a**
253 **minimum of 20% thereafter.** Analysis of the swing parameters and their related launch conditions
254 revealed a significantly lower launch angle for the high kick point driver (Table 4).

255

256 INSERT FIGURE 3-4 ABOUT HERE

257 INSERT TABLES 3-4 ABOUT HERE

258

259 The results from the regression analyses are shown in Table 5. The regression models for each
260 driver were able to explain a significant amount of variance in clubhead speed. Specifically, 60%
261 of variance was explained for the driver fitted with the shaft containing the low kick point and 67%
262 of variance was explained for the driver fitted with the shaft containing the high kick point. For
263 each model, the two variables most strongly associated with clubhead speed were related to the
264 wrist. For the driver with the high kick point shaft wrist release point in the downswing ($\beta = 0.415$)

265 and radial deviation of the wrist at the top of the backswing ($\beta = 0.380$) were two variables most
266 associated with clubhead speed. The two other variables included in this model were slower lower
267 trunk axial rotation velocity at ball impact ($\beta = -0.249$) and radial deviation of the wrist at ball
268 impact ($\beta = 0.176$). For the low kick point shaft, radial deviation of the wrist at the top of the
269 backswing ($\beta = 0.775$) and radial deviation of the wrist at ball impact ($\beta = 0.568$) were the two
270 variables most associated with clubhead speed. The other two variables in the model were, a
271 reduced amount of trunk lateral bending at ball impact ($\beta = -0.486$) and greater lower trunk
272 maximum axial rotation ($\beta = -0.438$).

273

274 INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

275

276 **DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

277 This study hypothesised that there would be a difference in golf swing kinematics for highly skilled
278 golfers hitting with drivers fitted with shafts of modifiable properties. There were two aims of this
279 study: (a) determine whether trunk and wrist kinematics, and swing parameters and related launch
280 conditions would differ when using drivers fitted with shafts of different kick point location; and
281 (b) determine what trunk and wrist kinematics were most strongly associated with clubhead speed
282 for each of the drivers. While four between-driver differences in swing kinematics were found
283 (Table 3), it could be reasonably argued that only two of these four variables (trunk axial rotation
284 velocity at ball impact and the point of wrist release in the downswing) would seem to be
285 meaningful in a practical sense. This is due to the small magnitude of differences being evident
286 between-drivers for the other two variables. A discussion of the two findings with practical
287 application follows.

288

289 Slower trunk axial rotation velocity at ball impact was reported for the driver fitted with the high
290 kick point shaft. This may be related to the fact that the high kick point shaft condition in this study
291 was created by using a heavier (78 g) shaft when compared to the low kick point shaft condition
292 (56 g). No differences in clubhead speed and ball velocity were observed in the two drivers. The
293 experimental findings of Haeufle et al. (2012) also revealed no differences in clubhead speed for
294 two drivers with the same 22 g difference in shaft mass and they speculated that the increase in
295 shaft mass may cause muscles related to the trunk to contract more slowly. The second between-
296 driver difference of a later wrist release for the driver fitted with the high kick point shaft may be
297 related to the slower trunk axial rotation velocity. Wrist release was shown to have occurred 4.3
298 % later in the downswing. A delayed wrist release has been shown to increase clubhead speed
299 (Sprigings & Neal, 2000; Teu et al., 2006). As no between-driver difference in clubhead speed was
300 seen, it could be assumed that clubhead speed was generated by more involvement of the wrist
301 than the trunk for the driver fitted with the high kick point shaft. Alternatively, the early wrist
302 release for the driver fitted with the low kick point shaft may explain that the faster trunk axial
303 rotation velocity helped to achieve a similar clubhead speed to the driver fitted with the high kick
304 point shaft.

305

306 The delayed wrist release for the driver fitted with the high kick point shaft may be explained by
307 the interaction of the wrist and the heavier, high kick point shaft. White (2006) explained that wrist
308 release elicits changes in the performance of the shaft during the downswing. It was reported that
309 shaft properties such as moment of inertia are affected by wrist release. A higher moment of inertia,
310 increased tip stiffness (Figure 2), as well as an increased amount of bending in the latter stages of

311 the downswing have been previously reported for the high kick point shaft when compared to the
312 low kick point shaft (Joyce et al., 2014). The between-driver difference in wrist release may be
313 due to participants attempting to optimise the un-loading of the shaft through these properties in
314 the downswing for optimal swing and related launch parameters. One such difference in launch
315 parameters seen in this study was that of a lower launch angle for the driver fitted with the high
316 kick point shaft (Table 4). As implied above, clubhead presentation may be influenced by the
317 bending of the shaft in the downswing, as well as stiffer shafts (Figure 2) being less lofted at ball
318 impact (Wishon, 2011; Haeufle et al., 2012; Joyce et al., 2014).

319
320 The regression models generated for each driver resulted in similar (and high) amounts of variance
321 being explained in clubhead speed (Table 5). Importantly, the most strongly associated variables
322 with clubhead speed for both models were variables related with the wrist, which is consistent with
323 previous research (Milburn, 1982; Osis & Stefanyshyn, 2012; Sprigings & Neal, 2000). These
324 variables were specifically; the release point of the wrists in the downswing, as well as the radial
325 / ulnar deviation of the wrist at the top of the backswing and at ball impact. Firstly, participants
326 who displayed greater radial deviation of the wrist joint (or wrist cocking) at the top of backswing
327 had greater clubhead speed and this has been supported in previous research (Chu et al., 2010).
328 Previous studies have shown an increased wrist cock angle at the top of the swing is essential for
329 accelerating the club in the early stages of the downswing (Chu et al., 2010; Sprigings & Neal,
330 2000). Shortly after the point of wrist release, wrist velocity rapidly decreases at approximately
331 90% of downswing (see Figure 4). It has been suggested that wrist torque increases at this point
332 (reducing wrist velocity), so that the club can release through ball impact and maximise clubhead
333 speed (Kaneo & Sato, 2000; Osis & Stefanyshyn, 2012). The finding of a small amount of wrist

334 cock maintained at ball impact being related to increased clubhead speed is in agreement with
335 previous studies (Chu et al., 2010; Pickering & Vickers, 1999).

336

337 Variables of lower associations with clubhead speed (Table 5), firstly for the driver fitted with the
338 high kick point shaft, were lower trunk axial rotational velocity at ball impact. This finding was
339 previously discussed when a more delayed wrist release was seen for the driver fitted with the high
340 kick point shaft, as well as slower trunk rotational velocity at ball impact. From what also can be
341 seen in the regression model for the driver fitted with the high kick point shaft, the delayed release
342 of the wrists was most likely the cause of clubhead speed, and involvement of the trunk and lower
343 trunk not as important. Secondly, for the driver fitted with the low kick point shaft, lower
344 associations with clubhead were seen by reduced right lateral bending and increased lower trunk
345 maximum axial rotation. Previous recommendations report increasing right lateral bending of the
346 trunk to facilitate higher launch angles (Gluck, Bendo, & Spivak, 2007) so it is unclear why this
347 was reported for this study. Increasing lower trunk maximum axial rotation has been previously
348 reported as being highly associated with clubhead speed (Joyce et al., 2013a). However, for both
349 regression models, wrist segment variables were the most highly associated with clubhead speed
350 which conforms to other investigations into the importance of the wrist at producing clubhead
351 speed (Sprigings & Neal, 2000; Teu et al., 2006).

352

353 There were some limitations of this study. Firstly, isolating the single shaft modification of kick
354 point was not permitted without other observed differences in mass, swing weighting and flexural
355 rigidity (Joyce et al., 2014). Although this suggests that other shaft factors may have influenced
356 differences in swing parameters and related launch conditions than kick point alone, it has

357 previously been shown that modifying swingweight has no effect on swing and launch conditions
358 (Haeufle et al., 2012; Wallace & Hubbell, 2001; Wallace, Otto, & Nevill, 2007). Secondly, there
359 may have been more practically applicable differences in swing kinematics observed and possibly
360 different associations with clubhead speed if participants were able to perceive shot outcome
361 during indoor testing as in the outdoor familiarisation. In staging these limitations however, the
362 bending, and flexural rigidity profiles of each shaft were known (Joyce et al., 2014). This type of
363 detail has not been described in previous research examining wrist release and shaft stiffness
364 (Betzler, 2010; Osis & Stefanyshyn, 2012).

365

366 **CONCLUSION**

367 Slower trunk axial rotation velocity and a greater delayed release of the wrist were seen when
368 using the driver fitted with the high kick point shaft. With no between-driver difference in clubhead
369 speed, the delayed wrist release may have helped attain a similar clubhead speed to that of the
370 driver fitted with the low kick point shaft, which showed a faster trunk axial rotation velocity, and
371 an earlier wrist release. A similar amount of variance was explained for both drivers and similar
372 variables were shown to be associated with clubhead speed. The results from this study may assist
373 teaching professionals and club fitters in understanding the interaction between the golfer, and the
374 club that they are hitting with to maximise golfing performance. Future research which examines
375 shaft bending profiles during the downswing and player interaction for modifiable driver
376 properties will also be important for biomechanists and teaching professionals.

377

378 **REFERENCES**

- 379 Betzler, N. F. (2010). *The effect of differing shaft dynamics on the biomechanics of the golf swing*.
380 (Published PhD Thesis). Napier University, Edinburgh.
- 381
- 382 Betzler, N. F., Slater, C., Strangwood, M., Monk, S. A., Otto, S. R., & Wallace, E. S. (2011). The
383 static and dynamic stiffness behaviour of composite golf shafts and their constituent materials.
384 *Sports Engineering, 14*, 27-37. doi: 10.1007/s12283-011-0068-1
- 385
- 386 Brouillette, M. (2002). On measuring the flexural rigidity distribution of golf shafts. In E. Thain
387 (Ed.), *Science and Golf IV: Proceedings of the World Scientific Congress on Golf*. (pp. 287-302).
388 London: Taylor & Francis.
- 389
- 390 Cappozzo, A., Catani, F., Leardini, A., Benedetti, M. G., & Croce, U. D. (1996). Position and
391 orientation in space of bones during movement: experimental artefacts. *Clinical Biomechanics*,
392 *11*, 90-100. doi: 10.1016/0268-0033(95)00046-1
- 393
- 394 Cheetham, P., Martin, P., & Mottram, R. (2001). The importance of stretching the “X-factor” in
395 the downswing of golf: The “X-factor stretch”. In P. R. Thomas (4th Ed). *Optimising Performance*
396 *in Golf*. (pp.192-199). Brisbane: Australian Academic Press Ltd.
- 397
- 398 Cheong, S. K., Kang, K. W., & Jeong, S. K. (2006). Evaluation of the mechanical performance of
399 golf shafts. *Engineering Failure and Analysis, 13*, 464-473. doi:
400 10.1016/j.engfailanal.2004.12.035
- 401
- 402 Chu, Y., Sell, T. C., & Lephart, S. M. (2010). The relationship between biomechanical variables
403 and driving performance during the golf swing. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 28*, 1251-1259. doi:
404 10.1080/02640414.2010.507249
- 405
- 406 Fleiss, J. L. (1986). *The Design and Analysis of Clinical Experiments*. New York: John Wiley &
407 Sons.
- 408
- 409 Fletcher, I. M., & Hartwell, M. (2004). Effect of an 8-week combined weights and plyometric
410 training program on golf drive performance. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 18*,
411 59-62.
- 412
- 413 Gluck, G. S., Bendo, J. A., & Spivak, J. M. (2007). The lumbar spine and low back pain in golf: a
414 literature review of swing biomechanics and injury prevention. *The Spine Journal, 8*, 1-11.
415 doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2007.07.388
- 416
- 417 Gstoettner, M., Sekyra, K., Walochnik, N., Winter, P., Watcher, R., & Bach, C. M. (2007) Inter-
418 and intraobserver reliability assessment of the Cobb angle: manual versus digital measurement
419 tools. *European Spine Journal, 16*, 1587-1592.
- 420

421 Haeufle, D. F. B., Worobets, J., Wright, I., Haeufle, J., & Stefanyshyn, D. (2012). Golfers do not
422 respond to changes in shaft mass properties in a mechanically predictable way. *Sports Engineering*,
423 *15*, 215-220. doi:10.1007/s12283-012-0104-9
424

425 Joyce, C., Burnett, A. and Ball, K. (2010). Methodological considerations for the 3D measurement
426 of the X-factor and lower trunk movement in golf. *Sports Biomechanics*, *9*, 206-221. doi:
427 10.1080/14763141.2010.516446
428

429 Joyce, C., Burnett, A., Cochrane, J. and Ball, K. (2013a). Three-dimensional trunk kinematics in
430 golf: Between-club differences and relationships to clubhead speed. *Sports Biomechanics*, *12*, 108-
431 120. doi: 10.1080/14763141.2012.728244
432

433 Joyce, C., Burnett, A. and Matthews, M. (2013b). A new method to identify the location of the
434 kick point during the golf swing. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, *29*, 779-784. doi:
435 PMID:23271218.
436

437 Joyce, C., Burnett, A., Reyes, A. and Herbert, S. (2014). A dynamic evaluation of how kick point
438 location influences swing parameters and related launch conditions. *Proceedings of the Institution*
439 *of Mechanical Engineers, Part P: Journal of Sports Engineering and Technology*, *228*, 111-119.
440 doi: 10.1177/1754337113515469
441

442 Kaneo, Y., & Sato, F. (2000). The adaptation of golf swing to inertia property of golf club. In S.
443 Haake (Ed.), *The engineering of sport – research, development and innovation*. (pp. 469-476).
444 London: Blackwell.
445

446 Kenny, I. C., Wallace, E. S., & Otto, S. R. (2008). Influence of shaft length on golf driving
447 performance. *Sports Biomechanics*, *7*, 322-332. doi: 10.1080/14763140802233249
448

449 Lacy, T. E., Yu, J., Axe, J., & Luczak, T. (2012). The effect of driver mass and shaft length on
450 initial golf ball launch conditions: A designed experimental study. *Procedia Engineering*, *34*, 379-
451 384. doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2012.04.065
452

453 MacKenzie, S. J., & Sprigings, E. J. (2009). A three-dimensional forward dynamics model of the
454 golf swing. *Sports Engineering*, *11*, 165-175. doi: 10.1007/s12283-009-0020-9
455

456 Milburn, P. (1982). Summation of segmental velocities in the golf swing. *Medicine and Science*
457 *in Sports and Exercise*, *14*, 60-64. doi: PMID:7070260
458

459 Myers, J., Lephart, S., Tsai, Y. S., Sell, T., Smoliga, J., & Jolly, J. (2008). The role of upper torso
460 and pelvis rotation in driving performance during the golf swing. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *26*,
461 181-188. doi: 10.1080/02640410701373543
462

463 Osis, S. T., & Stefanyshyn, D. J. (2012). Golf players exhibit changes to grip speed parameters
464 during club release in response to changes in club stiffness. *Human Movement Science*, *31*, 91-
465 100. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2011.02.006
466

467 Pickering, W. M., & Vickers, G. T. (1999). On the double pendulum model of the golf swing.
468 *Sports Engineering*, 2, 161-172. doi: 10.1046/j.1460-2687.1999.00028.x
469

470 Sprigings, E. J., & Neal, R. J. (2000). An insight into the importance of wrist torque in driving the
471 golfball: A simulation study. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, 16, 356-366.
472

473 Suzuki, S., Hoshino, Y., & Kobayashi, Y. (2009). Skill analysis of the wrist release in the golf
474 swings utilising shaft elasticity. *Journal of System Design and Dynamics*, 3, 47-58. doi:
475 10.1299/jsdd.3.47
476

477 Sweeney, M., Mills, P., Mankad, A., Elliott, B., & Alderson, J. (2012). Wrist kinematics during
478 the golf drive from a bilaterally anatomical perspective. In L. Bradshaw, A. Burnett, & P. Hume
479 (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Biomechanics in Sports*. Melbourne,
480 International Society of Biomechanics in Sport.
481

482 Teu, K. K., Kim, W., Fuss, F. K., & Tan, J. (2006). The analysis of golf swing as a kinematic chain
483 using dual euler angle algorithm. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 39, 1227-1238. doi:
484 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2005.03.013
485

486 Tucker, B. C., Anderson, R., & Kenny, I. C. (2013). Is outcome related to movement variability in
487 golf? *Sports Biomechanics*, 12, 343-354.
488

489 Wallace, E. S., & Hubbell, J. E. (2001). The effect of golf club shaft stiffness on golf performance
490 variables – implications for club-fitting. In F. H. Froes, & S. J. Haake (Eds.), *Materials and Science
491 in Sports* (pp. 23-25). USA: TMS.
492

493 Wallace, E. S., Otto, S. R., & Nevill, A. (2007). Ball launch conditions for skilled golfers using
494 drivers of different lengths in an indoor testing facility. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 7, 731-737.
495 doi: 10.1080/02640410601113221
496

497 White, R. (2006). On the efficiency of the golf swing. *American Journal of Physics*, 74, 1088-
498 1094. doi: 10.1119/1.2346688
499

500 Wiseman, F., & Chatterjee, S. (2006). Comprehensive analysis of golf performance on the PGA
501 Tour: 1990-2004. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 102, 109-117. doi: 10.2466/pms.102.1.109-117
502

503 Wishon, T. (2011). *The new search for the perfect golf club*. Arizona: Fireship Press.
504

505 Woltring, H. J. (1986). A fortran package for generalised, cross-validatory spline smoothing and
506 differentiation. *Advanced Engineering Software*, 8, 104-113. doi: 10.1016/0141-1195(86)90098-7
507

508 Worobets, J. T., & Stefanyshyn, D. J. (2007). Stiffness significantly influences golf clubhead speed
509 at impact. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 40(S2), 279. doi: 10.1080/14763141.2012.674154
510

511 LIST OF TABLES

512 **Table 1** Properties of the two drivers fitted with the high and low kick point shafts.

513 **Table 2** Placements of the retro-reflective markers and defined joint coordinate systems.

514 **Table 3** Summary of the segment swing kinematics ($M \pm SD$).

515 **Table 4** Swing and launch parameters for the drivers fitted with the high and low kick point shafts
516 ($M \pm SD$).

517 **Table 5** Linear regression models explaining clubhead speed for the drivers fitted with the high
518 and low kick point shafts.

519

520 LIST OF FIGURES

521 **Figure 1** Method used to determine qualitative stiffness grading of shafts.

522 **Figure 2** Flexural rigidity (EI) profiles for the high and low kick point shafts. Higher EI values
523 indicate higher stiffness.

524 **Figure 3a** Ensemble averages of lateral bending, flexion/extension and axial rotation angular
525 displacement data. The ensemble averages are shown for the trunk and lower trunk segments from
526 the top of the backswing (0%) to ball impact (100%) for both the high kick point and low kick
527 point drivers. Shaded areas represent one standard deviation from the mean.

528 **Figure 3b** Ensemble averages of wrist radial / ulnar deviation angular displacement data. The
529 ensemble averages are shown from the top of the backswing (0%) to ball impact (100%) for both
530 the high kick point and low kick point drivers. Shaded areas represent one standard deviation from
531 the mean.

532 **Figure 4** Ensemble averages of trunk, lower trunk and wrist angular velocity data. The ensemble
533 averages are shown from the top of the backswing (0%) to ball impact (100%) for both the high
534 kick point and low kick point drivers.