

Brian Mackenzie's
Successful Coaching

Issue 17 November 2004

Increases in joint range of motion with the Bodywall system

Patria A Hume, Simon Pearson and Chris Whatman present the results of their study to determine the effectiveness of the Bodywall system in improving joint range of motion

Flexibility has important implications in terms of sporting performance, health and fitness, and general movement function. The Bodywall is a new training tool developed to help improve joint range of motion. This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of the Bodywall system in improving joint range of motion. Forty-five subjects from the general active population were assigned to one of three groups (Bodywall stretching; control stretching; no stretching) and measured for joint range of motion before and after a six-week intervention period. The two stretching groups both produced significant increases in joint range of motion, with the Bodywall group showing greater improvement. No changes in range of motion were seen in the non-stretching group.

Introduction

The range of motion (ROM) around a joint (Prentice, 1983) can be referred to as either static or dynamic flexibility. Static flexibility is the degree to which a joint can be passively moved to its end point of range of motion and dynamic flexibility is the joint's ease of movement through its ROM (Blum and Beaudoin, 2000). Angular measurements of limits of joints motion are usually used to determine static flexibility, whereas dynamic flexibility is examined by measures of muscle stiffness (Knudson, 1999). Muscle stiffness is defined as the force required to produce a given change in length (Shrier and Gossal, 2000).

Improving flexibility is an important goal in the training and rehabilitation of athletes, as increases in flexibility are thought to help prevent injuries (Muir, Chesworth and Vandervoort, 1999) and to enhance performance (Godges, MacRae and Engelke, 1993). Flexibility is also an important aspect of clinical rehabilitation. The most common and easiest method of improving flexibility is through stretching exercises including static, passive, ballistic, and pro-

prioceptive neuromuscular facilitation (PNF) techniques. Increases in ROM have been reported following both chronic (Draper, Miner, Knight and Ricard, 2002) and acute stretching (Godges et al, 1993; McNair and Stanley, 1996) in a variety of joints. The indication from previous studies has been that static stretching and PNF stretching are the most effective in terms of increasing joint ROM, with any difference between these two methods being inconclusive (Condon and Hutton, 1986; Gribble, Guskiewicz, Prentice and Shields, 1999). For our study static stretching was chosen over PNF due to the relative simplicity of the static

'The Bodywall stretching system is a novel tool for increasing joint range of motion'

stretching method, and because the majority of the target subject group (active, general population) were likely to have previously experienced static stretching, but possibly not PNF. Previous studies also indicated that the greatest changes in ROM were gained when stretches were held for 15 to 30 seconds (Bandy, Irion and Briggler, 1997; Feland, Myrer, Schulthies, Fellingham and Measom, 2001; Madding, Wong, Hallum and Medeiros, 1987; Mohr, Pink, Elsner and Kvitne, 1998) and were repeated three to five times (Taylor, Brooks, and Ryan, 1997).

What is Bodywall?

The Bodywall stretching system is a novel tool for increasing joint range of motion. Users wear gloves and slip-on shoes covered in velcro-like grips made from 3M Nulock to attach their hands and feet to a wall and floor construction which is also covered in Velcro-like material (see Figure 1). The purpose of our study was to investigate the effects of Bodywall stretching on lower limb joint range of motion after a six-week stretching intervention period.

Methods

Forty-five subjects were recruited from the general population and randomly assigned into three groups: (1) experimental, (2) stretching control, (3) pure control. All subjects had their ROM measured immediately before and after completing a six-week intervention period. For the experimental group, the intervention period consisted of supervised stretching sessions three times per week using the Bodywall to perform a series of stretches covering most of the major joints in the body. Stretches were performed as a 20-second static stretch repeated three times, with each repetition interspersed with a brief period during which no stretch was applied. The stretching control group completed essentially the same intervention period as the experimental, except that the stretches were performed without the aid of the Bodywall. The pure control group had no stretching intervention, simply maintaining their normal activity levels for the six-week period.

Flexibility measures assessed ROM for gastrocnemius, hip flexors, knee extensors, hamstrings, shoulder extension, and shoulder abduction. Digital video footage was captured of each subject performing three repetitions of each ROM measure. Markers were taped over the greater trochanter, femoral lateral epicondyle, lateral malleolus, lateral aspect of the fifth metatarsal head,



Figure 1: A sample stretch using the Bodywall.

and the acromion process. Using images taken from the video footage the relevant joint angles were measured for each of the repetitions using Silicon Coach video analysis software.

Analysis

Means and standard deviations were calculated from the three trials for all ROM measurements (pre- and post-intervention). Change scores and 95% confidence intervals for the size of the change in ROM from pre to post-intervention were calculated.

Results and discussion

Descriptive characteristics of the 45 participants are exhibited in Table 1. The three groups were closely matched in terms of age, weight, height, and the average amount of exercise performed in a week. Groups were also matched for gender, with both the experimental and stretching control groups consisting of nine females and six males, while the pure control group consisted of eight females and seven males. One of the most important areas in terms of group

matching for a stretching intervention study is pre-intervention joint ROM. As this study involved a number of range of motion measures we were not able to match groups directly from individuals' range of motion results. However, as the largest source of variation in flexibility was gender, matching groups for gender should have acted as a fairly effective control.

Results (see Table 2) show that for the group stretching with the Bodywall significant improvements were seen from baseline for the gastrocnemius (5.9°), hip flexors (4.2°), and hamstring measures (8.3°), in addition to a substantial improvement in shoulder abduction ROM (4.6°). In comparison, the stretching control group exhibited a significant improvement in hip flexor ROM (4.1°), with substantial improvements also seen in the hamstrings (3.4°) and shoulder abduction (3.7°) measures. Based on reliability assessment the measurement error for the ROM measures used in this study was 3-4°, meaning that any change over this amount could be confidently interpreted as an actual

change. It is worth noting that in all measures, except for shoulder extension, the Bodywall stretching group improved more than the stretching control group, with the difference in the hamstrings and gastrocnemius measures being statistically significant. No real changes were seen in the pure control group, with all differences falling within the range of what could be considered normal systematic measurement error based on the results of the pre-study reliability testing.

Our study did not allow us to determine the mechanisms behind the greater improvements when stretching with the Bodywall than when performing standard static stretches. Potential mechanisms are an increased contribution from body weight to the stretch as well as a reduction in antagonistic muscle action whilst performing the stretch. The greater freedom of position selection may also play a role in improving the effectiveness of a stretch, in particular with stretches such as the elevated leg hamstring stretch in which the foot can be placed at variable heights in order to facilitate the stretch.

However, it cannot be discounted that the greater improvements exhibited by the Bodywall stretching group were the result of some sort of novelty effect, with the subjects using the Bodywall being more rigorous with their stretching due to the use of a new and potentially more interesting piece of equipment, in contrast to the control stretching to which they will have already been exposed.

Conclusion

The Bodywall system was effective in improving joint range of motion following a six-week stretching programme. The results show stretching with the Bodywall to be generally more effective than unassisted static stretching. However, the mechanistic causes for this difference could not be determined from the measures in this study.

*Patria A Hume, Simon Pearson,
Chris Whatman
New Zealand Institute of Sport and
Recreation Research,
Auckland University of Technology*

Table 1: Descriptive characteristics for 45 participants

	Experimental (n = 15)	Stretch control (n = 15)	Pure control (n = 15)	Entire group (n = 45)
Age (years)	25.2 ± 8.0	26.7 ± 6.7	26.7 ± 4.3	26.2 ± 6.4
Weight (kg)	65.8 ± 9.9	67.9 ± 12.3	72.5 ± 8.5	68.3 ± 11.0
Height (cm)	170.9 ± 7.0	171.9 ± 7.9	175.1 ± 9.9	172.6 ± 8.3
Exercise (hrs/wk)	5.9 ± 3.6	6.5 ± 3.8	6.1 ± 3.5	6.1 ± 3.6

Results presented as mean SD. No significant differences between any of the groups (p<0.05).

Table 2: Average changes in joint range of motion (95% confidence limit) following the six-week stretching intervention period

Measure	Experimental	Stretching control	Pure control
Gastrocnemius	5.9° (3.2-8.6)**	2.7° (1.1-4.3)	1.6° (-0.6-3.7)
Hip flexors	4.2° (2.8-5.6)*	4.1° (2.7-5.5)*	-0.3° (-1.8-1.0)
Quadriceps	1.8° (-2.1-5.6)	0.6° (-2.8-4.0)	1.5° (-0.9-3.9)
Hamstrings	8.3° (5.8-10.8)*†	3.4° (0.7-6.1)	0.8° (-1.7-3.2)
Shoulder extension	1.6° (-0.1-3.2)	2.5° (-0.3-5.4)	0.9° (-0.5-2.4)
Shoulder abduction	4.6° (1.7-7.5)	3.7° (1.8-5.6)	1.5° (-1.0-3.9)

* = significant (p<0.05) greater improvement from baseline.

† = significant (p<0.05) greater improvement than stretching control.

Contributors

Brian Grasso Brian is the president of Developing Athletics which is a company dedicated to educating coaches, trainers, parents and youth sporting officials throughout the world on the concepts of athletic development. He is also the director of Athlete Development for the Sports Academy Northwest in Chicago Illinois. Brian can be contacted through his website at www.DevelopingAthletics.com

Danny M. O'Dell MA Danny is an NSCA certified strength and conditioning coach from the USA. He is the author of four training manuals: *Wilderness Basics*, *Strength Training Secrets*, *Composite Training* and *Power up your Driving Muscles*. Danny has published articles in national and international magazines describing the benefits of living the healthy fitness lifestyle. Danny can be contacted through his website at www.Explosivelyfit.com

Dave Zimmer Dave is a teacher, coach and high school principal in Nebraska. He runs workshops for coaches on incorporating character into coaching. Dave can be contacted through his website at www.davezimmerspeaks.com

Jeremy Boone Jeremy is a speed and conditioning consultant in the USA. His clients have included the NFL Carolina Panthers and the WUSA Atlanta Beat. He can be contacted through his website at www.athletebydesign.com

Matthew Barreau Mathew is an assistant track and field coach at Adams State College, a USATF Level II certified endurance coach and a USATF Level II certified sprints/hurdles/relays coach. He can be contacted through his college website at athletics.adams.edu

Nigel Hetherington CChem MRSC Mathew is an assistant track and field coach at Adams State College, a USATF Level II certified endurance coach and a USATF Level II certified sprints/hurdles/relays coach. He can be contacted through his college website at athletics.adams.edu

Patria Hume PhD Patria is head of research in the Division of Sport and Recreation, and is a director for Hume Management Consultants Limited, Sports Science New Zealand, New Zealand Gymnastics, and the International Society of Biomechanics in Sports.

Brian Mackenzie Brian is a UK Athletics level 4 performance coach and a coach tutor. He has been coaching sprint, middle distance and combined event athletes for the past 20+ years and has 35+ years experience as an endurance athlete. Brian is the editor of the *Successful Coaching Newsletter* and can be contacted through his website at www.brianmac.demon.co.uk

Talk about this issue online

Have you visited our online community yet?

It's a thriving place where coaches, athletes and sportspeople can meet to chat about training, fitness and all the other things our readers care about. A place where you can ask questions, get help, offer opinions and make friends. Brian Mackenzie and other members of the *Successful Coaching* team drop by regularly to give advice and join in the chat.

It's 100% free and very easy to use. Just go to:

www.pponline.co.uk/community

From here, you'll be able to see what other community members are talking about. To join in, simply register and choose a username and password.

Brian Mackenzie's Successful Coaching

Successful Coaching is published by Electric Word Publishing plc.
67-71 Goswell Road, London EC1V 7EP

Editor: Brian Mackenzie

Customer services: Mike Hurst

Email: mike.hurst@electricwordplc.com

Please call + 44 (0)20 7954 3426 or email mike.hurst@electricwordplc.com if you have a problem with your subscription

Every care is taken to assure the accuracy of the information in *Successful Coaching*, but no responsibility can be accepted for the consequences of actions based on the advice contained herein

© 2004 Electric Word Publishing. All rights reserved