IMPROVING HAMMER THROW TECHNIQUE AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Saidova Sarvinoz Iskandar kizi
Asia International University Department of Physical Culture
E-mail boymurodovg@icloud.com
0009-0008-2230-1185

Abstract

This paper presents a methodological framework for improving hammer throw technique among university students. It considers the relationship between preliminary swings, rotational footwork, delivery, and recovery, and proposes a progressive sequence of special preparatory exercises. Particular attention is given to individual differences, movement consistency, instructor feedback, and the assessment of technical learning. Published biomechanical analyses provide the technical background, while the instructional sequence represents a practical proposal for university teaching. No experimental intervention was conducted; consequently, the paper does not claim measured improvements in performance. The proposed framework can guide lesson planning and provide a basis for future evaluation in university physical education and sports training programmes.

Keywords: hammer throw, university students, technical preparation, coordination, special preparatory exercises, motor learning, video feedback.

Introduction

Hammer throwing is a technically demanding athletics event in which the athlete must coordinate body movement with the motion of an external implement. Successful instruction therefore requires more than developing muscular strength. Students must learn how to establish a controlled hammer path, enter the first turn, connect successive turns, and complete delivery while retaining balance. These elements should be taught as related parts of one movement rather than as isolated positions.

The university setting presents particular teaching challenges. Students differ in previous athletics experience, physical preparation, confidence, and ability to learn rotational movements. Some may understand verbal explanations quickly but struggle to reproduce the movement, whereas others benefit primarily from demonstration and guided practice. A common lesson objective can therefore require different preparatory tasks and rates of progression.

Published championship analyses describe release parameters, turn durations, support phases, and other characteristics of hammer throwing [1–3]. These variables help identify meaningful features for observation. However, elite performance should not become a rigid model imposed on beginners. Instruction should translate biomechanical knowledge into achievable tasks appropriate to the student's current level.

The biomechanical literature also examines hammer speed, centre of mass motion, cable force, and angular momentum [4–8]. These areas provide a foundation for understanding why coordinated movement is essential. Their practical application requires instructors to select explanations and exercises that students can understand and perform.

Purpose and Methodological Scope

The purpose of this paper is to develop a structured approach to technical improvement in university hammer throw instruction. The proposed approach combines published biomechanical knowledge with practical teaching recommendations.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

The paper is a theoretical and methodological discussion rather than a systematic review or an experimental study. No participants were recruited, and no original performance measurements were collected. Accordingly, the instructional sequence and assessment procedures presented below require practical evaluation before their effectiveness can be established.

Technical Foundations of the Throw

For teaching purposes, the throw can be organised into preliminary swings, entry into rotation, successive turns, delivery, and recovery. This division provides a useful instructional structure, although the complete action is continuous. A correction made in one phase may influence the next. For example, an uncontrolled entry can make subsequent footwork difficult even when the student understands the required steps.

Preliminary swings should prepare a repeatable entry. At this stage, the instructor observes posture, grip, movement control, and the relationship between the arms and trunk. Students should avoid treating the swings as a separate effort performed at maximum speed. The teaching objective is to establish conditions from which rotation can begin without a sudden loss of balance.

During the turns, attention shifts to coordinated foot contacts and control of the athlete–implement system. Biomechanical descriptions distinguish single-support phases, when one foot contacts the ground, from double-support phases, when both feet are in contact [1–3]. These terms can help instructors analyse movement timing. They should not be simplified into an instruction to keep both feet on the ground for as long as possible, because the quality and sequence of movement also matter.

Research on centre of mass motion and angular momentum demonstrates that hammer throwing involves the interaction of several related mechanical variables [6, 8]. For teaching purposes, this supports attention to the complete movement pattern. Focusing exclusively on arm action or foot placement may overlook the coordination required between body segments and the implement.

Delivery connects the final turn with release. Release velocity, release angle, and release height are measured in biomechanical assessments [2, 3]. In beginner instruction, the immediate objective should be a controlled delivery that follows the preceding movement. An identical release angle should not be prescribed for every student, and throwing distance alone should not determine whether technique has improved.

Initial Assessment and Individualisation

Before introducing full throws, the instructor should assess students through manageable tasks such as controlled pivots, balance exercises, movement imitation, and basic posture checks. The purpose is to identify teaching needs and select an appropriate starting point.

An individual technical profile can record whether the student maintains balance, follows the demonstrated footwork, and connects a swing with a controlled entry. Students who lose orientation during rotation may need additional imitation practice. Those who perform isolated elements correctly but struggle with transitions may benefit from short combinations rather than repeated full attempts.

Individualisation should also consider the student's ability to understand and apply feedback. One student may respond effectively to a demonstration, while another may require a short verbal cue or a slower version of the movement. The instructor should observe whether the selected explanation produces the intended change.

Progression should depend on observable control. Increasing speed, adding turns, or changing the implement introduces additional demands. The instructor should normally change one main task condition at a time so that the source of an improvement or difficulty remains clear. The appropriate implement and exercise complexity should reflect the student's preparation and the available facility.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

Progressive Teaching Sequence

The first stage develops familiarity with the starting position, grip, and controlled swings. Demonstration should be followed by supervised practice and short explanations of the immediate objective. Students can rehearse movement without a release before attempting a complete throw. The instructor should correct excessive tension and unstable posture without interrupting every repetition with multiple instructions.

The second stage introduces rotational footwork without an implement. Students practise a controlled pivot and a single turn, initially at a speed that allows them to recognise foot placement and retain balance. Several separate turns can be rehearsed before they are connected. A student should be able to finish the exercise in control before the instructor increases its complexity.

The third stage links preliminary swings with entry and a limited number of turns. The central task is to preserve continuity between components already practised separately. A suitable training implement may be introduced under supervision when the student demonstrates adequate control. Adding more turns is a progression option rather than evidence of improvement in itself. If continuity deteriorates, the instructor should return to a simpler combination.

The fourth stage integrates delivery and recovery within the full action. Students practise completing the movement without an abrupt, isolated pull at the end. The instructor observes the sequence leading into release and the ability to remain controlled afterwards.

Full throws should be performed in a suitable facility with a protective cage, a clear landing sector, and direct supervision. Retrieval must be coordinated so that no one enters the sector during throwing. These arrangements should be established before integrated practice begins.

Special Preparatory Exercises and Lesson Organisation

Special exercises should address an identified technical objective. Footwork imitation can be used to practise movement sequencing, controlled turning can address orientation, and short swing-to-entry combinations can develop transitions. These exercises are proposed teaching tools, and their value should be assessed through the student's subsequent performance.

General strength and mobility exercises may complement technical work, but they should not replace practice of the event itself. No single exercise should be assumed to correct every student's difficulty. Exercise selection should follow observation of the movement problem and a clear explanation of the intended correction.

A proposed lesson begins with general preparation and an event-specific warm-up, followed by rehearsal of the selected technical element. Students then practise a short combination and, where appropriate, supervised integrated attempts. The lesson ends with a brief review of the learning objective and the next practice task. This structure can be adapted to class size and the available teaching time.

Repetition volume should be adjusted to movement quality and the student's readiness. If balance, concentration, or control deteriorates, additional maximal attempts may no longer serve the immediate learning objective. Rest or a simpler drill may be more appropriate. A teaching record should document the exercise, task conditions, feedback, and observed response rather than only counting attempts.

Feedback and Assessment of Technical Learning

Feedback should be specific and limited to an achievable correction. Instead of asking a student to improve the entire throw, the instructor can select one feature, such as a more controlled entry or a consistent finish. The student then repeats the task with that objective in mind. Short questions about what the student felt or observed can help connect external feedback with personal movement awareness.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

Video recording is proposed as a supplementary teaching tool. Short clips taken from a consistent, safe position can support comparisons across attempts. Students should review one or two relevant features rather than analyse every body segment. Ordinary video can assist qualitative observation, but it should not be presented as an accurate measurement of three-dimensional release velocity without a validated measurement procedure.

Assessment should combine technical observation with performance measures. A practical checklist can cover control of preliminary swings, continuity of entry, repeatability of footwork, coordination through turns, and balance after delivery. Each criterion should have a clear description so that ratings remain consistent. Throwing distance and the proportion of valid attempts can supplement the checklist when testing conditions are comparable.

A future evaluation could compare students before and after a defined teaching period. It should report participant characteristics, teaching content, attendance, implement specifications, and testing procedures. Where feasible, a comparison group receiving usual instruction would strengthen interpretation. Assessors should use the same criteria at both time points, and conclusions should distinguish improved task familiarity from broader technical learning.

Conclusion

Technical improvement in university hammer throwing should be approached through progressive, individualised instruction. Preliminary swings, entry, turns, delivery, and recovery need to be connected into a controlled action. The framework proposed here prioritises manageable exercises, clear progression criteria, and focused feedback.

Assessment should consider movement quality and consistency alongside throwing distance. Published biomechanical research provides a technical foundation, while practical instruction must account for students' initial abilities and learning needs. The effectiveness of the proposed framework should be examined through a clearly described university-based intervention.

References

1. IAAF. (2010). Biomechanical analysis of the hammer throw at the 2009 IAAF World Championships in Athletics. *New Studies in Athletics, 25*(3/4), 37–60.
2. IAAF. (2018). *Biomechanical report for the IAAF World Championships London 2017: Hammer throw men's.* IAAF and Leeds Beckett University.
3. Dinsdale, A., Thomas, A., & Bissas, A. (2018). *Biomechanical report for the IAAF World Championships London 2017: Hammer throw women's.* IAAF and Leeds Beckett University.
4. Castaldi, G. M., Borzuola, R., Camomilla, V., Bergamini, E., Vannozzi, G., & Macaluso, A. (2022). Biomechanics of the hammer throw: Narrative review. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living, 4*, 853536. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2022.853536
5. Dapena, J. (1984). The pattern of hammer speed during a hammer throw and influence of gravity on its fluctuations. *Journal of Biomechanics, 17*(8), 553–559. https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(84)90086-1
6. Dapena, J. (1986). A kinematic study of center of mass motions in the hammer throw. *Journal of Biomechanics, 19*(2), 147–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(86)90144-2
7. Dapena, J., & Feltner, M. E. (1989). Influence of the direction of the cable force and of the radius of the hammer path on speed fluctuations during hammer throwing. *Journal of Biomechanics, 22*(6–7), 565–575. https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(89)90008-0

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.