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1 Introduction

Free fall occupies a large chunk of a standard course in introductory mechanics. For completeness, once Newton’s laws are learned, the physics of the takeoff should be discussed. Although humans are in a privileged position of not having to jump to navigate or to escape predators, jumping still holds enchantment, an expression of joy, or a climactic flourish to a sequence of moves in sports and dance [1]. One can leverage the popularity of sports [2] and dance to get students excited at applying the physics they learned to investigate the jump through construction of a simple model.

Most discussions on jumping take as a starting point a force that develops between the object and the ground. Although a lot can be extracted from this model, particularly if a force plate is used to measure the ground force [3] [4] [5] [6], one drawback is that we know that jumping is initiated internally through muscle contractions before the force is communicated to the ground, so from a pedagogical perspective it would be nice to have a simple solvable model that attempts to show how internal forces causally lead to the development of external forces. Moreover, since this model considers the internal structure of the jumper, we will be able to predict the ground force generated by a human jumper, finding good agreement with force plate measurements.

In this paper we use Newton’s 3rd law to deduce the simplest model of an object that can perform a standing vertical jump – a two-segmented object with an initial constant repulsive force between the segments, followed by an abrupt attractive force. Such an object, when placed on a sturdy ground, will jump, and the motion can be calculated using only the constant acceleration equations, making the example suitable for algebra-based physics. We then proceed to solve for the motion of an $n$-segmented object, and determine the optimal number of segments for jumping. We then discuss a few similarities and
Figure 1: Left – an internal repulsion causes separation of the two segments. Right – after a max separation distance $d$, the opposite force-pair become attractive.

differences of this simple model from jumping robots and jumping humans, and then conclude by arguing the model’s pedagogical merits.

2 Deducing the Model

Consider an organism made of two parts, a top segment of mass $m_1$, and a bottom segment of mass $m_2$, resting on a hard surface. Given that internal forces between the top and bottom segments must be equal but opposite, one can ask students whether the internal force pair that initiates the jump is attractive or repulsive. Students can reason that the top segment must move upwards before the bottom segment can, so there must be an upward force produced internally on the top segment, and from Newton’s 3rd law, an equal downwards force on the bottom segment, hence initially there is repulsion: see Fig. 1. The top segment accelerates upward, but the bottom segment is prevented from accelerating downward due to the ground, which therefore supplies an external upwards force. As the top segment displaces upward, its separation from the bottom segment (which remains static, pressed into the ground) increases. This separation cannot continue indefinitely if the object is to not break apart, so the internal forces must change their direction and become attractive as the upper segment pulls the bottom segment upwards, and from Newton’s 3rd law, is itself pulled downwards by the bottom segment. One can then ask students to make an analogy of this model with jumping by humans, and would likely get answers discussing how, from a crouched position, muscles exert internal forces causing humans to unfold, but once the human has completely straightened to
reach maximum separation, muscle forces switch to joint forces to prevent the two halves from separating.

3 Solving the Model

To calculate the speed at which the object leaves the ground, we model the initial phase of the jump as comprising a constant repulsive force $F$ exerted over a maximum separation distance of $d$ between the two segments. Once the distance $d$ is reached, we model the attractive force between the two segments as an abrupt completely inelastic collision, after which the segments are locked together.

The velocity of the upper segment under constant acceleration $a = \frac{F - m_1 g}{m_1}$ over a distance $d$ is

$$v_f = \sqrt{2 \left( \frac{F - m_1 g}{m_1} \right) d + v_i^2}. \quad (1)$$

We model the second phase as a completely inelastic collision between the lower and upper segments, where the final velocity of the combined system is:

$$v_f' = \frac{m_1 v_f}{m_1 + m_2} \quad (2)$$

$$= \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \sqrt{2 \left( \frac{F - m_1 g}{m_1} \right) d + v_i^2},$$

Once in the air, the object is in free-fall and the height of the jump is given by

$$h = \frac{v_f'^2}{2g} \quad (3)$$

$$= \frac{m_1}{(m_1 + m_2)^2} \left( \frac{F - m_1 g}{g} \right) d,$$

where $v_i$ was set to zero because the upper segment is initially at rest.

Traditionally, collisions are treated long after Newton’s 3rd law and the constant acceleration equations [7]. We therefore in Appendix B offer an alternate derivation of Eq.(2) using only the constant acceleration equations, so that the model can be introduced earlier.

4 Extension to N-Segments

We simplify the problem by having all segments be the same, $m_1 = m_2 = ... = m_N = m$, and that the $n^{th}$ segment does not turn on its repulsion until the
Figure 2: The multi-segment system treated like a two-segment system, where one of the segments is the dotted box comprising \( n-1 \) segments, and the \( n^{th} \) segment lies just below.

\((n - 1)^{th}\) segment has collided with the \((n - 2)^{th}\) segment: see Fig. 2. At that moment denote the velocity of the entire upper mass of \((n - 1)m\) as \( v_{n-1} \). After completing the interaction with the \( n^{th} \) mass, the new velocity \( v_n \) of the combined mass \( nm \) is, using Eq. (2),

\[
v_n = \frac{(n - 1)m}{(n - 1)m + m} \sqrt{2 \left( \frac{F - (n - 1)mg}{(n - 1)m} \right) \frac{d}{m} + v_{n-1}^2}.
\] (4)

Plugging in a few numbers

\[
v_2 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2 \left( \frac{F - mg}{m} \right) \frac{d}{m} + 0^2} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{d}{m} \sqrt{F - mg}}
\] (5)

\[
v_3 = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 \left( \frac{F - 2mg}{2m} \right) \frac{d}{m} + v_2^2} = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{\frac{d}{m} \sqrt{F - \frac{5}{3} mg}}
\]

\[
v_4 = \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{2 \left( \frac{F - 3mg}{3m} \right) \frac{d}{m} + v_3^2} = \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{\frac{d}{m} \sqrt{F - \frac{7}{3} mg}}.
\]

From the pattern we guess \( v_n = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{n} \sqrt{\frac{d}{m} \sqrt{F - \frac{2n-1}{3} mg}}} \) which we can verify by indeed showing that it satisfies Eq. (4). Therefore for \( N \) identical segments the velocity upon takeoff and maximum height attained are:
\[ v_f = \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{N}} \sqrt{\frac{d}{m}} \sqrt{\frac{F - \frac{2N-1}{3}mg}{g}} \]  
Eq. (6) is also derived in Appendix A using the work-kinetic energy theorem.

5 Interpreting the N-Segment Result

If we express the force \( F \) between segments as a multiple \( \alpha \) of the weight \( mg \) of each segment \( (F = \alpha mg) \), so that \( \alpha \) is the strength-to-weight ratio of each segment, then the height in Eq. (6) becomes:

\[ h = \frac{v_f^2}{2g} = \frac{N-1}{N} \left( \frac{1}{2m} \right) \left( F - \frac{2N-1}{3}mg \right) d. \]

The height of the jump is proportional to the uncoiling length \( d \) between segments, but for a given \( \alpha \), different values of \( N \) maximize the height \( h \). Students in algebra-based physics courses can numerically plug in different \( \alpha \) values and use graphing tools to find the \( N \) value which maximizes \( h \) (see Fig. 3).
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Figure 3: Jump height ratio \( h/d \) vs number of segments \( N \), for different values of the strength-to-weight ratio \( \alpha \) of each segment. The curves have a decreasing tail that goes as \( h/d = \frac{\alpha + 1}{2} - \frac{N}{3} + O(\frac{1}{N}) \), which is the large-\( N \) limit of Eq. (7).

Calculus yields the exact result of \( N_{\text{max}}(\alpha) = \sqrt{\frac{3\alpha + 1}{2}} \) and \( h_{\text{max}}(\alpha) = h(N_{\text{max}}(\alpha)) = \)}
\[
\frac{\sqrt{3\alpha+1}-\sqrt{2}}{6}d, \quad \text{which implies that the greater the force each segment can exert relative to its weight, the more segments you can add to maximize your jump before adding becomes counterproductive. When } \alpha = 2.3 \text{ the maximum height occurs when there are two segments, and when } \alpha = 5.7 \text{ the maximum height occurs when there are three segments.}
\]

For humans, the number of segments can be estimated to be between \( N = 2 \) and \( N = 3 \) (e.g. one can uncoil at both the knees and the hips using the quadriceps and glutes, respectively), suggesting \( 2.3 < \alpha < 5.7 \). In Eq. (8) we show that the ground force (as would be measured by a force plate) throughout the jump varies from a minimum value of \( F_{g}^{\text{min}} = (\alpha + 1)mg \) to a maximum value of \( F_{g}^{\text{max}} = (\alpha + N - 1)mg \), which when written in terms of the total mass \( M = Nm \) corresponds to \( F_{g}^{\text{min}} = \frac{(\alpha + 1)}{N}Mg \) and \( F_{g}^{\text{max}} = \frac{(\alpha + N - 1)}{N}Mg \). Plugging in \( \alpha = 2.3 \) for \( N = 2 \) and \( \alpha = 5.7 \) for \( N = 3 \) predicts that a force plate would measure 1.7\( Mg \) for 2 segments and between 2.2\( Mg \) and 2.6\( Mg \) for 3 segments. This is not too far from force plate measurements which put the force measured as between 2\( Mg \) and 2.4\( Mg \).\(^1\)

### 6 Mechanical Realization of Multiple Segments

The two-segment model kind of resembles a robot leg powered by a hydraulic cylinder, where expansion of the cylinder provides the repulsive force and separation of the upper and lower segments is achieved by opening at the hinge: see

---

\(^1\)One can avoid calculus by noting that Eq. (7) can be written as
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Figure 5: Two segments that repel via the muscle-joint-kneecap system, the sum of whose forces has an upward component.

Fig. 4. It should be noted that the cylinder, being connected to both the lower and upper segments, must deform as the two segments separate, which it does by extending.

Muscle and joints are more complicated. In Fig. 5 the contraction of the muscle, which we model with a tension $T$ in the string, causes an attractive rather than a repulsive force. However, the hinge itself provides a reaction force $R$ that ultimately causes a net upward force on the upper segment. The force $N$ comes from the normal force of the string wrapped around the kneecap. Analysis of such a device is most natural in terms of torque, where it becomes obvious that the tension $T$ causes the center of mass of the top segment to move upwards as it rotates clockwise, despite the fact that it is pulling downward.

7 Conclusion

Accurate biomechanical models of humans can go as far as having 16 rigid bodies joined together comprising 38 degrees of freedom [8], which resists any attempts at an analytic solution. Analytic solutions for the jumping motion of springs [9, 10] have been made, but as the forces are not constant, they require the solving of differential equations. In theory at least, students who know the principles of physics but lack knowledge of calculus can model a varying force by partitioning the force over many small intervals and assuming the force is constant within each interval. Interesting investigations can be made using such partitions [11], and are more in the spirit of physics than integrating a function. Although historically calculus and physics are connected, the very existence of algebra-based physics courses indicates the belief that the essential features of
physics do not require calculus. Why limit constant force equations to constant forces?

A N-segments Using Work Kinetic-Energy Equation

When \( n \) segments are in the air, the ground must support the weight of \( N - n \) segments, along with the force \( F \) pressing on these segments:

\[
F_{\text{ground}}^{(n)} = (N - n)mg + F.
\]

(8)

Therefore the net external force on the entire system when \( n \) segments are in the air is:

\[
F_{\text{net}}^{(n)} = F_{\text{ground}}^{(n)} - Nmg = F - nmg.
\]

(9)

When \( n \) segments move upwards a distance \( d \), the center of mass of the system moves upward by:

\[
\Delta X_{\text{COM}}^{(n)} = \frac{nd}{N}.
\]

(10)

Therefore using the work kinetic-energy equation:

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} F_{\text{net}}^{(n)} \Delta X_{\text{COM}}^{(n)} = \Delta K
\]

(11)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (F - nmg) \frac{nd}{N} = K_f
\]

Using the famous sums \( \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n = \frac{N(N-1)}{2}, \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n^2 = \frac{(N-1)N(2N-1)}{6} \), along with setting \( K_f = Nmgd \) for free-fall, one gets:

\[
\left( \frac{N(N-1)}{2}F - \frac{(N-1)N(2N-1)}{6}mg \right) \frac{d}{N} = Nmgd
\]

(12)

\[
\frac{N-1}{N} \left( \frac{1}{2m} \right) \left( \frac{F - \frac{(2N-1)mg}{g}}{g} \right) d = h,
\]

which agrees with Eq. (6).

B Constant Force Impulse Approximation

To derive Eq. (2) without collision equations, we assume that after the repulsive force \( F \) acts for a distance \( d \), the constant attractive force \( F' \) acts for a distance
\( \epsilon \), after which both segments lock together and move at the same velocity \( v_f' \).

The top segment deaccelerates to

\[
v_f' = \sqrt{v_f^2 - \frac{F'}{m_1} \epsilon}
\]

in time

\[
t = \frac{v_f - v_f'}{\frac{F'}{m_1}}
\]

while the bottom segment accelerates to

\[
v_f' = \frac{F'}{m_2} \left( \frac{v_f - v_f'}{\frac{F'}{m_1}} \right)
\]

\[
v_f' = \frac{m_1 v_f}{m_1 + m_2},
\]

which proves Eq. (2). Moreover, we see that for Eqs (13) and (14) to be equal, we must have

\[
F' = \left( \frac{v_f^2}{2\epsilon} \right) \frac{m_1 m_2 (2m_1 + m_2)}{(m_1 + m_2)^2}.
\]

Therefore we have the freedom to make \( \epsilon \) very small with the corresponding \( F' \) in Eq. (15) very large, such that their product in Eq. (13) is unchanged. We can then neglect \( \epsilon \) whenever compared to \( d \), so that we may still say that two segments lock and move together when their separation distance reaches \( d \).
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