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Do existing surface meet the requirements of the user?

What do the users see as important?
Do existing surface meet the requirements of the user?

Current surfaces are designed and built with little to no input from the end user.

There is no systematic approach to evaluate feedback from users to ascertain the quality of existing surfaces.

Many surfaces are designed based on past experience/expertise and ‘what has worked well in the past!?’
What do the users see as important?

The performance requirement of the user are not fully understood.

Factors seen as important by one group of users may not be considered important by another!

The preferences of users may be different between sports, skill level and even playing positions.
Case Study (Field Hockey)

Three Significant Sections of Data Collection:

1. In-depth Qualitative Subjective Interviews (N = 22)
2. Quantitative Preference Questionnaires (N = 204)
3. Pitch Specific Questionnaires (N = 87)
Structured Relationship Model

- Ball Roll
  - Consistency of ball roll
  - Ball roll distance
  - Ball bounce consistency

- BALL/SURFACE INTERACTION
  - Ball Spin
    - Generated by the player
    - Relationship between ball roll distance and carpet density
  - Ball Bounce
    - Generated by the player
    - Angle of ball bounce
    - Height of ball bounce

- PLAYER PERFORMANCE
  - Effect of pitch type on ball spin
  - Relationship between surface hardness and injury

- PLAYING ENVIRONMENT
  - Weather conditions
    - Effect of irrigation on surface abrasiveness
  - Relationship between pitch type and surface abrasiveness

- SPORTSURF
  - Sport Surfaces Research Forum
  - www.sportsurf.org
Importance Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Characteristics</th>
<th>Importance Rating (1 = not at all important; 7 = extremely important)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height of Ball Bounce</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underfoot Grip</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Roll Speed</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Ball Spin</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Hardness</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Perform Skills</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Uniformity</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Players’ Preferences

Mean Score (1 = low, slow or soft & 7 = high, fast or hard)

- Height of Ball Bounce: 1.87
- Underfoot Grip: 4.97
- Ball Roll Speed: 6.11
- Surface Hardness: 3.62
Surface Measurements

- 6 pitches measured for:
  
  Ball Rebound Resilience/Height
  
  Underfoot Grip (both Translational and Rotational)
  
  Ball Roll Distance/Surface Pace
  
  Surface Hardness/Stiffness (Berlin and Clegg Hammer)

- Pitches assessed adhering to FIH protocol
Ball Rebound Height
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Underfoot grip – Pendulum Tester

Perceived
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Measured Linear Coefficient of Friction

Perceived Underfoot Grip (1 = low, 7 = high)
$R^2 = 0.8506$

Measured Rotational Traction (Nm) vs. Perceived Underfoot Grip (1 = low, 7 = high)
Surface Hardness - Berlin

Perceived Measured

www.sportsurf.org
$R^2 = 0.9685$
Conclusion

• Players perceived performance characteristics were identified and the ‘ideal’ surface features were obtained.

• Players are sensitive to pitch differences and the questionnaire was a suitable method to elicit perceptions for each surface.

• The usefulness of Berlin artificial athlete, ball rebound resilience and rotational traction test equipment/methods to index/classify sports surface have been reinforced by strong correlations with players perceptions.

• The appropriateness of ‘ball roll’ and ‘pendulum friction’ tests have been brought into question.
3rd Generation Pitches for Rugby

• A questionnaire survey of elite Rugby (league and union) players was conducted to elicit opinions on the suitability of artificial surfaces.

• Natural grass in ideal conditions was preferred by the majority of players’. However, in ‘bad’ weather conditions artificial alternatives were considered a better option.
3rd Generation Pitches for Rugby

Once familiarised with artificial turf it was considered to provide an excellent facility to train and develop skills.

A high proportion of players suggested their game had changed through training regularly on artificial turf.
Summary

• Before we can become confident in producing improved sports surfaces we need to understand the requirements of the user.

• A more systematic approach to elicit user requirements is necessary and should become more widely used.

• The influence of the surface on a sport and sports technique is not always clear and needs to be investigated.