

PDGA Target Survey - Summary Results

Questions - PDGA Target Survey				Letter Codes in Chart to Left																		
				<<DISAGREE<< N >>>AGREE>>>> 1.6 1.4 1.2 1.0 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2 0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 1.2 1.4 1.6													P	M	S	L		
																	PDGA	DG	Spons	PDGA		
																	Mem	Mfgs	Pros	Leaders		
Current Target Specifications																						
Q1 A	None of the existing target specs need to be updated	B						M											0.42	-0.50	-	0.53
		S						M			P	L							0.02	-0.67	-	0.13
		C			X				P	L									-0.32	-0.71	-0.73	-0.13
Q1 B	A currently approved target should retain its "approved status" for at least 10 more years even if it does not meet some of the revised specs	B																	0.67	1.17	-	0.73
		S									X			P	L		M		0.42	1.00	-	0.48
		C											X				M		-0.10	0.71	-0.21	-0.19
Q1 C	A target should lose its approval if it is modified in the disc catching area with parts not provided by the manufacturer and that modified design had not been approved	B				M	L												-0.51	-1.00	-	-0.82
		S				M													-0.05	-1.00	-	-0.42
		C					M												0.46	-0.71	0.27	0.06

PDGA Target Survey - Summary Results

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		Member Pct (unweighted)			Results
		Disagree	N	Agree	
Current Target Specifications					
Q1 A	None of the existing target specs need to be updated	26%	15%	58%	It appears members don't feel the current guidelines need to be updated for targets used in the lowest tier events but support updated guidelines for higher tiers, which is especially supported by sponsored pros. Manufacturers seem OK with updating all specs as needed.
		40%	16%	44%	
		53%	13%	35%	
Q1 B	A currently approved target should retain its "approved status" for at least 10 more years even if it does not meet some of the revised specs	20%	13%	66%	Overall support for retaining existing target approval indefinitely except there's mild support to eventually phase out older targets for the highest level events.
		29%	13%	59%	
		47%	11%	42%	
Q1 C	A target should lose its approval if it is modified in the disc catching area with parts not provided by the manufacturer and that modified design had not been approved	61%	13%	26%	Members support allowing people to modify baskets with their own materials for use at lower level events but mildly support using only manufacturer provided parts for targets used at the highest level events. Manufacturers seem OK with any parts being added to their targets, regardless of source, and retaining approval for use at all levels.
		45%	14%	41%	
		30%	11%	59%	

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		<<DISAGREE<< N >>>AGREE>>>										PDGA	DG	Spons	PDGA										
		1.6	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	Mem	Mfgs	Pros	Leaders			
Deflection Assemblies																									
Q2 A	All targets approved after 2008 must have a deflection assembly	B												L	P				0.64	-0.33	-	0.42			
		S									M					L	P		1.05	0.00	-	0.85			
		C											M				L	P	S	1.26	0.29	1.44	1.00		
Q2 B	Deflection assembly must not allow discs to penetrate thru the top and fall into the basket	B													P				0.37	-0.17	-	0.24			
		S														P			0.58	-0.17	-	0.48			
		C										M			L	P		S	0.72	0.29	1.25	0.55			
Q2 C	The height of the opening available for discs to strike the deflection assembly above the basket rim should remain the choice of the manufacturer with no PDGA specification	B														P	L		-0.78	-	-	-0.64			
		S														P	L		-1.13	-	-	-0.94			
		C										X					L		-1.29	-	-1.38	-0.97			
Q2 D	Deflection device must be made of chains	B																L	0.28	-0.83	-	-0.24			
		S																L	0.66	0.00	-	0.24			
		C																M	0.86	-0.14	1.44	0.48			
Q2 E	A deflector that makes the sound of chains when struck (sound chip) would be acceptable even if not made with chains	B																P	L	-0.61	0.00	-	-0.44		
		S																P	L	M	-0.81	-0.33	-	-0.59	
		C										S						P	L	M	-0.90	-0.29	-1.31	-0.72	
Q2 F	All new target models submitted for approval after some future date (to be determined) must use the same deflection assembly design, size and be made from the same materials	B																	P	-0.16	-1.17	-	-0.39		
		S																	L	0.19	-1.17	-	-0.27		
		C																M	L	0.45	-0.86	0.31	-0.15		
Q2 G	The exact height of the opening (+/- 2cm) available for discs to strike the deflection device should be set as the same value for all future targets (see dimension A on diagram)	B																L	P	0.75	-0.50	-	0.45		
		S																	M	L	P	1.14	0.33	-	0.85
		C																	M	L		X	1.34	0.43	1.63

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		Member Pct (unweighted)			Results
		Disagree	N	Agree	
Deflection Assemblies					
Q2 A	All targets approved after 2008 must have a deflection assembly	20% 10% 8%	15% 9% 7%	65% 81% 85%	Strong support that all new target models have a deflection assembly. However, manufacturers seem OK if targets made for the lowest tier don't have them.
Q2 B	Deflection assembly must not allow discs to penetrate thru the top and fall into the basket	27% 25% 23%	20% 13% 12%	52% 62% 66%	Strong support that deflector designs prevent discs from entering the basket from the top. Manufacturers appear luke warm regarding that design restriction.
Q2 C	The height of the opening available for discs to strike the deflection assembly above the basket rim should remain the choice of the manufacturer with no PDGA specification	68% 83% 86%	16% 8% 6%	17% 9% 8%	Strong support from all stakeholders that the height of the opening to strike the deflection assembly be established as a specification.
Q2 D	Deflection device must be made of chains	28% 19% 16%	27% 19% 16%	46% 61% 67%	Players love chains in the deflector. Manufacturers don't support that requirement for lower tier baskets and seem neutral for targets used at higher tier levels.
Q2 E	A deflector that makes the sound of chains when struck (sound chip) would be acceptable even if not made with chains	53% 62% 64%	30% 25% 23%	18% 13% 12%	Apparently just the sound of chains isn't enough to replace the real thing if a deflection device could be made from other materials but manufacturers appear less against that option.
Q2 F	All new target models submitted for approval after some future date (to be determined) must use the same deflection assembly design, size and be made from the same materials	46% 35% 31%	20% 16% 13%	34% 49% 57%	Members support the development of a standardized deflection assembly that could be made by any manufacturer for use at higher level events if that can be done in the future. Manufacturers really dislike that idea for any level of target. PDGA leaders mildly don't support the idea or perhaps aren't sure it can be done?
Q2 G	The exact height of the opening (+/- 2cm) available for discs to strike the deflection device should be set as the same value for all future targets (see dimension A on diagram)	18% 9% 8%	13% 5% 3%	70% 86% 89%	This question was asked in the opposite way from Q2C above due to the importance of this concept. Again, we find strong support from all stakeholders to set a spec range for the size of the opening to the deflector although manufacturers don't feel it's necessary for targets produced for the lowest level.

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		<<DISAGREE<< N >>>AGREE>>>										PDGA	DG	Spons	PDGA								
		1.6	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	Mem	Mfgs	Pros	Leaders	
Basket Specifications																							
Q3 A	Future baskets should be designed so discs cannot penetrate from the outside to stick in the side or bottom	B																	0.09	-0.40	-	0.18	
		S										M	X							0.32	0.20	-	0.42
		C											X					S		0.49	0.33	1.06	0.48
Q3 B	Current baskets must be at least 15 cm deep. A maximum depth should also be specified	B																	0.47	0.17	-	0.12	
		S											X	P						0.77	0.50	-	0.33
		C											S	X				P		0.93	0.29	0.19	0.39
Q3 C	Nubs of some sort on the basket rim should be required	B																	-0.59	-1.00	-	-0.84	
		S				M	L	P												-0.46	-1.00	-	-0.53
		C				M	L	P												-0.40	-1.00	-0.31	-0.53
Top of Target																							
Q4 A	Projections like flags or number plates above the target are OK as long as they are uniformly provided on every target	B																	0.53	0.50	-	0.34	
		S																		0.74	0.83	-	0.56
		C																		0.90	0.86	1.25	0.69
Q4 B	No restrictions should be made on what can be attached to or extend upwards from the top of a target	B																	0.22	0.17	-	0.67	
		S																		0.01	0.50	-	0.42
		C																		-0.16	0.57	-0.25	0.27
Rotational Symmetry																							
Q5 A	All targets must be rotationally symmetrical with the pattern repeating at least 12 times (per most existing baskets)	B																	0.22	-1.00	-	-0.03	
		S																		0.64	-1.00	-	0.52
		C																		0.83	-0.86	1.25	0.61
Q5 B	Directional baskets that can be set up to allow better access from some directions than others should be allowed	B																	-0.76	0.33	-	-0.67	
		S																		-1.02	-0.83	-	-1.00
		C																		-1.12	-1.00	-1.69	-1.15
Q5 C	No symmetry at all is necessary. Rocks, benches or trees are acceptable targets.	B																	-0.87	0.00	-	-0.61	
		S																		-1.32	-1.00	-	-1.39
		C																		-1.50	-1.14	-1.69	-1.45
Q5 D	The ideal target would be circularly symmetrical if that were possible to design and manufacture	B																	0.63	-0.33	-	0.39	
		S																		0.80	-0.17	-	0.61
		C																		0.87	-0.14	0.94	0.64

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		Member Pct (unweighted)			Results
		Disagree	N	Agree	
Basket Specifications					
Q3 A	Future baskets should be designed so discs cannot penetrate from the outside to stick in the side or bottom	32% 28% 27%	26% 18% 15%	42% 53% 58%	Members would like to see baskets on new target designs prevent discs from sticking in the side of the basket although seem ambivalent whether it's needed for lower level targets and manufacturers don't feel it's needed at that level either.
Q3 B	Current baskets must be at least 15 cm deep. A maximum depth should also be specified	22% 15% 13%	19% 12% 10%	59% 73% 77%	Strong support for setting a maximum basket depth although sponsored pros have only mild support. Not sure if that means they prefer "the deeper the better" and we shouldn't restrict how deep they can be? Some members have commented the minimum depth spec should also be set deeper than 15 cm.
Q3 C	Nubs of some sort on the basket rim should be required	52% 50% 48%	36% 33% 33%	11% 17% 19%	There's no love for nubs on the baskets used at any level. Not enough information to declare them unacceptable. But certainly there's no support to require them as part of the design if the manufacturer doesn't wish to provide them.
Top of Target					
Q4 A	Projections like flags or number plates above the target are OK as long as they are uniformly provided on every target	14% 10% 9%	30% 22% 18%	57% 67% 73%	Strong support to allow flags and number plates in target designs although some members strongly objected in their comments. Some pointed out this was a double question and some were OK with items on top of the basket but didn't care if all targets had flags or were all at a uniform height.
Q4 B	No restrictions should be made on what can be attached to or extend upwards from the top of a target	31% 40% 45%	21% 17% 16%	48% 42% 39%	Manufacturers want the flexibility to design what they want to on the top of targets. However, members seem a little more leery about providing carte blanche to allow just anything on top as the tier level gets higher.
Rotational Symmetry					
Q5 A	All targets must be rotationally symmetrical with the pattern repeating at least 12 times (per most existing baskets)	25% 12% 10%	31% 23% 20%	45% 65% 70%	Quite a stark difference between manufacturers who are against requiring rotational symmetry similar to current top line target models. Members are more certain they want symmetry the higher the tier level a target is used for.
Q5 B	Directional baskets that can be set up to allow better access from some directions than others should be allowed	67% 79% 81%	13% 8% 7%	20% 13% 12%	No support among members to produce directional targets for any level of play. Sponsored pros object to directional targets so much that they might refuse to play on them at Championships. Manufacturers seem to think the concept is worth trying for the lowest level of play.
Q5 C	No symmetry at all is necessary. Rocks, benches or trees are acceptable targets.	68% 86% 90%	15% 9% 6%	17% 5% 4%	Members are looking for at least some symmetry in the targets used for play at all levels. Manufacturers could support non-symmetrical targets for the lowest tier.
Q5 D	The ideal target would be circularly symmetrical if that were possible to design and manufacture	11% 9% 8%	27% 22% 22%	61% 69% 70%	Members seem to indicate the more circularly symmetrical a target is the better. Manufacturers are slightly negative on the issue and perhaps are skeptical it's possible or don't feel strongly that should be a primary goal for target design.

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		<<DISAGREE<< N >>>AGREE>>>										PDGA	DG	Spons	PDGA							
		1.6	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	Mem	Mfgs	Pros	Leaders
Future Target Specifications																						
Q6 A	At some point in the future, all new targets produced should be the same design where the agreed upon design can be produced by any manufacturer	B			M				L				P					0.39	-1.00	-	-0.12	
		S			M						L			P				0.77	-1.00	-	0.18	
		C				M					L				P	S		1.00	-0.71	1.13	0.27	
Q6 B	A smaller design for future targets should be created to make the catching zone more challenging than on current targets	B			L	P		M										-0.93	-0.50	-	-1.15	
		S		M		X												-0.97	-1.33	-	-1.03	
		C				L	X											-0.86	-0.86	-0.75	-1.03	
Q6 C	The top of targets should be designed to reduce the chance for discs to land on it	B	M					L	P									-0.27	-1.67	-	-0.48	
		S		M				L	P									-0.21	-1.33	-	-0.36	
		C			M			L	P	S								-0.16	-1.29	0.00	-0.30	
Q7 A	Specifications should be established to approve targets (posts/tone poles) with no basket								M	X								-0.06	0.17	-	-0.09	
Q7 B	The acceptable holing out height and position on a post or tone target with no catching assembly should be specified for manufacturers seeking approval for such a target								M		L	P						0.43	0.17	-	0.27	
Competition Questions																						
Q8 A	Targets installed so they can swing freely should be secured when used in sanctioned competition	B							X				X	S				-0.10	-	-	-0.18	
		S													X	S		0.44	-	0.63	0.36	
		C														X	S	0.70	-	1.31	0.85	
Q8 B	Targets must all be the same model on a course used for competition including portable targets used on temp holes	B			L	P												-0.54	-	-	-1.00	
		S					L	S	P									0.00	-	-0.19	-0.39	
		C										L		X				0.74	-	0.81	0.36	
Q8 C	To provide some variety and challenge, it's OK if a few targets are installed at different heights higher or lower than standard height	B										P	L					0.32	-	-	0.70	
		S					S				P	L						0.12	-	-0.50	0.42	
		C						S		P			L					-0.03	-	-0.69	0.30	
Q8 D	I don't care if a mix of targets are used because everyone plays the same course	B										P		L				0.44	-	-	0.85	
		S									P	X						0.12	-	0.38	0.39	
		C						S	P		L							-0.26	-	-0.31	0.12	
Q8 E	Objects such as trees, poles and benches marked in some way (duct tape) to identify the holing out zone are acceptable for competition	B						P	L									-0.31	-	-	-0.18	
		S	S		X													-1.12	-	-1.56	-1.24	
		C	S	X														-1.33	-	-1.75	-1.42	

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		Member Pct (unweighted)			Results
		Disagree	N	Agree	
Future Target Specifications					
Q6 A	At some point in the future, all new targets produced should be the same design where the agreed upon design can be produced by any manufacturer	27% 18% 15%	19% 10% 8%	54% 72% 77%	Members support the development of a specific target model that could be made by anyone, especially for higher level events. This goes beyond Q2F which only addressed deflection assemblies. Manufacturers again are against this common target idea.
Q6 B	A smaller design for future targets should be created to make the catching zone more challenging than on current targets	72% 74% 70%	21% 18% 18%	7% 8% 12%	Some have written that our target is too easy for our top level players. However, there seems little support for making a smaller target to provide more challenge at any level.
Q6 C	The top of targets should be designed to reduce the chance for discs to land on it	39% 40% 38%	42% 37% 37%	19% 23% 25%	Members mildly disagree there's any need to design targets so discs don't rest on top and manufacturers really wouldn't like that design challenge.
Q7 A	Specifications should be established to approve targets (posts/toner poles) with no basket	36%	26%	39%	Everyone it seems can go either way on whether target poles without baskets should be approved.
Q7 B	The acceptable holing out height and position on a post or toner target with no catching assembly should be specified for manufacturers seeking approval for such a target	18%	25%	57%	However, if poles are going to be approved, there's support for identifying a standardized target area.
Competition Questions					
Q8 A	Targets installed so they can swing freely should be secured when used in sanctioned competition	41% 29% 25%	27% 14% 11%	32% 57% 64%	Members seem OK with swinging baskets not being secured for lower level competitions. But members and sponsored pros in particular would prefer that they be secured for higher level events.
Q8 B	Targets must all be the same model on a course used for competition including portable targets used on temp holes	61% 43% 24%	20% 16% 8%	19% 41% 68%	Members primarily are concerned about having all targets the same only at the highest tier events. This may have as much to do with practicality as desire.
Q8 C	To provide some variety and challenge, it's OK if a few targets are installed at different heights higher or lower than standard height	28% 38% 42%	15% 9% 10%	57% 52% 48%	Members and leaders seem OK with allowing some baskets at different heights for all level of events. For the leaders, this may also simply be accepting the reality of target installations on existing courses. Sponsored pros on average prefer every target the same height.
Q8 D	I don't care if a mix of targets are used because everyone plays the same course	25% 37% 52%	16% 14% 12%	60% 49% 36%	This is pretty much the opposite phrasing of Q8B. Players prefer targets to be more alike on the course, the higher the level of event.
Q8 E	Objects such as trees, poles and benches marked in some way (duct tape) to identify the holing out zone are acceptable for competition	46% 80% 85%	20% 11% 7%	34% 9% 8%	Members support only using targets for all events although roughly a third would be OK with using object targets at a lower level event.

Questions - PDGA Target Survey		<<DISAGREE<< N >>>AGREE>>>											PDGA	DG	Spons	PDGA				
		1.6	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	Mem	Mfgs
Background Questions		Number of Respondents >											826	10	17	34				
Q9	How many years have you been playing disc golf?												12.5	-	13.4	18.8				
Q10	How many PDGA singles Championships have you played?												2.6	-	8.6	7.7				
Q11	How many of these disc golf related activities have you been doing in the past 3 years												1.8	-	5.2	5.0				
Q12	Average age												38	-	35	45				
Q13	The region of the world where you live												-	-	-	-				
	North America												93.1%	-	-	-				
	Europe												5.0%	-	-	-				
	Asia												0.4%	-	-	-				
	Australia, New Zealand												0.9%	-	-	-				
	Other												0.8%	-	-	-				
Q14	Tell us your three favorite permanent targets <i>(based on weighting 1st x 1.5 and 2nd x 1.25)</i>												-	-	-	-				
	Discatcher (Innova)												26%	-	25%	27%				
	Chainstar (Discraft)												17%	-	18%	17%				
	Mach V (DGA)												22%	-	26%	25%				
	Mach III (DGA)												26%	-	22%	24%				
	Mach New II (DGA)												7%	-	8%	7%				
	Octopus (Discin)												1%	-	0%	0%				
	Jellyfish (Discin)												0.3%	-	0%	0%				
	Pro Target (Pro Mfg)												0.5%	-	0%	0%				
Q15	If you could create your ideal target, what parts would you like from existing baskets																			
	On Top of the Target												Number Plate with Flag							
	Chain Support												Sliders Like DGA **							
	Chain & Ring Pattern												Chains Like Mach III							
	Basket												Current Design Wire Basket							

** Spons Pros chose Discatcher style