8635 Bright Angel Way
Las Vegas, NV 89149
800-501-3808

800-501-3808
sales@castercity.com

Push/Pull Force and Ergonomic Caster Selection

Understanding Rolling Resistance, Breakaway Force, and the Engineering Factors That Determine Whether Your Casters Help or Hurt Your Workforce

Executive Summary

Every manual cart push is a biomechanical event. The operator's muscles, joints, and spine absorb forces that depend directly on caster selection. Choose well, and a 2,000-pound load glides with 30 pounds of effort. Choose poorly, and that same load demands 80 pounds—well beyond safe ergonomic thresholds.

The difference isn't luck. It's engineering. Rolling resistance, breakaway force, and swivel effort are determined by measurable physical properties: wheel diameter, wheel material hardness, bearing type, floor surface interaction, and load distribution. These factors combine to produce the push/pull force that operators actually experience—and that force determines injury rates, productivity, and long-term workforce health.

This white paper explains the physics of caster ergonomics, identifies the design factors that reduce push/pull force, and provides specification guidance for applications where manual handling is a primary concern. The goal is simple: help specifiers select casters that protect workers while maintaining operational efficiency.

The Business Case for Ergonomic Caster Selection

The Scale of Manual Material Handling Injuries

Overexertion injuries—sprains, strains, and musculoskeletal disorders from pushing, pulling, and lifting—consistently rank among the most common and costly workplace injuries. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that overexertion injuries account for roughly one-third of all workplace injuries requiring days away from work. Back injuries alone cost U.S. employers an estimated $20 billion annually in direct workers' compensation costs, with indirect costs (lost productivity, replacement labor, training) multiplying that figure several times over.

Push/pull tasks are a significant contributor. Unlike lifting—where weight limits are intuitive and widely understood—push/pull forces are invisible. A cart that "feels heavy" might require 40 pounds of force or 100 pounds; operators can't easily distinguish, and neither can supervisors watching from across the facility. The injury develops gradually through repeated exposure, making cause-and-effect difficult to trace.

Ergonomic Force Thresholds

NIOSH (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health) and ergonomics researchers have established guidelines for acceptable push/pull forces based on frequency, duration, and worker population. While specific limits vary by methodology, general consensus supports these thresholds for occasional manual cart handling:

Initial force (breakaway): The force required to start a stationary cart moving. Should not exceed 50 pounds for tasks performed occasionally throughout a shift. For frequent tasks (more than once per minute), initial force should stay below 35 pounds.

Sustained force (rolling): The force required to keep a moving cart in motion. Should not exceed 35 pounds for occasional tasks, 20 pounds for frequent tasks. Sustained forces below 20 pounds are generally considered low-risk for most worker populations.

These thresholds assume good posture, appropriate handle height (between hip and shoulder), dry floor conditions, and adequate traction footwear. Real-world conditions often degrade from these assumptions, making lower target forces advisable.

The Caster's Role

Casters are the interface between load and floor. Every pound of push/pull force the operator exerts passes through the caster system. The caster's job is to convert that input force into motion as efficiently as possible—minimizing the force "lost" to rolling resistance, bearing friction, and swivel effort.

A well-specified caster system might require 25 pounds of force to move a 1,500-pound load. A poorly specified system might require 75 pounds for the same load—three times the effort, potentially exceeding ergonomic thresholds that the "correct" system easily satisfies. Same cart, same load, same operator—but dramatically different injury risk based solely on caster selection.

The Physics of Rolling Resistance

What Rolling Resistance Actually Is

Rolling resistance is the force opposing motion when a wheel rolls across a surface. Unlike sliding friction (which depends primarily on the normal force and coefficient of friction), rolling resistance arises from deformation—of the wheel, the floor, or both.

When a loaded wheel contacts a floor, both surfaces deform slightly at the contact patch. The wheel flattens; the floor compresses. As the wheel rolls forward, material at the leading edge of the contact patch is being compressed while material at the trailing edge is recovering. This continuous cycle of compression and recovery consumes energy—energy that must come from the push/pull force applied by the operator.

The energy isn't destroyed; it's converted to heat through a process called hysteresis. Soft rubber wheels get warm during extended rolling precisely because they're absorbing energy through this deformation cycle. That absorbed energy represents work the operator had to perform—force times distance—to move the load.

The Rolling Resistance Equation

Rolling resistance force can be approximated by: $F = (Crr \times W) / r$, where F is the rolling resistance force, Crr is the coefficient of rolling resistance (a property of the wheel/floor combination), W is the load on the wheel, and r is the wheel radius.

This equation reveals two critical relationships:

Rolling resistance increases linearly with load. Double the weight, double the resistance. This is intuitive—heavier loads are harder to push.

Rolling resistance decreases with increasing wheel diameter. A larger wheel has a longer contact patch relative to its deformation depth, reducing the energy lost per revolution. This is why larger diameter wheels are easier to push—and why the smallest caster that "fits" is often the wrong choice for ergonomic applications.

Coefficient of Rolling Resistance by Wheel Material

The coefficient of rolling resistance (Crr) varies dramatically by wheel material and floor surface. On smooth, hard floors typical of industrial facilities:

Forged steel wheels: Crr ≈ 0.002–0.005. Minimal deformation means minimal energy loss. Lowest rolling resistance of any wheel type—but transfers all vibration and impact to the load and creates significant floor noise and potential damage.

Hard polyurethane (90–95A durometer): Crr ≈ 0.010–0.020. Excellent balance of low rolling resistance and floor/load protection. The standard choice for ergonomic applications on smooth floors.

Phenolic/nylon: Crr ≈ 0.015–0.025. Hard plastic wheels with low deformation. Good rolling resistance but can be slippery on wet floors and noisy on hard surfaces.

Soft rubber (60–70A durometer): Crr ≈ 0.030–0.050. Significant deformation increases rolling resistance substantially. Provides vibration damping and quiet operation but at ergonomic cost on smooth floors.

Pneumatic (air-filled): Crr ≈ 0.025–0.040 (properly inflated). Excellent for rough surfaces where the tire absorbs irregularities, but higher resistance on smooth floors than hard wheels. Resistance increases significantly if underinflated.

The practical implication: switching from soft rubber to hard polyurethane wheels on the same cart can reduce rolling resistance by 50–70%. That's the difference between a cart that meets ergonomic thresholds and one that doesn't.

Breakaway Force: The Critical First Push

Why Starting Is Harder Than Rolling

Breakaway force—the force required to initiate movement of a stationary cart—is always higher than sustained rolling force. Often significantly higher: 2× to 3× the sustained force is common, and poorly designed systems can show 4× or greater differentials.

Several mechanisms contribute to elevated breakaway force:

Static deformation: When a loaded cart sits stationary, the wheel material creeps into a flat spot at the contact patch. The longer the cart sits, the more pronounced this flat becomes. Starting motion requires "climbing out" of this deformation—additional force beyond steady-state rolling resistance.

Bearing stiction: Bearing lubricants exhibit higher resistance to initial motion than to sustained rotation. This "stiction" (static friction) must be overcome at startup. The effect is most pronounced in plain bearings and minimized in precision ball bearings with proper lubrication.

Swivel orientation: If swivel casters have rotated so their wheels aren't aligned with the intended direction of travel, the initial push must simultaneously overcome rolling resistance and rotate the swivel assembly. This combined load spikes breakaway force dramatically—often the largest single contributor to high initial force.

Floor surface bonding: On some floor coatings, soft wheel materials can develop adhesion to the floor surface over time. This "cold welding" effect requires additional force to break. Most common with soft rubber on painted or coated concrete.

Reducing Breakaway Force

Breakaway force can be reduced through design choices that address each contributing mechanism:

Harder wheel materials: Less static deformation means smaller flat spots and lower breakaway penalty. Polyurethane wheels develop less flat-spotting than rubber.

Precision ball bearings: Lower stiction than roller bearings or plain bearings. The balls provide point contact rather than line or surface contact, minimizing the lubricant film that must be sheared at startup.

Larger swivel lead: Casters with greater offset between the swivel axis and wheel center self-align more readily with direction of travel, reducing the force required to reorient misaligned casters.

Quality swivel bearings: Smooth swivel rotation requires adequate bearing capacity and proper lubrication. Undersized or dry swivel bearings dramatically increase the force required to reorient the caster.

Bearing Selection and Ergonomic Impact

Bearing Types and Their Characteristics

The wheel bearing converts axle rotation to wheel rotation. Bearing efficiency—how much of the input force actually produces motion versus being lost to friction—varies substantially by bearing type.

Plain bearings (bushings): The wheel rotates directly on the axle or on a sleeve. Friction is surface-to-surface contact. Lowest cost, highest friction, shortest service life under heavy loads. Appropriate for light-duty applications where cost matters more than rolling effort. Poor choice for ergonomic applications.

Roller bearings: Cylindrical rollers between inner and outer races. Line contact rather than point contact means higher load capacity than ball bearings of equivalent size, but also higher friction. Good for heavy loads where capacity is the priority; acceptable but not optimal for ergonomics.

Ball bearings: Spherical balls between races provide point contact—the lowest friction configuration. Standard ball bearings provide excellent balance of load capacity, service life, and low rolling resistance. The default choice for ergonomic applications.

Precision sealed ball bearings: Tighter tolerances and sealed lubrication provide the lowest friction and longest service life. Higher cost but justified in ergonomic applications where bearing drag directly affects operator effort. Sealing excludes contamination that would otherwise increase friction over time.

Tapered roller bearings: Designed to handle combined thrust and radial loads. Common in kingpinless casters where the swivel bearing must handle both vertical weight and lateral forces. Higher capacity than ball bearings but higher friction; appropriate where load capacity drives specification.

Quantifying the Bearing Impact

Bearing selection can change total push/pull force by 15–30% independent of wheel selection. A cart with plain bearing wheels might require 50 pounds of sustained force; the same cart with precision ball bearing wheels might require 35 pounds. The load, wheel material, and floor are identical—only the bearing changed.

For breakaway force, the differential is even larger. Plain bearings with their high stiction can require 2–3× more breakaway force than precision ball bearings under the same load. This is where bearing quality has its greatest ergonomic impact.

The cost premium for ball bearings over plain bearings is typically small relative to total caster cost—often 10–20% at the caster level. For ergonomic applications, this premium is almost always justified by the reduction in push/pull force and the corresponding reduction in operator fatigue and injury risk.

Wheel Diameter: The Overlooked Factor

Why Bigger Wheels Roll Easier

Wheel diameter affects rolling resistance inversely—larger wheels require less force to roll under equivalent loads. The physics are straightforward: a larger wheel has a longer contact patch relative to its deformation depth, spreading the compression/recovery cycle over more material and reducing energy loss per unit distance traveled.

The relationship is approximately linear within typical caster size ranges. An 8-inch wheel requires roughly half the rolling force of a 4-inch wheel carrying the same load—all else being equal. This is a dramatic difference that directly impacts operator effort.

Larger wheels also handle floor imperfections better. A crack, threshold, or debris pile that stops a 3-inch wheel might barely slow an 8-inch wheel. The obstacle height that a wheel can roll over is proportional to wheel diameter; larger wheels encounter fewer "hard stops" that require extra force to overcome.

The Trade-Offs

If larger wheels are ergonomically superior, why isn't every caster as large as possible? Because diameter creates trade-offs:

Cart height: Larger wheels raise the cart deck. Ergonomic loading/unloading height may conflict with ergonomic rolling effort. Applications with height constraints may not accommodate larger wheels.

Cost: Larger wheels cost more—more material, larger bearings, heavier construction. The cost increase is roughly proportional to the square of the diameter.

Swivel clearance: Larger wheels require larger swivel radius, potentially conflicting with frame geometry or creating interference issues.

Weight: Larger casters add weight to the cart itself, partially offsetting the rolling resistance advantage. Typically a minor factor but relevant in lightweight applications.

The specification decision balances these trade-offs against the ergonomic benefit. For applications where push/pull force is a primary concern, upsizing wheel diameter is often the single most effective intervention—but it must fit within the application's physical and economic constraints.

Floor Surface Interaction

Hard Floors vs. Rough Floors

The optimal wheel material depends critically on floor surface. The same wheel that excels on smooth concrete may perform poorly on rough asphalt—and vice versa.

Smooth, hard floors (sealed concrete, epoxy, tile): Hard wheels excel. Minimal floor deformation means all rolling resistance comes from wheel deformation. Harder wheels = lower resistance. Polyurethane and phenolic wheels outperform rubber significantly.

Rough or uneven floors (unsealed concrete, asphalt, expansion joints): Softer wheels can actually outperform hard wheels. The soft wheel deforms around surface irregularities, maintaining a consistent contact patch. A hard wheel bounces over irregularities, creating repeated impact loading that increases effective rolling resistance. The "correct" wheel depends on how rough the floor actually is.

Very rough terrain (gravel, grass, outdoor surfaces): Pneumatic tires often provide the lowest rolling resistance despite their higher Crr on smooth surfaces. The tire absorbs terrain irregularities that would stop rigid wheels entirely. The "best" wheel is the one that can actually roll; ergonomic optimization is secondary to basic mobility.

Floor Contamination and Condition

Real floors aren't laboratory test surfaces. Contamination affects rolling resistance:

Water/moisture: Generally reduces rolling resistance slightly (lubrication effect) but may reduce traction for pushing. Soft rubber wheels can develop hydroplaning characteristics at high speeds.

Oil/grease: Reduces rolling resistance but dramatically reduces traction. Operators may slip while pushing. Hard wheels perform better than soft in oily conditions.

Debris/grit: Increases rolling resistance as the wheel must climb over or crush particles. Larger wheels are less affected than smaller wheels. Debris can become embedded in soft wheels, creating permanent flat spots.

Wear/deterioration: Older floors with pitting, spalling, or worn coatings present higher rolling resistance than new surfaces. Floor maintenance is an ergonomic intervention as well as an aesthetic one.

Swivel Resistance and Caster Orientation

The Hidden Force Multiplier

Push/pull testing reveals a consistent pattern: force requirements vary dramatically based on how the swivel casters are oriented at the start of movement. A cart that requires 30 pounds to push when casters are aligned with travel direction might require 60 pounds when casters are perpendicular—and 80+ pounds when casters oppose each other.

This variation arises because the initial push must accomplish two tasks simultaneously: overcome rolling resistance to move forward, and provide torque to rotate the swivel assemblies into alignment. The swivel torque requirement depends on swivel bearing friction, caster geometry, and the angular misalignment.

In the worst case—two swivel casters oriented in opposite directions—the push force must rotate both casters 90° or more while simultaneously initiating forward motion. The forces don't simply add; they interact in ways that can double or triple the required effort compared to the aligned condition.

Design Features That Reduce Swivel Effort

Swivel lead (offset): The horizontal distance between the swivel axis and the wheel center. Greater offset creates a mechanical advantage that helps the caster self-align with the direction of travel. Casters with adequate swivel lead "trail" behind the attachment point like a shopping cart wheel, naturally rotating to follow the push direction.

Swivel bearing quality: Low-friction swivel bearings—ball bearings rather than plain bearings, adequate lubrication, proper preload—reduce the torque required to rotate the swivel assembly. A caster that swivels freely when unloaded but binds under load has inadequate swivel bearings for its rated capacity.

Kingpinless designs: Large-diameter ball bearing raceways in kingpinless casters typically provide lower swivel friction than kingpin designs with thrust bearings, especially under high loads. The ergonomic advantage of kingpinless casters is most pronounced in heavy-duty applications where swivel effort becomes significant.

Caster configuration: Applications using two rigid and two swivel casters generally require less total push force than four-swivel configurations, because only two casters must reorient. However, two-swivel configurations sacrifice maneuverability and may not suit all applications.

Push/Pull Testing Methodology

Why Testing Matters

The physics described in this paper allows estimation of push/pull forces—but estimation has limits. Real-world performance depends on manufacturing tolerances, actual (versus specified) material properties, floor surface variations, and interaction effects that simplified equations don't capture.

Empirical testing provides ground truth. A properly instrumented push/pull test measures actual force under controlled conditions, validating (or contradicting) theoretical predictions. For ergonomic applications where force thresholds are critical, testing provides the confidence that estimation alone cannot.

Test Parameters

Rigorous push/pull testing controls for the variables that affect force measurements:

Load increments: Testing at multiple loads (typically 500, 1,000, 1,500, and 2,000 pounds or application-specific values) reveals how force scales with weight. Non-linear scaling can indicate bearing or structural limitations.

Caster orientation: Testing with casters aligned, perpendicular (same direction), and perpendicular (opposed) captures the range of real-world starting conditions. The perpendicular-opposed condition typically produces the highest breakaway force.

Push versus pull: Pushing and pulling engage caster geometry differently. Both directions should be tested; results often differ by 10–20% for the same caster configuration.

Multiple runs with averaging: Single measurements can be anomalous. Proper methodology performs multiple runs for each condition, discards outliers, and averages the remainder. Seven runs with high/low discarded is a common protocol.

Floor surface standardization: Test floors must be specified and controlled. Smooth polyurethane or epoxy coatings simulate modern industrial floors; results on different surfaces are not directly comparable.

Interpreting Test Results

Push/pull test data should be compared against ergonomic thresholds for the intended use case. Key questions:

Does the maximum breakaway force (worst-case orientation) stay below the initial force threshold for the task frequency? Does the sustained rolling force stay below the sustained force threshold? How much margin exists—is the system barely acceptable or comfortably within limits? How do results compare across different wheel/bearing configurations to identify the optimal specification?

Specification Guidelines for Ergonomic Applications

Decision Framework

Wheel material: For smooth floors, specify polyurethane (90–95A durometer) as the default ergonomic choice. Rubber wheels only where vibration damping or noise reduction justify the rolling resistance penalty. For rough floors, softer durometers or pneumatic tires may outperform hard wheels—test if uncertain.

Wheel diameter: Specify the largest diameter that fits the application's height and clearance constraints. Every inch of additional diameter reduces rolling resistance measurably. Don't default to smaller wheels to save cost without understanding the ergonomic penalty.

Bearings: Precision sealed ball bearings for ergonomic applications. Roller bearings where load capacity requires. Plain bearings only for light-duty applications where push/pull force is not a concern.

Swivel design: Adequate swivel lead for self-alignment. Ball bearing swivel raceways rather than plain thrust bearings. Kingpinless designs for heavy loads where swivel effort becomes significant.

Capacity margin: Specify casters rated for at least 30% above maximum expected load. Overloaded casters exhibit elevated rolling resistance as bearings and wheels deform excessively. Adequate capacity margin maintains ergonomic performance across the load range.

When to Test

Empirical push/pull testing is warranted when:

Ergonomic compliance is required (regulatory, customer specification, or corporate policy mandates force limits). The application is high-volume and the cost of suboptimal specification multiplies across many units. Injury history suggests existing casters may be contributing to overexertion injuries. Theoretical calculations suggest the application is near ergonomic thresholds—testing provides confidence that margins are adequate. Multiple configurations are under consideration and objective data will drive selection.

Conclusion

The force required to push a cart is not random. It's the predictable result of physical properties—wheel diameter, wheel material, bearing type, floor surface, and caster geometry—interacting according to well-understood engineering principles. Every component choice either reduces or increases the burden on the operator.

Specifying for ergonomics means choosing components that minimize rolling resistance and breakaway force within the application's constraints. Larger diameter polyurethane wheels with precision ball bearings on smooth floors. Adequate swivel lead and quality swivel bearings to reduce reorientation effort. Capacity margins that prevent overload-induced drag. These choices cost modestly more than minimum-specification alternatives—but pay returns in reduced injury rates, improved productivity, and workforce longevity.

The economics favor ergonomic specification. A single overexertion injury—lost workdays, workers' compensation, replacement labor, potential litigation—costs thousands to tens of thousands of dollars. The incremental cost of ergonomically optimized casters versus minimum-specification alternatives is measured in dollars per caster. One prevented injury pays for ergonomic casters across an entire facility.

The question isn't whether you can afford better casters.

The question is whether you can afford the injuries that result from ignoring the physics of push/pull force.

For any organization with manual material handling, the answer is almost always no.

About Caster City LLC

Caster City operates as a hybrid manufacturer-distributor based in Las Vegas, Nevada. Founded in the 1970s, the company maintains $25 million in component inventory for rapid 2–3 day assembly and delivery while manufacturing custom polyurethane wheels in-house at our Texas facility.

Through our manufacturing partners, Caster City has access to fully instrumented push/pull testing facilities capable of measuring breakaway force, sustained rolling resistance, and swivel effort across the full range of load conditions and caster configurations. This empirical testing capability allows us to validate ergonomic performance for applications where force thresholds are critical.

Our engineering team provides consultation for ergonomic applications, helping facilities select caster configurations that meet force thresholds while satisfying load, dimensional, and environmental requirements.

For ergonomic caster specification, push/pull testing, or application-specific engineering support, contact Caster City at 800-501-3808 or sales@castercity.com.

This white paper is based on established physics of rolling resistance, ergonomic research from NIOSH and peer-reviewed literature, and empirical testing data from instrumented push/pull measurement systems. The relationships between caster design parameters and push/pull force represent fundamental mechanical engineering applicable to all manual material handling applications.