## ARTICLE IN PRESS

Journal of Safety Research xxx (2018) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

### Journal of Safety Research



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jsr

# The effect of a gearshift interlock on seat belt use by drivers who do not always use a belt and its acceptance among those who do

### Q3 Q2 David G. Kidd, <sup>a,\*</sup> Jeremiah Singer, <sup>b</sup> Richard Huey, <sup>b</sup> Laura Kerfoot <sup>a</sup>

Q4 <sup>a</sup> Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, 1005 N. Glebe Road, Arlington, VA 22201, United States

5 <sup>b</sup> Westat, Inc., 1600 Research Blvd, Rockville, MD 20850, United States

6 7

#### ARTICLE INFO

8 Article history:9 Received 29 August 2017

10 Received in revised form 31 January 2018

11 Accepted 7 March 2018

12 Available online xxxx

18 \_\_\_\_\_\_ 36 Keywords:

37 Seat belt use

- 38 Enhanced reminder
- 39 Gearshift interlock
- 40 Part-time belt user

#### ABSTRACT

Introduction: Seat belts reduce the risk of fatal injury in a crash, yet in 2015, nearly 10,000 people killed in 18 passenger vehicles were unrestrained. Enhanced seat belt reminders increase belt use, but a gearshift interlock 19 that prevents the vehicle from being placed into gear unless the seat belt is used may prove more effective. 20 Method: Thirty-two people with a recent seat belt citation and who admitted to not always using a seat belt as 21 a driver were recruited as part-time belt users and asked to evaluate two new vehicles. Sixteen drove two vehi- 22 cles with an enhanced reminder for one week each, and 16 drove a vehicle with an enhanced reminder for one 23 week and a vehicle with a gearshift interlock the following week. Sixteen full-time belt users who reported al- 24 ways using a seat belt drove a vehicle with a gearshift interlock for one week to evaluate acceptance. Results: Rel- 25 ative to the enhanced reminder, the gearshift interlock significantly increased the likelihood that a part-time belt 26 user used a belt during travel time in a trip by 21%, and increased the rate of belt use by 16%; this effect 27 approached significance. Although every full-time belt user experienced the gearshift interlock, their acceptance 28 of the technology reported in a post-study survey was fairly positive and not significantly different from part-29 time belt users. Six part-time belt users circumvented the gearshift interlock by sitting on a seat belt, waiting 30 for the system to deactivate, or unbuckling during travel. Conclusion: The gearshift interlock increased the likeli- 31 hood that part-time belt users buckled up and the rate of belt use during travel relative to the enhanced reminder 32 but could be more effective if it prevented circumvention. Practical applications: An estimated 718-942 lives 33 could be saved annually if the belt use of unbuckled drivers and front passengers increased 16-21%. 34

© 2018 National Safety Council and Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. 35

**4**2 43

#### 45 1. Introduction

46 Devising countermeasures to increase the belt use of vehicle occupants who do not routinely buckle up can save thousands of lives 47 every year. Seat belts reduce the risk of being fatally injured in a crash 48 by 45% for front row occupants of passenger cars and 60% for front 49 50 row occupants of trucks and vans (Kahane, 2000); however, not every vehicle occupant always uses a seat belt when driving or riding in a 51 vehicle. A roadside observational study conducted by the National 52 53 Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) in the United States found 90% of front seat occupants observed during the daytime at 54 55 controlled intersections in 2016 were using a seat belt (Li & Pickrell, 56 2017). Although daytime belt use in the U.S. has increased nearly 20 57 percentage points from 71% in 2000 to 90% in 2017, 9874 (48%) passen-58 ger vehicle occupants killed in motor vehicle crashes in 2015 were unrestrained in cases where restraint use was known (National Center 59 60 for Statistics and Analysis, 2017).

> \* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* dkidd@iihs.org (D.G. Kidd).

A promising method for encouraging unrestrained vehicle 61 occupants to buckle up is using vehicle technology to cue belt use or 62 motivate belt use. For instance, two national surveys found that of occu- 63 pants who report not using a seat belt regularly, or part-time belt users. 64 a little more than half say they frequently forget to use a belt (Boyle & 65 Lampkin, 2007; Kidd, McCartt, & Oesch, 2014). Seat belt reminders 66 that provide a visual and/or auditory signal can cue forgetful part-time 67 belt users to buckle up. Seat belt reminders short in duration have not 68 been shown to be effective at increasing belt use (e.g., Geller, Casali, & 69 Johnson, 1980; Robertson & Haddon Jr, 1974), but enhanced seat belt 70 reminders with an auditory reminder lasting longer than 8 s have 71 been shown to increase belt use 3-6 percentage points (Ferguson, 72 Wells, & Kirley, 2007; Freedman, Levi, Zador, Lopdell, & Bergeron, 73 2007; Williams, Wells, & Farmer, 2002). More aggressive enhanced re- 74 minders with at least 90 s of a continuous or intermittent auditory 75 and visual signal and possessing other characteristics required by the 76 European New Car Assessment Programme (2015) are even more 77 effective at increasing belt use based on observations of seat belt use 78 (Krafft, Kullgren, Lie, & Tingvall, 2006; Lie, Krafft, Kullgren, & Tingvall, 79 2008). 80

#### https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2018.03.005

0022-4375/© 2018 National Safety Council and Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article as: Kidd, D.G., et al., The effect of a gearshift interlock on seat belt use by drivers who do not always use a belt and its acceptance among those who do, *Journal of Safety Research* (2018), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2018.03.005

2

### **ARTICLE IN PRESS**

#### D.G. Kidd et al. / Journal of Safety Research xxx (2018) xxx-xxx

81 Part-time belt users cite other reasons for not always using a seat 82 belt besides forgetfulness, such as taking a short trip (Boyle & Lampkin, 2007; Kidd et al., 2014). Belt use during short trips on and 83 84 off public roadways (e.g., parking lots, private drives) is important considering that crash injury risk is elevated for unrestrained occu-85 86 pants relative to restrained ones even at low speeds (Viano & 87 Parenteau, 2010). However, part-time belt users may be willing to tol-88 erate visual and auditory signals from a seat belt reminder system 89 when traveling on short trips unbelted, thereby limiting the efficacy 90 of this technology.

Seat belt interlock systems that restrict a vehicle function until the 91 92 driver's seat belt is fastened may be more effective than seat belt reminder systems for motivating part-time users to buckle up on 93 94 every trip. Van Houten, Hilton, Schulman, and Reagan (2011) conducted 95 a pilot test where a small sample of commercial drivers drove a vehicle 96 with a system that increased accelerator pedal resistance when the driver was unbelted at speeds above 25 mph; resistance increased as 97 98 vehicle speed increased. Van Houten et al. found that the system increased belt use from under 70% to 100%. Delaying unbelted drivers 99 from shifting out of gear for periods as short as 8 s also has been 100 found to increase belt use among fleet drivers (Van Houten et al., 101 102 2010; Van Houten, Malenfant, Austin, & Lebbon, 2005). However, 103 these drivers disliked that the gearshift delay system required belt use 104 when traveling on short trips.

Acceptance is critical to the viability of using vehicle technologies to 105 increase belt use, but interlocks may not be acceptable. In 1973, NHTSA 106 required that all new vehicles without passive restraints (e.g., airbags) 107 108 have ignition interlocks that prevented the driver from starting the vehicle until the driver belt was in use (Transportation Research Board, 109 2003). The technology was so unpopular that Congress prohibited 110 NHTSA from requiring interlocks or even allowing seat belt interlocks 111 112 that prevent starting or operating a motor vehicle if an occupant is not 113 using a seat belt as an alternate route to compliance with any motor 114 vehicle safety standard. These restrictions were in place until 2012 with the enactment of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st 115 Century Act of, 2012 (MAP-21), which amended federal code removing 116 117 the restriction on allowing interlocks as an optional means of compli-118 ance, but maintaining the prohibition against requiring them. Public sentiment about seat belt interlock technology has seemingly not 119 changed and is especially low among those who do not always use a 120 seat belt. A national telephone survey found low support for technology 121 122 that prevented the vehicle from starting, from being shifted out of park, 123 from exceeding a certain speed, or disabled use of an entertainment sys-124 tem among respondents who did not always use a seat belt, and only 125 around half of respondents who always wore a belt supported each of these technologies (Kidd et al., 2014). However, few or none of the sur-126 127 vey respondents likely had ever experienced any of the interlock technologies. Perceptions of a technology change following actual use and 128 may change whether the technology is acceptable (e.g., Ghazizadeh, 129 Lee, & Boyle, 2012). 130

No regulations yet have been proposed to permit seat belt interlocks 131 132 as an alternative to a safety standard, but General Motors became the 133 first manufacturer to offer a gearshift interlock in the U.S., beginning with specific 2015 model year fleet vehicles. General Motors' Seat Belt 134 135 Assurance System prevents the driver from placing the vehicle in gear for 30 s after ignition unless the driver and, if present, front right passen-136 137 ger are belted. This technology may substantially increase belt use among part-time belt users (e.g., Van Houten et al., 2005; Van Houten 138 et al., 2010) but may not be acceptable. Furthermore, it has the potential 139 to aggravate full-time belt users who buckle up after placing the vehicle 140 in gear. A national telephone survey found that among respondents 141 who reported always using a seat belt when driving, about 15% did 142 not routinely buckle up before putting the vehicle in gear (Kidd et al., 143 2014). Similarly, an observational study of 1600 drivers found that 144 almost one-quarter buckled up after placing the vehicle in gear 145 146 (Malenfant & Van Houten, 2008).

The current study extends on previous studies that evaluated gear- 147 shift interlocks (e.g., Van Houten et al., 2005, Van Houten et al., 2010) 148 by assessing the effectiveness of using a gearshift interlock for increas- 149 ing belt use among passenger vehicle drivers who do not routinely use 150 a seat belt relative to an enhanced seat belt reminder. Drivers who 151 received a seat belt citation and self-reported not always using a seat 152 belt drove a vehicle with an enhanced reminder for one week. The 153 next week, half drove a vehicle with a gearshift interlock, while the 154 other half drove a vehicle with the same reminder system. It was hy- 155 pothesized that the gearshift interlock would significantly increase 156 belt use among part-time belt users compared with the week-to-week 157 changes in belt use observed for part-time belt users who continued 158 to drive a vehicle with an enhanced seat belt reminder. A secondary ob- 159 jective of the study was to evaluate whether full-time belt users and 160 part-time belt users found the gearshift interlock acceptable. Based on 161 findings from Kidd et al. (2014), it was hypothesized that full-time 162 belt users would find the gearshift interlock more acceptable than 163 part-time belt users who drove a vehicle with the gearshift interlock 164 and find other technologies designed to increase belt use more accept- 165 able too. Additionally, part-time belt users who drove a vehicle with 166 the gearshift interlock were expected to report different opinions 167 about acceptance of the technology than part-time belt users who did 168 not drive a vehicle with the technology because they actually experi- 169 enced it (e.g., Ghazizadeh et al., 2012). 170

#### 2. Method

171 172

#### 2.1. Recruitment

The recruitment process is illustrated in Fig. 1. Maryland residents 173 were recruited within a radius of approximately 30 miles from 174 Rockville, Maryland. This range included the counties of Montgomery, 175 Frederick, Prince George, and Howard. Part-time belt users were 176 defined as individuals who had received a seat belt citation and re- 177 ported occasional or frequent seat belt nonuse while driving. Full-time 178 belt users were defined as those who reported almost always or always 179 using a seat belt while driving. Different methods were used to recruit 180 part-time belt users and full-time belt users. Maryland has a primary 181 enforcement seat belt law that requires all drivers and front seat passen- 182 gers to use a seat belt. Contact information for individuals who had 183 received a citation for not using a seat belt as a driver in Maryland 184 between January 1, 2015, and June 8, 2016, was obtained from the 185 Maryland Court System. Flyers were mailed to 7960 people inviting 186 them to participate in a vehicle evaluation study. The flyer indicated 187 that study participants would drive two 2015 or 2016 model year vehi- 188 cles for one week each and provide feedback about their experience. The 189 flyer also specified that the recipient must be between 25 and 60 years 190 old and drive at least 5 days per week to be eligible. 191

In total, 735 people responded to the invitation. Researchers 192 administered a short screener questionnaire to each potential partici- 193 pant over the phone to determine eligibility. The screener gathered 194 information about respondents' personal vehicles, driving frequency, 195 driving history, use of cellphones or navigation systems while driving, 196 demographic information, medical history, vehicle insurance, and seat 197 belt use. Respondents were eligible to participate if: they were 25- 198 60 years old; were willing to use a Chevrolet Cruze as their personal 199 vehicle; did not ride a motorcycle as their primary vehicle; reported 200 driving 5 days or more each week; had been driving more than 201 3 years; provided proof that they carried the minimum amount of 202 automobile insurance required in the state of Maryland; agreed to a 203 driver's license check to verify they had fewer than 4 penalty points 204 on their license, no serious traffic infraction in the past 3 years, and no 205 police-reported crashes in the last year; did not report a seizure in the 206 past year, a heart attack or a condition leading to a loss in consciousness 207 or awareness in the past 6 months, and were not taking medications, 208 drugs, or substances that would impair driving ability; and were not 209

Please cite this article as: Kidd, D.G., et al., The effect of a gearshift interlock on seat belt use by drivers who do not always use a belt and its acceptance among those who do, *Journal of Safety Research* (2018), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2018.03.005

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6973607

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6973607

Daneshyari.com