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Introduction:

- Risk factors of driving
- Scarce research-based evidence concerning the ability to improve the driving skills of drivers
- In particular of bus drivers (Classen et al., 2014; Broughton et al., 2003).
Occupational therapy and driving

- To examine new ways of intervening

- Applying different strategies to reduce risk factors (Pellerito, 2006).
• Increase drivers' consciousness to their way of driving.
The research model

- Driving as an Everyday Competence (Lindstrom-Forneri, et al., 2010).

- Interaction between individual and environment moderated by beliefs and awareness, leading to strategic level decisions regarding driving behaviors.
The DEC model was adjusted to the professional driving in public transportation line of work and its particular risk factors.
Objective

• To examine the effectiveness of a metacognitive-functional intervention program for the reduction of risk factors among professional drivers relative to a control group.
The intervention

- Raising awareness to safe driving risk factors
  - Ergonomic, perceptual-cognitive and on-road driving data
  - Reference to the difficulties that the driver raised
  - Providing coping strategies.

Three sessions of two hours each.
Control group

The employer's routine intervention:

- Covert inspections detecting troublesomeness while driving
- Conversations
- Records in the drivers' personal files
Materials and methods:

Participants

- This study is a short-term follow-up
- Seventy seven professional male bus drivers from a large bus company in central Israel
- Twenty-one drivers continued to the intervention stage; four of them dropped out before the end of the intervention.
Meta-Cognitive-Functional Intervention Program Tools

Objective measures:
- In-Vehicle Data Recorders (IVDR)
- G sensors events
- Traffic accident data before and after the intervention

Subjective measures:
- Occupational performance questionnaire for bus drivers
## Unsafe events that occurred during the trip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sudden lane deviations (LD)</th>
<th>Unsafe Headway Distance (HW)</th>
<th>Urban Forward Near-Collision (UFNC)</th>
<th>InterCity Forward near-collision (IFNC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event is registered whenever unplanned deviations without signaling occur.</td>
<td>Event is registered whenever the driver goes down within less than a second from the vehicle in front of him.</td>
<td>Event is registered whenever the driver goes down from 2.7 seconds from the vehicle in front of him.</td>
<td>Event is registered whenever the driver goes down from 2.7 seconds from the vehicle in front of him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active from 55 kph or higher and therefore more adapted to long-distance travel.</td>
<td>Active from 30 kph or higher.</td>
<td>Driving up to 30 kph; for slow speeds of traffic jams in the city.</td>
<td>Active from 30 kph or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G sensors

- Number of accelerations above threshold limit
- Number of sudden braking
- Number of high speed turns
We developed an occupational performance questionnaire, based on interviews with bus drivers.

To detect main problems that bus drivers deal with in their daily routine.
Occupational Performance Questionnaire for Bus Drivers:

- Contains 50 every day driving situations.
- Level of performance
- Level of satisfaction of that rating.

- Set the individual goals of the intervention program and to follow subjective outcome measures.
Crashes records

- Number of accidents recorded in the last year before and one year after participating in our research.
- The data was provided by the bus company.
Results
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Difference between the degree of change in the rate of G sensor perilous events before and after the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G sensor decrease (control)</th>
<th>G sensor decrease (experiment)</th>
<th>G sqrt decrease (control)</th>
<th>G sqrt decrease (experiment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Differences in the number of accidents per year before and after the intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-cognitive intervention</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subjective ratings of the level of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation 1</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation 2</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment 1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment 2</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subjective ratings of satisfaction with the level of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Occupation 1</th>
<th>Occupation 2</th>
<th>Environment 1</th>
<th>Environment 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dealing with distractions while driving (N=7)
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- Satisfaction from level of performance
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Relationship with the passengers (N=8)

- Level of performance
- Satisfaction from level of performance

Number of meetings vs. level of performance and satisfaction from level of performance.
Ergonomic Intervention (N=13)
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Conclusions

- Improved objective and subjective measures
- Potential contribution of occupational therapists to prevent car accidents
- Improving the well-being of drivers.
- Enables familiarity with advanced technologies
- Enriches the knowledge in regards to using a wide variety of driving assessment tools
- Making the best practice decisions.
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