3.1.1 SOCIAL SAFETY DEMAND

Workshop | 01 December, 2010
Munich – Germany

Reakka KRISHNAKUMAR
Annie Langlois
1. Objectives of CASPER project
2. Objective of Subtask 3.1.1 “Social Safety Demand”
3. Research design
4. Focus group: What is it?
5. Participant recruitment & profil
6. Focus group: Structure
7. Discussion: Results
8. Visual Stimulis: Results
10. Conclusion
11. Limits and benefits
WP3.1. Overview of child safety environment in cars

ST3.1.1 SOCIAL SAFETY DEMAND

OBJECTIVES OF CASPER PROJECT

Reduce the numbers of fatalities on European roads.

But driver's behaviour is still non-adapted (CRS's misuses)

Sociological overall understanding of safety practices in car transportation

“8 out 10 children are not or badly restrained”
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OBJECTIVES OF SUBTASK 3.1.1
“Social safety demand”

Understanding the reality of child environment as car passenger: what are the social barriers, for drivers in charge of children transportation, to a correct use of CRS?

Social sensitivity

Social barriers
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RESEARCH DESIGN

COMBINED METHODS:

1. Quantitative method: a questionnaire
   - Deduction
   - Objectivity
   - Predetermined questions
   - Cause

2. Qualitative method: Focus group
   - Induction
   - Subjectivity
   - Open questions
   - Explanation
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FOCUS GROUP: WHAT IS IT?

DEFINITION:

1. Group of individuals selected and assembled by researchers to discuss and comment on, from personal experience, the topic that is the subject of the research (Powell & al, 1996: 499)

2. Group which relies on the interaction within the group based on topics that are supplied by the researcher. (Morgan 1997: 12)

The main characteristic of focus groups is the insight and data provided by the interaction between participants.
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PARTICIPANTS RECRUITMENT

RECRUITMENT:

1. Parents were recruited through fliers distributed at nursery and primary schools.
2. Parents could participate if:
   - they had a driving licence
   - they owned or rented a car
   - they had at least one child aged between 0 and 10 years.

LOCATION:

Participants = 21

Participants = 6
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**PARTICIPANTS PROFIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.5% = 31-45 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years = 22%</td>
<td>36-40 years = 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 -45 years = 18.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average children under 10/household</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan area</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country town</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All volunteers received 30€ for their participation.
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FOCUS GROUPS: STRUCTURE

Survey → Discussion → Visual stimuli → Discussion → Scenarios → Conclusion

90 min - Recorded on video
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### FOCUS GROUPS: STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL TOPICS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Level of confidence: do you find them secure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children evolution &amp; CRS change</td>
<td>▪ Issues during transition phases?</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ When and how did you change the CRS, its position?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CRS choice</td>
<td>▪ Information? Demonstration (video, sale assistant…)?</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Suggestions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-perception, perception of the others, perception of the real world</td>
<td>▪ Behaviour adapted to child safety? / ▪ Possible mistakes?</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Situations with less security? / ▪ Behaviour of other drivers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children behaviour in cars</td>
<td>▪ What driver are you with children in the car?</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Problems caused by children presence in the car?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. VISUAL STIMULI+ Discussion</td>
<td>▪ Reactions?</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SCENARIOS</td>
<td>▪ Reactions? Does it change the self-perception?</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conclusion</td>
<td>▪ Something to add to conclude the discussion?</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISCUSSION: RESULTS

ADVANTAGES

1. CRS provide safety and comfort

2. Children can see out of the window
   S1 in FG1: “My son can see the road”

3. CRS for younger children are very safe

4. Harness booster seats are the safest
   S2 in FG7: “Harness should be compulsory both for adults and children”

DISADVANTAGES

1. Booster cushion is unsteady, unreliable and uncomfortable
   S1 in FG7: “I’m not confident with the booster cushion: that is just a bit of foam”.
   S3 in FG1: “The child is not more fastened than with a seat belt”.

2. Difficult to use. Especially harness booster seats and rearward-facing seats.

3. CRS are not easily portable from one car to another.
   S4 in FG4: “CRS are very big, too heavy” = Unwieldy

4. Safety issues: head not enough supported and CRS are too easy to unbuckle.

5. CRS are too expensive and too many;

S1 in FG7: “I’m not confident with the booster cushion: that is just a bit of foam”.
S3 in FG1: “The child is not more fastened than with a seat belt”.
S4 in FG4: “CRS are very big, too heavy” = Unwieldy.
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DISCUSSION: RESULTS

INTERESTING POINTS

1. The CRS parents perceived as the safest are also the most difficult to use.

2. For many participants, the booster cushion is not safe and useless.

3. Some parents said they paid more the price for younger children than for older children.
   
   S5 in FG3: “I noticed that more they [children] are young and small, more we pay the price. (...) I paid the price until he was 3 years old. But the booster cushion, I bought it in a supermarket”.

4. The topic “Advantages and Disadvantages” was the most discussed subject during the sessions.
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DISCUSSION: RESULTS

CHILDREN EVOLUTION & CRS CHANGE

1. The majority of responses was “No problem”.

2. A few parents admitted they did not know when moving a baby from a rearward facing position to a forward-facing position.

Second issue: knowing when a child can be in booster cushion.

*S2 in FG3: “From 6 years, children do not want to sit in a booster cushion”.

CRS CHOICE AND SAFETY INFORMATION

1. Information available in specialized shops is good for half of participants.

2. But the great majority said that:
   - The information is not enough clear
   - No demonstration at the purchase

3. Suggestions:
   - Video demonstration
   - Test CRS in the car at the purchase
   - Information in different places (hospital, Paediatricians, health department, schools)
   - Standard systems (CRS are too many)

Lack of knowledge

Lack of Information places, CRS test
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### DISCUSSION: RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF-PERCEPTION</th>
<th>Children behaviour in cars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants believed their own attitude is safe and appropriate. That's the other drivers who do wrong.</td>
<td>1. Older children are less cooperative (boys from 6 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the same time, they admitted they could make some mistake. They did not know which one but they mentioned situations: - Short trips - When pressed by time - When not enough comfort for the child</td>
<td>2. Presence of children in cars = lack of attention, distraction, danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Some parents said their children were obedient (mainly girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. But children can unfastened themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parents: Lack of safety Awareness. They do know what is wrong**

**Children: Lack of safety Awareness & knowledge**
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VISUAL STIMULIS: RESULTS

Did you ever restrained your child/children like that?

- For people who answered “Yes”:
  - Level of risk/danger is low
  - Half of them reported that children are safe, half of them indicated children should be in a booster cushion and admitted they do not always use the booster cushion.

- For people who answered “No”:
  - Level of risk is quite high
  - 90% wrote the booster missed

For 1 out of 2 parents, not using the booster cushion is a low risk.
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Did you ever restrained your child/children like that?

- For people who answered “Yes”:
  - Level of risk/danger: High
  - 2 parents said the child is fastened and rests. 6 parents knew that the child is not correctly restrained and safe, and they admitted doing wrong.
  - Reasons: long trips, comfort for the child.

- For people who answered “No”:
  - Level of risk: High
  - The child needs a CRS, is not properly restrained: very dangerous.

The great majority knew the child is not properly restrained and totally unsecure. But still a third of parents admitted their children were fastened the same way in specific situations.
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Did you ever restrained your child/children like that?

- For people who answered “Yes”:
  - Level of risk/danger: Low
  - Parents reported that this child was properly restrained, but still 7 parents saw that the harness was not snug enough and admitted doing the same.

- For people who answered “No”:
  - Level of risk: Quite high
  - They saw the harness was not snug, used in the wrong way. 2 parents said the picture was not enough clear.

For parents, it is hard to know if the harness is enough snug. They did not consider it as a misuse.

Image of a boy: Boy 1 year 9 kg 72 cm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Did you ever restrained your child/children like that?

- For people who answered “Yes”:
  - Level of risk/danger: between quite high and low
  - Children are correctly restrained. 1 parent talked about Isofix.

- For people who answered “No”:
  - Level of risk: Quite high
  - Reasons: parents said it was forbidden to put a rearward-facing infant seat at the back.
  - 2 parents did not understand the picture.

According to parents, it’s not possible to use a rearward facing seat at the back. Several parents do not like the rearward Facing position;

This picture also showed that parents did not know ISOFIX.
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SCENARIO 1

The objective is seeing people reactions to data from French field studies.

Road safety data 1

« 40% of fatal accidents among children as passenger happen on trips under 3 kilometers. » Direction de la Sécurité et de la Circulation Routière, July 2007

1. Most of the people knew this data.

2. After few minutes of discussion, people admitted that they did not always use the CRS for a very short trip, when they drive on a parking, when they bring children to school. S2 in FG 3: “It takes more to fasten the child than to drive him to the school”.
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SCENARIO 2

Road safety data 2

▲ “Eight children out of ten are not or badly restrained in cars

1. All drivers were very surprised: “It is not possible that 8 parents out of 10 do not want to secure their children!”.

2. Probably, they do wrong sometimes but “a small error cannot make a difference” (FG5).

3. Parents were asked what would be effective messages to promote a correct use of CRS:
   - Police, Health department, Schools, legislation
   - Safety messages should target older children to turn them into both users of, and advocates of, CRS use.
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CONCLUSIONS

Barriers to a correct use of CRS:

- Lack of knowledge, safety awareness
- Self-perception is too good
- The way are perceived the products: systems which seem complex are well perceived but are not well used (harness systems, rearward facing infant seat)
- Children behaviour
- Not clear information, no demonstration
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LIMITS & BENEFITS

LIMITS

- Non representative sample
- Information from respondents can not be linked to socioeconomic or other characteristics of parents

BENEFITS

- Participants were not restricted by the « A,B,C » choice of a questionnaire. Important insights on knowledge, perceptions and attitudinal barriers to the correct use of CRS. It is an important input to complete the results of the survey.
- Stimulis can make new reactions and modify self-perceptions.
- Focus group was useful to built the questionnaire design.
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Thank you for your attention!