

Aging Independently

Living Arrangements and Mobility

**K. Warner Schaie ■ Hans-Werner Wahl
Heidrun Mollenkopf ■ Frank Oswald**

Editors

K. Warner Schaie, Ph.D., is the Evan Pugh Professor of Human Development and Psychology and Director of the Gerontology Center at Pennsylvania State University. He also holds an appointment as Affiliate Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Science at the University of Washington. He received the Kleemeier Award for Distinguished Research Contributions from the Gerontological Society of America and the Distinguished Scientific Contributions award from the American Psychological Association. He is author or editor of 32 books including the textbook *Adult Development and Aging* (with S. L. Willis) and the *Handbook of the Psychology of Aging* (with J. E. Birren), both of which are now in their 5th edition. He has directed the Seattle Longitudinal Study of cognitive aging since 1956. His current research interest is the life course of adult intelligence, its antecedents and modifiability, as well as methodological issues in the developmental sciences.

Hans-Werner Wahl, Dr. Phil., is Professor of Social and Environmental Gerontology and Chair of the Department of Social and Environmental Gerontology at the German Centre for Research on Ageing at the University of Heidelberg. His current research interests cover conceptual and empirical issues of environmental gerontology, the psychosocial consequences of age-related vision loss, and the everyday competence of older adults and appropriate intervention strategies. He is the author or coauthor or the editor or coeditor of 10 books and over 100 journal articles and chapters related to the study of human aging. He was awarded the Max-Bürger-Preis for outstanding research in gerontology from the German Society of Gerontology and Geriatrics.

Heidrun Mollenkopf, Dr. Phil., is Senior Researcher at the German Centre for Research on Ageing (DZFA) at the University of Heidelberg, Department of Social and Environmental Gerontology. Her main research interest is the interplay among personal, societal, technical, and environmental conditions with regard to maintaining autonomy and social participation and, by this, quality of life in old age. She has been in charge of large-scale research projects on the outdoor mobility of older people and on technology and aging, and she has published widely in these fields. She was the German delegate to the European COST A5 program "Ageing and Technology," and she was a member in the European Commission's ETAN (European Technology Assessment Network) Expert working group.

Frank Oswald, Dr. Phil., is Senior Researcher at the German Centre for Research on Ageing at the University of Heidelberg, Department for Social and Environmental Gerontology. His research interests are the context of adult development, person-environment transaction, and housing and relocation in old age. He has completed studies on the subjective experience of home and on relocation from home to home, and he is currently involved in two European studies on mobility and housing in old age. He is coeditor of 3 books and the author/coauthor of several articles and chapters in the area of environmental gerontology. He is a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Housing for the Elderly*.



Springer Publishing Company

- International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-97)*, Nagoya, Japan (Vol. 2, pp. 1577–1592). San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- Engels, K., & Dellen, R. G. (1989). Der Einfluss von Suchfahrten auf das Unfallverursachungsrisiko [The influence of disorientation on accident risk]. *Zeitschrift für Verkehrssicherheit*, 35(3), 93–100.
- Popp, M. M. (1988). Orientierungsprobleme von Kraftfahrern in fremden Städten: Subjektive Einschätzungen und objektive Beobachtungen [Orientation problems of drivers in foreign cities: Subjective evaluation and objective observations]. In M. Kastner (Ed.), *Fortschritte der Verkehrspsychologie '87* (pp. 385–394). Cologne, Germany: TÜV Rheinland.
- Rasmussen, J. (1986). *Information processing and human-machine interaction: An approach to cognitive engineering*. New York: North-Holland.
- Somberg, B. L., & Salthouse, T. A. (1982). Divided attention abilities in young and old adults. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 8, 651–663.
- Wilde, G. J. S. (1982). Incentive systems for accident-free and violation-free driving in the general population. *Ergonomics*, 25(10), 879–890.

Programmatic Interventions with the Older Driver: A Conceptual Framework

Sherry L. Willis

This chapter focuses on the dilemma facing the older driver in Western society. The concerns are perhaps most acute in North America given the singular dependence on the auto for many aspects of daily living. The private auto remains the primary mode of transportation in the United States, with persons over age 65 making more than 90% of their trips by private vehicle (American Association of Retired Persons [AARP], 1999). Many elderly people in the United States live in suburban areas where automobile transportation is the only choice. In 1983 a little over half of the adults aged 65 and older were licensed drivers; now over three-quarters of this age group are licensed drivers. A recent survey conducted in the United States found that almost three-quarters of people over the age of 75 still drive (AARP, 1997). Alarm has been expressed over emerging demographics suggesting the increasing magnitude of the problem in the near future as the baby boomers in the United States and in Europe approach old age and particularly old-old age (AARP, 1999; Schlag, 1993).

There is widespread recognition that major societal efforts to intervene into this phenomenon are required. Much debate is centered on intervening at the person versus environmental level (Schaie & Pietrucha, 2000). Government agencies are spending considerable effort on developing new, more appropriate tools for assessing older drivers—often with little thought about

what interventions are appropriate and feasible with older adults, who are identified as having deficiencies when assessed with these new assessment tools. There is agreement that broad programmatic intervention efforts are needed; however, most current intervention efforts (e.g., share-a-ride programs) are quite small in scale and are designed for specific limited geographical areas (Freund, 2000).

In this chapter, a heuristic known as the lifespan intervention cube is presented to foster consideration of intervention efforts from a broad programmatic perspective. Programmatic interventions are seen as multidimensional such that a number of dimensions must be considered in combination when planning and evaluating intervention efforts. The intervention cube also serves as a schema for examining the scope of current intervention programs and for identifying missing niches within current intervention efforts.

LIFESPAN DRIVING INTERVENTION CUBE

The driving intervention cube is shown in Figure 18.1. It is adapted from a model proposed by Brim and Phillips (1988). The cube indicates that at least 3 broad dimensions must be considered in conceptualizing programmatic interventions: age, target of the intervention, and domain of intervention.

Age at Intervention

The age dimension focuses on the chronological age of the person or group targeted for the intervention. Intervention into driving is regarded as a life-span phenomenon (Baltes & Danish, 1980). The age of the target may range from adolescence to old age. We have also included the category of non-driver, which is more likely to represent old-old adults but may be a status at any chronological age. Although the focus here is on the older adult driver, a life-span perspective of intervention is required for several reasons. First, driving skills and attitudes are typically developed early in life, and the older driver's performance and judgments represent the accumulation of experiences over the entire adult life course (Evans, 1991). Second, similar services and venues may be relevant for interventions with drivers of different ages; therefore, a life-span perspective is useful.

In many driving interventions, the *level of functioning* of the target person




FIGURE 18.1. Intervention cube with intervention cell.

or group may be a more appropriate indicator than chronological age per se (Fozard, 2000; Staplin, 2000). For example, a recent national survey conducted in the United States, which focused on elderly people over age 75, found that 73% of elders over the age of 75 still reported some driving activity: 89% of the males and 64% of the females (AARP, 1997). Given that such a large percentage of old-old continue to drive in the United States, functional age, rather than chronological age, becomes increasingly important to consider, given the wide individual differences in functional competence within the old-old. When such a perspective is taken, this dimension represents functional age with respect to driving. Functional driving age may take into account such factors as cognitive skills related to driving, sensory limitations, mobility, and support systems (Fozard, 2000). Functional limitations, such as hearing and visual impairment, have been found to be important predictors of when older adults curtail their driving (Ball & Owsley, 2000; Schlag, 1993). Functional competence, rather than chronological age, is also important in cases of cognitive impairment. In the United States only 4% of those diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease are believed to continue to

drive; however, these drivers are 2 to 4 times more likely to be in an accident than nondemented elders.

Whether age is considered chronologically or functionally depends in part on the domain of the intervention. For example, many legal approaches to intervention are based solely or primarily on chronological age—age of eligibility to drive and age at which specific criteria for renewal of licenses are imposed. Likewise, many social programs have chronological age eligibility criteria for certain services.

Target of Intervention

The second dimension of the cube focuses on the target of the intervention. The target of intervention may be at the individual or group level or at the environmental level. Interventions targeted at the individual or group level extend from the individual, to family and friends, to communities and society (Smyer & Gatz, 1987). In terms of the driving environment, the vehicle, the roadway, and the traffic control system can be targets of intervention (Hanowski & Dingus, 2000).

Interventions Targeted at Individual or Group

Individual-level interventions typically focus on the psychological and physical health and economic or social functioning of the person (Smyer & Gatz, 1987). A key assumption of individual-level interventions is that they are targeted primarily at the person, with little or no attempt to intervene into his or her primary social or physical context. In contrast, intervention at the level of family and friends focuses on the primary social context of the individual. Some community psychologists maintain that a family system perspective is needed for responding to the individual's mobility needs and concerns; focusing solely on the individual outside of the social context may limit the scope or durability of the intervention (Gesten & Jason, 1987). Community- and society-level interventions have as their desired outcomes improved functioning at the community or societal level. Community-level interventions would include van services, share-a-ride, and educational efforts to increase use of mass transportation options (Freund, 2000; Sterns & Sterns, 2000). Societal-level interventions include both citizen-initiated programs (e.g., MADD, or Mothers against Drunk Driving) and government-initiated efforts, such as the public information campaigns on using seat

belts. Societal-level intervention may also involve social policy initiatives or the enactment of laws and regulations.

Interventions Targeted at the Driving Environment

The driving environment includes the vehicle, the roadway, and traffic-control systems (Hanowski & Dingus, 2000). Vehicle-related interventions include devices, such as air bags, antilock braking, and obstacle-detection systems (Swigart, 2000). Interventions into the roadway include traffic signage and markings, reflective pavement markings, traffic lanes, shoulder rumble strips, and left lane markings (Jovanis, 2000). These types of interventions are effective for all age groups. They are, however, particularly useful for elderly drivers with sensory deficits or in complex driving situations requiring divided attention or multitasking, skills known to decline with age.

The distinction between targeting the individual driver versus groups of drivers for intervention is also relevant for intervention into the driving environment. Vehicle-related interventions are focused on the individual driver, while roadway and traffic-control system interventions are targeted at large groups of drivers at the community or societal level. A recent, national U.S. study found that at least 30% of older drivers reported feeling uncomfortable with specific physical design aspects of roadways or traffic situations that they routinely encountered (AARP, 1997). Over one-third reported changing their driving patterns to avoid certain roadway or traffic situations. Over 50% of older drivers reported avoiding night driving and avoiding rush-hour traffic.

Domain of Intervention

The third dimension of the driving intervention cube is concerned with the domain or mechanism of the intervention. Five broad intervention approaches are suggested: education, social services, engineering and human factors, the legal system, and economic subsidies.

Education

Educational programs have been one of the most common approaches to driving interventions. Educational interventions range from training on spe-

cific cognitive skills related to driving, to educational programs targeted at specific groups such as 55 Alive (AARP, 1999), to broad public service informationals alerting drivers to keep a certain distance from the car in front or to use seat belts.

Education-based driving interventions for older adults are generally provided by 3 sources: by nonprofit organizations or the private sector, by state driver education programs, and through self-assessment materials. Most educational interventions have focused on disseminating information; far fewer programs have focused on actual training of a specific skill or driving ability (Ball & Owsley, 2000). The AARP 55 Alive/Mature Driving Program is completed by 640,000 older drivers annually (AARP, 1999). A major incentive for attending driving renewal programs is that 34 states and the District of Columbia have laws that require insurance premium discounts or reductions in infraction points for older people who take an approved driving course such as 55 Alive (AARP, 1999).

Social Services

A second intervention approach has focused on the provision of services either to all citizens or to targeted groups, particularly groups of a certain age. Many of the traditional social services for the elderly have been targeted at elders making the transition from driving to not driving or to the frail elderly needing special assistance with transportation. These services include van services and share-a-ride systems (Freund, 2000; Sterns & Sterns, 2000). Also included are special incentives (fee reductions) for the use of public transportation and devices such as wheelchair lifts to aid in the use of public transportation.

While these types of interventions have traditionally been provided by community or governmental systems, the business or for-profit sector is becoming increasingly involved. Social or governmental agencies are either contracting with the for-profit sector to provide these services, or business is providing alternatives to the increasingly limited options provided by social services. Similarly, business is also moving into educational interventions related to driving.

Public transit has been recently touted as an option for elderly in the United States (see Burkhardt, 2000, for an alternative position). However, in the United States public transit accounts for only 3% of all trips taken by those aged 65 and over. Over 85% of nondrivers report that they do not use public transportation, citing lack of availability, inconvenience, and physical problems in usage. In a recent survey, 55% of nondrivers reported that a bus

stop was farther than they could walk; however, 32% of the nondrivers who could not walk to an existing bus stop said that they would be able to walk if a bus stop were within 5 blocks of their residence (AARP, 1997). The types of social services described above are often more popular and accepted by elders than public transportation for several reasons. First, they are often planned and targeted to the specific needs and preferences of elders in a particular cultural or geographical setting. Second, they often enhance or maintain the personal freedom and control of the elder. For example, van services are provided to medical and shopping facilities of relevance to elders, rather than a transportation route of interest to the general public. The elder maintains control over timing of transportation and with whom he or she shares transit activities.

Engineering and Human Factors

Instead of targeting the individual, most engineering and human factors interventions are focused on the vehicle or roadway (Hanowski & Dingus, 2000). The focus is on altering or intervening into the physical driving environment. These types of interventions are sometimes presented as requiring little initiative or effort on the part of the individual; however, as these interventions become more cognitively complex, the competence of the individual using them is becoming increasingly important (Willis, 2000). For example, navigational systems in cars require that the individual be cognitively able to program and then to interpret the information provided by the instrumentation.

Legal System

The legal system intervenes by regulating all phases of the driving experience—determining who is allowed to drive, when and where one is allowed to drive, one's conduct while driving, and under what conditions one's driving privileges can be restricted or revoked (U.S. Roads-TransSafety, 1997). Two types of legal actions are directly relevant to older drivers: graduated licensing laws and age-based licensing laws (Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, 2001).

1. Graduated licensing laws have been enacted by approximately one-third of the states in the United States. These laws enable the state to identify driving conditions under which a particular driver's privileges might be restricted, and then to issue a graduated license that restricts the person from driving under those unsafe conditions. Holders of graduated licenses can be

licensed to drive only under specific conditions relating, for example, to time of day, destination, or type of vehicle.

2. Age-based licensing laws vary from state to state, but they often involve what is known as accelerated renewals (Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, 2001). These renewals require that above a certain chronological age individuals renew their licenses more frequently than younger drivers. In addition, some states require special testing or personal appearances at the time of license renewal for older drivers. Accelerated renewal and testing may create a disincentive for older drivers to attempt to renew their licenses. At this time, there has been limited research to determine whether age-based requirements result in removing unsafe older drivers or in simply reducing the number of older drivers whether they are safe drivers or not (AARP, 1999; U.S. Roads-TransSafety, 1997).

The particular intervention approach chosen often reflects basic assumptions regarding the primary causes of particular driving problems. These assumptions are often not explicitly stated. For example, many driving education programs, such as 55 Alive, are based on the largely untested assumption that lack of information regarding driving underlies the poor driving performance of elders. The instructional format for these educational interventions, furthermore, is based on the assumption that the needed information can be provided in a lecture format in a group setting. In a related manner, the legal system often appears to be operating under the assumption that punishment (financial, revoking license) of certain driving behaviors (e.g., speeding) is the most effective intervention to modify that behavior.

Economic subsidies are another possible intervention domain, but they are not included in the current cube. Such subsidies are implicit in many of the social and environmental interventions described above. There may be economic programs to provide battery-powered wheelchairs to individuals with physical or financial limitations. Alternatively, economic subsidies may be available for communities to acquire specially fitted vans for use by elders with mobility limitations.

DRIVING INTERVENTIONS: COMBINING DIMENSIONS OF THE CUBE

A particular driving intervention represents a combination of the above 3 dimensions of the cube. An intervention is typically focused on a certain

age group. The target of the intervention can range from particular individuals to all drivers in a community, or may target the vehicle or roadway. In addition, a particular intervention involves a certain intervention approach, such as education, provision of services, or a legal action. By examining the portion of the intervention cube enclosed by a particular intervention, we gain a better understanding of the extent to which interventions are programmatic in nature (Brim & Phillips, 1988). Interventions that cover all age groups of drivers versus those targeted at a particular age group can be examined. Considering various parts of the cube indicates how different approaches to interventions intersect with certain targets of intervention.

Cells, Plugs, and Bars

The smallest unit of intervention would be an *intervention cell*, focusing on one specific age group (e.g., old-old), one target of intervention (e.g., individual), and one domain of intervention (e.g., legal). An intervention representing only one cell in the cube is quite narrow or focused on the impact of the intervention. By mapping various existing programs or interventions onto the cube, different shapes appear—plugs, bars, slices, blocks, and single cells. The shapes of the intervention units reflect how broad the age group or target is for the intervention, as well as what mechanism for intervening is most likely to be employed in relation to a particular driving concern or problem (Brim & Phillips, 1988). Different societies or countries may have very different shaped intervention units to deal with the same driving problem or concern. Also the shape of intervention units for the same driving problem may change over time. We will illustrate these issues with a few prototypical types of driving interventions.

Intervention Cell

One example of an intervention cell is age-based licensing laws (see Figure 18.1 above). Some states in the United States have special assessment and renewal procedures for drivers above a certain age. The intervention is focused on a particular, narrow age group (the old). The legal system is the domain or mechanism by which the intervention is administered. The target of the intervention is at the level of the state, indicated in the intervention cube as at the community or societal level. Such a narrowly targeted intervention would be represented by an intervention cell.




FIGURE 18.2. Intervention plug.

Intervention Plug

An example of an intervention plug is driving in hazardous weather conditions (see Figure 18.2). Many of the recent interventions dealing with driving during dangerous weather conditions have involved engineering and human factor efforts (domain). These have focused on interventions in the vehicle and on the roadway (target). These intervention efforts typically have not been specifically focused on a particular age group, but have been standard features of vehicles or roadways that affect drivers of all ages. This type of intervention would thus represent a plug, extending across all ages, with the target of intervention being the vehicle or roadway and the intervention approach based on engineering or human factors.

Another example of a plug-shaped intervention is seat belt usage, illustrated by educational interventions targeted at the community or societal level. These include public service educational initiatives to encourage seat belt usage or to keep a certain distance from the preceding car while driving. These educational interventions, targeted at all age groups, are focused at the community or societal level.

Broken Bars

We can alternatively think of combinations of interventions that are targeted at a special population group, such as the elderly (see Figure 18.3). These represent broken bars within the intervention cube. For example, some interventions focusing on the young-old and old-old involve services at both the individual and community levels. These may include education, social service, and legal approaches to intervention. For example, services focusing on elderly with driving limitations might include driver education, alternative transportation services (social services), and legal restrictions on time of day driving is permitted.

It should be noted that all the interventions and domains discussed above have been shown to be effective with respect to certain needs of the older driver. Interventions are often more effective when multiple intervention domains or targets are included. This multidimensional approach to interventions is best illustrated in the intervention plugs and broken bars discussed above. The multidimensional approach takes into account that the needs of




FIGURE 18.3. Broken bars.

the elderly are often complex, and they are best dealt with by interventions involving both the individual and the setting (physical or social) in which the individual functions. For example, interventions into the sensory problem of glare encountered by many elderly may include corrective lenses in glasses that reduce glare, but also traffic lights and roadway surfaces that reduce glare. Likewise, intervening into the social context in which the elder lives may be more effective than intervening solely with the individual. Share-a-ride programs pair the transportation needs of one elder with the economic or social incentives of another member of the community.

CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO THE POINT OF INTERVENTION

A number of additional issues related to programmatic driving interventions merit further discussion.

Target of Intervention: Active or Passive

The dimensions of the cube related to target and domain may be reconceptualized in terms of the extent to which the intervention represents a continuum from active to passive decision making (Evans, 1991). Active versus passive interventions are conceptualized in terms of the number of decision makers and the extent to which the intervention reflects volitional actions at the level of the individual. Targeting the intervention at the level of the individual suggests a form of intervention that involves volitional acts on the part of many decision makers—the most *active* form of intervention. Interventions targeted at the individual, such as driver education or seat belt usage, require many decision makers making volitional acts to implement the intervention.

In contrast, targeting interventions at the level of the vehicle or roadway typically involves interventions in which there are fewer decision makers and may require fewer volitional acts on the part of the individual—thus characterized as a more *passive* form of intervention. Passive interventions involving the vehicle or roadway include air bags and antilock braking in vehicles, as well as roadway designs, which are imposed on all drivers.

Voluntary versus Involuntary

A related dichotomy is voluntary, individually based interventions versus involuntary, legislative-based interventions. Voluntary individual-based in-

terventions may be of 2 types. First, voluntary interventions may take the form of self-regulation (Dobbs, 2000; Evans, 1991). Three forms of self-regulation include compensation, avoidance, and cessation. For example, an individual may decide to self-regulate his or her driving behavior by avoiding driving while drinking, or ceasing night driving, or compensating for possible deficits by involving a copilot. The second form of voluntary, individual-based interventions focuses on educational efforts, such as 55 Alive.

Evans (1991) has suggested that one of the limitations to interventions based on self-regulation comes from individual drivers not being able to identify major driving risks from their own direct driving experience. There is often a sparsity of useful personal feedback available to the driver to use in making a judgment regarding self-regulation. Given the low incidence of serious auto crashes, the individual driver has little information on which of his or her driving behaviors might double or triple the likelihood of being involved in a serious crash. The role of limited feedback on self-regulation is particularly relevant for the older adult. Older adults have fewer accidents than members of other age groups, but they are more likely to experience serious injuries when a serious accident occurs.

It has been argued that passive or involuntary interventions with few decision makers are likely to have the most widespread effects on road safety. It is asserted that such interventions may be much more efficient to implement in the society as a whole. There are, however, limitations on the types of driving problems that can be easily resolved by using solely passive interventions. For example, there are limitations to passive interventions for driving situations that require complex decision making, such as safely executing a left-hand turn. It may be argued that, as the complexity of the driving situation increases, the difficulty will increase in devising a completely passive, nonvolitional intervention to deal with the situation. Some form of conscious action on the part of the driver often will be needed.

Timing of the Intervention: Primary, Secondary, or Tertiary

A key issue in prevention intervention research has focused on the timing of the intervention (Smyer & Gatz, 1987). *Primary* prevention is defined as that occurring before the problem arises. In terms of driving interventions, this would include crash-avoidance interventions. *Secondary* prevention occurs after the initial identification of the problem but before serious harm has arisen. Secondary prevention efforts, which involve prompt treatment of

identified problems, may be particularly important in terms of intervention efforts with the elderly. These types of interventions might be initiated after a fender bender in which no one was injured, after a driving assessment, or after a "near miss." Although secondary interventions are often implemented at a different stage in the problem, many of the interventions may be similar to those included as primary interventions. *Tertiary* interventions occur after the problem has progressed to a more critical stage. In terms of driving, this would include crash-protection interventions, or withdrawal of driving privileges after an accident.

A complete model of driving interventions must consider the range of interventions from those to avoid crashes (primary prevention) to interventions to protect during a crash (tertiary intervention). Most interventions focus on primary prevention or crash avoidance (Evans, 1991); however, a number of the engineering and human factors approaches targeted at the vehicle, in particular, are aimed at protection during a crash. These include air bags, seat belt restraints, and special materials (shatterproof glass, padded dash boards) to reduce the likelihood of an injury as a result of a crash. Many of these interventions, aimed at protecting during a crash, can be labeled as passive, rather than active.

Interventions focused on crash avoidance include both passive and active interventions. Many of the same types of intervention may be involved in primary-prevention and secondary-prevention efforts. Active crash-avoidance interventions include education, possible use of copiloting, and driving restrictions for time of day or certain types of roadways. Passive crash-avoidance interventions include road construction and vehicle equipment, such as obstacle-detector systems and antilock braking. Although crash-avoidance interventions are more frequent and have been given greater attention, they are often much more difficult to evaluate. Part of the difficulty in evaluating crash-avoidance interventions is in documenting and counting the incidents of crash avoidance. Active crash-avoidance interventions are particularly difficult to evaluate. In contrast, crash-protective interventions, implemented during a crash, and particularly those which are passive, are considered the easiest to evaluate.

Research shows that public attitudes toward interventions are influenced by evidence demonstrating an identifiable survivor or beneficiary of an intervention (Evans, 1991). It has been much easier to document survivors or beneficiaries of crash-protective interventions, particularly of the passive type, than beneficiaries of crash-avoidance interventions. This characteristic of public attitudes toward interventions may contribute to the difficulty in obtaining public support for and adherence to certain types of crash-avoidance interventions.

SUMMARY

In this chapter we have discussed issues related to programmatic interventions with the older driver. We have argued that programmatic interventions must be conceptualized as multidimensional. We have presented an intervention cube as one schema for thinking about programmatic interventions into driving. The 3 dimensions of the cube include the age group, the target of the intervention (individual, community, vehicle, or roadway), and the domain or mechanism for administering the intervention. Common intervention mechanisms include education, provision of services, human factors and engineering, and legal actions.

Each intervention mechanism is based on assumptions that are rarely articulated fully; for example, educational interventions assume that the driver's deficit is due to a lack of knowledge. Current educational interventions focus on dissemination of factual information with much less focus on developing skills and enhancing actual driving performance. Legal-based interventions often assume that chronological age rather than functional age is an appropriate criterion for determining the group to be the target of the intervention (Fozard, 2000).

By considering various existing interventions with respect to the intervention cube, we can begin to determine what types of programmatic interventions represent certain cells, plugs, or blocks of the entire cube. We suggest the cube has heuristic value for examining what aspects of the cube characterize existing interventions and what future interventions might be needed to involve other dimensions of the cube.

REFERENCES

- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). (1997). *Community transportation survey*. Washington, DC: AARP.
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). (1999). *Older drivers*. Washington, DC: Public Policy Institute, AARP.
- Ball, K., & Owsley, C. (2000). Increasing mobility and reducing accidents of older drivers. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 213-250). New York: Springer.
- Baltes, P. B., & Danish, S. J. (1980). Intervention in life-span development and aging: Issues and concepts. In R. R. Turner & H. W. Reese (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology: Intervention* (pp. 49-78). New York: Academic Press.
- Brim, O. G., Jr., & Phillips, D. A. (1988). The life-span intervention cube. In E. M. Hetherington & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Child development in life-span perspective* (pp. 277-299). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Burkhardt, J. E. (2000). Limitations of mass transportation and individual vehicle systems for older persons. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 97–124). New York: Springer.
- Dobbs, A. R. (2000). Commentary: The role of concordance between perceived and real competence for mobility outcomes. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 251–268). New York: Springer.
- Evans, L. (1991). *Traffic safety and the driver*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Fozard, J. L. (2000). Sensory and cognitive changes with age. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 1–44). New York: Springer.
- Freund, K. (2000). Commentary: Into the transportation future. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 145–156). New York: Springer.
- Gesten, E. L., & Jason, L. A. (1987). Social and community interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 427–460.
- Hanowski, R. J., & Dingus, T. A. (2000). Will intelligent transportation systems improve older driver mobility? In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 279–298). New York: Springer.
- Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. (2001). *U.S. driver licensing renewal procedures for older drivers*. Arlington, VA: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.
- Jovanis, P. P. (2000). Commentary: Intelligent transportation systems and the older traveler: Prospects for mobility. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 315–322). New York: Springer.
- Schaie, K. W., & Pietrucha, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Mobility and transportation in the elderly*. New York: Springer.
- Schlag, B. (1993). Elderly drivers in Germany—fitness and driving behavior. *Accident Analyses & Prevention*, 25, 47–55.
- Smyer, M. A., & Gatz, M. (1987). Intervention research approaches. *Research on Aging*, 8, 536–558.
- Staplin, L. (2000). Commentary: Countering mobility losses due to functional impairments in normally aging individuals: Applying Fozard's framework to everyday driving situations. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 63–70). New York: Springer.
- Sterns, H. L., & Sterns, R. (2000). Commentary: Social structures and processes in public and private transportation. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 125–144). New York: Springer.
- Swigart, T. F. (2000). Commentary: Intelligent transportation systems and the older driver: An auto industry perspective. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 299–314). New York: Springer.
- U.S. Roads-TransSafety. (March, 1997). Licensing older drivers: Part 1. *Road Management and Engineering Journal*. Available at www.USRoads.com/journals/rej/9703/re970302.htm.
- Willis, S. L. (2000). Commentary: Driving competence: The person \times environment fit. In K. W. Schaie & M. Pietrucha (Eds.), *Mobility and transportation in the elderly* (pp. 269–278). New York: Springer.

Future Perspectives of Aging Independently: Combining Perspectives of Aging Inside and Outside the Home
