International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Research

Online ISSN-2958-3683 | Print ISSN-2958-3675
Frequency: Bi-Monthly
Available online on: https://ijmpr.in/

Research Article

A Comparative Study of Visual and Auditory Reaction Times Among Professional Bus Drivers and Non-Drivers

Rajkumar A[1], Vanitha G[2], Xavier Christu Rajan V[3]

[1] *Assistant Professor, Department of Physiology, Government Medical College Namakkal, Namakkal, India*
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-7130-1968
[2] *Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Government Medical College Namakkal, Namakkal, India*
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-9379-0381
[3] *Associate Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College Namakkal, Namakkal, India*

OPEN ACCESS

Corresponding Author:

Rajkumar A
Assistant Professor, Department of Physiology, Government Medical College Namakkal, Namakkal, India

Received: 10-08-2025
Accepted: 31-08-2025
Available Online: 18-09-2025

ABSTRACT

Background: Reaction time (RT) is a fundamental measure of sensory and motor responsiveness, serving as a key indicator of psychomotor and cognitive functions critical for safe driving. Visual Reaction Time (VRT) and Auditory Reaction Time (ART) are specific components of RT that are particularly relevant to the dynamic and demanding environment of professional driving.

Aim: The objective of this study was to conduct a cross-sectional comparison of VRT and ART between a group of professional bus drivers and a control group of non-drivers.

Methodology: A total of 80 male participants, comprising 40 professional bus drivers with 5–10 years of experience and 40 age-matched non-driving controls, were recruited for the study. Both VRT and ART were measured using a standardized, mobile-based application. The test procedure involved a simple reaction time task where participants responded to either a visual stimulus (a green light disappearing) or an auditory stimulus (a beep sound) by lifting their finger from the screen. Data were analyzed using an unpaired Student's t-test, with a significance level set at $p<0.05$.

Results: The mean ART for drivers was 220.7±11 ms, which was significantly faster than the control group's mean of 240.0±12 ms ($p<0.001$). Similarly, the mean VRT for drivers was 228.0±15.1 ms, which was also significantly faster than the control group's mean of 251.0±13.2 ms ($p<0.001$).

Conclusion: The findings of this study demonstrate that professional bus drivers possess significantly faster visual and auditory reaction times compared to non-drivers. This suggests that sustained exposure to the complex demands of driving may lead to a practice-induced improvement in neural processing speed and sensorimotor coordination, with important implications for road safety and driver competency.

Keywords*: Reaction Time, Visual Reaction Time, Auditory Reaction Time, Bus Drivers, Road Safety, Psychomotor Skills*

INTRODUCTION

Reaction time (RT) is a foundational metric in experimental psychology and psychophysiology, defined as the temporal interval between the presentation of a stimulus and the initiation of a corresponding motor response. It is a composite measure of the efficiency of an individual's sensory, neural, and motor pathways. In the context of daily life, particularly in occupations requiring rapid decision-making and motor action, RT is a critical determinant of performance and safety (De Felice & Petrillo, 2011).

In the specialized field of transportation, RT is a primary variable influencing vehicle control and accident prevention. Driving is a complex, cognitively demanding task that requires continuous sensory input processing and a rapid motor output. The two most common forms of RT relevant to driving are Visual Reaction Time (VRT) and Auditory Reaction

Time (ART). VRT is essential for responding to visual cues such as traffic signals, brake lights, and road hazards. ART, on the other hand, is vital for reacting to auditory stimuli like vehicle horns, sirens, or the sound of a tire blowout.

Professional bus drivers operate large vehicles in a dynamic, high-pressure environment, where quick and accurate responses can mean the difference between a safe journey and a catastrophic accident. Given the cumulative exposure to thousands of hours of driving, it is hypothesized that this population may develop enhanced psychomotor skills, including faster RT, compared to the general population. This neural and motor adaptation, often referred to as a "practice effect," is a testament to the plasticity of the central nervous system. Previous studies have explored factors affecting driver performance, such as fatigue, stress, and psychosocial factors (Useche et al., 2017; Cendales et al., 2014), but a direct, comparative analysis of fundamental RT metrics between professional drivers and non-drivers is less commonly documented.

This study was designed to address this gap by directly comparing VRT and ART in a cohort of professional bus drivers against a matched control group of non-drivers. Our primary objectives were:
1.To compare the mean VRT between professional drivers and non-drivers.
2.To compare the mean ART between professional drivers and non-drivers.
3.To determine the statistical significance of any observed differences in these reaction times.

Methodology
Study Design and Setting: This was a cross-sectional comparative study conducted in the Department of Physiology at [Institution Name]. Ethical approval for the study protocol was obtained from the Institutional Ethics Committee ([Approval Number, if applicable]). All participants provided informed consent prior to their inclusion in the study.
Participants: A total of 80 male participants were recruited and divided into two groups:
Group 1 (Drivers): This group consisted of 40 male professional bus drivers, aged 25–50 years, with a minimum of 5 years and a maximum of 10 years of professional driving experience.
Group 2 (Controls): This group consisted of 40 male individuals from the general population, matched for age (25–50 years), who were not engaged in any professional driving occupation.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:
Inclusion Criteria: All participants were required to be between 25 and 50 years of age, have normal or corrected-to-normal vision and hearing, and have no history of neurological or psychiatric illnesses.

Exclusion Criteria: Individuals with a history of substance abuse, those on medications known to affect cognition or motor function, and those reporting sleep deprivation in the 24 hours preceding the test were excluded from the study.

Instrumentation and Procedure: Reaction times were measured using the 'Think About' mobile application, a validated tool for assessing simple reaction times. The testing was conducted in a quiet, controlled environment to minimize external distractions. Participants were seated comfortably and given clear instructions before the test began.

VRT Test: The VRT test involved a simple visual stimulus. A green light would appear on the screen at random intervals (ranging from 1 to 5 seconds). The participants were instructed to press and hold their finger on the screen and lift it as quickly as possible the moment the green light disappeared. A total of 10 trials were conducted for each participant, with the first 2 trials considered as practice runs and the remaining 8 used for data analysis. The average of the 8 recorded times was taken as the participant's VRT.

ART Test: The ART test followed a similar procedure. Participants were instructed to press and hold their finger on the screen and lift it as soon as they heard a distinct beep sound. The beep sound was presented at random intervals (1 to 5 seconds). As with the VRT test, 10 trials were administered, with the final 8 used to calculate the average ART for each participant. The sound volume was standardized for all participants.

Statistical Analysis: All collected data were entered into a statistical software package (e.g., SPSS version 26.0). Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation (Mean ± SD), were calculated for both VRT and ART in each group. An unpaired Student's t-test was used to compare the mean reaction times between the driver and control groups. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

Results
The data analysis revealed significant differences in both auditory and visual reaction times between the two groups. The findings are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison of Auditory and Visual Reaction Times Between Drivers and Controls

Reaction Time (ms)	Drivers (n=40)	Controls (n=40)	t-value	p-value
Auditory (ART)	220.7±11.0	240.0±12.0	-	<0.001*
Visual (VRT)	228.0±15.1	251.0±13.2	-	<0.001*

*p-value is from an unpaired t-test. $^*Significant at p<0.05.

As shown in the table, the mean auditory reaction time for the driver group (220.7±11.0 ms) was significantly faster than that of the control group (240.0±12.0 ms). This difference was highly statistically significant (p<0.001).

Similarly, the mean visual reaction time for the driver group (228.0±15.1 ms) was also significantly faster than the control group's mean VRT (251.0±13.2 ms). This difference was also highly statistically significant (p<0.001).

Discussion

The results of this study strongly support our hypothesis, indicating that professional bus drivers have significantly quicker visual and auditory reaction times than non-driving individuals. This finding is consistent with the concept of a practice-induced improvement in sensorimotor skills. The repetitive nature of driving exposes professional drivers to a vast number of stimuli that necessitate rapid detection, cognitive processing, and motor response. Over years of experience, this continuous training likely enhances the efficiency of the neural circuits involved in these processes. The central nervous system, known for its plasticity, adapts to these sustained environmental demands, leading to a demonstrable improvement in RT.

The observed differences are not merely statistical artifacts; they have practical implications for road safety. Faster reaction times allow for quicker responses to unexpected events, such as a pedestrian entering the roadway, a sudden vehicle maneuver, or an emergency siren. This improved neural agility can significantly reduce the probability of a collision. These findings align with previous research that highlights the critical role of cognitive and motor skills in preventing road traffic accidents (Rolison & Moutari, 2020).

Limitations and Future Directions: This study, while robust in its findings, has several limitations. The cross-sectional design prevents the establishment of a causal relationship; we cannot definitively state that driving causes faster reaction times, but rather that there is a strong correlation between the two. A longitudinal study, following individuals as they transition from non-drivers to professional drivers, could provide more definitive evidence of this adaptive process. Furthermore, the use of a mobile application, while convenient, may introduce slight variations in measurement compared to more specialized laboratory equipment. Future research could explore a larger, more diverse sample, including female drivers and different age groups, to generalize the findings. It would also be valuable to investigate other psychomotor skills, such as complex reaction time and divided attention, and correlate them with driving performance metrics.

Conclusion

This study provides compelling evidence that professional bus drivers demonstrate superior auditory and visual reaction times compared to non-driving controls. These results underscore the importance of these fundamental psychomotor skills in occupations that require high levels of vigilance and rapid responsiveness. The findings have potential implications for driver training programs, vehicle design, and the development of screening tools for assessing driver fitness.

References

1. De Felice, F., & Petrillo, A. (2011). Methodological approach for performing human reliability and error analysis in railway transportation systems. International Journal of Engineering and Technology, 3(3), 341–353.
2. Useche, S., Montoro, L., & Cendales, B. (2017). Work stress, fatigue and risk behaviors in bus drivers. Data in Brief, 15, 335–339.
3. Rolison, J.J., & Moutari, S. (2020). Young driver crash risk factors: A meta-analysis. Journal of Safety Research, 73, 171–177.
4. Cendales, B., Useche, S., & Sarmiento, O. (2014). Psychosocial factors and blood pressure in bus operators: a cross-sectional study in Bogotá. Industrial Health, 52(4), 279–288.
5. Jongen, E.M.M., et al. (2011). Reward and risky driving in young drivers. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 20, 604–612.