Factors affecting fall severity from a ladder: impact of climbing direction, gloves, gender and adaptation

Erika M. Pliner^a, Na Jin Seo^b, Kurt E. Beschoner^{a*}

Abstract

Ladder falls cause many fatal injuries. The factors that affect whether a ladder perturbation leads to a fall are not well understood. This study quantified the effects of several factors on a person's ability to recover from a ladder perturbation. Thirty-five participants each experienced six unexpected ladder missteps, for three glove conditions (bare hands, high friction, low friction) and two climbing directions (ascent, descent). Fall severity was increased during ladder descent ($p < 0.001$). Gloves did not affect fall severity. Females compared to males had greater fall severity during ascent ($p < 0.001$) and descent ($p = 0.018$). During ascent, females had greater fall severity during the second perturbation but similar fall severity to males during the other perturbations. Additional protection may be needed when descending a ladder. Also, females may benefit from targeted interventions like training. This study does not suggest that gloves are effective for preventing ladder falls.

Keywords ladder falls; climbing direction; gender

1. Introduction

Ladder falls are the leading cause of fatal falls (BLS 2012) and 63 percent of ladder injuries result in a fracture or sprain (Partridge, Virk et al. 1998). Nearly half of these ladder fall fractures lead to over \$5,000 in medical cost per case (Smith, Timmons et al. 2006). However, these severe injuries are believed to be preventable through safer ladder climbing practices (Muir and Kanwar 1993, Socias, Chaumont Menéndez et al. 2014). Identifying the climbing practices associated with reduced fall risk and the individuals at risk for falling is important to develop and target strategies for reducing the number of people who suffer from injuries of ladder falls.

Ladder falls can be broadly categorized into falls from ladders and falls with ladders (Shepherd, Kahler et al. 2006). A fall with a ladder is typically a result of unstable ladder placement (Shepherd, Kahler et al. 2006, Smith, Timmons et al. 2006, Hsiao, Simeonov et al. 2008). Instability in the ladder placement can cause the ladder to tip or the base to slide. Therefore, prevention strategies for falls with ladders have focused primarily on securing the ladder (Hsiao, Simeonov et al. 2008), improving friction between the ladder base and ground surface (Chang, Chang et al. 2005) or optimizing the inclination angle of extension ladders (Chang, Chang et al. 2004). A fall from a ladder is the result of the climber losing their supporting hand and/or foot contact with the ladder (e.g. slip of the hand or foot). A majority of falls from ladders result from a climber's overbalance, slip, or misstep (Shepherd, Kahler et al. 2006). The ladder design and biomechanics of ladder climbing have been found to be associated with slip propensity and a climber's ability to recover from a slip (Pliner, Campbell-Kyureghyan et al. 2014, Schnorenberg, Campbell-Kyureghyan et al. 2015). The present study aims to expand on this research to identify factors that affect a person's ability to recover after a ladder climbing perturbation.

1
2
3
4 Epidemiology research has suggested that climbing direction (ascent/descent) may be an
5
6 important risk factor for falls from ladders. A review of mining injury reports revealed that ladder
7
8 fall injuries occur three times more often for miners exiting (and thus descending ladders) mining
9
10 equipment compared with entering equipment (Moore, Porter et al. 2009). One explanation that
11
12 was offered by the authors of this study is that miners may have poorer balance during descent due
13
14 to the amount of vibration exposure that is experienced between ascent at the start of a shift and
15
16 descent at the end of the shift (Moore, Porter et al. 2009). However, previous research has
17
18 suggested that exposure to vibration does not have substantial short-term impacts on balance
19
20 (Cornelius, Redfern et al. 1994, Santos, Larivière et al. 2008). An alternative hypothesis is that more
21
22 falls are experienced during ladder descent because recovering from a perturbation during descent
23
24 is more challenging than ascent due to the body's downward momentum. Although injury records
25
26 show more descending ladder falls than ascending, a gap in the literature exists regarding whether
27
28 this is because of some exposure that typically occurs between ascent and descent or because
29
30 recovering from a perturbation during descent is more challenging.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Glove use has also been suggested to be an important risk factor for recovery after a climbing
39
40 perturbation since glove use affects friction and tactile perception. The use of gloves is known to
41
42 impact the achievable forces between a hand and a handle, which is believed to affect a person's
43
44 ability to recover from a ladder climbing perturbation (Barnett and Poczynck 2000, Hur, Motawar et
45
46 al. 2012, Hur, Motawar et al. 2014). Specifically, the coefficient of friction (COF) between the rung
47
48 and hand is positively correlated with the amount of frictional force that can be applied to a rung
49
50 before the rung is pulled out of the hand's grasp (Hur, Motawar et al. 2012). Also, a low COF
51
52 between the glove and rung has been associated with an increase in the muscular effort required to
53
54 stabilize a sudden upward impulse force applied to a rung (Hur, Motawar et al. 2014). However,
55
56 previous studies that examined the impact of friction on recovery from a ladder perturbation only
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 considered the interaction between the hand and the rung in a stationary position (Barnett and
5
6 Poczynck 2000, Hur, Motawar et al. 2012, Hur, Motawar et al. 2014) without consideration of the
7
8 role that the rest of the body plays after a ladder perturbation. This method may be an over-
9
10 simplification of the effects that gloves have between the hand and rung during an actual ladder
11
12 falling scenario. Thus, additional research is needed to determine if these changes in force
13
14 application translate into improved ability to recover from a ladder perturbation.
15
16
17
18

19 Contradicting evidence exists regarding if gender would have an impact on ladder fall severity.
20
21 Differences across genders in anthropometry and strength may lead to different capacities for
22
23 reaching rungs and applying the required forces, which could then have an impact on fall severity.
24
25 Females have less upper body strength than males (Miller, MacDougall et al. 1993) even after
26
27 normalizing for body mass (Young, Woolley et al. 2009) and increased upper body strength is
28
29 believed to be critical to prevent a ladder fall (Hur, Motawar et al. 2012). Also, females are shorter
30
31 in stature, have shorter arms and tend to have smaller hand sizes (Chaffin, Andersson et al. 1999),
32
33 which may impact their ability to reach and grasp ladder rungs. Previous research found females to
34
35 have a lower grip force than males, which is partially due to their smaller hand size (Fransson and
36
37 Winkel 1991, Seo and Armstrong 2008). Yet, male workers account for the majority of ladder fall
38
39 injuries, have higher ladder fall incidence rates (Socias, Chaumont Menéndez et al. 2014), and incur
40
41 more severe ladder fall injuries than female workers (Björnstig and Johnsson 1992). These
42
43 epidemiology studies should be interpreted cautiously since they may be affected by gender
44
45 differences in the frequency of using ladders during work. Thus, controlled laboratory studies may
46
47 provide better characterization of the effects of gender on ladder falling risk.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Repeated perturbations to a ladder climber have not been studied to quantify the adaptation
57
58 process. In gait perturbation studies, participants have been found to alter their gait biomechanics
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

when perturbed repeatedly (i.e. by shifting their center of mass anteriorly, reducing foot angle, increasing knee angle, and decreasing trunk angle) (Owings, Pavol et al. 2001, Bhatt, Wening et al. 2006). These adaptations can be made before or after perturbation onset (Bhatt, Wening et al. 2006), and are correlated with increased stability (Bhatt, Wening et al. 2006) and potential fall elimination (Owings, Pavol et al. 2001). In addition, adaptation changes have also been noticed in participants anticipating a slip during gait (Cham and Redfern 2002). Similarly, a person's ability to recover from a perturbation and avoid a fall may change after repeated exposures to a ladder perturbation.

The purpose of this study is to determine the impacts of climbing direction, gloves, gender and adaptation on fall severity following a ladder perturbation. This study will test the following hypotheses. Hypothesis 1: Falls during ladder descent will result in more severe fall outcomes compared to ladder ascent. Hypothesis 2: The use of gloves will affect fall severity outcomes. Hypothesis 3: Female ladder climbers will have more severe fall outcomes following a perturbation than their male counterparts. Hypothesis 4: Fall severity will vary with continuing perturbations.

2. Material & Methods

2.1 Subjects

Thirty-five healthy participants between the ages of 18 and 29 years were recruited. The demographic consisted of 22 males (23.8 ± 5.3 yrs., 80.6 ± 7.8 kg, 1.8 ± 0.1 m) and 13 females (25.5 ± 6.0 yrs., 63.3 ± 6.6 kg, 1.7 ± 0.1 m). Exclusion criteria included musculoskeletal disorders, previous shoulder dislocations, osteoporosis/osteoarthritis, neurological/cognitive disorders, balance disorders and pregnancy. This study was approved by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Institutional Review Board (Protocol Number: 11.366) and all participants signed informed consent prior to participation.

2.2 Apparatus

A vertical 12-foot custom-designed ladder was secured in the middle of the motion capture volume (Figure 1). The ladder had twelve cylindrical rungs, which were 31.8 mm (1.25 in) in diameter and spaced 305 mm (12 in) apart, in compliance with U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards (OSHA 2003). All rungs excluding the fourth rung were equipped with two strain gauges that were sampled at a frequency of 2000 Hz. The strain gauges were located at the bottom and the side of the rung facing the climber, positioned in the center. To ensure all participants experienced the same climbing perturbation, a ladder misstep was created by a mechanical release, based-off a specific event in the individual's climbing cycle. A simulated misstep perturbation was induced on the fourth rung (referred to as the breakaway rung hereafter) by releasing the rung under the foot during climbing. The left and right side of the breakaway rung had a spring-loaded connector inside the rung. A rod was used to compress each spring-loaded connection to attach the breakaway rung with the ladder. The rod and spring connection was held in place with electric magnets during baseline climbing. When the breakaway rung was triggered to release, the magnets would demagnetize and the springs would extend, breaking the rungs connection with the ladder. The breakaway rung was programmed to release when less than five percent of the participant's body weight remained on the previous rung. Foot-off of the leg contralateral to the perturbation leg was selected as the perturbation time, based on previous research that found that this is typically the time when the foot slips off of a rung (Schnorenberg, Campbell-Kyureghyan et al. 2015). Prior to testing, participants were informed they would be climbing stable and unstable ladders, but they were not informed of the perturbation mechanism and location.

Figure 1: Instrumented ladder with electronically-controlled breakaway rung. The ellipse encircles the breakaway rung.

2.3 Experimental Approach

The testing session was started by recording the mass and height of the participant. The participant was equipped with climbing attire, footwear, shin guards and a safety harness. The footwear was a standard work shoe with a rubber sole and raised heel. The shin guards acted as additional protection to the climber in case their legs accidentally contacted the ladder after the perturbation. The safety harness was equipped with a load cell, which collected force data at a frequency of 1000 Hz to measure the weight supported by the harness. Forty-seven reflective markers were placed on the participant's anatomical landmarks for the head (3 markers), torso (10 markers), upper extremities (14 markers) and lower extremities (20 markers). Only the bilateral

1
2
3
4 anterior superior iliac spine (ASIS) and posterior superior iliac spine (PSIS) torso markers were
5
6 analyzed in this study. Markers were recorded by 13 motion capture cameras at a frequency of 100
7
8 Hz (Motion Analysis Raptor Corp., Santa Rosa, CA). In a single testing session, participants were
9
10 perturbed three times while ascending and three times while descending the ladder out of 30 total
11
12 ascent and descent trials. The perturbations were conducted once in each climbing direction
13
14 (ascent and descent) for each of three different glove conditions (bare hands, latex-coated gloves
15
16 and cotton gloves). The latex-coated gloves was selected as a high friction glove condition whereas
17
18 the cotton gloves were selected as a low friction glove condition (Hur, Motawar et al. 2012). Both
19
20 gloves were bought off-the-shelf. High friction gloves were made of knitted fabric with a latex palm
21
22 (HD30503/L3P, West Chester, Inc., Monroe, OH) and low friction gloves were made of 100% cotton
23
24 (COTPR, Drillcomp, Inc., New Hope, PA). The high friction gloves were 1.57 mm thick and the low
25
26 friction gloves were 0.31 mm thick. Three glove sizes were available for the high friction and low
27
28 friction gloves to accommodate different hand sizes. Perturbation order was randomized.
29
30 Participants acclimated to the ladder with each glove condition prior to data collection. Three to six
31
32 regular climbing trials were collected prior to each perturbation to reduce anticipation of the
33
34 perturbation (Pliner, Campbell-Kyureghyan et al. 2014). Rest time of approximately two minutes
35
36 was allotted after each perturbation. Participants were instructed to climb at a “comfortable but
37
38 urgent pace” to simulate climbing speed of a regular-to-busy workday. To ensure participant
39
40 safety, each participant had an impact mat at the bottom of the ladder, a spotter and belayer.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **2.4 Data and Statistical Analysis**

52
53
54

55 Fall severity to a ladder perturbation was measured by the load cell that was attached to the
56
57 safety harness. A high harness force was associated with a more severe fall and a low harness force
58
59 was associated with a less severe fall (Yang and Pai 2011). The harness force was normalized to
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 each participant's body weight. Therefore, fall severity was analyzed as a continuous variable and
5
6 defined as the peak harness force found across a period of time that represented the time from
7
8 perturbation onset (start of fall) until the time when the person had either fallen into the harness
9
10 or had arrested the fall (end of fall). The velocity of climber's mid-hip joint center was also
11
12 quantified at the time of perturbation onset and the peak downward velocity between the start of
13
14 fall and end of fall in order to characterize the momentum of the body. These measures were
15
16 intended to explain differences in the body's momentum between ascent and descent. A more
17
18 downward (negative) mid-hip joint center velocity was indicative of greater fall severity (Pavol and
19
20 Pai 2002, Pai 2003, Beschorner and Cham 2008). The start of fall was defined as the time that the
21
22 breakaway rung was triggered to release. The end of fall was defined as the first local maximum in
23
24 harness force after the first minimum of mid-hip joint center's downward vertical displacement.
25
26 This method was selected based on initial observations in the harness force data where the peak
27
28 harness force was typically observed either just before or shortly after the local minimum in hip
29
30 elevation. Mid-hip joint centers were calculated using Bell's Method and the ASIS and PSIS markers
31
32 (Bell, Pedersen et al. 1990). Trials were excluded (43 out of 210 trials) due to technical equipment
33
34 error (27 trials), participant withdrawal (8 trials), and incongruence between the end of fall time
35
36 calculated by the algorithm versus the time identified by visual inspection (8 trials).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Two statistical analyses were used to determine the effect of climbing direction (first analysis)
46
47 and the other independent variables (second analysis) on fall severity. A repeated measures ANOVA
48
49 was performed with normalized harness force as the dependent variable; while subject number
50
51 (random), perturbation number (nominal) and climbing direction were the independent variables.
52
53 Perturbation number was added to the model to adjust for potential confounding effects due to
54
55 participants adapting to the multiple perturbations. Gloves and gender were not included in the
56
57 first model because ladder ascent and descent were determined to be fundamentally different
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

tasks and, therefore, it was determined that the effects of gloves, gender and adaptation should be assessed for ascent and descent separately. To assess the body's momentum between climbing direction, repeated measures ANOVAs were performed with the mid-hip joint center velocity at perturbation onset and peak downward velocity as the dependent variables. In consistency with the first ANOVA, subject number (random), perturbation number (nominal) and climbing direction were the independent variables. The second analysis was a generalized linear model with normalized harness force as the dependent variable and subject number (random), perturbation number (nominal), glove condition, gender, and first order interactions as the independent variables. Models were performed separately for ascent and descent. In addition, first order interactions that did not occur for every condition were removed (e.g., subject number x gender). A square root transformation was needed to ensure that harness force was normally distributed for both analyses. A significance level of 0.05 was used. Post-hoc comparisons were made using Tukey HSD tests for any primary effects with more than two categories. Given the large number of combinations for the interaction effects between gender and perturbation number (12 combinations for gender x perturbation number), t-tests using a Bonferroni correction ($0.05/6$) were performed that only considered differences across gender for each perturbation number (i.e., differences between male and female for perturbation 1, 2, 3, etc.). This limited post-hoc test reduced the number of comparisons from 12 to 6 in order to provide sufficient power for describing this interaction. An additional analysis was performed on climbing cycle time to assess anticipation of the perturbation. This temporal parameter is similar to another study that identified changes in stance duration during slip-anticipation gait trials (Cham and Redfern 2002). Cycle time was calculated from the baseline trial prior to each perturbation trial. Cycle time was defined as the time period from foot contact on the third rung to foot contact on the fifth rung for ascending perturbations and vice versa for descending perturbations. Foot contact was determined from

strain gauge data on the rungs captured in the vertical direction and filtered using a zero-phase fourth-order Butterworth low-pass filter with a cut-off frequency of 36 Hz (Chang, Chang et al. 2011). Foot contact was defined as the point in time when strain activity exceeded 10% of the peak strain activity on the corresponding rung during the baseline trial. A repeated measures ANOVA was run with cycle time as the dependent variable and subject number (random) and perturbation number (nominal) as the dependent variables. Analyses were run separate by climbing direction.

3. Results

Climbing direction was found to have a substantial impact on fall severity. The average normalized harness force (standard deviation) observed in this study across all trials was 0.288 (0.258). Descending perturbations led to harness forces more than double those of ascending perturbations, which confirmed Hypothesis 1 ($p < 0.001$, $F = 65.325$) (Figure 2). Harness force did not significantly change across the six perturbations ($p = 0.078$, $F = 2.033$) in the ANOVA.

Figure 2: Average harness force normalized to body weight for ascent and descent. Error bars represent standard deviation.

The mid-hip joint center velocities were higher for ascent than descent at perturbation onset ($p < 0.001$; $F = 1090.380$). In addition, ascending perturbations had a smaller (less negative) peak downward mid-hip joint center velocity than descending perturbations ($p < 0.001$; $F = 280.174$) (Figure 3). The mid-hip joint center velocity did not significantly change with perturbation number at perturbation onset ($p = 0.437$; $F = 0.986$), but slightly reduced (less negative) at peak downward velocity from the first to sixth perturbation ($p = 0.032$; $F = 2.533$). The average (standard deviation) mid-hip joint center velocity for ascending and descending climbers was 0.709 (0.180) m/s and -0.015 (0.153) m/s at perturbation onset, respectively. The average (standard deviation) minimum mid-hip joint center velocity was -0.869 (0.259) m/s and -1.504 (0.351) m/s for ascending and descend perturbations, respectively.

Figure 3: Representative velocity of a climber's vertical mid-hip joint center from the time of perturbation onset (vertical black line, time = 0) during an ascending (solid gray line) and descending (black dashed line) perturbation. The vertical gray lines show the time of end of fall for ascent (solid) and descent (dotted) perturbations. The circles represent the peak downward velocity.

Gender and the interaction between gender and perturbation order but not glove condition were determined to affect fall severity. Harness force did not significantly vary across glove condition during ascent or descent (Table 1). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not confirmed. Average normalized harness force for bare hands, high friction gloves, and low friction gloves was 0.171 (0.154), 0.178 (0.174), and 0.194 (0.184) during ascent and 0.393 (0.261), 0.369 (0.302), and 0.453 (0.302) during descent, respectively. Females had significantly higher normalized harness forces than males during ascent and descent (Table 1), confirming Hypothesis 3. Specifically, normalized harness forces were 0.13 (0.14) and 0.26 (0.18) for males and females on ascent and 0.34 (0.24) and 0.50 (0.33) for males and females on descent, respectively. Perturbation order did not influence the overall harness forces for either ascent or descent, thus not confirming Hypothesis 4 (Table 1). However, the gender x perturbation number interaction was significant during ascending perturbations (Table 1). Females had a greater fall severity on their second perturbation during ascent compared to male participants (Figure 4.a). The gender x perturbation number interaction during descent was not significant ($p = 0.087$, Figure 4.b). The gender x glove condition and perturbation number x glove condition interactions were not significant for either ascent or descent (Table 1). In the analysis to assess anticipation, climbing cycle time was not significant across perturbation number for both ascending ($p = 0.807$; $F = 0.455$) and descending ($p = 0.119$; $F = 1.865$) climbing directions.

Table 1: Statistical results of analysis 2: generalized linear model

Ascent						
	Gender	Perturbation Number	Glove Condition	Gender x Perturbation Number	Gender x Glove Condition	Perturbation Number x Glove Condition
p-value	< 0.001*	0.484	0.461	0.020*	0.258	0.135
Chi-Sq.	13.254	4.472	1.549	13.391	2.708	14.913
Descent						
	Gender	Perturbation Number	Glove Condition	Gender x Perturbation Number	Gender x Glove Condition	Perturbation Number x Glove Condition
p-value	0.018*	0.065	0.447	0.087	0.140	0.190
Chi-Sq.	5.624	10.389	1.610	9.608	3.935	13.636

(a)

Figure 4: Average harness force normalized to body weight for males (black lines and black markers) and females (gray lines and gray markers) for perturbations one (P1) through six (P6) during ascent (a) and descent (b). Error bars represent standard deviation.

4. Discussion

This study revealed that fall severity was greater during ladder descent than ladder ascent, greater for female participants, and that the adaptation process was different for female participants than male participants. Specifically, fall severity initially increased for female participants after one exposure during ascent and then decreased. This finding indicates that female participants who have been exposed to some but not many ladder perturbation may be at increased risk of falling. Interestingly, gloves did not have any impact on fall severity suggesting that this is not a particularly effective intervention for preventing ladder fall events. Climbing cycle time did not change across perturbations, suggesting limited anticipation of the perturbation. However,

changes in fall severity across perturbations for female participants suggest adaptations of recovery responses were occurring in these participants.

This study confirms that ladder descent leads to more severe falls than ladder ascent. Given that a previous study defined a harness weight support threshold for falling to be 30% of body weight (Yang and Pai 2011), the high harness forces for descending perturbations (40% of body weight) indicate that relatively severe falls were observed during descent. The average harness forces during ascent (18% of body weight) were well under this 30% threshold, suggesting that fall severity during ascent was relatively mild. This study suggests the reason that more descending falls have been reported epidemiologically (Moore, Porter et al. 2009) is because ladder descent is a more hazardous task than ladder ascent. Lower fall severity during ascent may be due to the time delay between perturbation onset and when the climber begins to have downward acceleration.

At perturbation onset, the body was confirmed to be moving upward during ascending and downward during descending perturbations (Figure 3). Thus, the body was already accelerating (as opposed to decelerating) downward at perturbation onset during descending perturbations. This led to a smaller peak downward vertical velocity for ascent, indicating a less severe fall for ascending perturbations than descending (Pavol and Pai 2002, Pai 2003, Beschorner and Cham 2008). Therefore, the momentum of the body after a perturbation during ladder descent may be too large to recover without assistance from the harness during ladder descent. Increased risk during ladder descent may explain why another study found that participants descended a ladder slower than when ascending a ladder (Hammer and Schmalz 1992). Also, the act of placing the feet further from the head may reduce the visual information that is available to guide foot placement during descent. Regardless of the mechanism, this study suggests that targeting interventions such as fall arrest systems (e.g., climbing harness with a safety locking sleeve) (Vi 2008) to ladder descent may be effective at preventing ladder fall injuries.

Glove condition did not affect fall severity. Although previous research indicated that increased force from high friction gloves would reduce ladder fall severity (Hur, Motawar et al. 2012, Hur, Motawar et al. 2014), this study did not confirm this effect. One explanation is that the safety harness supported enough of the body weight such that the hand forces did not become great enough to force a decoupling of the hand from the rung. Another explanation is that hand force may not be a limiting factor in fall recovery. Previous research has found that even in low friction handholds, participants were capable of generating forces between 73% and 88% of their body weight for each hand (Young, Woolley et al. 2009). Additional research that allows the climber to fall a greater distance before engaging the harness may lead to hand-rung decoupling where gloves play a more important role. Overall, this study suggests that increased force from high friction gloves does not translate to reducing fall severity at least during the portion of a fall leading up to the time of harness support.

Females had greater difficulty recovering from a ladder fall than males. Interestingly, fall severity initially increased for females during ascent whereas fall severity for males did not change with continuing perturbations (Figures 4.a). This result is in contrast to many fall-related perturbation studies, where fall outcome was found to decrease with continuing perturbations (Bhatt, Wening et al. 2006, Pai and Bhatt 2007). A key difference in this study as opposed to other fall-related studies is that a misstep from a ladder may be a more novel experience than a perturbation experienced during gait. Most individuals have experienced a slip or trip during walking with daily-living, resulting in some form of preset response from the central nervous system (Bhatt, Wening et al. 2006) whereas a ladder misstep may be a completely new experience. Therefore, a different motor adaptation process may be used to develop effective responses to ladder perturbations. Previous research studies on motor skill development have divided the motor learning process into three phases: exploration, discovery and stabilization, and exploitation

(Araujo, Davids et al. 2009). A solution is discovered after an individual has explored many degrees of freedom to find movements most relevant to achieve the desired outcome (Araujo, Davids et al. 2009). This exploration leads to unpredictable outcomes which can be worse than the outcome during the first attempt (Newell, Liu et al. 2001). Females may have utilized the exploration phase of decision making more than males, resulting in an increase in their fall severity before a decrease. Importantly, females decreased their fall severity after the second perturbation suggesting that they identified a successful recovery response or abandoned exploration and returned to their initial response. Gender differences such as upper body strength (Muir and Kanwar 1993) and anthropometry (Chaffin, Andersson et al. 1999) may explain why this effect was only seen in females and not males. For example, reduced strength and stature in female participants may have forced them to fine-tune their strategy as opposed to relying on their strength and height. Male participants were taller than females on average ($p < 0.001$) which may have allowed male participants to reach higher for rungs or extend lower to reestablish foot placement onto the rungs after a misstep.

This research provides important information regarding fall severity factors during ladder climbing that may provide a foundation for future research that investigates interventions and further explores the mechanisms for the observed gender effects. For example, future research may aim to develop interventions that focus on reducing the severity of ladder falls during descent. Also, research that controls for strength and anthropometry may help determine if the gender effects are due to strength and anthropometry differences or due to some other difference. Lastly, training programs that allow female ladder climbers to experience ladder perturbations and go through the exploratory motor learning phase in a safe and controlled environment may lead to safer responses to actual ladder perturbations. Previous research has demonstrated that a

perturbation in training can be translated across contexts (Parijat and Lockhart 2012) and from a lab environment to a real living environment (Rosenblatt, Marone et al. 2013).

This study has a few limitations that should be acknowledged. First, this study only considered a fixed vertical ladder and the results of the study may not be generalizable to all other ladder designs (extension, A-frame, etc.). In addition, this study did not simulate a work task to be performed between ascent and descent. Climbers may be less alert or more fatigued during descent due to a work task that might be performed between ladder ascent and descent. Thus, the effects of climbing direction that were observed in this study may actually be underestimated compared with real work circumstances. Also, the perturbation mechanism, which was intended to mimic the timing of foot decoupling during ladder slips, may not have been representative of all types of ladder slips or missteps since the rung broke away from the ladder. Thus, additional research may be needed to determine if the findings of this study are similar when other types of ladders and perturbation types are utilized. Lastly, a harness system was used to protect participants, which may have interfered with part of the recovery process. However, there was not an increase in harness force with continuing perturbations, indicating that participants were not increasing their reliance on the harness. Yet, additional research that allows participants to fall further before engaging the harness may reveal aspects of recovery that were not considered in this study.

In conclusion, this study identified important climbing and individual factors associated with ladder fall severity. Specifically, descending from ladders was associated with greater fall severity, which explains previous research that found higher prevalence of falls during descent from equipment. Fall protection should be prioritized on ladder descent to maximize fall prevention efforts. Gloves were not found to be a factor that influenced ladder fall severity during the initial fall phase, suggesting that

1
2
3
4 interventions involving gloves may be of limited effectiveness. Females were found to have increased
5
6 fall severity. The gender difference was particularly pronounced during the 2nd perturbation while
7
8 ascending the ladder, but this difference disappeared after experiencing several perturbations. This
9
10 finding suggests that training programs that improve their post-perturbation response may be
11
12 particularly effective for female climbers.
13
14

15 16 17 **Acknowledgments** 18 19

20 This work was supported by the National Institute for Occupational Safety & Health
21
22 (NIOSH R21OH010038) and by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship
23
24 Program (NSF GRFP 1247842).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Araujo, D., K. W. Davids, J. Y. Chow, P. Passos and M. Raab (2009). "The development of decision making skill in sport: an ecological dynamics perspective." Perspectives on cognition and action in sport: 157-169.
- Barnett, R. and P. Poczynck (2000). "Ladder rung vs. siderail hand grip strategies." Safety Brief (Triodyne Inc.) **16**(4): 1-15.
- Bell, A. L., D. R. Pedersen and R. A. Brand (1990). "A comparison of the accuracy of several hip center location prediction methods." Journal of biomechanics **23**(6): 617-621.
- Beschorner, K. and R. Cham (2008). "Impact of joint torques on heel acceleration at heel contact, a contributor to slips and falls." Ergonomics **51**(12): 1799-1813.
- Bhatt, T., J. Wening and Y.-C. Pai (2006). "Adaptive control of gait stability in reducing slip-related backward loss of balance." Experimental Brain Research **170**(1): 61-73.
- Björnstig, U. and J. Johnsson (1992). "Ladder injuries: mechanisms, injuries and consequences." Journal of Safety Research **23**(1): 9-18.
- BLS (2012). Work-related fatal falls, by type of fall, 2010. -. r. d. Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries Charts. Washington, DC, edited by United States Department of Labor.
- Chaffin, D. B., G. Andersson and B. J. Martin (1999). Occupational biomechanics, Wiley New York.
- Cham, R. and M. S. Redfern (2002). "Changes in gait when anticipating slippery floors." Gait & posture **15**(2): 159-171.
- Chang, W.-R., C.-C. Chang and S. Matz (2004). "Friction requirements for different climbing conditions in straight ladder ascending." Safety science **42**(9): 791-805.
- Chang, W.-R., C.-C. Chang and S. Matz (2005). "Available friction of ladder shoes and slip potential for climbing on a straight ladder." Ergonomics **48**(9): 1169-1182.
- Chang, W.-R., C.-C. Chang and S. Matz (2011). "The effect of transverse shear force on the required coefficient of friction for level walking." Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society **53**(5): 461-473.
- Cornelius, K. M., M. S. Redfern and L. J. Steiner (1994). "Postural stability after whole-body vibration exposure." International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics **13**(4): 343-351.
- Fransson, C. and J. Winkel (1991). "Hand strength: the influence of grip span and grip type." Ergonomics **34**(7): 881-892.
- Hammer, W. and U. Schmalz (1992). "Human behaviour when climbing ladders with varying inclinations." Safety science **15**(1): 21-38.
- Hsiao, H., P. Simeonov, T. Pizatella, N. Stout, V. McDougall and J. Weeks (2008). "Extension-ladder safety: solutions and knowledge gaps." International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics **38**(11): 959-965.
- Hur, P., B. Motawar and N. J. Seo (2012). "Hand breakaway strength model—Effects of glove use and handle shapes on a person's hand strength to hold onto handles to prevent fall from elevation." Journal of biomechanics **45**(6): 958-964.
- Hur, P., B. Motawar and N. J. Seo (2014). "Muscular responses to handle perturbation with different glove condition." Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology **24**(1): 159-164.
- Miller, A. E. J., J. MacDougall, M. Tarnopolsky and D. Sale (1993). "Gender differences in strength and muscle fiber characteristics." European journal of applied physiology and occupational physiology **66**(3): 254-262.
- Moore, S. M., W. L. Porter and P. G. Dempsey (2009). "Fall from equipment injuries in US mining: Identification of specific research areas for future investigation." Journal of safety research **40**(6): 455-460.
- Muir, L. and S. Kanwar (1993). "Ladder injuries." Injury **24**(7): 485-487.

Newell, K. M., Y.-T. Liu and G. Mayer-Kress (2001). "Time scales in motor learning and development." Psychological review **108**(1): 57.

OSHA, U. S. O. S. a. H. A. (2003). *Stairways and Ladders: A Guide to OSHA Rules*. Washington, DC, US Department of Labor , Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Owings, T. M., M. J. Pavol and M. D. Grabiner (2001). "Mechanisms of failed recovery following postural perturbations on a motorized treadmill mimic those associated with an actual forward trip." Clinical Biomechanics **16**(9): 813-819.

Pai, Y.-C. (2003). "Movement termination and stability in standing." Exercise and sport sciences reviews **31**(1): 19-25.

Pai, Y.-C. and T. S. Bhatt (2007). "Repeated-slip training: an emerging paradigm for prevention of slip-related falls among older adults." Physical therapy **87**(11): 1478-1491.

Parijat, P. and T. E. Lockhart (2012). "Effects of moveable platform training in preventing slip-induced falls in older adults." Annals of biomedical engineering **40**(5): 1111-1121.

Partridge, R. A., A. S. Virk and R. E. Antosia (1998). "Causes and patterns of injury from ladder falls." Academic emergency medicine **5**(1): 31-34.

Pavol, M. J. and Y.-C. Pai (2002). "Feedforward adaptations are used to compensate for a potential loss of balance." Experimental Brain Research **145**(4): 528-538.

Pliner, E. M., N. H. Campbell-Kyureghyan and K. E. Beschorner (2014). "Effects of foot placement, hand positioning, age and climbing biodynamics on ladder slip outcomes." Ergonomics **57**(11).

Rosenblatt, N. J., J. Marone and M. D. Grabiner (2013). "Preventing trip-related falls by community-dwelling adults: a prospective study." Journal of the American Geriatrics Society **61**(9): 1629-1631.

Santos, B. R., C. Larivière, A. Delisle, A. Plamondon, P.-É. Boileau, D. Imbeau and V. R. Group (2008). "A laboratory study to quantify the biomechanical responses to whole-body vibration: The influence on balance, reflex response, muscular activity and fatigue." International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics **38**(7): 626-639.

Schnorenberg, A. J., N. H. Campbell-Kyureghyan and K. E. Beschorner (2015). "Biomechanical response to ladder slipping events: Effects of hand placement." Journal of biomechanics **48**(14): 3810-3815.

Seo, N. J. and T. J. Armstrong (2008). "Investigation of grip force, normal force, contact area, hand size, and handle size for cylindrical handles." Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society **50**(5): 734-744.

Shepherd, G. W., R. J. Kahler and J. Cross (2006). "Ergonomic design interventions—a case study involving portable ladders." Ergonomics **49**(3): 221-234.

Smith, G. S., R. A. Timmons, D. A. Lombardi, D. K. Mamidi, S. Matz, T. K. Courtney and M. J. Perry (2006). "Work-related ladder fall fractures: identification and diagnosis validation using narrative text." Accident Analysis & Prevention **38**(5): 973-980.

Socias, C. M., C. K. Chaumont Menéndez, J. W. Collins and P. Simeonov (2014). "Occupational ladder fall injuries-United States, 2011." MMWR **63**(16): 341-346.

Vi, P. (2008). *Effects of Ladder Types On Energy Expenditure and Forearm Force Exertion During Ladder Climbing*. 2008 National Occupational Injury Research Symposium (NOIRS). Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Yang, F. and Y.-C. Pai (2011). "Automatic recognition of falls in gait-slip training: Harness load cell based criteria." Journal of biomechanics **44**(12): 2243-2249.

Young, J. G., C. Woolley, T. J. Armstrong and J. A. Ashton-Miller (2009). "Hand-handhold coupling: effect of handle shape, orientation, and friction on breakaway strength." Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society **51**(5): 705-717.