Title of Manuscript: “They’re lunatics on the road”: Exploring the normative influences of parents, friends, and police on young novices’ risky driving decisions

Authors: Bridie Scott-Parker^{1,3, 2}

Barry Watson^{1, 3}

Mark J King^{1, 3}

Melissa K Hyde ^{2, 3}

Affiliations:

¹Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety – Queensland, Queensland University of Technology, K Block, 130 Victoria Park Road, Kelvin Grove, Queensland, 4059, Australia.

²School of Psychology and Counselling, Queensland University of Technology, O Block B Wing, Victoria Park Road, Kelvin Grove, Queensland, 4059, Australia.

³Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation (IHBI), Queensland University of Technology, Kelvin Grove, Queensland, 4059, Australia.

Abstract

Young novice drivers experience significantly greater risk of being injured or killed in car crashes than older more experienced drivers. This research utilised a qualitative approach guided by the framework of Akers' social learning theory. It explored young novice drivers' perspectives on risky driving including rewards and punishments expected from and administered by parents, friends, and police, imitation of parents' and friends' driving, and advantages and disadvantages of risky driving. Methods: Twenty-one young drivers (12 females, 9 males) aged 16 to 25 years ($M = 17.71$ years, $SD = 2.15$) with a Learner ($n = 11$) or Provisional ($n = 10$) driver licence participated in individual or small group interviews. Findings and Conclusions: Content analysis supported four themes: (1) rewards and (2) punishments for risky driving, and the influence of (3) parents and (4) friends. The young novice drivers differed in their vulnerability to the negative influences of friends and parents, with some novices advising they were able to resist risky normative influences whilst others felt they could not. The authority of the police as enforcers of road rules was either accepted and respected or seen as being used to persecute young novices. These findings suggest that road safety interventions should consider the normative influence of parents and friends on the risky and safe behaviour of young novices. Police were also seen as influential upon behaviour. Future research should explore the complicated relationship between parents, friends, the police, young novices, and their risky driving behaviour.

Keywords

Young driver; novice; rewards; punishments; social learning theory

1 Introduction

1.1 The young novice driver

Around the world, young novice drivers continue to be injured and killed in car crashes at rates that far exceed those of older, more experienced drivers. The novice faces the greatest risk when they first are able to drive unsupervised, typically whilst on an intermediate (Provisional) driver's licence, and this risk continues until approximately 25 years of age (Keating, 2007). Persons aged 17-24 years contributed 21.8% of all fatalities in Queensland, Australia in 2009, while accounting for only 12% of the population. Novices are also more likely to be at fault in a car crash: in Queensland between July 1998 and June 2008, novice drivers with a Provisional licence were found to be responsible for nearly 8 out of 10 Police reported car crashes in which they were involved (Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2010). The overrepresentation of young novices in crash statistics has persisted even after the implementation of numerous countermeasures, policies and practices, such as fear-based media campaigns, driver training, and graduated driver licensing (GDL) programs (The GDL program in Queensland contains three licensing stages with various conditions, restrictions and tests, see Scott-Parker et al., 2011 for the GDL experiences of Learners in Queensland, and Scott-Parker et al., in press, for the compliance of Learners and Provisional drivers with GDL and general road rules).

1.2 A theoretical framework

In an attempt to ameliorate the pervasive problem of young driver risky behaviour, it is important that research into the psychosocial influences upon their risky driving be informed by relevant psychosocial theory which can subsequently be utilised to formulate countermeasures and road use policy (Trifiletti et al., 2005). Akers' social learning theory (SLT) (Akers et al., 1979) is one psychosocial theory that has the potential to make a contribution to understanding young driver risky behaviour. Young drivers not only learn to

drive a vehicle on a roadway, they also learn safe and risky driving attitudes and driving behaviours through exposure to and the imitation of models and the experience of punishments (such as a car crash) and rewards (such as shorter journey durations). Akers' SLT appears preferable to other social-cognitive models such as the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) which considers the intention to perform a behaviour and the perceived behavioural control over that behaviour. Instead, Akers' SLT focuses upon the influence of other people who are important in the lives of the young novice, such as their parents and their peers, and how reinforcement can shape attitudes and behaviours.

Akers' SLT emerged in the 1960's and is a criminological application of traditional social learning theory principles of a decade earlier (Bandura et al., 2003). The theory recognises that behaviour such as risky driving is learnt by observation and imitation of significant others. These significant others reinforce driving behaviour through the administration (or the lack of administration) of punishments and reinforcement (herein referred to as rewards) (DiBlasio, 1987). Accordingly young novices subsequently perform *conforming* driving behaviours (following all road rules) or *deviant* driving behaviours (not following all road rules, herein referred to as risky driving) (Akers & Sellers, 2004). For young drivers, the significant others who administer these rewards and punishments most often are their parents and friends (Scott-Parker et al., 2009a); however the police as enforcers of road rules can also be influential (DiBlasio, 1987).

Rewards for conforming and risky driving can be positive (non-social rewards include feelings of excitement; social rewards include improved status in a social group) or negative (lack of punishment for risky driving such as driving in excess of posted speed limits). Punishments for conforming and risky driving can also be positive (non-social punishments include feelings of fear and removal of driving privileges through licence suspension or lack of access to a vehicle; social punishments include social censure such as berating by friends)

or negative (friends did not reward nonconforming or risky driving behaviour as expected) (Akers, 2009).

Akers' SLT has been operationalised in quantitative young novice driver research, and has been found to explain a significant amount of variance in their risky driving behaviour. Imitation of parents and friends, and rewards and punishments anticipated from both parents and friends were significant predictors of young novice drivers' risky behaviour (Scott-Parker et al., 2009a, 2009b). Akers SLT has had limited application in qualitative driver research (e.g., speeding by Australian drivers, Fleiter et al., 2010), but when used in this way has allowed insights into the nature of risky driver behaviour that are unlikely to be accessible through quantitative methodologies. The research strategy to be adopted in the research reported here is that of guided qualitative content analysis (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004). The relationships between the words spoken by the young novice drivers shall be explored and linkages identified (Bryman, 2008), guided by Akers' SLT. Importantly, the analysis will not simply quantify the number of endorsements for particular constructs of interest which is typical of content analysis approaches.

There is a dearth of research exploring the normative influences of parents, peers, and police on the risky behaviour of young novice drivers, particularly in the Australian GDL context. Focus groups and interviews have explored the negotiation of car use and emergence of identity in teen drivers and have afforded a unique insight into the changing role of the novice driver within the family (Best, 2006) which was unlikely to have been realised through quantitative research methodologies.

Further, recent American research using focus group methodology explored the perspectives of 300 young drivers and interviews with more than 40 young drivers regarding the variables that influence their safety in cars. Whilst the influence of parents, peers and the police were not specifically explored, analysis of the focus group findings revealed that all

three groups were influential in the risky behaviour of the young drivers. In addition, whilst the specific constructs of rewards, punishments, disadvantages, imitation and influence were not explicitly explored, the responses of the young drivers could be placed within these themes. The qualitative data informed the development of a questionnaire gauging the experiences and attitudes of young drivers which was administered to 5665 American students (CHOPD, 2009a, 2009b).

In addition, as noted previously, there is also a scarcity of research utilising Akers' framework to guide qualitative research in road safety. Countermeasures designed to ameliorate the risky behaviour of young novices, and the injuries and fatalities arising from crashes that result from such risky behaviour, have largely been developed without asking young novice drivers about their experiences, and indeed who the important persons and groups within their lives are, and how these people influence their behaviour. A qualitative approach is therefore likely to provide greater insight into young novice driver experiences, and consequently better inform and guide countermeasure development and evaluation.

1.3 Study aims

The goal of the research was to identify key themes related to the risky behaviour of young novice drivers. Drawing on Akers' framework, the study was designed to explore the nature of *imitation* and the influence of parents and peers, the *rewards* and *punishments* administered by parents, friends, and the police as potential influences in the risky behaviour experiences of the young novice driver. For example, the anticipated rewards construct of Akers' social learning theory explores the rewards that the young driver anticipates for performing risky behaviour. Without actually speaking to young drivers themselves, road safety researchers can only presume – possibly erroneously – what these rewards are. The interview questions accordingly were designed to explore the constructs of interest, therefore

the guided qualitative content analysis focuses on the sub-themes, codes, and meaning units (elaborated upon in 2.3) that explain each of the themes for the young novice driver.

2 Method

2.1 Participants

Purposive sampling was used to recruit 21 young drivers (12 females, 9 males) aged 16 to 25 years ($M = 17.71$, $SD = 2.15$) with a Learner ($n = 11$, 6 females) or Provisional ($n = 10$, 6 females) driver's licence. The Learners had held their licence for between 4.5 months and 2 years (average duration = 10.4 months); and the novices with a Provisional licence had held their licence for between 1 month and 3.5 years ($M = 8.9$ months). Females had held their driver's licence on average for 9.9 months (range = 4.5 months – 3.5 years); males on average for 9.4 months (range = 1 month – 2 years).

2.2 Design and Procedure

Pilot research undertaken with young novice drivers (preliminary small group interviews, unpublished, which informed the research of Scott-Parker et al., 2009a, 2009b) explored the perception of transgressions of road rules by the target group. Young novice drivers reported that 'minor' transgressions such as speeding by 5 kilometres per hour, illegal U-turns and texting whilst driving were only 'bending' the road rules, whilst in contrast 'major' transgressions such as speeding by 20 kilometres per hour and driving through a red light were 'breaking the road rules'. Therefore the first question asked in the current interviews was "*What is the difference between bending and breaking the road rules?*" Accordingly every question regarding the normative influences of parents, friends, and police on young novice driver behaviour, and explorations of advantages and disadvantages of road rule transgressions incorporated *both* terminologies to ensure that the full novice experience was captured. As can be seen from the Appendix, questions 2 – 6 were designed to explore Akers' construct of differential reinforcement which considers the rewards and punishments

anticipated from and received for risky driving behaviour, and questions 7 – 10 were designed to explore the construct of imitation.

During the second week of the summer school holidays (the main holidays of the academic year, of six weeks' duration), young persons who appeared to be of the age at which they typically would have a novice driver's licence (Learner or Provisional) visiting the food court vicinity of a major metropolitan shopping centre between 9 am and 12 midday were approached. It was expected that this would provide a setting in which a range of novice experiences could be gathered in an environment which is very popular, comfortable, and familiar to the participants. The consistency of data collection was enhanced by interviewing only during this week, indicating a dependable (methodologically valid, reliable and rigorous) approach to the content analysis which was undertaken in the same venue during the morning only and over a short period of time (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004).

Each individual was asked if they had a novice driver licence. If they responded 'yes', they were told about the research aims and procedure, and were offered the opportunity to participate in recorded 20-minute interviews (on average depending on the number of interviewees) about their driving experiences and attitudes. In return they received \$20 for their time. If the novice was alone (3 females and 2 males, 1 each of whom held a Learner licence), an individual interview was conducted. If the novice was with a group of friends, the researcher clarified that all group members were young novice drivers, and a small group interview was conducted. Consequently participants were interviewed either individually or in small groups of up to four participants, some comprised of mixed gender and mixed licence levels.

As young novices drive both alone and with passengers, and with passengers of same and/or different gender, this approach allowed insight into influences within each travel mode. The inclusion of both small group and individual interviews allowed a triangulation of

findings sourced through each method (Liamputtong and Ezzy, 2005), enabling a more comprehensive consideration of Akers' constructs as they pertain to the risky behaviour of young novice drivers. Consistent with ethics requirements participants were given a participant information sheet. They also completed a consent-to-participate form and a brief demographic questionnaire self-reporting their age, gender, type of novice driver licence and how long they had held this licence. Recruitment ceased when it became apparent that saturation of responses, including for each gender and each licence level (also see 2.3), had occurred (Liamputtong and Ezzy, 2005). All interviews were transcribed verbatim.

2.3 Data analysis

The first author conducted the interviews with a research assistant. The assistant transcribed the recordings verbatim within 48 hours of their completion; their integral involvement in recruitment, interviewing, recording and timely transcription helped ensure the dependability of the analyses (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004). The first author recorded memos both during and after the interviews summarising key points whilst reflecting upon the larger themes, and upon receipt of the transcriptions continued the reflection upon the interview content. In particular, the content was reflected upon and considered both in its entirety and for each gender and each novice licence level separately, allowing the identification of response saturation. The co-authors were consulted regarding the codes and sub-themes identified by the first author. In addition, analysis of transcripts occurred over an extended period of time, allowing the authors to develop a coherent guided thematic content analysis.

The unit of analysis in this paper is the transcribed interview text regarding the young person's experiences of being a novice driver. Initially the interview texts were analysed question by question to focus upon the key components of Akers' SLT. The text was considered within the context of the memos noted during and shortly after each interview,

and analysis commenced with the first interview. Considering the overarching processes within Akers' SLT and the discussions within both the group and the individual interviews, the interviews were initially sorted into four content areas: (1) the influence of parents, (2) the influence of friends, (3) the influence of Police, (4) the influence of the graduated driver licensing program.

However as the content analysis continued, it became apparent these divisions which reflected the overarching sources of influence consistent with Akers' SLT were unsuitable. The following content areas provided a better fit with the data and were also guided by the tenets of Akers' SLT: the influence of (1) parents and (2) friends including imitation; (3) punishments for risky driving anticipated from and administered by parents, friends and the police; and (4) rewards for risky driving behaviour anticipated from and administered by parents, friends and police. A review of the memos recorded during the interviews led to the influence of friends and parents (themes) being further divided into 'no', 'indirect', and 'direct' influence (sub-themes).

Content analysis was commenced by systematically dividing the transcript texts into meaning units (Mayring, 2000). All meaning units were comprised of the exact phrasing used by the young novice driver to explain their experience. Direct quotes were labelled male (M) or female (F), followed by the driver's age in years, and whether they had a Learner (L) or Provisional (P) licence, such that "L17M" represents a quote from a 17 year old male driver with a Learner driver licence. Meaning units were condensed and then abstracted and given a code that grouped the condensed meaning units according to a focal meaning in accordance with the guidelines of Graneheim and Lundman (2004).

To illustrate, the whole sentence "*Um, like easier to get places and stuff like that*" (L17F) (transcribed text) uttered in response to the question "What are the advantages of bending or breaking the road rules?" was deconstructed (Weber, 2004) to the meaning unit of

“easier to get places” (L17F). This meaning unit and the meaning unit *“get there quicker”* (P18M) were combined to form the condensed meaning unit labelled ‘Instrumental rewards for risky behaviour’. This condensed meaning unit was subsumed within the code ‘Non-social reward for risky driving’. Codes were grouped into sub-themes, and in this example the sub-theme became ‘Experience reward for risky driving’. This code was part of the ‘Reward’ theme, one of the four themes that reflected the manifest content which was guided by the framework of Akers’ SLT.

All codes, sub-themes and themes were constantly compared by the authors throughout the content analysis. Whilst this approach is consistent with a grounded theory analysis, the qualitative content analysis was guided by Akers’ SLT constructs and therefore differs from a grounded theory analysis (Liamputtong and Ezzy, 2005). It is noteworthy that the themes capture the content of the entire transcripts. It is also notable that whilst four themes dominate and are considered separately within the discussion (see 3), theme two capturing punishments for risky driving behaviour contains considerably more meaning units than the remaining themes. This perhaps reflects not only the content and duration of the interviews attributed to this dimension of influence, but may be interpreted as suggesting that this influence is important in the risky behaviour of the young novice. Such a determination is beyond the scope of the current analyses, and future qualitative or quantitative research should examine the level of importance – and the type of influence – of each of the four themes.

3 Findings and Discussion

Interestingly a similar pattern of responses regarding the difference between ‘bending’ road rules and ‘breaking’ road rules occurred as was found in the pilot research. In addition, the novices appear to have insight into the nature of their transgressions (e.g., *“bending the road rules is pretty much the same as breaking them but I guess people would argue that*

bending it means you don't get caught, breaking it means you do", P18F; *"bending is rules that you don't think are right. Breaking are, they put them there to keep them alive"*, P18M; *"you don't really do anything that's bending them without breaking them"*, L17M).

Regarding the thematic analysis, four themes of (1) rewards for risky driving behaviour, (2) punishments for risky driving behaviour, (3) influence of parents on risky driving behaviour, and (4) influence of friends on risky driving behaviour will be discussed according to the sub-themes emergent within each theme.

3.1 Theme 1: Rewards for risky driving behaviour

Table 1 summarises the content analysis for the theme of rewards for risky driving behaviour and reveals there are five condensed meaning units, four codes and three sub-themes.

3.1.1 Sub-theme 1: Experience reward from risky driving

All participants, irrespective of age, gender and licence, were able to identify rewards for risky driving behaviour. These rewards included the experience of social rewards and non-social rewards. Novices of all ages, genders and licence readily reported a variety of social rewards for risky driving, and these consisted of their friends who would *"cheer you on"* (L17M) and *"tell you to do it again"* (L16F). These social rewards encourage the risky behaviour for which the reward was received (Brown et al., 2008). Instrumental rewards – whilst non-social in this instance – may also be social, particularly if the desire to spend more time with friends was the motivating factor for driving in a risky manner (e.g., speeding).

Whilst not explicitly explored in the current study, car ownership, and, for males in particular, the type of car and the perceived capabilities of the young driver in that car can also be rewarding. The vehicle can also be instrumental in presentation of a desirable image among the young novice driver's social group (Redshaw, 2006). A range of non-social rewards such as experiencing pleasurable emotions and a faster journey were also reported. In

previous research, rewards correspond to a greater likelihood that a behaviour will be repeated (Price and Archbold, 1995; see also Cooper et al., 2009; Higgins et al., 2009).

3.1.2 Sub-theme 2: Negative reward

A lack of police punishment for transgressions was also rewarding, and some of the females with Learner licenses believed that the Police were more lenient because they were Learners and therefore they could feign a lack of knowledge or a mistake to avoid punishment for wilful risky driving behaviour. Such negative reinforcement (a lack of punishment) (Price and Archbold, 1995) is considered to have the same effects on risky driving behaviour as positive reinforcement, i.e., it increases its likelihood (Akers and Sellers, 2004; Winfree and Bernat, 1998). In addition, this experience of negative reinforcement may also contribute to the development of the novice drivers' social identity through increasing their standing within their social group; an assumption requiring further exploration.

3.1.3 Sub-theme 3: Reward from needs being met

Interestingly only novices with a Provisional licence disclosed that risky driving was a means of developing and defining their identity. This perhaps reflects that young novice drivers are adolescents, and as such are experiencing considerable personal development (Vanzetti and Duck, 1996). As Learners, these Provisional drivers had to drive with a supervisor, frequently a parent (Queensland Transport, 2007; Scott-Parker et al., 2011). However as Provisional drivers, they can drive alone, and when accompanied are more likely to carry young passengers who are their friends and therefore integral to their psychosocial development (Scott-Parker et al., 2009b). The young novice driver is also a young adult who is maturing physically, psychologically and socially, and as part of this maturation is forging their self-identity. Self-identity is constructed through self-categorisation and internalisation of group norms, attitudes and behaviour standards (Tajfel and Turner, 2003), and driving independently with friends further facilitates the development of their social identity. The

influence of psychosocial development and maturation upon risky and conforming behaviour requires further elucidation that lies beyond the scope of the current research.

3.1.4 Summary: Theme 1

The application of SLT to the reduction of the incidence of young novice driver risky behaviours entails minimising the rewards they experience for risky driving. Some of these rewards can be directly addressed, for example education campaigns could target youth and discourage them from rewarding the risky driving of their friends. Some rewards, such as an inadvertent reward in the form of a lack of punishment, fall within the scope of government authorities, particularly the discretionary authority of the Police. Other rewards may be more difficult to address, such as maturational needs that are being met by the risky behaviour.

[Insert Table 1 here]

3.2 Theme 2: Punishments for risky driving behaviour

Table 2 summarises the content analysis for the theme of punishments of risky driving and shows that there are 30 condensed meaning units, 12 codes and 5 sub-themes.

3.2.1 Sub-theme 1: Social punishment

The sub-theme of social punishment included the young novice driver inflicting harm upon other road users, such as “*make roads more dangerous for everybody else*” (P17F).

3.2.2 Sub-theme 2: Non-social punishment

The sub-theme of non-social punishment included the young novice driver incurring harm and incurring loss. Incurring harm included causing harm to themselves, in particular death; and the negative emotional responses associated with such harm, including “*embarrassment of even having a crash and getting caught*” (L16F). Incurring loss comprised damage to their own property or that of other persons, costs and legal consequences such as “*getting caught by the Police*” (P22F), loss of mobility as a result of damage to their own car, legal consequences such as “*losing your licence*” (P22F), “*having to*

use parents” (L16F) to get around, and time delays from waiting for car repairs to be undertaken. Such anticipated loss of autonomy and freedom can reduce the likelihood that risky behaviour is undertaken (Best, 2006). It is noteworthy, however, that the non-social punishments may also have social aspects to them, particularly if the mobility is used for social purposes, and as such a loss of mobility indirectly affects social rewards.

Male novice drivers were also aware of the consequences for their progression through Queensland’s GDL program, in particular the difficulties arising from accumulating demerit points and having licence suspensions at either novice level. This influenced their driving behaviour, for example “*not do it or get smarter about it*” (P17M). ‘Not doing it’ is behavioural change consistent with Akers’ principles which assert that punishment reduces the likelihood the behaviour will be undertaken (Brezina and Piquero, 2003). However, ‘getting smarter about it’ suggests that the young novice has devised mechanisms to avoid this punishment without ceasing the behaviour, and therefore the behaviour is not likely to reduce, rather it may be undertaken under more risky circumstances, such as at night and in isolated areas. Friends were involved in the process of ‘getting smarter’, and structuring opportunities (Brown et al., 2008) such as suggesting times and locations that police detection of risky driving is unlikely to occur also increases the likelihood that risky behaviour will be undertaken.

Risky behaviour resulting in incurring harm such as personal injury or injury to others was only mentioned by *female* novices. This difference may reflect gender-based optimism bias (Weinstein, 1980) on the part of male novices, none of whom reported any harm to themselves or other road users as being a disadvantage of risky driving behaviour. *Male* novices contributed many responses to the condensed meaning units ‘potential costs/ legal consequences’ and ‘loss of mobility’. Potential costs were an incentive for male drivers to be less risky. This suggests that more tangible consequences are influential in changing the risky

behaviour of male young novice drivers. Such a supposition is endorsed by the behaviour change that was reported by two male participants who had either directly or vicariously experienced negative consequences to risky driving and subsequently modified their behaviour: *“had car slide out...sensitive to feeling in skid...take the corners a bit slower now”* (L17M); and *“saw my mate roll his 4WD in front of us...so I know the limits and it changes your perspective of what they can do”* (P17M). These findings have implications for countermeasures targeting risky behaviour by novices: focusing on incurring loss and tangible costs may be more effective for male novices, whilst focusing on incurring harm to themselves or other road users may be more effective for female novices.

3.2.3 Sub-theme 3: Punishment by friends

The punishments administered by friends were also perceived as influential. Friends were likely to punish risky driving that was seen by the young novice driver as very risky, such as *“20 km or over”* (P17M), out of character for the novice, or if the friends were not risky drivers themselves. The type of punishment varied widely from passing comments, to getting *“annoyed”* (L17F), to *“definitely discourage”* (P22F).

The sub-theme of punishment from friends indicated however that friends did not always punish risky driving behaviour, with novices of all ages and genders with a Learner licence believing that their friends would not say anything about their risky behaviour because they *“simply wouldn’t care”* (L16F). Given that these drivers were Learners, their answers may have been hypothetical: they may not have driven with peer passengers, and if they had, their peers may have deferred to the driving supervisor(s) the responsibility for giving feedback. In contrast, none of the novices with a Provisional licence reported that friends would not punish risky driving, suggesting that such independent novices have indeed been punished by their friends for risky driving, either whilst they were their passengers or not.

Friends travelling as passengers of the young novice were also perceived as having no right to mention risky driving behaviour. However, the notion that friends would not speak out was found to be emotionally disturbing to one female novice who felt great responsibility in carrying her friends as her passengers. The reactions of friends were also influenced by other variables, including the age of the friends in relation to the novice, such that older friends would punish the behaviour whilst the friends of a similar age or younger would encourage the behaviour, reflecting the developmentally-pervasive drive for the adolescent to fit in with their social group (Bonino et al., 2003; Sebold, 1992). Conformity to the norms of their social group (Prinstein and Dodge, 2008) and the lack of punishment for risky behaviour is unlikely to reduce the incidence of risky behaviour, per Akers' principles (Preston and Goodfellow, 2006). Believing that others in the social group would expect the novice to drive in a risky way, and anticipating that this behaviour would be rewarded, also provides motivation for risky driving (Gibbons et al., 2008; Winfree and Bernat, 1998).

Friends' reactions were also dependent upon the outcome of the risky behaviour; friends only punishing the young novice *if* their risky behaviour resulted in a *negative* outcome such as a crash. Such conditional punishment again is unlikely to reduce the incidence of risky driving (Bandura et al., 2003), and this is a concern for road safety as negative outcomes such as car crashes, whilst more likely if the young novice engages in risky driving, are a relatively rare occurrence that do not arise after every incidence of this behaviour (Vassallo et al., 2008). The lack of punishment by friends is problematic for the risky behaviour of young novice drivers, because if they believe their friends are not going to punish them for risky driving behaviour, they are unlikely to drive in a less risky fashion per Akers' SLT.

There appears to be some potential for friends to change young novice driver behaviour (Miller, 2010), for example, when the chief investigator asked a group of male

novices if the opinions of their friends mattered, one responded “*if they think I am a bad driver I want to change that because they have to be in the car with me, so I don’t want them to think that*” (L17M). The reactions of friends in this instance are critical, and may therefore be a mechanism for encouraging less-risky driving behaviour in the young driver population generally (Buckley and Sheehan, 2008).

3.2.4 Sub-theme 4: Punishment by parents

Punishment by parents was also seen as pivotal in novice risky behaviour: “*you’ve gotta listen to them don’t you? You live with them*” (P17M). The sub-theme of punishment from parents revealed that the same pattern of codes emerged, that is some novices reported that their parents were not likely to punish their risky behaviour, others that they were likely to punish risky driving, and that the reactions of some parents was influenced by other factors.

A male Learner reported he had broken road rules whilst his parents were supervising his driving and he had not been corrected, nor punished, at the time or after the event. Driving with a Learner licence is the time when the young person is developing the skill of driving, and therefore the time when errors should be corrected before they become driving habits. Parents frequently take on the role of supervisor throughout this period (Scott-Parker et al., 2011), and they may do so for a number of reasons including the expense of professional driving instruction. If they decide to be a supervisor, they teach the young person the skills and knowledge needed to not only operate the vehicle, but to follow the road rules when they are driving. They as supervisors are also uniquely positioned to monitor compliance with road rules, to notify the Learner of their transgressions of the road rules, and to encourage compliance and this can be through such mechanisms as punishment. Research supports the benefits of consistent and clear correction of driving errors by the novice (e.g., Prato et al., 2010). Modelling risky behaviour, and such a lack of correction and punishment, is unlikely

to reduce the incidence of risky driving, per Akers' SLT (Krohn et al., 1985; Winfree and Bernat, 1998).

The motive for the risky driving was also thought to influence the reactions of the parents. Novices stated that if it was accidental or part of the learning process their parents would be more understanding and lenient, whilst if the risky driving was deliberate they expected a stronger reaction. Male drivers with a Provisional licence in particular reported that their parents were unlikely to be sympathetic if they were caught breaking the road rules and that rather than punishing the novice directly themselves, they would ensure they suffered the punishments imposed by the police. To illustrate, in the circumstances that a fine was issued, they would have to pay this themselves rather than rely on their parents to pay it, and when their car had been impounded, they had to find alternative means of transport and they were not allowed to use their parents' car(s). Whilst not punishing the novice themselves, parents ensured that they did not minimise the punishments administered by the Police and this is likely to reduce the incidence of risky driving in accordance with Akers' SLT assertions.

It is noteworthy however that the lack of additional punishment by parents of the novices may contribute to feelings of confusion surrounding their parents' expectations of driving behaviour (Nygaard and Grube, 2005), in particular whether they endorse the formal sanctions or not, and this confusion may diminish the punitive impact associated with Police detection of offences. To ameliorate this lessening in punitive impact, parents could be encouraged to administer their own punishments in addition to formal sanctions.

Parents also used emotional punishment, being "*disappointed*" (L17F) as they expected the novice to make responsible decisions. The effect of such a punishment is unclear. One female novice also felt that her parents would "*be too scared to drive with me*"

(L17F) if she did any risky driving, and that this would impact on her ability to accrue hours for her logbook and she was therefore motivated to follow all the road rules.

Other novices expected their parents to react very strongly, and some of this expectation was based on past experience with risky driving and parental punishment. Parents would “*restrict...where...can and can’t drive*” (P17M) or “*take something off you or just not give you money or something*” (P19F). Such strong punitive reactions are likely to reduce the incidence of risky driving behaviour (Hwang and Akers, 2003). Novices also acknowledged that this response may be because the parents recognised that they themselves are risky drivers, and “*they don’t want me to end up as a driver like they are*” (P24F). However in this case, the novice is again exposed to conflicting messages (Nygaard and Grube, 2005) and exposed to a risky role model to imitate for many years prior to gaining their own licence, both of which may neutralise any benefits from punishing risky driving behaviour.

Parents may feel they are unable to influence the risky behaviour of their novice with a Provisional driver licence (e.g., Simons-Morton et al., 2002), however the small group interviews reveal that parents are integral (Kim et al., 2010) to the risky behaviour of the young novice driver. For example they are frequently the provider (e.g., Nygaard and Grube, 2005) of the vehicle in which the novice engages in risky behaviour. Countermeasures could encourage parents to not only be non-risky driving role models for their children, but emphasise the importance of negative consequences for risky driving behaviour by the novice. Furthermore, GDL programs are an additional ally for parents when imposing driving conditions and restrictions (e.g., Simons-Morton et al., 2002; Williams et al., 2006).

Parents and their novice driver children have been found to differ by a substantial amount in their knowledge of exactly what the novice’s driving rules are and the consequences of violating these (Hartos et al., 2004). Parents also may not understand the breadth and nature of risks faced by their novice children, and in particular the role they can

play in minimising these risks (Williams et al., 2006). Accordingly parents should be encouraged to explicitly set rules and consequences for breaching these rules with the young novice prior to any young novice driving, but particularly before independent, unsupervised driving (Simons-Morton et al., 2006).

3.2.5 Sub-theme 5: Punishment by Police

The sub-theme of punishment by police indicated that the novice driver expected or had experience of the police not punishing risky behaviour. Success in talking their way out of a ticket frequently involved a personal appraisal of the skills and discretionary authority (Travis, 2005) of the Police Officer involved. Police also failed to detect violation of road rules, including restrictions and conditions specific to the GDL program. Novices felt the punitive reactions of the police were dependent on other variables, *“on what it was...how I had behaved...very conditional on all of those”* (P22F). This has consequences for the risky behaviour of young novice drivers, *“I’ve been pulled over four times and they’ve let me go all four times for not wearing P plates. So like that just makes me not even wear them anymore”* (P18F).

Accordingly the young novices continued their risky driving behaviour, and conflicting messages (Nygaard and Grube, 2005) regarding risky driving perceived by the young novice driver appear to negate any benefits intended by such community policing. Warnings from police regarding risky driving may not be effective in behaviour change, for example, drivers in Maryland who were detected speeding and did not incur any legal consequences were re-detected for another speeding offence sooner than those who did incur a legal consequence (Lawpoolsri et al., 2007).

Although non-punishment by Police was reported, punishment of risky behaviour was also reported, with novices of all ages, gender and licence able to provide examples of anticipated police reactions such as *“community service or something”* (L17F) and *“spend the*

night in jail” (L16M). These reactions were likely to reduce the performance of risky behaviour, consistent with Akers’ assertions (Watson, 2004).

The novices were divided into those who accepted the authority of the police, and those who did not. The latter group was further able to be divided into two sub-groups, one of which was comprised only of males on a provisional licence who had strong feelings of persecution by the Police for being a novice driver, and their reactions were mixed, “*when you’re a P-plate you’re a magnet for cops so...you gotta watch out*” (P17M), and “*got to keep them (P Plates) up, want to keep your licence*” (P17M). These novices monitored police presence on the road and were asked to share this information with older novice siblings. They also attempted to avoid detection by police by not travelling routes frequented by police operations such as speed cameras and random breath (alcohol) tests.

The other sub-group was comprised of novices who had received only a warning from the police for their risky behaviour, and these novices did not change their behaviour to a less-risky pattern, reflecting upon these persons of authority with some disdain. Such behaviours have implications for risky driving, as punishment avoidance reinforces risky behaviour (Fleiter et al., 2010). In contrast, the first group of novices accepted that they were a vulnerable group of road users, and that “*they’d (the police) be more harder on young people than they would be on older people*” (P19F), suggested “*because they see the badder things that happen all the time*” (P21F). These statements appear to indicate also that the young novice driver respects the authority of the police and that the police are upholding legislation enacted to protect them as vulnerable road users.

3.2.6 Summary: Theme 2

To summarise, both non-social and social punishments from parents, friends and the police are influential in the risky behaviour of young novices. Consistent with Akers’ assertions, punishment for risky driving behaviour is likely to lead to the desired behavioural

change in the young novice driver. Future research should also explore the circumstances in which novice drivers believe their friends and parents should impose punishments. Possible countermeasures include targeted education programs encouraging friends and parents to punish risky behaviour, and highlighting the potential harms for female novices and potential costs for male novices.

[Insert Table 2 here]

3.3 Theme 3: Influence of parents on risky driving behaviour

Table 3 summarises the content analysis for the theme of the influence of parents on risky driving behaviour and reveals there are 13 condensed meaning units, 6 codes and 3 sub-themes.

3.3.1 Sub-theme 1: Parents no influence on novice behaviour

The sub-theme of parents having no influence on novice behaviour indicates that the novice does not imitate their parents' driving, whether it is risky ("*my Mum drives pretty fast, so I don't go that fast*", P21F) or not ("*I speed and they don't*", P18F).

3.3.2 Sub-theme 2: Parents indirect influence on novice behaviour

Parents also have an indirect influence on novice behaviour (sub-theme 2), novices seeing the non-risky way their parents drive and choosing to drive the same way ("*I try to drive like him (Dad)*", L16M), or seeing their risky driving and choosing not to drive that way ("*my Mum has road rage sometimes...and I'm like 'Mum, just calm down.'*", L17F). In the interests of road safety it is positive that some novices *do not* imitate the risky behaviour of their parent. However it is concerning that some novices also advise that they *do* imitate their parents' risky behaviour.

3.3.3 Sub-theme 3: Parents direct influence on novice behaviour

Parents are also directly influential (sub-theme 3) upon the risky behaviour of the young novice driver (Bonino et al., 2005). Some Learners being taught by their parents felt

their parents were “*more experienced and I guess I am just learning*” (L16F), whilst others felt that they had no choice but to imitate their parents’ driving style as they are being taught to drive by them in their car. Furthermore the independent Provisional drivers modified their risky behaviour in response to criticism when their parents were their passengers. Some parents also exhibited extended supervision of novice driving behaviour, monitoring where their novice was driving irrespective of whether they were borrowing the family car or not, novices acknowledging “*they want me to be safe...and not drive stupid*” (P19F).

3.3.4 Summary: Theme 3

Road safety countermeasures for novice drivers could highlight the vital role of parental influence and imitation in the risky behaviour of the young novice, and encourage this relationship to continue even when independent driving has begun. Parents have consistently been found to be a role model for their children in a range of risky behaviours, including driving behaviour (Prato et al., 2010). The novice driver has been found to imitate the driving style of their parent quite closely in the first stages of independent driving (Lahatte and Le Pape, 2008), a time when the novice is at greatest risk of injury and fatality from a car crash. Therefore parents should be encouraged to be a positive model for their child *even before* they have their novice licence.

Greater leniency and less parental monitoring of driving behaviour has been found to be associated with more risky driving behaviour, which was also evidenced as more offence and crash involvement by young novice drivers (e.g., see Hartos et al., 2000; Simons-Morton et al., 2002). A program such as Checkpoints (see Simons-Morton et al., 2006) encourages parents to be involved in their child’s driving after independent driving has commenced, and has been found to be associated with reduced risky behaviour by the young novice in their earliest stages of independent driving.

Parents in the current study were both a direct and indirect source of influence upon the risky behaviour of young novice drivers. This influence included both positive and negative elements. Accordingly countermeasures like targeted education and advertising campaigns, particularly for the parent of children *before* they receive a Learner driver's licence, could emphasise the potential for them to influence their children to become risky drivers if they observe risky behaviour, thereby stressing the importance of providing a non-risky driving model. Such a program is currently being utilised in Australia to reduce the incidence of binge drinking of alcohol by adolescents and has been found to be associated with increased awareness of risky drinking levels and the importance of modelling responsible alcohol consumption in both parents and their children (Department of Health and Ageing, 2009).

[Insert Table 3 here]

3.4 Theme 4: Influence of friends on risky driving behaviour

Table 4 summarises the content analysis for the theme of the influence of friends on risky driving behaviour and reveals there are 13 condensed meaning units, 9 codes and 3 sub-themes.

3.4.1 Sub-theme 1: Friends no influence on behaviour

The sub-theme of friends having no influence on novice behaviour indicates that (1) for the young novices, many of their friends did not yet have a licence; (2) Learners may not yet carry friends with them; and (3) female novices in particular avoid travelling as a passenger of their friends for fear of what may happen.

3.4.2 Sub-theme 2: Friends indirect influence on behaviour

The sub-theme of friends having an indirect influence on novice behaviour pertains to the novice's friendship group accepting risky driving behaviour, and this increases the likelihood that the novice will drive in a risky way (Brauer, 2009). Novices are vulnerable to

perceived group norms and are more likely to comply as they try to establish their self-identity. Novices who are on the cusp of progressing from a Learner to a Provisional driver's licence may be most at risk of negative peer influence as uncertainty about their identity is likely to be greater at that developmental stage, and increased uncertainty corresponds to increased vulnerability and conformity. Such conformity is also more likely when the novice perceives social rewards for the risky behaviour (Blanton and Burkley, 2008), and if the novice is susceptible to the negative influence of their friends (Miller, 2010).

3.4.3 Sub-theme 2: Friends direct influence on behaviour

Friends were also found to be a direct influence on the novice's behaviour, with novices consciously (i) driving like their risky friends; (ii) not driving like their risky friends; or (iii) driving like their non-risky friends. Some of the novices, irrespective of age, gender and licence reported that they drove in a risky manner just like their friends, consistent with other research indicating that adolescents tend to engage in risky behaviour such as smoking cigarettes just like their friends (Chen et al., 2001). The novice had been exposed to the risky behaviour of their friends at some point, and these friends served as a role model for driving behaviour (Brown et al., 2008).

Males in particular reported that their friends overtly encouraged them to be risky drivers or encouraged this behaviour simply through their presence in the vehicle (*"a little bit of peer pressure when I get in the car with a few mates"* (L16M)). Such peer pressure is normative during adolescence (Nichter, 2010), as is risk taking behaviour which serves many purposes such as the development of identity and autonomy (Bonino et al., 2003). Young male novices also reported they felt powerless to not drive in a risky way, and the antagonistic behaviours they anticipated from their friends as passengers, such as teasing, were also considered by the driver (Brown et al., 2008).

Novices also reported that they were not influenced by their friends whether the friends were risky drivers or not, “*try to be myself...an individual*” (P17M), “*I basically drive how I think is suitable for...the situation, whether or not they’re in the car it doesn’t matter because I’m the one driving*” (P18F). Such individuals appear to have established their self identity and therefore appear to be less vulnerable to the negative influences of their friends (Blanton and Burkly, 2008). However it may not necessarily be the case that their driving behaviour is not risky; rather their driving style is risky and that they are not able to be persuaded by their friends to be a less risky driver. This phenomenon requires further exploration in future research.

Risky friends could also exert a positive influence: novices irrespective of age, gender and licence reported they had friends who had undertaken risky driving and experienced a negative outcome such as a crash or a fine and had explicitly told the novice to drive in a less-risky fashion. Other friends were seen as “*lunatics on the road, and I’m sensible*” (L16F). It may be that these novices have developed their identity and are resilient and not susceptible to the negative influence of their friends (Miller, 2010), or that they have an inaccurate perception of their driving skills, abilities, and behaviours (Weinstein, 1980).

3.4.4 Summary: Theme 4

Friends again were a source of influence, with both direct and indirect mechanisms, upon the risky behaviour of young novice drivers. This influence included both positive and negative elements (Brown et al., 2008; Prentice, 2008). Accordingly countermeasures such as targeted education and advertising campaigns could capitalise upon the positive direct and indirect influence of friends upon risky behaviour found in the interviews, highlighting their potential power to encourage safer driving behaviour in the young novice. Friends are also influential in the maturation of the individual, and in particular in the social development of the young novice driver. Therefore future research should attempt to elucidate both the nature

and the mechanisms of this influence, and specifically the manner and circumstances in which maturation influences the decision of the young novice to engage in conforming and risky behaviour.

[Insert Table 4 here]

4 Conclusion

An exploration of the meanings young drivers assign to aspects of their driving such as perceived advantages and disadvantages of risky driving, punishments and rewards received or anticipated from the Police and from the parents and friends of the young novice driver, and if the young novice driver believe that their parents and friends influenced their driving was guided by Akers' social learning theory. It is noteworthy that the participants were young novice drivers recruited from one location over a one week period, and therefore the results may not be generalisable to all young novice drivers. Aspects of the young novice driver experience requiring further investigation – such as the role of maturation and identity issues, and the nature of punishments – have been identified throughout the discussion. In addition, the strength and priority of the influence of the various sub-themes within each theme should be investigated.

The young novice drivers were readily able to cite numerous advantages to risky driving. Females reported potentially incurring harm to themselves or other road users as a disadvantage to risky driving. In contrast, males were influenced by the potential tangible costs of the risky behaviour such as monetary fines. Parents, friends and the police were found to have direct and indirect influence on the risky behaviour through the administration of rewards and punishments. Countermeasures such as education campaigns should target parents and friends, emphasising that it is important for them to model non-risky driving behaviour, and not to reward risky driving behaviour, but to punish it. Parents should also be encouraged to continue monitoring the driving behaviour of their young adults when

independent driving has begun. In addition, there is a need for further research into strategies to reduce punishment avoidance among novice drivers and the likely impact of warnings on their behaviour.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Ms Melissa Johns for her assistance in recording and transcribing the interviews, and Dr Ioni Lewis for her valuable insight and constructive feedback regarding an earlier version of the manuscript.

References

- Akers, R. L. (2009). A social learning theory of crime. In F. R. Scarpitti (Ed.), *Crime and criminals: Contemporary and classic readings in criminology* (pp. 215-225). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Akers, R. L., Krohn, M. D., Lanza-Kaduce, L., Radosevich, M. 1979. Social learning and deviant behaviour: A specific test of a general learning theory. *American Sociological Review* 44, 636-655.
- Akers, R. L., Sellers, C. S. 2004. *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation, and application*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publications.
- Azjen, I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* 50, 179-211.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., Ross, S. A. 2003. Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. In Hogg, M. A. (Ed.), *Social Psychology: Vol 2. Social interaction*, pp. 191-208. London: Sage. (Original work published 1963).
- Best, A. L. 2006. Freedom, constraint, and family responsibility. Teens and parents collaboratively negotiate around the car, class, gender, and culture. *Journal of Family Issues* 27, 55-84.
- Blanton, H., Burkley, M. 2008. Deviance regulation theory: Applications to adolescent social influence. In Prinstein, M. J., Dodge, K. A. (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents*, pp. 94-124. London: Guilford.
- Bonino, S., Cattelino, E., Ciairano, S. 2005. *Adolescents and risk. Behavior, functions, and protective factors*. Milan: Springer-Verlag Italia.
- Brauer, J. R. 2009. Testing social learning theory using reinforcement's residue: A multilevel analysis of self-reported theft and marijuana use in the national youth survey. *Criminology* 47, 929-970.

- Brezina, T., Piquero, A. R. 2003. Exploring the relationship between social and non-social reinforcement in the context of social learning theory. In Akers, R. L., Jenson, G. F. (Eds.), *Social learning theory and the explanation of crime: A guide for the new century*, pp. 265-288. New Jersey: Transaction.
- Brown, B. B., Bakken, J. P., Ameringer, A. W., Mahon, S. D. 2008. A comprehensive conceptualization of the peer influence process in adolescence. In M. J. Prinstein, & K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents*, pp. 17-44. London: Guilford.
- Bryman, A. 2008. *Social research methods*. Oxford Uni Press: Melbourne.
- Buckley, L., Sheehan, M. C. 2008. The relevancy of ‘mates don’t let mates....’ As a key strategy for a school curriculum-based road safety program. In *Proceedings High risk road users – motivating behaviour change: What works and what doesn’t work?* National Conference of the Australasian College of Road Safety and the Travelsafe Committee of the Queensland Parliament, Brisbane.
- Chen, P. H., White, H. R., Pandina, R. J. 2001. Predictors of smoking cessation from adolescence to young adulthood. *Addictive Behaviors* 26, 517-529.
- CHOPD (The Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia). 2009a. Driving: Through the eyes of teens. <http://www/chop/edu/youngdrivers>.
- CHOPD (The Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia). 2009b. Driving: Through the eyes of teens. A closer look. <http://www/chop/edu/youngdrivers>
- Cooper, K., May, D., Soderstrom, I., Jarjoura, G. R. 2009. Examining theoretical predictors of substance use among a sample of incarcerated youth. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 48, 669-695.
- Department of Health and Aging. 2009. National Binge Drinking Campaign – evaluation survey April 2009.

[http://www.health.gov.au/internet/drinkinghibghmare/publishing.nsf/Content/3F34473572CF15F2CA257679007C3A7A/\\$File/eval.pdf](http://www.health.gov.au/internet/drinkinghibghmare/publishing.nsf/Content/3F34473572CF15F2CA257679007C3A7A/$File/eval.pdf)

DiBlasio, F. A. 1987. Predriving riders and drinking drivers. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 49, 11-15.

Department of Transport and Main Roads. 2010. Car Crashes in Queensland, 1 July 1998 – 30 June 2008s. Brisbane: DTMR.

Fleiter, J. J., Lennon, A. J., Watson, B. 2010. How do other people influence your driving speed? Exploring the ‘who’ and the ‘how’ of social influences on speeding from a qualitative perspective. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 13, 49-62.

Gibbons, F. X., Pomery, E. A., Gerrard, M. 2008. Cognitive social influence: Moderation, mediation, modification, and ...the media. In Prinstein, M. J., Dodge, K. A. (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents*, pp. 45-71. London: Guilford.

Graneheim, A. H., Lundman, B. 2004. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today* 24, 105-112.

Hartos, J. L., Eitel, P., Haynie, D. L., Simons-Morton, B. G. 2000. Can I take the car? Relations among parenting practices and adolescent problem-driving practices. *Journal of Adolescent Research* 15, 352-367.

Hartos, J. L., Shattuck, T., Simons-Morton, B. G., Beck, K. H. 2004. An in-depth look at parent-imposed driving rules: Their strengths and weaknesses. *Journal of Safety Research* 35, 547-555.

Higgins, G. E., Mahoney, M., Ricketts, M. L. 2009. Non-social reinforcement of the nonmedical use of prescription drugs: A partial test of social learning and self-control theories. *Journal of Drug Issues* Fall, 949-963.

- Hwang, S., Akers, R. L. 2003. Substance use by Korean adolescents: A cross-cultural test of social learning, social bonding, and self-control theories. In Akers, R. L., Jenson, G. F. (Eds.), *Social learning theory and the explanation of crime: A guide for the new century*, pp. 39-63. New Jersey: Transaction.
- Keating, D. P. 2007. Understanding adolescent development: Implications for driving safety. *Journal of Safety Research* 38, 147-157.
- Kim, E., Kwak, D. H., Yun, M. 2010. Investigating the effects of peer association and parental influence on adolescence substance use: A study of adolescents in South Korea. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38, 17-24.
- Krohn, M. D., Skinner, W. F., Massey, J. L., Akers, R. L. 1985. Social learning theory and adolescent cigarette smoking: A longitudinal study. *Social Problems* 32, 455-473.
- Lahatte, A., Le Pape, M. C. 2008. Is the way young people drive a reflection of the way their parents drive? An econometric study of the relation between parental risk and their children's risk. *Risk Analysis* 28, 627-634.
- Lawpoolsri, S., Li, J., Braver, E. R. 2007. Do speeding tickets reduce the likelihood of receiving subsequent speeding tickets? A longitudinal study of speeding violators in Maryland. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 8, 26-34.
- Liamputtong, P., Ezzy, D. 2005. *Qualitative research methods* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Oxford.
- Mayring, P. 2000. Qualitative content analysis. In Flick, U., Von Kardoff, E., Steinke, I. (Eds.), *A companion to qualitative research*, pp. 266-270. London: Sage.
- Miller, H. V. 2010. If your friends jumped off of a bridge, would you do it too? Delinquent peers and susceptibility to peer influence. *Justice Quarterly* 27, 473-491.
- Nichter, M. 2010. Adolescent health. In Coreil, J. Coreil (Ed.), *Social and behavioral foundations of public health*, 2nd ed., pp 207-366. Sage: London.

- Nygaard, P., Grube, J. W. 2005. Mixed messages: Contributions to adolescent drinking and driving. *Addiction Research and Theory* 13, 411-426.
- Prato, C. G., Toledo, T., Lotan, T., Taubman-Ben-Ari, O. 2010. Modelling the behavior of novice young drivers during the first year after licensure. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 42, 480-486.
- Prentice, D. A. 2008. Mobilizing and weakening peer influence as mechanisms for changing behaviour: Implications for alcohol intervention programs. In Prinstein, M. J., Dodge, K. A. (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents*, pp. 161-180. London: Guilford
- Preston, P., Goodfellow, M. 2006. Cohort comparisons: Social learning explanations for alcohol use among adolescents and older adults. *Addictive Behaviors* 31, 2268-2283.
- Price, V., Archbold, J. 1995. Development and application of social learning theory. *British Journal of Nursing* 4, 1263-1268.
- Prinstein, M. J., Dodge, K. A. 2008. Current issues in peer influence research. In Prinstein, M. J., Dodge, K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents*, pp. 3-16. London: Guilford.
- Queensland Transport, 2007. Learner driver handbook. Safe driving in Queensland. Retrieved 12 January 2009, from <http://www.transport.qld.gov.au/learningtodrive>
- Redshaw, S. 2006. Dangerous gender performances: 'Hydraulic masculinity' as a norm for young male drivers. 2006 Australasian Road Safety Research, Policing and Education Conference, 25-27 October 2006, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia.
- Scott-Parker, B. Bates, L., Watson, B., King, M. J., Hyde, M. K. 2011. The impact of changes to the graduated driver licensing program in Queensland, Australia on the experiences of Learner drivers. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*. doi: 10.1016/j.aap.2011.01.012

- Scott-Parker, B., Watson, B., King, M. J., 2009a. Understanding the influence of parents and peers upon the risky behaviour of young drivers. *Transportation Research Part F* 12, 470-482.
- Scott-Parker, B., Watson, B., King, M. J., 2009b. Exploring how parents and peers influence the behaviour of young drivers. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 Australasian Road Safety Research, Policing and Education Conference*, 10-12 November, 2009, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
- Scott-Parker, Watson, B., King, M. J., Hyde, M. K. In press. Young, inexperienced and on the road – do novice drivers comply with road rules? *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C.
- Sebal, H. 1992. *Adolescence: A social psychological analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Simons-Morton, B. G., Hartos, J. L., Leaf, W. A. 2002. Promoting parental management of teen driving. *Injury Prevention* 8(SII), ii24-ii31.
- Simons-Morton, B. G., Hartos, J. L., Leaf, W. A., Preusser, D. F. 2006. Increasing parent limits on novice young drivers: Cognitive mediation of the effect of persuasive messages. *Journal of Adolescent Research* 21, 83-105.
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J. C. 2003. The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In Hogg, M. (Ed.), *Social psychology: Vol 4. Intergroup behaviour and societal context*, pp. 73-101. London: Sage. (Original work published 1986).
- Travis, L. E. 2005. *Introduction to criminal justice*, 5th ed. Matthew Bender & Co: Cincinnati.
- Trifiletti, L. B., Gielen, A. C., Sleet, D. A., Hopkins, K. 2005. Behavioral and social sciences theories and models: Are they used in unintentional injury prevention research? *Health Education Research* 20, 298-307.
- Vanzetti, N., Duck, S. 1996. *A lifetime of relationships*. Melbourne: Brooks/Cole.

- Vassallo, S., Smart, D., Sanson, A., Cockfield, S., Harris, A., McIntyre, A., et al. 2008. Risky driving among young Australian drivers II: Co-occurrence with other problem behaviours. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 40, 376-386.
- Watson, B. 2004. The psychosocial characteristics and on-road behaviours of unlicensed drivers. Unpublished PhD, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.
- Weber, R. P. 2004. Content analysis. In Searle, C. (Ed.), *Social research methods: A reader*, pp. 117-175. New York: Routledge.
- Weinstein, N. D. 1980. Unrealistic optimism about future life events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39, 806-820.
- Williams, A. F., Chaudhary, N. K., Tefft, B. C., Tison, J., 2010. Evaluation of New Jersey's graduated driver licensing program. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 11, 1-7.
- Williams, A. F., Leaf, W. A., Simons-Morton, S. G., & Hartos, J. L. (2006). Parents' views of teen driving risks, the role of parents, and how they plan to manage the risks. *Journal of Safety Research* 37, 221-226.
- Winfrey, L. T., Bernat, F. P. 1998. Social learning, self-control, and substance abuse by eighth grade students: A tale of two cities. *Journal of Drug Issues* 28, 539-558.

Appendix

Interview Questions

- (1) What is the difference between bending and breaking the road rules?
- (2) What are the advantages of bending or breaking the road rules?
- (3) What are the disadvantages of bending or breaking the road rules?
- (4) How would your friends react if you bent or broke the road rules?
- (5) How would your parents react if you bent or broke the road rules?
- (6) How would the Police react if you bent or broke the road rules?
- (7) Do you drive like your parents? In what way?
- (8) Do you drive like your friends? In what way?
- (9) How much influence do your friends have over the way you drive? In what way?
- (10) How much influence do your parents have over the way you drive? In what way?

Highlights

- Parents can continue to influence driver behaviour beyond the Learner period.
- Friends likely to react to risky driving if the outcome is negative (eg crash).
- Friends unlikely to react to risky driving if there are no negative outcomes.
- Friends are an underused resource who could decrease risky driving by novices.
- Rewards for risky driving should be targeted and potential loss emphasised.

Table 1. Rewards for Risky Driving – Sub-Themes, Codes, Condensed Meaning Units and Meaning Units

Sub-Theme	Code	Condensed Meaning Unit	Meaning Unit¹
Experience reward for risky driving	Non-social reward for risky driving	Instrumental rewards for risky behaviour	Get there quicker (P18M) Easier to get places (L17F)
		Positive emotional response for risky driving behaviour	Seems more fun than what everyone else is doing (P18M) Thrill of everyone going so easy on you because you've only just started (L16F)
	Social reward for risky driving	Friends encourage risky behaviour with direct reward	If you had stupid friends...they'd say "Oh you should do it again ...because you're so cool" (L16F)
Negative reward	Punishment avoidance	Avoid detection of risky behaviour by Police	No-one's going to catch you (P22F)
Reward from needs being met	Maturation issues psychosocial	Risky behaviour helps define identity	Be yourself; try to be different (P17M) Feel like you're in control...of your own choices and the vehicle and stuff like that (P24F)

¹ All Meaning Units are direct excerpts from the transcripts. Illustrative quotations are provided.

Table 2. Punishments for Risky Driving – Sub-Themes, Codes, Condensed Meaning Units and Meaning Units

Sub-Theme	Code	Condensed Meaning Unit	Meaning Unit ¹
Social punishment	Inflict harm	Potential harm to others	Injure someone else, ruin someone's life (P24F, L17F)
Non-social punishment	Incur harm	Potential harm to self	If this happened I could die (P22F)
		Negative emotional response	Feel really guilty about possible injuring that person (P24F) Scary, you know how much can go wrong (P22F)
		Potential damage to property	Damaging your property or your car (P22F, L17F)
	Incur loss	Potential costs/legal consequences	Consequences if you get caught (L18M, P22F) Pretty good incentive to...not do it or get smarter (P17M)
		Loss of mobility	You'd have no car, you couldn't get anywhere (P21F, L16M) You gotta call on your mates to come and pick you up (P18M)
		Delay caused by third party	If it goes through insurance it takes ages (L16F)
		Consequences for GDL progression	Makes it a lot harder to get your P's and your Open's when you get to it because of the points on your Learners (L17M)
	Punishment by friends	Friends unlikely to punish risky driving behaviour	Don't think they be that too concerned. It's your licence, you're going to lose it, they don't care (L18M)
		Friends travelling as passengers unlikely to mention risky driving	They're driving in your car so they won't really say too much (L18M)
		Emotional response to friends being unlikely to punish risky driving	If I did bend them they wouldn't say anything which is kind of scary because it's their lives that I'm driving (P17F)
		Friends unlikely to mention risky driving as they also are risky drivers	Don't ever really tell me off because they do the same (P17M)
	Friends likely to punish	Friends likely to mention risky driving behaviour	Goody-two-shoes would be like "Oh you can't do that" (P21F) Get annoyed but they'd just laugh...tease me about how much I gotta pay and stuff like (P18M)
		Friends react strongly to risky driving behaviour	Very shocked...not that sort of person (P22F) Some of my friends would be freaking out because they'd be really scared...drink driving...tell me off (L17F)
Punishment by parents	Parents unlikely to punish	Reactions of friends influenced by other variables	I guess we're at that age...burnouts...to fit it (L16F) Older friends would tell me off and the ones my age and younger would just have a bit of a laugh (P24F)
		Outcome influences reactions of friends to risky driving behaviour	It depends what happens. If nothing bad...they'd probably tell you to do it again...but...something bad did...be upset (L16F)
		Parents unlikely to mention risky driving behaviour	I've been in the car with them and broken the road rules and they didn't say anything (L17M)

Punishment by Police	Parents likely to punish	Parents not punish, unsympathetic	(Lost car and said) Get on your bike (P18M) She'd say it's your licence, if you do it you've got to pay the fine (P17M)
		Parents not punish, emotional response only to risky driving behaviour	Disappointed...very, very disappointed in me.... they're not big on punishments or consequences I guess (P22F) No (punishment) because they expect me to be able to make the decision for myself (P18F)
		Parents likely to react to risky driving behaviour	Just give me a warning and tell me not to do it again (L16M) Yelling...angry (P21F, L16F)
		Parents react strongly to risky driving behaviour	My mother would freak out. She'd yell at me...stop me from driving the car...I didn't stop at a red light at the end of (school) term 4...wouldn't let me drive...for 2 weeks (P17F)
	Reactions of parents influenced by other variables	Motive for risky behaviour influences reactions of parents	If it was an accident...I'm still on my L's (L17M) If I did it on purpose they'd probably be pretty angry (L17M)
	Police unlikely to punish risky behaviour	Inconsistent experience of Police Police failed to detect rule violation	I've been pulled over...7 times...all Police are different (P21F) Didn't realise I had no P Plates on (P17M)
	Police likely to punish risky behaviour	Police react to risky driving behaviour	Fines, demerit points, permanent record (P17M, L16F) They'd go spastic, they'd be worse than our parents (L16F)
		Accept Police authority	They just have to do their jobs...punish me (L17M) Don't think they're very tolerant. Especially of young drivers breaking the road rules (P22F)
		Do not accept Police authority and feel persecuted for being a young novice driver	They always seem to be picking on anyone with a P plate...targeted me cos I've got a P plate and its really starting to annoy me (P17M) Reason we have to wear...P plates...so...can pull us over (P17M)
		Recognise are a member of an at-risk group of drivers Unable to avoid Police punishment	Being a P plater, kinda got a stigma attached to us, probably for a good reason (P24F) I can't talk my way out of it – I had my car impounded for 24 hours and had to go to Court a couple of weeks ago (P17M)
	Reactions of Police influenced by other variables	Talked self out of ticket as Police did not want to do paperwork	Depends on what you did...on my L's I could've gotten my car impounded for 24 hours and my licence suspended, talked my way out of that ...didn't want to do that paperwork (P18M)

¹ All Meaning Units are direct excerpts from the transcripts. Illustrative quotations are provided.

Table 3. Influence of Parents – Sub-Themes, Codes, Condensed Meaning Units and Meaning Units

Sub-Theme	Code	Condensed Meaning Unit	Meaning Unit ¹
Parents no influence on novice behaviour ²	Do not drive like non-risky parents	Parents not risky drivers, novices do not imitate <u>their behaviour</u>	No. I think they're a bit more cautious...more slow (P22F) No, no way. Dad's like a grandpa, takes ages to get there and (he) <u>just doesn't drive like you're meant to</u> (P17M)
		Parents do not modify their vehicle, <u>encourage novice to do same</u>	Doing up your car, modifications...they don't like it (P18M)
Parents indirect influence on novice behaviour	Drive like risky parents	Parents risky drivers, novices <u>concede self a risky driver</u>	Not at all! They...break the road rules a lot more than I do...Dad on mobile...even though I still do break the road rules (P24F)
		Parents risky drivers, novices imitate their behaviour	Yes apparently I drive like my Mother (told by Father)... passive aggressive (P17F)
	Do not drive like risky parents	Parents risky drivers, novices do not imitate their behaviour	My Mum's a spastic. She's just there screaming and yelling... swearing "Put your indicator on!" (I'm) more patient (L16F) No influence...Because they are terrible drivers and I don't <u>want to drive the same way they do</u> (P24F)
	Some driving like non-risky parents	Parents not risky drivers, novice imitates some behaviour	I do listen to some things they say and other things I think are pretty irrelevant...got to do what I want to do (P17M)
	Drive like non-risky parents ³	Parents not risky drivers, novice imitates their behaviour	I guess having them as my parents, no matter where I am...that I'll want to do what they think's best so I'll drive safely (P22F)
Parents direct influence on novice behaviour	Drive like non-risky parents	Novice has to imitate parents' driving behaviour	Well, yeah, I have to but (L16F) On my Learner's they're sitting right next to me...direct every <u>single thing I do</u> (L17M)
		Emotional response to need to imitate parents' driving behaviour	I feel under pressure to stay at the right speed...because you feel like they're (Mum/Dad) watching (L16F) Because they're my parents they're meant to know a lot of <u>things about driving. I trust them with everything</u> (L17F)
		Modify behaviour in response to parents' presence and requests	It depends...when they're not in the car I drive how I want but when they're in the car they complain a lot so...I do what they ask...because I don't want to hear it (P18F)
		Novice imitates parents' driving behaviour	Yeah I guess so...they teach me how to drive...so I just drive like they do (L17M) I'm driving their car and they're the ones who taught me to drive and I feel kind of compelled to listen to them (P17F)
		Novice wants to imitate parents'	I try to drive like my Dad cos he's a safe driver (L16M)

driving behaviour	My Dad used to drag race...he's real good with cars...I trust him ...way he drives...want to learn from him as best I can (L17M)
Parents display extended supervision of novice driving behaviour	I always tell them where I'm going...just so they know where I am and how I'm driving as well (P21F) I borrow the car from my Dad so he's got a big say about how I drive, where I drive most of the time (P17M)

¹ All Meaning Units are direct excerpts from the transcripts. Illustrative quotations are provided.

² Please note that all meaning units were interpreted from the utterances of the young novice driver. No evidence of direct or indirect influence upon the self-reported risky driving of the young novice was apparent in this Sub-Theme.

³ Some codes are repeated in different Sub-Themes

Table 4. Influence of Friends – Sub-Themes, Codes, Condensed Meaning Units and Meaning Units

Sub-Theme	Code	Condensed Meaning Unit	Meaning Unit ¹
Friends no influence on behaviour	Do not drive like <u>risky friends</u> ²	Friends risky drivers, novices do not imitate their behaviour	Because they're lunatics on the road and I'm sensible (L16F)
	Travelling with friends	Friends evoke negative emotional response in novice driver	I would not have clue...too scared to go in (their) car (L16F) I think a lot of my friends haven't been taught to drive properly ...I get really nervous when I'm in the car with them (P17F)
		Friends do not travel with novice	They never drive with me anyway so it doesn't...matter (L16F)
	Friends are not a source of driving influence	Novice does not care what friends think of driving Friends do not have a licence	I don't really care how they drive, if I choose to drive safely... I'm going to do it. I don't care what they say or do (L17M) Most of my friends don't have (a licence) (P21F, L17M)
Friends indirect influence on novice behaviour	Drive like risky friends	Friends risky drivers, novices imitate their behaviour	Yeah...like we think it's ok to go over the speed limit in certain situations because it's accepted within...group (P24F)
	Do not drive like risky friends	Friends risky drivers, novice does not imitate their behaviour	I've got some friends who are really bad drivers, so I wouldn't drive like them (P22F)
Friends direct influence on novice behaviour	Drive like risky friends	Modify behaviour in response to friends' risky presence and requests	If they say go faster or something I'll probably go faster (L16F) They're always telling me to do stuff that's not legal on...road ...go faster...sometimes you do it, sometimes you don't (P17M)
		Friends risky drivers, novices imitate some of their behaviour	Yeah...they speed as well (P18F)
	Drive like non-risky friends	Novice imitates friends' non-risky driving behaviour	Yeah I would...like being aware...like approaching corners too fast when I should've braked a bit earlier (P19F)
		Novice wants to imitate friends' driving behaviour	I watch how they drive because I am in the car with them (L16F)
	Do not imitate risky behaviour of friends	Friends risky drivers, encourage novice to be less risky	Some have had speeding tickets and tell me not to speed as much... look after people in...passenger seat as well (P18M)
	Gender influences imitation	Gender differences in imitation of friends' driving behaviour	Yeah kinda... like female friends, not male (L16F) More fast than my female friends (P17M)

¹ All Meaning Units are direct excerpts from the transcripts. Illustrative quotations are provided.² Some codes are repeated in different Sub-Themes