

Framing road risks: Why road crash messages don't put people in the driver's seat

Rebecca Pedruzzi^a, Anne Swinbourne^a, Frances Quirk^{ab}

^aJames Cook University, ^bBarwon Health

Abstract

Road safety advertising in Australia is largely based on the assumption that more fear results in greater persuasion. As such, the portrayal of violent road crashes remains the status quo. The current research aimed to investigate if individuals perceive they can influence such outcomes, as theory suggests that efficacy perceptions are central to fear appeal success. Results from two studies demonstrated that participants believed their behaviours would influence financial and point penalty outcomes but not the occurrence of road crashes. This research demonstrates why the portrayal of car crash outcomes in road safety messages needs to be reconsidered.

Background

At their most basic, fear appeals are communication attempts that present the negative consequences of engaging in risky behaviours. The message aims to elicit fear by presenting a threat, in an attempt to encourage motivation for the performance of protective behaviours (Ruiter, Abraham, & Kok, 2001). In Australia, road safety advertising frequently employs the use of fear appeals that demonstrate severe consequences of risky driving in graphic ways (Donovan & Henley, 2003; Lewis, Watson, & White, 2008; O'Rourke, 2000). The consequences portrayed often involve horrifying pictures of mangled cars, bloodied victims and even the death of children (Algie & Rossiter, 2010). While some advertisements have focused on legal sanctions such as fines and demerit points (Donovan, Jalleh, & Henley, 1999) and others have appealed to perceptions of social acceptability (see the 'Pinkie' campaign, New South Wales Government, n.d.), outcomes portraying crashes, injury and death certainly remain the status quo (Algie & Rossiter, 2010; Carey, McDermott, & Sarma, 2013; Lewis, Watson, & White, 2013). It seems that Australia is not alone in this endeavour, with countries such as New Zealand, the USA and UK also favouring this approach. This is decidedly different to countries like The Netherlands who have a long history of employing tactics such as humour in this field (Hoekstra & Wegman, 2011).

The use of fear appeals in Australian road safety advertising became particularly popular in the 1990s. At this time, the Victorian Transport Accident Commission (TAC) had employed a series of hard hitting advertisements that demonstrated graphic scenes of road carnage, accompanied by depictions of the physical and emotional consequences (Donovan et al., 1999; Lewis, Watson, Tay, & White, 2007). These advertisements were expensive to create with estimated costs between \$AUD 250,000 and 450,000 per advertisement. The TAC won international recognition for these advertisements and their approach was swiftly adopted by several other Australian jurisdictions (Donovan et al., 1999).

While experts have recommended that theoretical foundations and prior research are necessary to create successful road safety campaigns (Delaney, Lough, Whelan, & Cameron, 2004; Delhomme et al., 2009; Woolley, 2001), in practice this rarely occurs (Elliott, 2011; Wundersitz, Hutchinson, & Woolley, 2010). This is despite the potential pitfalls of fear appeals as a method of risk communication in road safety being emphasised for some time. Employing learning theory principles, Job (1990) highlighted how embedding fear as a punishment procedure in road safety messages is likely to be ineffective. Henley and Donovan (1999) noted the frequent use of death threats in Australian threat appeals generally. They maintain that death is a qualitatively different outcome in comparison to non-death outcomes in threat appeals. With non-death outcomes, it

might be possible to offer solutions or behaviours that affect the outcome. However, it is much more difficult to reassure individuals that their behaviours will prevent death (Henley & Donovan, 1999). This is especially important to consider in a road safety domain because death is a consistently portrayed outcome in risk communication attempts. Similar concerns regarding the suitability of fear campaigns in road safety advertising have continued to be conveyed (Castillo-Manzano, Castro-Nuño, & Pedregal, 2012; Elliott, 2003, 2005; Hoekstra & Wegman, 2011; Wundersitz & Hutchinson, 2011).

Even though evidence for the use of fear appeals in road safety is scarce, fear campaigns continue to be used as a method of road safety advertising. It has been suggested that change is unlikely and the state of affairs will need to be tolerated for years to come. That is, decisions regarding the content of road safety advertising will continue to be made without thorough evaluation or scientific evidence (Wundersitz et al., 2010). Consequently understanding the factors that influence the relationship between fear and persuasion may be more valuable to investigate (Lewis et al., 2007). Proponents of this view have employed fear appeal theory – in particular the Extended Parallel Process Model (EPPM; Witte, 1992) as a theoretical foundation upon which to base research (Lewis, Watson, & White, 2010; Lewis et al., 2013). Inherent to this model is the idea that the perception of threat is needed to generate fear which, in turn, motivates processing of a message. However, it is coping appraisal which determines whether the message is accepted or rejected (Lewis et al., 2007; Maloney, Lapinski, & Witte, 2011). The coping appraisal component of the EPPM concerns evaluations of self efficacy and response efficacy. Self efficacy can be defined as a person's belief or confidence in performing a behaviour while response efficacy refers to a person's belief that the behaviour will be effective in preventing the threat (Boer & Seydel, 1996; Maloney et al., 2011). The relationship between threat perception and coping appraisal hypothesised by the EPPM is an interactive one. That is, threatening information will only result in adaptive behaviour (message acceptance) if there are positive coping appraisals (Ruiter, Verplanken, Kok, & Verrij, 2003).

Empirical evidence for the proposed theoretical relationship has been inconsistent. Meta analyses from the broader health literature have demonstrated main effects of threat and efficacy but have provided no evidence for the proposed interaction between these variables (de Hoog, Stroebe, & de Wit, 2007; Witte & Allen, 2000). These findings indicate that higher threat alone can facilitate message acceptance. Peters, Ruiter, and Kok (2012) hypothesised that the inconsistent evidence could be due to poor selection of the target audience, as audience profiles on threat and efficacy are not considered prior to receiving a threatening message. Thus, a review of empirical evidence by these authors included only studies that manipulated both variables. Results demonstrated an interaction effect between threat and efficacy whereby threat only had an effect on adaptive behaviour when efficacy was high. Likewise, the effect of efficacy was only significant when threat was high. This research suggests that unless efficacy perceptions are high at baseline (or effectively enhanced via an intervention), threatening communications can be ineffective at influencing adaptive behaviour (Peters et al., 2012).

The implications of this work are important to consider when discussing road safety outcomes. As noted by Pedruzzi, Swinbourne, and Quirk (2012) a negative road outcome can be perceived, correctly, as a function of other people's behaviour. Therefore individuals may feel they have limited ability to influence outcomes. Road outcomes fall into two broad categories. Those an individual has control over (e.g. their own speeding behaviour) and those an individual has no control over (e.g. a speeding driver in another car). Road campaigns tend to target the former by demonstrating how the viewer's driving behaviour can result in negative outcomes. The work of Peters et al. (2012) suggests that the effectiveness of these messages may depend upon pre-existing perceptions of driving behaviours to influence negative outcomes. However, the EPPM will have different predictions depending upon the target outcome. Individuals may have control over their

own road behaviour but negative road outcomes can still occur in the presence of this behaviour. Such a situation will likely affect efficacy appraisals. It therefore makes sense to evaluate individuals' belief in their ability to influence road outcomes. This is important because real world applications of road safety risk communication generally fail to include or address efficacy components. Understanding efficacy appraisals could provide valuable insight into audience beliefs about road risks, and, the most appropriate outcomes to target in road safety research and advertising employing threat as a stimulus.

The current research thus aimed to investigate if belief in one's ability to perform a set of road behaviours is in fact related to beliefs in influencing the occurrence of negative road outcomes. In order to do this participants were asked to estimate control perceptions, specifically their confidence in their ability to control or influence a set of road behaviours and outcomes. Numerous road safety advertisements focus on crash or fine outcomes, therefore these outcomes were the subject of this investigation. As the occurrence of fine penalties are ultimately due to individual behaviour, it was hypothesised that perceived control over road risk behaviour and perceived control over the occurrence of fines would be similarly high, and related to each other. In contrast, it was hypothesised that perceived control over the occurrence of crash outcomes would be relatively low and have weak or no relationship with perceived control over road risk behaviours.

Study 1

Method

Participants

A sample of 236 participants was recruited from the Townsville region in North Queensland via the advertisement of an online survey. The survey link was largely advertised on online social networks, university newsletters, and community events pages. Participants could click on the advertised link to proceed to the survey. Of this sample, 31 participants requested to fill out a paper questionnaire. The majority (85%) of the sample were Queensland residents while 25 participants reported living elsewhere in Australia. There were 3 participants who reported living overseas while 4 individuals did not give any information about their place of residence.

The sample consisted of 156 females and 76 males (4 participants did not indicate their gender) ranging in age from 18 to 73 years ($M = 38.97$, $SD = 13.89$). Eight percent of the respondents reported their highest level of education was year 10 in secondary school. A further 22% reported completing year 12. Almost 33% had completed an undergraduate degree. About 8% of the sample reported having a trade qualification while the remaining 27% reported completing some other form of education. Cases were examined for missing values. A total of 29 participants were missing data on one or more of the variables of interest and were excluded. These participants were older than those without missing data ($t_{(233)} = -2.01$, $p = .05$). However the distribution of gender did not differ between groups ($\chi^2(1, N = 232) = 2.19$, $p = .15$). Six participants with missing data had been involved in a car crash compared to fifty participants without missing data. These proportions were not significantly different ($\chi^2(1, N=235) = .10$, $p = .75$). Missing data was dealt with using list wise deletion thus resulting in a final sample of 207 participants.

Measures

This study was embedded within a broader project, and only the behaviours and outcomes specific to this report are grouped and listed below. Specifically, three target variables were examined. These were control over road behaviours, and control over fine and crash outcomes.

Control over road behaviours

Participants were presented with a number of road behaviours. These behaviours included ‘driving without talking on a mobile phone,’ ‘driving without texting,’ ‘driving over the speed limit,’ and ‘driving with a blood alcohol level over the legal limit.’ Participants were asked to consider each behaviour happening to them, and indicate their confidence in their ability to control or influence each one. Participants responded on a 7 point Likert scale (1 = no confidence, 7 = complete confidence).

Control over fine and crash outcomes

A number of road related outcomes pertaining to fines were presented to the participants. These outcomes included ‘being booked for speeding,’ ‘being booked for drink driving,’ ‘being booked for talking on a mobile phone while driving,’ and ‘being booked for texting while driving.’ One item ‘being involved in a car crash’ assessed control over a crash outcome. Participants were asked to think about the outcomes happening to them and indicate their confidence in their ability to control or influence each one. Participants responded on a 7 point Likert scale (1=no confidence, 7 = complete confidence). Participants were also asked to indicate whether or not the event had happened to them.

Procedure

Ethics approval was obtained through the James Cook University Ethics Committee (H4576). Participants were directed to an online version of the survey which was hosted at Survey Gizmo. Participants were asked to think about the behaviours and outcomes described as actually happening to them before indicating their confidence in their ability to control or influence each one.

Results

Statistical methods & data preparation

Data was analysed using both SPSS and AMOS (version 22). In order to test the effects of behavioural control on fine and crash outcomes, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) with AMOS was used. The strength of this approach, in comparison to creating composite variables, is that latent variables can be tested and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) can be performed simultaneously. Furthermore, SEM can provide more accurate estimates of relationships as it models the error variance specific to each variable. The overall models were tested with Maximum Likelihood Estimation using the covariance matrix. Univariate and multivariate non normality were assessed by examining normality statistics in AMOS (see Byrne, 2010). To adjust for inflated standard errors when data was identified as multivariate non normal, Bollen-Stine bootstrapping procedures were performed with 2000 bootstrapped samples at 95% confidence intervals (Bollen & Stine, 1992). Sample size considerations for SEM require at least 10 participants per estimated parameter as less than this can result in power and model stability issues (Kline, 2011). In consideration of this, no more than 20 estimated parameters were modelled with the current sample.

Model fit was assessed with chi square indices, Bentler’s Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), the Root Means Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). A non-significant chi square is indicative of good model fit. The post hoc adjustment made by the Bollen –Stine bootstrap also yields a non-significant p value to indicate good model fit. For CFI, values obtained should be greater than .95 (.90 at minimum) AGFI should be above .90, RMSEA less than .06 and SRMR less than .05 (Byrne, 2010). Latent variables were created for ‘control over behaviours’, and ‘control over fine outcomes’. CFA was performed to evaluate the validity of the latent variables used in the structural model.

Control appraisals

Participants' average ratings of control for the behaviours and both fine and crash outcomes are presented in Table 1. The table also includes the average ratings for each item. Internal consistencies are presented for the latent variable measures.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations and internal consistencies for each item and measure

Control appraisals	Mean (SD)	α
Driving without phone	5.97 (1.50)	
Driving without texting	6.27 (1.33)	
Speeding	5.76 (1.34)	
Drink driving	6.26 (1.56)	
Control over behaviours	6.06 (1.05)	.71
Booked for phoning	5.95 (1.57)	
Booked for texting	6.03 (1.60)	
Booked for speeding	5.68 (1.45)	
Booked for drink driving	6.45 (1.14)	
Control over fine outcomes	6.03 (1.19)	.84
Control over a car crash	3.66 (1.51)	

Tests of the hypothesised model

Normality testing demonstrated significant evidence of multivariate non normality. Mardia's multivariate kurtosis index was 82.33 (C.R. = 42.09). As such Bollen-Stine bootstrap was employed to adjust for the lack of multivariate normality. The hypothesised model and pathways are illustrated in Figure 1 along with their standardised coefficients. Only the direct relationships between variables were tested. No mediation was tested nor was it expected to occur for the following reasons. Fine outcomes are not necessarily indicators of risk for road outcomes such as crashes. Furthermore, in an applied context fine outcomes are not portrayed as leading to crash outcomes.

The direct pathway between the latent variables 'control over behaviours' and 'control over fine outcomes' was significant ($p < .001$). This relationship indicates that as perceived control over road behaviours increases, perceived control over fine outcomes tends to increase as well. The pathway between 'control over fine outcomes' and control over 'being involved in a car crash' was not significant ($p = .23$). The relationship between 'control over behaviours' and control over 'being involved in a car crash' was also not significant ($p = .79$). The factor loadings for each item onto the respective latent factors were all significant ($p < .001$). The item reliabilities are reported in Table 2. In particular, control over speeding and control over drink driving seem to be poor measures of the 'behaviours' construct. Likewise, control over being booked for speeding and control over being booked for drink driving are also weak measures of the 'control over fine outcomes' construct. These items require further investigation. Model fit statistics indicated a poor fitting model with $\chi^2(25) = 177.68, p = .00; CFI = .84; AGFI = .72; RMSEA = .17$ (90% CI = .15;

.20); SRMR = .12. Bollen-Stine bootstrap produced an adjusted p value < .001 further supporting poor model fit.

The zero order correlations between the behavioural control and fine outcome control items were further investigated. These correlations (using Spearman's rho) are presented in Table 3. These relationships were investigated due to the poor model fit, and poor item reliability of the speeding and drink driving items for both the behaviours and fine outcome constructs. Of importance here is that the behavioural items correlated significantly with their respective fine outcomes. For example, perceived control over speeding and perceived control over being booked for speeding was significantly and positively correlated. All behavioural items were significantly and positively correlated with their corresponding fine items. The model output suggests that the items assessing use of a phone while driving or being booked for using a phone while driving account for most of the variance in the control over behaviours and fine outcomes factors. The correlation between control over 'driving without talking on a mobile phone,' and control over 'driving without texting' was significant, positive and particularly strong, suggesting the items assessed similar behaviours. In addition, the significant positive correlation between control over 'being booked for talking on a mobile phone while driving,' and control over 'being booked for texting while driving' is suggestive of a similar situation. There were significant positive correlations between the remaining road behaviours. Specifically, as control over one road behaviour increased, control over another road behaviour tended to increase as well.




Figure 1. Road model including standardised coefficients for structural pathways and measurement model

**p < .001

Table 2. Item reliabilities for items in the measurement model

Item	Estimate
Driving without talking on a mobile phone	.78
Driving without texting	.72
Driving over the speed limit	.20
Driving with a blood alcohol level over the legal limit	.10
Being booked for speeding	.28
Being booked for drink driving	.27
Being booked for talking on a mobile phone while driving	.97
Being booked for texting while driving	.87

Table 3. Correlations between items in the measurement model

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Speeding	1							
2. Driving without phone	.43	1						
3. Driving without texting	.40	.75	1					
4. Drink driving	.38	.26	.33	1				
5. Booked for speeding	.55	.33	.31	.28	1			
6. Booked for drink driving	.31	.26	.26	.46	.48	1		
7. Booked for phoning	.34	.55	.52	.33	.48	.47	1	
8. Booked for texting	.33	.47	.57	.34	.41	.43	.89	1

Note. All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level

Discussion

The aim of the current study was to investigate relationships between behavioural control and negative road outcomes frequently communicated in road safety advertising. This was conducted in order to understand if an individual's perceived ability to perform road behaviours was in fact able to influence the occurrence of negative road outcomes. Understanding these relationships would provide insight into the best outcomes to model in road safety advertising. It was found that ratings for perceived control over behaviours and perceived control over fine outcomes were, on average, quite high. This result was not unexpected. The road behaviours employed in this study are enforced by compliance frameworks which will affect motivation to carry out such behaviours. Likewise, being booked for speeding or drink driving cannot occur unless an individual performs the risky behaviour. Specifically, as beliefs in the ability to control road behaviours increased, so did beliefs in the ability to control fine outcomes. This is in contrast to a situation where the individual did not wholly determine outcomes. For example, control over being involved in a car crash was comparatively low, and not related to control over behaviours. This could be because a car crash outcome can occur in the presence of a risk mitigation behaviour due to the behaviour of other drivers on the road.

The implications of these findings are straightforward and impact upon theory and practice. The first consideration involves control perceptions, efficacy and the hypotheses of the EPPM. Perceived control over an outcome or situation is a function of one's perceived ability to enact a set of behaviours, and the belief that the behaviour will be effective in influencing the outcome. These beliefs are reflected in self-efficacy and response efficacy respectively (Boer & Seydel, 1996; Maloney et al., 2011). These components are extremely important to fear appeal theory which hypothesises that without high efficacy, message acceptance is unlikely, rendering the fear appeal ineffective (Witte, 1992, 1996). The investigation of different control targets in this study, allowed for the identification of a negative outcome characterised by high perceived control, specifically, a fine outcome. However, of particular importance here is understanding whether self-efficacy for performing a behaviour is in fact related to bringing about an outcome. These appraisals may determine the effectiveness of threatening road safety messages. Results from the current study suggest that messages focusing on outcomes such as road crashes would be ill informed as such outcomes have no relationship with perceived control over behaviours. Rather, there was a strong relationship between control over road behaviours and fine outcomes demonstrated here. It would therefore seem that in order to best influence behaviour, outcomes related to graphic crashes and deaths should instead be replaced with outcomes related to financial and point penalties. Further, the correlations between the behavioural items indicates that the perceived ability to control a risky or protective road behaviour allows an individual to influence other road related behaviours. Interventions targeting at least one risk behaviour may therefore have some benefit in reducing other behaviours.

While this study has important implications for the focus of road safety campaigns, there are some limitations. First, the item assessing control over a car crash allowed for the perception that another person can cause a crash. Future work should employ items that exclude this possibility. If the relationship between behavioural control and occurrence of a car crash changes when perceiving fault, it has direct implications for interventions. The finding would suggest that making fault salient could result in more effective campaigns. This was addressed in Study 2. Further, some of the items used in the model were not reliable indicators of the latent variables. For example, the items related to speeding and drink driving were poor indicators of their constructs. This may be a consequence of the phone offence items used for each construct. These items were very similar, highly correlated, and as such accounted for most of the variance in both the behaviour and fine variables. Additionally, the behavioural items were not framed consistently. Two items were framed as protective behaviours while the remaining two were framed as risk behaviours. It could

be that the poor reliability of the items may be an effect of frame. These issues were also addressed in Study 2.

Study 2

Study 2 aimed to retest the structural model developed in Study 1 with a new sample. Study 1 allowed individuals to perceive that a car crash outcome could be due to the fault of another person. Study 2 corrected for this assumption by making fault salient. The item reliability issues from Study 1 were also addressed. It was hypothesised that behavioural control would have a strong and positive relationship with control over fine outcomes as previously demonstrated. No other significant relationships were expected to occur in the structural model.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited mainly from the North Queensland region in Australia. Recruitment occurred largely via advertisements on local radio and news channels, online forums, newsletters and local car enthusiast websites and Facebook pages. Advertisements were also put up around the University and psychology students could participate for credit points. As the survey was conducted as an online survey, advertisements included the address of the online URL. Initially, 339 participants chose to participate by clicking the start button. Of these, 43 participants did not provide any further information. Another 24 of the participants indicated they lived outside of Australia and were thus removed from the analysis. A further 44 participants did not have scores on the variables of interest and were also excluded, resulting in a final sample size of 228 participants. There were 77 males and 133 females in the sample (18 people did not give information about gender). Participants ranged in age from 17 years to 71 years ($M = 34.89$, $SD = 15.17$) and approximately 30% of participants indicated their highest level of education was an undergraduate degree.

Measures

This study was embedded within a broader project, and only the variables specific to this report are described. To assess perceived control over road behaviours, 7 items were used employing different frames. Four items were framed as protective behaviours and three items were framed as risk behaviours. Examples of protective items included ‘driving to the speed limit,’ and ‘driving without using a mobile phone.’ Examples of risk items included ‘driving over the speed limit’ and ‘being distracted by a mobile phone whilst driving.’ Three items assessed perceived control over fine outcomes. These were ‘being booked for speeding,’ ‘being booked for using a mobile phone while driving’ and ‘being booked for drink driving.’ One item ‘having a crash as the driver at fault’ assessed perceived control over a crash outcome. Participants responded on a 7 point Likert scale (1 = no confidence, 7 = complete confidence). Participants were also asked questions about their driving history.

Procedure

Ethics approval was obtained through the James Cook University Ethics Committee (H5043). The survey was hosted at Survey Monkey and participants were directed to an online link ‘Road threats: Feelings, thoughts and behaviours’ which first described the study. As per Study 1, participants were asked to think about the behaviours and outcomes happening to them before indicating their ability to control or influence each one.

Results

Statistical methods

Data was analysed using SPSS and AMOS (versions 22). For the analyses employing SEM techniques latent variables were created for ‘control over behaviours’ and ‘control over fine outcomes’. For control over behaviours, protective items were grouped separately to risk items. Therefore, any effects of frame could be included and accounted for. Model fit was assessed using the same indices described in Study 1.

Sample characteristics

About 90% of the sample reported having access to a car for their own personal use. Approximately 10% reported having access to a motorbike while 4 participants reported access to a scooter. Participants reported being licenced for .5 to 59 years ($M = 17.04$, $SD = 15.00$) and also reported high amounts of driving activity. On average participants spent over 9 hours driving as a driver per week ($SD = 9.26$). Approximately 60% of respondents reported they had been booked for a traffic offence. The most frequently reported offence was speeding. While 40% of respondents indicated they had never been in an accident as a driver, the remainder had been in at least one accident as a driver. When asked to think about the most severe accident they had been involved in, 66% of respondents reported being the driver. Almost half (48%) of these individuals reported they were at fault. About 18% of respondents reported having an insurance claim made against them in the past and 10% reported losing their licence at some stage.

Retest of the measurement model and structural pathways

In a similar manner to study 1, control over road behaviours and control over fine outcomes were modelled as latent variables. However, in this study the road behaviour items were grouped by the frame employed. This resulted in two separate latent variables, ‘control over risk behaviours,’ and ‘control over protective behaviours.’ Participants’ average ratings of control for each item and their corresponding latent variables are presented in Table 4. Internal consistencies are also presented for the latent variables.

CFA was performed in AMOS to again evaluate the validity of the latent variables used in the structural model. The latent variable ‘control over risk behaviours’ was chosen in this analysis. This measure had a greater estimate of reliability (Table 4), but most importantly control over risk behaviours is more appropriate to use due to the risk frame largely employed in road campaigns¹. Normality statistics in AMOS demonstrated evidence of multivariate non normality – specifically positive kurtosis (Mardias coefficient = 32.02, C.R. = 21.54). As such Bollen-Stine bootstrapping procedures were performed with 2000 bootstrapped samples at 95% confidence intervals (Bollen & Stine, 1992). The final model consisted of 19 estimated parameters. The measurement model and pathways under investigation are presented in Figure 2. The standardized coefficients for the structural pathways are included in the figure. There was no relationship between control over risk behaviours and control over having a car crash as the driver at fault. The direct pathway between control over risk behaviours and control over fine outcomes was significant. This relationship indicated that as perceived control over risk behaviours increased, so did control over fine outcomes. This accounted for 45% of the variance in control over a fine outcome ($R^2 = .45$). There was a significant and positive relationship between control over fine outcomes and control over

¹For interest the hypothesised model employing ‘control over protective behaviours’ has been included as an appendix. Standardized coefficients for the structural pathways and factor loadings for the measurement model have been provided along with indices of model fit. Item reliabilities for items in the measurement model are also provided (See Appendix A).

having a crash as the driver at fault. This relationship indicated that as control over fine outcomes increases, control over a car crash at one's own fault tends to increase as well.

The factor loadings for each item onto their respective latent variable are displayed in Table 5. All loadings were significant ($p < .001$). Item reliabilities are reported in Table 6. Modification Indices were examined to assess any source of model mis-specification. These indices give an indication of the residual covariance, and represent the decrease in the value of the chi-square that would result if the parameter was freed. An examination of the modification indices suggested to co-vary the error terms as specified in Figure 2. The highest cross loading was between e3 and e6 (coeff = .31). Model fit statistics indicate good model fit with $\chi^2(9) = 17.19$, $p = .05$; CFI = .99; AGFI = .94; RMSEA = .06 (90% CI = .01; .11); SRMR = .03. The Bollen-Stine bootstrap procedure to correct for non normality produced an adjusted p value of .27, thus also suggestive of adequate model fit. The entire model accounted for 29% of the variance in control over a road crash outcome ($R^2 = .29$).

Table 4. Means, standard deviations and internal consistencies for each item and measure

Measures	Mean (SD)	α
Driving over the speed limit	5.46 (1.55)	
Being distracted by a mobile phone whilst driving	5.21 (1.76)	
Driving with a blood alcohol content (BAC) over legal limit	4.86 (2.55)	
Control over risk behaviours	5.18 (1.60)	.72
Driving to the speed limit	6.11 (1.18)	
Driving without using a mobile phone	6.03 (1.41)	
Refraining from drinking and driving	6.64 (.99)	
Ensuring you are not tired when driving	5.30 (1.36)	
Control over protective behaviours	6.02 (.86)	.64
Control over fine outcomes	5.80 (1.36)	.81
Control over having a crash as the driver at fault	4.86 (1.57)	




Figure 2. Measurement model and structural pathways tested for hypothesised model of road control

** $p < .001$

Table 5. Factor loadings for each item onto their respective latent variables

Control over risk behaviours	Factor loading
Driving over the speed limit	.71
Being distracted by a mobile phone whilst driving	.82
Driving with a blood alcohol level over the legal limit	.62
Control over fine outcomes	
Being booked for speeding	.63
Being booked for using a mobile phone while driving	.87
Being booked for drink driving	.81

Table 6. Item reliabilities for items in the measurement model

Item	Estimate
Control over driving over the speed limit	.50
Control over being distracted by a mobile phone whilst driving	.67
Control over driving with a blood alcohol level over the legal limit	.39
Control over being booked for speeding	.40
Control over being booked for using a mobile phone while driving	.75
Control over being booked for drink driving	.65

Discussion

A retest of the measurement model and structural pathways demonstrated results that were for the most part as hypothesized. The relationship between perceived control over risk behaviours and perceived control over fine outcomes was particularly strong, accounting for 45% of the variance in perceived control over being fined. This finding suggests as belief in the ability to control risky road behaviours increases, so does belief in the ability to control fine outcomes. Specifically, being able to control the performance of risky road behaviours such as speeding, distraction, and drink driving, was generally perceived as being effective in controlling whether or not an individual is fined for such behaviour. In contrast no relationship between perceived control over risk behaviours and perceived control over a crash outcome was detected. This relationship was not evident even though this study rectified the limitation of Study 1. The crash outcome was clearly framed as the respondent's fault, that is, as a consequence of the respondent's behaviour. These findings should provide a warning against the consistent use of crashes in Australian road safety campaigns.

The significant and positive relationship between perceived control over fine outcomes and perceived control over crashing at fault was unexpected. This relationship indicated that increases in the perceived ability to control fine outcomes were related to increases in the perceived ability to control crashing as the driver at fault. In order to explain this relationship, it is helpful to consider the hypotheses proposed by the EPPM (Witte, 1992). Specifically, if an individual perceives risk of a fine, s/he will be motivated to act to decrease their fear. However, this action could include carrying out a behaviour that alleviates the threat but does not comply with driving laws. For example, if the location of a speed camera is known, an individual may speed but take an alternate route to avoid a fine. The avoidance of fine outcomes may lead to beliefs of superior driving ability. If an individual overestimates their driving ability, crashing at fault would be perceived as an unlikely occurrence. This hypothesis may explain the unexpected relationship between the fine and crash outcome variables. Additionally, overestimations of driving ability have been found to be quite common in motorists (Harré, Foster, & O'Neill, 2005; Job, 1990; Pedruzzi & Swinbourne, 2009). If motorists perceive that they are unlikely to crash at fault, it also gives rise to the possibility that the model employed in this study was unable to adequately capture the hypothesised relationship between behavioural control and control over crashing at fault. Future work should aim to understand if overestimations of driving ability affect this pathway.

The increased reliability of the measurement model, compared to Study 1, could be a result of the consistent frame employed for the items in this study. In Study 1 the behavioural control variable consisted of behaviours framed in both positive and negative ways. The model employed in this study used items that were framed consistently as risk behaviours. Additionally, some of the item reliability issues were addressed in the current study. For example, two separate (and highly correlated) items were used in Study 1 to assess perceived control over talking or texting while driving. The current study instead replaced these items with one item assessing perceived control over mobile phone related behaviours. The current study freed pathways between the respective behaviour and fine outcomes as suggested by the modification indices. This was not performed in Study 1 due to sample size considerations. This likely contributed to the better model fit in the current study. Correlated error terms in a measurement model indicate overlap in the unique variance of items, therefore the approach is usually reserved for error terms within latent factors. In this situation, it makes sense that residual error would be shared by the items specified in the model. For example, perceived control over speeding behaviour allows an individual to control the occurrence of being booked specifically for speeding. However, the relationship between each factor and control over crashing at fault demonstrates that they are qualitatively different measures. It is also possible that the better reliability of the measurement model is due to the change in sample.

The main limitation of this work regards the selection of the sample. While research examining road safety behaviour in regional samples has been called for (Veitch, Sheehan, Turner, Siskind, & Pashen, 2005) it might be hasty to draw conclusions to large metropolitan areas. The environment in North Queensland requires drivers to switch driving strategies more often than metropolitan drivers. Specifically, the region consists of smaller urban areas connected by long stretches of highway driving. These roads have considerably less traffic and fewer lanes, however more random road risks are prevalent. For example, highways can be crossed by wildlife at any time of the day thus impacting on driving conditions without warning. Poorly designed roads are often damaged or inaccessible as a result of severe weather events such as storms and cyclones. These events contribute to a high risk environment that can be more unpredictable than some metropolitan areas. Consequently, these experiences may have contributed to the perception that road behaviours were not able to influence the occurrence of crashes. Future work should be carried out in an urban environment to ensure the validity of the framework across diverse driving environments and thus samples.

Finally, the framework employed in the current body of research allows inferences to be made regarding the selection of outcomes for the development of effective road messages. This framework could also be used to predict message acceptance outcomes frequently employed in the literature. Most research using models such as the EPPM (Witte, 1992) sums the components of self-efficacy and response efficacy in order to test the relationship between efficacy and message acceptance or message rejection. The current research demonstrates how this could be problematic in a road context. Ensuring the relationship between self-efficacy for performing a behaviour is in fact related to controlling an outcome is necessary for adaptive behaviour. This research demonstrates that the predictions of the EPPM will be different depending upon the road outcome targeted. This insight could be lost, and potentially result in inconsistent evidence, if efficacy components are simply combined. Instead, the relationships between the components need to be defined in the model. In this study individuals believed that performing a preventative or risk behaviour on the road had no relationship with the occurrence of a road crash outcome. Beliefs such as these prior to receiving a message might, therefore, act as potential barriers to acceptance of threatening road messages. The identification of appropriate control targets may consequently need consideration to enhance the predictive power of the EPPM. Future work should consider this possibility both within and outside of the road safety field.

Concluding remarks

This study demonstrates that the portrayal of crash outcomes in road safety advertising is counterintuitive because even high perceptions of self-efficacy for road behaviours are perceived to have little bearing on crash outcomes. Participants tended not to consider that crashes were in their control, or that engaging in risk mitigation behaviours such as driving within the speed limit would have any benefit in terms of preventing crashes – even when the crash was framed as the fault of the individual. These findings are quite surprising and somewhat alarming. This research suggests that campaign designers should concentrate their efforts on increasing the perception that people will be penalized with financial and point penalties for risky road behaviours. As these outcomes are largely appraised as controllable by individuals, risk mitigation behaviours should increase in an effort to avoid fine outcomes. Engaging in these behaviours will consequently reduce the number of road crashes.

Additionally, it is suggested that such messages should remind audiences that they are responsible for the occurrence of fine outcomes, by providing clear and controllable behavioural directives to prevent such outcomes. Factors in the environment may activate beliefs that interfere with pre-existing control perceptions. For example, there are groups in the community that actively seek out concealed speed cameras and warn others of their whereabouts (“Masked protesters,” 2014). Likewise, social media campaigns exist to block fine efforts by the police (O'Rourke, 2015). Radar

scrambling devices can be easily purchased which stop traffic cameras from detecting speeding cars. Anecdotal evidence suggests that many motorists perform these behaviours because they believe that hidden traffic cameras exist for ‘revenue raising.’ It could be suggested that groups such as these are less likely to believe that fines are appropriate enforcement activities. As such, advertising efforts should remind people that these outcomes are under their own personal control. The implementation of such efforts may involve roadside billboards, messages, and increased policing efforts. For example, the use of speed monitoring devices on the road are an instant cue to slow down. This feedback method may also act to remind people that they will be caught if they continue to speed. The execution of these methods will need to constantly evolve in order to be ahead of motorists performing behaviours to escape negative consequences (Job & Sakashita, 2009).


References

- Algie, J., & Rossiter, J. R. (2010). Fear patterns: a new approach to designing road safety advertisements. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 38(4), 264-279. doi:10.1080/10852352.2010.509019
- Boer, H., & Seydel, E. R. (1996). Protection motivation theory. In M. Connar & P. Norman (Eds.), *Predicting Health Behavior: Research and Practice With Social Cognition Models*. (pp. 95-120). Buckingham, PA: Open University Press.
- Bollen, K. A., & Stine, R. A. (1992). Bootstrapping goodness-of-fit measures in structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 21(2), 205-229.
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (Second ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Carey, R. N., McDermott, D. T., & Sarma, K. M. (2013). The impact of threat appeals on fear arousal and driver behavior: a meta-analysis of experimental research 1990-2011. *PLoS One*, 8(5), e62821. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0062821
- Castillo-Manzano, J. I., Castro-Nuño, M., & Pedregal, D. J. (2012). How many lives can bloody and shocking road safety advertising save? The case of Spain. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour*, 15(2), 174-187. doi:10.1016/j.trf.2011.12.008
- de Hoog, N., Stroebe, W., & de Wit, J. B. F. (2007). The impact of vulnerability to and severity of a health risk on processing and acceptance of fear-arousing communications: A meta-analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 11(3), 258-285. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.11.3.258
- Delaney, A., Lough, B., Whelan, M., & Cameron, M. (2004). *A review of mass media campaigns in road safety* (0732617308). Retrieved from <http://www.monash.edu.au/miri/research/reports/muarc220.pdf>:
- Delhomme, P., De Dobbeleer, W., Forward, S., Simoes, A., Adamos, G., Areal, A., . . . Walter, E. (2009). *Manual for Designing, Implementing and Evaluating Road Safety Communication Campaigns*. Retrieved from Brussels, Belgium:
- Donovan, R., & Henley, N. (2003). *Social marketing: Principles and practice*. Melbourne: IP Communications.
- Donovan, R., Jalleh, G., & Henley, N. (1999). Executing effective road safety advertising: are big production budgets necessary? *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 31, 243-252.
- Elliott, B. J. (2003). *The Psychology of Fear Appeals Re-Visited*. Paper presented at the Road Safety Research, Policing and Education Conference, Sydney.
- Elliott, B. J. (2005). *The use of threat (fear) to reduce adolescent risk taking: A Literature review*: Unpublished report prepared for VicRoads.
- Elliott, B. J. (2011). Beyond reviews of road safety mass media campaigns: Looking elsewhere for new insights. *Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety*, 22(4), 11-18.
- Harré, N., Foster, S., & O'Neill, M. (2005). Self-enhancement, crash-risk optimism and the impact of safety advertisements on young drivers. *British journal of Psychology*, 96(2), 215-230. doi:10.1348/000712605X36019

- Henley, N., & Donovan, R. (1999). Threat appeals in social marketing: Death as a ‘Special Case’. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 4(4), 300-319.
- Hoekstra, T., & Wegman, F. (2011). Improving the effectiveness of road safety campaigns: Current and new practices. *IATSS Research*, 34(2), 80-86. doi:10.1016/j.iatssr.2011.01.003
- Job, R. F. S. (1990). The application of learning theory to driving confidence: The effect of age and the impact of random breath testing. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 22(2), 97-107.
- Job, R. F. S., & Sakashita, C. (2009). *The Psychology of Punishment: The Category Shift Problem in Road Safety and how to address it*. Paper presented at the Road Safety 2020: Smart Solutions, Sustainability, Vision, Perth, Western Australia.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lewis, I. M., Watson, B., Tay, R., & White, K. M. (2007). The Role of Fear Appeals in Improving Driver Safety: A Review of the Effectiveness of Fear-arousing (threat) Appeals in Road Safety Advertising. *International Journal of Behavioral Consultation and Therapy*, 3(2), 203-222.
- Lewis, I. M., Watson, B., & White, K. M. (2008). An examination of message-relevant affect in road safety messages: Should road safety advertisements aim to make us feel good or bad? *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour*, 11(6), 403-417. doi:10.1016/j.trf.2008.03.003
- Lewis, I. M., Watson, B., & White, K. M. (2010). Response efficacy: the key to minimizing rejection and maximizing acceptance of emotion-based anti-speeding messages. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 42(2), 459-467. doi:10.1016/j.aap.2009.09.008
- Lewis, I. M., Watson, B., & White, K. M. (2013). Extending the explanatory utility of the EPPM beyond fear-based persuasion. *Health Commun*, 28(1), 84-98. doi:10.1080/10410236.2013.743430
- Maloney, E. K., Lapinski, M. K., & Witte, K. (2011). Fear appeals and persuasion: A review and update of the extended parallel process model. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(4), 206-219. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00341.x
- Masked protesters warn drivers of upcoming speed cameras in protest of WA Government revenue raising. (2014, 28, August). *Perth now*. Retrieved from <http://www.perthnow.com.au/news/western-australia/masked-protesters-warn-drivers-of-upcoming-speed-cameras-in-protest-of-wa-government-revenue-raising/story-fnhocxo3-1227040659341>
- New South Wales Government. (n.d.). Speeding - No One Thinks Big Of You. *Strategic Communications*. Retrieved from <http://www.advertising.nsw.gov.au/campaigns/speeding-no-one-thinks-big-you>
- O'Rourke, J. (2000, 17, December). Shock tactics to stop carnage. *The Sun Herald*.
- O'Rourke, J. (2015, 4, January). Block Their Shot: Social media campaign blocking mobile speed cameras from clocking drivers. *The Daily Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/nsw/block-their-shot-social-media-campaign-blocking-mobile-speed-cameras-from-clocking-drivers/story-fnfn1181-1227173575482>
- Pedruzzi, R., & Swinbourne, A. L. (2009). *It won't happen to me: optimism, biases, and recall of road-risk information*. Paper presented at the Australian College of Road Safety Conference: Road safety 2020: smart solutions, sustainability, vision, Perth, Australia.
- Pedruzzi, R., Swinbourne, A. L., & Quirk, F. (2012). One size fits all: communicating the unknown in health promotion. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 19(Suppl 1), S273-S274.
- Peters, G. J., Ruiter, R. A., & Kok, G. (2012). Threatening communication: a critical re-analysis and a revised meta-analytic test of fear appeal theory. *Health Psychol Rev*, 7(Suppl 1), S8-S31. doi:10.1080/17437199.2012.703527
- Ruiter, R. A., Abraham, C., & Kok, G. (2001). Scary warnings and rational precautions: A review of the psychology of fear appeals. *Psychology & Health*, 16(6), 613-630. doi:10.1080/08870440108405863

- Ruiter, R. A., Verplanken, B., Kok, G., & Verrij, M. Q. (2003). The role of coping appraisal in reactions to fear appeals: Do we need threat information? *J Health Psychol*, 8(4), 465-474. doi:10.1177/13591053030084006
- Veitch, C., Sheehan, M. C., Turner, R., Siskind, V., & Pashen, D. (2005). *The economic, medical and social costs of road traffic crashes in rural north Queensland: a 5-year multi-phase study*. Paper presented at the National Rural Health Conference, Alice Springs.
- Witte, K. (1992). Putting the fear back into fear appeals: The extended parallel process model. *Communications Monographs*, 59(4), 329-349. doi:10.1080/03637759209376276
- Witte, K. (1996). Predicting risk behaviors: Development and validation of a diagnostic scale. *J Health Commun*, 1(4), 317-342. doi:10.1080/108107396127988
- Witte, K., & Allen, M. (2000). A Meta-Analysis of Fear Appeals: Implications for Effective Public Health Campaigns. *Health Education & Behavior*, 27(5), 591-615. doi:10.1177/109019810002700506
- Woolley, J. E. (2001). *Literature review on best practice with mass media*. Retrieved from Adelaide:
- Wundersitz, L. N., & Hutchinson, T. P. (2011). What can we learn from recent evaluations of road safety mass media campaigns? *Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety*, 22(4), 40-47.
- Wundersitz, L. N., Hutchinson, T. P., & Woolley, J. E. (2010). *Best practice in road safety mass media campaigns: A literature review*. Retrieved from <http://casr.adelaide.edu.au/publications/list/?id=1165>:

1 **Appendix A**



2 *Factor loadings and structural pathways for model employing control over protective (safe) behaviours²*

3 **p < .001

4 ² All factor loadings were significant ($p < .001$). Model fit statistics indicate poor model fit with $\chi^2(16) = 38.77, p < .001$; CFI = .96; AGFI = .90; RMSEA = .08 (90% CI = .05; .11); SRMR = .05. A Bollen-Stine bootstrap procedure to correct for non normality produced an adjusted p value of .04, also suggestive of poor model fit.