Stockholms universitet

Psykologiska institutionen

Masteruppsats VT-2011

Tendency to Aggressive Driving and Road Rage: Identifying Drivers Prone to Aggressive
Driving and Road Rage in Motor Vehicle Traffic in Sweden

Jukka Teräsvirta

Handledare: Docent Petri Laukka

Abstract

In the present study possible associations between driver characteristics and aggressive driving were examined. 210 participants responded to a questionnaire consisting of self-report measures of emotion regulation ability, personality traits, and attitudes towards traffic behaviours in a Swedish translation of the Propensity for Angry Driving Scale (PADS). The main results showed that females, older age, agreeableness, openness, and social desirability were negatively correlated with angry driving behaviour as measured by the PADS. Impulsivity, attention seeking, trait irritability, verbal trait aggression, positive attitude towards speeding, and a high self-reported car manoeuvring ability were positively correlated with angry driving. Partial correlations showed that social desirability, trait irritability, and a positive attitude towards speeding explained most of the unique variance. Multiple regression analysis showed that trait irritability, positive attitude towards speeding, and a high self-reported car manoeuvring ability were the most important predictors of angry driving.

Keywords: Anger; Angry driving; Road rage; Emotion; Emotion regulation; Personality trait; Propensity for angry driving

Tendency to Aggressive Driving and Road Rage: Identifying Drivers Prone to Aggressive Driving and Road Rage in Motor Vehicle Traffic in Sweden

Jukka Teräsvirta

Introduction

Paying greater attention to angry driving and road rage gradually began in the USA as early as during the forties. The increasingly solemn assurance that this type of driving behaviour is alarming and dangerous, along with traffic accidents, and ever growing motor vehicle traffic and congested roads, has lead to increasing research on these driving behaviour problems also in other countries, such as UK, Australia, and Sweden. Accordingly, angry driving is not limited to US traffic (Knee, Neighbors, & Victor, 2001).

Several researchers have approached and studied these driving behaviour problems partly from different points of view and accentuations but the importance and essence of angry driving and road rage, and the primary role of the human factor in driving are common in the studies. The aim of this study was to find possible correlations between the driver's emotion control ability, personality traits, and angry driving and road rage.

The following sections essentially and directly deal with the aim of the study: Emotional aspects, Personality aspects. The other sections, for example, Communication between drivers and Social desirability deal with important variables in connection with the above sections.

Emotional aspects

Theoretical aspects of emotions

When describing and analyzing one's anger filled aggressive driving behaviour, for example, from the cognitive point of view, the following factors are crucial: Cognitive factors, which mean that the driver's memory of his or her past traffic experiences and appraisal of the current traffic situation, such as "Again, those idiots blocking the road." gives rise to additional traffic information inputs. Situational anger evaluations often have shown to be, but are not necessarily always influenced by earlier, recent constraints (Stephens & Groeger, 2011). It is noteworthy that the present study does not follow any specific theory of emotion strictly.

Anger

Anger naturally is one of the central variables in this study. Accordingly, a driver's ability to control it is crucial, along with his or her general ability to control emotions. Anger is to a great extent an acute emotional reaction elicited in traffic by situations often perceived or misinterpreted by the driver as deliberate provocations by other drivers (Björklund, 2007). Such stimuli by other drivers, whether real provocations or not, as overt aggression, threat, verbal attack, impediment, and the driver's own disappointment and frustration often trigger his or her anger. However, physical attacks in traffic are relatively rare in Sweden.

Thus, exposure to perceived manifestations of anger by other drivers, whether real or not, easily trigger a driver's arousal and lead to anger and aggressive driving behaviour for several additional potential reasons, for example, such driver characteristics as adopted aggressive models of behaviour, inclination to rapid and intense emotional arousal, desensitization to violence, lacking restraints on aggressive behaviour, and distorted views about conflict resolution. A variety of driver characteristics, including driving style have shown to be active factors in causing irritation and anger (Björklund, 2007).

Even irritation as such is dangerous in certain traffic situations in which an irascible driver with angry impatience, hasty temper, overexcitation, and in driving undue emotional sensitivity, often grow into angry driving behaviour or road rage. Anger interferes with the driver's behaviour in many ways, for example, perception, attention, traffic information processing and motor performance, thus increasing the risk of an accident (Björklund, 2007).

There seems to be a complex multitude of anger instigating variables and interaction between them in traffic. Potential variables include personality traits. For example, one of these is agreeableness, among the Big Five, and its role in the driver's ability to control his or her anger.

Traffic to a considerable extent is an interpersonal environment in spite of the fact that drivers mostly are anonymous, sitting in their motor vehicles (Björklund, 2007). Naturally, there may be simultaneously many kinds of (subjective) social status apprehensions among drivers in a certain traffic situation, and accordingly partly different driving behaviours. Trait anger easily is manifested when this refers to a driver's perceived low social status, together with low or missing Big Five personality trait agreeableness. This naturally refers to a negative correlation between agreeableness and trait anger, and between (the driver's) social esteem and trait anger. Interestingly, similar conclusions (concerning driving behaviour) have shown to be actual when controlling for social desirability (Kuppens, 2005). Another example of the probably complex nature of to anger instigating variables while driving is the driver's anger-congruent behaviour. This refers to driving behaviour transfers between traffic situations. So, it is not necessarily completely the anger causing stimulus or stimuli that lead to the driver's anger, but this sometimes results from anger provocation other than the one(s) in which anger is manifested (Stephens & Groeger, 2011).

Road rage

Certain emotional and personality variables and traffic situations lead to road rage. This is a manifestation of extreme fury or “a grossly disproportional outburst of aggression by the driver of a motor vehicle in response to a perceived discourtesy or transgression by another road user” (Colman, 2001, p. 642). Road rage also can be defined as a composition of thoughts, feelings, and forms of driving behaviour that result when the driver perceives subjectively unjustified provocation in traffic. This to a high degree refers to emphasizing the crucial role of assessing the driver’s emotions, thoughts, and driving behaviours that forms the road rage reaction, and addressing his or her attributional processing in such a traffic situation (Britt & Garrity, 2006).

Naturally, as emotions in general, also road rage is found in different intensities between different drivers, and within one and the same driver, and in different traffic situations, and for different reasons. For example, reckless driving by other drivers as such has shown to be a greater cause of road rage than impeding traffic (Dukes, Clayton, Jenkins, Miller, & Rodgers, 2001). Due to road rage, safe and rational driving occasionally is impossible. When in pathological measures, it may be “indicative of an intermittent-explosive disorder or some other impulse-control disorder” (Colman, 2001, p. 642).

Aggression

One theoretical approach to aggression is that of the frustration-aggression hypothesis. According to its extreme variant, an impulsion to aggressive form of behaviour always requires (a driver’s) frustration followed by aggression (Colman, 2001, p. 291). For example, in a traffic jam a driver prone to aggressive driving and road rage easily engages himself or herself in this type of driving behaviour. However, frustration does not always lead to aggression and frustration is not necessarily the cause of aggression. Also, aggression (while driving) sometimes occur in the absence of frustration (Morlan, 1949). Another theoretical approach is Anderson’s General Model of Affective aggression (Anderson, Deuser, & DeNeve, 1995). This model includes the following points: The first level, Acute Situational Variables, including pain, discomfort, frustration, attack; The second level consists of three parts: Aggressive Cognitions, including hostile thoughts, hostile memories, aggression scripts; Affect, including anger, hostility; Arousal, including physiological arousal and perceived arousal (The points on this level may interact.). The third level is Primary Appraisals, including interpretation of situation and of affect. The fourth level is Secondary Appraisals, including re-examining situation, coping alternatives, likely consequences; The final level is Behavioural Choice (Anderson et al., 1995).

Affects and moods

Affects in connection with different stimuli often seem to considerably influence the driver’s driving behaviour, and cause error of judgement and decision making. This refers to one’s

(the driver's) experienced feelings about a stimulus, or integral affect, and feelings that are independent of a stimulus, or incidental affect (Peters, Västfjäll, Gärling, & Slovic, 2006).

A driver's external manifestations of emotions or observable affects in his or her driving behaviour, sometimes are quite conspicuous, alarming and provocative to other drivers. For example, this behaviour with situation-specific anger, often is based to a great extent on the driver's transient emotional state. However, also manifestations of the driver's sustained and pervasive emotional states, such as angry mood seem to play some role in one's driving behaviour. Also, one's driving behaviour often has shown to be dominantly conscious. Already existing angry mood too may influence unconsciously his or her driving behaviour (Stephens & Groeger, 2011).

Emotion control

Controlling one's emotions can be demanding anywhere. Particularly, governing them in such rapid reactions requiring situations as in driving in heavy traffic, sometimes becomes instantaneously unmanageable. Individual differences in drivers' emotion control in one and the same traffic situation for several reasons have been found, for example, variations in attentional deployment. The Process Model of Emotion Regulation is one way of assessing and understanding these differences (John & Gross, 2007, pp. 351-352). The model deals with the emotion-generative process in which individual differences are found. The differences arise at the following points: Situation Selection (avoidance), Situation Modification (self-assertion), Attentional Deployment (distraction), Cognitive Change (re-appraisal), Response Modulation (suppression). The first point, Situation Selection refers to simply avoiding certain situations (for example, occurring during rush hour in traffic) where negative emotions occur. When the person (driver) has selected a situation in which he or she can decrease its negative nature, for example, by giving way (Situation Modification), and by Attentional Deployment it is possible to pay attention to negative elements in the situation and thereby avoid them. By Cognitive Change the person (the driver) creates or picks up a more positive meaning out of the meanings in the situation. Response Modulation refers to trying to influence emotion-response tendencies once they have been brought forward.

It has been found that many of the links between emotion control and the Big Five personality traits are significant. For example, conscientiousness and such emotion control strategies as Situational Selection, Situation Modification, and Attentional Deployment have been shown to be related. Conscientiousness means, for example, socially prescribed impulse control that make task and goal directed behaviour possible. This has shown to be the case in following the (traffic) rules, planning, organizing, preference of tasks, delayed satisfaction, and thinking before acting (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Personality aspects

Theoretical aspects and personality traits

The theoretical approaches also to personality vary in assumptions and accentuations concerning the main factors in them. However, certain concepts or variables, such as personality traits are rather common in the approaches. The Big Five Model or the Five Factor Model (FFM) is widely considered as a general theory of personality in which traits form the foundation. The Big five elements or dimensions are based on questionnaires, such as trait self-rating scales, personality inventory items, and adjective check listing. A research example: The common elements in the three measures, and the variation differences were adapted to behavioural-genetic models. The Big Five dimensions were essentially and approximately equally inherited. Gender differences in heritability, and the effect of family environment were not significant. However, there was some effect of shared environment regarding agreeableness and conscientiousness in measure-specific variation on the personality inventory. For extraversion and neuroticism there was somewhat more support in models of non-additive genetic variation or twin contrast effects (Loehlin, McCrae, & Costa, 1998). As noted earlier, many links between the Big Five personality traits, and emotion control have shown to be significant. For example, conscientiousness often is beneficial in thinking first and acting then, and openness to experience refers to greater awareness, clarity, and the intensity of a particular emotion in a positive way (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Though there are common personality trait variables or dimensions (among drivers), such as extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness (John & Srivastava, 1999), it still is important to take into account the driver's other aspects in individual ways of behaving, for example, conflict resolution which in their organization or patterning account for the driver's unique adjustment to his or her total environment, not only in traffic. DePasquale, Geller, Clarke, and Littleton (2001) point out the predictive value of a driver's personality traits and emotion control with a view to aggressive driving and road rage: For example, it has been found that trait anger, hostility, venturesomeness predict this kind of driving behaviour or a positive correlation with aggressive driving and road rage. For example, a driver with physical aggressiveness sometimes attributes a hostile purpose to an offending driver when in a state of road rage, and as a result, he or she reacts in an even more aggressive way (Britt & Garrity, 2006).

Trait variability

A driver's perceived stimuli in one and the same traffic situation, impression formation or interpretation of other drivers' driving behaviour and traits sometimes differ greatly between drivers. For example, neuroticism has shown to be a variable with an immense and dominant effect in these attempts to understand others' (driving) behaviour which refers to trait centrality (Colman, 2001, p. 750). Also, one sometimes suffers from a tendency for distorted or negative perceived information about other's (driving) behaviour to have more impact on

his or her (driving) reactions than positive information, for example, another driver giving way, which refers to (the driver's) trait negativity bias or "A tendency for unfavourable information about a person to have more impact on impressions of that person than favourable information," (Colman, 2001, p. 750). Naturally, the opposite and variation between these extremities are found among drivers, even to some extent among those prone to angry driving and road rage.

Communication between drivers

Naturally, communication between drivers in traffic is limited. This has shown to be an important factor in many cases of aggressive driving and road rage. When a driver (mis)interprets another driver's driving behaviour as irritative, provocative, or even hostile, he or she often becomes affected by anger suddenly and overwhelmingly (Björklund, 2007). In the light of interpreting other drivers' (seemingly) imperfect driving behaviour, it is noteworthy that such forms of it as blocking a lane, reacting slowly to traffic lights etc. often is unintentional but still may be misinterpreted as intentional, irritative, provocative, or even hostile. Due to a (mis)interpretation, for example, irritation has shown to be a factor that spreads as a chain reaction from driver to driver (Björklund, 2007).

Anonymity of drivers

A feeling that it is not likely to become responsible for endangering other drivers' safety under the veil of anonymity is dangerous. Being unidentified easily increases the probability of the driver's transgressing traffic rules. Experienced relative anonymity and limited means of communication in traffic have shown to be common and crucial risk factors in traffic environment (Björklund, 2007).

Non-standard traffic situations

Emotional reactions in driving sometimes are aroused by actually new or rare traffic situations, for which the driver has no standard, familiar, habitual or ready-made pattern of (semi-automatic) response. In addition to standard traffic situations these new, rare, unexpected, quick, even improvisation in driving behaviour demanding, dangerous non-standard traffic situations sometimes appear suddenly in normal traffic, for example, grave transgressions such as overtaking in a no overtaking area or in near zero visibility which cause other drivers' distorted, disturbed, disorganized, even extreme emotional driving behaviour. This refers, for example, to forced abrupt yielding which in turn cause aggressive driving or road rage. This latter form of aggressive driving behaviour refers to cases, for example, where physically attacking a driver or intentionally colliding with another car have shown to be the result (Björklund, 2007).

Traffic rules and driver's position

Every driver has to a certain extent an unique personal interpretation, idea or comprehension of the prevailing traffic regulations and situation that has shown to be even greatly different from those of the other drivers in the very same situation (Björklund, 2007). The driver sometimes regards certain traffic regulations, such as speed limits, unnecessary or even absurd. The driver's position often is regarded as his or her personal space about, into which, and too close to which other drivers are not normally allowed to intrude, without provoking an aggressive reaction by him or her. The vehicle often is regarded as a very private shelter by the driver where the driver subjectively, in his or her opinion, has the right to interpret traffic regulations and the situation as he or she wishes.

Attribution

According to the attribution theory a person analyzing own and another person's behaviour, verbal reactions and concrete deeds tries to find out or determine whether these reflect the object person's underlying characteristics or only forced responses to a given (traffic) situation. When analyzing another person's behaviour according to the attribution theory "we tend to attribute another person's behaviour to internal, dispositional causes rather than external, situational causes if the behaviour seems different from how other people would behave in the same situation" (Colman, 2001, p. 64). Also, it has been found that this occurs in traffic in many kinds of driving situations, and leads even to road rage when a driver prone to aggressive driving, reacts in driving by actually vague but subjectively firm attributions. There often is a risk of an accident due to distorted attributions and apprehensions of traffic situations. For example, a confused driver blocking a lane occasionally is not aware of causing angry driving by other drivers. These, often unintentional and unpremeditated forms of driving, such as impeding, often are regarded as provocative (Björklund, 2007).

Attribution error

A driver's fundamental attribution error is found in many traffic situations. Limited means of communication, and misunderstandings increase the likelihood of one's (the driver's) pervasive tendency to underestimate the role of the prevailing external situational (traffic) demands and pressures, and to overestimate the role of another person's (driver's) internal (driving) motives and dispositions, when interpreting his or her (driving) behaviour (Colman, 2001, p. 293), for example, when one's own driving is disturbed by another driver blocking the lane. The role of the driver's attribution has shown to be important in causing angry driving and road rage. However, his or her reactions to anger provoking traffic situations are not necessarily mediated by attributional processing completely (Britt & Garrity, 2006).

Social desirability

Presenting oneself in a favourable light seems to be a common human phenomenon also among drivers. Quite interestingly, this phenomenon may occur even in studies where a questionnaire method of data collection is used, as it was in the present study, though the subjects answered anonymously. So, anonymity does not seem to exclude or guarantee against the risk of that subjects in this type of data collection method answer under the influence of social desirability (af Wählberg, 2010). Social desirability is a possible source of error or a threat to construct validity.

Earlier research

A possible positive correlation between a driver's irritation and his or her aggressive driving behaviour is a crucial question because this emotion as a matter of fact is a mild form of anger which in turn easily trigger angry driving or road rage in certain traffic situations. Impeded driving progress, reckless driving, and outright hostility were common sources of irritation and thereby aggressive driving behaviour. Also, impeded female drivers reported slightly more irritation than male drivers. Gender played a role in traffic situations where other drivers were driving recklessly. This refers to female drivers reporting more irritation than male drivers (Björklund , 2007)

The attributions drivers make in anger-provoking traffic situations and their personality traits have shown to be important factors in driving behaviour. Attributions and personality traits predicted unique and independent variation in road rage response (Britt & Garrity,2006).

In addition to the driver's emotion control ability and personality traits, also the role and nature of traffic stimuli has been studied. The drivers showed more road rage due to other's aggressive driving in general than due to particular classes of aggressive drivers (Dukes et al., 2001).

Understanding road rage has been an important part of the research on aggressive driving behaviour. Controlled orientation in driving was related to experiencing more driving anger due to other driver's driving behaviour, and more traffic citations than autonomy orientation. Driving anger and road rage mediated the relation between controlled orientation and aggressive driving. The driver's self-esteem and social anxiety did not account for the motivation or orientation results (Knee et al., 2001).

A possible relation between (a driver's) social relations and trait anger has been one topic in research. A great significance of social relations alone did not further trait anger without a combination of it and specific negative interpersonal attitudes and beliefs. A subject's perceived social esteem correlated negatively with trait anger. Also, the predictive value of the role of the variables agreeableness and perceived social esteem was increased when social relations were more appreciated. There was a positive correlation between trait-anger and distrust. Agreeableness and perceived social esteem played a crucial role as mediating variables in this which referred to the possibility of conceptualizing distrust as a combination

of these variables when predicting trait anger. A negative correlation between agreeableness of the Big Five and trait anger was found (Kuppens, 2004).

The role of affect in decision making and judgement (in traffic) is important. Both integral and incidental variables influenced the person's decision making and judgement. Affect hampered decision making among the subjects, but affective rationality advanced it (Peters et al., 2006).

Aggressive driving behaviour has been found (partly) stemming from earlier traffic situations. Anger-congruent driving behaviour transfers across traffic situations were found. (Stephens & Groeger, 2011).

Study questions and hypotheses of the present study

The Propensity for Angry Driving scale questionnaire (PADS; DePasquale et al., 2001) has proved to be a reliable tool for research on aggressive driving behaviour. Its ability to identify drivers prone to aggressive driving makes it suitable and useful in research on driving behaviour and accordingly in questionnaire-based data collection. The original US-version consists of 19 different motor vehicle traffic scenarios. However, due to cultural differences between USA and Sweden, a modification to Swedish traffic situations was necessary. Also important are the language aspects which refer to the important role of the translation or idiomatic and perspicuous Swedish as being a necessary prerequisite of correctly understanding the scenarios, and choosing the right response options. The aim of the present study was to first translate the PADS from American English into Swedish, and then to use it to investigate the correlations between emotion control, personality traits, traffic attitudes, and aggressive driving. The crucial question in the present study was the relation between emotion control, personality traits and angry driving. This relation probably is of a complex nature. This has shown to be the case in earlier research. For example, (in driving) agreeableness and perceived social esteem were negatively correlated with trait anger (Kuppens, 2004). It was found that a driver high in social desirability showed a weaker or negative correlation between it and angry driving (af Wåhlberg, 2010). Problems with emotion control have shown to be crucial factors in making safe and rational driving difficult or even impossible (Björklund, 2007). Also, frustration is one of the dynamic factors that have an effect on (driving) behaviour (Morlan, 1949).

Method

Pilot study

A preliminary, small-scale pilot study was conducted in order to try out procedures, calibrate measures, and in general make a survey of presuppositions and conditions. Nineteen

participants filled in a preliminary Swedish translation of the Propensity for Angry Driving Scale questionnaire (PADS; DePasquale et al., 2001) which consisted of 18 scenarios, each with 4 response options (one scenario was omitted because it was not compatible with Swedish traffic). The original PADS was modified to suit Swedish traffic, for example, instead of a speed limit of 55 mph, 70 kmph was used. Also, the average actual time needed in filling the questionnaire in was of importance, and taken into account for planning and constitution of the present study. This refers to scientific and statistical requirements principally but also to actual practice, especially the subjects' willingness and readiness for choosing the response options, or filling in the questionnaire of the present study. Internal validity of the study showed to be good. The measurement instrument (PADS) measured the tendency to angry driving. Also, based on the pilot responses, one additional scenario from the original American version of the PADS was excluded because according to the participants it was not compatible with Swedish traffic.

Main study

Subjects

Participating driver subjects were university students, drivers from parking lots, petrol stations, and in principle, drivers from anywhere. This refers to driving licence holders. The age range was 18 to 72. Two hundred and ten participants, (127) women completed the questionnaire package. For more information on the participant sample, see Table 1.

Data collection

In the data collection, established validated scientific questionnaire methods were used. Data collection procedure was carried out by using the Web-based "SurveyMonkey" survey tool (www.surveymonkey.com). The subjects were given the Internet address of the questionnaire by means of slips, e-mail, and mobile phone text messages. Also, a short description of the aim of the study, and an approximate time needed for filling it in was provided. It is difficult to precisely estimate the response rate, but approximately 1 out of 10 respondents who were asked to take part in the study actually filled in the questionnaire.

Background and attitude questions

Relevant background variables were assessed: gender, age, driving licence and the response options "Yes", "No"; Also, "How many (Swedish) miles do you usually drive per year?"; "How many years' driving experience do you have?"; Further, "Have you met with a traffic accident as a driver?"; "Have you ever been in a "near shave situation", or a situation in which nothing occurred but which could have turned into a serious accident?" and the response options: "No, never", "Yes, once", "Yes, some times", "Yes, several times". A

couple of questions also assessed attitudes towards relevant traffic behaviours: “Do you usually drive faster than permitted?” and the response options: “No, never”, “Seldom”, “Sometimes”, “Often”; “How good do you consider yourself in manoeuvring a car?” and the response options: “A little inferior to the average”, “Approximately as the average”, “A little better than the average”, “Much better than the average”.

SSP

The Swedish Universities Scales of Personality inventory (SSP; Gustavsson, Bergman, Edman, Ekselius, von Knorring, & Linder, 2000) is based on the Karolinska Scales of Personality (KSP). The number of items is reduced, and the psychometric quality concerning face validity, internal consistency, response differentiation, and the usefulness of the test battery is improved. There are 91 questions or statements and four response options. These concern the subject’s habits, opinions, way of reacting, and how he or she usually feels. In the present study the SSP was used in order to investigate and control for social desirability effects or as a social desirability scale. The following are examples of the SSP questions used in the present study: stress susceptibility (SS) “I get tired and hurried too easily.”; impulsiveness (I) “I have a tendency to act on the spur of the moment without really thinking ahead.”; adventure seeking (AS) “I’m always keen on trying new things.”; social desirability (SD) “I’m always polite and self-controlled, regardless of whom I talk to.”; trait irritability (TI) “Sometimes I get annoyed just by having people around me.” and verbal trait aggression (VTA) “I often get into arguments with people who disagree with me.”. There was a total of 42 questions. The four response options were: “Does not apply at all”, “Does not apply very well”, “Applies pretty much”, “Applies completely”. The scale scores (points) were transformed into standard scores (points) or T-values by using a transformation table following Gustavsson et al. (2000).

PADS

The ability to identify drivers prone to angry driving behaviour and road rage makes the Propensity for Angry Driving Scale (PADS; DePasquale et al., 2001) useful in addressing the underlying emotional mechanisms or thought processes that instigate to or trigger angry and hostile reactions when driving, especially in the common win/lose climate in traffic (DePasquale et al., 2001). This characterization refers to the rivalry climate that often seems to prevail in normal traffic when regarding other drivers as competitors or enemies, especially in connection with aggressive driving, for example, overtaking at the last second before taking an exit. The following traits or variables play an important role in the PADS validity assessment: Measures for convergent validity: Trait anger, hostility; Measures for discriminant validity: Venturesomeness, impulsivity; Measures of criterion validity: The predictive value of the driver’s past confrontations while driving or the strength of the possible correlation between scores of the test and the independent criterion as a standard (DePasquale et al., 2001). The Swedish translation of the PADS is shown in the Appendix.

In the present study the frequency of specific potentially dangerous driving behaviours was targeted by using the PADS. PADS originally from the USA, translated from American English into Swedish, and modified to the Swedish traffic conditions, comprised 17 different traffic scenarios. As noted earlier, there were originally 19 of them, but based on the pilot study, two of them had not relevance to the actual Swedish traffic scenarios. There were 4 response options a), b), c), d) from which the subjects chose the one that most closely corresponded to their way of action in the scenario in question.

DERS

Emotion regulation was assessed using the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS; Gratz & Roemer, 2004). The DERS was developed for analyzing emotion dyscontrol more comprehensively than by other methods earlier. The choice of items was based on difficulties in emotion control. This refers to such dimensions as awareness of and understanding emotions, acceptance of emotions, the ability to adapt oneself to goal directed behaviour and refrain from impulsive behaviour when having negative emotions. Also, access to emotion strategies regarded or perceived as effective is included which refers to an attempt to measure the flexible use of situationally suitable strategies in modulating emotional responses. The DERS has high internal consistency, good test-retest reliability. In addition, its construct and predictive validity are sufficient. There are significant correlations between the DERS subscales analyzing deficits in awareness, understanding, and acceptance of emotions, and constructs of emotion avoidance and expressivity. The foundation of the DERS is the comprehensive conceptualization of emotion control which the correlations above support (Gratz & Roemer, 2004).

In the present study emotion regulatory tendencies were assessed by using a Swedish translation of selected subscales from the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. There was a total of 8 questions. For example, the following questions were included: "When I'm upset, I believe that I'll end up feeling very depressed.", "When I'm upset, I believe that I will remain that way for a long time.", "When I'm upset, I believe that wallowing in it is all I can do." The response options were: "1= Almost never", "2= Sometimes", "3= About half of time", "4= Mostly", "5= Almost always".

The Big Five Inventory

The Swedish translation by Zakrisson (2010) of John and Srivastava's (1999) Big Five Inventory was used to assess personality characteristics. These characteristics are extraversion, for example, directing personality outward and social interest; agreeableness, for example, pleasant manner and warmth; conscientiousness, for example, organization and reliability; neuroticism, for example, nervousness and temperamentality; openness, for example, imagination and curiosity. The inventory is intended to assess the above characteristics and contains 44 questions or statements. For example, the following questions

or statements were included: “I See Myself as Someone Who”... (in every question or statement) “1. Is talkative”, ” 2. Tends to find fault with others”, ” 3. Does a thorough job”. The response options were: “1. Disagree strongly”, ” 2. Disagree a little”, “3. Neither agree or disagree”, “4. Agree a little”, “5. Agree strongly”.

Analysis procedure

Apart from descriptive statistics, the main analyses used were first order and partial correlations. The internal consistency of the scales used was assessed using Cronbach alpha. Further, the extent to which differences in angry driving could be predicted from individual differences in self-reported emotion regulation and personality variables were investigated by using multiple regression analysis in order to analyse the joint and separate influences of the predictor variables on angry driving and road rage.

Results

Background variables

As can be seen in table 1, the descriptive statistics including the background variables are shown. The positively skewed distribution towards the younger drivers partly may be due to the considerable number of university students most of whom are relatively young. The great dispersion in miles driven per year seems to correspond to that of the whole population of licence holders. This refers to the fact that some licence holders do not drive at all, whereas some drive often and long distances. A party to a traffic accident as a driver among the subjects was relatively rare, as well as a party to a near shave situation. Here it is important to note that regarding a traffic situation as a near shave situation is to a considerable degree subjective, as well as the driver's self-reported ability to manoeuvre a vehicle.

Scale validity

The descriptive statistics and internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) of the scales of the present study are shown in Table 2. The Swedish translation of the PADS scenarios proved to be reliable in measuring the subjects' driving behaviour in Swedish traffic. Cronbach alpha was good for the PADS, indicating a good degree of internal consistency. This aspect of reliability or the extent to which the parts of the present study measure the same function shows the usefulness of the measuring instruments used. The degree to which the items measured the attribute or construct in question was acceptable.

Intercorrelations between background variables

Intercorrelations of all the variables, except the PADS, are shown in Table 3. It is noteworthy that driving experience to a considerable extent depends on the driver's age, and admitting speeding possibly is influenced by social desirability. The correlations to a considerable degree indicate validity that could be expected which means that they can be regarded as being (partly) in line with the findings in previous research on driving behaviour, which seems to refer to good external validity. Difficulties in emotion regulation, trait irritability, and verbal trait aggression are common, and logical variables that in research on driving behaviour often have been found to correlate positively with aggressive driving and road rage (Stephens et al., 2011; DePasquale et al., 2001).

Associations between predictor variables and the Propensity for Angry Driving Scale

The main results are shown in Table 4. The degree of the linear relationships (Pearson r) and the partial correlations (r_p) between the PADS scenarios and the independent predictor variables are shown. The main results showed that female gender, older age, agreeableness, openness, and social desirability were negatively correlated with self-reported angry driving behaviour as measured by the PADS. Impulsivity, attention seeking, trait irritability, verbal trait aggression, positive attitude towards speeding, and a high self-reported car manoeuvring ability instead were positively correlated with the PADS. As could be expected, the predictive validity of certain variables was rather good. SD, TI and speeding explained most of the unique variance. The first-order correlations for their part indicate the complex nature of the relationships between the background variables and angry driving and road rage as measured by the PADS scenarios. These partial correlations (r_p) in which the effect of one predictor variable was held constant or removed, for the most part were non-significant. These correlations advance internal validity by controlling for the variables in question.

The results from the multiple regression analysis are shown in Table 5. Multiple correlations (R) and the standardized regression coefficients or beta coefficients indicating the relationship between the PADS and predictor (independent) variables are shown. This refers to multiple causal relationships and prediction or the predictive value of the variables. The results were mostly non-significant. However, this linear analysis of the joint and separate effects between the PADS and the predictor variables or the effects of the latter on the PADS scenarios showed certain significant results. The results of the analysis concerning the relative importance of TI and speeding in determining the predictive value, could be expected to be significant.

Discussion

The data in the present study was based on a relatively limited sample of drivers. However, the results to a considerable extent fall in line with other research findings in driving behaviour, for example, (Kuppens, 2004) which generally show that a driver's emotion regulation ability and personality traits are of great importance in how he or she reacts to the great variety of stimuli in traffic. This refers to the fact that motor vehicle traffic is a demanding environment where regulating emotions may be very difficult, and such difficulties sometimes lead to a disaster.

In the present study the scales the SSP, the DERS, and the Big Five, as established and validated inventories, were useful and appropriate in analyzing a driver's emotion control ability, and personality traits with a view to a predictive role of the different variables in them. Concerning the PADS, impulsiveness, attention seeking, trait irritability, being for the affirmative regarding speeding, and self-reported car manoeuvring ability were the most important variables in aggressive driving behaviour. This could be expected. It is noteworthy that speeding not necessarily is completely correlated with aggressive driving though it often might be regarded as such. The predictive value and ability of the PADS to identify drivers prone to aggressive driving and road rage were found in the present study. This has been shown earlier in research on driving behaviour. The PADS predicted obscene gestures and verbal confrontations significantly (DePasquale et al., 2001). This was shown after controlling for hostility and anger which indicates the importance of emotional variables and personality traits in one's driving behaviour.

According to comments, the PADS scenarios were found especially interesting by several subjects in the present study, and already in the pilot study. For example, the scenarios got some of them to analyze own driving in general. However, the whole questionnaire was regarded as too long by a few of the subjects.

Anger easily leads to aggression. Instrumental and emotional or hostile aggression is one way of classifying aggression. In traffic the former refers to deliberately using aggressive driving behaviour in order to achieve a goal related to driving. However, this type of aggression, as tailgating and honking the horn, among response options in the PADS, is not always intended to harm other drivers. Nevertheless, one purpose of the emotional or hostile type of aggression is to make the "enemy" or "competitor" driver to suffer both psychologically and even physically. This has shown to be a factor that makes the aggressive driver to feel better at least momentarily (Björklund, 2007). A common element in this context is punishment, or in one PADS scenario a retaliation. Also, the aggressive driver sometimes tries to educate and sanction the "wrongdoer" (Björklund, 2007). When engaged in aggression one (the driver) often shows relatively thoughtless and unplanned behaviour, including attacks. These occur under immense feelings which indicate affective aggression. Also, other forms of this type of aggression are found. In short, a strong negative affect has shown to be a reason for a need for attacking a suitable target (in traffic) (Berkowitz, 2003, p. 806). In the present study, for example, I and TI appeared to be important variables in the light of choosing the negatively

characterized PADS response options. Life problems, such as domestic quarrels, a “bad day” etc. in addition to problems in emotion control and negative personality traits, sometimes trigger aggressive driving.

There are such external manifestations of aggressiveness in the driver’s driving behaviour as aggressive tailgating, headlight flashing, obscene gestures, intentionally obstructing other motor vehicles, and verbal abuse (Knee et al., 2001), also among response options in the PADS. It is also of interest to point out that in extreme cases of road rage even physical violence occurs, though, as noted earlier, outrageous traffic behaviour of this type is met only on rare occasions in Sweden.

In the present study the role of a driver’s emotion control ability was essential and probably manifested in many ways. A driver who has problems in emotion control often acts as an initiator of a dangerous chain reaction by letting intense negative emotions, even road rage, dominate and guide his or her driving, instead of driving rationally (among the response options in the PADS), for example, by using cognitive emotion regulation. This type of driving behaviour easily spreads among the drivers in a traffic situation (Björklund, 2007) which in turn sometimes results even in fatalities. In general, being able to control one’s emotions is regarded as essential and necessary. Being able to behave correctly even in irritation or anger provoking situations generally is considered to be an admirable virtue, and a sign of a reasonable and rational person.

Due to problems in emotion control and negative personality traits, safe and rational driving seems to be difficult in the present study, for example, due to I, TI, and VTA. In general, (a driver’s) personality traits are usually relatively persistent and consistent, and thereby they have important role in, and are correlated with one’s (driving) behaviour. Findings by other authors have shown that there is variation among personality trait’s effects on (driving) behaviour. For example, agreeableness was negatively correlated with trait anger (in driving) (Kuppens, 2005), and narcissism was positively correlated with aggressive driving (Britt & Garrity, 2006).

One’s (a driver’s) ability to perceive correctly, become aware of, and comprehend stimuli (in traffic), express emotions exactly, understand emotional messages from others (drivers), and organize and use of this emotional information refer to social intelligence which normatively should help in adhering to (legal) social norms (traffic rules). However, social intelligence needs more research on it. In spite of the fact that it is a rather popular subject, its existence or real nature still are open questions to a considerable degree (Colman, 2001, p. 687).

The norm of social commitment, or driving in accordance with traffic regulations, as something that everybody should endorse appears to be unrealistic in actual everyday practice in traffic. When engaged in angry driving or road rage a driver easily shows resistance even by attacking or fighting against perceived discourtesies, transgressions or threats by other drivers. This sometimes occurs in traffic situations in which the driver privately rejects social norms, and traffic regulations, or even regards them unnecessary. In spite of the conforming nature of social desirability, there may be individual differences in interpreting and regarding what is socially desirable, for example, depending on the variables age and gender. A young

male might regard speed limits as oppressive or absurd, whereas an elderly female might have the opposite opinion which refers to the possibility that these variables (partly) influenced the subjects' choice of response options in the PADS scenarios.

As noted earlier, social desirability is a risk of error in self-reporting questionnaires (af Wåhlberg, 2010). In the present study the SSP was used to examine and control for this problem. As the data collection method in the present study was the multiple-choice questionnaire, there was a potential source of error because of social desirability. This refers to social desirability response set or bias or (the driver's) "predisposition or readiness to respond to items of a multiple-choice questionnaire with responses calculated to present oneself in a favourable light according to perceived social norms and values." (Colman, 2001, p. 686). In the present study this was a threat to construct validity, though the subjects answered anonymously. So, there might be unconscious elements here. The tendency to respond under the influence of social desirability bias is a common risk of error in questionnaire data collection which refers to the majority of accepted and widely used psychometric scales used in research on driving behaviour (af Wåhlberg, 2010).

In addition to problems in emotion control and negative personality traits there are many other threats to traffic safety. Different types of illusion of safety are dangerous. This was not examined in the present study. As an inference from actual traffic, common inadequate, unrealistic and distorted comprehension of the facts or laws of physics which, in addition to aggressive driving, probably are the major reasons for tailgating and in general not keeping a safe distance behind a vehicle which in turn sometimes lead to severe (chain) crashes. Also, modern comfortable cars further alienate a driver from these facts or laws. In addition, "speed blindness" seems to be a common phenomenon. Ignorance of the dangers of speeding, and even regarding it as mere nothing, especially in aggressive driving, also sometimes result in fatalities. It is noteworthy that a positive attitude towards speeding predicted angry driving in the present study. Also, driving times without number and without accidents or near shave situations but in fact to a considerable degree risking safety, for example, by speeding and tailgating, are likely to create an illusion of safety.

According to the statistics, the main reason to traffic accidents is the human factor. There is the great paradox here: On the one hand every driver in general knows, or normatively as a driving licence holder should know, how to drive safely according to traffic regulations which may be the chosen response options partly due to social desirability in the present study, and on the other hand in actual practice he or she often ignores them unreasonably persuading oneself that "an accident cannot happen to me". Accordingly, drivers often more or less consciously appear to let (negative) emotions to steer instead of driving rationally. As in human behaviour in general, there appears to be a common tendency to conformity even in a negative sense in traffic or to allow one's driving behaviour to a considerable extent be influenced and governed by common prevailing negative and potentially dangerous forms of that behaviour in traffic. For example, whether caused by aggressive driving or not, speeding and not keeping a safe distance between vehicles probably are difficult to abolish. Traffic safety is a very important subject on which more research is needed, not only on aggressive driving and road rage but also on many other aspects of the human factor in traffic.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank associate professor Petri Laukka for supervision, and Gröna Bilister for assistance in data collection.

References

- Anderson, C. A., Deuser, W. E., & DeNeve, K. M. (1995). Hot temperatures, hostile affect, hostile cognition, and arousal: Tests of a general model of affective aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 434-448.
- Berkowitz, L. (2003). Affect, aggression, and antisocial behaviour. In R.J. Davidson, K.R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 804-820). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Björklund, G. M. (2007). Driver irritation and aggressive behaviour. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 40, 1069-1077.
- Britt, T. W., & Garrity, M. J., (2006). Attributions and personality as predictors of the road rage response. *British Journal of Social psychology*, 45, 127-147.
- Colman, A. M. (2001). A dictionary of psychology. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Deffenbacher, J. L., White, G. S., & Lynch, R. S. (2004). Evaluation of two new scales assessing driving anger: The Driving Anger Expression Inventory and The Driver's Angry Thoughts Questionnaire. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26, 87-99.
- DePasquale, J. P., Geller, E. S., Clarke, S. W., & Littleton, L. C. (2001). Measuring road rage: Development of the Propensity for Angry Driving Scale. *Journal of Safety Research*, 32, 1-16.
- Dukes, R. L., Clayton, S. L., Jenkins, L.T., Miller, T. L., & Rodgers, S. E. (2001). Effects of aggressive driving and driver characteristics on road rage. *Social Science Journal*, 38, 323-331.
- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L., (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26, 41-54.
- Gustavsson, J. P., Bergman, H., Edman, G., Ekselius, L., von Knorring, L., & Linder, J. (2000). Swedish universities Scales of Personality (SSP): Construction, internal consistency and normative data. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 102, 217-225.

- John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Individual differences in emotion regulation. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 351-371). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Knee, R. C., Neighbors, C., & Vietor, N. A. (2001). Self-determination theory as a framework for understanding road rage. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 889-904.
- Kuppens, P. (2005). Interpersonal determinants of trait anger: low agreeableness, perceived low social esteem, and the amplifying role of the importance attached to social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 13-23.
- Loehlin, J. C., McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1989). Heritabilities of common and measure-specific components of the big five personality factors. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 23, 431-453.
- Morlan, G. K. (1949). A note on the frustration-aggression theories of Dollard and his associates. *Psychological Review*, 56, 1-8.
- Peters, E., Västfjäll, D., Gärling, T., & Slovic, P. (2006). Affect and decision making: A "hot" topic. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 19, 79-85.
- Stephens, A. N., & Groeger, J. A. (2011). Anger-congruent behaviour transfers across driving situations. *Cognition and Emotion*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/02699931.2010.551184.
- Wåhlberg, af, A. E. (2010). Social desirability effects in driver behavior inventories. *Journal of Safety Research*, 41, 99-106.
- Zakrisson, I. (2010). Big Five Inventory (BFI): Utprövning för svenska förhållanden. *Social Science Reports from Mid Sweden University*, 2010:3.

*Table 1.**Descriptive statistics for the background variables assessed in this study.*

Variable	Valid N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	SD
Gender						
Women	127					
Men	83					
Age	210	34.9	31	18	72	12.79
Licence						
Yes	203					
No	7					
Mileage (km/year)	191	15550	8000	0	50000	4754.10
Experience (years)	200	14.5	10	0	50	12.53
Accident	200	1.61	1	1	4	0.76
Near shave	201	2.37	3	1	4	0.95
Speeding	200	2.65	3	1	4	0.88
Manoeuvring	201	2.45	2	1	4	0.80

Note. Accident = Responses to the question “Have you met with a traffic accident as a driver?”; Near shave = Responses to the question “Have you ever been in a “near shave situation, or a situation in which nothing occurred but which could have turned into a serious accident?” (response options: 1 = No, never; 2 = Yes, once; 3 = Yes, some times; 4 = Yes, several times); Speeding = Responses to the question “Do you usually drive faster than permitted?” (response options: 1 = No, never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often); Manoeuvring = Responses to the question “How good do you consider yourself in manoeuvring a car?” (response options: 1 = A little inferior to the average, 2 = Approximately as the average, 3 = A little better than the average, 4 = Much better than the average).

Table 2

Descriptive statistics and internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) of the scales used in the present study.

Scale	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Cronbach alpha
Extraversion	171	27.4	5.22	11	38	0.84
Agreeableness	171	30.8	31.0	18	40	0.74
Conscientiousness	171	34.6	35.0	17	45	0.83
Neuroticism	171	20.6	21.0	8	36	0.86
Openness	171	35.4	36.0	21	48	0.77
DERS	175	14.6	14.0	8	37	0.87
PADS	177	32.7	31.0	19.7	63.1	0.80
SS	195	2.1	2.03	1.0	3.4	0.75
I	195	2.2	2.14	1.3	3.3	0.62
AS	195	2.5	2.42	1.0	3.7	0.82
SD	195	2.8	2.85	1.1	4.0	0.52
TI	195	2.5	2.42	1.0	3.7	0.79
VTA	195	2.1	2.10	1.0	3.1	0.71

Note: DERS = Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (Gratz & Roemer, 2004); PADS = Propensity for Angry Driving Scale (DePasquale et al., 2001); SS = Stress susceptibility, I = Impulsiveness, AS = Adventure seeking, SD = Social desirability, TI = Trait irritability, VTA = Verbal trait aggression (all from the Swedish Universities Scales of personality (Gustavsson et al., 2000)).

Table 3

Intercorrelations between all variables (except PADS)

Scale	Ge	Age	Ex	Ag	Co	Ne	Op	DE	SS	I	AS	SD	TI	VTA	Dr	Ac	Ne	Sp	
Age	.05	-																	
Ex	.19*	.14	-																
Ag	.02	.24**	.19*	-															
Co	.20**	.23**	.20**	.24**	-														
Ne	.20**	-.37***	-.27***	-.46***	-.36***	-													
Op	.01	.15	.20**	.14	-.01	.04	-												
DE	.09	-.34***	-.24**	-.43***	-.20**	.64***	-.12	-											
SS	.07	-.20**	-.27***	-.27**	-.47***	.63***	-.04	.46***	-										
I	-.05	.01	.23**	.00	-.42***	.01	.02	-.06	.09	-									
AS	-.06	-.05	.32***	.05	-.19*	-.08	.16	-.04	-.04	.39***	-								
SD	.06	.17	.21**	.44***	.31***	-.34***	.10	-.28***	-.25**	.01	.05	-							
TI	-.11	-.26**	.05	-.54***	-.24**	.45***	-.17	.35***	.33***	.18**	.15	-.44***	-						
VTA	-.05	-.22**	.03	-.58***	-.32***	.36	-.13	.30***	.23**	.20**	.19*	-.42***	.58***	-					
Dr	-.07	.93***	.16	.27***	.27***	-.41***	.11	-.34***	-.21**	.03	.00	.20**	-.26**	-.25**	-				
Ac	-.13	.36***	.02	.06	.13	-.21**	.09	-.19*	-.10	.06	-.05	.09	.00	-.10	.41***	-			
Ne	-.22**	.21**	.05	.03	-.05	-.13	.09	-.14	-.13	.16	.06	.06	-.09	-.04	.19*	.20*	-		
Sp	-.19*	.06	-.20*	-.22**	-.19*	.02	-.10	-.01	.04	.17*	.08	-.18*	.18*	.23**	.13	.05	.12	-	
Ma	-.25**	.14	.22**	.06	.09	-.29***	-.09	-.18**	-.32***	.13	.15	.10	.01	.06	.18*	.16*	.24**	.11	-

*** $p < .0001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, $N = 168$ (casewise deletion of missing data). Ge = gender (0 = female, 1 = male), Age = age, Ex = extraversion, Ag = agreeableness, Co = conscientiousness, Ne = neuroticism, Op = openness, De = DERS, SS = stress susceptibility, I = impulsiveness, AS = adventure seeking, SD = social desirability, TI = trait irritability, VTA = verbal trait aggression, Dr = driving experience, Ac = party to a traffic accident, Ne = near shave, Sp = speeding, Ma = car manoeuvring ability.

Table 4

Correlations (Pearson r) and partial correlations (r_p) between PADS and predictor variables

Scale	r	r_p
Gender	-.19**	-.14
Age	-.15*	-.04
Extraversion	.03	.02
Agreeableness	-.20**	.16*
Conscientiousness	-.07	.14
Neuroticism	.09	.03
Openness	-.20*	-.13
DERS	.14	.07
SS	.00	-.08
I	.16*	.03
AS	.23**	.14
SD	-.29***	-.19*
TI	.44***	.22**
VTA	.39***	.15
Experience	-.12	-.02
Accident	.01	.04
Near	.09	.08
Speeding	.27***	.18*
Manoeuvring	.27***	.12

Note. *** $p < .0001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, $N = 170 - 177$. Gender (0 = female, 1 = male); DERS = Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (Gratz & Roemer, 2004); PADS = Propensity for Angry Driving Scale (DePasquale et al., 2001); SS = Stress susceptibility, I = Impulsiveness, As = Adventure seeking, SD = Social desirability, TI = Trait Irritability, VTA = Verbal trait aggression (all from the Swedish Universities Scales of personality (Gustavsson et al., 2000)).

Table 5

Summary of results from multiple regression analysis between PADS and predictor variables in terms of multiple correlation (R) and standardized regression coefficients (β).

Variable	R _(11, 168)	β	p
	.60		<.0001
Gender		-.10	ns
Age		-.09	ns
Agreeableness		.16	ns
Openness		-.10	ns
I		-.04	ns
AS		.13	ns
SD		-.15	ns
TI		.29	<.001
VTA		.14	ns
Speeding		.14	<.05
Manoeuvring		.18	<.01

Note. Gender (0 = female, 1 = male); PADS = Propensity for Angry Driving Scale (DePasquale et al., 2001); I = Impulsiveness, AS = Adventure seeking, SD = Social desirability, TI = Trait irritability, VTA = Verbal trait aggression (all from the Swedish Universities Scales of Personality (Gustavsson et al., 2000)).

Appendix: Swedish translation of the Propensity for Angry Driving Scale (PADS;
DePasquale et al., 2001)

Nedan följer beskrivningar av olika möjliga trafikscenarier och för varje scenario ges fyra olika sätt man kan reagera på. Din uppgift är att välja det alternativ som bäst passar in hur du skulle ha reagerat i situationen i fråga. Ibland finns det inget alternativ som passar perfekt. I sådana fall ska du välja det alternativ som ligger närmast hur du skulle ha reagerat.

1. Du kör din bil längs en tvåfilig väg. Utan varning kör en annan bil framför dig från en parkeringsplats. Du måste bromsa hastigt för att undvika en sammanstötning. Hur reagerar du?
 - a) Du suckar av lättnad över att inget värre hände och kör vidare.
 - b) Lutar dig ut ur bilfönstret och skriker åt den andra föraren.
 - c) Tutar med ditt signalhorn för att låta den andra föraren veta att han/hon nästan vållade en olycka.
 - d) Följer efter den andra bilen fram till dess destination, så att du kan säga ditt hjärtas mening till föraren.

2. Du kör din bil längs en motorväg i omkörningsfilen. Du hinner upp en bil som kör mycket saktare än du. Du blinkar med helljuset för att signalera till den andra bilen, men den byter inte fil för att släppa fram dig. Hur reagerar du?
 - a) Gör en otrevlig gest mot föraren medan du kör om till höger.
 - b) Rycker på axlarna och fortsätter med att vänta på att den andra bilen ska köra åt sidan.
 - c) Börjar köra nära den andra bilen och tutar med hornet.
 - d) Fortsätter med att blinka dina framlyktor i hopp om att beteendet ska få den att släppa fram dig.

3. Du kör längs en enfilig väg. Utan någon synbar orsak så kör bilen framför dig ryckligt och bromsar in och ökar hastigheten om vartannat, vilket stör din körning. Hur reagerar du?
 - a) Tutar och svär högt över föraren.
 - b) Tutar med ditt horn och gestikulerar mot föraren som orsakar störandet.
 - c) Hejdar farten litet för att hålla säkert avstånd.
 - d) Avsiktligt kör nära den andra bilen samt tutar då och då.

4. Du befinner dig på en full parkeringsplats. Du ser en förare lämna sin plats och signalerar med dina blinkers att du avser att köra in på platsen när den blir ledig. När bilen kör iväg, så kilar en annan bil in framför dig från andra sidan och tar parkeringsplatsen. Hur reagerar du?
 - a) Stirrar argt mot den andra föraren när du kör vidare för att hitta en annan parkeringsplats.
 - b) Rycker på axlarna och letar efter en annan plats för att parkera.

- c) Väntar tills den andra föraren kommer ut ur sin bil och öppnar sedan ditt bilfönster och skriker något otrevligt åt honom/henne.
- d) Stannar din bil och går till den andra bilen för att låta ditt vrede gå ut över föraren.
5. Du kör ditt fordon i höger fil mitt i rusningstrafiken. Från ingenstans kör en bil om dig på väggrenen och försöker tränga sig in framför dig. Hur reagerar du?
- a) Gör ingenting. Låter bilen tränga sig in.
- b) Gör obscena gester och skriker "idiot" till den andra föraren medan du försöker hindra föraren från att tränga sig in framför dig.
- c) Låter bilen tränga sig in men tutar med ditt horn för att demonstrera ditt ogillande.
- d) Tutar med signalhornet och hindrar bilen från att komma in framför dig.
6. Du kör i 110 km/h längs omkörningsfilen på väg där hastighetsbegränsningen är 70 km/h. En bil kommer i mycket hög fart bakom dig. Bilen kör nära dig och blinkar med helljuset samt tutar med signalhornet. Hur reagerar du?
- a) Stannar kvar i omkörningsfilen i nuvarande hastighet för att avsiktligt hindra den andra bilen från att passera.
- b) Visar den andra föraren fingret och saktar avsiktligt ner för att reta föraren bakom dig.
- c) Byter fil så snabbt som möjligt och låter den andra bilen passera.
- d) Visar den andra föraren fingret och stannar kvar i omkörningsfilen i din nuvarande hastighet.
7. Du kör längs en motorväg när ett annat fordon kommer bredvid din bil. Du tittar dit och ser en fullständig främling göra obscena gester till dig. Hur reagerar du?
- a) Struntar i den andra föraren genom att titta rakt fram och håller dig till dina egna angelägenheter.
- b) Tittar på den andra föraren och skakar ditt huvud av tvivel. Sedan saktar du ner och väntar på att den andra bilen kör vidare.
- c) Stirrar hotfullt tillbaka på den andra föraren.
- d) Gör obscena gester tillbaka till det andra fordonets förare.
8. Du har suttit fast i din bil i trafikrusningen i över 20 minuter. Plötsligt stöter bilen bakom till dig lätt. Hur reagerar du?
- a) Kliver ut ur bilen och skriker åt den andra föraren att denne är en värdelös förare och inte varit uppmärksam i trafiken.
- b) Struntar i det. Stöten var inte tillräckligt hård för att vålla någon skada.
- c) Skriker genom fönstret till den andra föraren att denne ska vara mer uppmärksam.
- d) Skriker högt i din bil, men inte till den andra föraren.
9. Du kör på en motorväg. En av bilarna framför dig byter oavbrutet fil och hindrar därmed andra bilar från att passera obehindrat. Detta leder till att trafiken blir långsammare. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Svär högt inne i din bil och tutar många gånger för att visa ditt missnöje.
- b) Kör närmare den filbytande bilen så att du kan tuta och skrika obsceniteter till föraren som blockerar trafiken.
- c) Suckar och saktar ner farten med resten av trafiken.
- d) Svär högt inne i din bil.

10. Du kör på en gata. Utan varning springer plötsligt en fotgängare ut på gatan framför din bil och det är nära att du kör på honom/henne. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Gör ingenting utom känner tacksamhet över att ingen blev skadad.
- b) Stannar din bil och stiger ut för att skrika till fotgängaren att denne varit vårdslös och dum.
- c) Skriker till fotgängaren ut ur bilfönstret att han/hon ska se upp i trafiken.
- d) Svär högt till fotgängaren ut ur fönstret och säger till honom/henne att nästa gång tänker du minsann inte stanna.

11. Din avfart närmar sig snabbt, men föraren av bilen bredvid dig kör på ett sätt som gör att du inte kan byta fil. Du kan missa din avfart. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Tutar och skriker ut ur fönstret till föraren att han/hon ska släppa fram dig.
- b) Gasar på för att komma framför den andra bilen och skriker obsceniteter när du passerar.
- c) Svär tyst och saktar farten för att kunna byta fil.
- d) Följer efter den andra bilen fram till dess destination så att du kan skrika obsceniteter till den andra föraren.

12. Du kör på en motorväg. Föraren av bilen framför dig kastar en mugg kaffe ut genom sitt bilfönster. Muggen träffar din vindruta. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Tutar med ditt signalhorn och skriker åt den andra föraren inifrån din bil.
- b) Gasar på tills du är nära bilen och gör obscena gester åt den andra föraren.
- c) Skakar på huvudet och sätter på vindrutetorkarna.
- d) Gasar på för att köra om bilen och kastar sedan ut någonting på den andra bilen genom ditt bilfönster.

13. När du svänger till vänster stänger du av vägen för en annan bil av misstag. Som svar följer den andra föraren efter dig till nästa korsning där han/hon kör intill din bil och skriker obsceniteter till dig tills trafikljuset blir grönt. Sedan kör den andra föraren hastigt bort. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Följer efter bilen till nästa korsning för att kunna skrika obsceniteter tillbaka.
- b) Drar en suck av lättnad för att pinan är över.
- c) Kör nära bakom den andra bilen fram till nästa korsning. Sedan kör du bredvid bilen och skriker obsceniteter tillbaka till den andra föraren.
- d) Skriker tillbaka till den andra föraren och talar om att det var ett misstag och att han/hon borde lugna ner sig.

14. Du har varit fast i en trafikrusning i nära 40 minuter. När du är ouppmärksam så stöter du av misstag till bilen framför dig lite grann. Föraren i bilen lutar sig ut ur fönstret och svär åt dig mycket högt. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Rycker på axlarna för att visa att det inte var avsiktligt.
- b) Stöter avsiktligt ihop med bilen igen.
- c) Skriker tillbaka till den andra föraren och manar honom/henne att lugna ner sig eftersom det var oavsiktligt och ingen skada skedde.
- d) Visar fingret åt den andra föraren och skriker tillbaka.

15. Du kör på en motorväg i omkörningsfilen. Du närmar dig en annan bil i samma fil och signalerar med framlyktorna för att den andra bilen ska flytta på sig och släppa fram dig. Istället för att flytta sig ser du föraren i den andra bilen visa fingret åt dig och stanna kvar i omkörningsfilen. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Börjar blinka med dina lyktor i snabbare takt i hopp om att få föraren att flytta på sig.
- b) Kör nära den andra bilens bakre stötfångare. Blinkar med dina lyktor och tutar med signalhornet för att skrämma föraren till att flytta på sig.
- c) Skakar på huvudet och väntar på att bilen framför ska flytta på sig eller svänga in på en avfart.
- d) Kör nära den andra bilens stötfångare och tutar med ditt signalhorn.

16. Du står bakom ett annat fordon vid trafikljusen för att svänga vänster. När det blir grönt ljus för vänstersväng, så kör inte bilen framför dig för föraren har inte sett att ljusen slagit om. När du tutar på bilen för att komma iväg, så visar föraren av den andra bilen fingret åt dig i bakspeglén. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Tutar på bilen en gång till.
- b) Du ilsknar till litet men gör ingenting.
- c) Tutar länge med ditt horn.
- d) Tutar länge med ditt horn och visar fingret tillbaka.

17. Du kör på en väg sent på natten och fordonet som kommer emot dig har helljuset på. Du blinkar med ditt helljus, men den andra bilen bländar inte av. Hur reagerar du?

- a) Gnisslar med tänderna i frustration och väntar på att bilen ska passera så att du kan se ordentligt igen.
- b) Sätter också på helljuset och tutar med signalhornet.
- c) Sätter också på helljuset som en hämnd.
- d) Gör en u-sväng och kör efter bilen med helljuset på.