

Regional variations of the road risk in France: A psychosocial study

Anita Bec-Gerion, PhD student, Laboratoire de Psychologie des Pays de la Loire, France ; Sandrine Gaymard, Professor, Laboratoire de Psychologie des Pays de la Loire, France

BACKGROUND

Road accidents remain the leading cause of death among young adults (18-24yrs; ONSIR, 2019)

- Importance of **human factor**
 - Human behavior accounts for 90% of accidents and 65% of the time as the only factor (Sabey & Taylor, 1980)
- Importance of the **context**
 - Environment influences behavior, especially road behavior (e.g. Gaymard et al., 2015 ; Lewin, 1935)
 - Geographical disparities are very large in terms of accident rates (ONISR, 2019)

AIMS

- Since traditional prevention campaigns are limited in terms of efficacy, we are interested in new areas of research to develop more effective prevention actions :
 - There is a need to clarify the **psychosocial determinants of risk taking**
 - We seek to understand how drivers relate to the **concept of traffic rules**, through their representation, driving behavior and certain **personality traits**
 - How **social rules** impact road behavior ? (Gaymard, 2007)

METHODS

- **Online self-reported questionnaire** composed such as:
 - **Psychological** part addressing :
 - Their representation of traffic rules
 - Their personality profiles (IPIP & TLOC) (Goldbert, 2006; Ozkan, 2005)
 - Conditionality of the rule seen as “legitimate transgressions” (Gaymard, 2014)
 - **Driving behavior** questions
 - **Sociodemographic** questions
- Data were collected in **six areas** chosen for their specificity in terms of road safety behavior and environment

RESULTS part.I

- **Representation** of traffic rules: discourse organized around **three** axes:
 - **Illegitimacy** of the traffic rule (42,6%): “Useless, annoying, slow, boring, money”
Male, Higher number of lost points
 - **Description** of the rule (42%): “Speed, limit, road, national”
Female, Lower number of lost points
 - **Safety** aspect of the rule (15,4%): “Security, preventive, restriction, death”
- **Conditionality of the rules:**
 - The *speed limit scenario* continue to have the highest degree of conditionality (Gaymard, 2007)
 - Lowest degree of conditionality for the **SMS & Call scenarios**

RESULTS part.II

- **Personality** profiles: **four** groups identified
 - High level of *altruism, morality, and internal orientation*: **safer group**
 - High level of *excitement-seeking*: **higher speed** limit transgression
 - High level of *angry/hostility, anxiety* and *excitement-seeking*: **riskier** group
 - High level of *anxiety* and *morality*: **anxious** group
- **Regional variations:**
 - Personality profiles: appeared **homogenous** across our areas
 - Conditionality of the rules: **differences** across our areas, specifically for SMS and call scenarios

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

- **Personality** is linked to **road risk taking** through the **representation** and the **conditionality** of the rules (e.g. Gaymard & Tiplica, 2019)
- **Social rules > Legal rules**
 - Specifically for men
 - For speed limit rules
- Greater **compliance** is observed in contexts where the **road safety culture** is better **implemented:**
 - Specifically for women
 - For traffic rules on the use of SMS and calls

Limitations, challenges, future directions ?

Results would have to be refined by age group analyses (Gaymard & Tiplica, 2019)