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Road Rage and Aggressive Driving:

A Review of the Literature

In today’s society, where the vast majority of people drive on a daily basis in order to reach their destinations, it is no wonder that road rage has become a serious issue. In 1997, Vest, Cohen, and Tharp, reported that since 1990, aggressive driving had increased by 51%. Pepper (1997) reported that aggressive driving continues to increase about 7% every year. The AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, in 1997, reported that since 1990, 218 deaths and 12,610 injuries occurred due to road rage.

According to Baron and Byrne (1994), there are two types of aggression, instrumental and hostile. Instrumental aggression while driving includes acts such as speeding off, running a red light, weaving in and out of traffic, etc. These are acts that will enable the driver to get away from the person or situation which is bothering them. Hostile aggression while driving may consist of insulting comments or gestures, horn honking, cutting someone off, etc. These acts are performed in order to hurt or get revenge on the person who is causing the frustration and/or anger.

Wells-Parker, et al. (2002), suggest that the term road rage “implies specific incidents of anger and aggression intentionally directed at another driver, vehicle, or object,” (p. 271). Road rage varies from mild to extreme forms. Mild forms may include, “verbally expressing anger in unobtrusive ways such as yelling through a closed window, complaining to oneself or to other passengers in the vehicle, or using vehicle signals such as the lights to express frustration,” (p. 271).
More extreme forms may include “direct physical assaults with the vehicle or a weapon, or
direct confrontation with another driver or passenger with the intent of injury … deliberately
tailgating, or cutting another driver off the road … [or the] use of obscene gestures,” (p. 271).

In their study of US adult drivers, Wells-Parker, et al. (2002), found that individuals who
scored high on an angry/threatening driving subscale of road rage (extreme forms of road rage)
were more likely to be involved in crashes, be habitual speeders, drive while under the influence
of alcohol, and receive traffic violations. However, they did not find a correlation between high
scores on a verbal/frustration expression subscale (mild forms of road rage) and any of the above
outcomes, except for an increase in driving violations.

Factors that are believed to influence the likelihood of road rage include
frustration/irritation, traffic congestion, driver characteristics (such as age, gender, ethnicity, etc.
of both instigator and aggressor), personality characteristics, and social status (of both instigator
and aggressor). Shinar (1998) argued that frustration resulting from delays and traffic congestion
is a contributor to aggressive driving. This study examined Israeli drivers’ reactions to a situation
in which the driver ahead of them did not move when the traffic light turned green. Shinar found
that when the light the participants were at only stayed green for a short amount of time, they
were quicker to honk than when they were at a light which remained green for a longer period of
time. He also found that drivers were quicker to honk during weekday rush hours than during the
weekend and that males and younger drivers were more impatient.
However, another study that examined the effects of traffic congestion found different results (Lajunen, Parker, and Summala, 1999). Contrary to Shinar’s study (1998) they found no significant correlations between rush hour driving and driver aggression. This study was carried out in Great Britain, Finland, and the Netherlands, and unlike Shinar’s study (1998), was based on self-reported responses rather than observed behaviors. It was suggested that a possible explanation for this difference in results may be due to differences between cultures.

Interestingly, in 2002, Parker, Lajunen, and Summala published another study of driver aggression in Great Britain, Finland, and the Netherlands. Contrary to their previous study, they suggest that traffic density may in fact provoke aggression in drivers.

In a study by Dukes, Clayton, Jenkins, Miller, and Rodgers, (2001), participants were presented with driving scenarios and asked how they would respond to them. The characteristics of the drivers revealed in the scenarios were age, gender, and cell phone use. The results revealed that situations in which a driver was reckless produced higher reported levels of road rage than when a driver held up traffic. However, there were no significant differences in reported aggression resulting from any of the driver’s characteristics.

Yagil (2001) found that drivers who are anxious or competitive and highly irritable are more likely to become aggressive when they are frustrated. This study took place in Israel and the sample consisted of only male participants. The participants were given three driving scenarios and then asked how they would react. It was also found that hostility was higher overall toward male drivers and drivers that the participant had a negative image of.
Social status is yet another factor that has been found to affect driver aggression. McGarva and Steiner (2000) performed a study in which participants, driving their own vehicles, were honked and gestured at by a man driving either a low or high status automobile. The participants’ level of aggression was measured by acceleration rate, verbal comments, gestures, and horn honking. The results showed that acceleration was quicker in the low status condition. However, none of the participants in either condition honked their horn and there were no significant differences when comparing the two conditions as far as verbal comments and gestures. McGarva and Steiner suggest that social status does contribute to driver aggression when it comes to instrumental aggression (speeding off).

A similar study done in Germany by Diekmann, Jungbauer-Gans, Krassnig, and Lorenz (1996) examined aggressive responses (honking and flashing lights) of drivers who were blocked at an intersection. It was found that the higher the class of their vehicle, the quicker the drivers were to display aggressive responses toward the car blocking them. They also found that the younger drivers were quicker to honk or flash their lights at the car blocking them, compared to the older drivers. Interestingly, contrary to Shinar’s study (1998), the day of the week did not result in any significant differences in aggressive behaviors.

Another factor that influences aggression in driving situations is whether one is aggressive in other situations. Lawton and Nutter (2002) found that individuals reported anger equally in both driving and non-driving experiences. However, in the driving situations, the participants reported displacing their anger more than in the non driving situations. They also
found that while driving, people with high anger levels, reported being more outwardly aggressive than when they were not driving.

In another similar study that compared aggression while driving to aggression in other activities, the results indicated that anger did occur more frequently when the participants were driving (Parkinson, 2001). This was found after they controlled for the almost 16 times greater amount of time people spend in activities other than driving. In other words, if you compared how often a person is angered when they spend 16 hours driving versus 16 hours engaged in other activities, the number will be higher while driving. The same would occur if you compared one hour of driving to one hour of non-driving activities. Parkinson believes this may be due to reports of low self-accountability while driving by the participants.

While the review of these studies on road rage and driving aggression has brought up conflicting results, one must note that the populations which were studied varied greatly. This suggests that among all the factors influencing driver aggressiveness and acts of road rage discussed above, societal norms should also be included. It is important for future researchers to compare driver aggression levels and acts of road rage across cultures in order to determine which societal characteristics increase the likelihood of such acts.
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