



The **effectiveness** of driver training as a road safety measure

INTRODUCTION

There is continuing public debate in Australia and overseas about the value of training for car drivers as a means of improving driver behaviour and reducing road crash involvement. This document provides an up-to-date summary of scientifically-based Australian and international research about the effectiveness of driver training programs for:

- learner drivers,
- young/recently licensed drivers, and
- experienced drivers.

Effectiveness means the degree to which driver training programs reduce the participant's risk of crashing compared with drivers who did not undertake such programs.

While driver training and driver education are not the same, these terms are often used synonymously (1-2). This summary deals with driver training rather than education per se. However, as many driver training programs have been termed "education" published materials labelled as both "driver education" and "driver training" are considered.

The effectiveness of driver training for learner drivers

Learner drivers are particular targets for driver training efforts of various types (3-5).

Pre-licence Training Programs

Various organizations or groups operate special driver training programs for learners and pre-learners. These programs usually aim to encourage the development of safe driving techniques, and can involve road law knowledge tuition and some in-car components, either on an off-road track or circuit, or on-road under supervision.

The research literature suggests that, beyond imparting basic car control and road law knowledge skills, these courses contribute little to post-licence reductions in casualty crashes or traffic violations (6-10).

In addition, some of these programs that have been made compulsory and offered through high schools in countries overseas, have not been found to be effective and may contribute to increased exposure-to-risk for young drivers, particularly females, by encouraging early solo licensing (11-14).

There is also considerable evidence that driver training that attempts to impart advanced skills such as skid control to learner drivers may contribute to increased crash risk, particularly among young males (15-17). This pattern of results has been confirmed and replicated across numerous studies conducted in Australia, New Zealand, North America, Europe and Scandinavia over the last 30 years (eg 18-26).

Evaluations of pre-licence training programs have generally found no significant differences between learners trained off-road (ie at off-road facilities that are not part of the road network) and those trained on-road, in real world driving conditions, in respect of subsequent crash or violation involvement (20, 25, 27-28). Off-road training is more expensive to provide than on-road training as off-road facilities are costly to build, operate and maintain (18-20). Such facilities



may also divert scarce funds away from more effective road safety initiatives and countermeasures.

Professional Driving Instruction for learners

Basic driver training works at an instructional level. Most people are initially trained to drive by a driving instructor, friends, relatives, or a combination of these, in order to obtain their driver licence. This type of driver training concentrates on basic car control skills, driving techniques, road law knowledge and initial driver licensing (6).

Greater levels of supervised, real world experience during the learner period have been shown to reduce post-licence crash involvement by up to about 35% (29). Comparisons of the post-licence crash experience of learners who were trained exclusively by professional driving instructors and those trained exclusively by parents, relatives or friends, is much the same (30). However, research shows that encouraging cooperation between driving schools and parents in teaching learners how to drive may be beneficial in increasing the quality of instruction, and the quantity of learner driver experience (31).

Research studies suggest that the best learning environment for the beginning driver is the real road system under the supervision of an experienced driver or instructor (17, 32). Learner drivers under supervision on-road have a low risk of crash involvement, probably the lowest of all driver groups (33). The accumulation of an on-road driving "experience bank" is perhaps the major potential contributor to reduced crash risk in solo driving for novice drivers.

The effectiveness of driver training for young and/or recently licensed drivers

Some young or recently licensed drivers attend post-licence driver training courses with the belief that this may improve their driving skills and reduce crash risk. At face value, this has some intuitive appeal. New drivers are at greatest crash risk in the first six months of solo driving (34). However, there would appear to be little evidence that training programs undertaken by young and/or recently licensed drivers are effective in reducing crash risk or traffic violations (35-37). Such training often leads to an increase in confidence and optimism bias (ie where novices can believe that they are more skillful than they actually are) and sometimes an increase in crash risk for novices, particularly young males (10, 13, 30).

From a theoretical perspective, there is support for the development and application of programs that target optimism bias, over-confidence and attitudinal or motivational factors that influence driving behaviour (17, 29, 38-39). Several programs using this approach - sometimes referred to as "Insight" training - have been trialled in Sweden (40) and the Netherlands (41) in recent years. Evaluations using

behavioural rather than crash-based methods have been undertaken. However, there is little evidence thus far that this type of training reduces crash/violation risk among novices as few crash-based studies of these newer approaches to training have been completed.

The effectiveness of driver training for experienced drivers

There is no sound evidence that either advanced or defensive driving courses reduce the crash involvement of experienced drivers who attend them (3-5). This is perhaps not surprising as such drivers, particularly those between the age of 25 and 59 years, are quite experienced and already have a relatively low crash risk per distance travelled.

There is evidence from US studies that some programs designed to reduce offence rates among drivers with a history of traffic violations may be effective, but this does not seem to translate into reduced crash involvement (42-44).

Driver training may be more effective in fleet settings than for drivers in general (4, 45-47). However, crash reductions among fleets that have been attributed to driver training programs often disappear when the effects of other factors are taken into account (45). Swedish research suggests that other more economical measures, such as group discussion on safety issues and incentive programs may be more effective in crash reduction terms than driver training programs (5, 48).

Why does driver training not seem to be effective in reducing crashes?

Promoting driver training as a means of improving driving skills and knowledge assumes that there are deficiencies in the skills or knowledge of drivers, and that these can be improved via training. It also assumes that these skill deficiencies increase the risk of crash involvement. These assumptions are largely false and based on beliefs not supported by research evidence (13, 49).

It may be unreasonable to expect driver training to deliver crash reductions (4, 50). Improving knowledge and skill does not always lead to a change in behaviour among drivers. Furthermore, a driver trainer has little control over the post-course behaviour of trainees, the motivation of trainees to apply what has been learned or the many other risk factors that may contribute to crash causation. Drivers, particularly young drivers, can and do take risks that have little to do with how much skill and/or knowledge they have, but much to do with motivation and psychological factors (4, 51-52). There is little real world evidence to suggest that driver training accelerates the development of hazard perception skills, or other cognitive skills. These skills can be developed via the experience of real world driving (10, 53). There is some emerging evidence



based on simulator research that some skills may be learned.

Some recent driver training programs claim to modify “attitudes”. Even if attitudes could be changed it would not necessarily be helpful as there is a poor causal relationship between attitude and actual behaviour (49, 54). In addition, driver training is unlikely to undo firmly established past learning nor alter motivation or change underlying personal values.

Alternatives to conventional driver training

Recent research suggests that alternative road safety initiatives may be more beneficial than conventional driver training, particularly among novice drivers. Alternatives worth considering include:

Increasing the amount of supervised on-road experience that learner drivers receive:

Recent research shows that learners who received about 118 hours of supervised experience had up to 35% fewer crashes than those who received only 41-47 hours (29). VicRoads, TAC, RACV and other road safety organisations are encouraging this approach in Victoria, where a minimum of 120 hours of supervised, on-road instruction/ experience prior to solo driving is advocated. Programs developed by VicRoads, TAC, and RACV encourage learners to gain greater supervised experience through cooperation between parents and driving instructors (33, 55-56).

A Different Type of Training:

Improvements in driver training may be achieved in the longer term by concentrating on cognitive and perceptual skills, together with a greater emphasis on how factors such as beliefs and motivation shape driver behaviour (9, 16). This would require a different type of training program than is currently offered. Education programs delivered over several years, perhaps through secondary schools, to foster development of safe belief /motivational factors, has also been suggested as an alternative to short-term driver training (57). While theoretically sound, the effectiveness of such programs in effecting changes in attitude, behaviour or crash risk is yet to be proven.

Higher Order Testing within a Graduated Driver Licensing Program:

Some graduated driver licensing (GLS) programs require novices to pass additional tests of higher-order skills to progress to less restricted licensing levels and to “graduate” to full licence status. Preliminary research from Victoria’s use of hazard perception testing within the probationary licensing system suggests that such tests can predict novice drivers likely to be at greater crash risk (59).

Comprehensive Fleet Management Safety Programs:

A combination of approaches can help reduce crash risk and involvement within company fleets (46, 48). A multifaceted approach to fleet safety dealing with the selection of vehicles (ie purchasing only vehicles with good crashworthiness features) and management of where, when and how vehicles are used may help reduce crash risk. Recent studies have identified ways of increasing fleet safety via the application of best practice approaches. This includes the implementation of integrated occupational health and safety policy and practices within the

organization to influence fleet vehicle selection, education about safe vehicle use for employees, incentives for crash free driving (not rewards) and the promotion of a safety culture within the organisation (60).

Enforcement: Police enforcement is effective, particularly when drivers understand that they will get caught and perhaps lose their license if they break the law (4). The most effective enforcement targets behaviour such as drink-driving, speeding and red light running.

Conclusions

Overall, the research evidence suggests that most current driver training contributes little to reductions in accident involvement or crash risk among drivers of all age and experience groups. Low individual crash risk and decay of learning work against the potential effectiveness of driver training programs that concentrate on car control skills or deal with rare events such as emergencies. The high motivation which trainees usually bring to driver training does not compensate for these factors.

Improving driver knowledge and skill does not always lead to a change in on-road behaviour or reduced crash risk among trainees. While skill and knowledge are important, particularly for novice drivers, they have little influence on the driving environment or conditions under which driving behaviour occurs post-training. On-road driving experience is the way most higher-order cognitive skills related to driving (eg hazard perception) are developed and maintained. Conventional driver training is unlikely to undo firmly established past learning laid down over weeks, months and years of practice and experience, nor alter motivation or personal values.

It is of concern that the provision of conventional driver training beyond that required to gain an initial driver licence often leads to increased crash risk among novice drivers. Research suggests that this is because the training can encourage earlier licensing, increase exposure-to-risk and/or unduly increase the confidence of novices about their driving abilities.

Resources committed to traditional driver education/ training may also divert scarce funds and community attention away from more effective initiatives likely to reduce crash risk.

A better alternative for novice drivers is to promote extensive supervised driving experience among learners. This approach has been taken up by most Australian driver licensing jurisdictions and some in North America via the implementation of Graduated Licensing schemes (GLS) which provide for and encourage learner drivers to gain more supervised, on-road driving experience before solo driving. However, this approach requires cooperation between novice drivers, parents (or supervisors) and professional driving instructors over a period of months and perhaps years.

Research and development in respect of driver training may eventually show some approaches to be useful in reducing casualty accident risk/involvement. In the interim, other approaches such as increased supervision and graduated licensing for novice drivers are likely to make greater and more lasting contributions to road safety.



may also divert scarce funds away from more effective road safety initiatives and countermeasures.

Professional Driving Instruction for learners

Basic driver training works at an instructional level. Most people are initially trained to drive by a driving instructor, friends, relatives, or a combination of these, in order to obtain their driver licence. This type of driver training concentrates on basic car control skills, driving techniques, road law knowledge and initial driver licensing (6).

Greater levels of supervised, real world experience during the learner period have been shown to reduce post-licence crash involvement by up to about 35% (29). Comparisons of the post-licence crash experience of learners who were trained exclusively by professional driving instructors and those trained exclusively by parents, relatives or friends, is much the same (30). However, research shows that encouraging cooperation between driving schools and parents in teaching learners how to drive may be beneficial in increasing the quality of instruction, and the quantity of learner driver experience (31).

Research studies suggest that the best learning environment for the beginning driver is the real road system under the supervision of an experienced driver or instructor (17, 32). Learner drivers under supervision on-road have a low risk of crash involvement, probably the lowest of all driver groups (33). The accumulation of an on-road driving "experience bank" is perhaps the major potential contributor to reduced crash risk in solo driving for novice drivers.

The effectiveness of driver training for young and/or recently licensed drivers

Some young or recently licensed drivers attend post-licence driver training courses with the belief that this may improve their driving skills and reduce crash risk. At face value, this has some intuitive appeal. New drivers are at greatest crash risk in the first six months of solo driving (34). However, there would appear to be little evidence that training programs undertaken by young and/or recently licensed drivers are effective in reducing crash risk or traffic violations (35-37). Such training often leads to an increase in confidence and optimism bias (ie where novices can believe that they are more skillful than they actually are) and sometimes an increase in crash risk for novices, particularly young males (10, 13, 30).

From a theoretical perspective, there is support for the development and application of programs that target optimism bias, over-confidence and attitudinal or motivational factors that influence driving behaviour (17, 29, 38-39). Several programs using this approach - sometimes referred to as "Insight" training - have been trialled in Sweden (40) and the Netherlands (41) in recent years. Evaluations using

behavioural rather than crash-based methods have been undertaken. However, there is little evidence thus far that this type of training reduces crash/violation risk among novices as few crash-based studies of these newer approaches to training have been completed.

The effectiveness of driver training for experienced drivers

There is no sound evidence that either advanced or defensive driving courses reduce the crash involvement of experienced drivers who attend them (3-5). This is perhaps not surprising as such drivers, particularly those between the age of 25 and 59 years, are quite experienced and already have a relatively low crash risk per distance travelled.

There is evidence from US studies that some programs designed to reduce offence rates among drivers with a history of traffic violations may be effective, but this does not seem to translate into reduced crash involvement (42-44).

Driver training may be more effective in fleet settings than for drivers in general (4, 45-47). However, crash reductions among fleets that have been attributed to driver training programs often disappear when the effects of other factors are taken into account (45). Swedish research suggests that other more economical measures, such as group discussion on safety issues and incentive programs may be more effective in crash reduction terms than driver training programs (5, 48).

Why does driver training not seem to be effective in reducing crashes?

Promoting driver training as a means of improving driving skills and knowledge assumes that there are deficiencies in the skills or knowledge of drivers, and that these can be improved via training. It also assumes that these skill deficiencies increase the risk of crash involvement. These assumptions are largely false and based on beliefs not supported by research evidence (13, 49).

It may be unreasonable to expect driver training to deliver crash reductions (4, 50). Improving knowledge and skill does not always lead to a change in behaviour among drivers. Furthermore, a driver trainer has little control over the post-course behaviour of trainees, the motivation of trainees to apply what has been learned or the many other risk factors that may contribute to crash causation. Drivers, particularly young drivers, can and do take risks that have little to do with how much skill and/or knowledge they have, but much to do with motivation and psychological factors (4, 51-52). There is little real world evidence to suggest that driver training accelerates the development of hazard perception skills, or other cognitive skills. These skills can be developed via the experience of real world driving (10, 53). There is some emerging evidence



based on simulator research that some skills may be learned.

Some recent driver training programs claim to modify “attitudes”. Even if attitudes could be changed it would not necessarily be helpful as there is a poor causal relationship between attitude and actual behaviour (49, 54). In addition, driver training is unlikely to undo firmly established past learning nor alter motivation or change underlying personal values.

Alternatives to conventional driver training

Recent research suggests that alternative road safety initiatives may be more beneficial than conventional driver training, particularly among novice drivers. Alternatives worth considering include:

Increasing the amount of supervised on-road experience that learner drivers receive:

Recent research shows that learners who received about 118 hours of supervised experience had up to 35% fewer crashes than those who received only 41-47 hours (29). VicRoads, TAC, RACV and other road safety organisations are encouraging this approach in Victoria, where a minimum of 120 hours of supervised, on-road instruction/ experience prior to solo driving is advocated. Programs developed by VicRoads, TAC, and RACV encourage learners to gain greater supervised experience through cooperation between parents and driving instructors (33, 55-56).

A Different Type of Training:

Improvements in driver training may be achieved in the longer term by concentrating on cognitive and perceptual skills, together with a greater emphasis on how factors such as beliefs and motivation shape driver behaviour (9, 16). This would require a different type of training program than is currently offered. Education programs delivered over several years, perhaps through secondary schools, to foster development of safe belief /motivational factors, has also been suggested as an alternative to short-term driver training (57). While theoretically sound, the effectiveness of such programs in effecting changes in attitude, behaviour or crash risk is yet to be proven.

Higher Order Testing within a Graduated Driver Licensing Program:

Some graduated driver licensing (GLS) programs require novices to pass additional tests of higher-order skills to progress to less restricted licensing levels and to “graduate” to full licence status. Preliminary research from Victoria’s use of hazard perception testing within the probationary licensing system suggests that such tests can predict novice drivers likely to be at greater crash risk (59).

Comprehensive Fleet Management Safety Programs:

A combination of approaches can help reduce crash risk and involvement within company fleets (46, 48). A multifaceted approach to fleet safety dealing with the selection of vehicles (ie purchasing only vehicles with good crashworthiness features) and management of where, when and how vehicles are used may help reduce crash risk. Recent studies have identified ways of increasing fleet safety via the application of best practice approaches. This includes the implementation of integrated occupational health and safety policy and practices within the

organization to influence fleet vehicle selection, education about safe vehicle use for employees, incentives for crash free driving (not rewards) and the promotion of a safety culture within the organisation (60).

Enforcement: Police enforcement is effective, particularly when drivers understand that they will get caught and perhaps lose their license if they break the law (4). The most effective enforcement targets behaviour such as drink-driving, speeding and red light running.

Conclusions

Overall, the research evidence suggests that most current driver training contributes little to reductions in accident involvement or crash risk among drivers of all age and experience groups. Low individual crash risk and decay of learning work against the potential effectiveness of driver training programs that concentrate on car control skills or deal with rare events such as emergencies. The high motivation which trainees usually bring to driver training does not compensate for these factors.

Improving driver knowledge and skill does not always lead to a change in on-road behaviour or reduced crash risk among trainees. While skill and knowledge are important, particularly for novice drivers, they have little influence on the driving environment or conditions under which driving behaviour occurs post-training. On-road driving experience is the way most higher-order cognitive skills related to driving (eg hazard perception) are developed and maintained. Conventional driver training is unlikely to undo firmly established past learning laid down over weeks, months and years of practice and experience, nor alter motivation or personal values.

It is of concern that the provision of conventional driver training beyond that required to gain an initial driver licence often leads to increased crash risk among novice drivers. Research suggests that this is because the training can encourage earlier licensing, increase exposure-to-risk and/or unduly increase the confidence of novices about their driving abilities.

Resources committed to traditional driver education/ training may also divert scarce funds and community attention away from more effective initiatives likely to reduce crash risk.

A better alternative for novice drivers is to promote extensive supervised driving experience among learners. This approach has been taken up by most Australian driver licensing jurisdictions and some in North America via the implementation of Graduated Licensing schemes (GLS) which provide for and encourage learner drivers to gain more supervised, on-road driving experience before solo driving. However, this approach requires cooperation between novice drivers, parents (or supervisors) and professional driving instructors over a period of months and perhaps years.

Research and development in respect of driver training may eventually show some approaches to be useful in reducing casualty accident risk/involvement. In the interim, other approaches such as increased supervision and graduated licensing for novice drivers are likely to make greater and more lasting contributions to road safety.

References

1. Horneman, C. (1993) Driver education and training: A review of the literature. Research Note RN 6/93. Rosebery, NSW: Roads and Traffic Authority (NSW) Road Safety Bureau.
2. Palmer, J.W. (1995). Prospects for improving driver training in the United States. In H.S. Simpson (Ed) (1996). New to the Road: Reducing the Risks for Young Motorists. Proceedings of the First Annual International Conference of the Youth Enhancement Service, June 8-11 1995. (pp 115-120). University of California: Los Angeles.
3. Saffron, D.G. (1981). Driver and rider education, training and licensing: A brief review. Report No. 4/81. Rosebery: Traffic Accident Research Unit, New South Wales.
4. Christie, R. (1996). Driver training - What have we learned? NRMA Today, Edition 12, 20-24.
5. Watson, B., Fresta, J., Whan, H., McDonald, J., Dray, R., Beuermann, C., & Churchward, R. (1996). Enhancing driver management in Queensland. Brisbane: Land transport & Safety Division, Queensland Transport.
6. McKnight, A.J (1992) Driver licensing in Victoria. Report No. 27. Clayton, Victoria, Monash University Accident Research Centre.
7. Henderson, M. (1991) Education, publicity and training in road safety: A literature review, Report No. 22. Clayton, Victoria: Monash University Accident Research Centre.
8. Lourens, P.F. (1993) Looking for evidence that driver education works. Driver/Education (Canada), March, 4-5.
9. Twisk, D. (1994) Experiences from countermeasures, including the role of driver instruction and training. In Proceedings - FERSI/OECD Driver Education and Training Workshop, October, Warsaw, Poland.
10. Mayhew, D. R. & Simpson, H.M. (1996). The Effectiveness and Role of Driver Education and training in a Graduated Licensing System. Ottawa, Ontario: Traffic Injury Research Foundation.
11. Levy, D.T. (1990). Youth and traffic safety: The effects of driving age, experience and education. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 22(4), 327-334.
12. Potvin, L. (1991). The Evaluation of a compulsory driver training policy: Quebec 1980-1984. In Proceedings - New to the Road Symposium: Prevention Measures for Young or New Drivers, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.
13. Woolley, J. (2000). In-car driver Training at High schools: A Literature Review. Report No. 6/2000. Adelaide: Transport SA.
14. Roberts, I., Kwan, I., & the Cochrane Injuries Group Driver Education Reviewers. School based driver education for the prevention of traffic crashes (Cochrane Review). In: The Cochrane Library, Issue 3, 2001. Oxford: Update Software.
15. Glad, A. (1988). Phase 2 Driver education, Effect on accident risk. Oslo, Norway: Transport Institute.
16. Lynam, D. (1995). Prospects of improving driver training in Europe. In H.S. Simpson (Ed) (1996). New to the Road: Reducing the Risks for Young Motorists. Proceedings of the First Annual International Conference of the Youth Enhancement Service, June 8-11 1995. (pp121-126). Los Angeles: University of California.
17. Gregersen, N.P. (1996). Young drivers' overestimation of their own skill: An experiment on the relation between training strategy and skill. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 28(2), 243-250.
18. Council, F.M., Roper, R.B. & Sadof, M.G. (1975). An evaluation of North Carolina's multi-range program in driver education: A comparison of driving histories of range and non-range students. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center.
19. Dreyer, D. & Janke, M. (1979). The effects of range versus non-range driver training on the accident and conviction frequencies of young drivers. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 11(3), 179-198.
20. Strang, P.M., Deutsch, K.B., James R.S., and Manders S.M., (1982). A comparison of on-road and off-road driver training. Report No. 1/82 SR. Hawthorn, Victoria: Road Safety & Traffic Authority.
21. Stock, J.R., Weaver, I.K., Ray, H.W., Brink, T.R. and Sadof, M.G. (1983). Evaluation of safe performance, secondary school driver education curriculum demonstration project. Final Report. Springfield, VA, USA: National Technical Information Services.
22. Wynne-Jones, J.D. & Hurst, P. (1985). The AA Driver Training Evaluation. Traffic Research Report No. 33. Wellington, New Zealand: NZ Ministry of Transport.
23. Lund, A.K. Williams, A.F., Zador, P. (1986). High school driver education. Further evaluation of the De Kalb county study. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 18 (4), 349-357.
24. Langford, J. (1998). Further Evaluation of Tasmania's Pre-Driver Education program. Hobart: Road Safety Branch, Department of Transport, Tasmania.
25. Haworth, N., Kowalco, N. & Tingvall, C. (2000). Evaluation of pre-driver education program. Report No. 167. Clayton, Victoria: Monash University Accident Research Centre.
26. McKenna, C.K., Yost, B., Muzenrider, R.F. & Young, M.L. (2000). Program evaluation of Pennsylvania's Driver Education Program. Harrisburg, PA.: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.
27. Roads & Traffic Authority (RTA) (1996). Defensive and advanced driver training. In Proceedings of Drivers as Workers, Vehicles as Workplaces: Issues in Fleet Management seminar. Staysafe Report No 9/51, Parliament of NSW Joint Standing Committee on Road Safety: Sydney. 129-135
28. Christie, R. (2000). Off-road facilities for traffic safety education and novice driver training- A cautionary tale. In Proceedings of the Saferoads, Local Government Road Safety Conference, Melbourne, Australia, 20-21 July.
29. Gregersen, N.P. (1997). Evaluation of 16-years age limit for Driver training. First report No. 418A. Linköping, Sweden: VTI (Swedish National Road & Transport Research Institute;
30. Lynam, D. and Twisk, D. (1995). Car Driver Training and Licensing Systems in Europe - Report prepared by members of Forum of European Road Research Institutes (FERSI) and supported by European Commission Transport Directorate (DG VII), Report No. 147. Crowthorne (UK): Transport Research Laboratory (TRL).
31. Gregersen, N.P. (1994). Systematic co-operation between driving schools and parents in driver education. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 26(4), 453-461.
32. Mayhew, D. R. & Simpson, H.M. (1995). The Role of Driving Experience: Implications for the Training and Licensing of New Drivers. Insurance Bureau of Canada: Toronto.
33. VicRoads (1998). Getting there from Ls to Ps : A Step-by-Step Guide for Learners and Supervising Drivers Author: Kew.
34. VicRoads. (2000) Road Safety Strategy for Victoria 2000-2005 Discussion Paper. Kew: Author.
35. Holubowycz, O.T., and McLean, A.J. (1980). Evaluation of a road safety program for automotive apprentices. Adelaide, SA: Road Accident Research Unit, University of Adelaide.
36. Payne, S., Brownlea, & Hall, A. (1984). Evaluation of Queensland defensive driving course. Report No. CR 27. Canberra: Federal Office of Road Safety.
37. Watson, B. (1994). Driver education and training: An overview of the evidence and the implications for young drivers. Brisbane. Queensland Transport.
38. Gregersen, N.P. (1995). What should be taught? Basic vehicle control skills or higher order skills? In H.S. Simpson (Ed) (1996). New to the Road: Reducing the Risks for Young Motorists. Proceedings of the First Annual International Conference of the Youth Enhancement Service, June 8-11 1995. (pp103-114). University of California: Los Angeles.
39. Gregersen, N.P. & Bjurulf, P. (1996). Young novice drivers own skill: Towards a model of their accident involvement. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 28(2), 229-241.
40. Nyberg, A. & Engstrom, I. (1999). The driver training concept "The Insight" - an evaluation. VTI Report No. 443A (English Summary). Linköping: Swedish National Road & transport Research Institute (VTI).
41. Siegrist, S (Ed) (1999). Driver Training, Testing & Licensing - towards theory-based management of young drivers' injury risk in road traffic. Results of EU Project GADGET, Work Package 3. Berne: Schweizerische Beratungsstelle für Unfallverhütung (BFU).
42. Brown, I.D., Grueger J.A. and Biehl, B. (1987). Is driver training contributing enough to road safety? In Rothengatter, J.A. and de Bruin, R.A. (Eds). Road Users and Traffic Safety, Assen/Maastricht, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
43. Struckman-Johnson, D.L. Lund, A.K. Williams, A.F. and Osborne, D.W. (1989). Comparative effects of driver improvement programs on crashes and violations. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 21(3), 203-215.
44. McKnight, A.J. & Stewart, M.A. (1990). Final report: Development of a competency based driver licence testing system. Sacramento, California.: Department of Motor Vehicles.
45. Manders, S.A. (1986). Fleet management techniques. An investigation of the effectiveness of various techniques on vehicle collision prevention. Report GR 86/17. Hawthorn, Victoria: Road Traffic Authority.
46. Christie, R. (1991). Driver Training/Education: The Wrong Place to Start in Safe Fleet Management?, Paper presented to Australian Fleet Magazine's Fleet Management Conference. Melbourne and Sydney, September.
47. Lord, P. (2000). Advanced blindness: Advanced driver training produces safer drivers, right? Maybe, maybe not, say the experts. Wheels Magazine, 21-23.
48. VTI - Swedish Road and Traffic Research Institute (1990). Traffic safety in the Telecommunications Administration, in VTI Annual Report 1989/90. Linköping, Sweden: Author.
49. Watson, B. (1997). When common sense just won't do: misconceptions about changing the behaviour of road users. In Bullen & Troutbeck (Eds). The Second International Conference on Accident Investigation, Reconstruction, Interpretation & the Law: Proceedings, 20-23 October 1997 (pp347-359): Brisbane.
50. Smith, D.L. (1983). The De Kalb driver education project. The same mistakes: improper criteria. Journal of Traffic Safety Education. 2, 14.
51. McKnight, A.J & Resnick, J. (1993). Youthful driver at risk workshop: Background issue paper. In K.Young (Ed). (1993). Workshop to Identify Training Requirements Designed to Reduce Young Driver Risk Taking and improve Decision Making Skills. Report No. DOT HS 808 066. Washington, DC: US Dept of Transportation, National Highway Traffic safety Administration.
52. Catchpole, J., Cairney, P. & Macdonald, W. (1994). Why are young drivers over-represented in traffic accidents? Special Report No. 50. Vermont South, Victoria.: Australian Road Research Board.
53. Williams, A.F. & Mayhew, D.R. (1999). Graduated Licensing: A Blueprint for North America. Arlington, VA, USA: Insurance institute for Highway Safety.
54. Elliot, B. (1992). Report on Achieving High Levels of compliance with road safety Laws - A review of road user behaviour modification. Report No. 6. Brisbane: Travelsafe Committee, Legislative Assembly of Queensland.
55. Cavallo, A. & Harrison, W. (1998). Guidelines and logbooks for learner drivers. In I.J. Faulks, K.B. Smith & K.P. Smith (Eds). Young drivers: Proceedings of a conference on young drivers held by the Staysafe Committee of the Parliament of New South Wales and the Australian College of Road safety; Parliament House, Sydney(NSW), 30 April 1997 (pp111-118); Parliament of New South Wales.
56. Cockfield, S. & Healy, D. (1999). HELP - An integrated communications approach targeting young driver safety. In Proceedings of Road Safety Research, Policing & Education Conference 1999 (Volume 1, pp299-304). November, University House, Canberra.
57. Brown, I.D. (1997). How traffic and transport systems can benefit from psychology. In T. Rothengatter & E. Carbonell Vaya (Eds). Traffic and Transport Psychology: Theory and Application (pp 9-20). Amsterdam: Pergamon.
58. Roads & Traffic Authority (RTA) (2000). New Drivers' Handbook. Surry Hills, Sydney: Author.
59. Congdon, P. (1999). VicRoads Hazard perception test, can it predict accidents? Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER).
60. Haworth, N., Tingvall, C. & Kowalco, N. (2000a). Review of best practice road safety initiatives in the corporate and/or business environment. Report No. 166. Clayton, Victoria.: Monash University Accident Research Centre



This monograph is based on a report prepared for RACV by Dr Ron Christie of RCSC Services called "The Effectiveness of Driver training as a Road Safety Measure: A review of the literature".