

Research Paper

## Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults

C. Harshini<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Deviga Subramani<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Young adults often experience existential concerns like mortality salience and death anxiety, contributing to risky driving behaviours. Research suggests that Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) and Self-Efficacy influence driving outcomes. This study used standardized scales to examine relationships among Aggressive Driving Behaviour, T-LOC, Death anxiety, and Self-efficacy in a sample of 374 young adults. Results indicated that Self-efficacy and Death anxiety significantly predicted conflict behaviour. Additionally, death anxiety and the Fate domain of T-LOC significantly predicted speeding behaviour ( $p < .05$ ). The findings emphasize the significance of fostering an internal locus of control, managing self-efficacy, and reducing death anxiety to promote safer driving practices.

**Keywords:** *Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety, Aggressive Driving, Young Adults*

Safe driving behaviour is crucial for preventing accidents and maintaining smooth traffic flow. Young drivers aged 18 to 25 are likely to engage in risky driving, with factors like overestimating abilities, immaturity, inexperience, and risk-taking being primary causes of accidents (Gicquel et al., 2017; Hildebrandt, 2019). Understanding and analysing driving behaviour is essential for maintaining road safety.

### Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is the belief that one can accomplish a certain task. Rike et al. (2015) found that driving self-efficacy and functional abilities in individuals post-brain injury remained unchanged. However, lower self-efficacy beliefs were linked to driver errors and inattention, decreased driving mileage, and increased use of compensatory driving measures. Suh et al. (2017) found that self-efficacy was positively correlated with health promotion behaviour in taxi drivers, suggesting that education programs should focus on techniques to raise self-efficacy to promote health promotion behaviours.

### Death Anxiety

Death anxiety is an emotional manifestation of mortality awareness, and psychological buffers like worldviews and self-esteem protect against this awareness. The Terror

<sup>1</sup>MSc. Clinical Psychology, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru, India.

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru, India.

\*Corresponding Author

Received: December 13, 2024; Revision Received: March 28, 2025; Accepted: March 31, 2025

## **Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults**

Management Theory suggests that when mortality salience is combined with death anxiety, individuals may defend themselves or their social group when threatened (Pyszczynski et al., 2015). Israeli soldiers with driving abilities that were relevant to their self-esteem were more likely to engage in reckless driving after being reminded of mortality (Ben-Ari et al., 1999). Carey and Sarma (2011) examined the influence of threat appeal messages on risky driving intentions in the context of the terror management theory in which participants with high driving related self-esteem when presented with death-related facts and images, expressed an increased willingness to take driving risks compared to those given neutral information. This suggests that death reminders can trigger terror management mechanisms, leading to attempts to improve and validate one's self-esteem, even in actions that may endanger life (Ben-Ari, 2019).

### **Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC)**

The Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) is a personality attribute that reflects drivers' perceptions of traffic accidents, influenced by factors such as self, other drivers, vehicle or environment, and fate. Ozkan and Lajunen (2005) found that Internal locus of control orientation (Self) in the Multidimensional Traffic Locus of Control Scale was found to be predictive of the self-reported number of overall accidents, active accidents, offenses, aggressive and ordinary violations, and errors. Huang et al. (2012) found that driver training can induce change in locus of control, decreasing externality and increasing internality, ultimately improving safe driving behaviours. Choi et al. (2015) found a positive correlation between reckless driving behaviour and external locus of control, specifically the belief in fate. External factors like "Fate" and "Interpersonal Anger" were positively correlated with driving behaviour, including avoiding problems, stimulus seeking, aggression, and interpersonal anger. Măirean & Havârneanu (2019) found that mortality salience interacts with external traffic locus of control and the relevance of driving for self-esteem in predicting risky driving behaviour.

### **Aggressive Driving Behaviour**

Aggressive driving behaviour consists of i) conflict behaviour, which includes aggressive behaviours exhibited towards other drivers, and ii) speeding behaviour, which consists of driving at higher speeds (Houston et al., 2003). Compared to non-aggressive drivers, aggressive drivers drive 5.32 km/h faster on average and commit 2.51 times more driving errors (Su et al., 2023). Javid et al. (2021) found that attitudes, behavioural control, personality traits, and traffic awareness influence drivers' speeding behaviour. Perceived behavioural control and attitudes towards speeding behaviour have a negative correlation with speeding behavioural intentions, while traffic enforcement and awareness factors have a positive correlation with behavioural intentions. Speeding intentions are also influenced by factors like marital status, car drivers, and vehicle engine capacity. Tanglai et al. (2022) found that drivers with high scores for anger and normlessness, high education, and more working days are more likely to report risky driving behaviour. Shamo-Nir (2023) found that higher state-trait anxiety was associated with hostile aggressive behaviours. Problem focused coping style was found to reduce hostile aggressive driving.

Few studies have explored the relationship among self-efficacy, traffic locus of control, death anxiety, and aggressive driving behaviour, particularly among young adults. This is in contrast to the growing individual research on these factors. Understanding these psychological factors' influence on driving behaviours is crucial for developing educational measures and initiatives that promote safer driving and improve psychological health.

## METHODOLOGY

### *Hypotheses*

- Hypothesis 1: There is a significant relationship between death anxiety and the aggressive driving behaviour of young adults.
- Hypothesis 2: Conflict behaviour during driving in young adults can be explained by death anxiety and self-efficacy.
- Hypothesis 3: Speeding behaviour in young adults can be explained by death anxiety and Traffic locus of control.

### *Sampling and Data collection*

The sample size is 374, consisting of 245 females and 129 males across various states in India, aged 18 to 25. Data was collected through questionnaires after seeking informed consent and assurance of confidentiality. Purposive sampling was used and data was collected through online circulation of the questionnaire.

### *Inclusion criteria*

Young adults aged 18 to 25 years who drive a two-wheeler or four-wheeler vehicle were included in the study.

### *Exclusion criteria*

Eligible participants were not diagnosed with any psychiatric illness that affects comprehension or chronic illness.

### **Measures**

Self-efficacy is measured using the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (Chen et al., 2001), Death anxiety is measured using the Scale of Death Anxiety (SDA) (Cai et al., 2017), Locus of Control is measured using the Multidimensional Traffic Locus of Control Scale (Özkan & Lajunen, 2005) and Driving Behaviour is assessed using Aggressive Driving Behaviour Scale (Houston et al., 2003).

- **New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE):** The scale, with 8 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale, has a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value of 0.87 and a test-retest reliability value of 0.64. It has adequate content and discriminant validity, with NGSE having better construct validity compared to the SGSE scale (Chen et al., 2001).
- **Multidimensional Traffic Locus of Control Scale (T-LOC):** This questionnaire consists of 17 items, 5 for internal T-LOC and 12 for external T-LOC. Participants rate their driving style and external conditions on a 5-point Likert scale. The scale has a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value of 0.92, indicating strong reliability (Hwang et al., 2018). Factor analysis confirms the distinctiveness of subscales- Self, Others, Vehicle and Environment, and Fate. The scale successfully predicts accidents and aggressive violations (Özkan & Lajunen, 2005).
- **Scale of Death Anxiety (SDA):** A five-point Likert scale with 17 items rated on four dimensions: dysphoria, death intrusion, fear of death, and avoidance of death, showed good internal consistency (Cai et al., 2017). Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for dysphoria, death intrusion, fear of death, and avoidance of death was 0.80, 0.78, 0.77, and 0.57 respectively. Depression, trait anxiety, and the effect of traumatic experiences were significantly positively correlated with total Scale of death anxiety (SDA), while subject happiness was negatively correlated.

## Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults

- Aggressive Driving Behaviour Scale:** The scale has 10 items and 2 subscales- conflict behaviour and speeding behaviour- to assess participants' frequency of 11 behaviours over the past six months. The scale, with a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value of 0.80, showed a significant positive correlation with the Cook Medley Hostility scale, Driving Aggression scale, and Hyper competitiveness attitude scale. The overall measure and its subscales were found to correlate with feelings and thoughts related to aggressive driving, hyper competitiveness, and hostility (Houston et al., 2003).

### Data Analysis

The statistical program jamovi (Version 2.5) was used for data analysis. The results of the study are calculated and described in the following sections. Descriptive statistics, correlation and multiple regression analyses are computed.

## RESULTS

Hypothesis one proposed that there is a significant relationship between death anxiety and the aggressive driving behaviour of young adults. Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed to assess the linear relationship between death anxiety, conflict behaviour, speeding behaviour, and aggressive driving behaviour.

**Table No.1 Correlation Matrix for Death Anxiety and Aggressive Driving Behavior**

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	1
1. Death Anxiety	40.1	15.2	—
2. Conflict Behavior	20.0	6.65	0.34***
3. Speeding Behavior	8.29	3.12	0.29***
4. Aggressive Driving Behaviour	28.3	9.06	0.35***

Note: \*\*\* Correlation is significant at 0.001 level (2-tailed)

There is a significant positive relationship between death anxiety, conflict behaviour, speeding behaviour, and aggressive driving behaviour. There is a weak positive correlation between death anxiety and conflict behaviour,  $r(372) = .34, p = .001$ , and a weak positive correlation between death anxiety and speeding behaviour,  $r(372) = .29, p = .001$ . Additionally, there was a weak positive correlation between death anxiety and aggressive driving behaviour, which comprises the two domains- conflict behaviour and aggressive driving behaviour,  $r(372) = .35, p = .001$ . Thus, there is enough evidence to support hypothesis one.

Hypothesis two proposed that Conflict behaviours during driving, in young adults can be explained by death anxiety and self-efficacy. A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between death anxiety, self-efficacy, and conflict behaviour.

**Table No. 2 Model Fit Measures for Predicting Conflict Behaviour from Self Efficacy and Death anxiety**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	df1	df2	p
1	0.37	0.13	0.13	28.7	2	371	< .001

Note: R<sup>2</sup> adjusted = .13 ( $p < .001$ );  $F(2,371) = 28.7$

**Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults**

***Multiple Regression Coefficients for Predicting Conflict Behaviour from Self Efficacy and Death anxiety***

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate	95% CI [LL, UL]
Intercept	7.91	2.36	3.36	<.001		
Self-Efficacy	0.18	0.07	2.83	0.005	0.14	[.04, .24]
Death Anxiety	0.16	0.02	7.46	<.001	0.37	[.27, .47]

Note:  $R^2$  adjusted = .13 ( $p < .001$ );  $F(2,371) = 28.7$

The overall model was significant,  $F(2, 371) = 28.7$ ,  $p < .001$ , and accounted for approximately 13% of the variance in conflict behaviour ( $R^2 = 0.13$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.13$ ). The regression coefficients indicate that both death anxiety ( $\beta = 0.37$ ,  $SE = 0.02$ ,  $t = 7.46$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [0.27, 0.47]) and self-efficacy ( $\beta = 0.14$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $t = 2.83$ ,  $p = .005$ , 95% CI [0.04, 0.24]) are significant predictors of conflict behaviour with 95% confidence interval. For every one standard deviation increase in death anxiety, conflict behaviour is predicted to increase by 0.37 units, holding self-efficacy constant. And, for every one standard deviation increase in self-efficacy, conflict behaviour is predicted to increase by 0.14 units, holding death anxiety constant. The intercept for the model was significant,  $b = 7.91$ ,  $t(371) = 3.36$ ,  $p < .001$  indicating that the expected value of conflict behaviour is not zero when predictors are zero. These results suggest that higher levels of death anxiety and self-efficacy are associated with greater conflict behaviour.

***Table No. 3 Model Fit Measures for Predicting Conflict Behaviour from Dimensions in Death Anxiety***

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	df1	df2	p
1	0.36	0.13	0.13	13.5	4	369	<.001

Note:  $R^2$  adjusted = .13 ( $p < .001$ );  $F(4,369) = 13.5$

***Regression Coefficients for Predicting Conflict Behaviour from Dimensions in Death Anxiety***

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate	95% CI [LL, UL]
Intercept	13.47	0.96	13.94	<.001		
Dysphoria	-0.11	0.14	-0.79	0.429	-0.07	[-.25, .11]
Fear of Death	0.23	0.10	2.30	0.022	0.19	[.03, .35]
Avoidance of Death	0.35	0.13	2.68	0.008	0.16	[.04, .27]
Death Intrusion	0.19	0.09	2.29	0.023	0.16	[.02, .29]

Note:  $R^2$  adjusted = .13 ( $p < .001$ );  $F(4,369) = 13.5$

Multiple linear regression was computed to examine whether different dimensions of death anxiety (Dysphoria, Fear of Death, Avoidance of death and Death Intrusion) significantly predict conflict behaviour. The overall model was significant,  $F(4, 369) = 13.5$ ,  $p < .001$  and explained 12.8% of the variance in conflict behaviour ( $R^2 = 0.13$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.13$ ) with 95% confidence interval.

The regression analysis showed that the Fear of Death ( $\beta = 0.19$ ,  $SE = 0.1$ ,  $t = 2.301$ ,  $p = .022$ , 95% CI [0.3, 0.35]), Avoidance of Death ( $\beta = 0.16$ ,  $SE = 0.1286$ ,  $t = 2.685$ ,  $p = .008$ ,

**Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults**

95% CI [0.4, 0.27]), and Death Intrusion ( $\beta = .16$  SE = 0.09,  $t = 2.287$ ,  $p = .023$ , 95% CI [0.2, 0.29]) are significant predictors of conflict behaviour, while Dysphoria ( $\beta = -0.07$ , SE = 0.14,  $t = -0.79$ ,  $p = .43$ , 95% CI [-.25, 0.11]) does not significantly predict conflict behaviour. This suggests that higher levels of Fear of Death, Avoidance of Death, and Death Intrusion are associated with increased conflict behaviour, while Dysphoria does not have a significant impact on conflict behaviour in this model. Hence, there is enough evidence to support hypothesis two.

Hypothesis three proposed that Speeding behaviours in young adults can be explained by death anxiety and Traffic locus of control. A multiple regression analysis was computed to examine whether Death Anxiety and Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) significantly predict speeding behaviour.

**Table No. 4 Model Fit Measures and Regression Coefficients for Predicting Speeding Behaviour from T-LOC**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	df1	df2	p
1	0.29	0.09	0.08	17.4	2	371	< .001

Note: R<sup>2</sup> adjusted = .08 ( $p < .001$ );  $F(2,371) = 17.4$

**Regression Coefficients for Predicting Speeding Behaviour from T-LOC**

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate	95% CI [LL, UL]
Intercept	4.84	1.03	4.68	< .001		
Death Anxiety	0.06	0.01	5.52	< .001	0.28	[.18, .38]
T-LOC	0.02	0.018	1.16	0.246	0.06	[-.04, .16]

Note: R<sup>2</sup> adjusted = .08 ( $p < .001$ );  $F(2,371) = 17.4$

The model was significant,  $F(2, 371) = 17.4$ ,  $p < .001$ , accounting for approximately 8.0% of the variance in speeding behaviour ( $R^2 = .08$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .081$ ).

The regression analysis indicated that Death Anxiety significantly predicts speeding behaviour ( $\beta = 0.28$ , SE = 0.01,  $t = 5.52$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [0.18, 0.38]), indicating that as Death Anxiety increases, speeding behaviour also increases. However, Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) does not significantly predict speeding behaviour ( $\beta = .06$ , SE = 0.02,  $t = 1.16$ ,  $p = 0.25$ , 95% CI [-.04, 0.16]). This suggests that while Death Anxiety has a significant impact on speeding behaviour, T-LOC does not significantly predict speeding behaviour in this model.

**Table 5 Model Fit Measures for Predicting Speeding Behaviour from Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) Dimensions**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	df1	df2	p
1	0.28	0.08	0.07	8.00	4	369	< .001

Note: R<sup>2</sup> adjusted = .07 ( $p < .001$ );  $F(4, 369) = 8.0$

**Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults**

***Regression coefficients for Predicting Speeding Behaviour from Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) Dimensions***

<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>Stand. Estimate</b>	<b>95% CI [LL, UL]</b>
Intercept	6.09	1.03	5.89	<.001		
Other drivers	-0.01	0.05	-0.26	0.794	-0.02	[-.14, .11]
Self	0.08	0.04	1.85	0.066	0.1	[-.01, .21]
Vehicle & Environment	-0.15	0.09	-1.71	0.088	-0.11	[-.23, .02]
Fate	0.32	0.07	4.99	<.001	0.26	[.15, .36]

*Note: R<sup>2</sup> adjusted = .07 (p < .001); F (4, 369) = 8.0*

A multiple regression analysis was computed to examine the extent to which the dimensions of Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC): Other drivers, Self, Vehicle & Environment, and Fate predict speeding behaviour. The model was significant,  $F(4, 369) = 8.00$ ,  $p < .001$ , accounting for approximately 7.0% of the variance in speeding behaviour ( $R^2 = 0.08$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.07$ ).

The regression analysis showed that the dimension of "Fate" within the T-LOC significantly predicts speeding behaviour ( $\beta = 0.26$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ ,  $t = 4.994$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [0.15, 0.36]), suggesting that individuals who attribute traffic outcomes to fate are more likely to engage in speeding behaviour. The other dimensions of T-LOC—Other drivers ( $\beta = -0.02$ ,  $p = 0.79$ , 95% CI [-.14, .11]), Self ( $\beta = .08$ ,  $p = 0.066$ , 95% CI [-.01, .21]), and Vehicle & Environment ( $\beta = -0.11$ ,  $p = 0.09$ , 95% CI [-0.23, 0.02])—did not significantly predict speeding behaviour. This shows that among the T-LOC dimensions, only the belief in fate significantly contributes to predicting speeding behaviour in this model. Thus, there is partial evidence to support hypothesis three.

## **DISCUSSION**

This study examined the predictive relationships between self-efficacy, death anxiety, Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) and aggressive driving behaviour consisting of two domains- conflict behaviour and speeding behaviour.

There is found to be a significant positive relationship between death anxiety and aggressive driving behaviour indicating that higher levels of death anxiety are associated with increased levels of conflict behaviour and speeding behaviour. Anxious drivers who are aggressive tend to change lanes more quickly, which increases the likelihood of accidents (Adavikottu & Velaga, 2024). The result is consistent with existing research stating that mortality salience is associated with actual risk-taking (Miller & Mulligan, 2002), and higher intentions for reckless driving when driving were thought to be relevant to self-esteem.

Death anxiety and self-efficacy are found to be significant positive predictors of conflict behaviour implying that individuals with high levels of death anxiety and high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to exhibit conflict behaviour while driving. Risky driving tendencies are increased by mortality salience, particularly in individuals with low control desirability (Alper & Özkan, 2015). The results of the study are consistent with the Terror Management Theory which contends that taking more risks can be a reaction to mortality salience, serving as a buffer against death anxiety.

## Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults

Death anxiety is found to be a significant predictor of speeding behaviour, but Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) as a variable did not significantly predict speeding behaviour. However, the domain “Fate” in Traffic Locus of Control significantly predicts speeding behaviour implying that a belief that driving outcomes are controlled by fate, is associated with increased speeding behaviour. According to Becheur & Guizani (2017) belief in fate may reduce proactive risk management or preventive health behaviour. According to Qu et al. (2023), driving errors were positively predicted by self-attribution and attribution to vehicle/environment and fate attribution, while being negatively predicted by an external locus of control.

The results in this study showed that except Fate, the other domains in T-LOC: Self, Other drivers, Vehicle and Environment do not significantly predict speeding behaviour. Self-attribution may be related to errors in driving rather than speeding and maybe influenced by stress and situational pressures. The domain “Other drivers” involves interaction with other drivers rather than speeding which can explain why the domain does not predict speeding behaviour. Speeding maybe influenced by personality traits like risk perception, sensation-seeking, traffic conditions and social influence (Ertaş and Kırlar-Can, 2023). Additionally, the adrenaline rush experienced while speeding may increase the likelihood of engaging in speeding behaviour. There is a complex interplay of self-efficacy, death anxiety, and Traffic Locus of Control, which exert influence on aggressive driving behaviour. Drivers high in self-efficacy and death anxiety may engage in increased conflict behaviour and speeding behaviour. Although higher self-efficacy is generally linked to better outcomes, in this context, it may increase the likelihood of engaging in conflict behaviour. This might occur because people with higher self-efficacy may feel inclined to asserting themselves, even in aggressive driving situations. Similarly, drivers who attribute traffic outcomes to fate in Traffic Locus of Control may tend to exhibit increased speeding behaviour. This creates a dire need for interventions to modify the attribution of traffic outcomes to fate and as well as to address death anxiety. Psychological research and interventions are required to study and manage the negative impact of having high self-efficacy in this context.

### *Limitations and Future Directions*

Due to the sample size consisting of unequal number of males and females, there is limited potential for generalization due to unequal representation of females and males in this sample. Due to the cross-sectional nature of the study, the changes in the variables with increasing age are not examined and the findings of the study have limited generalizability to older adults or individuals who drive other types of vehicles. The questionnaire used to measure aggressive driving behaviour was standardized outside India, indicating possible cultural differences in driving. Future research is needed to understand the direction of influence between self-efficacy, death anxiety, and conflict behaviour. A longitudinal design of the study could better understand the causal pathways. There is also a need for interventions to counterbalance the negative impact of high self-efficacy levels on aggressive driving behaviour. Driver education programs and psychological interventions specifically addressing the attribution of driving outcomes to external factors, such as fate are needed to reduce the likelihood of aggressive driving behaviour.

## **CONCLUSION**

The study found that self-efficacy, death anxiety, and the fate domain of Traffic Locus of Control (T-LOC) increase aggressive driving in young adults. Future research should examine personality traits, stress, cultural, and situational factors to understand driving

## Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults

behaviour better. The link between self-efficacy and T-LOC emphasizes fostering an internal locus of control to enhance self-efficacy. Further research is needed on balancing self-efficacy, reducing death anxiety, and strengthening internal locus of control to promote safe driving practices.

### REFERENCES

- Adavikottu, A., & Velaga, N. R. (2024). Modeling the impact of driving aggression on lane change performance Measures: Steering compensatory Behaviour, lane change execution duration and crash probability. *Transportation Research Part F Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, *103*, 526–553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2024.05.001>
- Alper, S., & Özkan, T. (2015). Do internals speed less and externals speed more to cope with the death anxiety? *Transportation Research Part F Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, *32*, 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2015.05.002>
- Becheur, I., & Guizani, H. (2017). Free Will or Determinism: When Fate Attributions Affect Persuasion in Road Safety Campaigns Using Fear and Guilt—An Extended Abstract. In: Rossi, P. (eds) *Marketing at the Confluence between Entertainment and Analytics. Developments in Marketing Science: Proceedings of the Academy of Marketing Science*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47331-4\\_104](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47331-4_104)
- Ben-Ari, O. T. —., & Skvirsky, V. (2019). The Terror Management Underpinnings of risky behaviour. In *Elsevier eBooks* (pp. 559–576). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-811844-3.00023-8>
- Ben-Ari, O. T. —., Florián, V., & Mikulincer, M. (1999). The impact of mortality salience on reckless driving: A test of terror management mechanisms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(1), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.35>
- Cai, W., Tang, Y., Wu, S., & Li, H. (2017). Scale of Death Anxiety (SDA): development and validation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00858>
- Carey, R. N., & Sarma, K. M. (2011). The impact of threat appeal messages on risky driving intentions: A Terror Management Theory perspective. *Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety*, *22*(4), 51-56. (PDF) The impact of threat appeal messages on risky driving intentions: A Terror Management Theory perspective
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a New General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, *4*(1), 62-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Choi, B., Oh, J., Park, S., & Lee, S. (2015). The relationship between multidimensional traffic locus of control and reckless driving behaviour. *The Korean Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *28*(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.24230/kjio.p.v28i1.1-22>
- Ertaş, M., & Kırlar-Can, B. (2023). Recreational motorcyclists: the relationships among sensation seeking, risk perception, fear, and risk handling. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *27*(10), 1631–1648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2023.2214718>
- Gicquel, L., Ordonneau, P., Blot, E., Toillon, C., Ingrand, P., & Romo, L. (2017). Description of various factors contributing to traffic accidents in youth and measures proposed to alleviate recurrence. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *8*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00094>
- Hildebrandt, S. (2019). The Influence of Personality and Self-Efficacy on Young Drivers and their Driving Behaviour [Bachelor's thesis, University of Twente]. The Influence of Personality and Self-Efficacy on Young Drivers and their Driving Behaviour - University of Twente Student Theses

**Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults**

- Houston, J., Harris, P., & Norman, M., (2003). The Aggressive Driving Behaviour Scale: Developing a self-report measure of unsafe driving practices. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 5, 269-278. (PDF) The Aggressive Driving Behaviour Scale: Developing a self-report measure of unsafe driving practices
- Huang, S., Du, H., & Qu, C. (2021). Emotional responses to mortality salience: Behavioural and ERPs evidence. *PLOS ONE*, 16(3), e0248699. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248699>
- Hwang, Y., Kim, D., Jang, B., & Choi, H. K. (2018). The Mediation Effect of Traffic Locus of Control on the Relationships between Psychological Characteristics and Reckless Driving of Drivers. *2018 International Conference on Information and Communication Technology Convergence (ICTC)*. doi:10.1109/ictc.2018.8539446
- Javid, M. A., Ali, N., Shah, S. a. H., & Abdullah, M. (2021). Structural Equation modeling of drivers' speeding behaviour in Lahore: importance of attitudes, personality traits, behavioural control, and traffic awareness. *Iranian Journal of Science and Technology, Transactions of Civil Engineering*, 46(2), 1607–1619. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40996-021-00672-1>
- Măirean, C., & Havârneanu, C. (2019). The relation between mortality salience, traffic locus of control, and risky driving behaviour. *Death Studies*, 45(2), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2019.1626935>
- Miller, R. L., & Mulligan, R. D. (2002). Terror management: the effects of mortality salience and locus of control on risk-taking behaviours. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(7), 1203–1214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(02\)00009-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(02)00009-0)
- Morisset, N., Terrade, F., & Somat, A. (2010). Perceived Self-Efficacy and risky driving behaviours. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 69(4), 233–238. <https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000027>
- Ozkan, T., & Lajunen, T. (2005). Multidimensional Traffic Locus of Control Scale (T-LOC): factor structure and relationship to risky driving. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(3), 533–545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2004.05.007>
- Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. (2015). Thirty years of terror management theory: From genesis to revelation. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 52, pp. 1-70). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aesp.2015.03.001>
- Qu, W., Luo, X., Hou, J., & Ge, Y. (2023). Impact of locus of control on dangerous driving behaviour and positive driving behaviour in China. In *Communications in computer and information science*, 82–90. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36004-6\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36004-6_12)
- Rike, P., Johansen, H. J., Ulleberg, P., Lundqvist, A., & Schanke, A. (2015). Exploring associations between self-reported executive functions, impulsive personality traits, driving self-efficacy, and functional abilities in driver behaviour after brain injury. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 29, 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2015.01.004>
- Shamoa- Nir, L. (2023). Road rage and aggressive driving behaviours: The role of state-trait anxiety and coping strategies. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 18, 100780. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2023.100780>
- Su, Z., Woodman, R., Smyth, J., & Elliott, M. (2023). The relationship between aggressive driving and driver performance: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 183, 106972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2023.106972>
- Suh, H. J., Kim, J. S., Kim, J. O., Kim, H. S., Cho, I. Y., & Kim, H. S. (2017). Effects of emotional labor, depression and self-efficacy on health promotion behaviour of taxi driving workers. *Journal of Digital Convergence*, 15(8), 489-500. <https://doi.org/10.14400/JDC.2017.15.8.489>

## Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults

Tanglai, W., Chen, C., Rattanapan, C., & Laosee, O. (2022). The Effects of Personality and Attitude on Risky Driving Behaviour Among Public van Drivers: Hierarchical Modeling. *Safety and Health at Work*, 13(2), 187–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2022.03.005>

The jamovi project (2024). *jamovi* (Version 2.5) [Computer Software]. Retrieved from <https://www.jamovi.org>

### **Acknowledgment**

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Harshini, C. & Deviga S. (2025). Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(1), 3213-3224. DIP:18.01.309.2025 1301, DOI:10.25215/1301.309

## APPENDIX

### **Tables**

**Table No.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix for study variables**

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Self-Efficacy	30.6	5.05	—			
2. Traffic Locus of Control (TLOC)	58.2	9.09	.058	—		
3. Death Anxiety	40.1	15.2	-.213***	.158**	—	
4. Aggressive Driving Behavior	28.3	9.06	.020	.129*	.348***	—

**Note.**  $n = 374$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table No.2 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix for Self-Efficacy and T-LOC domains**

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>1. Self-Efficacy</b>	30.6	5.05	—	.107*	.016	.088	-.071	.061	-.071
<b>2. TLOC: Other Drivers</b>	22.5	4.11	.107*	—	.367***	.581***	.117*	.024	-.011
<b>3. TLOC: Self</b>	16.2	4.07	.016	.367***	—	.391***	.193***	.091	.104*
<b>4. TLOC: Vehicle &amp; Environment</b>	10.8	2.22	.088	.581***	.391***	—	.170***	.044	-.034
<b>5. TLOC: Fate</b>	8.79	2.47	-.071	.117*	.193***	.170***	—	.240***	.255***
<b>6. Conflict Behavior</b>	20.0	6.65	.061	.024	.091	.044	.240***	—	.681***
<b>7. Speeding Behavior</b>	8.29	3.12	-.071	-.011	.104*	-.034	.255***	.681***	—

**Note.**  $n = 374$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Examining the Interplay: Self-Efficacy, Traffic Locus of Control, Death Anxiety and Driving Behaviour among Young Adults**

**Table No.3 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix for Domains in T-LOC and Aggressive Driving Behaviour**

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Other Drivers	22.5	4.11	—	.367***	.581***	.024	-.011
2. Self	16.20	4.07	.367***	—	.391***	.091	.104*
3. Vehicle & Environment	—	—	.581***	.391***	—	.044	-.034
4. Conflict Behavior	20.00	6.65	.024	.091	.044	—	.681***
5. Speeding Behavior	8.29	3.12	-.011	.104*	-.034	.681***	—

Note.  $n = 374$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table No.4 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix for Self-Efficacy and Death Anxiety domains**

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Dysphoria	9.36	4.34	—	.5***	.79***	.694***	-.221***
2. Avoidance of Death	7.52	3.01	.5***	—	.51***	.452***	-.108*
3. Fear of Death	11.8	5.35	.79***	.51***	—	.588***	-.218***
4. Death Intrusion	11.5	5.36	.69***	.45***	.59***	—	-.148**
5. Self-Efficacy	30.6	5.05	-.22***	-.11*	-.22***	-.148**	—

Note.  $n = 374$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table No.5 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix for Death Anxiety domains and Aggressive Driving Behaviour**

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Dysphoria	9.36	4.34	—	.50***	.79***	.69***	.26***	.23***
2. Avoidance of Death	7.52	3.01	.498***	—	.51***	.45***	.29***	.22***
3. Fear of Death	11.8	5.35	.79***	.51***	—	.59***	.30***	.27***
4. Death Intrusion	11.50	5.36	.69***	.45***	.59***	—	.29***	.24***
5. Conflict Behavior	20.00	6.65	.26***	.29***	.30***	.29***	—	.68***
6. Speeding Behavior	8.29	3.12	.23***	.22***	.27***	.24***	.68***	—

Note.  $n = 374$ . \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .