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Executive Summary

The ‘Going Solo’ brochure is based on material developed by Whelan, Oxley, and Charlton (2007) at Monash University (Melbourne, Australia). Following success in Australia the brochure was adapted for the New Zealand audience by New Zealand's AA Driver Education Foundation (AADEF), with expert assistance from MUARC and Associate Professor Samuel Charlton (of the Waikato University TARS group). The work and resulting publication was sponsored and funded by Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited.

The New Zealand brochure, like the original Australian version, targets the need for continuing parental supervision during the restricted licence period. This is the driving "solo" period where young drivers become independent road users, subject to restrictions dictated by the graduated driver licensing framework (GDLS).

Statistical evidence gathered by the Ministry of Transport indicates that novice drivers present a significant increase in crash likelihood during the transition from supervised to unsupervised (or ‘solo’) driving. This is supported by findings both from a survey of Victoria (Australia) crash statistics as well across other OECD nations. Because of the concern over crash occurrence during this transition period, the ‘Going Solo’ brochure was developed to inform parents and novice drivers of both the precipitating and mitigating factors leading to increased crash likelihood, and to encourage continued education and supervision during the restricted license period.

The present study was conducted to review the distribution, reception and effectiveness of Going Solo as perceived by the driver education community as a whole. Initial findings suggest that the majority of driving instructors were familiar with Going Solo; however, less than half the sample of instructors distributed the brochure on a regular basis. In contrast, road safety coordinators indicated that they distributed the brochure frequently, particularly as part of broader education initiatives.

Among instructors who distributed the brochure, satisfaction with the resource was generally regarded as high, and it was often recommended alongside other resources (such as NZTA websites) – and this view was shared by road safety coordinators. As instructors often had limited time with supervisors (parents and guardians), many were skeptical about the effectiveness of the brochure – especially given the recent emphasis toward online resources. Time constraints also seemed to prevent instructors discussing in any detail the contents of the brochure with trainees – with often a passing mention being the maximum extent of content discussions.
Road safety coordinators had similarly mixed views as to whether the brochure was being effectively utilized by all parental supervisors who they distributed it to; though regardless saw the continued distribution as useful even if the brochure was not always implemented.

Several reasons why Going Solo was not distributed by some driving instructors were identified. Instructors often developed their own resources or recommended other material to accompany on-road practical instruction. Some instructors did not believe that parents played a frequent or active role in their driver’s education, and hence were skeptical that the brochure would be utilized at all, or would significantly influence the supervisor trainee relationship. Lastly, there was a view held by several instructors that the AA branding on the brochure would present a conflict of business interest to independent driving schools. That is, although it was recognized that Going Solo was developed by the non-profit education foundation branch of the New Zealand Automobile Association Incorporated (AA), these instructors felt the logo would still negatively impact their own market share and negatively influence their business interests if they presented the brochure.

Recommendations for change highlight a need for greater emphasis on the importance on standards of professionalism and collaboration between various types of driver educators. This may also serve to increase the utilization of Going Solo without the potential negative effects of competing commercial interests.

It is apparent that while driving instructors and road safety coordinators cater to distinct groups; neither may work with the most at risk individuals. Driving instructors were limited to working with individuals who can afford professional tuition, whereas road safety coordinators often encountered individuals as part of programs which attracted more engaged parents; whereas higher risk teens might have more disengaged/permissive parents or be from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Road Safety Coordinators can only work with the parents/supervisors who sign up for free community education initiatives. This issue could be addressed, perhaps through greater emphasis on school curriculum-based and community-based programs.

Current international literature, as well as the findings from this present study, suggests that driving instructors need to be more aware of the essential role that parents play in making a safe transition to solo driving – and this is in keeping with the guideline document developed for use in New Zealand1. Greater parental involvement should be encouraged as a priority in providing comprehensive and robust driving education.

---

1 Safer Young Drivers: A Guide to best practice education (National Road Safety Committee, et al., 2008)
Improving awareness of the broad variety of resources available to parents is advisable, and should be emphasized to assist parental supervisors in coaching novice drivers. In the present context, instructors would benefit by seeking out professional development (such as provided by the NZIDE annual conferences, and related workshops). For some years, the NZIDE professional development program has included how to effectively use the brochure, given the limitations of exposure frequency and time constraints within lessons.

Going Solo was originally distributed to road safety coordinators by the AADEF, and has been used within their varied community-based education initiatives. An increased emphasis on essential life-skills programs within schools appears to be desirable, and would supplement the at-risk demographic. However, it is difficult to introduce new initiatives within the already crowded school curriculum. The brochure has been offered to a number of secondary schools, and has been used within some life-skills courses.

Presently, a shift in New Zealand driver licensure increasing the complexity of driver skills required to gain a restricted license may incline novice drivers and parents to utilize resources more proactively. This is an opportune moment for the distribution of the latest revision of Going Solo, which contains updated information regarding safety statistics, the recent change in law regarding youth alcohol and driving, as well as more accessible language. The new well-advertised www.safeteendriver.co.nz website is referenced (and other safety information URLs updated), and includes an online version of a Vehicle Access Agreement, which parallels the Going Solo version.

In summary, driving instructors and road safety coordinators were open to the underlying concept behind the Going Solo brochure; however, they varied in how often they distributed the brochure, and the audience/s to which they distributed it. There is a potential that the brochure could be even more effectively used to augment both on-road and in class instruction and education by instructors.

Notably, where the brochure is incorporated within the broader context of driver education, instruction, and existing resources, it provides a valuable resource in equipping parents and their children for a safer driving experience. As intended, it provides a simple ‘glove-box’ resource which spells out facts on driving risks, and provides parents with tools they can employ during on-road coaching sessions to illustrate particular discussion points, reduce risks, and the reasons behind recommended safe driving practices.
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1. Current Study: Aims, and Methodology

Inspired in part by the success of the ‘Checkpoints’ program in the United States, as well as a range of other resources which identify the needs of parents and restricted license drivers, Whelan, Oxley, and Charlton (2007) developed the first iteration of the Going Solo brochure at Monash University with funding from ExxonMobil. This was released in Australia with a generally positive reception. The brochure was designed to explain potential risk factors, inform parents regarding the Graduated Licensing System restrictions for unsupervised drivers, and encourage parents to be more involved in the continued education and primary enforcers of restrictions. Whelan et al., (2007) mention the three main motivations underlying the development and contents of Going Solo:

1. Provide parents with current research related to the crash risk factors of young novice drivers
2. Provide helpful strategies to assist parents in managing these risk-factors
3. Encourage parents to proactively implement these strategies with their novice driver through the use of a Vehicle Access Agreement.

1.1 New Zealand Going Solo brochure

Following the relatively positive reception of Going Solo in Australia, the AADEF gained sponsorship from Mobil to adapt the contents of the brochure to a New Zealand audience. AADEF contracted Samuel Charlton from the University of Waikato TARS group and Michelle Whelan from MUARC to customize the brochure whilst maintaining the concepts in the brochure correctly. Changes included revising the layout and imagery of the brochure, updating the scientific basis of crash risks to be consistent with contemporary research and statistics, and altering the language to be more relevant to both a teenage and parental audience in New Zealand. The second edition (which is the subject of this evaluation) was released in 2009 with revision to include recent legislative changes covering the use of mobile phones. The brochure covers the following subject matters (see http://www.aa.co.nz/about/aa-driver-education-foundation/going-solo/ (2012) for the online third edition that takes in the recent zero Youth BAC law change):

1. Legal restrictions for restricted licence drivers
2. Crash factors and information regarding high-risk situations (distractions, weather and road conditions, high speed roads, intersections, fatigue, night time driving, alcohol and drugs)
3. Selecting a safe vehicle
4. Vehicle Access Agreement and tips for discussing safe driving practices
5. More information including recommended online resources

Concurrent to the release of the NZ second edition of the brochure, Zhao (2009) released her findings regarding the effectiveness of Going Solo in a sample of Australian parents and teenage drivers. The findings of the study suggested that Going Solo brochure was effective in increasing parents' general awareness of young driver crash risks, with some parents indicating that the resource presented some good insight into young driver behavior. However, despite a relatively positive reception by parents, after follow-up Zhao suggested that there was little indication of changes in supervision by parents of their children’s driving behavior and an extremely limited implementation of recommendations presented in the brochure by parents with their teenage driver (Zhao, 2009).

Additionally, it was found that the vehicle access agreement was not utilized by any members of the sample, although the number of discussions regarding safe driving practices was perceived to increase on the part of parents. These findings suggested that while parents have good intentions towards discussing road safety issues, young drivers were not influenced significantly. Zhao concludes:

"Results from the current study suggest that, as an educational resource, Going Solo was indeed effective in raising awareness and improving knowledge, however its effects on actual driving behaviour was inconclusive. To understand this aspect would require a much larger and more in-depth research program (pp. 64)"

Since the introduction of the New Zealand edition of the Going Solo brochure, approximately ninety thousand brochures have been distributed through Mobil Service Stations, community education events for young drivers (and at other educational events for older drivers, if they indicate they have teen driver grandchildren), licensing outlets, schools, community road safety fairs, AA driver training and testing centers, and driving instructors across New Zealand.

The use of the Going Solo brochure demonstrated great success when implemented within the context of a community based education and awareness setting. A pilot school-based program was undertaken by the AADEF on the 22nd August, 2009. It targeted high-risk teens (who had been selected as persons of concern by two local high-schools) and each teen was accompanied by a parent/supervisor. The program was developed and supervised by AADEF, Peter Sheppard (AADEF Board Member and Driver Educator), and Karen Dickson (AA Driver Training Limited) and sponsored by the Otago Motor Club Trust (Dunedin).
The course involved a seminar presentation where the Going Solo brochure was explained and distributed, and on-road practice similar to the paradigm used in the Frontal Lobe project (see Isler, Starkey, Drew and Sheppard, 2008) which drew on MUARC’s “Insight” Driver training model. The information sheet provided to participants outlines the motivation underlying behind the “insight” training model:

One of the major issues facing young drivers is gaining the understanding that driving a motor vehicle involves more than just vehicle control skills. Additional training in vehicle handling skills may influence overall control skills and create a sense of accomplishment, but it will not lead to safer driving behaviour and subsequent crash risk reduction. “Insight” driver training allows drivers to discover for themselves they may not be as skilled as they had believed, and that they cannot rely on their own current skill and car handling ability in dangerous situations. The aim of the “Insight” driver training is to calibrate the driver’s self-assessment and to encourage the driver to drive with larger safety margins. To do this a selection of purpose built practical driving exercises are used to enable this insight to their driving ability.

The findings of the Dunedin study seem to suggest that in settings where road safety coordinators, instructors, parents and young people participated in driver training seminars and exercises together, as well as young drivers being able to experience dangerous road situations, there have been good changes in attitudes toward safer driving practices and solid acquisition of higher level driving skills.

The program showed a good degree of success, and was extremely well received by parental supervisors and teenage drivers, as well as the driving instructors who participated in the program. This success was also reflected where road safety coordinators have broadly utilized the Going Solo brochure in programs across New Zealand – many of which used a similar paradigm to the ‘insight’ program that is discussed in greater detail by Senserrick (2007).
1.2 The current study

The current study evaluates the effectiveness of Going Solo in New Zealand, as measured by interviews with distributors of the brochure. It recommends changes that might be effective in encouraging greater utilization of the brochure in future.

This study evaluated the viewed reception and the distribution of the Going Solo brochure by a sample of road safety coordinators and driving instructors across a New Zealand sample. Most of the findings contained within this report reflect the attitudes and opinions held by the road safety coordinators and driving instructors contacted, and do not necessarily indicate the effectiveness of the tool across a much broader distributive audience (including, but not limited to, schools, AA centers and regional testing offices, and other channels in the transportation and road safety education sector).

A report commissioned by the Ministry of Transport by Cognition Education (2010), *Review of the Effectiveness of Road Safety Education for Young People in New Zealand*, indicated that when compared with other long-standing road safety education resources reviewed, Going Solo compared well in its “recognition” by students and driving instructors. An important finding of the Cognition Education review was that while 94% of a sample of 34 driving instructors said they were aware of the Going Solo brochure, only 42% of the sample promoted the resource. However, it is important to note the Cognition survey was conducted within six months of the first release of Going Solo.
1.3 Research and sampling methodology

To evaluate the effectiveness of the Going Solo brochure distribution, a series of 46 semi-structured interviews were conducted with individuals across the driver education and research sector throughout New Zealand (7 road safety coordinators, 5 research and/or long-standing education consultants, and 34 professional driving instructors). Ethical approval for human research was granted on the 12th December 2011 by the Waikato University FASS department ethics committee.

1.3.1 Sample Demographics and Location

Approximately 50 driver training providers were contacted across New Zealand, of which 34 agreed to participate in the study. 21 providers agreed to have the conversation recorded for later transcription, and the remainder declined; however, written notes were taken by the researcher and have been included in the findings of this report. The findings of interviews are presented in this section as being representative of the sample of the driving instructors that participated in the study, and are not necessarily representative of the entire driver instructor community.

The geographic spread of the interviews with driving instructors involved the Northland, Auckland, Waikato, Bay of Plenty, Wellington, and Canterbury regions. Of the sample, 7 of the driving instructors were affiliated with the AA (as contracted instructors referred through regional AA centers), and the remaining 27 were independent instructors contacted through either the NZIDE listings or Yellow Pages searches. Driving Instructor organization affiliation will not be analyzed in the context of findings presented here, but is given to provide relevant demographic information.

The majority of driving instructors indicated that their primary clientele was young novice drivers who were either receiving instruction in basic vehicle skills (i.e. learner licensing approaching solo driving) or more advanced restricted license holder drivers (who were wanting additional instruction relevant to the full-license exam). Several instructors also provided more advanced vehicle skills training, or were contracted by other organizations to provide other driver education services or school-based education. The majority of driver training representatives indicated that their primary role in education specifically involved in-vehicle tuition, and advice regarding safe vehicle practices and licensing test requirements.
Road Safety Coordinators and research/education consultants

A representative sample of Regional Road Safety Coordinators were interviewed to provide both their perspectives and insight into the use of Going Solo in a broader context and demographic (than that encountered by driving instructors), and to assist in the interpretation of findings made through interviews with driving instructors, as well as providing a framework for recommendations that are made in the later part of this report. These individuals were contacted based upon referrals made from within the driver research/education community (such as TARS and AADEF), as well as listings found on regional council websites.

Several Road Safety Coordinators and road-safety researchers and education consultants were consulted before interviews with instructors commenced, to provide context and insight into the nature of the driver education and instruction industry. These interviews included members of the AA Driver Training fleet, NZIDE, and several road safety researchers (the Steering Group).

For the most part, interviews with Road Safety Coordinators were conducted toward the end of the interview period, when the analysis of the interviews with instructors had been largely concluded. Hence, these interviews with Road Safety Coordinators did not follow the same regimented series of questions used to interview instructors. Rather, the interviews involved a discussion of major themes raised by instructors (and other community educators) as well as contemporary issues in driver education, and the use of Going Solo within programs that were or had been conducted in the regional setting.

Several key individuals involved in road safety research (Steering Group) were consulted in meetings throughout the course of this project, and largely toward the end of this report in order to evaluate findings, and assist in making recommendations – which would be helpful given the concurrent release of the third version of the brochure. Meetings were held in both Hamilton and Wellington. The investment of knowledge from these individuals has shaped the presentation of major findings, and the recommendations made in this report.

Professional Driving Instructors

As no national database exists for driving instructors, instructors were recruited to participate in the interviews using telephone listings from the New Zealand Institute of Driving Educators (NZIDE) directory, referrals made by contacting regional Automobile Association branches, and from Yellow Pages listings, using the search key words ‘driving schools’ and ‘driving instructor’. This strategy yielded
contact details for approximately 250 instructors or driving schools throughout New Zealand – and for this project, this list was considered to be sufficiently representative of driving instructors in New Zealand.

From these lists, instructors and driving schools were sampled at random and contacted by using a VoIP telephone service (Skype). In the instance that an instructor or driving school was unable to be contacted, or unwilling to take part in an interview, the consecutive listing was contacted instead. When driving schools or instructors did not answer the phone themselves (i.e. a secretary answered the phone), they were told briefly the nature of the call, and asked to transfer to an available instructor. Often, instructors were unable to take the call, in which case a voicemail message was left informing them that they would be contacted again within the following several days. Additionally, times were scheduled in advance with many instructors in which interviews would be suitable, and these were frequently outside business hours.

1.3.2 Interview method and research questions

Interviews with driving instructors extended from 16th December through to the 6th March 2012. As this time corresponded with changes in licensing legislations, as well as the release of www.safeteeendriver.co.nz the findings of this report need to viewed through the lens of changes occurring within the driver education community at the time. Additionally, as some instructors who were contacted had not had the opportunity to review the brochure, copies were posted and they were invited to participate in follow-up interviews at a later date – however, these individuals are not included in the sample of instructors.

Interviews were largely structured around a script that was formulated to give some indication as to the distribution and utilization of the brochure, but also provided the opportunity for individuals to voice their own opinions, which were later analyzed using qualitative methods which are detailed below. Additionally, throughout the interviews, other issues were raised, and these are canvassed where appropriate. Some of the interview data provided information which was quantifiable, and was coded numerically and was analyzed accordingly. Qualitative data was gathered and has been analyzed using a simple thematic analysis, and has been largely presented as direct quotations illustrating personal points of view.

Telephone interviews were conducted using the VoIP service Skype, so that conversations could be later transcribed and analyzed. Instructors were contacted and invited to participate in the study. Because of
limitations and time constraints, frequently times needed to be organized in advance and were followed up later at convenient times for the instructors. In keeping with ethical considerations, driving instructors were invited to have the conversation recorded, but were free to decline. In several cases, some of the interviews were conducted using the normal telephone service, and these conversations were not recorded however, notes were taken during these conversations.

The majority of interviews with instructors lasted between 10 and 15 minutes, and followed a semi-structured format based around questions that were based loosely about a previous survey of driving instructors conducted by Dr. Diane Thomson (AA Research Foundation) following a national conference for instructors in 2010, as an initial evaluation of this channel for the distribution of Going Solo in 2009. This interview structure\(^2\) was used to allow a degree of flexibility in the interview method for instructors to be able to voice their own perspectives and focus on specific issues that they recognized as important for driver education in relation to the Going Solo brochure and parental involvement in driving instruction. The interview questions were:

1. What are some of the major challenges faced by young drivers making the transition from supervised to solo driving?
2. Are you aware of the Going Solo brochure developed by the AA?
3. Do you believe the brochure is helpful as an educational tool?
4. Do you provide the Going Solo brochure to young drivers?
5. If you provide the brochure, who do you give it to (learner drivers or caregivers)?
6. How do provide the brochure with or without other materials or resources?
7. Do you discuss the contents of the brochure, and to what extent?
8. What recommendations would you suggest to improve on the contents of the brochure?
9. Considering these recommendation, would you consider using the brochure in the future?
10. Do you have any other comments about the brochure?

---

\(^2\)It is important to note that while these questions formed the foundation for the interview structure, many instructors were happy to run with a particular theme or train of thought regarding Going Solo, so these questions only provided a basic schema for the interview to follow. Interviews with Community Educators did not follow a pre-formatted structure.
1.3.3 Data transcription and analysis technique

From the interviews, quantitative data was entered into a spreadsheet corresponding with questionnaire items, and analyzed using Microsoft Excel to give descriptive statistics and charts. Much of the analysis involved a simple thematic analysis of the recorded interviews and notes. Major themes were identified in interviews by replaying sections of interview recordings or consulting written notes. Where themes could be illustrated through the use of quotations from individuals, the relevant section of the interview was transcribed to represent these themes where appropriate and contextually relevant. Major categories and relevant connections are discussed in greater detail in both the results and recommendation sections of this report.
2. Results and discussion

2.1 Perspectives of Road Safety Coordinators and other community educators

Road Safety Coordinators indicated that they had been involved in the planning and development of Going Solo. All road safety coordinators who were contacted (N=7) in this study were aware of the brochure, and used it on a regular basis as part of broader education initiatives. Additionally, the 5 consulting road safety education experts for this study were familiar and supportive of distribution and utilization of the brochure along with higher-level cognitive skills training for young drivers, and raising parental awareness of potential for involvement in partnership.

Many community educators and road safety coordinators viewed driver education in New Zealand tending in the right direction, although indicated that more could be done to improve the way the industry approached young driver safety and parental involvement, particularly involving partnerships and focusing on higher-level skills in young novice drivers. Road Safety coordinators were very positive regarding the Going Solo brochure:

“Yes definitely, we had a group of parents who were keen to do the best for their young people, so they had enlisted them this program that we were running... and it was about assessing the young person's driving abilities, and then giving them some feedback to say 'you should go to your next license phase' or 'you shouldn't' or 'you need more help'... so we had the Going Solo as a resource for parents which we gave to them along with some other material... we gave them as much information as possible that we can get their hand on... and you usually find that if the parents are keen enough to get them along to these courses, then they're also keen to do the best for their young person... and we also build on that by saying 'the best thing that you can do for your young driver is stay with them, and let them drive as long as possible for as much time as you can’...”

“... I have my son whose thinking of going down the driving route, and looked at that resource and thought 'well yes, I better get hold of that'... I mean, we try as community educators, as much stuff as we can we give out, we just hope that if fifty percent of it is read, and I know it is because I have people come back to me and feed back to me and say 'I read such and such'... and if we are preparing something to do with young drivers I’ll take a stack [of the Going Solo brochures] with me...”

Road safety coordinators were supportive of the brochure, but as with views held by driving instructors, were similarly uncertain as to whether it would be effective in influencing parental involvement in young
driver education. Although all coordinators indicated they distributed the brochure, and that it formed an integral component in many of their education and community initiatives, there was still a degree of uncertainty as to whether parents adopted the suggestion in the brochure for increased supervision, greater enforcement of limits, or a Vehicle Access Agreement (VAA) with their restricted driver. One road safety coordinator noted the inadequacies in current lower-level skill programs:

“... you’re getting parents who aren’t invested in their kids’ education, it’s a big problem... overall, yes, you might find the occasional gem, but road safety has to be part of kids daily living, part of those essential life-skills... too much of training focuses on unit standards, it deals with the emotional side, and emotion is fine, but that higher level training is lacking... but the program was still a success in a way, you know, we had one parent come up ‘I don’t think my child should be part of this’, we found out the parent was in the mob, and now the kid wants to join the police as a result of that program...”

While it was considered to be an “informative” resource for parents who did take the time to read through the brochure, it was found (where parents were followed up) that the recommendations in the brochure were not as widely implemented as would be hoped. This is in keeping with the findings made by Zhao (2009) in Australia of parental engagement, – and this may be more owing to the potential difficulty facing road safety educators to engage with a range of parenting styles and individual circumstances; as is indicated in the following quotations:

“... of the parents that I have spoken to, um, and they thought that it was a brilliant idea, but none of them have taken it on-board... they haven’t actioned it... and while its good and [they] read it, and think it’s a great idea, and its more like ‘well, we don’t really need it’, at least, one could think that’s what they were saying... many parents are too busy, and many are happy to sit down and talk about, you know, they’re happy to talk about it, chat for ten minutes over a cup of coffee... but then its passed on, and its, ‘ah, well Johnny [child] this is your thing so you read it’...”

“... to hold parents down and say ‘this is what you need to do’, it’s like, ‘yes, you’re right’ and if you look into the demographics of one part of my community, they’ve got two or three jobs, [so they say] ‘when do we do this?’... then if look into the other side of the demographics of the community, and they clearly say ‘mum and dad are working hard, you’re the one getting paid for it, you do it’...”

It is worth noting that in almost every instance, the brochure was used in conjunction with a community based program and not as a stand-alone resource. This is in keeping with the expectations of the
brochures’ creators who set out to align it with all known best practice resources for young drivers and their supervisors. In the context of a community based program (such as those frequently provided by Road Safety Coordinators), parents and teenage drivers participated together in a variety of activities (such as hazard perception tasks, on-road instruction, or seminars). The intention here is to form an environment suitable to incubate the partnership intended by the Going Solo brochure between parents, young drivers, and all road safety educators.

What may be important to note is that these community programs were voluntary for participants, and so were thought to attract parents who were more interested and invested more time into their children’s driving education. These same programs might not be so successful in attracting parents who were disengaged - consequently, might not receive the same degree of quality education that participants may receive. This may present an area where secondary schools (with more universal attendance) might be able to further use the Going Solo brochure in assisting parents and learner drivers - especially those young people at greater risk – as part of current life-skills curriculum.

“… road safety needs to have a multiplicity of disciplines, and brochures are just one instance amongst many… I think those kinds of programs reach good law-abiding people or people who want to make a change… they’re usually the majority of people who are going to drive safely and not the same group as those who are at risk... we have to tailor each message to the audience…”

“… they have a different risk on them, they have a different risk component on them... here we've got different groups of youngsters and parents, we've got the ones who you just can’t get [into a program], for whatever reason, you know, buying a pack of cigarettes is more important than safety, going to the money machine, the gaming machine is more important, so priorities are different, and these kids are at risk of getting pinged by the cops, no warrant of fitness, no license, no nothing... then you look at the other extreme where these kids, everything they get is to compensate for a lack of parental presence, so they’re causing some behavioral issues on the road such as speeding, and my parents will get me out of this, because, well, here’s a lawyer... so similar issues, just opposite ends of the spectrum…”

Anecdotally, it appears that many secondary schools do not provide comprehensive driver education as part of the curriculum, and even fewer provided Going Solo as a resource for parents. This might be an area that could be addressed in the future by the AADEF. Particularly, education needs to be addressed in the light of parenting styles, focusing on at risk groups.
The community involvement approach facilitating the parent-teen driver partnership endorsed in the Going Solo brochure may potentially be an extremely beneficial avenue in effectively distributing the brochure via driving instructors in the future – as has been observed by Road Safety Coordinators – and as was noted during a pilot-release of such a partnership program by one driving instructor:

“This course has made me deal with parents more as well as the student. I now have more of a debrief and discussion with the student than before and try to do this with a parent as well. It is not sufficient for the student to progress (if the parent hands the whole job over to the instructor). Armed with this experience I feel I can now be a better teacher and not just a driver trainer.”

And: “... he felt linking with the parents had made them take the learning to drive process of their teenagers more seriously – and the fact the instruction was free made this even more so. He felt the exercises on the first day had shown students the complexity of the driving task and he had seen them use the skills learned on that day out on the road throughout the following five formal lessons. The students asked a lot of questions and were focused on learning to drive and passing their tests. What was really different (from normal situation he operated in) was that the parents were “100%” behind them and got involved in the learning process.”

It has been mentioned by several community education experts that the brochure had been used across multiple contexts, not just novice driver training – one such example being literacy and numeracy programs, and elderly driving programs (where they might be influential as grandparents of young drivers) i.e. if they had teen driver grandchildren.

A dual-materials approach to providing resources was something that was suggested. Young people seemed to utilize online resources, whereas parents would possibly be more comfortable with using hard-copy brochures as opposed to online material. This perspective seemed to differ from the perspectives held by instructors, but given that instructors interacted more with young people as opposed to both young people and parents, this is understandable:

“... it provides something that they can take away and read, and that's where the benefit of having something like a brochure can be helpful... NZTA has gone a long way to downloading stuff off the internet, and I don't really think that works... I think having something that you can sit in your hand... um, you know, I have had parents said to me 'you know, I took that away, and waited while they went and had a drive, and read it while I was sitting in the car waiting for the young person' and that kind of reference material you just have to have and keep and hope that people take it up...”
2.2 Perspectives of professional driving instructors

2.2.1 Awareness of the Going Solo brochure

A large proportion of driving instructors were aware of the Going Solo brochure, or had seen the brochure presented at their national conferences, with only 4 instructors (~12% of the sample) indicating that they had not heard of the brochure previously – and this is shown in Figure 2.2.1. This finding corresponds to the awareness of Going Solo by driving instructors as indicated in the earlier Cognition Education (2010) review of road safety education in NZ. The widespread awareness of the brochure is likely to be attributed to distribution at annual driver education conferences - such as those held by the NZIDE and their professional development workshops. The AADEF follows up and distributes the brochure on request to the wider driver training industry.

![Pie chart showing awareness of Going Solo brochure]

**Figure 2.1.1**: Awareness of the Going Solo brochure as indicated by driving instructors.

Instructors who indicated that they were unaware of the brochure were sent copies of the brochure and were invited to review the brochure then participate in an interview within two-weeks. One reason for the lack of awareness of the brochure was that these instructors catered predominately to a different clientele than young novice drivers (i.e. higher vehicle licensure, fleet drivers, senior citizens).
2.2.2 Distribution and discussion of Going Solo with students and parental supervisors

Of the driving instructors who were aware of the brochure, under half (N=14) indicated that they distributed the brochure to students on a regular basis (approximately 47% of the sample), and this is indicated in Figure 2.2.2.1. Driving instructors who did distribute the brochure either had copies currently, or were able to obtain the brochure without difficulty from AA Centers or the AADEF or through local authority personnel (i.e. Road Safety Coordinators).

Figure 2.2.2.1: Distribution of the brochure to novice drivers or caregivers by driving instructors (N=34).

This finding is similar to that made in the Cognition Education (2010) review of driving instructors throughout New Zealand, which found that 42% of schools utilized the brochure (from a sample of 32 schools). Feedback by instructors who did use the brochure generally regarded it as being an excellent source of information for parents on the risks associated with the transition from parentally supervised to unsupervised driving:

“... sure, yep, we include it in with our packages for trainer drivers... it’s a hope that parents will take it on board, you know, its blunt explaining all the dangers [of solo driving]...and [parents] should play a more of a role in the training process... [Professional] instruction should be a big part in drivers’ education, but parents need to know the limitations, and often the first road encounters for kids is with their parents... Going Solo is a good resource for parents, but they really need to sit down with their kids and talk about it...”
Instructors who did not distribute the brochure noted that they had received and currently held copies of the brochure, but haven’t spent time to become familiar with the content (or perhaps the message underlying Going Solo). This is illustrated by one instructor who noted:

“... I have seen the brochure in the past, and we do have several in the office, but I haven’t really spent much time reading through it...”

Instructors who did distribute the brochure to trainees on a regular basis (N=14), five indicated that they distributed the brochure to restricted licence students only, and the remaining nine instructors distributed the brochure to both learner and restricted students (or their supervisors), and this is shown in Figure 2.2.2.2.

![Figure 2.2.2.2: The distribution of the brochure at different stage of licensing by driving instructors (N=14). The greater proportion of instructors distributes the brochure to both learner and restricted licensed drivers (N=9).](image)

Because the brochure is targeted towards parents specifically during the transition from supervised to unsupervised driving, and is branded as such, it is commendable that the larger number of instructors used the brochure across the span of the graduated licensing sample.

What is important to note about these interviews, is that it is difficult to gauge exactly when in their training restricted license drivers were presented with the brochure. Some instructors who did not find the brochure useful suggested that they often encounter students at a point where they were approaching the end of the restricted driving period and requesting ‘practice for licence examination’. This may be a matter for increased awareness and effectiveness of the use of the brochure in the future,
as it is conceivable that the ‘learner’ parentally supervised (or learner) stage of novice driver training is a more opportune time to be introducing the Going Solo brochure – a suggestion that is in keeping with the findings from the Cognition Education (2010) report regarding the stage of licensing that instructors encounter drivers, as well as a recommendation from Zhao (2009).

A further question related to distribution is whether instructors also discussed the content of the brochure with the supervisors (parents/guardians), and this information is presented in Figure 2.2.2.3. Although instructors did seem willing to discuss safe driving practices with supervisors, many instructors often did not interact extensively, or allocated limited time with parental supervisors; and hence often did not have much opportunity to discuss the contents of the brochure with any consistency. In the case where discussions did occur (N=3), they were often not seen to be extensive. Only one instructor indicated that he/she discussed the contents of the brochure ‘comprehensively’ to cover the key points.

![Figure 2.2.2.3: Presentation of the brochure to students, supervisors or both.](image)

Driving instructors (N=14) were asked the extent of how elaborately they reviewed the contents and discussed the implications of unsupervised driving with students and supervisors. Three categories ranging from “mention” through “overview” through to “elaborate” were used to describe the extent to which discussion occurred, and the findings are represented in Figure 2.2.2.4.
**Figure 2.2.2.4:** Approximate extent to which driving instructors discussed the contents of the brochure with students.

It is important to note that the measure of comprehensiveness in discussing the brochure might differ between driving instructors because this is quite subjective, and it is difficult to clearly say the amount of time instructors dedicated following lessons or in-class to discuss the contents with supervisors and students. Driving lessons appeared to range in time and specific needs of students from 30 minutes to as much as an hour in length - and given the time constraints instructors suggested they were under - it may be unlikely that anything more than a brief overview the brochure would occur. It is also possible that instructors were unfamiliar with the contents of the brochure. This is represented in the following quotations:

“... Its advice for parents, and so, I don't know, if you can get it into the parents hands... but you got to get it into parent hands... a teenager won’t even go there... you get it into the right hands, where it might make a difference... we don't even get to give it to the parents, we often don’t have contact with parents at all you see...”

Despite a few reservations by instructors not knowing whether *Going Solo* was utilized by parental supervisors and teenage drivers, it was still generally perceived as a positive step in improving driving risk-factors in New Zealand. Alongside practical instruction, the brochure was seen as a valuable resource by several instructors who use it to accompany class and on-road lessons - although it was generally thought likely to be more beneficial to parents rather than teenage drivers.

---

3 This may be an area worth addressing in future research - the amount of time dedicated to discussion as an estimate rather then relying upon subjective impressions.
Amongst instructors who did distribute the brochure, the majority saw it as both an excellent resource for parents (more than directed at teenage drivers), and tended to view it as the primary means of educating parents about the risks of unsupervised driving. Some instructors saw it as a good resource, but thought that it would not be as well received as their own resources accompanied by their professional instruction, or alternative web based resources such as www.practice.co.nz

2.3 Reasons for non-distribution of the Going Solo brochure

As was previously noted, four instructors were unaware of the brochure, however, this discussion will focus upon the reasons why those instructors who were aware of the program did not distribute the brochure. Despite 30 driving instructors being aware of Going Solo, more than half did not distribute the brochure at the time of the survey and indicated that they had not at any stage since its introduction since 2009. The following results and discussion will explore the principal findings from these interviews.

A number of themes emerged from interviews regarding the non-distribution of the brochure. Although reasons as to why the brochure was not being utilized did vary subtly between driving instructors, several main reasons were identified and these have been outlined below.

2.3.1 Conflict of interest issues

Instructors viewed their in-vehicle training as alternative to that of parents

Driving instructors may believe that they should have a greater role than parents in driver educations, as they perceive themselves as providing a higher quality and standard of training to novice drivers.

“… Driving instructors are primarily responsible for the delivery of driving instruction, and because they are, this [brochure] is not driving instruction… this might by the reason why you need to do these things [such as parental education], but it’s not driving instruction.”

This view was also recognized by road safety coordinators as a potential issue:

“… you have got to remember that they have a commercial interest in this - and I hate to sound cynical, but a lot of these driving instructors, their living is by getting people coming to them and perhaps taking that responsibility away from the parents and moving it on to the driving instructors, so they’ve got a vested interest to be the person that’s educating that person… and I really think that this explains why their view might be slightly different to us as road safety
educators... you know, we try to get as much [material] out as possible, and even if only fifty percent is read then it still has an impact...”

It would seem that for many driving instructors, they view their role as providing on-road vehicle training, and that education for parents needs to be directed through alternative channels such as school based avenues, or else at places where learner and restricted licenses are assessed and administrated. As one instructor noted:

“... its giving some parents some really good ideas, so perhaps improving how that's delivered might make a difference to how it's used in the future...”

This implies that many instructors have misunderstood the value of the partnership approach: which Going Solo is intended to assist. Within this approach, both driving instructors, parents, and others such as community educators all provide a contribution toward young driver training through clear and aligned safety messages.

The **AA branding was viewed as conflicting business interest**

It is also noted that a number of driving instructors viewed the AADEF branding as a conflict of interest to their own business market. Although many instructors expressed an interest in the underlying message and presentation of the *Going Solo* brochure, some were reluctant to distribute the program to trainees as they felt this might negatively influence their share of the market (in competition to the AA contracted driving instructors). This sentiment was encapsulated in the comments made by several instructors:

“... I like the ideas of the resource, but I find the AA is a little bit of a conflicting position... because they are also my opposition in town... I mean I’m not inclined to hand out a brochure with their name on it... you see the AA has their own driving instruction in [town] and now they're also an agent for people to go and sit their license... Without the AA branding, the material would be very useful. But as it stands, it is a conflict with my business...”

“...If I keep using that AA stuff, the message I send is that my clients should be with the AA...”

“... They did a good job of handing them out at the last conference and you had instructors coming up and saying ‘it’s a pity it’s got that on the bottom of it’ [the AA logo]... you’ve got members in the upper echelons of the AA that weren’t conducive to the brochure and saw us as their competition...”
It is understandable that instructors who were not affiliated with the AA did not want to introduce material that would present as a business conflict. This issue was also familiar to road safety coordinators:

“... there’s the possibility that with the logo there, one can influence a student focusing on the AA, and if you are an instructor outside the AA you’re pointing them to the AA... classic example, you have Defensive Driving and then you have Street Talk, a very similar program, but they cannot use the words 'defensive driving' because they [the AA] have the trademark... so if you look at the Going Solo brochure, you’re definitely going to see a conflict of interest...”

2.3.2 Instructors held mixed views regarding the usefulness of the brochure

Instructors who distributed the brochure tended to view the material being relevant to supervisors, in particular, raising awareness of the restrictions that apply to ‘restricted’ licensing that they may be unfamiliar with (e.g. night driving curfews). However, one reason given for the non-distribution of the brochure is that some instructors believed that it would neither be read, nor would influence the behavior of parent supervisors or young drivers. This view was expressed by one instructor:

“... the general attitude with parents is if you are a driving instructor or coordinator you are the one responsible for safety education... parents are going to disengage unless they’re confronted with the stark reality, and a brochure is just not going to achieve that... you know, there’s a serious crash and we get the wakeup call, but within a few months we go back to rest, and we slumber...”

One possible conclusion to draw from this is that instructors did not see again the value of partnering with parents in developing safe young drivers as their responsibility. Driving instructors suggested they interact more frequently with student rather than engaging with parent supervisors - and in this light, the absence of encounters and positive effects of the brochure on parents might bias instructors perspectives.
2.3.3 Stage in GDLS that instructors encounter students may influence instructors’ perspectives

Instructors seemed to suggest they often encountered students at a point in their training leading up towards taking the full license test, and hence the brochure might not be viewed as being as relevant during this later stage of education. This was encapsulated by the following quote:

“...most parents just drop their kids in and I only really see [students] who are interesting in passing the licensing, or are [leading] up toward taking a practical test... parents are aware of risks, but I just don't think that many would take time to read through if they're just wanting [their children] to pass the practical...”

Recent developments in the GDLS may influence greater parental involvement in coaching their teen drivers to optimize their likelihood of reaching the requirements of the greater licence test demands. This may also encourage instructors to allocate more time and emphasis on educating parents on how to lever off professional instruction and provide best practice, supervision, and coaching for their teen drivers.

However, the finding within the industry regarding instructors views of parental involvement at time of this study is consistent with the issues raised by Simons-Morton and Hartos (2003): that parents are often ambivalent towards their childrens’ driving education; in that, they are concerned both about the safety of their young driver, but also keen to have their young driver progress quickly to driving independence. This demonstrates that parents often lack understanding of the task-demands of driving that novice drivers encounter when solo driving.

This might introduce a degree of uncertainty by instructors as to how many parental supervisors used the brochure and arranged vehicle access agreements with their children, as many driving instructors tended not to interact overly with parental supervisors and often only mentioned the brochure in passing; or else did not frequently provide follow-up lessons or block courses after trainees had been awarded a restricted license.

2.3.4 Professional instruction was viewed as essential in producing safe teen drivers

Driving instructors largely held the view that they provided the essential training for young drivers. Instructors mentioned that they often develop and customize their own resources to accompany lessons. This seems to largely reflect the view held by instructors that young novice drivers required professional supervision that accompanied the relevant road-rule rule fact sheets from NZTA during instruction. Often instructors involved a combination of both on-road and class based education, and relied largely upon the
points observed through in-vehicle observation backed up and supported by resources which had either been developed by the driving instructor (or their company) or those offered through NZTA.

While this is discussed later in the report, most driving instructors interviewed suggested they utilized the fact-sheets dealing with specific traffic situations, as well as personally developed materials, and also recommended web-based resources that were available online and could be accessed from home at a later stage. It appears as though they felt that non-professional (or parental) supervision would be inadequate by itself in meeting the training needs of novice drivers, and that professional instruction should become a mandatory component of the graduated licensing system.

“...personally myself I know what it’s trying to say, but bring it to the younger driver themselves, they’re probably just going to say ‘well I got my license so let’s get rid of this’... I see a benefit of the parents of knowing about it, but it’s not going to impact young drivers…”

“As far as the brochure is itself is concerned, it is only advisory, and I don’t think that what you’re going to find is that many parents are going to take much notice of it... you can put the information in their hands, but a lot of parents are just really interested in just getting their kids to drive... you know, and I’m trying to look at it from my own perspective too, is would I have given it to my own kids, well I’m aware of it and probably wouldn’t have anyway…”

Many driving instructors indicated that they provided material or recommended other resources to students. Of the instructors who provided the brochure, all indicated they recommended or provided other materials in addition to Going Solo – and this was also found in interviews with Road Safety Coordinators and community educators. Major categories of educational material being promoted across all interviewed driving instructors are shown in Figure 2.3:
The official road code was indicated to be the most relevant resource currently utilized by driving instructors, and lessons seemed to be based about the practical application of road rules, as well as hazard perception, safe maneuvering, and correct use of mirrors. The most popular resource promoted by driving schools were the NZTA factsheets such as those indicating specific road rules, as well as the official New Zealand road code. Of the instructors who did not distribute the going solo brochure, 64% indicated they recommend online resources, 80% utilized the NZTA material to accompany their on-road training, and 50% recommend their own resources in addition to these tools. These figures are very similar to those used by those instructors who did distribute Going Solo, suggesting that the Going Solo brochure often accompanied other recommended resources provided by instructors. Going Solo takes an inclusive approach and recommends a variety of online sites, listed on the rear of the brochure. This list has recently been updated at time of publication to include www.safeteendriver.co.nz and other useful sites.

At the time of this study, a recent NZTA campaign had been developed to raise parent awareness, and provide an online resource (www.safeteendriver.co.nz), and this may partially explain why instructors
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*It is worth noting that this figure represents the entirety of all instructors contacted, including those who were unaware of the Going Solo brochure. Those who were unaware will be mentioned later.*
seemed to recommend it frequently, or encounter trainees and parents who were familiar with such resources. Online resources developed by NZTA were the most recommended resource by instructors, accompanying the New Zealand road code. This is demonstrated by the following quotation:

“... Remember the Land Transport has launched their own website and advisement campaign... practice.co.nz and safeteendriver.co.nz and you may very well see those sites overtaking the need for the [paper] brochure...”

Notably, the NZTA online site reflects the motivation and message conveyed by the previously released Going Solo brochure. While these resources were not previously available when Going Solo was originally released, the NZTA site adopted many of the ideas contained within the Going Solo brochure – which NZTA had initially helped to edit along with other government safety agencies and road safety experts. These resources, together with Going Solo, address the need for continued parental supervision during restricted licensure; however, given the recent campaign, the new online resource was perceived by driving instructors to be more user friendly and likely to be engaging with young drivers.

Many instructors noted that that www.safeteendriver.co.nz was frequently mentioned and seemed to be popular amongst students, as both students and parental supervisors were familiar with the televised advertisement; and young drivers who could afford to pay for a professional lesson often had ready access to a computer where they could view the material. In light of this finding, it is impossible to say what would have been the view of Going Solo before the websites were created (concurrent with the present study).

However, this suggests the driving instructors may not specifically develop their own resources focusing on educating parents of the risks associated with unsupervised driving – as it might be that instructors now assume that parents are aware of the limitations or risks associated with restricted licensure. While many driving instructors do develop their own material, there still remains significant reliance upon the traditional road code (for in-vehicle tuition), and very little utilization of other materials which have been more recently developed to raise awareness regarding higher-level cognitive training and skills – and it is unknown whether parental supervisors utilized any resources, even following instructors recommendations.

Although driving instructors indicated they developed and presented material of their own design, the standard or content of these materials was not investigated as part of this report - however, given the absence of a governing body for driver instructors, the recommendations of the Cognition Education (2010) review should be taken strongly for the need for consistency of key messages across the entire...
community of road safety educators. While outside the scope of this analysis, these findings suggest that some instructors are not providing any material beyond the lower-level skill-based instruction - and in light of more recent innovations in driver education may place some students at a considerable disadvantage in developing safe driving practices.
3. Recommendations

The majority of road safety educators who distributed the resource were satisfied with the contents of the brochure, and found the information was helpful to parents. However, there were some recommendations for changes that could be implemented in future versions, and might work to both increase the effectiveness of the brochure as well as improve the distribution by driving instructors who did not utilize the brochure. These recommendations should be viewed as being the authors opinion based upon interview themes, and should be interpreted through the lens of both the Cognition Education (2010) and Zhao (2009) reports.

3.1 Encouraging partnership and collaboration amongst all road safety educators

Encouraging partnership and an inclusive approach amongst all road safety educators is important in training young novice drivers to the standards of best practice. This could be accomplished by contacting a broader school and community demographic, and continued collaboration with Road Safety Coordinators (SASTA). The NZIDE annual conference has been an avenue used in previous releases of Going Solo to driving instructors, and this should remain an area of focus where instructors can be encouraged to partner with parents and the broader road safety industry, as well as receive the best of contemporary education techniques and standards of practice – this may help to improve an understanding of the importance of parental involvement in teen driver education and a focus toward higher-level training techniques.

Driving instructors mentioned that time constraints and a busy schedule, as well as limited time discussing issues with parental supervisors prevented them from comprehensively reviewing the contents of the brochure with either students or parents. The NZIDE may be able to assist instructors with being able to work alongside parents for greatest influence in promoting safer driving in young drivers.

Recommendations for change for future generations of the Going Solo brochure should focus on developing rapport and cooperation between instructors and educational organizations and councils in keeping with guidelines for best standards and practices outlined in the Cognition Education (2010) review, and in line the best traditions within the driver education community. Additionally, a greater emphasis on the importance of professional development and collaboration between driver educators...
could serve to increase the utilization of Going Solo without the negative effects of conflicting interests; and could serve to cross-pollinate driver educators with a variety of approaches and resources.

3.2 Target the broader novice driver demographic

This could be accomplished by contacting the IP holders (MUARC) and discussing how the title could be adjusted to broaden the appeal and reach of the brochure to all novice drivers, from the learner phase through to full-licensure. Presently, the language suggests that it is a resource intended only for restricted license holders, and thus, may not be reaching teen drivers and parents at a stage early enough in their education (and before they are potentially poorly calibrated). This is in keeping with the current change in legislation regarding the GDLS, requiring a greater degree of education before being able to obtain a restricted licence. Encouraging the distribution of Going Solo to learner drivers (rather than solely targeting the parents and restricted licensed driver) might provide a greater opportunity for the brochure to impact and improve safe driving practices.

3.3 Continue to target distribution through community based partnership initiatives

Given the wealth of resources developed by instructors, as well as those now available online, the Going Solo brochure and web based educational resources: parents and teen drivers now have access to an array of resources, and the capability to implement these resources to suit their particular family and supervisory context. In light of the recommendations by community educators, and by previous findings, road safety measures are often demonstrated to be ineffective when used as a stand-alone resource. Effective education would seem to be best achieved when parents and teens are able to partner constructively with a community based educational paradigm. This has been the underlying motivating of the Going Solo brochure since its inception, and should remain an essential focus in its continued and effective use.

It appears from a review of the literature that parents and students may both benefit from resources being made available in the context of community educations initiatives, and this continues to be the most effective avenue for the future use of the brochure. Mayhew and Simpson (2002) have noted that traditional driver education training has often failed to address the motivational and attitudinal aspects

---

5 The crash risk profile shown in Figure 1.1 is likely to change following these greater restrictions on passing through the GDLS under the current legislation changes.
of driver safety (Zhao, 2009), and this is where the Going Solo brochure may prove essential along with professional instruction, or community based training programs.

A positive psychology approach seems to be something that comes through – rather than focusing on the negative aspects of being involved in a crash, and this is something that can be implemented when the Going Solo brochure accompanies conversation with parents or instructors, as well as within programs conducted by road safety coordinators. Language changes in the recent version of Going Solo (about to be released following this report) include changes encouraging more open conversation with ‘talking points’.
4. Background Literature

Internationally, young drivers and passengers are over-represented in serious or fatal vehicle crashes, despite constituting a relatively small proportion of the driving population (Deery & Fildes, 1999; MacDonald, 1994). According to a report released by the World Health Organization (2009), motor vehicle accidents were recognized as being the leading cause of mortality for individuals in developed nations aged between 10 and 24 years of age. A particularly at risk group are young novice drivers aged 15-19 years old, and Toroyan and Peden (2007) have noted that vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death among this demographic. Evidence from crash statistics reveals that young and inexperienced drivers, particularly young men, are consistently at higher risk of crashing compared to older and more experienced drivers (Williamson, 2003) – making this population a high priority for intervention within the Safer Journeys paradigm (Ministry of Transport, 2010).

Research into what is known as the “young driver problem” has suggested that both youthfulness and experience play roles in predisposing young novice drivers to crash risk. Increased experience in using a vehicle has been shown to be essential in reducing a driver's crash likelihood, however, the heightened tendency to engage in risk taking that accompanies the late-adolescent period may also predispose young driver to being involved in a crash. It is notable that regardless of age, crash risk remains relatively high within the first several months of driving, and then declines rapidly. This inflated crash-likelihood is particularly noticeable during the ‘restricted’ period of driving, which follows the comparatively low crash risk during supervision (Ministry of Transport, 2009).

Due to the elevated risk associated with learning to drive, many nations have introduced a graduated system of licensing to prevent exposing novice drivers to the risk factors often precipitating accident involvement. This system of incremental licensing has been beneficial in reducing the risk of novice drivers being involved in crashes, however, during the learning period of driving the risk of crash involvement remains elevated. International research suggests that parental involvement during the solo period of learning to drive has a pronounced influence on reducing crash involvement. This has prompted a number of initiatives to inform parents of the risks associated with unsupervised driving, and encourage parents to have a more engaged role in the education of their children. In order to address the need for greater parental education and supervision, the AA Driver AADEF has adapted the Going Solo brochure to assist New Zealand parents to manage their young drivers’ transition to unsupervised driving.
The Going Solo brochure was initially developed by Whelan, Oxley, and Charlton (2007) at Monash University (Victoria, Australia). They were strongly influenced by the prior United States “Checkpoints” program (Mulvihill, Senserrick, & Haworth, 2005). The brochure aimed to make parents and restricted drivers aware of the risk-factors encountered by unsupervised drivers, provide ways in which families can discuss safe driving practices, and encourage parents toward improved monitoring of their restricted licence holder drivers through implementation of reasonable vehicle access agreements (VAA).

4.1. Young novice drivers and risk factors

Young drivers are over-represented in the number of fatal or injurious vehicle accidents that occur each year on New Zealand roads. According to statistics compiled in New Zealand in 2010, young and novice drivers aged 15 to 24 years were identified as being responsible for 104 fatal and 497 serious vehicle crashes, although only representing approximately 20 percent of all licensed road users (Ministry of Transport, 2011). It is estimated the economic and social costs of these crashes could be as high as $1.05 billion dollars per year, although the social consequences often have greater and immeasurable effect on both the families of victims and the broader community as a whole. The period where a young driver is most vulnerable to being involved in a serious crash occurs at the transition between supervised (learner license) and unsupervised (restricted license) driving (Lewis-Evans, 2010). As a consequence, a number of educational initiatives have been designed to reduce the risk factors associated with this transitional phase, and these will be discussed later.

Although age is a predictor of crash involvement through to an age of 25 years, inexperience coupled with risky behaviour among 15 to 19 year olds is particularly important in determining young novice drivers elevated crash involvement; and this is especially significant during the unsupervised or solo driving stage of licensing. A number of primary characteristics have been identified to be related to crashes involving young novice drivers: misjudging road conditions or driving at a speed inappropriate to conditions, driving under the influence of alcohol or other intoxicants, passenger and peer influence, and unsafe or otherwise reckless driving (Senserrick & Whelan, 2003). Reducing the influence of these factors has been the underlying motivation behind the graduated licensing system (GDLS).

Inexperience has been identified by researchers as one of the prevailing determinants of young driver crashes (Mayhew, Simpson, & Pak, 2003). Many crashes have traditionally been attributed to lack of
driver experience and perceptual training in hazard detection, and this lack of driving experience has been identified in playing a significant role in increasing accident likelihood in young drivers (McKenna, Alexander, & Horswill, 2006). Braitman and colleagues examined police reports in conjunction with interviews with drivers, and identified the primary factors in contributing increased crash risk to be poor hazard awareness and detection, followed by excess speed and lost control or traction. For example, young and inexperienced drivers are more likely to be involved in accidents through lack of awareness of other vehicles at intersections or roundabouts (Braitman, Kirley, McCartt, & Chaudhary, 2008). Additionally, unlike experienced drivers, young and inexperienced drivers appear to choose vehicle speeds corresponding to posted speed limits, rather than adjusting vehicle speed according to road conditions (Cantwell, 2010). This may make novice drivers more vulnerable to crashes involving loss of control when encountering dangerous road or surface conditions – and such ‘loss of control’ crashes due to inappropriate speed is observed in crash statistics (Ministry of Transport, 2011).

Young novice drivers are more likely to be involved in crashes involving a single vehicle (such as losing control on corners, leaving the road, rolling the vehicle, or colliding with a stationary object), as opposed to incidents involving multiple vehicles such as head-on collisions (Gonzales, Dickinson, DiGuiseppi, & Lowenstein, 2005; McKnight & McKnight, 2003). When compared with more experienced drivers, young novice drivers tend to be more likely to be involved in crashes where speeding; reckless driving, and/or alcohol were contributing factors. They are also more prone to engage in other risky driving behaviors such as close-following, dangerous overtaking, and failing to allow sufficient time to merge traffic lanes (Gullone & Moore, 2000).

Although primary driving skills can be acquired in a relatively short amount of time, inexperienced drivers often lack developed perceptual skills and the executive processes that are required in processing the sensory information needed to drive safely (Isler, Starkey, & Williamson, 2009), and tend to be less able to anticipate the behavior of other road users and react accordingly (McKenna, Alexander, & Horswill, 2006).
4.2. Graduated licensing system and the restricted (solo driving) transition.

The primary intervention that has been introduced to address the elevated risks posed by novice drivers is known as the graduated licensing system. This paradigm of compartmentalized and progressive licensing has been implemented across the majority of OECD nations with varying degrees of success.

The prevailing rationale behind the graduated licensing system is to divide the transition from learning to drive to being fully licensed into two distinct types of restrictions. These are the graduated driver licensing scheme (GDLS) framework, which was introduced in New Zealand in 1987; and attempts within it to reduce the crash likelihood of an inexperienced driver by enforcing restrictions through imposing “conditions” on the licence to avoid the novice driver being exposed to key risk factors which contribute to the majority of serious vehicle crashes (i.e., driving with passengers or at night) involving young drivers.

In New Zealand, the first stage of the GDLS involves a simple test of the drivers' general knowledge of the road rules, and this period marks the stage where a driver may operate a motor vehicle under the supervision of a fully licensed supervisor (often a parent or guardian) or that of a recognized driving instructor or training institute. Marking the end of the supervision period\(^7\), a learner driver may then sit a supervised assessment of on-road performance and graduate to the restricted period, where they may drive unaccompanied, but under certain curfew and passenger restrictions. These restrictions have been designed to reduce the exposure to risk factors that elevate crash likelihood in young novice drivers (Chen, Baker, & Li, 2006; Williams & Preusser, 1997; Simon-Morton & Hartos, 2003), and are described in detail below.

1. Curfew outside 5am and 10pm unless supervised: As night time driving exposes drivers to limited visibility and fatigue, driving at night has been shown to increase both the risk and severity of crashes involving young novice drivers (Williams & Ferguson, 2002). Consequentially, a curfew period is enforced which ensures drivers who are inexperienced at night time driving, and who have more demanding attentional requirements (for example, being more susceptible to fatigue: Smith, Horswill, Chambers, & Wetton, 2009) are not driving at a time where these are likely to influence their driving behavior.

2. Restrictions on passengers: restricted license drivers are unable to drive with passengers who do not possess a full license and who are able to act in a supervisory capacity. Peer influences are a major predictor of unsafe driving behavior in young drivers, and this restriction allows young novice drivers

\(^7\) It has been recommended that this period should involve approximately 140 hours (120 hours in NZ) of supervised driving (Gregerson, 1996; National Road Safety Committee et al, 2009)
to continue supervised driving without exposing them to passengers who may influence either their risk-acceptance or attitude toward safe driving practices (Chen, Baker, Braver, & Li, 2000; Senserrick, 2007).

3. Limited alcohol policy: depending upon age and level of experience, alcohol at the current adult limit may greatly interact with both the judgment and vehicle control capability of young novice drivers (Ferguson, 2003). Most recently, under new legislation, there is a zero breath-alcohol restriction on young novice drivers and a limit of 250mg/L for older restricted drivers.

The restricted period exists to allow novice drivers to accrue experience in varied traffic situations without the need for continual supervision, with the intention to allow them to develop the vehicle skills and higher-level hazard awareness and safe driving practices that are needed to be fully licensed and independent road users. As drivers move toward developing these skills, they may move into becoming fully licensed provided they demonstrate safe driving practices (such as appropriate hazard detection, use of mirrors, safe braking and following distance, and appropriate maneuvering) to the satisfaction of a profession driver assessor. However the current NZ graduated licensing system remains largely focused on increasing the quantity of driving experience without addressing the need for skill acquisition and improving hazard detection – known as higher-level skills. As a result, young drivers may become ‘poorly calibrated’ or overconfident in their abilities (McKnight & McKnight, 2003; Stradling, Meadows, & Beatty, 2000) leading to increased risk-taking.

Research suggests that the graduated licensing system has had significant impact in reducing the rates of crashes. For example, Begg and Stephenson (2003) have concluded that over the period of 1987-1998 the rate of serious crashes was halved for the young driving group (17-24), attributing this reduction primarily to the introduction of the graduated licensing system. It is worth noting that many of the fatal crashes involving young drivers occur in situations where the restrictions of the GDLS have been deliberately violated, and research suggests that attitudes of disregard or contempt for licence restrictions often accompany those young persons exposed to a greater driving risk. Overall, research suggests the introduction of incremental exposure to unsupervised driving along with restrictions such as limits on night time driving and passengers have resulted in reductions in teenage crash rates (Foss, Feaganes, & Rodgman, 2001; Shope, Molnar, Elliot, & Waller, 2001), and it remains unlikely that significant reductions in New Zealand crash rates will occur in young novice drivers without a significant paradigm shift.8

---

8 See Washington et al, (2011) and Senserrick (2007) for more insight into current education paradigm shifts.
4.3. Focusing on education and continued training through the restricted period

Despite the introduction of the GDLS, there seems relatively little continuation of supervised or instructed driver education during the restricted license period of the system. Although a period 120 hours of supervised driving is recommended (Gregerson, Nyberg, & Berg, 2003), evidence suggests that often novice learner drivers receive on average little more than 40 hours of supervised education (OECD Young Driver Education, 2006). Much evidence suggests that vehicle handling skills can be acquired quite rapidly, but that higher level skills and proper calibration of perceived driving capacity take much longer to acquire. This lack of supervised driving may place young drivers in the dangerous situation of being over-confident in their driving skill, and predispose them to greater risk-taking and misjudgment of the demands of safe driving.

Structured in-class driver education initiatives, (such as NZTA approved courses) may decrease the time a novice driver is required to undergo supervised driving, and as part of these courses the in-class concepts are then reinforced through a one-hour in-vehicle coaching session. Other programs provide more extensive in-vehicle training dealing predominantly with vehicle handling and management skills. While both types of course are well-intended on the part of providers, there is a distinct lack of evidence that such programs reduce young novice drivers’ crash likelihood.

For in-vehicle skills based training courses, the lack of effect is likely owing to an over-emphasis on the development of vehicle handling skills (i.e. the lowest tier of the GDE matrix; Figure 4.1), as these courses neglect higher-level skills such as hazard awareness and risk management (Berg, 2006; Isler, Starkey, & Williamson, 2009). In a report published recently by Washington, Cole, and Herbel (2011), they note that formal in-vehicle instruction may actually increase crash risk in young novice drivers. After reviewing formal instruction methods in both the US and Europe, they conclude:

... teaching drivers to improve skills such as high speed braking and cornering serves only to increase driving confidence to the point of decreasing road safety. It is likely that these drivers, on average, engage in riskier behavior after such training, and become less risk-averse drivers. These programs also may produce drivers that perform maneuvers too aggressive for less "skilled" drivers on the road. (pp. 74)

In a study conducted by Mayhew and colleagues, it was suggested that professional driver instruction had little effect on the rates of crash rates following full licensing (Mayhew, Simpson, Ferguson, & Williams, 1998), and this finding supports the notion that continued and regular supervision during the vehicle training period needs to take place – such as has been implemented in several European nations and the
United States involving compulsory driver training. The Goals for Driver Education matrix (Hatakka, et al., 2002) provides a framework for developing effective driver training.

![Figure 4.1: Goals for Driver Education (GDE) matrix](image)

Although the GDLS exists to provide a framework in which young drivers might accrue experience under the guidance of a supervisor (usually a parent or guardian), there is a significant increase in the crash likelihood once a young novice driver makes the transition to solo driving. Gregersen, Nyberg, and Berg (2003) have suggested that the risk of being involved in a crash is 33 times greater for drivers once novices begin solo driving – thus, the transitional period between supervised and unsupervised driving appears to be a period of considerable concern.

---

9 This image from taken from Cantwell (2012), adapted from Hatakka et al., (2002) The horizontal axis represents categories of skill, risk, and self-assessment. The vertical axis represents the critical stages in developing safe driving practices within the broader context of life-skills.
This finding suggests inadequacies within the current GDLS system, particularly in the education and preparation that a learner driver receives during the lead-up to achieving the unsupervised licence status. In addressing this, recent legislation regarding the difficulty of the restricted licence test in New Zealand takes into account higher level cognitive skills and attitudes that should have been internalized by young drivers before gaining unsupervised licence status (the highest tier of the GDE matrix: Figure 4.1), and there is likely to be a change in the rate of crashes of young people soon after gaining their restricted licence.

Mayhew and colleagues, indicating crash likelihood is greatest in the month immediately following licensing for all drivers regardless of age, and then decreases substantially over the course of the following six months (Mayhew, Simpson, & Pak, 2003). As highlighted in the Australian evaluation of Going Solo conducted by Zhao (2009), an evaluation of crash involvement of young drivers in Victoria revealed a marked increase in crash likelihood immediately following provisional (or restricted) licensure. This increase is also reflected in New Zealand statistics collected by the Ministry of Transport (2009), and is illustrated in Figure 4.2:

![Figure 4.2: Crash involvement profile of new drivers indicating significant increase in crash likelihood concurrent with unsupervised licensure (Ministry of Transport, 2009).](image)

Groeger (2000) suggests that this increase may be attributed to the lack of developed higher-level driving skills, and this suggestion is supported by research conducted by Mayhew and Simpson (2002), which
suggests that the amount of supervised experience young drivers receive is insufficient to allow for the acquisition of competencies such as visual search and appropriate hazard perception abilities.

From a review of 30 driver education initiatives, they conclude that the amount of time behind the wheel and quality of instruction are insufficient to contribute significantly to safe driving practices. As most supervision or training involves basic vehicle handling skills, young novice drivers remain deficient in appropriate risk-management and hazard perception which is accrued over a much greater period of time, often extending well into full-licensure (Mayhew & Simpson, 2002). In addition, Isler, Starkey, and Williamson (2009) suggest that while vehicle handling skills are acquired quite rapidly, higher-level skills are substantially more complex to acquire and require a much greater period of time (and exposure to managing a variety of risk situations) than basic vehicle handling skills do. Furthermore, the absence of higher-level skills has been linked to increased crash likelihood in novice drivers. It is evident that continued education is a responsible intervention that can improve quality of education during the unsupervised licensed period.

The reviewed literature suggests that driver training should continue into the unsupervised period where crash likelihood becomes greatly inflated. Essential components of interventions during this time should incorporate both raised awareness of risk-factors and safe driving practices, as well as a continuance of quality driving supervision and enforcement of restrictions. Parents can play an essential role in providing these components, and should be specifically targeted for their unique position of influence with young novice drivers (see Mulvihill et al., 2005)

4.4. The role of parental involvement in driver training

While crash rate during the supervised period is relatively low, there seems to be increased exposure to both the variety of traffic situations and the amount of behind-the-wheel experience\textsuperscript{10} within six months following the transition to unsupervised driving; and this implies that parental supervision may not be adequate in meeting the needs of trainee drivers (McCartt, Shabanova, & Leaf, 2003).

Although parents are often the primary providers of trainee supervision, there is little evidence to suggest that parents are as invested in the education of learner drivers as they could (Simon-Morton & Hartos, 2003) – nor are they equipped with a sufficient understanding of contemporary regulations or issues concerning driver education. One major reason for this is lack of knowledge among parents of the impact they can have on their teen driver’s crash risk level. This is a key education opportunity which the

\textsuperscript{10} This is often referred to as the quality and quantity of driver experience in transportation literature.
Going Solo brochure sets out to address as many parents learned to drive under a very different licensing regime.

Simon-Morton and Hartos (2003) note that many parents underwent substantially different licensure conditions prior to the introduction of graduated licensing systems, and thus are unfamiliar with the merits or restrictions to driver education that have been introduced in more recent times. Considering that the GDLS was introduced to New Zealand almost 30 years ago, many parents would be unfamiliar both the system, nor would they be aware of the advancements made in driver education, or the risks associated with unsupervised driving.

Despite the potential lack of awareness of parents regarding the changes in licensing, Goodwin and Foss (2004) note a number of studies suggesting that approval of the graduated licensing system is high, although in New Zealand compliance with restrictions is often poor, and this is identified also by Mulvihill et al., (2005) in their review of parental enforcement of driving restrictions.

Additionally, Simons-Morton and Quimet (2006) suggest that parental supervision, though almost a norm under the current GDLS system, may actually hinder the development of safe driving practices in learner drivers (regardless of the amount of supervision) because (if not done effectively) they may naturally limit the range of on-road experience to relatively safe or uncomplicated traffic situations, and provide more verbal feedback or increased vigilance regarding approaching hazards. In doing so, parents may prevent supervised drivers from experiencing situations that they are likely to encounter when entering into solo driving, or hinder the development of a personal awareness of traffic hazards and risk-factors. As Groeger (2000) has suggested, young drivers may not develop higher-level driving skills because they come to depend upon the feedback provided by supervisors during the supervised period of licensure, and are unable to perform these complex functions once unaccompanied by a supervisor. For instance, parents may assume the role of detecting other vehicles in the side mirrors, and it has been noted by young drivers making the shift to independent driving that they are unable to drivers to manage the blind spots about the vehicle. This demonstrates the need for parents to be educated in how to effectively administer driving supervision, and draws attention to critical risk situations that parents need to ensure their teen drivers experience with them.

In a review of parental monitoring of young novice drivers across several studies, a consistent finding was that crash likelihood reduced with increased parental involvement in novice driver training (Simon-Morton & Quimet, 2006). It has been proposed that this is due to restrictions placed on learner drivers and the offset in time between acquiring a license and becoming a solo driver.
However, as Zhao (2009) indicated in an Australian review of the relationship between parenting style and driver education, parental supervision (or coaching) tends not to extend beyond the supervised learner period of licensing. In a review of the amount of parental supervision across several American states, it was suggested that the amount of supervision young drivers receive from parents ranged between 40 to 50 hours of on-road experience (cited in Simons-Morton & Quimet, 2006).

Restrictions placed on young drivers by parents also seem to be elastic, transient, or often poorly enforced, and parents are largely unaware of the behavior of their children during unsupervised driving. Utilization of educational resources also seems to be dependent upon parenting style according to the evaluation of Going Solo in Melbourne conducted by Zhao (2009), and expectations of restrictions often differ substantially between parents and children (Beck, Harton, & Simons-Morton, 2005).

According to Arnett (2000, 2002), the years from 18 to 25 years cover a period of life best described as ‘emerging adulthood’ in which individuals undergo a variety of developmental changes, particularly changes in personal identity and societal status, and refinements to higher cognitive processes (Dahl, 2004). Consistent with models of emerging adulthood, particularly the work by Arnett (2002), the transition from adolescence through to adulthood is marked by departure from previous restrictions associated with adolescence and entrance into the freedom associated with adulthood. In many ways gaining unrestricted access to use of a vehicle may be viewed as a ‘rite of passage’ into adulthood both by teenagers and parents, and hence, may limit the restrictions that parents place upon restricted licensed teenagers regardless of the perceived risks attached to solo driving. The freedom associated with emergent adulthood may play a role in the increased crash-risk associated with young drivers as opposed to comparatively inexperienced older drivers (Arnett, 2002). As Simon-Morton and Quimet (2006) suggest:

Parents are ambivalent about teen driving—concerned about the risks, but interested in reducing the time they spend transporting teens. Most parents experienced a considerably simpler driver licensing process when they were teenagers, before knowledge about the risk of teen crashes and the benefits of restrictions on newly licensed drivers were fully understood. Also, many parents perceive their teenage children to be generally responsible and want to give them what they want—and what teens want is to drive... parents and youth may share a common motivation for teens to become independent drivers and parents must balance the convenience that early teen licensure provides with concerns about safety. (pp. 30)

Research conducted by Beck, Shattuck, and Raleigh (2001) found that increased parental supervision accompanied by limiting access to a vehicle has resulted in a significant reduction in the likelihood of
young novice drivers performing unsafe driving behavior, whereas Simon-Morton and Hartos (2003) suggest that low parental monitoring accompanies an increase in risky driving behaviors and traffic violations.

Because parents play a crucial role as primary supervisors of learner drivers, a number of initiatives have been undertaken to promote the relationship between parents and unsupervised drivers. Perhaps one of the most significant advances was achieved in USA through the Checkpoints program (as discussed in Mulvihill et al., 2005). The purpose of Checkpoints was to encourage parents to play a more attentive role in the education of their restricted drivers, especially during the transition to unsupervised driving. It was identified that parents seemed to experience difficulty in educating drivers, and resources should be developed to raise awareness of the risks associated with unsupervised driving, and encourage them to implement positive safety practices and restrictions for young drivers.

The Going Solo brochure was developed aimed at informing parents of the risks of unsupervised driving, and encouraging them to implement restrictions and vehicle access agreements with restricted drivers (Zhao, 2009).
Limitations of the current study

Although this study was conducted as thoroughly as possible within the given scope, there are several key points that should be considered when interpreting the findings of this report.

This study was conducted during a time at which several changes were introduced to New Zealand licensure legislation, as well as an intensive awareness campaign related to online resources developed by NZTA (www.safeteeendriver.co.nz). Considering this, there may be a bias in the resources mentioned or recommended by professional driving instructors and community educators, and this should be taken into account. Additionally, interviews were conducted prior to the latest revised release of the Going Solo brochure, and it may be valuable conducting a future review within the following six months to determine how the revised version is being utilised within the driver education community.

The sample population of professional driving instructors was quite small in comparison to the total number of instructors pooled from across New Zealand. Considering the stratified sampling methodology employed, as well as interviews being limited to major regions, it would be prudent not to extrapolate present findings in this report to be representative of the entirety of professional instructors and community educators throughout New Zealand (either independent or AA-affiliated). Interview questions regarding the distribution demographic and extent of discussion of the brochure were only relevant to approximately half the interview sample, and given the sample size, future studies may address these limitations. Concurrently, this may also be a consideration for future research regarding reasons for the non-distribution of the brochure.

Telephone and VoIP interviews, while being a useful method in collecting data, are limited both by time constraints and interviewee availability (as has been previously discussed). Additionally, this researcher notes that there is a potential for interviews to become focussed upon questions that are perceived as most salient to the interviewee. While this has been helpful in identifying the major issues raised by interviewees, future studies may be augmented through the use of postal or online surveys which may both retain survey focus, while reaching a much broader audience.\footnote{It is worth noting that questionnaires have been previously used at national conferences with only limited success, and this may be worth addressing as a tool for future conferences. Additionally, anecdotally, it appears that there may be only limited use by professional instructors of online communication mediums, which may limit the usefulness of online surveys.}

This report has focused upon the primary agents responsible for the distribution of the Going Solo brochure, namely, professional driving instructors and regional road safety coordinators. Following the recommendations of both Zhao (2009) and the Cognition Education (2011) report, it may be worth investigating the utilisation of Going Solo both by parental supervisors and learner drivers. This would be

\footnotetext{11}{It is worth noting that questionnaires have been previously used at national conferences with only limited success, and this may be worth addressing as a tool for future conferences. Additionally, anecdotally, it appears that there may be only limited use by professional instructors of online communication mediums, which may limit the usefulness of online surveys.}
useful in providing a more comprehensive picture of the utilisation of the brochure, as well as provide ways to improve future editions of the resource.12

The thematic analysis employed in this report was conducted in such a way as to identify major themes and issues, and these themes were independently confirmed through consultation with experts with extensive experience within the driver education community. Because of the limited scope of this current study, verbatim transcripts were not subjected to advanced analysis using presently available computer-based qualitative techniques. While the method of analysis can be justified within the context of the present study, future research (especially that employing online surveys) may be enhanced through such heuristic analysis.

The interim findings of this report were discussed at the recent 2012 NZIDE national conference; and this may provide a valuable addendum to this report. In this regard, future research may utilise said discussion to indentify significant issues and enhance recommendations for improved utilisation of the Going Solo brochure.

---

12 It is noteworthy that such evaluations are being frequently conducted by the AADEF, and this has been employed in the continued development of the brochure. In the present context however, these focus studies have not been within the scope of the present study.
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