Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology

35(4): 1-12, 2019; Article no.CJAST.47188
ISSN: 2457-1024
(Past name: British Journal of Applied Science & Technology, Past ISSN: 2231-0843, NLM ID: 101664541)

The Predictive Influence of Demographic and Personality Traits on Risky Driving Behaviour among Traffic Offenders in Osun State, Nigeria

R. J. Akinniyi[1*], E. O. Akinnawo[1], B. C. Akpunne[1] and J. T. Oyeleke[2]

[1]Department of Behavioural Studies, Redeemers University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Psychology, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author RJA designed the study and wrote the protocol and the first draft of the manuscript. Authors EOA and BCA performed the statistical analysis and managed it in the study while author JTO managed the literature searches. Meanwhile all the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/CJAST/2019/v35i430192
Editor(s):
(1) Giovanni Bucci, Full Professor, University of L'Aquila, Italy.
(2) Dr. Umar Nirmal, Senior Lecturer, Centre of Advanced Mechanical and Green Technology, Faculty of Engineering and Technology, Multimedia University, Malaysia.
Reviewers:
(1) Akshat Pandey, India.
(2) Dalibor Pešić, University of Belgrade, Serbia.
(3) Peter Choate, Mount Royal University, Canada.
Complete Peer review History: http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/47188

Original Research Article

Received 31 January 2019
Accepted 12 April 2019
Published 28 May 2019

ABSTRACT

Aim: Accidents are a common phenomenon on Nigerian roads and are attributed to individual, environmental and contextual factors such as excessive speeding, disobeying traffic laws, aggressive driving among others. This study investigated the predictive influence of demographic and personality traits on risky driving behaviour among traffic offenders in Osun state, Nigeria.
Study Design: Cross-sectional survey design.
Place of Study: Federal Road Safety Commission office and Redeemer's University Osun State, South western Nigeria.
Methodology: Two hundred and eighty three (283) traffic offenders were selected through systematic sampling technique from the population of traffic offenders docked by Traffic offenders Tribunal and formally screened using Driving Behaviour Survey (DBS) and Big-five Personality Inventory (BFI). Descriptive and inferential statistics was used for data analysis.

**Corresponding author: E-mail: akinniyi_rotimi@yahoo.com;*

Results: Personality traits jointly predicted risky driving behaviour. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience significantly independently predicted driving. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experiences jointly predicted anxiety based performance, exaggerated safety caution behaviour, and hostile aggressive behaviour. Demographics variable were observed to be weak predictors of risky driving behaviour among the traffic offenders.
Conclusion: There was high incidence of risky driving behavior among traffic offenders; extraversion, agreeableness conscientiousness and openness to experience were factors predicting risky driving behavior. The study recommends psychological assessment for traffic offenders and applicants of driver's license.

Keywords: Personality traits; traffic offenders; risky driving behaviour.

1. INTRODUCTION

Risky driving refers to the use of a vehicle in a way which makes people vulnerable to harm or injury. This phenomenon has reached a pandemic height and has become one of the most precarious daily challenges in Nigeria. This aberrant behaviour establishes dangerous or risky driving behaviour. This behaviour consequently puts the life of the driver and the lives of other road users in danger [1] The Federal Road Safety Commission (FRSC) (Establishment) Act in its interpretation part (i.e. section 30) characterizes risky driving as "driving in a way that is risky, unsafe, hazardous, careless, reckless and perilous in any conditions of the case" [2]. Risky driving comprises both careless and reckless driving practices.

Ben-Ari, Mikulincer and Gillath [3], distinguished between four major driving styles: (a) reckless and careless driving, (b) anxious driving, (c) angry and hostile driving, and (d) patient and careful driving. All over the world, about 1.2 million people are killed and 20 to 50 million more are injured or disabled annually due to road traffic crashes [4]. According to Roberts, Mohan and Abbasi [5] the losses account for 2.1% of global mortality and 23% of deaths due to injury. Road traffic accidents impose substantial psychological distress and economic costs both in micro and macro scales. Factors that cause road crashes fall into three categories: environmental (e.g. undivided, curved, or inclined and accident-prone roads; lighting, weather conditions and visibility of objects), vehicle (e.g. security equipment, safety maintenance), and human factor (driver's mental and physical capacity, driving style, violations and errors) [6].

The traffic studies have copious evidences that indicate diverted attention or distracting activities which could lead to poor judgment, aggressive driving and hazardous drunk-driving habit [7,8]. Any driving behaviour performed purposely and with the goal of harming such as road rage, disobeying signals, tossing objects, mirror smashing, side-swiping and constraining a driver off the road are referred to as risky driving behaviour.

The factors as predictors of risky driving behaviours and harmful driving outcomes range from psychological, social, environmental to contextual factors. In all, human factors are associated with road accidents and the primary factor leading to road crashes. Thus, there is need to understand the underlying behavioural and cognitive mechanisms of such behaviours. Driving is a complex and goal-directed behaviour that relies on various higher-orders cognitive processes which encompass executive functions. The list of risk factors is endless, however, this study attempts a serious scrutiny of identified demographic and personality traits as predictors of risky and dangerous driving behaviour. The analysis of psychological variables by which the risky driving and road traffic rules violations could be explained still remains significant.

Scientists agree that personality can influence how individuals approach and behave in certain driving situations [9]. It is believed that certain personality traits determine driver's specific attitudes in risky driving. Personality is a vital part of psychological variables influencing human behavior [8]. This behaviour may likewise incorporate driving behaviour. The big five traits include openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism [10]. Openness reflects the level of intellectual interest, resourcefulness and an inclination for curiosity. Conscientiousness describes the

predisposition to be reliability, orderliness and the feeling of obligation. Extraversion attribute is represented by vitality, positive feelings, friendliness and the tendency to look for incitement in the organization of others. Agreeableness involves the propensity to be caring and helpful as opposed to being suspicious or adversarial towards others. For a neurotic personality it involves exhibiting undesirable feelings effortlessly such as outrage, nervousness among others. Personality traits have been accounted for as one of the factors influencing intentional road conducts among drivers [8]. Also, studies have shown that drivers with low agreeableness and conscientiousness but high neuroticism tend to violate road traffic rules and drive under the influence of alcohol [11].

High fatality rate as a result of road accidents is now acknowledged to be a global phenomenon. The road accidents have been identified as a major cause of global mortality as well as physical disability Reduction of road accidents is of a concern for everyone as well as cardinal goal of Decade of Action for Road Safety (2011-2020).

Many studies have addressed the causes and controls of motor vehicle accidents on the highways. The constant need for shift or transportation globally today makes road accident an inevitable but preventable phenomenon. Road traffic injuries and accidents still pose a major public health challenges that require concerted efforts to reduce through effective and sustainable method of preventions. Despite the growing burden of road traffic injuries, the road safety officials have received insufficient attention at both the international and national levels. This study investigated predictive influence of personality traits and demographic factors on risky driving behaviour among traffic offenders in Osun State southwestern Nigeria.

1.1 Research Hypotheses

1. Personality traits (OCEAN) will jointly significantly predict risky driving behaviour among the participants.
2. Demographic factors -age, marital status, education qualification, religion, occupation and year of driving will jointly significantly predict risky driving behaviour among the participants.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Research Design

The study was an ex post-facto which utilized the cross-sectional survey method to gather data. The independent variable was personality-traits while the dependent variable was driving behaviour. In addition, the socio-demographic factors were used as secondary variables. They included: age, gender, marital status, level of education, religious affiliation, occupation and years of driving experience. The description of the various categories is provided in Table 2 below.

2.2 Research Setting

The setting was the FRSC offices located in Osogbo, Ile-Ife and Gbongan in Osun state, southwestern Nigeria.

2.3 Participants

The participants were individuals apprehended and convicted for traffic offenses by the Federal Road Safety Commission (FRSC) officers. A total of two hundred and eighty -three (283) male and female participants (mean age = 34.34 years) took part in the study. The Participants were recruited from February 2018 to April 2018 in the FRSC offices. Participants were fully informed about the aims and scope of the study and they were assured that all information would be kept anonymous in the analyses and in the report of the study.

2.4 Sampling Technique

A multi-stage sampling technique was employed in the selection of the offenders. The first three clusters out of six were selected through balloting. These centres includes: Oshogbo, Ife and Gbongan. At these centres, two hundred and eighty -three were sampled through systematic sampling technique. Every third offender, arraigned by FRSC officers sitting for a period of hours was interviewed and questionnaires were administered to them after their judgment had been delivered.

2.4.1 Sample size estimation

Using a sample size formula by Kish [12], minimum sample size calculated and expected for the study was 364. However due to the nature

of the inclusion criteria for the study, only repeated traffic offenders were sampled for the study. Only two hundred and eighty - three (283) were repeated offenders included in the study.

2.4.2 Inclusion criteria

All the traffic offenders were: 1) drivers; 2) non-accidental traffic violations taken to the FRSC office (13) all drivers willing and able to complete written questionnaires.

2.4.3 Exclusion criteria

The exclusion criteria for both groups are listed below

1) Drivers that were not willing or not able to complete written questionnaires;

2.5 Measures

A battery of test was administered in form of questionnaire to collect data for the study. These are:
Driving Behavior Survey (DBS): The DBS [14] was used to measure anxious driving behaviour. This measure consists of 21 items that index the frequency of anxious driving behaviour across three domains: anxiety-based performance deficits: 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 14, 21; exaggerated safety/caution behaviors: 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19; hostile/aggressive behaviors: 2, 7, 10, 15, 17, 18, 20 (Note: DBS subscales scored as the mean of endorsed items). The items were rated on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale with higher mean scores indicating greater frequency of anxious behaviour. As previously noted, the DBS sub-scales had shown strong internal validity and consistency as well as convergent associations in prior research with both college and treatment-seeking samples [15,14,16]. DBS sub-scales were calculated by finding the scores across the seven items in each behavioural dimension. In the current sample, all three scales showed good to excellent internal consistency (α = .85–.93) and good test– retest reliability between post-treatment assessments (r = .80–.85).

Big-five Inventory (BFI) by John, Donahue, & Kentle, [17].

The version of the five inventories includes 44 questions with short phrases that were graded on a five-degree scale from completely disagree=1 to completely agree=5. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the five factors of neuroticism, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness were 0.78, 0.61, 0.68, 0.74 and 0.75 respectively.

The BFI has been used amongst various Nigerian populations and has been found to have similar psychometric properties compared to western population [18,19,20,21]. According to Oladimeji [22] after several years of research Omoluabi [18] re-standardized the BFI by using a sample of professional in Nigeria to ensure its suitability and relevance. Umeh [19] in a validation study highlighted a comparative report of American and Nigerian population; this is summarized in Table 1.

2.6 Procedure

Approval for this study was obtained from the FRSC sector commandant. The researcher was duly introduced to the offenders who were arrested. The researcher then educate the officers and offenders on the aim and objectives of the study, the inherent benefits, risks involved and the right to withdraw whenever they liked. Participants were randomly selected through the systematic sampling technique. Every third offender that appeared before the court was summarily examined and assessed with the questionnaire. They were screened for risky driving behaviour and personality traits. Those who met the inclusion criteria were considered suitable for inclusion in the study.

Table 1. Comparison table of BFI mean and standard deviation of American and Nigerian population

	Openness		Contentiousnes		Extraversion		Agreeabless		Neuroticim	
	Mean	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**
American populatin	3.92	0.66	3.45	0.73	3.35	0.90	3.64	0.72	3.32	0.82
Nigerian populatin	3.64	0.59	3.73	0.71	3.01	0.70	3.98	0.81	2.80	1.82

Umeh, [19] as cited by Oladimeji [22]

2.7 Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using the statistical package for social sciences SPSS 20.0 Software. Both the descriptive and inferential statistics were used for the analysis of data for this present study. The descriptive statistics such as percentage was used for analysis of the educational level, gender and age while the inferential statistics was used to test the hypothesis generated from this study.

3. RESULTS

Table 2 shows the larger percentage of the respondents: 44.9% were on the age range of 31-40 years, 26.1% were 21-30 years, 22.3% were 41-50 years, and 2.8% were 10-20 years while 3.9% were on the age range of 51 and above. A larger percentage of respondents of 80.9% were males while 19.1% were females, 72.8% of the respondents were married while 27.2% were single. 41.0% of the respondents were Islam, 36.0% were Christians while 23.0% were of traditional (native) religion.

Distribution by occupation showed that 14.8% of the respondent were teachers, 3.9% were tailors, 20.1% were drivers, 7.8% were students, 15.5% were traders, 28.6% were civil servants, 4.2% were farmers, 1.1% were retirees, 0.7% were consultants, 0.4% were engineers, 0.4% were

Table 2. The distribution of the respondents based on the socio-demographics

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
Age	10-20	8	2.8
		74	26.1
	31-40	127	44.9
	41-50	63	22.3
	51 and above	11	3.9
Sex	Female	54	19.1
	Male	229	80.9
Marital Status	Single	77	27.2
	Married	206	72.8
Religion	Christianity	102	36.0
	Islam	116	41.0
	Traditional Religion	65	23.0
Occupation	Teacher	42	14.8
	Driver	57	20.1
	Tailor	11	3.9
	Student	22	7.8
	Trading	44	15.5
	Civil Servant	81	28.6
	Farmer	12	4.2
	Retiree	3	1.1
	Consultant	2	.7
	Engineer	1	.4
	Nursing	1	.4
	Mechanic	3	1.1
	Business	1	.4
	Transporter	1	.4
	Banker	1	.4
	Unemployed	1	.4
Educational Level	Secondary School Certificate	125	44.2
	National Diploma Certificate	86	30.4
	Bachelor's Degree	47	16.6
	Master's Degree	25	8.8
Years of Driving experience	1 – 10 years	185	65.4
	11-20 years	88	31.1
	21-30 years	4	1.4
	Above 30 years	6	2.1

Table 3. Average mean scores on the dimensions of risky driving behavior

			N=283
	Anxiety based performance	**Exaggerated safety caution behaviour**	**Hostile aggressive behaviour**
Mean	19.2014	25.3534	24.5901
Std. Deviation	5.79359	8.68043	5.28226

Table 4. Multiple regression analysis of joint influence of personality traits on driving behavior

Predictors						N=283	
	B	**T**	**P**	**R**	**R^2**	**F**	**p**
Extraversion	-.46	-6.99	< .05				
Agreeableness	.41	3.98	<.05				
Conscientiousness	.17	3.68	< .05	.783	.612	87.54	.005
Neuroticism	-.14	-1.49	>.05				
Openness to experience	-.27	-4.20	<.05				

Table 5. The summary of multiple regression analysis showing the influence of personality traits on anxiety based performance, exaggerated safety caution behaviour and hostile aggressive behaviour

							N = 283		
	Anxiety based performance			**Exaggerated safety caution behaviour**			**Hostile aggressive behaviour**		
Variables	**β**	**t**	**Sig.**	**β**	**T**	**Sig.**	**β**	**t**	**Sig.**
Extraversion	-.631	-6.784	.000	-.111	-2.182	.030	-.448	-7.396	.000
Agreeableness	.178	1.223	.222	.570	7.172	.000	.045	.475	.635
Conscientiousness	-.030	-.446	.656	.332	9.102	.000	-.015	-.335	.738
Neuroticism	.337	2.509	.013	-.188	-2.557	.011	-.468	-5.356	.000
Openness to experience	-.634	-6.993	.000	-.014	-.276	.782	-.057	-.958	.339
R		.47			.87			.82	
R^2		.22			.76			.67	
F –ratio		15.85			182.05			112.96	

Table 6. The summary of a multiple regression analysis showing joint influence of demographic variables on driving behavior

						N=283	
Predictors	**β**	**T**	***p***	**R**	**R^2**	**F**	***p***
Age	.040	.489	> .05				
Sex	.018	.282	>.05				
Marital Status	-.079	-1.088	> .05	.167.	.028	1.126	.399
Religion	-.057	-.877	>.05				
Occupation	.018	.289	>.05				
Educational Level	-.050	-.811	>.05				
Years of Driving	-.141	-1.851	>.05				

nurses, 1.1% were mechanics, 0.4% were business men/women, 0.4% were transporters, 0.4% were bankers while 0.4% were unemployed.

Distribution by educational qualification shows that 44.2% had secondary school certificate, 30.4% had National Diploma certificate, 16.6% had bachelor's degree, while 8.8% were master's degree holders. Finally, the distribution of participants by years of driving showed that 65.4% had been driving for 1-10 years, 31.1% had been driving for 11-20 years, 1.4% had been driving for 21-30 years, and 2.1% had been driving for 31 years and above.

The pattern of average scores on risky driving behavior shows that the drivers have moderate high scores on anxiety based performance (19.20±5.79), exaggerated safety caution behavior (25.23±8.68) and hostile aggressive behavior (24.59±5.28) (Table 3).

3.1 Test of Hypotheses

The first Hypothesis states that personality traits (openness to experiences, consciousness, extroversion, agreeableness and neuroticism) will significantly jointly predict driving behavior. This was tested using multiple regression analysis for testing composite relationship of the independent variables and the result is shown on Table 4.

The results indicated that there was significant joint influence of personality traits on risky driving behaviour: [F(5,283) = 87.54, R^2 = .612; p =.005] with the variables accounting for 61% of the variance in driving behavior. Further results show that extraversion (β=-.45; t= -6.99), agreeableness (β= 41; t = 3.98), conscientiousness (β=.17; t = 3.68), and openness to experience (β=-.27; t= -4.20) significantly predicted driving behavior while neuroticism (β=-.14 t= -1.49) does not significantly predict on driving behavior.

Further analysis tested the prediction of risky driving behavior based on the three dimensions of risky driving behavior: anxiety based performance, exaggerated safety caution behavior and hostile aggressive behavior. The results are presented in Table 5.

The result of multiple regression analysis as presented in Table 5. shows that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experiences jointly predicted anxiety based performance : (R^2 = .22, F (5, 277) = 15.85, *p*= .000; exaggerated safety caution behaviour(R^2 = .76, F (5, 277) = 182.054, *p*= .000; and hostile aggressive behaviour (R^2 = .67, F(5, 277) = 112.96, *p*= .000. The model reveals that 22%, 76% and 67% of variance observed in the dimensions of driving behaviour (anxiety based performance, exaggerated safety caution behaviour and hostile aggressive behavior respectively) among driving behaviour by personality factors (extraversion, agreeableness conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experiences).

The results further revealed that extraversion (β = -.63, t= -6.78, *p*=.000), neuroticism β = .34, t= 2.51, *p*= 013) and openness to experiences (β = -.63, t= -.7.00, *p* =.000) independently significantly predicted anxiety based performance. Extraversion (β = -.11, t= -.2.18, *p*= .030), agreeableness (β = .570, t= 7.17, *p*= .000), conscientiousness, (β = .333, t= 9.10, *p*<.000) and neuroticism (β = -.188, t= -2.56, *p*=.011) independently significantly predicted exaggerated safety caution behaviour while extraversion (β = -.45 t= -7.40, *p*=.000), and neuroticism (β = -.47, t= -5.36, *p*=.000) independently significantly predicted hostile aggressive behavior.

The second Hypothesis states that demographic variables (age, sex, marital status, education, religion and years of training) will significantly jointly predict risky driving behavior of the traffic offenders. This was tested using multiple regression analysis for testing composite relationship of the independent variables and the result is shown on Table 6.

The results indicated that there was no significant joint influence of the demographics variable on driving behaviour: [F(7,275) = 1.126, R^2 = .028; p= .399] with the variables accounting for 3% of the variance in driving behaviour. Further results show that 3.8% variation of driving behavior is accounted for by the demographic variables.

4. DISCUSSION

The study assessed the role of personality traits and demographic factors in risky driving-behaviour among traffic offenders in Osun State southwestern Nigeria. The result of the first hypothesis was supported. It demonstrated that the dimensions to driving behaviour were predicted by personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experiences). Extraversion, neuroticism and openness to experiences were significant independent predictors of anxiety based performance; extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism are predictors of exaggerated safety caution behaviour while extraversion and neuroticism predicted hostile aggressive behaviour.

Our research finding showing that extraversion significantly predicts reckless driving behaviour is supported by previous literature. For instance extraverts have pleasure interacting with others, tend to be assertive, sociable, energetic and

outward [23,24]. In relation with aggressive driving behaviour, Renner and Anderle, [25] reported positive relationships between extraversion and reckless driving. Also Benfield, Szlemko and Bell [26] as well as Dahlen and White [27] observed a positive correlation between extraversion and physical aggression in traffic. This finding also supports previous research findings and reported that drivers who scored high on extraversion would be likely to score higher levels of aggressive behaviour to other road users [26,28,29,30]. This is also in line with perspective of Alavi, Mohammadi, Souri, Kalhori, Jannatifard and Sepahbodi [31] that neuroticism can increase the odds of road accidents by 1.1-fold. Studies show that drivers who scored high in neuroticism reported more aggressive driving behaviour. Different facets of neuroticism may explain its positive association with aggressive driving behaviour. First individuals that are high in neuroticism are generally predisposed to psychological distress and particularly vulnerable to stress [24,32]. Neuroticism is a strong predictor of driver stress [33] and is associated with ineffective coping strategies [34]. Neurotics report more frequent use of aggressive and confrontational approaches to coping than others [35]. Beck, Daughters and Bina Ali [36] affirmed that people with a low tolerance to stress practice risky driving, have high levels of anger while driving and engage in a variety of aggressive driving behaviour. The reactions of individual that are high on neuroticism to stress include decreased cognitive and performance capacities [37], and such individuals may be more stress reactive than others in traffic [28]. In line with Shinar's [38] frustration-aggression model neurotics respond negatively in the presence of environmental stressors. The model affirms that certain aspects of the driver's personality interact with environmental factors to determine whether an aggressive disposition, and subsequently aggressive behaviour, occurs. In similar line of argument, aggressive drivers are characterized by being particularly prone to stress [39,40]. Again neurotic individuals are characterized by sensitivity to punishment [24]. Constantinou, Panayiotou, Konstantinou, Loutsioud-Ladd & Kapardis [41] reported that people with high levels of sensitivity to punishment commit a high number of errors in traffic and traffic violations as well as other aggressive traffic behaviour.

The second facet is in exploring the link between neuroticism and anger [24,42]. Low emotional stability is reported to generally predict aggressive behaviour [43]. Moodiness, being temperamental and emotional instability are central aspects of neuroticism [24]. Emotionally unstable individuals are more prone to anger than emotionally stable individuals [44]. Deffenbacher et al. [42] and Deffenbacher et al., [45], linked anger to aggressive driving. The relation between emotional stability and aggressive driving behavior is also supported [46,43,27,47]. Thirdly, neurotic individuals frequently experience impatience, tension, nervousness and irritation [48], which may elicit aggressive driving behaviour as predicted by Shinar's [38] in the frustration-aggression model.

As in other studies [27] openness was not found to significantly predict aggressive driving behaviour. Individuals with high scores on the openness are often characterized by aesthetic appreciation, values, idea acceptance, self-actualization, personal growth and development [49]. Few studies returned significant relation between openness and aggressive driving behaviour [43]. In support to the finding of this study Dahlen and White [27] found that openness personality trait was negatively associated with aggressive driving behaviour.

Also, agreeableness was not found to significantly predict risk driving behaviour, but predicted exaggerated safety caution behaviour which is supported by previous studies [50,26]. Individuals who score high on agreeableness are inclined to trust others, are altruistic, tolerant and empathic and are likely to forgive, generous and gentle [51,52]. Such people practice careful driving style while those with a low score in agreeableness drive in an angry, reckless, anxious and desolate way, they behave more hostile and more furious [43,47]. According to Benfield et.al, [26] individuals with high scores in agreeableness manifest adaptive behaviours in traffic. Dahlen et al. [50] also reported a negative relation between agreeableness and violation of traffic rules.

Furthermore, high score in conscientiousness is characterized by order, self-discipline, organization, intention to do and resolve things and problems [23]. Our study found that conscientiousness is positively related to exaggerated safety cautious behaviour. In other words drivers that have high score in conscientiousness are careful in traffic. This is supported by Arthur & Graziano Jr. [53] who demonstrated the existence of a negative relation between conscientiousness and involvement in

accidents. Thus, drivers with a high score on conscientiousness are organized, self-discipline, and are rarely involved in traffic accidents than those with low conscientiousness scores. In a similar research finding Jovanovic et al. [43] and Benfield et al. [26] showed that manifestation of physical aggression and verbal aggression while driving relate negatively with conscientiousness, while those with high scores on conscientiousness manifested reduced physical and verbal aggressive behaviour when driving.

The results of this study further indicated that there was no significant joint influence of the demographics variable (age, sex, marital status, education, religion and years of training) on driving. The reason for this difference could be resultant from the combination of the demographic variables used. The predictive effect of each of the variables on driving behaviour might have yielded a different result. Several studies have examined personality factors and situational correlates of driving anger and aggression. In reference to personality factors, younger age and male gender have been associated with greater likelihood of engaging in aggressive driving behavior [54,55].

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results indicated that there was significant joint influence of personality traits on risky driving behaviour. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience are significant independent predictors of driving. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experiences are joint predictors of anxiety based performance, exaggerated safety caution behaviour and hostile aggressive behaviour.

Extraversion, neuroticism and openness to experiences are significant independent predictors of anxiety based performance. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism are significant independent predictors of exaggerated safety caution behaviour while extraversion and neuroticism are significant independent predictors of hostile aggressive behavior. Finally the identified demographics variables failed to jointly predict driving behaviour among the participants.

There should be an enlightenment programs for road users in other not to drive or ride motorbikes in a reckless manner. Road users should also abide by the rules and regulations governing transportation. Psychological assessments of repeat traffic offenders should be carried out by psychologists in collaboration with traffic control officers to ascertain that they are mentally fit and emotionally stable to drive. Finally, in this present study only a small part of the complex domain of personality traits as well as a combined influence of certain demographic characteristics of drivers was examined. To establish a more comprehensive knowledge, future research effort should explore the relationship of each of domains of the personality profile and specific demographic variables on a cross-cultural level within Nigeria.

6. LIMITATIONS

The study sampled only traffic offenders in Osun State south-western Nigeria, hence limiting the generalizability of results. Also only traffic offenders who were willing and able to complete the questionnaires participated in this study.

CONSENT

Informed oral were obtained and written consent forms were completed by the traffic offenders after explanation of the purpose and importance of the study. They were assured that their responses would not affect them negatively in whatsoever way. Confidentiality of obtained information was ensured. Anonymity of the study subjects was assured as no name or any means of identification was requested.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Approval for this study was obtained from the FRSC sector commandant. Ethics on human subjects was adhered to. Finally researchers' intention for the study was subjected to scrutiny and approved by the internal research ethic committee of Redeemer's University, Nigeria.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Wang P, Rau PL, Salvendy G. Road safety research in China: review and appraisal. Traffic injury prevention. 2010;11(4):425-32.
[PubMed PMID: 20730690. Epub 2010/08/24. Eng]
2. Federal Road Safety Commission Act (FRSC); 2018.

Available:http://lawnigeria.com/LawsoftheFederation/Federal-Road-Safety-Commission-%28Establishment%29,-Act,-2007.html

3. Ben-Ari OT, Mikulincer M, Gillath O. The multidimensional driving style inventory – scale construct and validation. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 2004;36(3):323-332.
DOI: 10.1016/S0001-4575(03)00010-1
4. WHO. World report on road traffic injury prevention. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2004.
5. Roberts I, Mohan D, Abbasi K. War on the roads. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2002;324(7346):1107-8.
[PubMed PMID: 12003866. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC1123075. Epub 2002/05/11. Eng]
6. Thompson JP, Baldock MR, Mathias JL, Wundersitz LN. An examination of the environmental, driver and vehicle factors associated with the serious and fatal crashes of older rural drivers. Accident; analysis and prevention. 2013;50:768-75.
[PubMed PMID: 22818779. Epub 2012/07/24. Eng]
7. Jafarpour Saba, Vafa Rahimi-Movaghar. Determinants of risky driving behavior: A narrative review. Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran. 2014;28(1):142.
8. Akinniyi RJ. Personality factors and alcohol use as predictors of driving behavior and accident proneness among injured drivers in Ladoke Akintola University teaching hospital, Oshogbo, University of Ibadan. Theses; 2015.
9. Najeeb PM. A study of psychological factors influencing rule violation of driver's international cooperation on theories and concepts in traffic safety. Transportation Research Institute; 2012.
10. Costa PT Jr., McCrae RR, Dye DA. Domains and facets: Hierarchical personality assessment using the revised NEO personality. Inventory Journal of Personality Assessment 1995;64(1):21-50.
DOI: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6401_2
11. Ucho A, Terwase JM, Ucho AA. Influence of big five personality traits and locus of control on road safety rules compliance among motorcycle riders in north-central Nigeria. Asian Pacific Journal of Education, Art and Science. 2016;3(1).
12. Kish L. Survey sampling. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1965;78-94.
13. Federal Road safety corps National Headquarters, Abuja; FRSC statistics digest, second quarter edition; 2017.
Available:https://frsc.gov.ng/fdg.pdf
14. Clapp JD, Olsen SA, Beck JG, Palyo SA, Grant DM, Gudmundsdottir B, Marques L. The driving behavior survey: Scale construction and validation. Journal of Anxiety Disorders. 2011;25:96–105.
Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2010.08.008. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
15. Clapp JD, Baker AS, Litwack SD, Sloan DM, Beck JG. Psychometric properties of the Driving Behavior Survey in a clinical sample. Journal of Anxiety Disorders. 2014;28:1–7.
[PMC free article][PubMed]
16. Clapp JD, Olsen SA, Danoff-Burg S, Hagewood JH, Hickling EJ, Hwang VS, Beck JG. Factors contributing to anxious driving behavior: The role of stress history and accident severity. Anxiety Disorders. 2011;25:592–598.
Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2011.01.008. [PMC free article][PubMed]
17. John OP, Donahue EM, Kentle RL. The big five inventory-versions 4a and 54. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research; 1991.
18. Omoluabi PF. Big five inventory manual. Lagos: PPC Nigeria Agency; 2002
19. Umeh CS. The impact of personality characteristics on students' adjustment on campus. Unpublished PhD research monograph, Department of psychology, University of Lagos; 2004.
20. Okhakhume AS. Influence of personality factors and loneliness on mental health among undergraduates of distance learning, University of Ibadan. Contemporary Journal of Applied Psychology. 2015;2(1):122-138.
21. Ugalahi TO. Suicidal behaviour among senior secondary school students in Ile-Ife, Nigeria. A dissertation presented to the West African College of Physicians, Faculty of Psychiatry; 2017.
22. Oladimeji BY. Psychological assessment techniques in health care. ANOL Publication Ibadan. 2018;185-195.
23. John OP, Srivastrava S. The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. University of California, Berkeley; 1999.
24. McCrae RR, John OP. An introduction to the five-factor model and its applica-

tions. Journal of Personality. 1992;60: 175–215.
25. Renner W, Anderle FG. Venturesomeness and extraversion as correlates of juvenile drivers traffic violations. Accident, Analysis and Prevention. 2000;5:673-678.
26. Benfield AJ, Szlemko JW, Bell PA. Driver personality and anthropomorphic attributions of vehicle personality relate reported aggressive driving tendencies. Personality and Individual Differences. 2006;42:247-258.
27. Dahlen ER, White RP. The big five factors, sensation seeking, and driving anger in the prediction of unsafe driving. Personality and Individual Differences, 2006;41:903-915.
28. Clarke S, Robertson IT. A meta-analytic review of the Big Five personality factors and accident involvement in occupational and non-occupational settings. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology. 2005;78(3):355-376.
DOI: 10.1348/096317905X26183 51
29. Lajunen T. Personality and accident liability: Are extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism related to traffic and occupational fatalities? Personality and Individual Differences. 2001;31:1365-1373.
30. Oltedal S, Rundmo T. The effects of personality and gender on risky driving behaviour and accident involvement. Safety Science. 2006;44(7):621-628.
DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2005.12.003
31. Alavi SS, Mohammadi MR, Souri H, Kalhori MS, Jannatifard F, Sepahbodi G. Personality, driving behavior and mental disorders factors as predictors of road traffic accidents based on logistic regression a review of the literature on aggressive driving research; 2017.
32. Pappas S. Personality traits & personality types: What is personality? Live science contributor; 2017.
Available:https://www.livescience.com/41313-personality-traits.html
33. Matthews G, Dorn L, Glendon AI. Personality correlates of driver stress. Personality and Individual Differences, 1991;12(6):535-549.
DOI: 10.1016/0191- 8869(91)90248-A
34. Dorn L, Matthews G. Two further studies of personality correlates of driver stress. Personality and Individual Differences, 1992;13(6):949-951.
DOI: 10.1016/0191- 8869(92)90014-G
35. Galovski TE, Blanchard EB. Road rage: A domain for psychological intervention? Aggression and Violent Behavior. 2004; 9(2):105-127.
DOI: 10.1016/S1359- 1789(02)00118-0
36. Beck KH, Daughters SB, Ali B. Hurried driving: Relation to distress tolerance, driver anger, aggressive and risky driving in college students. Accident Analysis and Prevention. 2012;51:51-55.
37. Steffy BD, Jones JW, Murphy LR, Kunz L. A demonstration of the impact of stress abatement programs on reducing employees' accidents and their costs. American Journal of Health Promotion. 1986;1(2):25-32.
DOI: 10.4278/0890-1171-1.2.25
38. Shinar D. Aggressive driving: The contribution of the drivers and the situation. Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour. 1998;1(2):137-160.
DOI: 10.1016/S1369-8478(99)00002-9 58
39. Mayer RE, Treat JR. Psychological, social and cognitive characteristics of high-risk drivers: A pilot study. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 1977;9(1):1-8.
DOI: 10.1016/0001-4575(77)90002-1
40. Selzer ML, Rogers JE, Kern S. Fatal accidents: The role of psychopathology, social stress and acute disturbance. American Journal of Psychiatry. 1968; 124(8):1028- 1036.
41. Constantinou E, Panayiotou G, Konstantinou N, Loutsiou-Ladd A, Kapardis A. Risky and aggressive driving in young adults: Personality matters. Accident Analysis and Prevention. 2011; 43:1323-1331.
42. Deffenbacher JL, Deffenbacher DM, Lynch RK, Richards TL. Anger, aggression, and risky behavior: A comparison of high and low anger drivers. Behavior Research and Therapy. 2003;41(6):701-718.
DOI: 10.1016/S0005- 7967(02)00046-3
43. Jovanovic D, Lipovac K, Stanojevic P, Stanojevic D. The effects of personality traits on driving-related anger and aggressive driving behavioramong Serbian drivers. Transportation Research Part F. 2009;14:43-53.
44. Bone SA, Mowen JC. Identifying the traits of aggressive and distracted drivers: A hierarchical trait model approach. Journal of Consumer Behavior. 2006;5(5):454-464.
DOI: 10.1002/cb.193

45. Deffenbacher JL, Huff ME, Lynch RS, Oetting ER, Salvatore NF. Characteristics and treatment of high-anger drivers. Journal of Counselling Psychology. 2000; 47(1):5-17.
DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.5
46. Herzberg PY. Beyond "accident-proneness": Using five-factor model prototypes to predict driving behavior. Journal of Research in Personality. 2009;43:1096-1100.
47. Taubman-Ben-Ari O, Yehiel D. Driving styles and their associations with personality and motivation. Accident Analysis and Prevention. 2011;45:416-422.
48. Carver CS, Scheier MF. Perspectives on personality (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Ally and Bacon; 1999.
49. McCrae RR, Costa PT, Jr. Personality in adulthood: A five factor theory perspective, Second Edition, New-York, Guilford Press; 2006.
50. Dahlen ER, Edwards BD, Tubre T, Zyphur MJ, Warren CR. Taking a look behind the wheel: An investigation into the personality predictors of aggressive driving. Accident Analysis and Prevention. 2011;45:1-9.
51. John OP, Srivastava S. The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In Pervin LA, John OP (Eds.), Handbook of personality. Theory and research (2nd ed). New York, NY: Guilford. 1999;102-138.
52. McCrae RR, John OP. An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. National Institute on Aging, NIH, University of California at Berkeley; 1990.
53. Arthur Jr. W, Graziano WG. The five - factor model, conscientiousness, and driving accident involvement. Journal of Personality. 1996;64:593-618.
54. Vanlaar W, Simpson H, Mayhew D, Robertson R. Aggressive driving: A survey of attitudes, opinions and behaviors. Journal of Safety Research. 2008;39(4): 376-81.
DOI: 10.1016/j.jsr.2008.05.005
[Epub 2008 Jul 30]
55. Wickens CM, Mann RE, Stoduto G, Ialomiteanu A, Smart RG. Age group differences in self-reported aggressive driving perpetration and victimization. Transportation Research Part F. 2011; 14(5):400-412.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/47188