



## FlashReport

# The weapons effect on wheels: Motorists drive more aggressively when there is a gun in the vehicle<sup>☆</sup>



Brad J. Bushman<sup>a,\*</sup>, Thomas Kerwin<sup>b</sup>, Tyler Whitlock<sup>c</sup>, Janet M. Weisenberger<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Communication and Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University, USA

<sup>b</sup> Driving Simulation Laboratory, The Ohio State University, USA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University, USA

<sup>d</sup> Department of Speech and Hearing Science, The Ohio State University, USA

## ARTICLE INFO

## Keywords:

Weapons effect  
Aggressive driving  
Road rage  
Driving simulator

## ABSTRACT

In discussions about guns, one factor rarely considered is the fact that merely seeing a gun can increase aggression. This effect—called the “weapons effect”—was first demonstrated in a 1967 study, and has been replicated many times since then. The present experiment used a driving simulator to provide a novel test of the weapons effect. One of the most dangerous activities people engage in is driving a vehicle, and survey studies indicate that driving might be more dangerous if there is a gun in the vehicle. In this experiment, participants ( $N = 60$ ) were randomly assigned to drive a frustrating driving scenario with a gun or a tennis racket in the vehicle's passenger seat. Participants drove more aggressively when there was a gun in the vehicle than when there was a tennis racket in the vehicle. These findings suggest that the mere presence of a gun can make drivers more aggressive.

## 1. The weapons effect on wheels: motorists drive more aggressively when there is a gun in the vehicle

In gun control discussions, one factor that is rarely considered is the fact that merely seeing a gun can make people more aggressive. This effect—called the “weapons effect”—was first demonstrated by Berkowitz and LePage (1967). In their seminal study, male college students evaluated each other's performance on a task using unpleasant electrical shocks. However, one of the participants was actually an accomplice. First, the accomplice evaluated the participant's performance by using either 1 shock (low anger condition) or 7 shocks (high anger condition). Next, the participant “evaluated” the accomplice's performance, which was the aggression measure. The participant was seated at a table that had a shotgun and a handgun on it, or badminton racquets and shuttlecocks. The items on the table were described as part of another study that another experimenter had supposedly forgotten to put away. There was also a control condition with no items on the table. The experimenter told participants to ignore the items on the table, but they apparently could not. Angered participants who saw the guns were significantly more aggressive than the other participants. Aggression

levels did not differ for participants who saw the badminton racquets and shuttlecocks on the table, and those who saw no items on the table.

The weapons effect has been replicated many times, both inside and outside the lab (Benjamin, Kepes, & Bushman, 2017). The present study provides a novel experimental test of the weapons effect using a manipulation similar to the one used by Berkowitz and LePage (1967), but in a driving simulator car.

### 1.1. Aggressive driving and road rage

Driving a car is the most dangerous behavior most people engage in every day. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), about 1.25 million people die each year as a result of road traffic crashes, and they are the leading cause of death among 15 to 29 year olds (WHO, 2016). The leading cause of traffic crashes and injuries is aggressive driving, which accounts for more than half of all traffic fatalities (American Automobile Association, n.d.).

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) defines *aggressive driving* as “the operation of a motor vehicle in a manner which endangers or is likely to endanger persons or property” (NHTSA,

<sup>☆</sup> Author Note: We would like to thank the employees of the Driving Simulation Lab for their help conducting this study, especially Kevin Smearsoll for his javascript help on the mimic car and traffic light obstacles. This study was supported by a Social and Behavioral Sciences Undergraduate Research Grant, College of Arts and Sciences to Tyler Whitlock, who is now at Wright State University.

The data for this study are available at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5086885.v1>.

\* Corresponding author at: School of Communication, The Ohio State University, 3016 Derby Hall, 154 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH, USA.

E-mail address: [bushman.20@osu.edu](mailto:bushman.20@osu.edu) (B.J. Bushman).

2016, 2017). Examples include speeding, tailgating, blocking other drivers, driving off the road, running red lights or stop signs, honking horns, flashing bright headlights, making obscene gestures, and cursing or shouting angrily at other drivers.

The NHTSA defines *road rage* as “an assault with a motor vehicle or other dangerous weapon by the operator or passenger(s) of one motor vehicle on the operator or passengers(s) of another motor vehicle or vehicles precipitated by an incident which occurred on a roadway” (NHTSA, 2016, 2017). Examples include colliding into other vehicles or pedestrians. Road rage is a criminal offense. The present driving simulation experiment examined instances of both aggressive driving and road rage.

### 1.2. Survey evidence linking guns to aggressive driving

Survey research shows that drivers with guns in their vehicles are more aggressive drivers than drivers without guns in their vehicles. For example, a random-digit dialing survey of 2770 American drivers found that drivers who had a gun in their vehicle at least once in the past year were significantly more likely than drivers with no gun in their vehicle in the past year to make obscene gestures at other drivers (23% vs. 16%), tailgate (14% vs. 8%), or both (6.3% vs. 2.8%), even after controlling for many other factors related to aggressive driving, such as gender, age, urbanization, census region, and driving frequency (Hemenway, Vriniotis, & Miller, 2006). A random-digit dialing study of 790 Arizona drivers found similar results (Miller, Azrael, Hemenway, & Solop, 2002). However, causal inferences are difficult to make from these survey studies. Thus, we used an experimental design to test whether the mere presence of a gun increases aggressive driving.

### 1.3. Driving simulators

Because it is unethical to conduct experimental studies of aggressive driving using real vehicles on the road, this experiment used a driving simulator. Previous research has shown that driving behavior in simulators closely mirrors driving behavior in actual vehicles. A review of the available evidence concluded that driving simulators “provide a valid tool for assessing a variety of driving performance measures such as speed, lateral position, brake onset, divided, attention, and risky traffic behaviors” (Mullen, Charlton, Devlin, & Bedard, 2011, p. 13–1). This driving simulation experiment recorded speed, brake onset (i.e., tailgating), and risky traffic behaviors (e.g., driving off the road).

### 1.4. Overview

In the present driving simulation experiment, participants were randomly assigned to drive a frustrating scenario with a gun or a tennis racket in the passenger seat. We predicted that participants would drive more aggressively when there was a gun on the passenger seat than when there was a tennis racket on the passenger seat.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions, all manipulations, and all measures in the study. Data collection in driver simulation experiments is quite expensive. According to NHTSA (2016), the minimum acceptable number of participants for driving simulation studies involving driver distraction from in-vehicle devices (e.g., texting) is 24 participants per group. Our goal was to test 30 participants per group. We continued to test participants until we achieved that goal. A total of 77 participants were tested, but 17 did not complete the study (9 experienced motion sickness, 1 had no experience driving, 6 sessions were terminated due to technical problems with the simulator, and 1 session was terminated due to experimental error). The

final sample consisted of 60 university students (23 men in gun condition, 22 men in tennis racket condition, 7 women in gun condition, 8 women in tennis racket condition).

### 2.2. Procedure

Participants were tested individually. Prior to the experiment, participants reported their gender and completed the short Aggression Questionnaire (Bryant & Smith, 2001), which contains 12 items (e.g., “Given enough provocation, I may hit another person,” “I can’t help getting into arguments when people disagree with me”; 1 = *extremely uncharacteristic of me* to 5 = *extremely characteristic of me*; Cronbach  $\alpha = .84$ ). We wanted to test whether the mere presence of a gun would increase aggressive driving above and beyond gender and any pre-existing aggressive tendencies of participants.

Participants were told that the researchers were studying how people behave in various driving situations. By the flip of a coin, participants were randomly assigned to a gun or no gun condition. In the gun condition, there was an unloaded black airsoft training pistol on the passenger seat, which looks like a real 9 mm semi-automatic handgun (i.e., same color, size, appearance, weight, texture). The experimenter looked at the gun and said, “I told the other experimenter to clean up after himself, but he must have forgot. Please leave that gun exactly where it is. It is unloaded. It is for a different study involving police officers.” In the no gun condition, the experimenter said: “I told the other experimenter to clean up after himself, but he must have forgot. Please leave that tennis racket exactly where it is. It is for a different study.” This manipulation is very similar to the one used by Berkowitz and LePage (1967). We did not include a control condition in which there was no object in the seat because Berkowitz and LePage (1967) found no difference in aggressive behavior between participants in the no-object control condition and participants in the sports equipment condition.<sup>1</sup>

Details about the driving simulator are in the Supplemental Materials section. The driving scenario mimicked a two-lane road with a posted speed limit of 60 miles per hour—mph (96.6 km per hour—kph). The simulated traffic was programmed to have an average speed of 55 mph (88.5 kph). Five frustrating events were programmed to take place at pre-determined spots in the driving scenario: (1) a car pulled out in front of the participant from a side-road, (2) traffic jam, (3) construction zone, (4) a mimic car that copied the participant’s car, and (5) a short traffic light. Each frustrating event occurred once.

Although all the other cars were computer generated and controlled, participants were told that other participants were driving some of the other cars. This made the driving situation more realistic, and gave participants targets for their anger and aggression.

After 3–5 min of practice, the participant drove the simulated scenario. All participants were told to get to the end of scenario as quickly as possible, and that the top two finishers would each receive a \$25 gift card. Participants took 15–25 min. A debriefing followed. No participants expressed suspicion about the object on the passenger seat, or about some cars being controlled by other participants.

<sup>1</sup> As an exploratory variable, we also manipulated whether the billboards in the driving scenario contained advertisements for alcoholic or nonalcoholic beverages. We averaged across billboard conditions because there was no interaction between type of billboard and type of object on the seat for any of the dependent variables ( $ps > 0.19$ ). Unfortunately, there was a serious confound with the billboard manipulation. Namely, the alcohol billboards were more interesting and noticeable than the non-alcoholic billboards. We are planning a replication study about the effects of alcohol-related cues on aggressive driving, but using a similar manipulation to the one reported in this article. Specifically, we plan to put either a case of beer or a case of water on the passenger seat. In this study, we also included a measure of narcissism, which was positively related to aggressive driving. Those findings are reported in another article, along with two other studies that investigated the link between narcissism and aggressive driving (Bushman, Steffgen, Kerwin, Whitlack, & Weisenberger, 2017).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5045694>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5045694>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)