6-8-2007

Drink-driving: An examination of instrinsic and extrinsic exchange benefits

Marie-Louise Fry
University of Newcastle

Stephen Holden
Bond University, sholden@bond.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: http://epublications.bond.edu.au/business_pubs

Part of the Marketing Commons

DRINK-DRIVING: AN EXAMINATION OF INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC EXCHANGE BENEFITS

Marie-Louise Fry
Stephen Holden

Social problems, such as drink-driving, involve complex behaviours and require strategies to influence voluntary behaviour. For high at-risk groups, drink-driving prevention strategies often incorporate information telling individuals what they are doing is wrong and that they must change their behaviour. One of the major challenges facing government is communicating the problems associated with drink-driving in ways that are not considered patronising and which fit with young adults' lives. Typically, discussions of symbolic meaning of alcohol consumption view drink-driving as a combined consequence of excessive drinking and risk-taking behaviour. As a result, there is little consideration given to the benefits young adults derive from the act of drink-driving as distinct from those derived from consuming alcohol. This qualitative study, investigates young adults' perceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic exchange benefits derived from their drink-driving. Key factors shaping drink-driving behaviour vary across the under-the-limit, borderline and extreme drink-driver groups. These factors include: driving as a right versus privilege; fear versus fatalistic attitude towards drink-driving; and drink-driving as a means of escape, excitement and adventure versus a utilitarian method for getting home. Implications of this research for theory and policy are discussed, along with future research objectives.

Keywords: social marketing, road safety advertising, benefits, young adults

Marie-Louise Fry
Lecturer
School of Business & Management
University of Newcastle, AUSTRALIA
Email: marie-louise.fry@newcastle.edu.au

Stephen J.S. Holden
School of Business
Bond University
AUSTRALIA

Drink-driving: An examination of intrinsic and extrinsic exchange benefits

1. Introduction

Driving while intoxicated is one of the leading single causes of death and serious injury worldwide (Peder et al, 2004). Major initiatives addressing this problem include both physical (road design, police enforcement, vehicle modifications) and social infrastructure (school-based education and advertising campaigns). Fear-based advertising interventions continue as the key social initiative in creating pro-social road safety attitudes and behaviour. Yet, despite success in reducing overall population fatalities via combined fear-based advertising and police enforcement strategies, young adults continue to be over-represented in road-related fatalities (Young and Powers 2005). In the Australian context, young adults represent 12 percent of the Australian population (ABS 2001), 17 percent of licensed drivers, and yet are involved in approximately one-third of over-the-limit alcohol-related road crashes (i.e. over 0.05g of alcohol in 100ml of blood) (ATSB 2004). Such figures raise concerns regarding the effectiveness of current fear-based anti-drink driving advertising-based campaigns.

The challenge for road safety advocates centres on creating messages that address the drink-driving topic, while simultaneously enhancing the relevance and desirability of taking up responsible behaviour. The challenge becomes especially critical for new drivers, and those high at-risk who may not necessarily or easily accept the advocated anti-drink driving position. Recent perspectives suggest that high at-risk young adults are unmoved by fear-based messages as they have little sense of their own mortality (Hastings et al, 2004), view such ads with hypocrisy given the level of violence shown in television programs (Fry, 2006), consider prevention ads as personally irrelevant, and see scare tactics as working for others but not them (Cohn, 1998). Furthermore, the vast amount of literature reporting the impact of excessive alcohol on health, behaviour, and socialisation typically examines the alcohol consumption – outcome (i.e.: vomiting, drink-driving, crime) relationship as a bundle of behaviours. As a result, there is little consideration given to the benefits young adults derive from the act of drink-driving as distinct from those derived from consuming alcohol. Understanding the benefits or value young people derive from engaging in drink-driving behaviour becomes imperative as road traffic authorities are examining alternate avenues for reaching high at-risk individuals who gain benefits from engaging in socially inappropriate behaviour. In addressing this gap, this research explores the intrinsic and extrinsic benefits young adults derive from drink-driving and relate these to motivated reasoning and counter-argumentation end-states in order to increase the relevance of prevention advertising to this cohort, especially those high at-risk for continuing harmful behaviour. The following discussion examines the utility of taking a relational perspective in preventive advertising and then examines the concept of benefits gained in a drink-driving context.

2. Preventive advertising: relational perspective

Social marketing has been criticized for its individual, micro-experimental focus targeting people's 'bad behaviour' and emphasizing a downstream approach to strategy development (Andreasen, 2006). Over the past thirty years social marketing has acknowledged individual change depends not only on the choices of individuals, but also on the pressures in the environment in which individuals live (Bentz et al, 2005). This approach recognizes relational thinking within the exchange process, a perspective promoted by Bagozzi (1975) thirty years ago. It is clear that a relational perspective has been applied to road safety with the inclusion of stakeholders such as police, government policy, school education, legal policy, vehicle manufacturers and liquor hospitality groups. However, we question whether a relational

perspective has been undertaken with the target market in the development of advertising messages.

Typically, advertising positioning strategies for safe driving behaviour emphasise cognitive and affective cues, particularly fear, as pre-cursors to attitude and behaviour change. This assumes the target market possesses no or little knowledge of the consequences of drink driving, and that fear is effective in the persuasion process. In spite of this assumption there is evidence to suggest that drink-driver offenders and non-offenders possess similar levels of correct knowledge regarding legal blood alcohol levels (Baum, 2000). Similarly, while the particular effects of fear appeals have been well documented, current perspectives regarding the effectiveness of fear appeals suggest less agreement on fear as a key moderator to attitude and/or behaviour change (Hastings et al 2004).

In light of the less than satisfactory results from existing approaches, we propose an alternative approach focusing on determining what benefits are being derived by young adults when making the decision to drink and drive. And can these benefits be utilised in prevention advertising strategies?

3. The 'value' proposition in a drink-drive context
At the heart of the exchange process is a concept of 'value' (Bagozzi 1975), and consequently, value-creation is considered an essential component of marketing strategy (Porter, 1985). Stakeholder theory from a relational perspective suggests that firms form positive exchanges with customers and suppliers in order to forge long-term relationships, and that most economic exchanges are nested within the context of social relationships (Kimery and Rinehart 1998). In the process of creating value, Polonsky et al (2003) recognise that positive economic exchanges may also produce harmful outcomes to various parties within the exchange process. These authors argue that in enhancing 'value', consideration of any harm that might arise from the exchange process is imperative. They propose and develop the 'harm chain' advocating a relational perspective of all stakeholders in the production of goods for market.

Extending the application of the 'harm chain' to a social marketing context, Previte and Fry (2006) put forward the drink-drive value-chain which consists of two parallel value chains – positive and negative. The perspective of positive or negative value is dependent on the stakeholder and their motivated reasoning for taking such a stance. Designers of drink-driving prevention strategies typically address the *negative value chain* by identifying problems of drink-driving and associated reckless behaviour with fear cues emphasizing gory images. Alternatively, young adults who continue to drink-drive derive benefits from maintaining their behaviour through a *positive value chain* – that is, they focus on the benefits to themselves. Binge-drinking is often practiced to achieve social acceptance which, in turn, reinforces social norms supporting excessive alcohol consumption and influences reckless behaviour such as drink-driving, unsafe sex and crime. Positive value or benefit, is reinforced via story-telling, hangovers and vomiting. These badges of valor validate the concept of a 'great night out'. The complexity of the task for social marketers resides in altering 'value' perceptions considered by the high at-risk target group as positive at the individual level, but which society sanctions.

The application of a relational perspective to the development of drink-driving prevention advertising necessitates understanding the social structure young adults inhabit in contemporary society. In particular, a relational perspective advocates understanding what

attitudes and motives the target market considers of 'value' from both a usage perspective and an exchange perspective. What benefits are derived from usage, and what benefits might be exchangeable or tradeable for some other benefit. The degree of benefit, or the potency of the value is delineated for each entity involved in the exchange (Alderson 1965). Alderson identifies potency as the motivating force behind behaviour unique to the entity and is characterized as extrinsic and/or intrinsic. An extrinsic characteristic refers to benefit derived from the marketplace, and as such has broad market value. In a drink-driving situation extrinsic benefits may include continuing life, health and possessing socially acceptable driving morals. Intrinsic characteristics refer to benefits derived from any source other than the market, yet which may also have market value. In a drink-drive situation intrinsic benefits can be related to the value an individual derives from continuing a harmful behaviour eg: perceptions of driving efficacy or convenience traveling between drinking venues. These are not benefits on which social marketers are likely to position prevention advertising.

Taking into consideration over 20 years of fear-based advertising, it is argued that positioning preventive advertising within a negative value chain framework is no longer valid to individuals who inhabit this new market space. Prevention advertising often provokes negative reactions from the key target group (i.e. those high at-risk individuals) as it condemns actual behaviour, identifies what is wrong and that behaviour must change. In the situation where information received is inconsistent with the individual's past, people rationalize and justify their conclusion to convince themselves and others (Kunda 1990). Justification takes the form of motivated reasoning whereby the individual discounts the argument advanced, increases counter argumentation and continues his/her current harmful behaviour. Thus, for high at-risk individuals who perceive 'positive value' from continuing harmful behaviour, the negative positioning of prevention advertising becomes problematic. Australian road safety authorities are looking at alternate perspectives for positioning road safety advertising. This suggests moving away from a 'what does advertising do to people?' perspective towards a 'what do people do with advertising?' approach. The latter gives greater emphasis to the cultural meaning and symbolism of consumption within the dynamically changing marketspace that young adults inhabit. The current landscape is quite different from that experienced by earlier generations (eg: liberalization of alcohol, proliferation of pubs, clubs and hybrid venues and technology innovation). In order to develop effective prevention advertising for drink driving it is important to have a clear understanding of the perceived benefits (both intrinsic and extrinsic) young adults derive from their drink-driving experiences, and then develop advertising campaigns around this information. Thus, the objective of this study was to capture an understanding of drink-driving experiences of young adult novice drivers, as well as understand the benefits attached to unsafe and safe drink-driving behaviour with a view to increasing the relevance of drink-driving prevention strategies to the young adult cohort generally, and more specifically to those who continue to drink and drive.

4. Method
Focus groups consisted of fifty-three young adult males and females aged between 17 and 25 years to account for gender based perspectives. Data collection was conducted in the Hunter region, New South Wales, Australia. Recent drink-driving statistics identify this region as possessing the highest average positive breathalyser tests in the State with one in 85 tests reporting positive reading as compared with one in 123 for the State average (Proudman, 2005). To ensure representation of a wide range of perceptions, the focus group discussions included a cross section of young adults who were employed, unemployed or attended university. Employed respondents represented a number of industries including advertising,

sales, business, finance, administration, law, medicine, shipping and coal. University respondents were represented across a number of faculties: law, medicine, business, engineering, social sciences. Gender was equally represented (males n = 25; females n=28).

Focus group sessions were carried out till no new information was obtained and were held for approximately two hours (Taylor 1994). Each session was conducted as a 'grand tour' across three topic areas: drink-driving knowledge, typical drink-driving decisions and benefits of drink-driving. Incorporating a non-directive approach ensured broad topic areas were addressed, but that individuals would respond according to their own assumptions (McCracken 1988). Interview transcripts and notes were imported into NUD*IST for coding.

5. Findings
Several themes were evident in the findings. Justification for driving while intoxicated revealed a mixture of defiance, commonsense and rationalisation. Young adults are highly informed at a cognitive level of the consequences of drinking and driving as a result of school-based education. Despite awareness of the physical and social risks of drink-driving the short-term personal experiences of revelry are more pertinent to them on an everyday basis. The act of driving plays an important role in symbolising freedom and independence in a young person's life, with drink-driving described, by some, as a behaviour that served several uses.

The qualitative discussions revealed three relatively distinct drink-driving groups: 1) *under-the-limit drink-drivers* who considered drink-driving to be immoral and socially unacceptable (n = 15), 2) *borderline drink-drivers* who consumed alcohol throughout the evening, stopped consumption at least one hour prior to driving home and believed they were borderline in terms of legal blood alcohol content level (n = 20), and 3) *extreme drink-drivers* who reported they regularly drove home after binge drinking sessions (n = 18). Study findings discuss similarities and differences in attitudes and perceptions towards drink-driving across the three drink-driver categories where pertinent. The following elaborates on young adults' attitudes towards drink-driving knowledge, typical drink-driving decisions and benefits of drink-driving.

Drink-driving knowledge
Prior to a general questioning, drink-driving knowledge was measured by a series of questions that aimed to test the respondent's level of knowledge regarding the legal BAC (blood alcohol concentration levels)and the limit to the number of standard alcoholic drinks required to stay under the limit. The responses were coded correct or incorrect. All groups (under-the-limit, borderline and extreme drinkers) identified high levels of correct knowledge regarding BAC (95% correct). There was less understanding of safe drinking practices overall, and women scored higher on safe drinking practices (93%) relative to men (60%). When asked if the effects of alcohol were the same for men and women, women were more likely to be correct (90% vs. 63% of men). School-based drug and alcohol programs were identified as the key source of knowledge of safe drink-driving practices. Despite high levels of cognitive knowledge and awareness of safe alternatives, young adults in the borderline and extreme drinking groups self-reported they had driven drunk at least once in the past eight weeks.

Overall, respondents correctly identified broad drinking limits required to ensure under-the-limit driving: for women - one standard drink in the first hour and one every hour thereafter, and for men - two standard drinks in the first hour and one every hour thereafter. Yet, there was confusion as to what constitutes a standard drink. Confusion surrounded how to measure

a standard unit of alcohol when different types of alcohol possess differing alcohol percentages, and alcohol packaging differs across alcohol categories, as well as serving sizes across pubs and clubs. Respondents were likely to identify that a standard drink was a glass of wine served by a publican, thus counting glasses as a measure of how much alcohol they consumed. When shown the 'standard drink guide' respondents across all groups were surprised that their general knowledge of what constitutes a standard drink was incorrect.

> 'I always thought a glass of wine was one standard drink…' (Female, under-the-limit)
> 'Yeah…we always drink schooners. You're a loser if you don't. I try to buy myself a light (beer) when it's my time to buy a round. It's just not accepted if you own up to drinking a light (beer)' (Male, borderline)

Interestingly, it appeared that those with an open licence possessed less knowledge of correct drinking levels compared to those with a restricted provisional licence.

Drink-driving decisions
Under-the-limit drivers considered drink-driving to be morally and socially unacceptable, and vigorously opposed such behaviour. Responsibility for one's actions and responsibility to others were imperative. This group considered driving as a privilege with certain responsibilities (i.e., with legal and/or moral obligations) attached.

> 'We are lucky to live in a time in which we do. We have technology and transport at our finger tips. When we drive we have a responsibility on the road, as well as to pedestrians. I'm fortunate that I live in a time where I can get around easily.' (Female, under-the-limit)
> 'Absoultely .. I have zero tolerance for it (drink-driving). My initial response is that the "law says it's bad" (Male, under-the-limit)

In contrast, extreme drinkers and the borderline drinkers perceived driving as a "right of adulthood". These individuals claimed driving as part of their mobility and independence. The act of driving was discussed from an individual perspective acknowledging the personal gratification of driving rather than from a broader social perspective with greater social implications. Males in particular appeared to identify driving as a part of their masculinity evidenced by the type of car they owned, or would like to own.

> 'The larger the engine size and the faster the speed …. That's all that counts' (Male, extreme)
> 'Driving is something that you do as soon as you are able do to … you don't wait … it gives you access to where ever you want to go, whoever you want to be… it's your freedom' (Female, borderline)

Although borderliners also engaged in risky driving behaviour they appeared more likely to do so within self-justified limits. This group were cognisant that the nature of their behaviour involved risk, yet engaged in high levels of rationalization to ratify their behaviour. Frequent statements justifying risky driving behaviour included: "driving a few kilometres over the speed limit", or "taking the back streets home after a few drinks".

Benefits of drink-driving
A number of factors appear to shape drink-driving for extreme and borderliner drink-driver groupings. Table 1 reports the key intrinsic and extrinsic benefits of young adults across the three drink-driving groups.

Under-the-limit drivers perceive positive pro-social benefits from limiting their alcohol consumption when driving. Moral obligation was a key intrinsic and extrinsic driver for this

group. Motivations of personal responsibility to friends, responsibility for one's actions, obligation to prevent harm when in charge of others, maintaining a non-drinking status for benefit of others were reported as intrinsic benefits from not drink-driving. At an extrinsic value level, the social unacceptability of drink-driving and the stigma of loss are paramount. This group feels strongly that drink-driving is morally and socially unacceptable, identifying drink-driving as 'stupid and irresponsible'. These participants felt a higher sense of responsibility for their own actions as a member of society to prevent harm. Loss involved cancellation of licence, employment or employment choices (eg: law, medicine), licence points and the resulting outcome of informing family and friends. Some feel strongly that such loss would incur emotions of guilt, and that peers may reconsider their opinion of them as a result of such reckless behaviour.

Under-the-limit drivers identified two additional intrinsic benefits for not drink-driving: penalty issues of being caught drink-driving and financial issues. For many, penalty issues were driven by fear. Fear of being breath-tested, convicted, jailed, having to attend the traffic offence program, and fear of going to court. As one individual mentioned 'the simple fear of being caught over the limit is enough.' In terms of financial benefits, many commented they do not have the finances to waste on drinking-to-excess nor for paying fines. As they mentioned: 'it's cheaper to stay sober'.

TABLE 1: Intrinsic and Extrinsic benefits of drink-driving

Benefit	Under-the-limit drivers	Borderline drink-drivers + Over-the-limit drink-drivers
Intrinsic	Moral - personal responsibility to friends Penalty - loss of licence - living with ramifications of a fatal accident Financial - less expensive to stay sober - career implications	Defiance - fatalistic attitude Driving efficacy Financial - less expensive to drive than catching a taxi Mobility & convenience
Extrinsic	Moral - socially unacceptable - social stigma of licence loss	Vehicle safety

<u>Borderliner and extreme drink-drivers</u> perceived similar intrinsic and extrinsic benefits from engaging in a drink-driving behaviour. The key difference resides in the potency of attitudes associated with drink-driving. Extreme drink-drivers believed the experience of drink-driving was sublime and continually engaged in such behaviour for its sheer thrill and excitement. Very little consideration was given to the social, physical or psychological effects of a fatal accident. Alternatively, borderliners were highly cognisant that drink-driving has potentially harmful outcomes and engaged in high levels of justification to legitimately rationalise their behaviour.

Both extreme and borderliner groups possessed a fatalistic attitude towards vehicle accidents and police convictions. They believed that 'accidents occur anyway' and that 'if we get caught, we get caught'. Importantly, those belonging to the extreme drink-driver group were more interested in the individual benefits derived from engaging in risky behaviour. They commented that they engaged in multiple forms of risky behaviour mostly just for the adrenalin rush. Importantly, group norms sanctioned engagement in risky behaviour.

Although at a broad level, extreme drink-drivers understood their behaviour has potentially harmful outcomes, there was little consideration of social or personal harm eventuating. Individual interest was paramount, and centred on getting home when the individual wanted to leave the venue.

> 'Getting home is important. Just have to get home. That's all there is to it.' (Male, extreme)
>
> 'Never been caught and won't be caught' (Female, extreme)

For extreme drink-drivers, a key motivating force is the ability to demonstrate driving efficacy. Many identified drink-driving as taking a calculated risk in order to arrive home, that they are able to drive more efficiently when drunk, and they acquire extra confidence which in turn enhanced a sense of security. Many extreme drink-drivers commented on their enhanced driving skills when drunk, especially that they are able to handle the car better on corners and have an extra sense of perception.

> 'At the point of being drunk … it's like it (alcohol) gives people extra confidence and they're like "I won't crash, I won't get caught" and so it's like when you're drunk you have a sense of security to drive.' (Male, extreme)

Driving efficacy was not a major concern for borderline drink-drivers. This group was more concerned with maintaining safe driving practices (i.e.: not travelling too close to other vehicles, allowing enough braking space). Although they mentioned a fatalistic attitude towards being caught for driving while intoxicated, they simultaneously engaged in precautionary driving practices even if over the legal blood alcohol limit to drive.

Mobility and convenience were key drivers for the extreme and borderline group to drive to a drinking venue. Lack of viable transport options (taxis, public transport infrastructure and safety from stop to home) was frequently cited by borderliners as a key consideration for driving to a drinking venue. Ability to leave venues without time restrictions and the ability to travel between venues were cited as major reasons for drink-driving. Although borderliners may have intended to not drive after drinking, concerns for vehicle safety then became a major concern. Consequently, extrinsic concerns for the vehicle overrode any intentions not to drink and drive.

> 'I won't leave the car in town. Too much vandalism of cars left in the street. Smashed windows or slashed tyres. I'll make sure the car gets home.' (Female – borderline)

6. Discussion

The key objective of this study was to gain insight of young adults' attitudes towards drink-driving. Exploring the intrinsic and extrinsic benefits of drink-driving aims to understand the symbolic meaning young adults associate with a behaviour discouraged by society, yet which yields positive value for at least some individuals. Overall, justification for driving while intoxicated revealed a mixture of defiance, commonsense and rationalisation which supports previous research of attachment to thrill-seeking behaviour, driver efficacy and disregard for conviction (Young and Powers 2005, Jonah 1997).

The findings of this study are significant as they illustrate the dynamic interactions young people have with drink-driving, particularly those at-risk for continuing to drink and drive. It is clear drink-driving benefits differ not only within the young adult market across those who drink and drive and those who do not, but also within the drink-driver cohorts. Importantly, the drink-driver cohort can be segmented by those who are likely to be borderline BAC level and those who admitted to excessive drinking then driving as a regular occurrence. The study

further indicates benefits differ considerably from under-the-limit drivers as compared to extreme drink-drivers. Borderline and extreme drink-drivers exhibited similar benefits. For both groups, intrinsic characteristics of defiance and driving efficacy, mobility and convenience, as well as extrinsic characteristic of vehicle safety/possession explain drink-driving behaviour. Importantly, the strength and type of benefit associated with drink-driving behaviour, serve to differentiate these two groups.

Thematic analysis of study outcomes suggests three key factors explain intrinsic and extrinsic benefits young adults derive from drink-driving. These factors include: (i) driving perceived as a "right vs. privilege"; (ii) "fear versus fatalistic" attitude towards drink-driving; and (iii) drink-driving as "escape, excitement and adventure" versus a "utilitarian" means of getting home.

Young adults' attitudes towards driving expectancy (i.e.: driving as a "right vs. privilege") appeared to influence behaviour to drink-drive. It appeared that the greater the degree to which an individual considered driving as a "right" the more individualistic they were about their driving behaviour, less conscious of the social and risk ramifications, and more likely to engage in drink-driving behaviour. At the high potency end for drink-driving were the extreme drink-driver group who indicated they regularly drove whilst intoxicated and engaged in other risky driving behaviour (e.g.: speeding, drag racing). Extreme drink-drivers were more interested in the individual gratification derived from partaking in risky behaviour, rather than considering the social, health or psychological aspects of the risky nature of their behaviour. In contrast, under-the-limit drivers believe driving is a "privilege" which implicitly has certain responsibilities to friends, society and self, as well as legal and moral obligations. Internalisation of socially acceptable values translates into safe drink-driving behaviour.

Drink-driving behaviour appeared to be driven fear amongst some, and by a fatalistic attitude amongst others. For under-the-limit drivers fear of a fatal accident was a vital motivation for maintaining safe drink-driving behaviour. There was also the personal fear about the possibility of being convicted of a drink-driving offence or losing a licence, having to inform family and friends, possibility of employment loss, etc. On the other hand, extreme and borderline drink-drivers possess a fatalistic attitude towards drink-driving with little fear of being caught for driving while intoxicated, being convicted, or having an accident. For extreme drink-drivers partaking in risky behaviour was a norm. Despite acknowledging that harm may occur, their central focus was on personal gratification.

Motivations related to escapism versus utilitarian means for getting home served to differentiate the extreme and borderline drink-driver groups. Extreme drink-drivers believe the experience of drink-driving is sublime. Drink-driving is a premeditated, accepted behaviour. It is a form of behaviour they enjoy, and offers self-fulfilment on a number of levels: transformation though superior driving capability; enhances control over surroundings, it is an outward expression of inner self, and defies authority. Furthermore, individualistic benefits of escape and thrill were paramount. The vehicle represents an extension of the self symbolising individualism and machismo, is an expression of the consumption of risky behaviour where speed and vehicle modification are vital, and acts as a visible status cue. In contrast, borderline drink-driving capability is synonymous with safety as represented by precautionary driving strategies with peers despite intoxication and a benefit function of getting home. Borderliner behaviour is contradictory on a number of levels. Altruistically they perceive their drink-drive behaviour as accidental, while simultaneously perceiving alternative prevention strategies as unacceptable and police conviction a possible outcome.

This suggests that borderliners represent a complex mix of defiance and utilitarian purpose with moral and social responsibility.

These findings are important for consumer research as they show that in order to understand drink-driving behaviour, it is necessary to obtain a deep understanding of the benefits young people perceive to be associated with drink-driving rather than merely providing an account of the physical outcomes of risky behaviour, or bundling all related risky behaviour together (i.e., consuming alcohol and driving behaviour).

As with all research, this study has its limitations. The results are qualitative and observations about differences between groups should be treated as tentative. The study focuses on risky road-behaviors, but might be deepened and strengthened by a consideration of other domains of risky behaviors.

7. Conclusion
In promoting road safety, it is important to ensure that the symbolism and cultural meaning of communications has relevance, especially to young adults. The suggestion that drink-drinking behaviour can be segmented has important implications for road safety policy makers in developing prevention strategies. Implementing differential prevention strategies based on direct drinking-driving experiences allows for a targeted approach reflecting deliberate choices and purposes of drink-driving. This study provides some input into understanding the motivations for, and benefits young adults derive from drink-driving behaviour.

References
Alderson, W. (1965). *Dynamic Marketing Behaviour*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin Inc.

Andreasen, A.R. (2006). *Social Marketing in the 21st Century.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

ABS. (Australian Bureau of Statistics) (2001) *Census of population and housing: Basic community profile – Australia.* Reported viewed at: http://www.abs.gov.au

ATSB. 2004. Road Safety in Australia: A publication commemorating World Health Day 2004: Australian Transport Safety Bureau.

Bagozzi, R.P. (1975). Marketing as exchange. *Journal of Marketing*, 32, 32-9.

Baum, S. (2000). Drink driving as a social problem: comparing the attitudes and knowledge of drink driving offenders and the general community. *Accident, Analysis and Prevention,* 32, 689-694.

Bentz, J.W., Dorfman, L., Denniston, R., & Novelli, W. (2005). Opportunities for social change through upstream partnerships. *Social Marketing Quarterly,* 11(3-4), 17-24.

Hastings, G., Stead, M., and Webb, J. (2004). Fear appeals in social marketing: Strategic and ethical reasons for concern. *Psychology and Marketing*, 21(11), 961-986.

Jonah BA. 1997. Sensation seeking and risky driving: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Accident Analysis & Prevention.* **29**(5): 651-665.

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 636-647.

Kimery, K.M., & Rinehart, S.M. (1998). Markets and constituencies: An alternative view of the marketing concept. *Journal of Business Research.* 43(3), 117-24.

Peder, M., Scurfield, R., Sleet, D., Mohan, D., Hyder, A. A., Jarawan, E., et al. (2004). *World report on road traffic injury prevention (No. ISBN: 92 4 156260 9).* Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organisation.

Previte, J., & Fry, M.L. (2006). Conceptualising the harm chain in social marketing strategy: A drink-drive application. *Australian & New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference*, Brisbane, 4-6 December.

Proudman D. 2005. Message ignored: Alcohol the scourge of Hunter roads. *Newcastle Herald*: May 7.

Polonsky, M.J., Carlson, L., & Fry, M.L. (2003). The harm chain: a public policy development and stakeholder perspective. *Marketing Theory* 3(3), 345-364.

Porter, M.E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance.* The Free Press, USA.

Taylor, R. E. (1994). Qualitative Research. In M. W. Singletary (Ed), *Mass Communication Research* (pp.265-279). New York, Longman.

Williams, P. (2000). *Alcohol-related social disorder and rural youth: Part 2 – Perpetrators (No. 149).* Canberra, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology: Trends and Issues.

Young, A., and Powers, J. (2005). *Australia women and alcohol consumption 1996-2003.* Canberra, Australia. Department of Health and Aging. National Alcohol Strategy.