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Abstract

Graduated licensing has been identified as the most promising approach to reducing the crash risk of novice drivers. However, research suggests that the effectiveness of graduated licensing appears to differ between urban and rural novice drivers and according to race or ethnicity. Extensive supervised driving practice as a learner driver is an important component of graduated licensing systems in Australia and many other countries. Earlier CARRS-Q research identified that falsification of logbooks was more common among particular demographic groups. The factors underlying this are not well understood. It is unclear whether this reflects a lack of understanding of the importance of supervised practice (given that it is not a licensing requirement in many countries of origin), or it reflects lack of access to vehicles and supervising drivers, or whether there is less respect for driver licensing requirements among some groups. It is possible that the importance of these factors may differ across ethnic groups, depending on socioeconomic factors and cultural attitudes to road safety. In an attempt to better understand these issues, this study presents some preliminary results of focus groups examining the experience of the Queensland Graduated Driver Licensing System by Korean-Australian novice drivers and their parents.

Introduction

The 2011 Australian Census revealed that 26% of the Australian population was born overseas and a further 20% had at least one parent who was born offshore (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, 2008). Hence as a nation with various nationalities, there are drivers who have learnt to drive in different environments and road regulations that are currently driving on Australian roads. Thus, road safety is an important issue and there is the need to observe driving behaviours specifically of those who have learnt to drive overseas.

Overseas-born driving behaviour

Driving styles are influenced by the drivers’ personality characteristics, sense of themselves as a driver and their driving experience (Lajunen, et al., 1998). Findings suggest social behaviour, cognitive processes and attitudes are influenced by cultural backgrounds (Berry, et al., 1992), and it has been reported that people from different cultures express different levels of sense of control and aggressiveness, and that these factors influence driving behaviour.

Socio-economic status also contributes to variations among mortality and morbidity rates. Education levels distinguish people according to their ability to benefit from new knowledge and their income status differentiates their access to materials and goods. A Swedish study demonstrated clear significant socio-economic differences in traffic injuries. Young drivers from manual worker families showed an 80% higher risk for traffic related injuries compared to families with salaried employee parents. These results confirmed that in Sweden, the risk of injuries among young drivers varied according to their socio-economic backgrounds (Hasselberg & Laflamme, 2003).

It has been shown that the prevalence of risky driving behaviours and crash risk varies between cultural and ethnic groups. This may be due to the differences in defining risks and levels of risk acceptance among the different cultural and ethnic groups (Tursz, 2000). Previous studies have shown foreigners were more likely to be involved in motor vehicle crashes than local residents. A study of hospital records in Greece showed foreign drivers were at increased risk of having car accidents.
crashes in comparison to native Greek drivers (Petridou et al., 1999). Furthermore in Crete, foreigners from left-sided driving countries had a 2.5 times increased crash risk compared to those from right-sided driving countries when they rented rather than owned their vehicle (Petridou et al., 1997). Furthermore, a study by Wilks, Watson and Hansen (2000) reviewed the safety of international visitors driving in Australia. The findings were consistent with those of Petridou et al. (1997), as Wilks et al. (2000) reported that international drivers were more at risk to crashes than native drivers.

However, another study in Australia revealed contradictory results. The study reviewed the driving behaviours of young drivers born in Asia compared to those born in Australia (Boufous, et al., 2010). This indicated young Asian drivers were involved less in risky driving behaviour.

Graduated driver licensing system

Internationally, many jurisdictions have introduced graduated driver licensing (GDL) systems to reduce the crash risks of novice drivers. Within these systems, novice drivers gain supervised driving experience on a learner’s permit. Then they proceed to the unsupervised provisional or probationary driving stage with specific driving restrictions in order to reduce their exposure to hazardous situations while the novice drivers gain driving experience. When this period is completed, the drivers are then able to obtain a full-unrestricted licence (Beanland et al., 2013). The rationale for this progressive system is to develop the novice drivers to reasonably safe drivers by supporting them to gain experience whilst minimising exposure to high-risk situations.

What constitutes ‘best practice’ in GDL is constantly being evaluated and adjusted, including by extending the learning phase and the time required for supervised driving. In the United States, the general minimum requirements are a minimum learner licence period of six months, with 50 hours of supervised driving in order to obtain a provisional licence (Foss & Evenson, 1999). A study by Berg et al. (2004) in Sweden observed the outcomes of new legislation in which the learner’s permit age was lowered from 17.5 years to 16.5 years. This change was only allowed under the circumstance that those wanting to drive earlier must be supervised by a driving school instructor or an adult older than 24 years with an instructor’s permit. The licensing age remained at 18 years and the results showed those who started driving earlier had accumulated 2.5 times more driving hours before obtaining a full licence and had 24% fewer crashes than those who started driving at 17.5 years. Hence this showed that greater experience of driving prior to licensure had lowered the crash rates of young drivers.

In July 2007, Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads extensively modified the GDL system by introducing the requirement of 100 hours of supervised driving, documenting logbook hours, two stages of provisional licence (P1 and P2), passenger restrictions and a hazard perception test, among other initiatives designed to improve young novice driver safety. Passenger restrictions involved P1 drivers aged under 25 years to be restricted from carrying more than one passenger aged under 21 years between 11pm and 5am. Furthermore, the hazard perception test is an online test that measures the ability of driver’s response to dangerous driving situations which P1 licence holders must pass in order to advance to P2. After the introduction of these changes, in 2010 there were 63 fatalities involving young drivers or riders (aged 17 to 24) which was 25.3% of the Queensland road toll for the same period. This was 29 fatalities less than the previous year and 50 fatalities less than the average for three years prior to the change in the system (Department of Transport and Main Roads, 2012).

GDL system for overseas-born drivers

The GDL systems have established a safe, real-world learning environment for drivers to learn through exposure during initial months of driving, and many have been shown to be the effective in
reducing the crash rates for novice drivers. However, very little research has examined the safety of novice drivers who were born overseas, and whether the GDL system is equally effective for those from different ethnic backgrounds. In the United States, a review of the GDL system across different states showed an overall reduction in the crash involvement of young drivers but the reduction was small among non-white and rural young drivers (Shope & Molinar, 2003). A survey in Queensland identified socio-demographic, GDL and behavioural factors that were associated with unsupervised driving and submitting inaccurate logbook entries (Scott-Parker, et al., 2012). Learner drivers who did not speak English as their first language reported higher inaccuracies in their logbooks. The study showed unsupervised learners and drivers who submitted inaccurate logbooks were significantly more likely to report speeding and non-compliant behaviours when they reached the stage of intermediate (provisional) driver.

In order to address these matters, Australian road safety and government agencies have implemented a number of programs and policies to enhance the safety of overseas-born drivers. Signage and educational programs have been established to improve their safety. In addition, the driver licensing system allows driving for a limited time on international licences before the driver must apply for a Queensland licence.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads in Queensland and Austroads now allows licences from some foreign countries to be exchanged for Queensland driver’s licences without further testing. According to the legislation, if a driver has held a licence within the last five years which is not a learner’s licence and corresponds to either class C, RE or R licence granted from a prescribed country, the driver does not need to take a written or on-road driving test. (Class C represents vehicles other than a motorbike and those that are no more than 4.5t GVM. It also includes mopeds and specially constructed vehicles including tractors. They can be driven with or without a trailer. Class RE categorises mopeds and R categorises motorbikes that have unlimited engine size.) In addition, if the country is categorised as a recognised country, then as long as the driver is over 25 years of age and has held the licence within the last five years that corresponds to class C, RE or R, then they too do not need to take the written and on-road driving test. The list of the prescribed or recognised countries can be accessed through the Austroads or Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads website.

Overseas-born drivers may have different knowledge, values and experiences and this is likely to vary across different nationalities. Although there are reports showing that the GDL system helps to improve young driver safety, there is still little information on how effective the system is for overseas-born novices. Among them, little is known about Korean-born drivers. The Republic of Korea has now been included in the recognised country class by Austroads, hence drivers from Korea are no longer required to progress through the Australian system and instead, their licences can now be exchanged for an Australian licences. Therefore, the parents of young Korean Australians may have limited knowledge and experience of the Queensland driver licensing system. This may result in difficulties for young Korean Australian drivers as their parents may not understand the rationale for supervised driving which can lead to less practice and greater falsification of the logbook. Therefore, there is a need to research the different factors which influence the driver licensing experience of foreign born novices and whether they pose any potential threats to road safety.

The purpose of this research was to better understand the experiences of young overseas-born drivers as they progress through the graduated licensing system in Queensland. The research was particularly focused on Korean Australians, but many of these factors may apply to other drivers born in different countries. Young drivers’ experience is likely to be influenced by factors such as personal, family, Australian and Korean cultural factors, as well as the official requirement of the graduated licensing system. Hence the association of such factors were investigated.
Given that young drivers’ experience is likely to be influenced by personal, family, Australian-culture and Korean-culture factors, as well as the official requirements of the graduated licensing system, Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) was considered a useful framework for this research. It was proposed that the progressive stages of the environment would be able to explain the differences that are present between young Korean Australian drivers and native Australian drivers.

Bronfenbrenner (1994) proposed an ecological systems model that identified five environmental systems that interact in the process of human development. The first stage is the microsystem which is a pattern of experiences of a person in a setting where they are faced with particular physical, social and symbolic features that interact in their immediate environment. Common examples are settings such as family, school, peers and workplace. Secondly, the mesosystem comprises the linkages and processes that take place between two or more settings containing the developing person. This can be between home and school or home and workplace. Thus a mesosystem is a system of microsystems that interact. Thirdly, exosystems are the linkages and processes in a setting where the developing person is not present, but in which the person is indirectly influenced within immediate settings. For a child, the exosystem could be the relation between the home and workplace of the parent. Next, the macrosystems comprise the overarching pattern of micro, meso and exosystems characteristics. This describes the culture in which individuals live and includes their socioeconomic status, religion and ethnicity. Finally, the chronosystem is the parameter that extends the environment into a third dimension. It encompasses change or consistency over time for both the characteristics of the person and also the environment. The changes of life course can be in family structure, socioeconomic status, employment, accommodation and the ability in everyday life.

Methodology

The research involved three focus group discussions consisting of two different categories of Korean-Australians. The first category was novice drivers aged between 16 to 25 years who held at least a Queensland Learner’s licence. The second category was parents whose children held at least a Queensland Learner’s licence. They were not necessarily the parents of the young drivers in the first category. No specific lengths of stay in Australia were required for the participants. In total three focus group sessions were conducted with two focus group sessions for young novice category and one for the parental group. The participants were approached face-to-face in Korean community churches with the researcher and were asked if they were interested in taking part in the study. Each of the focus group sessions ran for approximately 90 minutes and was moderated by the principal researcher and audio taped for later transcription. The participants were informed that participation was voluntary and their responses would remain anonymous. The QUT Human Research Ethics Committee approved the study in April 2013 (Approval Number 1300000178).

The two novice driver focus groups involved eight females and six males with a mean age of the 21.4 years (range 17-25). The range of stay in Australia ranged from 2 years to 21 years with a mean of 9.9 years. Less than two years of stay was categorised as ‘recently arrived’ and beyond two years was categorised as ‘long-term resident’.

Eight parents participated (5 females and 3 males) who had a mean age of 49.8 years (range 48 – 53). Their length of stay in Australia was substantially longer than for the novice drivers, ranging from 6 to 22 years with a mean of 14.1 years.
**Procedures**

The focus groups were conducted at a Korean community church on the Gold Coast during May and June 2013. The participants were questioned on topics in relation to the experiences during the process of obtaining a licence that was associated to cultural and personal issues. Through each question asked, the group had a discussion on the relevant topic with the moderator administering the session. Key questions such as their perceptions of the aims and fairness of the practical driving test were discussed. Furthermore, their experiences as young drivers or their views as parents for the licensing procedure were discussed and their suggestions to enhance the efficiency of the current licensing system were discussed.

The discussion began by the moderator asking questions in relation to the process of obtaining the learner’s licence. The reason for obtaining it and any difficulties experienced during the process of obtaining the licence were discussed. Then key questions in relation to the participants experience with accuracy of logbook entries and supervised driving were asked along with their views on the requirement of 100 hours of supervised driving. Furthermore, whether there were any challenges with fulfilling the requirement was discussed. Questions were raised regarding their opinions of the current GDL system along with their experience of the practical driving test. Finally, their perception of the driving behaviour of other young Korean Australians and overall young Asian drivers’ behaviour was reviewed in comparison to young Australian-born drivers.

**Results**

**Obtaining the learner’s licence**

From the young driver group of participants, six participants obtained their learner’s licence at the minimum legal age of 16 years whereas the other eight obtained their learner’s licence after they finished Year 12 (when many Queensland students are 17 years of age). Their parents’ expectation to achieve high academic results in high school, which is common within an Asian family, may contribute to the delay in licensure.

The most commonly reported reason for obtaining a learner’s licence was for self-mobility due to poor public transportation in Queensland. Thus obtaining the learner’s licence when they turn 16 years, would allow them to be fully licensed to drive as soon as possible.

*The transportation is bad in Australia, as I grow older I need to obtain a licence to move around places without my parent’s help. Regardless of whether I want it or not, it is a necessary thing that we need.* (Long term resident, female Learner)

The parents had the same view that the public transportation was restricted; hence their children obtaining their driver’s licence was thought to be necessary.

*To be free from pickups and it was according to the child’s will.* (Mother, long term resident)

Additionally, the young drivers believed that it was a social obligation to obtain a licence. The participants reported most of their peers would obtain their licence, so they too went to acquire the licence when they reached the legal age.

*It’s a social obligation. My friends drive around so I don’t want to fall behind.* (Long term resident, female open driver)
Logbook entries and 100 hours of supervision

When discussing the topic of logbook entries and its accuracy, many of the young drivers reported falsifying entries. Although it was not common to falsify large amounts of hours, a pattern of increasing the kilometres driven and the time by rounding up the minutes was reported. According to the young drivers, their parents insisted that it was important for the young drivers to keep the rules especially during their learner period. Nonetheless, the young Korean drivers reported that their parents believed that 100 hours of supervised driving was too long. Participants reported that there was a limit in distances travelled, and hence 100 hours of driving was a difficult requirement to meet. For this reason, although they believed it was important to follow the rules, there was a high noncompliance rate and some parents had allowed their children to falsify the records to some extent.

My parents believed 100 hours were too much as my high school was 7 minutes walking distance from home. We would only travel short distances, filling up 100 hours was difficult. So time and money was a burden especially the cost of driving instructors. (Long term resident, female Learner)

There were some instances where a participant drove unsupervised because of family reasons.

My mother was very ill with cancer. So I had to drive myself and had to falsify because it was impossible for me to receive supervision. I ended up increasing the kilometre mileage by 1000 kilometres. (Long term resident, male, P2 driver)

Practical driving

Of the fourteen participants, only five had received professional lessons from a professional driving instructor. Some participants reported that they had easy access to a vehicle at home. However, for those who were overseas students living away from home, they had limited access to vehicles. Furthermore, some reported that as their parents were busy during the day or were away from home, there were difficulties in receiving supervision.

It was a problem for me to have supervision. I couldn’t always receive professional lessons for hours because simply the cost is too high and having to live here by myself, it was hard to get the hours up. (Long term resident, male, Open driver)

The participants who had professional lessons reported that they learnt to drive primarily from the instructor, then practised with their family and friends in their residential areas such as roundabouts and later on highways.

I was able to practise in variety of situations with the driving instructor; such as large intersections and hill start. (Recently arrived, male, Open driver)

There are lots of roundabouts around my home, so I did lots of practice there and to get to my gym, I had to travel on the highway so did my highway practice by going to gym. (Long term resident, female, Open driver)

In the practical driving test, there were not many reports of language barriers among the participants. The majority of the participants had been in Australia for a substantial length of time and had adequate English skills to understand the examiner. Nevertheless, there were reports that participants may not have performed as well as their potential because of the nervousness and anxiety factor related to receiving instructions from an English speaking examiner. Furthermore, there were reports of other family members struggling in their tests due to lack of English competence, especially for the practical driving test.
I was very nervous, stalled once and I was more nervous because I knew the examiner was checking points that I was making mistakes. Also, the test done in English made me nervous too, maybe not performed to my best potential. (Recently arrived, male, Open driver)

My mum can’t speak English so she had to study extra harder to understand the written test. Also had to wait for the English translator for the written test but going on the set allocated time was difficult. The biggest problem was with practical test because she couldn’t understand the examiner and which also made her very nervous. (Long term resident, female, Learner)

In addition, some participants reported perceptions of some inconsistency among the examiners. It was discussed that although there were set tasks that needed to be accomplished in the test, many of the participants had said it really depended on the examiner. Several participants reported that some examiners were stricter than others as some reported their minor faults were overlooked, whilst there were others that had experienced very strict assessment.

I think the examiner had pity on me maybe? I think I was lucky to pass with some mistakes. (Recently arrived, female, Open driver)

I think it really depends on the examiner because my older brother did it three times and he said that he had more mistakes on the third go but ended up passing the test. I think there are some biases to the exam depending on the examiner. (Long term resident, female, Learner)

**Perceptions of the current GDL system**

The procedure to be licensed in Korea is rather different to the Queensland licensing system. The applicant must be over 18 year of age to apply for licensure in Korea and they must pass the physical health examination and the written test. Afterwards they progress to driving course test in which the drivers are tested to drive on a set track course. Once this is passed, the final practical on-road examination is conducted (Driver’s Examination Office, 2012). The system in Korea does not provide gradual progress and the process is brief as it does not require certain amounts of time between written and practical examination. Although there are minimal hours of supervised training, depending on circumstances, some drivers can proceed through written, driving course and on-road examination between periods of one day to one month and become fully licensed. Therefore, there have been comments that suggested the Korean licensing system is too short to be able to fully educate and provide skills through experience to the new novice drivers.

Hence many participants, both young drivers and the parents, agreed on the positive features of the Australian GDL system. They commented that the system was thorough and precise which helped novice drivers to learn and practice before being qualified to drive unsupervised. Thus, the participants perceived that the Australian system, by having the gradual process and time to increase the skills step by step, assisted novice drivers in gaining confidence and the skills to be more competent once they received their licence and could drive unsupervised.

The tests are strict and precise which actually tests the drivers for their driving abilities in detail for various driving situations. (Long term resident, female, Open driver)

As there is sufficient practise, you have fewer worries when you are licensed. In Korea it’s different because you still feel you’re not prepared to drive on your own even when you have been licensed. (Recently arrived, male, Open driver)
However, comments were raised in relation to 100 hours of supervision. Young drivers agreed that supervision time was necessary, but were not sure if 100 hours were essential. Some suggested that 50 hours of supervised driving would be adequate. On the other hand, the parents all reported that although 100 hours of supervision can be lengthy during the process, they all believed that the time required was crucial for their children. They reported that the longer training would be more beneficial to their child’s safety in the long term. The parents acknowledged that the time was reasonable for their child to acquire the necessary skills for safe driving and also to learn defensive driving measures if risk was present from another party.

*Although it is difficult at the point in time but I believe it is essential.* (Mother, long term resident)

*I think some may think it’s too short and others may think it’s too long. But I personally think that the longer the better as driving is directly associated to life.* (Mother, long term resident)

Thus, the perception of young novice drivers that their parents do not agree with the 100 hours of requirement was not confirmed by the participants in the parental focus group.

The age for licensure was also discussed. One young driver and most parents queried whether 16 years was too young to begin to drive even under supervision. The parents believed that their children may not be fully developed in cognitive function for risk aversive measures and rather lead to risky driving behaviours due to overconfidence and lack of perception to risk.

*Why does the licensing program begin so early at age of 16 years? To increase the safety delaying the starting age of licensure may be a method. In Korea, you can apply for the licence at the age of 18 years.* (Recently arrived, male, Open driver)

*I believe that although young drivers are quick in reaction these days, but I believe they are still too young to be fully be capable of understanding and initialising actions during the times of dangerous risks.* (Mother, long term resident)

**Differences between native Australian driver and Korean Australian drivers and road conditions**

Finally participants’ perception of the risk taking behaviours of Australian and Korean Australian drivers were discussed. Some participants mentioned that as the licensing procedure in Australia required more time and has a comprehensive structure, young Australian drivers should be able to drive competently when faced with unexpected dangerous situations. Nevertheless, the majority of the participants believed that on average young Koreans Australians were safer and better drivers than young Australian drivers. The key reason behind this was the fact that the Korean culture itself has the tendency to be interdependently structured with high compliance asked to the rules of society and particularly to the parents. The families encouraged their children to follow the rules and obey their parents which may be the reason behind having less risk taking behaviours.

However, some did suggest that the minority group of Korean Australians that are in Australia on a ‘working holiday’ visa may have some different outcomes. They would come to Australia to work and purchase a cheap vehicle just for transportation purpose. In this case they have the potential to drive in a risky manner like other native Australian drivers. Nevertheless, the conclusion to the discussion was that the key reason for Korean Australians to drive safely was due to having lower rates of vehicle ownership. Thus when driving their family car, this may lead them to drive with more care and comply with the road regulations.
Discussion

The topics raised by the participants can be explained within Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model. Acquiring a licence for young Korean Australians was a necessary requirement due to social factors as well as the poor public transportation in Queensland. However, during the process of licensure, participants reported falsifying the logbook entries as it was difficult to comply with the required 100 hours of supervised driving. The reasons behind falsification may have stemmed from a lack of understanding of the importance of supervision, particularly among the young drivers. Applying the model, the interactions of the microsystems and mesosystems are represented for both the licensure and falsification as direct influences from peers, family, socioeconomic status and cultural beliefs are present.

In addition, the perception of the GDL system may differ between Korean Australian parents and Australian parents. Following the regulations and fulfilling the required time of supervision is a necessary procedure that is essential for novice drivers to increase their experience and skills in driving. However, when the supervised driving should have been an essential task on its own, few Korean Australian parents reported they would provide supervision when there was a need to travel. The young drivers would chauffeur the family members to the destination and hence, as there was a limited amount that the family would need to travel, there were difficulties in reaching 100 hours. This agrees with previous study showing greater falsification among non-Australian drivers (Scott-Parker et al., 2012). Nevertheless, the majority of the parents understood the necessity to comply with the regulations. Only the young drivers considered the 100 hours to be overly long and strenuous whereas the parents voiced strong belief in the importance of the gradual process. The macrosystem for the parents and the young drivers had influenced this outcome. The parents and the young drivers had different views of the same task. This may reflect differences in the age, experience, knowledge, customs, life-style, culture and education between the two groups. Korean parents were educated in more authoritarian family structures than the younger drivers. Hence the attitude to compliance to rules differs and from the experience and knowledge of the parents, they were more aware to the benefits to following the structure than the young drivers.

Furthermore, issues were raised that some of participants’ relatives experienced difficulty in understanding the examiner’s direction due to English being their second language. It was also commented that as English was their second language, their elevated nervousness had impacted on their performance. Although English was not a major communication problem for this group in obtaining their licence, there were effects of the language barrier due to the distinct ethnicity difference.

Yet, the majority of the participants believed that young Korean drivers were safer and less risk taking than other Australian drivers. This was consistent with previous studies showing that Asian drivers were less involved less in risky driving situations than other native drivers (Boufous et al., 2010). It was a contradictory outcome for Asian drivers to display safer driving behaviours despite the literature by Scott-Parker et al. (2012) reporting Asian drivers to show lower rates of complying with the licensing procedure. This effect can be explained by Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) that the environment in which the Korean Australians were educated in and brought up was different to those from Australian backgrounds. The micro-, meso-, exo- and macrosystems of the participants including their parents, religion, peers, education, socioeconomic status, values and cultures of the families were factors that influenced the driving behaviours of the Korean Australians. Correlating to the previous literature, participants reported the obligation to study, to obey parents and to be on right behaviour, and the ownership of the vehicle being the parent for young Korean Australian drivers and not having primary access to the vehicles may have been the reasons behind Korean Australians displaying safer driving behaviour (Garcia-Espana, et al., 2009).
Conclusion

The majority of the participants reported the advantages of GDL systems being comprehensive and providing sufficient time to learn skills needed for novice drivers before being fully licensed. The perceptions were generally positive towards the system and the driving behaviour showed to be less risk taking compared to other Australian drivers. However, there is a need for overseas-born drivers to comply more accurately with the requirements. Also there need to be solutions for the young drivers who do not have sufficient access to vehicles for supervision due to family circumstances or as they are students from overseas. As it is realistically impossible to fulfil 100 hours with professional instructor, countermeasures need to be developed to assist those having difficulty receiving supervision. In addition, there have been requests by the parents for information in regards to licensing to be translated into Korean. For those whose English proficiency is not high, this would enable them to be more aware of the system in detail and thus may be able to generate higher compliance rate for their children when progressing through the GDL system.

However, there were some limitations to the current study as the data was collected only with the Korean participants. By sampling the Australian participants and comparing their perception to the GDL system would provide a stronger significance to the study. Therefore, in the next part of the study, Korean samples will be investigated through a questionnaire regarding to their experiences and other factors that might have influenced their experience. Then they will be compared to the Australian samples that have been previously investigated by Scott-Parker, et al. (2012).

Furthermore, as the study was conducted through focus group discussion sessions, there were difficulties in collecting participants’ specific information in regards to their cultural and socio-economical details. In order to study the association between their status and cultural figures, to their experience of the driver licensing system, further data collection through questionnaires will be conducted that would enable the participants to report in detail, their personal backgrounds including socio-economic status, education or cultural backgrounds in conjunction to their licensing experience. Moreover, future study will be needed to closely examine the reasons behind the lower compliance rate and develop methods to increase this by adapting the system with factors that are associated with their noncompliance behaviour. This will contribute towards enhancements to the GDL to increase on road safety for both Australian and overseas-born drivers.
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