



## Consumer s' Opinions of Using a Mobile Phone whilst Driving In the City of Edinburgh, UK

Mohammad Elahi<sup>1\*</sup>, Nadereh Sadat Najafizadeh<sup>2</sup> and Mojtaba Farokhi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Management & languages; Dept. of Business Management, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK

<sup>2</sup> Department of Management, Arak Branch, Islamic Azad University, Arak, Iran

---

### ABSTRACT

This study was conducted with the main aim of gaining a better understanding of the role and relative impact of a certain number of factors which form consumers' opinions of using a mobile phone whilst driving. Legally, many countries charge a driver for using a mobile while driving if he/she has been involved in any accident. Further, there is general agreement that using push buttons and not holding the phone to receive a call is not punishable. In order to achieve aims of the role and relative impact of a certain number of factors which form consumers' opinions of using a mobile phone whilst driving Research, 140 participants were selected for the study and a questionnaire was used to collect the data for this research study in the City of Edinburgh, UK. The questionnaire had mostly closed questions with liker scales to measure the level of agreement to the variable.

**Keywords:** Consumer behaviour, Theory of Planned Behaviour, Behavioural expectations, attitude.

---

### BACKGROUND

The cell phone is one of the most rapidly growing new technologies in the world [22]. In 2001, cell phone subscriptions were less than a billion worldwide with the majority of the subscriptions from the developed countries. At the end of 2010, however, cell phone subscriptions had reached five billion worldwide with subscriptions from developing countries outnumbering that of the developed countries [15];[22]. The increased popularity of cell phones in recent years has attracted research attention. Some of the common cell phone related research topics include cell phone use while driving [8];[13];[18], One study, by University of South Florida's Centre for Urban Transportation Research, summarized research on the issue as finding that people who used a mobile phone while driving "were anywhere from 34 percent to 300 percent more likely to have an accident." [7]. The single most widely cited scientific research on this subject is a 1997 article by Donald A. Redelmeier and Robert J. Tibshirani in the New England Journal of Medicine, based on a research study conducted in Toronto in 1994-95. This study found that ... using a cellular telephone was associated with a risk of having a motor vehicle collision that was about four times as high as that among the same drivers when they were not using their cellular telephones. This relative risk is similar to the hazard associated with driving with a blood-alcohol level at the legal limit. We also found that cellular telephones have benefits, such as allowing drivers to make emergency calls quickly [21]. To gain a better understanding of the role and relative impact of a certain number of factors which form consumers' opinions of using a mobile phone whilst driving, literature on factors leading to possible opinions was sought. The use of phone while driving is a behaviour that can be learned through attitudes, influence. As Ajzen [3]; [6], human behaviour towards certain phenomenon and norms (the use of phones) is guided by the existing beliefs about the expected results of the actual user, believes on the expectations of others on the use as well as the motivations to abide by such expectations and believes that there exist certain factors that may make it possible or which may affect the behaviour. According to Ajzen [3]; [6], beliefs about certain behaviours produce different attitudes toward the planned behaviour while believes which are normative give rise to perceived social pressure. Further, controlled beliefs result to perceived behavioural control. Generally, a more favourable attitude and greater perceived control leads to a higher probability of a person's intention to execute the behaviour in question [3]. In this regard as Ajzen [3] puts it, given more freedom for actual control over any behaviour, a person is expected to perform his/her intentions once an opportunity arises making intention the immediate behaviour. Attitude towards certain behaviour is the ability with which the perceived performance of the behaviour is valued [3]. Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) is the most explicit theory of planned behaviour that can be used to explain personal habits on the use of mobile phone while driving as it utilises the reasoning abilities and actions based on through understanding of people's intentions and wishes [3]; [6]; [9]; [12]. The theory of planned behaviour was proposed as an extension of the theory of reasoned action to account for conditions where individuals do not have complete control over their

---

\*Corresponding Author: Mohammad Elahi, School of Management & languages; Dept. of Business Management, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK. E-mail: melaahi@gmail.com. Tel: +989187608602. Fax: +988612162352

behaviour [1]. However, According to Ajzen [3], the TPB has been considered in many instances as the best theory to explain human behaviour in cases where the individual has not any control or is not allowed to make any choices but in which the researcher can make inferences about his/her skills and opportunities as in the case of using phone while driving where the driver can get a text which requires instant reply. The theory of planned behaviour is an extension of the theory of reasoned action [4];[10] made necessary by the original models limitations in dealing with behaviours over which people have incomplete volitional control. However, according to the expectancy value model, a person's attitude toward certain behaviour is determined solely by a number of behavioural believes which link the perceived behaviour to the different outcomes/attributes. Since Wicker's [25] review of research examining the relationship between attitudes and behaviour, and his conclusion that attitudes probably do not predict behaviour, social psychologists have sought to improve the predictive power of attitudes. In recent years, the main approach within this area has been to develop integrated models of behaviour, including additional determinants of behaviour such as social norms or intentions [24]. Arguably the most widely researched of these models are the Theories of Reasoned Action [4]; [10] and Planned Behaviour [2]; [3]. The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) is essentially an extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) that includes measures of control belief and perceived behavioural control. Behavioural expectations are normative when they combine with a person's motivation to abide by different situations often determine the prevailing subjective norm [17]. This is manifested in the way the person has to say whether he/she has been using a phone while driving. Specifically, according to McBride [17] the motivation to abide by different norms contributes a lot to the subjective norm proportionally to his/her subjective probability that he/she will perform according to the behaviour in question. On the other hand, subjective norm is said to be the perceived social urge to actively engage in certain behaviour. Further, control believes are concerned with the perceived factors that act like catalysts which facilitate and at times impede performance of certain behaviour [3]. 'The relative importance of attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control in the prediction of intention is expected to vary across behaviours and situations'. [3]. TPB also takes into considerations individual attitudes inclined towards certain behaviours and the willingness to being subjective. The model further has the ability to take control of individual behaviours with much considerations put on the level of his/her socio-economic well being, existing opportunities and the existing conditions and situations [17]. To McBride further, people's actions and believes are according to resources and opportunities and are in most cases inclined towards certain intentions and impact directly on one's behaviour [20]. The perception of an individual towards certain behaviour significantly contributes to the way he/she performs and whether he/she will stop certain behaviour towards others. TPB has been employed in many instances and mostly in health research works to control the occurrence of certain diseases and physical body appearances e.g. weight and shape. Further, the model has been used in HIV/AIDS awareness campaigns as well as in high blood pressure diagnosis and cancer screening. Leisure activities line the use of phones while attempting different cores has been key in the advocacy of the model. For there to be recorded success, Neter et al. [20] argues the importance of the TPB model saying that it is better placed to explain and individual better than other models as it takes into consideration past behaviours to explain future success behaviours. Past behaviours are considered as good measures of how best a certain individual does some chores and how often. For validity and reliability of behaviour change depends on different matters which include personalised habits although such habits are not easier to explain planned future behaviours if the individual has both negative and positive habits [11]. To Godin et al., habits support planned behaviours and cannot be treated whatsoever as unique variables which significantly explains and individuals' future behaviours. To According to Ajzen [3], there exists a link between the various individual behaviours of interest and the expected results in that a behavioural belief offers uncertainty that the behaviour will result into a known outcome. A person normally has many behavioural believes associated to any behaviour but a small number of the believes are available once. This believes and the expected behaviours determine the attitudes to the planned future behaviour. To Ajzen [3], evaluating each expected outcome has positive proportional contributions towards the attitudes and the actual outcome. According to Godin et al. [11] and Neter et al. [20], planned behaviour alternatives have a direct bearing on the actual planned behaviour. In any research involving the TPB, it is always advisable to give the participants all the alternatives in order to make choices. For example tow researchers in Singapore Joo and Pei [14] used TPB to examine Singaporean investors' intention to e-trade. Questionnaires were administered to a sample of 363 respondents through an interview conducted in the business district area known as Raffles Place in Singapore. The results showed that attitude and social factors importantly influenced investors' intention towards adopting Internet stock trading. Another researcher in Singapore Lim et al. [16] utilized a survey on the 600 Singapore companies' intention to adopt negotiation support systems (NSS) based on two theoretical models, the TPB and the TAM. Questionnaires were used to the 600 hundred companies in Singapore via mail. The findings showed that TPB provided a better prediction of intention to adopt NSS compared to TAM, with subjective norm and perceived behavioural control being the most significant determinants of intention. And also in a study conducted on 53 banks

in Taiwan, Shih and Fang [23] found that attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control, all influenced banking customers' intention to adopt Internet banking. In another study investigating Internet banking acceptance, Md-Nor and Pearson [19] found that attitude, perceived behavioural control and subjective norm, all had positive significant effect on the intention to use Internet banking among banking customers in Malaysia. This research study wishes to employ the use of TPB model to gain a better understanding of the role and relative impact of a number of factors on the formation of consumers' opinions of using a mobile phone whilst driving.

**Aim and Objectives**

Even though the use of mobile phones among drivers seems to be on the rise and is a potential traffic safety problem, less studies have investigated the using a mobile phone whilst driving. The purpose of this study was to investigate the using a mobile phone whilst driving in the City of Edinburgh in one of the biggest city at the UK. The main focus was to explore the amount of phone use while driving among the drivers.

**METHODOLOGY and RESEARCH DESIGN**

The data were collected through written questionnaires sent by mail and interview to a sample of 140 randomly selected but currently active drivers from the Vodafone Company in the Edinburgh City at the UK. The questionnaires were sent out during the summer of 2011. The questionnaire had mostly closed questions with likert scales to measure the level of agreement to the variable. The majority don't intend to use my mobile phone to send a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month [M = SD = 1.921] and are not likely to use my mobile phone to send a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month [M = 4.77, SD = 2,223]. Further, The model with PBC, subjective and attitude as predictors explains 45.5% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2$  (138) = 0.455] while the model with PBC, subjective, attitude and Past Behaviour explains 46.7% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2$  (138) = 0.467]. The introduction of Past Behaviour improves the model by 1.2%.

**ANALYSIS**

The research study data was analyzed using SPSS. Tables and charts were mostly used to represent the results as they are easy to understand and comprehend.

**RESULTS**

Table 1: Reliability Test Results

Item	Obs	Sign	item-test correlation	item-rest correlation	average inter-item covariance	alpha
q3_0	140	+	0.6808	0.6109	.7054376	0.8611
q3_1	140	+	0.7889	0.7294	.6601347	0.8549
q3_2_1	140	-	0.7128	0.6690	.7337461	0.8609
q3_2_2	140	-	0.5749	0.5201	.760582	0.8660
q3_2_3	140	-	0.5960	0.5477	.7630381	0.8657
q3_2_4	140	-	0.7733	0.7261	.6969417	0.8566
q3_2_5	140	-	0.6113	0.5434	.7351604	0.8643
q3_2_6	140	-	0.4661	0.4167	.7882999	0.8697
q4_1	140	+	0.3510	0.2700	.7910355	0.8740
q4_2	140	+	0.6074	0.5294	.7256235	0.8649
q4_3	140	+	0.5531	0.4697	.7391807	0.8674
q4_4	140	+	0.5467	0.4459	.7283561	0.8697
q4_5	140	+	0.4783	0.4112	.7720902	0.8692
q5_1	140	+	0.7756	0.7161	.6696837	0.8557
q5_2	140	+	0.6648	0.5963	.7141278	0.8619
q5_3	140	+	0.3391	0.2486	.7902572	0.8755
q5_4	140	+	0.1489	0.0592	.8274617	0.8812
q6_1	140	+	0.5516	0.5331	.8103542	0.8713
<b>Test scale</b>					<b>.7450839</b>	<b>0.8729</b>

All the Cronbach Alpha values for the reliability analysis for each of the TPB constructs shows that they are reliable in the TPB model since all the values are greater than 0.7 (see table 1). Reliability analysis involved the calculation of the average.

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Int1	140	5.49	1.921
Int2	140	4.77	2.223
att1	140	2.32	1.353
att2	140	1.96	1.274
att3	140	1.89	1.170
att4	140	2.97	1.726
att5	140	2.89	1.645
att6	140	1.54	1.007
sn1	140	5.78	1.469
sn2	140	4.27	1.858
sn3	140	4.69	1.827
sn4	140	3.74	2.154
sn5	140	5.99	1.365
pbc1	140	3.60	2.128
pbc2	140	2.51	1.829
pbc3	140	5.96	1.625
pbc4	139	1.63	1.505

From table 2 above, the majority don't intend to use my mobile phone to send a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month [M = SD = 1.921] and are not likely to use my mobile phone to send a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month [M = 4.77, SD = 2,223]. Further, majority agree that texting while driving is harmful, dangerous, bad, worthless, un-enjoyable and consider it a wrong thing to do [M<3 for all constructs]. Again, it is evident that people who are important and whose opinions are valued to the participants disapprove their responding to a text message whilst driving and will not use their phone to text whilst driving. Further, the participants say that they have complete control stop themselves from responding to a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month while the majority feel that they can send a message if the feel like although it will be difficult to do so. However, responding to a text message according to many is not their own making. 78.6% of the participants agree to having used a phone while driving compared to 21.4% who have never used a phone while driving.

**Simple Regressions**

Running simple regression of intention over attitude

**Table 3: Simple regression of intention and attitude ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	43.033	1	43.033	52.943	.000
Residual	112.169	138	.813		
Total	155.202	139			

Note: Predictors: (Constant), attitude, Dependent Variable: intention

The model with attitude as the predictor is significant at 5% level of significance [F (1, 138) = 52.943, p = 0.000, p<0.05]. The model explains 27.7% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2$  (138) = 0.277].

**Table 4: Simple regression of intention and attitude coefficients**

	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	7.353	.337		21.836	.000	6.687	8.019
attitude	-.983	.135	-.527	-7.276	.000	-1.250	-.716

Note: Dependent Variable: Intention

The coefficients for attitude associated with intention is significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta$  = -.983, p = .000, p < .05). This means that a unit increase in attitude leads to a -0.983 units decrease in the intent to not use the phone while driving.

Running simple regression of intention over subjective norm;

**Table 5: Simple regression of intention and subjective norm ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	105.689	1	105.689	33.520	.000
Residual	435.117	138	3.153		
Total	540.805	139			

Note: Predictors: (Constant), subjective. Dependent Variable: intention

The model with subjective norm as the predictor variable is significant at 5% level of significance [F (1, 138) = 33.520, p = 0.000, p<0.05]. The model explains 19.5% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [r<sup>2</sup> (138) = 0.195].

**Table 6: Simple regression of intention and attitude coefficients**

	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	1.426	.658		2.168	.032	.125	2.726
subjective	.757	.131	.442	5.790	.000	.499	1.016

Note: Dependent Variable: intention

The coefficients for subjective norm associated with intention is significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.757$ , p = .000, p < .05). This means that a unit increase in subjective norm leads to a 0.757 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving.

Running simple regression of intention over Perceived Behavioural Control (PBC);

**Table 7: Simple regression of intention and PBC ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	194.477	1	194.477	77.493	.000
Residual	346.328	138	2.510		
Total	540.805	139			

Note: Predictors: (Constant), PBC. Dependent Variable: intention

The model with PBC as predictor is significant at 5% level of significance [F (1, 138) = 77.493, p = 0.000, p<0.05]. The model explains 36% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [r<sup>2</sup> (138) = 0.360].

**Table 8: Simple regression of intention and PBC coefficients**

	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	1.755	.406		4.321	.000	.952	2.559
PBC	.986	.112	.600	8.803	.000	.764	1.207

Note: Dependent Variable: intention

The coefficient for PBC associated with intention is significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.986$ , p = .000, p < .05). This means that a unit increase in PBC norm leads to a 0.986 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving.

**Multiple Regressions**

Hierarchical regression was used to determine the contribution of past behaviour to intentions of not using mobile phones while driving.

**Table 9: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.675	.455	.443	1.47210	.455	37.851	3	136	.000
2	.683	.467	.451	1.46132	.012	3.015	1	135	.085

Note: Model1-Predictors: (Constant), PBC, subjective, attitude. Model 2-Predictors: (Constant), PBC, subjective, attitude, Past Behaviour

The model with PBC, subjective and attitude as predictors explains 45.5% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [r<sup>2</sup> (138) = 0.455] while the model with PBC, subjective, attitude and Past Behaviour explains 46.7% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [r<sup>2</sup> (138) = 0.467]. The introduction of Past Behaviour improves the model by 1.2%.

**Table 10: Full Model ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	246.081	3	82.027	37.851	.000
	Residual	294.724	136	2.167		
	Total	540.805	139			
2	Regression	252.519	4	63.130	29.563	.000
	Residual	288.286	135	2.135		
	Total	540.805	139			

Note: Model1-Predictors: (Constant), PBC, subjective, attitude. Model 2- Predictors: (Constant), PBC, subjective, attitude, Past Behaviour. Dependent Variable: intention

The model with PBC, subjective and attitude as the predictors is significant at 5% level of significance [F (3, 136) = 37.851, p = 0.000, p<0.05] while that with PBC, subjective, attitude and Past Behaviour as predictors is also significant at 5% level of significance [F (4, 135) = 29.563, p = 0.000, p<0.05].

**Table 11: Full Model Coefficients**

Model		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.912	.900		3.235	.002	1.132	4.692
	attitude	-.519	.144	-.278	-3.612	.000	-.804	-.235
	subjective	.201	.131	.117	1.536	.127	-.058	.460
	PBC	.703	.120	.428	5.871	.000	.467	.940
2	(Constant)	2.561	.916		2.796	.006	.750	4.373
	attitude	-.491	.144	-.263	-3.416	.001	-.775	-.207
	subjective	.176	.131	.103	1.346	.181	-.083	.435
	PBC	.609	.131	.371	4.659	.000	.351	.868
	Past Behaviour	.599	.345	.132	1.736	.085	-.083	1.282

Note: Dependent Variable: intention

**Model 1**

The coefficient for attitude is significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = -0.519$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in attitude holding PBC and subjective norm constant leads to a -0.519 units decrease in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for subjective norm is not significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.201$ ,  $p = .127$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in subjective norm holding PBC and attitude constant leads to a 0.201 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for PBC is significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.703$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in PBC holding attitude and subjective norm constant leads to a 0.703 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving.

**Model 2**

The coefficient for attitude is significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = -0.491$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in attitude holding PBC, subjective norm and past behaviour constant leads to a -0.491 units decrease in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for subjective norm is not significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.176$ ,  $p = .181$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in subjective norm holding PBC, attitude and past behaviour constant leads to a 0.176 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for PBC is significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.609$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in PBC holding attitude, subjective norm and past behaviour constant leads to a 0.609 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for past behaviour is not significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.599$ ,  $p = .085$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This means that a change in behaviour to using a mobile phone while driving in the past leads to 0.599 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Reliability analysis was carried out to test for reliability of the constructs. According to Bryman, A. [5], Alpha coefficient greater than 0.70 signifies reliable variables. In this case, all the Cronbach Alpha values for the reliability analysis for each of the TPB constructs are greater than 0.7 showing that they are reliable in the TPB model. Further, descriptive statistics were carried out and from the results; the majority didn't intend to use my mobile phone to send a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month and were not likely to use my mobile phone to send a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month. Further, majority agreed that texting while driving is harmful, dangerous, bad,

worthless, un-enjoyable and consider it a wrong thing to do. Again, it was evident that people who are important and whose opinions are valued to the participants disapprove their responding to a text message whilst driving and will not use their phone to text whilst driving. Further, the participants say that they have complete control stop themselves from responding to a text whilst driving in the forthcoming month while the majority feel that they can send a message if they feel like although it will be difficult to do so. However, responding to a text message according to many is not their own making. 78.6% of the participants agree to having used a phone while driving compared to 21.4% who have never used a phone while driving. Different simple regression models were performed to answer the question "how much" the intent to not use a mobile phone while driving. The model with attitude as the predictor variable was found to be significant at 5% level of significance [ $F(1, 138) = 52.943, p = 0.000, p < 0.05$ ] and explained 27.7% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2(138) = 0.277$ ]. Further, the coefficients for attitude associated with intention was found to be significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = -0.983, p = .000, p < .05$ ) which meant that a unit increase in attitude leads to a -0.983 units decrease in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The model with subjective norm as the predictor variable was also found to be significant at 5% level of significance [ $F(1, 138) = 33.520, p = 0.000, p < 0.05$ ]. The model explains 19.5% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2(138) = 0.195$ ]. The coefficients for subjective norm associated with intention was found significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.757, p = .000, p < .05$ ) which meant that a unit increase in subjective norm leads to a 0.757 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. Another model was that with intention and PBC as the predictor and was found to be significant at 5% level of significance [ $F(1, 138) = 77.493, p = 0.000, p < 0.05$ ]. The model explains 36% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2(138) = 0.360$ ]. The coefficients for PBC associated with intention was found to be significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.986, p = .000, p < .05$ ) which meant that a unit increase in PBC norm leads to a 0.986 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. Further, hierarchical regression was used to determine the contribution of past behaviour to intentions of not using mobile phones while driving. The results indicate that a model with PBC, subjective and attitude as predictors explains 45.5% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2(138) = 0.455$ ] while the model with PBC, subjective, attitude and Past Behaviour explains 46.7% of the total variation in intentions to use a phone number while driving [ $r^2(138) = 0.467$ ]. The introduction of Past Behaviour improves the model by 1.2%. again, it was evident that the model with PBC, subjective and attitude as the predictors is significant at 5% level of significance [ $F(3, 136) = 37.851, p = 0.000, p < 0.05$ ] while that with PBC, subjective, attitude and Past Behaviour as predictors is also significant at 5% level of significance [ $F(4, 135) = 29.563, p = 0.000, p < 0.05$ ]. In the first model, the coefficient for attitude was found to be significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = -0.519, p = .000, p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in attitude holding PBC and subjective norm constant leads to a -0.519 units decrease in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for subjective norm was not significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.201, p = .127, p > .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in subjective norm holding PBC and attitude constant leads to a 0.201 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for PBC was significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.703, p = .000, p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in PBC holding attitude and subjective norm constant leads to a 0.703 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. In the second model, the coefficient for attitude was significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = -0.491, p = .001, p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in attitude holding PBC, subjective norm and past behaviour constant leads to a -0.491 units decrease in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for subjective norm was not significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.176, p = .181, p > .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in subjective norm holding PBC, attitude and past behaviour constant leads to a 0.176 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for PBC was significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.609, p = .000, p < .05$ ). This means that a unit increase in PBC holding attitude, subjective norm and past behaviour constant leads to a 0.609 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving. The coefficient for past behaviour was not significant at 5% level of significance ( $\beta = 0.599, p = .085, p > .05$ ). This means that a change in behaviour to using a mobile phone while driving in the past leads to 0.599 units increase in the intent to not use the phone while driving.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to express their sincere appreciation to the managers of Vodafone Company for their special cooperation.



## REFERENCES

1. Ajzen, I, 1985. From intentions to actions: a theory of planned behaviour, *Action control: from cognition to behaviour*, 11-39, NY Springer
2. Ajzen, I, 1988. *Attitudes, personality and behaviour*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press
3. Ajzen, I.1991. The theory of planned behaviour. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50:179-211.
4. Ajzen, I and M. Fishbein, 1980. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice. Hall
5. Bryman, A. 2008. *Social Research Methods*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Beck L and I. Ajzen 1991. Predicting dishonest actions using the theory of planned behaviour. *J. Research in Personality*. 25(3): 223–301.
7. Cain, A. Burris, M.V. 1999. Investigation of the use of mobile phones while driving, Center for Urban Transport, University of South Florida,
8. Caird, J. K., Willness, C, R., Steel, P., & Scialfa, C. 2008. A meta-analysis of the effects of cell phones on driver performance. *Accident analysis and prevention*, 40, 1282-1293.
9. Dejoy DM and MG Wilson, 1995. *Critical issues in worksite health promotion*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
10. Fishbein M, and I. Ajzen, 1975. *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison. Wesley.
11. Godin G 1993. The theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour: Overview of findings, emerging research problems and usefulness for exercise promotion. *J. Applied Sport Psychology*. 5:132–147.
12. Heatherton TF, LT. Kozlowski, RC Frecker and KO. Fagerstrom, 1991. The Fagerstrom test for nicotine dependence: A revision of the Fagerstrom tolerance questionnaire. *Brit J. Addiction*. 86: 1110–1130.
13. Horrey, W. J., & Wickens C. D. 2006. Examining the impact of cell phone conversations on driving using meta-analytic techniques. *Human Factors*, 48, 196-205.
14. Joo E and S, Pei, 2002. A retail investor's perspective on the acceptance of Internet stock trading. *Proceedings of the 36th Hawaii Intl Conf on System Sciences (HICSS'03)*
15. Kelly, T. 2009. Mobile 2.0 beyond voice? Research agenda. Keynote address at International Communication Association preconference, Chicago, IL.
16. Lim J, B Gan and T. Chang, 2002. A survey on NSS adoption intention. *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Hawaii Intl Conf on System Sciences (HICSS'02)*.
17. McBride PE, 1992. The health consequences of smoking: Cardiovascular diseases. *The Medical Clinics of North America*. 76(2): 331–334.
18. McCartt, A. T., Hellinga, L. A., & Braitman, K. A. 2006. Cell phones and driving: Review of research. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 7, 89-106.
19. Md-Nor K and J. Pearson, 2008, an exploratory study into the adoption of Internet banking in a developing country: Malaysia, *J. Internet Commerce*. 7:29 – 73.
20. Neter J, W. Wasserman and MH, Kutner, 1989. *Applied linear regression models*. Irwin.
21. Redelmeier, D. A. and R. J. Tibshirani, 1997. "Association between Cellular Phone Calls and Motor Vehicle Collisions." *New England Journal of Medicine*.
22. Rebello, J. 2010. Global wireless subscriptions reach 5 billion. Retrieved from <http://www.isuppli.com/Mobile-and-Wireless-Communications/News/Pages/Global-Wireless-Subscriptions-Reach-5-Billion.aspx>
23. Shih Y and K Fang, 2004. The use of a decomposed theory of planned behaviour to study Internet banking in Taiwan. *Internet Research: Electronic Networking Applications and Policy*.14:213 – 223.
24. Olson JM and MP. Zanna, 1993. Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 44:117–154.
25. Wicker AW, 1969. Attitudes versus actions: The relationship of verbal and overt behavioural responses to attitude objects. *J. Social Issues*. 25:41–47.