Measuring Driving Fear: Development and Validation of the Instrument for Fear of Driving (IFD)

Multistudy Report

Authors: Carolin Fischer^{a,b}, Prof. Dr. Annette Schröder^{a,b}, Assoc. Prof. Joanne E. Taylor^c, Dr. Jens Heider^b

^aDepartment for Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, University of Koblenz-Landau, Landau, Germany

^bOutpatient clinic for psychotherapy at the University of Koblenz-Landau, Landau, Germany

^cSchool of Psychology, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

Corresponding author:

Carolin Fischer

University of Koblenz-Landau, Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy

Ostbahnstraße 10

76829 Landau, Germany

phone: 0049 - 6341-280 356 27

e-mail: fisc8458@uni-landau.de

Keywords

driving fear, self-report measure, psychometric properties, sensitivity, specificity

Titles of all figures and tables:

Table 1: IFD: German items and their English translation

Table 2: Item characteristics

Table 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results: Factor Loadings, Standard Errors (SE, z- and p-values for each of the IFD Items

Table 4: Characteristics of the IFD

Table 5: Correlations, means and standard deviations for the IFD and its correlates

Table 6: Description of sample

Table 7: Cut-Off-Scores and values of sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values and Youden-Indices

Figure 1: ROC-Curve: Individuals with and without driving fear

Conflict of Interest: None.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Contributors

This research article was written in the context of the first author's dissertation process. All authors contributed to the writing process, drafted and critically revised the work. All authors contributed to and have approved the final manuscript.

Role of Funding Sources

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest

All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Author Note

The presented data was not disseminated prior to this article and there was no narrative interpretation of the research appearing in the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The permission to use the ASI in the current study was given to us by Dr. C. J. Kemper which is greatly appreciated. The assistance from Marie-Louise Riedel and Johannes Gein, two students in the master's program of Psychology in Landau, in the administration and evaluation of the study as part of their master theses was very valuable.

Abstract

Presently, there is no instrument to support the diagnosis of driving fear and its severity. To enable a reliable and valid diagnosis, the five-item German-language Instrument for Fear of Driving (IFD) was developed. The items, in accordance with DSM-5 criteria for specific phobia, measure the emotional, cognitive and physiological components of driving fear as well as the degree of avoidance and impairment. The present paper comprises two studies that describe the development of the IFD and its psychometric properties. In Study 1, the IFD was administered to 810 non-clinical participants in an online survey and demonstrated good reliability and construct validity. In Study 2, 54 people with a clinical diagnosis, including clinically relevant driving fear, completed the IFD and a clinical interview. The IFD demonstrated good sensitivity and specificity, and a cut-off score resulted in 95% sensitivity and 97% specificity. The IFD is a promising screening instrument for driving fear and its severity.

1. Introduction

Driving fear is a highly heterogeneous phenomenon, ranging from mild concerns and occasional discomfort to high levels of anxiety (C. Fischer, Heider, Schröder, & Taylor, 2020). It can vary in terms of severity of fear, feared situations, focus of fear and degree of avoidance (Taylor, Deane, & Podd, 2007; Wald & Taylor, 2000). Clinically relevant driving fear can occur within various psychological diagnoses. Diagnostically, it can be classified as a specific phobia, the most common anxiety disorder (Rinck et al., 2002), with a 6-20% lifetime prevalence, depending on the study (Bland, Orn, & Newman, 1988; Fredrikson, Annas, Fischer, & Wik, 1996; Magee, Eaton, Wittchen, McGonagle, & Kessler, 1996). While the animal type (e.g., dogs, spiders) is the most common subtype of specific phobia, driving phobia is one of the most common situational specific phobias, with an estimated lifetime-

prevalence of 1.1% (Becker et al., 2007). Clinical practice shows cases with extreme impairment in everyday life requiring treatment, as there is limited access to social and occupational activities. According to DSM-5, driving fear as a situational specific phobia is characterized by an intense and consistent fear of driving a car that is evoked when driving or by the mere anticipation of driving (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Anxiety while driving is either endured or avoided, the fear is out of proportion to the actual danger posed by the driving situation, and it results in a reduction in independence, mobility and wellbeing. Fear of driving can be classified as a specific phobia of the situational type when the duration of symptoms is at least six months and the fear is persistent (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Taylor, Deane, & Podd, 2002).

However, driving fear can also be classified as panic disorder (free-floating panic attacks occur while driving and in other situations), agoraphobia (situations such as being away from home and in public evoke fear and the fear of driving is not the only concern), social phobia (fearing the judgement of others in driving situations and others in everyday life), or post-traumatic stress disorder (Blanchard & Hickling, 1997; C. Fischer et al., 2020; Hickling & Blanchard, 1992; Kuch, Swinson, & Kirby, 1985). Clinically relevant driving fear can occur in the various diagnoses mentioned above, consisting of the fear of driving, cognitive fear components, safety and avoidance behavior and impairment in everyday life. Established inventories of those correlates such as phobia, social anxiety, and post-traumatic symptoms exist but do not explicitly address driving fear and are therefore vague for the purpose of solely measuring driving fear and its severity (e.g., Turner, Beidel, & Dancu, 1996). Some existing measures only focus on driving fear subsequent to motor vehicle crashes, such as the Accident Fear Questionnaire, the Safety Behaviors Questionnaire or the Travel Phobia Beliefs Questionnaire (Ehring, Ehlers, & Glucksman, 2006; Kuch et al., 1985). Further questionnaires assess specific driving situations or maladaptive coping strategies (e.g., Driving Behavior

Survey, Driving Situations Questionnaire) (Clapp et al., 2011; Ehlers, Hofmann, Herda, & Roth, 1994). There is a need for a validated screening tool for driving fear for the purposes of both applied research and clinical practice (Taylor, Stephens, & Sullman, 2021). A brief measure will help move the research field forward and can identify individuals early enough to provide treatment, to reduce symptoms and to generally improve health outcome at low cost (Iragorri & Spackman, 2018).

The measure developed here, the Instrument for Fear of Driving (IFD), is intended to be used to diagnose driving fear (categorical diagnosis) and to measure the intensity of the fear (dimensional supplement). This approach chosen is supposed to lay the foundation for future research on epidemiology and clinical characteristics, such as guiding treatment and monitoring symptoms over time (Knappe et al., 2013). A dimensional conceptualization and ability to evaluate symptom severity, subclinical degrees of driving fear and changes over time is important for research and clinical practice (Lebeau et al., 2012). Addressing subclinical problems can prevent more serious mental health problems and reduce a possible indicator of psychopathology vulnerability (Trumpf, Margraf, Vriends, Meyer, & Becker, 2010; Wardenaar et al., 2017). Subthreshold conditions might increase the risk for clinically relevant driving fear and other fears can be potentiated in the context of increased avoidance behavior (Eaton, Bienvenu, & Miloyan, 2018; Lieb et al., 2016). A suitable brief instrument would assess the intensity of fear symptoms and can indicate the need for intervention, while the specific appropriate intervention strategy depends on the phobia etiology, as assessed in the Driving Cognitions Questionnaire (DCQ; e.g., pure phobia versus PTSD versus agoraphobia versus social anxiety) (Ehlers et al., 2007). While the existing DCQ assesses driving-related fear cognitions, the purpose of the new instrument is to support the diagnosis of driving fear, to measure its severity and to assess avoidance behavior and impairment.

The objective of this paper is to present the IFD, which is a new, brief, theoretically-derived self-report measure of fear of driving (in German), as well as to describe its clinical utility and psychometric properties. In order to explore the capacity of the IFD to capture various degrees of driving fear, samples with a wide range of subclinical to clinical severity were included in the present paper. While the IFD does not capture the full range of facets of driving fear or specific situations, its use as a brief screening instrument fills a gap in the driving fear research. In addition to enabling a categorical diagnosis, the IFD is supposed to assess the intensity of driving fear, discriminating between mild, subclinical and clinically relevant driving fear. The IFD, as presented here, could enable further research on the dimensional assessment, treatment guidance and symptom monitoring over time. Study 1 examined the reliability, construct validity, and dimensionality of the IFD with 810 non-clinical participants, and Study 2 investigated the sensitivity and specificity of the IFD with a clinical sample of 54 people.

2. Item Development

For the development of the IFD as a screening instrument, the brief self-rated scales for anxiety disorders by Lebeau et al. (2012), which follow a dimensional approach to measuring DSM-5 anxiety disorders were taken into consideration (Lebeau et al., 2012; Rinck et al., 2002). Their scales assess the frequency and intensity of cognitive and physical symptoms and the frequency of escape and avoidance behaviors. A one-item instrument (e.g., “Are you afraid of driving?”) was considered unsuitable as it did not capture the different components of driving fear. Instead, assessment of driving fear and its cognitive, emotional and behavioral facets added significant clinical information beyond just asking individuals if they are afraid of driving, and would be more useful for research and therapeutic contexts.

To ensure content validity, the development of the items for the IFD was based on the current DSM-5 criteria for specific phobia and the recommendations of the DSM-5 Taskforce and the Specific Phobia Dimensional Scale (SP-D) were taken into consideration (Helzer, Wittchen, Krueger, & Kraemer, 2007; Lebeau et al., 2012). In order to provide a brief and economic self-report instrument for fear of driving (categorical diagnosis) and to measure its intensity (dimensional supplement), five items were designed. To avoid redundancy and meet the goal of providing a brief screening instrument, only one item per DSM-criterion was designed. The A-criterion for specific phobia in DSM-5 (persistent fear) was conceptualized by an item referring to the emotional components of fear (“I am afraid of driving”) and by an item referring to the cognitive component of fear (“When I think of driving, I envision what could happen”), which is also intended to capture the anticipatory anxiety and the anxious expectation that is typical in driving fear and other specific phobias. The B-criterion (anxiety response) was conceptualized by an item referring to the physiological sensations of fear (“When I drive, I experience fear physically, e.g. racing heartbeat, sweating, shaking, chest tightness, muscle tension etc.”). To conceptualize the C-criterion (avoidance), the fourth item was designed to assess the degree of avoidance behavior (“I avoid driving”). In accordance to the F-criterion (impairment and distress), a fifth item referred to the degree of impairment and burden due to the experienced driving fear (“My fear of driving is a burden to me”). To propose a measure sensitive to change, the items should be answered with regard to the last month, as is the case in the SP-D. Each item is rated on a four-point scale, ranging from 0 (“not at all applicable”) to 3 (“fully applicable”), with 1 meaning “sometimes applicable” and 2 meaning “oftentimes applicable”. A five-point scale, which was used in the SP-D, was not used, to avoid attenuated psychometric precision and to avoid tendency towards the center (Simms, Zelazny, Williams, & Bernstein, 2019). A total score is created by summing the five item scores (range of possible scores: 0-15). The items are found in Table 1. The IFD was

developed and validated in German. The English translation was done for the purpose of this article and is yet to be validated.

3. Study 1: Psychometric Properties, Unidimensionality, Reliability and Construct

Validity

3.1. Aim

The aim of Study 1 was to examine item characteristics, unidimensionality, reliability and construct validity of the IFD. Given the high correlations between anxiety sensitivity and alternative constructs measuring anxiety and body vigilance (Kemper, Ziegler, & Taylor, 2009), the IFD was expected to be moderately to highly positively correlated with measures of anxiety sensitivity, general anxiety symptom ratings and driving fear-related cognitions. For further examination of the construct validity of the measure, the World Health Organization's wellbeing-index and measures of impulsivity and willingness to take risks were administered (Topp, Østergaard, Søndergaard, & Bech, 2015). These measures were expected to have negative associations with the IFD, given the low correlation between impulsivity and anxiety sensitivity (Kemper et al., 2009). Additionally, impulsivity and the willingness to take risks are associated with the personality trait of sensation seeking, which is characterized by a reduced risk perception and a higher tendency to take risks (Roth & Hammelstein, 2003). These habits are in contradiction to typical driving fear related components such as higher risk and danger perception and the overrated chance of being involved in crashes, hence the expectation of low impulsivity in individuals experiencing driving fear. Because all five IFD items measured driving fear, unidimensionality was expected and was examined using confirmatory factor analysis.

3.2. Method

3.2.1. Participants and Procedure

A sample of 810 people (602 women, 204 men, 4 gender identity not listed) participated in the online study in Germany between January and May 2019. This convenience sample was recruited through social media, medical facilities, email lists of the university and self-help platforms on the internet. Written consent was obtained prior to the commencement of the study. The questionnaire was completed anonymously online via “Limesurvey” (version 2.67.3). A positive ethic vote was received from the local ethics commission of the University (registration number 175_2019). Participants were between the age of 16 and 79 years, with a mean age of 27.91 years ($SD = 11.69$). 49.5% of the participants ($n = 401$) held a high school diploma, while 36.2 % ($n = 293$) held a university degree.

To thoroughly investigate the characteristics of the sample, further driving-related items were included in the survey. With regard to the possession of a driver’s license, 797 individuals (98.4%) affirmed that, while the 13 participants (1.6%) not holding one were either still in training or never attempted to receive a license due to driving fear. More than 50% of the participants had held their license for more than seven years. Considering driving practice, 310 individuals (38.3%) drove on a daily basis, 270 individuals (33.3%) drove multiple times a week and only 57 (7.0%) drove less than once a month. Participants were asked to rate their level of driving fear on a three-point rating scale: 571 participants (70.5%) stated to not be afraid of driving, while 176 individuals (21.7%) were partly afraid and 63 participants (7.8%) were afraid of driving according to their self-report. More than 50% of those stating to be afraid of driving experienced their driving fears for at least 36 months. A complete driving avoidance due to driving fear was indicated by 24 participants (3.0%). A partial driving avoidance was indicated by 188 individuals (23.2%), driving only on familiar roads or taking short trips close to home. With regard to feared driving situations, 160 participants (19.8%) feared driving during bad weather conditions (e.g., rain, fog or icy

roads), while 135 participants (16.7%) were afraid of driving unknown routes. Using highways and freeways was chosen as a fear evoking driving situation by 117 participants (14.4%) and driving during high traffic density and waiting in traffic jams by 115 people (14.2%).

Of the 810 participants in the sample, 652 participants (80.5%) had witnessed car crashes, 581 individuals (71.7%) were involved in car crashes while being in the passenger seat, 505 of the participants (62.3%) had experienced a car crash as the driver and around 80% of the sample experienced one to three car crashes while being the driver, in the passenger seat or as a witness. During the worst experienced car crash, 414 individuals (51.1%) were physically injured, 403 participants (49.8%) thought their life was threatened and in 359 cases (44.3%) others were physically injured. 341 participants (42.1%) experienced great fear during the car crash and 306 (37.8%) experienced (increased) driving fear since then.

3.2.2. Measures

Instrument for fear of driving. We developed the five-item Instrument for Fear of Driving (IFD; see Appendix) to provide a brief screening instrument for driving fear, which also enabled a dimensional approach (e.g., assessing the intensity) besides the categorical diagnosis. The IFD measures the core characteristics of specific phobia according to DSM-5. Participants were instructed to rate the applicability of the driving-related statements during the last month on a four-point Likert scale from 0 (*Not at all applicable*) to 3 (*Fully applicable*). In the current study, scores are summed, with higher scores indicating greater driving fear (scores ranging from 0-15).

Driving fear-related cognitions. The German version of the Driving Cognitions Questionnaire (DCQ) was used to measure driving-related fear cognitions and to test the convergent validity of the IFD (Ehlers et al., 2007; Heider, Fischer, & Schröder, 2018). Due

to feedback received during the publication process of the German DCQ and due to a few items loading on more than one factor, the wording of six items was revised, leading to the German Driving Cognitions Questionnaire Revised (DCQ-R). Yet, only minor changes were made. The German DCQ-R is a 20-item measure assessing panic-related (e.g., “I will tremble and not be able to steer”), accident-related (e.g., “I will cause an accident”) as well as social-related concerns or cognitions while driving (e.g., “People will criticize me”). Responses are recorded on a five-point Likert scale from 0 (*I never have this thought*) to 4 (*This thought always occurs*). The mean of each subscale (six and seven items respectively per scale) is calculated, with higher means indicating more driving-related fear cognitions. The DCQ-R has demonstrated good psychometric properties, sufficient reliability, factorial validity as well as construct validity (C. Fischer et al., 2020; Heider et al., 2018).

Anxiety Sensitivity. The Anxiety Sensitivity Index-3 (ASI-3) was included in the current study to test the convergent validity of the IFD (Kemper et al., 2009). The ASI-3 is an 18-item measure assessing anxiety sensitivity on the three scales of physical concerns (e.g., “It scares me, when my heart beats rapidly”), cognitive concerns (e.g., “When I cannot keep my mind on a task I worry that I might be going crazy”) and social concerns (e.g., “It’s important for me not to seem nervous”). Responses are recorded on a five-point Likert scale from 0 (*Not at all*) to 4 (*Very much*). The measure is scored by summing responses across the six items per scale, with higher scores indicating greater anxiety sensitivity on the particular concern-subscale. The German ASI-3 has demonstrated good psychometric properties, sufficient reliability, factorial validity as well as construct validity, and measurement invariance with the English version (Kemper et al., 2009).

Anxiety Symptoms. The ICD-10 Symptom Rating (ISR) was included assessing the extent of psychological distress in line with the syndrome structure of the ICD-10 (Tritt et al., 2008). The ISR consists of 29 items on six syndrome scales: depression, anxiety,

obsessive/compulsive, somatoform, eating disorders and a supplementary scale covering a variety of symptoms. Responses are recorded on a five-point Likert scale from 0 (*Not applicable*) to 4 (*Fully applicable*). A mean of each subscale is calculated, with higher means indicating greater symptom manifestation on the particular syndrome-subscale. The ISR showed a high degree of internal consistency and good psychometric properties (Tritt et al., 2008). In order to keep the survey as short as possible, only the four-item anxiety subscale was included as a convergent validity measure (e.g., “I try to avoid situations, that make me anxious”).

Wellbeing. The five-item self-report wellbeing-index (WHO-5) of the World Health Organization (WHO) was used to test the construct validity of the IFD (Topp et al., 2015). Participants are asked to rate statements on their subjective positive wellbeing in the last two weeks on a six-point Likert scale from 0 (*At no time*) to 5 (*All of the time*) (e.g. “I feel calm and relaxed”). The measure is scored by summing responses across the five items, with higher scores indicating better wellbeing. It has shown good internal consistency and to be a valid measure of subjective wellbeing and depression in various samples (Löwe, 2004; Newnham, Hooke, & Page, 2010).

Impulsivity. The eight-item scale Impulsivity-8 (I-8) measuring the psychological construct of impulsivity was included to test the construct validity of the IFD (Kovaleva, Beierlein, Kemper, & Rammstedt, 2014). It is a highly economic self-report scale which measures four facets of impulsive behavior with two items each, for urgency, intention, perseverance and risk appetite. Responses are recorded on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (*Doesn't apply at all*) to 5 (*Applies completely*). The measure is scored by summing the two responses per scale, with higher scores on urgency and risk appetite and with lower scores on intention and perseverance indicating higher impulsivity (e.g., “I am happy to take chances”). It shows

good psychometric properties and reliability and findings indicate good construct and criterion validity (Kovaleva et al., 2014).

Risk appetite. The one-item scale Risk Appetite-1 (R-1) measuring risk appetite was also included to test construct validity of the IFD (Beierlein, Kovaleva, Kemper, & Rammstedt, 2014). The response is recorded on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (*Not at all willing to take risks*) to 7 (*Very willing to take risks*) and since the scale consists of only one item (“How do you see yourself – how willing are you in general to take risk?”), the item score is equivalent to the total score, a higher score indicating a higher risk appetite. The R-1 shows good reliability and findings indicate good construct and criterion validity (Beierlein et al., 2014).

3.2.3. Data Analysis

Psychometric properties, item characteristics and reliability scores were calculated using SPSS 25. To test construct validity, correlations between the IFD and the selected measures were calculated (see section 3.3.4). Distribution was tested using histograms for the assessment of kurtosis and skewness. Due to not normally distributed data, Spearman Rho (ρ) was examined as a non-parametric measure of correlation. The confirmatory factor analysis was done using the software R (lavaan package) (Rosseel, 2012). For the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), the estimator DWLS (diagonally weighted least squares) was chosen due to not normally distributed data and ordinally scaled items with less than five categories (Beauducel & Herzberg, 2006; Curran, West, & Finch, 1996; Eid, Gollwitzer, & Schmitt, 2011; Hox, Maas, & Brinkhuis, 2010).

3.3. Results

3.3.1. Item characteristics

The data was not normally distributed and was positively skewed, since the online survey was open to anyone, regardless of the presence or intensity of driving fear (see Table 2). As shown in Table 2, all inter-item total correlations fell within the acceptable range of $> .30$ (Moosbrugger & Kelava, 2012). These item total statistics suggested that the deletion of any of the items would not improve the reliability of the scale.

3.3.2. Factorial Validity

The data was expected to best describe a one-factor (“driving fear”) model. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed to test the fit of a unidimensional model and to evaluate whether the items of the IFD were adequately represented by a single factor. Scale refinement was an iterative process, examining model fit, standardized parameter estimates (loadings) and modification indices. Fit indices were assessed by employing Schermelleh-Engel and Moosbrugger’s (2003) recommendations. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) of equal or greater than .97 are considered as demonstrating good incremental model fit (that is, compared with a null model). The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) are considered as demonstrating good fit, when being smaller .05. The chi-square-test (χ^2 -test) should not be significant to indicate a good fit of the model and χ^2/df should be less or equal 2 (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003). The model subjected to CFA was the one-factor model as described above. The model provided a good fit to the data when examining the indices: $\chi^2(5) = 7.68$, RMSEA = .03. Additionally, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00 and SRMR = .02 further indicate a good fit of the model. As shown in Table 3, all standardized factor loadings were significant ($p < .001$) and ranged from .68 to .93. Removing any one of the five items led to less convincing fit indices. At the end of the process, the one-factor model was maintained.

3.3.3. Reliability/Internal consistency

The five-item IFD demonstrated good internal consistency, with McDonalds Omega of $\omega = .92$ (see Table 4). The split-half-reliability was examined and led to correlations between .74 and .89, depending on the chosen calculation method. To obtain measures of internal consistency, we computed the composite reliability and average variance extracted (Netemeyer, Bearden, & Sharma, 2003). The composite reliability is .93 and the average variance extracted is .73, thus indicating good internal consistency. The examination of the non-parametric inter-item correlation Spearman's Rho (ρ) showed that the items were fairly well correlated ($r_s = .38 - .65$).

3.3.4. Construct validity: Convergent Validity

The convergent validity of the IFD was assessed by examining its associations with the DCQ-R, ASI-3, and the anxiety subscale of the ISR. The magnitude of the correlations was assessed by employing Cohen's (1988) recommendations of correlations of 0.1 being small, of 0.3 being medium and of 0.5 being high (Cohen, 1988). As shown in Table 5, there were large positive associations with negative driving fear-related cognitions on the DCQ-R ($r = .78$) as well as with its subscales, such as panic-related concerns ($r = .71$), accident-related concerns ($r = .67$) and social-related concerns ($r = .67$). There was a small to moderate positive correlation with overall anxiety sensitivity (ASI-3) ($r = .29$), as well as the subscales of cognitive concerns ($r = .30$), social concerns ($r = .22$) and physical concerns ($r = .21$). Furthermore, a moderate positive association was found between the anxiety subscale of the ISR and driving fear ($r = .47$). Associations with the WHO-5, measuring wellbeing, the risk-appetite subscale of the I-8 and R-1, both measuring risk appetite and the participants' willingness to take risks, were examined. There were small to moderate negative associations

with the WHO-5 ($r = -.23$), I-8 ($r = -.24$) and R-1 ($r = -.23$). Thus, all associations demonstrated good convergent validity.

3.4. Summary of the Findings of Study 1

The findings suggest that the IFD is a useful brief and unidimensional tool for assessing the syndrome of driving fear. An internal consistency reliability of $\omega = .92$ and composite reliability of .93 indicate that the IFD is a reliable instrument for driving fear. Content validity is reflected by the items being in accordance with DSM-5 criteria. The high correlations ($r = .78$) with for example the DCQ-R as an indication of content validity. As expected, the IFD was significantly and sufficiently associated with measures of driving-related fear cognitions, anxiety sensitivity and anxiety symptoms according to ICD-10, and showed negative correlations with risk appetite and wellbeing, indicating adequate convergent construct validity. Divergent validity is yet to be examined. Yet, the IFD and its convergent correlates cannot be seen as redundant, since they differ in their main purposes of either enabling the measurement of the intensity of driving fear (IFD) or, in the case of the DCQ-R, the assessment of driving-related fear cognitions. The IFD has promising reliability and validity as an economic measure of driving fear.

4. Study 2: Sensitivity, Specificity and Criterion Validity

4.1. Aim

In Study 2, the IFD was assessed for its purpose as a brief screening instrument. Criterion validity was evaluated by examining cut-off scores for clinically significant driving fear. Sensitivity and specificity were examined by assessing differences in IFD scores among people with a diagnosis of clinically relevant driving fear. For screening instruments, high

sensitivity and acceptable specificity are relevant, since false positives can be identified in subsequent detailed assessment, while false negatives would remain undetected and untreated.

4.2. Method

4.2.1. Participants and Procedure

The sample consisted of 54 people who were recruited in the outpatient clinic for psychotherapy at the University between July 2019 and December 2019. They were recruited among all patients who recently had begun psychotherapy at the outpatient clinic. Two trained and supervised interviewers informed participants about the nature of the study and its procedure. The participants provided written informed consent prior to a clinical interview. They filled out two questionnaires regarding fear of driving, the Driving Cognitions Questionnaire Revised (DCQ-R) and the IFD. Subsequently, the interview was administered, consisting of the specific phobia items of the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID-I), which were adjusted to assess the fear of driving. Additionally, SCID-I sections for panic disorder, agoraphobia, social phobia and generalized anxiety disorder additional anxiety disorders were administered to diagnose anxiety disorders. Furthermore, there was a diagnostic classification of the participants in accordance with the DSM-IV International Diagnostic Checklists (IDCL). The interviewer asked further self-report questions with regard to driving history, such as year of obtaining their driver's license, driving frequency (daily, 2-3 times a week, once a week, once a month, less frequently), onset of driving fear (no idea about reasons for onset, accident as reason for onset, other) and self-evaluation of their own driving skill (very good, fairly good, average, rather poor, poor). The obtained information was used to further describe the participants. The procedure took 45 minutes on average.

Out of the 54 participants, 40 were female (74.1%), while 14 were male (25.9%). Participants were between the age of 20 and 69, with a mean age of 44 years ($SD = 14.66$).

All participants possessed a driver's license, which was the inclusion criterion for the participation in the study. With regard to their level of education, 26 (48.1%) indicated a completed vocational training as their highest degree, while 17 (31.5%) held a secondary school diploma, and the remainder possessed a university degree. The majority ($n = 34$, 63%) said they drove on a daily basis. Concerning the subjectively perceived driving skill, 22 individuals (40.7%) rated their own driving skill as very good. 44 participants (81.5 %) did not know the reasons for the onset of their driving fear, while 4 individuals (7.5 %) had experienced an accident prior to the onset of their driving fear and the remaining 6 participants (11.1 %) stated other reasons for the onset.

As shown in Table 6, 20 participants were diagnosed with a clinically relevant driving fear, in the context of either specific phobia or agoraphobia. 16 participants met criteria for the diagnoses of any kind of anxiety disorder without meeting criteria for driving fear and 18 participants belonged to the control group of individuals without any kind of anxiety disorder and driving fear. Due to an ongoing treatment program for driving fear at the outpatient clinic at the time of recruitment, a substantial amount of people with the diagnosis of a specific phobia of driving could be included in the study. A positive ethic vote was received from the local ethics commission of the University (registration number 2019_193).

4.2.2. Measures

Instrument for fear of driving. The five-item Instrument for Fear of Driving (IFD; see appendix) was administered.

Driving-related fear cognitions. The 20-item Driving Cognitions Questionnaire Revised (DCQ-R), as described above, was used to measure driving-related fear cognitions with the foci on panic-related, accident-related and social concerns (Ehlers et al., 2007; Heider et al., 2018).

DSM-IV International Diagnostic Checklists (IDCL). The IDCL are a set of semistructured instruments for the clinician assessment of mental and behavioral disorders according to DSM-IV criteria. Psychiatric symptoms and syndromes of the following categories are examined: affective, somatoform and psychotic disorders as well as substance abuse disorders, eating disorders and organically caused disorders (Hiller, Mombour, & Zaudig, 2008).

Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID-I). The section for specific phobia of the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV was used to examine a fear of driving as well as other specific phobias in a clinical interview (Kübler, 2013). The sections assessing panic disorder, agoraphobia, social phobia and generalized anxiety disorder were also administered in order to screen for other anxiety disorders. With regard to keeping participants' time required for the examination low, only the F4-section of the SCID-I was administered.

4.2.3. Data Analysis

Analyses were conducted using SPSS version 25. Due to non-parametric data, a Kruskal-Wallis-Test was used to examine the differences in IFD scores between different subgroups of the data set. A Receiver Operation Characteristics (ROC) Analysis was used to examine sensitivity and specificity as well as to determine a cut-off score for the diagnosis of a clinically relevant driving fear.

4.3. Results

4.3.1. Differences among subgroups

Due to non-normally distributed data, differences in the mean values on the IFD were examined using a Kruskal-Wallis-Test, and there were significant differences between participants with a clinically relevant driving fear ($M = 8.85$, $SD = 3.41$, $N = 20$), those with

an anxiety disorder but no driving fear ($M = 1.15$, $SD = 1.15$, $N = 16$) and those with neither driving fear nor any other kind of anxiety disorder ($M = 1.06$, $SD = 1.06$, $N = 18$): $\chi^2(2, N = 54) = 36.38$, $p < .01$. The Dunn-Bonferroni-post-hoc-Test, adjusted for multiple tests, was used. Participants with clinically relevant driving fear had a larger mean IFD score than the control group ($z = 5.26$, $p < .05$, $r = .85$) and the other anxiety disorder group ($z = 5.03$, $p < .05$, $r = .84$). There was no difference in IFD scores between the group with other anxiety disorders and the control group.

4.3.2. Cut-Off, Sensitivity and Specificity

Figure 1 shows a ROC-curve of individuals with and without driving fear on the basis of the IFD score. The Area under the Curve (AUC) is 0.99. High sensitivity and acceptable specificity is desirable when determining the cut-off-score in order for the IFD to serve as a good screening instrument for diagnosing driving fear. A cut-off-score of 3.5 shows both good sensitivity of 95% and good specificity of 97%. With this cut-off-score, the highest Youden-Index of 0.92 indicates the excellent ability of the IFD to discriminate between individuals with and without driving fear. The positive predictive value of 95% shows the probability of 95%, that a person with a positive screening result ($IFD \geq 4$) does have a clinically relevant fear of driving. The negative predictive value of 97% states that a person with a negative screening result ($IFD \leq 3$) does not meet criteria for driving fear.

Choosing a different cut-off score rather than 3.5 involves mutual concessions for sensitivity and specificity. The cut-off was chosen at 3.5, since a screening instrument should be sensitive in order to examine the true positives, and false positives could still be assessed in subsequent more elaborate diagnostics, while false negatives would remain misdiagnosed and untreated. At 3.5, sensitivity and specificity are balanced out and both reach their highest possible score (see Table 7). In order to maximize the sensitivity score even more, the cut-off

score of 1.5 could have been chosen, with the cost of a much lower specificity of 71%, meaning a lower rate of true negatives and in consequence a much higher probability of 29% for false alarms (false positives). Hence, a cut-off at 3.5 seemed more reasonable.

Table 7 presents the cutoff scores, values of sensitivity and specificity, the positive and negative predictive values and the Youden-Indices. The IFD can be used for screening in clinical and non-clinical populations and demonstrates good sensitivity and specificity in specifically clinical and psychotherapeutic settings.

4.4. Summary of the Findings of Study 2

Given these findings, the German-language IFD can be used as a good, sensitive and specific screening instrument for driving fear. It assesses individual symptom severity. The examined subgroups differed significantly with regard to their IFD score. With a cut-off score of 3.5, the instrument showed 95% sensitivity and 97% specificity, so the probabilities of detecting true positives and true negatives are extremely high. There is only a 3% chance of diagnosing driving fear when there is actually none (false alarm). The area under the curve as well as the Youden-Index indicate the IFD's ability to discriminate between individuals with and without fear of driving. The positive and negative predictive values of also 95% and 97% respectively are satisfying, since there are very high chances of diagnosing driving fear due to the IFD-score correctly.

These findings are based on an ROC-curve examining people with and without driving fear, although the sample size has to be taken into consideration for interpreting the results. Additionally, also other comparisons were examined between individuals with driving fear and those without any kind of anxiety disorder (alternative 1) and people with driving fear and those with another anxiety disorder (alternative 2). Both alternatives lead to the same AUC-scores of .99. Alternative 1 lead to comparable scores, resulting in a 95% sensitivity and

an even 100% specificity score with the cut-off being 3.5. Alternative 2 yielded an AUC score of .99, while a cut-off-score of 3.5 revealed a sensitivity of 95% and a specificity of 94%. Therefore, the examination of different subgroups does not significantly affect the parameters of sensitivity and specificity using the IFD.

5. Discussion

Prior research has shown that driving fear can be part of many different psychological disorders and that a diagnostic instrument with a clear theoretical framework and the ability to assess symptom severity is timely (C. Fischer et al., 2020). The German-language IFD is a brief, reliable and valid instrument for assessing driving fear and its symptom severity. The findings suggest the IFD can be used in research and clinical practice to gain information on the prevalence and extent of driving-related fear. The instrument might serve as a bedrock for detailed future research on the dimensional assessment of driving fear, treatment guidance and symptom monitoring over time. The combination of the present measure with instruments for other clinical conditions (e.g. PTSD) could help gain information about the clinical etiology of fear of driving and can help to screen for or characterize higher frequency conditions, under which fear of driving is oftentimes subsumed.

The present study has several limitations. One such limitation is that the IFD items were not tested in a pilot study. However, the items were developed to be consistent with the DSM-5 criteria and according to the DSM-5 self-rating scales by Lebeau et al. (2012), so content validity was a consideration at the outset. Since the items were used in other studies of the ongoing treatment program for driving fear, item vetting consisted of testing not only the appropriate wording for the population but also the questionnaire's ability to capture the typical symptoms from the standpoint of individuals experiencing driving fear. However, it can be argued that building a broader measure with more than one item per DSM-criterion

first would have been ideal to obtain an even more reliable measure of driving fear. An increased breadth in symptom severity and presentation of facets could have led to the possibility of forming more than one meaningful factor with multiple items per DSM-criterion, prior to reducing the scale to create an alternate brief version. Moreover, it can be argued whether the decision for a scale with only four categories restricted variation in the data. However, a benefit of the chosen four-point rating scale can be seen in the avoidance of the tendency towards the center.

The data in Study 1 was not normally distributed due to many non-clinical participants without driving fear. The prompt for the participation in the online survey explicitly invited anyone to take part, in order to maximize the sample size and more importantly, to receive data with a wide range of symptom severity, from no driving fear and mild symptoms to severe driving fear. Consequently, the convenience sample was not representative of the German population, which should be kept in mind when interpreting the results. The constitution of the data required the estimator DWLS in confirmatory factor analysis. Simulation studies have shown that diagonal weighted least squares (DWLS) is a superior estimation method compared to ML or robust ML estimation when dealing with ordinal data (with less than five categories) and especially when the distributions are highly skewed like in our data set (Li, 2016). The findings regarding reliability, factor structure and validity need to be replicated in a more homogenous and representative sample, allowing the estimator Maximum Likelihood (ML) to be used.

Moreover, the application of only the SCID-I-section for anxiety disorders in the clinical interviews in Study 2 is a limitation. The administration of the complete SCID-I would have led to a more sophisticated overview on the diagnoses in the sample. However, due to keeping the interviews short, the given diagnoses from their therapists were included with the consent of the participants. The focus was on anxiety disorders, since individuals experiencing driving

fear tend to show comorbid anxiety disorders, a factor impeding the interpretation of empirical data. In addition, sample size was small ($N = 54$) and a representative sample in terms of a clinical anxiety population would be ideal to determine cut-offs. Hence, the results should be interpreted with caution, bearing in mind the small sample size and the small numbers in each group. However, the higher proportion of females (74.1%) in the study seem to at least represent the typical gender distribution in anxiety populations (Currow et al., 2020).

Further studies should be conducted to verify these preliminary findings in larger and representative samples. Additionally, research should be done on the English language version of the IFD to validate the English items. Moreover, divergent validity should be tested, for example using an instrument measuring intelligence as divergent construct that seems unrelated to driving fear.

The wording of item 2 and 4 may require revision because of imprecision concerning the fear-content. Specifically, item 2 could be changed to “When I think of driving, I think of possible danger to myself and others”, referring to the anticipated danger or panic attack. This would define more precisely that non-fear-content, such as the anticipated next steps like getting petrol for instance, is not the focus of the item. Similarly, item 4 could be revised to “I avoid driving due to my driving fear” to highlight the fear-content of the item.

Also, a more concise instruction for the IFD could be considered to avoid distorted findings, since many people only tend to fear specific driving scenarios (e.g., highway, tunnel) and seem to answer the items either according to the specific situation they fear or average their chosen answers, with as well the feared scenarios as the not-feared scenarios in mind. An alternative instruction to ask participants to answer in accordance to their individual feared situation could be *“For the following five items, we are interested in your own experience during the past month. Please choose the answer that best fits your experience*

when driving or when thinking about driving. Make sure to choose your answer with regard to the driving scenario/s that you fear. Please specify:

- *I am generally afraid of driving* ○
- *I am afraid of the following driving situation(s):* _____

Results concerning the factorial validity of the IFD are in line with empirical findings of other anxiety research. There was no theoretical reason to believe any kind of fear and specifically driving fear should be positively correlated to impulsivity and willingness to take risks. To the contrary, research on anxiety disorders showed a relationship between behavioral inhibition and anxiety sensitivity as risk factors for the development of an anxiety disorder later on in life (Barlow, 2000). This is reflected in the present results of highly significant correlations between anxiety sensitivity, symptoms of anxiety and driving fear.

With regard to clinical implications, the IFD can be proposed as a screening instrument for clinicians and can be used in populations where a higher risk for driving fear is assumed (e.g., individuals with anxiety disorders). The total score and the cut-off can be taken into consideration for interpreting individual data. Generalizability of the findings is yet to be examined due to the small sample used in the present study. Furthermore, the IFD can be used to examine symptom severity for repeated measurements (e.g., at the beginning and end of therapy, after certain interventions, such as in-vivo exposure), while its sensitivity to change is yet to be examined.

6. Conclusion

The German-language IFD is an efficient and economic instrument for the assessment of driving fear and fills a research gap. Based on the current findings, its good psychometric properties, sensitivity and specificity, it can be used as a screening instrument for driving fear and symptom severity. The IFD can be recommended for further scientific research on the

epidemiology of driving fear. Additionally, the IFD can be used for clinical purposes. Ongoing research suggests the IFD's ability to serve as an indicator for granting access to treatment programs for driving fear (Fischer, Heider, Taylor & Schröder, in preparation). First findings suggest the capacity of the IFD to measure symptom severity longitudinally as well as therapy outcome after intervention, while the IFD's sensitivity to change needs to be examined in future research (Husted, Cook, Farewell, & Gladman, 2000).

7. Appendix

Table 1

IFD: German items and their English translation

German Item	English Translation
1. Ich habe Angst vor dem Autofahren.	1. I am afraid of driving.
2. Bei dem Gedanken Auto zu fahren male ich mir aus, was alles passieren könnte.	2. When I think of driving, I envision what could happen.
3. Wenn ich Auto fahre, spüre ich die Angst körperlich (z.B. Herzrasen, Schwitzen, Zittern, Engegefühl in der Brust, muskuläre Anspannung o.ä.)	3. When I drive, I experience fear physically, e.g. racing heartbeat, sweating, shaking, chest tightness, muscle tension etc.
4. Ich vermeide das Autofahren.	4. I avoid driving.
5. Meine Angst vor dem Autofahren belastet mich.	5. My fear of driving is a burden to me.

Table 2

Item characteristics

Item	<i>M</i>	median	mode	kurtosis	skewness	<i>SD</i>	difficulty (Dahl)	<i>r</i> _{it}
1	0.46	0.00	0	3.11	1.82	0.75	15.35	.81

2	0.67	1.00	0	1.08	1.19	0.80	22.39	.61
3	0.40	0.00	0	3.70	1.95	0.70	13.33	.77
4	0.39	0.00	0	3.58	2.09	0.79	13.13	.69
5	0.37	0.00	0	4.00	2.23	0.80	12.39	.74

Note. $N = 810$.

Table 3

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results: Factor Loadings, Standard Errors (SE, z- and p-values for each of the IFD Items

Item	<i>Factor Loading</i>	<i>Factor Loading Standardized</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	<i>p</i>
Item 1	1.00	.92			<.001
Item 2	.74	.68	.02	31.67	<.001
Item 3	.99	.91	.02	41.84	<.001
Item 4	.90	.82	.03	34.83	<.001
Item 5	1.01	.93	.03	39.95	<.001

Table 4

Characteristics of the IFD

	<i>M</i>	kurtosis	skewness	<i>SD</i>	ω	split-half-reliability (odd-even)	split-half-reliability (pairs of items according to item total correlation)		
						Spearman-Brown-correction	Spearman-Brown-correction		
IFD	0.46	3.98	2.07	0.63	.92	.74	.86	.80	.89

Note. $N = 810$.

Table 5
Correlations, means and standard deviations for the IFD and its correlates

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)	9)	10)	11)	12)	13)
1) IFD	—												
2) DCQ-R: panic-related concerns	.71**	—											
3) DCQ-R: accident-related concerns	.67**	.69**	—										
4) DCQ-R: social concerns	.67**	.64**	.58**	—									
5) DCQ-R overall	.78**	.87**	.88**	.85**	—								
6) ASI: physical concerns	.21**	.34**	.27**	.15**	.29**	—							
7) ASI: social concerns	.22**	.27**	.24**	.38**	.34**	.44**	—						
8) ASI: cognitive concerns	.30**	.40**	.37*	.38**	.44**	.59**	.56**	—					
9) ASI overall	.29**	.40**	.35**	.37**	.43**	.82**	.82**	.85**	—				
10) ISR: anxiety	.47**	.48**	.41**	.38**	.48**	.47**	.40**	.51**	.55**	—			
11) WHO-5	-.23**	-.25**	-.19**	-.27**	-.27**	-.19**	-.28**	-.36**	-.33**	-.39**	—		

12)	I-8: risk appetite	-.24**	-.14**	-.20**	-.22**	-.22**	-.15**	-.19**	-.16**	-.20**	-.20**	.21**	—	
13)	R-1: risk appetite	-.23**	-.15**	-.19**	-.20**	-.21**	-.14**	-.17**	-.12**	-.18**	-.18**	.20**	.75**	—
	<i>M</i>	0.46	0.27	0.65	0.57	0.50	5.15	8.22	4.44	17.81	0.85	14.73	2.93	3.63
	<i>SD</i>	0.63	0.49	0.67	0.72	0.54	4.79	5.18	4.34	11.85	0.90	4.96	0.93	1.35

Note. $N = 810$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 6
Description of sample

Clinically relevant driving fear (N = 20)		No clinically relevant driving fear but any other kind of anxiety disorder (N = 16)		Control group: no anxiety disorder, no clinically relevant driving fear (N = 18)	
as part of a specific driving phobia (F40.2)	18	any other kind of anxiety disorder and comorbid affective disorder	12	any kind of affective disorder	11
additional affective and/or other anxiety disorder	6	any other kind of anxiety disorder and comorbid personality disorder (F60.30, F60.6)	2	any kind of somatoform disorder (F45) and comorbid affective disorder	4
additional psychological and behavioral factors associated with disorders or diseases classified elsewhere (F54)	1	any other kind of anxiety disorder and comorbid substance abuse (F10.1)	1	sleeping disorder (F51)	1
additional personality disorder (F60.6)	1	any other kind of anxiety disorder and comorbid eating disorder (F50.01)	1	eating disorder (F50.1)	1
as part of an agoraphobia with/without panic disorder (F40.00/F40.01)	2			other neurotic disorders (F48.0)	1

Note. $N = 54$.

Table 7

Cut-Off-Scores and values of sensitivity, specificity , positive and negative predictive values and Youden-Indices

Cut-Off-Score	<i>sensitivity</i>	<i>1-specificity</i>	<i>specificity</i>	<i>Positive predictive value</i>	<i>Negative predictive value</i>	<i>Youden-Index</i>
0.5	1.00	0.65	0.35	0.48	1.00	0.35
1.5	1.00	0.29	0.71	0.67	1.00	0.71
2.5	0.95	0.12	0.88	0.82	0.97	0.83
3.5	0.95	0.03	0.97	0.95	0.97	0.92
4.5	0.90	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.94	0.90
5.5	0.80	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.89	0.80
7.0	0.70	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.85	0.70
8.5	0.60	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.81	0.60

Note. $N = 54$

Figure 1

ROC-Curve: Individuals with and without driving fear

References

- American Psychiatric Association (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 5th edition: Dsm-5* (5. ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Barlow, D. (2000). Unraveling the mysteries of anxiety and its disorders from the perspective of emotion theory. *American Psychologist*, 55(11), 1247.
- Beauducel, A., & Herzberg, P. Y. (2006). On the performance of maximum likelihood versus means and variance adjusted weighted least squares estimations in CFA. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 13(2), 186–203.
- Becker, E. S., Rinck, M., Türke, V., Kause, P., Goodwin, R., Neumer, S., & Margraf, J. (2007). Epidemiology of specific phobia subtypes: findings from the Dresden Mental Health Study. *European Psychiatry*, 22(2), 69–74.
- Beierlein, C., Kovaleva, A., Kemper, C. J., & Rammstedt, B. (2014). *Eine Single-Item-Skala zur Erfassung von Risikobereitschaft: Die Kurzskala Risikobereitschaft-1 (R-1)*. <https://doi.org/10.6102/ZIS183>
- Blanchard, E. B., & Hickling, E. J. (1997). *After the crash: Assessment and treatment of motor vehicle accident survivors*: American Psychological Association.
- Bland, R. C., Orn, H., & Newman, S. C. (1988). Lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders in Edmonton. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 77(Suppl 338), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1988.tb08544.x>
- Clapp, J. D., Olsen, S. A., Beck, J. G., Palyo, S. A., Grant, D. M., Gudmundsdottir, B., & Marques, L. (2011). The Driving Behavior Survey: Scale construction and validation. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 25(1), 96–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2010.08.008>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2. ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 16–29.
- Currow, D. C., Chang, S., Reddel, H. K., Kochovska, S., Ferreira, D., Kinchin, I., . . . Ekström, M. (2020). Breathlessness, Anxiety, Depression, and Function—The BAD-F Study: A Cross-Sectional and

- Population Prevalence Study in Adults. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 59(2), 197–205.e2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2019.09.021>
- Eaton, W. W., Bienvenu, O. J., & Miloyan, B. (2018). Specific phobias. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 5(8), 678–686.
- Ehlers, A. [A.], Hofmann, S. G., Herda, C. A., & Roth, W. T. (1994). Clinical characteristics of driving phobia. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 8(4), 323–339.
- Ehlers, A. [A.], Taylor, J., Ehring, T. [T.], Hofmann, S. G., Deane, F. P., Roth, W. T., & Podd, J. (2007). The Driving Cognitions Questionnaire: Development and preliminary psychometric properties. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 21(4), 493–509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2006.08.002>
- Ehring, T. [Thomas], Ehlers, A. [Anke], & Glucksman, E. (2006). Contribution of cognitive factors to the prediction of posttraumatic stress disorder, phobia and depression after motor vehicle accidents (PSYNDEXshort). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(12), 1699–1716. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.11.013>
- Eid, M., Gollwitzer, M., & Schmitt, M. (2011). *Statistik und Forschungsmethoden* (2. Aufl.). Weinheim: Beltz.
- Fischer, C. [C.], Heider, J. [J.], Schröder, A. [A.], & Taylor, J. (2020). “Help! I’m Afraid of Driving!” Review of Driving Fear and its Treatment. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 44(2), 420–444. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-019-10054-7>
- Fredrikson, M., Annas, P., Fischer, H., & Wik, G. (1996). Gender and age differences in the prevalence of specific fears and phobias. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 34(1), 33–39. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(95\)00048-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(95)00048-3)
- Heider, J. [J.], Fischer, C. [C.], & Schröder, A. [A.] (2018). Die deutsche Version des „Driving Cognitions Questionnaire“ (DCQ). *Zeitschrift Für Klinische Psychologie Und Psychotherapie*, 47(1), 36–47.
- Helzer, J. E., Wittchen, H. U., Krueger, R. F., & Kraemer, H. C. (2007). Dimensional options for DSM-V: The way forward. In J. E. Helzer, H. C. Kraemer, R. F. Krueger, H. U. Wittchen, P. J. Sirovatka, & D. A. Regier (Eds.), *Dimensional approaches in diagnostic classification: refining the research agenda for DSM-V* (pp. 115–127). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Hickling, E. J., & Blanchard, E. B. (1992). Post-traumatic stress disorder and motor vehicle accidents. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 6(3), 285–291.
- Hiller, W., Mombour, W., & Zaudig, M. (2008). *Internationale Diagnosen Checklisten für ICD-10 und DSM-IV: IDCL ; Manual* (2. Aufl., [Nachdr.]). Bern: Huber.
- Hox, J. J., Maas, C. J., & Brinkhuis, M. (2010). The effect of estimation method and sample size in multilevel structural equation modeling. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 64(2), 157–170.
- Husted, J. A., Cook, R. J., Farewell, V. T., & Gladman, D. D. (2000). Methods for assessing responsiveness: a critical review and recommendations. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 53(5), 459–468. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-4356\(99\)00206-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-4356(99)00206-1)
- Iragorri, N., & Spackman, E. (2018). Assessing the value of screening tools: Reviewing the challenges and opportunities of cost-effectiveness analysis. *Public Health Reviews*, 39, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-018-0093-8>
- Kemper, C. J., Ziegler, M., & Taylor, S. [Steven] (2009). Überprüfung der psychometrischen Qualität der deutschen Version des Angstsensitivitätsindex-3. *Diagnostica*, 55(4), 223–233.
- Knappe, S., Klotsche, J., Strobel, A., LeBeau, R. T., Craske, M. G., Wittchen, H. U., & Beesdo-Baum, K. (2013). Dimensional anxiety scales for DSM-5: sensitivity to clinical severity. *European Psychiatry*, 28(7), 448–456.

- Kovaleva, A., Beierlein, C., Kemper, C. J., & Rammstedt, B. (2014). *Die Skala Impulsives-Verhalten-8 (I-8)*. <https://doi.org/10.6102/ZIS183>
- Kübler, U. (2013). Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID). In M. D. Gellman & J. R. Turner (Eds.), *Springer reference. Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine* (pp. 1919–1920). New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1005-9_66
- Kuch, K., Swinson, R. P., & Kirby, M. (1985). *Post-traumatic stress disorder after car accidents*: SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Lebeau, R. T., Glenn, D. E., Hanover, L. N., Beesdo-Baum, K., Wittchen, H. U., & Craske, M. G. (2012). A dimensional approach to measuring anxiety for DSM-5. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 21(4), 258–272.
- Li, C.-H. (2016). The performance of ML, DWLS, and ULS estimation with robust corrections in structural equation models with ordinal variables. *Psychological Methods*, 21(3), 369–387.
- Lieb, R., Miché, M., Gloster, A. T., Beesdo-Baum, K., Meyer, A. H., & Wittchen, H. U. (2016). Impact of specific phobia on the risk of onset of mental disorders: A 10-year prospective-longitudinal community study of adolescents and young adults. *Depression and Anxiety*, 33(7), 667–675.
- Löwe, B. (2004). Comparative validity of three screening questionnaires for DSM-IV depressive disorders and physicians' diagnoses. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 78(2), 131–140. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0327\(02\)00237-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0327(02)00237-9)
- Magee, W. J., Eaton, W. W., Wittchen, H. U., McGonagle, K. A., & Kessler, R. C. (1996). Agoraphobia, simple phobia, and social phobia in the National Comorbidity Survey. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 53, 159–168. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1996.01830020077009>
- Moosbrugger, H., & Kelava, A. (2012). *Testtheorie und Fragebogenkonstruktion* (2. Aufl.). Springer-Lehrbuch. Heidelberg: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20072-4>
- Newnham, E. A., Hooke, G. R., & Page, A. C. (2010). Monitoring treatment response and outcomes using the World Health Organization's Wellbeing Index in psychiatric care. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 122(1-2), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2009.06.005>
- Rinck, M., Bundschuh, S., Engler, S., Müller, A., Wissmann, J., Ellwart, T., & Becker, E. S. (2002). Reliabilität und Validität dreier Instrumente zur Messung von Angst vor Spinnen. *Diagnostica*, 48, 141–149.
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36.
- Roth, M., & Hammelstein, P. (Eds.) (2003). *Sensation Seeking: Konzeption, Diagnostik und Anwendung*. Göttingen, Bern, Toronto, Seattle: Hogrefe Verlag für Psychologie.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23–74.
- Simms, L. J., Zelazny, K., Williams, T. F., & Bernstein, L. (2019). Does the number of response options matter? Psychometric perspectives using personality questionnaire data. *Psychological Assessment*, 31(4), 557.
- Taylor, J., Deane, F., & Podd, J. (2002). Driving-related fear: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 22(5), 631–645.
- Taylor, J., Deane, F., & Podd, J. (2007). Diagnostic features, symptom severity, and help-seeking in a media-recruited sample of women with driving fear. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 29(2), 81–91.

- Taylor, J., Stephens, A., & Sullman, M. (2021). Psychometric properties of the Driving Cognitions Questionnaire, Driving Situations Questionnaire, and Driving Behavior Survey. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 76, 202–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2020.11.010>
- Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84(3), 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000376585>
- Tritt, K., Heymann, F. von, Zaudig, M., Zacharias, I., S-Ällner, W., & Loew, T. (2008). Development of the "ICD-10-Symptom-Rating"(ISR) questionnaire. *Zeitschrift für Psychosomatische Medizin und Psychotherapie*, 54(4), 409–418. <https://doi.org/10.13109/zptm.2008.54.4.409>
- Trumpf, J., Margraf, J., Vriends, N., Meyer, A. H., & Becker, E. S. (2010). Specific phobia predicts psychopathology in young women. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45(12), 1161–1166.
- Turner, S. M., Beidel, D. C., & Dancu, C. V. (1996). *SPAI: Social Phobia & Anxiety Inventory*: Multi-Health Systems.
- Wald, J., & Taylor, S. [S.] (2000). Efficacy of virtual reality exposure therapy to treat driving phobia: A case report. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 31(3-4), 249–257.
- Wardenaar, K. J., Lim, C. C. W., Al-Hamzawi, A. O., Alonso, J., Andrade, L. H., Benjet, C., . . . Florescu, S. E. (2017). The cross-national epidemiology of specific phobia in the World Mental Health Surveys. *Psychological Medicine*, 47(10), 1744.

Open Science Section

Data Transparency: Data is available at the online repository “PsychArchives”, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.4754>

Code Transparency: Code is available at the online repository “PsychArchives”, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.4754>

Research Material Transparency: The research material used consists mainly of the newly developed Instrument for Fear of Driving (IFD) which is made publicly in this manuscript.

Study Preregistration: This study is pre-registered at “PsyArXiv”.

Analysis Plan Preregistration: The analysis plan of this study was not preregistered.

Design and Analysis Transparency: We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all data inclusion/exclusion criteria, whether inclusion/exclusion criteria were established prior to data analysis, all measures in the study, and all analyses including all tested models. If we use inferential tests, we report exact *p* values, effect sizes, and 95% confidence or credible intervals.