# Appendix B

## *Table A1. Databases Consulted, Keywords Used and Period Consulted. Sources: Authors.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Database Queried | Keywords Used | Date of Research | Number of Results Obtained |
| Mots libres | (Disabled people OR People OR individuals with disabilit\* OR Young adults OR Adolescents OR Inabilit\* OR Incapacit\* OR Handicap OR Disability/ies OR Physically challenged OR Intellectually challenged OR Incapability OR Mentally disabled person OR Incapacitate/d OR Infirm Or Disable) AND (Driving readiness OR Learning to drive OR Driving training OR Driving OR Driving license OR Driving school OR Automobile driving OR Driving instruction) AND (Satisfaction OR Expectation OR Assumption OR Belief OR Supposition OR Need OR Anticipation OR Apprehension OR Hope OR Possibility OR Demand OR Want OR Wish OR Attitudes OR Opinion\* OR Point of view\* OR Perception\* OR Perspective\* OR Viewpoint\*) | N/A | N/A |
| ERIC | (DE "Disadvantaged" OR DE "Disadvantaged Youth\*" OR DE "Late Adolescent\*" OR DE "Young Adult\*" OR DE "Early Parenthood" OR DE "Disabilit\* Identification\*" OR DE "Disabilit\*" OR Disabled people OR individual\* with disabilit\* OR People with disabilit\* OR Young adult\* OR Adolescent\* OR Inabilit\* OR Incapacit\* OR Handicap\* OR Physically challenged OR Intellectually challenged OR Incapabilit\* OR Mentally disabled OR Incapacitat\* OR Infirm\* Or Disable\*) AND (DE "Driver\* Education\*" OR Driving readiness OR Learning to drive OR Driving training\* OR Driving OR Driving license OR Driving school OR Automobile driving OR Driving instruction\*) AND (DE "Satisfaction" OR DE "Adolescent\* Attitude\*" OR DE "Belief\*" OR DE "Preference\*" OR DE "Satisfaction\*" OR DE "Attitude\*" OR DE "Participant\*" OR Satisfaction\*"OR DE "User Satisfaction (Information)" OR DE "Motivation\*" OR DE "Achievement\* Need\*" OR DE "Learning Motivation\*" OR DE "Self Motivation" OR DE "Aspiration\*" OR DE "Intention\*" OR DE "Interest\*" OR DE "Need\*" OR DE "Expectation\*" OR DE "Educational Demand\*" OR Assumption OR Supposition OR Anticipation\* OR Apprehension\* OR Hope\* OR Possibilit\* OR Demand\* OR Want\* OR Wish\* OR Attitude\* “Opinion” OR “Point\* of view\*” OR “viewpoint\*” OR “Perception\*” OR “Perspective\*” OR DE "Personal Narratives") | 02/11/2017 | 108 |
| PsychInfo | (“Disabled people” OR “People with disabilit\*” OR “Individual\* with disabilit\*” OR “Young\* adult\*” OR “Adolescent\*” OR “Inabilit\*” OR “Incapacit\*” OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR “Physically challenged” OR “Intellectual\* challenged” OR Incapabilit\* OR “Mentally disabled person” OR Infirm\* Or Disable\* OR “Disabled (Attitudes Toward)” OR “Adult Attitudes” OR “Emerging Adulthood” OR “Adolescent\* Attitude\*” OR “Disabled (Attitudes Toward)” OR “Disabilities”)  AND (“Driving readiness” OR “Learning to driv\*” OR “Driving train\*” OR Driving OR “Driving license” OR “Driving school” OR “Automobile driving” OR “Driving instruction” OR “Driver\*” OR “Driver Education”) AND (Satisfaction\* OR Expectation\* OR Assumption\* OR Belie\* OR Supposition\* OR Need\* OR Anticipation\* OR Apprehension\* OR Hope\* OR Possibilit\* OR Demand\* OR Want\* OR Wish\* OR Attitude\* OR DE "STUDENT interests" OR “Expectation\*” OR “Experimenter Expectation\*” OR “Need\*” OR “Hope\*” OR “Attitude\*” OR “Opinion\*” OR “Point of view\*” OR “Perception\*” OR “Perspective\*” OR “viewpoint\*”) | 02/11/2017 | 5212 |
| Social Sciences Full Text | (“Disabled people” OR “People with disabilit\*” OR “Individual\* with disabilit\*” OR “Young adult\*” OR Adolescent\* OR “Inabilit\*” OR “Incapacit\*” OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR “Physical\* challenged” OR “Intellectual\* challenged” OR Incapabilit\* OR “Mental\* disabled person\*” OR Infirm\* Or Disabl\* OR DE "People with disabilit\*" OR DE "People with mental disabilit\*" OR DE "Student\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "Developmental\* disabl\*" OR DE "Disabilit\*" OR DE "Parent\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "Parent\* with mental\* disabilit\*" OR DE "People with visual\* disabilit\*" OR DE "Teen\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "Teen\* with mental\* disabilit\*" OR DE "Teen\*" OR DE "Young adult\*" OR DE "Youth" OR DE "Young worker\*" OR DE "Youth with mental\* disabilit\*" OR DE "Teen\* with mental\* disabilit\*" OR DE "Mental\* ill\*" OR DE "Mental\* ill\* parent\*" OR DE "Mental\* ill\* teen\*" OR DE "Mental\* ill\* youth") AND (“Driving readiness” OR “Learning to driv\*” OR “Driving train\*” OR Driving OR “Driving license” OR “Driving school” OR “Automobile driving” OR “Driving instruction” OR DE "Motor vehicle\*") AND (Satisfaction\* OR Expectation\* OR Assumption\* OR Belie\* OR Supposition\* OR Need\* OR Anticipation\* OR Apprehension\* OR Hope\* OR Possibilit\* OR Demand\* OR Want\* OR Wish\* OR Attitude\* OR DE "STUDENT\* interest\*" OR DE "Life expectanc\*" OR DE "Need\* (Psychology)" OR DE "Hope" OR DE "Desire" OR DE "Public opinion\*" OR DE “Opinion\*” OR DE “Perspective\*” OR DE “Perception\*” OR DE “Point of view\*” OR DE “Viewpoint\*”) | 02/11/2017 | 116 |
| Ergonomics Abstracts | (DE "PEOPLE with disabilit\*" OR DE "STUDENT\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "DISABILIT\*” OR DE "PEOPLE with mental\* disabilit\*" OR DE "PEOPLE with visual\* disabilit\*" OR DE "YOUNG adult\*" OR DE "TEEN\*" OR DE "YOUNG adult\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "YOUTH" OR DE "ADOLESCEN\*" OR DE "PARENT\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "TEEN\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "YOUNG adult\* with disabilit\*" OR DE "DEVELOPMENT\* disabilit\*" OR DE "MENTAL\* ill\*" OR DE “Disable\* people” OR DE “individual\* with disabilit\*” OR DE “Adolescent\*” OR DE “Inabilit\*” OR DE “Incapacit\*” OR DE “Handicap\*” OR DE “Physic\* challenge\*” OR DE “Intellect\* challenge\*” OR DE “Incapabilit\*” OR DE “Mental\* disable\* person\*” OR DE “Incapacitat\*” OR DE “Infirm\*” OR DE “Disable\*”) AND (DE "AUTOMOBILE\* driv\* school\*" OR DE "DRIV\* license\*" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE\* driv\*" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE\* license\*" OR DE "MOTOR\* vehicle\* driving\*" OR DE "Driv\* read\*" OR DE "Learn\* to driv\*" OR DE "Driv\* train\*" OR DE "Driv\*" OR DE "Driv\* school\*" OR DE "Driv\* instruction\*") AND (DE "SATISFACTION\*" OR DE "EXPECTATION\* (Philosophy)" OR DE "LIFE expectanc\*"OR DE "NEED\* (Psychology)" OR DE "HOPE\*" OR DE "POSSIBILIT\*" OR DE "DESIRE\*" OR DE "PUBLIC opinion" OR DE "Expectation\*" OR DE "Assumption\*" OR DE "Belief\*" OR DE "Supposition\*" OR DE "Anticipation\*" OR DE "Apprehension\*" OR DE "Demand\*" OR DE "Want\*" OR DE "Wish\*" OR DE "Attitude\*" OR DE “Opinion\*” OR DE “Perception\*” OR DE “Viewpoint\*” OR DE “Point of view\*”) | 02/11/2017 | 34 |
| CINAHL | ((MH "Disabled") OR (MH "Mentally Disabled Persons") OR (MH "Intellectual Disability") OR (MH "Young Adult") OR (MH "Adolescence") OR (MH "Students, Disabled") OR (MH "Developmental Disabilities") OR "Disabled people" OR "People with disabilit\*" OR "individual\* with disabilit\*" OR "Young adult\*" OR Adolescen\* OR Inabilit\* OR Incapacit\* OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR "Physically challenged" OR "Intellectually challenged" OR Incapabilit\* OR "Mentally disabled person\*" OR Incapacitat\* OR Infirm\* OR Disable\*) AND ((MH "Automobile Driving") OR (MH "Drive") OR (MH "Automobile Driver Examination") OR "Driving readiness" OR "Learning to drive" OR "Driving training" OR Driv\* OR "Driving license" OR "Driving school" OR "Automobile driving" OR "Driving instruction") AND ((MH "Personal Satisfaction") OR (MH "Patient Satisfaction") OR (MH "Health Beliefs") OR (MH "Information Needs") OR (MH "Health Services Needs and Demand") OR (MH "Human Needs (Physiology)") (MH "Human Needs (Psychology)") OR (MH "Hope") OR (MH "Attitude") OR Satisfaction\* OR Expectation\* OR Assumption\* OR Belief\* OR Supposition\* OR Need\* OR Anticipation\* OR Apprehension\* OR Hope\* OR Possibilit\* OR Demand\* OR Want\* OR Wish\* OR Attitude\* OR Opinion\* OR Perception\* OR Perspective\* OR Viewpoint\* OR "Point of view")) | 02/11/2017 | 3 148 |
| PubMED | ("Disabled Persons"[Mesh] OR "Mentally Disabled Persons"[Mesh] OR "Young Adult"[Mesh] OR "Adolescent"[Mesh] OR "Intellectual Disability"[Mesh] OR Disabled people OR People with disabilit\* OR Persons with disabilit\* OR Young adult\* OR Adolescent\* OR Inabilit\* OR Incapacit\* OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR Physically challenged OR Intellectually challenged OR Incapabilit\* OR Mentally disabled person OR Incapacitat\* OR Infirm OR Disabl\*) AND ("Automobile Driving"[Mesh] OR "Driving Under the Influence"[Mesh] OR "Distracted Driving"[Mesh] OR Driving readiness OR Learning to drive OR Driving training OR Driv\* OR Driving license\* OR Driving school\* OR Automobile driving OR Driving instruction\*) AND ("Personal Satisfaction"[Mesh] OR "Patient Satisfaction"[Mesh] OR "Health Services Needs and Demand"[Mesh] OR "Needs Assessment"[Mesh] OR "Anticipation, Psychological"[Mesh] OR "Hope"[Mesh] OR "Personal Satisfaction"[Mesh] OR "Attitude"[Mesh] OR "Public Opinion"[Mesh] OR Satisfaction\* OR Expectation\* OR Assumption\* OR Belief\* OR Supposition\* OR Need\* OR Anticipation\* OR Apprehension\* OR Hope\* OR Possibilit\* OR Demand\* OR Want\* OR Wish\* OR Attitude\* OR Opinion\* OR perception\* OR perspective\* OR Viewpoint\* OR "Point of view") | 02/11/2017 | 2 651  (best match) |
| Academic Search Premier | (“Disabled people” OR “People with disabilit\*” OR “Individual\* with disabilit\*” OR “Young adult\*” OR Adolescent\* OR “Inabilit\*” OR “Incapacit\*” OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR “Physically challenged” OR “Intellectual\* challenged” OR Incapability OR “Mentally disabled person” OR Infirm Or Disable OR DE "PEOPLE with disabilit\*" OR DE "STUDENTS with disabilit\*" OR DE "DEVELOPMENTALLY disabled" OR DE "ADOLESCENCE" OR DE “TEENAGER\*” OR DE "PEOPLE with mental disabilit\*" ) AND (“Driving readiness” OR “Learning to driv\*” OR “Driving train\*” OR Driving OR “Driving license” OR “Driving school” OR “Automobile driving” OR “Driving instruction” OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving in literature" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education (Elementary)" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education (Secondary)" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving simulator\*" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education -- Psychological aspect\*" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving school\*" OR DE "TRAFFIC safety education") AND (Satisfaction OR Expectation OR Assumption OR Belief OR Supposition OR Need OR Anticipation OR Apprehension OR Hope OR Possibility OR Demand OR Want OR Wish OR Attitude\* OR Opinion OR Viewpoint OR Perception OR Perspective OR DE "STUDENT interest\*" OR DE "HUMAN factor\* in automobile driving" OR DE "SATISFACTION" OR DE "CLIENT satisfaction" OR DE "CONTENTMENT" OR DE "ATTITUDE (Psychology)" OR DE "EXPECTATION (Psychology)" OR DE "NEED (Psychology)" OR DE "ACHIEVEMENT motivation" OR DE "ACHIEVEMENT motivation in adolescence" OR DE "HOPE" OR DE "WISH\*” OR DE "PERSPECTIVE (Philosophy)" OR DE "PERCEPTION (Philosophy)") | 02/11/2017 | 1028 |
| Web of Science | (“Disabled people” OR “People with disabilit\*” OR “Individual\* with disabilit\*” OR “Young adults” OR Adolescents OR “Inabilit\*” OR “Incapacit\*” OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR “Physically challenged” OR “Intellectual\* challenged” OR Incapability OR “Mentally disabled person” OR Infirm Or Disable OR DE "PEOPLE with disabilities" OR DE "STUDENTS with disabilities" OR DE "DEVELOPMENTALLY disabled" OR DE "ADOLESCENCE" OR DE “TEENAGERS” OR DE "PEOPLE with mental disabilities" ) AND (“Driving readiness” OR “Learning to driv\*” OR “Driving train\*” OR Driving OR “Driving license” OR “Driving school” OR “Automobile driving” OR “Driving instruction” OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving in literature" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education (Elementary)" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education (Secondary)" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving simulators" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education -- Psychological aspects" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving schools" OR DE "TRAFFIC safety education") AND (Satisfaction OR Expectation OR Assumption OR Belief OR Supposition OR Need OR Anticipation OR Apprehension OR Hope OR Possibility OR Demand OR Want OR Wish OR Attitude\* OR Opinion OR Viewpoint OR Perception OR Perspective OR DE "STUDENT interests" OR DE "HUMAN factors in automobile driving" OR DE "SATISFACTION" OR DE "CLIENT satisfaction" OR DE "CONTENTMENT" OR DE "ATTITUDE (Psychology)" OR DE "EXPECTATION (Psychology)" OR DE "NEED (Psychology)" OR DE "ACHIEVEMENT motivation" OR DE "ACHIEVEMENT motivation in adolescence" OR DE "HOPE" OR DE "WISHES” OR DE "PERSPECTIVE (Philosophy)" OR DE "PERCEPTION (Philosophy)") | 02/11/2017 | 4031 |
| Current Contents Connect | (“Disabled people” OR “People with disabilit\*” OR “Individual\* with disabilit\*” OR “Young adult\*” OR Adolescent\* OR “Inabilit\*” OR “Incapacit\*” OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR “Physically challenged” OR “Intellectual\* challenged” OR Incapability OR “Mentally disabled person” OR Infirm Or Disable OR DE "PEOPLE with disabilit\*" OR DE "STUDENTS with disabilit\*" OR DE "DEVELOPMENTALLY disabled" OR DE "ADOLESCENCE" OR DE “TEENAGER\*” OR DE "PEOPLE with mental disabilit\*" ) AND (“Driving readiness” OR “Learning to driv\*” OR “Driving train\*” OR Driving OR “Driving license” OR “Driving school” OR “Automobile driving” OR “Driving instruction” OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving in literature" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education (Elementary)" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education (Secondary)" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving simulator\*" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driver education -- Psychological aspect\*" OR DE "AUTOMOBILE driving school\*" OR DE "TRAFFIC safety education") AND (Satisfaction OR Expectation OR Assumption OR Belief OR Supposition OR Need OR Anticipation OR Apprehension OR Hope OR Possibility OR Demand OR Want OR Wish OR Attitude\* OR Opinion OR Viewpoint OR Perception OR Perspective OR DE "STUDENT interest\*" OR DE "HUMAN factor\* in automobile driving" OR DE "SATISFACTION" OR DE "CLIENT satisfaction" OR DE "CONTENTMENT" OR DE "ATTITUDE (Psychology)" OR DE "EXPECTATION (Psychology)" OR DE "NEED (Psychology)" OR DE "ACHIEVEMENT motivation" OR DE "ACHIEVEMENT motivation in adolescence" OR DE "HOPE" OR DE "WISH\*” OR DE "PERSPECTIVE (Philosophy)" OR DE "PERCEPTION (Philosophy)") | 02/11/2017 | 3046 |
| Sociological Abstract | (“Disabled people” OR “People with disabilit\*” OR “Individual\* with disabilit\*” OR “Young adult\*” OR Adolescent\* OR “Inabilit\*” OR “Incapacit\*” OR Handicap\* OR Disabilit\* OR “Physically challenged” OR “Intellectual\* challenged” OR Incapability OR “Mentally disabled person” OR Infirm Or Disable OR “Physically Handicapped” OR Handicapped OR “Mentally Retarded” OR “Congenitally Handicapped” OR Adolescents OR “Young Adults” OR Youth OR Adolescents) AND (“Driving readiness” OR “Learning to driv\*” OR “Driving train\*” OR Driving OR “Driving license” OR “Driving school” OR “Automobile driving” OR “Driving instruction”) AND (Satisfaction OR Expectation OR Assumption OR Belief OR Supposition OR Need OR Anticipation OR Apprehension OR Hope OR Possibility OR Demand OR Want OR Wish OR Attitude\* OR “Client Satisfaction” OR “Role Satisfaction” OR needs OR Motivation OR Expectations OR Beliefs OR Desire OR Goals OR Attitude\* OR “Student\* Attitude\*” OR Perception\* OR “Social Perception\*” OR Opinion OR Viewpoint OR Perspective)  ((all("Disabled people") OR all("People with disabilit\*") OR all("Individual\* with disabilit\*") OR all("Young adult\*") OR all(Adolescent\*) OR all("Inabilit\*") OR all("Incapacit\*") OR all(Handicap\*) OR all(Disabilit\*) OR all("Physically challenged") OR all("Intellectual\* challenged") OR all(Incapability) OR all("Mentally disabled person") OR all(Infirm) OR all(Disable) OR all("Physically Handicapped") OR all(Handicapped) OR all("Mentally Retarded") OR all("Congenitally Handicapped") OR all(Adolescents) OR all("Young Adults") OR all(Youth) OR all(Adolescents)) AND (all("Driving readiness") OR all("Learning to driv\*") OR all("Driving train\*") OR all(Driving) OR all("Driving license") OR all("Driving school") OR all("Automobile driving") OR all("Driving instruction")) AND (all(Satisfaction) OR all(Expectation) OR all(Assumption) OR all(Belief) OR all(Supposition) OR all(Need) OR all(Anticipation) OR all(Apprehension) OR all(Hope) OR all(Possibility) OR all(Demand) OR all(Want) OR all(Wish) OR all(Attitude\*) OR all("Client Satisfaction") OR all("Role Satisfaction") OR all(needs) OR all(Motivation) OR all(Expectations) OR all(Beliefs) OR all(Desire) OR all(Goals) OR all(Attitude\*) OR all("Student\* Attitude\*") OR all(Perception\*) OR all("Social Perception\*") OR all(Opinion) OR all(Viewpoint) OR all(Perspective))) NOT (all(Alcohol) OR all(Drug\*) OR all(hiv) OR all(Sex\*) OR all(risk\*) OR all(cessation) OR all(Drink\*) OR all(Drunk\*)) | 08/11/2017 | 103 |

# Appendix B

## *Table B1. Classification of Scores Attributed to Each Article*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors | Criteria for Evaluating Qualitative Articles\* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | 2A | | | 2B | | | | 2C | | | | | 2D | | | | 3 | | | | | 4 | | | | 5A | | | | 5B | | | 5C | | | Total | | | Quality |
| Almberg et al. (2017) | 3 | | | 3 | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | 3 | | | 27 | | | QI (Good) |
| Audrey and Langford (2014) | 3 | | | 3 | | | 0 | | | | 3 | | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 3 | | | 21 | | | QII (Fair) |
| Carrabine and Longhurst (2002) | 0 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | 11 | | | QIII (Weak) |
| Chee et al. (2014) | 3 | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | 3 | | | 26 | | | QI (Good) |
| Cox et al. (2012) | 2 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 3 | | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 3 | | | 20 | | | QII (Fair) |
| Falkmer et al. (2015) | 3 | | | 3 | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | 2 | | | 28 | | | QI (Good) |
| Kirby et al. (2011) | 2 | | | 3 | | | 0 | | | | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 3 | | | 22 | | | QII (Fair) |
| McGill and Vogtle (2001) | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | 24 | | | QI (Good) |
| Mirman et Kay (2012) | 3 | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 3 | | | | 0 | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | | 20 | | | QII (Fair) |
| Mullholand Behm (2014) | 2 | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | 24 | | | QI (Good) |
| Scott-Parker (2015) | 3 | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | 26 | | | QI (Good) |
| Törnqvist et al. (2009) | 2 | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | 26 | | | QI (Good) |
| Authors | Criteria for Evaluating Mixed Articles\*\*\* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S1 | | S2 | | | 1.1 | | | | 1.2 | | | | 1.3 | | | | 1.4 | | 3.1 | | | 3.2 | | | | 3.3 | | | 3.4 | | | | 5.1 | | | 5.2 | | | 5.3 | | Quality |
| Guttman (2013 | 1 | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | 50% (Fair) |
| Sacks and Rosenblum (2006) | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 50% (Fair) |
| Simms (1991) | 0 | | 1 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0% (Very weak) |
| Authors | Criteria for Evaluating Quantitative Articles\*\*\* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | | | 3 | | | | 4 | | | | 5 | | 6 | | | | 7 | | | 8 | | | | 9 | | | 10 | | 11 | | | | 12 | | | 13 | | | 14 | Quality |
| Begg et al. (2009) | Y | Y | | | N | | | | Y | | | | N | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | NA | | | NA | | N | | | | NA | | | NA | | | Y | Good |
| Delbosc and Currie (2014) | Y | Y | | | N | | | | N | | | | N | | N | | | | N | | | Y | | | | Y | | | NA | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | N | Fair |
| Hartos and Huff (2008) | Y | Y | | | Y | | | | N | | | | N | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | Y | | | NA | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | Y | Good |
| McCartt et al. (2007) | Y | Y | | | Y | | | | Y | | | | N | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | N | | | NA | | Y | | | | NA | | | NA | | | Y | Good |
| McKay et al. (2008) | Y | Y | | | N | | | | Y | | | | Y | | Y | | | | N | | | NA | | | | Y | | | NA | | Y | | | | N | | | NA | | | N | Good |
| Scott-Parker et al. (2015)  Global score | Y | Y | | | CD | | | | Y | | | | Y | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | N | | | NA | | N | | | | NA | | | NA | | | N | Poor |
| Scott-Parker et al. (2015)  Study 1 | Y | Y | | | CD | | | | Y | | | | Y | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | N | | | NA | | N | | | | NA | | | NA | | | N | Fair |
| Scott-Parker et al. (2015)  Study 2 | Y | Y | | | CD | | | | Y | | | | Y | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | N | | | NA | | N | | | | NA | | | NA | | | N | Poor |
| Scott-Parker et al. (2015)  Study 3 | Y | Y | | | N | | | | Y | | | | Y | | CD | | | | CD | | | NA | | | | N | | | NA | | N | | | | NA | | | NA | | | Y | Good |
| Sherman et al. (2004) | Y | Y | | | Y | | | | Y | | | | N | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | Y | | | NA | | Y | | | | N | | | NA | | | Y | Good |
| Tronsmoen (2011) | Y | Y | | | N | | | | Y | | | | Y | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | CD | | | NA | | N | | | | NA | | | NA | | | Y | Fair |
| Williams (2011) | Y | Y | | | N | | | | Y | | | | N | | N | | | | N | | | Y | | | | N | | | NA | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | Y | Good |
| Williams and Chaudhary (2008) | Y | Y | | | Y | | | | Y | | | | N | | N | | | | N | | | NA | | | | N | | | NA | | N | | | | NR | | | NA | | | Y | Fair |

*Legend:* Y = Yes; N = No; CD = Cannot determine

*Note.* \* Quality determined based on the Cesario, Morin and Santa-Donato Scale (2002). Quality level: QI(22.5-30) = Good; QII(15-22.4) = Fair; QIII(<15) = Poor. Criteria descriptions: 1 = descriptive vividness; 2A = rigor in documentation; 2B = procedural rigor; 2C = ethical rigor, 2D = confirmability; 3 = analytical preciseness; 4 = theoretical connectedness; 5A = intuitive recognition; 5B = relationship to existing body of knowledge; 5C = applicability. \*\* Quality was determined based on the scale from Pluye et coll. (2011). To ensure a certain level of uniformity, the quality levels were based on the nomenclature proposed by Cesario et coll. (2002). Quality level: 0% = very poor; 25% = poor; 50% = fair; 75% = good; 100% = excellent. Criteria descriptions: S1 = clear qualitative and quantitative research questions; S2 = collected data address the research question; (1: Qualitative) 1.1 = sources of data relevant, 1.2 = process for analyzing data relevant, 1.3 = findings relate to the context, 1.4 = findings relate to researchers’ influence; (2: Quantitative randomized controlled trials) 2.1 = clear description of the randomization, 2.2 = clear description of the allocation concealment, 2.3 = complete outcome data above 80% , 2.4 = low drop-out below 20%; (3: Quantitative nonrandomized) 3.1 = recruitment in a way that minimizes selection bias, 3.2 = measurements appropriate, 3.3 = participants comparable in control, 3.4 = complete outcome data; (4: Quantitative descriptive) 4.1 = sampling strategy relevant, 4.2 = sample representative, 4.3 = measurements appropriate, 4.4 = acceptable response rate above 60%; (5: Mixed methods) 5.1 = mixed methods research design relevant, 5.2 = integration of qualitative and quantitative data relevant, 5.3 = appropriate consideration given to the limitations associated with this integration. \*\*\* Quality was determined based on the scale, which, in turn, is based on the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute Scale (n.d.). Quality level: determined by the evaluator based on the general quality and relative importance of errors from poor to fair to good. Criteria descriptions: 1 = Research question; 2 = study population description; 3 = study population participation rate; 4 = groups recruited from the same population and uniform eligibility criteria; 5 = sample size justification; 6 = exposure assessed prior to outcome measurement; 7 = sufficient time frame to see an effect; 8 = different levels of the exposure of interest; 9 = exposure measure and assessment; 10 = repeated exposure assessment; 11 = outcome measures; 12 = blinding of outcomes assessors; 13 = follow-up rate; 14 = statistical analyses.

## *Table B2. Summary of the Results and Classification of Articles in Decreasing Order of Strength of Evidence*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification based on the scale from Daly et coll. (2007) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authors  (Year) | | Study Design | | Purpose of the Study | | Population | Region | | Methods Used | | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence | |
| Mullholand Behm (2014) | | Qualitative: Narrative | | To describe the experiences of 16-to-26-year-olds with TS managing issues that are important to them their stage of life. | | Total (n=24)  Age: 16–18 years (n=10), 19–26 years (n=14)  F: (n=24)  Licence: NS | United States (n=22) and Denmark (n=2) | | Semi-structured interviews using sequential e-mail communication  Total of 27 questions.  Collection time: before, during, after | | Burden  - 6 participants out of 14 still do not drive or found the experience so (-) that they stopped driving.  Ethicality  - Learning driving: critical event in coming of age.  - Drivers: (n=8) prefer to use public transportation or do not like driving  Personal efficacy  - Self-confidence related with independence gained with the licence. | 24/30  QI\*  1, 2B, 3, 4, 5B | 2a | |
| Almberg et al. (2017) | Qualitative: Pheno-menology | | To explore the facilitators or barriers to driving education experienced by ASD or ADHD with learner’s permit | | Total (n=33)  Age: 18–29 years old  Licence: learner’s  Characteristics: ADHD (n=14), ASD (n=19). | | | Sweden | | Telephone interview with questionnaire  Collection time: during | Affective attitude  - ASD: frustrations related to other drives not respecting the Highway Code  Burden  - ASD + ADHD: Difficult to learn theory off the road  - ASD + ADHD: Problems manoeuvring and being attentive enough when practising on the road  - ADHD: Problems integrating theory into practice | 27/30  QI\*  3, 4 | | 3a |
| Audrey and Langford (2014) | Qualitative:  Ethnography | | To explore young people’s views about driving and car ownership. | | By observation:  Total (n=173)  F: (n=76), M: (n=78), other: (n=19). | | | United Kingdom | | Observations from 4 pre-driving training sessions of 1 hour + 3 discussion groups.  Collection time: before | Affective attitude  - Concerns of parents about safety < perceived benefits of driving.  Ethicality  - Advantages of driving: freedom, maturity and independence for getting around, improved access to jobs and education, practical/convenient  Opportunity cost  - Disadvantages of driving: related costs, difficult to schedule driving lessons with school  Personal efficacy  - Raison for not having a licence: lack of confidence in learning to drive | 21/30  QII\*  2B, 2D, 3, 4, 5B | | 3a |
| Carrabine and Longhurst (2002) | Qualitative: Ethnography | | To consider the place of cars and the interaction with cars in contemporary youth culture | | Total: (n=24)  Age: 17–18 years  Licence: none or in the process of obtaining ones | | | United Kingdom | | Semi-structured interview.  Collection time: before and after | Affective attitude  No car = feelings of being left out and frustration  Ethicality  - Benefits perceived before licence: Maintaining and creating relationships, improving ADL management and family organization, feeling safe when travelling  Opportunity cost  - Costs of driving lessons and car limit acquiring licence | 11/30  QIII\*  1, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 3, 4, 5B, 5C | | 3a |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | Purpose of the Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| Chee et al. (2014) | Qualitative: Pheno-menology | To understand the viewpoints of young adults ASD on driving. | Total: (n=107)  Age: 18 years and older  Licence: none ASD: (n=29), TD: (n= 4); learner’s ASD: (n=4), TD: (n=14); licence ASD: (n=17), TP: (n=39) | Australia | Q method  (59 items) in person, supervised by a researcher  Collection time: before, during, after | Affective attitude  - ASD: Anxious when driving, so drive only when necessary or when less traffic  Ethicality  - TD: Prefers driving > public transportation. Not anxious when driving. Driving facilitates participation in exterior activities and increases quality of life.  - ASD: Importance of driving < walking or taking the bus to participate in exterior activities  Opportunity cost  - ASD: Buying a car is expensive.  Personal efficacy  - ASD: Did not find driving complex, are confident. | 26/30  QI\*  2A, 2B, 2C, 4 | 3a |
| Cox et al. (2012) | Qualitative:  Pheno-menology | To gain a better understanding  of driving and ASD. | Total (n=123)  Age: parents/caregivers of young people from 15 to 25 years old  Licence: none (23%), learner’s (29%), licence (48%) | United States | Online survey  Collection time: before, during and after | Affective attitude  - Concern of parents regarding their child’s driving skills + fear of children driving limit access to driver’s licence.  Ethicality  - Lack of interest of the young person (46%); no permission of parents (12%) + doctor (4%) limited access to licence  Perceived efficacy  -Poor learning strategies: emotivity, too many instructions/corrections and not using the same car  - Good learning strategies: practice + repetition, learning in steps; starting in a safe context; creating verbal/visual scenarios before going on the road, calm/patient teaching and the use of technology with ASD  Personal efficacy  - Dx of ASD is the reason of not having a licence (19%) | 20/30  QII\*  1, 2A, 2B, 2D, 3, 4, 5B | 3a |
| Falkmer et al. (2015) | Qualitative: Phenomenology | To identify viewpoints of ASD on: the barriers and facilitators of public transport + transportation preferences  to contrast these against viewpoints of neurotypical | Total: (n=111)  Age: 18 years and older  Licence: no ASD: (n=28), TD: (n=4); learner’s ASD: (n=12), TD: (n=13); licence ASD: (n=14), TD: (n=40) | Australia | Q method (59 items) in person, supervised by researcher  Collection time: before, during after | Ethicality  - ASD +TD: Prefer driving to public transportation.  Opportunity cost  - TD: Drive since the transportation system is not developed.  - ASD + TD: Are comfortable and content using public transportation, especially with the electronic ticket system. Leave the house only when necessary and prefer public transportation, but do not like crowding. | 28/30  QI\*  3AP, 5C | 3a |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | | Purpose of the Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| Guttman (2013) | Mixed: Sequential expla-  natory design | Qualitative: Grounded theory | To learn about the views of parents of young drivers regarding parental responsibility regarding young drivers’ driving | Total: (n=20)  Age: NS  Licence: NS | Israel | Semi-structure interview  Collection time:  NS | Affective attitude  - Worried parents  Personal efficacy:  - Low involvement: believe they have limited influence and the child must learn by himself.  - High involvement: responsibility for teaching driving | 50%  Fair\*\*  1.1, 1.4, 3.4, 5.3 | 3a |
| Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | Total: (n=906)  Age: 17–24 years old  Licence: learner’s (n=200), licence < 3 months (n=358), licence 3-6 months (n=348) | Semi-structured telephone interview  Collection time: during (n=200), after (n=706) | Affective attitude  - The more young drivers gain experience, the less parents are anxious  Ethicality  - 79% think they should be involved in teaching driving.  Personal efficacy  - 47% believe that the majority of parents do not feel able to influence a child to drive safely. | 3b |
| Kirby et al. (2011) | Qualitative:  Phenomenology | | To compare students with DCD to equivalent aged controls. | Total: (n=115)  Age: 17–25 years old  Licence: licence (57.9% DCD, 84.4% TD) | United Kingdom | Semi-structured questionnaire  Collection time: before and during | Affective attitude  - Before: DCD worried about driving lessons and dyspraxia.  - During: Feeling victorious after passing the test.  Burden  - During: Certain DCD stop learning, because it is too difficult.  Ethicality  - Before: Certain DCD do not see the need to drive in the city  Opportunity cost  - Before: reason for not driving for DCD + TD = high costs.  - Certain postpone driving lessons until after the school year  Perceived efficacy  - Not enough trained and understanding instructors  Personal efficacy  - DCD: confidence in one’s driving skills: during >before | 22/30  QII\*  1, 2B, 2D, 3, 4, 5B | 3a |
| McGill and Vogtle (2001) | Qualitative:  Phenomenology | | To explore students with physical disabilities feeling about learning to drive in a high school regular class | Total: (n=11)  Age: 14-18 years  Licence: none (n=9), licence (n=2) | United States | Semi-structured interview  Collection time: during (n=9), after (n=2) | Affective attitude  Frustration: waiting times for driving lessons: scheduling constraints and lack of adapted driving equipment.  Ethicality  - Ability to drive perceived as: beneficial, allows freedom, independence, commitment in ADL and social participation.  - Desired instructors: people with disabilities/pro instructor with expertise in the impact of disabilities on driving  - Desired learning site: The majority prefer at school with peers  - The majority want to increase the number of training sessions.  Intervention coherence  - School lacks initiative and information for driving process  Perceived efficacy  - Instructors not perceived as having the ability to deal with this clientele. | 24/30  QI\*  1, 2A, 2D, 3, 4 | 3a |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | | | Purpose of the Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| Mirman and Kay (2012) | Qualitative:  Phenomenology | | | To describe parents' perceptions about the learning-to-drive process for novice adolescent drivers. | Total: (n=66)  Age: parents of teens from 16 to 18 years  Licence: learner’s | United States | Semi-structured interviews or written surveys with open-ended questions  Collection time: before | Affective attitude  - Concerns about problems in recognizing distractions.  Burden  -Safe driving and responsibility of young person and parents.  Perceived efficacy  - Help learning on the road: experience/practice; involvement in accident, driving in difficult weather conditions/at night; direct instructions; observations of other drivers, good listening skills, patience and communication from parents  Personal efficacy  - Age: not sufficient for ensuring licence (= opportunity and ≠ law). | 20/30  QII\*  2B, 2C, 3, 4, 5B, 5C | 3a |
| Sacks and Rosenblum (2006) | Mixed: Sequential explanatory  design | Qualitative: Phenomeno-logy | | To obtain information on driving issues for teens with low vision | Total: (n=15) Age: 14–18 years  Licence: NS | United States | Telephone interview  Collection time: NS | Ethicality  - Importance: social independence  Intervention coherence  - 27% know about low-vision driving options.  Opportunity cost  -Advantage of not driving: No car payments  Personal efficacy  - 1/3 believe they are capable of driving. | 50%\*\*  1.4, 4.2, 4.4, 5.2, 5.3 | 3a |
| Quantitative: Incidence or prevalence study without comparison group | | Total: (n=63)  Age: 14–18 years old  Licence: NS | Self-administered questionnaire  Collection time: NS | Affective attitude  - Frustrations explaining why they cannot drive, cannot get go to where they want to without being dependent on the family  Personal efficacy  - 57.6% believed they were able to drive. | 4b |
| Scott-Parker (2015) | Qualitative: Narrative | | | To describe the teen driver's experiences of graduated driver licensing during the learner phase. | Total: (n=37)  Age: 16–18 years  Licence: learner’s (n=37) | Australia | 45-minute discussion group  Collection time: during | Affective attitude  - Anxiety related to learning on the road  - Frustration of young people when both parents involved  Buren  - High cognitive burden at the beginning of the practical courses.  Opportunity cost  - High cost for Pro-supervised lessons, exams, driving lessons and gas  Perceived efficacy  - Feedback from supervisors is not always clear. | 26/30  QI\*  2C, 3, 4 | 3a |
| Simms (1991) | Mixed: Trian-gulation design 1 | | Qualitative:  Cross-sectional analytic study | To collect information on the car use and driving experience of SB and HC an to compare with able-bodied peers. | Total: (n=86)  Age: 17–34 years  Licence: licence (n=86) | United Kingdom | Quantitative and qualitative questionnaire  Collection time: after | Burden  - No problems learning  Ethicality  - Driving increases independence and freedom, facilitates finding a job.  Opportunity cost  - 27% of participants have problems paying for lessons.  Perceived efficacy  - CP + TD: Instructor assisted during process  - CP + SBH: Need help with vehicle and adaptation  Personal efficacy  - SBH + TD: Low confidence the first year after obtaining the licence. | 0%\*\*  1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 | 3a |
| Quantitative: Case series | 4b |

*Note* 1: Since the quantitative and qualitative results were analyzed together, no distinction was made when presenting the results.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | Purpose of the Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| Törnqvist et al. (2009) | Qualitative: Narrative | To interview children with language impairment (LI), and their parents, to collect information regarding the life situation and the potential restrictions to psychosocial participation in many realms. | Total: (n=7)  Age: 32, 33 and 38 years old  Licence: licence | Sweden | Semi-structured interviews.  Collection time: after | Affective attitude  - Young people: obtaining a licence = feeling of price, accomplishment and independence  - Parents: obtaining a licence = price, satisfaction, confidence and validation  Ethicality  - Avoid situations that require a lot of communication.  Perceived efficacy  - Specialized schools in primary and secondary school provide the opportunity to complete theoretical studies before passing the practical driving test.  Personal efficacy  - Parents: obtaining licence = reinforcing and contributes to growing up. | 26/30  QI\*  1, 3, 4, 5B | 3a |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification Based on the Levels of Evidence of the Centre for Evidence‐Based Medicine (CEBM) at Oxford University (version 2011) | | | | | | | | |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | Purpose of Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| Begg et al. (2009) | Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | To investigate the opinions of new drivers regarding the reasons for getting a licence | Total: (n=3992)  Age: 15–20 years old  Licence: learner’s | New Zealand | Self-administered questionnaire.  Collection time: during | Ethicality  Very important: Freedom to go where they want and to work.  Not at all important: Friends have a licence.  - Importance differs significantly based on sex and age  - No significant difference based on living environment, except for those going to sporting activities. | Good\*\*\*  3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 | 3b |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Delbosc and Currie (2014) | Quantitative:  Cross-sectional analytic study | To measure and compare the attitudes of young drivers and those of young nondrivers | Total: (n=216)  Age: 17–25 years old  Licence: None (24%), learner’s (20%) and licence (57%) | Australia | Directed interview using a questionnaire  Collection time: before, during and after | Ethicality  - Reasons for participants not having and not wanting a licence: use money for other things, social networks allow contact with friends,  - Consensus: driving fosters independence.  Opportunity cost  - Raisons for participants not having a licence, but wanting one: a car is a major responsibility, cost of car and process for obtaining one is too high, other modes of transportation are currently fine | Fair\*\*\*  3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 | 3b |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Guttman (2013) | Mixed: Sequential explanatory design | Qualitative: Grounded theory | To learn about the views of parents of young drivers regarding parental duty regarding young drivers’ driving | Total: (n= 20)  Age: NS  Licence: NS | Israel | Semi-structured interviews  Collection time:  NS | Affective attitude  - Parents concerned  Personal efficacy:  - Low involvement: Parents not very confident about influencing driving, child must learn by himself.  - High involvement: Parents should not avoid the responsibility of teaching driving. The young person needs to be guided.  - Parents confident about skills. | 50%  Fair\*\*  1.1, 1.4, 3.4, 5.3 | 3a |
| Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | Total: (n=906)  Age: 17–24 years old  Licence: learner’s (n=200), 0–3 months (n=358), 3–6 months (n=348) | Semi-structured telephone interview  Collection time: during (n=200), after (n=706) | Affective attitude  - The more young drivers gain experience, the less parents are anxious.  Ethicality  - 79% think that they should be involved in the driving learning process.  Personal efficacy  - 47% believe that the majority of parents do not feel able to influence a child to drive safely. | 3b |
| Hartos and Huff (2008) | Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | | To assess parent attitudes toward integrating parent involvement into teenage driver education classes. | Total: (n=321)  Age: parents of young people aged 14.5 years or older  Licence: No characteristics: Driving lessons at high school | United States | Survey sent by mail  Collection time: during | Ethicality  - 75% parents believe they have to be involved in the learning process  - Desired involvements: written documentation sent to the home (67%), information on the Internet (64%), discussions with instructor (62%), information via e-mail (59%), telephone discussions with the instructor (62%)  - 73–91% want to have information on: Ways of increasing safety on the road after obtaining a licence, monitoring the driving of the car, ways of reinforcing the driving lessons, ways of teaching a child how to drive, ways of improving educational material, times and places where young people should practise driving and driving once the licence has been obtained. | Good\*\*\*  4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 | 3b |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | Purpose of the Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| McCartt et al. (2007) | Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | To assess parental decision making regarding the timing of teenagers initiating driving and monitoring teenagers’ driving after licensure. | Total: (n=915)  Age: parents of teens aged 16-17 years  Licence: Learner’s | United States | Surveys via interviews  Collection time: during | Ethicality  - Reasons for obtaining learner’s permit early: Young person wanted it (60–81%)  Intervention coherence  - 10–21% of parents did not know that they could postpone a licence until their child was 18 years old.  Opportunity cost  - Reasons for postponing obtaining a learner’s permit: meeting the necessary conditions for the process (18–36%), scheduling constraints (8–21%).  - Reasons not explaining why no licence was obtained: costs of the process, lack of vehicle and low marks at school.  Personal efficacy  - Raison for obtaining licence early: Young person ready (22–32%).  - Reason for postponing learner’s permit: Not mature (14–34%)  - Reason for obtaining licence early: no need other than it is practical (13–25%)  - Reason for postponing licence: Need more practical hours (34–52%), low marks at school (10–11%) | Good\*\*\*  5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 | 3b |
| McKay et al. (2008) | Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | To determine the attitudes of teens and parents towards the enhanced graduated driver licensing | Total: youth (n=750), parents (n=811)  Youth age: 16-17 years  Licence:  licence | United States | Survey via mail  Collection time: after | Perceived efficacy  - Approval for night-driving restrictions: 70.6% parents have an appropriate curfew of 11 p.m. VS 54% teens wanting it to be midnight.  - Approval for restrictions regarding n of passengers with n of seatbelts available VS: 60.5% parents VS 87.4% teens agree. 38.5% of parents prefer more restrictive measures. | Good\*\*\*  3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14 | 3b |
| Scott-Parker et al. (2015) | **Study 1**  Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | To develop a young novice driver-specific instrument that measures the psychosocial purpose of driving. | Total: (n=656)  Age = 17-20 years  F: (n=450)  M: (n=206)  Licence: temporary | Australia | Survey: PsychoSocial Purpose of Driving Scale or PSPDS (7 items), Behavioral of Young Novice Drivers Scale, 44 items.  Collection time: during | Ethicality  - Equally M and F: driving allows to more easily see their friends, feel independent and have a feeling of freedom | Poor\*\*\*  3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 | 3b |
| **Study 2**  Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | To explore the relationships between psychosocial driving purpose and self-reported risky driving behaviour in a sample of young Learner drivers. | Total: (n=1051)  Age: 17-20 years  F: (n=629)  M: (n=422)  Licence: learner’s | Survey: Behaviour of Young Novice Drivers Scale (44 items), PSPDS (7 items).  Collection time: during | Ethicality  - Most common reasons for driving: feeling of freedom, feeling independent and can easily see their friends.  - M = acquire status among friends, and relaxes  - F = feeling independent | Poor\*\*\*  3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 | 3b |
| **Study 3**  Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study and cohort study | To examine differences in driving purpose over time, as drivers progressed from a Learner to a Provisional driver’s licence. | Total: (n=351)  Age: 17-21 years  F: (n=242)  M: (n=109)  Licence: temporary | Survey:  36 items in the revised Behaviour of Young Novice Drivers Scale (36 items), PSPDS (7 items).  Collection time: during | Ethicality  Most common reasons for driving: feeling of freedom, feeling independent, see their friends more easily.  - M = feel powerful and acquire status among friends  - People with cars: feel independent  - Temporary > learner: freedom, independence and see friends more easily | Poor\*\*\*  3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 | 3b |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | | Purpose of the Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| Tronsmoen (2011) | Quantitative:  Cross-sectional analytic study | | To examine and compare the amount and content of lay instructor and professional driver training. | Total: (n=1419)  Age: 18–20 years  F: (n=724)  M: (n=695)  Licence: licence | Norway | Questionnaire: 18-indicator Norwegian measurement instrument, 32-items instrument d’Åberg and Rimmö’s (1998), 31 indicators de Tronsmoen (2008  Collection time: After | Personal efficacy  - 31% variance in driving skills is explained by driving experience.  *Variables that predict more variance in self-evaluation of specific skills:*  - Self-evaluation of skills M > F  - Lay has more impact on variance than Pro  - Instructions by Lay are (+) correlated with self-evaluation of skills  - Lessons given by Pro are (-) correlated with self-evaluation of skills  - Feeling of security and atmosphere of trust have a major influence for both Lay and Pro  - Quantity of instructions had a fair effect | Fair\*\*  3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 | 3b |
| Williams (2011) | Quantitative: Incidence or prevalence study without comparison group | | To learn teenagers’ opinions about licensing policies | Total: (n=1383)  Age: 15–18 years  Licence: none (37%), learner’s (23%), probationary (13%), licence (26%) | United States | Survey  Collection time: before, during, after | Ethicality  - 82–89% of young people prefer obtaining their licence as soon as possible.  - 17% of young people without a licence do not want to obtain it in the near future.  - Approve the existence of a course to guide parents in supervising driving  Opportunity cost  -no car available, too busy with other activities, too costly, can reach desired destinations without driving and parents too busy to supervise them. | Good\*\*\*  3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 | 3b |
| Williams and Chaudhary (2008) | Quantitative: Cross-sectional analytic study | | To determine parental views about enhancements to the learner stage | Total: (n=398)  Age: parents of young people aged 15–17 years  Licence: NS  Total: (n=409) Age: 18 years and older | United States | Survey  Collection time: NS | Ethicality  - % of parents who support the statement fully or somewhat: increased quantity of driving supervision required for learner drivers under 18 years old (75%); increase the learning period for learner drivers under 18 years old (63%); | Fair\*\*\*  5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 | 3b |
| Sacks and Rosenblum (2006) | Mixed: Sequen-tial  expla-natory | Qualitative: Phenomenology | To obtain information on driving issues for adolescents with low vision | Total: (n=15)  Age: 14–18 years  Licence: NS | United States | Interview  Collection time: NS | Ethicality  - Importance of socio-economic independence.  Intervention coherence  - 27% know the options of driving with low vision.  Opportunity cost  -The advantage of not driving: No car payments  Personal efficacy  - 1/3 believe they are capable of driving. | 50%\*\*  1.4, 4.2, 4.4, 5.2, 5.3 | 3a |
| Quantitative: Incidence or prevalence study without comparison group | Total: (n=63)  Age: 14–18 years  Licence: NS | Self-administered questionnaire  Collection time: NS | Affective attitude  - Frustrations in explaining why they cannot drive, not being able to get around or wanting to without being dependent on the family  Personal efficacy  - 57.6% believe they are capable of driving.  - 48% believe they have excellent/good skills for travelling | 4b |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Authors  (Year) | Study Design | | Purpose of the Study | Population | Region | Methods Used | Results | Quality! | Strength of Evidence |
| Sherman et al. (2004) | Quantitative: Incidence or prevalence study without comparison group | | To compare the teens’ and parents’ expectations concerning the process of learning to drive and acquiring driver’s licence | Total: (n=613) (parent–teen duos)  Age: ≥15  Licence: none (n=67), Learner’s (n=544) | United States | Self-administered questionnaire: 2 versions (parents and teens)  Collection time: during | Affective attitude  - Feeling of parents about driving supervision: enthusiastic (35.2%), nervous (39.6%) and impatient (28.4%)  - Parents:driving = concerns  Ethicality  - 99.3% young people want to practise with their parents as their parents do (97%).  Opportunity cost  - Parents believe that licence = saving time and inconvenience.  Personal efficacy  - Impressions of parents regarding driving supervision: competent (52.7%), committed (66.7%), available (44.4%). | Good\*\*\*  5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13 | 4b |
| Simms (1991) | Mixed: Triangulation design1 | Qualitative:  Cross-sectional analytic study | To collect information on the car use and driving experiences of drivers with SB and HC an to compare with their able peers. | Total: (n=86)  Age: 17–34 years  Licence: licence | United Kingdom | Quantitative and qualitative questionnaire  Collection time: after | Burden  - No problems learning.  Ethicality  - Driving a car increases independence and freedom, and makes it easier to find a job  Opportunity cost  - Problems paying for driving lessons for 27% participants.  Perceived efficacy  - CP + TD: Instructor assisted during learning process.  - SBH + CP: Need advice about vehicle and adaptation.  Personal efficacy  - SBH + TP: Lacks confidence during the first year after obtaining the licence | 0%\*\*  1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 | 3a |
| Quantitative: Case series | 4b |

*Legend.* TD = typically developed; SB = spina bifida; HC = hydrocephalus; SBH = spina bifida with hydrocephalus; CP = cerebral palsy; ASD = autism spectrum disorder; NS = not specified, n = number; Dx = diagnosis(es); ADHD = attention deficit disorder with or without hyperactivity; CI = cognitive impairment; F = female; M = male; ADL = activities of daily living; teen(s): adolescent(s); DCD = Person with development coordination disorder; collection time = time of collecting data with regard to the process of learning how to drive a car; < = less than or greater than; > greater than or more important than; pro = professional; lay = lay instructor.

*Note*: All results were classified based on the model proposed by Sekhon, Cartwright and Francis (2017).

! Only elements lowering the quality score of the article are listed after the global score.

a: The qualitative strength of evidence level was determined based on the scale from Daly et coll. (2007).b: The quantitative strength of evidence level was determined based on the evidence levels table of the Centre for Evidence‐Based Medicine at Oxford University (version 2011).

\* The quality was determined based on the Cesario, Morin and Santa-Donato (2002) scale. Quality level: QI(22.5-30) = Good; QII(15-22.4) = Fair; QIII(<15) = Poor. Criteria descriptions: 1 = descriptive vividness; 2A = rigor in documentation; 2B = procedural rigor; 2C = ethical rigor, 2D = confirmability; 3 = analytical preciseness; 4 = theoretical connectedness; 5A = intuitive recognition; 5B = relationship to existing body of knowledge; 5C = applicability. \*\* Quality was determined based on the scale from Pluye et coll. (2011). To ensure a certain level of uniformity, the quality levels were based on the nomenclature proposed by Cesario et coll. (2002). Quality level: 0% = very poor; X; 25% = poor; 50% = fair; 75% = good; 100% = excellent. Criteria descriptions: S1 = clear qualitative and quantitative research questions; S2 = collected data address the research question; (1: Qualitative) 1.1 = sources of data relevant, 1.2 = process for analyzing data relevant, 1.3 = findings relate to the context, 1.4 = findings relate to researchers’ influence; (2: Quantitative randomized controlled trials) 2.1 = clear description of the randomization, 2.2 = clear description of the allocation concealment, 2.3 = complete outcome data above 80% , 2.4 = low drop-out below 20%; (3: Quantitative nonrandomized) 3.1 = recruitment in a way that minimizes selection bias, 3.2 = measurements appropriate, 3.3 = participants comparable in control, 3.4 = complete outcome data; (4: Quantitative descriptive) 4.1 = sampling strategy relevant, 4.2 = sample representative, 4.3 = measurements appropriate, 4.4 = acceptable response rate above 60%; (5: Mixed methods) 5.1 = mixed methods research design relevant, 5.2 = integration of qualitative and quantitative data relevant, 5.3 = appropriate consideration given to the limitations associated with this integration. \*\*\* Quality was determined based on the scale, which, in turn, is based on the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute Scale (nd). Quality level: determined by the evaluator based on the general quality and relative importance of errors from poor to fair to good. Criteria descriptions: 1 = Research question; 2 = study population description; 3 = study population participation rate; 4 = groups recruited from the same population and uniform eligibility criteria; 5 = sample size justification; 6 = exposure assessed prior to outcome measurement; 7 = sufficient time frame to see an effect; 8 = different levels of the exposure of interest; 9 = exposure measure and assessment; 10 = repeated exposure assessment; 11 = outcome measures; 12 = blinding of outcomes assessors; 13 = follow-up rate; 14 = statistical analyses