GDL laws differ across states as there are no federally required provisions. This study describes the distribution of the content of state GDL laws in relation to five key law elements: (1) curfew restrictions, (2) passenger restrictions, (3) drug/alcohol use, (4) traffic violations, and (5) cell phone usage.

Methods A content analysis was conducted on all 50 US state GDL laws. State GDL laws were independently reviewed and analyzed by two coders. For each GDL law, the written language corresponding to each of the five key elements were coded based on the presence of the element in the state law: 1= present in state law or 0= absent in state law. Variation in the specific language used for the five key law elements across states were identified and described.

Results Most state GDL laws included specific language in relation to curfew restrictions (98%), passenger restrictions (94%), and traffic violations (86%). Fewer state laws included specific language on drug/alcohol violations (52%) and cell phone usage (76%). We found great variation in the language used in relation to the five key law elements across states, with curfew times and penalties for traffic violations varying widely across states.

Conclusion While all states have GDL laws, variations exist in the law elements included in state laws and the language used in these laws. Future research should examine how these variations in GDL laws may impact crash rates among young drivers.

Significance and Contributions This study furthers our knowledge of the content and language used in GDL laws across states as well variations in these laws from state to state.
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Statement of Purpose The purpose of this study was to explore the beliefs of NCAA coaches across Divisions I, II, & III about their role in concussion management, perspectives about the culture of concussion on their campuses, and their thoughts on concussion safety.

Methods/Approach As part of a larger survey, open-ended questions were included to explore coaches’ attitudes and perceptions of their role in concussion management, the culture of concussion on their team and campus, reporting behaviors of athletes, and overall thoughts on concussion. Colleges from all three divisions of the NCAA were randomly selected based on the proportions represented (31% DI, 27% DII, 41% DIII). Coach and assistant coach emails from selected colleges of contact/collision or limited contact sports were sent a link to the survey. Qualitative data was analyzed using a phenomenological, inductive approach.

Results Thematic analysis suggests that coaches believe their role was one of supporting the Athletic Trainers and healthcare professionals as well as coaching to instruct and enforce safety. They also indicated that concussion are serious although some indicated concussions are overly-hyped. Coaches indicated that reporting behavior is mixed with some suggesting that athletes report and others indicating that athletes do not report or underreport. Coaches provided reasons they thought athletes may under or over report as well. They also indicated that concussions are serious but better diagnostic assessments are needed and return to play protocols are too long.

Conclusion Overall, our findings suggest that coaches report cautious attitudes towards concussion, but there are areas for improvement.

Significance and Contributions to Injury and Violence Prevention Science Exploring the culture of concussion from the perspective of coaches contributes to the socio-ecological framework to more fully understand the larger context in which student-athletes are reporting concussions and provides an understanding of how to target future education.