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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 Introduction

1.1.1 The initial objectives of the research into unlicensed driving set out by the then Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (now Department for Transport, or DfT) were as follows:

- Estimate the extent of unlicensed driving, including the proportion of drivers who drive unlicensed, the frequency and circumstance of unlicensed driving and the miles driven.
- Consider the road safety implications of unlicensed driving with reference to crash reports and self-reported accident involvement.
- Determine the characteristics of unlicensed drivers.
- Identify the motivations for unlicensed driving and the beliefs and attitudes associated with the behaviour including consideration of possible consequences and the effectiveness of existing and possible deterrents.
- Make recommendations for countermeasures.

1.1.2 Several strands of research have been completed as part of the project. These have included the following:

- Literature review.
- National postal surveys of potential unlicensed drivers, and those who have been caught driving while never having held a licence.
- Telephone and face-to-face interviews with actual and potential unlicensed drivers.
- Matching of police STATS19 accident records with police prosecution data on unlicensed driving.
- Delphi questionnaire survey and workshop to consider countermeasures.
- Focus group discussions with actual and potential ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving to consider countermeasures.

1.1.3 These strands of research (including their methodology, analysis and results) are reported in depth elsewhere within this report. Within this executive summary we combine the main results and present our main conclusions with respect to each of the objectives above. We also provide our recommendations for countermeasures, which have been developed in light of the findings from all the strands of the research.
1.1.4 It should be noted that there are a number of caveats to the main results, which are described within Chapter 3. These reflect the fact that in attempting to assess the total amount of driving and relative crash risk of unlicensed drivers it has been necessary to provide a large range in our estimates due to uncertainty regarding results. This uncertainty is due to various factors, including:

- Small sample sizes and low response rates from surveys.
- Duplicate records on the DVLA database of drivers.
- Unwillingness to admit to an anti-social behaviour.
- A potential under-estimate as to crashes involving an unlicensed driver (as a result of undetected unlicensed drivers, errors of omission during the manual search of records, and cases where there was no prosecution of an unlicensed driver).

1.1.5 However, where assumptions have been used, care has been taken to ensure they tend towards the conservative, or a range has been presented, where appropriate.

2 Extent of Unlicensed Driving

2.1.1 Unlicensed driving can be carried out by several different categories of driver:

- Those who have Never held a Licence (referred to as NELIs).
- Provisional licence holders (who may drive otherwise than in accordance with the restrictions of the provisional licence).
- Drivers who may drive after being disqualified from driving for
  a) a drink-driving offence;
  b) some other single offence; and
  c) the totting up of penalty points.
- Drivers whose licence was revoked under the provisions of the Road Traffic (New Drivers) Act 1995 (who may drive before reapplying for a provisional licence, and may also drive otherwise than in accordance with the restrictions of the provisional licence if they decide to reapply for one).

2.1.2 Estimates of the amount of unlicensed driving have been based upon results of national postal surveys of the above categories asking drivers if they had driven unlicensed, and if so, how much they had done. It should be noted that response rates to these surveys were varied (19 per cent for provisional drivers; 9, 4 and 9 per cent respectively for disqualified drink-drivers, totters and other single offenders; 8 per cent for New Driver’s Act revokes; and only 1 per cent for NELIs. Due to the low response rate, results from the NELI survey were subsequently rejected). These proportions were then applied to the population of each category as determined from the DVLA database of driving licences. These estimates are presented in Table E1.
2.1.3 There is uncertainty as to the amount of driving completed by all NELIs, as there is no simple way to determine numbers of those who have driven while never having held a licence. As we know little about this group of drivers, we are also unable to accurately estimate how much driving each of these drivers perform on average.

2.1.4 The DVLA holds records of those NELIs who have been caught without a licence and so have subsequently received ‘points’ on any future licence they apply for (these records are kept for a limited period as described within Chapter 4). From these figures we have tried to estimate the total population of NELIs, including those who have not been caught, or who have been subsequently removed from the database. For this analysis we have presented a lower and upper estimate for NELIs.

2.1.5 For the lower estimate it has been assumed that NELIs drive a similar amount to the disqualified drivers (say 4 hours per month). It is estimated that 50,000 NELIs are caught driving each year. Our survey of a different group, the disqualified drivers, revealed that of those who admitted driving while disqualified around a third said they had been caught doing so. If we were to apply this same proportion to the numbers of NELIs who appear on the DVLA database, there would be 50,000 x 3 = 150,000 NELIs in total, driving per year. If these NELIs completed a typical month’s driving before the start of the year in which they were caught, we would estimate a total of 600,000 hours per month (150,000 x 4 hours = 600,000 hours per month).

### Table E1: Estimate of unlicensed driving by potential unlicensed drivers (excluding NELIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Population (from DVLA)</th>
<th>Proportion from survey admitting to unlicensed driving %</th>
<th>Average number of hours driven per month unlicensed</th>
<th>Estimated population of unlicensed drivers (approx)</th>
<th>Estimated hours of unlicensed driving completed per month (approx)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Provisional Licence Holders</td>
<td>Drink-drivers</td>
<td>144,344</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Totters’</td>
<td>34,916</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other single offence</td>
<td>43,521</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Drivers Act ‘Revokee’</td>
<td>Not holding any licence</td>
<td>12,558</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-obtained a provisional licence</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,479,943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>476,300</td>
<td>553,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total population of provisional licence holders according to the DVLA database was 5,576,000. This was adjusted downwards to account for records no longer valid due to changes in name, or death of licence holder for example (see section 3.2 for more details).
2.1.6 For the upper estimate it has been assumed that on average the NELIs complete around half the amount of driving of the average driver as determined from the DfT’s National Travel Survey (5.7 hours per month). Again applying the figure from the disqualified driver survey (which revealed that of those who admitted driving while disqualified around a third said they had been caught doing so) we can calculate that from the total number of NELIs who appear on the DVLA database, there would be 200,000 x 3 = 600,000 NELIs in total (600,000 x 5.7 hours = 3,420,000 hours per month). This assumes that all NELIs on the database drive in any given month.

2.1.7 The estimate of total amounts of unlicensed driving for NELIs is presented in Table E2. Estimates using the lower and upper estimates of amount of driving by NELIs range from 1,153,000 to 3,973,000 hours per month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated unlicensed driving by provisional licence holders, disqualified drivers, New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ (hours/month)</th>
<th>Estimated unlicensed driving by NELIs (hours/month)</th>
<th>Estimated total amount of unlicensed driving (hours/month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>553,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>= 1,153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>553,000</td>
<td>3,420,000</td>
<td>= 3,973,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.8 The potential range of driving for NELIs varies considerably depending on the estimates. Regardless of the estimates, NELIs perform the largest amount of driving in hours per month for all types of unlicensed drivers (600,000 to 3,420,000 hours per month). This is followed by provisional licence holders (397,000), those disqualified for drink-driving (78,000) ‘totters’ (48,000), those convicted of another single offence (10,000) and revokees (7,000).

2.1.9 Using data from the DfT’s National Travel Survey it was estimated that there are, on average, approximately 620 million hours of car driving completed per month in Great Britain. The total amount of driving completed by unlicensed drivers in comparison to all drivers can be seen in Table E3. The total proportion of driving completed by unlicensed drivers could range between 0.19 per cent up to 0.64 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated number of hours of unlicensed driving (hours/month)</th>
<th>Estimated number of hours of driving (hours/month)</th>
<th>Proportion of unlicensed driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1,153,000</td>
<td>620,000,000</td>
<td>= 0.0019 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>3,973,000</td>
<td>620,000,000</td>
<td>= 0.0064 0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Road Safety and Unlicensed Driving

3.1.1 Through the matching of police prosecution records with associated STATS19 crash records we have been able to assess the number of crashes (and casualties) for which a driver was subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving in three police force areas. In total, just over 3 per cent of all personal injury crashes involve a driver subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving, nearly 3.5 per cent of all casualties. Applying these findings to Great Britain in 2000 there would be around 7,000 crashes (11,000 casualties) involving drivers subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving, as shown in Table E4.

Table E4: Crashes involving drivers subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Total number of crashes and casualties in Great Britain (year 2000)</th>
<th>Proportion of crashes and casualties for which an unlicensed driver was prosecuted in Study areas (%)</th>
<th>Estimated total number of crashes and casualties for which an unlicensed driver was prosecuted in Great Britain (using year 2000 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crashes</td>
<td>Casualties</td>
<td>Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI</td>
<td>35,607</td>
<td>41,564</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>198,122</td>
<td>278,719</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233,729</td>
<td>320,283</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sample size of 12,856 crashes, of which 393 involved a driver subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving.

3.1.2 Not all prosecutions result in a finding of guilt, but it was not possible to determine from police records as to which individual unlicensed driving prosecutions resulted in a finding of guilt. Therefore national Home Office records (1997) were used to assess the proportion of findings of guilt for all unlicensed driving prosecutions nationally (57 per cent), and this proportion was applied to estimate the national number of crashes for which a driver was subsequently found guilty of unlicensed driving. This is shown within Table E5.

Table E5: Crashes involving drivers subsequently found guilty of unlicensed driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Total number of crashes and casualties in Great Britain (year 2000)</th>
<th>Proportion of crashes and casualties for which an unlicensed driver was found guilty in Study areas (%)</th>
<th>Estimated total number of crashes and casualties for which an unlicensed driver was found guilty in Great Britain (using year 2000 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crashes</td>
<td>Casualties</td>
<td>Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI</td>
<td>35,607</td>
<td>41,564</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>198,122</td>
<td>278,719</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233,729</td>
<td>320,283</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.3 It can be seen that there are around 6,300 casualties annually as a result of crashes involving an unlicensed driver and around 900 of these are killed or seriously injured (KSI). Not all crash involved unlicensed drivers are detected and of those who are, not all are prosecuted. Therefore it is possible that this represents an underestimate.

3.1.4 By comparing crashes involving unlicensed drivers with all crashes, we can say:
- They typically involve a higher severity.
- They involve a higher number of casualties.
- There are more male casualties.
- The age of these casualties is lower.
- A higher proportion occurs on unclassified roads, and in low-speed environments.
- The greatest number of crashes tend to occur at the evening peak, but weekend crashes are over-represented, as are those late in the evening or early morning.
- Passengers are significantly over-represented for this group.
- There is a higher proportion of motorcyclists involved in crashes involving unlicensed drivers compared with crashes not involving unlicensed drivers.

3.1.5 As for the unlicensed drivers involved in these crashes, we can say that:
- They tend to be male.
- They are younger (average age 28 years) than the average crash involved driver (average age 37 years).
- They are significantly more likely to produce a positive breath-test result.
- There is an unlicensed driver effect over and above the increased crash risk of being a young male.

4 Relative Crash Risk of Unlicensed Driving

4.1.1 Our study of unlicensed driver crash involvement estimated that around 1.7 per cent of crashes involved a driver who was subsequently found guilty of an unlicensed driving offence. (The true extent of crash involvement will most likely be greater than 1.7 per cent because of cases of hit and run involving unlicensed drivers who are never traced, or where insufficient evidence is gathered for example).

4.1.2 As we have been able to calculate lower and upper estimates for the amount of driving which results from unlicensed drivers, we can also estimate the risk of crash involvement for such drivers. This is shown within Table E6.
4.1.3 Comparative crash risk of unlicensed drivers could range anywhere between 2.7 to 9 times greater than that for all drivers. The lowest estimate in the proportion of all driving completed by unlicensed drivers corresponds to the highest level of crash risk and vice versa (for example, the less driving completed then the riskier they are). It should not be forgotten that in terms of road safety, unlicensed drivers will include two extremes ranging from the wilfully negligent joy rider to the experienced driver who has driven regularly for several years without being involved in any crashes.

5 Characteristics of Unlicensed Drivers

5.1.1 Characteristics of unlicensed drivers were assessed from the results of postal surveys and in more detail from telephone and face-to-face interviews. Interviews were conducted with a variety of groups, including provisional licence holders (a total of 390), disqualified drivers (99), prisoners convicted of motoring offences at young offenders institutions (31), and venues such as a pensioner’s drop-in centre, Hindu Temple, Town and City centres, motor convoy, school/university, and music festival (696 interviews in total).

5.1.2 The characteristics of drivers varied between the different groups of unlicensed drivers. However, when comparing drivers who admitted to driving unlicensed with those who said they had not, there were some factors common to all:

- There was a high proportion who were young and male.
- They tended to have a high belief in their own driving ability.
- They tend to be more likely to drive without insurance, and to drink and drive.
- They tended to agree with statements supporting aggressive driving (such as ‘I enjoy the sensation of accelerating rapidly’).
- They were less likely to have passed the theory test.

5.1.3 There were many reasons as to why unlicensed driving occurred, including:

- In the event of an emergency.
- For convenience.
- Because they could not afford lessons or the driving test.
- From a need to practise driving; for lifestyle and self image reasons.
- For a lack of alternative transport (for example in rural areas).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Proportion of crashes involving unlicensed drivers (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of driving completed by unlicensed drivers (%)</th>
<th>Relative crash risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E6: Comparative crash risk of unlicensed drivers
5.1.4 A number of unlicensed driving ‘danger points’ were also identified, situations whereby the chances of driving unlicensed increased. These included:

- Those who couldn’t wait between the theory and practical driving test, particularly if they were confident of passing; failing the theory test.
- Those who thought they have ‘nothing to lose’.
- For some it was too late to ‘come clean’.
- Those who were from another driving culture.
- Socially excluded elderly (for instance those not now able to drive on medical grounds or a non-licence holder now driving due to death of a spouse).

5.1.5 Finally, throughout all the different surveys and for the various categories of unlicensed driver, a number of groups who may be susceptible to some form of unlicensed driving for different reasons have been encountered. These groups are not necessarily mutually exclusive:

- Rural residents with poor public transport.
- Shift workers.
- Low income earners who cannot afford lessons, test or insurance.
- Excluded young individuals – lack of stimulation and activities.
- Those ignorant of the regulations – foreign licence holders.
- Old people excluded from driving for medical reasons, widows with no licence.
- Men adhering to car culture under peer pressure.
- Joy riders.
- Car enthusiasts.
- Those with a criminal personality and those exposed to a criminal environment.
- Young persons disqualified ahead of getting a licence.

6 Potential countermeasures

6.1.1 A Delphi survey and workshop were undertaken to assess the possible effectiveness and acceptability of a number of potential countermeasures to unlicensed driving. The Delphi methodology involves the questioning of a group of administrators and ‘experts’ to pool their judgements in order to determine a satisfactory course of action. In addition the views of potential ‘perpetrators’ to measures were also assessed.

6.1.2 Based on these findings and the other findings from the research, the following potential countermeasures are suggested.
1: The police should ensure that resources for policing are increased and sustained at a high level to ensure effective enforcement against unlicensed driving and other traffic offences.

2: A mandatory requirement to carry the driving licence (or driving licence photocard where people have one) when driving should be introduced. To assist in this, research should be undertaken to assess the number of people who already carry their licence (or driving licence photocard), and public support for the mandatory carriage of the driving licence (or driving licence photocard), should be measured and monitored over time.

3: Encourage existing paper driving licence holders to convert to photocard licences. The portability of the photocard could be highlighted as an incentive if mandatory carriage of the driving licence or driving licence photocard was to be introduced as in countermeasure 2.

4: Undertake a review of the potential for technological advances in information technology to improve the current system used by police to check the driving licences and details of drivers at the roadside.

5: DVLA, DSA, the police and the courts should co-operate in an assessment of alleged loopholes in the system of issuing, checking and disqualifying driving licences, and then close any loopholes identified.

6: Employers should be required through Health and Safety regulations to check their employees’ driving licences when taking on new staff, and periodically afterwards if driving is a part of the job.

7: The use of alternative, rehabilitative penalties such as community service penalties and driver improvement schemes for more motoring offences should be trialled and evaluated. If successful they should be incorporated into a hierarchy of penalties for motoring offences.

8: A review of the consistency of the penalties imposed for unlicensed driving (and possibly other motoring offences) by different courts should be undertaken to determine the extent of inconsistency, its implications, and if deemed necessary, measures to improve consistency.

9: The police, the courts, and the Crown Prosecution Service should be encouraged to adopt a consistent approach to charging, prosecuting and imposing penalties for unlicensed driving offenders when more than one offence has been committed. The aim would be to ensure that in the eyes of the offender, the authorities were not overlooking the offence of unlicensed driving.
10: In addition to explaining clearly to those found guilty of unlicensed driving the possible penalties for re-offending at the time of sentencing, we recommend that courts should follow this up with a letter repeating this, along with the end date of a driving ban where applicable.

11: Include on the provisional driving licence photocard an explanation of the restrictions of the licence and of the penalties for driving otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence. This information should also be clearly presented on literature when applying for and when receiving the provisional licence.

12: An evaluation of the current community based motor project schemes should be undertaken to assess their effectiveness in changing attitudes and behaviour. A successful model that would address the needs of different groups of offenders and those who are in danger of offending for the first time should then be implemented nationally.

13: An investigation should be undertaken to assess the possibility of introducing some form of financial assistance to those learning to drive, possibly through loans or through the Benefit Agency as part of job seeking.

14: The DSA and DVLA should review and if necessary improve the information provided to drivers when applying and obtaining the provisional and full licence, and when learning to drive, to ensure that novice drivers are aware of the New Drivers Act rules.

15: The DfT should continue to monitor the number of revocations under the New Drivers Act and the number of subsequent driving test re-passes. The number of drivers who receive endorsements between revocation and re-passing the driving test should also be monitored.

16: DSA should continue to maintain a consistent six-week target waiting time in delivering a practical driving test. DSA should also advise ADIs that they should exercise caution when telling their learners that they are ready for a test long before the test can be taken. The aim would be to avoid the pupil being tempted to drive otherwise than in accordance with the provisional driving licence while waiting for their test.

17: Research should be undertaken to assess the effect of failing the driving test and this should include an assessment of whether this contributes to unlicensed driving.

18: The use of a ‘Crimestoppers’ telephone hotline (or a similar service) for reporting unlicensed driving should be publicised, so that a trial can be undertaken of its effectiveness.
6.1.3 In addition to the countermeasures, a number of opportunities for future research are described within Chapter 8 of the main report.

7 Conclusions

7.1.1 Findings from the literature review found that there is little previous research on the issue of unlicensed driving. This may be related to the difficulty in studying this topic, particularly due to the illegal nature of the behaviour involved. This difficulty has resulted in a number of caveats in the research, and where possible, either lower estimates of the extent of unlicensed driving have been used, or a range provided.

7.1.2 There is a wide range of types of unlicensed driving and drivers. Unlicensed drivers will include two extremes ranging from the wilfully negligent joy rider to the experienced driver who has driven regularly for several years perhaps without being involved in any crashes.

7.1.3 The proportion of unlicensed driving against all driving completed appears to be relatively low. The total proportion of driving completed by unlicensed drivers could range between 0.19 per cent up to 0.64 per cent. However, the actual crash risk is high as are estimated numbers of those killed or injured. Comparative crash risk of unlicensed drivers could range anywhere between 2.7 to 9 times greater involvement than that for all drivers. Estimates indicate that there are around 6,300 casualties annually as a result of crashes involving an unlicensed driver and around 900 of these are killed or seriously injured (KSI). Not all crash involved unlicensed drivers are detected and of those who are, not all are prosecuted. Therefore it is likely that this represents an underestimate.

7.1.4 There are a number of potential countermeasures that could be implemented to reduce unlicensed driving.
### DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accident/Crash</td>
<td>The term ‘accident’ is used in official records (for example, Road Accidents Great Britain), however, we prefer to use the term ‘crash’ where possible. It is considered that the use of the term ‘accident’ is misleading because it suggests that most crashes are not preventable and allows drivers to avoid facing their responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVLA</td>
<td>Driver Vehicle Licensing Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETR/DTLR/DfT</td>
<td>The Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions was renamed the Department for Transport Local Government and the Regions after reorganisation following the general election of June 2001. A further reorganisation took place in May 2002 to create the Department for Transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELI</td>
<td>Those who drive who have Never held a Licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLH</td>
<td>Provisional Licence Holder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATS19</td>
<td>STATS19 is the name of the crash report form used by all police forces to record data about personal injury road crashes and their consequent casualties, in order to allow statistics to be presented to a consistent national format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical significance</td>
<td>Findings of significance using standard statistical tests such as the chi-squared test and student’s t-test are reported where the same result has no more than 5 per cent probability of occurring by chance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed driving</td>
<td>There are various categories of unlicensed driver. We have included the following within our definition of drivers who conduct unlicensed driving:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• those who drive otherwise than in accordance of the provisional licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• those who drive while disqualified from driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• those who drive when never having held a driving licence (NELIs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• those who drive after having had their licence revoked under the New Drivers Act 1995.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART A: INTRODUCTION, METHODOLOGY AND CAVEATS

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 In October 1999 the Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions (DETR, now the Department for Transport) appointed Ross Silcock and Social Research Associates to complete research into unlicensed driving.

1.1.2 At that time very little was known about the extent of unlicensed driving and implications for road safety. There was concern that changes to the driving testing system had made progression to a full driving licence more challenging. These changes included the introduction of the theory test for learner drivers as well as changes to the practical driving test.

1.1.3 In addition, new legislation (The New Drivers Act 1995) had been implemented to revoke the driving licence of novice drivers if they accumulated six or more penalty points on their driving licence within two years of passing their driving test. After the revocation of their licence the individual would have to reapply for a provisional licence and re-pass the driving tests in order to regain their full licence. However, fewer individuals were regaining their licences in the numbers that would be expected.

1.1.4 There was also concern over the numbers of disqualified drivers who may be tempted to drive while disqualified. The effectiveness of disqualification as a deterrent to dangerous driving behaviour could be brought into question if a large proportion of drivers were to ignore this sanction. This is particularly pertinent due to the recent publication of the Government’s Consultation Paper into Road Traffic Penalties (December 2000) and subsequent report of the review (July 2002), which suggests a number of changes to the use of disqualification as a penalty.

1.1.5 Thus several categories of potential unlicensed drivers were identified by DETR:

- Drivers who do not hold a valid licence, including those who have never applied (eligible and under-age drivers) and those who once held a provisional licence which has since expired (i.e. one which was issued before 1 October 1982).
- Drivers who hold a provisional licence but do not abide by the associated regulations, which require that they display L-plates and are accompanied by another driver who has held a full licence for at least 3 years and is at least 21 years of age.
Drivers who have been disqualified, either for offences committed on a single occasion or as a result of the ‘totting’ up of penalty points, or who have had their licence revoked under the conditions of the Road Traffic (New Drivers) Act 1995.

1.2 Objectives

1.2.1 The initial objectives of the research as stated in the DETR project specification are as follows:

- Estimate the extent of unlicensed driving, i.e. the proportion of drivers who drive unlicensed, the frequency and circumstance of unlicensed driving and the miles driven.
- Consider the road safety implications of unlicensed driving with reference to crash reports and self-reported accident involvement.
- Determine the characteristics of unlicensed drivers.
- Identify the motivations for unlicensed driving and the beliefs and attitudes associated with the behaviour including consideration of possible consequences and the effectiveness of existing and possible deterrents.
- Make recommendations for countermeasures.

1.3 Strands of Research Conducted

1.3.1 The research methodology adopted has included the following main strands:

- Literature review.
- National postal surveys of potential unlicensed drivers, and those who have been caught driving while never having held a licence.
- Telephone and face-to-face interviews with actual and potential unlicensed drivers.
- Matching of police STATS19 accident records with police prosecution data on unlicensed driving.
- Delphi questionnaire survey and workshop to consider countermeasures.
- Focus group discussions with actual and potential ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving to consider countermeasures.

1.3.2 It was intended that the national postal surveys, followed up by more in-depth telephone and face-to-face interviews, would offer a hierarchical approach. The larger sample of the national postal survey would provide estimates as to the extent of unlicensed driving and provide an initial investigation of the characteristics of unlicensed drivers. The subsequent in-depth interviews would elicit more detailed information on the characteristics of such drivers along with their associated motivations, beliefs and attitudes.
1.3.3 The comparison of STATS19 and police data was proposed in order to allow crashes involving unlicensed drivers to be identified. The numbers of such crashes could then be combined with results as to the extent of unlicensed driving in order to assess the road safety implications of the behaviour. The characteristics of such crashes could also be identified.

1.3.4 The Delphi survey and workshop process, and the focus group discussions with actual and potential ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving were proposed to fulfil the final objective of the research specification, to ‘make recommendations for countermeasures’. It was intended that the Delphi survey would provide an ‘expert view’ of potential countermeasures. In addition, discussion groups of potential ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving have been completed to investigate the potential of various countermeasures in the view of those who may do it, or have done it.

1.3.5 As the project has progressed the various strands of research have been completed separately. Here we combine, develop and summarise the results to address the questions in the research specification.

1.4 **Structure of the Report**

1.4.1 The report is presented in three main parts:

- Part B: The Scale and Nature of the Problem.
- Part C: Countermeasures.

1.4.2 Within Part A of our reporting, following this introduction, Chapter 2 describes the literature review and methodologies adopted for the strands of the research investigating the extent, road safety implications and characteristics of unlicensed driving.

1.4.3 Unlicensed driving, by its nature, is a difficult subject to investigate. During our research a number of assumptions have been necessary in order to reach the conclusions and estimates reported here. Therefore, the most conservative estimates, or a range of higher and lower estimates have been adopted where appropriate. However, the results should not be viewed as precise and should only be considered with reference to the assumptions that have been made. Accordingly these assumptions have been detailed within Chapter 3 of the report, and relate to those methodologies described within Chapter 2.
1.4.4 Part B of the report describes the scale and nature of the problem of unlicensed driving. Within Chapter 4 we estimate the extent of unlicensed driving with reference to data collected from the national postal surveys, in combination with data obtained from the Driver Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) database of driving licences. Chapter 5 deals with the issue of unlicensed driving and road safety with reference to a comparison of STATS19 and police prosecution data. The results are combined with the estimate of the extent of unlicensed driving in Chapter 4 to present the comparative crash risk of unlicensed drivers. Chapter 6 describes the results of the national postal surveys and in-depth interviews of unlicensed drivers to determine their characteristics, motivations, beliefs and attitudes. This information was a valuable input to the development of potential countermeasures.

1.4.5 Part C describes our investigation into the potential countermeasures to unlicensed driving through the Delphi survey and workshop, and ‘perpetrator’ focus groups. This leads us to our overall conclusions and countermeasures reported within the final Chapter 8.
2 METHODOLOGY AND DATA

2.1 Literature Review

2.1.1 A literature review was undertaken during the early stages of the project. Two main databases were used to identify relevant references on the subject of unlicensed driving. These were:

- International Road Research Database.

2.1.2 The list of references identified from the above databases was supplemented by other documents known to the research team and identified from various other sources. To provide useful input to the research the review of literature was presented under several relevant topic headings:

- Survey Methods and Data Collection.
- Extent of the Problem.
- Characteristics of Unlicensed Drivers.
- Motivations and Reasons for and Against Driving While Unlicensed.
- Unlicensed driving and Criminal Activity.
- Unlicensed driving and Road Safety.
- Countermeasures to Unlicensed Driving.

2.1.3 The whole literature review is too large to include here, but a summary of the main findings along with the list of references has been reproduced within Appendix A of this report. The full review will also be published as a separate document. One finding from this review is the lack of previous research in this area.

2.2 National Postal Survey of Those Who Have Applied for a Licence (Potential Unlicensed Drivers)

2.2.1 There are three main categories of person that were identified as potential unlicensed car drivers that the project steering group agreed should be surveyed using the DVLA database of driving licence records. These were:

- Provisional licence holders (who may drive otherwise than in accordance with the restrictions of the provisional licence).
- Drivers who may drive after being disqualified from driving for
  a) a drink-driving offence
  b) some other single offence
  c) the totting up of penalty points.
Drivers whose licence was revoked under the provisions of the Road Traffic (New Drivers) Act 1995 (who may drive before reapplying for a provisional licence, and may also drive otherwise than in accordance with the restrictions of the provisional licence if they decide to reapply for one).

2.2.2 These categories are people who at some stage have applied for a licence in the usual way and have ‘entered the system’, and may or may not have driven unlicensed.

2.2.3 The category of provisional licence holders was subdivided into a sample of those drivers who applied for a provisional driving licence approximately a year previously but had not yet passed the practical driving test, and a sample of drivers who had only very recently passed the practical driving test. These two samples would include drivers with a range in the time taken between obtaining a provisional licence and obtaining a full driving licence and would therefore allow an investigation as to how this and the number of L-test failures may affect the decision to drive unlicensed.

The names and addresses of people targeted for survey were therefore requested and supplied from a random selection of DVLA database records to the specifications shown in Table 2.1.

### Table 2.1: Specifications for Name and Address Lists Supplied from DVLA Database Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 5,000 names and addresses of people who first applied for a provisional driving licence for a motorcar during March 1999 and who had not yet passed the practical driving test by May 14th, 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5,000 names and addresses of people who have recently passed the practical driving test (5,000 drawn from full licences issued during February or March 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5,000 names and addresses of those disqualified beginning during the two month period 1/3/99 to 30/4/99 for drinking and driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5,000 names and addresses of those disqualified beginning during the two-month period 1/3/99 to 30/4/99 for a single offence other than drinking and driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5,000 names and addresses of those disqualified beginning during the two-month period 1/3/99 to 30/4/99 as a result of the ‘totting up’ of penalty points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 5,000 names and addresses of those whose licence was revoked under the New Drivers Act during the nine-month period 1/12/98 to 31/8/99.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4 It can be seen from Table 2.1 that the names and addresses supplied are for people who have been issued with a provisional licence or received a disqualification or revocation order within a defined time period. The time periods were carefully chosen to ensure that the person receiving the questionnaire would have recently had the opportunity to drive unlicensed. The time periods specified also had to be long enough in duration for sufficient people of that type to exist within the DVLA records from which 5,000 could then be randomly selected. Questionnaires were posted to the sample during the months of May and June 2000.

2.2.5 A separate (but similar) questionnaire was designed and sent to each of the three main categories of driver (provisional licence holders, disqualified drivers and New Drivers Act ‘revokees’). To encourage a good response rate to a questionnaire that is,
after all, asking about illegal behaviour, the recipient was advised that the returned questionnaires were anonymous unless the respondent was willing to discuss their views, in which case they were asked to provide their telephone number. The questionnaires also incorporated a return postage pre-paid address and therefore could be returned by simply folding and posting them. The respondents were also advised that the questionnaire gave them an opportunity to tell us what they thought of the current system in the hope that this may encourage even more people to respond. The different subcategories within the overall sample were sent questionnaires on different coloured paper so that the subcategories could be anonymously identified upon return. A copy of each of the three questionnaires is included within Appendix B.

2.2.6 Table 2.2 shows the categories and numbers of drivers surveyed. Although it was initially intended that 5,000 questionnaires would be sent to each category, a slightly reduced number were eventually sent due to printing or packing errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Total issued</th>
<th>Total returned</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provisional Licence Holders</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not yet passed</td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recently passed</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disqualified Drivers</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink-drivers</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Totters’</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Drivers Act ‘Revokees’</td>
<td>4,966</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,678</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.7 As can be seen, the response rate to the survey varied for the different categories of drivers surveyed. It can only be speculated as to why this should be, though it may be partly because of some category’s greater disaffection with authorities. Overall 3,425 valid questionnaires were returned, giving an overall response rate of 11.5 per cent.

Audit of Non-Responses

2.2.8 An audit of non-responses was completed to assess the sample validity of the returned postal questionnaires by conducting the same surveys over the telephone with potential unlicensed drivers who were sent the postal questionnaire. Comparisons could then be made between the data acquired from the postal returns and the telephone audit, thus testing the validity of the postal sample.

2.2.9 In summary it was found that some minor differences with regard to sex, employment and home location distribution were apparent between the postal survey and telephone audit. Although minor differences were observed on some of the socio-economic criteria, these differences were not of sufficient magnitude to question the socio-economic sample validity of the postal investigation.
2.2.10 The overall conclusion of the audit was that the people who returned the postal questionnaire were similar in socio-economic profile to those who did not. However, it is more difficult to know whether the two groups were comparable in terms of illegal driving behaviour.

2.3 National Postal Survey of Those Who Have Never Held a Licence (NELIs)

2.3.1 As well as those who have at some stage applied for a licence whose records are held by DVLA described above, there is a further category of those who have never applied for a licence, but were caught or reported driving without one. The DVLA create a file to record the endorsements for these people in case they subsequently apply for a licence, or in case further offences and further endorsements need to be added to an individual’s record. These are known informally as ‘NELIs’ (those who have Never held a Licence). The project steering group agreed that this separate category of NELIs should also be surveyed.

2.3.2 In February 2001 the DVLA had nearly 210,000 current records of individuals who had an endorsement while not holding a licence. A list was requested from the DVLA of the name and address records of 10,000 drivers most recently caught or reported driving without a valid GB licence. A questionnaire was designed and sent in August 2002 to all the 10,000 supplied names and addresses. A copy of the questionnaire is included within Appendix B. As with the survey of potential unlicensed drivers the questionnaire was anonymous to encourage a good response rate given the nature of this particular group of drivers.

2.3.3 The sample did not include NELIs who have driven without a licence after having had their licence revoked under the New Driver’s Act. However, they included people with driving licences from countries other than GB, including those whose licence was valid and those whose licence was invalid:

- Illegal overseas licence holders: Those who have an overseas driving licence which is not eligible for use in this country or those who have an overseas driving licence for which the conditions under which it can be used in the UK have expired.

- Legal overseas licence holders: Those who have an overseas licence which is valid for use in this country, but who have committed an offence leading to a licence endorsement for which a NELI file is created in order to record the endorsement. Apart from the driving offence leading to the endorsement, this category has not driven illegally.

2.3.4 It was difficult to determine whether the small number of responses from overseas licence holders were illegal or legal licence holders and so these were excluded from the analysis.
2.3.5 It is important to remember that the survey of NELIs included only those reported by the police (those that had been caught), and did not include those who drove without a licence who have not been caught. It is not known as to what proportion of NELIs are caught driving illegally, or if those who are caught differ in the amount of driving or in their characteristics to those who are not caught. Also, unlike the other surveys of potential unlicensed drivers, with the NELI survey all are by definition illegal drivers, and a comparison of legal drivers with illegal drivers was not possible.

2.3.6 The response rate for the NELIs postal questionnaire of just over 1 per cent was much lower than expected, and is shown in Table 2.3. After a month of sending the 10,000 questionnaires only 165 were returned. Of these, 25 were returned marked as ‘person not known at this address’, 14 were not included in the analysis due to obviously unreliable answers, 11 claimed to have foreign licences which allowed them to drive legally in this country, four claimed to have a valid GB licence and a further four were returned blank. A total of 107 valid responses were included within the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3: Summary of response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimed to have valid foreign licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimed to have a British licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person not known at the address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent back blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Interviews with Provisional Licence Holders, Disqualified Drivers, Offenders and the General Public

2.4.1 A combination of methods was used to research the attitudes and opinions of unlicensed drivers. These included in-depth semi-structured telephone and face-to-face interviews with provisional licence holders (PLH) and disqualified drivers whose details were identified from the DVLA database of driving licences; face-to-face in-depth interviews with young offenders (prisoners and non-prisoners) convicted of motor offences and face-to-face questionnaire surveys with members of the general public at selected venues. Table 2.4 summarises the methods used for each target group. The interview schedule was semi-structured, with a range of open-ended questions. The research was conducted in four main areas namely Leicester, Lincolnshire, Essex and Tyne and Wear in order to provide a range of urban and rural respondents thought to be reasonably representative of the nation as a whole.
2.4.2 The DVLA provided names and addresses of individuals who obtained their provisional licence or were disqualified between March and June 1999. The relevant telephone numbers were sought from directory listings with relative success (around 50 per cent). However, many telephone numbers were subsequently found to be out of date – not surprising in the light of the sample profile which included a higher than average number of students in the case of provisional licence holders and a more mobile population in the case of disqualified drivers. Eventually, approximately 20-25 per cent of the PLH contacted were interviewed. The percentage was lower for the disqualified drivers ranging between 6 and 17 per cent, many of whom were hostile and unwilling to talk. The total number of persons contacted and interviews conducted are displayed in Table 2.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
<th>Essex</th>
<th>Tyne and Wear</th>
<th>Lincolnshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Provisional Licence Holders (PLH) Contacted</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLH Interviewed</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disqualified Drivers Contacted</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified Drivers Interviewed</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.3 To supplement the data from the telephone interviews, contact was also made with driving schools who distributed approximately 500 leaflets to PLH. A further 600 leaflets were displayed at leisure centres, university unions and academic departments, and charity organisations. The leaflets invited PLH and disqualified drivers to phone a free-phone telephone number and talk about their experiences of unlicensed driving. Further interviews were conducted at venues where young people were likely to be present such as colleges and universities, cinemas and shopping centres. At each location experienced interviewers interviewed young people whom either held provisional licences or who had recently passed their driving test.

2.4.4 Another strand of the research involved interviewing young offenders who had been convicted of motor-related crime and other offences including unlicensed driving. Two types of offenders were interviewed. The first was selected from local ‘Motor Projects’ running rehabilitative programmes in conjunction with the probation
The second group comprised prisoners who had committed motor-related offences, such as driving while disqualified, dangerous driving and taking a vehicle without the owner’s consent (TWOC) among others.

2.4.5 The final research method consisted of surveys at selected venues (focal points). The interviews followed a short one-page questionnaire that explored the incidence of unlicensed driving and asked basic demographic details of the participants such as their age, sex and ethnicity. In total over 500 people were interviewed. The idea behind this approach was to gauge the incidence of unlicensed driving among members of the general public. This was in contrast to the earlier more targeted groups. The focal point research involved the following groups of individuals:

**Leicester**
- Pensioners drop-in centre
- Hindu temple group
- Cohort of university students
- Candidates leaving theory test centre

**Essex**
- Candidates leaving theory test centre (Chelmsford)
- Visitors to town centre (Colchester)
- Car enthusiasts at an evening gathering (Southend)
- 6th Form College

**Lincolnshire**
- Candidates leaving theory test centre
- Agricultural college (Caythorpe)
- Shoppers outside supermarket (Grantham)
- Stamford town centre

**Tyne and Wear**
- Young people in city centre
- Candidates leaving theory test centre
- North Shields Fish Festival attendees
- Community Centre
2.4.6 The groups of persons interviewed using the above three methods cannot be said to accurately reflect national proportions of drivers. However, a range of areas were covered, including urban and rural, and participants were recruited at random from the above locations. Accordingly the results reflect a representative sample of the groups selected who were chosen to reflect ‘average drivers’.

2.4.7 Thus, the in-depth interviews conducted from the list supplied by the DVLA provide insight into the attitudes and opinions of both licensed and unlicensed drivers. The in-depth interviews with young offenders indicate the scale of unlicensed driving within this selected minority. The focal point surveys draw attention to the incidence level in the general population.

2.4.8 In addition, the in-depth nature of the interviews (many lasting for over an hour), have produced a great deal of insights into the motives, background and processes that influence the incidence of unlicensed driving.

2.5 Comparison of STATS19 and Police Prosecution Data

Background

2.5.1 In order to consider the road safety implications of unlicensed driving (objective (b) of the project specification), analysis of data relating to crashes in which an unlicensed driver was involved was completed. Data held by various police forces on reported prosecutions for unlicensed driving that arose from involvement in motor vehicle crashes have been examined. Where possible, the relevant prosecution data has then been matched with the associated STATS19 crash records, also compiled by the police. Data on crashes involving an unlicensed driver have been compared with data for all crashes occurring in the same police area, and during the same period, and differences between the two types highlighted.

2.5.2 The collection of data, and the method of analysis of the data, is described below. The results and overall conclusions from this strand of the research project are presented within Chapter 5.
Data Collection

2.5.3 Co-operation and support was obtained from a number of police forces, to whom we are grateful. Although a straightforward task in principle, a number of difficulties arose while obtaining the complete sets of data required, particularly in establishing whether there was a link between the prosecution and crash databases. For historic reasons each police force contacted has collected and stored their data in a different manner, and in every case the prosecution and crash records are stored separately. In no cases have the two sets of data been electronically linked. At best the only link that has been found to exist for some cases is the use of a common reference number (such as an accident reference number) stored on both computer databases. In these cases it has been possible to obtain prosecution data for various categories of unlicensed driving which include an accident reference number, and then to use the accident reference numbers to extract the associated crash data from the separate STATS19 database.

2.5.4 It has been found to be more usually the case in most police forces contacted that there is no common reference number stored electronically on the two databases. Any linking reference number exists upon paper records only. To complete a manual match of paper prosecution and STATS19 crash records would be extremely laborious and time consuming, and would be beyond the reasonable resources of the project and of the police forces involved, but could form the basis for future research.

2.5.5 To ensure reasonable consistency in the data acquired from the different police forces, a table of the offences directly related to unlicensed driving was produced with reference to Home Office and local police force codes. The offences for which data was requested are reproduced below in Table 2.6.

Table 2.6: Offences directly related to unlicensed driving for which data was requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid and Abet driving while disqualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while disqualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving otherwise than in accordance with licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause/permit driving other than in accordance with licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid abet driving other than in accordance with licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of provisional licence holder failure to provide driving licence/counterpart to PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to produce driving licence/counterpart to PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to produce driving licence to court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of provisional licence holder failure to state date of birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of provisional licence holder failing to provide name and address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor failing to provide owner's name and address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.6 The decision as to which police forces to approach was made based upon an initial desire to choose four locations that were also targeted as part of the local area interview surveys. It was also intended that the police forces contacted would be representative of a range of urban and rural situations. Due to the problems encountered in finding suitable data, the number of police forces approached was expanded. Further police forces were approached based upon research team and DfT staff knowledge as to which police forces were most likely to compile and store data in a way that would be useful to us.

2.5.7 Some form of data has been successfully obtained from the following police forces:
- Leicestershire Constabulary
- Essex Police
- Lincolnshire Police
- Northumbria Police
- Avon & Somerset Constabulary

2.5.8 However, due to the low number of cases and inconsistencies in the data from Lincolnshire and Essex, both of these areas were dropped from further study.

2.5.9 The three areas of Leicestershire, Northumbria, and Avon & Somerset were analysed, and it is considered that these areas with their diverse mixture of rural and urban roads may be considered fairly representative of other districts throughout Great Britain.

Analysis

2.5.10 STATS19 data were analysed for each of the three areas separately. The data was then combined for analysis for all areas. Chi squared and t-tests have been conducted to determine levels of significance where appropriate. The results presented within Chapter 5 examine only the combined results.

2.5.11 The data set for crashes involving unlicensed drivers is compared with all crashes for the same geographic area and period. As STATS19 reports only include crashes involving a personal injury (including a fatality), only these types of crashes have been examined.

2.5.12 In two of the three areas analysed (Northumbria, and Avon & Somerset) we were able to determine which of the drivers involved were unlicensed. We are therefore able to determine the average age, the gender, breath-test result and type of vehicle driven for these offenders. Where this analysis has been performed, the results have been compared against all crashes from the same two areas only.
2.5.13 A complicating factor when comparing results across different police forces is that some prosecution databases maintained by the police contain information pertaining to proceedings for which the outcome is not recorded, whereas for others information as to whether there was a prosecution, caution or no further action was recorded. For reasons of consistency, only prosecutions have been included in each analysis. As a result of this, we are unable to tell from our analysis how many drivers were subsequently found not guilty of their charge. Surprisingly, it was discovered that it would be an extremely time-consuming job for the Police to ascertain which prosecutions had been successful.

2.5.14 We are able to determine from the national figures the degree of success for proceedings for various offences. The Home Office publication *Offences relating to motor vehicles – England and Wales, 1997 Supplementary Tables* highlights court proceedings for driving licence offences. The Table 2.7 below is adapted from this report.

### Table 2.7: Findings of guilt from court proceedings for driving licence offences 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Magistrates courts</th>
<th>Crown courts</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total proceedings</td>
<td>Total findings of guilt</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while disqualified</td>
<td>48,946</td>
<td>40,032</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise than in accordance</td>
<td>217,408</td>
<td>123,466</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to produce licence</td>
<td>108,183</td>
<td>48,419</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crown courts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while disqualified</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise than in accordance</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to produce licence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while disqualified</td>
<td>51,577</td>
<td>42,452</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise than in accordance</td>
<td>218,068</td>
<td>124,058</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to produce licence</td>
<td>108,187</td>
<td>48,422</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>377,832</td>
<td>214,932</td>
<td>56.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.5.15 For most of this report, the analysis performed is on prosecutions. When scaling up to estimate the number of unlicensed drivers throughout Great Britain, the Home Office figures for findings of guilt given in Table 2.7 have been used to estimate convictions.

2.5.16 It is likely that the findings here in terms of numbers of unlicensed drivers are conservative. This is because there is the chance that an unlicensed driver was undetected at the time of the crash (particularly if the Police did not attend at the scene). There may also have been errors of omission during the manual search conducted by the Police. It is also the case that for fatal crashes where the unlicensed driver was killed, there would not be any proceedings for unlicensed driving.
3 CAVEATS TO RESEARCH FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 With many research projects a number of assumptions are necessary in order to assess the findings from surveys and reach conclusions. The findings should only be considered with respect to the assumptions made as part of the research. To present the findings without reference to the acknowledged limitations of the results would be misleading and could result in ineffective recommendations being developed.

3.1.2 Part of our research into unlicensed driving is based on national postal survey of potential unlicensed drivers and those who have been caught driving while never having held a licence, another strand analysing police prosecution and STATS19 accident data for unlicensed drivers, and a further strand of interviews. A number of assumptions were necessary as part of the methodology adopted and unforeseen problems were also encountered while completing the investigation into what is a difficult subject to examine.

3.1.3 For these reasons it is considered that the limitations to the research and data collected should be clearly stated. The findings from the national postal surveys, the analysis of crash and prosecution records and the in-depth interviews are dealt with in turn below, with reference to the following bullet points.

National Postal Surveys:
- Respondents to survey may be self-selecting
- Use of DVLA records
  - Out of date address details
  - Large number of provisional licence holders according to DVLA records
- Survey sample different to population
- Comparatively small number of survey responses compared with the population

Analysis of Prosecutions and Crashes of Unlicensed Drivers
- Each police force is different:
  - Recording prosecution data
  - Different offence codes
  - Police force policy on unlicensed driving offences
- No record of findings of guilt
- Under-estimation of unlicensed crashes
- Are our police forces’ areas representative of the Nation’s police force areas?
- Small amount of data analysed
- Attributing blame
In-depth Interviews

- DVLA list not wholly accurate (for example, wrong address)
- Sample not entirely random
- Some interviewees self-selecting
- Concern that prosecution reduced willingness on the part of some to admit to unlicensed driving (in spite of assurances of confidentiality)
- Unwillingness to admit to anti-social behaviour.

3.2 National Postal Surveys

Respondents to surveys may be self-selecting

3.2.1 The national postal survey of NELIs relied upon sufficient numbers of NELIs to respond to the questionnaire. It is unknown whether NELIs who drive more frequently are more likely to return the questionnaire than those who do not drive as frequently.

3.2.2 The national postal survey of potential unlicensed drivers relied upon a sufficient number of potential unlicensed drivers responding to the anonymous questionnaire asking about unlicensed driving. It is unclear as to whether people who do drive unlicensed are more likely or less likely to return the questionnaire than those who do not drive unlicensed. However, a telephone audit of non-responses suggests that those who did not respond are of a similar socio-economic profile to those who did.

Use of DVLA records

3.2.3 Questionnaires were sent to potential unlicensed drivers whose names and addresses were taken from the DVLA database of driving licence holders. DVLA rely upon members of the general public to inform them of any changes to personal details such as name and address. It is thought that many records may be out of date due to members of the public not bothering to inform DVLA of such changes. It is possible that people with a more criminal inclination are less likely to inform DVLA of such changes to their details.

3.2.4 The ‘grossing up’ to estimate the national extent of unlicensed driving is based upon the proportion of respondents to our survey who admit to unlicensed driving, multiplied by the total number of such potential unlicensed drivers (obtained from DVLA records), multiplied by the amount that our survey respondents said they did it.
3.2.5 However, there are a number of concerns over the apparently large number of provisional licence holders, according to the DVLA database (5,576,000 records). This large number of provisional licence holders, according to DVLA records, is the equivalent of approximately 1 in 10 members of the UK population, which is considered to be too many to be realistic. This perhaps overly large population on the DVLA database is due to the acknowledged limitations of the database, which is thought to have a large number of provisional licence records that are not valid. For example, the provisional licence, once obtained, is valid until the age of 70. Some people may mislay their licence and then apply for another licence inadvertently using a slightly different name or initials, which would generate a new record. Others may reapply for a provisional licence with a new name, for example, after marrying, without reference to their old licence. In addition to this, a number of records may relate to people who have died. This is not the fault of the DVLA who rely on the general public to make correct applications or inform them of changing details. It is also thought that the recent introduction of the photocard driving licence which has now replaced the paper licence and which has to be replaced every 10 years will result in a more up-to-date database being maintained.

3.2.6 It was also ascertained that DVLA had completed some internal research (unpublished), which found that around 20 per cent of those applying for a provisional licence had already done so previously. It was thought that around 85 per cent of these were those who had changed their name due to marriage, while about 15 per cent were due to those who had re-applied using a slight variation in their name. It is unknown how the numbers applying for a second provisional licence has changed over time, or how many such licences have subsequently been identified and removed from the database by DVLA. In the absence of any further information the researchers have assumed that the total number of provisional licences on the DVLA database should be reduced by about 20 per cent to provide a more accurate estimate of the number of ‘valid’ provisional driving licences.

3.2.7 DVLA also advised that a recent parliamentary question had asked about the number of relatives who inform DVLA on the death of a licence holder. It was thought by DVLA that only 12 per cent inform them of the death of a relative. No information could be provided on how this estimate was reached. It is not known how these numbers of people may have changed over time, or how many records DVLA may have identified by other means and removed from their database. Given that the death rate among the younger age groups which form the majority of active provisional licence holders is lower than the national average, in the absence of further information, the researchers have conservatively assumed that the number of provisional licence holders who drive unlicensed should be reduced by a further 5 per cent to reflect the number of licences belonging to persons now deceased.

3.2.8 Hence the population of valid provisional licence holders has been assumed to be 5,576,000 x 0.8 x 0.95 = 4,237,760. However there is uncertainty as to the accuracy of this estimate.
Survey sample different to population

3.2.9 The sample of NELIs who were surveyed were individuals who had been caught and so appear on the DVLA database. However, it is unknown as to whether these NELIs who were caught differ from others who drive without a licence who are not caught in their characteristics or in the amount of driving they do. It is also unknown as to what proportion of those who drive having never obtained a licence are caught. Therefore although we know how many NELIs are caught each year, we can only guess as to how many there may be who are not caught.

3.2.10 In order to achieve a sufficiently large response rate to our postal survey the questionnaires were sent to those whose DVLA records may be more likely to contain an up-to-date postal address (those who would have recently been in contact with DVLA). For this reason questionnaires were sent to provisional licence holders who had recently passed their test, and provisional licence holders who a year previously had applied for the provisional licence.

3.2.11 However, this sample is not necessarily representative of provisional licence holders as a whole. This is because our respondents are perhaps more likely to have been recently driving in some form because they had recently passed the test, or recently applied for the provisional licence. This is in comparison to the general population of provisional licence holders, many of whom may have obtained a provisional licence several years previously, but may not have driven for several years. Conversely, they may be driving regularly with no intention of taking a test.

Comparatively small number of survey responses compared with the population

3.2.12 Over 200,000 NELI records exist on the DVLA database. Ninety per cent are thought to be records that are maintained for four years, nine per cent were thought to be records maintained for 11 years (for more serious offences) and one per cent are thought to belong to foreign licence holders. Based on this it was estimated that 50,000 NELIs are added to the database each year. Questionnaires were issued to the 10,000 most recent NELIs and valid responses were received from just 107 – a response rate of only one per cent. This is a small number compared with the total number of NELIs who are caught and appear on the database each year. There are also likely to be many more NELIs who drive who are not caught.

3.2.13 Within the resources available it was possible to issue almost 30,000 postal questionnaires to potential unlicensed drivers (provisional licence holders, disqualified drivers and New Drivers Act ‘Revokees’). Around 3,400 questionnaires were returned – a response rate of 11.5 per cent. Of these about 500 admitted to unlicensed driving. This is a small number compared with the total number of potential unlicensed drivers according to DVLA records (in excess of 5 million people on the database).
3.3 Analysis of Prosecutions and Crashes of Unlicensed Drivers

Each police force is different

3.3.1 For historic reasons each police force has collected and stored their data using a different method, and in every case the prosecution and STATS19 accident data have been stored separately. With regard to the STATS19 data this does not present a problem because the STATS19 form is used to record data about personal injury road crashes and their consequent casualties, to a consistent national format. However, with the prosecution data, there is no consistent method of recording data. For example, some forces have recorded the number of proceedings, whereas others have recorded whether there was a prosecution, caution or whether no further action was taken. For consistency we have analysed prosecutions only.

3.3.2 To try to ensure reasonable consistency, data was obtained for a number of offences directly related to unlicensed driving with reference to Home Office and local police force codes for these offences. However, it was apparent that the police forces varied in the way that the offences were categorised and coded.

3.3.3 Different police forces’ policies on unlicensed driving appear to be different. We have written to the police forces from where data was obtained, asking for clarification. Some examples of differences were identified from the responses. It appears that for one police force prosecutions for more than one unlicensed driving offence are more likely to be made (i.e. failing to produce a licence and driving otherwise than in accordance) while in other areas only prosecutions for single offences were generally made. In other areas it is policy to automatically prosecute for some offences, while in others it is dependent on circumstances as to whether a prosecution is pursued. Also it could be that different police forces place a higher degree of importance on some offences, compared with other police forces. This may influence our results when we try to scale our findings up to the national level.

No record of findings of guilt

3.3.4 There was no record of whether each prosecution resulted in a finding of guilt, and to inquire as to the result of the prosecution would be very time consuming for the police forces involved. To ‘gross up’ to the national total number of STATS19 records in which a guilty unlicensed driver was involved we have applied national proportions of findings of guilt from Home Office national statistics. These can be found in Table 2.7.

3.3.5 It is known that in some cases, more minor offences (such as unlicensed driving) are dropped when a number of charges are laid, before they reach the courts. Such cases will not result in a finding of guilt, even though the driver was unlicensed. Therefore the adjusted figures for findings of guilt (using Table 2.7) discussed above will be an under-estimate of all crashes involving a guilty unlicensed driver.
Under-reporting of unlicensed driver crashes

3.3.6 As discussed earlier, other factors could lead to an under-estimation of crashes. These include undetected unlicensed drivers (particularly where the Police did not attend at the scene), errors of omission during the manual search of records by the Police, and cases where the unlicensed driver was killed and so no prosecution was made.

Are the police forces’ areas representative of the Nation’s police forces’ areas?

3.3.7 Originally we hoped to obtain data for at least four police forces whose locations would coincide with local area interview surveys of unlicensed drivers. The four locations were intended to provide a range of urban and rural situations. In the event it was necessary to collect data from any force that had suitable data. It is unclear as to how representative the three police forces areas from where useful data was eventually obtained are of the Nation’s Police forces as a whole, with respect to unlicensed driving. For example, we were advised by one police force, where it was found that there were a much higher proportion of driving while disqualified offences, that they would expect this result due to higher levels of unemployment and social deprivation in their area.

Small amount of data analysed

3.3.8 The number of crashes that could be linked to a prosecution for unlicensed driving and were analysed within the resources available is a relatively small number compared with the total number of potential unlicensed driving crashes. It is unclear how representative the unlicensed crashes analysed are of such crashes as a whole.

Attributing blame

3.3.9 Within the STATS19 data analysed there is no record of who was to blame for each of the records involving an unlicensed driver. For this reason it could be argued that some multi-vehicle crashes may have occurred eventually anyway, regardless that an unlicensed driver was involved. However, it could also be argued that had the unlicensed driver not been on the road at the time of the crash, then it would not have happened.

3.4 In-depth Interviews

DVLA list not wholly accurate

3.4.1 The contact details (names and addresses) of the PLH and disqualified drivers provided by the DVLA were not entirely correct or up to date. Since the DVLA relies largely on the general public to update their records, this anomaly is not the fault of the DVLA. Using the information provided it was possible to locate the telephone numbers of the relevant individuals from directory listings. However, some of these telephone numbers were not in working order. The absence of contact telephone numbers and incorrect information reduced the potential sample size.
Sample not entirely random – Interviewees may be self-selecting

3.4.2 Those willing to be interviewed, whether licensed or unlicensed, may have had more time, were more co-operative and had opinions about the licensing system which they wanted to discuss. This differentiates them from those who did not participate and provides a potentially biased viewpoint. However, since not all participants were immediately willing to be interviewed and some were gently persuaded, it is felt that a varied sample was achieved.

Sample not entirely random – Variations in willingness to admit to unlicensed driving

3.4.3 The telephone interviews were conducted with both licensed and unlicensed drivers to provide a comparison between the two groups. It is unclear, however, whether certain people were more likely than others to admit to unlicensed driving. There is reason to believe that because the questions were asking about illegal behaviour, coupled with the fact that the interviewer had personal information about the respondent, those contacted may have been wary about admitting to unlicensed driving. Those who did admit to unlicensed driving may have different overall attitudes, in particular, trust, and less fear of authority, which made them more inclined to participate.

Socially desirable answers

3.4.4 Participants are sometimes inclined to provide socially desirable answers and opinions, which they think should be ‘correct’ and socially accepted. Although at the start of the interviews it was made clear that it was their personal opinion that was being asked for, this is still a phenomenon that cannot be ruled out. Ultimately, this affects the validity of the results.

3.4.5 It is felt that the actual incidence of unlicensed driving is under-represented in this research. The voluntary nature of the study and the fact that it is an illegal activity which people might not be open about means that we cannot rule out the possibility that a greater proportion of people are actually committing unlicensed driving than reported. It is therefore suggested that the results are interpreted as the basic minimum.
PART B: THE SCALE AND NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

4 ESTIMATION OF THE EXTENT OF UNLICENSED DRIVING

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The specification stated that the project should attempt to estimate the extent of unlicensed driving, including the proportion of drivers who drive unlicensed, the frequency and circumstance of unlicensed driving and the miles driven. In order to achieve this aim, national postal surveys of individuals appearing on the DVLA database were undertaken. It was agreed during questionnaire design that in order to make the questions as easy to understand as possible, the amount of time spent driving would be asked rather than the number of miles driven. This would still allow for the quantity of unlicensed driving to be assessed and compared with the amount of legal driving.

4.1.2 Two main categories of individuals on the DVLA database were surveyed:

- Those who were potential unlicensed drivers (provisional licence holders, disqualified drivers and New Driver Act ‘revokees’) who may or may not drive unlicensed.
- Those who had been caught driving who had never held a licence.

4.1.3 The survey methodology is described in more detail in Chapter 2. Below we describe the results of the surveys dealing with the two main categories in turn. As stated previously unlicensed driving, by its nature, is a difficult subject to investigate. During our research a number of assumptions have been necessary in order to reach the estimates reported here. The results should not be viewed as precise and should only be considered with reference to the assumptions that have been made (described in detail in Chapter 3). Accordingly a range of higher and lower estimates is presented.
4.2 National Postal Survey of Potential Unlicensed Drivers

4.2.1 The questionnaires used in the national postal survey of potential unlicensed drivers asked the recipients if they had ever done any unlicensed driving, and if so, how much they had done it (in hours), and also whether they were accompanied at the time. The time period over which the recipients had had the opportunity to conduct unlicensed driving was also known, either through information provided on the questionnaire or through the specification of groups to whom the questionnaire was sent. Hence the average number of hours per month of unlicensed driving completed could be calculated for those admitting to it.

4.2.2 The proportion of drivers admitting to different types of unlicensed driving and how much they did it on average per month could then be applied to the population of potential unlicensed drivers as obtained from the DVLA database of driving licences. This is shown in Table 4.1 for the categories of potential unlicensed drivers (i.e. New Drivers Act ‘revokees’, disqualified drivers and provisional licence holders). The New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ are divided between those who may drive after their licence is revoked (and no longer hold any licence), and those who had re-obtained a provisional licence and so may drive otherwise than in accordance with that licence.
Table 4.1: Estimate of the extent of unlicensed driving by potential unlicensed drivers (not including NELIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Population (from DVLA)</th>
<th>Postal questionnaires issued</th>
<th>Number of survey respondents</th>
<th>Survey response rate (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents admitting to unlicensed driving (%)</th>
<th>Average number of hours driven per month unlicensed</th>
<th>Total population of unlicensed drivers (approx)</th>
<th>Total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month (approx)</th>
<th>Percentage of total hours driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Provisional Licence Holders</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,237,760*</td>
<td>9,931</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>436,500</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified Drivers</td>
<td>Drink-drivers</td>
<td>144,344</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Totters’</td>
<td>34,916</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other single offence</td>
<td>43,521</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Drivers Act ‘Revokee’</td>
<td>Not holding any licence</td>
<td>12,558</td>
<td>4,966</td>
<td>392 (257 had re-obtained a provisional licence)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-obtained a provisional licence</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,479,943</td>
<td>29,678</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>476,300</td>
<td>553,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total population of provisional licence holders according to the DVLA database was 5,576,000. This was adjusted downwards to account for records no longer valid due to changes in name, or death of licence holder for example (see section 3.2 for more details).

Table 4.2: Estimates of the extent of unlicensed driving by those who have never held a licence (NELIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population on DVLA database</th>
<th>Postal questionnaires issued</th>
<th>Number of survey respondents</th>
<th>Survey response rate (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents admitting to unlicensed driving (%)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Average number of hours driven per month unlicensed</th>
<th>Total population of unlicensed drivers (approx)</th>
<th>Total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month (approx)</th>
<th>Lower (by definition all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who have never held a licence</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>3,420,000</td>
<td>3,420,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Of the potential unlicensed driver categories, it can be seen that due to their large potential population the provisional licence holders complete the greatest amount of unlicensed driving – 72 per cent, (although the smallest amount of average driving per month per individual). Although there is no doubt that there is a much greater population of provisional licence holders than for the other categories in Table 4.1, there is a degree of uncertainty. This is because the estimate of the population of provisional licence holders is based on the DVLA database and then adjusted to account for invalid records due to changes in name or death of licence holders (see section 3.2 for more details).

4.2.4 It is interesting to note that about a fifth of New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ admit to unlicensed driving in contrast to only a tenth of first provisional licence holders. Another finding of note is the greater proportion (nearly two-fifths) of those who have been disqualified for totting up penalty points who admit to driving while disqualified compared with the other categories of disqualified driver. It could be that the ‘totters’ do not feel they have committed any serious offences, rather just a collection of less serious offence and so consequently take their ban less seriously.

4.2.5 It should be remembered that although an average amount of driving per month has been used to calculate an overall total, within each category there is a wide range in the amount of driving by those who admit to it. For example, there may be those who have driven only once or twice as opposed to those who drive extensively and as frequently as every day.

4.3 Drivers Who Have Never Applied for a Driving Licence (NELIs)

Introduction

4.3.1 It was established that DVLA maintain name and address records for drivers who have received an endorsement when driving without a licence, in case the individual subsequently applies for a driving licence or which requires the endorsement adding to it. An anonymous postal survey of the 10,000 most recent NELI additions to the DVLA database was undertaken asking about the amount of unlicensed driving completed before and then after they were caught.

4.3.2 However, due to the extremely low response rate to this questionnaire (1 per cent), we have not used the results in this analysis. Therefore, estimates have had to be made regarding the amount of driving performed by NELIs, as well as the total population of NELIs. Due to uncertainty; with these estimates, a range in the values for the amount of unlicensed driving completed by NELIs has been used (described below).
Population of NELIs

4.3.3 In February 2001 the DVLA had a total of about 210,000 current records of individuals who had received an endorsement while not holding any licence. DVLA advised that the vast majority of these (around 90 per cent) would be individuals who had received an endorsement lasting four years (and so are maintained on the database for four years), one per cent would be for foreign drivers (i.e. no UK licence), and most of the others would relate to drivers who had received a more serious endorsement lasting 11 years (and so are maintained on the database for 11 years). After endorsements have expired or a licence obtained, they are taken off the database.

4.3.4 Although we know how many NELIs exist on the DVLA database, we do not know how many there may be who drive without a licence and are not caught, and who therefore do not appear on the DVLA database. Therefore for the purposes of making an estimate of the total amount of unlicensed driving a range in the values for the population of NELIs has been used.

Lower Estimate (see Table 4.2)

4.3.5 For a lower estimate in the amount of unlicensed driving completed by NELIs it has been assumed that on average, the NELIs drive a similar amount to the disqualified drivers (say 4 hours per month).

4.3.6 With regard to population it is known that there are 209,410 NELIs on the DVLA database. However, around 5 per cent of these are duplicates, and so adjusting for this, we can estimate a total of 198,940 individual NELIs. Ninety per cent are 4-year endorsements, and 9 per cent are 11-year endorsements. Using this information we can calculate an estimate for the average total number of new NELIs appearing on the database each year thus:

Number of 4-year endorsements = 198,940 x 90 per cent = 179,046
Number issued per year = 179,046/4 = 44,762
Number of 11-year endorsements = 198,940 x 9 per cent = 17,905
Number issued per year = 18,900/4 = 4,476
Average total number of endorsements issued per year = 44,762 + 4,476 = 49,238 (say 50,000 per year)

4.3.7 Our survey of a different group, the disqualified drivers, revealed that of those who admitted driving while disqualified around a third said they had been caught doing so. If we were to apply this same proportion to the numbers of NELIs who appear on the DVLA database, there would be 50,000 x 3 = 150,000 NELIs in total, driving per year. It has then been assumed that all the 150,000 NELIs in a year completed a typical month’s driving before the start of the year in which they were caught. For the lower estimate it has been assumed that NELIs drive a similar amount to the disqualified drivers (say 4 hours per month). If the NELIs completed a typical month’s driving before the start of the year in which they were caught, we would estimate a total of 600,000 hours per month.
4.3.8 For an upper estimate in the amount of unlicensed driving completed by NELIs it has been assumed that on average the NELIs complete half the amount of driving as the average legal driver as determined from the DfT’s National Travel Survey (say 5.7 hours per month).

4.3.9 Our survey of a different group, the disqualified drivers, revealed that of those who admitted driving while disqualified around a third said they had been caught doing so. If we were to apply this same proportion to all of the NELIs who appear on the DVLA database there would be 198,940 x 3 = 596,820 NELIs in total (say 600,000). This assumes that all NELIs on the database drive in any given month. Multiplying this total number of NELIs by 5.7 hours per month gives a total of 3,420,000 hours driving per month by this group of unlicensed drivers.

Summary of the amount of driving by NELIs

4.3.10 It is unclear exactly how much driving each NELI completes on average. It has been assumed that the amount lies somewhere between the amount of driving completed by disqualified drivers who drive while disqualified, and half the amount of driving completed by the average legal driver.

4.3.11 It is also unclear how many NELIs there may be who complete unlicensed driving. A range in the total population of NELIs has been used in presenting a lower and upper estimate in the total amount of unlicensed driving completed by NELIs, as seen in Table 4.2.

4.3.12 From Table 4.2 it can be seen that the upper estimate is around six times greater than the lower estimate. Unfortunately based on the information available we can be no more accurate than to say the actual value lies somewhere between the upper and lower estimates.

4.4 Total Amount of Unlicensed Driving

4.4.1 We have estimated and shown within Table 4.1 that the total amount of unlicensed driving completed by provisional licence holders, disqualified drivers and New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ is about 553,000 hours per month. Within Table 4.2 we have provided lower and upper estimates as to the total amount of unlicensed driving completed by NELIs (600K and 3,420K hours per month respectively). Therefore the total amount of unlicensed driving completed by all unlicensed drivers is also presented as a range of lower and upper estimates within Table 4.3:
To assess the proportion of all car driving completed by unlicensed drivers, an estimate of the total amount of car driving completed in Great Britain was required. For this the assistance of the Transport Statistics division of DfT was greatly appreciated. Using data from the DfT’s National Travel Survey it was estimated that there are, on average, approximately 620,000,000 hours of car driving completed per month in Great Britain. Therefore the proportion of all car driving completed by unlicensed drivers (corresponding to the lower and upper estimates within Table 4.3) is as shown within Table 4.4.

Table 4.3: **Overall estimates of the total amount of unlicensed driving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated total unlicensed driving by provisional licence holders, disqualified drivers, New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ (hours/month)</th>
<th>Estimated total unlicensed driving by NELIs (hours/month)</th>
<th>Overall estimates of the total amount of unlicensed driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>553,000 + 600,000 = 1,153,000</td>
<td>= 1,153,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>553,000 + 3,420,000 = 3,973,000</td>
<td>= 3,973,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proportion of unlicensed driving compared with the total amount of car driving**

To assess the proportion of all car driving completed by unlicensed drivers, an estimate of the total amount of car driving completed in Great Britain was required. For this the assistance of the Transport Statistics division of DfT was greatly appreciated. Using data from the DfT’s National Travel Survey it was estimated that there are, on average, approximately 620,000,000 hours of car driving completed per month in Great Britain. Therefore the proportion of all car driving completed by unlicensed drivers (corresponding to the lower and upper estimates within Table 4.3) is as shown within Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: **Proportion of unlicensed driving compared with the total amount of car driving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated total number of hours of unlicensed driving (hours/month)</th>
<th>Estimated total number of hours of driving GB (hours/month)</th>
<th>Proportion of unlicensed driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1,153,000</td>
<td>620,000,000</td>
<td>0.0019 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>3,973,000</td>
<td>620,000,000</td>
<td>0.0064 0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the total proportion of driving completed by unlicensed drivers could range between 0.19 per cent up to 0.64 per cent. These estimates are used in the following Chapter 5 ‘Unlicensed Driving and Road Safety’ to calculate the comparative accident risk of unlicensed drivers.

**4.5 Circumstances of Unlicensed Driving**

The data gathered from the questionnaires used in the national postal survey of potential unlicensed drivers provide a more detailed breakdown of the different circumstances of unlicensed driving admitted to (for example, such as whether the individual was accompanied, or whether they displayed L-plates when driving when

---

1 The estimates presented here are restricted to the total amount of car driving: other vehicles are not included.
holding a provisional licence). This was not possible for the national postal survey of NELIs which used a slightly different questionnaire design. The findings are summarised within the following paragraphs for each category of potential unlicensed driver surveyed, along with the proportions admitting to unlicensed driving. The sections are presented in rank order of the categories of potential unlicensed driver contributing most to the total amount of unlicensed driving. More detailed tables of this data are provided within Appendix C.

4.5.2 It should be noted that the different circumstances of unlicensed driving described in the following paragraphs are not mutually exclusive. For example, a driver may have admitted to driving on their own on some occasions, and with their family on others.

4.5.3 Figure 4.1 shows that just over half of all unlicensed driving completed by provisional licence holders was while they were on their own (51 per cent). A small proportion (6 per cent) was completed while accompanied by a person not eligible to supervise them, and slightly less than half (43 per cent), was completed while not displaying L-plates.

![Figure 4.1: Provisional licence holders, population 4.2 million, unlicensed drivers 440,000](image)

4.5.4 It can be seen from Figure 4.2 that most of the driving while disqualified by those disqualified for drink-driving was completed while alone (45 per cent). Thirty seven per cent was completed while accompanied by other people as passengers and only 18 per cent had been completed while accompanied by members of their family.
4.5.5 It can be seen from Figure 4.3 that most of the driving while disqualified by those disqualified for totting up penalty points was completed while alone (52 per cent). A smaller proportion was completed while accompanied by other people as passengers (34 per cent), and a much smaller proportion (14 per cent) had been completed while accompanied by members of the family.
4.5.6 It can be seen from Figure 4.4 that most of the driving while disqualified by those disqualified for some other single offence was again completed while alone (50 per cent). A smaller proportion was completed while accompanied by other people as passengers (29 per cent) and only 21 per cent had been completed while accompanied by members of the family.

4.5.7 From Figure 4.5 it can be seen that most of all the unlicensed driving by New Drivers Act 'revokees' without a licence was completed while on their own (61 per cent). Very little was completed when members of the family accompanied the driver (3 per cent).
4.5.8 From Figure 4.6 it can be seen that the largest proportion of unlicensed driving by New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ after they had re-obtained a new provisional licence was while they were on their own (77 per cent). A smaller proportion (23 per cent) was completed while accompanied by a person not eligible to supervise them, and nearly two-thirds of that was completed while not displaying L-plates.

4.5.9 From the above it can be seen that for all the categories of disqualified unlicensed driver and New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ the largest proportion of driving is completed alone, followed by being accompanied by other people (such as friends or colleagues). The least amount of driving is completed when accompanied by family members.

4.5.10 For those holding a provisional licence for the first time and New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ who have re-obtained a provisional licence, again the largest proportion of unlicensed driving is completed alone. When driving accompanied by someone not eligible to supervise, most drivers do not display L-plates.
5 UNLICENSED DRIVING AND ROAD SAFETY

5.1 Method

5.1.1 Information was gathered from three police forces, identifying those crashes that had occurred involving a driver subsequently charged for unlicensed driving. Information on each of these crashes was extracted from the STATS19 database, and this information was compared with similar information on all crashes occurring in these same areas, and during the same time period.

5.1.2 The results presented here are the amalgamation of data from these three areas. Details of the methodology adopted and the analysis performed can be found in Section 2.4.

5.2 Main Results

5.2.1 Table 5.1 shows the number of crashes that included a driver subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving, compared with crashes of all types in these same areas, and during the same period of time.

5.2.2 Drivers prosecuted for some form of unlicensed driving accounted for around 3 per cent of all personal injury crashes. The table also indicates a trend towards a higher percentage of serious crashes. Statistical analysis of the data shows that crashes were significantly more severe when an unlicensed driver was involved.

5.2.3 Table 5.2 shows the number of casualties resulting from crashes involving an unlicensed driver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Number of crashes by severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2: Number of casualties by severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Casualties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.4 In terms of casualties, around 3.5 per cent of all casualties in our areas of study involved an unlicensed driver.

5.2.5 We can scale up these results to determine the number of crashes involving an unlicensed driver throughout Great Britain. Using the year 2000 figures for Great Britain shown in Table 5.3, it is estimated that drivers prosecuted for an unlicensed driving offence are involved in around 1,395 fatal or serious crashes and 5,817 slight crashes.

5.2.6 We can also scale up the results from this analysis to estimate the total number of casualties in Great Britain. Again, based on the 2000 figures, we could estimate that there were 1,647 fatal or serious injuries, and 9,483 slight injuries (Table 5.3).

5.2.7 However, not all prosecutions result in a finding of guilt. It was not possible to determine from police records as to which individual unlicensed driving prosecutions resulted in a finding of guilt. Therefore national Home Office records (1997) were used to assess the proportion of findings of guilt for all unlicensed driving prosecutions nationally (56.89 per cent – see Table 2.6), and this proportion was applied to estimate the national number of crashes for which a driver was subsequently found guilty of unlicensed driving. Hence we can estimate that 1.74 per cent of personal injury crashes involved a driver subsequently found guilty of an unlicensed driving offence. We can further estimate that from throughout Great Britain, approximately 794 crashes involved a fatal or serious casualty, and 3,309 involved a slight casualty (see Table 5.4).

Table 5.3: Crashes involving drivers subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Total number of crashes and casualties in Great Britain (year 2000)</th>
<th>Proportion of crashes and casualties for which an unlicensed driver was prosecuted in Study areas (%)</th>
<th>Estimated total number of crashes and casualties in Great Britain (using year 2000 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crashes</td>
<td>Casualties</td>
<td>Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSI</td>
<td>35,607</td>
<td>41,564</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>198,122</td>
<td>278,719</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233,729</td>
<td>320,283</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sample size of 12,856 crashes, of which 393 involved a driver subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving.

2 The total number does not equal the sum of Killed/Seriously Injured (KSI) and Slight because the proportion of KSI and slight in Great Britain are not the same as those in the study areas. The figures in the table are also subject to rounding errors.

5.2.8 We can also apply the Home Office figures (from Table 2.6) to determine the number of casualties resulting from a crash involving a driver subsequently found guilty of an unlicensed driver offence. We estimate that almost 2 per cent of all reported casualties involved a driver subsequently found guilty of an unlicensed driving offence. We can further estimate that from throughout Great Britain there were 937 fatal and serious casualties, and 5,395 slight casualties (Table 5.4).

5.2.9 The number of casualties for crashes involving an unlicensed driver averaged 1.54 per crash, while the number for all crashes was 1.37 casualties. Casualty numbers appear to be over-represented for unlicensed drivers, and this result is statistically significant.

5.2.10 In terms of crash severity (the worst severity for all casualties in any given crash), it was found that the severity for crashes involving an unlicensed driver was worse than for all crashes. However, it was found that of all casualties, there was not a significant difference in severity between the two groups. Coupled with the finding of a greater number of casualties, it is possible that there are a greater number of passengers in vehicles driven by unlicensed drivers. An alternative explanation is that due to some characteristic of unlicensed driver crashes (such as time of day, or where such drivers drive), there are more passengers in other vehicles involved in such crashes.

5.2.11 In two of the three areas analysed we were able to determine which of the drivers involved in an accident were unlicensed. We are therefore able to determine the average age, the gender, breath-test result and type of vehicle driven for these offenders. Where this analysis has been performed, the results have been compared against all accidents from the same two areas only.

5.2.12 Table 5.5 demonstrates that, of the unlicensed drivers involved in crashes, the vast majority were males (84 per cent). The number of males is significantly higher than expected for crashes involving unlicensed drivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Total number of crashes and casualties in Great Britain (year 2000)</th>
<th>Proportion of crashes and casualties for which an unlicensed driver was found guilty in Study areas (%)</th>
<th>Estimated total number of crashes and casualties for which an unlicensed driver was found guilty in Great Britain (using year 2000 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSI</td>
<td>35,607</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>198,122</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233,729</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4,065(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The total number does not equal the sum of Killed/Seriously Injured and Slight because the proportion of KSI and slight in GB are not the same as those in the study areas. The figures in the table are also subject to rounding errors.
5.2.13 The result for the over-representation of male drivers in unlicensed driving crashes is supported by analysis of all casualties involved in unlicensed driving crashes, where 67 per cent were males, while 33 per cent were females (Table 5.6). The number of male casualties is significantly higher than we would expect when compared with all crashes.

Table 5.6: Sex of casualty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Casualty</th>
<th>Unlicensed</th>
<th>All Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>9,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>7,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.14 It was found that for both the sex of the driver, and sex of all casualties that the proportion of males was significantly higher for the unlicensed driver crashes. As has been found in other strands of the research, the results for driver sex may be explained by the higher number of males who engage in unlicensed driving compared with females.

5.2.15 The average age of all unlicensed drivers involved in a crash was almost 28 years. This compares with the average for all crashes of 37 years. The difference between the two groups is statistically significant. In addition, the average age of all casualties in unlicensed driving crashes is around 29 years, compared with all casualties of 33 years, also a significant difference.

5.2.16 The average age of all drivers involved in an unlicensed driver crash was significantly lower than for all crashes. This finding could be explained by the high proportion of these drivers driving otherwise than in accordance with their licence. We have seen from previous strands of this research that these drivers tend to be young.

5.2.17 It can be seen from Table 5.7 that for crashes involving unlicensed drivers, a lower proportion of crashes occur on higher class roads compared with all crashes, the difference being significant.
5.2.18 For crashes involving an unlicensed driver, proportionally more occurred on roads with a 30 mph speed limit than for all crashes (Table 5.8). This result is also significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>Unlicensed</th>
<th>All Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 mph</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>7,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 mph</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 mph</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 mph</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.19 There are two possible explanations for these findings. It is possible that unlicensed drivers have greater difficulties on such roads, and so a greater number of crashes. Another more likely explanation is that these unlicensed drivers are more inclined to drive more frequently on these types of roads. This would imply that these drivers are making a proportionally higher number of local trips than for drivers involved in all crashes.

5.2.20 From Table 5.9, it appears that a higher proportion of crashes involving unlicensed drivers occur on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays than for all crashes. It was found that this result was statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Unlicensed</th>
<th>All Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.21 It can be seen from Figure 5.1 that crashes involving unlicensed drivers are generally over-represented at times later in the evening, and in the early morning, and are well under-represented during the day, and particularly the morning peak. For the purpose of analysis, times were grouped together in 3 hour blocks (midnight to 3am, 3am to 6am, etc). The difference between the two groups of drivers is significant.

5.2.22 It was apparent that a significantly higher proportion of crashes occurred during the weekend period (Friday to Sunday) for unlicensed drivers. It was also clear that crashes involving unlicensed drivers are generally over-represented at times later in the evening, and in the early morning. In addition, such drivers are well under-represented during the day, and particularly the morning peak. It is likely, then, that unlicensed drivers do a significantly higher proportion of driving on these days of the week, and times of the day.

5.2.23 Of all the casualties involving an unlicensed driver, 56 per cent were drivers of vehicles, 35 per cent were passengers, and 8 per cent were pedestrians. Passengers are significantly over-represented when compared with casualties for all crashes (Table 5.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casualty Class</th>
<th>Unlicensed</th>
<th>All Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>10,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger/Pillion</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>4,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.24 This finding supports the earlier result which showed a greater number of casualties involved in crashes that included an unlicensed driver. It is also apparent that unlicensed drivers are involved in significantly fewer crashes involving pedestrians. This may be a function of the circumstances of where and when such drivers drive, or different driving strategies adopted by such drivers.

5.2.25 From Table 5.11 we can see there are differences between the type of vehicles involved in crashes relating to an unlicensed driver, and those of all crashes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Unlicensed</th>
<th>All Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>12,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Vehicle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.26 Unlicensed drivers are involved in crashes that include a greater proportion of motorcycles, and less so with cars and goods vehicles. The difference between the groups of drivers is statistically significant.

5.2.27 Around 17 per cent of unlicensed drivers involved in a crash that were breath-tested produced a positive result (Table 5.12). This compared with a total of 3 per cent of drivers involved in all crashes. The difference between the groups of drivers is significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breath-Test Result</th>
<th>Unlicensed</th>
<th>All Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.28 Drivers who were not requested to provide a breath-test, or where the driver was not contacted at the time of the crash are not included as part of this analysis. If all unlicensed drivers who were involved in a crash are included, then 10.7 per cent tested positive, compared with 1.7 per cent of drivers involved in all crashes.

5.2.29 We can also analyse these results with reference to the amount of driver exposure (Table 4.1). By taking account of the amount of driving per month performed by unlicensed drivers and all drivers, we calculate that crash involved unlicensed drivers are at least 15 times more likely to be tested positive than all crash involved drivers, relative to the amount of time driven.

3 Comparing 27 positive unlicensed driver results with 273 positive all driver results over the estimated hours per month for unlicensed drivers of either 1,153,000 or 3,973,000 (see Chapter 4), and for all drivers of 620,000,000 (from the National Travel Survey) produces a ratio of at least 15:1 for unlicensed drivers compared with all drivers. The figures for exposure relates to UK wide figures, so this calculation assumes that the proportions of unlicensed to all driving is the same in our sample areas.
5.2.30 The breath-test results from the paragraphs above all indicate that crash involved unlicensed drivers are far more likely to produce a positive breath-test than ordinary drivers. This may be a function of driver exposure due perhaps to the later times that unlicensed drivers are on the road.

5.3 Caveats

5.3.1 It has only been possible to present the results described above by making a number of assumptions in order to complete the various analyses. The caveats to this strand of research are presented within Section 3.3.

5.4 Conclusions: Characteristics of Unlicensed Driver Crashes

5.4.1 Approximately 3 per cent of crashes involve a driver subsequently prosecuted for unlicensed driving, and we estimate that around 1.7 per cent of crashes involve a driver subsequently found guilty of an unlicensed driving offence.

5.4.2 From the results presented above, we are able to determine a great deal about the characteristics of crashes involving unlicensed drivers, and indeed about the unlicensed drivers themselves. In terms of crashes, we can say the following:

- They typically involve a higher severity than ordinary crashes.
- They involve a higher number of casualties.
- There are more male casualties in such crashes.
- The age of these casualties is lower than for all crashes.
- Crashes tend to occur on unclassified roads, and in low-speed environments.
- The greatest number of crashes tend to occur at the evening peak, but weekend crashes are over-represented as are those late in the evening or early morning.
- Casualties are mainly drivers, as for all crash types, but passengers are significantly over-represented for this group.
- The vehicle most commonly used is a car, as for all types of crashes, but those using motorcycles are over-represented for this group.

5.4.3 As for the unlicensed driver themselves, we can say that:

- They tend to be male.
- They are younger than the average crash involved driver (averaging 28 years).
- They are significantly more likely to produce a positive breath-test result than other crash involved drivers.
5.5 Conclusions: Comparative Crash Risk of Unlicensed Drivers

5.5.1 As we have discussed above, around 3 per cent of all crashes in our study areas involved a driver subsequently prosecuted for an unlicensed driving offence. Of these drivers, we can estimate the number of drivers who are subsequently found guilty of such an offence using the Home Office figures in Table 2.6. Around 1.7 per cent of crashes in our study areas involved a driver who was subsequently found guilty of an unlicensed driving offence. (For example, The true extent of crash involvement will most likely be greater than 1.7 per cent because of cases of hit and run involving unlicensed drivers who are never traced, or where insufficient evidence is gathered).

5.5.2 As we have been able to calculate lower and upper estimates for the amount of driving which results from unlicensed drivers (from Chapter 4, Table 4.4), we can also estimate the risk of crash involvement for such drivers. This is shown within Table 5.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Proportion of crashes involving unlicensed drivers (%)</th>
<th>Proportion of driving completed by unlicensed drivers (%)</th>
<th>Relative crash risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>= 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>= 2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 It can be seen that the comparative crash risk of unlicensed drivers could range anywhere between 2.7 to almost 9 times greater than that for all drivers. The lowest estimate in the proportion of all driving completed by unlicensed drivers corresponds to the highest level of crash risk and vice versa (i.e. the less driving completed then the riskier they are). It should not be forgotten that in terms of road safety unlicensed drivers will include two extremes ranging from the wilfully negligent joy rider to the experienced driver who has driven regularly for several years without being involved in any crashes.

5.5.4 In an attempt to explain the degree to which the over-representation of young male drivers aged 17-29 influence risk, (it is known that there is a higher crash risk for this group of drivers), a further analysis was conducted. Table 5.14 shows the relative crash risk of young male drivers and other drivers (not young males), licensed and unlicensed as well as all drivers.
5.5.5 In summary, by hours driven:

- Young male drivers (17-29 years) are about three times more likely to involved in a crash than all drivers, but unlicensed young male drivers are between 3.25 and 11.6 times more likely to be involved in a crash than all drivers.

- This additional risk indicates that there is an unlicensed driver effect over and above the increased crash risk of being a young male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of driver</th>
<th>Percentage of crashes</th>
<th>Percentage of driving</th>
<th>Relative crash risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All drivers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young male drivers (17-29 yrs)</td>
<td>34.59(^1)</td>
<td>11.61(^2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other drivers (not young males)</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>88.39</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed drivers – Lower estimate</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed drivers – Higher estimate</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed young males – Lower estimate</td>
<td>1.04(^3)</td>
<td>0.09(^4)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed young males – Higher estimate</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other drivers (not unlicensed young males)</td>
<td>98.96</td>
<td>99(^5)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 4,447 crashes for 17-29-year-old males from a total of 12,856
2 Personal Communication, DfT Stats Division analysis of National Travel Survey – 72 million hours for 17-29-year-old males from a total of 620 million hours for the population
3 235 crashes for 17-29-year-old males from a total of 12,856
4 Approximately half of unlicensed driving is completed by males aged 17-29
5 Approximate figure over the lower and higher estimates
6 CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES OF UNLICENSED DRIVERS

6.1 Provisional Licence Holders

National postal survey

6.1.1 The characteristics of provisional licence holders (PLH) were first investigated as part of the national postal survey. The questionnaire used within the survey asked the recipient to provide a number of basic details. The basic characteristics of those admitting to unlicensed driving (those who had driven otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence) could then be compared with those who did not admit to unlicensed driving. There follows a summary of the characteristics where a significant difference was found between the two groups.

6.1.2 It was found that males were more likely to admit to illegal driving compared with females: 14 per cent of males admitted to unlicensed driving and 8 per cent of females admitted to it. Forty per cent of the responding sample consisted of males.

6.1.3 A higher proportion of those living in a rural area or city admitted to unlicensed driving (15 and 13 per cent respectively) compared with those who lived in a town or a village (10 and 8 per cent respectively).

6.1.4 Those with student status were less likely to admit to unlicensed driving (6 per cent) compared with those not working, working full time or working part time (14, 12 and 12 per cent respectively).

6.1.5 A much higher proportion of those owning a car before passing the practical test admitted to unlicensed driving (14 per cent) compared with those who did not own a car (8 per cent). Thirty two per cent of the sample owned a car before passing the practical test.

6.1.6 There was found to be a strong association between driving before obtaining a provisional licence and then driving otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence. Although only 6 per cent of the sample admitted to driving before obtaining a provisional licence, of these, 45 per cent also drove otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence.

Interviews

6.1.7 More detailed investigations of the characteristics and attitudes of PLH were completed through conducting interviews. PLH were either interviewed on the telephone or in person at public locations such as universities, colleges, shopping centres, pubs and other likely locations. Both licensed and unlicensed drivers were interviewed.
6.1.8 A total of 390 PLHs were interviewed across Leicester, Essex, Tyne and Wear and Lincolnshire. Out of these, 130 admitted to unlicensed driving (33 per cent). The results in Table 6.1 overleaf show significant differences between those who admitted to unlicensed driving and those who did not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status with regard to driving tests</th>
<th>Legal drivers N = 260</th>
<th>Driven unlicensed N = 130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not yet taken the written test</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed the written test</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to take written test within 6 months (% of those who had not yet passed)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage who felt they were ‘definitely capable of passing written test now’ (% of those who had not yet passed)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet taken the practical test</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed the practical test</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to take the practical test within 6 months</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage who felt they were ‘definitely capable of passing practical test now’ (% of those who had not yet passed)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage agreeing that the possibility of gaining a police record was a deterrent (to unlicensed driving)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with attitude statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I enjoy the sensation of accelerating rapidly’</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It’s important to show other drivers they can’t take advantage of you’</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Social disapproval stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The risk of being in an accident stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The risk of causing injury to others stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motoring offences committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never speeding</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drink and drive</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drive without tax</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drive without MOT</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drive without insurance</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.9 Table 6.1 shows that 80 per cent of the illegal drivers were male. The results also found that, as with the postal survey, more males admitted to unlicensed driving than females. Forty five per cent of males interviewed admitted to driving otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence compared with 16 per cent of females. Males comprised 58 per cent of the sample interviewed. The percentage of unlicensed driving is higher than what was found in the postal survey.

6.1.10 There were differences in unlicensed driving rates between the different age groups. Approximately 30 per cent of the participants aged 24 years and under had driven otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence. This group made up 87 per cent of the sample interviewed. Seventy per cent of the participants between 25 and 34 years of age had driven unlicensed; however, this group made up only 7 per cent of the sample interviewed. The majority (75 per cent) of the unlicensed drivers were aged 24 and under.

6.1.11 There were some differences in unlicensed driving incidence rates between the living areas. Town dwellers represented the highest proportion of unlicensed drivers (47 per cent); among those living in towns, 35 per cent claimed to drive unlicensed as a PLH. Thirty seven per cent of those living in a city and 16 per cent of those living in a village also claimed to drive unlicensed.
6.1.12 It was found that 40 per cent of participants with a student status admitted to driving unlicensed, which contrasts significantly with the postal survey, which showed a representation of 6 per cent. There were, however, a higher proportion of students in the sample interviewed (52 per cent). Twenty per cent of respondents with a full-time work status, 27 per cent with a part-time status and 43 per cent of those unwaged admitted to driving unlicensed, which reflect higher overall proportions compared with the postal survey.

6.1.13 Semi-skilled or unskilled manual workers were most likely to drive unlicensed. Twenty six per cent of semi-skilled or unskilled manual employees had driven unlicensed compared with 20 per cent of participants employed in clerical or administrative roles and 16 per cent of the skilled manual employees. These groups were equally represented in the sample.

6.1.14 Of the participants who had no cars in their household (11 per cent of participants), 48 per cent had driven unlicensed as a PLH. Of those with one car (30 per cent of participants), 34 per cent had driven unlicensed and of those with more than one car (59 per cent of participants), 29 per cent had driven unlicensed as a PLH.

6.1.15 The results also indicate that unlicensed PLHs are less likely to be deterred by the possibility of gaining a police record. They also hold different attitudes, for example, to speeding, risk, drink-driving, tax and insurance evasion. Insurance and tax evasion were committed more often than drink-driving and driving without a MOT. Three-quarters of unlicensed drivers claimed they enjoy the ‘sensation of accelerating rapidly’ compared with less than half of the legal drivers.

6.1.16 There were differences in the success rate of the theory and practical tests. Unlicensed drivers were less likely to have passed the written test but also more likely to feel they could pass it. They were also less likely to have taken the practical test or be planning to take it, but more likely to feel they could pass if they did. Social disapproval was less of a deterrent to them than the possibility of causing injury to others or being in a crash.
6.1.17 There were no significant differences between the legal and unlicensed PLH relating to the issues in Table 6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2: Summary of issues for which there were no significant differences between the legal and unlicensed PLH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No significant differences in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views about expense of learning to driving and test fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about the fairness of the testing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the idea of a written and a practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrent effect of being fined if caught while driving unlicensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking for seriousness of various motoring offences (apart from unlicensed driving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car ownership (45% owned a car)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to a car once passed test (90% – 95%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.18 It is noteworthy that both groups were equally likely to own a car and have access to one once they passed the driving tests. Owning a car did not have a significant effect on the likelihood of driving unlicensed unlike the postal survey, which found that respondents who owned a car before passing the practical test were more likely to drive unlicensed. Both licensed and illegal drivers in the interviews held similar opinions about the fairness of the system and the level of expenses.

6.1.19 The data from interviews with unlicensed drivers were also analysed separately and the results are shown in Table 6.3. These results show that three-quarters of the unlicensed drivers claimed they drove more carefully when driving unlicensed. Three-quarters were also confident about their driving ability in general. Fifteen per cent of them drove unlicensed all the time, 25 per cent drove often and 60 per cent drove occasionally. More than half were not concerned about being caught, and qualitative results show that this is attributed to the fact that being caught is perceived as unlikely. However, the majority would not recommend driving unlicensed to others because of the risks involved especially getting caught, receiving endorsements and being banned. In terms of the purpose of unlicensed journeys, half were for recreation, 15 per cent for getting to work and 8 per cent for practising their driving.
### Table 6.3: Results of analysis of data for unlicensed PLH only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of unlicensed driving</th>
<th>Occasionally drive without a licence 52%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the time 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence levels when driving unlicensed</th>
<th>Not confident 20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly confident 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very confident 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence increasing gradually 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern about getting caught</th>
<th>Not concerned 56%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly concerned 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very concerned 23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you drive more carefully when driving unlicensed?</th>
<th>Yes 74%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you recommend unlicensed driving to others?</th>
<th>Yes 29%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For sporadic drivers, no of incidents of unlicensed driving</th>
<th>One-off 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 or 3 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For occasional drivers, length of time in weeks unlicensed driving carried out</th>
<th>1-2 17%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-6 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More 63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For regular drivers, length of time in years unlicensed driving carried out</th>
<th>One or less 32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 or less 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whose car do you drive?</th>
<th>Parent/other relative 43%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared with others 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Frequency and Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of unlicensed driving journeys</th>
<th>Work 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal business 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driving practice 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times a week do you drive alone?</th>
<th>Average once or twice a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many miles a week do you drive alone?</td>
<td>Average 20 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours a week do you drive alone?</td>
<td>Average one or two hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times a week with passengers?</td>
<td>Average once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many miles a week with passengers?</td>
<td>Average 20 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours a week with passengers?</td>
<td>Average one or two hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.20 Crash rates, the awareness of penalties as well as the time lag between applying and taking tests were explored among unlicensed drivers with the results presented in Table 6.4. The results show that 12 per cent had been involved in a crash, mainly alone (70 per cent) and mainly ‘damage only’ (90 per cent).

6.1.21 More than half felt that the ‘current system’ actually ‘encourages’ people to break the licensing rules due to a variety of factors. In particular it was felt that driving should be allowed at younger ages, that it was unfair not to allow friends with insufficient driving experience to teach learners and that the chances of getting caught were very low. In addition the cost of learning to drive was frequently mentioned as an encouragement to ignore the rules. Approximately half of the drivers were aware of the penalties for unlicensed driving. Many others made wild guesses – both over-estimating and under estimating the penalties. Three-quarters felt that the time lag between applying for and taking the theory and practical tests was too long.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.4: Analysis of crash rates, penalties awareness and time gaps in test application among unlicensed PLH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crashes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in a road accident while driving unlicensed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of accident?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does current system encourage people to break the licensing rules?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penalties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know the penalties for unlicensed driving?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know the penalties for driving when disqualified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks between applying and sitting theory test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this too long?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks between applying and taking practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this too long?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Driving Examiners fair?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of findings of the characteristics and attitudes of PLH who drive unlicensed**

6.1.22 An initial investigation into the characteristics of PLH was possible via the national postal survey. The proportions of unlicensed driving committed by males and females and the separate categories of students, workers and unwaged persons was found to be greater in the in-depth interviews than in the postal survey. However, the proportions of these groups represented in the two samples were different, for example, with the interviews including more students than the postal survey. The proportions of village and rural dwellers in the interview sample were not sufficient to draw definite conclusions regarding their driving behaviour, although what is clear is that both studies showed a high proportion of city dwellers committing unlicensed driving as a PLH.
6.1.23 The in-depth interviews (many lasting for over an hour) have produced a great deal of insights into the motives, background and processes that influence the incidence of unlicensed driving. These issues are discussed here using personal quotes to emphasise the points.

6.1.24 **Danger points:** There are a number of danger points that contribute towards the likelihood that the PHL will commit unlicensed driving. This includes the time between being told they are ready for the test and getting a date for the test. The longer the gap, ultimately the greater is the risk. The pressure to take a practical test within two years of the theory test is another factor.

- ‘There is uncertainty because it can take 11 to 12 weeks before the test date which is too long a waiting period.’
- ‘Shouldn’t limit the time between taking theory to passing practical to 2 years, to have to take the theory test again is the worst thing, one may become involved in other matters and have no time for lessons.’

Another danger point is the point at which they feel confident in their ability as a driver especially if advised by the instructor that they are ready. Failing the tests (both theory and practical) and losing motivation to be re-examined are other factors.

- ‘People get tempted to drive because they are skilled and confident, even the instructor may be confident about their skills.’
- ‘You seem to get bad drivers who pass so if I am better than them but have no licence then why not (drive).’
- ‘I’ve seen people pack it in after failing over and over again.’

6.1.25 **Perceptions of risk:** A wide range of judgements existed in relation to risk perception. People used different strategies to avoid getting caught including driving extra carefully, making short trips, using a decent car, and choosing routes they consider ‘low risk’ routes.

- ‘You keep an eye on things, are more aware, check mirrors more, more attention to speed.’
- ‘I drove as careful as possible, deliberately slowly because I had no licence or insurance.’
- ‘If you are able to drive, and are driving carefully it’s not dangerous for others.’

Others who judged the risk to be low emphasised the lack of police, or interest by police in the offence.

- ‘It’s too easy to break the rules, easy to drive without insurance and tax – the system makes it easier, not enough surveillance around the country, unless you are not driving properly you can’t be caught.’
- ‘They (police) just stop you when you are speeding.’
6.1.26 **Penalties:** More young people are deterred by informal controls (especially parental disapproval) than by formal penalties.

- ‘My parents would ban me from using the car.’

On the other hand, others have parents who are aware of their driving habits.

- ‘My mum didn’t mind as long as it wasn’t a regular routine.’

A first driving offence (not necessarily for unlicensed driving) can lead to an ‘in for a penny, in for a pound view’. This includes not having insurance/MOT. The existing penalties in themselves do not seem to act as a big deterrent. People who get away with it the first time lose their fears.

- ‘I was stopped a couple of times by the police while driving unlicensed but they didn’t ask me for my licence.’
- ‘There are so few police that people are not afraid to break the rules.’
- ‘The system does not directly encourage it but it leaves the opportunity open because penalties aren’t too harsh. Odds are you are not going to be caught.’

6.1.27 **Reasons for unlicensed driving:**

**Driving from a young age:**

- ‘I am very confident and have been driving for 8 years on my own.’
- ‘If you know how to drive it doesn’t really matter if you don’t have a full driving licence.’

**In the event of an emergency:**

- ‘To take my mother to the hospital.’
- ‘To get to work.’
- ‘If you need to drive to work someone may not always be there to take you.’

**Convenience:**

- ‘I can’t be bothered to take the bus or walk.’
- ‘Public transport is a nightmare.’

**Cannot afford lessons/test:**

- ‘Lessons should be done for free because people with no money can’t afford lessons.’
- ‘Anyone can get access to a car especially when a car is cheaper than qualification.’
Need to practice (parents cars not insured):

- ‘If you don’t have someone to practice with who is legal it is tempting to gain practice by going out with friends, who may not be legal.’
- ‘People need to get practice, but driving lessons are too expensive and if you want to learn driving you need to practice.’
- ‘It’s a lot easier getting lessons from my mates than it is from a driving instructor and I think that by driving on my own my driving is better.’
- ‘It would be embarrassing to ask how many years my mates have had a licence in order to accompany me.’

Lifestyle and self-image/distinctions made by ‘older’ young people about ‘young people’:

- ‘It’s a cultural thing for working-class men, for young men lots of esteem to be gained from owning and driving a car.’
- ‘I was rebelling.’
- ‘It’s to do with culture – failing a driving test is more embarrassing for guys.’

6.1.28 Sex: Majority men.

6.1.29 Rural areas: Being less accessible to towns and cities encourages unlicensed driving; young people interviewed in the rural areas owned cars before passing their tests.

- ‘Not a lot of transport in villages, no choice but to drive.’
- ‘Much easier in the countryside, less traffic and no motorways.’

6.2 New Drivers Act ‘Revokees’

6.2.1 An investigation into the basic characteristics of New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ was possible via analysis of the national postal survey results. An in-depth investigation of the attitudes and motivations of this group through interviews was not possible due to their much smaller population dispersed throughout the country. There follows a summary of the significant differences between ‘revokees’ who admitted to driving without a licence compared with those who did not (as determined from the national postal survey).

6.2.2 More male ‘revokees’ admit to driving without a licence (22 per cent) than female ‘revokees’ (12 per cent).

6.2.3 The incidence of driving without a licence appears to be linked to car ownership after revocation. A higher proportion of ‘revokees’, who continued to own a car after their licence was revoked, admitted to driving without a licence (26 per cent), compared with those who did not continue to own a car (14 per cent) or did not own a car at any stage (14 per cent).
6.2.4 The incidence of driving without a licence also appears to be associated with ‘revokees’ who had not reapplied for a provisional licence (27 per cent of all those who had not reapplied). The proportion of those who had reapplied and not passed the theory test, not passed the practical test, and those who had re-passed both driving tests, who admitted to driving without a licence was 24 per cent, 21 per cent, and 13 per cent respectively.

6.2.5 Driving without a licence is highly associated with those ‘revokees’ who had been convicted with an offence not to do with motoring. Of 40 ‘revokees’ who indicated that they had been convicted of such an offence 17 (43 per cent) admitted to driving without a licence. This compares with just 17 per cent of those not convicted of a non-motoring offence that admitted to driving without a licence.

6.2.6 A comparison of the characteristics of ‘revokees’ who did and did not admit to driving otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence (after re-obtaining the provisional licence) was also made. It was found that driving otherwise than in accordance with the provisional driving licence was highly associated with those who had also driven without any licence. Of the 43 who drove otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence 32 (74 per cent) had also driven without any licence.

6.3 **Disqualified Drivers**

*National postal survey*

6.3.1 The characteristics of disqualified drivers were first investigated as part of the national postal survey. Three categories were surveyed: drink-drivers, those disqualified for some other single offence, and those disqualified as part of the totting up process. The basic characteristics of those admitting to unlicensed driving (those who had driven while disqualified) were compared with those who did not admit to driving while disqualified. There follows a summary of the main characteristics where a significant difference was found between the two groups.

6.3.2 More male disqualified drivers admit to driving while disqualified (18 per cent) than female disqualified drivers (10 per cent).

6.3.3 There was a higher proportion within the younger age groups (20 years or less and 21 to 30 years) who admitted to driving while disqualified. The mean age overall was also found to be significantly lower for those who admitted to driving while disqualified (31.6 years old) compared with those who did not admit to it (37.4 years old).

6.3.4 Overall, for the three categories combined, there were found to be fewer respondents from villages and more from cities and towns who drove while disqualified than would be expected.
Overall, for the three categories combined, there was found to be fewer respondents working full time and more who were not working who admitted they had driven while disqualified than would be expected.

For the categories ‘those disqualified for some other single offence’ and ‘those who were disqualified as a result of the totting up process’ it was found that the mean length of the period of disqualification was significantly longer for those who had admitted to driving while disqualified. The mean length of ban for all the groups combined was found to be significantly longer for those who admitted to driving while disqualified.

There was a significantly higher proportion of respondents who had been convicted for an offence not to do with motoring who admitted to driving while disqualified within each of the categories of disqualified drivers. Overall, the proportion of those who admitted to driving while disqualified who had a conviction for a non-motoring offence was 39 per cent. In comparison the proportion of those who did not drive while disqualified who had been convicted of such an offence was only 11 per cent.

**Interviews – Sample group not imprisoned**

More detailed investigation into the characteristics and attitudes of disqualified drivers was completed through conducting interviews. One method used was to contact disqualified drivers whose names and addresses were obtained from the DVLA database. This group of drivers was more difficult to contact than the PLH because of inaccurate information from the DVLA and greater resistance to being interviewed. The other method was to interview young offenders disqualified for motor-related offences. Below we refer to ‘legal’ disqualified drivers as being those who have not driven while being banned. Altogether 99 disqualified drivers were interviewed, out of which 42 had driven unlicensed (42 per cent). See Table 6.5 for a summary of the differences between the legal and unlicensed drivers.

With regard to the unlicensed driving incidence rates, it was found that 10 per cent of the drivers disqualified for drink-driving, 28 per cent of drivers disqualified for some other single offence and 55 per cent of those who had been disqualified as a result of totting up points had driven while disqualified. This trend agrees with the findings of the postal survey in which totters admitted the most to driving while disqualified. More than twice as many single offenders and marginally fewer drink-drivers drove while disqualified than in the postal survey. All the young offenders (those who never had a licence but were disqualified from applying for a licence) had driven while disqualified. Results reflect the combined data from all four categories of disqualified drivers.

Almost all (97 per cent) the unlicensed disqualified drivers were male. This large percentage could be related to the high proportion (93 per cent) of males in the sample. Among the males interviewed, 45 per cent had driven unlicensed and among the females, 14 per cent had committed the same offence. This trend was similar to that of the postal survey albeit with a greater magnitude.
6.3.11 The majority of the unlicensed drivers were 24 years or under (74 per cent) while most (80 per cent) of the legal drivers were over 25 years. Among the participants under 18 (19 per cent of all participants), 84 per cent had driven unlicensed. Among those between 18 and 24 years old, (comprising 24 per cent of the population), 58 per cent had driven unlicensed and among those between 24 and 34 years old, 43 per cent had done the same. Twenty per cent of participants between 35 and 44 had driven unlicensed. Twenty five per cent of the sample comprised participants over the age of 45 of which none had driven unlicensed. The finding of a higher proportion within the younger age groups admitting to driving while disqualified is similar to the postal survey.

6.3.12 More legal drivers (76 per cent) were employed than unlicensed drivers (38 per cent). Of those working full time (55 per cent of the sample), 26 per cent had driven while disqualified; all the students interviewed (10 per cent of the sample) had driven while disqualified; and 65 per cent of those unwaged (17 per cent of sample) had driven while disqualified. This compares with the results from the postal survey where fewer respondents working full time and more who were not working who admitted they had driven while disqualified.

6.3.13 Of those who did not personally own a car (40 per cent), 50 per cent admitted to driving unlicensed compared with 21 per cent of those who owned a car. This suggests that many of the unlicensed drivers are using other people’s cars, with or without permission. In a separate question about household car ownership, it was found that in households with no cars, 57 per cent of participants drove unlicensed. In households with one and more than one car, the percentages were 32 per cent and 50 per cent respectively.

6.3.14 Of the city dwellers, 72 per cent admitted to driving unlicensed, compared with 35 per cent of those who lived in a town and 25 per cent who lived in a village. Half of the unlicensed drivers said they lived in a city whereas half of the legal drivers said they lived in a town. The representation of city dwellers among the unlicensed drivers is higher than would be expected. The postal survey found more respondents from both cities and towns who drove while disqualified.

6.3.15 The unlicensed drivers had been disqualified more times than the legal drivers. Twice as many unlicensed than legal drivers felt that the driving system was at fault. The possibility of gaining a police record was more of a deterrent to the legal drivers than to the unlicensed drivers. The risks of being in a crash and getting pulled over would deter only half of the unlicensed drivers compared with 85 per cent of the legal drivers. As with the PLH, social disapproval was not seen as a major deterrent to the unlicensed drivers. Injury caused as a result of a crash would deter most drivers from driving unlicensed. Contrary to what would be expected it was found that more legal drivers would drink and drive (43 per cent) than unlicensed drivers (31 per cent).
6.3.16 There were no significant differences in the attitudes of disqualified drivers surrounding a range of issues as demonstrated in Table 6.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.5: Summary of percentage differences between the behaviour and attitude of ‘legal’ and unlicensed disqualified drivers</th>
<th>Legal drivers N = 57</th>
<th>Driven unlicensed N = 42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of times they have been disqualified</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three times</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five times</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage who agree that the current system encourages people to break the licensing rules</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage agreeing that the possibility of gaining a police record was a deterrent (to unlicensed driving)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with attitude statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I enjoy the sensation of accelerating rapidly’</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Social disapproval stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The risk of being in an accident stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The risk of being pulled over stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The risk of causing injury to others stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motoring offences committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never speeding</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drink and drive</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drive without tax</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drive without MOT</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drive without insurance</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24 or less</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 or more</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unwaged</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>1 or 2 people</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 or more people</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal car ownership</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household car ownership</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living area</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.17 Unlicensed disqualified drivers were also asked a range of questions regarding the frequency of their journeys and an assessment of their own driving ability and confidence. These results are shown in Table 6.7. It shows that 60 per cent drove regularly (often/all the time). Three-quarters were confident about their driving ability. The same proportion were concerned about being caught. More than 80 per cent said they drove more carefully, mainly to avoid being caught. The same proportion would not recommend that others drive unlicensed. Thirty per cent drove to get to work, a quarter for shopping, and 80 per cent for recreation purposes.

Table 6.6: Summary of issues for which there were no significant differences between the legal and unlicensed disqualified drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No significant differences in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views about expense of learning to driving and test fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling embarrassed about failing a driving test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about the fairness of the testing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the idea of a written and a practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrent effect of police record if caught while driving unlicensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking for seriousness of various motoring offences (apart from unlicensed driving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling that they were treated fairly when disqualified (64-68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to a car once passed test (82%-88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7: Results of analysis of data for unlicensed disqualified drivers only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion driving while disqualified</th>
<th>Drink-driver</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totter</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other single offender</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Confidence levels when driving unlicensed | Not confident | 24% |
|                                          | Fairly confident | 30% |
|                                          | Very confident | 40% |
|                                          | Confidence increasing gradually | 5% |

| Concern about getting caught | Not concerned | 33% |
|                             | Fairly concerned | 42% |
|                             | Very concerned | 25% |

| Do you drive more carefully when driving unlicensed? | Yes | 83% |
|                                                     | No | 17% |

| Would you recommend unlicensed driving to others? | Yes | 19% |
|                                                   | No | 81% |

| For sporadic drivers, no of incidents of unlicensed driving | One-off | 63% |
|                                                           | 2 or 3 | 12% |
|                                                           | More | 25% |

| For occasional drivers, length of time in weeks unlicensed driving carried out | 1-2 | 11% |
|                                                                                | 3-6 | 22% |
|                                                                                | More | 67% |

| For regular drivers, length of time in years unlicensed driving carried out | Two or less | 52% |
|                                                                               | More than 2 to 6 | 44% |
|                                                                               | More | 4% |

| Whose car do you drive? | Parent/other relative | 24% |
|                        | Own | 35% |
|                        | Friend | 12% |
|                        | Shared with others | 24% |

| Frequency and Purposes | How many times a week do you drive alone? | Varies between once and every day |
|                       | How many miles a week do you drive alone? | Average up to 20 miles |
|                       | How many hours a week do you drive alone? | Average one to three hours |
|                       | How many times a week with passengers? | Average twice a week |
|                       | How many miles a week with passengers? | Average up to 15 miles |
|                       | How many hours a week with passengers? | Average four hours |

| Purpose of unlicensed driving journeys | Work | 30% |
|                                       | Shopping | 24% |
|                                       | Education | 8% |
|                                       | Personal business | 19% |
|                                       | Recreation | 81% |
6.3.18 Table 6.8 presents a summary of the crash rates as well as general offending behaviour of unlicensed disqualified drivers. This summary shows that a quarter of the unlicensed drivers had actually been involved in a crash. Most of them were not alone at the time of the crash, and half of the crashes resulted in damage of the vehicle only, the other half involved injury as well. Almost half of the unlicensed drivers had also been convicted of an offence not to do with motoring. A third had received warnings from police and the same proportion received penalty tickets.

| Table 6.8: Summary of crash rates and general offending behaviour of unlicensed disqualified drivers |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Involved in a road accident while driving unlicensed?** | 25% (Yes) |
| **What kind of accident?** | **Damage only** | 50% |
| | **Alone** | 16% |
| **Conviction of offences not to do with motoring** | 46% |
| **Warning received by police without any action being taken** | 35% |
| **Fixed penalty ticket received** | 32% |

Summary of findings of the characteristics and attitudes of unlicensed disqualified drivers

6.3.19 An initial investigation into the characteristics of unlicensed disqualified drivers was possible via the national postal survey. The in-depth interviews revealed a similar trend of results in terms of representation by males, drivers under 30 years, city dwellers, respondents who were not working and highest incidence rates by drivers disqualified for totting up points on their licence. The magnitude of findings was greater in the in-depth study than in the postal survey. The in-depth interviews revealed, in addition to the results reported above, a great deal of information about the motives and attitudes of the disqualified drivers. These are presented below with relevant quotes, which emphasise individual points.

6.3.20 **Lifestyle:** One of many illegal aspects of lifestyle:

- ‘I have been involved in commercial burglary, car theft, TWOC (taking without owner’s consent), GBH (Grievous Bodily Harm) and drugs.’

6.3.21 **Penalties:** Community service, attendance centres and other programmes are not considered as effective deterrents. A larger fine and/or prison sentence is considered to be more of a deterrent.

- ‘You can even drive a stolen car to the attendance centre… no one will know – community service means nothing to me.’
- ‘Only after my friend went to prison did I realise the seriousness of what we were doing.’
6.3.22 **Attitudes to driving:** Seeking peer approval and respect:
- ‘The faster the car you’ve got the more respect you’ll have on the street.’

6.3.23 **Sex:** Mainly male

6.3.24 **Livelhood:** Employment was a central factor:
- ‘People still need to get to work.’
- ‘I used to work as a driver and lost my job because of the disqualification.’

6.3.25 **Costs:** Insurance costs and test costs are too high hence vicious cycle
- ‘Costs add up in buying a car, insuring it, MOT, tax – there is nothing to help the young driver.’
- ‘One should not be punished for life (higher insurance, lack of job opportunities) after serving one’s disqualification especially after already serving the required sentence.’

6.3.26 **Access to cars:** Cars are either taken without the owner’s consent (TWOC), or borrowed from parents quite easily:
- ‘It’s easy to steal a car, I can do it in 5 seconds flat depending on the car.’
- ‘If you get chased you can just abandon the car and run away.’

6.3.27 **Perception of seriousness:**
- ‘Driving without a licence does not make you an offender in most people’s eyes.’

6.4 **Those Who Have Never Held a Licence (NELIs)**

**National Postal Survey**

6.4.1 A postal survey of the 10,000 most recent entrants on the DVLA database of those who had been caught driving without a licence was undertaken. A very low response of just over 1 per cent was achieved (107 valid questionnaires were received). Due to this low response rate, the results of this survey need to be treated with caution, and these figures have not been used in other relevant strands of the research. The results of the survey are included here for completeness.

6.4.2 As all NELIs by definition drive without a licence, a comparison of the characteristics of those who do it with those who do not was not possible. However, the following provide an indication of NELI characteristics based on our sample.
- NELIs were predominantly male (94 per cent).
- They were predominantly young (64 per cent were 20 years old or younger).
- The majority of NELIs (56 per cent) indicated that they would describe where they live as being in a town, 24 per cent in a village or rural area, with 19 per cent in a city.
NELIs were roughly equally split between those working full time (39 per cent) and those not in employment (40 per cent). Another 10 per cent worked part time and 11 per cent were students.

Nearly half (47 per cent) of NELIs indicated that they had been convicted of other non-motoring offences.

Most driving was completed alone, followed by with friends or colleagues. A lot less driving was completed accompanied by family members.

The most common trip purposes were stated as ‘to see friends’, ‘to go shopping’, ‘just for the sake of driving’ and ‘to and from work’.

Of the 20 per cent of drivers who stated that they had been caught as a result of being in an accident, around two-thirds admitted that they were to blame either entirely or quite a lot. Most of the accidents (74 per cent) involved damage to property only.

Despite being caught, 36 per cent indicated that they had driven again without a licence.

The most common motoring offences that the NELIs were charged with were the document offences of driving without a licence, insurance or MOT.

The most common penalties imposed were driving bans, fines and penalty points.

The most common reasons or excuses for not having a licence were the cost involved or that they were underage.

6.4.3 With regard to the extent of driving completed by NELIs, it was found that there is a wide variation between those who admit to driving regularly several hours a day, to those who drove on the one off occasion that they were caught. It was found that the NELIs fall into one of two main groups:

- Those who drove frequently – at least a few days a week (63 per cent).
- Those who drove very much less often, typically in a one-off emergency, or the one time that they were caught (37 per cent).

6.4.4 Analysis was completed to compare the characteristics of the ‘frequent’ and ‘infrequent’ drivers. Because the sample sizes were small, the results can only be considered to be indicative. It was found that:

- The trip purposes differed in that the most common reasons given by the ‘infrequent’ drivers was ‘just for the sake of driving’ ‘for an emergency’; or ‘other reasons’ compared with ‘to go shopping’, ‘to see friends’ and ‘to and from work’ for the ‘frequent’ drivers.
- The ‘frequent’ drivers were on average older than the ‘infrequent’ drivers.
- A higher proportion of ‘frequent’ drivers indicated that they lived in a city (22 per cent compared with 13 per cent of ‘infrequent’ drivers).
- The ‘infrequent’ drivers were more likely to be caught as a result of being in an accident (30 per cent compared with 18 per cent).
Although driving with no licence and no insurance were the most common offences that both sets of drivers were charged with, one difference was that taking without consent was the third most common for ‘infrequent’ drivers but only seventh for ‘frequent’ drivers.

A driving ban was by far the most common penalty imposed upon the ‘frequent’ driver category, whereas fines and penalty points were more common for the ‘infrequent’ drivers.

A much higher proportion of the ‘infrequent’ drivers (47 per cent) gave the reason of being underage for not having a licence compared with 25 per cent for the ‘frequent’ drivers.

A larger proportion of ‘frequent’ drivers had been convicted of a non-motoring offence (59 per cent) compared with ‘infrequent’ drivers (35 per cent).

Analysis was also completed to compare the characteristics of those who indicated that despite being caught that they had driven without a licence again (35 per cent), with those who had not done so. Again, due to small sample sizes the results can only be considered as indicative but seemed to suggest that:

- The likelihood of driving again after being caught was associated with the frequency of driving. Fifty percent of the frequent drivers admitted to driving again, compared with only 16 per cent of the infrequent drivers.
- The amount of driving by those who drove again only slightly decreased after being caught.
- The trip purpose ‘to and from work’ was much more common among those who admitted to driving again after being caught.
- A higher proportion who had driven again had committed other non-motoring offences (64 per cent) compared with those who had not driven again (43 per cent).

6.5 Prisoners

In-depth interviews were conducted at four young offender institutions (prisons) in England with prisoners convicted for motoring offences. Thirty-one male prisoners varying between the ages of 16 and 32 were interviewed. The interviews were conducted to provide detailed information about the frequency of unlicensed driving and the motivations and attitudes towards the behaviour among regular unlicensed drivers. Of the prisoners interviewed, 93 per cent had been sent to prison as a consequence of their motoring offence. The findings presented within Table 6.9 describe the characteristics of the prisoners interviewed. The points described below explain some of the most pertinent issues.

6.5.2 Lack of moral and social conscience: At least half of prisoners felt that there was little social disapproval attached to unlicensed driving. At least five felt that it would only constitute a serious offence when someone gets seriously injured.
‘I guess hurting a young child would make me stop as I have child of my own’

6.5.3 **Penalties:** A minority of prisoners who heavily relied on driving felt that imprisonment was not the most effective punishment.

- ‘One can easily fall into a routine of getting in and out of prison.’
- ‘This prison is like a holiday resort, lots of support and people to talk to but it helps me realise and understand that I have to do things the right way. Some people might take advantage of this, bully others and think they can get away with it.’
- ‘If you are homeless, you are better off in a prison.’
- ‘Penalties are not a sufficient deterrent, if they are going to do it they will.’

A couple of prisoners focused on the length of the prison sentence as a factor for deterrence.

- ‘The little sentences did not deter me, the larger sentences make you think about the offence and what you are missing out on.’
- ‘A ban is nothing. If I got a bigger sentence (for example, four years in jail) that might stop me.’

One prisoner felt that imprisonment encouraged further criminal behaviour.

- ‘Imprisonment is worse for the young criminals, as they learn more about crime in prison.’

Another prisoner felt unjustly treated because he considered his crime to be less serious than someone else’s.

- ‘Disqualified driving you get 18 months in jail, with home burglary you only get 14 months, it’s unfair.’

Twelve prisoners interviewed at an ‘open’ establishment appeared to have been rehabilitated and assimilated into society. Consequently they seemed less likely to re-offend.

- ‘I should be able to become a HGV driver with my NVQ and I can have a normal life.’
Table 6.9: Characteristics of prisoners interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of prisoners interviewed</th>
<th>Number of times they have been imprisoned</th>
<th>Percentage of first-time offenders for which this was their main conviction</th>
<th>Percentage of repeat offenders sentenced for</th>
<th>Length of prison sentences</th>
<th>Age at which they started learning to drive</th>
<th>Percentage who will have access to a car upon release from prison</th>
<th>Percentage who believe they are capable of passing their practical driving test</th>
<th>Percentage who believe they are capable of passing their theory driving test</th>
<th>Percentage agreeing that the possibility of gaining a police record was a deterrent (to unlicensed driving)</th>
<th>Agreement with attitude statements</th>
<th>Motoring offences committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Driving while disqualified</td>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>Before age of 10</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>‘I enjoy the sensation of accelerating rapidly’</td>
<td>Never speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Driving while disqualified</td>
<td>Between 6 and 12 months</td>
<td>Between 10 and 12 years</td>
<td>Strongly agree: 68%</td>
<td>Strongly disagree: 66%</td>
<td>Agree: 53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Social disapproval stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>Never drink and drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three times</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Taking a vehicle without the owner's consent (TWOC)</td>
<td>Between 12 and 24 months</td>
<td>Between 13 and 15 years</td>
<td>Strongly agree: 53%</td>
<td>‘The risk of being in an accident stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>Strongly agree: 53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The risk of being pulled over stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td>Never drive without tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than three times</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Taking a vehicle without the owner's consent (TWOC)</td>
<td>Between 2 and 5 years</td>
<td>Between 16 and 18 years</td>
<td>Strongly agree: 55%</td>
<td>‘The risk of causing injury to others stops me from driving unlicensed’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never drive without MOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Car theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I trust my own driving ability more than I trust that of other drivers’</td>
<td>Never drive without insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never drive without MOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three or more offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never drive without insurance</td>
<td>Never drive without insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never drive without insurance</td>
<td>Never drive without insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prisoners = 31
A few participants gave suggestions for penalties and schemes that they felt would prevent prisoners from re-offending. For example, one said:

- ‘Why keep banning people when you know they will do it again, why don’t they put them on a programme which will help them get a licence.’

6.5.4 Lack of resources/opportunities: The issues of finance and literacy were relevant in contributing to unlicensed driving; for example, not being able to afford lessons and tests or being unable to study the Highway Code. Almost all the prisoners reflected this opinion, which they felt was relevant either to themselves directly, or in general.

- ‘I can’t pass the driving theory test so I will have to continue driving.’
- ‘It’s too expensive to do the test again and again, the insurance is also expensive.’
- ‘I can’t read or write so it’s impossible.’
- ‘It’s a vicious cycle, if you get banned before you could get a licence.’
- ‘If there was something to do, like a driving course this wouldn’t happen.’

6.5.5 Exclusion: About a quarter of the prisoners were excluded from school by the age of 15; a lack of constructive activities and consequently boredom were considered relevant factors that led them to start driving early.

- ‘I wish I realised when I was younger what it would come to; I was never told either way that driving was right or wrong.’
- ‘The younger generation have nothing to do so they see the older ones and learn from them.’
- ‘Many people who get released commit crime straight away because they have no option and their parents don’t want to know anything.’
6.5.6 **Perceptions of risk:** The low-risk attitude was mentioned by practically all the prisoners; it was perceived to be easy to escape a police chase, to buy and sell cars discreetly and with great ease have possession of a vehicle. In addition, some felt that, unless they were well known by the authority, they could easily get away with driving without being stopped by the police.

・ ‘It’s easy not to get caught; if you can drive carefully and not draw attention to yourself, it’s okay; you can also give a false name and it never goes through the DVLA.’

・ ‘When you get caught, you are given a producer which means you should show your licence at a police station but you can ignore it or give a false name.’

・ ‘I thought (wrongly) that it was a road traffic offence not a criminal offence where you get a prison sentence for it.’

・ ‘Easy to get away with it, not enough restrictions, couple of penalty points, you go out and do it again.’

・ ‘Easy not to get caught; in another city, the cops wouldn’t know me and I can give a false name easily.’

6.5.7 **Reasons for unlicensed driving:** A small minority (a tenth) of prisoners were imprisoned for causing injury or harm to others in an accident and not for driving unlicensed *per se*. The rest of the prisoners, however, drove unlicensed either occasionally (3 per cent), often (7 per cent), or ‘all the time’ (87 per cent). The majority (81 per cent) had been driving regularly for over 2 years. For some of them, driving was very much a way of life. For others, it was the convenience of being able to get somewhere without relying on public transport that was the attraction. A number of the younger offenders considered driving to be a hobby and enjoyed the freedom and status it provided.

・ ‘Cars just picked up and then dumped, usually with friends, was just for the sake of it and trying to show off.’

・ ‘Many of my friends are in the same situation, most are now banned.’

・ ‘It’s a pain to get the bus, and the taxi is dear even to go up the road.’

・ ‘I started joy riding at an early age; get money by exchanging cars; it’s fun and something to do.’

6.5.8 **Association with other offences:** In only a small number of cases (22 per cent) did the prisoner commit only one imprisonable offence. Most of the participants were imprisoned as a consequence of a number of offences. The common ones were TWOC (Taking a vehicle without the owners consent), abandoning a vehicle, driving with excess alcohol, dangerous driving, driving while disqualified, assault, burglary and GBH (grievous bodily harm). Commercial and home burglary was sometimes
committed with a stolen car driven by an underage and unlicensed person. Money, alcohol and drugs were connected with unlicensed driving; some prisoners only drove when intoxicated with alcohol or drugs.

- ‘I only drive when I have had a few drinks, then I get the confidence.’
- ‘It’s mostly people who are unemployed or involved in drugs.’

6.5.9 **Attitude:** It was the attitude of some prisoners that the motivation and discipline to stop driving unlicensed had to come from within.

- ‘Nothing can make you stop unless you want to.’
- ‘When you are banned you know you are not supposed to drive but the temptation is there because there is no one physically stopping you.’
- ‘Access to a car plays a big role, the fact that one can get hold of a car.’
- ‘There is no real authority telling you to stop.’

One prisoner rationalised that by stealing he could make more money than by working.

- ‘What’s the point of getting a job for a hundred quid a week if you can ‘earn’ it in a few minutes.’

A few (10 per cent) prisoners who had families seemed very remorseful.

- ‘I have a 6 year ban and won’t drive unlicensed again, too much to lose, I have a young son.’

One prisoner referred to the danger of addiction to driving.

- ‘Even if rules were stricter people would do it; it’s a drug, driving is a challenge, the chances of getting caught are not high either.’

### 6.6 Focal Point Interviews

6.6.1 Face-to-face interviews were conducted with members of the general public at specific locations in the four chosen areas, Leicester, Essex, Tyne and Wear and Lincolnshire. The aim of this research strategy was to explore the incidence of unlicensed driving among varied groups, such as older drivers, ethnic minority groups, young car enthusiasts and shoppers to name a few.

6.6.2 Of 696 participants, 21 per cent had driven without a licence, 22 per cent had driven outside the regulations as a provisional licence holder, and 4 per cent had driven while disqualified. These three types of unlicensed driving are not mutually exclusive; participants may have committed more than one type of offence.
6.6.3 Only 27 per cent of the persons interviewed had a full licence at the time of interview, 15 per cent possessed a provisional licence, 27 per cent did not have any licence, and 2 per cent had duplicate licences. Of those who did not have any kind of licence, 24 per cent had driven in the past. Of the provisional licence holders, 28 per cent had driven at some point before acquiring their provisional licence, while 36 per cent had driven otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence. Among the group who held a full licence, 20 per cent had driven in the past without a licence and 22 per cent had driven unlicensed as a provisional licence holder. Significant differences between these three categories of ‘unlicensed drivers’ are analysed separately in Tables 6.10, 6.11 and 6.12.

6.6.4 The incidence of unlicensed driving varied between the different focal point groups as described in Table 6.13. Results show that the elderly driver group exhibited the lowest rates and the Southend motor convoy group showed the highest. Brief descriptions of age and sex distribution are given for each focal point in Table 6.14.

| Table 6.10: Summary of characteristics of unlicensed drivers (driven without a licence) compared with the rest of the participants |
|---|---|---|
| **Age** | Rest of participants N=353 | Driven without a licence N=88 |
| Under 18 | 14% | 20% |
| 18 – 29 | 36% | 56% |
| 30 – 64 | 37% | 20% |
| 65 and over | 13% | 4% |
| **Sex** | Female | 47% | 30% |
| Male | 53% | 70% |
| **Passed a practical driving test** | 56% | 48% |
| **Passed a theory driving test** | 29% | 28% |

6.6.5 According to the results, the majority (75 per cent) of those who had driven without a licence were under 29 years of age. Among those under 29 years of age, 60 per cent drove without a licence. Seventy per cent of the unlicensed drivers were male. Twenty seven per cent of all male participants admitted to unlicensed driving compared with 15 per cent of the females. The practical and theory pass rates were comparable between the two groups. Table 6.11 gives a summary of the characteristics of drivers who had driven otherwise than in accordance with a provisional licence.
Table 6.11: Summary of characteristics of unlicensed drivers (driven unlicensed as a provisional driver) compared with the rest of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rest of participants N=343</th>
<th>Driven unlicensed as a provisional driver N=97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 29</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 64</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed a practical driving test</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed a theory driving test</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.6 Table 6.11 shows that the majority (75 per cent) of those who had driven unlicensed were currently under 29 years of age. At the same time, 57 per cent of all participants below 29 years of age admitted to driving otherwise than in accordance with the regulations of the provisional licence. Three-quarters of the unlicensed drivers were male. Twice as many males admitted to driving unlicensed than females. Thirty per cent of all males admitted to this category of unlicensed driving compared with 14 per cent of females. Unlicensed drivers were as likely to pass the test as the licensed drivers. Table 6.12 summarises the characteristics of drivers who had driven while disqualified.

Table 6.12: Summary of characteristics of unlicensed drivers (driven while disqualified) compared with the rest of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rest of participants N=424</th>
<th>Driven while disqualified N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 29</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 64</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.7 Table 6.12 shows that, unlike the previous two groups, less than half of the drivers who had driven unlicensed were under 30 years of age. The results also found that 6 per cent of those under 29, and 9 per cent of those over 30 years of age admitted to driving while disqualified. The majority of the disqualified unlicensed drivers (80 per cent) were male. However, only 6 per cent of males admitted to driving while disqualified.
These combined results indicate the prevalence of male drivers in the population who are in their late teens and twenties driving without a licence, or with a provisional licence but illegally. What is interesting is that 30 per cent of the unlicensed drivers are female, which is more than the reported numbers of females among provisional and disqualified drivers interviewed over the phone using the DVLA records. This might indicate either the lack of openness of females in admitting to unlicensed driving over the phone, or a smaller likelihood of them being caught and hence being recorded with the DVLA. Driving while disqualified is less common. Male drivers who have been disqualified but continue to drive tend to be over 30 years old. Only half of the drivers who admitted to driving unlicensed at some point had actually passed their practical driving test. This could be interpreted as a result of past failure and unwillingness to take the test.

Table 6.13: Unlicensed driving incidence among the different focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Driven without a licence</th>
<th>Driven unlicensed with a provisional licence</th>
<th>Driven while disqualified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioners drop-in-centre</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu temple</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University cohort</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend motor convoy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester town centre</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside shopping areas</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth-form college</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham town centre, outside supermarkets</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caythorpe Agriculture College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford town centre outside shops and at the college</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle town centre on street and in pubs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shields Music Festival</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre/Working Men's Club</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6.9 Focal point interviews were also conducted with provisional licence holders (PLH) taking their theory test. They were interviewed after they completed their tests at the respective test centres. Of the 240 PLH interviewed, 14 per cent admitted to having driven without a licence in the past, 11 per cent admitted to driving beyond the regulations of a provisional licence (without L-plates, on their own or with someone not qualified to accompany them) and 1 per cent admitted to driving while disqualified. The last percentage figure is expected to be low due to their status of not having had their licence for long. Table 6.15 summarises the characteristics of the provisional licence holders interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point Locations</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leicester Pensioners drop-in-centre</td>
<td>93% over 30 years of age&lt;br&gt;Equal distribution of males and females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu temple</td>
<td>25% between 18 and 29 years&lt;br&gt;58% between 30 and 64 years of age&lt;br&gt;Majority male = 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University cohort</td>
<td>90% between 18 and 29 years of age&lt;br&gt;Majority female = 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Southend motor convoy</td>
<td>93% under 30 years of age&lt;br&gt;High majority male = 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester town centre outside shopping areas</td>
<td>43% between 18 and 29 years&lt;br&gt;48% over 30 years&lt;br&gt;Slightly more males = 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth-form college</td>
<td>59% under 18 years&lt;br&gt;41% between 18 and 29 years&lt;br&gt;Slightly more males = 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Grantham town centre, outside supermarkets</td>
<td>66% over 30 years of age&lt;br&gt;Slightly more females = 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caythorpe Agriculture College</td>
<td>66% under 23 years of age&lt;br&gt;Majority male = 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford town centre outside shops and at the college</td>
<td>75% over 30 years of age&lt;br&gt;Equal numbers of males and females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Newcastle town centre on street and in pubs</td>
<td>83% under 30 years of age&lt;br&gt;Majority male = 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shields Music Festival</td>
<td>50% under 30 years of age&lt;br&gt;Majority male = 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre/Working Men’s Club</td>
<td>60% under 30 years of age&lt;br&gt;Majority male = 63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6.10 Table 6.16 shows a breakdown of the characteristics of the unlicensed drivers who had driven without a licence compared with the rest of the PLH. It can be seen that 46 per cent of PLH who had driven without a licence were under 18, compared with only 27 per cent of the rest of the PLH. Within the individual age groups, it was found that 21 per cent of the provisional licence holders under 18 years had driven at some point without a licence, compared with 11 per cent of those between 18 and 29 years and 13 per cent of those over 29 years. More males than females admitted to driving before obtaining a provisional licence. Sixteen per cent of all the male provisional licence holders had driven without a licence in the past compared with 11 per cent of the females.

### Table 6.16: Summary of characteristics of PLH driven without a licence compared with the rest of the PLH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Rest of PLH N=207</th>
<th>Driven without a licence N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 29</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 64</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage passed the theory test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.17 shows the comparison between PLH who had driven beyond the regulations of the provisional licence and the rest of the PLH. It can be seen that the age distribution of PLH who had driven unlicensed is similar to the rest of the participants. No particular age group was more or less likely to commit the offence. This is confirmed by the finding that on average 12 per cent of participants in all three age groups had driven beyond the regulations of the provisional licence. Interestingly, more unlicensed drivers than legal drivers had passed their theory test (albeit only by a small percentage). In both tables 6.16 and 6.17, female unlicensed drivers represented between 33 and 37 per cent of the unlicensed drivers. The sex distribution was quite similar; 13 per cent of all male participants and 10 per cent of female participants had driven unlicensed in this way. Due to the relatively small percentage (1 per cent) of disqualified drivers having driven unlicensed, the breakdown of the result by age group and sex was not possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.17: Summary of characteristics of PLH driven outside the regulations of the PL compared with the rest of the PLH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage passed the theory test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.18 displays the type of unlicensed driving by area. Essex had the greatest percentage of drivers who had driven without a licence (28 per cent), Tyne and Wear and Lincoln had almost similar proportions (14-18 per cent). However, Leicester had the least proportion that had driven without a licence. Apart from Leicester, all the other areas had approximately the same proportions of drivers who had driven beyond the regulations of a provisional licence (average of 15 per cent). Three per cent of drivers had driven while disqualified in Essex, compared with 0-1 per cent in the other areas.
6.7 Summary

6.7.1 Unlicensed driving rates varied between the different locations and survey methods. A comparison of incidence rates is given in Table 6.19. Among provisional licence holders, a greater incidence rate was recorded via the telephone interviews than through the postal survey (see Section 4). Among the disqualified drivers in the postal survey, those who had totted up sufficient points displayed the highest incidence rates (39 per cent). A comparison of all groups reveals that disqualified drivers interviewed over the telephone or in person were most likely to drive unlicensed (42 per cent). This group consisted of young offenders (a fifth) who were sentenced in court for committing motor-related offences and tended to be repeat offenders.

6.7.2 The focal point interviews are indicative of the types of people who are most likely to drive unlicensed and at which point in their lives. Driving without a licence (underage driving) was most common in Newcastle. Driving without a licence was also common among young people under 25 and with car enthusiasts. It was least common among the pensioners and in towns in Lincolnshire. Driving unlicensed with a provisional licence was most common among the same groups as above. The pensioners and temple group were more likely to drive unlicensed on a provisional licence than without a licence. The car enthusiasts were almost twice as likely to drive unlicensed with a provisional licence than without a licence. Participants in the historic market town in Essex were more likely to drive without a licence than unlicensed with a provisional licence, an unusual finding not in accordance with the other results. It appears that driving not in accordance with the provisional licence is more common than driving without a licence in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVLA Centres</th>
<th>Driven without a licence</th>
<th>Driven beyond the regulations of a provisional licence</th>
<th>Driven while disqualified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.19: A comparison of unlicensed driving incidence rates, between the Postal Survey, DVLA telephone interviews, Focal point survey and DSA Theory test centre survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of survey</th>
<th>Type of driver</th>
<th>Percentage admitting to unlicensed driving</th>
<th>Notes and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSTAL</td>
<td>Provisional licence holders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disqualified drink-drivers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disqualified totters</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Among the disqualified drivers; totters (those totting up points) were most likely to drive unlicensed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disqualified single offenders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVLA</td>
<td>Provisional licence holders</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Greater percentage of unlicensed driving rates than in the postal survey. Could be that a personal phone conversation or face-to-face interview elicits more honest opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone interviews and face to face</td>
<td>Disqualified drivers not imprisoned</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Largest percentage group admitting to unlicensed driving – a third consist of young offenders who are serving a driving ban and court order, most likely to continue unlicensed driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA Theory Test Centre</td>
<td>Provisional licence holders</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>See last row for a breakdown of types of unlicensed driving committed by this group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal points</td>
<td>Provisional licence holders</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15 per cent of participants in the focal point interviews had a provisional licence. Out of this group, 36 per cent had driven otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence. See below for a summary of the incidence of unlicensed driving by group and type of unlicensed driving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of unlicensed driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of group</th>
<th>Percentage driven without a licence</th>
<th>Percentage driven unlicensed on a provisional licence</th>
<th>Percentage driven while disqualified</th>
<th>Notes and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCAL POINT INTERVIEWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pensioners least likely to have driven without a licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A quarter young, half between 30 and 64 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor convoy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Highest rate of unlicensed driving with provisional licence. Group consist of 20-30 year olds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Young people, with high rates of unlicensed driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic market town in Essex</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Equal numbers over and under 30 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth-form college</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Young people (under 29 years). High overall incidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns in Lincolnshire (average per cent)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lowest overall rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre Newcastle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mixed group of participants – driving unlicensed with provisional licence common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music festival</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Highest rate of driving without a licence – mixed group from a specific low social economic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA Theory Test Centres</td>
<td>All provisional licence holders</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C: COUNTERMEASURES

7 DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTERMEASURES TO UNLICENSED DRIVING

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 The final objective of the research specification was to ‘make recommendations for countermeasures’. Two related components of work have been completed to address this requirement:

1) A Delphi questionnaire survey of ‘experts’.

2) Discussion group surveys of ‘perpetrators’ (or potential ‘perpetrators’) of unlicensed driving.

7.1.2 It was intended that the Delphi survey would provide an ‘expert view’ of potential countermeasures. In addition, discussion groups of potential ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving have been completed to investigate the potential of various countermeasures in the view of those who may do it, or have done it. The Delphi process culminated in a workshop of selected participants during which the main issues were discussed. Results of the Delphi questionnaire survey were combined with results of the ‘perpetrator’ discussion groups and were presented at the workshop to facilitate discussion. The following sections describe the methodology adopted to complete the Delphi survey, discussion groups and subsequent workshop, followed by a description of the overall results of the process.

7.2 The Delphi Method

7.2.1 The Delphi methodology involves the questioning of a group of panellists to pool their judgements in order to determine a satisfactory course of action. This is achieved by a series of questionnaires, interspersed with controlled feedback. Adler and Ziglio (1996)⁴ give three considerations that are important for Delphi applications (‘to issues related to social policy and public health’):

- The problem does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques but can benefit from subjective judgements on a collective basis;
- The problem at hand has no monitored history nor adequate information on its present and future development; or
- Addressing the problem requires the exploration and assessment of numerous issues connected with various policy options.

7.2.2 Although the other strands of research have provided a broad estimate of the present extent of unlicensed driving, there has not been any previous systematic monitoring of the extent of unlicensed driving. Any future continuous monitoring would also be difficult. The potential countermeasures to unlicensed driving are diverse, and implementation would require the involvement of a number of governmental departments and administrators. Therefore, based on the above criteria, the Delphi questionnaire process, culminating in a workshop, was considered particularly suitable for the consideration of countermeasures to unlicensed driving. A further main advantage of the Delphi method is that it allows a group of geographically dispersed specialists to communicate via the feedback from the questionnaires used in the process.

7.2.3 Other features of the Delphi method are that it:
- Focuses attention on the issue being investigated;
- Provides a framework so that individuals from different backgrounds can work together;
- Minimises the tendency to follow the leader;
- Allows participants to refine their views in the light of group feedback;
- Provides an equal opportunity for everyone involved to participate; and
- Produces documented records.

7.3 Stages

7.3.1 In theory the Delphi method could involve several rounds of questionnaires. However, previous experience has shown that two rounds of questionnaires are effective in allowing an exchange of comments and reaching a broad consensus of opinion. The panellists may suffer fatigue from having to complete more rounds of postal questionnaire, leading to low response rates. In addition to two rounds of postal questionnaire, it was decided to hold a workshop session to which selected panellists were invited to attend. This was undertaken in order to discuss the main issues arising from the questionnaire process. This also provided an opportunity to provide panellists with results from discussion groups of potential ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving that were being undertaken in parallel with the Delphi process, investigating some of the same issues and measures as those covered in the questionnaire. The Figure 7.1 below illustrates the stages of the Delphi process that have been used for this study.
7.4 Selection of Delphi Panellists

7.4.1 A list of panellists was compiled by the research team and was designed to include individuals from various government departments, administrative agencies, academic researchers and other stakeholders with an interest in reducing, or who are responsible for enforcing measures to reduce unlicensed driving. This included all the individuals who were members of the cross-departmental Unlicensed Driving Advisory Group which had been set up to provide advice during the life of the project. Individuals from the following categories of organisations were invited, and took part in the process:

- Road Safety Division of the Department for Transport Local Government and the Regions (the client)
- Association of Chief Police Officers
- Police Officers
- Driver, Vehicle Licensing Agency
- Driving Standards Agency
- Driving Schools and Driving Instructors Associations
- Home Office
- Justice Clerk’s Society
- Crown Prosecution Service
- Magistrates
• Motor Insurer’s Bureau
• Motor Industry Groups
• Special Interest Groups
• Road Safety Researchers
• Local Authority Road Safety Staff
• Probation Service
• Young Offenders Institutions
• Community Motor Projects

7.4.2 Although the panel was chosen to include the knowledge and expertise from a range of organisations, it was emphasised to the panellists throughout the process that it was their individual views that we sought, not those of the organisation that they represented or employed them. It was also stated that the process was not a formal consultation exercise and responses would be treated confidentially.

7.5 Questionnaire Design

7.5.1 The first postal questionnaire was designed using a proven format adopted in previous research completed by the project team. A total of 37 possible measures to reduce unlicensed driving were generated by the project team from discussions and suggestions encountered during the course of the project, and from examples used in other countries described within the project literature review. The measures were presented within the questionnaire under the following headings:

• Education and Publicity
• The Driving Test
• Driver Licensing
• Law Enforcement
• Judicial Penalties
• Other Measures
• Measures not Considered Above (under this heading panellists were invited to add their own ideas if they wished).

7.5.2 Some measures, it could be argued, could be placed under more than one of the headings, but the division of the questionnaire into these sections was considered useful in order to assist the panellists in their deliberations. The panellists were also issued with a background paper to describe the purpose of the project and an indication of the findings from the other strands of the research so far.
7.5.3 The questionnaire was divided into two main sections. Within Part One of the questionnaire the panellists were asked to do three things thus:

1 **REVIEW** all the measures on the questionnaire.

2 **MAKE COMMENTS** on any measure you want to. Feel free to suggest clarifications, argue in favour of or against measures, ask questions, include amendments to the measures, or make suggestions for other policies or interventions not included.

3 **RATE** the level of effectiveness and acceptability of each measure by circling 1 to 5 against each measure according to the following scale. By effectiveness we mean will it work: by acceptability we mean would the general public accept it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may or may not be effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely ineffective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.4 Within Part Two of the questionnaire the panellists are asked to undertake one further task and to then return the questionnaire by post thus:

‘The page overleaf contains a list of all the measures identified in Part I. Please **SELECT** the combination of seven measures you consider would make the most impact to reduce unlicensed driving. Place the measure numbers in the boxes at the foot of the page so as to assign a value of “1” to the most important, “2” to the next most important and so on, until the seventh measure (the least important of the seven) is assigned a value of “7”.’

7.5.5 The results and comments received as part of Questionnaire 1 were then compiled and presented within Questionnaire 2, alongside the listed measures. An additional ten measures were added to Questionnaire 2 in response to comments and suggestions received in Questionnaire 1. The panellists were then asked to complete the same tasks in Questionnaire 2, in light of the responses to the first questionnaire. A copy of Questionnaire 2 is included in Appendix D.
7.6 Response Rates

7.6.1 Initially 97 individuals were contacted to see if they would like to take part in the study. Questionnaire 1 was then issued to 77 individuals who had agreed to take part. If necessary the participants were contacted by telephone to remind them to return their questionnaire as the deadline approached. Consequently 51 questionnaires from the first round were returned before the deadline (a response rate of 66 per cent).

7.6.2 The second round questionnaire was issued to 78 individuals (including an additional person whom it had not been possible to contact previously) and a total of 50 were returned before the deadline (a response rate of 64 per cent).

7.6.3 Following the second round questionnaire a selected number of 30 panellists were invited to take part in the workshop. The panellists were chosen so as to include individuals from a range of backgrounds, and who had indicated that they would be willing to attend. A total of 20 panellists were eventually able to attend the workshop, with six members of the project team and four staff from the client organisation, also present.

7.7 Analysis of Delphi Questionnaire Survey

Effectiveness and Acceptability

7.7.1 It was important to identify those measures considered the most suitable (‘effective’ and ‘acceptable’) from the questionnaire process, so that they could be discussed during the workshop session. Responding to Questionnaire 1, each respondent gave a rating for the effectiveness and acceptability of each potential countermeasure on a 1 to 5 scale. The overall mean ratings for effectiveness and acceptability for each of the measures listed in Questionnaire 1 were then calculated and presented within Questionnaire 2. The results of the first round questionnaire can therefore be seen within the copy of Questionnaire 2 included in Appendix D.

7.7.2 The results of the second round questionnaire were then calculated and the mean ratings for effectiveness and acceptability for each measure were plotted against each other as shown in Figure 7.2 overleaf. (The numbers in the plot correspond to the numbering of the measures within the Delphi questionnaires, and in the list below the Figure.)

7.7.3 In Figure 7.2 it can be seen that the further toward the top right a measure is plotted, the more effective and acceptable it was considered to be by the Delphi panel. It was thought that it would be possible to discuss around 16 measures during the time available for the workshop. Therefore a diagonal line was added to the plot to divide the 16 measures that could be considered both effective and acceptable (denoted by a solid circle) from those considered less so (denoted by a transparent circle).
7.7.4 A simple ranking of the measures that are considered both effective and acceptable can be obtained by simply adding the mean effectiveness and acceptability ratings (E+A). Accordingly the measures are listed in rank order in Table 7.1 and 7.2 beneath Figure 7.2.

Figure 7.2: Mean Effectiveness vs. Mean Acceptability For Each Countermeasure

Table 7.1: Measures considered both Effective and Acceptable (Shown by a solid circle in Figure 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>E+A</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tighten administrative loopholes</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Online checking of licence details in police vehicles</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Online checking of licence details in police stations</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Employers to check driving licences if driving is a job requirement</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Explain to provisional licence holders the penalties for unlicensed driving</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Convert all licences to photocard licences as soon as possible</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28A</td>
<td>Introduce harsher penalties for repeat offenders</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Explain to drivers at their disqualification the penalties for breaking their ban</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Introduce a wider range of penalties for various types of unlicensed driving</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Police (or Probation Service where appropriate) follow up/monitoring</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Increase the use of non-disqualification penalties for motoring offences</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Increase police resources for detection</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Harsher penalties for unlicensed driving</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase teaching of safe driving in schools, highlighting unlicensed driving</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Educate young motoring offenders in the long-term effects of committing crime</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Explain to drivers at disqualification the start and finish dates of their ban</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>E+A</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reduce the expected waiting time between applying and taking driving tests</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Enhance public knowledge of the restrictions of the provisional licence</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Introduce the mandatory carrying of driving licences</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24A</td>
<td>Add traffic policing to the core functions of the police</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Introduce mandatory smart card driving licences</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28B</td>
<td>Use existing penalties better or reduce the discretion of magistrates</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increase local and national publicity on the penalties for unlicensed driving</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Encourage the public to report suspects to a telephone hotline</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A</td>
<td>Develop smart ignition systems to ban unauthorised drivers</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highlight the insurance cost implications of unlicensed driving to the public</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase publicity on the road safety problem of unlicensed driving</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encourage community schemes/motor projects for the young</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17A</td>
<td>Allow increased roadside checking of driving documents</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Compulsory display of insurance/MOT documents in the vehicle</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for projects for young motoring offenders</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Draw the attention to the link between unlicensed driving with other crime</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Alternatives to car to increase mobility of those without driving licence</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A</td>
<td>Make it a keepers offence ‘not to allow an unlicensed driver to use a car’</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Develop code of practice for instructors to warn pupils of unlicensed driving</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>More accessible theory test for those with low levels of literacy</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Insurers to obtain copies of drivers’ licences</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Publicise link between unlicensed driving and criminal activity</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31A</td>
<td>Electronically tag the cars of unlicensed drivers to allow tracking</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Impound the vehicles of disqualified drivers during their ban</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Publish ‘shame lists’ of disqualified drivers in local press</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Improve perceived fairness of practical driving exams</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Immobilise the vehicles of disqualified drivers during their ban</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>Move from theoretical to simulated driving tests</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Confiscate the cars of unlicensed drivers</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Increase the frequency with which licences have to be renewed</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Means tested fee reduction for driving tests and subsidies for driving lessons</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Importance and Effectiveness and Acceptability**

7.7.5 The Delphi questionnaire respondents were also asked to select, in order, the seven most important measures. An importance score could then be calculated for each measure using the method of attributing seven points to the measure selected as most important down to one point for the measure selected as least important. The importance score for each measure was then plotted against the combined mean effectiveness and acceptability rating (E+A) for each measure, and this is shown within Figure 7.3. Solid circles have again been used to denote the measures considered both effective and acceptable, identified previously.

7.7.6 It can be seen from Figure 7.3 that nearly all the measures identified as being both effective and acceptable also obtained an above average ‘Importance’ score, apart from measure 13: *Explain to drivers at disqualification the start and finish dates of their ban.*

7.7.7 It can also be seen from Figure 7.3 that a small number of further measures may also be worthy of further discussion if their importance score is taken into account, namely the measures:

- 17: Introduce the mandatory carrying of driving licences
- 24A: Add traffic policing to the core functions of the police
- 19A: Develop smart ignition systems to ban unauthorised drivers
- 5: Encourage community schemes/motor projects for the young
- 20: Compulsory display of insurance/MOT documents in the vehicle
7.8 Focus Group Discussions

7.8.1 Focus group discussions were conducted mainly with ‘perpetrators’ (and potential ‘perpetrators’) of unlicensed driving. The main aim of these discussions was to investigate the potential of various countermeasures to prevent unlicensed driving from the viewpoint of those who may be likely to drive unlicensed.

7.8.2 The group discussions were intended to identify participants’ own views as to what countermeasures would be effective, but as a starting point a semi-structured discussion schedule was developed, incorporating similar questions as those used for the Delphi questionnaires.

7.8.3 An area of particular interest identified by previous research with unlicensed drivers is the current administrative and enforcement procedure. Many claims were made by those interviewed previously about the ease with which they could avoid detection, or get round the processes used to implement sanctions. These cover procedures used by the police, the courts and DVLA. It may be that some of these claims are simply expressions of bravado, but the group discussions were held in order to obtain further information about the size of the loopholes in the current system and the effectiveness of enforcement and prevention procedures.

7.8.4 To this end, discussions were held with the groups listed in Table 7.3. They are select groups and hence caution should be exercised in generalising the results to all populations. In addition, a discussion was held with senior police with experience of traffic enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prisoners at a Young Offenders Institution</td>
<td>Sentenced for motor-related crimes All male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Older Persons</td>
<td>Retired Rural residents Mixed Gender</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Theory/Practical Test Failures</td>
<td>Mixed group of learner drivers including ethnic minorities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Young Offenders at a Motor Project</td>
<td>Under-aged drivers All Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Young People at Community Centre in a deprived area</td>
<td>Mixed gender group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tyne &amp; Wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Learner drivers</td>
<td>Mixed gender and age</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>Essex/ Nottingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.9 Delphi Workshop Design

7.9.1 The main aim of the Delphi workshop was to develop further some of the issues highlighted through the Delphi questionnaire process and focus groups discussions. The analysis described within Section 7.7 identified the measures that were considered the most effective, acceptable and important by the Delphi panellists and which therefore warranted further discussion at the Delphi workshop. The focus groups also highlighted additional issues that were considered important by the ‘perpetrators’. It was decided to combine measures dealing with similar themes into a single ‘issue area for discussion’ at the workshop.

7.9.2 At the workshop a short presentation was given at the beginning of each ‘issue area for discussion’ where the results from the questionnaire survey for each of the related countermeasures was described. The presentation then proceeded with a description of the views given by the ‘perpetrators’ during the focus groups on the same countermeasures.

7.9.3 An attempt was made at the workshop to direct discussions to address the following questions. However, in order to maintain the debate with minimal interruption, this was not always achieved in practice.

- Should we implement this measure?
- How should it be implemented?
- What are the main barriers to implementation?
- Who should be responsible for implementing the measure?

7.10 Results

7.10.1 A full description of the outcome of the ‘perpetrator’ discussion focus groups and Delphi questionnaire and workshop are reported within Appendix E. Within Appendix E each main ‘issue area for discussion’ is dealt with in turn, starting with a description of the ‘perpetrator’ discussion groups. A description of the discussions during the Delphi workshops is then provided. The description indicates which measures were considered effective in terms of both enforcement and/or prevention. The researchers were also interested to understand why some measures were not considered effective. Quotes (indicated by the italicised sentences) from the participants have also been included to elaborate on the findings.

7.10.2 For a concise presentation of results a summary of the main findings are presented under the ‘issue area for discussion’ headings in the following sections 7.11 to 7.26. The reader should refer to Appendix E for a more detailed account of the discussions.
7.11 ISSUE (A): USE OF JUDICIAL PENALTIES FOR UNLICENSED DRIVING

7.11.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary
- Prison and/or fines are considered ineffective penalties.
- Punishing the lender of a car, or preventing the use of one’s car would only lead to unlicensed drivers stealing vehicles.
- When issuing penalties, it is helpful to ensure that they are consistent and predictable.
- For first-time offenders, the penalty of community service together with the firm and clear message of what the next penalty would be was considered effective.
- Guidance for offenders in the form of personal counselling was suggested.
- It was thought that financial help for those who are serious about wanting to become legal drivers was needed.
- Strict, physical punishment in the style of Boot Camps was seen as an effective punishment.
- More policing and detection was thought to increase the likelihood of getting caught, and hence considered an effective deterrent to unlicensed driving.

7.11.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary
- Some thought that better detection of unlicensed driving was more important than penalties.
- It was felt that unlicensed driving was perhaps not being seen as a serious offence and that this could be changed by using existing penalties more effectively, rather than through harsher penalties.
- Several people advocated harsher penalties for repeat offenders, though it was also questioned whether there was any evidence that this worked.
- The concept of ‘smarter penalties’ tailored to the type of offender, not harsher penalties, was advocated.
- Unlicensed driving should be recognised as part of the wider socio-economic problem of crime and disorder that concern many communities.

7.12 ISSUE (B): USE OF JUDICIAL PENALTIES FOR MOTORING OFFENDERS GENERALLY

7.12.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary
- The New Drivers Act was seen as a measure that would increase, rather than decrease, the likelihood of unlicensed driving.
- Support for the use of non-revocation penalties was received.
7.12.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary

- Again the concept of ‘smarter penalties’ was advocated, a possibility being driver improvement schemes, and greater use of compulsory retesting.
- A hierarchy of penalties was suggested, with strong warnings for first offences, and then increased penalties for subsequent offences.
- A complaint was made that magistrates do not always use available punishments to the full, and that there was inconsistency because magistrates were not bound to sentencing guidelines.
- Concern was raised over the effectiveness of the New Drivers Act due to low rates of revoked drivers re-entering the system, and the increase of licence endorsements generally.
- It was suggested that a more important form of deterrence was increased detection, and that new technology would improve this over time.

7.13 ISSUE (C): INCREASE POLICE RESOURCES

7.13.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- Follow up of released prisoners was recommended.
- Participants felt that it was important to increase the perception of unlicensed driving as a serious offence.
- The delay in the prosecution procedure was considered to be a contributory factor.

7.13.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary

- The importance of ‘detection’ was highlighted. It was suggested that this could be achieved in ways that would not necessarily require increased resources, but through better means of driver identification and automatic number plate recognition for example.
- The link between traffic offences and general crime should be highlighted in order to gain support from the public and ministers for increasing police resources to combat unlicensed driving.

7.14 ISSUE (D): ONLINE CHECKING OF DRIVING LICENCES, FORMAT AND CARRYING OF DRIVING LICENCES

7.14.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- The majority of participants were in support for online checking of driving licences.
- Strongest support was received for the suggestion of combining various documents on to a secure card or document.
• The older participants felt that it should be mandatory for dangerous drivers to undergo a driver-retraining course.
• Some groups agreed that the regular renewal of licences might be a good idea provided it was available free of charge.

7.14.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary
• The online checking of driving licence details either in police stations or patrol vehicles was considered a good idea, subject to the costs involved.
• Several options (or combinations thereof) were considered to offer possible solutions:
  – Introduce mandatory carriage of driving licences.
  – Introduce photocard driving licences.
  – Making the photograph of the driver available on the online police system.
• It was thought that there was growing public support for the use of identity cards since the World Trade Center terrorist attack, and the greater use of the driving licence for identification purposes could test this notion.
• It was accepted that mandatory carriage of the driving licence would not be popular with much of the general public. Clear guidelines would be required for how police powers could be used for inspection of such identity documents.
• Some practical problems with the checking of driving licences were perceived to be:
  – Inaccurate information on DVLA database (due to the public not informing of changes)
  – There would always be a way of obtaining forgeries
  – The quality and size of the photograph on photocard licences

7.15 ISSUE (E): OBTAINING DRIVING LICENCES
7.15.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary
• Participants agreed that if it were more difficult to duplicate licences and other documents, this would most likely reduce unlicensed driving.

7.15.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary
• Many thought that the tightening of loopholes should be completed anyway. It was added that it should be only one of a number of interventions.
• Some existing problems were thought to be:
  – False addresses on licences, and informing DVLA of the change of address
  – The use of duplicate licences
  – Checks on licence applications are too lax
• When improved databases are available to the police, it was recommended that officers should remember to use them to check driver’s details.
• The passport office was cited as an example of a similar agency whose processes may be applicable to DVLA.
• An option could be to provide approved centres where photographs could be taken for the obtaining of driving licences.

7.16 ISSUE (F): EMPLOYERS TO CHECK EMPLOYEE’S DRIVING LICENCES

7.16.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary
• Participants agreed that employers have a responsibility to ensure that employees are driving legally.

7.16.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary
• It was considered that under Health and Safety Law the employer has a responsibility to make sure that their employees are properly licensed.
• This requirement, if effectively enforced, was considered to provide a way to prevent unlicensed driving in the following situations:
  – Employers allowing staff to do it on purpose
  – Employees doing it without the knowledge of their employer
  – Those for whom driving is their primary work task
  – Those for whom driving is only a part of their job
• The Health and Safety Executive was thought to be the authority that would enforce any such regulations.

7.17 ISSUE (G): PROVIDE INFORMATION TO DRIVERS AT DISQUALIFICATION

7.17.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary
• The penalties for driving while disqualified should be clarified to discourage unlicensed driving.
• More needs to be done to remind disqualified drivers of their ban status and in particular the completion date.

7.17.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary
• Due to possible problems with offenders not knowing (or claiming not to know) the finish date of their ban and the penalties for breaking their ban some thought that a letter sent to offenders after disqualification would be helpful.
• Others thought that such information was already provided effectively, and that such a measure would only be effective for a limited group of less serious offenders.
• The provision of a letter would have resource implications, and it was not known as to who should be responsible, the courts or DVLA.

7.18 ISSUE (H): EDUCATION – TEACHING DRIVING IN SCHOOLS

7.18.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary
• No consensus was reached on the issue of school intervention.
• The offenders were in agreement with driver training being provided in school.
• However, the older persons felt that the responsibility should rest on either the family or community to teach young people to drive.
• It was agreed by most groups that driving schools should play a bigger role in providing teaching on safer driving behaviour.

7.18.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary
• There was disagreement as to whether the teaching of safe driving in schools was a good idea.
• There was more support for teaching safe driving through community safety partnerships rather than only through schools, but schools could be involved along with others such as driving instructors and police for example.

7.19 ISSUE (I): EDUCATION – YOUNG MOTORING OFFENDERS

7.19.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary
• Education in the form of guidance and friendship from a reformed offender was considered an effective way to encourage young offenders to think about their actions.

7.19.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary
• Community based motor projects were thought by many to offer the potential to divert young people from offending, though others were sceptical.
• The selection of the ‘teacher’ for such projects was considered important. The use of motor mechanics, for example, was preferred over ex-offenders and schoolteachers.
7.20 ISSUE (J): EDUCATION – RESTRICTIONS OF THE PROVISIONAL LICENCE

7.20.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- More attention needs to be drawn to the restrictions on the provisional licence.
- Driving otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence did not seem to be considered a very serious offence, possibly because of the lack of awareness of the penalties.

7.20.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary

- There was considered to be a general lack of awareness of the restrictions of the provisional licence.
- It was suggested that information could be presented in a clearer manner and that the restrictions of the provisional licence could be provided on the back of the driving licence, for example, in simple bullet point form.

7.21 ISSUE (K): PUBLICITY TO HIGHLIGHT UNLICENSED DRIVING AS AN ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

7.21.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- It was felt that most provisional licence holders are not aware of what could happen if they were to break the law.
- Publicity on the penalties for unlicensed driving was considered an effective deterrent.
- It was considered a useful measure for members of the public to report unlicensed drivers so long as they could remain anonymous.

7.21.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary

- It was thought by some that general publicity highlighting the possible penalties for unlicensed driving would deter only the less serious offenders.
- The probability of being caught was thought by many to be a more important issue than publicity on possible penalties, which would not have much effect if people did not think that they would be caught.
- Despite problems of possible miss-reporting it was thought that encouraging members of the public to report unlicensed drivers anonymously through a ‘Crimestoppers’ type telephone hotline might act as a deterrent.
7.22 ISSUE (L): ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE DRIVING TESTS

7.22.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- The cost of learning to drive and taking tests was considered an issue that needs attention.
- The perceived time delay before a test date could encourage those who consider themselves competent drivers to risk driving unlicensed.
- The need to attend to learner drivers with low levels of literacy was mentioned.
- It was felt that more support for young offenders in prisons was needed especially given their confidence in their driving ability and propensity to drive upon release from prison.

7.22.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop

- Although many thought that reducing the time between applying and taking the test would reduce the amount of unlicensed driving, it was also argued that the current period of about six weeks was about right to ensure that people do not take the test before they are ready.
- It was thought beneficial to introduce some form of financial assistance to those learning to drive as part of job seeking, possibly through loans or through the Benefit Agency.
- With regard to private motoring it was considered that the cost of the driving tests were small in comparison with car running costs and insurance. Also those who cannot afford professional driving lessons simply attempt to learn through private practice.

7.23 ISSUE (M): COMMUNITY SCHEMES

7.23.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- Community schemes were given a lot of support by all groups.
- The inclusiveness of the schemes was deemed to be helpful in changing the behaviour of offenders.
- It was mentioned that for some offenders, a motoring course might be counterproductive.

7.23.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Summary

- Community schemes and motor projects were thought to be a useful way of gaining skills which would increase employment prospects and could help to address social exclusion problems, as well as encouraging good attitudes to driving.
- A number asked for evidence that such schemes worked, and suggested that research be undertaken on their effectiveness.
7.24 ISSUE (N): PROVIDE LEGAL OPPORTUNITIES TO DRIVE OFF-ROAD OR ON PRIVATE LAND

7.24.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- It was highlighted that driving unlicensed is one way for an adolescent to display his/her rebellion.
- Some participants said that being given the opportunity to drive on private land would be sufficient to satisfy their desire to drive though it cannot be speculated whether this would apply to all unlicensed drivers.

7.24.2 Delphi Workshop Summary

- It was thought that the provision of off-road driving opportunities should only take place as part of a wider community motor project, and should not be the focus of any such project.

7.25 ISSUE (O): EASY CAR PURCHASE

7.25.1 ‘Perpetrator’ Focus Group Discussions Summary

- The relative ease with which under-aged drivers can buy cars was considered a serious issue.

7.25.2 Delphi Workshop Summary

- It was thought that any measure to try to prevent non-licence holders purchasing cars was unlikely to be enforceable, and in any case some people may wish to own cars, but not drive them.

7.26 Concluding Remarks

7.26.1 In interpreting the ‘perpetrator’ focus group discussion conclusions, it is worth bearing in mind that the public often have unrealistic views about enforcement. They do not necessarily understand the complexities and costs of administration, which would render some solutions impractical. There are also considerations such as the degree of intrusion which different groups would find acceptable. Not all participants judged these issues on the same scale.

7.26.2 It can be seen that for many issues little consensus was reached within the groups of ‘experts’ or between the ‘experts’ and the ‘perpetrators’. However, the workshop was useful to highlight many of the issues for and against each potential countermeasure. The following chapter provides a number of potential countermeasures that have been developed in light of the views provided by the ‘perpetrators’ and ‘experts’ reported here.
8 POTENTIAL COUNTERMEASURES

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 A Delphi survey and workshop was undertaken to assess the possible effectiveness and acceptability of a number of potential countermeasures to unlicensed driving in the views of administrators and ‘experts’ as well as potential ‘perpetrators’. Our following recommendations on potential countermeasures are our views on what could be done to reduce unlicensed driving. These are based on the findings from the Delphi process along with the other findings from the research.

*Increase police resources for the enforcement of unlicensed driving*

8.1.2 It has been found that an increase in the likelihood or perception of likelihood of being caught for driving while unlicensed was considered an effective deterrent by many of those who commit some form of unlicensed driving. For many, the current likelihood of being caught was thought to be very low. An increase in police activity to enforce against unlicensed drivers was therefore considered an important issue. There was a concern expressed during the Delphi workshop that there was often pressure to use police resources elsewhere to concentrate on ‘more serious’ crimes and that road traffic policing was losing out as a result. There was a call for traffic policing to be made a higher priority.

8.1.3 As well as this, a number of our other recommendations below may require additional funds or resources to be implemented. However, it is acknowledged that to use resources in this way would require the support of the public and the backing of Ministers. It has been suggested that to convince decision makers that the use of increased resources to combat unlicensed driving (and other motoring offences) is worthwhile, a number of points could be highlighted thus: Unlicensed driving is associated with a much greater crash risk and has been shown to be a road safety problem. It is thought that many motoring ‘document offences’ go hand in hand with other offences. Many of those who drive unlicensed are often uninsured and their vehicle untaxed too. Where uninsured drivers are involved in crashes it is the general motoring public who foot the bill through their insurance company’s contributions to the Motor Insurance Bureau who provide compensation in such cases. Also, those who commit traffic offences are more likely to be involved in other criminal activities. Increased traffic enforcement is one way to disrupt or restrict a criminal’s activities.

**Countermeasure 1:** The police should ensure that resources for policing are increased and sustained at a high level to ensure effective enforcement against unlicensed driving and other traffic offences.
Mandatory carriage of the driving licence

8.1.4 In a number of other countries it is compulsory to carry the driving licence. This requirement would make it easier for the police to enforce unlicensed driving efficiently. However, the issue of imposing a mandatory carriage requirement, and the use of compulsory identity cards generally has wider implications for law enforcement and society than just reducing unlicensed driving. It is acknowledged that the introduction of a mandatory carriage requirement cannot be made without consideration of these wider implications.

8.1.5 It is likely that there would be some public opposition to the introduction to mandatory carriage of the driving licence. However, it has also been suggested that there may be growing public support for the use of identity cards. With the introduction of the credit card sized photocard driving licences, many people already carry the photocard portion of the driving licence. In Countermeasure 3 we recommend that people be encouraged to convert to driving licence photocards, and it is considered that this would assist in introducing a mandatory carriage requirement if only the photocard portion of the driving licence had to be carried.

8.1.6 We are aware that some research has already been completed to assess the number of people who currently already carry their licence. We recommend that this research should be reviewed and if necessary expanded upon. The aim would be to assess the number of drivers who currently already carry their driving licence or driving licence photocard, and to assess the acceptability of imposing a mandatory carriage requirement, and to monitor this over time. The longer-term goal would be to introduce mandatory carriage of the driving licence or driving licence photocard when enough people already carry them anyway, and when a mandatory carriage requirement would be more easily accepted.

Countermeasure 2: A mandatory requirement to carry the driving licence (or driving licence photocard where people have one), when driving should be introduced. To assist in this, research should be undertaken to assess the number of people who already carry their licence (or driving licence photocard), and public support for the mandatory carriage of the driving licence (or driving licence photocard), should be measured and monitored over time.

Photocard driving licences

8.1.7 Since March 2000 the DVLA stopped issuing paper licences and now only issues photocard licences, along with a paper counterpart. The photocard and the paper counterpart together make up the complete driving licence, and currently both must be produced when required. The photocards are credit card sized and contain the licence holder’s signature and image and were introduced as a result of an EU directive. The DVLA state on their website that among other advantages, the
photocard licences offer a more secure format which reduces the opportunity for misrepresentation, would minimise the chances of a person holding more than one licence, (either by accident or by design), and would increase the accuracy of the DVLA database, which will in turn provide better information to the police and the courts. (It is thought that many licence records on the DVLA database may be incorrect due to the fact that DVLA rely on the public to inform them of changes in address or name, whereas the photocard licence has to be up-dated every 10 years, and DVLA issue reminders to holders.) However, there are no plans to recall existing paper licences and these can be used until they expire.

8.1.8 The most obvious advantage of the photocard is its use for verifying the identity of a driver, which would assist in the enforcement of unlicensed driving (and other motoring offences, as well as other crime). Another advantage of the photocard is that because of its portable credit card size, people will be more likely to carry their photocard with them. The more people who carry their photocard with them, the easier it would be to introduce a mandatory requirement to carry the photocard when driving, as suggested above.

8.1.9 Because of the advantages of the photocard, the ideal situation would be for everyone to convert to the photocard driving licence. However, it is acknowledged that this would involve a substantial cost, and use of DVLA resources. Costs would include contacting those people who hold paper licences and possibly advertising to publicise the change and its benefits. Another cost would be the production of the licences themselves (DVLA charge £18 for the exchange of an old style licence to the new photocard licence).

8.1.10 Because all new licences are issued as photocard licences, (including those issued to people who reapply for a licence after disqualification), over time the population of paper licence holders will reduce. Therefore rather than insist that everyone convert to photocard licences, those who still hold the older style paper versions should be encouraged to change to the photocard. If mandatory carriage of the driving licence (or photocard) was introduced as suggested above, its portability could be highlighted as an incentive to convert.

Countermeasure 3: Encourage existing paper driving licence holders to convert to photocard licences. The portability of the photocard could be highlighted as an incentive if mandatory carriage of the driving licence or driving licence photocard was to be introduced as in Countermeasure 2.
Information technology and the checking of driving licences

8.1.11 The ability of the police to check driving licence details quickly and accurately received strong support from administrators or ‘experts’ as well as ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving. At present the police can check a driving licence over the radio using the PNC (Police National Computer). However, this requires the officer at the roadside to be sure of the identity of the person whose licence is being checked. In practice this means that a person could give a false name of a different person who is a licence holder and the police officer may have to accept the information returned over the radio.

8.1.12 Therefore it was suggested that it would be helpful if drivers’ photographs were available on an online system either in patrol vehicles or police stations. Another suggestion was to combine various documents (tax, insurance, licence, MOT) onto a secure card or document for use by drivers. It was hoped that such improvements would allow the police to check the legality of a driver at the roadside rather than require them to produce their documents at a police station several days later.

8.1.13 It is clear that technological advances in information technology have the potential to provide a number of benefits to the police in the enforcement of ‘document offences’ including unlicensed driving. It has not been possible within the scope of this research to investigate these in detail. It may only be possible to implement many such ideas in the longer term, and may well involve substantial cost. However, it may be possible to achieve some improvements in the driving licence information available to police in the short-term. Therefore we recommend that an assessment be made of the potential for technological improvements to the current system of police checking of licence and other driving documents. The long-term goal would be to allow the police to accurately assess the details of a driver at the roadside. This goal would be complemented by the previous countermeasures for mandatory carriage and use of photocard driving licences.

Countermeasure 4: Undertake a review of the potential for technological advances in information technology to improve the current system used by police to check the driving licences and details of drivers at the roadside.

Tightening of loopholes in the driving licensing system

8.1.14 During our surveys involving ‘perpetrators’ of unlicensed driving, a number of respondents claimed to know of a number of loopholes allowing them to easily obtain false or duplicate driving licences or use false identities when producing documents at police stations for example. If these claims are true then there is cause for concern that the licensing system is being brought into disrepute. It has been suggested that the monitoring and closing of alleged loopholes should already be undertaken as a matter course.
8.1.15 In order to investigate the claims of loopholes in the licence issuing, checking and disqualification system the DVLA, DSA, the police and the courts should co-operate to assess what the claimed loopholes are, whether they are genuine, and what should be done to close them. It is possible that a ‘mystery shopper’ type of survey may be of use in assessing alleged loopholes. It is also possible that the increasing use of information technology (as suggested in Countermeasure 4) would assist in closing any loopholes.

Countermeasure 5: DVLA, DSA, the police and the courts should co-operate in an assessment of alleged loopholes in the system of issuing, checking and disqualifying driving licences, and then close any loopholes identified.

Employers to check employees’ driving licences

8.1.16 An independent Work-Related Road Safety Task Group was appointed in May 2000 as a result of the Government’s Road Safety Strategy. Their report ‘Reducing at-work road traffic incidents’ was published in November 2001. The document included an outline of what guidance to employers on managing-at-work road safety might cover. This includes a set of principles which should be used to direct employers approach when taking appropriate measures. This includes the following: ‘Selecting drivers who are entitled to drive the vehicle … continuing licence inspections …’.

8.1.17 Our research showed that many administrators or ‘experts’, as well as ‘perpetrators’, considered that employers have a responsibility to ensure that their employees are driving legally and are properly licensed if their job involves having to drive. This included those for whom driving was their primary work task as well as those for whom driving was only a part of their job. It was considered that driving licence checks should be made when first employing a member of staff, and periodically afterwards. Therefore we recommend the following:

Countermeasure 6: Employers should be required through Health and Safety regulations to check their employees’ driving licences when taking on new staff, and periodically afterwards if driving is a part of the job.

Penalties for unlicensed driving

8.1.18 The government has already undertaken a consultation on road traffic penalties through their consultation paper ‘Road Traffic Penalties A Consultation Paper’, the results of which were published in July 2002 by the Home Office, the Department for Transport and the Lord Chancellor’s Department and was titled ‘Report on the Review of Road Traffic Penalties’. Although the following countermeasures have been formulated at too late a date to be included as part of the government’s review, it is hoped that they could still be considered as part of the implementation of any changes to the system.
8.1.19 One of the main issues to arise from our surveys of administrators and ‘experts’ as well as ‘perpetrators’ was a need for a consistent and predictable structured penalty system. This would include alternative penalties and an increased hierarchy of penalties for repeat offences.

8.1.20 For many offenders the threat of imprisonment was not a deterrent. They appeared to be caught in a loop, as it seemed likely that they would continue to drive unlicensed upon release. Also, the threat of fines was also not a deterrent to some, as fines imposed by the courts have to be constrained by the means of the offender.

8.1.21 The concept of ‘smarter’ penalties tailored to the type of offender was advocated during our research. Suggestions included community service or strict physical exercise punishment in the style of ‘Boot Camps’. We believe that alternative penalties to imprisonment and fines may be more effective in many cases, and should be used as part of an increasing hierarchy of penalties for motoring offences, with imprisonment for the most serious cases.

**Countermeasure 7:** The use of alternative, rehabilitative penalties such as community service penalties and driver improvement schemes for more motoring offences should be trialled and evaluated. If successful they should be incorporated into a hierarchy of penalties for motoring offences.

8.1.22 It was also thought that an increased certainty regarding the possible penalties for re-offending would act as a greater deterrent. However, it has been suggested that magistrates do not always use available punishments to the full, and that there was inconsistency because magistrates were not bound to sentencing guidelines. A lack of consistency was considered an important issue to many offenders and a perception of unfair treatment was considered a justification to continue to drive and would contribute to repeat offending. Therefore we recommend the following:

**Countermeasure 8:** A review of the consistency of the penalties imposed for unlicensed driving (and possibly other motoring offences) by different courts should be undertaken to determine the extent of inconsistency, its implications, and if deemed necessary, measures to improve consistency.

8.1.23 Another issue arising from our research is that in many cases of unlicensed driving that come to the attention of the police, other more serious offences have also been committed (such as careless or dangerous driving, or driving without insurance for example). Although no systematic assessment has been undertaken, it is thought anecdotally that in some cases the offender is only prosecuted for the most serious of the offences they are charged with, or if they are prosecuted with all the offences then the court penalties relate largely to the most serious of these, and consequently the offence and penalty for unlicensed driving is overshadowed. This was considered to reduce the seriousness of unlicensed driving in the eyes of offenders.
8.1.24 Therefore it was suggested that this issue should be highlighted to the police as well as the Crown Prosecution Service and courts, and consistency should be encouraged. Courts should ensure that they make specific mention of unlicensed driving offences when sentencing. The aim would be to ensure that in the eyes of the offender, the authorities were not overlooking the offence of unlicensed driving.

Countermeasure 9: The police, courts and the Crown Prosecution Service should be encouraged to adopt a consistent approach to charging, prosecuting and imposing penalties for unlicensed driving offenders when more than one offence has been committed. The aim would be to ensure that in the eyes of the offender, the authorities were not overlooking the offence of unlicensed driving.

Public knowledge of the penalties for unlicensed driving

8.1.25 A further current weakness was considered to be the lack of the public’s knowledge as to the likely penalties for committing some form of unlicensed driving offence and also the penalties for repeat offences. It has been suggested that in addition to the courts explaining to offenders at the time of sentencing the consequences for re-offending, awareness could be further increased if a follow-up letter was sent following court sentencing repeating this, along with the end date of a driving ban where applicable. A possible benefit of sending a follow-up letter would be to give the offender the impression of being monitored following their court appearance.

Countermeasure 10: In addition to explaining clearly to those found guilty of unlicensed driving the possible penalties for re-offending at the time of sentencing, we recommend that courts should follow this up with a letter repeating this, along with the end date of a driving ban where applicable.

8.1.26 A further method of increasing awareness of penalties would be to include on provisional driving licences the restrictions of the licence and penalties for driving otherwise than in accordance with the licence. It is understood that the information included on the driving licence photocard for full driving licences is defined by EU Directives, but that this does not apply to the provisional driving licence photocard. The only restriction on the information provided on the provisional driving licence photocard would be the space available and the flexibility of the system that produces the photocards to accommodate any changes. At the very least, information on the restrictions of the provisional licence and penalties for driving otherwise than in accordance with the licence should be clearly presented on literature when applying for, and when receiving the provisional licence.
Rehabilitation and assistance to offenders and potential offenders

8.1.27 Some prisoners indicated their desire to become legal drivers and were supportive of community driving courses and motor projects to help to rehabilitate unlicensed drivers and motoring offenders. The lack of follow-up assistance for released prisoners was considered a contributory factor in reverting to their criminal lifestyles.

8.1.28 There was support during the Delphi workshop for the teaching of safe driving attitudes through community partnerships rather than only through schools. The careful selection of a role model within such schemes, to whom offenders could look up to, was suggested.

8.1.29 An example of a community-based scheme is the ‘SKIDZ’ Wycombe Motor Project, which has been described by Jones, D. W. (2001)\(^5\). It is reported that ‘Motor Projects typically have the aim of diverting the energy and motivation of young people who are in danger of, or who already have embarked upon offending careers’. Focusing on such potential offenders who though perhaps relatively small in number, but who may be responsible for a disproportionate amount of motoring offences and crashes, could be considered an effective use of resources.

Countermeasure 11: Include on the provisional driving licence photocard an explanation of the restrictions of the licence and of the penalties for driving otherwise than in accordance with the provisional licence. This information should also be clearly presented on literature when applying for and when receiving the provisional licence.

Countermeasure 12: An evaluation of the current community-based motor project schemes should be undertaken to assess their effectiveness in changing attitudes and behaviour. A successful model that would address the needs of different groups of offenders and those who are in danger of offending for the first time should then be implemented nationally.

8.1.30 It was also suggested during the Delphi workshop that the schemes could provide a good opportunity to emphasise that a clean driving licence could be a valuable asset to jobseekers. Allied to this was the finding that the financial burden of attempting to become a driving licence holder was considered a factor in increasing the risk of unlicensed driving among young drivers. An idea suggested at the Delphi workshop was for some form of financial assistance for those learning to drive as part of job seeking, possibly through loans or through the Benefit Agency via schemes such as the Job Seekers Allowance, especially as there is a current shortage of drivers for both freight and public transport. Assisting those with limited financial resources to learn to drive would promote social inclusion and we consider that this idea is worth investigating further.

---

The New Drivers Act

8.1.31 It has been found that there is a lack of knowledge on the possibility of revocation of the driving licence under the provision of the New Drivers Act 1995. This is despite the fact that at the end of every driving test that results in a pass, the examiner explains the New Drivers Act to the driver, and this information is also included on a leaflet that the examiner gives to successful candidates. It has been suggested that providing this information during the euphoria of passing the test may not be the most effective time.

8.1.32 It has also been found that those who have had their licence revoked are much more likely to have driven while unlicensed compared with first provisional licence holders. It is understood that there may be a large proportion of those who have had their licence revoked who have not reapplied for a new licence. A further concern was that if there were an increasing number of driving licence endorsements as a result of greater use of safety cameras, for example, there would be an increasing number of New Drivers Act revocations. The cost of lessons and driving examinations was also felt to be prohibitive and therefore a factor in increasing unlicensed driving among many young drivers.

8.1.33 For these reasons there is cause for concern over the possibility that the New Drivers Act is not acting as a deterrent to committing motoring offences among novice drivers, because many are not aware of the rules. Therefore to try to increase the awareness of the New Drivers Act rules we recommend the following:

Countermeasure 13: An investigation should be undertaken to assess the possibility of introducing some form of financial assistance to those learning to drive, possibly through loans or through the Benefit Agency as part of job seeking.

Countermeasure 14: The DSA and DVLA should review and if necessary improve the information provided to drivers when applying and obtaining the provisional and full licence, and when learning to drive, to ensure that novice drivers are aware of the New Drivers Act rules.

8.1.34 There is also cause for concern that there may be an increasing population of those who have had their licence revoked who are more likely to drive unlicensed. We are aware that monitoring of the DVLA database has been undertaken to evaluate the New Drivers Act. We also know that DfT Road Safety Division monitor the numbers of revocations and driving test re-passes by those who have had their licence revoked by sex and by age each month. We recommend that this monitoring be continued and expanded to include an assessment of the number drivers who receive endorsements after having their licence revoked and before re-passing the driving test. This will provide useful information as to whether any amendments to the operation of the New Drivers Act may be required.

The driving test

8.1.35 Surveys of provisional drivers revealed that a ‘danger point’ that contributes towards the likelihood that the provisional licence holder will commit unlicensed driving is the time gap between being told they are ready or feeling they are ready for the test and the date that the test takes place. The longer this time gap, then the greater the risk.

8.1.36 It is understood that DSA have a target to deliver a car practical test in an average of six weeks. A consistent six-week wait is considered beneficial by many ADIs in that it allows time to ensure that their pupils are fully prepared for the test after a test date is received. It is also argued by ADIs that long waiting times are not so much of a problem as inconsistent waiting times, in that it is difficult to adjust training when a test is scheduled to take place in three weeks time, when a wait of six weeks was expected. To overcome this DSA encourage ADIs to state the earliest date that the candidate will be ready.

8.1.37 Therefore it is suggested that DSA continue to maintain a six-week target waiting time in delivering a practical driving test. DSA should also consider advising ADIs that they should exercise caution when telling their learners that they are ready for a test long before the test can be taken.

Countermeasure 16: DSA should continue to maintain a consistent six-week target waiting time in delivering a practical driving test. DSA should also advise ADIs that they should exercise caution when telling their learners that they are ready for a test long before the test can be taken. The aim would be to avoid the pupil being tempted to drive otherwise than in accordance with the provisional driving licence while waiting for their test.

8.1.38 Some evidence suggested that a further ‘danger point’ was the effect of failure of the driving test, especially with regard to the theory test on the part of those who feel aggrieved because they see themselves as good practical drivers. We believe that there is a case for more research into the effect of failing the driving test and this should include an assessment of whether this contributes to unlicensed driving.

Countermeasure 17: Research should be undertaken to assess the effect of failing the driving test and this should include an assessment of whether this contributes to unlicensed driving.
8.1.39 From our surveys it was found that those who may undertake unlicensed driving thought that an effective countermeasure would be to provide opportunities for members of the general public to report cases of unlicensed driving (such as driving while disqualified for example). Despite problems of possible miss-reporting it was also considered that a ‘Crimestoppers’ type anonymous telephone hotline could act as a deterrent by those at the Delphi workshop. Therefore we recommend that using the ‘Crimestoppers’ hotline (or a similar system) in this manner should be publicised so that a trial can be undertaken.

\begin{center}
Countermeasure 18: The use of a ‘Crimestoppers’ telephone hotline (or a similar service) for reporting unlicensed driving should be publicised, so that a trial can be undertaken of its effectiveness.
\end{center}

8.2 Opportunities for Future Research

8.2.1 In attempting to assess the total amount of driving and relative crash risk of unlicensed drivers it has been necessary to provide a large range in our estimates. This is due to uncertainty, not least because of our small sample sizes and the difficulty of asking people about an illegal activity. It is also apparent that the population of unlicensed drivers will include extremes in terms of road safety, ranging from the wilfully negligent to those who may have been driving regularly for years who take extra care to avoid detection. Further in-depth research targeting groups who are known to be most likely to be involved in road crashes rather than unlicensed drivers as a whole will be of benefit.

8.2.2 In attempting to conduct surveys using DVLA data as a resource it has become apparent that there is a large amount of information held by the DVLA that could be of benefit to those with an interest in road safety, road traffic offences and the driving population. However, the DVLA system was designed primarily as an administrative system and information is not in a format readily accessible by researchers. It is understood that the DfT statistics branch are in the process of obtaining DVLA data and converting it to a format suitable for producing statistics. We applaud this and suggest that DfT should consider the possibility of publishing periodically, statistical information and tabulations derived from the DVLA database of driving licences.

8.2.3 We understand that the information being obtained by the DfT from the DVLA database will be anonymous and will not include names and addresses. Therefore to conduct postal surveys of driving licence holders lists of names and addresses will still have to be extracted from the DVLA database. In order that this process can be achieved efficiently we suggest that a system with nominated DVLA staff with whom researchers could consult should be implemented.
8.2.4 We are grateful for the assistance provided by several police forces in obtaining information to assess the link between road crashes and motoring offences. However, obtaining suitable data has proved very difficult. In most cases police STATS19 accident records and prosecution records are maintained separately and do not have any common reference number. In other cases where there may be a common number, these are not included on computer records. This makes the matching of such records a laborious and difficult task. We believe that the matching of prosecution data and road crashes has the potential to provide valuable information to those interested in road safety and motoring offences. This could be simply achieved by adding a common reference number linking STATS19 and prosecution records such as a common ‘incident number’, or by adding the STATS19 reference number to prosecution records where there is a crash associated with the prosecution. Ideally this information should be included on computer databases.

8.2.5 More research is also needed to explore the link between the acquisition of a driving licence and social exclusion. Most of the existing research concentrates on the provision of public transport to overcome transport poverty, but our research suggests there is also considerable scope for mitigation via help in learning to drive. The help required is both financial and related to learning difficulties.
APPENDIX A: SUMMARY FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review was completed during the early stages of the research project. A number of summary points from the literature review are reproduced below, followed by the list of references.

Survey Methods and Data Collection

- Contacts with drivers for surveys have been made using records from magistrates’ courts, DVLA records, and a database of drivers willing to help with research.

- Problems with using DVLA records for survey contacts have been noted in more than one study. Problems include a high proportion of incorrect addresses due to a failure of drivers to notify the Agency of such changes, and a lag time before DVLA records are updated, for which DVLA are dependent on the courts.

- The types of survey used have included postal questionnaires and interviews (in-depth and semi-structured) by skilled interviewers. Interviewees in one study were chosen as a result of data returned by postal questionnaire.

- Direct approaches to drivers have also been made at a time and place relevant to the research (i.e. roadside interviews, interviews with pub patrons).

- Only one previous study in the UK has linked accident data and prosecution data. This was only possible through an extensive analysis of police accident record books that contained details of associated prosecutions.

- Analysis of motoring convictions of disqualified drivers using the DVLA database has been completed as part of several studies. Research prior to this was only possible using police card file indexes.

- Detailed research has been possible in other countries where information stored on computer includes driving licence and crash involvement data combined (for example, the US Fatal Accident Reporting System).

- Assessment of the effectiveness of countermeasures has been completed in the US relatively recently. The effectiveness of vehicle immobilisation, impoundment and licence plate sticker laws has been assessed.

Extent of the Problem

- Around 42,500 defendants were found guilty in England and Wales of one type of unlicensed driving, driving while disqualified in 1997.
• Previous analysis of DVLA data suggests that as many as 17 per cent of disqualified drivers have a conviction for driving while disqualified.

• Conviction rates for driving while disqualified by high-risk offenders for drink-driving suggest a lower breach rate than that for disqualified drivers as a whole.

• There are a larger number of convictions for other types of unlicensed driving (174,000 findings of guilt for driving licence offences in England and Wales, in 1997), a large proportion of which relate to provisional driving licence offences (approximately 70 per cent in 1992).

• Analysis of DVLA data has shown that unlicensed drivers commit around 9 per cent of all motoring offences.

• As well as the incidence of unlicensed driving, as revealed by motoring conviction statistics, there are likely to be many more unlicensed drivers who are not necessarily detected by the authorities. Surveys of disqualified drivers have led to estimates of between 27 and 45 per cent of disqualified drivers who drive.

• There appears to be variations in the proportions of drivers admitting to driving while disqualified, depending upon the offence for which they were disqualified, with drink-drivers less likely to drive while disqualified. This concurs with the pattern of motoring offences, which also suggest a lower breach rate for drink-drivers.

• There is no detailed research into the amounts (time or distance) of driving while disqualified, or into the extent of other types of unlicensed driving other than driving while disqualified in the UK.

**Characteristics of Unlicensed Drivers**

• Males perpetrate nearly all driving while disqualified offences and there is an over-representation of younger age groups.

• Early research found that driving while disqualified was associated with a ‘weightier’ motoring offence record (more occasions in court, more convictions and more disqualifications), was associated with a criminal record, and with individuals who were first convicted of a motoring offence before the age of 21.

• The likelihood of driving while disqualified is related to the type of offence for which the driver was convicted, with drink-drivers, for example, typically having a lower breach rate.

• Driving while disqualified has been found to be associated with a lower socio-economic status.
In the US, drivers involved in fatal accidents with aberrant driving licences tended to be younger, more often male, more apt to have been involved in a fatal crash during the hours of darkness, more apt to have been driving while intoxicated, more apt to have been recently convicted of driving while intoxicated, and more apt to have received several (3+) recent suspensions or revocations.

In the UK there is little research into the characteristics of unlicensed drivers other than those who drive while disqualified. However, it is thought that many young people may drive unlicensed when learning to drive and that these are predominantly males, and from all social backgrounds. Other groups could be people with ‘deviant’ lifestyles, people who have lost their licence on medical grounds and rural residents. Some drivers from ethnic minority groups suggested unique social and cultural reasons for unlicensed driving in their communities.

There is evidence that unlicensed drivers may have a higher opinion of their driving skills, and are more likely to agree with statements supporting aggressive driving styles.

**Motivations and Reasons for and Against Driving while Unlicensed**

- Some main influences affecting the decision to drive unlicensed include the availability of a vehicle, knowledge of the penalties for driving, knowledge of the chances of being caught, and the influence and opinion of family and friends.

- The reasons given for driving while disqualified are varied and include because of rare, exceptional circumstances such as driving during an emergency, as well as common, mundane journeys such as driving to the shops.

- The perceived unfairness of the penalty of disqualification was also thought to affect the decision to drive while disqualified.

- The absence of viable alternative forms of transport and the need to complete journeys for financial reasons to get to work were often cited as reasons. Some claimed to have a psychological need to drive.

- Possible explanations for other forms of unlicensed driving include the difficulty of the Theory Test and perceived fairness of the driving test system.

- The cost of driving lessons and taking driving tests was often cited as a reason for unlicensed driving. The absence of insurance was also seen as cost effective for many and there was a lack of concern regarding any possible consequences.

- Many who had been ‘caught’ for unlicensed driving claimed to have been able to avoid the consequences by manipulating the system, for example, by using other people’s documentation.
Further explanations for some people were that they were part of a community with different traditions, others did not want to admit to other family members that they had failed the driving test again, and others led a lifestyle whose aim was to avoid as much bureaucracy as possible.

Unlicensed Driving and Criminal Activity

- Research has shown that those who commit traffic offences often have a history of other traffic violations, often have a criminal record and may also be associated with activities that would generate ‘immediate police interest’.
- Drivers who drive while disqualified have also been found to be more likely to have a criminal record, to have a larger criminal record and to have ‘weightier’ motoring convictions compared with other disqualified drivers.

Unlicensed Driving and Road Safety

- There are a number of previous research projects detailing the proportion of crashes involving unlicensed drivers, however, the exposure of this group has rarely been considered in order to provide a comparative accident risk of unlicensed drivers with the main driving population.
- One project, conducted in California, utilised a ‘quasi-induced’ exposure method and found that suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers had a higher fatal crash involvement of 3.7:1 and 4.9:1 respectively, compared with validly licensed drivers.
- Many drivers who drive while disqualified appear to be apprehensive of the possible consequences and so alter their behaviour. This may involve strategies to avoid detection and adoption of a safer driving style.

Countermeasures to Unlicensed Driving

- Measures involving a sanction against the vehicle as a countermeasure to unlicensed driving have been tried in the US. These have involved special sanctions relating to the issue of car licence plates and the impoundment or immobilisation of offenders’ vehicles.
- Measures with regard to the issue of licence plates could not be implemented in the UK without major change to the system.
- Impoundment or immobilisation is possible in the UK, but practical problems with such laws in the US have so far tended to negate much of the potential benefit.
Other suggestions for reducing unlicensed driving include:

- An increase in the checking of driving licences;
- More targeted enforcement;
- An increase in the information on driving licences;
- More detailed, centrally held records on driving licences;
- Use of photographs and mandatory carrying of driving licences;
- Electronic driving licences; and
- Alcohol ignition interlocks (to prevent repeat cases of drink-driving)

It is hoped that our own research will produce evidence and ideas and for the application of an administrative and situational approach to the prevention of unlicensed driving in Britain.

**Literature Review References**


APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRES FOR NATIONAL POSTAL SURVEY OF POTENTIAL UNLICENSED DRIVERS AND THOSE WHO HAVE NEVER HELD A LICENCE
Dear Sir/Madam

This questionnaire is just 18 questions long and takes less than 10 minutes to complete. We would be grateful if you could spare a few minutes to answer the questions and then fold (according to the instructions on the back page) and post it back to us (no stamp required).

Each questionnaire returned to us will be anonymous and has no identifying marks so that the individual returning it cannot be identified. Therefore please answer the questions honestly and openly; the data collected will be used to calculate national statistics only.

This questionnaire has been sent to some 10,000 people using names selected randomly from Driver and Vehicle Licence Agency records. Many of our questions refer to the time when you held a provisional driving licence. If you have any queries please contact Duncan Knox at Ross Silcock Limited Tel: 0207 928 9002. This survey is being conducted as part of a project for the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. Thank you in advance for your help.

Yours faithfully

Duncan Knox

SECTION A: LEARNING TO DRIVE

1 What type of driving have you done whilst holding a provisional driving licence?
   a) Have you driven with a Driving Instructor? YES □ NO □
   b) Have you driven with L-plates, with someone allowed to supervise you? YES □ NO □
      (i.e. someone over 21 who has held a licence for more than 3 years)
   c) Have you driven with L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you? YES □ NO □
   d) Have you driven with no L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you? YES □ NO □
   e) Have you driven on your own? YES □ NO □

2 How much driving have you done whilst holding a provisional driving licence?
   a) How often have you driven with a Driving Instructor? More than once a week □
      □ (write in your best guess): .......... times
      □ Every week □
      □ (write in your best guess): .......... times
      □ Every month □
      □ (write in your best guess): .......... times
      □ Less often □
      □ (write in your best guess): .......... times
      □ Never □

   How many times altogether? .......... times
   How many hours altogether? .......... hours
Appendix B1 – Provisional Licence Holders Questionnaire

b) How often have you driven with L-plates, with someone allowed to supervise you? (i.e. someone over 21 who has held a licence for more than 3 years)

- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every month
- Less often
- Never

How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... times
How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... hours

---

c) How often have you driven with L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?

- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every month
- Less often
- Never

How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... times
How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... hours

---

d) How often have you driven with no L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?

- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every month
- Less often
- Never

How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... times
How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... hours

---

e) How often have you driven on your own?

- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every month
- Less often
- Never

How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... times
How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): .......... hours

---

3. a. Before passing the driving test have you been involved in a road accident as a driver?

- YES
- NO

b. If yes, what kind of accident have you been in?

- Injury accident
- Damage only (no one injured)
- L-plates, with someone allowed to supervise you?
- L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?
- On your own?

---

c. If you have had an accident, were you driving...

- With a Driving Instructor?
- With L-plates, with someone allowed to supervise you? (i.e. someone over 21 who has held a licence for more than 3 years)
- With L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?
- On your own?
### SECTION B: YOUR DRIVING LICENCE AND DRIVING TESTS

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Did you ever drive a car on the road before you held a provisional licence?</td>
<td>Never □</td>
<td>Occasionally □</td>
<td>Regularly □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When did you obtain your provisional driving licence? (Please write in the month and year:)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month: ............</td>
<td>Year .............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Have you passed the theory test?</td>
<td>YES □</td>
<td>NO □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How many times have you taken the theory test?</td>
<td>None □</td>
<td>1 □</td>
<td>2 □</td>
<td>3 or more □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Have you passed the practical driving test?</td>
<td>YES □</td>
<td>NO □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, please write in the month and year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month: ............</td>
<td>Year: .............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How many times have you taken the practical driving test?</td>
<td>None □</td>
<td>1 □</td>
<td>2 □</td>
<td>3 or more □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Do you (or did you) own a car before passing the practical driving test?</td>
<td>YES □</td>
<td>NO □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Now complete sections C, D and E**

### SECTION C: ABOUT YOU

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Are you male or female?</td>
<td>Male □</td>
<td>Female □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>How old are you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.......... years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>How would you describe where you live?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City □</td>
<td>Town □</td>
<td>Village □</td>
<td>Rural area □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Are you working?</td>
<td>Working full time □</td>
<td>Working part time □</td>
<td>Not working □</td>
<td>Student □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>a) Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence not to do with motoring?</td>
<td>YES □</td>
<td>NO □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If yes, please write in the offence(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: MOTORING OFFENCES (before passing the driving test)

16  a) Many drivers are warned by the police for motoring offences without any other action being taken. Has this happened to you before passing the driving test?

   YES □   NO □

   b) If yes, what were you warned about?

17  a) Have you ever received a fixed penalty ticket for a motoring offence before passing the driving test?

   YES □   NO □

   b) If yes, please write in the offence(s):

18  a) Have you ever been convicted for a motoring offence before passing the driving test?

   YES □   NO □

   b) If yes, what were you prosecuted for?

SECTION E

If you have any comments about the issues covered in this questionnaire, please write them in below. If you would be willing to discuss your views in confidence please also provide your telephone number.

Thank you very much indeed for completing the questionnaire.
Please follow the instructions overleaf to fold and return the questionnaire (no stamp necessary)
Please fold along 1st and 2nd fold lines. Tuck section A into B, with address showing.

Thank you
Dear Sir/Madam

This questionnaire is just 16 questions long and takes less than 10 minutes to complete. We would be grateful if you could spare a few minutes to answer the questions and then fold (according to the instructions on the back page) and post it back to us (no stamp required).

This questionnaire gives you the chance to tell us in confidence what you think about the current system of penalties for driving offences. We are particularly interested to get information from drivers who have been disqualified from driving. Therefore we are writing to drivers selected randomly from the DVLA database who have been disqualified at some time. Each questionnaire returned to us will be anonymous and has no identifying marks so that the individual returning it cannot be identified. Therefore please answer the questions honestly and openly; the data collected will be used to calculate national statistics only.

If you have any queries please contact myself, Duncan Knox at Ross Silcock Limited (Tel: 0207 928 9002). This survey is being conducted as part of a project for the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

Thank you in advance for your help.

Yours faithfully

Duncan Knox

SECTION A: DRIVING

1. Have you ever driven on the road whilst disqualified from driving?  
   YES □  NO □  
   (If no, go to Section B)

2. If yes, while disqualified.
   a) did you do any driving on your own?  
      YES □  NO □

   b) did you do any driving with members of your family as passengers?  
      YES □  NO □

   c) did you do any driving with other people as passengers?  
      (e.g. friends, colleagues)  
      YES □  NO □

Please turn over
SECTION A (continued)

3 How much driving did you do while disqualified?

a) How often did you drive alone?

- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every month
- Less often
- Never

- How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… times
- How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… hours

b) How often did you drive with members of your family as passengers?

- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every month
- Less often
- Never

- How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… times
- How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… hours

c) How often did you drive with other people as passengers?

- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every month
- Less often
- Never

- How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… times
- How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… hours

4 a) If you drove when you were disqualified, were you involved in a road accident as a driver? YES □ NO □

b) If yes, what kind of accident have you been in:

- Injury accident
- Damage only (no one injured)

- c) Was anyone else in the vehicle with you when you had the accident?

- NO, I was alone
- YES, members of my family
- YES, other people (e.g. friends, colleagues)

Now complete Sections B, C and D 🔄
**SECTION B: ABOUT YOU (to be answered by all)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When did you first pass the driving test? Please write in the month and the year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month: …………… Year: ……………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>According to DVLA records you were disqualified from driving about one year ago. How long was your ban?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…………… Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Did you own a car before you were disqualified? YES □ NO □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Did you continue to own a car while you were disqualified? YES □ NO □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Have you ever been convicted of an offence not to do with motoring? YES □ NO □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, please write in the offence(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a) Many drivers are warned by the police for motoring offences without any other action being taken. If you drove while disqualified did this happen to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES □ NO □ Not Applicable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If yes, what were you warned about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>a) If you drove while disqualified did you ever receive a fixed penalty ticket for a motoring offence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES □ NO □ Not Applicable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If yes, please write in the offence(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a) If you drove while disqualified were you ever convicted for a motoring offence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES □ NO □ Not Applicable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If yes, what were you prosecuted for?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D:**

If you wish, tell us below what you think about the current system of penalties for driving offences. If you would be willing to discuss your views in confidence please also provide your telephone number.

Thank you very much indeed for completing the questionnaire.

Please follow the instructions overleaf to fold and return the questionnaire (no stamp necessary)
Ross Silcock Limited
Old Brewery Court
156 Sandyford Road
NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE
NE2 1BR

Thank you
Dear Sir/Madam

This questionnaire is just 18 questions long and takes less than 10 minutes to complete. We would be grateful if you could spare a few minutes to answer the questions and then fold (according to the instructions on the back page) and post it back to us (no stamp required).

This questionnaire gives you the chance to tell us in confidence what you think about the current driving licence system. Answers are anonymous and confidential and the data will be used to calculate national statistics only. Please answer the questions honestly and openly.

This questionnaire has been sent to some 5,000 people using names selected randomly from Driver and Vehicle Licence Agency records. Many of our questions refer to the time when your driving licence was taken away under the provisions of the New Drivers Act. If you have any questions about this survey, Mr Duncan Knox at Ross Silcock Limited will be happy to take your call (Tel: 0207 928 9002). This survey is being conducted as part of a project for the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. Thank you in advance for your help.

Yours faithfully

Duncan Knox

---

### SECTION A: DRIVING AFTER YOUR DRIVING LICENCE WAS TAKEN AWAY

1. After your licence was taken away, did you ever drive on the road, before getting a new provisional driving licence?  
   - YES ☐ NO ☐  
   
2. If yes, what type of driving did you do without a new provisional licence?  
   - a) Did you do any driving on your own?  
     - YES ☐ NO ☐  
   - b) Did you do any driving with members of your family as passengers?  
     - YES ☐ NO ☐  
   - c) Did you do any driving with other people as passengers?  
     - YES ☐ NO ☐  
     
   If yes, how much driving have you done without a provisional licence?  
   - a) How often did you drive on your own?  
     - More than once a week ☐  
     - Every week ☐  
     - Every month ☐  
     - Less often ☐  
     - Never ☐  
     
   How many times altogether?  
   - (write in your best guess): .......... times  
   
   How many hours altogether?  
   - (write in your best guess): .......... hours  

   - b) How often did you drive with members of your family as passengers?  
     - More than once a week ☐  
     - Every week ☐  
     - Every month ☐  
     - Less often ☐  
     - Never ☐  
     
   How many times altogether?  
   - (write in your best guess): .......... times  
   
   How many hours altogether?  
   - (write in your best guess): .......... hours  

### SECTION B: DRIVING AFTER GETTING A NEW PROVISIONAL DRIVING LICENCE

4. Have you got a *new provisional* driving licence yet?  
   - YES  
   - NO [If no, go to Section D]  
   
   If yes, when did you get a new one?  
   *Please write in the month and year:*  
   - Month:  
   - Year: 

5. What type of driving have you done after getting a *new provisional* driving licence?  
   a) Have you driven with a Driving Instructor?  
      - YES  
      - NO  
   b) Have you driven with L-plates, with someone allowed to supervise you?  
      - *i.e. someone over 21 who has held a licence for more than 3 years*  
      - YES  
      - NO  
   c) Have you driven with L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?  
      - YES  
      - NO  
   d) Have you driven with no L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?  
      - YES  
      - NO  
   e) Have you driven on your own?  
      - YES  
      - NO

6. How much driving have you done after getting a *new provisional* driving licence?  
   a) How often have you driven with a Driving Instructor?  
      - More than once a week  
      - Every week  
      - Every month  
      - Less often  
      - Never  
      
      How many times altogether?  
      - *(write in your best guess):*  
      - ........ times  
      
      How many hours altogether?  
      - *(write in your best guess):*  
      - ........ hours

   b) How often have you driven with L-plates, with someone allowed to supervise you?  
      - *i.e. someone over 21 who has held a licence for more than 3 years*  
      - More than once a week  
      - Every week  
      - Every month  
      - Less often  
      - Never  
      
      How many times altogether?  
      - *(write in your best guess):*  
      - ........ times  
      
      How many hours altogether?  
      - *(write in your best guess):*  
      - ........ hours

   c) How often have you driven with L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?  
      - More than once a week  
      - Every week  
      - Every month  
      - Less often  
      - Never  
      
      How many times altogether?  
      - *(write in your best guess):*  
      - ........ times  
      
      How many hours altogether?  
      - *(write in your best guess):*  
      - ........ hours
d) How often have you driven with no L-plates, with someone not allowed to supervise you?

More than once a week □
Every week □
Every month □
Less often □
Never □

How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… times

How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… hours

e) How often have you driven on your own?

More than once a week □
Every week □
Every month □
Less often □
Never □

How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… times

How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… hours

SECTION C: THE DRIVING TESTS

Since your licence was taken away...

7 Have you repassed the theory test? YES □ NO □

8 How many times have you retaken the theory test?

None □
1 □
2 □
3 or more □

How many times altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… times

How many hours altogether? (write in your best guess): ……… hours

SECTION D: ABOUT YOU

11 Are you male or female?

Male □ Female □

12 How old are you?

…………… years old

13 How would you describe where you live?

City □
Town □
Village □
Rural area □

14 Did you own a car before your driving licence was taken away? YES □ NO □

15 Did you own a car before your driving licence was taken away? YES □ NO □

16 Did you continue to own a car after your driving licence was taken away? YES □ NO □

17 What motoring offences had you committed for your licence to be taken away?

Please write in the motoring offences:

Now complete Sections C, D and E
Are you working?

- Working full time [ ]
- Working part time [ ]
- Not working [ ]
- Student [ ]

Have you ever been convicted of an offence not to do with motoring? If yes, please write in the offence(s):

Yes [ ] No [ ]

SECTION E

If you wish, tell us below what you think about the system that means a driving licence is revoked if the driver exceeds 6 penalty points within 2 years of passing the test. If you would be willing to discuss your views in confidence please also provide your telephone number.

Thank you very much indeed for completing the questionnaire.

Please follow the instructions overleaf to fold and return the questionnaire (no stamp necessary)
Please fold along 1st and 2nd fold lines. Tuck section A into B, with address showing.

Thank you
Dear Sir/Madam

We are conducting an anonymous nationwide survey on driving and driving licences. According to the Driver Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) you have been found to be driving without a licence. This questionnaire provides you with the opportunity to let us know anonymously why you had not applied for a licence, and how that has affected you. We would greatly appreciate your input into this study. The questionnaire should take no more than 10 minutes to fill in and can be easily returned by folding and posting back to us by free post. Don’t worry about getting into any trouble by answering this questionnaire. We will have no idea who you are when you return it, and we will not share individual questionnaires with anyone else, so you can be safe in the knowledge that you can have your say without fear of being identified and your anonymous response will be used for this research project only.

This survey is being conducted as part of a project for the Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions. If you have any queries please contact Duncan Knox at Babtie Ross Silcock on 0207 968 2720.

If you would be willing to let us contact you confidentially at a later date to discuss some of the issues on the questionnaire, you have the option to leave your name and contact details in at the end of the questionnaire. Any contact between you and us will remain strictly confidential.

If this questionnaire has been sent to you in error please accept our apologies.

Thank you for your help

Yours faithfully

Duncan Knox

1 How often did you drive on average before you were caught driving without a licence? (complete one row as appropriate.)
   a) Every day □ How many times each day? ___ How many hours each day in total? ____ hrs ____ mins
   b) Every week □ How many times each week? ___ How many hours each week in total? ____ hrs ____ mins
   c) Every month □ How many times each month? ___ How many hours each month in total? ____ hrs ____ mins
   d) Less often □ How many times in a year? ___ How many hours in a year in total? ____ hrs ____ mins

2 Before you were caught, how often did you drive...
   on your own? always □ often □ sometimes □ never □
   with members of your family? always □ often □ sometimes □ never □
   with friends or colleagues? always □ often □ sometimes □ never □
3. What sort of journeys did you make when driving without a licence? (please tick all that apply)
   - To and from work
   - As part of work
   - To go to the shops
   - School run
   - To go to the cinema or other leisure activities
   - To see friends
   - For an emergency
   - Just for the sake of driving
   - When on holiday in Great Britain
   - Other reason?

4. Since you were caught, how often have you driven without a licence? (please tick a), b), c), d), or e) as appropriate.)
   a) Never
   b) Every day
      - How many times each day? ___
      - How long each day in total? ___ hrs ___ mins
   c) Every week
      - How many times each week? ___
      - How long each week in total? ___ hrs ___ mins
   d) Every month
      - How many times each month? ___
      - How long each month in total? ___ hrs ___ mins
   e) Less often
      - How many times in a year? ___
      - How long in a year in total? ___ hrs ___ mins

5. What led to the Police finding that you had been driving without a licence? (please tick as appropriate)
   a) Involved in an accident
   b) Stopped by the Police
   c) Some other reason

6. If you were involved in an accident, to what extent do you think you were to blame? (please tick as appropriate.)
   - Not involved in an accident
   - Not at all
   - A little
   - Quite a lot
   - Entirely

7. How serious was the accident? (please tick a), b), c), d) or e) as appropriate.)
   a) Damage to property only. No injuries.
   b) You or someone else was slightly injured (minor cuts and bruises).
   c) You or someone else was seriously injured.
   d) Someone was killed.
   e) Not involved in an accident.

8. What offences were you reported for/charged with when you were found driving without a licence?
9. What were you actually found guilty of, and what penalties did you receive?

___________________________________________________________________________________________________

10. Why did you not get a GB driving licence before you first decided to drive in Great Britain? *Please explain.*

___________________________________________________________________________________________________

11. Have you now got a valid GB driving licence? YES □ NO □

12. If No, do you intend to get one in the future? YES □ NO □

13. If you do NOT intend to get a licence in the future, why not?

___________________________________________________________________________________________________

14. Are you… Male □ Female □

15. What was your age last birthday _______ years

16. How would you describe where you live? *(please tick most appropriate)*
   - City □
   - Town □
   - Village □
   - Rural area □

17. Are you working? *(please tick most appropriate)*
   - Full time □
   - Part time □
   - Student □
   - Not working □

18. Have you ever been convicted of an offence not to do with motoring? Yes □ No □
   If Yes, please write in the offence(s) _____________________________________________________________

Is there anything else you would like to add? If you would be willing to help us further in this research, please provide contact details. Any contact between you and us will remain strictly confidential.

___________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much indeed for completing the questionnaire. Please follow the instructions overleaf to fold and return the questionnaire freepost (no stamp needed).
1st Fold

BUSINESS REPLY SERVICE
Licence No NT 2528

Babtie Ross Silcock
Horsley House
Regent Centre
Gosforth
NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE
NE3 3BR

2nd Fold

Please fold along 1st and 2nd fold lines. Tuck section A into B, with address showing.

Thank you
## APPENDIX C: CIRCUMSTANCES OF UNLICENSED DRIVING

### Unlicensed driving by New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ without a licence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ without a licence who admitted to driving without a licence = 2,499</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their own</td>
<td>With members of their family as passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population of unlicensed drivers admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours driven per month by those admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of hours per month of unlicensed driving completed</td>
<td>6,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month</td>
<td><strong>10,251</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unlicensed driving by New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ after re-obtaining a provisional licence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of New Drivers Act ‘revokees’ with a new provisional licence who admitted to unlicensed driving = 1,143</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With L-plates, accompanied by someone not eligible to supervise</td>
<td>With no L-plates, accompanied by someone not eligible to supervise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population of unlicensed drivers admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours driven per month by those admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of hours per month of unlicensed driving completed</td>
<td>5,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month</td>
<td><strong>7,446</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unlicensed driving by those disqualified for drink-driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of those disqualified for drink-driving who admitted to driving while disqualified = 17,177</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With members of their family as passengers</td>
<td>With other people as passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population of unlicensed drivers admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours driven per month by those admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of hours per month of unlicensed driving completed</td>
<td>35,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month</td>
<td><strong>78,129</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unlicensed driving by those disqualified for some other single offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>On their own</th>
<th>With members of their family as passengers</th>
<th>With other people as passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of those disqualified for some other single offence who admitted to driving while disqualified = 13,617</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population of unlicensed drivers admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours driven per month by those admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of hours per month of unlicensed driving completed</td>
<td>24,626</td>
<td>6,699</td>
<td>16,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month</td>
<td><strong>47,672</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unlicensed driving by those disqualified for totting up penalty points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>On their own</th>
<th>With members of their family as passengers</th>
<th>With other people as passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of those disqualified for totting up penalty points who admitted to driving while disqualified = 13,617</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population of unlicensed drivers admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours driven per month by those admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of hours per month of unlicensed driving completed</td>
<td>126,592</td>
<td>13,469</td>
<td>104,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month</td>
<td><strong>244,223</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unlicensed driving by provisional licence holders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>On their own</th>
<th>With L-plates, accompanied by someone not eligible to supervise</th>
<th>With no L-plates accompanied by someone not eligible to supervise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of provisional licence holders who admitted to unlicensed driving = 460,000</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population of unlicensed drivers admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours driven per month by those admitting to type of driving</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of hours per month of unlicensed driving completed</td>
<td>126,592</td>
<td>13,469</td>
<td>104,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total number of hours of unlicensed driving completed per month</td>
<td><strong>244,223</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: SECOND ROUND DELPHI QUESTIONNAIRE

DTLR

Research into Unlicensed Driving

Delphi Survey Questionnaire II

BTT206190 21 November 2001
Dear Panellist

This is the second Delphi questionnaire aimed at exploring the numerous issues linked to unlicensed driving by recommending policies and measures to reduce it. As you will see, this questionnaire is based on the responses obtained in the first questionnaire.

As with the first questionnaire the second is divided into two parts. In Part I you are asked to review, comment on, and rate the measures we have presented for effectiveness and acceptability. In Part II you are asked to select an appropriate combination of these measures to tackle the problem of unlicensed driving and present them in order of importance.

Accompanying each measure is a comment based on the panel's responses to the first questionnaire the comment places the ratings for effectiveness and acceptability and importance in context with those of the other measures. The responses of the entire panel for effectiveness and acceptability have also been included along with the mean value to allow you to compare your opinion with those of other panellists. The level to which the panellists agree or disagree on some issues has been identified in some cases where the consensus of opinion has been especially high or low.

Please return your response by 6 December 2001 in the envelope provided.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART I

In Part I of this Questionnaire you are asked to do three things:

REVIEW all the measures on the questionnaire.

MAKE COMMENTS on any measure you want to. Feel free to suggest clarifications, argue in favour of or against measures, ask questions, include amendments to the measures, or make suggestions for other policies or interventions not included.

RATE the level of effectiveness and acceptability of each measure by circling 1 to 5 against each measure according to the following scale. By effectiveness we mean will it work; by acceptability we mean would the general public accept it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely effective</td>
<td>definitely acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably effective</td>
<td>probably acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may or may not be effective</td>
<td>may or may not be acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably ineffective</td>
<td>probably unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely ineffective</td>
<td>definitely unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low
**Education and Publicity**

**Measure 1**
Increase the amount of national and local publicity on the road safety problems associated with unlicensed driving

This measure was considered by the panel to be the least effective despite its relative acceptability. It was considered that this measure would not be of use in targeting the habitual unlicensed driver, although it could be useful in targeting specific groups such as the young and parents. Concerns were also raised that publicity may increase the level of unlicensed driving.


**NEW Measure 1A**
Publicise the issues relating to unlicensed driving, encouraging the public to report suspected offenders to Crimestoppers or some other such hotline.

The panellists that suggested this measure considered that it would work in conjunction with increased education and publicity and/or ‘shame lists’.


**Measure 2**
Highlight the cost implications to the general public when unlicensed drivers are involved in accidents (in terms of insurance payouts).

This measure was considered to be ineffective despite being acceptable. Although it was considered to have little effect on the unlicensed drivers themselves, approaches identified by the panel were to target this information at parents and/or to highlight the involvement of the Motor Insurer’s Bureau in settling claims and the effect that has on insurance premiums.


**Measure 3**
Increase the amount of national and local publicity to highlight the link between unlicensed driving and wider criminal activity.

This measure was considered by the panel to be very ineffective but of average acceptability. It was considered that this measure might run the risk of public outcry, if not undertaken carefully, despite the clarity of the link.
Education and Publicity

Measure to reduce unlicensed driving

Measure 4
Increase the teaching of safe driving in schools, highlighting unlicensed driving.

Considered to be of average effectiveness this measure was found to be relatively acceptable. The panel had a very good level of consensus on this issue. Those who commented were split on this issue as to whether it was a good idea or whether schools had enough to do at the moment without additional burdens. Some questioned that the issues of lawful behaviour should already be covered in schools.

“NEW” Measure 4A
Educate potential young motoring offenders in the long-term effects of committing crime at an early age.

Panellists highlighted the restrictions that disqualification places on mobility, the inability to find effective insurance cover and the likelihood of imprisonment for persistent offending.

Measure 5
Encourage community schemes and motor projects for young car enthusiasts to discourage unlicensed driving.

This measure was found to be of average effectiveness and acceptability. Concerns were raised that the projects could be seen as rewarding offenders, or teaching those involved in crime. Others highlighted the high costs, and identified that they have been shown to work.

Measure 6
Develop guidelines on the responsible application of community schemes and motor projects for young motoring offenders to discourage unlicensed driving.

This measure was considered by the panel to be relatively ineffective and of average acceptability. Some respondents agreed with a need for guidelines, but others suggested that widespread access to motor projects would create a problem, by raising awareness in potential offenders. Funding and staffing issues were also raised.
Education and Publicity

The Driving Test

Measure 7
Increase the amount of national and local publicity on the penalties for unlicensed driving.

Considered to be relatively ineffective by the panel this measure was identified as relatively acceptable. It was considered that the existing penalties were not harsh enough, or that those issued by the court were not applied to their fullest extent. This measure may be of use in targeting specific groups of unlicensed drivers.

_______________________________________________
_______________________________________________
_______________________________________________

Measure 8
Enhance public knowledge of the restrictions of the provisional licence (i.e. drivers must be supervised by someone at least 21 years old who has held a full licence for 3 years).

Considered by the panel to be relatively ineffective this measure was identified as relatively acceptable. It was considered that the rules were common knowledge. However, one respondent did report that they knew a magistrate who didn’t know about it. The key issue being the supervisor’s qualifications, it was suggested that a warning should be clearly stated on the provisional driving licence.

_______________________________________________
_______________________________________________
_______________________________________________

Measure 9
Reduce the expected waiting time between applying and taking driving tests.

Although considered to be of average effectiveness this measure was found to be acceptable relatively unimportant. The panel had a good level of consensus on this issue. Some confusion has been noted over the target of this measure, those who drive otherwise than in accordance with their provisional licence. It is appreciated that this measure does not address other forms of unlicensed driving. Concerns were raised that this could lead to drivers taking the test before they are ready.

_______________________________________________
_______________________________________________
_______________________________________________

The Driving Test

Comments

Please insert here any comments you would like to make

Rating
E = Effectiveness ■
A = Acceptability □
1 = High, 5 = Low

Previous Rating:

E Mean = 2.74
A Mean = 1.68

New Rating:
E 1 2 3 4 5
A 1 2 3 4 5
The Driving Test

Measure 10
Improve the perceived fairness of the practical driving examination method for minority groups (please provide any ideas that you may have to achieve this).

The panel considered this measure to be very ineffective and of average acceptability. The panel had a good level of consensus on this issue. A large proportion of the comments received questioned the existence of this problem. And a similar number queried how this could be done. Problems were noted for ethnic minorities and dyslexics, and the current procedure was noted as rewarding ‘dexterity rather than good judgment’.

Measure 11
Make the theory test more accessible to those with low levels of literacy (please provide any ideas that you may have to achieve this).

The panel considered that this measure would be relatively ineffective but of average acceptability. It was suggested that literacy may not be the problem but that exams are off-putting. It was further suggested that a certain level of literacy be required to drive a car. Suggestions such as: oral examination; interactive computer simulations; pictograms and group training were suggested as solutions to the problem.

Measure 12
Introduce a means-tested fee reduction for theory and practical driving tests and subsidies for driving lessons.

The panel identified this measure as relatively ineffective and very unacceptable. The panel had a low level of consensus on this issue. It has been suggested that the cost of lessons is not the issue but that of insurance and taxes. It was questioned who would be means-tested and who would pay – hypothecation of traffic fines was put forward as one solution. It is noted that means-testing can be seen by those just outside the thresholds, as unfair.

Please insert here any comments you would like to make.

Rating

E = Effectiveness ■
A = Acceptability □
1 = High, 5 = Low

Previous Rating:

E Mean = 3.17
A Mean = 2.15

New Rating:
E 1 2 3 4 5
A 1 2 3 4 5

“NEW” Measure 10A
Move away from the theoretical testing of provisional drivers towards testing based on simulated driving.

No comments accompanied this measure.

Previous Rating:

None

New Rating:
E 1 2 3 4 5
A 1 2 3 4 5

Measure 10
Improve the perceived fairness of the practical driving examination method for minority groups (please provide any ideas that you may have to achieve this).

Previous Rating:

E Mean = 2.78
A Mean = 2.13

New Rating:
E 1 2 3 4 5
A 1 2 3 4 5

*NEW* Measure 10A
Move away from the theoretical testing of provisional drivers towards testing based on simulated driving.

Previous Rating:

E Mean = 2.85
A Mean = 3.08

New Rating:
E 1 2 3 4 5
A 1 2 3 4 5
Deterrent Measures

Measure 13
Clearly explain to drivers at the time of their disqualification the start and finish dates over which their ban is effective.

The panel identified this measure as relatively ineffective and very unacceptable. The panel had a low level of consensus on this issue. Suggestions focus on the immediacy of the ban and sending information that reminds the disqualified driver that their ban is in force or due to end. It is, however, considered by some that the unlicensed driver knows (s)he is breaking the law.

Measure 14
Clearly explain to drivers at the time of their disqualification the penalties for breaking their ban.

This measure was considered to have average effectiveness and was acceptable. The panel had a good level of consensus on this issue. Many considered that most people already know this and that it is already done in court at the hearing. It was suggested that a leaflet could be handed to the offender to act as a reminder after the emotion of the court appearance has reduced.

Measure 15
Make clear to drivers at the time of gaining their provisional licence the penalties associated with driving otherwise than in accordance with the licence (as research shows that most provisional drivers are not aware of these).

The panel considered this measure to be both effective and acceptable. The panel had a good level of consensus on this issue. Many found the lack of awareness surprising and it was noted that this was already done by many ADIs. It was agreed that ignorance should not be an excuse.
Deterrent Measures

Measure to reduce unlicensed driving

The panel considered this measure to be of average effectiveness but unacceptable. The panel had a low level of consensus on this issue. It was considered by many that this measure would assist in the ‘shopping’ of offenders, and would most certainly assist in highlighting the problem. Conversely, it was perceived as unlikely to change behaviour, and likely to increase an offender’s esteem within their peer group. Issues were also raised with regard to human rights.

Measure 16
Publish ‘shame lists’ of disqualified drivers in the local press.

This measure was considered by the panel to be effective but very unacceptable. It was considered that this presented a number of wider issues akin to the debate surrounding identity cards. It was also identified as a burden on the police, but combined with the power to stop and search would greatly increase the perception of being caught driving without a licence.

Measure 17
Introduce the mandatory carrying of driving licences.

“NEW” Measure 17A
Allow the police to undertake roadside checks on all driving documents.

Driver Licensing

Measure to reduce unlicensed driving

The panellists raising this issue suggested that it would be a useful tool that works well in other countries.
Driver Licensing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>New Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 18</td>
<td>Convert all licences to photo-card licences as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 19</td>
<td>Introduce the use of mandatory smart card driving licences (i.e. card with electronically stored data).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;NEW&quot; Measure 19A</td>
<td>Introduce smart card technology linked to vehicles ignition to prevent use by unauthorised drivers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 20</td>
<td>Introduce the compulsory display of insurance and MOT documents in the vehicle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The panel considered this measure to be effective and have average acceptability. The panel had a good level of consensus on this issue. It was considered this would be worthwhile but would serve little purpose without mandatory carrying of licences. Cost implications were also highlighted.

This measure was considered by the panel to be relatively effective but relatively unacceptable. Comments received were similar to those for the previous two measures highlighting civil liberties and mandatory carrying. In addition, the cost of such a measure was queried.

A large proportion of the panellists identified this as an additional measure, although it was suggested that is might be a little too futuristic and inconvenient for legitimate drivers.

This measure was identified as of average effectiveness and relatively unacceptable by the panel. The panel had a low level of consensus on this issue. Many respondents noted that this measure only validated the vehicle and not the driver. They also highlighted the issue of theft from vehicles, and the increased burden on enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>E = Effectiveness ■</th>
<th>A = Acceptability □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = High</td>
<td>5 = Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Please insert here any comments you would like to make.
Driver Licensing

Measure 21
Tighten administrative loopholes that allow duplicate and false driving licences to be obtained.

This measure was considered to be very effective and the most acceptable measure in Questionnaire I. The panel had a very good level of consensus on this issue. The panel noted that this measure was long overdue and should be expected as the norm. However, it was noted that this could be difficult to achieve in practice.

Law Enforcement

Measure 22
Increase the frequency with which licences have to be renewed.

This measure was considered to be relatively ineffective and the least acceptable measure in Questionnaire I. The panel had a very low level of consensus on this issue. It was considered that this would only add to bureaucracy, have little effect, and probably add to unlicensed driving. It was noted that the testing system would be unlikely to cope with this measure. Conversely, it was considered beneficial but mostly to catch those no longer fit to drive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>New Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Law Enforcement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 24</strong></td>
<td>Increase police resources for the detection of unlicensed driving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 25</strong></td>
<td>Provide instant online checking of driving licence details in police patrol vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 26</strong></td>
<td>Provide instant online checking of driver’s licence details at police stations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Please insert here any comments you would like to make.
# Law Enforcement

## Measure 27

**Police (or Probation Service where appropriate) follow up and monitoring of disqualified drivers (increase surveillance).**

The panel considered this measure to be relatively effective and of average acceptability. The panel raised the question of the diversion of police resources away from ‘real’ crime. There was also a call for better communication between the courts, police and probation services to ensure that accurate information is available. The advantage of this being a targeted measure was also noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Rating:</th>
<th>New Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Mean = 2.24</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Mean = 2.29</td>
<td>A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measure 28

**Introduce harsher penalties for unlicensed driving.**

The panel considered this measure to be of average effectiveness and be relatively acceptable. The panel did not generally consider the current maximum sentences to be a problem; this was considered to be detection and the level of the penalty actually imposed by the court. Harsher penalties were welcomed for repeat offenders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Rating:</th>
<th>New Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Mean = 2.60</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Mean = 1.85</td>
<td>A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# Judicial Penalties

## Measure 28A

**Introduce a greater reflection of previous offences in the sentencing of repeat offenders.**

No comments accompanied this measure.
### Judicial Penalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>New Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 28B</td>
<td>Encourage greater use of existing penalties in relation to driving licence offences or reduce the discretion allowed by magistrates.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 29</td>
<td>Introduce a wider range of penalties for the various types of unlicensed driving tailored to the type of offender.</td>
<td>E Mean = 2.28 A Mean = 2.19</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 30</td>
<td>Impound the vehicles of disqualified drivers for the period of their ban.</td>
<td>E Mean = 2.72 A Mean = 3.17</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 31</td>
<td>Immobilise the vehicles of disqualified drivers for the period of their ban.</td>
<td>E Mean = 2.77 A Mean = 3.11</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no comments accompanied by Measure 28B.

The panel identified Measure 29 as relatively effective and had average acceptability. The panel had a good level of consensus on this issue. Comments were received with regard to retaining equality within a system of this type, otherwise it was considered to be a useful measure.

The panel considered Measure 30 to be of average effectiveness and very unacceptable. The panel had a very low level of consensus on this issue. Human rights issues were raised here along with issues of ownership and restrictions on third-party users other than the offender. It was also noted that a habitual offender would just use another vehicle.

This measure was considered to be relatively ineffective and very unacceptable. The panel had a very low level of consensus on this issue. Human rights issues were raised here along with issues of ownership and restrictions on third-party users other than the offender. It was also noted that a habitual offender would just use another vehicle. Overall this was considered an improvement over impounding the vehicle.
Judicial Penalties

Measure to reduce unlicensed driving

Comments were received that better use should be made of available technologies.

*NEW* Measure 31A
Electronically tag the cars of disqualified drivers to alert the police of their use and allow officers to follow up on suspected illegal driving.

This measure was considered to be of average effectiveness and very unacceptable by the panel. The panel had a very low level of consensus on this issue. Some confusion was identified over the use of the word confiscate. The issue of permanently taking possession of a vehicle as a punishment was only considered appropriate by some for repeat offenders.

Measure 32
Confiscate the cars of unlicensed drivers.

This measure was rated as effective and of average acceptability by the panel. If the perception of community service being a soft option could be overcome, the panel considered this measure to be of use, especially for low-income offenders. It was suggested that the driver improvement schemes could be used before a driver loses his or her licence.

Measure 33
Increase the use of non-disqualification penalties for motoring offences, for example, community service or driver improvement schemes.

Comments were received that better use should be made of available technologies.

Previous Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Measures

**Measure 34**
Provide improved alternatives to the car, to increase mobility of those without a valid driving licence, especially in rural areas and for those with low income.

This measure was identified as relatively ineffective and of average acceptability by the panel. The panel had a low level of consensus on this issue. Although welcomed this was not thought to address unlicensed driving issues. It was also considered to be expensive and unviable especially on a realistic time scale.

**Measure 35**
Require employers to check employees driving licences if driving is part of the job requirement: a) when taking on staff; and b) periodically afterwards.

This measure was considered to be effective and of average acceptability. This measure was widely welcomed by respondents and it was considered by many that it should already be undertaken.

**"NEW" Measure 35A**
Introduce a new vehicle owner’s offence ‘not to allow an unlicensed driver to use their vehicle’.

No comments accompanied this suggestion.

**Measure 36**
Require that insurers of motor vehicles and drivers obtain copies of drivers’ licences when insurance policies are taken out and renewed.

The panel identified that this measure was of average effectiveness and average acceptability. This was seen as a good idea, however, it was noted most unlicensed drivers are also uninsured as well. It was considered that this would be burdensome on insurers who would pass costs on to legitimate drivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>New Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 34</td>
<td>E Mean = 2.51 A Mean = 2.45</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 35</td>
<td>E Mean = 2.94 A Mean = 2.17</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 35A</td>
<td>E Mean = 2.00 A Mean = 2.13</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 36</td>
<td>E Mean = 2.51 A Mean = 2.45</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>E 1 2 3 4 5 A 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Measures

Comments
Please insert here any comments you would like to make

Measure 37
Through the driving instructor’s organisations, develop a code of practice where warnings about unlicensed driving are passed on to pupils by driving instructors.

This measure was considered to be relatively ineffective and of average acceptability by the panel. It was considered that this should already be done, but those taking lessons were not the problem.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART II

In Part II of this questionnaire you are asked to undertake one further task:

The page overleaf contains a list of all the measures identified in Part I. Please SELECT the combination of seven measures you consider would make the most impact to reduce unlicensed driving. Place the measure numbers in the boxes at the foot of the page so as to assign a value of ‘1’ to the most important, ‘2’ to the next most important and so on, until the seventh measure (the least important of the seven) is assigned a value of ‘7’.

(Note that the overall rating from the first questionnaire is shown in brackets by each measure)
Measures to reduce unlicensed driving
(abbreviated statement and rank from Questionnaire I)

EDUCATION AND PUBLICITY
1 Increase publicity on the road safety problem of unlicensed driving (=24)
*1A* Encourage the public to report suspects to a telephone hotline (-)
2 Highlight the insurance cost implications of unlicensed driving to the public (17)
3 Publicise link between unlicensed driving and criminal activity (26)
4 Increase teaching of safe driving in schools, highlighting unlicensed driving (=8)
*4A* Educate young motoring offenders in the long-term effects of committing crime (-)
5 Encourage community schemes/motor projects for the young (4)
6 Develop guidelines for projects for young motoring offenders (=20)
7 Increase local and national publicity on the penalties for unlicensed driving (31)
8 Enhance public knowledge of the restrictions of the provisional licence (=20)

THE DRIVING TEST
9 Reduce the expected waiting time between applying and taking driving tests (=27)
10 Improve perceived fairness of practical driving exams (37)
*10A* Move from theoretical to simulated driving tests (-)
11 More accessible theory test for those with low levels of literacy (=20)
12 Means-tested fee reduction for driving tests and subsidies for driving lessons (=24)

DETERRENCE MEASURES
13 Explain to drivers at disqualification the start and finish dates of their ban (36)
14 Explain to drivers at the time of their disqualification the penalties for breaking their ban (=27)
15 Explain to provisional licence holders the penalties for unlicensed driving (=8)
16 Publish ‘shame lists’ of disqualified drivers in local press (=8)

DRIVER LICENSING
17 Introduce the mandatory carrying of driving licences (=1)
*17A* Allow increased roadside checking of driving documents (-)
18 Convert all licences to photo-card licences as soon as possible (6)
19 Introduce mandatory smart card driving licences (=15)
*19A* Develop smart ignition systems to ban unauthorised drivers (-)
20 Compulsory display of insurance/MOT documents in the vehicle (5)
21 Tighten administrative loopholes (=15)
22 Increase the frequency with which licences have to be renewed (35)

LAW ENFORCEMENT
23 Draw the attention of the police to the link between unlicensed driving with other crime (29)
24 Increase police resources for detection (3)
*24A* Add traffic policing to the core functions of the police (-)
25 Online checking of licence details in police vehicles (=1)
26 Online checking of licence details in police stations (=32)
27 Police (or Probation Service where appropriate) follow up/monitoring (18)

JUDICIAL PENALTIES
28 Harsher penalties for unlicensed driving (7)
*28A* Introduce harsher penalties for repeat offenders (-)
*28B* Use existing penalties better or reduce the discretion of magistrates (-)
29 Introduce a wider range of penalties for various types of unlicensed driving (11)
30 Impound the vehicles of disqualified drivers during their ban (=32)
31 Immobilise the vehicles of disqualified drivers during their ban (23)
*31A* Electronically tag the cars of unlicensed drivers to allow tracking (-)
32 Confiscate the cars of unlicensed drivers (14)
33 Increase the use of non-disqualification penalties for motoring offences (=12)

OTHER MEASURES
34 Alternatives to car to increase mobility of those without driving licence (19)
35 Employers to check driving licences if driving is a job requirement (=12)
*35A* Make it a keeper’s offence ‘not to allow an unlicensed driver to use a car’ (-)
36 Insurers to obtain copies of drivers’ licences (30)
37 Develop code of practice for driving instructors to warn pupils about unlicensed driving (34)

Most Important

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
APPENDIX E: REPORT OF THE ‘PERPETRATOR’
FOCUS GROUPS AND DELPHI WORKSHOP

In the following sections each main ‘issue area for discussion’ is dealt with in turn. First the outcome of the ‘perpetrator’ discussion focus groups is reported. A description of the discussions during the Delphi workshop is then provided. Quotes (indicated by the italicised sentences) from the participants have also been included to explicate the findings. A summary of the main views is provided within Chapter 7.

1 ISSUE (A): USE OF JUDICIAL PENALTIES FOR UNLICENSED DRIVING

1.1 Focus Group Discussions

1.1.1 It was unanimously agreed by participants that the current penalties do not serve as very effective deterrents. Both the prison group and the young offenders from the Motor Project felt that being sent to prison was an ineffective penalty. Comments include:

‘Prison life is quite easy… with regular meals and warmth, what more do you need?’

‘You get DVDs, Playstation, television, radios, the gym, it’s great.’

‘Some people can’t wait to get back in, they are used to it.’

‘They feel they belong in prison because of the friendships.’

1.1.2 It was certainly not considered an effective enough deterrent. In addition, the inmates felt that the fine system currently in place is not realistic as most offenders would not be able to afford the fines. They would opt for a jail sentence instead, which counteracts the fine.

1.1.3 With regard to impounding or immobilising the vehicles of disqualified drivers during their ban, and confiscating the cars of unlicensed drivers, all groups (prisoners, young offenders and young people at the community centre) agreed that these measures would not be very effective. They agreed that it is quite easy to buy or steal a car and hence they would not be deterred.

‘Driving is a must in this world, confiscating a car from an offender would deter friends from lending cars to unlicensed drivers, so I would just pinch one. It may reduce the number of first-time offenders but I can’t see it working.’

‘The lender is not at fault; the driver is taking the risk and should take the responsibility.’
1.1.4 Electronically tagging cars of disqualified drivers to alert the police of their use was considered unacceptable as was punishing the owner who has allowed the unlicensed driver to drive.

1.1.5 Confronting offenders with the filmed injuries sustained by victims and victim confrontation was considered effective by only the young people at the community centre.

1.1.6 As an alternative to the suggested measures, it was felt that standardising the penalties so that offenders know what to expect the next time they offend would be more effective.

‘There are no standards for fines and sentencing, it is dependent on the judge at the time.’

‘If they do not know what to expect, they are more likely to take a chance in the hope that they will be given a light sentence.’

1.1.7 Both the group of young offenders from the Motor Project and the prisoners also felt that knowing what was the penalty for a re-offence would deter them. The prisoners were aggrieved about the injustice of the system in targeting them.

‘There are lots of old people and drunks who shouldn’t be driving, it’s the aggressive driver who should be banned or trained.’

1.2 Alternative Suggestions from Focus Group Discussions

1.2.1 The focus group participants suggested the following alternatives as being effective measures in preventing and deterring unlicensed driving:

1.2.2 Community and driver improvement schemes instead of jail sentence:

‘For first-time offenders, rather than issuing ‘producers’ which they could ignore, they should be required to attend community service or driving courses.’

1.2.3 Unlicensed drivers should undergo counselling:

‘Like in the case of drink-drivers having to attend counselling or courses, unlicensed drivers should be made to see someone to talk about their behaviour.’

1.2.4 Help to reduce the cost of learning to drive for those who would most benefit from financial help:

‘Money is an issue in the expense of getting a licence; community courses may help in reducing the final cost.’

1.2.5 Reduce the age restriction for a provisional licence holder:

‘As in North America – driving is something that many young people wish to experience and will do it anyway.’

‘Sixteen years old is fair.’
1.2.6 Military style camps:

‘Alternative sentencing like Boot Camps in America are really demanding and might be a good deterrent.’

1.2.7 Increase the perception/reality of the likelihood of getting caught:

‘People are willing to take the risk these days as they don’t think they will be caught.’

1.3 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

1.3.1 The measures considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys were:

- Introduce a wider range of penalties for unlicensed driving, tailored to the type of offender (rank 9)
- Introduce harsher penalties for unlicensed driving (rank 13)

1.3.2 In the questionnaire responses there were some comments suggesting that detection of unlicensed driving was more important than the penalties:

‘My perception is that offenders do not expect to get caught.’

‘Ineffective without increasing the probability of detection.’

1.3.3 One view was that to raise the deterrent level appreciably, a disproportionately severe penalty would need to be introduced.

1.3.4 It was argued that raising the seriousness of the offence would deter those who currently think that it is ‘not such a big deal’. Allied to this was the fact that convictions tend to be for uninsured driving rather than unlicensed driving, and that document offences are not always included within prosecutions where some other more serious offence has been committed. The average fines for offences were thought to be much lower than the maximum possible. It was thought possible that these factors lead to the perceived message that a firm line was not being taken on unlicensed driving. Therefore it was not necessarily a matter of changing the law but implementing the existing laws more effectively:

‘The possible penalties are severe, whether they are fully used is another matter’

1.3.5 An idea to highlight to offenders that unlicensed driving was also unacceptable, was to outline to the offenders when imposing a fine, the proportions of the fine related to each offence, rather than using one lump sum.

1.3.6 It was thought that greater equality and consistency generally might be achieved through magistrates’ sentencing guidelines being followed more rigorously.
1.3.7 A specific example was offered where it was suggested that magistrates would like ‘uninsured driving’ to become imprisonable, because repeat offenders can only be fined (yet again) and disqualified. More than one individual raised the issue of stronger penalties for repeat offenders. However, it was also questioned whether there was any evidence that harsher penalties deter offenders from re-offending, or deter other people from offending for the first time.

1.3.8 A problem with the current system that was highlighted was that driving disqualifications are often longer than the probation support provided for offenders. It was also highlighted that many offenders want to become legal drivers, but that after convictions the cost of insurance increases dramatically. Therefore due to the increased costs, they may be likely to offend again by driving uninsured and unlicensed. It was suggested that penalties should be long term but should offer the possibility for remission for those who demonstrate their commitment to reform.

1.3.9 It was suggested that because unlicensed driving presents a wide range of deviancy from wilful or careless, to ignorant, then penalties should be tailored to the type of offender. The concept of ‘smarter penalties’ not harsher penalties was strongly advocated. An example may be driver retraining, which provides an incentive for the driver to change their behaviour. It was suggested that the offenders often require assistance to achieve a disciplined lifestyle. An example offered was Boot Camps. One method could be the extension of community service hours in return for driving lessons. However, it was also recommended that these types of penalties should not be seen as giving an unfair advantage to those who have offended over those who use the system correctly.

1.3.10 The fact that unlicensed driving or ‘illicit’ driving was part of a wider overall socio-economic problem was also raised. This issue should be highlighted as part of general ‘crime and disorder’ and the concern among communities about wider crime problems. It was also mentioned that the fact that a driving licence should be valued as a potential ‘ticket to a job’, especially to those who are generally not highly skilled, should be publicised, perhaps as part of driver training.

2 ISSUE (B): USE OF JUDICIAL PENALTIES FOR MOTORING OFFENDERS GENERALLY

2.1 Focus Group Discussions

2.1.1 There was a general lack of knowledge of the Road Traffic New Drivers Act 1995. Upon discussion, the learner drivers felt that the penalty of licence revocation was unfair and too severe. It was felt that the time period of two years (within which they were allowed to accumulate six points before having their licence revoked) was too short and a driver should not lose his/her licence as it can be demoralising and it is unlikely that they will be motivated to be re-examined. Participants felt that the New Drivers Act would increase the likelihood of unlicensed driving.
2.1.2 The groups interviewed felt that they would be inclined to continue driving if their licence was revoked; they perceived the risk of getting caught to be low.

‘It isn’t a question of skill if your licence is revoked due to an accumulation of speeding points (referring to totting up of points) – so there is little to stop you from continuing, especially if you have family commitments and have to drive.’

2.1.3 Support for the use of non-disqualification (non-revocation) penalties was received. Participants agreed that other existing penalties could be used instead, provided the progression and severity of penalties for re-offenders was clarified.

2.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

2.2.1 The measures considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys were:

- Introduce a greater reflection of previous offences in the sentencing of repeat offenders (rank 7)
- Increase the use of non-disqualification penalties for motoring offences (rank 10)
- Use existing penalties better or reduce the discretion of magistrates (rank 22)

2.2.2 The reader should note that a number of the comments made under this issue heading were also applicable to the previous heading (issue A) and vice versa.

2.2.3 Again the concept of smarter penalties was raised with the use of driving courses advocated. These could be used to assess candidates and then to only use disqualification if the course does not work for an individual – a ‘delayed ban’. Greater use should also be made of compulsory retesting for all motor offences, funded by the offender. It was also argued by one that driver improvement schemes are not appropriate for banned drivers or those who have never held a licence, whereas another suggested that as they are expensive to administer they should be reserved for more serious offences.

2.2.4 It was mentioned by many that courts already take account of previous convictions when sentencing. More than one mentioned the possibility of a hierarchy of penalties for repeat offenders, which would ‘delay’ disqualification perhaps for a first offence, but that a firmer warning would need to be used as part of the first penalty:

‘Make them aware their first offence has been dealt with compassionately, then any subsequent offence hit them hard.’

‘Ratcheting up of penalties may discourage repeat offenders.’

‘The potential loss of licence under the totting up procedure focuses the mind of drivers with accumulated points. The introduction of a suspended disqualification could have similar deterrent effects.’
2.2.5 Concern was raised over the effectiveness of the New Drivers Act. It was thought that only about a third of those who had their licence revoked had regained their licence, and that with the increase in the use of speed cameras there may be many more licence endorsements generally which would lead to many more licence revocations. It was also mentioned that:

‘People don’t know about it for it to be a deterrent.’

2.2.6 The issue of the knowledge of penalties was considered a reoccurring issue, along with the consistency of their use. Getting the message across to magistrates was considered important. With regard to the use of magistrates’ guidelines it was advised that they are considered in-depth, but the magistrates are not bound to them. Because of this vagueness consistency cannot be achieved. A common complaint is that magistrates do not use available punishments to the full.

2.2.7 It was thought that intervention during the early stages of the driving career would be beneficial, and it was wondered what information was provided to drivers during the process of obtaining a driving licence. It was advised that information provided to drivers after they had passed their test was not likely to be ‘taken in’ after the euphoria of passing.

2.2.8 In regard to the fines imposed by courts, it was advised that the magistrates are constrained by court reports on the financial status of the offender, and therefore may levy lower fines so as to not impose too high a penalty. It was accepted that ability to pay was a problem for low-income offenders.

2.2.9 Again it was argued that the problem is not with disqualification, but with greater deterrence through detection. It was suggested that technology would improve this over time.

3 ISSUE (C): INCREASE POLICE RESOURCES

3.1 Focus Group Discussions

3.1.1 The suggestion for the police or probation service to follow up or monitor progress of offenders was well received. It was felt that guidance after release from prison is crucial so that offenders feel that they have some direction and purpose and do not revert to their old lifestyle.

‘You should have plans to get your life back again.’

3.1.2 The young offenders as well as older persons noted the need for an increase in police resources for detection – especially in order to increase the likelihood of getting caught (considered an effective deterrent, see point 2.2.7).

3.1.3 There was also support for traffic policing to be added to the core functions of the police. However, some young offenders were more concerned about the need to
concentrate on the ‘more serious’ crimes. Others highlighted the need to increase the perceived seriousness of unlicensed driving. They also mentioned the issue of delay in the prosecution procedure, considered to be a contributory factor.

‘The police should make more immediate enquiries about the unlicensed driver, in addition to issuing a producer if they want to impress upon them the seriousness of the illegal behaviour.’

‘You know the police know yet they let you get away with it, it makes you laugh.’

‘The police know that there is not much they can do about unlicensed drivers except give them a producer. It can take up to 6-7 months for a follow up before they are called to court. Someone I know had accumulated 50 producers. Furthermore, committing another crime while waiting to be summoned by the courts is common.’

3.1.4 Participants revealed that they would be more likely to be involved in a crash if involved in a chase. One of the prisoners said:

‘Obviously if stopping at an accident meant that I would have to go to prison, I would not stop regardless of the state of the victim.’

3.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

3.2.1 The measures considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys were:

- Police (or probation service) follow up and monitoring of disqualified drivers (rank 10)
- Increase police resources for the detection of unlicensed driving (rank 12)
- Add traffic policing to the core functions of the police (rank 19)

3.2.2 It was felt that the detection of unlicensed driving was linked mainly to the carriage of driving licences and means of identification of drivers, which would not require increased resources but would in fact release resources as there would be no need to have ‘producers’ at stations. It was also mentioned that the increased use of automatic number plate recognition systems would assist in detection.

3.2.3 It was accepted that the enforcement of unlicensed driving and traffic offences in general was a good way of targeting and disrupting the criminal activities of more serious offenders. It was felt that the link between driving while disqualified and other criminal activity was likely to be strongest than with other forms of unlicensed driving. It was suggested that the established link to more general crime (as well as road safety) was important and that therefore the communication between the ‘crime’ and ‘traffic’ functions within police forces should be improved. This link should also be publicised, because using resources in this way needs the support of the public and the backing of ministers. This would allow inclusion within performance indicators for example, which would help the police become more effective.
3.2.4 However, it was recognised that it may be difficult to convince the public and ministers to increase resources in this area, and concerns were raised about the cost to enforcement of other serious crime:

‘This measure could increase effectiveness but at a cost to other law enforcement.’
‘An increase in police resources would not remain focused on this issue for long because more “sexy” issues would divert attention from it.’
‘How high would this be on the public’s list of effective uses for extra police resources?’
‘This could trigger a negative response in the motoring lobby, which already feels unduly put upon.’

3.2.5 Two suggestions were put forward within the returned questionnaires. It was wondered if it may be possible to develop the principles of hypothecation:

‘…netting off from speed cameras into other areas of enforcement such as this.’

Another suggestion was to use a separate dedicated enforcement agency similar to TV licence enforcement, trading standards etc.

3.2.6 With regard to the follow up of offenders, it was suggested that the use of curfew orders and electronic tagging could be options.

4 ISSUE (D): ONLINE CHECKING OF DRIVING LICENCES, FORMAT AND CARRYING OF DRIVING LICENCES

4.1 Focus Group Discussions

4.1.1 There was support for online checking of licence details both in police stations and vehicles but there was some concern that there would always be ways to claim false identity. One prisoner said:

‘People will always find ways around the law.’

4.1.2 The learner drivers supported the conversion of all licences to photo card licences.

4.1.3 Participants were divided about the issue of mandatory carrying of licences. Some participants felt that if they lost their licence it could become more problematic (for example, more cost, might be used by someone else). A suggestion was put forward for the implementation of an ‘invisible’ code, linking insurance, tax and licence details that cannot be replicated for example, using smart card technology). The group very well received this suggestion. Another group suggested that the mandatory carrying of driving licences should apply only to provisional licence holders.

4.1.4 With regard to the compulsory display of insurance/MOT documents in the vehicle, no consensus was achieved and it was felt that this would cause more problems if stolen.
4.1.5 Participants suggested increasing the frequency with which licences have to be renewed. The young persons group suggested renewals after every 20 years; others felt that length of licence ownership rather than age should be the deciding factor.

4.1.6 The older persons were wary of licence renewals as they felt it targeted them. They were more in favour of retraining measures for dangerous drivers and those involved in crashes. Rather than making it mandatory to take a test at 70 years of age, they felt that it would be better to provide greater enforcement through the use of cameras and make it mandatory to take a driving course if one was involved in dangerous driving and/or speeding.

‘Many older drivers are a menace on the road. Some people think they have to take a medical exam to renew their licence after a certain age. Many older people lie about their medical conditions. It is costly (£68) to take a medical exam and get a certificate.’

‘Perhaps doctors should be given the responsibility to inform the DVLA if a patient is unfit to drive?’

‘Even doctors are not able to stop people from driving – if one wants to he or she will continue driving. It should be the responsibility of the person driving to do what is right to inform the DVLA of changes that could affect their driving. Insurance, for one would become invalid if someone develops a medical condition.’

4.1.7 A few participants personally knew drivers who drive without a licence or insurance.

‘People are living longer and getting fitter. They would object to their licence being revoked. There are drivers who have never taken a test but are legal drivers because they started driving before the enforcement of licences.’

4.1.8 The group of learner drivers who had consistently failed their tests felt that licence renewal would be accepted only if the testing process or renewal is provided free of charge by the government, and took place regularly (for example, every 10-15 years) upon getting a licence. It was felt that renewals should be made mandatory.

4.1.9 The older persons group felt that it should be mandatory for someone involved in a crash/driving offence to go through some form of schooling.

‘Motor vehicle selling especially the way they “push” their products gives the wrong impression to young people about the capabilities of a car. The cost element of retraining needs to be considered.’

‘If such programmes are made optional only the drivers who care will take them up.’

‘Nowadays people comply with the speed limits only because they don’t want to get caught. Similarly if people felt they would be caught, they would not drive unlicensed.’

‘Same with crime – it would be reduced if detection was improved.’
More deterrent measures are needed. Enforcement is poor.
You get more cautious as you get older.

4.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

4.2.1 The measures considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys were:
• Provide instant online checking of driving licence details in police patrol vehicles (rank 2)
• Provide instant online checking of driving licence details at police stations (rank 3)
• Convert all licences to photocard licences as soon as possible (rank 6)
• Introduce the mandatory carrying of licences (rank 19)
• Introduce the use of mandatory smart card driving licences – cards with electronically stored data (rank 21)

4.2.2 Within the questionnaires comments with regard to online checking of licence details were positive, subject to the costs involved:
Useful innovation if the costs are reasonable.
Even without a vast increase in resources these measures would produce a considerable deterrent.

4.2.3 At the workshop it was advised that it is already possible to check the details of an individual at the roadside or in police stations, however, it is not possible at the present time to check whether the person is who they say they are. It was suggested that there are several possible solutions (or combinations of solutions):
• Introduce mandatory carriage of driving licences
• Introduce photocard driving licences
• Making the photograph of the driver available on the online police system.

4.2.4 There was disagreement as to whether online checking of licences would mean that mandatory carriage would be necessary, or whether the inclusion of the photograph on the online systems would mean that mandatory carriage would be necessary. It was suggested that as a consequence of the terrorist attack of September the 11th the issue of identity cards for the general public was again ‘on the agenda’:
…there is growing support for identity cards in order to combat crime.

4.2.5 Some thought it possible that the greater use of the driving licence for identification purposes was being considered as a way of ‘testing the notion of a national identity card’. It was commented that mandatory carriage would release a burden on the police, who would not have to keep asking for the production of police documents at police stations.
4.2.6 With regard to mandatory carriage of driving licences, it was advised that previous research (completed some years ago) had shown that many drivers were against, but that women were more in favour (possibly because in many cases they permanently carried their licence in their handbag anyway). It was accepted that mandatory carriage of licences would not be acceptable to many members of the general public because of the intrusion upon the liberty of the individual. It was also suggested that this dislike was peculiar to the British compared with other European Countries for example. The implementation of mandatory carriage would require clear guidelines as to how the police would use powers to request inspection of the licence (as with breath-testing):

‘…the acceptability would depend on justification.’

‘It would make offenders out of otherwise quite innocent drivers.’

4.2.7 Possible problems were mentioned with respect to checking licences: The DVLA database of driving licence details was thought to be inaccurate in many cases due to the obligation of the public to inform DVLA of changing details, which was not always completed. It was also suggested that there are always methods of obtaining forgeries. However, it was also asserted that if obtaining or making forgeries was made to be more difficult, then forgeries will be restricted to the more extreme criminal element upon which more police force resources could then be focused. The quality and size of the photograph used on the photocard licence was raised as an item that may need improving if the use of photocards was to be effective.

4.2.8 The mandatory introduction of photocard licences would also be considered by some to place a burden on the law-abiding motorist. It was suggested that obtaining them should be made free of charge as an incentive.

5 ISSUE (E): OBTAINING DRIVING LICENCES

5.1 Focus Group Discussions

5.1.1 All groups agreed that the tightening of administrative loopholes is needed to prevent duplication of false licences, easy use of someone else’s licence and use of false insurance certificates.

‘One can get a phoney licence/insurance certificate for £140. Even a five year no claim bonus.’

5.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

5.2.1 The measure considered the most useful of all by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys was:

• Tighten administrative loopholes that allow duplicate and false driving licences to be obtained (rank 1)
5.2.2 Within the questionnaire returns it was stated by more than one respondent that the tightening of administrative loopholes was ‘worth doing in any event’. A number of perceived problems were raised within the questionnaires and at the work shop including:

- False addresses on licences, and informing DVLA of any change of address
- The use of duplicate licences
- Checks that are made prior to the issue of the first licence are too lax.

5.2.3 It was suggested that such problems would be reduced when a new police database comes into use, but only if police officers bother to check drivers’ details. This was because it was considered that many of the drivers who obtain duplicate licences could be disqualified drivers who carry them to deceive police officers when stopped.

5.2.4 It was acknowledged that the tightening of loopholes might require the collaboration of several organisations including the Post Office, the Police and DVLA. It was stated that the DVLA are expected to provide a rapid service to someone who has lost or had his licence stolen and needs a new one urgently, and that the passport office complete a similar function.

5.2.5 One idea was to provide approved centres for the obtaining of driving licences where photographs could be taken for use on identity cards in a secure environment. These centres could be based at driving centres, it was suggested.

5.2.6 It was argued that reliance on technology to tighten loopholes would not address behavioural issues, and that a number of interventions would be necessary overall, not just enforcement:

‘...we need a multi-pronged approach.’

6 ISSUE (F): EMPLOYERS TO CHECK EMPLOYEES DRIVING LICENCES

6.1 Focus Group Discussions

6.1.1 This measure was fully supported by all groups. Participants raised the point that some large employers already implement this measure.

6.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

6.2.1 The measure considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys was:

- Require employers to check employees driving licences if driving is part of the job requirement: a) when taking on staff, and b) periodically afterwards (rank 4)
6.2.2 This proposal received a number of positive comments within the questionnaire survey:

‘This should already be done – employer has a responsibility to make sure employee is licensed.’

6.2.3 It was suggested that there are two categories of offenders: employers doing it on purpose, and employees doing it without the knowledge of their employer. There was also thought to be two main categories of employee: those for whom driving is an essential part of their work (but not their main task), and those for whom driving is their primary work task:

‘…easy win, not just van-man but mondeo-man too.’

6.2.4 This subject was highlighted as a health and safety issue and it was thought that the Health and Safety at Work Act required the checking of employees’ licences even when driving on private land. However, it was suggested that checks have not been implemented, and that there would be resource implications for the Health and Safety Executive who would be the potential enforcers of such requirements. There would also be resource implication for employers. There may be a problem when companies place a contract for others to complete work for them as to whether there would be a delegation of responsibility to check licences or not. It was acknowledged that the government had created the inter-agency Work-Related Road Safety Task Group.

6.2.5 A further issue was the problem of ignorance of the type of licence required for certain vehicles. It was thought that the health and safety sector might be able to provide education in this area.

6.2.6 It was wondered whether it was possible to include employer’s details on the driving licence and whether courts would be able to tell employers that their member of staff had been disqualified. It was added that court proceedings are public domain information anyway.

6.2.7 It was argued that this issue would send out the message to comply to those looking for work:

‘If I lose my licence, I lose my employment.’

6.2.8 It was advised that it should also be noted that ‘points on the licence’ of their employees could affect employers’ group insurance policies.
7  ISSUE (G): PROVIDE INFORMATION TO DRIVERS AT DISQUALIFICATION

7.1  Focus Group Discussions

7.1.1  From previous research on the behaviour of disqualified drivers, it was uncovered that many drivers are not aware of the penalties for driving while disqualified. Participants felt that:

‘They (disqualified drivers) should also be made aware of the range and severity of penalties for re-offending.’

‘The penalty for a repeat offence should be more severe than the first penalty to deter them from committing it again. They might then realise that they are not getting away with the offence so easily.’

7.1.2  It was also agreed that it would be helpful if a letter was sent reminding the disqualified drivers of the finish date and penalties for driving while disqualified. As one participant exemplified:

‘Just in case they were nearing the end of the ban and were tempted to drive.’

7.2  Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

7.2.1  The measure considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys was:

- Clearly explain to drivers at the time of their disqualification the penalties for breaking their ban (rank 8)
- Clearly explain to drivers at the time of their disqualification the start and finish dates of their ban (rank 16)

7.2.2  It was argued by one within the questionnaires that the provision of better information would ‘close the door’ on leniency based on a claimed misunderstanding or ignorance. It was argued at the workshop, however, that the belief that claiming ignorance (as to when a driving ban ended for example) would help the offender in court was a ‘red herring’, because it is made ‘black and white’ in court and the offender must hand over their licence. It was also claimed that even repeat offenders deny knowledge of what penalties are. However, it was also suggested that the time the disqualification starts may not be a problem, but when it ends may be.

‘In court we disqualify for so many days, weeks, months or years and do not mention a finish date.’

7.2.3  There was also thought to be confusion as to the date when ‘penalty points’ start. Court sentences may also be subject to appeal which, it was suggested, may be the reason why the end date of disqualifications are not given.
7.2.4 At the workshop it was wondered as to what information is provided to drivers currently. It was thought that a lot of information is issued at the time of gaining a licence but in the euphoria of passing the test many see that the information is not relevant to them. It was thought that offenders are clearly told verbally in court as to their penalty and the penalty for breaking their ban. The point was made that this would not affect those whose licence is revoked under the New Drivers Act, as they do not have to appear in court.

7.2.5 It was agreed that information provided in courts may be problematic and therefore a letter after disqualification reminding the offender of their disqualification and the penalties for breaking their ban would be useful. Such a letter may also act as a deterrent to re-offending by making the offender feel that the authorities are monitoring them. A problem with sending a letter was identified in that the DVLA database may not have up-to-date addresses (due to the fact that DVLA have to rely upon the public to provide them with address information), and the offenders may be a mobile population.

7.2.6 However, a number of comments were made within the questionnaires that claimed information was already provided effectively:

‘Is this not done already?’

‘...I believe this is done effectively including handing out a leaflet...’

‘If knowledge of the penalty when caught effectively deterred crime we would have a crime-free society. The penalty is already announced at court and I doubt that publishing it further would have any effect.’

7.2.7 The view was also expressed that these measures would only affect a limited group of less serious offender:

‘…only effective with “peripheral” offenders.’

‘...would only affect a limited group but would be effective for them.’

‘I would suggest that those who drive while disqualified are fully aware of their action.’

7.2.8 The provision of information to offenders after the court appearance would have resource implications and it was not clear as to who would have this responsibility, the courts or DVLA.
8 ISSUE (H): EDUCATION – TEACHING DRIVING IN SCHOOLS

8.1 Focus Group Discussions

8.1.1 There were two ‘schools of thought’ on this measure. From the point of view of the offenders, it was felt that if safe driving was discussed at school, and particularly if they were able to practise driving, it would satisfy their curiosity and also educate them on the potential penalties for driving unlicensed. However, the older persons group and the young people at the community centre did not agree with school intervention. They felt that driving should not be included in academic education. It was proposed that the responsibility belonged to the family to educate young people about driving.

8.1.2 The learner drivers felt that driving centres should teach safe and good driving behaviour. The older persons also suggested this. One older participant said:

‘One can actually pass the test in a relatively short period of time – this should not be allowed. The training should be longer.’

8.1.3 Participants felt that there should be more awareness training:

‘Things that you learn apart from the test, particularly about the process of driving.’

8.1.4 One of the older participants said that he would be interested in advanced driver training but would be reluctant to take it up, in case he found out he was a poor driver. Retraining for older drivers needs to consider this fear.

8.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

8.2.1 The measure considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys was:

- Increase teaching of safe driving in schools, highlighting unlicensed driving (rank 14)

8.2.2 Comments within the questionnaires highlighted the fact that teaching safe driving would ‘fit-in’ with the wider issue of being a responsible citizen. The teaching should focus on the high crash risk of younger drivers, it was suggested.

8.2.3 Some problems were identified however:

‘…such measures are unlikely to appeal to the conscience of the “hard core” but may deter less committed future and present offenders’

‘You need to attend school to benefit. My hardcore of offenders do not go to school.’

8.2.4 It was also mentioned that there would be problems teaching safe driving in schools due to pressures of the national curriculum, and that qualified driving instructors should be responsible for such teaching anyway.
Another comment was that such teaching was unlikely to stop unlicensed driving, and one doubted the wisdom of teaching safe driving in schools at all.

At the workshop it was asked as to what training is currently provided in schools. The DSA provide a schools programme that focuses mainly on ‘demystifying the test’ and to encourage positive attitudes to obey the law, but does not focus on unlicensed driving. Citizenship training within schools excludes learning to drive as it was thought that it might dominate the subject.

It was argued that schools are becoming adept at identifying and teaching ‘likely lads’ or those at risk of social exclusion. It was also mentioned that in rural areas where the car was essential and where there had been a high crash rate among pupils, the community had approached the school ‘to do something’. It was also considered a way of providing skills for low academic achievers.

However, it was argued that any teaching of safe driving would be constrained by the demands of the national curriculum, and to try to include safe driving would be ambitious. Some schools, it was argued, would rather their pupils concentrated on their A-levels.

It was suggested that teaching of safe driving should not be the responsibility of schools. Instead it should be encouraged through the use of community safety partnerships led by educationalists and perhaps in partnership with schools and Police. The role of the family should not be downplayed, but reservations were expressed as to the ‘picking up of bad habits’ from parents. The example of France where classroom teaching of driving takes place within specialist driving schools was cited.

It was also argued that the teaching of driving should depend upon the age of the pupils and that:

‘you do not want to encourage people to start driving younger than they otherwise would.’

ISSUE (I): EDUCATION – YOUNG MOTORING OFFENDERS

Focus Group Discussions

What came across as a very significant issue with the young offenders at the Motor Project was the influence of a role model. Participants felt that learning from a reformed offender could help them. They agreed that they would be more willing to concede if advice was received from an ex-offender.

‘I have already started thinking about my actions as I don’t want to go through what he’s been through.’
9.1.2 It was not discussed in full whose responsibility it would be to provide a role model.

9.1.3 The measure considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys was:

- Educate potential young motoring offenders in the long-term effects of committing crime at an early age (rank 15)

9.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

9.2.1 It should be noted that some of the discussion and comments recorded under this heading are applicable to the previous issue regarding the education of safe driving in schools and vice versa.

9.2.2 The questionnaire comments included several which questioned how potential young motoring offenders would be identified. It was considered by many that there would be little impact on the offenders. Some raised the problem that the education would not necessarily prevent offending in the future:

'... few young people think beyond the “now” to be able to project future consequences of particular actions.'

'Does not address the problem of impulsive offending.'

9.2.3 One suggestion was to introduce mandatory retraining (similar to the National Driver Improvement Scheme) for those reverting to learner status under the New Driver Act 1995.

9.2.4 The SKIDZ Wycombe Motor Project was cited as a good example of a community motor project to divert young people from becoming offenders. An evaluation report can be found on the website: www.skidz.org.uk

9.2.5 At the workshop it was suggested that although such schemes should be completed within the community, schools are a good point of contact to identify those who may be at risk of becoming offenders. Discussion focused on who would complete such teaching and the ‘identity between the student and teacher’. It was advised that the use of ex-offenders as teachers was not recommended, and a good alternative may be mechanics who could be seen as a father figure and provide a dialogue between the generations. Schoolteachers were not thought to be the best option for this work.
10 ISSUE (J): EDUCATION – RESTRICTIONS OF THE PROVISIONAL LICENCE

10.1 Focus Group Discussions

10.1.1 Participants who had repeatedly failed their driving tests were not entirely aware or clear about the restrictions on the provisional licence. They were also not sure of the exact penalties for driving unlicensed (without a licence, with a provisional licence but not in accordance with the restrictions or while disqualified). Driving without any licence was considered a more serious offence than driving with a provisional licence but not in accordance with the restrictions on the licence.

10.1.2 Participants felt that the restrictions on the provisional licence are not well known. They said that a booklet with lettering in small font is currently provided but not much attention is paid to it.

‘There should be more eye-catching information about the restrictions when a provisional licence is issued such as a sheet of paper with bullet points.’

10.1.3 Alternatively, it was suggested that these restrictions could be printed on the back of the provisional licence thereby making them more obvious. Participants also agreed that the consequences for the accompanying passenger who is under 21 years or has not had a licence for three years should also be highlighted.

‘Young people sometimes get their parents and siblings to accompany them in the car without realising the restrictions that apply to the passenger.’

10.1.4 When asked, the learner drivers felt that most provisional licence holders are generally NOT aware of the restrictions on the provisional licence.

10.1.5 Participants said that the restrictions should be made clear not only to the general public, but more importantly to the provisional licence holders (PLH) themselves.

‘There is a lack of awareness of the exact restrictions of the provisional licence and clearly something more effective needs to be done to draw attention to these restrictions.’

10.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

10.2.1 The measure considered useful by the Delphi panellists from the questionnaire surveys was:

- Enhance public knowledge of the restrictions of the provisional licence (rank 18)

10.2.2 It was considered that there could be a general ‘unawareness’ on this issue. Within the questionnaires it was considered by some that enhancing the knowledge of restrictions would be a good idea, but that it would not have a big impact on unlicensed driving. It was also suggested that:
'A warning on the licence would be a good idea.'
'The details are in the Highway Code and should form part of the theory test syllabus if they don’t already.'
'Existing channels are ineffective.'

10.2.3 A general lack of knowledge of the restrictions of the provisional licence was raised as being a problem at the workshop. There was also thought to be a lack of knowledge among parents because different rules may have been in place when they were younger. There was also thought to be a lack of knowledge of many other licensing restrictions for other vehicles regarding weights, use of trailers and motorcycles for example. It was suggested that some current publications describing the restrictions were ‘pitched at too high a level’ and even police had made enquiries for clarification. Some individuals hear by word of mouth and may be given incorrect information.

10.2.4 It was noted that the restrictions of the provisional licence are included within the DSA schools programme. A suggestion was to provide some simple bullet points on the back of the licence as to the restrictions of the provisional licence.

11 ISSUE (K): PUBLICITY TO HIGHLIGHT UNLICENSED DRIVING AS AN ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

11.1 Focus Group Discussions

11.1.1 Increasing publicity on the penalties rather than the incidence or occurrence of unlicensed driving was considered important and effective in preventing unlicensed driving.

‘Provisional licence holders are not usually aware of what would happen if they were to not follow the rules of the provisional licence.’

11.1.2 Encouraging the public to report suspects was also well supported.

‘It would help if the public could report the unlicensed drivers anonymously.’

11.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

11.2.1 Measures considered slightly useful by Delphi panellists:

- Increase local and national publicity on the penalties for unlicensed driving (rank 23)
- Encourage the public to report suspect to a telephone hotline (rank 24)

11.2.2 Within the Delphi questionnaire returns it was commented that publicity on penalties would be useful to deter only some types of unlicensed driver – those that do not otherwise break the law, and would have little impact on ‘hard core’ groups.
However, it was also argued that:

‘the existing penalties do not constitute a sufficient deterrent at the present and it is doubtful whether greater publicity will increase the deterrence.’

11.2.3 It was also suggested that the probability of being caught was the key issue, not the penalties.

11.2.4 With regard to the proposal of a telephone hotline for the public to report offenders, a number of respondents commented in the questionnaires that this would be ‘worth a try’. However, other comments included that unlicensed driving was ‘too petty a problem’ to be dealt with in this way, there could be problems with malicious reporting, and fear of retaliation may deter the public from reporting. Other wondered how effective ‘Crimestoppers’ was and questioned whether the police would have the resources to respond.

11.2.5 The possibility of publishing the names of those who have been convicted of offences was raised but some questioned whether ‘name and shame worked’ and another suggested that ‘shame lists’ would appear to give offenders some sort of status.

11.2.6 Within the workshop discussion it was highlighted that enforcement should be effective in order to raise the perceived risk of being caught. The fact that crashes involving unlicensed drivers increase the insurance premiums of lawful drivers (through the Motor Insurers Bureau fund) was raised.

11.2.7 It was considered important to define the target group for any publicity. It was thought that different messages should be used for different groups, for example, repeat offenders compared with the rest of society generally.

11.2.8 Workshop discussion on the ‘telephone hotline’ proposal included the comment that there would be many ‘false’ or incorrect complaints due to the lack of knowledge of the general public on driver licensing. In reply it was claimed that although only very few calls to ‘Crimestoppers’ were actionable, it was still very cost effective. It was also claimed that it had been used for cases of drink-driving in the past. It was suggested that the public may be more willing to ‘shop’ unlicensed drivers when it was pointed out that they have a higher crash rate. Encouraging the public to use ‘Crimestoppers’ to report unlicensed drivers would also act as a general deterrent.

11.2.9 Another area where publicity could be used was suggested – when receiving fixed penalty notices. It was suggested that provision of information as to why the fixed penalty was issued would be beneficial.
12 ISSUE (L): ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE DRIVING TESTS

12.1 Focus Group Discussions

12.1.1 Measures pertaining to the driving test that were considered effective are ranked below, starting with the most important.

12.1.2 Consider fee reduction for those who cannot afford to retake test:

‘Cost is an issue.’

‘The first few (for example, 20) lessons for every person who needs it should be subsidised.’

12.1.3 Probation service to pay for driving lessons for young offenders who have financial difficulties and who are most likely to re-offend if they do not pass their tests:

The following comments were made:

‘There should be assisted places provided by the government.’

‘Funding by the probation service should depend on individual circumstances.’

12.1.4 Reduce the waiting time between applying and taking the tests:

‘What we do is apply for a test even before we are ready because we know that it will be a few months before we get a date. If we are not ready near the test date, we can cancel and rebook. Most provisional drivers know about this and others jump in when there are cancellations.’

12.1.5 Participants attributed their experience of delay between applying and sitting a test to a lack of examiners and test centres. They also mentioned that it would be helpful if there were younger instructors and examiners, which would put younger learner drivers at ease.

12.1.6 Participants talked about the wider role that a driving instructor should play in preventing and discouraging unlicensed driving, but this was not expanded upon because of time constraints.

12.1.7 Make it easier for people with low levels of literacy to understand the tests – assuming that this is a barrier:

‘It is necessary to possess basic literacy to be able to read road signs and instructions so it is not too much to expect most people to be able to take the theory test.’

12.1.8 However, participants felt that for candidates who face difficulties in understanding the test, at the very least, the test questions should be read out to them. Similarly for instructions that accompany the licence, participants felt that these should be read out to drivers possessing poor literacy so that they are fully aware of the relevant restrictions and conditions of the licence.
12.1.9 The Driving Standards Agency does currently make provisions for candidates with learning difficulties and literacy problems. Voiceovers in English and foreign languages are available and furthermore additional time (up to double time) may be granted to those who can substantiate their request for it. In addition, if a candidate needed to have a reader-supported test, this would be considered on its own merits.

12.1.10 Help provided for dyslexic candidates was acknowledged by one of the participants who said

‘Although help had not been provided upfront it was given eventually.’

12.1.11 Make improvements so that people believe that the examination method for the practical test is fair, especially for minority groups – participants felt that not much can be done about the exam:

‘The very fact that it is an exam would make the learners nervous.’

12.1.12 However, some participants considered examiners to be too strict.

12.1.13 Move away from the theoretical testing of provisional drivers towards testing based on simulated driving:

12.1.14 The group of learner drivers agreed that the theory test should continue testing the Highway Code. However, they felt that it should not incorporate situation specific questions which tend to be quite subjective.

‘Some questions are considered unrealistic and as situations differ it is not always possible to select one correct answer.’

12.1.15 Participants wanted the inclusion of information about car maintenance.

‘Basic information about what to do in emergencies should be given when a licence is issued so that people are prepared for all eventualities. Consequently, they may become safer drivers.’

12.1.16 The prisoners believed that they would pass the theory test easily if given the opportunity.

‘A CD-ROM is available in prison to practice theory questions but it is not used much.’

‘The juvenile inmates (15-17 year olds) tend to have more access to the software than us. It’s not fair.’

12.1.17 There was a sense of resentment about the fact that the young offenders received less educational support than their ‘juvenile’ counterparts.

12.1.18 The prisoners felt that they did not need to be taught how to drive.

‘We’re good enough.’
12.1.19 The prisoners expressed their wish to obtain driving licences upon release from prison. However, for some, the extended licence ban means that they will still be disqualified from driving even after leaving prison. It was indicated that they would be likely to carry on driving unlicensed.

12.2 *Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions*

12.2.1 Measures considered slightly useful by Delphi panellists:
- Reduce the expected waiting time between applying and taking driving tests (rank 17)

12.2.2 A measure not considered useful at all was:
- Means-tested fee reduction for driving tests and subsidies for driving lessons (rank 47 – last!)

12.2.3 The questionnaire returns included several comments that suggested that if you reduce the number of potential unlicensed drivers by reducing the number waiting for the test after applying, the amount of unlicensed driving would also then reduce. Another comment advised that if someone feels they have ‘only just failed’, then a long waiting time before the next retest could contribute to unlicensed driving. However, it was also stated that ‘fast tracking’ retests might encourage some to take the initial test too early.

12.2.4 Other comments doubted whether long waiting times contributed to unlicensed driving. It was also advised that the DSA’s charter tries to ensure only a six-week wait. It was also argued at the workshop that the current maximum delay between applying and taking the driving test of six weeks was the best it had ever been, and is about right anyway because some drivers want to get their licence as fast as possible when perhaps they are not yet ready.

12.2.5 Despite being rated as the least useful measure, some positive comments on the proposal to introduce a means-tested fee reduction for the driving test and subsidies for driving lessons were made on the questionnaire returns. These included those that thought that the idea may have merit in assisting people on benefits or where unemployment is high and where many advertised jobs are for drivers. A scheme called ‘Wheels for Work’ operated in partnership with the Benefits Agency was cited as a good example.

12.2.6 Within the workshop it was argued that we should aim to help those who cannot afford to learn to drive to become ‘legal’ and to ‘remove barriers to get people back into the system’. It was also suggested that such help could be part of rehabilitation: ‘tough on the causes of crime and social exclusion’. The cost of learning to drive was discussed and it was thought that typically, with professional driving lessons and where the driver passes first time, costs could be in the region
of £800 to £1000. It was wondered whether a job seeking related loan system for new drivers could be established. For example, student loans are available for those who wish to undertake college education.

12.2.7 Other questionnaire comments were less positive, but did not relate directly to learning to drive as an aid to employment:

‘Cost of theory and practical test is insignificant compared with running costs of a car.’

‘Insurance particularly is the major expense.’

‘People do without professional driving lessons if they cannot afford them.’

12.2.8 The administration of means-testing and subsidies was thought by some likely to be problematic:

‘Administrative nightmare.’

‘Not worth the cost of administering it!’

13 ISSUE (M): COMMUNITY SCHEMES

13.1 Focus Group Discussions

13.1.1 There was support for the existence of community and youth schemes that include traditionally excluded people. Participants felt that such schemes inculcate a sense of belonging and self worth as well as provide opportunities to develop new skills. These schemes were seen as part of the bigger picture in trying to reduce crime and juvenile behaviour.

13.1.2 Community intervention: Would it work?

Participants felt that driving courses would be justified for those who need to drive for a genuine reason (i.e. not joyriders):

‘Half of the people on the dole can’t afford to get a licence.’

13.1.3 Community Motor Schemes:

Young offenders at the Motor Project rated some schemes better than others. One of the participants drew attention to the fact that most young people only participate in schemes if they know their friends are also involved. They would not want to participate in a scheme alone. In the same vein, if they observed older boys committing crimes, they would be inclined to imitate them especially if it appeared ‘cool’. These participants did say, however, that they would not encourage younger boys to do the same.

13.1.4 Participants in the prison group agreed that community schemes can at times be counterproductive particularly if young offenders learn more about how to steal cars and fix them through these schemes.

‘They become smarter rather than redeem themselves and become law abiding.’
13.1.5 They agreed that attending a course would be more effective than going to prison.

'A course would be beneficial and we would probably learn a lot.'

'Those who volunteer to be on a course would do better than people who are made to go.'

13.2 Delphi Questionnaire and Workshop Discussions

13.2.1 Measures considered slightly useful by Delphi panellists:

- Encourage community schemes and motor projects for the young (rank 28)

13.2.2 A number of questionnaire respondents thought that the use of community-based motor project schemes were worth trying with some adding that they need to be well targeted and managed (for example young offenders), and part of a progression plan for young people and not an end to themselves. It was added by one:

'I do wonder if we couldn’t make virtue of necessity and get the youngsters into driving jobs.'

13.2.3 Another comment raised the possibility that by teaching driving skills without regular access to a car there would be a danger of increasing the temptation to ‘borrow’ cars and drive unlicensed.

13.2.4 A large proportion of comments called for research into the effectiveness of these schemes:

'Need research to assess effects of such schemes on recidivism.'

'Suggest obtaining statistics on effectiveness of current motor projects from the probation service.'

'This would need to be decided on a cost/effectiveness basis.'

'What evidence do you have that such schemes work at the moment?'

13.2.5 It was claimed at the workshop that such schemes are not nowadays to do with just driving but with employability too, and that schemes are more sophisticated compared with 10 years ago. It was claimed that the best schemes had survived and the less successful such as ‘banger racing’ type schemes discontinued. It was emphasised that the riding and driving aspect of schemes are only a small element.

13.2.6 It was thought that community-based schemes could be a good way of addressing social exclusion problems. An example was given where discussions with older drivers had revealed that many fear losing their licence. It was therefore suggested that community projects could be a good way to improve their skills and address this fear.

13.2.7 It was wondered which organisation may be able to identify and recommend best practice and perhaps oversee national or regional facilitation. A suggestion was through Learning and Skills Councils or youth offending teams.
13.2.8 It was questioned as to which categories of unlicensed drivers such schemes would target, and it was doubted that they would address all types.

14 ISSUE (N): PROVIDE LEGAL OPPORTUNITIES TO DRIVE OFF-ROAD OR ON PRIVATE LAND

14.1 Focus Group Discussions

14.1.1 Participants raised the issue that providing access to private land might abate the curiosity associated with driving among young people, allowing those normally law abiding to ‘try out’ driving. Thus they might satisfy their desire to drive without being a hazard on the road. Participants said that if they were allowed to use private property, with permission, or through a motor project, they would probably avoid the main roads.

‘Part of the reason we want to drive is because we can’t.’

‘If schools offered a driving programme we would attend school.’

14.1.2 Apparently some schools provide lessons on the Highway Code and other aspects of driving and the theory test. One participant was in a school which organised go-karting and motorbike lessons which he considered safe and interesting and which kept him interested in attending school.

14.1.3 Some participants had been exposed to cars from a young age through their families and were not concerned about getting caught. Others knew they would be severely reprimanded by their family members if they were caught driving unlicensed.

14.2 Delphi Workshop Discussions

14.2.1 This issue was not included within the Delphi questionnaire process, but emerged from the focus group discussion with the ‘perpetrators’ as being important and was therefore included within the Delphi workshop discussions.

14.2.2 At the Delphi workshop it was explained that motoring insurance now included driving in any public place and that consequently providing legal opportunities to drive off road is more expensive.

14.2.3 It was suggested that off-road driving currently happens anyway, and that therefore providing opportunity to do it legally would be beneficial. It was argued that this kind of activity should only be promoted as a small part of a larger project such as the community motor projects discussed earlier.

14.2.4 An example of a scheme providing off-road driving opportunities was given: ‘Under 17 Car Club’.
15 ISSUE (O): EASY CAR PURCHASE

15.1 Focus Group Discussions

15.1.1 The participants unanimously agreed that measures should be implemented to discourage selling cars to under-aged drivers.

‘It’s easy to get hold of a car through auctions, papers, there are no checks made of their licence, or insurance documents.’

‘Should the responsibility be laid on the driver or person lending or selling?’

‘Should be asked to show one’s licence before buying a car. It’s too easy to fill in the registration documents with a false name and address.’

15.2 Delphi Workshop Discussions

15.2.1 This issue was not included within the Delphi questionnaire process, but emerged from the focus group discussion with the ‘perpetrators’ as being important and was therefore included within the Delphi workshop discussions.

15.2.2 It was mentioned that the number of abandoned cars was increasing due to the scrap value of such cars decreasing. Therefore, it was suggested that the sale of such vehicles to under-age drivers for a nominal fee was becoming an increasingly attractive option for owners as an easy way of disposing of their cars.

15.2.3 However, it was thought that it would be difficult to police any law that tried to prevent persons under the age of being able to drive or who did not have a driving licence to be able to purchase a car. There would always be the possibility that someone else could make the purchase on his or her behalf anyway. It was also mentioned that it was quite legitimate to want to own a vehicle but not to drive it. One workshop participant argued:

‘This would be an extraordinary measure to bring in.’