THINK! Road Safety Campaign Evaluation
Annual Survey 2009 Report

December 2009

Prepared for:
Department for Transport

Prepared by Helen Angle, Sarah Bone, Emily Goddard, TNS-BMRB
Telephone: 0207 656 5636 Email: sarah.bone@bmrb.co.uk
Part of BMRB Limited (British Market Research Bureau) BMRB/HA/SB/45108903

Printed on 100% recycled paper 🌿

BMRB is also a member of the London Remade environment scheme and is working with the Woodland Trust to offset the paper used in the course of our business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Research objectives and method</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Arrangement of this report</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management summary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Introduction and background</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Motorist profile</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Attitudes towards road safety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Attitudes towards driving</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Road user behaviour</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Driver profile</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Types of road users</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Type of area live in</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Types of journey made</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Distance drive and length of time driving</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attitudes towards road safety</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Most important road safety issues</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Influences on safe driving</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Attitudes towards road safety</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attitudes towards driving</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Acceptability of certain behaviours</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Attitudes towards dangerous driving</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Drink or drug driving</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>Speeding and mobile phones</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Seat belts and other behaviours</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Road user behaviour</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviours ....................................................... 47
   6.1.1 Driving under the influence of drink or drugs ............................................... 47
   6.1.2 Speeding .................................................................................................. 50
   6.1.3 Use of mobile phones ............................................................................... 53
   6.1.4 Seat belt wearing ................................................................................... 55
   6.1.5 Other behaviours ................................................................................... 56
6.2 Driving related penalties ...................................................................................... 58
6.3 Passenger experience ......................................................................................... 60
   6.3.1 Driving under the influence of drink or drugs ............................................... 61
   6.3.2 Speeding .................................................................................................. 63
   6.3.3 Use of mobile phones ............................................................................... 66
   6.3.4 Seat belt wearing ................................................................................... 66
   6.3.5 Other experiences ................................................................................... 68
6.4 Precautions taken to avoid accidents ................................................................. 70
7 Awareness of, and attitudes towards, the THINK! brand ..................................... 73
   7.1 Spontaneous awareness of advertising about road safety .............................. 73
   7.2 Prompted awareness of the THINK! Logo ..................................................... 76
   7.3 THINK! brand personality .......................................................................... 77
   7.4 Attitudes towards THINK! and road safety advertising ............................... 79
APPENDIX A – Sampling Method ........................................................................... 84
APPENDIX B: Weighting Procedures ..................................................................... 85
Target Weights Applied ........................................................................................... 85
APPENDIX C: Questionnaire .................................................................................... 87

Copyright: survey findings and deliverables are normally intended for use within the Client's organisation or its consultants and other associate organisations such as advertising agencies. Should the Client intend wider circulation of the survey findings and deliverables, the Client should inform BMRB prior to such disclosure and agree the form and content with BMRB. The client should acknowledge BMRB as the source of the information with wording acceptable to BMRB.
Index of Charts

Chart 3a: Types of road users 10
Chart 3b: Description of area live in 12
Chart 3c: Types of journey made (1) 13
Chart 3d: Types of road users (2) 14
Chart 3e: Types of road users (3) 15
Chart 3f: Average miles driven in a year 17
Chart 3g: Types of road users 18
Chart 4a: Top three road safety issues most important to address (1) 20
Chart 4b: Top three road safety issues most important to address (2) 21
Table 4c: Top three road safety issues most important to address (all motorists vs. non motorists) 23
Chart 4d: Top three most effective in influencing how safely you drive 24
Chart 4e: Agreement with statements about road safety (all respondents) 26
Chart 4f: Agreement with statements about road safety (all motorists) 27
Chart 4g: Agreement with statements about road safety (all non motorists) 28
Chart 5a: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (1) – all respondents 30
Chart 5b: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (1) – all motorists 31
Chart 5c: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (1) – all non motorists 32
Chart 5d: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (2) – all respondents 34
Chart 5e: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (2) – all motorists 35
Chart 5f: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (2) – all non motorists 35
Chart 5g: Attitudes to dangerous driving – drink and drugs (all respondents) 37
Chart 5h: Attitudes to dangerous driving – drink and drugs (all motorists) 38
Chart 5i: Attitudes to dangerous driving – drink and drugs (all non motorists) 39
Chart 5j: Attitudes to dangerous driving – speeding and mobile phones (all respondents) 40
Chart 5k: Attitudes to dangerous driving – speeding and mobile phones (all motorists) 41

Chart 5l: Attitudes to dangerous driving – speeding and mobile phones (all non motorists) 42

Chart 5m: Attitudes to dangerous driving – Level of danger associated with each statement (all motorists) 43

Chart 5n: Attitudes to dangerous driving – seatbelts and other (all respondents) 44

Chart 5o: Attitudes to dangerous driving – seatbelts and other (all motorists) 45

Chart 5p: Attitudes to dangerous driving – seatbelts and other (all non motorists) 46

Chart 6a: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – drink/drug driving 48

Chart 6b: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – drink/drug driving 49

Chart 6c: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – speeding 50

Chart 6d: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – speeding 51

Chart 6e: Agreement with statement: 52

Chart 6f: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – mobile phones 53

Chart 6g: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – mobile phones 54

Chart 6h: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – seat belts 55

Chart 6i: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – seat belts 56

Chart 6j: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – Other 57

Chart 6k: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – other 58

Chart 6l: Driving penalties ever gained 59

Chart 6m: Offences in last three years 60

Chart 6n: Passenger experience – drink/drugs (all respondents) 61

Chart 6o: Passenger experience – drink/drugs (all motorists vs. non motorists) 62

Chart 6p: Passenger experience – speeding (all respondents) 64

Chart 6q: Passenger experience – speeding (all motorists vs. non motorists) 65

Chart 6r: Passenger experience – mobile phones (all respondents) 66

Chart 6s: Passenger experience – seat belts (all respondents) 67
Chart 6t: Passenger experience – seat belts (all motorists vs. non motorists)  68
Chart 6u: Passenger experience – other (all respondents)  69
Chart 6v: Passenger experience – other (all motorists vs. non motorists)  70
Chart 6w: Precautions taken to avoid accidents with bikers and cyclists (prompted)  71
Chart 7a: Spontaneous awareness of road safety advertising  73
Chart 7b: Spontaneous awareness of source of road safety advertising (all respondents)  74
Chart 7c: Spontaneous awareness of source of road safety advertising (all motorists vs. non motorists)  75
Chart 7d: Prompted awareness of THINK! logo  76
Chart 7e: Selected words to describe the THINK! campaign (prompted)  77
Table 7f: Selected words to describe the THINK! campaign (all motorists vs. non motorists)  78
Chart 7g: Agreement with statements about the THINK! brand (all respondents)  79
Chart 7h: Agreement with statements about the THINK! brand (all motorists vs. non motorists)  80
Chart 7i: Agreement with statements about road safety (all respondents)  81
Chart 7j: Agreement with statements about road safety (all motorists vs. non motorists)  82
1  Introduction

1.1  Background

The THINK! Road Safety publicity campaign was launched in 2000, as part of the Government’s road safety strategy, *Tomorrow’s roads: safer for everyone*. The strategy set out targets to reduce road casualties in Great Britain by 50% for children and 40% overall between 2000 and 2010. A mix of engineering, enforcement and education measures are used to help meet these targets, of which the THINK! Road safety publicity campaign forms part.

The THINK! campaign aims to encourage all road users to recognise that it’s the small things they do that can lead to crashes on the road and that there are simple steps they can take to reduce their risk to themselves and others. THINK!’s power is that it fosters an attitude of shared responsibility.

THINK! campaign priorities are identified by the Department for Transport’s publicity team in collaboration with policy officials in Road User Safety Division. They are chosen because they account for the highest number of road casualties and it is felt that they will benefit most from coordinated national publicity.

1.2  Research objectives and method

In July 2006 BMRB Social Research took over the evaluation of the THINK! campaign. This report focuses on the Annual Survey research carried out in October 2008. The Annual Survey differs to the normal waves of THINK! research in that a focus was placed on gaining annual KPI measures of road safety attitudes and behaviour among the British population, rather than simply focusing in on campaign measurement and evaluation.

The November 2009 Annual Survey covered the following elements:

- Awareness of, and attitudes towards, the THINK! road safety brand as a whole;
- General attitudes towards road safety, and its perceived importance in relation to other social issues;
- Attitudes towards driving, and influences on driving behaviour;
- Driving and road safety behaviour among different users, including the prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour;
- Knowledge and understanding of speed limits, indicated by road signs and other means;
A focus on motorcyclists, in particular how they differ attitudinally from other road users and what precautions they take to stay safe on the roads.

Fieldwork for the Annual Survey ran from 5\textsuperscript{th} to 11\textsuperscript{th} November 2009 among all adults in Great Britain for one week.

Interviews were conducted using BMRB’s Omnibus survey. This is a survey that is run each week by BMRB, with different clients placing questions onto a common questionnaire, and sharing the costs of fieldwork and analysis. All results are confidential to the individual client. Interviews were conducted in-home, using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) by fully trained members of BMRB’s own fieldforce, working under supervision. The sample was drawn by means of Random Location sampling (see appendices for further details).

In total 2,010 interviews were conducted with those aged 15+ in Great Britain in the main week of data collection. Of these 1,233 were motorists.

Data were weighted to be representative of the population. Only weighted data are shown in this report.

1.3 Arrangement of this report

This report describes the results from the November 2009 Annual Survey wave of research for the THINK! road safety campaign, compared with the results from the 2006, 2007 and 2008 Annual Surveys carried out using the same methodology. Where it is relevant, comparisons over time have also been drawn with earlier waves of research carried out by two research agencies - GFK-NOP in June 2005 (by PAPI methodology) and TNS in October 2005, March 2006 and May 2006 (by CAPI methodology).

Following this introduction is a management summary of the findings. The main body of the report provides a detailed commentary, illustrated by summary tables and charts. Appendices contain details of the cluster analysis, the sampling method, weighting, the sample profile and the questionnaire.

Data have been supplied in separate volumes.

In charts and tables ‘-’ denotes 0 and ‘*’ denotes a proportion of less than half of one per cent, but more than 0.
2 Management summary

2.1 Introduction and background

This report focuses on the THINK! Annual Survey, carried out in November 2009.

A total of 2,010 interviews were conducted in Great Britain, with those aged 15+. Among these, 1,233 interviews were conducted with motorists (those who drive a car, van, lorry or motorcycle).

2.2 Motorist profile

One in three (34%) respondents drove a car to and from work, one quarter (25%) as part of their job and two thirds (64%) for other reasons. Six per cent drove a van or lorry and two per cent rode a motorcycle, scooter or moped. Nearly one in five people reported riding a bicycle (18%).

The 2008 survey recorded falls in the proportion of people travelling as a passenger in a car in a typical week, and the proportion driving a car as part of their job, but the 2009 figures for these activities are restored to the previous levels, with three-quarters travelling as a passenger (74%) and one quarter driving a car as part of their job (25%).

Motorists were more likely than non-motorists to live in a village, whilst non-motorists were more likely than motorists to live in the centre of a large town or city.

Nearly nine in ten (88%) motorists made short local journeys by motor vehicle at least once a week, and four in ten (42%) did so five or more times per week. Seven in ten made journeys in a motor vehicle to and from pubs and restaurants (71%), with over a quarter (27%) doing so at least once a week.

The proportion of motorists saying that they drive up to 5000 miles per year has increased slightly, now accounting for 47% (compared with 43% with this mileage in 2008). The proportion driving over 5000 miles has correspondingly fallen from 56% in 2008 down to 51% in 2009.

Six in ten (60%) motorists reported having over 20 years driving experience. This is very slightly down on the 2008 figure (62%) but in line with the trend towards more experienced motorists observed since 2006.

2.3 Attitudes towards road safety

When asked to specify the most important road safety issues for the government to address, drink-driving is the most commonly mentioned (64%), followed by
speeding (44%) and use of mobile phones (38%). These three issues have headed the list since 2006.

A visible police presence was felt to be the most effective influence on driving safely, rated in the top three by over half (54%) of motorists. This was followed by speed cameras (46%), the threat of prosecution or fines (40%), and influence of family (34%). These were also regarded as the top four influences when this question was asked in 2006 and 2008.

The following factors were rated as top three influences by 20% of respondents each: Road safety advertising, in car safety systems, and roadside signs and posters. The proportion citing speed humps as one of their top three influences has declined slightly in 2009, and now stands at 17%.

Just over half (53%) of respondents believed that traffic calming measures make the roads safer, and one quarter of respondents (25%) believed that roads are safer than they were five years ago, up from 21% in 2008. Three in ten (30%) believed that there are more police officers on the road nowadays. Each of these measures has been fairly constant since 2006, notwithstanding a dip on each measure in 2007.

Just fewer than four in ten adults (37%) agreed that you are more likely to die when driving on a rural road than you are to die driving on a motorway or busy road. This proportion has declined slightly since 2008, when it stood at 41%.

2.4 Attitudes towards driving

The behaviours considered most unacceptable by the highest proportion of respondents were driving after drug-taking (96%), not wearing a seatbelt in a front seat (93%) and using a mobile phone whilst driving (94%). Each of these was rated as unacceptable by in excess of 90% of respondents. To put this in context, shoplifting was rated as unacceptable by a similar proportion (96%).

Between 80% and 90% of respondents considered driving without insurance/MOT and not wearing a seatbelt in a back seat to be unacceptable, and this is similar to the proportion regarding dropping litter in the street as unacceptable. Between 70% and 80% of respondents considered driving when tired and driving at 40mph in a 30mph area as being unacceptable, on a similar level of unacceptability of failing to purchase a TV licence. Only around two thirds of people believed that driving after drinking two pints was unacceptable (69%).

The 2009 survey found that an increasing proportion of the public regarded specified behaviours as being dangerous. Around nine in ten agreed completely with the notion that it is dangerous to drive after taking Class A drugs (92%), and it is dangerous for a person to drive when they know they are over the legal
alcohol limit (90%). Around eight in ten agreed completely that it was dangerous to drive after smoking cannabis (81%), or if a person was unsure whether they were over the legal alcohol limit (83%). On most of these behaviours, the 2009 survey found that the level of complete agreement that the specified behaviours were dangerous reached a new high, or at least matched a previous peak. The exception was the level observed for driving when over the legal alcohol limit, which was just slightly lower than its previous peak (94% in 2007).

Nine in ten agreed completely that texting on a mobile phone whilst driving was dangerous (89%), and just over eight in ten agreed completely that it was dangerous to use a mobile phone without a hands-free kit while driving (83%), and that it is dangerous to drive too fast for the conditions (81%). Other specified behaviours in this category were less widely regarded as dangerous, namely driving at 90mph on a clear motorway, and using a mobile phone with the aid of a hands-free kit whilst driving, which were regarded as dangerous by 38% and 29% respectively. The proportion agreeing completely that each of these behaviours was dangerous increased in the 2009 survey, reaching new peaks.

Just over three-quarters of respondents agreed completely that it is dangerous to fail to wear a seatbelt in the front seat (73%), and that is dangerous to drive without insurance/MOT (76%). Two thirds agreed completely that it was dangerous to drive when too tired, and to fail to use a seatbelt in a rear seat (66%). Nearly one third agreed completely that it was dangerous to park on double yellow lines (31%). Most of these measures reached a new peak level of complete agreement in the 2009 survey. The exception was on failure to wear a seat belt in a rear seat (66%), which was just slightly short of its previous peak.

Half of respondents agreed completely that driving at 40mph in a 30mph area was dangerous. This was a new statement included at this question, with no trend history.

2.5 Road user behaviour

Prevalence of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs was in line with the level observed in previous years.

Just one per cent admitted driving after taking a class A drug, and two per cent did so after smoking cannabis, but showing no significant change in the trend. Around one in twenty (6%) claimed to know at least one person who drove after taking class A drugs, and one in ten (10%) claimed this for cannabis smoking.

Only one in twenty (5%) motorists aged 18+ admitted to driving whilst over the legal alcohol limit, and there has been negligible change on this measure since 2006. The proportion driving when unsure whether they were over the legal alcohol limit has declined to its lowest point in since 2005 (10%).
The proportion saying that they knew people who drove when over the legal alcohol limit has declined slightly, from 31% in 2008 to 28% in 2009. The proportion saying they knew people who drove when uncertain whether they are over the legal alcohol limit has remained static at around four in ten.

Speeding is the most prevalent of the dangerous behaviours asked about. Nearly six in ten motorists interviewed admitted driving at 40mph in a 30mph area (57%). The perception is that such behaviour is very common, with three-quarters believing that they knew people who did this.

The proportion admitting to driving at 90mph on a motorway with clear traffic remained stable at 40%, but the proportion admitting driving too fast for the conditions actually increased from 27% in 2008 to 33% in 2009. Again the perception is that such behaviour is widespread, with two thirds knowing people who drive at 90mph on the motorway with clear traffic, and six in ten knowing people who drove too fast for the conditions (58%).

A quarter (24%) of motorists admitted to using a mobile phone with a hands-free kit while driving. One in six (17%) admitted doing so without a hands-free kit, and one in eight (12%) admitted texting while driving. These proportions have remained stable for the last three surveys. Two thirds knew people who used a mobile phone with a hands-free kit while driving (62%), half knew people who used a mobile phone without hands-free kit while driving, and four in 10 knew people who texted whilst driving (38%).

A quarter of motorists admitted to not wearing a seatbelt in a rear seat (24%), and one in ten admitted doing so in a front seat. These proportions were stable over the last three surveys. The proportion who said they knew people who did not wear seat belts has fallen slightly since 2008. In terms of front seats it is down from 31% to 23%, and for rear seats there has been a smaller decline, from 47% to 44%.

The proportion of motorists admitting driving when too tired stands at 40% in 2009, and has been increasing slightly in the last two years. The proportion admitting parking on double yellow lines is 37% in 2009, up a little from 2008, but in line with 2006 and 2007. Only three per cent admitted driving without insurance/MOT, and this figure has shown negligible change since 2006.

Nearly half of motorists said that they have received a penalty of some sort (47%), with one third receiving points on their licence (34%), and three in ten having been fined for speeding (29%). These proportions have not changed significantly in the last three years.

When asked about experiences as a passenger, 16% had refused to travel with a driver they suspected of being over the legal alcohol limit, with 13% travelling
despite this concern. The comparable figures for drivers they suspected of drug use were 7% and 5% respectively.

As passengers, four in ten had previously asked a driver to slow down. This was the same level observed in 2008, but down from the peak of 46% in 2007. Nearly four in ten have felt unsafe as passengers because of the drivers’ speed (37%), and this was down slightly from just over four in ten in the previous surveys. Only 5% had asked the driver to go faster, down from the peak of 8% in 2008 but in line with the longer-term trend.

2.6 Awareness of, and attitudes towards, the THINK! Brand

Recall of road safety advertising has declined from its peak of 64% in 2006, but after a fall to just 39% in 2008 (due to a more reduced campaign schedule that year) it has recovered to stand at 48% in 2009.

The proportion attributing road safety advertising to the Government rose dramatically to nearly one third of those aware of such advertising between 2007 and 2008, and this has been maintained in 2009. The proportion spontaneously mentioning THINK! with regards to who produced the advertising remains at around one fifth (22%), which is a consistent level over the last three surveys. Only one in ten now mention the Department for Transport as the sponsor of the advertising (10% down from 15% in 2007), while the proportion attributing it to the Police has risen to 8%.

When prompted, eight in ten said they had previously seen the THINK! logo. This has remained at a quite consistent level since 2006.

The THINK! brand personality is overwhelmingly viewed as positive, with "helpful" and "thought provoking" being the descriptions most commonly associated, with around 50% of respondents choosing these terms. The terms "caring" and "influential" where each chosen by around one quarter of respondents. No negative terms were chosen by more than 5%.

This report finds evidence of relatively high levels of risk taking behaviour and attitudes among young males, but it is encouraging to note that young males were more likely than other groups to describe THINK! as "influential" and "caring".

Nearly three-quarters of respondents said that they take notice when they see the THINK! logo, two thirds said that they trusted it and just over half believed that the campaign was making roads safer. Each of these figures is an increase on the previous year, moving back towards the high levels found in 2006.
Nearly half of respondents agreed that road safety advertising has a strong impact on how people behave on the roads. This figure of 48% is the highest level recorded so far. Just 11% believed that there was too much road safety advertising, down from 14% in 2008, but in line with the longer-term trend.
3 Driver profile

This chapter profiles the survey respondents in terms of their motoring status, type of area that they live in, the types of journeys that they make, distance that they drive and length of time driving.

3.1 Types of road users

In order to identify groups of road users, and frequency of road usage, all respondents were asked how long, in a typical week, they spend doing the following (Chart 3a):

- Walking on the pavement or road;
- Riding a bicycle;
- Riding a motorbike, scooter or moped;
- Driving a van or lorry;
- Driving a car (either to and from work, as part of a job, or for other reasons);
- Travelling in a car as a passenger

If necessary, people were asked to think about their experience in the last three months. For example, for those who only use a motorbike in the summer (i.e. for whom there is not a typical week of usage), they would be asked to reference what they had done over the last three months in order to enable them to answer more accurately.

The question for the June 2005 wave differed slightly from the question for subsequent waves. In addition, respondents were asked only how often they drive a car in a typical week, rather than how often they drive a car for each of the three purposes asked about since then. Comparisons between the 2005 wave and more recent waves should therefore be treated with caution¹.

¹ See THINK! Annual Survey 2006 for an explanation of the difference.
The figures observed from the November 2009 survey continued a pattern of a very stable trend in types of road usage in a "typical week".

Walking on pavements and roads remains a near universal activity, undertaken by 94% of our respondents, very closely in line with the last four data points.

Driving a car as part of a job has returned to the previously observed level of 25%, following a slight dip (to 20%) in October 2008.

Around one third (34%) drive to and from work, rising to more than half of working age men. The length of time spent driving to and from work also remains stable, with just under two in ten people spending three or more hours per week in this way (17% in 2009, 18% in 2008). Just under two thirds (64%) drive for other reasons.

The overall proportion driving a van or lorry is steady at 6%, but beneath this average it should be noted that the figure for men is 12% and women just one per cent.
Three quarters (74%) of respondents reported being a passenger in a typical week consistent with the proportions of passengers in November 2006 and November 2007, and up from a slight dip (to 69%) observed in October 2008.

Use of motorcycles/scooters/mopeds (2%) and bicycles (18%) in a typical week remained in line with the long-term trends for these methods of transport, both of which are predominantly used by men (four per cent of men using motorcycles/losers/mopeds, and 25% men using a bicycle).

### 3.2 Type of area live in

In 2008 a new question was introduced to the survey to enable identification of the types of areas in which our respondents were resident. We know that area type can be an influence on people's transport options and driving behaviour so understanding and analysing by area type is important, especially for issues such as rural speed.

All respondents were asked to define the area they live in as one of: countryside; village; small town; outskirts of large town or city; or centre of large town or city. Chart 3b displays the proportion of respondents, drivers and non-drivers who said they live in each of the areas.
The two descriptions most commonly chosen by respondents were "outskirts of large town/city" (37% in both 2008 and 2009 surveys) and "small town" (34% in 2008, 32% in 2009). Those saying that they lived in a "village" fell slightly from 19% in 2008 to 16% in 2009, but those specifying "countryside" rose from 2% to 5% across this period, meaning that the overall figure for rural residents was 21% in both surveys. The proportion describing their area as "centre of large town/city" changed little, from 7% in 2008 to 9% in 2009. Consequently it is clear that there is a high degree of consistency between the 2008 and 2009 sample profiles, in terms of area type.

Not surprisingly, people who do not drive any vehicle were more likely to live in the centre of large towns/cities. Among non-drivers, 15% live in the centre of large towns/cities (compared with 9% overall), and only 11% live in villages (compared with 16% overall).

### 3.3 Types of journey made

Car, van and lorry drivers were asked a series of ‘frequency of journey’ questions
designed to measure how often they go on various sorts of journeys. This measure was also used in June 2005 and November 2007 but was excluded from the November 2006 survey.

The first types of journeys to be considered are short local journeys and journeys to pubs and restaurants. These journey types were introduced to the questionnaire in 2008, and consequently 2009 is our first opportunity to look at a trend for these figures.

Almost all drivers made short local journeys by motor vehicle (96%). Just over two in five did this five or more times per week (42%), and the next most common frequency was between two and four times per week (35%). Only 8% made such journeys less than once a month or less. These figures are very close to those observed in the 2008 survey.

Driving to pubs and restaurants was less common, but still undertaken by seven in ten (71%), and there has been no significant change since 2008, either at the overall level or on individual frequencies. Only one in ten made such journeys more than once a week (10%), though two groups stand out as having particularly greater propensity to drive to pubs and restaurants at this relatively high level of frequency - young males aged 17 and 34 (27%), and those living in
the countryside (21%), though it should be noted be latter figure is from a small base size (n = 66) and should be regarded as indicative only.

The overwhelming majority of drivers made journeys with passengers. The figure from our fieldwork in November 2009 was 92%, the same as for October 2008, and extremely close to the figure observed in June 2005 and November 2007. Indeed the frequencies reported have hardly changed at all over this period, producing a very stable picture in which around one quarter drive with passengers five or more times a week, and just over a third do so between two and four times per week.

The great majority of drivers do drive on motorways (90%), though only one third do so once or week or more (10% five or more times a week, 9% between two and four times a week, and 12% just once a week), rising to around six in ten among males aged 30-54. Frequency of motorway driving has not changed significantly since its measurement on the survey began in 2005.

Just over nine in ten drivers reported driving on country roads, and the proportion doing so at least once a week has remained at precisely 61% since measurement on the survey began in 2007. Not surprisingly, those living in the
countryside and villages were most likely to have done this least once a week (around 90%).

Over 90% of drivers reported making journeys after dark, and this figure has been consistent on the survey since 2007 (within the range 90% - 93%). The slightly lower figure observed in 2005 (87%) was almost certainly caused by the timing of the survey, in June with its lighter evenings, whereas subsequent measures have been taken in October and November. The post 2005 figures are consistent in terms of frequency of driving after dark, with all three data points within the range 69%-75% driving such journeys at least once a week.

In 2009 we found that 54% of drivers drove to and from work. This is consistent with the findings from 2007 onwards (range = 54% - 56%), when the survey was conducted in either October or November. Most of those driving to work do so five or more times per week (range = 35% - 39% since 2007), with the lowest figure recorded in 2009, possibly related to the increase in unemployment over this period.

Men aged between 15 and 54 are most frequent drivers to and from work, with around seven in ten doing so at least once a week, compared with an average
around half across the whole sample, reflecting the higher employment rates within this demographic group.

Just over one third of drivers (36%) reported making journeys by motor vehicle as part of their actual job, and again this figure is very consistent from the 2007 survey onwards (range = 35% - 37%). In 2009 the proportion making such journeys five or more times per week was 18%, and 29% once or more per week. The once or more per week figure was not significantly different from the 2007 and 2008 findings. The group most likely to make motor vehicle journeys as part of their job were men of working age, over half of whom do so.

The proportion of drivers making long journeys of 50 miles or more was around nine in ten (89% in 2009, 2008 and 2007), but with much lower frequency than observed for most other types of journeys. Just five per cent did this five or more times per week, and only 22% made such a journey once a week or more, down slightly from the previous two surveys - 26% in 2007 and 25% in 2008. Men aged 30-54 were the most likely group to make long journeys by motor vehicle, with around four in ten of this group doing so at least once a week. Not surprisingly, those who drive for work (37%) were much more likely than the average to make long journeys once a week or more.

### 3.4 Distance drive and length of time driving

Respondents who drive at all were asked how many miles they drive in a year, including both personal and work-related driving. This question was first introduced in 2007, and the 2008 results are almost identical to those from 2007 (Chart 3f).
As the chart illustrates, there is very little change over the three surveys. The only notable change is a small increase in the proportion driving 3001-5000 miles per year (24% in 2009, compared with 20% and 21% previously), offsetting small reductions in the higher mileage figures: in 2009 28% of motorists did 5001-10,000 miles (down from 31% in both previous surveys) and 23% did 10,000+ miles (down from 25% in both previous surveys). This may reflect the slight decline observed in the proportions driving to and from work five or more times per week.

The groups with the highest mileage (10,000+ miles per year) were men aged 30-54 (nearly half (x47%), countryside and village dwellers (around 30%), those commuting by motor vehicle (36%) and those driving for work (42%).

All drivers were asked how long they have been driving for, as a way of measuring their driving experience (Chart 3g).
Most drivers have been driving for over 20 years. In 2009 this figure stood at 60%, down slightly from 2008 (62%), but this group has grown significantly since the 55% figure recorded in 2006. For obvious reasons this group is older than average, and is predominantly male (64% of men have this level of experience, combined with 54% of women), and "upmarket" (63% of ABC1 at this level of experience, combined with 54% of the C2DE).
4 Attitudes towards road safety

This chapter first of all looks specifically at which road safety issues were felt to be most important and what has the most effective influence on safe driving. It then goes on to explore attitudes towards road safety.

4.1 Most important road safety issues

To look at attitudes towards road safety in more detail, all respondents were asked to choose from a list the three most important road safety issues which they felt that the Government should address (Charts 4a and 4b). This has been asked since 2005, but tailgating and road rage were added in 2006. Since the question asks people to specify their top three choices, the introduction of two new, additional options on the 2006 survey caused a decline in the proportion specifying a number of issues, simply because there were more issues to choose from, but still only three choices are available. For this reason, analysis in the commentary below focuses on trends since 2006.

It is also important to note two changes to this section of the questionnaire in 2009.

- "Use of mobile phones" has been split into two categories, namely "use of mobile phones with a hands-free kit" and "use of mobile phones without a hands-free kit". This represents a very different way of asking respondents about mobile phone usage, and will be treated as completely new questions without reference to previous data. By splitting this category into two, we have created an additional option whilst leaving the number of permitted answers at three, and we might therefore expect to see some slight reductions in the proportions mentioning each of the other issues.

- The category "drivers not fully concentrating" has been replaced by "careless driving" in the 2009 survey. This is a subtle change of wording around the same concept, and reference will be made to previous data based on the old terminology, but with a note advising caution due to the likely small, but possibly significant change attributable to the new wording.
The issues most commonly cited within the top three have been consistent since 2005, topped by drink-driving (around two thirds of people considering this a top three issue), followed by speeding and mobile phone usage (consistently mentioned by 40% to 50% of respondents). Below this come drug driving (generally around 30%), drivers not concentrating/careless driving and child road awareness (generally around one in five people considering these issues in their top three). In the following section we look in more detail at each of these trends.

Drink-driving remains the most commonly mentioned safety issue, mentioned in the top three by 64% of respondents in 2009. However it should be noted that this is at the bottom end of the range that this issue has scored since 2006 (range = 64% - 70%).

The next most commonly mentioned top three issue was speeding (44%). Speeding has been the second most commonly mentioned issue in three of the last four surveys, and its 2009 score is at the top end of its range since 2006 (range = 43% - 47%), possibly linked to the new campaign.

The third most commonly mentioned top three issue was use of mobile phones – specifically without a hands free kit (38%) in the 2009 survey.
Careless driving was mentioned as a top three issue by 32%. Note we should be cautious about the trend for this issue, due to the change in terminology mentioned above (from "drivers not fully concentrating").

Drug driving was considered a top three issue at 31% in 2009. This issue peaked at 35% in June 2005 but has subsequently hovered around the 30% mark in the last four surveys. The 2009 figure is a slight increase to 31% following a dip in 2008, to a low point of 28%.

Child road awareness was considered a top three issue by 15% in 2009, no change from the 2008 figure of 16%. This issue was more salient in 2006 and 2007 when it was considered a top three issue by 20% and 19% respectively.

Chart 4b shows the remaining issues from this question, which were regarded as top three concerns for a small proportion of respondents.

Chart 4b: Top three road safety issues most important to address (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>June 05</th>
<th>Nov 06</th>
<th>Nov 07</th>
<th>Oct 08</th>
<th>Nov 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tailgating</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road rage</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wearing seat belts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while tired</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not using child restraints</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle accidents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents June '05 (2,240), Nov '06 (2,259), Nov '07 (2,019), Oct '08 (2,009), Nov '09 (2,010)

Of the remaining issues, none was considered in the top three by more than one in eight people. A brief summary is provided below, for each of these remaining issues.
Tailgating was specified in the top three issues by 13% in 2009, within a fairly narrow range observed at previous surveys (range = 12% - 16%).

In 2009 road rage was considered top three by 12%, very close to the figure recorded in the previous two years, and slightly down from a peak of 15% in 2006.

Not wearing a seatbelt has declined steadily from its peak of 17% in 2005, to the point in 2009 at which only 11% regard this as a top three safety issue.

Driver tiredness has also declined in perceived top three importance, from 14% in 2005 to just 9% in 2009.

Only eight per cent of respondents mentioned not using child restraints as a top three issue in 2009. This has shown a gradual decline since the 11% recorded in 2005.

Motorcycle accidents were considered a top three issue by just five per cent of respondents in 2009. This figure has hardly changed across the five annual surveys conducted so far. Not surprisingly the group most likely to mention this in their top three were motorcyclists, though even among these respondents, only 18% did so.

Table 4c shows how motorists and non motorists rated different road safety issues as being the top three most important for the Government to address.
### Table 4c: Top three road safety issues most important to address (all motorists vs. non motorists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nov 07 Motorists (1,274) %</th>
<th>Nov 07 Non motorists (745) %</th>
<th>Oct 08 Motorists (1,227) %</th>
<th>Oct 08 Non motorists (782) %</th>
<th>Nov 09 Motorists (1,233) %</th>
<th>Nov 09 Non motorists (777) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drink driving</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mobile phones</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug driving</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers not fully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentrating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailgating</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child road awareness</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road rage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while tired</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wearing seat belts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not using child restraints</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle accidents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note 2009 figures based on changed terminology, previously “drivers not fully concentrating” changed to “careless driving”.

Some interesting patterns are notable when we compare the top three mentions of motorists and non motorists. Some issues are more likely to be in the motorists top three, whilst others are more likely to be in the non motorists top three.

Motorists were more likely to mention poor concentration/careless driving, mobile phone use and particularly tailgating as top three risks. Non motorists were more likely than motorists to mention drink-driving, speeding, child road awareness and not wearing seat belts. Part of the explanation might lie in the fact that all issues more commonly mentioned by non motorists have been the subject of major mass media campaigns. The difference in emphasis may therefore lie in the fact that non motorists have less personal experience, and therefore focus more specifically on what they have learned from campaigns, as well as being the issues most likely to affect them personally.
There was no consistent difference between motorists and non-motorists in terms of drug driving, road rage, driving while tired, not using child restraints, or motorcycle accidents.

### 4.2 Influences on safe driving

Motorists need to take personal responsibility when it comes to driving safely, but there are many factors which can influence this. Motorists were asked to choose, from a prompted list, which they felt were the top three most effective means in influencing how safely they drove. Note that this question was not asked in 2007.

#### Chart 4d: Top three most effective in influencing how safely you drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Nov-06</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible police presence</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed cameras</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of prosecution/penalties</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs/posters by the road about road safety issues</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety advertising</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed humps</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-car safety systems e.g. seat belt reminders, speed warnings</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving lessons</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles about road safety/accidents</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All motorists Nov '06 (1,489), Oct '08 (1,227), Nov '09 (1,233)

The general pattern for this data is one of consistency, with the proportion mentioning each influence remaining stable over the three surveys, and very little movement observed in the ranking.

A visible police presence has been perceived as the most effective influence on all of the annual surveys. In 2009 this was mentioned in the top three by 54%,
down slightly on the figures of 57% and 59% recorded in 2006 and 2008 respectively.

The next most effective influence was speed cameras, mentioned by 46% in 2009. Speed cameras have been second only to a visible police presence in three of the four surveys so far.

The threat of prosecution/penalties was mentioned in the top three by 40% motorists in 2009. Over the last three surveys this influence has been rated in the top three by between 36% and 40% of motorists.

The influence of family has fallen in 2009, down to 34% from its peak of 40% in 2008.

The following influences were mentioned by one in five motorists in their top three influences in the last three surveys. Percentages for 2009 shown in brackets as follows: in car safety systems (20%), signs/posters about road safety (20%) and road safety advertising (20%). Road humps had previously been mentioned by one in five, but have now fallen to 17% in 2009.

### 4.3 Attitudes towards road safety

A series of statements were used to assess how people feel about road safety and measures taken to make the roads safer. These cover perceptions of the safety of roads now compared with five years ago, whether people believe there is a greater police presence on the roads, whether traffic calming measures are felt to have an impact on road safety and perceptions of the chances of a fatality on a rural road compared with motorways or busy roads. The following charts show agreement with these statements among all respondents (Chart 4e), all motorists (Chart 4f) and all non motorists (Chart 4g).
Chart 4e: Agreement with statements about road safety (all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Nov 06</th>
<th>Nov 07</th>
<th>Oct 08</th>
<th>Nov 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps) make roads safer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are more likely to die driving in a rural area than you are to die</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving on a motorway or busy road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are now more police officers on the road than ever before</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads are safer than they were five years ago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents June '05 (2,240), Nov '06 (2,259), Nov '07 (2,019), Oct '08 (2,009), Nov '09 (2,010)
Chart 4f: Agreement with statements about road safety (all motorists)

- There are now more police officers on the road than ever before.
- Traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps) make roads safer.
- You are more likely to die driving in a rural area than you are to die driving on a motorway or busy road.
- Roads are safer than they were five years ago.
- You are more likely to drive over the limit on rural roads because there are fewer vehicles and pedestrians around (new 2009).
- I am more likely to drive over the limit on rural roads because there is less police presence (new 2009).

Base: All motorists Nov '06 (1,489), Nov '07 (1,274), Oct '08 (1,227), Nov '09 (1,233)
All measures that were tracked from 2006 followed a similar pattern (common to motorists and non motorists) in that they dipped slightly between 2006 and 2007, recovered in 2008 and maintained this level in 2009.

Indeed, for the statement "roads are safer than they were five years ago" the position has strengthened slightly in 2009. The proportion agreeing with the statement had previously tended to be around one in five (range = 17% in 23% for all respondents), but now stands at one in four (25%).

Three in ten believe that there are more police officers on the road than ever before (30%). For each annual survey we have found that non motorists are more likely to agree with this than motorists, and this was again the case in 2009 (35% compared with 27% of motorists).

The proportion agreeing that traffic calming measures make roads safer (53%) is exactly the same as found in 2008, just short of the peak 2006 figure of 56%. As noted previously, although there is no significant difference in the proportions of motorists and non motorists agreeing with the statement, there is a difference in levels of disagreement. One third (35%) of motorists disagree, compared with only one quarter (26%) of non motorists.
The statement "you are more likely to die driving in a rural area than you are to die driving on a motorway or busy road" met with agreement from 37% of all respondents in 2009, down from the 41% figure recorded in 2008, when this was included for the first time on the annual survey. There is much more agreement with the statement from motorists (43%) than from non motorists (26%), though this difference is largely accounted for by the greater proportions of non motorists saying "neither agree nor disagree" or "don't know".
5  Attitudes towards driving

Following our examination of general attitudes towards road safety, this section looks more specifically at attitudes towards driving – first looking at the perceived acceptability of certain driving and non-driving behaviours, then at attitudes towards dangerous driving behaviours.

5.1 Acceptability of certain behaviours

Respondents were read a list of twelve types of (negative) behaviour; nine were driving related behaviours while the remaining three were non-driving related; these were asked to provide context. For each of the behaviours, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they thought it was unacceptable or acceptable (where 1 was ‘fairly acceptable’ and 5 was ‘extremely unacceptable’). Some of these statements appeared in the 2005 survey, so data amongst all respondents are provided for comparison where applicable (this is not available split out into motorists and non motorist). This question was not asked in 2006.

The following charts show the percentage of adults (Chart 5a), motorists (Chart 5b) and non motorist (Chart 5c) who gave a score of 4 or 5 on the 5-point scale (‘5’ being extremely unacceptable) for behaviours relating to driving under the influence of drink or drugs, not wearing seat belts, driving without motor insurance and carrying on driving when too tired.

Chart 5a: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (1) – all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Jun 05</th>
<th>Nov 06</th>
<th>Nov 07</th>
<th>Oct 08</th>
<th>Nov 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving after taking drugs</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wearing a seatbelt in the front of a car</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving without motor insurance</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wearing a seatbelt in the back of a car</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on driving when too tired</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving after drinking two pints</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents June ’05 (2,240), Nov ’06 (2,259), Nov ’07 (2,019), Oct ’08 (2,009), Nov ’09 (2,010)
Chart 5b: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (1) – all motorists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Unacceptable Behavior</th>
<th>Nov '05</th>
<th>Nov '06</th>
<th>Nov '07</th>
<th>Oct '08</th>
<th>Nov '09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving after taking drugs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving without motor insurance</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wearing a seatbelt in the front of a car</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wearing a seatbelt in the back of a car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on drinking when too tired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking after drinking two pints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All motorists Nov '06 (1,489), Nov '07 (1,274), Oct '08 (1,227), Nov '09 (1,233)
The overall picture across these issues is one of remarkable stability, year on year, and minimal (if any significant) differences between motorists and non motorists.

The issue on which respondents felt most strongly was driving after taking drugs. Almost nine in ten (88%) scored this as a ‘5’, i.e. "extremely unacceptable", with a further eight per cent rating it as a ‘4’. Only three per cent scored this as ‘3’ or lower out of five.

Most people also found driving after drinking two pints to be unacceptable, but strength of opinion is softer with only 45% scoring this as a ‘5’, and a further 24% scoring it as a ‘4’ (total 69% scoring ‘4’ or ‘5’). The fact that 30% rate this behaviour as ‘3’ or less, including five per cent saying it is "fairly acceptable" (i.e. a score of ‘1’) will be of concern. Prominent among this five per cent are males aged 15-24 (8%), those with under three years driving experience (10%) and Londoners (10%). Motorcycle riders were also notable in this respect, with 12% finding this behaviour "fairly acceptable", although it should be noted that this is based on only 45 respondents.
Opinion on seatbelt wearing varied according to whether we were referring to the front seat or back seat of a car. Although the proportions scoring ‘4’ or ‘5’ was high in both cases, there was significant variation in the strength of feeling. The 93% believing that failure to wear a seatbelt in the front was unacceptable comprised 82% scoring ‘5’, and 11% scoring ‘4’. By contrast, the 83% believing that failure to wear a seatbelt in the back was unacceptable comprised just 63% scoring ‘5’, and 20% scoring ‘4’. Thus it seems evident that there is some way to go before wearing seatbelts in the back of a car is perceived as equally important as wearing them in the front.

Perceptions of the unacceptability of driving whilst tired remain stable, at 78% scoring ‘4’ or ‘5’ in 2007, 2008 and 2009.

Around nine in ten respondents have scored ‘4’ or ‘5’ in the last three annual surveys when asked about driving without insurance and MOT. Opinions are quite strong in this respect, with 79% scoring this as ‘5’ (i.e. "extremely unacceptable").

Charts 5d (all respondents), 5e (motorists) and 5f (non motorists) show the ratings of 4 or 5 for the remaining driving behaviours (speeding in a 30mph area, using a mobile phone whilst driving and parking on double yellow lines), as well as the three behaviours used for context: dropping litter in the street, not buying a television licence and shoplifting.
Chart 5d: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (2) – all respondents

% unacceptable 4/5

Base: All respondents June '05 (2,240), Nov '06 (2,259), Nov '07 (2,019), Oct '08 (2,009), Nov '09 (2,010)
Chart 5e: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (2) – all motorists

% unacceptable 4/5

- Using mobile phone when driving: 96%
- Shoplifting: 79%
- Dropping litter in the street: 73%
- Not buying a licence for your television: 70%
- Driving at 40mph on a 30mph speed limit area: 66%
- (Illegal) parking on double yellow lines: 61%

Base: All motorists Nov ’06 (1,489), Nov ’07 (1,274), Oct ’08 (1,227), Nov ’09 (1,233)

Chart 5f: Extent to which think behaviour is unacceptable (2) – all non motorists

% unacceptable 4/5

- Using mobile phone when driving: 96%
- Shoplifting: 79%
- Dropping litter in the street: 73%
- Not buying a licence for your television: 70%
- Driving at 40mph on a 30mph speed limit area: 66%
- (Illegal) parking on double yellow lines: 61%

Base: All non motorists Nov ’06 (770), Nov ’07 (745), Oct ’08 (782), Nov ’09 (777)
Once again we can see a general pattern of stability over time and relatively small differences between motorists and non motorists.

Driving whilst using a mobile phone has a high disapproval rating, with 94% scoring it as a ‘4’ or ‘5’ - a slight increase from 92% in 2008. Only drug driving is regarded as more unacceptable.

Driving at 40 in a 30mph zone was relatively acceptable with 7 in 10 finding it acceptable. We should note that motorists are less likely to score this as a ‘4’ or ‘5’ than non motorists (70% against 75% respectively), and the strength of feeling on this issue across all respondents is relatively weak, with only 45% scoring it has a ‘5’, which is the lowest score of five for any issue (equal with driving after drinking 2 pints) other than parking on double yellow lines.

The data on non-driving behaviour provides some enlightening context. It is clear that shoplifting is regarded as equally serious as the driving after taking drugs (both scored ‘4’ or ‘5’ by 96%). Dropping litter in the street is regarded as being slightly more unacceptable as driving whilst tired and driving at 40mph in a 30mph area, particularly when scores of ‘5’ (i.e. "extremely unacceptable") are compared - 59% for littering, 51% for driving whilst tired, and 45% for driving at 40mph in a 30mph area. These contextual findings may be regarded as somewhat surprising, given that the driving behaviours in question are potentially life-threatening, whilst the same cannot be claimed in relation to shoplifting and littering.

5.2 Attitudes towards dangerous driving

Respondents were shown a list of fifteen dangerous driving behaviours, and asked to rate the extent to which they agreed these were dangerous on a six-point scale from agree completely to disagree completely.

Respondents who did not agree completely that these behaviours were dangerous are a key target of THINK! campaigns. Looking across all behaviours it is clear that there are some groups with a more relaxed attitude towards such risk-taking. The groups consistently containing relatively high disagreement are young people aged 15-29 (especially males), city centre dwellers, single people and motorcyclists (though we should note that the base size for motorcyclists is small, just 45 respondents).
5.2.1 Drink or drug driving

All adults were asked of their attitude towards dangerous driving situations related to drugs and alcohol. Charts 5g, 5h and 5i show the proportion who agreed completely that each behaviour was dangerous.

Chart 5g: Attitudes to dangerous driving – drink and drugs (all respondents)

[Chart showing % Agree completely for various behaviors over time]

Base: All respondents Nov ’06 (2,259), Nov ’07 (2,019), Oct ’08 (2,009), Nov ’09 (2,010)
Chart 5h: Attitudes to dangerous driving – drink and drugs (all motorists)

% Agree completely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Nov 06</th>
<th>Nov 07</th>
<th>Oct 08</th>
<th>Nov 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive when over alcohol limit</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive after smoking cannabis</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive when unsure if over alcohol limit</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive after taking class A drugs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All motorists Nov '06 (1,489), Nov '07 (1,274), Oct '08 (1,227)
The great majority agree completely that these activities are dangerous. Around nine in ten agree completely that driving after taking Class A drugs (92%) and driving when over the alcohol limit (90%) are dangerous behaviours. The comparable figure is around eight out of ten for driving when unsure whether one is over the alcohol limit (83%), and driving after smoking cannabis (81%). The proportion agreeing completely slightly increased between 2008 and 2009, caused largely by greater proportions of non motorists agreeing completely. This group increased its rating for each measure shown above by between three and six percentage points, between 2008 and 2009.

### 5.2.2 Speeding and mobile phones

All adults were asked of their attitude towards dangerous driving situations related to speeding and mobile phone usage while driving. Charts 5j, 5k and 5l show the proportion who agreed completely that each behaviour was dangerous.
Chart 5j: Attitudes to dangerous driving – speeding and mobile phones
(all respondents)

% Agree completely

- Use mobile phone to text whilst driving
- Use mobile phone without hands free
- Drive too fast for conditions
- Drive at 40mph in a 30mph area
- Drive over speed limit
- Drive at 90mph on motorway when no traffic
- Use mobile with hands free

Base: All respondents Nov '06 (2,259), Nov '07 (2,019), Oct '08 (2,009), Nov '09 (2,010)
#### Chart 5k: Attitudes to dangerous driving – speeding and mobile phones (all motorists)

**% Agree completely**

- Use mobile phone to text whilst driving
- Use mobile phone without hands free
- Drive too fast for conditions
- Drive at 40mph in a 30mph area
- Drive over speed limit
- Drive at 90mph on motorway when no traffic
- Use mobile with hands free

Base: All motorists Nov '06 (1,489), Nov '07 (1,274), Oct '08 (1,227), Nov '09 (1,233)
Only three of these issues have the same level of complete agreement observed for drink and drug related behaviours (i.e. around eight out of ten or higher), but all but one of them has experienced a significant rise between 2008 and 2009. Texting, using mobile phones without a hands-free kit and driving too fast for the conditions stand out as having the highest levels of complete agreement.

Driving over the speed limit is the only other issue having complete agreement from over half of our respondents. Note that the terminology for this statement changed from "driving over the speed limit" in 2008, to "driving at 40 mph in a 30 mph area" in 2009, but there is no indication that this has had a major impact on the trend. Indeed, this was the only issue that did not show a significant increase in complete agreement, with the figure of 56% under the old terminology (2008) replaced by 57% under the new terminology (2009).
Chart 5m (below) looks in more detail at attitudes relating to drivers exceeding the speed limit in certain scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 5m: Attitudes to dangerous driving – Level of danger associated with each statement (all motorists)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very dangerous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving 10mph over the speed limit in bad weather conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving 5mph over the speed limit in bad weather conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving 10mph over the speed limit when the road is clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving 5mph over the speed limit when the road is clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding the national speed limit (70mph) on motorways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding the national speed limit (60mph) on rural roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairly dangerous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not very dangerous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not at all dangerous</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response to these questions indicate that perceptions of danger are strongly influenced by weather conditions and the type of road.

By far the greatest perception of danger was seen as coming from exceeding the speed limit by 10mph when driving in bad weather conditions (48% saying very dangerous, and 45% saying fairly dangerous). The next behaviour in terms of perceived danger level was driving on rural roads in excess of the national speed limit of 60mph (37% saying very dangerous, and 45% saying fairly dangerous).

Just under six in 10 people felt that driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a clear road was dangerous, and the same proportion believed that exceeding the 70 mph motorway speed limit was dangerous. In neither of these cases did the proportion saying very dangerous reach one quarter.

5.2.3 Seat belts and other behaviours

The remaining dangerous driving behaviours included not wearing seat belts, driving without insurance or MOT, carrying on driving when too tired and parking on double yellow lines (Charts 5n, 5o and 5p).
Chart 5n: Attitudes to dangerous driving – seatbelts and other (all respondents)

% Agree completely

Don’t use seatbelts in front of car
Don’t use seatbelts in back of car
Drive without insurance/MOT
Carry on driving when too tired
Don’t use seatbelts in back of car
Park on double yellow lines

Base: All respondents Nov ’06 (2,259), Nov ’07 (2,019), Oct ’08 (2,009), Nov ’09 (2,010)
Chart 5o: Attitudes to dangerous driving – seatbelts and other (all motorists)

% Agree completely

- Don’t use seatbelts in front of car
- Drive without insurance/MOT
- Don’t use seatbelts in back of car
- Carry on driving when too tired
- Park on double yellow lines

Base: All motorists Nov ’06 (1,489), Nov ’07 (1,274), Oct ’08 (1,227), Nov ’09 (1,233)
These behaviours have between 60% and 80% of respondents agreeing completely that they are dangerous, with the exception of parking on double yellow lines (31%). On each of the issues we can see that the proportion of all adults completely agreeing that they are dangerous has increased between 2008 and 2009.

The proportion of motorists agreeing completely has gone up particularly for driving without insurance/MOT (five percentage points), parking on yellow lines (four percentage points) and not wearing a seatbelt in the back (three percentage points), but there are larger increases among non motorists.

The proportion of non motorists agreeing completely has strongly increased for driving without insurance/MOT (eight percentage points), parking on yellow lines (seven percentage points), and driving whilst tired (six percentage points).
6 Road user behaviour

This chapter explores the prevalence of dangerous driving behaviours and the perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviours. It then goes on to look at the proportion of drivers who have received driving related penalties and finally the experiences of different road users – passengers and car, van or lorry drivers.

6.1 Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviours

In order to measure prevalence of dangerous driving, respondents were asked how often, if at all, they carried out a range of specified behaviours. Since 2006, in order to reduce social desirability bias, these questions have been asked as a self-completion exercise using a computer based survey on a laptop to all drivers aged 18 plus. In 2005 they were asked as self-completion but using a paper questionnaire. Therefore, on some measures, there was a step change in the data from 2005 to 2006 as the paper method of data collection may have felt less anonymous to some respondents and may therefore have prevented them from giving completely truthful answers.

Following this, for the first time in 2008, motorists aged 18+ were then asked, of the people they know who drive, how many they thought carried out the same dangerous driving behaviours. This was to gauge which behaviours drivers felt were common amongst people they knew, with the hypothesis that it is more socially acceptable to carry out a behaviour if you perceive more people to be behaving in that way, even if it is dangerous or illegal. On all the behaviours, more people said that they knew people that carried them out than they themselves admitted to doing personally.

In each of the sections that follow, data is first shown to illustrate the prevalence of each group of behaviours (driving under the influence of drink or drugs, speeding, mobile phones, use of seat belts and other behaviours), over the four years that these have been measured, and then to demonstrate the perceived prevalence of these measures to provide a comparison.

6.1.1 Driving under the influence of drink or drugs

Chart 6a shows the prevalence of drink and drug driving. It should be noted that certain subgroups consistently admitted to higher levels of these behaviours across the issues. This was predominantly true of young adults (particularly males), those with under six years driving experience, city centre dwellers and motorcyclists (though we should note that the base size for motorcyclists is small, just 45 respondents).
By far the most common behaviour admitted in this section was driving when unsure whether they were over the legal alcohol limit, admitted to by one in ten (10%), down from higher levels (13% or 14%) seen over the previous three surveys. Groups well above this average were males under the age of 34 (17%), social class C1 (15%), single people (15%), and city centre dwellers (14%).

One in twenty (5%) people admitted driving when they knew that they were over the legal alcohol limit, and this figure has been very steady since the questions were first asked on a survey in 2005. The groups most likely to admit to this behaviour were city centre dwellers (16%), young males 17-34 (9%) and those with up to six years driving experience (8%).

The proportions admitting driving after smoking cannabis (two per cent) and driving after taking class A drugs (one per cent) have remained extremely steady throughout all waves of the survey. Those most likely to admit these behaviours are young people aged 15-24 (six per cent and four per cent respectively).

The perceived prevalence of driving whilst under the influence of alcohol and drugs by other people is shown in Chart 6b. Adjacent bars show the figures for 2008 and 2009.
Over four in ten (42%) respondents said that they knew at least a few people who drive when unsure if they are over the legal alcohol limit, with two per cent saying that most people they know do this.

Around three in ten (28%) respondents said that they knew at least a few people who drive when over the legal alcohol limit, though the proportion saying that most people they know do this has fallen below one per cent.

In the case of drugs, one in ten (10%) respondents said they knew at least a few people who drive after smoking cannabis, and around one in twenty (six per cent) said that they knew at least one person who drives after taking class A drugs.

Comparison of 2008 with 2009 reveals a stable picture. A very small amount of change is observable, with increases of 2-4 percentage points in the "no one I know does this" proportions. This is particularly notable for driving when over the legal alcohol limit, for which the proportion saying they know nobody who does this has risen from 67% to 71%.
6.1.2 Speeding

Prevalence of speeding is shown in Chart 6c.

Chart 6c: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – speeding

Until the 2008 survey we asked respondents whether they drove over the speed limit, and since 2006 just over 70% admitted this behaviour. In 2009 this statement was dropped, and a more specific speeding behaviour was introduced in its place, i.e. driving at 40mph in a 30mph area. This more specific terminology was admitted to by over half (57%) but well down from the level yielded by the previous terminology. Those most likely to admit this behaviour were young adults, and particularly males aged 15-29 (73%).

Four in ten respondents admitted to driving at 90mph on a motorway when there is no traffic (40%), and this level has remained quite stable since the 2006 survey. Those most likely to admit to this behaviour were motorcyclists (67%), men aged 17-34 (62%), those who drive as part of their job (49%) and those with three to six years driving experience (47%). (Note that the base size for motorcyclists is small, just 45 respondents).

One third admitted sometimes driving too fast for the conditions, and between 2008 and 2009 this proportion has risen from 27% to 33%. This behaviour was most common among young males aged 17-34 (53%). Other groups with high
propensities to drive too fast for the conditions were commuter drivers (40%) and those who drive as part of their job (39).

The next chart (6d) shows the responses to the questions we asked about perceptions of speeding by other people. Adjacent bars show the figures for 2008 and 2009, except for the two bars on the left which it show findings from questions asked only in 2009 (far left) and 2008 (second to left).

Chart 6d: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – speeding

It is evident that most respondents knew somebody who behaved in one or more of these ways.

The most commonly perceived of these behaviours was ‘driving over the speed limit’. When asked in this general way in 2008, 79% of respondents claimed to know at least a few people who did this. In 2009 this question was changed to the more specific behaviour of driving at 40mph in a 30mph speed limit area, and this new phrasing found that 72% of people claimed to know at least a few people doing this.

Two thirds (64%) of respondents knew at least a few people who drive at 90mph on the motorway when there is no traffic, and the findings for this question have remained almost completely unchanged between 2008 and 2009. Around one in ten respondents believe that most people they know do this.
Six in ten respondents knew at least a few people who drive too fast for the conditions, and again there was no significant change between the 2008 and 2009 findings. Only three per cent of respondents believed that most people they know drive in this way.

One further question about speeding was asked, but in a different question set. Chart 6e shows the level of agreement with this additional statement "when I am driving in the country and there is a clear road, I put my foot down".

Chart 6e: Agreement with statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All motorists 2008</th>
<th>All motorists 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All motorists 2008 (1,277), 2009 (1,233)

Just over one third (36%) of our respondents agreed that they speed on country roads, when clear, but half (50%) disagreed. The pattern of response did not change significantly between 2008 and 2009. The groups most likely to agree that they behave like this were men (43%), males aged 17-34 (53%) and motorcyclists (52%) (though we should note that the base size for motorcyclists is small, just 45 respondents).
6.1.3 Use of mobile phones

Prevalence of using mobile phones whilst driving is shown in Chart 6f.

Chart 6f: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – mobile phones

The use of mobile phones in these different contexts (with a hands-free kit, without a hands-free kit and texting whilst driving) varies between 12% and 24%, and the trends show remarkable stability over the last few surveys.

One quarter (24%) of respondents said that they used mobile phones with a hands-free kit while driving. Men (31%) were twice as likely to do so as women (15%). More specifically, high levels of this activity were found among males aged 17-34 (43%), those with between three and six years driving experience (38%) and motorcyclists (36%) (Note that the base size for motorcyclists is just 45 respondents).

Use of mobile phones without a hands-free kit while driving was admitted by 17% of motorists. Men (19%) were more likely to do so than women (14%), but the gender difference is much narrower than seen for use of a hands-free kit. Young
people aged 17-34 were particularly likely to do this, especially males (39%), though females of this age group were also above average (28%). Certain other social groups were also much more likely than average to use a mobile phone without a hands-free kit while driving, namely, those with between three and six years driving experience (34%), city centre dwellers (28%) and black and minority ethnic respondents (27%).

We then looked at respondent perceptions of other people’s behaviour with mobile phones when driving, and the findings are shown below in chart 6g. Adjacent bars show findings for 2008 and 2009.

The first thing to note is that the pattern of response is remarkably stable between 2008 and 2009.

Most knew at least a few people who used a hands-free kit for their mobile phone whilst driving (62%), with one in 10 believing that most people they knew did this. Almost half knew at least a few people who used their mobile phone whilst driving without the aid of a hands-free kit (46%), but the proportion believing that most people do this was lower, at just 3%.

Base: All motorists aged 18 or over 2008 (1,219), 2009 (1,229)
Four in 10 people claimed to know a few people who used text messages whilst driving, though the proportion believing that most people do this was low, at just 3%.

### 6.1.4 Seat belt wearing

Seat belt wearing was a key issue tackled in 2008/09, with a campaign aimed to shock drivers with what may happen to them if they have a crash at 30mph while not wearing a seat belt.

**Chart 6h: Prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – seat belts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% At all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 22% in Jun '05 (1,517)
- 28% in Oct '06 (1,462)
- 24% in Nov '07 (1,258)
- 23% in Oct '08 (1,219)
- 24% in Nov '09 (1,229)

**Base:** All motorists Jun '05 (1,517), All motorists aged 18+ Nov '06 (1,462), Nov '07 (1,258), Oct '08 (1,219), Nov '09 (1,229)

About one quarter of respondents reported not using a seatbelt when sitting in the back of a car (24%). This trend has generally "flat lined" since 2005, with the exception of a high point in November 2006 (28%). Those most likely to fail to wear a seatbelt in the back of a car were men aged 30-44 (31%), city centre dwellers (32%), those driving for work (30%) motorcyclists (31%). (Note that the base size for motorcyclists is just 45 respondents)

About one in ten respondents admitted not using seat belts whilst in the front of the car. The groups most likely to admit this behaviour were young males aged 15-29 (25%), males aged 30-44 (22%), motorcyclists (22%), city centre dwellers (19%), those who drive for work (15%) and social class C2D (15%).
We then looked at respondent perceptions of other people's behaviour with seat belts, and the findings are shown below in chart 6i. Adjacent bars show findings for 2008 and 2009.

**Chart 6i: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – seat belts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't use seatbelts while sitting in the front of the car</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't use seatbelts while sitting in the back of the car</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't use seatbelts when sitting in the front of the car</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't use seatbelts when sitting in the back of the car</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All motorists aged 18 or over 2008 (1,219), 2009 (1,229)

Only one quarter of 2009 respondents said that they knew at least a few people who did not wear a seatbelt whilst sitting in the front of the car (23%). This is down from nearly one third in 2008 (31%).

Fewer than half of 2009 respondents reported knowing that at least a few people who did not wear a seat belt in the back of the car (42%), and this has fallen slightly since 2008 (47%).

**6.1.5 Other behaviours**

Other behaviours measured were driving when too tired, parking on double yellow lines and driving without insurance or MOT.
The proportion of respondents reporting that they carried on driving when too tired stands at 40% in 2009, the same proportion seen since 2006. The social groups most likely to carry on driving when tired were people aged 17-34 (52%), those driving for work (52%) and commuter drivers (49%).

Just over a third of 2009 respondents admitted parking on double yellow lines (37%). The reporting of such behaviour has been within a fairly narrow band of prevalence since the first survey in 2005, with a range of 33% to 38%. Those most likely to admit parking on yellow lines were those with three to six years driving experience (48%), social class D (48%), males aged 17-34 (46%) and those whose work involved driving (44%).

As one might expect, only a very small proportion admitted driving without insurance/MOT, standing at 3% in 2009, consistent with previous years. Those most likely to drive without insurance/MOT were aged 17-34 (8%), city centre dwellers (9%) and black and minority ethnic people (7%). Countryside dwellers and social grades DE were both twice as likely as average to drive without insurance/MOT, at six per cent.
We then looked at respondent perceptions of other people's behaviour in terms of tiredness, parking on yellow lines and driving without insurance/MOT, and the findings are shown below in chart 6k. Adjacent bars show findings for 2008 and 2009.

Chart 6k: Perceived prevalence of dangerous driving behaviour – other

The overall picture is of very little change between 2008 and 2009.

Just over half the respondents knew at least a few people who they believed parked on double yellow lines, and five per cent believed that most people did this.

Similarly, just over half the respondents knew at least a few people who they believed carried on driving when they were tired. Only three per cent believed that most people they knew did this.

Only 10% knew at least a few people who had driven without insurance/MOT, with less than one per cent believing that most people they knew did this.

6.2 Driving related penalties

In the self completion section of the survey, all motorists aged 18 or over were asked to state which common driving penalties they had ever received, and which
they had received more recently (in the last three years). The latter measure is perhaps the more reliable one due to memory limitations over time. Both measures have remained stable since 2007, and we would not expect to see significant changes in reporting of these measures year on year.

There was close to an equal split between motorists aged 18 or over having ever had penalties (47%), and motorists who have never had a penalty (52%). Interestingly, people who were motorcyclists and cyclists had relatively high prevalence of previous penalties (73% and 55%). (Note that the base size for motorcyclists is just 45 respondents).

In demographic terms, the highest incidence was among men aged 35-54, at 64%. Men in general were almost twice as likely to have had a penalty than were women (59% and 33% respectively).

The penalties most commonly incurred, by around a third of motorists, were points on the licence (34%) or a fine for speeding (29%).
Around one in twenty said they had at some point had a conviction (five per cent) or a ban (four per cent). A very small minority said they had received a fine for not wearing a seat belt (one per cent), using a mobile phone whilst driving (two per cent) or driving with no MOT or insurance (one per cent).

Chart 6m shows the proportion of all motorists aged 18 years and over who have received the various penalties in the last three years.

Nearly one in five motorists (18%) had received a penalty within the last three years. As with penalties ever received, motorists were most likely to have received either points on their licence (11%) or a fine for speeding (11%) within the last three years. Each of the other penalties had been received by one per cent of motorists, or fewer. As with the other penalty related findings shown above, these figures are substantively no different from those found in the 2007 and 2008 surveys.

6.3 Passenger experience

It is interesting to look at dangerous driving behaviours from a passenger point of view, i.e. what they may have been involved in or subjected to, as behaviour is subject to change when carried out in the social domain, and second party
presence in a car may have an influence on a driver’s actions. All respondents were asked to state from a prompted list which they had experienced personally as a passenger.

On the following charts, data have been split out to show firstly all respondents and then motorists and non motorists separately, to see whether the experiences of the two key groups differed.

6.3.1 Driving under the influence of drink or drugs

Until the 2008 survey two statements addressed the issue of experiencing driving under the influence of "drink or drugs" – whether travelling with, or having refused to travel with a driver who was possibly under the influence of drink or drugs. In order to examine differences between the influence of drink and the influence of drugs, the statements were split on the 2009 survey. Clearly this interrupts the trend and consequently the 2009 figures are not presented as part of a continuous trend line, in charts 6n and 6o).

Chart 6n: Passenger experience – drink/drugs (all respondents)

Chart 6n (above) is based on all respondents, and reveals that experiences in relation to drink are more than twice as common as those relating to drugs. The drink related figures for 2009 are almost identical to the figures from surveys in 2006-2008, in which drink and drugs were not separated in the question. This
implies that those having experiences with drivers possibly influenced by drugs are a subset of those having experiences with drivers influenced by drink, rather than being a different population group. As identified in the recent drug drive evaluation, it appears that these two groups do indeed overlap somewhat.

The groups most likely to have travelled with a driver who was possibly under the influence of drink are males 17-34 (23%) and motorcyclists (21%). (Note that the base size for motorcyclists is just 45 respondents).

The same groups are much more likely than the average to have travelled with a driver who was possibly under the influence of drugs (those aged 17-34 = 13% and motorcyclists = 9% respectively). Other groups with a high propensity to have done this are cyclists (9%) and city centre dwellers (10%).

Chart 6o (below) splits these findings to enable comparison of the experiences of motorists and non motorists. As in chart 6n, the trend lines show data from the 2006-2008 surveys (with the related legend above these lines), and the individual data points on the right-hand side show figures from the 2009 survey with drugs related experience separated from drink related experience, (and the relevant legend down the right-hand column).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passenger experiences – motorist/non motorists, drink/drugs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travelled with driver possibly under influence of drink or drugs (motorists) (06-08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to travel with driver possibly under influence of drink or drugs (motorists) (06-08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelled with driver possibly under influence of drink or drugs (non motorists) (06-08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to travel with driver possibly under influence of drink or drugs (non motorists) (06-08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refused to travel with driver possibly under influence of drink (motorists) (09)
Refused to travel with driver possibly under influence of drink (non motorists) (09)
Travelled with driver possibly under influence of drink (non motorists) (09)
Travelled with driver possibly under influence of drink or drugs (motorists) (09)
Travelled with driver possibly under influence of drink or drugs (non motorists) (09)
Refused to travel with driver possibly under influence of drugs (motorists) (09)
Refused to travel with driver possibly under influence of drugs (non motorists) (09)

Chart 6o: Passenger experience – drink/drugs (all motorists vs. non motorists)

Base: All motorists Nov ’06 (1,489), Nov ’07 (1,274), Oct ’08 (1,227), Nov ’09 (1,233) / All non motorists Nov ’06 (770), Nov ’07 (745), Oct ’08 (782), Nov ’09 (777)
The 2006-2008 survey trends were indicating a worrying increase in the proportions reporting travelling with drivers who may have been under the influence of drink or drugs, whilst the trend on refusal to travel with such drivers was more stable.

The 2009 figures do not continue this trend, because of the more specific terminology, but they do allow us to look separately at drink related and drugs related experiences. This reveals very little difference between motorists and non motorists.

Around one in six motorists (17%) had refused to travel with a driver they suspected of being influenced by drink, and the corresponding figure for non-motorists was 15%. The proportion travelling with such a driver was 13% in both cases.

Only seven per cent of motorists had refused to travel with a driver they suspected of being influenced by drugs, and the corresponding figure for non-motorists was eight per cent. The proportion travelling with such a driver was five per cent in both cases.

**6.3.2 Speeding**

Speeding was addressed through three measures, two of which were aimed at whether the passenger thought the driver was driving too fast (asking a driver to slow down, or feeling unsafe because of the speed the driver was driving at), and one asking whether the passenger had ever encouraged speeding behaviour (Charts 6p and 6q).
Chart 6p: Passenger experience – speeding (all respondents)

- **Asked a driver to slow down**: 41% (Nov '06), 42% (Nov '07), 42% (Oct '08), 41% (Nov '09)
- **Encouraged a driver to drive faster**: 6% (Nov '06), 7% (Nov '07), 8% (Oct '08), 5% (Nov '09)
- **Felt unsafe because of the speed that the driver was driving at**: 37% (Nov '06), 43% (Nov '07), 46% (Oct '08), 42% (Nov '09)

Base: All respondents Nov '06 (2,259), Nov '07 (2,019), Oct '08 (2,009), Nov '09 (2,010)
Approximately four in ten respondents had asked a driver to slow down (41%), and a slightly lower proportion had felt unsafe because of the speed the driver was driving at (37%). Both of these figures have declined since the 2008 survey. Asking a driver to slow down peaked at 46% in 2007 and feeling unsafe fell from a previously stable level around 42%-43%.

Only one in twenty (five per cent) admitted to asking a driver to drive faster, down from eight per cent in 2008, but in line with the longer-term trend.

There do seem to be differences between motorists and non motorists in terms of these measures. Motorists were more likely to ask a driver to slow down (45%) and to feel unsafe (41%), than where non motorists (34% and 29% respectively). This may be because motorists feel better qualified to pass judgement on other people's driving than do non motorists.

Interestingly, when we look at the proportions encouraging a driver to go faster, the pattern is not as clear. Although a gap seems to have opened up in 2009, with eight per cent of non motorists reporting this behaviour, against only four per cent of motorists, the trend since 2006 is inconclusive on this matter.
6.3.3 Use of mobile phones

Chart 6r shows the proportion of all respondents, motorists and non motorists who said they had felt unsafe as a passenger because a driver was using a mobile phone.

Chart 6r: Passenger experience – mobile phones (all respondents)

One in five people have felt unsafe because a driver was using a mobile phone (all respondents = 19%). The closeness of the lines demonstrates that the difference between the experiences of motorists and non motorists in this respect is negligible. The data for non motorists shows a little more variation around the trend line (range = 17% - 22%), probably because there are fewer non motorists than motorists in the sample, meaning that the base size for non motorists is such that we can expect slightly more statistical variation.

The group most likely to report feeling unsafe for this reason was men aged 30-44 (32%).

6.3.4 Seat belt wearing

Passenger experiences of not wearing a seat belt in the front or back seat are shown in Charts 6s and 6t.
The proportion of passengers reporting not wearing a seatbelt is in decline on both measures, though one in five (21%) still admit to having not worn a seatbelt in a rear seat, and around one in ten admit having not worn one when travelling in the front seat (11%).

Those most likely to fail to wear a seatbelt (front or rear seats) are males aged 17-34 and motorcyclists. (Note that the base size for motorcyclists is small, just 45 respondents).

Chart 6t (below) examines these experiences, comparing motorists with non motorists.
Chart 6t: Passenger experience – seat belts (all motorists vs. non motorists)

These figures reveal that there is very little difference between the behaviour of motorists and non motorists in relation to wearing seat belts. As observed before, the data for non motorists shows a little more variation, almost certainly because the base size within the survey sample is small for non motorists, and will therefore be prone to slightly less stability, wave to wave.

6.3.5 Other experiences

The final passenger experiences covered in this section are being involved in an accident as a passenger and feeling unsafe because the driver was tired.
In each survey since 2006 we have found that around one in five respondents report having been involved in an accident when travelling as a passenger (20% in 2009). The proportion reporting as a feeling unsafe because a driver was tired is also extremely consistent, at around one in six (16% in 2009).

Those most likely to have been a passenger in an accident where males aged 30-44 (27%), those driving for 10-14 hours in a typical week (28%) and those with 6-10 years driving experience (30%).

The respondents most likely to have felt unsafe because a driver was tired were males 30-44 (24%).
Chart 6v demonstrates that there is very little difference between the experiences of motorists and non motorists in these respects.

6.4 Precautions taken to avoid accidents

In order to look at the perspective of car, van or lorry drivers on sharing the road safely with other road users, they were asked about what measures they took to avoid accidents with motorcyclists and cyclists.
Between 2006 and 2007 there was a significant increase in the proportion of drivers reporting that they checked their mirrors regularly, but this has fallen back very slightly since 2007, and now stands at 78%.

In terms of leaving enough space between cars and cyclists/bikers, there is a steady upward trend, from 72% in 2006 to 78% in 2009.

For other measures relating to consideration of bikers and cyclists, 2008 witnessed a worrying downturn, but the upward trend has been restored in 2009. For looking out for bikers and cyclists when turning and coming out of side roads, the figures are very close to the 2007 peaks, but consideration when opening car doors is still short of its previous high point (65% in 2007, 60% in 2009).

For the other precautionary behaviours measured, 2009 has seen significant increases. Paying extra attention in bad conditions has gone up from 50% in 2008 to 56% in 2009. Expecting sudden movements in bad conditions has increased from 39% in 2008 to 44% in 2009, and turning headlights down for oncoming traffic has risen from 36% to 44%.
Looking across these measures it would seem that 2008 was not typical of the ongoing trends in precautionary behaviour, and 2009 has seen a return to the general improvements observed between 2006 and 2007.
7 Awareness of, and attitudes towards, the THINK! brand

This section covers the awareness of, and attitudes towards, the THINK! road safety brand as a whole – the sum of its individual campaign parts.

7.1 Spontaneous awareness of advertising about road safety

As a spontaneous measure of THINK! road safety campaign activity, all respondents were first asked if they recalled seeing any advertising about road safety (Chart 7a). They were then asked who they thought produced the road safety advertising that they recalled seeing (Charts 7b and 7c).

Recall of road safety advertising declined sharply from its peak in 2006 (60% of all respondents) to the point in 2008 at which only four in ten (39% of all respondents) could recall such advertising. The figures for 2009 show that recall has increased significantly, returning almost to 2007 levels, with nearly half (48% of all respondents) recalling road safety advertising.

It is interesting to note that non motorists (51%) now exhibit slightly higher levels of recall than do motorists (46%). This is quite different from the pattern
observed in 2006 and 2007 in which recall by motorists was much higher than recall by non motorists (range of difference = 7-9 percentage points.

We asked respondents to tell us who they thought was responsible for the advertising that they recalled, and findings are shown below, in Chart 7b.

Since 2006 the two leading responses have been Government and THINK! At the 2006 and 2007 surveys the proportion of respondents making these two suggestions were roughly similar, around the 20% mark, but in 2008 the proportion specifying the Government increased dramatically. The findings for 2009 show that Government is consolidated as the leading (perceived) source of the advertising, accounting for around three in ten suggestions (31% in 2008 29% and in 2009), whilst THINK! remains steady at around the one in five (19% in 2008 and 22% in 2009).

The proportion of respondents citing the Department for Transport as the source of the advertising was consistently in the range 13% to 15% until 2009, when it declined to 10%. At the same time, the proportion suggesting that the advertising is the responsibility of the Police has increased to eight per cent, having been consistently in the range four to six per cent in previous years.
When comparing the actions of motorists and non motorists about who is responsible for safety advertising, we need to bear in mind that non motorists (28%) were more likely to reply "don't know" than were motorists (21%), meaning that fewer non motorists made substantive suggestions.

Attribution of the campaign to the Government has grown amongst both motorists and non motorists, with a particularly sharp rise between 2007 and 2008. Among motorists this increase was maintained into 2009, but has fallen back somewhat amongst non motorists.

Attribution of the campaign to THINK! has been fairly consistent over the three-year period, notwithstanding a divergence in 2007, when the figure for motorists peaked at 24%, whilst the same figure amongst non motorists fell to a low point of 15%. If we leave 2007 out of the analysis, we can see that all measures for both groups have been within a relatively narrow band between 18% and 23% on surveys in the other years.

Motorists (12%) were twice as likely to think that the Department for Transport was responsible for road safety advertising as were non motorists (five per cent). Conversely, non motorists (10%) were slightly more likely than motorists (seven per cent) to think that the Police were responsible.
7.2 Prompted awareness of the THINK! Logo

As a measure of awareness of the THINK! brand, all respondents were shown the THINK! logo on the screen of the laptop and then asked if they had seen it before (Chart 7d).

When prompted, eight in ten (84%) respondents recognised the THINK! logo. This level of awareness has remained stable since 2006.

Motorists were more likely to recognise the THINK! logo than non drivers (87% of drivers compared with 77% of non motorists). This finding is consistent with previous waves. Among drivers, those who travelled further over the course of the year were more likely to recognise the brand (91% of those who travelled 10,000+ miles in a year, falling to 83% of those who travelled for up to 3,000 miles), though this gap is narrower than the one found in 2008 (94% and 75% respectively).

As in previous waves the level of recognition falls off among those aged 55 and older (89% of 15-54s, falling to 73% of those aged 55+).
7.3 THINK! brand personality

In order to measure the perceived image, or personality, of the THINK! brand, all respondents who recognised the THINK! logo were shown a list of a words (both favourable and unfavourable) and were asked to select which they felt best described the THINK! campaign (Chart 7e).

The colour coding of positive descriptions in red/yellow and negative descriptions in green/blue clearly demonstrates, at a glance, that the overall response was very positive towards the campaign, just as we have found in previous years.

The descriptions chosen by respondents recognising the THINK! logo have been quite consistent over the years, in their relative proportions. "Helpful" and "thought provoking" are the two leading choices, each chosen by around half of respondents in every survey, with the figures being 54% and 50% respectively in 2009. The group most likely to say "helpful" was young males 15-29 (61%), and the groups most likely to choose "thought-provoking" were females aged 30-44 (63%) and motorcyclists (68%), though we should note the small based size of just 45 motorcyclists.
"Influential" (25%) and "caring" (25%) were both mentioned in similar proportions to previous waves. We have noted at several points in this report the tendency for young males to report relatively high levels of risk taking behaviour, and it is therefore perhaps surprising to note that males aged 15-29 were also much more likely than average to choose to describe the campaign as "influential" (34%) and "caring" (35%).

As in previous years, each negative trait was mentioned by a low proportion of respondents. "Boring" was mentioned by six per cent, "old fashioned" and "irrelevant" were mentioned by five per cent each, with "bossy" mentioned by just 3% and "intrusive" by two per cent.

In table 7f (below) we compare the use of these descriptions by motorists and non motorists.

| Table 7f: Selected words to describe the THINK! campaign (all motorists vs. non motorists) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
|                                                   | Nov 07                                          | Oct 08                                          | Nov 09                                          | Non motorists (777) %                                   | Non motorists (569) %                                   | Non motorists (536) %                                   | Non motorists (1,020) %                                   | Non motorists (1,081) %                                   | Non motorists (1,233) %                                   | Non motorists (536) %                                   | Non motorists (1,020) %                                   | Non motorists (1,081) %                                   |
|                                                   | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Motorists %                                    | Non motorists %                                       | Non motorists %                                       | Non motors
No other differences between these groups are sufficiently large or consistent to be significant.

### 7.4 Attitudes towards THINK! and road safety advertising

As a measure of attitudes towards the THINK! campaign, respondents who recognised the THINK! campaign logo were then shown a series of attitudinal statements and asked whether they agreed or disagreed with each (Charts 7g and 7h). These statements were designed to measure brand affinity, persuasion and momentum.

The trend across all three statements is remarkably consistent, with the highest levels of agreement recorded in 2006, dipping in 2007 and 2008 before recovering in 2009.

The statement "when I see something with the THINK! logo on I take notice" increased by four percentage points in 2009. It now stands at 73%, still short of its peak of 78% in 2006.

The statement "when I see something with the THINK! logo on I trust it" has recovered to very close to its 2006 peak of 68%, and stands at 67% in 2009.
Similarly, the statement "the THINK! campaign is really making a difference to the safety of our roads" has recovered to 55% agreement, just short of the 57% seen at its peak in 2006.

It is interesting to note that some of the highest levels of agreement with each of the statements came from young adults, and particularly young males. For example on the "trust" statement, 77% of males aged 17-34 agreed, compared with just 61% of people aged 55+. There were also particularly high levels of agreement from black and minority ethnic respondents, with 76% agreeing with the "trust" statement, compared with just 65% of white respondents.

Chart 7h (below) examines these trends by comparing responses from motorists with those from non motorists.

Levels of agreement from motorists and non motorists were broadly similar on individual statements, and have remained so on all surveys. Motorists were slightly more likely than non motorists to agree with the "take notice" statement (75% to 71%), though there has only been a notable difference for this statement on the last two surveys.
Non motorists have been slightly more likely to agree to the "trust" statement in previous surveys but now the difference has narrowed to negligible proportions.

The "making a difference" statement exhibits a consistent pattern since 2006, with non motorists being more likely to agree than motorists, by between three and five percentage points on each occasion (58% to 53% in 2009).

The next two attitudes statements were designed to test perceptions around the impact of road safety advertising, and the view that there was too much road safety advertising. Findings are shown in Chart 7i & 7j.

Nearly half of respondents (48%) agreed that road safety advertising has a strong impact on how people behave on the road. This is the highest figure so far recorded, though broadly in line with the previous results. It is worth noting that even respondents with previous driving penalties were in line with the views of other respondents (i.e. 48% - 50% agreeing with the statement, with slight variation according to penalty type). About three in ten respondents disagreed that road safety advertising has a strong impact on how people behave on the road, and notably high levels of disagreement came from respondents who drove for 10-14 hours in a typical week (40%), and from motorcyclists (40%), though we should note that the figure from motorcyclists is based on only 45 interviews.
Around one in ten respondents (11%) thought that there was too much advertising about road safety, but two thirds (68%) disagreed with the statement. Again this is broadly in line with the ongoing trend, though it is a small fall from the peak of 14% agreeing with this in the 2008 survey. The highest levels of agreement were found among young males aged 15-29 (19% agree), city centre dwellers (19% agree) and black and minority ethnic respondents (24% agree).

Chart 7j (below) examines the responses to these questions from motorists and non-motorists.

The trend lines show that there is little difference between the opinions of motorists and non-motorists on these issues.

Motorists (49% agree in 2009) have tended to be slightly more positive about the value of road safety advertising than non motorists (45% agree in 2009), though the reverse was true just once, in the 2007 survey.

Non motorists (14% agree in 2009) were slightly more likely to believe that there is too much advertising about road safety than were motorists (10% agree in
2009). However the degree of difference between the two groups is small, at three or four percentage points over the last three surveys.
APPENDIX A – Sampling Method

The sampling technique used in this survey is a tightly controlled form of random location sampling developed within BMRB, and is the basis of most consumer surveys which BMRB conducts.

The aim of random location sampling is to eliminate the more unsatisfactory features of quota sampling without incurring the cost and other penalties involved in conducting surveys according to strict probability methods.

One of the principal advantages of probability techniques of sampling is that selection of respondents is taken from the hands of interviewers. In conventional quota sampling, on the other hand, interviewers are given quotas to fill, usually from within specified administrative areas. When, for example, an interviewer is asked to complete a quota of AB respondents, she will tend to go to a part of the district where she knows such individuals to be available. AB individuals living in mixed social class areas will have little chance of inclusion. This and similar defects lead to biases which are concealed by superficial agreements between sample profiles and accepted standard statistics.

The principal distinguishing characteristic of random location sampling, as operated by BMRB, is that interviewers are given very little choice in the selection of respondents. Respondents are drawn from a small set of homogenous streets, selected with probability proportional to population after stratification by their ACORN characteristics and region. Quotas are set in terms of characteristics which are known to have a bearing on individuals’ probabilities of being at home and so available for interview. Rules are given which govern the distribution, spacing and timing of interviews.

The sample of areas takes as its universe all sample units (groups of Census 2001 Output Areas, on average, 300 households) in Great Britain. Output areas are stratified in the following manner:

(i) Standard Region

(ii) Within Standard Region - by Acorn type

(iii) Within Standard Region by County and ITV Region

Thus, the design is single stage, using direct selection of appropriate groups of Output areas, rather than taking streets at random from larger units such as wards or parishes.
APPENDIX B: Weighting Procedures

The data are weighted to ensure that demographic profiles match those for all adults in Great Britain aged 15 or over. A rim weighting technique is used in which target profiles are set for eight separate demographic variables. The computer system then allocates a weight to each individual such that the overall composition of the sample is balanced in terms of the targets set.

The actual weights applied thus vary slightly between surveys; precise figures for specific cases are available from BMRB if required.

**Target Weights Applied**

**Sex 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>48.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women without children</td>
<td>32.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women with children</td>
<td>19.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sex 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men working full time</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men not working full time</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women working at all</td>
<td>24.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women not working at all</td>
<td>27.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age within Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Grade within Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire/Humberside</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>12.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source of profile data: BMRB Target Group Index, 2005 and NRS, 2005)
### APPENDIX C: Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In a typical week, how many hours do you spend doing each of the following?</td>
<td>Base: All Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER: IF NECESSARY SAY: Please think about the last 3 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER: PLEASE ROUND ANSWER TO NEAREST HOUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less than 1 hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 - 2 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 - 5 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6 - 9 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 - 14 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15+ hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This question is repeated for the following loop values:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Driving a car as part of my job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Driving a car to and from work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Driving a car for other reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Driving a van/lorry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Riding a motorcycle/scooter/moped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Riding a bicycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Travelling in a car as a passenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Walking on the pavement/road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On average, how many miles do you drive in a year? Please include all miles driven for personal and work purposes, if appropriate. (SINGLE CODE)</td>
<td>Base: All Motorists (all who selected codes 1/2/3/4/5 AND who drive between “less than one hour” to “15+ hours” at Q1 (excludes those who say ‘none’ at Q1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOW SCREEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Up to 3000 miles a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3000 - 5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5000-10,000 miles a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More than 10,000 miles a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How would you describe the area you live in? (SINGLE CODE)</td>
<td>Base: All respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOW SCREEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outskirts of large town or city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre of large town or city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How frequently do you make the following type of journeys by motor vehicle?</td>
<td>Base: All Motorists (as at Q1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5+ times per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2-4 times per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Once a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Once a month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Long journeys i.e. 50+ miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Journeys involving motorway driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Journeys to and from work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Journeys as part as my actual job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Journeys after dark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Journeys with passengers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Journeys on country roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Journeys to and from pubs/restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Short local journeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Which of these types of vehicles do you drive in a typical week? (MULTICODE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOW SCREEN – CODE ALL THAT APPLY</td>
<td>Base: All Motorists (as at Q1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saloon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports (cabriolet/ coupe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPV / People carrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4X4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatchback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorry / HGV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Thinking about the car/van you use most often, approximately how old is this? (SINGLE CODE)</th>
<th>Base: All car/van/lorry drivers at Q1 = 1/2/3/4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 I would now like you to think about road safety. Which of the issues below do you consider to be the most important issues that the Government should address to improve road safety? Please pick your top three. SHOW SCREEN – CODE TOP THREE IN ORDER RANDOMISE (to match previous surveys)</th>
<th>Base: All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drink driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mobile phones without hands free kit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of mobile phones with a hands free kit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wearing seatbelts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not using child restraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child road awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while tired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail gating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road rage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 To what extent would you agree or disagree that the following behaviours are dangerous? IF RESPONDENT ASKS FOR ‘HANDS – FREE’ DEFINITION, PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING: “Any device that enables you to answer or speak on the phone without actually holding the phone in your hand” DO NOT ROTATE</th>
<th>Base: All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Agree completely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree slightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disagree slightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disagree somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disagree completely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive when unsure if they are over the legal alcohol limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive at 90mph on the motorway when there is no traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a mobile phone to text whilst driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive after taking Class A drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving at 40mph in a 30mph speed limit area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive without insurance / MOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on driving when too tired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on double yellow lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive too fast for conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use mobile phones while driving without a hands-free kit
Use mobile phones while driving with a hands-free kit
Don’t use seatbelts while sitting in the front of the car
Drive when over the legal alcohol limit
Don’t use seatbelts when sitting in the back of the car
Drive after smoking cannabis

9 I am now going to read out some various types of behaviour and for each one, I would like you to tell me how acceptable or unacceptable you think it is for people to do these things, using the scores on the screen. A score of one means you think the behaviour is fairly acceptable and a score of five means you think it is extremely unacceptable, or you can use one of the numbers in between.

- 01: FAIRLY ACCEPTABLE
- 02
- 03
- 04
- 05: EXTREMELY UNACCEPTABLE
- (DK)

Carry on driving when too tired
Driving after drinking two pints
Driving when unsure if they are over the legal alcohol limit
Driving after taking drugs
Driving at 40mph in a 30mph speed limit area
Driving without motor insurance / MOT
Dropping litter in the street
Parking on double yellow lines
Not buying a licence for your television
Not wearing a seatbelt in the back of a car
Not wearing a seatbelt in the front of a car
Shoplifting
Using a mobile phone whilst driving

10 Which of these are the most effective when it comes to influencing how safely you drive? Please pick your top three.

SHOW SCREEN - CODE TOP THREE IN ORDER

Newspaper articles about road safety/accidents
Signs/posters by the road about road safety issues
Driving instruction lessons
In-car safety systems e.g. seatbelt reminders, speed warnings
Speed cameras
Road safety advertising
Visible police presence
Speed humps
Threat of prosecution/penalties
Driving test
Family
Friends
Government
Don’t know
None of the above

11 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements…

RANDOMISE

- Strongly agree
- Slightly agree
- Neither
- Slightly disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don’t know

Roads are safer than they were five years ago
There are now more police officers on the road than ever before
There is too much advertising about road safety
Road safety advertising has a strong impact on how people behave on the roads
Traffic calming measures (e.g. speed bumps) make roads safer
When I am driving in the country and there is a clear open road, I put my foot down
You are more likely to die driving in a rural area than you are to die driving on a motorway or busy road.

I'm more likely to drive over the limit on rural roads because there are fewer vehicles and pedestrians around.

I'm more likely to drive over the speed limit on rural roads because there is less of police presence.

I feel excluded on a night out when I am the designated driver.

When I am on a night out as a designated driver, venues encourage me to avoid alcoholic drinks.

I don't enjoy my night out as much when I am the designated driver.

Thinking about your experiences as a passenger in a car or van, have you ever done any of the following? (MULTICODE)

- Asked a driver to slow down
- Not worn a seatbelt when travelling in the front seat
- Not worn a seatbelt when travelling in the rear seat
- Encouraged a driver to drive faster
- Felt unsafe because of the speed that the driver was driving at
- Refused to travel with a driver that you felt may be under the influence of drink
- Refused to travel with a driver that you felt may be under the influence of drugs
- Travelled with a driver who may have been under the influence of drink
- Travelled with a driver who may have been under the influence of drugs
- Been involved in an accident when travelling as a passenger
- Felt unsafe because a driver was using a mobile phone
- Felt unsafe because a driver was tired
- Don't Know
- Refused
- None of these

How long have you been driving? (SINGLE CODE)

- Less than a year
- Between 1 and 3 years
- Between 3 and 6 years
- Between 6 and 10 years
- Between 10 and 20 years
- More than 20 years
- Don't know

When driving, what precautions do you take to avoid accidents with motorcyclists and cyclists on the road? (MULTICODE)

SHOW SCREEN. RANDOMISE

- Checking mirrors regularly
- Watching for motorcyclists/ motorcyclists when turning
- Looking out for motorcyclists/ motorcyclists when coming out of a side road
- Leaving enough space between your car and motorcyclists/ motorcyclists
- Turning headlights down for oncoming motorcyclists/ motorcyclists
- Looking out for motorcyclists/ motorcyclists when opening car doors
- Expecting sudden movements in bad weather/ bad road surfaces
- Paying extra attention in bad weather/ bad road surfaces
- Other (specify)
- Don't know

How frequently, if at all, do you do each of the following?

SELF-COMPLETION EXERCISE: TYPE IN THE NUMBER NEXT TO YOUR ANSWER AND PRESS THE SPACE BAR. A CIRCLE SHOULD APPEAR IN THE BOX NEXT TO YOUR ANSWER.

IF YOU DON'T KNOW TYPE 'DK'. IF YOU DON'T WANT TO ANSWER THE QUESTION TYPE 'REF' PRESS THE F2 KEY TO MOVE ONTO THE NEXT QUESTION.

- 1 or more times a week
- Once a fortnight
- Once a month
- Once every 2-3 months
- Less often

Base: All Respondents

Base: All Motorists (as at Q1)

Base: All car/van/lorry drivers (all who selected codes 1/2/3/4 at Q1) aged 18 years and above (self completion)
### Questionnaire:

- **Q1**
  - Never
  - Don’t Know
  - Refused

This question is repeated for the following loop values:

- Drive when unsure if they are over the legal alcohol limit
- Drive at 90mph on the motorway when there is no traffic
- Use a mobile phone to text whilst driving
- Drive after taking Class A drugs
- Driving at 40mph in a 30mph speed limit area
- Drive without insurance/MOT
- Carry on driving when too tired
- Park on double yellow lines
- Drive too fast for conditions
- Use mobile phones while driving without a hands-free kit
- Use mobile phones while driving with a hands-free kit
- Don’t use seatbelts while sitting in the front of the car
- Drive when over the legal alcohol limit
- Don’t use seatbelts when sitting in the back of the car
- Drive after smoking cannabis

### Question 16:

Thinking about people you know who drive, how many of them do you think...?

**DO NOT ROTATE**

- Most people I know do this
- Some people I know do this
- A few people I know do this
- No one I know does this
- Don’t know

Drive when unsure if they are over the legal alcohol limit
Drive at 90mph on the motorway when there is no traffic
Use a mobile phone to text whilst driving
Drive after taking Class A drugs
Driving at 40mph in a 30mph speed limit area
Drive without insurance/MOT
Carry on driving when too tired
Park on double yellow lines
Drive too fast for conditions
Use mobile phones while driving without a hands-free kit
Use mobile phones while driving with a hands-free kit
Don’t use seatbelts while sitting in the front of the car
Drive when over the legal alcohol limit
Don’t use seatbelts when sitting in the back of the car
Drive after smoking cannabis

### Question 17a:

a) Which of these have you ever had? (MULTICODE)

- Driving ban
- Point on your licence
- Fine for speeding
- Fine for using a mobile phone while driving
- Fine for not using a seatbelt
- Fine for no MOT/insurance
- A conviction for any type of driving offence
- None of these
- Don’t know
- Refused

### Question 17b:

b) And which have you had in the last 3 years? (MULTICODE)

- Driving ban
- Point on your licence
- Fine for speeding
- Fine for using a mobile phone while driving
- Fine for not using a seatbelt
- Fine for no MOT/insurance
- A conviction for any type of driving offence
- None of these
- Don’t know
- Refused
For each of the following statements please indicate which level of danger you personally think is associated with each …

DO NOT ROTATE, KEEP IN CURRENT ORDER.

Very dangerous
Fairly dangerous
Not very dangerous
Not at all dangerous
Don't Know

Driving 10mph over the speed limit in bad weather conditions
Driving 10mph over the speed limit when the road is clear
Driving 5mph over the speed limit in bad weather conditions
Driving 5mph over the speed limit when the road is clear
Exceeding the national speed limit (60mph) on rural roads
Exceeding the national speed limit (70mph) on motorways

Can I just check, have you seen or heard any advertising about road safety recently? (SINGLE CODE)

Yes
No
Don't know

Who produced this advertising? (MULTICODE)

PROBE: Do you remember any logos or brands? DO NOT READ OUT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.

THINK!
Department for Transport/ DfT
Government – general
Police
Local Authority/ Local Council
AA/ RAC
Transport for London/ London Transport
GLA/ Mayor of London
Other (specify)
Don't know

Have you seen this logo before? (SINGLE CODE)

SHOW THINK! LOGO

Yes
No
Don't know

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the THINK! campaign…

RANDOMISE

- Strongly agree
- Slightly agree
- Neither
- Slightly disagree
- Strongly disagree
23 Here is a list of words, both favourable and unfavourable which could be used to describe the THINK! campaign.

Please could you pick out the words that you feel best describe the THINK! campaign from your point of view. (MULTICODE)

SHOW SCREEN. CODE ALL THAT APPLY. RANDOMISE LIST.

- Caring
- Expert
- Helpful
- Boring
- Intrusive
- Old fashioned
- Irrelevant
- Independent
- Innovative
- Bossy
- Thought provoking
- Influential
- None of these
- Don't know

Base: All who recognise Think! logo (Code 1 at Q21)

24 How often, if at all, do you drink alcohol away from home, that is at a friend’s house, in a pub, club or restaurant? (SINGLE CODE)

- More than once a week
- About once a week
- Two or three times a month
- About once a month
- Less than once a month
- Never away from home
- Never drink alcohol
- Don't know

Base: All respondents aged 18 years +