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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Report objective
The objective of this report is to present the detailed findings of a questionnaire and telephone survey of pre-driver education provision.

Study definition of pre-driver education
In the first instance, a broad definition of pre-driver education was adopted and included all driver education, prior to achieving a full licence. During the early months of the project, this definition was re-focussed to exclude education received following the receipt of a provisional licence. This resulted in the following definition being used by the study:

‘Pre-driver education is used to refer to a programme of instruction intended to inform the development of attitudes and beliefs ultimately related to driving that is aimed at students who have not yet obtained a provisional drivers licence.’

Survey of pre-driver education
The objective of the questionnaire survey was to develop an understanding of the current provision of pre-driver education in the UK and to investigate, to a lesser extent, any good practice applied by international providers.

The questionnaire survey achieved an acceptable response rate of 38% from a sample of 204 questionnaires issued. The sample comprised:

- all UK Road Safety Units (identified via the Local Authority Road Safety Officers’ Association (LARSOA) website – www.larsoa.org.uk);
- seven UK non-government providers; and
- four international organisations.

A follow-up telephone survey investigated the provision of pre-driver education by the 111 road safety officers (RSOs) who did not participate in the questionnaire survey. The information collection was primarily via telephone and the requirement was to ask whether their road safety team provided pre-driver education. In addition, the interviewer invited contacts to provide a brief description of their pre-driver education interventions (e.g. target groups, education method and media, and intervention name, if applicable). Information was collected for 103 of the sample (n = 111).
The combined findings of the questionnaire and telephone survey indicated that out of 173 UK road safety teams, 122 (71%) had a pre-driver education initiative in place and 51 (29%) did not.
1 QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

The objective of the questionnaire survey of pre-driver education schemes was to record and assess the current provision of pre-driver education in the UK and internationally.

1.2 Methodology

1.2.1 Survey design

The survey was developed in three stages, as shown in Figure 1.1.

1.2.1.1 Stage 1 – survey design document

The survey design document was produced using information from the following sources:

- a general review of pre-driver education literature;
- a review of a pre-driver education questionnaire administered in Irish secondary schools (Fuller and Bonney, 2002); and
- project team knowledge of good practice in training design, administration and evaluation.
The design document detailed:

- the proposed question;
- response type (e.g. tick box or open-ended);
- question justification; and
- expected analytical approach.

The design document was reviewed by the Department for Transport and an RSO in order to check question applicability and wording.

1.2.1.2 Stage 2 – pilot study

The questionnaire contained the following sections:

- Section 1 – background information.
- Section 2 – pre-driver education overview.
- Section 3 – pre-driver education programme information.
- Section 4 – programme design and evaluation.
- Section 5 – additional information.
- Section 6 – review of questionnaire.

The questionnaire was self-completion and could be either emailed or posted to respondents with a covering letter. For the pilot study, a sample of 15 RSOs was identified from the LARSOA website.¹ A systematic sampling method was used to identify RSOs from different counties across the UK. The pilot survey was also sent to the Department for Transport to enable the project management team to comment on the questionnaire content and format.

1.2.1.3 Stage 3 – main survey

The main survey questionnaire² was comprised of the following five sections and designed for self-completion. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1.

- Section 1 – background information.
- Section 2 – pre-driver education overview (programme attendees and throughput and training pipeline).

¹ LARSOA is a national road safety organisation that represents RSOs employed in local governments across the UK.

² Two versions of the survey were produced, one for the UK sample and the second for the international sample. For the international survey, responses specific to the UK were removed and made more generic and all references to the ‘Council’ were removed.
• Section 3 – pre-driver education programme information (programme instruction, content, delivery and equipment).
• Section 4 – programme design and delivery (programme design and evaluation).
• Section 5 – additional information (issues associated with the successful delivery of pre-driver education and young driver attitudes and beliefs).

1.2.2 Survey administration

The section includes an overview of sampling and questionnaire administration/distribution.

1.2.2.1 Sample

The sample for the main survey of pre-driver education was selected from four main sources:

• UK RSOs;
• UK private providers of pre-driver education;
• international government providers of pre-driver education; and
• international private providers of pre-driver education.

In order to ensure an acceptable achieved response rate for UK RSOs, it was decided that 100% sampling would be applied. As with the pilot study, the RSO sample was identified from the LARSOA website. The sample excluded RSOs who had previously taken part in the pilot study.

A sample of private providers of pre-driver education in the UK and international government providers were identified in conjunction with the Department for Transport (see Table 1.1).³ This process was supported by Air Affairs (UK) Ltd compiling a shortlist of courses and descriptions for review by the Department for Transport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1: Questionnaire sample for the main study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK RSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Limitations were imposed when identifying the international sample due to language restrictions. Only countries that detailed their courses on the websites in English could be included in the sample, therefore this excluded many European organisations and governments.
As part of the study, the team visited the Driving Standards Agency (DSA) to find out more about their course. During this visit, the DSA representative was provided with a copy of the survey questionnaire for completion, post the meeting.

When researching the UK private road safety education courses, web-based information resources, targeted at teachers, students and parents were also identified. For example:

- BMW – safe on the street;
- Renault – safety matters;
- the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents’ (ROSPA) road safety resources for teachers.

A review of these information providers was outside the scope of this study because they were resources for teachers rather than specifically designed courses.

1.2.2.2 Survey administration/distribution

Survey distribution/administration involved the following steps:

- An announcement about the survey at the RoSPA Congress 2006, which was attended by several RSOs.
- The release of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) via email or post, accompanied by a covering letter (see Appendix 2).
- The issue of a reminder email and/or letter two weeks later with a copy of the original questionnaire. The follow-up letter explained that the study was also interested to know about councils and organisations that did not have pre-driver education, and requested that they emailed the study team if this was the case. The aim of encouraging respondents to email was to reduce non-response bias associated with not having a pre-driver education programme.

---

4 Fourteen questionnaires were sent via post with a stamped addressed return envelope because an email address was not available.
2 QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY RESULTS

2.1 Response sample

The survey yielded a 35% response rate (67 responses from 189 questionnaire distributed). When the results of the pilot study are included in the analysis of the final response rate, the total number of responses is 77 (providing a 38% response rate, based on a total of 204 questionnaires distributed, 15 pilot questionnaires and 189 final questionnaires – see Table 2.1).

A breakdown of the organisations with which respondents indicated that they were associated is provided in Figure 2.1, and the range of job titles of the survey respondents is shown in Figure 2.2. Unsurprisingly, the majority of respondents were RSOs employed by local authorities or county councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1: Pre-driver education survey response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSOs (returned questionnaires)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSOs (information via email/telephone conversation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total response rate (main survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total response rate (including pilot and main survey)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The pilot study results have been analysed with the main study results.

6 It is worth noting that three councils completed two questionnaires each, one for each course they provided.
2.1.1 Data management issues associated with survey responses

Respondents were invited\(^7\) to indicate, via email, if they did not have a course. Ten email responses were received. As these respondents did not answer any of the survey questions, no additional information is available.

A small number of survey respondents stated they did not have a pre-driver education programme, however they still completed the whole questionnaire. These respondents were contacted and their programme was discussed. Where appropriate, and with the agreement of the respondent, the course was included within the analysis as a pre-driver education programme. However, the study team was unable

\(^7\) It should be noted that the questionnaire was designed to collect information from respondents who did and did not offer a pre-driver education programme.
to contact one respondent and a conservative decision to exclude their data was taken.

2.2 Descriptive results

This section describes the combined results of the RSOs’ (pilot and main survey results) and UK organisations’ survey responses \((n = 76)\). Where notable differences occur between RSOs and other UK organisations, these are discussed. As only one international survey \((n = 1)\) was received, it was not included in this analysis. However, a short discussion of the responses given in this survey is provided in Section 2.3.

2.2.1 Overview – pre-driver education programme provision

One key question relating to pre-driver education is how many pre-driver programmes are available within the UK. Figure 2.3 shows the number of councils who indicated that they had a pre-driver education programme. As the figure shows, 41 out of 68 councils (60%) had a pre-driver education programme.8

![Figure 2.3: Pre-driver education programme](image)

It should be noted that UK organisations were not included in this analysis. This was because the sample was pre-selected for those organisations that had a pre-driver education course. As a result, all UK organisations answered ‘yes’ when asked if they had a pre-driver education programme.

Those RSOs that indicated that they did not have a pre-driver education programme \((n = 27)\) were asked to indicate whether they planned to introduce a programme in the future. Analyses showed that nine (33%) were planning to introduce a programme and seven (26%) were not. It should be noted that 11 of the respondents

---

8 This finding was later revised with the addition of late responses (see Section 3.3).
who indicated that they did not have a pre-driver education course failed to answer this question (Figure 2.4).

2.2.2 Overview – pre-driver education programme sustainability

In order to understand the lifecycle of pre-driver education programmes, the study team asked those respondents who had a pre-driver education programme to indicate how long their programme had been running and what they predicted the future of their programme to be.

Analyses of the 44 responses to these questions showed that the average time pre-driver education programmes had been running was 5.7 years (minimum was 2 months, maximum was 20 years). In terms of programme future, most respondents could not accurately predict how long their programme might continue. The majority (47%) believed their course would continue indefinitely, and 19 respondents (39%) indicated that they did not know how long their course would continue. Only three respondents predicted how long their course would last, estimating, on average, four years (minimum was one year, maximum was six years) (see Table 2.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) predict course will run</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Average (years)</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indefinitely</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response(^9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that respondents were able to select more than one response category for this question.
### 2.2.3 Overview – pre-driver education location

In order to understand the geographical reach of pre-driver education programmes, respondents were asked to indicate where their programmes were delivered. As Figure 2.5 shows, the majority of programmes (73%) are delivered locally. However, responses from UK organisations indicated that four-fifths (80%) are delivered nationally. This is in direct contrast to programmes run by RSOs where only two were delivered nationally.

**Figure 2.5: Pre-driver education programme location**

Most programmes are provided in schools (73%) and colleges (41%) (see Figure 2.6).

**Figure 2.6: Establishment where pre-driver education programme is provided**

Of those programmes delivered in schools, 36 (73%) are delivered as part of PSHE (Personal, Social and Health Education) or an equivalent to PSHE. It is interesting to note that four out of the five UK organisation programmes were also integrated within PSHE.
As part of the analysis of programme delivery, respondents were asked to indicate the duration and period over which their pre-driver education programme was delivered. The range of response formats used to document this information, such as one to two hours, four times one-hour presentations, one-day courses and one week, means that summary data are not meaningful and are not reported.

2.2.4 Overview – pre-driver education aims

In order to understand how pre-driver education fitted into the broader context of road safety education, respondents were asked to detail their main priorities for road safety education. Results varied, but the following themes were identified:

- young drivers \( (n = 17) \);
- child pedestrian \( (n = 15) \);
- cycle training \( (n = 13) \); and
- decrease child/young driver casualties \( (n = 8) \).

The results indicate that the main priority in road safety and education is young drivers, followed by child pedestrians. Therefore it is unsurprising that, when examining the aims of the pre-driver education programmes, the main theme that emerged was in relation to traffic accidents among young drivers \( (n = 14) \). Other themes emerging from this analysis are listed below:

- to reduce traffic accidents among young drivers \( (n = 14) \), for example ‘ultimately reduce the numbers killed and injured on roads’ (RSO);

- to influence attitudes towards driving \( (n = 8) \), for example:
  - ‘to raise the awareness of the responsibility of driving to themselves and others whilst trying to affect their attitude to driving’ (RSO);
  - ‘influence and modify attitudes and behaviour before they become drivers’ (RSO); and
  - ‘examine attitudes, see how behaviour is influenced by attitude’ (RSO);

- to equip young people when they start driving \( (n = 7) \), for example:
  - ‘to prepare young people for the responsibilities of becoming a driver’ (RSO); and
  - ‘to brief students of what they are going to go through when they become a learner driver’ (RSO);

- to raise awareness of the consequences and dangers of driving \( (n = 4) \), for example:
  - ‘to raise the awareness of young people about the driving task and their vulnerability in terms of accident involvement as young drivers’ (RSO); and
  - ‘to raise awareness of potential consequences of poor driver behaviour’ (RSO).
2.2.5 Programme attendees

When asked whether their programme was targeted at a specific demographic group, only 6 of the 47 respondents (12%) indicated that it did. The following were identified as targeted groups:

- young offenders ($n = 2$);
- targeted based on local casualties ($n = 2$);
- people who were likely to drive cars ($n = 1$);
- excluded youths ($n = 1$);
- male drivers ($n = 1$); and
- young female passengers ($n = 1$).

Although the definition of pre-driver education provided at the beginning of the questionnaire was very broad, analysis of the survey results indicated that the majority aimed their intervention at 14–18-year-olds. The majority of respondents (80%) indicated that 16–17-year-olds were included within their target audience (Figure 2.7).

A total of 30 (61%) programmes impose an age limit on students attending the course (see Figure 2.8). Where age limits are imposed, the average minimum age is 15 years old ($SD = 1.09$) and the average maximum age is 19 years old ($SD = 2.4$).

---

10 It is important to note that, from this point on, throughout the chapter ‘no response’ refers to RSOs and/or UK organisations that have pre-driver education but have failed to complete the question discussed.
The three main reasons given for imposing age limits were:
- the course is specifically aimed at pre-drivers ($n = 11$);
- part of the day involves driving ($n = 3$); and
- younger children cannot relate to the content of the course ($n = 2$).

The pre-driver education survey also asked respondents whether participants had to meet any criteria in order to attend a programme. Only 2 of the 44 courses (4%) require students to meet a certain criteria to participate on the course. The criteria were ‘a requirement to hold a provisional licence’ and ‘age’.

Finally, when considering the target audience for a pre-driver education programme, the study team was particularly interested in whether programme providers tailored courses to meet the needs of the target audience. Analyses showed that just over half of the programmes ($n = 27, 55\%$) are tailored to address the specific needs of a target audience (see Figure 2.9).
Only eight respondents provided details about how they tailored their pre-driver education programme. The key reasons are as follows:

- **Tailored on a casualty basis** ($n = 2$), for example ‘targeted using accident stats to determine geographical areas with highest prevalence of young people involved in road accidents by home post-code’ (RSO).

- **Tailored to male drivers** ($n = 2$), for example, ‘specifically target young male drivers on attitude and young females on how vulnerable they are as passengers’ (RSO).

Interviews with experts on road safety education undertaken during this study indicated that interventions involving parents are desirable in terms of ensuring that road safety related attitudes and beliefs are developed by children. Therefore, respondents were asked to indicate whether parents were targeted for involvement in their pre-driver education programme. Interestingly, out of the 49 pre-driver education programmes, only eight (16%) included parents in the training programme (see Figure 2.10). Notably, only one of the UK organisations involved parents.

The following details were provided on how the programmes involved the parents:

- sent parents letters ($n = 2$);
- invited parents to attend the course ($n = 1$);
- encouraged the school to keep parents informed through the newsletter ($n = 1$);
- forwarded any follow-up information to the parents ($n = 1$);
- presumed the parents helped the student select the course ($n = 1$);
- parents asked to volunteer as trainers ($n = 1$); and
- invited parents and the students along to a presentation evening at the local garage ($n = 1$).
2.2.6 Programme throughput – cost

In order to examine the issues related to the cost-effectiveness of pre-driver education, the study team asked respondents to indicate the cost of training per person. Results indicated that in five out of the seven cases reported, the cost per person was under £25, only two courses were higher at £72 per person and £260 per person.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the cost of training per programme delivered. Figure 2.11 illustrates the cost per programme as reported by respondents. Once again responses to this question varied, the majority of respondents \((n = 7)\) said their programme cost ranged between £0 and £1,000. It is also important to note that most respondents \((n = 15)\) selected the ‘N/A’ option, and, in addition, four did not know the cost per programme and four failed to respond.

In addition to collecting information about programme cost, participants were also questioned about whether their pre-driver education programme was subsidised. The results (shown in Figure 2.12) indicate that 57\% \((n = 28)\) of courses are subsidised.
It is interesting to note that four out of the five programmes provided by UK organisations are subsidised. However, of the 24 RSO programmes that are subsidised, many (38%) are subsidised by their local authority; the UK organisations were subsidised by large companies (e.g. AA Insurance and Fed Ex).

2.2.7 Programme throughput – availability

In order to understand how easy pre-driver education programmes are for course attendees to access, respondents were asked to indicate how many times a year they ran their programmes. Unfortunately many respondents misunderstood this question and summary statistics were not meaningful. However, the responses ranged from ‘ongoing throughout the year’ and ‘2–4 times throughout the year’ to ‘once a year’ and ‘on request’.

Respondents were also asked to indicate how many places were available on each programme. Table 2.3 shows that, of the 13 programmes where this information was provided, the average number of available places was 188 (minimum was 9, maximum was 1,000). However, over one-third of respondents indicated that no limits were placed (35%) and almost one-third (31%) identified the limit as the school class size.

| Table 2.3: Places available in pre-driver education programmes |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
|                | Places available | School class size | No limit | ‘Other’ response | No response |
| Average/number | 188             | 15              | 17      | 2              | 2            |

2.2.8 Road safety education training pipeline

In order to understand the extent to which pre-driver education programmes are integrated within a training pipeline providing ongoing and progressive road safety training to young people, respondents were asked to provide information on their main five road safety programmes that their organisation provides to under 18-year-olds. The results were very varied, however Table 2.4 details the main courses/programmes identified.

Overall, these results indicate that a lot of emphasis is placed on the education of young children in pedestrian and cycle-training programmes. Theatre in education was frequently mentioned, suggesting this type of course is often used by councils throughout the UK.

To gain a better understanding of the training pipeline, respondents were asked to identify links between their pre-driver education programmes and other road safety courses provided by the same council or organisation. Of the 47 responses to this
question, 28 (57%) programmes were linked with other road safety training/education provided internally by their organisation/council (see Figure 2.13). A notable number of respondents (24%) also indicated that their course had links with other external road safety training/education.

Table 2.4: Road safety programmes provided to under 18-year-olds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme type</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian skills (including general pedestrian skills courses, Kerbcraft and Hedgehogs club)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle-training course</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre in education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-driver education</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior RSO</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s traffic club</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In car safety (including seat belts/car seats)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition year education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General road safety education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5 lists the most commonly mentioned internal links.

Table 2.5: Internal links with pre-driver education programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass Plus and young drivers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre production in schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting school in road safety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, respondents were asked to indicate what road safety training/education they believed their pre-driver education programme attendees might have undertaken prior to attending pre-driver education. Figure 2.14 shows that the majority of respondents ($n = 14$) did not know if students had attended other courses, while eight respondents believed that the students would not have attended any other courses prior to their pre-driver education programme. The most commonly mentioned programmes in this context were cycle training ($n = 4$), road safety education in primary schools ($n = 4$) and pedestrian training ($n = 4$). However, perhaps the most interesting result is that respondents were unaware of what education and/or training their course attendees might have undertaken. This would create difficulties in creating a pre-driver education course that builds progressively on students’ knowledge gained from other interventions.

Table 2.6 lists the most commonly mentioned external links.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/organisation</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSA (including Arrive Alive)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire brigade</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving schools/instructors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.9 Pre-driver education programme instruction

Analysis of responses to questions about programme instruction showed that over two-thirds (69%) of courses are instructor led. One-fifth of programmes (18%) use a combination of both instructor led and self-learning. Interestingly, only one
respondent indicated that their programme employed peer-to-peer learning (this was an RSO council run course) (Figure 2.15).

Figure 2.15: Pre-driver education programme instruction

Table 2.7 shows that the average amount of instruction time provided for a pre-driver education intervention is 3 hours and 13 minutes. Students are expected to self learn for 46 minutes per programme (on average).

Table 2.7: Time spent instructing pre-driver education programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor provided</th>
<th>Self-learning</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours/number Min./max.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 hours, 13 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 mins/40 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>46 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to indicate who delivers the pre-driver education programme. Figure 2.16 shows that instructors most commonly include RSOs (67%), however driving instructors (43%), the police (37%) and the fire service (35%) are also frequently involved in pre-driver education. Interestingly, only 10 programmes (20%) were delivered exclusively by RSOs and 22% (n = 11) do not involve RSOs at all. These results appear to indicate that most programmes involve both RSOs and other specialists, such as police and driving instructors.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether any additional people were involved in programme delivery. Results showed that the majority of programmes, (57%) include RSOs in the delivery of the programme; however 37% of programmes also use driving instructors as well as the police (35%) and the fire brigade (33%). This question was intended to gather information about people who may be involved in the programme but would not necessarily be considered an
instructor. However, the results appear to indicate that respondents had some interpretational difficulties with this question; the findings should be viewed with caution.

Results showed classroom instruction was the most commonly used teaching intervention ($n = 43, 88\%$). Interestingly, few programmes used techniques such as role-play or discussion and debate (see Figure 2.17).

As the quality of the instructor is a key contributor to the success of road safety education interventions, respondents were asked to provide details about instructor training. Figure 2.18 shows that 27 instructors (55%) receive training in course delivery, which is typically on-the-job and observational.
2.2.10 Programme content

One of the key areas of interest when surveying pre-driver education provision was the content of the education programmes. Table 2.8 shows the content of each programme, the average time a programme allocates to each component and the assessment method, if any, that is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the programme</th>
<th>Number of programmes, including this element</th>
<th>Time on each element</th>
<th>How each element is assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average time</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34 mins</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33 mins</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other road users</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36 mins</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat-belt use</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard perception</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42 mins</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial cost</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27 mins</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car control (skill)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52 mins</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22 mins</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car maintenance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31 mins</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24 mins</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving and the law</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43 mins</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28 mins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data indicate that pre-driver education typically includes:

- speed and hazard perception (92%);
- alcohol (90%);
- risk (90%);
- seat-belt use (88%);
- drug use (86%); and
- other road users (84%).

It is interesting to note that nearly two-thirds of programmes (63%) include information on car control and insurance. The time spent on each course element ranged from 22 minutes to 52 minutes. The most time was given to car control. These results should be viewed with caution, as most respondents either did not respond to the question or could not break down how much time was spent on each element (refer to the ‘unsure’ column).

As practical driving training prior to licensing was a key area of interest, respondents were specifically asked about whether their programme provided any practical (skills-based) training. The results indicate that 41% of programmes involve practical driving (see Figure 2.19). On average, 67% of the time available to these programmes is spent on theoretical training and 28% is spent on practical driver training.

![Figure 2.19: Inclusion of practical driver training](image)

Those respondents who indicated that their programme included practical driver training were asked to indicate whether training was provided to students under 17 years old. Figure 2.20 shows that, of the 20 programmes that include practical driving training, 17 (85%) provide driving training to students under 17 years old.
2.2.11 Pre-driver education programme delivery and equipment

Respondents were asked to provide details on the equipment and facilities used within their programme. The results showed that most programmes had used classrooms (78%) and videos (76%) during their instruction, as well as photographs (67%), leaflets (57%) and computers (55%) (Figure 2.21).

Respondents were also asked whether they provided information which could be taken away by students after a session. Analyses showed that students were most often provided with leaflets (61%) and posters (20%) (see Figure 2.22).
2.2.12 Pre-driver education programme design and evaluation

Good practice in education/training design and delivery indicates that programmes must be systematically designed and evaluated. Therefore, respondents were asked to provide information on how they identified the pre-driver education-training requirement, how they designed the programme, and how they evaluated their pre-driver education programme.

Results related to the identification of the training requirement showed that 63% of respondents reported that their programme was developed because of the number of accidents/fatalities of young people on the roads. The other most frequently cited reason was to affect attitudes held by young people before they start to drive (8%). Other reasons for the development of the course included:

- students require more information;
- it was requested by the school; and
- to bring awareness of the risks of drug taking and driving.

It is interesting to note that none of the designers appears to have conducted a detailed learning needs analysis prior to designing the pre-driver education programme.

In terms of programme design, the mostly commonly used process involved visiting and/or reviewing other current pre-driver education courses ($n = 10$). Table 2.9 provides an overview of the development methods used. Several respondents noted that more than one method was used to develop their programmes. It should be noted that the study team believed that some respondents misunderstood this question ($n = 5$) and therefore their responses were not analysed.
Respondents were also asked whom, if anyone, they had consulted during programme development. Most were developed by consulting RSOs (61%), teachers (43%) and the police (41%) (see Figure 2.23).

Respondents were asked a series of questions to determine how their pre-driver education programme was evaluated. Results showed that out of 49 pre-driver education programmes, 27 (55%) monitor instructors (Figure 2.24).

Those who indicated that instructor performance is monitored were asked whether monitoring was conducted by an internal or external organisation. The results showed that 25 respondents (95%) indicated that instructors were monitored internally (see Figure 2.25). Only one respondent stated that performance was monitored by an external organisation, and one stated that the programme was monitored by internally and externally appointed personnel.

Table 2.9: Pre-driver education programme development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on course development</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed literature</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with colleagues/agencies, e.g. police</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with academics/read research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited/contacted/reviewed current courses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous review of own course to further develop own course</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved young people to develop course</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought course from previous job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed resources available</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used local accident data</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstood question</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.23: Consultation with other organisations and groups

Respondents were asked a series of questions to determine how their pre-driver education programme was evaluated. Results showed that out of 49 pre-driver education programmes, 27 (55%) monitor instructors (Figure 2.24).

Those who indicated that instructor performance is monitored were asked whether monitoring was conducted by an internal or external organisation. The results showed that 25 respondents (95%) indicated that instructors were monitored internally (see Figure 2.25). Only one respondent stated that performance was monitored by an external organisation, and one stated that the programme was monitored by internally and externally appointed personnel.
Out of the 27 programmes that evaluate their instructors, 33% of respondents indicated that instructor evaluation takes place annually and 26% takes place after each session (see Figure 2.26).
Respondents were also asked to indicate whether a third party monitored pre-driver education programme content. Results showed that, of the 49 pre-driver education programmes, 19 (38%) have the content and presentation of the programme materials checked by a third party, whereas 21 (43%) do not (Figure 2.27).

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had information available to support the effectiveness of their programme. Results showed that 55% of respondents stated that they have information to support the effectiveness of their programme. Those who indicated that they had information were asked to indicate what form it took. Figure 2.28 shows that the main evidence is through post-course evaluation ($n = 6$) followed by local casualty records and statistics ($n = 5$) and feedback from students and teachers ($n = 4$). Additional evidence (listed under ‘other’ in Figure 2.28) included internal evaluation, internet research, and pre- and post-evaluation of attitudes, police evaluation and schools opting to use the course again.
Finally, respondents were asked whether they administered a questionnaire to programme participants during the pre-driver education programme to support subsequent analysis of changes in attitudes and beliefs towards driving and road safety. The results showed that attitude change was investigated by 21 (43%) of the pre-driver education programmes (see Figure 2.29).

![Figure 2.29: Administration of a questionnaire to programme attendees](image)

2.2.13 Issues associated with pre-driver education

In order to gather information about respondents’ general views on pre-driver education, a range of open-ended questions were included at the end of the survey. These questions addressed respondent opinion on the following topics:

- the benefits of pre-driver education;
- successful components of their programme(s);
- how pre-driver education, in general, could be improved;
- common attitudes held by students towards driving before taking the programme;
- main factors influencing pre-drivers attitudes towards driving; and
- road safety education priorities and aims.

Relatively few respondents completed this section of the survey, and results should be considered indicative only.

Forty-three respondents (88%) believed that their programme enables students to hold better attitudes to driving, 33 believed their programme enabled students to be a safer driver (67%), and 23 believed that it enabled students to be more courteous drivers (47%). Only three respondents (6%) believed that their programme would enable students to driver earlier (refer Figure 2.30).
Respondents \((n = 42)\) listed a number of components of their courses that they believed were particularly successful, these included:

- the practical aspect \((n = 8)\), many cited this as the area that students enjoy most – ‘the students however enjoy the practical driving aspect most’ (RSO);
- crash causation and avoidance \((n = 4)\) – ‘students learn how many factors can contribute to a crash happening; yet also learn that the ultimate responsibility lies with the driver’ (RSO);
- hazard perception \((n = 4)\);
- attitudes \((n = 2)\) – ‘raising their general knowledge about driving and attitudes to driving’ (RSO); ‘influencing their attitude to speed’ (RSO);
- theatre education \((n = 2)\) – ‘use of theatre in education is a particularly effective way of engaging the students and affecting their attitude, at least in the short to medium term’ (RSO); and
- bereaved volunteers \((n = 2)\) – ‘we give bereaved volunteers the opportunity to deliver the presentations – this has positive benefits for them and helps underline the importance of the session’s content’ (UK organisation).

A lesser number of respondents \((n = 29)\) were willing to suggest areas of their programme which could be improved, however those that did included:

- material \((n = 6)\) – ‘providing students with follow-up materials’ (RSO); ‘improved audio visual aids’ (RSO);
- evaluation \((n = 5)\) – ‘the programme would benefit from more structured evaluation’ (RSO); and
- time \((n = 4)\) – ‘more time from school to develop individual components of the course’. 

![Figure 2.30: Benefits of pre-driver education](image-url)
Road Safety Officers’ delivery would be welcomed’ (RSO); ‘increase in time to cover issues in greater depth’ (RSO).

A number of respondents suggested **improvements to pre-driver education** as a whole. These included the following:

- **Education in school.** Many respondents ($n = 14$) believed that more time should be provided in schools and/or road safety education should be part of the curriculum. One RSO suggested a ‘formalised, regularised programme consistently and regularly delivered in schools’ and also ‘by being given dedicated curriculum time and the resources to involve a wider partnership of contributors’ (RSO).

- **Establishment of a single course.** Some respondents ($n = 3$) believed that there should be a single course identified for use – ‘establishing a national model/syllabus developed by the DfT’ (RSO). Another RSO suggested a ‘central model that we could all use’.

- **Inclusion of practical driving.** Respondents’ opinions about including practical driving in pre-driver education varied. Several respondents felt that practical driving should not be emphasised in pre-driver education, however, some expressed opinions that supported driver training. Comments included:
  - ‘There should be less emphasis on skills and more on attitudes to risk-taking and peer pressure’ (RSO).
  - ‘Concerned about the effectiveness of some driver “education” schemes that seem to promote motoring as a priority over road safety’ (UK Organisation).
  - ‘Remove emphasis from driving skill. Kids get that anyway. Move more towards a social responsibility model’ (RSO).
  - ‘More sites should be available where off-road driving can be provided for underage students’ (RSO).

- **Funding.** Many RSOs ($n = 4$) suggested that more funding was needed in the area of road safety education.

### 2.2.14 Perceptions of young drivers’ attitudes

Respondents listed a range of **attitudes and beliefs** which they believed young people hold towards driving (see Figure 2.31). The most commonly mentioned were ‘driving is easy’ ($n = 8$) and ‘I won’t crash’ ($n = 7$).

Respondents were also asked about **factors influencing pre-driver attitudes.** Figure 2.32 shows that 57% ($n = 28$) of respondents believed that peer pressure was one of the main factors influencing pre-driver attitudes towards driving, followed by the media (24%) and parents (22%).
2.3 Survey results – international organisations

2.3.1 Programme overview

A questionnaire was sent to five international organisations. Unfortunately, only one questionnaire was returned. Brief programme details are provided in the following section.
2.3.2 International programme: an overview

The aim of the programme is to develop knowledge, understanding, communication and problem-solving skills to assist young people to be safer road users. There was a need for this programme because the crash statistics indicated that there is an over-representation of young people in fatal crashes. The programme was developed using research and current educational best practice.

A government body runs the programme, across all high schools in the state. It is part of PSHE provided in schools and is specifically aimed at students between 15–16 years old.

The programme is a combination of instructor led and self-learning, and is delivered by a teacher. Teachers receive training on road safety issues, provided by the Road and Traffic Authority, which is the education agency in New South Wales.

The programme contents include speed; alcohol; drugs; other road users; seat-belt use; hazard perception; risk; peer pressure; statistics; driving and the law; fatigue and passenger behaviour, which are delivered using case studies, role plays, theatre performances, scenarios and interviews. The assessment of this course is determined by the school.

A primary school PSHE programme on safety education, a ‘safety around school’ programme and a workshop entitled ‘helping learner drivers become safer drivers’ support this pre-driver education programme. There is also provision for parental education to support the supervision of learner drivers.

Although the instructors are not monitored, a third party checks the programme content prior to use. In addition, a four-year evaluation of resource use is conducted by the school.

2.4 Summary of key findings

The following section provides a summary of the main findings from the survey of pre-driver education.

2.4.1 Response rate

The survey yielded a 35% response rate (67 responses from a total for 189 questionnaires distributed). As the pilot study results have been included in the analysis of the final responses, the total response rate is 38% (77 responses from 204).
2.4.2 Overview

- Pre-driver education provision:
  - Out of the 73 UK questionnaire responses, 46 had a pre-driver education programme (63%). Of those, 41 are RSO-run courses and five are UK organisation courses.
  - Of the respondents who indicated that they did not have a pre-driver education programme, 33% indicated that they were planning to introduce one.

- Programme sustainability:
  - Results showed that the average time pre-driver education programmes had run was 5.7 years.
  - The majority of respondents could not predict how long into the future their programme would last. The majority believed their programme would continue indefinitely (47%). However, many indicated they did not know how long their programme would last (39%).

- Programme location:
  - The majority of pre-driver education programmes (73%) were delivered locally. Only 2 out of 44 RSO programmes were delivered nationally. By comparison, four out of five UK organisation programmes were delivered nationally.
  - Most programmes were delivered in schools (73%) and/or colleges (41%) within PSHE.

- Programme aims – the most frequently cited aim of pre-driver education programmes was to reduce traffic accidents among young drivers.

2.4.3 Programme attendees

- The age group that pre-driver education was targeted at was predominantly year 12 (16–17-year-olds). Although the definition of pre-driver provided to the audience at the beginning of the questionnaire was broad, the majority of respondents still interpreted pre-driver education as relating to 14–18-year-olds and over.

- Some of the programmes (30%) imposed an age limit on students attending the programme. The average minimum age was 15 years old and the average maximum age was 19 years old. The rationale for the upper and lower age limit given was that the course was aimed at pre-drivers.

- The majority of courses were not targeted towards a specific demographic group other than the pre-driver age group.
2.4.4 Programme throughput

- **Cost:**
  - In five out of seven cases the course cost per person was under £25, only two courses were higher at £72 per person and £260 per person.
  - The cost per programme typically ranged between £0 and £1,000. However, due to the small number of responses, it is inappropriate to report the average cost of a course.
  - The majority of programmes (57%) are subsidised. Many of the RSO programmes are subsidised by their local authority (38%), whereas most UK organisations (80%) are subsidised by large companies.

- **Availability** – the average number of places available on pre-driver education programmes was 188, however the majority of respondents reported that they either did not set any limits (35%) or that the limit was determined by the classroom size (31%).

2.4.5 Road safety training pipeline

- Fifty-seven per cent of pre-driver education programmes had links with other road safety programmes provided by their own council/organisation. These programmes predominantly comprised of pedestrian skills training ($n = 34$), cycle training ($n = 30$) and theatre in education ($n = 15$).

- There were slightly fewer links between the pre-driver education programmes and externally-provided programmes, with 49% of programmes indicating that this was the case. External links included Pass Plus and young drivers ($n = 6$) and cycle training ($n = 4$).

- A large number of respondents (45%) either did not know or believed that their students had not participated in any other road safety education programmes. This lack of awareness could create difficulties in developing a pre-driver education course that builds progressively on students’ knowledge gained from other interventions.

2.4.6 Programme Instruction

- The majority of programmes are instructor led (69%), with a combination of both instructor and self-learning also used by 18% of the programmes. Only one programme employed a peer-to-peer learning strategy.

- The average instructional time provided is 3 hours and 13 minutes.

- Instruction was provided mainly by RSOs (67%). However, driving instructors (43%) and the police (37%) are frequently involved. The results indicated that 20% of the programmes are delivered only by RSOs, whereas only 22% of
programmes have no instructional input from RSOs (three of these were UK organisation programmes).

- Most of the programmes were delivered using classroom instruction (88%) and case studies (47%).
- Eight programmes (16%) involved parents in the training programme.
- The results indicated that about half of instructors (55%) received training to provide the course. The training consisted mainly of observing other instructors.

2.4.7 Programme content

- The content of the majority of the programmes included speed, alcohol, hazard perception and risk.
- The average time devoted to the programme elements ranged from 22 minutes to 52 minutes.
- Forty-one per cent of programmes included practical driving. Of those, 81% included under 17-year-olds in their driver training.

2.4.8 Programme delivery and equipment

- Most programmes use classrooms (78%) and videos (76%) in the delivery of the pre-driver education programme.
- Most programmes (61%) provide leaflets for students to take away.

2.4.9 Programme design and evaluation

- The results suggested that no programmes used a formal design process to identify the needs of a pre-driver education programme. The majority of the programmes were developed as a response to the high numbers of young driver casualties.
- The results indicated that, in the majority of programmes, there is no formal design processes used for the development of the programmes.
- Fifty-five per cent of instructors were monitored in the delivery of the pre-driver education programme. This occurs in most cases annually (33%).
- In 38% of cases, a third party checks the programme content.
- Over half of the respondents stated that they have information to support the effectiveness of their programme (55%). Evidence included post-course evaluation, a reduction in local casualty records and feedback from teachers and students.
Almost half of the programmes (43%) administer a questionnaire to determine changes in students’ attitudes and beliefs towards driving and road safety following an intervention.

2.4.10 Issues associated with pre-driver education

- Many respondents (29%) believed that more time provided in school, or making pre-driver education compulsory in schools would improve pre-driver education.
- When respondents were asked to list the main influences on pre-driver education, many of them listed parents (22%). However, only eight programmes (16%) reported parental involvement. Examples of involvement include a letter sent to parents and the school informing parents through a newsletter. The results indicate that only two courses invite parents to attend and one course invites parents to volunteer as trainers.

2.5 Knowledge gaps

2.5.1 Definition of pre-driver education

A very broad definition of pre-driver education was presented to respondents at the beginning of the survey. This allowed respondents to review their own courses, decide which of them fitted the definition and respond to the survey. Interestingly, all respondents provided data about programmes delivered to students in their middle teens. As a result, information about pre-driver education with much younger students was not provided.

2.5.2 Provision of pre-driver education by the Fire and Rescue Service and the police

During the conduct of the survey of pre-driver education, it was identified that a significant number of pre-driver education initiatives currently take place which do not involve RSOs. For example, the fire services and the police undertake pre-driver education and some schools undertake pre-driver education independent of RSOs. To gain a picture of the full range of pre-driver education courses, the existing pre-driver education survey could be sent to a wider sample of non-RSO providers.

2.5.3 Origin of tailored programmes

During the study, it was evident that RSOs often tailor existing programmes and rename them. It was not possible for the study team to identify the source programme.
2.5.4 Course length and time frame

Two questions presented in the survey were not analysed, as it was felt that a significant number of respondents had misinterpreted the question. Both of the questions related to programme time frames. Owing to this, the survey analyses do not report data for course length (e.g. in hours) or time frame (e.g. two days a week for a month).

2.6 Observations

Notable differences between the guidance provided by the critical literature review (Deighton and Luther, 2007) and the questionnaire survey findings are summarised in Sections 2.6.1 to 2.6.7 below. It is important to emphasise that the points presented are based on the sample achieved by the questionnaire survey and may not be representative of UK pre-driver education.

2.6.1 Parent involvement

The literature review indicated that parents could have a significant influence on the road safety attitudes developed by their children. Pre-driver education programmes should also target parents to ensure that they also have appropriate attitudes towards driving/riding and being a passenger. However, the survey of pre-driver education indicated that only 16% of programmes involved parents. The ‘Good Practice Guide to Pre-driver Education’ should comment on parental involvement.

2.6.2 Requirements identification

The literature review indicated that a thorough analysis of learning requirements, including a clear identification of the target audience, is more likely to result in effective pre-driver education interventions. However, survey results indicated that very few programmes used a formal design process to identify the needs of a pre-driver education programme. The good practice guide should provide information on how to specify the requirements of a pre-driver education programme and the importance of doing so.

2.6.3 Practical driver training

The literature review indicated that practical driver training should not be included in pre-driver education programmes because overseas studies have linked it to lower average licensing ages, with participants completing the learning to driver process and becoming novice drivers earlier than they would have had they not participated, and possible increases in crash rates. However, the survey indicated that a substantial number of programmes include practical driving. The good practice guide should highlight the specific risks associated with the inclusion of practical driving in pre-driver education programmes. The opportunity to handle a vehicle
may be considered by some as an incentive for particularly vulnerable groups to attend a pre-driver training programme. If a provider takes this perspective, then it is essential to ensure that young people understand that they are not suitably qualified to handle a vehicle.

2.6.4 Instructor credibility

The literature review indicated that the credibility of the instructor could, in some cases, influence the likelihood of a change in attitude. This indicates that, when designing a pre-driver education programme, the mode of education intervention delivery, as well as course content, should be carefully considered. Survey results indicate that few pre-driver education instructors currently receive any formal training. The good practice guide should provide information on the qualities of an effective and credible instructor for pre-driver education.

2.6.5 Peer-to-peer interventions

The literature review concluded, tentatively, that peer-to-peer interventions are effective for pre-driver education. The survey identified only one pre-driver education programme currently using peer interventions. The effectiveness of peer-to-peer interventions requires further investigation.

2.6.6 Learning method – student participation

Road transport based attitude change initiatives are more successful when they include active participation, discussion, the use of personal experiences and reflective thinking. The survey of pre-driver education indicated that the delivery of most programmes takes place in the classroom using video materials and provide take home leaflets. Relatively few of the programmes appear to involve interactive elements. The good practice guide should provide information on how to select teaching methods and media that are appropriate given the programme’s requirements (e.g. educational goals, learning objectives, target audience).

2.6.7 Evaluation methodology

The literature review highlighted the importance of well-designed evaluations and found that many road safety interventions were not evaluated properly. Only half of the survey respondents stated that they had information to support the effectiveness of their programmes. The good practice guide should provide information on the different types of evaluations, how to conduct such evaluations and the importance of developing an evaluation methodology that determines whether the programme’s requirements have been met.
3 SURVEY OF NON-RESPONDENTS

3.1 Introduction

The findings of the questionnaires survey of pre-driver education provision indicated that 57% of UK RSOs reported that their road safety team had a pre-driver education initiative in place. This statistic is derived from a response sample (including late responses) of 70 RSOs. However, as 111 RSOs did not complete the questionnaire, further work was justified in order to determine the proportion of this sample which had a pre-driver education initiative in place. This was the objective of the telephone survey, the methodology and findings of which are reported in the following sections.

3.2 Methodology

The non-respondent sample comprised the 111 UK RSOs who did not respond to the pre-driver education questionnaire. The sample excluded the five organisations (two UK and three international) who did not participate in the main survey.

Information was collected primarily via telephone and contact numbers were obtained from the LARSOA website. The requirement was to ask RSOs whether their road safety team provided pre-driver education. During the telephone call, RSOs were briefed on the purpose of the survey, the overall objective of the pre-driver education project and the definition of pre-driver education used. All contacts were invited to provide a brief description of their pre-driver education intervention(s) (e.g. target groups, education method and media, and intervention name, if applicable). The call duration was between 5 and 25 minutes, and one consultant conducted all calls. The information was recorded in an Excel spreadsheet. At least two attempts were made to contact an RSO via telephone; if this was not successful then the RSO was contacted via email.

3.3 Results

In summary, information was collected for 103 of the sample \( n = 111 \). Of this group, 82 (80%) had a pre-driver education initiative in place and 21 (20%) did not.

In comparison, the questionnaire survey (including late responses) collected information from 70 RSOs representing 70 different road safety teams. Of this group, 40 (57%) indicated that they had a pre-driver education initiative in place and 30 (43%) did not.

Taken together these findings indicate that, in a total of 173 cases, 122 (71%) had a pre-driver education initiative in place and 51 (29%) did not.
It is concluded that the follow-up survey of non-respondents was justified given that the findings of the questionnaire survey underestimated the provision of pre-driver education across UK road safety teams.

3.4 General points

RSOs expressed a keen interest in the project and supported the development of good practice guidance to pre-driver education. In particular, on a number of occasions RSOs were interested in obtaining advice on how best to evaluate the effectiveness of their interventions. General advice was provided during the telephone conversation.

The availability of resources and funding was mentioned on several occasions as a factor influencing the implementation of pre-driver education. Once again this supports the need to provide road safety teams with resources (e.g. a toolkit) to support the practical implementation of good practice in pre-driver education.

In general, the question ‘what pre-driver education is provided by your road safety team’ prompted a discussion of education targeted at year 10 and 11s prior to provisional licensing; some exceptions were noted. In particular, on some occasions contacts did not initially consider theatre in education as ‘pre-driver education’.
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APPENDIX 1

Pre-driver education survey questionnaire (national and international)
Pre-Driver Education Questionnaire

Introduction
This project is looking at the courses, programmes and/or information that is provided to young people on road safety throughout the UK. This includes both formal instructed courses, informal talks, information provided and one day events etc.

We would be grateful if you could complete this questionnaire on your programme(s) that most closely relate to the following definition of pre-driver education:

Pre-driver education definition:
'Pre-driver education is used to refer to a programme of instruction intended to inform the development of attitudes and beliefs ultimately related to driving that is aimed at students who have not yet obtained a provisional drivers licence'.

Instructions:

a) This questionnaire comprises of 5 sections. Please, where appropriate, answer all questions.

b) When answering a ‘tick box’ question (e.g. ‘Yes’, ‘No’ or ‘Don’t Know’ response) please place a cross in the appropriate box or boxes. If you are completing the questionnaire on a computer, please note that response boxes are ‘text boxes’ therefore click your cursor on the required box and enter a letter ‘X’.

c) Additional space is provided at the back of the questionnaire if you require more room to answer a question. (Please note that text boxes should not be re-sized).

d) If your council / organisation runs more than one pre-driver education course, we would be most grateful if you would consider completing this questionnaire for more than one course. However this is not essential.

e) Based on the findings of our pilot study, we estimate that this questionnaire will take a maximum of 30 minutes to complete.

f) If you would like to provide further information on your programme, please use the additional space provided at the back of the questionnaire.

Thank you
SECTION 1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is the name of your council / organisation?

2. Is your organisation:
   - County council?
   - Local council?
   - Other government body?
   - Private company?
   - Charitable organisation?
   - Other?(please state)

3. What position do you hold within your organisation?
   - Road Safety Officer
   - Driving Instructor
   - Manager
   - Administrator
   - Other (please state)

4. What are your top three priorities for road safety training and education?

5. Please list the road safety programmes / information / education (formal and informal) your council / organisation provides to people under 18 years old. (Please state your main 5)

6. Do you / your organisation / council have a pre-driver education programme? (please refer to definition of pre-driver education stated on previous page)
   - Yes
   - No

6a. If no, are you planning on introducing a pre-driver education programme?
   - Yes
   - No

Thank you for completing the questionnaire, if you have any additional comments please turn to the last page.

SECTION 2. PRE-DRIVER EDUCATION OVERVIEW

Overview

7. What is the name of the pre-driver education programme you provide?

8. How many years has this pre-driver education programme been running?

9. Numerous factors can affect the sustainability of a programme, e.g. funding, legislation etc. Please indicate how many more years you expect your programme to run?

10. Where is the programme delivered? e.g. locally, nationally (state coverage).
   - Counties (please state)
   - Nationwide

Don’t know

Counties

Nationwide
11. In what establishment is the programme delivered? (Please select all that apply)
   - School (during school hours)
   - After school club (school run)
   - After school club (agency run)
   - Youth club
   - College
   - Council offices
   - Other (please give details)

11a. If the pre-driver education programme is provided in school / college, what subject / course is it integrated with?
   - Not integrated
   - PSHE (Personal, Social, & Health Education)
   - Equivalent to PSHE
   - Life skills
   - Citizenship
   - Other (please give details)

12. Do you tailor your programme to address the specific needs of different students / groups?
   - Yes
   - No
   - N/A

12a. If yes, please give details.

13. Please indicate the duration and period over which your programme is delivered. (e.g. 2 hours, two consecutive days)

Programme Attendees

14. What age group is the programme aimed at? (Please select all that apply)
   - Year group 1 (5 yrs – 6 yrs)
   - Year group 2 (6 yrs – 7 yrs)
   - Year group 3 (7 yrs – 8 yrs)
   - Year group 4 (8 yrs – 9 yrs)
   - Year group 5 (9 yrs – 10 yrs)
   - Year group 6 (10 yrs – 11 yrs)
   - Year group 7 (11 yrs – 12 yrs)
   - Year group 8 (12 yrs – 13 yrs)
   - Year group 9 (13 yrs – 14 yrs)
   - Year group 10 (14 yrs – 15 yrs)
   - Year group 11 (15 yrs – 16 yrs)
   - Year group 12 (16 yrs – 17 yrs)
   - Year group 13 (17 yrs – 18 yrs)
   - 18 years +

15. Is there a minimum and / or maximum age limit for students to participate on the programme?
   - Yes
   - No
   - N/A

15a. If yes, please give details.
   - Minimum age
   - Maximum age
   - Reason for age restriction

16. Is the programme targeted at any specific demographic group? (e.g. females; young offenders; armed forces etc.).
   - Yes
   - No

16a. If yes, please give details.
17. Are there any criteria a student must meet in order to participate in the programme?
   Yes □
   No □
   N/A □

17a. If yes, please give details.

18. What is the total training cost?
   Per attendee £ □
   and / or
   Per programme / course £ □
   Don't know □
   N/A □

19. Is the programme subsidised?
   Yes □
   No □
   Don't know □
   N/A □

19a. If yes, who subsidises the programme?

Training Pipeline

23. Does your programme have links with other road safety training education provided by your organisation / council?
   Yes □
   No □

23a. If yes, please provide details.

24. Does your programme have links with other road safety training education provided by other external organisations?
   Yes □
   No □

24a. If yes, please provide details.

25. What other Road Safety Programmes in your area might your students have attended prior to attending your programme?

Programme Throughput

20. Approximately how many times a year do you run this programme?

21. How many places are available on each pre-driver education programme?
   School class size □
   No limit □

22. On average, how many students attend each pre-driver education programme?

None □
Don't know □
SECTION 3. PRE-DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMME INFORMATION

Programme Instruction

26. Is this programme:
   - Instructor / teacher led? [ ]
   - Self learning? [ ]
   - Combination of instructor and self learning? [ ]
   - Peer to peer? [ ]
   - Other? (please give details) [ ]

27. How many hours of instruction does the programme consist of?
   - Instructor provided [ ]
   - Non-instructor (self learning) [ ]

28. If instructor led (partially or fully), who delivers the programme? (Please select all that apply)
   - Road Safety Officer or equivalent [ ]
   - Teacher [ ]
   - Police Officer [ ]
   - Fire Officer [ ]
   - Driving instructor [ ]
   - Driving examiner [ ]
   - Theatre group [ ]
   - Other (please give details) [ ]

29. Does the instructor receive any specific training relating to delivering the programme?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - N/A [ ]

29a. If yes, what training is provided? [ ]

29b. If yes, who provides the training? [ ]

30. Which of the following teaching methods are used when delivering the pre-driver education programme? (Please select all that apply)
   - Classroom based instruction [ ]
   - Hands on driving [ ]
   - Case studies [ ]
   - Role play [ ]
   - Theatre performance [ ]
   - Other (please give details) [ ]

31. What other people contribute to the delivery of the programme? (Please select all that apply)
   - Police [ ]
   - Fire Brigade [ ]
   - Victims [ ]
   - Teacher [ ]
   - Road Safety Officer [ ]
   - Driving instructor [ ]
   - Driving examiner [ ]
   - Actors [ ]
   - Other (please give details) [ ]

32. Do you involve parents / guardians / relatives of the students in any aspects of your pre-driver education programme?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

32a. If yes, please give details. [ ]
### Programme Content

33. In column 1 below, various elements of a driver education programme are listed. Please insert ‘YES’ against each element you have in your programme, indicate the time dedicated to this component and how it is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Elements of a pre-driver education programme</th>
<th>2. Insert ‘YES’ if the component is included in your programme</th>
<th>3. How many hours are given to this component?</th>
<th>4. How is this component assessed? E.g. written exam; oral exam. If not assessed write N/A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Road Users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seatbelt use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car control (skill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving and the law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If your course consists of any other elements please list them below*
Programme Delivery & Equipment

34. Which of the following equipment and facilities are used during training? (Please select all that apply)

- Classroom
- Halls
- Videos
- Slides
- Computers
- Photographs
- Simulators
- Real cars
- Leaflets
- Press cuttings
- Home learning facilities
- Other (please give details)

35. Does the programme involve any practical driving training?

- Yes
- No

35a. If yes, please detail the percentage of time given to practical and theoretical training.

- Theoretical %
- Practical driving %

35b. If yes, do you provide practical training for students under 17 years old?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

36. What additional resources do you provide for the students to take away? (Please select all that apply)

- Posters
- Leaflets
- CDs
- Videos
- CD-ROMs
- Other (please give details)

- No additional resources

SECTION 4. PROGRAMME DESIGN & EVALUATION

Programme Design

37. What is the overall aim of your pre-driver education programme?

38. What was the reason(s) underlying the need for this course?

39. What steps were taken to develop the course? (e.g. were other courses reviewed / used?)

- Don’t know
40. Was the material for the pre-driver education programme developed in consultation with any other organisation / group? (Please select all that apply)

- Police
- Academic Institutes
- Road Safety Officers
- Teachers
- Driving examiners
- Driving instructors
- Other (please give details)

Don't know

41. Are instructors monitored / checked to determine the continued effectiveness of their instructional skills?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- N/A

41a. If yes, is this conducted by an internal or external organisation?

- Internal
- External

41b. How often does this occur?

- [ ]

42. Is the content and presentation (format) of the programme materials checked by a third party, prior to use?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

43. Do you have information to support the effectiveness of the programme in relation to the overall aim?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

43a. If yes, please give details.

- [ ]

44. Do you administer a questionnaire at the beginning and end of the programme to determine changes in students' attitudes / opinions / beliefs towards driving and road safety?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

SECTION 5. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Issues associated with pre-driver education

45. Do you consider that your programme enables students to:

- Be a more courteous driver
- Hold better attitudes to driving
- Be a safer driver
- Be a more skilful driver
- Drive earlier
- Other (please give details)

- [ ]
46. Please describe components of your programme which you feel to be particularly successful?

47. Please describe components (if any) of your programme that you consider could be improved?

48. In your opinion how could pre-driver education, in general, be improved?

49. In your opinion, what are the common attitudes students hold towards driving before undertaking the programme?

50. In your opinion what are the main factors influencing pre-driver attitudes towards driving?

Please check that you have completed all appropriate sections.

Thank you very much for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me at clairel@airaffairs.co.uk or on 01935 434005

Please return the questionnaire either via email - clairel@airaffairs.co.uk or post:

Claire Launchbury
Air Affairs (UK) Ltd.
1 Market Street
Yeovil
Somerset
BA20 1HR

Young Driver Attitudes & Beliefs

49. In your opinion, what are the common attitudes students hold towards driving before undertaking the programme?
Additional space for questions & additional comments:

Please include question number.
Introduction
This project is looking at the courses, programmes and/or information that is provided to young people on road safety throughout the UK and internationally. This includes both formal instructed courses, informal talks, information provided and one day events etc.

We would be grateful if you could complete this questionnaire on your programme(s) that most closely relate to the following definition of pre-driver education:

Pre-driver education definition:
‘Pre-driver education is used to refer to a programme of instruction intended to inform the development of attitudes and beliefs ultimately related to driving that is aimed at students who have not yet obtained a provisional drivers licence’.

Instructions:

a) This questionnaire comprises of 5 sections. Please, where appropriate, answer all questions.

b) When answering a ‘tick box’ question (e.g. ‘Yes’, ‘No’ or ‘Don’t Know’ response) please place a cross in the appropriate box or boxes. If you are completing the questionnaire on a computer, please note that response boxes are ‘text boxes’ therefore click your cursor on the required box and enter a letter ‘X’.

c) Additional space is provided at the back of the questionnaire if you require more room to answer a question. (Please note that text boxes should not be re-sized).

d) If your council / organisation runs more than one pre-driver education course, we would be most grateful if you would consider completing this questionnaire for more than one course. However this is not essential.

e) Based on the findings of our pilot study, we estimate that this questionnaire will take a maximum of 30 minutes to complete.

f) If you would like to provide further information on your programme, please use the additional space provided at the back of the questionnaire.

Thank you
SECTION 1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is the name of your organisation?

2. Is your organisation:
   - Government body? [ ]
   - Private company? [ ]
   - Charitable organisation? [ ]
   - Other? (please state) [ ]

3. What position do you hold within your organisation?
   - Road Safety Officer / instructor [ ]
   - Driving Instructor [ ]
   - Manager [ ]
   - Administrator [ ]
   - Other (please state) [ ]

4. What are your top three priorities for road safety training and education?

5. Please list the road safety programmes / information / education (formal and informal) your organisation provides to people under 18 years old. (Please state your main 5).

6. Do you / your organisation have a pre-driver education programme? (please refer to definition of pre-driver education stated on previous page)
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

6a. If no, are you planning on introducing a pre-driver education programme?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

Thank you for completing the questionnaire, if you have any additional comments please turn to the last page.

SECTION 2. PRE-DRIVER EDUCATION OVERVIEW

Overview

7. What is the name of the pre-driver education programme you provide?

8. How many years has this pre-driver education programme been running?

9. Numerous factors can affect the sustainability of a programme, e.g. funding, legislation etc. Please indicate how many more years you expect your programme to run?

   - Don't know [ ]

10. Where is the programme delivered? e.g. state, region (state coverage).

   - State [ ]
   - Nationwide [ ]

   Thank you for completing the questionnaire, if you have any additional comments please turn to the last page.
11. In what establishment is the programme delivered? (Please select all that apply)
- School (during school hours)
- After school club (school run)
- After school club (agency run)
- College
- Council offices
- Other (please give details)

11a. If the pre-driver education programme is provided in school / college, what subject / course is it integrated with?

12. Do you tailor your programme to address the specific needs of different students / groups?
- Yes
- No
- N/A

12a. If yes, please give details.

13. Please indicate the duration and period over which your programme is delivered. (e.g. 2 hours, two consecutive days)

Programme Attendees

14. What age group(s) is the programme aimed at?

15. Is there a minimum and / or maximum age limit for students to participate on the programme?
- Yes
- No
- N/A

15a. If yes, please give details.

16. Is the programme targeted at any specific demographic group? (e.g. females; young offenders; armed forces etc.)
- Yes
- No

16a. If yes, please give details.

17. Are there any criteria a student must meet in order to participate on the programme?
- Yes
- No
- N/A

17a. If yes, please give details.

18. What is the total training cost?
- Per attendee
- Per programme / course
- Don’t know
- N/A
19. Is the programme subsidised?

Yes
No
Don’t know
N/A

19a. If yes, who subsidises the programme?


Programme Throughput

20. Approximately how many times a year do you run this programme?


21. How many places are available on each pre-driver education programme?

School class size
No limit

22. On average, how many students attend each pre-driver education programme?


Training Pipeline

23. Does your programme have links with other road safety training education provided by your organisation?

Yes
No

23a. If yes, please provide details.


24. Does your programme have links with other road safety training education provided by other external organisations?

Yes
No

24a. If yes, please provide details.


25. What other Road Safety Programmes in your area might your students have attended prior to attending your programme?

None
Don’t know

SECTION 3. PRE-DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMME INFORMATION

Programme Instruction

26. Is this programme:

Instructor / teacher led?
Self learning?
Combination of instructor and self learning?
Peer to peer?
Other? (please give details)

27. How many hours of instruction does the programme consist of?

Instructor provided
Non-instructor (self learning)
28. If instructor led (partially or fully), who delivers the programme? (Please select all that apply)
   - Road Safety Officer or equivalent
   - Teacher
   - Police Officer
   - Fire Officer
   - Driving instructor
   - Driving examiner
   - Theatre Group
   - Other (please give details)

29. Does the instructor receive any specific training relating to delivering the programme?
   - Yes
   - No
   - N/A

29a. If yes, what training is provided?

29b. If yes, who provides the training?

30. Which of the following teaching methods are used when delivering the pre-driver education programme? (Please select all that apply)
   - Classroom based instruction
   - Hands on driving
   - Case studies
   - Role play
   - Theatre performance
   - Other (please give details)

31. What other people contribute to the delivery of the programme? (Please select all that apply)
   - Police
   - Fire Brigade
   - Victims
   - Teacher
   - Road Safety Officer
   - Driving instructor
   - Driving examiner
   - Actors
   - Other (please give details)

32. Do you involve parents / guardians / relatives of the students in any aspects of your pre-driver education programme?
   - Yes
   - No

32a. If yes, please give details.
### Programme Content

33. In column 1 below, various elements of a driver education programme are listed. Please insert ‘YES’ against each element you have in your programme, indicate the time dedicated to this component and how it is assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Elements of a pre-driver education programme</th>
<th>2. Insert ‘Yes’ if the component is included in your programme</th>
<th>3. How many hours are given to this component?</th>
<th>4. How is this component assessed? E.g. written exam; oral exam. If not assessed write N/A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Road Users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seatbelt use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car control (skill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving and the law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If your course consists of any other elements please list them below*

---
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### Programme Delivery & Equipment

34. Which of the following equipment and facilities are used during training? (please select all that apply)

- Classroom
- Halls
- Videos
- Slides
- Computers
- Photographs
- Simulators
- Real cars
- Leaflets
- Press cuttings
- Home learning facilities
- Other (please give details)

35. Does the programme involve any practical driving training?

- Yes
- No

35a. If yes, please detail the percentage of time given to practical and theoretical training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Practical driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35b. If yes, do you provide practical training for students under 17 years old?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

### SECTION 4. PROGRAMME DESIGN & EVALUATION

**Programme Design**

37. What is the overall aim of your pre-driver education programme?

38. What was the reason(s) underlying the need for this course?

39. What steps were taken to develop the course? (e.g. were other courses reviewed / used?)

---

**Additional Resources for Students**

36. What additional resources do you provide for the students to take away? (please select all that apply)

- Posters
- Leaflets
- CDs
- Videos
- CD-ROMs
- Other (please give details)

- No additional resources

---
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40. Was the material for the pre-driver education programme developed in consultation with any other organisation / group? (Please select all that apply)

- Police
- Academic Institutes
- Road Safety Officers
- Teachers
- Driving examiners
- Driving instructors
- Other (please give details)
- Don’t know

Programme Evaluation

41. Are instructors monitored / checked to determine the continued effectiveness of their instructional skills?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
- N/A

41a. If yes, is this conducted by an internal or external organisation?

- Internal
- External

41b. How often does this occur?

- 

42. Is the content and presentation (format) of the programme materials checked by a third party, prior to use?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

43. Do you have information to support the effectiveness of the programme in relation to the overall aim?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

43a. If yes, please give details.

- 

44. Do you administer a questionnaire at the beginning and end of the programme to determine changes in students’ attitudes / opinions / beliefs towards driving and road safety?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

SECTION 5. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Issues associated with pre-driver education

45. Do you consider that your programme enables students to:

- Be a more courteous driver
- Hold better attitudes to driving
- Be a safer driver
- Be a more skilful driver
- Drive earlier
- Other (please give details)

46. Please describe components of your programme which you feel to be particularly successful?

- 

- 

47. Please describe components (if any) of your programme that you consider could be improved?

48. In your opinion how could pre-driver education, in general, be improved?

49. In your opinion, what are the common attitudes students hold towards driving before undertaking the programme?

50. In your opinion what are the main factors influencing pre-driver attitudes towards driving?

Please check that you have completed all appropriate sections.

Thank you very much for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me at clairel@airaffairs.co.uk or on (0044) 1935 434005

Please return the questionnaire either via email - clairel@airaffairs.co.uk or post:

Claire Launchbury
Air Affairs (UK) Ltd.
1 Market Street
Yeovil
Somerset
BA20 1HR
ENGLAND
Additional space for questions & additional comments:

Please include question number.
APPENDIX 2

Covering letter for pre-driver education survey
Dear Road Safety Officer,

Survey of Pre-driver education provision in the UK: A request for your support

Air Affairs (UK) Ltd has been commissioned by the Department for Transport (DfT) to undertake work to define best practice in Pre-driver Education. As part of this work we are required to collect information on the current and proposed future provision of pre-driver education within the UK and internationally.

We would be most grateful if you would consider completing the attached questionnaire and returning it via email to me Claire Launchbury clairel@airaffairs.co.uk by 31st March 06. The questionnaire should not take longer than 30 minutes to complete. We feel that all questions are important to the development of a comprehensive guide to good practice in pre-driver education and associated policy requirements. If you are unable to participate in the survey we would be grateful if you could let us know, again via email, or if preferred via telephone on 01935 434005.

A couple of important points

- We obtained your details via the LARSOA web-site and we are circulating this questionnaire to all Road Safety Units.

- Your information will be analysed by Air Affairs and used to support our development of a document detailing best practice in pre-driver education and policy requirements. Interim findings of the study will be reported to the Department in September 2006.

- Your name will not be presented in the report, nor will it be associated explicitly with the information that you provide. However, not surprisingly, we are keen to highlight examples of good practice in the report and as a result your organisation may be identifiable.

- The DfT point of contact for this work is Elaine Forsyth. In addition, I may be contacted on 01935 434005 if you would like to discuss the study and questionnaire in further detail.

And Finally

We appreciate that you are busy people and that this questionnaire represents an additional task, however, please be assured that all information provided will be used to support comprehensive guidance on best practice in pre-driver education. Many thanks in anticipation of your completion of the questionnaire.

Yours Sincerely,

Claire Launchbury BSc(Hons) MSc
Human Factors and Training Consultant
Air Affairs (UK) Ltd

AIR AFFAIRS (UK) Ltd. Further information on Air Affairs (UK) Ltd can be found at our web-site www.airaffairs.co.uk. Briefly, the company employs professionally trained Ergonomists, Psychologists and Training specialists and is a registered consultancy with the Ergonomics society.