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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines people’s attitudes towards road safety and aims to establish a high-quality baseline of data for 2010, with the scope to repeat the survey in future in order to measure trends over time if desired. It is based on a module of questions included in the NatCen Omnibus survey between February and April 2010.

Travel behaviour and views on road safety

With the exception of walking, travelling in a car was the most often mentioned mode of transport used in the previous 12 months: 78% having travelled in a car as a passenger and 70% having done so as a driver. Around two-thirds (67%) of drivers drove every day, while, of those travelling as passengers, only 10% did so every day.

Respondents were most likely to perceive road casualties as being caused by driving after drinking alcohol. However, according to official statistics (Department for Transport, 2010a), the most common contributory factor in personal injury road accidents in 2009, recorded by the police, was failing to pay attention while driving (‘failed to look properly’).

In general, respondents found current levels of police enforcement of traffic laws too low and existing penalties for road traffic offences too lenient. This was especially true of driving under the influence of illegal drugs, and driving dangerously or carelessly. However, views in relation to speeding were not as strong, where a considerable minority felt that police enforcement in this area was too high and that penalties were too harsh. This was more true of drivers than non-drivers.

Driving styles and behaviours

The majority (88%) of drivers felt themselves to be law-abiding drivers, to be safer drivers than most (77%) and sometimes got annoyed with fellow drivers.

Drivers were asked about a number of ‘risky’ behaviours and whether they had done these during the last year. The most prevalent of these behaviours reported were speeding (89%) and driving when tired (56%). More than a third (36%) said that they had driven after drinking one or two alcoholic drinks, and 7% had driven when they thought they were over the legal limit (and this was more common among men and those with the highest incomes). Fifteen per cent had driven without wearing a seat belt.

Men were more likely than women to engage in ‘risky’ behaviours, as were younger drivers compared with older drivers. Just 5% of drivers surveyed said they had not committed any of the risky behaviours and a third (34%) reported committing four or more.
Drink driving

On the whole, there was antipathy towards drinking before driving. Three-quarters (74%) agreed that drivers should not drink any alcohol before driving and 84% disagreed that people should be free to judge how much they can safely drink. However, 74% agreed that most drivers will drive after drinking alcohol if they think they are under the limit.

Those who had themselves driven after one or two alcoholic drinks were more likely to think this safe, and to know other drivers who did the same. Women were more likely to disagree that one or two drinks does not make drivers more likely to crash (62% compared with 50% of male respondents) and were more likely to advocate abstinence from alcohol before driving.

Speed

While 85% of respondents agreed that most drivers will drive a bit over the speed limit if they think it is safe, 67% agreed that people should always stay within the speed limit. Even among those who had themselves broken the speed limit, over half (58%) agreed that drivers should always stay within the limit.

In line with other research, speeding on 30 mph roads was more commonly reported than speeding on 60 mph roads. Men and younger drivers were more likely to report exceeding the speed limit than were other groups. Mostly, drivers exceeded the speed limit on roads they knew well (69% of those who had exceeded the limit on a 60 mph road cited this as a circumstance where they were more likely to do so; 61% for a 30 mph road).

Restraint use

There was widespread acceptance of the purpose of seat belts. Nearly all (95%) agreed that seat belts reduce the risk of serious injury and the vast majority disagreed that seat belts are not necessary, provided you drive carefully.

Younger drivers were the least likely to wear a seat belt. Drivers were most likely not to wear a seat belt when travelling on roads they knew well (32%) or when in a hurry (24%). Passengers were most likely not to wear a seat belt when travelling in the rear passenger seat (52%). Those who reported not always wearing a seat belt when driving, most frequently mentioned short journeys as the circumstances in which they were most likely not to wear a seat belt.
1 INTRODUCTION

Road safety is known to rank highly among important issues the public would like addressed by government (Lyons et al., 2008; p. 106). Safety when travelling is part of the Department for Transport’s third aim and objectives: ‘To contribute to better safety, security and health and longer life-expectancy through reducing the risk of death, injury or illness arising from transport, and promoting travel modes that are beneficial to health’.¹

This report examines people’s attitudes towards road safety and aims to establish a high-quality baseline of data for 2010, with the scope to repeat the research in the future in order to measure trends over time if desired. The report is based on a module of questions included in the NatCen Omnibus survey between February and April 2010 (see below and Appendix 3 for more details). The questions developed were broadly based on the Social Attitudes to Road Traffic Risk in Europe (SARTRE 3) study² with two distinct parts:

1. A set of core questions which aim to provide information required for regular monitoring at a high level (Sections 2 and 3 of the report cover the results relating to these questions).

2. A set of potentially rotating modules on particular aspects of road safety. For the 2010 survey, the topics chosen were drink driving, speed and restraint use (covered in Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the report, respectively).

The report additionally draws on findings from other recent surveys where relevant, notably the British Social Attitudes survey series (NatCen, 2010), the THINK! campaign annual tracking survey (Angle et al., 2009), and the RAC Foundation report on motoring (Spero, 2010). Overall, these surveys provide information on pertinent topics, such as attitudes towards driving after drinking alcohol, speeding, driving while using a mobile phone and seat-belt use. The Department for Transport road casualty figures are also utilised (Department for Transport, 2010a). Where appropriate, comparisons are made between the Omnibus data and these other sources.

This report details the results from the Omnibus survey: first, to provide an understanding of the views and behaviour of the population as a whole; second, analysis is conducted to identify how these vary among different subgroups, in particular, whether they vary by age, sex and income. Furthermore, the combination of both attitudinal and behavioural measures is used to shed light on the interaction between the two. Differences between measures are only highlighted if the observed differences in the data are statistically significant at the 95% level.

¹ www.dft.gov.uk/about/aimandobjectives (accessed on 29 October 2010).
² This is a survey carried out across 23 European countries of around 1,000 drivers per country. The most recent UK survey was conducted between February and March 2003). Only UK results are mentioned in this report; see SARTRE 3 consortium (2004).
The survey explored the following areas:

- Travel behaviour and general views on road safety (Section 2).
- Driving styles and experiences (Section 3).
- Drink driving (Section 4).
- Speed (Section 5).
- Restraint use (Section 6).

Detailed tables in Appendix 1 are available on the web, and the questions asked in the questionnaire are listed in Appendix 2.

### 1.1 NatCen Omnibus survey – design details

The NatCen Omnibus is a stratified random probability survey of adults aged 16 or over living in private households in Great Britain. The survey is designed to carry questions on a range of social data for government and other non-profit organisations.

Fieldwork was undertaken between February and April 2010 and a total of 1,538 face-to-face interviews were conducted (this represents a response rate of 55%). The questionnaire for the road safety and driver behaviour module comprised around 80 questions and was commissioned by the Department for Transport. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 2.

The sample was obtained using a multi-stage design, using the Postcode Address File (PAF) as the sample frame. The study population is therefore every adult resident in an address covered by the PAF. Different stages were used to select postcode sectors, addresses and individuals. The survey is weighted to correct for the unequal probability of selection of addresses and individuals, and is calibrated using population estimates to adjust for differential non-response between different groups (in terms of age and sex) and across regions. All results presented in this report are based on weighted figures.

The first part of the questionnaire was carried out using CAPI (computer-assisted personal interviewing), utilising showcards to offer answer categories. The respondent then completed the rest of the questions themselves on a laptop, via CASI (computer-assisted self-interviewing); respondents answered some practice questions first. CASI questions included potentially sensitive questions where respondents were asked about, for example, speeding, driving after drinking alcohol, and receipt of penalties and fines. Respondents could ‘lock’ the CASI on completion so that the interviewer could not see their responses. Appendix 3 contains full details of the methodology.

For further details about the NatCen Omnibus, see [www.natcen.ac.uk/study/omnibus](http://www.natcen.ac.uk/study/omnibus) or contact Alun.Humphrey@natcen.ac.uk.


2 TRAVEL BEHAVIOUR AND GENERAL VIEWS ON ROAD SAFETY

This section looks at people’s travel behaviour, especially travel by car or van. Perceptions of road safety are then considered, including causes of accidents and penalties.

2.1 Travel behaviour and other characteristics of the sample

Respondents were asked which forms of transport they had used in the previous 12 months:

- With the exception of walking, travelling in a car was the most often mentioned mode of transport used by respondents: 78% having travelled in a car as a passenger and 70% having done so as a driver (either of a car or van; Table A1.1). Throughout the remainder of this section and the rest of the report, the term ‘drivers’ is used as a shorthand to identify this group, i.e. those who had travelled by car or van as a driver in the preceding 12 months.

- Men were more likely to report having travelled as drivers than were women (78% compared with 62%). The proportion of drivers was also higher among those aged between 35 and 64 and those with higher incomes (Table A1.1).

Figure 2.1 shows the frequency with which respondents that travel by car as drivers or passengers had done so. Around two-thirds (67%) of drivers drove every day.

![Figure 2.1: Frequency of travelling by car or van as driver and as passenger](image)

Those that travelled as passengers did so less frequently; only a tenth (10%) travelled as a passenger every day (Tables A1.2 and A1.3).

Table A1.5 shows annual mileage covered by those reporting that they had driven a car in the last 12 months:

- around a fifth (22%) had driven up to 3,000 miles in the past year and 13% had driven in excess of 15,000 miles;
- men and those with higher incomes were more likely to report covering greater annual mileage; and
- the majority (78%) of respondents who reported travelling as drivers had in excess of 10 years’ driving experience (Table A1.4).

These results appear consistent with other sources, which suggests that the sample of drivers here is broadly representative of the driving population in terms of annual mileage.3

2.2 General views on road safety

2.2.1 Perceptions of road casualty numbers and causes of accidents

Respondents were asked how many people they thought were killed or seriously injured in road accidents in Great Britain during 2009 (Figure 2.2):

- Responses were weighted towards the lower end of the answer scale provided, with 19% believing the number to be between 5,000 and 10,000, and 14% estimating it at 10,000 to 20,000 (Table A1.6).
- Around a fifth of the sample (21%) was unable to give an answer.

In fact, during 2009, 26,096 people were killed or seriously injured on Britain’s roads (Department for Transport, 2010a)4 and 9% of respondents therefore estimated correctly (20,000 to 29,999).

---

3 For example, in the THINK! campaign annual tracking survey (Angle et al., 2009; Chart 3f, p. 17), 23% of drivers reported an annual mileage of up to 3,000 miles and 23% over 10,000 miles. The Department for Transport National Travel Survey found that main drivers’ average annual mileage (as a car driver) is around 6,900 miles (Department for Transport, 2010b; Table 0702).

4 These cover injury accidents reported to the police. It is recognised that the true figure may be higher than this, as it is known that not all accidents are reported.
Respondents were asked what they thought was the most common cause of road accidents (from a list). They were also asked to select what they thought were the second and third most common causes. The results are shown in Figure 2.3:

- By far the most frequently mentioned cause was driving after drinking alcohol; 30% mentioned this as the most common cause and 61% included it in their top three causes.\(^5\)

- Around a seventh mentioned exceeding the speed limit (14%), driving when tired (13%), not paying enough attention (13%) and driving too fast for the conditions (13%) as the most common cause of road accidents.

It is possible that respondents’ answers to questions such as those about common causes of accidents and drink-driving may be influenced by media campaigns (such as the THINK! campaign). There were a number of campaigns run in the previous year.\(^6\)

Based on the responses to these questions, there is evidence to suggest that people’s perceptions are out of line with official statistics on contributory factors to road casualties. In 2009, it was estimated that just 5% of all road casualties involved

---

5 Although response categories are not directly comparable, SARTRE 3 (unpublished UK results) found drink-driving (90%), following the vehicle in front too closely (85%) and driving too fast (87%) to be the most commonly mentioned causes of accidents in the UK (Quimby and Vilnitis, 2004). Similarly, the THINK! annual tracking survey (Angle et al., 2009) found drink-driving the most commonly cited, (64% mentioned it in the top three), then speeding (44%) and non-hands-free mobile (38%).

Factors considered as the most common causes of road accidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>In Top Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving after drinking alcohol</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers exceeding the speed limit</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving when tired</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road users not paying enough attention to the road</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers going too fast for the conditions</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a hand-held mobile phone while driving</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the vehicle in front too closely</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking when it is dangerous</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad weather conditions</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking illegal drugs and driving</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a hands-free mobile phone while driving</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly maintained roads</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


someone driving while over the legal alcohol limit (Department for Transport, 2010a; note that the survey question referred to driving after drinking alcohol as opposed to being over the limit, so these figures are not directly comparable). Instead, the official statistics show that the contributory factor to personal injury road accidents most frequently recorded by the police was ‘failed to look properly’,7 reported in 38% of all accidents. This compares with 13% of survey respondents mentioning ‘road users not paying enough attention to the road’, the fourth most popular answer.

2.2.2 Most important road safety issues

The respondents were asked what they thought were the most important issues to be addressed by the Government in order to improve road safety. ‘Drink driving’ was the most frequently mentioned issue respondents wanted to be addressed (Figure 2.4). For this question, the term ‘drink-driving’ was used, which did not distinguish between driving after one or two drinks and drinking above the legal alcohol limit:

- Just under a third (29%) of respondents identified drink-driving as the most important issue and in total, and 62% chose it in their ‘top three’ most important issues.8

7 Up to six contributory factors can be recorded for each accident. For further information on contributory factors, see article 4 of Reported Road Casualties Great Britain (Department for Transport, 2010a).

8 The THINK! annual tracking survey also found drink-driving to be of most concern to respondents (Angle et al., 2009; pp. 19–23).
• Excessive speed, road users not paying attention to the road and the use of hand-held mobile phones were also frequently mentioned.

The *RAC Report on Motoring 2010* also asked about issues of concern to motorists (although this was not limited to just road safety). According to the RAC survey, drink/drug driving was also the issue that caused most concern (84%), followed by use of hand-held mobiles while driving (74%). Breaking laws was an issue of ‘most concern’ to 63% of respondents (Spero, 2010; p. 22).

Those in the youngest age group were more likely to mention driving after drinking alcohol/drink-driving both as a cause of accidents and as an issue for the Government to address. Those with higher incomes were less likely to do so. Nearly half (46%) of 16- to 24-year-olds mentioned driving after drinking alcohol as the most common cause of accidents. This was just 14% among those in the highest income bracket (£24,701 or more; Tables A1.7 to A1.10).

### 2.2.3 Attitudes to enforcement and penalties

The respondents were asked to say whether they believed the current level of policing enforcement to be too high, about right, or too low for a series of areas of road traffic law. As is shown in Figure 2.5, on balance respondents were more inclined to say that they felt the levels of enforcement to be too low rather than too high:
• Around three-quarters felt enforcement was too low for driving while under the influence of illegal drugs (76%) and using a hand-held mobile while driving (75%). In each case, around a fifth felt it was about right.

• Sixty-two per cent said that enforcement was too low for driving or riding carelessly and 51% for driving after one or two drinks.

• The pattern is less marked for exceeding the speed limit. Just a third (33%) said enforcement was too low and 45% said it was about right. A considerable minority (21%) said that the level of police enforcement was too high. This compares with very low proportions for each of the other areas of traffic law.

![Figure 2.5: Views about the current level of police enforcement for areas of traffic law all respondents](image)


A similar set of questions was asked which focused on the harshness of penalties for the same set of areas of traffic law. The respondents were asked whether they thought the penalties for different types of traffic offence were too harsh, about right or too lenient, but were not provided with information about the penalties for each offence:

• The respondents were more likely to say that penalties were too lenient as opposed to too harsh: 58% saying so for drink driving, 65% for using a hand-held mobile while driving, 76% for driving under the influence of illegal drugs and 66% for driving dangerously or carelessly (Figure 2.6).
Again, views in relation to speeding were slightly different. A smaller proportion (29%) felt that penalties are too lenient for exceeding the speed limit, 50% said they were about right and 21% said they were too harsh.

These findings echo those from *British Social Attitudes 2009* (NatCen, 2010), where 76% agreed that the law on using mobile phones while driving is not properly enforced and 71% agreed that anyone caught drink-driving should be banned for at least five years.

They are also consistent with the SARTRE 3 survey where 74% of UK drivers said that they were in favour of greater enforcement of traffic laws. Furthermore, around 94% of UK respondents agreed that penalties for drink-driving should be more severe. This was 56% for speeding (SARTRE 3 consortium, 2004; Chapter 8).

The *RAC Report on Motoring 2010* also covered views on punishment: there was a desire for tougher punishments for those breaking the law and for more measures that force people to moderate their behaviour (Spero, 2010; p. 33).

Views on the leniency of penalties varied by age. Figure 2.7 shows the proportion of respondents saying penalties were either ‘much too lenient’ or ‘a little too lenient’ for the different road traffic offences by age group. Younger respondents tended to be less inclined to consider penalties as too lenient compared with their older counterparts.
Figure 2.7: Percentage considering penalties too lenient (‘a little too lenient’ or ‘much too lenient’) all respondents by age group

Source: NatCen Omnibus survey, 2010. Unweighted base = varies between 1,401 and 1,496.

Figure 2.8 shows how the respondents’ views on the leniency of penalties varied between those who were drivers and those who were non-drivers.9 In general, there was little difference between the two groups, with one notable exception. Drivers were much less likely to consider penalties for exceeding the speed limit as too lenient (22% compared with 46% among non-drivers).

Source: NatCen Omnibus survey, 2010. Unweighted base = varies between 956 and 1,037 (drivers); varies between 445 and 459 (non-drivers).

9 Drivers are defined as those who reported that they had driven a car or van in the previous 12 months, and non-drivers are those who reported not having done so.
3 DRIVING STYLES AND BEHAVIOURS

This section examines people’s driving styles and their experiences of driving.

Differences observed for subgroups of the overall sample (e.g. by age, sex or respondent income) are presented. Here, and throughout this report, it should be noted that such analysis considers each characteristic in isolation and does not control for relationships with other characteristics. For example, differences in respondent attitudes and behaviours by income group may reflect the different make-up of these groups, say in terms of age and gender. This should be kept in mind when considering the results presented.

3.1 Driving styles

The respondents who had driven a car or van in the past 12 months were asked a series of questions to ascertain their driving styles (in the following, this group will be referred to as ‘drivers’):

• Overall, nearly four-fifths of drivers felt themselves to be safer drivers than most (77%) and sometimes got annoyed with fellow drivers (80%; Figure 3.1).

![Figure 3.1: Degree of agreement with statements about driving drivers](source: NatCen Omnibus survey, 2010. Unweighted base = 1,057.)

10 This compares with findings from SARTRE 3, where two-thirds (66%) said their driving was (a little or a lot) less dangerous than other drivers (SARTRE 3 consortium, 2004; p. 101).
• Two-thirds (66%) preferred being a driver to a passenger.
• A minority said that they sometimes felt nervous driving (23%) or that they enjoyed driving fast (26%).
• Overall, 88% felt themselves to be a law-abiding driver (Figure 3.1 and Tables A1.21–A1.26).

There were some substantial differences in reported driving styles and preferences by sex, as shown in Figure 3.2:
• Men were more likely than women to report that they prefer driving to being a passenger (78% compared with 52%, respectively).
• Men (31%) were also more likely than women (21%) to report that they enjoy driving fast.
• Women were more likely to strongly agree that they were a law-abiding driver (38% compared with 26% of men; Table A1.24).
• Women were, however, more than twice as likely as men to report that they are sometimes nervous driving (34% and 14%, respectively; Tables A1.23–A1.25).

---

11 This is very similar to findings in SARTRE 3: 29% of drivers in the UK said they enjoy driving fast (SARTRE 3 consortium, 2004; p. 97).

12 This is consistent with the RAC Report on Motoring 2010, which found 90% of respondents to consider themselves law-abiding drivers (Spero, 2010; p. 14).
Figure 3.3 shows how reported driving styles and preferences varied by respondent age group:

- Drivers 65 years or over were least likely to think of themselves as safer drivers than most (68%; Table A1.21).
- Drivers aged 65 years or above were also less likely than their younger counterparts to report getting annoyed with other drivers (69%; Table A1.22).

The proportion of respondents considering themselves to be law-abiding drivers broadly increased with age. Of drivers aged 65 years or above, 93% considered themselves to be law-abiding, compared with 83% of 16- to 34-year-olds (Table A1.24).13

As seen in Figure 3.4, the proportion reporting sometimes being nervous when driving declined as annual respondent income rose; drivers in the highest income quintile were less likely than other drivers to report feeling nervous when driving (16% agreeing or strongly agreeing, compared with 36% of drivers in the lowest income quintile; Table A1.25).

13 Again, this is consistent with the RAC Report on Motoring 2010 which found that 96% of those over 70 consider themselves to be law-abiding drivers (slightly higher than the average) (Spero, 2010; p. 46).
3.2 Driving experiences

Those respondents who were drivers (i.e. reported having driven a car or van in the last 12 months) were asked about actions that they may have carried out while driving. This included questions relating to the frequency of having carried out a number of actions which might be generally considered as potentially ‘risky’ or ‘unsafe’ driving behaviours in the last 12 months – in total 10 actions were asked about. Although this terminology was not used in the questionnaire, it has been adopted in the following as a shorthand.

It should be noted that the figures presented here and elsewhere in this report relate to reported behaviours. Any variations between groups – for example, by age or sex – may therefore reflect differences in the propensity to report accurately as well as differences in actual behaviours. This should be considered when interpreting the results.
3.2.1 Prevalence of ‘risky’ behaviours

- By far the most prevalent of the ‘risky’ behaviours asked about was speeding, with 89% of drivers reporting having done this on one or more occasion in the past 12 months (see Figure 3.5 and Tables A1.27–A1.36).
- Over half of the respondents (56%) reported having driven when tired.
- More than a third (36%) had driven after drinking one or two alcoholic drinks and 7% had driven when they thought they were over the legal limit.
- A sixth (15%) had driven when not wearing a seat belt.
- Of the behaviours asked about, respondents were least likely to report having driven after taking an illegal drug, with 99% saying that they had never done this in the past year.

Figure 3.6 shows how the degree to which respondents reported carrying out various ‘risky’ behaviours varied by sex, with a higher proportion of men than women reporting that they had carried out most of the behaviours listed. This is consistent with the higher levels of agreement among women with the statement about being a law-abiding driver, noted above. In particular:

- while 28% of women drivers said they had parked on double yellow lines at least once or twice in the past 12 months, this was true of 39% of men (Table A1.28);
- in line with observational surveys (Department for Transport 2010c), women were less likely to report not wearing a seat belt than men, both as drivers (10% of women reported not wearing a seat belt at least once or twice when driving in the past 12 months, compared with 20% of men) and as passengers (14% of women and 23% of men reported having not worn a seat belt at least once or twice in the past 12 months; see Tables A1.30 and A1.31); and
- women were also less likely to report having overtaken another vehicle when they thought they could just make it (18% reported having done so compared with 33% of men; see Table A1.29). This is in line with the above findings regarding women being more likely than men to report sometimes feeling nervous when driving and less likely than men to enjoy driving fast.
Figure 3.5: How often carried out particular actions while driving in the last 12 months - all drivers (with the exception of ‘not worn a seat belt when a passenger’, which was asked of all those who had travelled by car as a passenger in preceding 12 months)

Reported driving experiences also often differed by age group (Figure 3.7):

- Younger drivers were far more likely than older drivers to report that they had driven when very tired. Seventy per cent of 16–34-year-olds said that they had driven when very tired at least ‘once or twice’ in the past 12 months, compared with 29% of those aged 65 years or over (Table A1.27).

- Drivers aged 16–34 years were more likely to have parked on double yellow lines than older drivers (45% reporting having done so at least ‘once or twice’ in the past 12 months; Table A1.28).

- Those aged 16–34 were also most likely not to have worn a seat belt at least ‘once or twice’ during the last 12 months, both as a driver and a passenger, which is in line with observational surveys (Department for Transport 2010c) that younger drivers are less likely to wear seat belts (Tables A1.30 and A1.31).

Drivers in managerial and professional occupations were more likely to wear a seat belt (only 10% of this group said they had not worn a seat belt at least once or twice compared with 18% in routine and manual occupations and 20% of those in intermediate occupations; Table A1.30).
Figure 3.7: Percentage having carried out particular actions while driving at least ‘once or twice’ in last 12 months drivers by age group

Source: NatCen Omnibus survey, 2010. Unweighted base = 224 (16 to 34), 207 (35 to 44), 223 (45 to 54), 207 (55 to 64), 197 (65 or above); as passenger = 292 (16 to 34), 196 (35 to 44), 217 (45 to 54), 207 (55 to 64), 269 (65 or over).
3.2.2 *Multiple ‘risky’ behaviours*

Figure 3.8 shows the number of ‘risky’ behaviours carried out by drivers (that is, how many of the 10 actions stated in Figure 3.5 they reported having carried out at least once or twice during the last 12 months). Just 5% reported having not carried out any of the risky behaviours, 14% had carried out one, 22% had carried out two, and 26% had carried out three in the past 12 months. A further 34% reported having committed four or more.

![Figure 3.8: Distribution of number of ‘risky’ behaviours carried out at least ‘once or twice’ in the last 12 months drivers](image)


Figure 3.9: Distribution of number of ‘risky’ behaviours carried out at least ‘once or twice’ in the last 12 months drivers by sex

![Figure 3.9: Distribution of number of ‘risky’ behaviours carried out at least ‘once or twice’ in the last 12 months drivers by sex](image)

Men were more likely to engage in these risky behaviours than women (Figure 3.9). The mean number of ‘risky’ behaviours that men reported having committed in the last 12 months was 3.3, higher than that of women (2.6).

3.2.3 Driving experiences: speeding

The respondents were asked how often they had driven over the speed limit (Table A1.36) – speeding is covered in more detail in Section 5:

- As shown earlier, 89% admitted having exceeded the speed limit in the previous 12 months. Eighteen per cent said that they had done so once or twice, 41% occasionally, 21% fairly often, and 10% very often.
- Women were as likely as men to say that they had driven over the speed limit at least once or twice in the past 12 months. However, men were more likely than women to say that they had done so very often (14% compared with 5% of women), while women were more likely than men to report that they had done so once or twice (21% and 15%, respectively).
- Age was related to speeding, with those aged 65 years or over least likely to report having driven over the speed limit very often or fairly often (19%).
- The respondents in the highest income quintile were more likely to have driven over the speed limit at least once or twice in the past 12 months (96%) than those in lower income groups.

3.2.4 Driving experiences: mobile phone use

In 2003 it became illegal to drive while using a hand-held mobile phone, with further penalties introduced in 2007. Data from British Social Attitudes 2009 (NatCen, 2010) show that 90% of respondents felt that it was not safe to talk on a hand-held mobile phone while driving, and 61% felt that using phones, including with hands-free kits, is dangerous. Just over half (53%) said that the use of all phones while driving should be banned (NatCen, 2010).

A third (34%) of drivers in the Omnibus sample said that they had used a hand-held mobile to speak or text while driving at least once or twice in the past 12 months (of which 9% did so occasionally and 4% very or fairly often). This is similar to other studies:14

---

14 The THINK! annual tracking survey found that 17% had used a mobile without a hands-free kit while driving and 12% had used a mobile to text while driving (Angle et al., 2009; p. 53). The RAC Report on Motoring 2010 found that 28% used a hand-held mobile phone to call/receive calls in the past six months while driving (8% while driving, and 20% ‘only when stationary’; Spero, 2010; p. 32). The Department for Transport’s observation survey Mobile Phone Use by Drivers: 2009 Survey Results for England (Department for Transport, 2010d) observed that, for the area surveyed, on average 1.4% of car drivers and 2.6% of van and lorry drivers were using a hand-held mobile while driving (at any one time).
• There was little difference between male and female drivers in terms of the proportion of respondents reporting the use of a hand-held mobile while driving (36% and 30%, respectively, reporting use at least once or twice in the last 12 months; Table A1.32).\textsuperscript{15}

• Younger drivers were more likely to have used a phone while driving than older ones (48% for 16–34-year-olds and 49% for 35–44-year-olds; Figure 3.7), as were drivers on a higher income (49% for the respondents in the highest income quintile).

• A third (30%) of respondents who consider themselves to be law-abiding drivers had used a hand-held mobile while driving at least once or twice in the past 12 months.

• Drivers who agreed that they enjoyed driving fast were more likely to have used a hand-held mobile at least once or twice (45%) than those who disagreed (24%).

• In contrast, respondents who said that they sometimes got nervous driving were less likely to report that they used a mobile while driving (24% did so at least once or twice) than those who disagreed that they are sometimes nervous (38%).

3.2.5 Driving experiences: drink and drug driving

It is currently legal in the UK to drive after drinking, so long as the ratio of alcohol in the blood does not exceed 80 milligrammes per 100 millilitres of blood (Section 4 deals more fully with drink driving):

• Over a third of respondents (36%) reported driving after one or two alcoholic drinks, with 17% having done so more than once or twice in the past 12 months (Table A1.33).\textsuperscript{16}

• Seven per cent of drivers reported having driven in the past 12 months when they thought they were over the legal limit at least once or twice, of which 1% said that they had done so occasionally.

• No-one said that they had driven when over the legal limit fairly often or very often (Table A1.34).

The RAC Report on Motoring 2010 (Spero, 2010) asked respondents if they thought they had ever driven while over the limit, or under the influence of drugs. Sixty-five per cent said that they had never driven while over the drink-drive limit, 12% knew

\textsuperscript{15} The THINK! annual tracking survey found that young men were more likely to use a hand-held phone when driving (Angle et al., pp. 53–54).

\textsuperscript{16} SARTRE 3 (unpublished UK report) found that, of the drivers who reported that they drank alcohol, 34% admitted to driving at least once a week after drinking a small amount of alcohol, and 2% admitted that they might drive sometimes when over the legal limit (Quimby and Vilnitis, 2004).
that they had broken the law in this way and a further 11% were unsure. This is higher than in the Omnibus sample (where 7% had driven when they thought they were over the legal limit), however the periods of reference were obviously quite different (Spero, 2010; p. 28).

Men were more likely to report driving after one or two drinks at least once or twice in the last 12 months (44%) than women (27%; see Table A1.33 and Figure 3.6). Men were also more likely to admit to driving when they thought they were over the legal limit (9% at least once or twice in the last 12 months, compared with 4% of women; see Table A1.34). This is in line with evidence that men are more likely to be involved in reported drink-drive incidents than women.17

There was a relationship between age and driving after one or two drinks (Table A1.33 and Figure 3.9). Evidence has found that younger drink drivers (up to the age of 30) create a greater risk than other age groups (North, 2010; p. 6). However, Figure 3.7 shows that it is not the younger drivers who were more likely to report driving after one or two drinks. Those most likely to report driving after one or two drinks were those aged 65 years or more (46%), and those least likely were aged 35–44 years (27%). As noted above, this could reflect differences in the propensity to report rather than differences in actual behaviour.

There was also a relationship between both occupation and income with driving after one or two drinks:

- The respondents in managerial and professional occupations were more likely to say that they had driven after one or two drinks at least once or twice in the last 12 months (44%) than those in routine and manual occupations (28%).
- Similarly, over half of those in the top income quintile said that they had driven after one or two drinks at least once or twice in the last 12 months (51%), a higher proportion than those in other income groups (Table A1.33).
- Drivers in the highest income quintile were also more likely to say that they had driven when they had drunk over the legal limit at least once or twice in the last 12 months (14%) compared with other income groups (Table A1.34).

Despite these differences, it is worth highlighting observations made in Lord North’s report that ‘normally responsible people who lapse on impulse … are from all social classes, various ages and both genders’ (North, 2010; p. 73).

---

17 For example, as quoted in North (2010), p. 57.
Driving after illegal drug-taking was less commonly reported than driving after drinking alcohol. Just 1% of respondents said that they had driven after taking an illegal drug at least once or twice in the last 12 months (Table A1.35).18

3.2.6 *Interaction between driving styles and experiences*

As might be expected, there were relationships between certain driving styles and drivers’ experiences (Figure 3.10):

- Drivers who said that they enjoy driving fast were more likely to report having overtaken when they thought they could just make it at least once or twice in the last 12 months (34%) than those who said they do not enjoy driving fast (19%; Table A1.29).
- Drivers who enjoy driving fast were also more likely to have driven at least once or twice when they thought that they were over the drink-drive limit (10%) than those who do not enjoy driving fast (4%; Table A1.34).
- Drivers who said they sometimes get annoyed with other drivers were more likely to report having driven above the speed limit at least once or twice (91%) than those who said that they do not get annoyed (82%; Table A1.36).

Drivers who considered themselves law-abiding were not immune from reporting having carried out ‘risky’ behaviours:

- For example, a third (33%) had parked on a double yellow line in the past 12 months, while 15% had not worn a seat belt when driving at least once or twice in the past year (Tables A1.28 and A1.30).
- Furthermore, 6% of drivers who consider themselves to be law-abiding said that they had driven when they thought they were over the legal alcohol limit once or twice in the past 12 months, and a further 1% had done so occasionally (Table A1.34).
- Similarly, of the drivers who think that they are safer than most, 89% said that they had driven over the speed limit on one or more occasion in the past 12 months. Of those who consider themselves a law-abiding driver, 89% reported having driven over the speed limit at least once or twice (Table A1.36).

However, there was no relationship found here between being nervous when driving, or enjoying driving fast and the likelihood of wearing a seat belt (Table A1.30).

---

18 The RAC report found that 9% of motorists reported having been in a car when the driver was under the influence of illegal drugs (18% of those aged 17–24 years) (Spero, 2010; p. 30).
Figure 3.10: Percentage having carried out particular actions at least ‘once or twice’ while driving in last 12 months drivers agreeing or strongly agreeing with statements related to driving

Source: NatCen Omnibus survey, 2010. Unweighted base = 943 (law abiding), 259 (nervous), 260 (enjoy driving fast); of passengers = 721 (law abiding), 211 (nervous), 198 (enjoy driving fast)
3.2.7 Involvement in accidents

Drivers were asked about their involvement in accidents in the past three years as a driver in which someone, including themselves, was injured and received medical attention. The majority (96%) had not been in any such accidents, 4% had been in one, 1% in two or more (Table A1.38).

A slightly higher proportion of drivers reported having been involved in accidents in the past three years as the driver where a vehicle was damaged but no-one was injured: 10% had been in one, 2% in two or more (Table A1.39).19

---

19 In SARTRE 3, 6% of UK drivers reported involvement in an accident with injury in the last three years (and 17% in at least one damage-only accident) (SARTRE 3 consortium, 2004; pp. 88 and 90). Since 2007 the National Travel Survey has included questions on accident involvement — summarised in article 5 in Reported Road Casualties Great Britain (Department for Transport, 2010a). The Omnibus results are broadly in line with these.
4 DRINK DRIVING

This section looks at attitudes towards driving after drinking alcohol. The first part looks at the questions asked of all respondents about their attitudes to drinking and driving; the second part explores in more detail the behaviour of those who reported driving after drinking one or two alcoholic drinks. The questions covered in this section were asked using computer-assisted self-interviewing (CASI) – respondents were asked to enter answers on a computer, with the interviewer being unable to see the responses provided.

4.1 Attitudes to driving after drinking alcohol

All respondents were asked whether they agreed with certain statements regarding driving after drinking alcohol (Figure 4.1 and Tables A1.40–A1.45):

![Figure 4.1: Attitudes to driving after drinking alcohol all respondents](chart)

• Around three-quarters (74%) agreed that drivers should not drink any alcohol before driving. This is higher than the SARTRE 3 report, which showed that 50% of UK respondents thought drivers should be allowed to drink no alcohol before driving. Taking it a step further, the RAC Report on Motoring 2010 showed that nearly half (46%) of respondents favoured a total ban on drinking alcohol before driving (Spero, 2010; p. 28).

• Furthermore, 84% of Omnibus respondents disagreed that people should be free to judge how much they can safely drink.

This is in line with evidence from British Social Attitudes 2009, which showed that 83% of respondents believed if anyone has drunk any alcohol they should not drive (NatCen, 2010). Despite this:

• three-quarters (74%) of respondents thought that most drivers will drive after drinking alcohol if they think they are under the limit (Table A1.40);

• forty-three per cent said that they knew someone who sometimes drove when over the limit – this compares with the THINK! campaign annual tracking survey which found that 71% of respondents said ‘nobody’ they know drives when over the legal limit (Angle et al., 2009; p. 49); and

• a fifth (21%) believed that having one or two alcoholic drinks does not make drivers more likely to crash (Table A1.41).

Findings from British Social Attitudes 2009 showed that 77% of respondents agreed that most people do not know how much alcohol they can drink before being over the legal drink-drive limit, indicating a degree of caution (NatCen, 2010). Similarly, the RAC Report on Motoring 2010 found that 41% of respondents said that they knew the drink drive limit, but when tested only 16% could state it correctly. Indeed, there is evidence that drivers are not always sure whether they are over the legal drink-drive limit: the same report found that 11% were ‘unsure’ whether they had driven when over the limit (Spero, 2010; p. 28).

• Here, just over half of respondents (57%) agreed or strongly agreed that it is difficult to know how much alcohol you can drink and be safe, while a third (33%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this (Table A1.43).

Figure 4.2 shows the proportion of respondents agreeing with each of the statements, among three different groups – those who had reported that they had
driven after one or two drinks (at least once or twice in the last 12 months), drivers who did not report this, and others (non-drivers):

- Those who reported that they had driven after one or two drinks displayed differing attitudes to drink-driving than the other groups. They were far less inclined to agree that drivers should not drink any alcohol before driving (45% compared with 85% of other drivers; Table A1.44).

- This group of respondents was also more likely to agree that one or two drinks does not make drivers any more likely to crash (30%; Table A1.41) and were more likely to say that they know other drivers who drive when above the limit (54%; Table A1.42).

There were differences in attitudes towards driving after drinking between men and women, as seen in Figure 4.3:

- Women were more likely than men to disagree that one or two drinks does not make drivers more likely to crash (62% and 50%, respectively; Table A1.41).

- Women were also more likely to advocate abstinence from alcohol prior to driving (81% agreeing that drivers should not drink any alcohol before driving)
Figure 4.3: Percentage agreeing or strongly agreeing with statements about driving after drinking alcohol all respondents by sex


compared with 67% of men). This is in line with Table A1.33, which shows that women were less likely than men to report having driven after one or two drinks.

- Men were also more likely than women to say that they know people who drove after drinking (48% and 38%, respectively; Table A1.42).

It should be noted that female tolerance to alcohol is likely to be lower than for males, which may affect some of the responses given here – for example, women may have to be more cautious about the effect of one or two drinks on their blood alcohol level than men.

As seen in Figure 4.4, attitudes towards drink-driving also varied with age:

- Younger respondents were more likely than older ones to say that they know people who drive when they might be over the limit (51% of 25–34-year-olds compared with 30% of those 75 or over; Table A1.42).

- The respondents aged 75 or over were least likely to agree that drivers should not drink any alcohol before driving (65%), followed by those aged 65–74 years (68%).

- Among drivers, those aged 65–74 years were also least likely to say that they had never driven after one or two drinks in the last 12 months (54%; Table A1.33).
There were some relationships between attitudes to drink driving and ethnicity:

- A fifth of non-White respondents (22%) disagreed that most drivers will drive after drinking alcohol if they think they are under the limit, nearly twice as many as White respondents (12%; Table A1.40).

- Non-White respondents (17%) were also more likely than White respondents (8%) to agree that people should be free to judge for themselves (Table A1.45).

### 4.2 Experiences of those driving after drinking

The respondents who reported that they had driven after one or two alcoholic drinks at least once or twice in the past 12 months were asked some questions about the last occasion on which this occurred:

- Almost all such drivers (97%) had been confident that they were under the legal alcohol limit the last time they had driven after one or two alcoholic drinks (61% very confident and 36% fairly confident; Table A1.46).

- Only 2% of these drivers had received any punishment for drink-driving in the last 3 years. These were in the form of a fine (2%) and penalty points on their licence (1%; Table A1.51).
The respondents who had driven when they thought that they were over the legal alcohol limit at least once or twice in the past 12 months were asked about the last time they did this. This only applied to a small number of respondents (70) so the data must be approached with caution:

- The most likely place of drinking before driving (when thought to be over the legal limit) was a pub or pubs (51%, 30 respondents), followed by drinking at someone else’s home (28%, 21 respondents). Drinking in a restaurant and at home before driving were also mentioned by at least 10 respondents (Table A1.47).

- The majority of these journeys were reported to be less than five miles (78%, 54 respondents; Table A1.48). When asked why they drove on this occasion, the most popular answers given by the respondents were that ‘Thought I was under the legal drink-drive limit at the time’ (65%, 43 respondents) and that ‘I felt safe to drive’ (61%, 43 respondents), followed by ‘No other means of transport available’ (22%, 16 respondents; Table A1.49).

- Finally, these drivers were asked in general about the circumstances under which they drive when they might be over the limit. The most popular answers included short journeys (10 minutes or less), travelling on roads you know well, and when driving alone (Table A1.50).
5 SPEED

This section examines the respondents’ attitudes and behaviour in relation to speed. The first part covers the attitudes of all respondents to speeding, and the second part relates to those who reported having driven above the speed limit, focusing on speeding on 30 mph and 60 mph roads. The questions covered in this section were asked used computer-assisted self-interviewing (CASI) – respondents were asked to enter answers on a computer, with the interviewer being unable to see the responses provided.

5.1 Attitudes to speeding

The survey included a series of statements about speed, to which respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed. There was a perception that exceeding the speed limit is a widespread phenomenon:

- In total, 85% agreed that most drivers will drive a bit over the speed limit if they think it is safe (26% agreed strongly, 60% agreed) and 82% agreed that they knew someone who breaks the speed limit (Figure 5.1, and Tables A1.52 and A1.54).

- Furthermore, the majority of respondents (69%) agreed that it is sometimes difficult to keep to the speed limit (Table A1.55).

However, in general, there was also recognition of the dangers of speeding:

- Fifty-five per cent strongly agreed that greater speed increases the likelihood of a serious injury in the event of an accident. In total, 89% agreed with this statement and only 5% disagreed (Table A1.53).

- The overwhelming majority (82%) disagreed that people should be able to drive as fast as they feel safe to, indicating an acceptance of the need for speed limits (Table A1.58).

- Two-thirds (67%) agreed that people should always stay within the speed limit and just 12% disagreed. (This is lower than the figure seen in British Social Attitudes 2009, where 92% of respondents agreed that people should drive within the speed limit (NatCen, 2010).) Furthermore, more respondents on the Omnibus survey disagreed (48%) than agreed (30%) with the statement that drivers should keep up with the traffic even if it is above the speed limit (Tables A1.56 and A1.57).

Previous Department for Transport research (Stradling et al., 2008) has explored behaviours related to (aspects of) speeding, such as speeding knowledge, attitudes and changes in behaviour, including exploring in more detail the issue of inappropriate high speed.20

20 Stradling et al. (2008) concluded that a substantial number of drivers report that they often break speed limits of 30, 60 and 70 mph, and a not insignificant minority break speed limits excessively, and they attempted to construct a typology of speeders.
Responses to each of the statements are shown separately among drivers who reported having driven over the speed limit (at least once or twice in the last 12 months) and those who did not are shown in Figure 5.2:

- Perhaps understandably, those who had themselves exceeded the speed limit were more likely to agree that it is sometimes difficult to keep to the speed limit and were much less likely to agree that drivers should always keep to the speed limit compared with both those who had not broken the speed limit and non-drivers.

- Nonetheless, it is interesting that even among those who had themselves broken the speed limit, more than half (58%) agreed that drivers should always stay within the limit (Table A1.57).

Those that had broken the speed limit were also comparatively more likely to agree that most drivers exceeded the speed limit (91% agreed) and that they knew someone who broke the speed limit (91%; Tables A1.52 and A1.54). This is consistent with the findings described in Section 3, where it was shown that most drivers had driven over the limit.
5.2 Nature of speeding on 30 mph and 60 mph roads

Drivers were asked how often in the preceding 12 months they had driven above the speed limit; firstly on a 30 mph road in an urban or residential area and, secondly, on a 60 mph single-carriageway rural road. The results are shown in Figure 5.3 (see also Tables A1.59 and A1.60):

- Speeding on 30 mph roads was more common than on 60 mph roads – a third (33%) of respondents said they had driven above the limit very often or fairly often on 30 mph roads and 21% had done so on 60 mph roads.

- The widespread occurrence of speeding is illustrated by the fact that most drivers (89%) had broken the limit at least once or twice on a 30 mph road, with 73% having done so on a 60 mph road.

This is consistent with other research. Department for Transport statistics on free-flow traffic speeds show that car drivers are more likely to exceed the speed limit on 30 mph roads than on 60 mph single-carriageways (48% and 9%, respectively; Department for Transport, 2009; Section 4).

See, for example, the RAC Report on Motoring 2010 (Spero, 2010; p. 31), the THINK! annual tracking survey (Angle et al., 2009; pp. 13 and 51) and SARTRE 3 (SARTRE 3 consortium, 2004; Chapter 3).
Men were slightly more likely than women to report driving above the speed limit:

- Ninety-two per cent of men said that they had exceeded the limit on 30 mph roads at least once or twice compared with 86% of women (Table A1.59).
- For 60 mph roads, the figures were 79% and 66% respectively (Table A1.60).

Figure 5.4 shows the proportion of respondents in different age groups who reported driving above the speed limit either fairly often or very often in the previous 12 months:

- Younger respondents were more likely to report driving above the speed limit. Two-fifths (40%) of 16–34-year-olds admitted to having done so on a 30 mph road. This decreased steadily with age to 20% among those aged 65 or over.
- Responses for 60 mph roads follow a similar pattern, decreasing from 32% to 9% respectively.

Figure 5.5 shows the reasons given for exceeding the speed limit by those respondents who reported driving above the limit at least once or twice in the last 12 months:

- Keeping up with other traffic was mentioned by 35% for 30 mph roads and 40% for 60 mph roads (Tables A1.61 and A1.62).
- A lack of awareness was also a factor, with 35% and 30% respectively saying that they had not seen a sign or were not familiar with the road.
- A considerable minority (18% and 27% for 30 mph and 60 mph roads, respectively) believed it safe to drive faster (than the speed limit).
Figure 5.4: Percentage driving above the speed limit very or fairly often on 30 mph and 60 mph roads in the last 12 months all drivers by age group

Source: NatCen Omnibus survey, 2010. Unweighted base = 219 (16 to 34), 206 (35 to 44), 221 (45 to 54), 201 (55 to 64), 190 (65 or over).

Figure 5.5: Reasons for driving above speed limit on 30 mph and 60 mph roads all drivers who reported driving above the limit at least once or twice in the last 12 months

Of those that reported driving above the speed limit on 30 mph roads, over half (53%) said that they usually did so by less than 5 mph, and a further 43% by between 5 and 10 mph above the limit (Figure 5.6). Just 3% reported usually going over the limit by more than 10 mph (Table A1.63). On 60 mph roads, just over a third (37%) reported usually going less than 5 mph above the limit, and 54% usually between 5 and 10 mph above the limit; 9% said that they usually exceeded the limit by 10 mph or more (Table A1.64).

Among the respondents that said they had driven above the speed limit on a 60 mph road, men reported going over the limit by a greater margin than women, on average (Figure 5.7):

- 46% of women usually drove less than 5 mph above the speed limit when they exceeded it, whereas this was 30% among men; and
- conversely 59% of men usually drove between 5 and 10 mph above the speed limit compared with 49% of women.

The respondents who had gone over the speed limit on each of the types of road were asked under what circumstances they were most likely to do so. They were able to give more than one answer from a list:

- The most frequently mentioned reason given by the respondents was travelling on roads that they knew well (61% and 69% for 30 mph roads and 60 mph roads, respectively; Figure 5.8, and Tables A1.65 and A1.66).
Figure 5.7: How far above the speed limit do respondents usually go when over the 60 mph limit – drivers who reported driving above the speed limit at least once or twice in last 12 months


- Slightly less than half (46% and 45% on 30 mph roads and 60 mph roads, respectively) mentioned ‘if there is not much traffic on the road’.
- Other frequently cited circumstances were if they were in a hurry, driving alone, good weather conditions, if other traffic is exceeding the limit, and a lack of pedestrians or cyclists (Figure 5.8).

Figure 5.8: Circumstances when most the respondents were likely to go over the speed limit on 30 mph and 60 mph roads – drivers who reported driving above the speed limit at least once or twice in last 12 months


5.2.1 Punishments for speeding

All drivers in the sample were asked about punishments received for speeding. The respondents could choose more than one answer (Tables 5.1 and A1.67):
• just under a fifth (17%) of drivers said that they had received some form of punishment for breaking the speed limit in the previous three years (Table A1.67);\(^{22}\) and

• for most, this was either a fine (8%) or penalty points (12%) – 4% had attended a speed awareness course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Whether respondents had received any punishment for breaking the speed limit in past three years</th>
<th>all drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty points on licence</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended speed awareness course</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified from driving</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received any punishment</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5.9 shows how the percentage of drivers that reported that they had received any punishment as a result of breaking the speed limit varies among different age groups. Earlier in this section, it was shown that younger respondents were the age group most likely to report driving above the speed limit very or fairly often (see

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 5.9: Percentage of drivers who have received punishment for breaking the speed limit in the last three years</th>
<th>all drivers by age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: NatCen Omnibus survey, 2010. Unweighted base = 219 (16 to 34), 206 (35 to 44), 221 (45 to 54), 202 (55 to 64), 191 (65 or over).

\(^{22}\) This is broadly in line with the THINK! annual tracking survey (Angle et al., p. 60), where 11% of the respondents had received a fine for speeding in the last three years.
Figure 5.4). Yet, as is shown in Figure 5.9, this group is among those least likely to report having received a punishment. Just 13% of those aged 16 to 34 said that they had received a punishment for breaking the speed limit compared with 23% among those aged 35 to 44. This may be related to a willingness to report having received a punishment, rather than whether a punishment was actually received.
6 RESTRAINT USE

This section covers questions asking about attitudes towards the use of restraints (i.e. seat belts), and the circumstances in which those who do not always wear restraints choose not to wear them. The questions covered in this section were asked using computer-assisted self-interviewing (CASI) – the respondents were asked to enter answers on a computer, with the interviewer being unable to see the responses provided.

6.1 Attitudes to seat-belt wearing

Seat-belt wearing for adults in all car seats has been legally enforceable since 1991. The respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed with a series of statements about seat-belt use. As shown in Figure 6.1, there was widespread acceptance of the purpose of seat belts:

- The majority (87%) of adults disagreed that if you drive carefully, seat belts are not necessary (Table A1.68).
- Nearly all (95%) felt that seat belts reduce the risk of serious injury for drivers and passengers (Table A1.69).
- Ninety per cent disagreed that seat belts are not necessary if the car has airbags (Table A1.73).
- The majority (91%) felt that it was the driver’s responsibility to make sure that everyone in their car is wearing a seat belt, and only a minority (12%) agreed that people should be free to choose to wear a belt or not (Tables A1.72 and A1.74).
- However, 43% of respondents reported knowing people who do not always wear a seat belt when driving, and 41% felt that wearing a seat belt carried the risk of trapping you in the event of an emergency (Tables A1.70 and A1.71).

As was seen in Section 2, 15% of drivers reported that they had not worn a seat belt at least once or twice in the past 12 months, as had 18% of passengers (Tables A1.30 and A1.31). The Department for Transport has commissioned more detailed qualitative research into seat-belt wearing (Strapping Yarns: Why People Do and Do Not Wear Seat Belts (Christmas et al., 2008)), which explored reasons for wearing/not wearing seat belts in more depth. The results presented here are broadly in line with the results of this more detailed research (which estimated, for example, that 14% of the adult population are inconsistent seat-belt wearers). Christmas et al. (2008) explore in more detail the reasons why people choose not to wear seat belts.


24 This is echoed in SARTRE 3 findings, where only 11% agreed that ‘seat belts are not necessary if drive carefully’ (SARTRE 3 consortium, 2004; p. 78).
Figure 6.1: Extent of agreement with statements about seat-belt use all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you drive carefully, seat belts are not necessary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat belts reduce the risk of serious injury for drivers and passengers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people I know do not always wear a seat belt when driving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a risk of being trapped by a seat belt in case of emergency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers should make sure everyone in their car is wearing a seat belt</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there are airbags in a car seat belts are not necessary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should be free to choose if they wear a seat belt or not</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 6.2 shows the difference in attitudes towards seat-belt wearing by drivers or passengers who reported having not worn a seat belt at least once or twice in the past 12 months, those who reported always wearing a seat belt, and non-drivers/passengers:

- As might be expected, those who did not always wear a seat belt were more likely to agree that if you drive carefully seat belts are not necessary (16%) than those who always wore a belt (8%; Table A1.68).
- Those who do not always wear a seat belt were also more likely to agree that a seat belt might trap someone (53%) than those who always wear a belt (37%; Table A1.71).
- Nonetheless, a sizeable majority (83%) of sometime non-seat-belt wearers felt that it was the driver’s responsibility to make sure that everyone in their car is wearing a seat belt, though this was lower than for those who always wear a seat belt (93%; Table A1.72).
- Perhaps the most telling difference between the two groups is that those who had not worn a seat belt were more likely to agree that people should be free to

25 Again, drivers are defined as those reporting that they had driven a car in the last 12 months. Passengers are those who reported that they travelled as a car passenger.
choose whether they wear a seat belt or not (26% versus 7% of those who said they had always worn a seat belt).

Men (47%) were more likely than women (38%) to report knowing drivers who do not always wear a seat belt when driving (Table A1.70). Men were also slightly more likely to agree that people should be free to choose whether they wear a seat belt or not (14% compared with 9% of women; Table A1.74).

Younger respondents were the most likely to say that they know drivers who do not always wear a seat belt when driving (67%):

- this decreases steadily with age to just 23% among those in the oldest age group (Table A1.70 and Figure 6.3); and

- this pattern is in line with the fact that younger respondents are more likely to say that they have themselves not worn a seat belt when driving (Figure 3.7).
There were some differences between White and non-White respondents in terms of their attitudes towards seat-belt wearing:

- White respondents were more likely to disagree that driving carefully meant seat belts are unnecessary (88% compared with 75% of non-White respondents) and to disagree that airbags made seat belts unnecessary (91% and 83%, respectively; Tables A1.68 and A1.73);
- White respondents were also more likely to disagree that people should be free to choose if they wear a seat belt or not (82% compared with 72% among non-White respondents; Table A1.74); and
- non-White respondents were more likely to report knowing people who do not always wear a seat belt than those who were White (56% and 41%, respectively; Table A1.70).

### 6.2 Experiences of non-seat-belt wearers

As was shown in Section 3.2, 15% of drivers had driven while not wearing a seat belt in the last 12 months. This group was asked about these occasions. Half (53%) said that they had forgotten to wear the seat belt, while 37% had decided not to. Passengers were asked the same question: 49% had forgotten and 29% chose not to wear the seat belt (Tables A1.75 and A1.76).

These drivers and passengers were then asked about the circumstances under which they were most likely not to wear a seat belt. The most frequently mentioned answers are shown in Figure 6.4:
short journeys were frequently cited by both drivers and passengers (59% and 43%, respectively);

for drivers, other often-mentioned circumstances were travelling on roads you know well (32%), being in a hurry to get somewhere (24%) and when driving alone (20%; Table A1.77); and

for passengers, the most often mentioned circumstance was travelling in the rear-passenger seat (52%) – other common circumstances were travelling in the front-passenger seat (20%) and being in a hurry to get somewhere (19%; Table A1.78).

Of those who had travelled without wearing a seat belt as either a driver or passenger, 6% had been stopped by the police and 4% had received a fine (Table A1.79). This is consistent with other findings: the THINK! annual tracking survey reported that 1% received penalties for not wearing a seat belt in 2009 (down from 3% in 2008; see Angle et al., 2009; p. 59), while SARTRE 3 also found that 1% of UK respondents received a penalty for not wearing a seat belt (SARTRE 3 consortium, 2004; p. 82).
7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The data covered in this report provide a picture of views and experiences in relation to road safety in Britain, with a focus on driving behaviour. In general, the results from the Omnibus survey support those from other sources – there is little presented here that is at odds with the large volume of previous research in this area. This study does, however, provide a useful benchmark for assessing any changes over time, should the survey be repeated on the NatCen Omnibus in the future. Furthermore, because the survey covered both attitudes and behaviour, looking at these together has uncovered some interesting relationships between them.

7.1 Driver attitudes and behaviours

In general, most drivers view their own driving in a favourable light. The majority see themselves as safer than most other drivers, they sometimes get annoyed with others, and consider themselves to be law-abiding drivers. However, there were often discrepancies between respondents’ attitudes and their reported behaviours.

For example, although most drivers felt themselves to be law abiding, at least once or twice in the last 12 months most of these (89%) reported having driven over the speed limit. Similarly, of drivers who think they are safer than most, 89% said that they had driven over the speed limit at least once in the previous 12 months.

It is likely that some ‘risky’ behaviours, such as driving when over the legal alcohol limit or taking illegal drugs, are viewed as more dangerous than others, such as speeding or driving when tired and that this is reflected in the prevalence of such behaviours.

The respondents’ perceptions of the most frequent causes of road casualties are out of line with official statistics (Department for Transport, 2010a). While a third (30%) of respondents considered driving after drinking alcohol as the most frequent cause of accidents (and 61% included it in their top three causes), official statistics in 2008 showed that only 6% of casualties were in an accident involving a driver over the legal drink-drive limit.26 In fact, the most frequently recorded contributory factor to accidents (by the police attending the accident scene) was ‘failed to look properly’ (37% of accidents) and it may be the more prevalent, ‘less risky’ behaviours that contribute to this.

7.2 Speeding

There is evidence for a widespread disregard of speeding laws. The vast majority of drivers admitted to having exceeded the speed limit in the 12 months prior to

26 Note that the survey question referred to driving after drinking alcohol as opposed to being over the limit so these figures are not directly comparable.
interview. This is despite the fact that people seem well aware of the dangers of speeding, with the majority agreeing that greater speed increases the likelihood of serious injury. Furthermore, although in general people wanted to see greater enforcement of traffic laws and hasher penalties, views were much more mixed in relation to the issue of exceeding the speed limit.

7.3 Drinking and driving

In general, people have a negative view towards drinking and driving. Driving after drinking alcohol was considered by the majority of people to be the most common cause of road accidents and it was also the most frequently mentioned road safety issue for the Government to address. Furthermore, around half of respondents would like to see greater enforcement of drink-driving traffic law and harsher penalties. Despite this, around a third of drivers admitted to having driven after consuming one or two drinks and 7% had driven when over the legal limit (at least once or twice in the last 12 months).

Men were more likely than women to report driving after drinking and were also less likely than women to favour an outright ban on drinking and driving. Drinking and driving was also more prevalent among those on higher incomes and this group was also less likely to select driving after drinking alcohol as a common cause of accidents.

7.4 Restraint use

Again, although the vast majority recognise the purpose of seat belts, a notable minority had failed to wear them at least on some occasions. This is more so among younger age groups.

There is some evidence to suggest that people are more likely to engage in risky behaviours when they are not travelling far. Short journeys were frequently cited as a circumstance in which people might not wear a seat belt (also, among those who had driven when they thought they were over the legal alcohol limit, this was predominantly on shorter journeys).27

27 Although this latter finding is based on a small sample size, and so should be treated with caution.
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APPENDIX 1: Excel tables

These tables are available at http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/road safety/research/rsrr/theme5
APPENDIX 2: Driver behaviour module questionnaire

Travel behaviour
ASK ALL

Methods: Which methods of travel have you used in the past 12 months? Only include travel within Great Britain.

SHOWCARD
INTERVIEWER: INCLUDE TRAVEL FOR BOTH PERSONAL AND BUSINESS PURPOSES. IN RARE CIRCUMSTANCES THE RESPONDENT MAY BE HOUSEBOUND BECAUSE OF DISABILITY OR ILLNESS ETC. IF THEY HAVE NOT BEEN OUT IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS PLEASE USE THE APPROPRIATE CODE.
CODE ALL THAT APPLY
Car/van – as driver
Car/van – as passenger
Motorcycle/moped/scooter
Taxi/minicab
Bicycle
Bus (including coach/private bus/minibus)
Train
Underground/metro
Light rail/tram
Walk
Plane (domestic/internal flights)
HGV
Other vehicle
Not been out in the last 12 months (spontaneous only)

IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHODS
Drivfreq: How often do you travel by car or van as a driver?
SHOWCARD
Every day
More than twice a week, but not every day
Once or twice a week
Less than once a week, but more than twice a month
Once or twice a month
Less than once a month, but more than twice a year
Once or twice a year
Less than once a year
IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS PASSENGER AT METHDS
PassFreq: How often do you travel by car or van as a passenger?
SHOWCARD
Every day
More than twice a week, but not every day
Once or twice a week
Less than once a week, but more than twice a month
Once or twice a month
Less than once a month, but more than twice a year
Once or twice a year
Less than once a year

IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS
YearsExp: How many years’ car driving experience have you had? Please exclude times when you have not driven for periods of 3 months or more.
SHOWCARD
Less than one year
Between one and two years
Between two and three years
Between three and five years
Between five and ten years
More than ten years

IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS
MilesDrv: About how many miles have you personally driven in the last 12 months?
SHOWCARD
INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT IS UNSURE ASK THEM FOR THEIR BEST ESTIMATE
3,000 miles or less
3,001 to 5,000 miles
5,001 to 7,000 miles
7,001 to 10,000 miles
10,001 to 15,000 miles
15,001 miles or more

Driving style
ASK DRIVERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS
I am now going to read out a series of statements about driving. For each one please tell me how much you agree or disagree.

So firstly, how much do you agree or disagree with . . .

Stysafe: . . . I think I’m a safer driver than most
SHOWCARD
Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

**Styannoy:** . . . I sometimes get annoyed with other drivers
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Stypref:** . . . I prefer driving to being a passenger
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Stylawab:** . . . I consider myself to be a law abiding driver
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Stynerv:** . . . I am sometimes nervous driving
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Styfast:** . . . I enjoy driving fast
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**General views about road safety**
ASK ALL

**Causacc1:** Which of the factors on the card do you think is the most common cause of road accidents in this country?
SHOWCARD
Driving when tired
Driving after drinking alcohol
Following the vehicle in front too closely
Drivers exceeding the speed limit
Drivers going too fast for the conditions
Overtaking when it is dangerous
Taking illegal drugs and driving
Using a hand-held mobile phone while driving
Using a hands-free mobile phone while driving
Road users not paying enough attention to the road
Poorly maintained roads
Bad weather conditions
Other (please specify)
None of the above

**Causacc2:** And the second most common?
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Causacc3:** And the third most common?
SHOWCARD AGAIN
GovPol1: And looking at the issues on this card, which do you think is the most important for the Government to address to improve road safety?

SHOWCARD
Driving when tired
Drink driving
Exceeding the speed limit
Driving under influence of illegal drugs
Use of hand-held mobile phone
Use of a hands-free mobile phone
Not using seat belts/child restraints
Road users not paying enough attention to the road
Other dangerous or poor road-user behaviour (please specify)
Poor road conditions
Other (please specify)

GovPol2: And which do you think is the second most important?

SHOWCARD AGAIN

GovPol3: And the third most important?

SHOWCARD AGAIN

I am now going to read out some areas of road traffic law. For each one can you tell me whether you think the current level of policing enforcement is too high, about right or too low.

So, firstly, do you think the current level of policing enforcement is too high, about right or too low for...

Enfdrnk: . . . drink driving

SHOWCARD
Much too high
A little too high
About right
A little too low
Much too low
Don’t know (not on showcard)

EnfSpdlt: . . . exceeding the speed limit

SHOWCARD AGAIN

EnfMob: . . . using a hand-held mobile phone while driving/riding

SHOWCARD AGAIN

Enfdrug: . . . driving or riding under the influence of illegal drugs

SHOWCARD AGAIN

Enfdange: . . . driving or riding dangerously or carelessly

SHOWCARD AGAIN
This time I will read out some traffic offences. For each one please tell me whether you think that the penalties are too harsh, about right or too lenient?

So, firstly, do you think the penalties are too harsh, about right, or too lenient for . . .

**Pendrnk:** . . . drink driving
SHOWCARD
Much too harsh
A little too harsh
About right
A little too lenient
Much too lenient
Don’t know (not on showcard)

**PenSpeed:** . . . exceeding the speed limit
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**PenMob:** . . . using a hand-held mobile phone while driving
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Pendrug:** . . . driving under the influence of illegal drugs
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Pendange:** . . . driving dangerously or carelessly
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Driving experiences**
ASK DRIVERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS

I am now going to read out some things you may have done while driving. For each one, I would like you to tell me how often you have done them in the last 12 months.

So, firstly, in the last 12 months how often would you say you have . . .

**DTired:** . . . Driven when very tired
SHOWCARD
Very often
Fairly often
Occasionally
Once or twice
Never

**Dyellow:** . . . Parked on double yellow lines
SHOWCARD AGAIN

**Dovtake:** . . . Overtaken when you think you can just make it
SHOWCARD AGAIN
Dbelt: . . . Not worn a seat belt when driving
SHOWCARD AGAIN

Dmobile: . . . Used a hand-held mobile phone to speak or text
SHOWCARD AGAIN

D1or2dr: . . . Driven after drinking one or two alcoholic drinks
SHOWCARD AGAIN

Dovalc: . . . Driven when you think you have been over the legal limit for alcohol
SHOWCARD AGAIN

Ddrug: . . . Driven after taking an illegal drug
SHOWCARD AGAIN

Dspeed: . . . Driven over the speed limit, even if only by a bit
SHOWCARD AGAIN

ASK PASSENGERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS PASSENGER AT METHODS
Now thinking about travelling in a car as a passenger.

DPbelt: In the last 12 months how often would you say you have not worn a seat belt travelling in the car as a passenger?
SHOWCARD AGAIN

CASI SECTION

INTERVIEWER: READ OUT TO ALL:
The next questions are for you to answer yourself using the computer. The computer is very easy to use. Some of the questions are more personal and, this way, your answers will be completely confidential and I won’t see them. When you have finished, the whole section will get automatically locked up inside the computer so that I can’t look back at it.

SCAccept
INTERVIEWER CODE:
Respondent accepted CASI
CASI to be asked face to face by interviewer
Respondent refused CASI

IF (SCAccept = Accept) THEN
InPrac
It is very important that you answer honestly and accurately so please take your time.
Before you start I will show you how to enter your answers into the computer.

INTERVIEWER: Press 1 and Enter, then turn the screen to the respondent and let them enter their answers while you observe and help if necessary.

If at any point you would like to change your answers you can go back to previous questions using the arrow keys. If you need any further help or explanations, do ask the interviewer.
At this point the respondent answered a small number of dummy questions to learn how to enter responses into the computer.

**Restraint use**

ASK ALL

The next questions are about seat-belt use. Some people wear seat belts all the time when travelling by car, while others do not.

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about seat belts...

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

So, firstly, how much do you agree or disagree that...

- SbNec: ...If you drive carefully seat belts aren’t really necessary
- SBlnj: ...Seat belts reduce the risk of serious injury for drivers and passengers
- SBkno: ...Some people I know don’t always wear a seat belt when driving
- SBemrg: ...There is a risk of being trapped by the belt in case of emergency
- SBsure: ...Drivers should make sure everyone in their car is wearing a seat belt
- SBairbg: ...If there are airbags in a car seat belts are not necessary
- SBchoos: ...People should be free to choose if they wear a seat belt or not

ASK PASSENGERS WHO SAY DO NOT ALWAYS WEAR SEAT BELT WHEN TRAVELLING AS A PASSENGER — (Very often ... to Once or twice at DPBelt)

PBltfgt: Earlier you said that you sometimes don’t wear a seat belt when travelling as a car passenger. Is this mainly because you forget to do so or because you decide not to?

- Forget
- Decide not to
- Other

CrcPbl: Looking at the following circumstances, which ones are those in which you are most likely not to wear a seat belt as a passenger? Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number...

- Travelling in front passenger seat
- Travelling in rear passenger seat
- Travelling on roads you know well
- Travelling on roads you don’t know well
- If you are in a hurry to get somewhere
Short journeys (10 minutes or less)
Journeys of more than 10 minutes
Travelling on roads with speed limits of 40 mph or less
Travelling on roads with speed limits of 50 mph or more
At night
During the day
When being driven by a family member or partner
When being driven by a friend
If there are more than 2 people in the car
If others in the car are not wearing their seatbelts
Other circumstance (specify)
Varies

ASK DRIVERS WHO SAY DO NOT ALWAYS WEAR SEAT BELT WHEN DRIVING – (Very often . . . Once or twice at DBelt)

DBltfgt: And on the occasions you don’t wear a seatbelt as a driver is this mainly because you forget to do so or because you decide not to?

Forget
Decide not to
Other

CrcDBl: Looking at the following circumstances, which ones are those in which you are most likely not to wear a seat belt as a driver. Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number.

Travelling on roads you know well
Travelling on roads you don’t know well
If you are in a hurry to get somewhere
Short journeys (10 minutes or less)
Journeys of more than 10 minutes
Travelling on roads with speed limits of 40 mph or less
Travelling on roads with speed limits of 50 mph or more
At night
During the day
When driving alone
When driving your family or partner
When driving your friends
When there are more than 2 people in the car
If others in the car are not wearing their seat belt
Other circumstance (specify)
Varies
ASK ALL WHO SAY DO NOT ALWAYS WEAR SEAT BELT – (very often . . . once or twice at DPBelt OR very often . . . once or twice at DBelt)

BltPolic: In the last 3 years have you been stopped by the police or fined for not wearing a seat belt? Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number . . .

Yes – stopped by the police
Yes – fined
No

Speed

ASK ALL

The next few questions are about how fast people drive

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how fast people drive . . .

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

So, firstly, how much do you agree or disagree that . . .

Spbitovr: . . . Most drivers will drive a bit over the speed limit if they think it is safe

SpInj: . . . The faster the speed the more likely that someone will suffer a serious injury in an accident

SpKnowbk: . . . People I know sometimes break the speed limit when driving

SpDiff: . . . It is sometimes difficult to keep to the speed limit

SpKeepup: . . . Drivers should keep up with the traffic flow even if it is above the limit

SpAlwys: . . . Drivers should always stay within the speed limit

SpFree: . . . People should be free to drive as fast as they feel safe to
ASK DRIVERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS
Brk30: How often in the last 12 months would you say that you have driven above the speed limit when driving on a 30 mph road in an urban or residential area, even if only by a little?
Very often
Fairly often
Occasionally
Once or twice
Never

ASK IF SPEEDED IN 30 MPH AREA (VERY OFTEN . . . ONCE OR TWICE AT BRK30)
Reas30: On the occasions you have driven above the speed limit on these types of roads would you say it is mainly because you . . .?
Please type in the number next to the statement which most applies to you
Don’t see the sign until too late/were not familiar with the road
You find it difficult to keep the car’s speed down
You are keeping up with other traffic
You believe it is safe to drive faster
You don’t think you will be caught
Or for some other reason (specify)?

Abv30: When you have been over the speed limit on these roads how far above the limit would you say you usually go . . .
Less than 5 mph above the limit
5 to 10 mph above the limit
or more than 10 mph above the limit?

Circ30: Under what circumstances are you most likely to go over the speed limit on a 30 mph road?
Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number
Travelling on roads you know well
Travelling on roads you don’t know well
If you are in a hurry to get somewhere
At night
During the day
When driving alone
When driving your family or partner
When driving your friends
If there is not much traffic on the road
If there are no pedestrians or cyclists around
If other traffic on the road is going above the speed limit
If the weather conditions are good
Other circumstance (specify)
Varies
ASK DRIVERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS

Brk60: How often in the last 12 months would you say that you have driven above the speed limit on a 60 mph single-carriageway rural road, even if only by a little?
Very often
Fairly often
Occasionally
Once or twice
Never

ASK IF SPEEDED IN 60 MPH AREA (VERY OFTEN . . . ONCE OR TWICE AT BRK60)

Reas60: On the occasions you have driven above the speed limit on these types of roads would you say it is mainly because you . . . ?
Please type in the number next to the statement which most applies to you
Don’t see the sign until too late/were not familiar with the road
You find it difficult to keep the car’s speed down
You are keeping up with other traffic
You believe it is safe to drive faster
You don’t think you will be caught
Or for some other reason (specify)

Abv60: When you do go over the speed limit on these roads how far above the limit would you say you usually go . . . ?
Less than 5 mph above the limit
5 to 10 mph above the limit
or more than 10 mph above the limit?

Circ60: Under what circumstances are you most likely to go over the speed limit on a 60 mph rural road? Please type in the number of every one that applies.
You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number
Travelling on roads you know well
Travelling on roads you don’t know well
If you are in a hurry to get somewhere
At night
During the day
When driving alone
When driving your family or partner
When driving your friends
If there is not much traffic on the road
If there are no pedestrians or cyclists around
If other traffic on the road is going above the speed limit
If the weather conditions are good
Other circumstance (specify)
Varies
ASK DRIVERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS
SpdPun: In the last 3 years have you been fined, received penalty points, attended a speed awareness course or received any other punishment for breaking the speed limit?
Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number
No
Fine
Penalty points on licence
Attended speed awareness course
Disqualified from driving
Other (specify)

Drink driving

ASK ALL
The next few questions are about driving after drinking alcohol.

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about driving after drinking alcohol. . .?
Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree

So, firstly, how much do you agree or disagree that . .

DDUnder: . . .Most drivers will drive after drinking alcohol if they think they are under the limit

DD1or2OK: . . .Having one or two alcoholic drinks doesn’t make drivers more likely to crash

DDknowlm: . . .People I know sometimes drive when they might be over the limit

DDdiffkn: . . .It is difficult to know how much alcohol you can drink and be safe

DDnotany: . . .Drivers should not drink any alcohol before driving

DDfree: . . .People should be free to judge how much they can safely drink
ASK ALL DRIVERS WHO HAD DRIVEN AFTER A FEW DRINKS – ALL WHO SAY THEY HAVE DRIVEN AT LEAST ONCE OF TWICE AFTER ONE OR TWO ALCOHOLIC DRINKS AT D1OR2DR

Alcconf: Earlier you said you have [textfill – driven after drinking one or two alcoholic drinks]. On the last occasion you did this how confident were you that you were under the drink-drive alcohol limit?

Very confident
Fairly confident
Not very confident
Not at all confident

ASK DRIVERS WHO SAID:
– DRIVEN WHEN THOUGHT OVER LIMIT AT (VERY OFTEN .. .ONCE OR TWICE AT DOVALC) OR
– SAID NOT VERY OR NOT AT ALL CONFIDENT AT ALCCONF

WhDrnk: Thinking about the last time you drove when you thought you may have been over the legal alcohol limit. Where had you been drinking before you drove?

Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number

At home
At someone else’s home
In a pub/pubs
In a restaurant
In a nightclub/club
Outside in a public place (e.g. park, street)
Other – please specify

Howfar: About how far did you drive on this occasion?

Less than 1 mile
1 mile but less than 5 miles
5 miles but less than 10 miles
10 miles but less than 15 miles
More than 15 miles

WhyDD: Why did you drive on this occasion?

Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number

Thought I was under the legal drink-drive limit at the time
I felt safe to drive
No other means of transport available
Alternative transport was too inconvenient
Alternative transport was too expensive
I did not think I would get caught
I was too drunk to think about it
Other – please specify
CircDD: And, in general, under what circumstances are you most likely to drive when you may be over the drink-drive limit? Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number

- Travelling on roads you know well
- Travelling on roads you don’t know well
- Short journeys (10 minutes or less)
- Journeys of more than 10 minutes
- Travelling on roads with speed limits of 40 mph or less
- Travelling on roads with speed limits of 50 mph or more
- At night
- During the day
- When driving alone
- When driving your family or partner
- When driving your friends
- If there is not much traffic on the road
- If there are no pedestrians or cyclists around
- If there is no other transport available
- Other circumstance (specify)
- Varies

ASK ALL DRIVERS WHO HAD DRIVEN AFTER A FEW DRINKS – ALL WHO SAY THEY HAVE DRIVEN AT LEAST ONCE OR TWICE … VERY OFTEN AT D1OR2DR

DrnkPun: In the last 3 years, have you been fined, been disqualified, or received any other punishment for drink driving? Please type in the number of every one that applies. You can type in more than one number by pressing the spacebar between each number

- No
- Fine
- Penalty points on licence
- Disqualified from driving for 1 year
- Disqualified from driving for more than 1 year
- Prison sentence
- Other (specify)

Knowledge and involvement in accidents

ASK DRIVERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS

AccInj: In the last 3 years, how many accidents, if any, have you been involved in, as the driver of a vehicle, in which someone, including yourself, was injured and received medical attention?

Press 0 for ‘none’

0 . . .20

Check if >5
ASK DRIVERS – IF TRAVELLED BY CAR AS DRIVER AT METHDS

AccNoInj: In the last 3 years, how many accidents have you been involved in, as the driver, where a vehicle was damaged but no-one was injured?
Press 0 for ‘none’
0 . . . 20
Check if >5
ASK ALL

NumCas: Finally, can I ask how many people do you think were killed or seriously injured in road accidents in Great Britain in 2009?
Less than 5,000
5,000 to 9,999
10,000 to 19,999
20,000 to 29,999
30,000 to 39,999
40,000 to 49,999
50,000 to 59,999
60,000 to 69,999
70,000 to 79,999
80,000 to 89,999
90,000 to 99,999
100,000 or more
Don’t know

END OF CASI SECTION
APPENDIX 3: NatCen Omnibus methodology

The NatCen Omnibus has been designed to carry questions for the Government, charities, academic institutions and other non-profit organisations interested in producing high-quality data on a range of social topics. It employs a stratified random probability sample and is conducted using computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI). This summary contains further details of the sample design and methods used to conduct the survey.

A3.1 Sample

The sample was obtained using a multi-stage sampling design. First, 153 postcode sectors were selected from the small users’ Postcode Address File (PAF). All sectors in mainland Great Britain (England, Wales and Scotland), excluding the area of Scotland north of the Caledonian Canal were covered.

Prior to selection, the postcode sectors had been ordered by Government Office Region (GOR);

• percentage of households where the household reference person was in National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC) categories 1–2, with variable banding used to create three equal-sized strata per GOR; and

• ranking by percentage of homes that were owner-occupied.

The sample of 153 postcode sectors was systematically selected from this list, with probability proportional to size.

Next, 20 addresses were sampled from the PAF from each selected postcode sector. This gave a total of 3,060 issued addresses, each selected with equal probability. A single adult (defined as anyone aged 16 or over) was then selected at random out of all adults residing at that address to take part in the survey.

A3.2 Questionnaire development

All questions were reviewed by the research team and then developed in collaboration with the sponsor before being programmed. The survey program was tested by the research and operations teams. Checks were made to ensure the accuracy and sense of questionnaire wording and response options, as well as the accuracy of showcard references. Scenarios were tested to ensure that routing was correct and that respondents would not be asked inappropriate questions dependent on the circumstances. There were also checks for screen layout, spelling and the clarity of instructions to interviewers.
A3.3 Fieldwork

Fieldwork began on Thursday 18 January and ended on Sunday 18 April 2010.

Interviews were carried out by NatCen interviewers using CAPI techniques. Computer-assisted interviewing improves data quality by including accurate routing to the relevant questions for a particular respondent and consistency checks on responses. All interviewers at NatCen receive extensive training in administering face-to-face surveys, including training in converting refusals at each address and, once an interview has been secured, asking questions in a non-biased way.

Interviewers were also briefed on the project to inform them of the particular survey procedures and content of the questionnaire. New interviewers attended a briefing in person. More experienced interviewers received a home-briefing pack and were asked to complete an assignment to ensure that they had taken the time to read their instructions and practise the questionnaire.

A letter was sent to each address in advance of the interviewer calling. The letter briefly described the purpose of the survey, the coverage of the questionnaire and reassured potential respondents that their answers would be treated in strict confidence. A £5 high street voucher was sent with every letter as an unconditional incentive to encourage participation in the survey. In this wave, a trial was conducted whereby half the sample received a £5 promissory note, redeemable on participating.

In order to improve responses, interviewers call at each address at least six times and up to a maximum of nine times, at different times of the day and at different times during the week. The first three calls must be made after 6 pm Monday to Thursday or at the weekend, when research has found that these are the optimum times for securing an interview. Interviewers recorded the time, date and outcome of all calls, and checks were made by field management. Non-contacts were not accepted unless the pattern, as well as the number of calls, conformed to the basic requirements that normally at least one call must be made at a weekend, and one on a weekday evening.

The average interview length was 32 minutes.

A3.4 Response

Interviewer progress was recorded and monitored using NatCen’s booking-in system.

The overall response rate was 55%, as shown in Table A3.1. The response rate is calculated as the number of achieved interviews as a percentage of the eligible sample.
Table A3.1: Response rate for Omnibus P2986 (Quarter 1 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issued addresses</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible addresses</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible addresses</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contacts</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-interview</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown eligibility (no contact)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown eligibility (contact)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive interviews</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3.5 Coding and editing

Interviewer checks in the CAPI program allow interviewers to clarify and query any data discrepancies directly with the respondent. The CAPI program applies range and consistency error checks, and both types of checks were used throughout the questionnaire. Where a check was triggered, the interviewer often opened and recorded a note explaining the respondent’s situation. These notes are recorded alongside the data and are reviewed by the project team in the operations department.

In-office coding and editing also took place on returned interviews. This involves a coder working through each interview in turn, using a modified version of the CAPI program. The coder reviewed all ‘other’ responses that had been entered to ensure that they could not be backcoded into any of the existing codes at that question.

In addition, there were open questions. The code frames used on this study were developed by the researchers from a listing of responses to the relevant questions from the first completed interviews.

In the course of the interview, where a respondent gave details of employment, this information was coded to the Standard Occupation classification – SOC (2000).

A3.6 Weighting

The weighting for the Omnibus survey consisted of two components: selection weights to correct for individuals’ differing probabilities of selection, and calibration weighting to adjust the weighted achieved sample to match population estimates.

A3.6.1 Selection weights

Selection weights are calculated to correct for the unequal probability of selection. In England and Wales each address on the PAF was equally likely to be selected, so a selection weight for the addresses was not needed. However, we interviewed only one adult per address so individuals in multi-occupied and large households would be under-represented in the final sample if this was not taken into account.

Individuals had been chosen by first choosing a dwelling unit out of all those in the address, and then choosing an adult at random from all those in the given dwelling...
unit. Thus, the correct selection weight is equal to the number of dwelling units at the chosen address multiplied by the number of adults identified at the dwelling unit.

A slightly different method was used for Scottish addresses, where the probability that an address is chosen was proportional to the Multiple Occupancy Index (MOI). Here the correct selection weight is equal to the number of dwelling units at the chosen address multiplied by the number of adults identified at the dwelling unit divided by the MOI.

A3.6.2 Calibration weights

The (weighted) achieved sample was then adjusted using calibration weighting so that the weighted distributions matched population totals. This reduces potential sample bias caused by any differential non-response between different groups and across regions. We calibrated to the marginal age/sex and GOR distribution, using the SAS macro CALMAR. In order to do this we needed to derive good estimates of the population size across region and age/sex group.

A3.6.2.1 The study population

The study population used in the Omnibus survey consists of every adult resident in an address covered by the PAF. In order to calibrate to this we need to know the population totals broken down by age/sex and GOR. The population totals we used were taken from the mid-year 2006 population totals supplied by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). The ONS totals refer to a slightly different population than the study population. For example, the study population excludes elderly people living in care homes (care homes are not included in the PAF), whereas the ONS estimated resident population of an area includes all people who usually live there. In order to obtain a good estimate for the population totals, we subtracted the estimated number of people living in care homes (based on 2005 estimates) from the ONS mid-year population estimates.

A3.6.2.2 Age bands

The achieved sample size was 1,538 responses. With this size of sample, bands of 10-year intervals were deemed appropriate. As the Omnibus survey defines an adult to be anyone aged 16 or over, we used the age bands 16–24, 25–34, 35–44 . . . 65–74, 75+. The estimated population size is given in Tables A3.2 and A3.3.

A3.6.3 Final weights

The calibration weights were then scaled to give the final weight. We scaled so that the sum of the final weights equalled the achieved sample size. These weights were checked for extreme values before being issued. A small number of large selection

29 Other methods such as scaling so they sum to the population size are equally valid, but our method has the advantage that, for any subgroup, the size of the weighted base will be approximately equal to the size of the unweighted base.
weights were trimmed. Trimming ensures that no individual has a disproportionately high influence on the survey estimates.

### A3.7 Datasets

Datasets include all questions included in each specific module, together with the standard classification variables.

Responses to multi-coded questions are stored as a series of dichotomous variables. Each variable corresponds to each separate answer category and is marked as either mentioned or not mentioned:

- **PSU_ID** identifies separate primary sampling units (postcode sectors); and
- **STRATUM** identifies separate sampling strata.