6j/60

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

FEDERAL OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY

DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL INFORMATION

Report No.	Date	Pages	ISBN	ISSN
CR52	OCT 1986	63	0 642 513708	OR = 0158-3077 CR = 0810-770 X

Title and Subtitle SURVEY OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDES: FORS ROAD SAFETY RESEARCH PROJECT

Author(s) TOUCHE ROSS SERVICES PTY

Performing Organisation (Name and Address) TOUCHE ROSS SERVICES PTY
RIALTO 525 COLLINS STREET
MELBOURNE VIC 3000

Sponsor (Name and Address) FEDERAL OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY
GPO BOX 594
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Available from (Name and Address) Price/Availability/Format

Federal Office of Road Safety

Abstract

Touche Ross Services was commissioned by FORS to develop core questions and administrative mechanisms for running bi-annual, national surveys on community attitudes to road safety, and to administer the first survey. This is a report of results from the first survey. Issues covered in the survey include drink driving, causes of crashes, safe driving skills, urban vs rural crash risk, perceptions of police enforcement, etc.

KEYWORDS: COMMUNITY ATTITUDES, PERCEPTIONS, SURVEYS, ROAD SAFETY

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDES: FORS ROAD SAFETY RESEARCH PROJECT

CONDUCTED JUNE 1986

BY

TOUCHE ROSS SERVICES PTY

OCTOBER 1986

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Touche Ross Services was commissioned by the Federal Office of Road Safety to develop core questions and administrative mechanisms for running bi-annual, national surveys on community attitudes to road safety and to administer the first survey.

The concept for an ongoing monitor arose from the fact that there was a paucity of trend data concerning community attitudes towards road safety. The study data therefore was to be used to assess changes in attitudes in response to changes in legislation, media campaigns, price changes and so on. In addition it would be used to evaluate the success of counter-measures, to identify new areas for intervention, and to allow comparisons between jurisdictions to be made.

The objectives of the study as defined in the original research brief were to:

- establish an on-going system for monitoring community attitudes to key issues in road safety;
- assess the importance of road safety on the community agenda;
- develop a basic set of questions to enable trends analysis and;
- develop an infrastructure for feeding in topical, one-off questions to the survey.

The development of the core questions was undertaken through a multi stage programme involving:

- desk research and preparation of a "Key issues" paper;
- development of draft questions in consultation with FORS;
- conduct of personal interviews in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide during which the draft core questions were evaluated;

- revision of the core questions based upon evaluation interviews;

- consultation with State and Territory Road Safety Authorities

- pilot study in Victoria and Queensland to verify interview content, length and administrative procedures;

- finalization of the core questions;

- preparation of the sampling methodology and analysis specifications.

Agreement on the core question design and other administrative matters was reached during May 1986. The first wave of the study involving the conduct of 1,000 telephone interviews throughout Australia was undertaken during early June. In this report we outline the conduct of this Wave 1 study and detail and comment upon the study findings.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of the first wave of what is proposed as an ongoing bi-annual monitor of community attitudes to road safety. The questions used were developed in conjunction with the Federal Office of Road Safety (FORS) and in consultation with road safety authorities throughout Australia. While it is intended that future monitors may well incorporate questions commissioned by the individual State road safety authorities, in this instance, the study comprised only the "core" questions developed to meet FORS requirements. Extensive computer analysis of the data was undertaken and computer tables provided to FORS. In this report, to facilitate state by state comparisons, major emphasis in presentation of the results has been placed upon State analysis.

It is apparent that while road safety and drink driving are issues on the community agenda, they are considered of less importance than issues relevant to the economy and unemployment. Having been given the opportunity to mention up to two issues in total, when all issues mentioned were taken into account, only 6% mentioned drink driving and road safety compared with 30% mentioning each of unemployment and economic issues. If drink driving and road safety are taken together, they ranked seventh on the "community agenda" of total issues.

Aided awareness of FORS was 19%, with awareness being highest in New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory.

The most frequently cited cause of crashes, mentioned by two fifths of respondents was drink driving. Mention of this factor was highest in Northern Territory, Western Australia and Queensland. It is interesting that in the latter two states, random breath testing does not apply. Speed was the next most frequently cited reason given by a fifth of respondents. Other major causes were careless and negligent driving, inattention and lack of concentration.

Given the chance to mention up to three causes of road crashes, virtually three quarters of respondents mentioned drink driving. Thus, while road safety and drink driving are not high on the "community agenda" drink driving is seen to be clearly implicated in road crashes.

Three skills were singled out as being the most important in terms of driving safely. In total, two thirds of respondents mentioned alertness/reaction time, concentration and care/patience. While a range of other skills were mentioned, none was mentioned by more than 8% of respondents.

Opinions are divided concerning whether crash risk is higher in the city or country. Approximately two in five felt there was most risk in built up areas of cities and an equivalent proportion considered the greater risk was on open country roads. No clear picture emerged of any group being more conscious of risk in one location compared with another.

With regard to perceptions of police enforcement, it is apparent that about three in five people consider the most frequent reason for being stopped by the police is speed or excessive speed. The major variation to this belief was in Tasmania where opinions were divided between speeding and random breath tests. Forty six percent of Tasmanians mentioned either random breath testing or drink driving. This compares with 17% for Australia as a whole.

The respondents included in the study were very favourably predisposed to random breath testing with virtually nine out of ten agreeing with the practice. In Victoria, agreement was almost universal whereas in Western Australia and Queensland, the two States without random breath testing, there was a slightly less favourable reaction than in other jurisdictions. Given the chance to choose between the alternative of random breath tests among all drivers or breath tests for only those who seemed drunk, three quarters of Australians favoured the former.

Those respondents in the study who were drivers were asked to indicate their behaviour with regard to drinking and driving. Approximately 20% claimed not to drink at any time and a further 30% maintained that if they drove they did not drink. The remaining fifty percent of respondents maintained they restricted their drinking when driving. Twenty percent of Queenslanders and West Australians indicated that they would change their behaviour if random breath testing were introduced. This paralleled the 20% in the other States who claimed to have altered their drinking and driving behaviour when random breath tests were introduced.

When considering road users whom drivers are most cautious about, opinion was evenly divided among each of four categories namely, adult cyclists, motor cyclists, car drivers and trucks. Pedestrians emerged as most vulnerable as only 12% of respondents identified them as worthy of caution.

With regard to driving at the speed limit or choosing a speed at which the driver felt safe, virtually three in five respondents opted for the latter. A definite difference in response between males and females was apparent.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A copy of the full questionnaire is included in Appendix A. The rationale for each question is explained below to place the questions in context.

Q.1.a. What issue facing the Australian community today is of most importance to you?

Q.1.b. What is the next most important issue of concern to you?

Question 1.a/b endeavour to establish whether road safety is an item on the community agenda. Framing the question to ascertain issues of concern was difficult. To a degree, the question suffers from time related issues in that any item which has been particularly prominent in the media could be mentioned. Since the study was being undertaken using the telephone, the use of prompt cards was precluded. Thus the question provides a completely unaided view of the relative importance of road safety on the community agenda and was asked before the respondent knew that the survey was being run for FORS. The way in which the issues change over time will provide a broad indicator of community concerns.

Q.2. In fact the issue which we are mainly talking about, is that of road safety. The survey is being conducted on behalf of the Federal Office of Road Safety or FORS in Canberra. Had you heard of the Federal Office of Road Safety before today?

Question 2 provides a measure of aided awareness of FORS. Over time, the growth or decline of awareness can be measured and possibly related to major publicity and/or media campaigns.

Q.3.a. What factor do you think most often leads to road crashes?

Q.3.b. What other factors are there?

Question 3. a/b measure beliefs concerning factors leading to road crashes. It is expected that the information gained can be used in the development of priorities for educational media campaigns. Thereafter, the effectiveness of media campaigns in alerting the community to hazardous factors can be monitored.

Q.4. What is the most important skill or ability required of a driver to drive safely?

Question 4 identifies beliefs about the skills or abilities required for safe driving. Again the movement of beliefs over time can be monitored and can be related to media campaigns and educational programs.

Q.5. On a journey involving driving in the built up areas of cities and open country roads where do you think a driver would be most at risk of having an accident?

Question 5 was developed through consideration being given by FORS to the conduct of a research assignment into the risk of crashes in the city versus the country.

Q.6. For what reason do you think motorists are most often stopped by the police?

Question 6 measures the community's perception of the direction of police enforcement of road rules.

Q.7. Do you agree with the random breath testing of drivers?

Question 7 measures the level of agreement with the random breath testing of drivers. Responses from those States where random breath testing does not exist, (ie. Queensland and Western Australia) can be compared with other jurisdictions to ascertain if differing views are dependent upon local legislation. The effect upon community opinion of changes of random breath testing activity can be measured over time.

Q.8. Do you think breath tests for blood alcohol should be taken only for drivers who seem drunk or do you favour breath test at random among all drivers?

Question 8 is included to provide a check against which to verify the results of Q.7. It allows a choice between two different breath testing methods.

Q.9.a. **Do you personally have a current driver or motorcycle licence or permit?**

Q.9.b. **Have you ever had a driver or motorcycle licence?**

Q.9.c. **What licence or licences do you hold/have you held?**

Question 9.a/b/c establish if respondents hold a driving licence. This information is necessary for establishing the respondent's driving orientation and to act as a screening question for subsequent questions dealing with drink driving.

Q.10. **Which of the following statements describes you with regard to drinking and driving?**

I don't drink at any time.

If I am driving, I don't drink.

If I am driving I restrict what I drink.

If I am driving I don't restrict what I drink.

Question 10 establishes personal behaviour with regard to drink driving and can be used to monitor if this behaviour changes over time.

Q.11.a. Queensland and Western Australia only

If random breath testing was introduced, would you change your drinking and driving behaviour from that which you have just told me?

Q.11.b. All other States

Is what you have just told me about your drinking and driving behaviour the same as what you would have said before random breath testing was introduced?

Question 11.a/b measures if there is a change in behaviour with regard to drink driving dependent upon drink driving control activity.

Q.12. **When you are driving, other than children, which kind of other road users are you most cautious about?**

Question 12 establishes which groups of road users drivers perceive as requiring the most caution. The information can be used, over time to measure the effectiveness of campaigns which might be addressed to the issue.

Q.13. When you choose a speed at which to drive, if there is no other traffic around, do you generally drive at?

Question 13 measures behaviour with regard to speed and can again be used, over time, to monitor changes in behaviour dependent upon different programs.

DEMOGRAPHICS

A. How long have you had/did you hold your licence or permit?

Demographic A is a broad measure of driving experience and can be used to establish whether attitudes and behaviour differ with the length of time a licence has been held.

B. Do you drive more often than twice a week?

Demographic B is a broad measure of driving frequency to establish whether behaviour and attitudes differ with frequency of driving.

C. How old are you?

Demographic C requires the individuals' exact age to facilitate further subgroup analysis as required.

D. Are you male or female?

Demographic D, the respondent's sex has been established to provide additional demographic information if required.

E. And what is your usual occupation?

Demographic E relates to occupation and has been established to facilitate analysis based upon socio-economic status.

F. **And what is the highest level of education you have reached?**

Demographic F relates to educational level and provides another opportunity for additional analysis.

G. **And the post code where you live?**

Demographic G concerns Postcode data and was collected to enable separation of respondents into State capital and other subgroups.

H. **And finally have you ever been involved in a road accident? ***

I. **During the past three years have you been in a road accident in which someone was injured?**

J. **How many accidents was that?**

Demographics H/I/J relate to involvement in road crashes and the potential this may have had for affecting attitudes.

OTHER ISSUES

A number of other issues relevant to road safety had been identified and discussed during the development of the core questions but were not included owing to limits upon the length of the questionnaire.

---

* Although FORS endorses the use of the term 'road crashes' rather than 'road accidents', it was necessary to use the latter term for this questionnaire in the interests of achieving maximum understanding by respondents.

STUDY METHODOLOGY AND TIMING

SAMPLE DEVELOPMENT

The study involved the conduct of 1,000 telephone interviews with respondents aged 15 and over. In order to gain reasonable sample sizes, allocation of the interviews was balanced across the States and Territories. Critical aspects of the study methodology were that:

- the interviews were distributed proportional to the population in the State capital and the rest of the State or Territory;

- age quotas proportional to population characteristics were used. Population figures were from ABS estimates of population at the 1981 census.

In Table I, the sample distribution and the age quotas utilized are detailed.

TABLE I. SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION AND QUOTAS

	Number of ints.	Population Proportion %	15 - 24 Years # of ints.	25 - 39 Years # of ints.	40 + Years # of ints.
NEW SOUTH WALES	150				
Sydney	92	61.2	21	28	43
Rest of NSW	58	38.8	13	18	27
VICTORIA	150				
Melbourne	104	69.0	24	32	48
Rest of VIC	46	31.0	11	14	21
QUEENSLAND	150				
Brisbane	66	43.9	16	20	30
Rest of QLD	84	56.1	20	26	38
SOUTH AUSTRALIA	150				
Adelaide	106	70.7	25	31	50
Rest of SA	44	29.3	10	13	21
WESTERN AUSTRALIA	150				
Perth	104	69.1	25	34	45
Rest of WA	46	30.9	11	15	20
TASMANIA	100				
Hobart	39	39.4	9	12	18
Rest of TAS	61	60.6	15	18	28
NORTHERN TERRITORY	100				
Darwin	50	50.1	14	22	14
Rest of NT	50	49.9	14	22	14
ACT	50	100	12	20	18

The sample frame utilised was the latest white pages telephone directory for the area under consideration. This provides the best possible sample frame though it is recognised that telephone sampling under-represents some population sub-groups such as those in rented accommodation and the young. The number of interviews to be gained from each telephone directory was established.

STUDY CONDUCT

Supervisors instructions which detailed the rational for the study, telephone book sampling methodology and quotas were prepared. The telephone book sample procedure is included in Appendix A. Interviewers instructions were also prepared and are incorporated in Appendix A together with the questionnaire.

Interviewers were personally briefed by their supervisors and each interviewer's work subjected to 10% audit. Interviewing was undertaken over the period 30 May - 3 June. Interviews were conducted during the day and evening at the weekend and in the evenings only on weeknights. Through the system of quotas more interviews than were required were obtained in some locations. The final sample size was 1,033 interviews.

Upon completion of auditing, the questionnaires were edited for completeness and passed through for coding, key punching and processing. The computer software package MICROTAB was utilized for the questionnaire analysis.

A field summary of calls and interviews achieved is included in Appendix B. From the summary it can be seen that overall interview achievement rate was 2.7 interviews per hour. However, State by State achievement varied from a high of 3.3 interviews per hour in South Australia to a low of 2.4 interviews per hour in Queensland. Completed interviews represented 28% of all calls attempted and 43% of households where contact was made. Some 22% of all calls made and 34% of households contacted were unsuitable since the quota had already been filled.

DETAILED FINDINGS

The results of the study are presented in this section. The computer tables upon which the report is based are too bulky to reproduce here, and any relevant tables are included.

It should be noted that the number of interviews (sample base) reported for some jurisdictions in the tables differs slightly from those in the field summary. This is due to the use during computer processing, of post codes to establish location. In some instances, for example Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales and Northern Territory, the postcode zones do not correspond exactly with the geographic region of the State or Territory. Hence the slight differences reported, none of which have any statistically significant effect on the results.

Throughout the tables in this section, data is presented, both weighted to Australia's total population aged 15 or over and unweighted. Weighting was carried out through calculation of a weighting factor for each age group within each State. Thus, the weighted data provides an indication of the responses for the Australian community as a whole and the unweighted for each relevant subgroup within the community. It should be noted that in view of the age quotas applied, the weighted data generally differs little from the unweighted data. Unless specifically indicated to the contrary, the discussion refers to unweighted data.

In considering these findings, it should be realised that many of the sample groups are small and thus have a large associated standard error.

A certain population of the total sample may have given a particular response to a question while within the total sample, sub-groups may have given different responses. However before any conclusions can be drawn, the statistical significance of these differences must be determined. MICROTAB has the facility to identify where a sub-group response differs significantly from that of the total sample (adjusted for the influence of the sub-group in question). Differences between sub-groups can also be calculated, the method is explained in Appendix C.

Differences can be considered signficant if they can be confidently expected to be reproduced on 95% or more of other sampling occasions, and are therefore highly likely (95% or more likely) to indicate a "real" difference in response. Thus, in the report, signficance is reported at 95%, 99% or 99.9% confidence levels (CL).

Note that with smaller sample sizes, tests of significance are less reliable, and results for small sub-groups must be treated with caution.

ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE

To ascertain if road safety was an item on the community agenda, respondents were asked to indicate the issue facing the Australian community which was of most concern to them. Subsequently they were able to indicate up to two additional issues of concern. Free response items were coded by interviewers into one of seventeen codes or listed as "something else". In Tables II and III, results for Australia as a whole and for each State and Territory are presented. Overall, some 7% of respondents were unable initially to indicate an issue and 22% were unable to give a second issue.

It can be seen from Table II that the two issues receiving almost equal mention as most important and accounting for 37% of responses were the economy/economic problems and unemployment/youth unemployment. Other issues being initially mentioned by 5% or more of respondents related to inflation/cost of living/taxes, drug taking/trafficking/alcohol abuse, war/nuclear war/atomic weapons and political parties/politics/government. Drink driving and the road toll/safety were mentioned initially by only 1% of respondents.

When respondents were prompted for additional issues of concern, the ranking of issues did not markedly change. Thus, in total, when all issues mentioned are considered (see Table IV), the economy and unemployment were each mentioned by 30% of respondents while inflation and drug taking issues were each mentioned by 18% of respondents. The issues of drink driving and road safety/toll were each mentioned by only 3% of respondents indicating that, road safety/drink driving does not come to mind as readily as unemployment and the economy when community issues of concern are raised.

Interestingly however, drink driving and road safety issues were mentioned by more respondents in Victoria (10%), Tasmania (15%), and Northern Territory (8%) than in other jurisdictions (1%-6%) and by women (7%), rather than men (5%), 17-19 year olds, 40-49 year olds (7% each), and those aged 60 plus (8%) rather than other age groups (4%-6%). Due to the small numbers involved, these figures can only be taken as indicative of a potential trend and are not statistically significant.

TABLE: II COMMUNITY ISSUE OF MOST IMPORTANCE

Q.1.a. What issue facing the Australian community today is of most importance to you?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Economy/Economic Problems	20	19	29	24	17	18	14	18	15	21
Unemployment/Youth Unemployment	19	18	19	16	21	18	23	13	29	7
Inflation/Cost of Living/Taxes	13	11	18	4	10	8	12	11	3	15
Drug Taking/Trafficking/Alcohol Abuse	8	9	5	12	12	4	9	4	15	8
War/Nuclear War/Atomic Weapons	6	7	3	4	8	6	4	10	5	14
Political Parties/Politics/Government	5	5	5	4	2	6	3	7	3	8
Road Toll/Road Safety	1	1	1	-	2	1	1	1	5	1
Drink Driving	1	1	1	2	2	1	-	1	4	3
Youth Affairs	2	1	2	-	4	1	1	1	2	1
Crime/Organised Crime	2	1	5	-	1	-	1	1	-	1
Violence/Personal Safety	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	1	1	2
Sexual Attacks	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union Power/Strikes/Problems	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	2	-
Pollution/Environmental Issues	1	1	2	4	1	-	2	1	2	1
Overseas Political Problems	1	*	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
Terrorism	-	*	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
Deteriorating Morals	1	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	1	1
Something Else	12	13	6	22	11	19	20	16	7	8
Don't know/Can't say	6	7	1	8	4	16	7	7	8	5
(Base)	(1035)	(1033)	(135)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A & B, Tables 1

TABLE: III

COMMUNITY ISSUE OF SECOND CONCERN

Q.1.b. What is the next most important issue of concern to you?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Economy/Economic Problems	12	11	15	20	12	9	7	10	13	7
Unemployment/Youth Unemployment	12	11	17	12	13	9	8	9	12	11
Inflation/Cost of Living/Taxes	7	7	12	6	3	4	8	7	5	9
Drug Taking/Trafficking/Alcohol Abuse	9	9	11	6	10	4	11	6	14	6
War/Nuclear War/Atomic Weapons	4	6	3	10	3	8	5	3	7	9
Political Parties/Politics/Government	5	4	5	-	8	6	4	4	-	4
Road Toll/Road Safety	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	1	4	1
Drink Driving	1	1	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	3
Youth Affairs	2	2	1	-	4	2	1	1	1	4
Crime/Organised Crime	1	2	-	2	1	1	1	1	3	2
Violence/Personal Safety	2	1	3	-	-	1	2	3	2	-
Sexual Attacks	1	*	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-
Union Power/Strikes/Problems	2	1	4	-	1	1	1	-	-	-
Pollution/Environmental Issues	2	1	2	2	1	-	-	1	2	-
Overseas Political Problems	1	1	2	2	-	1	-	1	-	-
Terrorism	1	1	3		-	1	-	-	1	1
Deteriorating Morals	1	1	1	2	4	-	2	1	-	-
Something Else	15	17	11	20	17	17	19	29	9	14
Don't know/Can't say	19	22	10	16	15	35	27	21	26	28
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 3 & B, Table 2

TABLE: IV ALL ISSUES OF COMMUNITY CONCERN

Q.1.a. What issue facing the Australian community today is of most importance to you?
1.b. What is the next most important issue of concern to you?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Economy/Economic Problems	32	30	44	44	29	26	21	28	27	28
Unemployment/Youth Unemployment	31	30	35	28	33	26	32	22	41	19
Inflation/Cost of Living/Taxes	20	19	30	10	13	12	20	18	8	25
Drug Taking/Trafficking/Alcohol Abuse	17	18	16	18	22	8	20	18	28	14
War/Nuclear War/Atomic Weapons	10	12	6	14	11	14	9	13	12	24
Political Parties/Politics/Government	10	9	9	4	10	12	7	11	3	12
Road Toll/Road Safety	3	3	2	2	6	3	2	1	9	2
Drink Driving	2	3	2	2	4	1	2	1	6	6
Youth Affairs	4	5	3	-	7	3	2	2	3	5
Crime/Organised Crime	3	3	5	2	3	1	3	3	3	3
Violence/Personal Safety	2	2	3	-	2	1	3	4	3	2
Sexual Attacks	1	*	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-
Union Power/Strikes/Problems	3	2	5	-	2	2	1	-	2	-
Pollution/Environmental Issues	3	2	4	6	2	-	1	3	4	1
Overseas Political Problems	2	1	3	2	1	1	-	1	-	2
Terrorism	2	1	3	-	2	-	1	-	1	1
Deteriorating Morals	3	2	2	2	5	2	3	2	1	1
Something Else	25	28	16	40	27	33	32	41	15	22
Don't know/Can't say	19	23	10	16	15	36	27	21	26	28
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 5 & B, Table 3

AWARENESS OF FORS

After the issues question, respondents were introduced to the fact that the study was concerned with road safety and was being conducted on behalf of FORS. They were asked to indicate their awareness of FORS.

Overall, virtually a fifth (19%) of the respondents indicated they had heard of FORS. Results of this question on a State by State basis are presented in Table V. However there were no statistically signficant differences between individual States and the national mean response.

Sub-groups scoring greater levels of awareness than the national total (adjusted for the influence of each sub-group - see Appendix C), were those in managerial occupations (25%, CL 95%) and those who had completed tertiary education (29%, CL 99.9%). Those less likely than the national total to be aware of FORS were those aged 15 or 16 years (9%, CL 95%) and those who had reached secondary education only (16%, CL 99%).

TABLE: V AIDED AWARENESS OF FEDERAL OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY

Q.2. In fact the issue which we are mainly talking about, is that of road safety. The survey is being conducted on behalf of the Federal Office of Road Safety or FORS in Canberra. Had you heard of the Federal Office of Road Safety before today?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Aware of FORS	20	19	15	26	19	15	21	16	17	16
Not Aware of FORS	77	79	70	72	81	82	79	82	82	82
Don't know/Can't say	3	2	5	2	1	3	-	2	2	1
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 7 & 8, Table 4

BELIEFS CONCERNING FACTORS LEADING TO ROAD CRASHES

Respondents were asked to indicate those factors which they think most often lead to road crashes. Responses were recorded as first mentioned and, after a prompt, up to two additional responses could be given. Responses were recorded on a precoded list of nineteen items with interviewers using judgement concerning the appropriate code to use. All respondents were able to nominate at least one factor, some could not give a second so there was an average of 1.5 factors per person. In Tables VI and VII, responses for first mentioned and other factors are recorded on a State by State basis. Factors which were mentioned by less than 5% of respondents were omitted from further analysis. Tables VIII and IX present the results of analysis by demographic variables for the remaining eight most frequently mentioned factors.

Overall, drink driving was mentioned by 41% of respondents as being the factor most often leading to road crashes. Concern about drink driving was even more accentuated than this in Northern Territory (59%), Western Australia (53%, CL 99%) and Queensland (47%, significantly higher than States other than NT and WA at CL 95%). It is worthy of note that the two latter States are those without random breath testing legislation. As can be seen from Table VIII women (44%) and the younger age groups were also more likely than the adjusted total to have mentioned drink driving as the most frequent cause of road crashes, but these results were not significant. Residents of NSW were significantly less likely than residents of any other jurisdiction to mention drink driving (20% compared with 36% or more, CL 95% or more).

Speed was the next most mentioned cause of crashes, nominated overall by 21% of respondents. Residents of New South Wales (30%) and older people (50-59 year olds, 33%; 60 or over, 27%) were significantly more likely than the national total to mention speed as a cause (CL 95% or more).

Careless or negligent driving together with inattention or lack of concentration account for another 17% of responses. Differences in beliefs between the different States were not marked. However, 28% of 17-19 year olds and 27% of 20-24 year olds mentioned these two reasons significantly more than the national response (CL 95% and 99% respectively). These results should be interpreted with caution because of the small sample sizes.

Driver behaviour, attitude or impatience and driver inexperience or young drivers were initially nominated by 6% and 5% respectively of respondents. All other reasons which could have been given were either not mentioned or were nominated by only 1 or 2% or respondents.

Table X presents the total results for the eight factors mentioned by respondents as most frequent and next most frequent factors in road crashes. From the table it can be seen that on an unweighted basis, drink driving was mentioned by 74% of all respondents and by 65% on a weighted basis (the difference being due to Tasmania's influence); as either first, second or third most frequent factors. Respondents in Western Australia, Northern Territory and Queensland remained the most likely to mention drink driving. Speed was mentioned by approximately half the respondents.

TABLE: VI FACTOR CONSIDERED MOST OFTEN LEADING TO ROAD CRASHES

Q.3.a. What factor do you think most often leads to road crashes?

	TOTAL (Wghted).		TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Drink Driving	34	41	20	36	40	47	38	53	40	59
Speed	24	21	30	26	22	22	18	11	23	14
Careless/Negligent Driving	11	10	12	14	10	7	14	7	15	3
Inattention/Lack of concentration	6	7	7	8	8	3	7	10	2	8
Driver behaviour/Attitude/Impatience	8	6	11	20	5	6	5	4	6	4
Driver inexperience/Young drivers	5	5	5	2	7	3	8	6	9	3
Driver training/Insufficient training	2	2	3	-	1	3	2	4	1	2
Drugs	1	1	1	-	4	-	1	1	1	-
Disregard for road rules	1	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	*
Road design/Poor road signage	*	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	1
Road conditions/Traffic congestion	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	-	-	1
Other drivers	*	*	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-
Driver fatigue	*	*	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Ignorance of road rules	1	*	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Weather conditions	1	*	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Vehicle design	*	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Vehicle maintenance/Lack of maintenance	*	*	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-
Level/Lack of police enforcement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other road users	1	*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Something Else	2	2	3	-	1	4	1	3	2	3
Don't know/Can't say	*	*	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 10 & B, Table 5

TABLE: VII OTHER FACTORS CONSIDERED TO LEAD TO ROAD CRASHES

Q.3.b. What other factors are there?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Drink Driving	31	29	30	38	35	31	23	29	30	23
Speed	28	26	30	16	25	26	23	33	33	14
Careless/Negligent Driving	14	15	18	20	14	11	11	19	15	18
Inattention/Lack of concentration	11	11	15	10	6	13	10	13	10	16
Driver behaviour/Attitude/Impatience	11	8	15	16	8	6	11	5	3	5
Driver inexperience/Young drivers	15	15	14	4	14	18	17	15	16	12
Driver training/Insufficient training	6	5	5	6	7	8	4	7	2	3
Drugs	10	9	10	10	13	5	7	8	9	8
Disregard for road rules	6	4	9	8	2	3	5	3	1	3
Road design/Poor road signage	5	3	5	6	5	4	3	1	-	3
Road conditions/Traffic congestion	4	4	3	6	5	7	3	6	2	2
Other drivers	2	2	2	-	3	3	3	-	-	2
Driver fatigue	3	3	5	4	1	1	4	3	2	8
Ignorance of road rules	3	2	5	-	3	1	3	1	1	2
Weather conditions	2	2	5	12	1	1	-	1	4	-
Vehicle design	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	2	-
Vehicle maintenance/Lack of maintenance	3	4	1	2	3	1	5	7	5	4
Level/Lack of police enforcement	*	*	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-
Other road users	1	*	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Something Else	6	8	4	4	1	12	9	19	2	6
Don't know/Can't say	1	2	-	-	4	1	3	3	6	-
	164%	158%	178%	166%	153%	155%	148%	175%	142%	135%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 13 & B, Table 6

TABLE: VIII FACTOR CONSIDERED MOST OFTEN LEADING TO ROAD CRASHES

Q.3.a. What factor do you think most often leads to road crashes?

	TOTAL (Unweighted)									
	Male %	Female %	15-16 Years %	17-19 Years %	20-24 Years %	25-29 Years %	30-39 Years %	40-49 Years %	50-59 Years %	60+ Years %
Drink Driving	38	44	57	45	43	47	45	42	49	35
Speed	19	22	7	12	11	12	21	24	33	27
Careless/Negligent Driving	10	10	10	21	14	15	10	6	4	7
Inattention/Lack of concentration	7	7	9	7	13	3	5	6	8	6
Driver behaviour/Attitude/Impatience	6	7	2	1	2	9	6	5	11	9
Driver inexperience/Young drivers	7	4	2	8	4	3	4	4	6	10
Driver training/Insufficient training	3	1	-	-	3	3	3	4	1	1
Drugs	1	1	3	1	-	1	-	1	-	2
(Base)	(484)	(549)	(58)	(76)	(108)	(86)	(262)	(140)	(134)	(170)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 11

TABLE: IX OTHER FACTORS CONSIDERED TO LEAD TO ROAD CRASHES

Q.3.b. What other factors are there?

	TOTAL (Unweighted)									
	Male %	Female %	15-16 Years %	17-19 Years %	20-24 Years %	25-29 Years %	30-39 Years %	40-49 Years %	50-59 Years %	60+ Years %
Drink Driving	28	30	24	29	25	29	32	27	31	31
Speed	26	27	19	20	23	38	28	26	25	27
Careless/Negligent Driving	14	16	22	21	20	16	15	12	11	12
Inattention/Lack of concentration	8	14	16	9	8	6	14	10	13	15
Driver behaviour/Attitude/Impatience	7	9	5	7	6	5	8	10	11	11
Driver inexperience/Young drivers	18	12	5	12	18	15	14	19	13	15
Driver training/Insufficient training	7	4	3	4	9	6	3	7	4	5
Drugs	8	9	14	11	6	8	8	10	9	10
(Base)	(484)	(549)	(58)	(76)	(108)	(86)	(262)	(140)	(134)	(170)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 14

TABLE: X MAJOR FACTORS CONSIDERED TO LEAD TO ROAD CRASHES

Q.3.a. What factor do you think most often leads to road crashes?
3.b. What other factors are there?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust.	Aust.	NSW	ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Drink Driving	65	74	50	74	74	78	61	83	70	81
Speed	51	47	61	42	47	48	41	45	56	29
Careless/Negligent Driving	25	25	30	34	24	18	25	27	29	28
Inattention/Lack of concentration	18	18	22	18	14	16	17	23	12	25
Driver behaviour/Attitude/Impatience	19	15	26	26	14	13	16	9	9	15
Driver inexperience/Young drivers	20	20	18	6	21	21	25	21	24	15
Drugs	11	10	10	10	17	5	8	9	10	8
Driver training/Insufficient training	9	7	7	6	7	10	6	11	3	5
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(165)	(159)	(154)	(150)	(103)	(97)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 16 & B, Table 7

BELIEF CONCERNING MOST IMPORTANT SKILL FOR SAFE DRIVING

Respondents were asked to indicate that skill or ability which they considered most important for driving safely. Again respondents' answers were categorised by interviewers into the appropriate precoded item. In Table XI, the data for this question is summarised on a State by State basis.

From the table it can be seen that the three most important skills given are alertness or reaction time (28%), concentration (18%) and care and patience (14%) and these account for two thirds of all responses overall. Victorians (38%) were particularly concerned with alertness significantly more so than the national mean. Northern Territory residents were significantly more likely than the other jurisdictions (30% vs 18%, CL 99%) to consider concentration as an important skill. Care and patience was singled out by Australian Capital Territory residents (24% vs 14%, CL 95%).

It would appear that views concerning the importance of alertness or reaction time are reasonably consistent regardless of age, sex, occupation or driving experience. With regard to concentration, 31% of 15-16 year olds significantly more than other age groups (CL 95%) and 28% of students significantly more than other occupations (CL 99%) mentioned this skill. However it should be remembered that this data is based on comparatively small groups.

The retired (21%, CL 95%) mentioned care and patience significantly more than the national total of 14%. Female respondents were significantly more likely to mention care and patience than males (16% vs 11%, CL 95%).

Defensive driving, Vehicle handling/knowledge, commonsense, experience and adherence to the road rules were each mentioned by between 5-8% of all respondents and accounted for 30% of all responses. The variation in the responses between different States, by respondents sex, age, occupation, education or driving experience were generally not sufficiently large to be significant.

TABLE: XI BELIEF CONCERNING MOST IMPORTANT SKILL FOR SAFE DRIVING

Q.4. What is the most important skill or ability required of a driver to drive safely?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Alertness/Reaction time	28	28	20	24	36	25	29	27	24	34
Concentration	18	18	19	18	21	18	13	21	21	30
Care/Patience	14	14	14	24	8	17	18	13	17	6
Defensive Driving	8	8	10	6	7	6	7	7	9	9
Vehicle handling/Knowledge	8	6	12	6	5	3	10	4	4	4
Commonsense	5	6	5	8	6	8	6	3	7	5
Experience	6	5	9	-	6	2	3	1	9	6
Adherence to rules	5	5	6	2	4	5	3	5	8	1
Judgement of speed	2	2	3	4	3	2	2	3	1	-
Judgement of distance	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	1	1	-
Something else	5	6	3	4	2	13	6	13	6	1
Don't know/Can't say	1	2	2	-	2	1	1	1	5	2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 23 & B, Table 8

BELIEF CONCERNING LOCATION OF MOST RISK OF CRASH

Respondents were asked to indicate where they thought a driver would be at most risk of having a road crash, in either the built up areas of cities or the open country road. Data from this question is presented in Tables XII and XIII. It should be noted that some 17% of respondents either opted for the belief that the risk depended on what drivers are used to, or considered there was equal risk in both situations. From the tables it can be seen that respondents in Western Australia were significantly more likely than the national total (50% vs 39%, CL 99%) to mention the built up areas of cities. The open country road tended to be more nominated than the national total by respondents in South Australia (53% vs 42%, CL 99%).

There was a signficant sex difference, with males seeing greater risk in city driving (45% vs 34%, CL 99.9%) and females seeing greater risk on rural roads (48% vs 37%, CL 99.9%). There was no significant difference in choice between rural and city dwellers, although capital city respondents tended to see more risk in city driving, while rural respondents were slightly more likely to say the risk is equal. No significant pattern of belief concerning risk emerged across the different age or occupational groups.

TABLE: XII

BELIEF CONCERNING LOCATION OF MOST RISK OF ACCIDENT

Q.5. On a journey involving driving in the built up areas of cities and open country roads, where do you think a driver would be most at risk of having an accident?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
In the built up areas of cities	37	39	30	52	42	43	27	50	39	38
In the open country	42	42	36	34	46	45	53	38	44	36
Equal Risk	15	12	28	10	11	6	11	4	13	11
Depends on what you are used to	4	5	5	4	1	5	5	6	4	15
Don't know/Can't say	2	2	2	-	-	2	3	2	1	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(186)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 27 & B, Table 9

TABLE: XIII

BELIEF CONCERNING LOCATION OF MOST RISK OF ACCIDENT

Q.5. On a journey involving driving in the built up areas of cities and open country roads, where do you think a driver would be most at risk of having an accident?

	All Capitals %	All Rural %	Drive more than 2 X per week: Held Licence to 3 Years %	Drive more than 2 X per week: Held Licence more 3 Years %	Drive less than 2 X per week: Held Licence to 3 Years %	Drive less than 2 X per week: Held Licence more 3 Years %	Non Driver %	Male %	Female %
In built up areas of cities	41	36	43	38	65	32	42	45	34
On the open road	43	41	38	43	29	43	44	37	48
Equal Risk	10	14	14	12	6	13	8	11	13
Depends on what you are used to	4	7	4	6	-	8	4	6	4
Don't know/Can't say	1	2	1	1	-	4	2	2	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(608)	(425)	(84)	(719)	(17)	(53)	(160)	(484)	(549)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Tables 27, 28

BELIEF CONCERNING REASON FOR BEING STOPPED BY POLICE

In order to establish beliefs concerning police enforcement of road roles, respondents were asked to indicate for what reason they thought motorists were most often stopped by the police. Again a precoded list of items was used with interviewers selecting the appropriate code. In Table XIV, data for each State is presented and it can be seen that virtually three in five respondents overall nominated speed or excessive speed. In particular, respondents in Australian Capital Territory (72%) and Western Australia (67%) were significantly more likely (at the 95% and 99% confidence levels respectively) than the national total (57%) to mention speed. Interestingly Tasmanians were virtually evenly divided in their opinions between speeding (35%, significantly less than the total, CL 99.9%) and random breath tests (34%, significantly more than the total, 9%, CL 99.9%). An additional 12% of Tasmanians nominated drink driving as a major cause of police interception (not significantly different from the total, 8%).

Other groups more likely than the national total to nominate speeding were those aged 30-39 years (64%, CL 95%) and those in managerial occupations (66%, CL 99%).

Random breath tests and drink driving were mentioned by 17% of respondents overall as were driving erratically and breaking the road rules. Thus, overall five groups of reasons accounted for 91% of all reasons given.

In addition to Tasmanians, those significantly more likely than the national total (16%) to nominate alcohol related reasons for police interception (random breath testing or drink driving) were residents of New South Wales (22%, CL 95%), respondents living in rural areas (21%, CL 99.9%) and those aged 15-16 years (26%, CL 95%). In the latter case, because of the small sample base involved, these subgroup variations should be taken as indicative reasons only.

TABLE: XIV BELIEF CONCERNING REASON FOR BEING STOPPED BY POLICE

Q.6. For what reason do you think motorists are most often stopped by the police?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Speed/excessive speed	57	57	54	72	59	58	59	67	35	55
Random breath tests	11	9	16	4	10	1	3	-	34	7
Breaking road rules	9	8	13	12	7	9	8	5	4	4
Driving erratically/dangerously/carelessly	8	9	3	6	9	12	16	10	3	10
Drink driving	6	8	6	2	6	6	5	9	12	14
Vehicle defect spot checks	2	2	2	-	4	1	1	1	8	2
Unroadworthy vehicles	1	2	-	-	2	3	1	3	1	2
Driving on P plates	*	*	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Driving flashy/unusual car	*	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
Something else	4	3	4	4	2	6	3	3	-	2
Don't know/Can't say	1	1	2	-	-	1	2	1	3	2
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(101)	(98)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 29 & B, Table 10

DRINKING AND DRIVING ISSUES

A number of questions specifically relating to alcohol and random breath testing were asked. The first two were asked of all respondents whereas the remaining two were administered to those who had previously held or currently held a driving licence. From Table XV, it can be seen that 88% of respondents agreed with the random breath testing of drivers (both weighted and unweighted). Agreement was almost unanimous (99%) among Victorians and higher than the national total among Northern Territory residents (95%) and Tasmanians (93%). Those least in agreement were Western Australian residents (77%) and Queenslanders (81%). Both results are significantly lower than the national total at the 99.9% and 99% confidence levels respectively. Interestingly, significantly more students (96%, CL 99%) and respondents aged 17-19 years (97%, CL 95%) were in agreement with random breath testing compared with the national response. It is worthy of comment that only 2% of respondents overall were unprepared to give an answer either for or against random breath testing.

The second question allowed a choice between the testing only of drivers who appear drunk and random breath testing. Overall there was a decrease of 9% in the number of respondents favouring random breath testing. This may be due to a real preference for target testing or an order effect may be operating. The results by State parallel those of the previous question and are presented in Table XV.

TABLE XV BELIEFS CONCERNING BREATH TESTING OF DRIVERS

Q.7 Do you agree with the random breath testing of drivers? If necessary: breath testing for alcohol?

	TOTAL (Wghted).	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Agree with random breath tests	88	88	85	92	99	81	88	77	93	95
Disagree with random breath tests	11	10	13	8	1	17	8	19	6	5
Don't know/Can't say	1	2	2	-	-	3	5	4	1	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Q.8. Do you think breath tests for blood alcohol should be taken only for drivers who seem drunk or do you favour breath test at random among all drivers?

Test only if seem drunk	16	19	17	16	6	25	18	35	17	12
Favour random breath tests among all drivers	76	74	68	82	91	72	75	61	77	72
Favour both	6	5	13	2	3	1	5	3	6	12
Don't Know/Can't say	2	2	2	-	-	3	2	3	1	2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(139)	(203)	(26)

Source: Detailed Cluster Results A, Tables 52 & 55 & B, Tables 11 & 12

The 84% of respondents who currently or had previously held a licence were asked to indicate their behaviour with regard to drinking and driving. Four statements representing a range of behaviour from teetotal, to drinking regardless of driving were used. In Table XVII, results of this question are presented.

Women are significantly more likely than men to indicate that they do not drink at any time (25% vs 15%, CL 99.9%) or that they do drink when driving (36% vs 25%, CL 99.9%). Men were significantly more likely to say that they restrict their drinking if they intend to drive (58% vs 39%, CL 99.9%), and the six respondents, less than 1%, who said they did not restrict their drinking even if driving, were all men.

TABLE: XVII

BEHAVIOUR REGARDING DRINKING AND DRIVING

Q.10. Which of the following statements describes you with regard to drinking and driving?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)								
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Don't drink at any time	19	20	14	12	24	24	20	21	23	15
If driving, don't drink	29	30	29	31	27	32	32	26	37	31
If driving, restrict drinking	50	49	55	55	49	44	47	52	38	52
If driving, don't restrict drinking	1	1	1	2	-	-	2	1	1	-
Don't know/Can't say	*	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(873)	(873)	(130)	(42)	(139)	(137)	(133)	(122)	(84)	(86)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 41 & B, Table 15

There were no significant variations in responses between the States and Territories, except that Tasmanians were less likely to say they restricted drinking when driving (38% compared with the total response of 49%, CL 95%) and they were more likely to say that they do not drink when driving, but not significantly.

A breakdown by age group indicates that the over 60 years group was significantly more likely than the national total to state they never drink at any time (32% vs 20%, CL 99.9%). Respondents aged 15-19 years were likely to claim not to drink if driving (52% vs 30%, CL 99.9%). Those restricting their drinking when driving were more likely to be 25-29 years (59%, CL 95%) or 30-39 years (59%, CL 99.9%), compared with the total response of 50%.

Occupational groupings show that respondents in managerial positions were more likely to drink, restricting the amount, when driving, compared with the total response (64% vs 49%, CL 99.9%). Others restricting drinking were in clerical and skilled occupations (56%, 59% respectively, both CL 95%). Students (60%, CL 99.9%) and respondents stating home duties (39%, CL 99%) were more likely to say they don't drink when driving, which parallels the sex and age results, as does the finding that retired people tend not to drink at any time (33% vs 20%, CL 99.9%).

Education level also showed significant variations. Respondents with primary or secondary education only were significantly more likely to state that they don't drink at any time (38%, CL 99.9% and 23%, CL 99% respectively), and significantly less likely than the total sample choosing to drive and restrict their drinking (27%, CL 99% and 43%, CL 99.9% respectively). Those with trade or tertiary qualifications were significantly more likely to state they drive and restrict drinking (65%, CL 99.9% and 58%, CL 99% respectively). Respondents with trade qualifications were significantly less likely to say they don't drink at any time (6% vs 20%, CL 99.9%).

Respondents in Queensland and Western Australia were asked whether they would change their drinking and driving behaviour if random breath testing were introduced (see Table XVIII). 20% stated that they would change their behaviour. The only significant sub-group variation was that males are more likely to change their behaviour than females (27% vs 14%, CL 99%). There was some indication that those in skilled occupations and those aged 25-29 would be more likely to change, however the sample sizes are very small. The results do match the groups who were more likely to restrict drinking and driving in the previous question.

In all remaining States, random breath testing is in existence. Accordingly, respondents were asked if they had changed their behaviour when random breath testing was introduced, (see Table XIX). Again, about 20% claimed to have changed their behaviour. The notable exception was Australian Capital Territory where virtually half the respondents indicated their behaviour had changed, but note the very small sample size.

TABLE: XVIII BELIEF CONCERNING DRINKING AND DRIVING IF RANDOM BREATH TESTING WAS INTRODUCED

Q.11.a. If random breath testing was introduced, would you change your drinking and driving behaviour from that which you have just told me?

	TOTAL (Unweighted)		
	Total %	QLD %	WA %
Would change behaviour	20	20	20
Would not change behaviour	79	79	79
Don't know/Can't say	1	1	1
Total	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(259)	(137)	(122)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 46

TABLE: XIX BELIEF CONCERNING DRINKING AND DRIVING BEFORE RANDOM BREATH TESTING WAS INTRODUCED

Q.11.b. Is what you have just told me about your drinking and driving behaviour the same as what you would have said before random breath testing was introduced?

	TOTAL (Unweighted)						
	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	SA %	TAS %	NT %
Behaviour was the same	78	78	52	81	79	85	78
Behaviour was not the same	20	19	48	16	20	15	20
Don't know/Can't say	2	3	-	3	2	-	2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(614)	(130)	(42)	(139)	(133)	(84)	(86)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 49

Men rather than women (25% vs 15%, CL 99%), those aged 20-24 years (31%, CL 95%) and those with trade qualifications (29%, CL 95%) compared with the adjusted total response (20%) were more likely to have changed their behaviour when random breath testing was introduced. Agan, this reflects the groups most likely to restrict their drinking and driving, rather than not drink.

DRIVERS BELIEFS' CONCERNING RISKS WITH OTHER ROAD USERS

Those respondents' who were drivers were asked which road users other than children, they treated with most caution. The question was framed this way to avoid the expected bias towards children which would have been recorded. In Table XX, State by State results of this question are shown from which it can be seen that overall, approximately 20%, were most cautious about each of the four categories of adult cyclists, motor cyclists, car drivers and trucks/heavy vehicles. Only 12% of respondents overall were most cautious of adult pedestrians. (weighted).

There were no major subgroup differences with regard to pedestrians. However, 36% of Australian Capital Territory residents compared with a norm of 22% were most cautious of adult cyclists. Similarly, Victorians (26%) and South Australians (25%) were most cautious of motor cyclists. New South Wales residents (35%) and Western Australians (25%) and those aged 40-49 years (26%) were most cautious of car drivers. Finally, those most cautious of trucks/heavy vehicles were residents of New South Wales (28%), Queensland (26%) and those aged 50-59 years (28%).

TABLE: XX

OTHER ROAD USERS TREATED WITH MOST CAUTION

Q.12. When you are driving, other than children, which kind of other road users are you most cautious about?

	TOTAL (Weighted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)								
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Adult pedestrians	12	13	6	7	14	14	20	13	12	9
Adult cyclists	20	22	11	36	25	18	22	30	26	2.
Motor cyclists	19	20	18	17	26	18	25	16	18	13
Car drivers	24	21	35	21	17	20	14	25	21	16
Trucks and heavy vehicles	20	19	28	17	12	26	16	15	18	31
Don't know/Can't say	4	4	2	2	5	5	5	2	5	9
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(614)	(873)	(130)	(42)	(139)	(137)	(133)	(122)	(84)	(86)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 61 & B, Table 15

BEHAVIOUR WITH REGARD TO SPEED LIMITS

Drivers were asked to indicate, if the speed they generally drove at when there was no other traffic around, was the existing speed limit or a speed they considered safe. Results of this question are summarised in Table XXI. It can be seen that approximately two in five (42%) claimed to drive at the speed limit, with the remaining three in five (57%) driving at a speed they considered to be safe.

Those more likely than the national mean response to drive at the speed limit were South Australians (53%), women (47%) and the over 60 age group. Those more likely than the norm to drive at a speed they considered safe were New South Wales residents (67%), 17-19 year olds (64%) and those involved in paid employment.

TABLE: XXI *SELECTION OF DRIVING SPEED*

Q.13. When you choose a speed at which to drive, if there is no other traffic around, do you generally drive at the existing speed limit or a speed which is considered safe?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)								
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Existing speed limit	39	42	32	48	41	45	53	43	42	35
A speed which is considered safe	61	57	67	52	59	55	46	56	58	65
Don't know/Can't say	*	*	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(873)	(873)	(130)	(42)	(139)	(137)	(133)	(122)	(84)	(86)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 64 & B, Table 16

The only significant variation among the States/Territories were that South Australians were rather more likely to drive at the speed limit compared with the national mean response (53% vs 39%, CL 99%) and residents of New South Wales were more likely to state that they drive at the speed they consider safe (67% vs 61%, CL 95%).

There was a significant difference between the sexes, with women more likely to drive at the speed limit (47% vs 37%, CL 99%) and men more likely to drive at the speed they considered safe (62% vs 52%, CL 99%). This result may be reflected in that respondents in managerial occupations were significantly moe likely than the national mean response to drive at the speed they considered safe (66% vs 57%, CL 99%) and respondents engaged in home duties were more significantly likely to stay at the speed limit (55% vs 42%, CL 99.9%). Respondents over 60 years of age were also more likely than the national mean response to drive at the speed limit (55%, CL 99%).

DRIVER PROFILE

Respondents were asked whether they held or had held a licence and if so, which types and how frequently they drove. In Table XXII and XXIII, data from these two questions is presented.

As can be seen from Table XXIII, virtually nine out of ten of the drivers had held licences for more than 3 years and in excess of nine out of ten drive more regularly than twice a week.

The final component of the interview involved the collection of information concerning involvement in crashes. This data is presented on a State by State basis in Table XXIV from which it can be seen that virtually three in five claimed involvement in a crash. However, 7% overall had been involved, within the past three years in a crash involving injury.

Overall, 81% of respondents held a current driving licence and 3% had held a licence in the past; 16% had never held a licence. There was a significant difference between males and females, with 89% of male respondents and 74% of females reporting that they held a current licence (CL 99.9%). There were significant differences across age groups, with the 15-19 year old and over 50 age groups having fewer licence holders than the 20-49 year age range (43% and 73% vs 94%, CL 99.9%).

Respondents were asked to state the kind of licence they hold, and multiple responses were allowed. Eighty-six percent stated that they held a learners permit, provisional licence and/or full licence for a car; 15% held a heavy vehicle or tractor licence; and 11% had some type of motorcycle licence. There were few differences noted between jurisdictions (see Table XXII for details).

TABLE XXII LICENCES HELD

Q.9.a. Do you personally have a current driver or motor cycle licence or permit?
9.b. Have you ever had a driver or motorcycle licence?
9.c. What licence or licences do you hold/have you held?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Have current licence	95	81	80	82	81	82	82	79	79	88
Not current/held previously	4	3	4	2	3	3	5	3	2	1
Never held	*	16	16	16	16	14	14	19	18	11
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Licences Held										
Car - Learners permit	3	4	1	26	2	1	3	7	2	-
Car - Provisional licence	4	4	1	16	2	3	2	7	1	-3
Car - Ordinary licence	91	78	76	80	78	82	78	67	79	64
Heavy vehicle licence	14	12	6	8	8	18	12	21	7	13
Tractor licence	4	3	2	4			2	1	-	1
Motorcycle - Learners Permit	1	1		-	1	-	2	-	1	1
Motorcycle - Provisional	*	1	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	1
Motorcycle Licence	8	9	3	6	4	17	10	12	3	16
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(165)	(159)	(154)	(150)	(103)	(97)

* Less than 1%

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Table 39 & B, Table 13

TABLE: XXIII DURATION OF LICENCE AND FREQUENCY OF DRIVING

Demographics A & B — How long have you had/did you hold your licence or permit?
Do you drive more often than twice a week?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)								
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Up to 3 years	11	12	8	7	11	14	14	12	14	9
More than 3 years	89	88	92	93	89	86	86	88	86	91
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Drive more than twice per week	92	92	95	93	90	92	90	95	96	91
Drive less than twice per week	8	8	5	7	10	8	10	5	10	9
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(873)	(873)	(130)	(42)	(139)	(137)	(133)	(122)	(84)	(86)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Tables 68 & 70 & B, Tables 17 & 18

TABLE: XXIV INVOLVEMENT IN ACCIDENT

Demographics H & I — Have you ever been involved in a road accident?
During the past three years have you been in a road accident in which someone was injured?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)								
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
Yes, involved in an accident	58	57	57	68	61	58	55	52	54	54
No, not involved in an accident	42	43	43	32	39	42	45	48	46	46
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)
Involved in an accident with injury within the past 3 years	8	7	11	6	6	7	4	12	11	2
Not involved in an accident with injury within the past 3 years	92	93	89	94	94	93	96	88	89	98
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(587)	(587)	(89)	(34)	(101)	(92)	(85)	(78)	(56)	(52)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Tables 82 & 85 & B, Tables 22 & 23

RESPONDENT PROFILES

Respondents were asked to give their age, occupation and highest educational level reached. This data is presented in Table XXV. The distribution of respondents across the different occupational groupings was as follows:

Managerial	33.5%
Clerical	35.7%
Skilled trades	18.9%
Manual worker	11.2%
Other	0.7%
	100.0%

Twenty percent of respondents were involved in full time home duties. Fifty eight percent of the sample had attained secondary education, 14% Trade or TAFE qualifications and 18% a tertiary qualification.

TABLE: XXV RESPONDENT AGE, OCCUPATION AND EDUCATION

Demographics C, E & F
How old are you?
What is your usual occupation?
What is the highest level of education you have reached?

	TOTAL (Wghted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)							
	Aust. %	Aust. %	NSW %	ACT %	VIC %	QLD %	SA %	WA %	TAS %	NT %
15-16 years	6	6	6	4	4	6	3	9	4	8
17-19 years	7	7	5	6	9	7	9	6	10	7
20-24 years	11	10	12	12	9	10	11	9	10	12
25-29 years	11	8	8	10	7	9	8	9	6	3
30-39 years	20	25	22	30	25	25	21	24	27	35
40-49 years	14	14	17	14	14	19	10	14	8	9
50-59 years	14	13	20	8	16	8	12	12	15	8
60 plus years	18	16	11	16	15	16	25	17	21	9
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Still at school	6	6	8	8	7	4	3	7	6	9
Tertiary or other student	3	3	3	-	4	3	3	3	2	1
Full time home duties	18	21	22	14	15	23	25	20	29	17
Retired/Pensioner	14	12	11	12	11	13	12	14	13	6
Unemployed	1	2	-	-	-	3	4	5	3	-
Working	57	56	55	66	63	53	53	51	46	68
Refused to give an answer	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	2	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Primary	7	8	3	6	5	16	8	5	15	2
Secondary	55	58	53	40	65	52	60	59	64	62
Trade/TAFE	17	14	22	12	15	17	10	12	9	15
Tertiary	19	18	21	40	15	16	21	17	9	20
Something else	2	2	1	2	1	-	1	7	4	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Base)	(1033)	(1033)	(155)	(50)	(166)	(159)	(155)	(150)	(103)	(98)

Source: Detailed Tabular Results A, Tables 73, 76 & 79 & B, Tables 19-21 inclusive

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE SURVEYS

It is not possible on the basis of this first wave of what is proposed as a monitoring study to make specific recommendations concerning legislation, media campaigns, counter measures and so on. Such recommendations will only be possible once a number of monitors have been undertaken and trends established.

In the conduct of future surveys, the following is recommended:

1. Design of Questionnaire

Car licences - the wording of the licence question needs review and interviewers should be instructed to ensure that respondents indicate posession of either a full licence or a provisional or learners permit.

Postcodes - to ensure correct geographic allocation of each interview it is recommended that following each interview, interviewers indicate whether the interview was in the capital city or rest of the State.

2. Analysis

As the sample sizes increase with future waves of the study, it is recommended that drink driving behaviour, behavioural change and agreement with random breath testing be cross-analysed.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND FIELD MATERIALS

INTRODUCTION

Good (... ..). My name is (.....) from Touche Ross Services and at the moment we are talking to people throughout Australia about issues of public concern. May I speak with the male/female aged 15 years or over, whose birthday is closest to todays date and who is home now IF LOOKING FOR QUOTA ASK: May I speak with a male/female aged (.) who is home now. Re-introduce if necessary

Q.1.a) What issue facing the Australian community today is of most importance to you?
RECORD FIRST MENTIONED IN FIRST COLUMN

Q.1.b) What is the next most important issue of concern to you.
RECORD SECOND MENTIONED IN SECOND COLUMN

	Q.1 a	Q.1 b
unemployment/youth unemployment	1	1
youth affairs	2	2
drug taking/drug trafficking/alcohol abuse	3	3
inflation/cost of living/taxes	4	4
the economy/economic problems	5	5
political parties/politics/government	6	6
crime/organised crime	7	7
violence/personal safety	8	8
sexual attacks	9	9
union power/strikes/industrial problems	10	10
road toll/road safety	11	11
drink driving	12	12
pollution/environmental issues	13	13
war/nuclear war/atomic weapons	14	14
overseas political problems	15	15
reforms	16	16
deteriorating morals/society's morals	17	17
something else (specify)	18	18
Don't know/can't say	19	19

Q.2. In fact the issue which we are mainly talking about, is that of road safety. The survey is being conducted on behalf of the Federal Office of Road Safety or FORS in Canberra. Had you heard of the Federal Office of Road Safety before today?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know/can't say	3

Q.3.a) What factor do you think most often leads to road crashes?

Q 3 b) What other factors are there?
RECORD FIRST MENTIONED AND UP TO TWO OTHERS

	Q.3 a	Q.3 b
speed/excessive speed/inappropriate speed	1	1
drink driving	2	2
drugs	3	3
driver attitudes/behaviour/impatience	4	4
driver inexperience/young drivers	5	5
older drivers	6	6
inattention/lack of concentration	7	7
careless/negligent driving	8	8
driver training/insufficient training	9	9
driver fatigue	10	10
disregard of road rules	11	11
ignorance of road rules	12	12
road design/poor road signage	13	13
road conditions/traffic congestion	14	14
weather conditions	15	15
vehicle design	16	16
vehicle maintenance/lack of maintenance	17	17
level/lack of police enforcement	18	18
other road users	19	19
something else (specify)	20	20
don't know/can't say	21	21
none others	[illegible]	22

Q.4 What is the most important skill or ability required of a driver to drive safely.
DO NOT PROMPT CODE ONE ONLY

vehicle handling/knowledge of vehicle	1
judgement of speed	2
judgement of distance	3
alertness/awareness/reaction time	4
concentration	5
experience	6
care/consideration of other road users/ patience	7
adherence to road rules	8
ability to predict/forecast traffic movement/defensive driving	9
commonsense	10
something else (specify)	11
don't know/can't say	12

Q 5. On a journey involving driving in the built up areas of cities and open country roads where do you think a driver would be most at risk of having an accident?

In the built up areas of cities	1
On the open country road	2
[illegible]	3
Depends on what you are used to	-
don't know/can't say	4

Q.6. For what reason do you think motorists are most often stopped by the police? CODE ONE ONLY

random breath testing	1
drink driving	2
driving erratically/carelessly/dangerously	3
speeding/excessive speed	4
breaking road rules	5
vehicle defect spot check	6
unroadworthy vehicle	7
driving on P plates	8
driving flashy/unusual car	9
something else (specify)	10
.....	
don't know/can't say	11

Q.7 Do you agree with the random breath testing of drivers? If necessary: breath testing for alcohol?

yes	1
no	2
don't know what random breath testing is	3
don't know/can't say	4

Q.8. Do you think breath tests for blood alcohol should be taken only for drivers who seem drunk or do you favour breath test at random among all drivers?

only if seem drunk	1
favour random breath tests among all drivers	2
both	3
don't know/can't say	4

Q.9.a) Do you personally have a current driver or motor cycle licence or permit?

ASK Q.9 c. ⟵ yes	1
ASK Q 9 b. ⟵ no	2

Q.9.b) Have you ever had a driver or motorcycle licence?

ASK Q.9. c. ⟵ yes	1
GO TO DEMOGRAPHICS C no	2

Q.9.c) PHRASE APPROPRIATELY
What license or licenses do you hold/ have you held?

learners permit - car	1
provisional licence/P plate - car	2
ordinary drivers licence - car	3
drivers licence/heavy vehicle	4
tractor licence	5
learners permit - motorcycle	6
provisional licence - motorcycle	7
motorcycle licence	8

Q.10. Which of the following statements describes you with regard to drinking and driving. READ OUT. CODE ONE ONLY

I don't drink at any time	1
If I am driving, I don't drink	2
If I am driving I restrict what I drink	3
If I am driving I don't restrict what I drink	4
(Don't know/can't say)DO NOT READ	5

Q.11.a) Queensland and Western Australia only

If random breath testing was introduced, would you change your drinking and driving behaviour from that which you have just told me?

yes	1
no	2
Don't know/can't say	3

Q.11.b) All other States

Is what you have just told me about your drinking and driving behaviour the same as what you would have said before random breath testing was introduced?

yes	1
no	2
Don't know/can't say	3

Q.12. When you are driving, other than children, which kind of other road users are you most cautious about? READ OUT LIST, ROTATE ORDER AND MARK * CODE ONE ONLY

adult pedestrians	1
adult cyclists	2
motor cyclists	3
car drivers	4
trucks and heavy vehicles	5
(don't know/can't say DO NOT READ	6

Q.13. When you choose a speed at which to drive, if there is no other traffic around, do you generally drive at...READ OUT

the existing speed limit or	1
a speed which you consider safe	2
(don't know/can't say)DO NOT READ	3

DEMOGRAPHICS

And now a few questions about yourself to help us analyse the results of the survey.

A. PHRASE APPROPRIATELY. IF MORE THAN ONE LICENCE OR PERMIT, ACCEPT FOR LONGEST
How long have you had/did you hold your licence or permit?
Would it be...READ OUT

up to three years	1
more than three years	2

B. Do you drive more often than twice a week?

yes	1
no	2

C. How old are you? RECORD IN BOXES
IF REFUSE AGE ASK:
Into which of the following age groups do you fit?
READ OUT AGE GROUP

15 - 16 years	1
17 - 19 years	2
20 - 24 years	3
25 - 29 years	4
30 - 39 years	5
40 - 49 years	6
50 - 59 years	7
60 plus years	8

D. Are you male or female?

male	1
female	2

E. And what is your usual occupation?

still at school	1
tertiary or other student	2
full time home duties	3
retired/pensioner	4
unemployed	5
WORKING (probe for position and industry)	6

F. And what is the highest level of education you have reached?
READ OUT IF NECESSARY

primary school only	1
secondary school	2
trade qualifications/TAFE courses	3
tertiary qualification	4
something else (specify)	5

G. And the post code where you live?
RECORD 4 DIGIT NUMBER

H. And [in all] have you ever been involved in a road accident [as a driver, rider or pedestrian]. IF NECESSARY SAY: as a driver, rider or pedestrian.

yes - ASK Q.I	1
no	2

I. During the past three years have you been in a road accident in which someone was injured

yes - ASK Q.J.	1
no	2

J. How many accidents was that?
RECORD IN BOXES

RESPONDENT NAME .....

TELEPHONE NUMBER.....

INTERVIEWER NAME.....

LOCATION .....

DATE .....

TELEPHONE BOOK SAMPLE PROCEDURE

NEW SOUTH WALES	AREA CODE	NO. INTERVIEWS
Sydney	02	92
Tamworth	067	4
Wagga Wagga	069	4
Newcastle	049	10
Dubbo	068	3
Lismore	066	5
Wollongong	042	4
Gosford	043	4
Kempsey	065	3
Broken Hill	080	1
Muswellbrook	065	1
Bathurst	063	4
Penrith	047	4
Albury	060	2
Goulburn	048	2
Nowra	044	2
Windsor	045	1
Campbelltown	046	2
Cooma	0648	1
Bega	0649	1
		150

VICTORIA	AREA CODE	NO. INTERVIEWS
Melbourne	02	104
Mildura	050	3
Bairnsdale	051	5
Geelong	052	7
Ballarat	053	6
Bendigo	054	6
Warrnambool	055	3
Warragul	056	3
Wangaratta	057	3
Shepparton	058	4
Mornington	059	6
		150

TELEPHONE BOOK SAMPLE PROCEDURE (Cont'd)

QUEENSLAND	BOOK NUMBER	AREA CODE	NO. INTERVIEWS
Brisbane		07	66
Cairns	Q.1	070	9
Rockhampton	Q.2	079	17
Maryborough	Q.3	071	8
Toowoomba	Q.4	076	8
Gold Coast	Q.5	075	13
Townsville	Q.6	077	13
Beaudesert	Q.7	075	3
Roma	Q.8	074	3
Sunshine Coast	Q.9	071	10
			150

SOUTH AUSTRALIA	AREA CODE	NO. INTERVIEWS
Adelaide	08	106
Barossa Valley	085	17
Port Augusta	086	13
South east	087	8
Yorke Peninsula	088	6
		150

WESTERN AUSTRALIA	AREA CODE	NO. INTERVIEWS
Perth Metropolitan Area	09	104
Rest of Western Australia Country	09	46
		150

TASMANIA	AREA CODE	NO. INTERVIEWS
Hobart	002	39
Launceston (North & North East Tasmania)	003	33
Burnie (North West & West Coast Tasmania)	004	28
		100

TELEPHONE BOOK SAMPLE PROCEDURE (Cont'd)

NORTHERN TERRITORY

Northern Territory - one telephone book only for the Territory. Hence select addresses proportional to:

Darwin	-	50 interviews
Rest of the Territory	-	50 interviews

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

One telephone book. Select to gain 50 interviews from the ACT book.

INTERVIEWER'S INSTRUCTIONS

The Study

This is a national study concerned with community attitudes towards road safety. The community in this case is defined as males and females aged 15 plus. The majority of questions relate to driving and driving issues. As you will see, this is Wave 1 of what is intended to be a bi-annual study. We expect, over time, to monitor changes in attitudes.

The questionnaire was piloted in Victoria and Queensland and since that time a number of minor changes have been made. Overall however, the respondents found the study to be enjoyable, were interested in the questions and prepared to give speedy responses. It was felt by the supervisors, that road safety is an issue that the majority of people have thought about and have firm views on.

So, you should find that the interviews go well and average no more than 9.5 minutes each.

Quotas

Age and location quotas have been established for the study. These are very important since we intend to gain views of a representative sample of the population and compare them over time.

You will be given quota instructions by your supervisors. As far as possible, we want to get equal numbers of male and female respondents. However, we have not quotaed for such. The age quota is far more important.

In the introduction, when you are not looking for quotas, select by birthdate rule. When looking for quotas, select that person in the household who conforms to your quota requirements.

Study Timing

The interviewing is to be undertaken over week ending 31st May/1st June. You can run on into the week commencing 2nd June. However, interviews must be done in evenings. No daytime interviews please.

The Questionnaire

Throughout the interview, please ensure that respondents answer quickly and do not dwell on questions, thereby wasting time.

Q.1. a/b.

This question is included in an attempt to measure where road safety is placed on the community agenda. The question is however, unprompted, since we do not mention road safety until Q.2.

You may find the respondent wants to dwell on this question. However, keep them moving as much as possible! The list of precoded items is long but is grouped into specific areas. So please be very familiar with the list prior to starting the interview. If you are unsure about where to place an item, record it in the "something else" code and we will post code. Circle a single code in each column.

Q.2.

From this point we are concerned with road safety questions. Read the question clearly and circle the appropriate code.

Q.3. a/b.

Here again we have a long list of precodes grouped into specific areas: Ensure you are familiar with the precodes prior to starting the interview. Code one item in the first column and up to 2 others in the second. Again, if you are unsure about where to place the code, write it in "something else" and we will post code it.

Q.4.

Think quite clearly about the respondent's response and use the appropriate code. If they query the question, read it out again. Do not attempt to explain it.

Q.5.

Read the question quite clearly and code the appropriate response. Again, if queried on the question, simply read it again.

Q.6.

Think carefully about the respondent's answer and circle the appropriate code.

Q.7.

Circle the appropriate code.

Q.8.

Circle the appropriate code remembering that code 2 refers to random breath tests which can involve all drivers, not just those who appear drunk. You have code 3 for both categories if respondents feel both categories of drivers should be tested.

Q.9. a/b/c/.

This question is a filtering question for drivers/non drivers. Providing a respondent has, at some stage, held a driving licence or permit, they answer the rest of the questionnaire. Thus a person on a learners permit still answers the rest of the questions, as does someone who for some reason have not got a current licence, eg. lost it for drink driving. Those who have never held a licence or permit go to demographics.

Remember in Q.9. c. that a respondent can hold more than one licence or permit.

Q.10.

Read the question and circle the appropriate code.

Q.11. a/b.

In Queensland and Western Australia, random breath testing does not exist. Hence, the need for the two different versions of this question. Circle the code in the question appropriate to your State/Territory. Cross out the other question.

Q.12.

Read the question and the list of items. Remember to rotate the order of reading out and mark where you start. If they say older drivers, code in car drivers, code 4. Circle one code only.

Q.13.

Read the question and circle the appropriate code.

DEMOGRAPHICS

A. We are only interested in the broad categories of up to 3 years and more than 3 years. Thus, providing they drive, ascertain the period of their longest held licence.

B. Again, broad categories apply to this question which relates to their personal driving behaviour.

C. If they had no licence, this is where you start asking the demographics. Ascertain their exact age or alternatively if they refuse, their age group.

D. Ascertain their sex.

E. Establish their usual occupation. If working, gain sufficient information to enable post coding into the appropriate code 01 - 13 as per the attached list.

F. Establish their educational level completed. Remember an apprenticeship would be a trade qualification.

G. Record their post code.

H/I/J/. If involved in an accident, ask I & J as appropriate.

Finally establish their name, confirm their telephone number and record your name, location and the date.

Before you move to the next interview, code their occupation from the attached list.

APPENDIX B
FIELD SUMMARY OF CALLS AND ACHIEVEMENT RATES

FIELD SUMMARY OF CALLS AND ACHIEVEMENT RATES

	Total %	Total No	QLD No	NSW No	ACT No	TAS No	NT No	SA No	WA No	VIC No
Completed interviews	28.3	1033	155	152	51	103	103	151	152	166
Terminated	0.2	9	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	3
Quota not available or full	22.3	815	194	88	11	42	80	62	129	209
Refused	11.6	424	85	56	16	16	29	62	57	103
Unsuitable	2.7	99	9	11	1	20	14	8	3	33
Total contacts		2380	443	308	81	181	226	283	344	514
No contact	34.0	1243	238	163	60	113	137	145	89	299
Answering machine	0.9	32	23	1	-	1	-	4	-	3
Total attempts	100.0%	3655	704	472	141	294	363	432	433	816
Interviews per hour		2.7	2.4	2.6	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.6

APPENDIX C

ESTIMATING STANDARD ERRORS

ESTIMATING STANDARD ERRORS

The standard error of a proportion is given by the formula

$$\sqrt{\frac{P \times Q}{N}}$$

where P is the first proportion,

Q is the remaining proportion

and N is the sample size.

The 95% and 99% confidence limits are given by multiplying the above formula by 2 and 3 (for 2 and 3 standard deviations) respectively. The table below presents the standard error for responses from a simple random sample, for varying sample sizes.

MARGIN OF ERROR TABLE (95% CONFIDENCE LEVEL
(PERCENTAGES GIVEN A PARTICULAR ANSWER)

Sample Size	5% 95%	10% 90%	15% 85%	20% 80%	25% 75%	30% 70%	35% 65%	40% 60%	45% 55%	50% 50%
50	6.2	8.5	10.1	11.3	12.2	13.0	13.5	13.9	14.1	14.1
100	4.4	6.0	7.1	8.0	8.7	9.2	9.5	9.8	9.9	10.0
150	3.6	4.9	5.8	6.5	7.1	7.5	7.8	8.0	8.1	8.2
200	3.1	4.2	5.0	5.7	6.1	6.5	6.7	6.9	7.0	7.1
250	2.8	3.8	4.5	5.1	5.5	5.8	6.0	6.2	6.3	6.3
300	2.5	3.5	4.1	4.6	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.7	5.7	5.8
400	2.2	3.0	3.6	4.0	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0
500	1.9	2.7	3.2	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.5
600	1.8	2.4	2.9	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1
700	1.6	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8
800	1.5	2.1	2.5	2.8	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5
900	1.5	2.0	2.4	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3
1000	1.4	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.2
1500	1.1	1.5	1.8	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6
2000	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2
3000	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8

(Produced by Market Research Society)

It is usual where the sampling plan is not a simple random sample to assume the sampling plan is 80% as efficient as a simple random sample. Thus, a correction factor of 11.8% (from $\sqrt{1.25}$) needs to be applied to the figures in the above table. It could be argued that the quota sample increases the accuracy of sampling, thus for the purpose of this study we can assume the standard errors in the above table should increase by a maximum of 10% of the % shown.

Thus, for a sample size of 150 respondents, where 50% give one response and 50% another (or other responses) the error associated with the response is $\pm$ 90%.

Microtab calculates the significance of differences between sub-group responses and the total response, adjusted for the influence of the sub-group. A similar procedure can be used to assess the significance of differences between associated sub-groups (i.e. between two States, or two age groups).

The statistic used is the Z test using the formulae set out below.

TOTAL-SUB-GROUP DIFFERENCES

$$Z = \frac{\frac{r}{n} - \left(\frac{R - r}{N - n}\right)}{\left(\frac{R}{N}\left(1 - \frac{R}{N}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{(N-n)}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

SUB-GROUP DIFFERENCES

$$Z = \frac{\frac{r_1}{n_1} - \frac{r_2}{n_2}}{\left(\left(\frac{r_1 + r_2}{n_1 + n_2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{r_1 + r_2}{n_1 + n_2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

WHERE R = response of the total group

r, r_1, r_2 = response of sub-group

N = number in total sample

n, n_1, n_2 = number in sub-group

The significance of differences is determined by the size of Z.

If $Z \geq 3.29$, significance is at 99.9% Confidence Level.
If $3.29 > Z \geq 2.58$, significance is at 99.0% Confidence Level.
If $2.58 > Z \geq 1.97$, significance is at 95.0% Confidence Level.