#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

#### FEDERAL OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY

#### **DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL INFORMATION**

Report No.	Date	Pages	ISBN	ISSN
•				OR = 0158 - 3077
CR 61	Sept. 87	65	0-642-51059-8	CR = 0810 - 770X

Title and Subtitle: SURVEY OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDES: TRAFFIC LAWS AND ENFORCEMENT

Author(s):

REARK RESEARCH PTY. LTD.

#### Performing Organisation (Name and Address):

REARK RESEARCH PTY. LTD., 88-90 FOVEAUX STREET, SURRY HILLS, N.S.W. 2010

#### Sponsor (Name and Address):

FEDERAL OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY GPO BOX 594, CANBERRA, A.C.T. 2601

#### Available from (Name and Address):

#### FEDERAL OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY

#### Abstract:

A national telephone survey of 1,027 persons aged 18 years and over, during 27-30 August, 1987. This report summarises the results of the survey. Issues covered included community attitudes toward current road rules, their perceived role and effect, the level of enforcement, the severity of penalties, factors seen as affecting road safety, and how safety could be improved.

## **KEYWORDS:**

#### NOTES:

- (1) FORS research reports are disseminated in the interests of information exchange.
- (2) The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the Commonwealth Government.
- (3) The Federal Office of Road Safety publishes two series of research reports:
  - (a) reports generated as a result of research done within the FORS are published in the OR series;
  - (b) reports of research conducted by other organisations on behalf of the FORS are published in the CR series.

# SURVEY OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDES: TRAFFIC LAWS AND ENFORCEMENT

A Quantitative Research Report of a survey conducted during 27 - 30 August, 1987

prepared for:

Federal Office of Road Safety,
5th Floor,
Cox Building,
Cooyong and Mort Street,
CANBERRA, A.C.T. 2600

by

Reark Research Pty. Ltd.

# CONTENTS

		Page No.
Introduction	on	1
Executive :	Summary	3
Conclusion	s	7
Research M	ethodology	9
1.	Respondent Definition	9
2.	Sample Size and Distribution	10
3.	Conduct of the Survey	10
4.	Data Processing	10
5.	Development of the Questionnaire	11
6.	Presentation and Reporting of Survey Results	12
Summary of	Findings	14
1.	What Influences the Way Motorists Drive?	14
2.	The Purpose of Road Rules	16
3.	Adherence to Road Rules and Reasons for Breaking Them	16
4.	Attitudes to Road Rules and the Chance of Being Stopped by Police	22
5.	Most Effective Ways of Increasing Road Safety	27
6.	Severity of Existing Penalties for Offences and Appropriate Penalties	31
7.	Penalties for Repeat Offenders	36
8.	Alternatives to Existing Penalties	41
9.	Personal Perceptions of Driving Safety	44

	<u>Page No.</u>
Appendix I	45
Demographic Profiles of Respondents	
Appendix II	49
Field Summary of Calls and Achievement Rates	
Appendix III	51
Questionnaire	
Appendix IV	64
Table of Standard Error Margins	

#### Introduction

The objectives of this project were to determine:

- \* community attitudes toward current road rules, including the purpose of road rules, and adherence to them
- \* the perceived role and effect of road rules, in particular, whether the community perceives road rules as being effective in increasing road safety and influencing road behaviour.
- \* what factors affect road behaviour
- \* how road safety could be increased
- \* attitudes toward the level of enforcement of road rules
- \* what type/s and severity of penalties are perceived as being appropriate for transgressing road rules, including repeat offences

- \* attitudes to existing penalties
- \* alternatives to existing penalties
- personal road behaviour, as perceived by respondents.

#### **Executive Summary**

This report summarises findings of a national telephone survey of 1,027 respondents, conducted during 27-30 August, 1987, investigating community attitudes toward road rules, their effect, and road behaviour.

Major findings of the survey were as follows:

- \* seven major influences of road behaviour were mentioned by respondents:
  - alcohol consumption (28%)
  - traffic flow/conditions (24%)
  - stress/pressure (23%)
  - whether motorists are in a hurry or not (23%)
  - speed of other road users (19%)
  - weather conditions (18%)
  - driving experience (13%)

Note that road rules and their effect, and concern for road safety, were infrequently mentioned as influences on motorists' road behaviour.

- \* two major purposes of road rules were cited:
  - to protect road users (60%)
  - to encourage good/responsible road behaviour (24%)
- four in five respondents with a licence or permit admitted to breaking road rules, at least on exception, with 10% stating that they break them frequently. 20%, however, stated that they never break road rules.
- \* The road rules broken most frequently were exceeding the speed limit in 60 Km/h zones (53%), and 100 Km/h zones or on highways (24%).
- \* reasons cited for motorists, in general, breaking road rules were most frequently:
  - motorists in a hurry (52%)
  - motorists are careless/have wrong attitude (25%)
  - motorists frustrated/distracted (23%)
  - motorists don't care about/respect laws (15%).
- \* most respondents believed that they are obliged to obey road rules. Only 14% disagreed, arguing that they should be able to disregard road rules occasionally or when justified.

- \* the majority of respondents (63%) agreed that <u>all</u> road rules contribute to road safety, with no single road rule being mentioned by more than 5% of respondents as <u>not</u> contributing to road safety.
- \* respondents believed that the probability of being stopped by police, when a motorist breaks a road rule, is quite low. In particular, one in five respondents believed there to be <u>no</u> chance of being stopped by police if road rules are broken.
- \* three main suggestions were offered by respondents to increase road safety:
  - better driver education/training/testing (37%)
  - increased enforcement/more police on roads (30%)
  - improve/upgrade roads (18%).
- \* given the choice between more police on the road and more severe penalties for offences, a clear preference was indicated for more police. In general, respondents most frequently suggested preventative rather than punitive measures, as ways of increasing road safety.
- the majority of respondents (57%) believed that penalties for drink-driving are too low. Opinion was more divided in respect of the severity of penalties for speeding, with 28% believing present penalties are too low and 13% saying they are too harsh.

- \* for offences such as speeding and failing to stop at a red light, appropriate penalties were commonly seen as:
  - a large monetary fine
  - disqualification from driving for up to 12 months
  - loss of points and a fine.
- \* widespread support was indicated for more severe penalties for motorists who are convicted of breaking a road rule <u>twice</u> in one year; 85% agreed, and 10% disagreed.
- \* the majority (54%) suggested disqualification from driving as an appropriate penalty for motorists convicted of breaking a rule twice in one year.
- \* two options were mentioned with some frequency, as alternatives to existing penalties:
  - driver education/training (26%)
  - community service (14%).
- respondents with a licence/permit typically had a high regard for their own driving safety. 53% stated that they drive more safely than most, whilst only 2% said they drive less safely than most.

Note, however, that this attitude was <u>not</u> correlated with personal attitudes regarding their moral obligation to obey road rules.

#### Conclusions

The results of the survey suggest that the purposes of road rules are well understood by the public, and that they are important to, and effective in keeping the roads safe. However, road rules are not frequently seen as an influence on the road behaviour of motorists.

The public generally feels obliged to obey road rules, and accepts that all road rules contribute to road safety. Influences on motorists, such as being in a hurry, being under stress or frustrated, are often seen as influencing road behaviour, and being reasons why motorists break road rules.

One in five people believe that the speed of other road users influences the way motorists drive. This suggests that some motorists hold the attitude that it is acceptable to speed, provided that other motorists are doing the same.

The research suggests that pressure on motorists and other external influences, rather than negative attitudes toward road rules and their effects, underlies failure to observe road rules at all times.

Existing penalties for breaking road rules are generally seen as suitable, although harsher penalties for drink-driving and for repeat offenders are supported. More than half the public agree that repeat offenders should have their licence suspended.

The public believes that the most effective ways of increasing road safety are to improve driver education and testing, and to increase the presence of police on the road. Increasing penalties for traffic offences is not perceived to be as effective. The research also found that the chance of being stopped by police is thought to be one in four, when a motorist breaks a road rule.

The majority of motorists see themselves as being safer drivers than most others, and also that they infrequently, if ever, break any road rules. Those views of personal road behaviour are clearly unrealistic.

There is some public support for community service and driver education and training, as alternatives to existing penalties for offenders.

Attitudes to road rules and their enforcement are quite consistent across the States and Territories of Australia. Older respondents and females drive less kilometres per year; they are more likely to believe they never break road rules, and that road rules, in general, should never be broken. Females also believe that motorists are more likely to be stopped by police if they break a road rule.

The research found that motorists who have been booked within the last two years, and those who have ever had their licence suspended or cancelled had somewhat different views to other motorists. They were more likely to prefer increased police presence on the road as a way of increasing road safety, to believe that penalties are too harsh for speeding, yet not for drink-driving, and less likely to agree with harsher penalties for repeat offenders.

#### Research Methodology

#### 1. Respondent Definition

Respondents to the survey were males and females, aged 18 years and over. Quota sampling was used to ensure that an equivalent number of males and females were interviewed.

A randomising factor was used in the questionnaire, the "nearest birthday" technique, whereby the targeted respondent was that person, aged 18 years or over. whose birthday comes closest to the interview date.

#### Sample Size and Distribution 2.

The final sample size for the survey was 1,027, which included respondents in both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas throughout Australia. The sample size and distribution was consistent with that used in prior Community Attitude Surveys, with the sample for each State and Territory being as follows:

State/Territory	Final Sample
New South Wales	166
Victoria	152
Queens land	151
South Australia	153
Western Australia	151
Tasmania	101
Northern Territory	103
A.C.T.	50
	<del></del>
Total	1027

The primary sample frame for this survey was the 1986/87 White Pages telephone directory.

#### Conduct of the Survey

Reark Research conducted all interviews using a Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing System (C.A.T.I.) whereby data is automatically entered into a terminal by interviewers. This system includes a telephone number management system, which allows for automatic re-dial of telephone numbers when no contact is made, or when the respondent is busy or unavailable.

Interviews were under the direct control of field supervisors, and the work of each interviewer was subject to a 10% audit to guarantee authenticity. Interviews were conducted from Reark's offices in the five mainland capital cities. All fieldwork was conducted during the evenings of 27 and 28 August, 1987, and the weekend of 29 and 30 August, 1987.

A survey of demographic profiles of respondents is included as Appendix I, with call results being summarised in Appendix II, enclosed.

## 4. <u>Data Processing</u>

Free response questions were coded by Reark after completion of interviews. Data was then processed in Melbourne by Reark's subsidiary, Computab, using Quantum Software and Convergent Technologies "Mighty Frame" computers.

Detailed tabular results were prepared, segmenting data based on the demographic profile of respondents. Detailed tabulations were presented as a separate document.

#### 5. Development of the Questionnaire

The final questionnaire used in this survey is enclosed as Appendix III. That questionnaire was developed as follows:

- \* preliminary investigative research was conducted, prior to the conduct of the qualitative phase, to assist in the development of a questionnaire for the survey
- \* a draft questionnaire was prepared, based on findings from preliminary research, and forwarded to the Federal Office of Road Safety
- \* Reark and FORS met in Canberra to discuss the draft questionnaire, with several amendments being made prior to piloting
- \* a pilot study was then conducted, with 26 interviews being completed in New South Wales
- \* final amendments were made to the questionnaire following the pilot study, with agreement then being reached between Reark and FORS.

The main survey was commenced on 27 August, 1987.

#### 6. Presentation and Reporting of Survey Results

The findings of the survey are summarised in this report. Note that all data is subject to random error, with a table of standard errors, assuming an 80% efficient sample, being enclosed as Appendix IV. Note that some tables do not add to exactly 100%, due to rounding.

Data presented in this report has been weighted for location, age and sex. Both weighted data, based on the 1981 Census of Population and Housing, and unweighted data, is presented herein for the total sample. All State and Territory data presented is unweighted.

Findings in this report are based on weighted data in all instances where totals are discussed. Variations between States/Territories, and demographic groups, are discussed in instances where they are statistically significant, at the 95% confidence level.

# Table 1. FACTORS AFFECTING ROAD BEHAVIOUR

Q.4 "What factors do you think influence or affect the way motorists drive?" (free response)

	TOTAL	TOTAL			STATE	/TERRI	TORY			
(We	eighted)	(Unweighted)		VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Factors	*	*	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	*	*	*	*	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	*	
Alcohol consumption	28	34	24	29	35	39	43	33	26	42
Traffic flow/conditions	24	19	36	16	15	12	13	16	32	16
Stress/pressure	23	26	25	22	27	26	23	27	30	31
Whether in a hurry	23	21	24	22	16	22	26	15	18	16
Speed of other road users	19	18	24	11	17	24	22	14	22	3
Weather conditions	18	22	21	19	16	14	41	24	36	17
Driving experience	13	11	14	14	9	12	9	12	14	7
Familiarity with roa	ad 6	6	7	7	1	7	7	8	10	8
Concern for public safety	5	4	7	1	5	3	4	2	6	1
Whether other people are in the car	4	4	4	5	3	3	9	1	8	2
Road rules/laws	4	5	5	5	3	5	7	2	6	6
Level of enforcement	t 4	4	4	4	3	3	4	7	2	4
Concern for own safety	3	3	4	1	3	4	3	1	2	3
Concentration/ inattention	2	2	2	1	_	4	1	3	_	1
Impatience	2	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	•••	-
Age of driver	2	2	1	1	4	2	1	4	_	1
Road conditions	2	2	2	3	3	2	1	3	_	4
All others	13	15	7	18	14	31	7	17	4	12
Don't know/no response	5	4	3	9	4	6	1	3	8	3
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)

Notes: Multiple responses accepted All factors mentioned by 1% or less of respondents have been included as other mentions.

#### Summary of Findings

1. What Influences the Way Motorists Drive?

Respondents were asked what factors they think influence or affect the way motorists drive. Seven factors were mentioned frequently:

- \* alcohol consumption (28%)
- \* traffic flow/conditions (24%)
- \* stress/pressure (23%)
- \* whether motorists are in a hurry or not (23%)
- \* the speed of other road users (19%)
- \* weather conditions (18%)
- \* driving experience (13%)

Findings are depicted in Table 1, opposite.

It is notable that neither traffic laws nor the enforcement of laws was frequently mentioned. Only 4% of the sample mentioned each of these factors. This suggests that traffic laws and their enforcement are not seen as major factors affecting road behaviour.

Safety was not mentioned regularly. 5% of respondents mentioned that concern for <u>public</u> safety was a factor, with 3% citing concern for their <u>own</u> safety. A further 4% stated that road behaviour is influenced by the number of people in the vehicle.

The speed at which traffic flows was mentioned most frequently, 43%, adding "traffic flow and conditions" and "the speed of other road users". This is an important finding in that road behaviour is <u>collective</u>; nearly half of the respondents believe that road behaviour is mediated by how <u>other</u> motorists are driving. These factors were particularly salient in N.S.W. and the A.C.T.

Pressure on motorists and whether or not they are in a hurry, were each mentioned by 23% of respondents. This is important in that many motorists appear to modify road behaviour as a reaction to pressure and anxiety.

Alcohol consumption was more frequently mentioned by respondents aged 18-29 (40%), single respondents (41%), those performing home duties (39%), and also those who had been booked for traffic offences one or more times during the last two years.

Traffic flow and conditions was more frequently mentioned in New South Wales, whilst weather conditions was most frequently mentioned in Western Australia. Weather conditions was also stated more frequently by respondents aged 18-39 (28%), compared to 16% of those aged 40 years and over. These variations were significant at 95% confidence.

The major conclusion is that neither safety nor traffic laws and their enforcement were perceived to be major factors influencing the way motorists drive.

#### 2. The Purpose of Road Rules

All respondents were asked to state their opinion of the main purposes of road rules. Two main purposes were frequently mentioned:

- to protect road users
- \* to encourage good/responsible behaviour on the road.

Protection of road users, at 60%, was the most frequently mentioned (see Table 2, overleaf).

Ancillary purposes were to stop accidents/safety, which is obviously similar to the purpose of protecting road users, and to maintain order/prevent chaos on the road.

#### Adherence to Road Rules and Reasons for Breaking Them

Respondents holding a licence/permit were asked if they have <u>ever</u> broken any road rules, and if so, what type of road rule/s that would be. All respondents were then asked why motorists, in general, break road rules.

Four in five respondents admitted to breaking road rules, at least on exception, with 39% breaking them either frequently or occasionally (see Table 3 overleaf).

The data indicates that the majority of motorists see themselves as being law abiding road users, who rarely or never break road rules. That belief was significantly more frequent amongst females than males (70% vs. 51%).

Table 2. MAIN PURPOSE OF ROAD RULES

Q.5 "Thinking now about road rules, excluding parking, what do you think is their main purpose?" (free response)

(I	TOTAL Weighted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)_			STATE	/TERR]	TORY			
(1	ne (girceu)	(Olime (gilled)	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Purpose	%	%	%	%	*	४	%	%	%	%
Protect road users	60	60	61	61	61	52	52	70	60	65
Encourage good/ responsible road behaviour	24	29	19	26	34	29	42	20	28	34
Safety/stop accidents	6	3	7	6	1	5	_	1	8	-
Order/prevent chaos	5	3	8	2	2	7	_	2	-	-
Raise revenue from fines	1	1	2	1	•	_	3	1		-
Reduce/control speed	1	*	1	1	_	1	-	1	-	_
All others	1	1	_	2	_	3	1	-	_	-
Don't know/no response	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	5	4	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)

<sup>\*</sup> Less than 1%.

Table 3. BREAKING OF ROAD RULES

2.6 "Have you EVER broken any road rules that you are aware of? Would that be...?"

	TOTAL (Weighted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)_			STATE	Z/TERR	TORY			
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Frequency	%	%	૪	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Frequently	10	9	7	15	8	5	.7	7	2	18
Occasionally	29	31	28	31	31	33	29	32	33	29
Rarely/on exceptions	40	40	45	28	44	45	46	38	44	29
Never	20	20	. 19	26	17	16	18	24	20	22
Don't know/no response		1	1	1	-	1	1	1	_	_
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(937)	(937)	(152)	(136)	(146)	(138)	(138)	(88)	(45)	(95)

Notes: Based on respondents with a licence or permit.

<sup>\*</sup> less than 1%

Table 4. TYPES OF ROAD RULES BROKEN MOST OFTEN

0.7 "And what type of road rule would you fail to observe most often?"

_	TOTAL (Weighted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)_			STATE	/TERRI	TORY			
			NSW	VIC	OLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Road Rule	%	8	%	%	*	%	۶,	%	%	%
Exceeding speed limit - 60 Km/h zone	53	49	57	52	35	51	61	34	44	53
Exceeding 100 Km/h in country/on highways	n 24	24	20	28	32	21	11	24	50	23
Going through red light	7	6	8	7	7	4	_	10	8	5
Not stopping at stop sign	7	6	4	11	11	6 -	5	_	6	5
Crossing double yellow lines	4	3	7	1	6	1	_	3	-	-
Change lanes/ turning without indicating	4	5	6	1	3	6	4	6	8	4
All equally/none in particular	3	3	4	1	2	2	2	4	6	4
All others	10	12	9	10	12	16	12	21	3	9
Don't know/no response	3	4	3	2	6	3	8	4	3	4
(Base)	(745)	(745)	(112)	(100)	(121)	(113)	(112)	(67)	(36)	(74)

Notes: Based on licensed/permitted respondents who admitted breaking road rules.

Multiple responses accepted.

Those licensed respondents admitting to breaking road rules, at least on exception, were then asked which types of rules they failed to observe. The most frequently mentioned road rules were, and by a wide margin, restrictions on speed. 53% mentioned exceeding the speed limit in 60 Km/h zones, with 24% stating that the exceed the legal limit on country roads or highways (100 Km/h).

Seven per cent mentioned going through red lights, and failing to stop at a stop sign. Less frequently mentioned were crossing double yellow lines, changing lanes or turning without indicating (4% each).

Table 5, overleaf, depicts respondents' perceptions of why motorists break road rules. By far the major reason cited by respondents was that motorists are in a hurry (52%).

Secondary reasons were identified as:

- \* motorists' carelessness/wrong attitude (25%)
- \* motorists frustrated/distracted (24%)
- motorists don't care about/respect laws (15%)

The enforcement of laws, or lack thereof, was not mentioned frequently. 3% stated that a lack of police on the road is a reason, although a further 7% stated that motorists don't believe they will be caught.



Table 5. REASONS WHY MOTORISTS BREAK ROAD RULES

0.8 "In general, why do you think motorists break road rules?" (free response)

(h	TOTAL Reighted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)	STATE/TERRITORY							
			NSW	AIC	OLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Reasons	*	8	%	*	*	8	*	8	%	号
Motorist in a hurry	52	51	55	51	51	47	48	52	50	54
Motorists careless/ wrong attitude	, 25	24	32	17	26	32	19	21	28	14
Motorist frustrated distracted	24	22	28	19	24	23	26	20	18	9
Don't care about/ respect laws	15	14	19	11	12	12	19	12	12	8
Happen accidently	8	9	10	8	5	9	14	10	10	12
Don't believe they will be caught	7	6	5	5	5	6	5	5	14	10
Don't know/ understand rules	- 6	6	5	6	7	8	11	2	8	5
Poor driver training education	g/ 3	5	5	1	2	8	10	2	14	-
No police/not enoug police	h 3	2	4	2	1	4	3	2	_	1
Because others brea	k 2	2	3	1	1	3	1	3	_	2
Speed limit too low unrealistic	2	1	2	3	_	1	2	_	_	_
Rules not enforced	ι	i	2	1	_	1	2	1	_	1
Penalties too low	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	-	_	_
Showing off	1	1	1	1	1	3	-	1	-	2
Selfishness/ intolerance of othe	ers 1	1	1	1	_	1	-	1	_	1
Alcohol/drink drivi	ing 1	2	2	1	3	-	-	6	2	1
Ignorance/don't kno rules	ow 1	1	-	2	_	_	-	3	_	-
Don't agree with a	1	1	2	1	-	1	_	_	2	_
Drivers make own rules/use own commo sense	on 1	1	1	1	. 1	_	·_	2	2	1
All others	- 5	4	3	9	6	8	1	. 4	2	3
Don't know/no response	2	2	1	2	2	5	1	3	6	2

(Base)

(1027) (1027) (166) (152) (151) (153) (151) (103) (50) (101

Note: Multiple responses accepted.

Implicit in responses to this question (0.8) was the belief that road rules are generally understood, with only 6% stating that motorists don't know or understand them. The major reason appears to be external demands placed on motorists, i.e. being in a hurry, not the failure of enforcement or ignorance of laws.

It was notable that the majority of responses suggested reactive behaviour on the part of motorists breaking road rules, rather than such behaviour being calculated or deliberate.

4. Attitudes to Road Rules, and the Chance of Being Stopped by Police

All respondents were asked to indicate which of the following statements best describes their attitude to road rules (0.9):

- road rules should never be broken, under any circumstances
- \* motorists should obey them unless they have a good reason for NOT obeying them
- \* motorists should be able to disregard them occasionally, as long as they are careful
- \* motorists should be able to disregard them whenever they feel it is justified.

Table 6. ATTITUDES TO ROAD RULES

0.9 "Which of the following BEST describes your attitude to road rules?"

	TOTAL Weighted)	TOTAL )(Unweighted)_			STATE	E/TERR]	[TORY			.01
4 <u></u>			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
General Attitude	*	8	%	8	ક	%	%	%	%	%
Should never be broken	36	32	38	34	25	34	34	38	16	28
Should obey them unless have good reason	50	53	46	53	56	49	60	50	66	55
Motorists should be able to break them occasionally if careful	11	10	10	12	12	10	5	12	8	12
Should be able to disregard whenever motorists feel it is justified	. 3	3	4	1	7	4	1	-	10	3
Don't know/can't say	*	*	1	-	-	1	_	1	_	ı
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(10)

<sup>\*</sup> less than 1%

Table 7. ROAD RULES NOT CONTRIBUTING TO ROAD SAFETY

Q.10 "Can you think of any road rules that do NOT contribute toward keeping the roads safe?" (free response)

(1	TOTAL Reighted)	TOTAL TOTAL ighted)(Unweighted)		STATE/TERRITORY								
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT		
Type of Road Rule	%	%	*	*	%	%	%	%	%	%		
None – all contribute to road safety	63	67	56	64	78	61	69	76	52	79		
Speed limits in country/highways	5	5	9	4	3	4	6	3	6	5		
60 Km/h speed limi	t 4	3	5	3	3	1	2	1	6	-		
100 Km/h speed lim	it 3	2	2	4	3	1	2	2	-	2		
Stop signs/give way sign <b>s</b>	3	3	3	3	4	1	3	2	8	ı		
Give way to right/ not consistent	2	1	1	5	1	<u> </u>	-	1	2	-		
Roundabouts/lack or education/confusion		1	2	· <b>-</b>	3	1	-	_		2		
Traffic lights	1	1	1	<b>-</b> ·	1	3	2	-	-	2		
Restrictions on passing/overtaking double yellow line		2	2	_	1	2	3	2	2	_		
All others	6	6	6	7	4	8	7	7	6	6		
Don't know/no response	12	11	17	13	3	22	7	8	22	4		

(Base) (1027) (1027) (166) (152) (151) (153) (151) (103) (50) (101)

Note: Multiple responses accepted.

This question arose from initial investigative research, which suggested that some motorists see road rules as guidelines for road behaviour, not rigid, immutable laws. It further indicates that the motorist should self-regulate road behaviour to some degree, in contrast to blind allegiance to them.

By far the majority of respondents opted for the first two statements, suggesting that motorists generally feel morally obliged to obey road rules. 14% did, however, opt for the two latter statements, which suggest a lower level of moral obligation on their part to observe road rules.

This question should not, however, be seen as a measure of irresponsibility; rather, the real issue is that a proportion of respondents (14%) have placed the responsibility for safe motoring on themselves to a greater degree.

Respondents were then asked if they could think of any road rules NOT contributing to road safety, and the chance of being stopped by police, when breaking road rules.

The majority of respondents (63%) agreed that <u>all</u> road rules contribute to road safety, with 25% believing that at least one road rule does <u>not</u> contribute to keeping the roads safe.

No single road rule was mentioned by more than 5% of respondents, although "speed limits in the country/highways" and "100 Km/h speed limits" together totalled 8%. The conclusion is that most respondents

## Table 8. CHANCE OF BEING STOPPED BY POLICE FOR SPEEDING

0.11 "When a motorist breaks road rules, such as speeding or going through a red light, what would be the chance of that motorist being stopped by police, say, on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 would mean no chance, and 10 would mean it is certain that they would be stopped?"

	TOTAL (Weighted)	TOTAL (Unweighted)_			STATE	/TERRI	TORY			
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Response	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
One (no chance)	20	18	17	22	24	13	13	25	8	19
Two	23	25	26	20	23	24	21	20	48	36
Three	24	20	27	20	19	25	16	19	16	13
Four	6	7	7	7	6	5	11	7	6	7
Five	14	16	11	16	20	16	25	14	6	14
Stx	3	4	1	5	4	5	5	5	2	3
Seven	3	3	2	5	2	2	4	1	2	3
Eight	2	1	3	-	1	3	1	1	2	1
Nine	*	1	1	_	_		3	1	2	1
Ten	1	1	2	_	1	1	1	-	2	1
Don't know/no response	4	4	5	5	1	7	2	7	6	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101

less than 1%

accept that all road rules contribute to safety, and that no single road rule is disputed by more than a small proportion of respondents.

The probability of being stopped by police for breaking a road rule, such as speeding or going through a red light, was generally considered to be quite low. One in five respondents indicated that there would be no chance at all of being stopped, whilst the average figure of 3.09 indicates that respondents believe a motorist would be stopped on approximately one in four occasions.

Respondents in Western Australia were more likely to suggest a greater chance of being stopped by police, which is statistically significant at 99.5% confidence. Males were significantly more likely to indicate lower probability of being stopped, at 99% confidence. Note that males drove more kilometres per year on average than females.

A further finding was that the perceived probability of being stopped by police was <u>not</u> correlated with respondents' attitudes to obligation to obey road rules.

#### 5. Most Effective Ways of Increasing Road Safety

0.12 gave respondents two options to choose from regarding the most effective way of increasing road safety:

- more police on the road
- \* more severe penalties for traffic offences.

Table 9. MOST EFFECTIVE OPTION TO INCREASE ROAD SAFETY

0.12 "Which of the following do you think would contribute more toward keeping the roads safe?"

	TOTAL (Weighted	TOTAL )(Unweighted)	STATE/TERRITORY								
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT	
<u>Method</u>	ક	*	%	ૠ	૪	*	%	%	%	%	
More police on road	58	53	60	56	58	44	51	47	50	52	
More severe penalties	22	25	20	22	20	33	21	32	24	28	
Both equal	15	17	14	16	15	16	23	17	20	15	
Neither/none	4	4	2	5	8	5	4	4	6	2	
Don't know/no response	1	1	2	1	-	2	1	1	-	3	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)	

A clear preference was indicated for increasing the number of police on the road, 58% vs. 22%. A further 15% indicated that both options would have equal effect, whilst 4% stated that neither would be effective.

Preference for more police on the road was forthcoming in all States and Territories, and by all demographic groups. Respondents who had had their licence suspended or cancelled were significantly more likely to prefer more police on the road, 68% vs. 52%.

A later question (0.22 opposite) gave respondents the opportunity to state their opinion on which way or means would be most effective in increasing road safety, with the following being the most frequently stated:

- \* better driver education/training/testing
  (37%)
- \* increase enforcement/more police on roads
  (33%)
- \* improve/upgrade roads (18%)

The variation between responses to Questions 12 and 22 may be explained by the nature of the two questions. Given a forced choice in Q.12, respondents most frequently opted for more police on roads. Other ways or means to increase road safety, particularly better driver education/training and testing, were then stated in Question 22, when respondents were free to give any response.

Table 10. MOST EFFECTIVE WAYS TO INCREASE ROAD SAFETY

0.22 "What do you think would be the most effective way or means to increase road safety?"

-	TOTAL TOTAL (Weighted)(Unweighted)			STATE/TERRITORY							
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT	
<u>Suggestion</u>	%	*	*	%	ૠ	98	%	%	%	ક	
Better driver education/training testing	7 37	41	40	32	36	41	56	38	52	40	
Increase enforce- ment/more police on roads	33	34	26	42	37	25	30	38	18	39	
Improve/upgrade roads	18	13	28	10	17	7	4	11	30	7	
Change driver attitudes/behaviou	r 11	10	12	11	3	13	9	12	14	5	
Increase Random Breath Testing	7	8	9	5	9	8	10	14	_	14	
More signpostings/ signs/road marking		5	10	5	5	3	3	2	14	5	
Improve car safety inspections	7	6	8	5	3	11	7	8	8	2	
Increase driving a	ge 5	8	6	2	5	12	13	8	12	7	
More road rules/ change road rules	4	3	4	5	3	3	3	1	8	2	
Periodic licence testing	3	1	4	2	_	1	_	1	_	2	
Reduce speed limit	s 2	2	2	1	1	5	_	2	2	_	
Harsher penalties/ fines	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	1	4	3	
Promotion/advertis about penalties/ safety measures	ing 2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	_	1	
Other	13	11	10	17	7	25	6	9	2	7	
Don't know/no response	6	6	4	10	7	8	3	8	6	6	
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)	

Note: Multiple responses accepted.

The most frequently mentioned response to Question 22, better driver education/training and testing, was consistent with perceptions of why motorists break road rules (0.8). Being in a hurry, carelessness and frustration or distraction were most frequently mentioned, all of which could be addressed by better driver education/training.

Looking at variations across demographic groups, better driver education/training/testing was most frequently mentioned by:

- respondents aged 25-39 (47%)
- \* white collar workers (47%)
- tertiary (50%) and trade/TAFE (46%)
   educated respondents
- respondents with a household structure of young couple and young family (47%).

In contrast, preference for increased enforcement was the highest amongst respondents aged 18-24 (33%), and lower white collar workers (30%).

These two questions indicate that the community sees preventative measures as the most likely to increase road safety, in contrast to punishment.

 Severity of <u>Existing Penalties for Offences</u>, and Appropriate <u>Penalties</u>

Respondents were asked whether they consider existing penalties to be too harsh, about right, or too soft, for:

- drink driving
- speeding.

Table 11. SEVERITY OF EXISTING PENALTIES FOR DRINK DRIVING OFFENCES

Q.14 "Thinking now about the severity of penalties prescribed for motorists who <u>Drink</u>

<u>Drive</u>, do you think that penalties are too harsh, about right, or too soft?"

	TOTAL (Weighted	TOTAL )(Unweighted)_	STATE/TERRITORY							
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
<u>Response</u>	*	*	%	%	ૠ	ઋ	%	%	%	%
Too harsh	4	4 ·	2	5	7	5	1	2	2	4
About right	31	29	34	26	28	33	22	31	36	24
Too soft	57	58	53	62	56	52	72	54	52	59
Depends/varies	6	6	8	4	5	7	3	11	6	10
Don't know/no response	2	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	4	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)

#### Table 12. SEVERITY OF EXISTING PENALTIES FOR SPEEDING OFFENCES

Q.15 "And do you think that penalties for <u>speeding</u> are too harsh, about right, or too soft?"

	TOTAL (Weighted	TOTAL )(Unweighted)_	STATE/TERRITORY							
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Response	8	8	*	8	ક	ક	ક	%	<sup>2</sup> 6	ક
Too harsh	13	10	10	16	15	7	5	9	12	6
About right	43	46	42	45	43	46	56	44	46	41
Too soft	28	29	32	24	25	27	26	34	34	34
Depends/varies	10	8	- 13	7	8	5	5	11	2	7
Don't know/no response	6	. 8	4	7	10	14	9	3	6	13
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)

Tables 11 and 12 indicate that the majority of respondents believed that penalties for drink driving are too low (57%), compared with only 4% that considered them to be too harsh. This attitude was held by the majority in all States and Territories, with respondents in Western Australia being most likely to say that penalties are too soft.

Opinion was more divided in respect of present penalties for speeding. The most frequent response was that penalties are about right (43%), although twice as many respondents stated that penalties are too soft, than are too harsh (28% vs. 13%).

Respondents who have had their licence cancelled or suspended, or been fined on one or more occasion during the past two years, were significantly <u>more</u> likely to agree that penalties for speeding are too harsh, yet not for drink-driving.

The data suggests that harsher penalties for drink driving would be generally accepted in the community, whilst increased penalties for speeding may be met with some opposition.

Respondents were then asked to give their opinion on the most appropriate type of penalty for:

- \* a motorist who exceeds the speed limit by 30 Km/h
- a motorist who fails to stop at a red light.

Table 13. APPROPRIATE PENALTIES FOR SPEEDING

Q.16 "What type of penalty do you feel is appropriate for a motorist who exceeds the speed limit by 30 kms per hour? (free response)

(	TOTAL (Weighted	TOTAL )(Unweighted)			STATE	TERRI	ORY			
_			NSW	VIC	OLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Penalty	%	ક	*	ૠ	%	ક	%	*	%	%
Large monetary fines	22	23	19	26	19	25	20	16	34	38
Disqualification from driving for up to 12 months	18	19	15	26	14	21	19	20	12	21
Loss of points and a fine	d 18	22	20	8	39	9	41	22	18	12
A small monetary fine	9	9	10	8	9	12	5	12	12	g
Disqualification from driving for 12 months or more	3	3	2	4	1	7	1	2	2	. 2
Enforced training. education	3	2	4	1	1	3	3	1	. 2	1
Prison sentence/ gaol	1	1	2	_	_	1	_	1	-	
Warning	1	1		1	_	1	_	1		2
All others	3	3	1	7	3	6	_	2	2	3
Depends on circumstances	13	11	17	12	10	10	6	12	10	9
Don't know/no response	6	4	7	7	3	5	3	5	6	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101

Table 14. APPROPRIATE PENALTIES FOR NOT STOPPING AT A RED LIGHT

Q.17 "And what type of penalty would be appropriate for a motorist who fails to stop at a red light? (free response)

O	TOTAL Weighted	TOTAL (Unweighted)_			STATE	/TERRI	TORY			
_			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
<u>Penalty</u>	%	%	8	*	*	*	%	%	%	%
Large monetary fine	26	25	27	27	19	28	15	19	32	44
Disqualification from driving for up to 12 months	22	22	23	23	13	28	24	26	20	20
Loss of points and a fine	16	21	18	5	41	11	44	19	12	8
A small monetary fine	8	6	5	11	8	8	1	5	4	5
Loss of points only	y 4	4	4	5	5 .	3	4	3	4	2
Disqualification from driving for 12 months or more	3	2	2	5	2	2	3	3	2	-
Prison sentence/ gaol	3	2	5	1	1	_	1	3	_	1
Enforced training/ education	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	4	-
Warning	1	1	1	1	_	1	_	2	_	2
All others	3	2	2	6	2	3	-	2	_	1
Depends on circumstances	6	8	5	6	7	9	3	12	12	12
Don't know/no response	7	5	6	10	2	5	3	4	10	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	. 100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101

For both offences, opinion was divided, with the most frequent responses being:

- \* a large monetary fine was mentioned as the appropriate penalty for speeding by 22% of respondents, and by 26% for not stopping at a red light
- disqualification from driving for less
   than 12 months (18% and 22% respectively)
- loss of points and a fine (18% and 16% respectively).

Responses were quite similar for each offence, indicating that the perceived magnitude of each is similar.

A notable variation between the States and Territories was the high proportion of Western Australian and Queensland respondents who indicated that the appropriate penalty for not stopping at a red light should be loss of points and a fine (44% and 41% respectively). Furthermore, substantial variations were apparent between States and Territories regarding the most appropriate penalty for each offence.

#### 7. Penalties for Repeat Offenders

Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed that penalties should be harsher for motorists convicted of a second offence within one year, and then what type of penalties would be appropriate for a

Table 15. PENALTIES FOR REPEAT OFFENDERS

O.18 "Do you agree or disagree that penalties should be harsher for motorists who are convicted of a second offence within one year?"

	TOTAL (Weighted	TOTAL >(Unweighted)_	STATE/TERRITORY							
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
	*	4	*	*	%	*	%	~~ *	%	%
Agree	85	85	83	85	81	83	87	86	86	90
Disagree	10	9	12	6	14	12	8	6	6	3
Don't know/no response	5	6	5	9	5	5	5	8	8	7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)

convicted twice in one year, for each of exceeding the speed limit by 30 Km/h, and failing to stop at a red light.

The data indicates a widespread attitude that motorists who break a road rule twice in any year should receive harsher penalties. 85% agreed, with only 10% disagreeing.

Those respondents who had been booked on one or more occasions for traffic offences were significantly <u>less</u> likely to agree with harsher penalties, compared to those that had not been booked (74% vs. 87%). It should be noted, however, that by far the majority of those respondents do agree with harsher penalties for repeat offenders.

Respondents who agreed that penalties should be harsher for repeat offenders were then asked what penalties should be prescribed for:

- \* a motorist who is convicted of exceeding the speed limit by 30 Km/h twice in one year
- \* a motorist who fails to stop at a red light twice in one year.

In both instances, 54% of respondents indicted that motorists should have their licences suspended, either by up to 12 months (36% and 29% respectively) or more than 12 months (18% and 25% respectively). (See tables 16 and 17 overleaf.)

For both offences, Victorian respondents were more likely to opt for a suspension of over 12 months, as were South Australian respondents in the case of speeding only.

Table 16. APPROPRIATE PENALTIES FOR REPEAT OFFENDERS

0.19 "And what type of penalty would be appropriate for a motorist who is convicted of exceeding the speed limit by  $30\,\mathrm{Km/h}$  twice in one year?"

-	TOTAL TOTAL (Weighted)(Unweighted)				STATE	E/TERR]	TORY			
			NSW	VIC	OLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
<u>Penalty</u>	%	*	૪	뫙	%	ૠ	%	%	%	%
Disqualification from driving for up to 12 months	36	38	37	33	37	36	43	43	26	41
Disqualification from driving for 12 months or more	18	19	16	25	15	- 28	18	17	7	17
A large monetary fine	17	16	16	17	15	13	11	10	30	24
Loss of points and fine	10	10	11	8	12	9	20	7	5	4
Prison sentence/ gaol	. 3	2	6	1	2.	3	1	1	-	1
Double previous penalty	2	2	1	2	6	1	-	2	_	3
Enforced training education	2	1	1	2	_	1	2	2	5	_
A small monetary fine	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	_	5	_
Cancellation of licence	1	1	-	3	_	1	_	1	_	_
Loss of points only	1	*	1	_	-	_	-	_	2	_
Community work/ community work an fine	d 1	1	-	1	2	1	1	-	_	jī,
All others	4	4	4	2	6	3	-	7	16	3
Depends on circumstances	5	5	4	6	5	3	4	10	5	5
Don't know/no response	4	3	4	2	5	2	-	2	12	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(871)	(871)	(138)	(129)	(123)	(127)	(131)	(89)	(43)	(91)

Table 17. APPROPRIATE PENALTIES FOR REPEAT OFFENDERS

Q.20A "And what type of penalty would be appropriate for a motorist who fails to stop at a red light twice in one year?" (free response)

10 <del></del>	TOTAL TOTAL STATE/TERRITORY									
	(Weighted)	(Unweighted	)							<del></del>
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	·WA	TAS	ACT	NT
<u>Penalty</u>	४	%	*	%	*	%	*	%	%	%
Disqualification from driving for up to 12 months	29	35	25	30	30	40	46	42	26	34
Disqualification from driving for 12 months or more	25	22	26	31	15	24	22	25	14	14
A large monetary fine	16	18	17	15	21	16	10	12	28	31
Loss of points and fine	13	10	14	9	14	7	11	4	12	4
Prison sentence/ gaol	4	3	8	2	2	4	2	2	_	-
Cancellation of licence	1	1	1	4	-	1	-		-	. <b>-</b>
Double previous penalty	1	1	1	.1	2	<u>-</u>	1	1	_	4
Loss of points only	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	5	-
Enforced training education	1	1	1	1	1	-	3	<del>-</del>	2	-
A small monetary fine	1		-	3	-	_	_	-	-	-
All others	•	1	-	1	3	2	2 -	. 1	_	4
Depends on circumstances	3	4	2	1	7	2	3	9	5	4
Don't know/no response	<b>3</b>	. 3		2	4	3	. <b>-</b>	2	9	3
Total	100	100	100 <sub>1</sub>	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(871)	(871)	(138)	(129)	(123)	(127)	(131)	(89)	(43)	(91)

Question 20B then asked respondents if they would consider these higher penalties for second offences to be applicable to themselves. All but a handful agreed, suggesting that in the event that they had higher penalties imposed on them, they would have little cause to complain. Of these 871 respondents, ten indicated they would not consider it fair and reasonable if such penalties were imposed on them, with a further 12 respondents indicating that it would depend on circumstances.

#### 8. Alternatives to Existing Penalties

All respondents were asked if they can suggest any alternatives to existing penalties, that would be effective in increasing road safety. Only two alternatives to existing penalties were mentioned by more than 5% of respondents:

- \* driver education/training (26%)
- \* community service (14%)

The next most frequent comment, gaol/prison, is already possible for serious offences. 44% of respondents gave no suggestion, offering a "none" or "don't know" response.

Driver education/training was most frequently cited in Western Australia (40%), and the A.C.T. (50%), and by the following demographic groups:

- respondents aged 25-29 years (36%)
- \* students and the unemployed (35%)

#### Table 18. ALTERNATIVES TO EXISTING PENALTIES

0.21 "What alternatives, if any, can you suggest to existing penalties, such as fines, loss of points and disqualification from driving, that would be effective in increasing road safety?" (free response)

	TOTAL	TOTAL			STAT	E/TERR	ITORY			
	(Weighted	(Unweighted)_								
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Alternative	%	%	%	%	8	%	%	%	%	%
Driver education/ training	26	27	33	20	23	27	40	17	50	15
Community service work in hospital	14	13	16	9	14	10	14	16	. 8	14
Prison/gaol	5	5	5	3	4	7	3	5	-	8
Stickers/signs on cars stating the offence	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	_	2	1
More police/more visible police presence	2	1	_	5	1	<del>-</del>	1	_	2	_
Restrictions/ restrict speed	1	1	1	1	1	1	****	1	_	_
Loss of licence/ disqualification for a long time/ for life	1 .	1	_	2	_	1	2	3	_	1
Impound car/lose car	1	1	1	1	_	-	1	_	-	2
All others	7	8	7	9	7	7	9	10	4	8
None	25	26	17	36	32	20	21	28	18	41
Don't know/no response	19	17	19	17	17	25	9	22	16	12
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)

Note: Multiple responses accepted.

Table 19. HOW SAFELY RESPONDENTS THINK THEY DRIVE

Q.13 Thinking about how safely you drive in comparison to other motorists, do you think you are <u>much</u> safer than most, slightly safer than most, about average, slightly less safe than most, or much less safe than most?

-	TOTAL TOTAL (Weighted)(Unweighted)_		STATE/TERRITORY							
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
	8	%	*	*	%	*	*	%	%	%
Much safer than most	22	21	20	26	18	26	22	25	16	13
Slightly safer than most	31	36	29	27	46	34	33	33	44	49
About average	45	41	47	46	35	38	45	39	40	35
Slightly less safe than most	e 2	1	3	_	1	1	_	1	_	1
Much less safe than most	*	•	1	_	-	_	_	_	_	-
Depends/varies	*	*	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	_
Don't know/no response	*	1	1	1	_	1	1	_	_	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(937)	(937)	(152)	(136)	(146)	(137)	(135)	(88)	(45)	(95)

Note: Based on respondents with a current licence or permit.

<sup>\*</sup> less than 1%.

- tertiary and trade/TAFE educated persons
   (34% and 33% respectively)
- respondents in young families (35%)

Community service was more frequently mentioned in N.S.W. and Tasmania (16% each), by white collar workers (14%), trade/TAFE and tertiary educated respondents (14%), and respondents with a young couple household structure (15%).

#### 9. Personal Perceptions of Driving Safety

Respondents holding a current licence or permit were asked if they think they drive:

- \* much safer than most
- \* slightly safer than most
- \* about average
- \* slightly less safe than most
- \* much less safe than most.

The majority of respondents with a licence or permit were of the opinion that they drive <u>more</u> safely than the majority of other drivers, with only 2% admitting that they drive slightly less safely than most. The remaining 45% indicated that they are average in respect of road safety.

Some variation between states was evident, with respondents in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania being more likely to state that they drive <u>much</u> safer than most.

# APPENDIX I

Demographic Profiles of Respondents

Table 20. LICENCES HELD AND KILOMETRES TRAVELLED

- 0.1 "Firstly, do you presently hold a motor vehicle licence or permit?"
- 0.2 "And what type or types of licence or permit would that be?"
- Q.3 "In total, how many kilometres would you drive/ride per year?"

-	TOTAL (Weighted)	STATE/TERRITORY									
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT	
Licensed	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	%	%	
Yes	90	91	92	89	97	90	91	85	90	94	
No	10	9	8	11	3	10	9	15	10	6	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Types of Licence	<u>es</u>										
Motor car	96	97	95	98	99	96	99	92	100	99	
Motor cycle	7	9	7	4	14	14	13	3	2	13	
Taxi/bus	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	-	3	
Heavy/commercial vehicle	l 7	12	6	5	18	8	16	25	2	9	
Don't know/no response	•	•	_	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	
Total	113	120	110	108	133	119	130	123	104	124	

Notes: Multiple responses accepted.

<sup>\*</sup> less than 1%

Kilometres per Year	•									
0 - 5,000	17	16	17	14	27	15	7	15	20	11
5,000 - 10,000	24	22	23	21	23	28	21	18	7	19
10,001 - 15,000	19	20	25	14	14	16	22	24	22	28
15,001 - 20,000	12	12	12	13	8	13	10	13	18	12
20,001 - 30,000	13	13	13	13	12	16	15	5	20	15
Over 30,000	11	14	7	18	14	9	22	14	9	15
Don't know/no response	5	4	3	8	2	2	3	13	4	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: Multiple responses accepted.

<sup>\*</sup> less than 1%.

#### Table 21. BOOKING AND ACCIDENT RECORD

- D.1 "Have you been booked for a traffic violation, other then parking, in the last two years?" (If yes) "How many would that be?"
- D.2 "Have you ever been involved in a road accident, as a driver, passenger or other road user?"

	TOTAL	TOTAL			STATI	/TERR	TORY			
	(Weighted)	(Unweighted)_								
			NSW	VIC	OLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	N°
Booking History	%	%	%	%	왕	8	*	8	8	9
None/nil	81	80	80	82	82	82	78	77	89	75
Once	13	13	13	10	15	12	14	14	7	17
Two or more	5	6	5	6	3	3	7	9	4	7
Don't know/no response	1	1	1	1	-	2	1	-	_	. 1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(937)	(937)	(152)	(136)	(146)	(137)	(138)	(88)	(45)	(95
Involved in an A	<u>ccident</u>									
Yes	61	59	64	56	64	64	55	55	60	5(
No	38	40	34	41	36	35	44	44	40	49
Don't know/no response	1	1	1	3	-	1	1	1	-	1 0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	10(
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(157)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(10)

# Table 22 RESPONDENT AGE, OCCUPATION & EDUCATION Demographics 6, 7 and 8

	TOTAL	TOTAL			STATE	/TERRI	TORY			
(1	leighted)	(Unweighted)								
			NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	ACT	NT
Age (Years)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	૪	*	*
18 - 24	15	13	13	20	12	14	10	6	14	10
24 - 29	12	13	14	14	13	8	17	13	12	11
30 - 39	22	27	20	21	24	27	27	31	24	45
40 - 49	16	20	19	16	21	22	25	17	24	19
50 - 59	15	11	15	10	13	6	7	17	8	10
60 and over	21	16	17	16	19	21	13	17	18	5
Tota1	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Occupation										
Student	5	.4	4	7	3	4	2	i	4	4
Full time home duties	16	18	16	13	21	22	26	19	8	11
Retired/pensioner	18	14	18	14	15	14	10	18	12	7
Unemployed	2	3	4	1	3	4	2	3	2	2
Lower blue collar	8	9	7	11	9	12	8	12	4	11
Upper blue collar	11	10	12	11	10	9	7	6	14	18
Lower white collar	32	34	31	36	30	27	38	36	44	39
Upper white collar	7	6	6	7	8	3	5	2	10	8
Total working	58	50	57	64	57	54	58	57	74	75
Refused/no response	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	~	1
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Primary	5	5	2	6	11	7	3	6	-	3
Secondary	53	55	49	58	56	58	48	68	42	57
Trade/TAFE	15	15	20	10	14	14	23	6	12	12
Tertiary	25	23	25	23	18	20	25	19	36	26
Other/no response/refused	3	3	5	3	1	2	2	1	10	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Base)	(1027)	(1027)	(166)	(152)	(151)	(153)	(151)	(103)	(50)	(101)

# APPENDIX II

Field Summary of Calls and Achievement Rates

Field Summary of Calls and Achievement Rates

	Total	NSW & ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NТ
Completed interviews	1026	216	152	151	153	151	103	100
Terminated	21	4	5	1	_	-	6	5
Refusals	583	153	160	120	30	37	66	17
Ouota full/ discarded	236	58	25	18	46	38	17	34
Total contacts	1866	431	342	290	229	226	192	156
Nil contacts (including recorded messages)	517	56	117	38	210	22	36	38
Total attempts	2383	487	459	328	439	248	228	194

Note: Calls were made from the following Reark offices:

<u>Office</u>	State/Territories
Brisbane	Queensland and Northern Territory
Sydney	New South Wales and A.C.T.
Melbourne	Victoria and Tasmania
Adelaide	South Australia
Perth	Western Australia

APPENDIX III

Questionnaire

#### TRAFFIC LAWS AND ENFORCEMENT

#### CS.1914.MD/MT.kj

#### Questionnaire, August, 1987

#### INTRODUCTION

Good (...). I'm (...) from REARK RESEARCH, the national survey company. Today we are talking to people about road traffic. May I speak with the person in your household, 18 years' of age or over, whose birthday comes closest to today's date.

#### RE-INTRODUCE YOURSELF IF NECESSARY

Q.1	Firstly, do you presently permit?	hold a motor vehicle licence or
		Yes( <u>Continue</u> ) 1
		No( <u>Go to 0.4</u> ) 2
		(Don't know)( <b>Go to Q.4)</b> 3
0.2	Q.2 And what type or types of Would that be ( <u>Read out</u> )	
ACCEPT MULTIPLES	Motor car 1	
		Motorcycle 2
		Taxi or Bus 3
		Heavy vehicle or other commercial vehicle 4
		(Don't know) 5

0.3

In total, how many kilometres would you drive or ride per

(Read out if necessary) vear? NOTE: THIS INCLUDES ALL MOTOR VEHICLES Less than 5,000 kms..... 1 5,001 - 10,000 kms..... 2 10,001 - 15,000 kms..... 3 15,001 - 20,000 kms..... 4 20,001 - 30,000 kms..... 5 Over 30,000 kms..... 6 (Don't know)..... 7 0.4 What factors do you think influence or affect the way motorists drive? ACCEPT MULTIPLES (Probe: What else influences or affects the way motorists drive?) Traffic conditions/amount of traffic on road/traffic Speed of other road users/cars..... 02 Whether other people are in the car.................. 06 Concern for public safety..... 07 Whether motorists are in a hurry or not.......... 08 Level of police/law enforcement...... 10 Alcohol consumption/drinking/drinking and driving..... 11 Stress/pressure/when worried...... 12 Other (Please specify)..... 14 

0.5	Thinking now about <u>road rules</u> , excluding parking, what do you think is their main purpose? ( <u>Probe if unsure: What are road rules trying to achieve?</u> ) <u>DO NOT AID!</u>
	Protect road users 1
	Encourage good/responsible behaviour on the road 2
	Raise revenue from fines 3
	Other ( <u>Specify</u> ) 4
	(Don't know) 5
0.6	IF HOLD LICENCE/PERMIT ("YES" TO 0.1) - OTHERWISE GO TO 0.8
	Have you <u>ever</u> broken any road rules that you are aware of? Would that be ( <u>Read out</u> )
	Frequently( <u>Go to 0.7</u> ) 1
	Occasionally( <u>Go to 0.7</u> ) 2
	Rarely or only on exceptions( <u>Go to 0.7</u> ) 3
	Never( <u>Go to 0.8</u> ) 4 (Don't know)( <u>Go to 0.8</u> ) 5
0.7	And what type of road rule would you fail to observe most often? (Probe if necessary) ACCEPT MULTIPLES
	Exceeding speed limit - 60 kmphr zone
	Exceeding 100 kmphr in country or on highways 02
	Going through red light
	Not stopping at a "stop" sign
	Crossing double-yellow lines
	Changing lanes or turning without indicating 06
	Drinking and driving 07
	(all equally/none in particular)
	Other ( <u>Please specify</u> )
	09
	(Don't know)

## 0.8 ASK EVERYONE

In general, why do you think motorists break road rules? (Probe if necessary) ACCEPT MULTIPLES

	Don't know rules/don't understand/not aware of them/ ignorance
	Poor driver education/training 02
	Happen accidentally/not deliberate
	Motorists in a hurry04
	Motorists frustrated/distracted
	Don't care about/respect laws
	Rules not enforced
	No police on road/not enough police/police presence 08
	Penalties too low
	People don't believe they will be caught 10
	Motorists/people are careless/have wrong attitude 11
	Because others break them 12
	Other ( <u>Please specify</u> )
	13
	(Don't know)
0.9	Which of the following statements $\underline{\text{best}}$ describes your attitude to road rules? (Read out)
	Road rules should never be broken, under any circumstances 1
	Motorists should obey road rules unless they have a good reason for not obeying them 2
	Motorists should be able to break road rules occasionally as long as they are careful 3
	Motorists should be able to break rules when-ever they feel it is justified4
	(Don't know/can't say)5

0.10	Can you think of any road rules that do not contribute toward keeping the roads safe?		
	<pre>IF "YES" WHAT RULE WOULD THAT BE? (Note: This excludes parking)</pre>		
		60 kph speed limit	1
		100 kph speed limit	2
		Speed limits in country r	egions/on highways. 3
		Stop signs/give-way signs	4
		Traffic lights	5
		Restrictions on passing/o yellow lines	
		Other (Please specify)	
			7
		(Don't know)	8
		None/all contribute to sa	fety9
2.11	through a red 1 being stopped	t breaks road rules, such light, what would be the ch by police, say, on a scal chance, and 10 would mean ed?	ance of that motorist e from 1-10, where 1
	One	01	Seven 07
	Two	02	Eight 08
		03	Nine 09
		04	Ten 10
		05	(Don't know) 11

Q.12	Which of the following toward keeping the roads	<pre>do you think would contribute more safe? (Read out)</pre>
		More police on the road 1
		More severe penalties for traffic offences 2
		(Both equal) 3
		(Neither/none) 4
		(Don't know) 5
0.13	Thinking about how safe motorists, do you think y	ly you drive in comparison to other ou are ( <u>Read out</u> )
		Much safer than most 1
		Slightly safer than most 2
		About average 3
		Slightly less safe than most 4
		Much less safe than most 5
		(Depends/varies)6
		(Don't know) 7
0.14	motorists who <u>drink drive</u>	verity of <u>penalties</u> prescribed for <u>e,</u> do you think that penalties are
	( <u>Read_out</u> )	Too harsh 1
		About right 2
		Too soft 3
		(Depends/varies)4
		(Don't know) 5
0.15		nalties for <u>speeding</u> are
	( <u>Read out</u> )	Too harsh 1
		About right 2
	ı	Too soft 3
		(Depends/varies)4
		(Don't know)5

0.16	What <u>type</u> of penalty do you feel is appropriate for a motorist who exceeds the speed limit by 30 kms per hour?
	RECORD IN GRID BELOW (Probe if necessary)

0.17	And what type would be appropriate for a motorist who fails to
	stop at a red light?
	DECORD IN CRID RELOW (Prohe if necessary)

	RECORD IN GRID BELOW (Probe if necessary)		
		Q.16	0.17
	A small monetary fine only	01	01
	A large monetary fine	02	02
	Loss of points only	03	03
	Loss of points and a fine	04	04
	Disqualification from driving for up to 12 months	05	05
	Disqualification from driving for 12 months or more	06	06
	Enforced training/education	07	07
	Prison sentence/gaol	08	80
	Other ( <u>Please specify</u> )		
		09	09
	Depends/depend on circumstances	10	10
	(Don't know)	11	11
0.18	Do you agree or disagree that penalties should be motorists who are convicted of a <u>second</u> offence year?		
	Agree( <u>Continue</u> )		1
	Disagree( <u>Go to 0.2</u>	<u>1</u> )	2
	(Don't know)( <u>Go to</u> 0.2	1)	3

0.19	And what type of penalty would be appropriate for a who is convicted of exceeding the speed limit by own per hour <u>twice</u> within one year?  (Probe if necessary) RECORD IN GRID BELOW		
Q.20A	And what type of penalty would be appropriate for a who fails to stop at a red light twice within one yea (Probe if necessary) RECORD IN GRID BELOW		rist
		0.19	<u>0.20</u>
	A small monetary fine only	01	01
	A large monetary fine	02	02
	Loss of points only	03	03
	Loss of points and a fine	04	04
	Disqualification from driving for up to 12 months	05	05
	Disqualification for driving for 12 months or more	06	06
	Enforced training/education	07	07
	Prison sentence/gaol	80	80
	Other ( <u>Please specify</u> )	09	09
	(Depends/depend on circumstances)	10	10
	(Don't know)	11	11
Q.20B	And would you consider that the penalties you mentioned would be fair and reasonable if YOU commit offences?	have ted t	just hese
	Yes	• • • • •	1
	No	••••	2
	(Depends on circumsta	inces)	3

(Don't know).....4

0.21	What <u>alternatives</u> , if any, can you suggest to existing penalties such as fines, loss of points and disqualification from driving, that would be effective in increasing road safety?  None
	Prison/gaol 2
	Community Service 3
	Driver education/training 4
	Other ( <u>Please specify</u> )
	5
	(Don't know) 6
0.22	What do you think would be the most effective way or means to increase road safety?  (Probe: What would have to be done to reduce road accidents?)
	ACCEPT MULTIPLES
	Better driver education/training/licence testing 01
	Change driver attitudes/behaviour
	More signposting/warning signs/road markings 03
	Improve/upgrade road conditions
	More road rules/change road rules
	Improve the safety of cars/car inspection 06
	Increase enforcement of road rules/more police on road 07
	Increase RBT (random breath testing)
	Increase driving age/age you can get a permit/licence. 09
	Other ( <u>Please specify</u> )
	10
	(Don't know)11

## **DEMOGRAPHICS**

).1	IF HAVE A CURRENT LICENCE/PERMITTO D.3	Γ - (YES TO 0.1) - OTHERWISE GO
	lave you been booked for a parking, in the last two years?  IF "YES", HOW MANY TIMES WOULD	
		None/nil 1
		)nce 2
		Two or more 3
		(Don't know/can't remember). 4
D.2	Have you ever been involved in passenger or other road user?	a road accident, as a driver,
	pussenger of other roug user.	Yes 1
		No 2
		(Don't know) 3

D.3	Have you <u>ever</u> had your licer traffic infringements?	e or permit <u>cancelled</u> due to					
		Yes 1					
		No 2					
		(Don't know) 3					
D.4	State/Territory <u>RECORD AUTOMATICALLY</u>						
	Queens land						
		New South Wales 2					
		A.C.T 3					
		Victoria 4					
		Tasmania 5					
		South Australia 6					
		Western Australia 7					
		Northern Territory 8					
D.5	Sex RECORD AUTOMATICALLY						
		Male 1					
		Female 2					
D.6	And into which of the following (Read out)	age groups do you fall?					
	(Read Out)	18-24 years 1					
		24-29 years 2					
		30-39 years 3					
		40-49 years 4					
		50-59 years 5					
		60 years and over 6					

D.7	And what is your us	ual occupation?	( <u>Read out if necessary</u> )
		Stu	dent/studying 1
		Hom	e duties 2
		Ret	ired/pensioner 3
			mployed/other not in work ce4
		Wor	king ( <u>Probe for position</u> ) 5
D.8	And what is the hig (Read out if necess		ucation you have attained?
		Pri	mary school only 1
		Sec	ondary school 2
		Tra	de/TAFE qualification 3
			tiary qualification/ ree/diploma4
		Oth	er5
D.9	And which of the your household? (R		describes the structure of
	Singl	e people	
	Young	couple	2
	Young	family (oldest	child to six years) 3
	Middl	e family (oldest	child to 15 years) 4
			child above 15 years, ng at home)5
	Later	family (no chil	dren at home)6
THANK	RESPONDENT AND CLOSE	; ••	

# APPENDIX IV

Table of Standard Error Margins

# STANDARD ERROR OF A PROPORTION 95% Sampling Tolerance Assumes Sampling Plan 80% as Efficient as a Single Random Sample

<u>Sample</u> Proportion	Sample Size						
	1000 ±%	500 ±%	400 <u>+</u> ቄ	300 ±%	200 ±%	150 ±8	±8 100
5/95%	1.5	2.2	2.4	2.8	3.5	4.0	4.8
10/90%	2.1	3.0	3.4	3.9	4.8	5.4	6.6
15/85%	2.5	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.7	6.4	7.8
20/80%	2.8	4.0	4.5	5.1	6.3	7.2	8.8
25/75%	3.0	4.3	4.8	5.5	6.8	7.7	9.5
30/70%	3.2	4.5	5.1	5.8	7.3	8.2	10.0
35/65%	3.3	4.7	5.3	6.1	7.5	8.6	10.5
40/60%	3.4	4.9	5.4	6.3	7.7	8.8	10.7
50/50%	3.5	5.0	5.5	6.4	7.8	9.0	11.0

Confidence Interval is  $\pm$  the given sample proportion. The above table is provided as a quide to maximum expected error variances for probability samples employed with reasonable cluster sizes. Experience suggests that actual error variances are smaller than the above theoretical values.