

WEST VIRGINIA'S DRIVER ATTITUDES AND AWARENESS SURVEY, 2011

Selected Results

Submitted to:
Governor's Highway Safety Office
Division of Motor Vehicles
West Virginia Department of Transportation

In preparation of:
West Virginia's 2012 Highway Safety Plan

Prepared by:
Stephen M. Haas, Ph.D.
Mountain State Criminal Justice Research Services, LLC

December 2011

Introduction

As part of a collaborative agreement between the Governor's Highway Safety Association (GHSA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), all State Highway Safety Offices (SHSO) are required to conduct a survey to track the knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of the driving public in relation to safety issues and programs. The survey inquired about the public's knowledge and attitudes about such issues as seat belt use, impaired driving, speeding and other driving safety related issues such as cell phone use and texting. The results of the survey will be included in WV's FY 2012 Highway Safety Plan. It is anticipated that the results of such surveys will contribute to safer highways by aiding the Governor's Highway Safety Office (GHSO) in developing more effective educational campaigns and monitoring the driving behaviors and attitudes of WV citizens.

Methodology

Eligible participants include all persons of driving age that come to each of 10 Division of Motor Vehicle regional offices for the delivery of services (i.e., new license or renewal or other). Collection of data from each of these sites regional sites helped to ensure a geographically representative sample of WV's driving population. Site coordinators were established at each site. These site coordinators were responsible for overseeing the survey administration procedures.

The sample was derived from the population of licensed drivers entering each DMV regional office for services. Every k^{th} person entering the DMV for services (e.g., every other, every 3rd person, etc.) was asked by site representatives whether they would volunteer to participate in the survey. The procedure allowed for each person entering the offices to have an equal chance of being selected to participate in the survey. Site coordinators explained that participation in the survey was voluntary and their answers would remain anonymous. It was further explained that the results of the study would help the West Virginia Department of Transportation create better public service announcements and other education-based programs to inform the public about certain driving hazards. The results would also assist in the monitoring of such programs and whether they have an impact on driving behaviors. The results would be used to help form the basis for WV's FY 2012 Highway Safety Plan. After completing the survey, respondents placed the survey in a secure envelop and placed it in a box rather than returning it to the site coordinators.

The two-page self-report survey captured information on driver awareness of media campaigns as well as driver attitudes and behavior. The survey was comprised of all core questions identified and recommended by the NHTSA-GHSA working group, plus a select few additional questions identified by WV's Governor's Highway Safety Office (GHSO). The survey asked questions about whether drivers had read, seen, or heard selected educational media campaigns on safety belt use, speeding, and impaired driving. In addition, the survey captured information on the driving behaviors of persons in each of these three areas as well as how often they talked on their cell phone or texted while driving. Finally, the survey captured information on the perceived likelihood of getting caught and potentially receiving a ticket or not wearing a safety belt, speeding or receiving a citation or being arrested for impaired driving. A copy of the survey is provided in the Appendix.

A total of 1,072 surveys were completed across the 10 DMV regional offices. Table 1 provides a summary of the demographic characteristics of respondents and the distribution of surveys across the 10 sites. The number of surveys completed at each site is representative of the size and level of services provided at each regional office. As a result, regional offices serving more populated cities and areas

comprised a greater proportion of the overall sample. Huntington (15.4%), Clarksburg (14.3%), and Martinsburg (13.2%) offices had the greatest proportion of completed surveys. Most respondents reported driving passenger vehicles (45.4%), followed by SUV's (24.4%) and pickup trucks (19.5%). The sample consisted mostly of white (92.5%), female (60.2%) drivers with a high school or equivalent degree (35.3%). The mean age of respondent's was 42 years old. Driver's reported driving an average of 18,465 miles during the past year.

Results

Education Campaigns and Driver Awareness

Tables 2 and 3 describe the results related to driver awareness and both general and specific highways safety education campaigns. Results are reported for both 2010 and 2011 for comparison purposes. Driver awareness of general public services messages by police on issues such as safety belt use, speeding, and impaired driving is presented in Table 2. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had read, seen, or heard a public service message about seat belt law enforcement in the past 60 days. A similar question was asked of respondents for speeding and impaired driving in the past 30 days.

For both 2010 and 2011, the results indicate that messages related to impaired driving and safety belt use were heard more often by respondents compared to educational campaigns related to speeding. Generally, there was little change in the percentage of respondents reporting awareness of each public service message. Selected findings include:

- 79.2% of respondents had read, seen, or heard a message about alcohol impaired driving in the past 30 days in 2011, compared to 81.5% of respondents in 2010.
- 73.0% of respondents had read, seen, or heard a message about seat belt law enforcement in the past 60 days in 2011, compared to 72.7% in 2010.
- 59.0% of respondents had read, seen, or heard a message about speed enforcement in the past 30 days in 2011, compared to 57.3% in 2011.

Table 3 displays the results of related to driver awareness of specific highway safety educational campaigns utilized in West Virginia for 2010 and 2011. The "Click it-or-Ticket" campaign is clearly the most widely read, seen, or heard message among this sample of WV drivers with roughly ninety percent of drivers reporting that they had been exposed to this campaign in the past sixty days. For the second consecutive year, less than fifty percent of drivers recall being exposed to the "Over-the-Limit, Under Arrest" and "Buzzed Driving is Drunk Driving" public service announcements.

Selected findings include:

- 90.1% of respondents had read, seen, or heard the "Click it-or-Ticket" service announcement in the past 60 days in 2010, compared to 85.4% in 2011. This is nearly a five percent increase between 2010 and 2011.
- Fewer than half of respondents recall having read, seen, or heard the "Over-the-Limit, Under Arrest" (45.7%) and "Buzzed Driving is Drunk Driving" (47.2%) service announcement in the past 60 days in 2010. This finding remained the same for 2011 with 47.3% and 45.1% of drivers having been exposed to "Over-the-Limit, Under Arrest" and "Buzzed Driving is Drunk Driving" campaigns, respectively.

Safety Belt Use and Attitudes

The impact of public service messages and receiving prior tickets on driver perceptions and safety belt use is presented in Table 4. The first two columns report the total frequency and percentage distributions for 2010 and 2011. Very little change occurred in the distributions between the two years. Drivers were slightly more likely to report wearing their safety belts “all of the time,” up nearly five percentage points from 71.6% in 2010 to 76.7% in 2011. At the same time, however, a smaller percentage of drivers reported that they were “very likely” to receive a ticket for not wearing a safety belt and that the penalty for not wearing a safety belt was “very strict.” Nonetheless, a majority of respondent indicated that the likelihood of receiving a ticket was at least “somewhat likely” and penalties were at least “somewhat strict.”

The second two columns in Table 4 present findings in relation to the impact of public service messages and prior tickets on safety belt use and perceptions of penalties for 2011. In contrast to 2010 results, the media campaign did not appear to impact safety belt use in this sample of drivers. Regardless of whether they heard the public service message or not in the past 60 days, drivers seemed to wear their safety belts just as often. However, the media campaign did appear to impact drivers’ perceptions of the likelihood of receiving a ticket as well as the severity of the penalties that would be imposed. Drivers who recalled hearing the campaign message in the past sixty days were significantly more likely to believe it was more likely they would receive a ticket and that the penalties would be at least “somewhat strict.”

The last two columns in Table 4 examine the impact of having received a ticket for not wearing a safety belt in the past on safety belt use and perceptions of the certainty and severity of penalties in 2011. The results indicate that respondents who received a ticket in the past were significantly *less* likely report wearing a safety belt on a regular basis. Therefore, despite having received a ticket in the past for not wearing a safety belt these drivers continue to report using safety belts less often than drivers who had never received a ticket. There was no statistical difference in driver’s perceptions of the likelihood of getting a ticket or the severity of penalties based on having received a ticket in the past. As a result, 2011 drivers who reported receiving a ticket for not wearing a seatbelt in the past were significantly less likely to wear a seatbelt regularly, no more likely to believe the certainty of receiving a ticket was greater, and did not perceive the strictness of penalties differently than drivers who had never received a ticket.

Selected findings include:

- 76.7% of respondents reported wearing a safety belt “all the time” in 2011, compared to 71.6% in 2010.
- 39.7% of respondents believed that the chance of getting a ticket was “very likely” in 2011, compared to 42.0% in 2010.
- Drivers exposed to the safety belt enforcement message in the past 60 days were no more likely to regularly wear a safety belt in 2011 compared to drivers who had not been exposed to the message.
- Respondents who had received a ticket for not wearing a safety belt in the past were significantly less likely to report wearing a seatbelt on a regular basis compared to those who had never received a ticket.

Speed Violations and Attitudes

Table 5 displays the impact of public service messages and prior speeding tickets on current use and perceptions of law enforcement responses. The first two columns present the results for the total samples in 2010 and 2011. The results indicate that a majority of respondents for both years violate 30 mph and 70 mph speed limits at least on occasion. In addition, the findings illustrate that a large percentage of respondents believe that the likelihood of getting a ticket for speeding is at least “somewhat likely” and that penalties are at least “somewhat strict.”

The second set of columns illustrates the differences in reported speeding and perceptions of law enforcement responses based on exposure to a public service announcement in the past 30 days. The results indicate that exposure to the campaigns message did not influence the likelihood of speeding as self-reported. However, they were significantly more likely to feel the chances of getting caught speeding were greater and that the penalties would be more severe.

The final set of columns in Table 5 compares respondents based on whether or not they had received a speeding ticket in the past 12 months. Respondents who reported receiving a speeding ticket in the past 12 months also reported speeding more often. This is consistent with the 2010 results. However, no differences were found in their estimates of the likelihood of getting caught speeding. Therefore, having received a ticket in the past did not make the respondents feel they were more likely to get a ticket compared to their counterparts. In contrast to 2010 results, drivers who had received a ticket in the past believed the penalties to be significantly stricter than those respondents who had not received a ticket in the past 12 months. Selected findings include:

- Slightly less than one-half of respondents reported having violated the speed limit at least “some of the time” in 2011. This is slightly less than 2010 results.
- Roughly ninety percent of respondents in 2010 and 2011 believed the chances of getting a ticket for speeding was at least “somewhat likely” and believed the penalties to be as least “somewhat strict” for speeding.
- In 2010, respondents exposed to an enforcement message in the past 30 days indicated violating the speed limit less often and perceived the likelihood of receiving a ticket and the severity of penalties to be greater. In 2011, however, there was no difference in the self-reported frequency of speeding based on exposure to the media campaign.
- Receiving a speeding ticket in the past 12 months had no impact on the perceptions of certainty among respondents in 2011.
- Respondents who had received a ticket in the past 12 months reported violating the speed limit *more* often than those who had not received a ticket. This result was found for both 2010 and 2011 samples.

Impaired Driving and Attitudes

The survey further assessed the impact of public service messages and receiving prior citations/arrest for impaired driving. Respondents were first asked to report their frequency of alcohol use and impaired driving. Results for both 2010 and 2011 are reported in Table 6. As shown in Table 6, more than one-half of respondents reported no alcohol consumption (50.3%) in 2010, compared to 53.6% in 2011. Likewise, ninety percent of respondents indicated that they had *not* driven while impaired in the past sixty days in 2010 (90.5%) and 2011 (92.5%).

Table 7 illustrates the impact of exposure to enforcement messages and prior citations/arrest on impaired driving for 2010 and 2011. Generally, a vast majority of respondents believe the likelihood of arrest for impaired driving is at least “somewhat likely” and that the penalties are at least “somewhat strict.” In 2010, no significant difference in self-reported impaired driving was found based on exposure to a public service message. In 2011, however, this changed. Based on the results reported in second set of columns in Table 7, drivers exposed to the media message in the past 30 days were significantly *less* likely to report having driven while intoxicated in the past 60 days. Exposure to an enforcement message did impact respondent’s beliefs about the likelihood of getting caught but did not change drivers perceptions of the severity of penalties.

The final set of columns in Table 7 compares the frequency of impaired driving and respondent’s perceptions law enforcement responses based on whether or not they had previously been arrested or received a citation for impaired driving. The results indicate respondents who had received a citation/arrest for impaired driving in the past, were also significantly *more likely* to report having driven impaired over the past sixty days in 2011. One-quarter of respondents who had been arrested or received a citation in the past indicated that they had driven impaired in the last two months (24.6%) in 2011, compared to 34.9% in 2010. They were also more likely to believe the penalties are “somewhat” or “very strict” compared to those who had never received a citation or ticket. Selected findings include:

- Less than ten percent of respondents reported driving impaired in the past sixty days in 2010 and 2011.
- For both 2010 and 2011, nearly ninety percent of respondents felt that the chance of getting arrested/receiving a citation for impaired driving was at least “somewhat likely.”
- Over three-quarters of respondents indicated that the penalties for impaired driving are at least “somewhat strict” in 2010 (79.1%) and 2011 (76.3%).
- Drivers exposed to the media message in the past 30 days were significantly *less* likely to report having driven while intoxicated in the past 60 days in 2011. No difference was found for 2010.
- Having read, seen, or heard a public service announcement on impaired driving did not impact drivers perceptions of the severity of penalties.
- In 2010 and 2011, respondents who had been arrested or received a citation for impaired driving in the past were significantly *more* likely to report impaired driving in the past 60 days. Nearly 25% of drivers who had received a ticket for impaired driving in the past reported driving while impaired in the past 60 days.
- In 2010 and 2011, respondents who had been arrested or received a citation for impaired driving in the past were significantly *more* likely to report penalties as being “very strict.”

Other Driver Safety Issues

Table 8 illustrates the frequency of self-reported use of cell phones and texting devices while driving for 2010 and 2011. Respondents were asked to report how often they talk and text on a cell phone when driving their vehicles. The results indicate that most drivers report talking or texting on cell phones rather infrequently. Roughly one-half of respondents indicated that they “never” or “rarely” talk on their cell phones while driving in 2010 (47.9%) and 2011 (50.0%). In addition, nearly two-thirds of respondents reported that they “never” text on a cell phone while driving in 2010 (63.0%) and 2011 (60.4%). Selected findings include:

- 20.3% of respondents indicate that they “never” talk on a cell phone while driving in 2011, compared to 20.6% in 2010.
- 60.4% of respondents indicate that they “never” text while driving in 2011, compared to 63.0% in 2010.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of survey respondents (N = 1,072)

Demographic Characteristics	N	%	Demographic Characteristics	N	%
Regional Office			Miles Driven in Past Year (Mean = 18,465; SD = 25,611)		
Martinsburg	142	13.2	4999 or less	152	15.6
Princeton	73	6.8	5000 to 9999	138	14.2
Lewisburg	52	4.9	10000 to 14999	244	25.0
Elkins	71	6.6	15000 to 19999	131	13.4
Beckley	101	9.4	20000 to 24999	113	11.6
Parkersburg	99	9.2	25000 to 29999	44	4.5
Huntington	165	15.4	30000 or greater	<u>153</u>	<u>15.7</u>
Clarksburg	153	14.3	Total	975	100.0
Wheeling	<u>58</u>	<u>5.4</u>			
Total	1072	100.0			
Vehicle Type			Age (Mean = 42.5; SD = 15.1)		
Passenger	471	45.4	Under 21	72	7.3
Pickup Truck	202	19.5	21 to 29	154	15.7
SUV	253	24.4	30 to 39	185	18.8
Van	70	6.8	40 to 49	250	25.5
Other	<u>41</u>	<u>4.0</u>	50 to 59	186	18.9
Total	1037	100.0	60 and over	<u>135</u>	<u>13.7</u>
			Total	982	100.0
Race/Ethnicity			Highest Education Level		
White	979	92.5	Less than 12 years	82	7.9
African-American	45	4.3	HS degree/equivalent	366	35.3
Hispanic	14	1.3	Some college/technical	298	28.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	8	0.8	College graduate	192	18.5
Native American	2	0.2	Post-graduate degree	<u>100</u>	<u>9.6</u>
Middle Eastern	4	0.4	Total	1038	100.0
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>0.6</u>			
Total	1058	100.0			
Gender					
Male	413	39.8			
Female	<u>624</u>	<u>60.2</u>			
Total	1037	100.0			

Table 2. Overview of driver awareness of general public service messages by police (N = 1,072)

Enforcement Message	2010		2011	
	N	%	N	%
Safety Belts				
Read, seen, or heard message about seat belt law enforcement, <i>in the past 60 days...</i>				
Yes	858	72.7	774	73.0
No	<u>323</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>287</u>	<u>27.0</u>
Total	1181	100.0	1061	100.0
Speed Limit				
Read, seen, or heard message about speed enforcement, <i>in the past 30 days...</i>				
Yes	668	57.3	616	59.0
No	<u>497</u>	<u>42.7</u>	<u>428</u>	<u>41.0</u>
Total	1165	100.0	1044	100.0
Impaired Driving				
Read, seen, or heard message about alcohol impaired driving (drunk driving) enforcement, <i>in the past 30 days...</i>				
Yes	938	81.5	796	79.2
No	<u>213</u>	<u>18.5</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>20.8</u>
Total	1151	100.0	1005	100.0

Table 3. Driver awareness of specific highway safety educational campaigns (N = 1,072)

Specific Highway Safety Campaign	2010		2011	
	N	%	N	%
Read, seen, or heard message any of the following highway safety messages, <i>in the past 60 days...</i>				
Click it-or-Ticket				
Yes	1015	85.4	908	90.1
No	<u>173</u>	<u>14.6</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>9.9</u>
Total	1188	100.0	1008	100.0
Over-the-limit, Under Arrest				
Yes	543	45.7	477	47.3
No	<u>645</u>	<u>54.3</u>	<u>531</u>	<u>52.7</u>
Total	1189	100.0	1008	100.0
Buzzed Driving is Drunk Driving				
Yes	561	47.2	455	45.1
No	<u>628</u>	<u>52.8</u>	<u>553</u>	<u>54.9</u>
Total	1189	100.0	1008	100.0

Table 4. Impact of public service messages on driver *safety belt use* and perceptions of law enforcement responses (N = 1,072)

	2010 Total	2011 Total	2011 Message in past 60 days...		2011 Ever received ticket...	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
Safety belt use						
All the time	71.6 (819)	76.7 (805)	77.8 (589)	74.0 (211)	35.4 (29)	80.2 (768)
Most of the time	16.9 (193)	12.8 (134)	11.9 (90)	15.4 (44)	31.7 (26)	11.3 (108)
Some of the time	6.3 (72)	5.5 (58)	5.4 (41)	5.3 (15)	13.4 (11)	4.9 (47)
Rarely	3.8 (43)	3.4 (36)	3.3 (25)	3.9 (11)	13.4 (11)	2.5 (24)
Never	<u>1.5 (17)</u>	<u>1.5 (16)</u>	<u>1.6 (12)</u>	<u>1.4 (4)</u>	<u>6.1 (5)</u>	<u>1.1 (11)</u>
Total	100.0 (1144)	100.0 (1049)	100.0 (757)	100.0 (285)	100.0 (82)	100.0 (958)
			($\chi^2 = 2.652$; $p < .ns$; $n = 1042$)		($\chi^2 = 92.806$; $p < .001$; $n = 1040$)	
Likelihood of ticket						
Very likely	42.0 (495)	39.7 (423)	41.8 (322)	34.5 (99)	45.2 (38)	39.3 (382)
Somewhat likely	35.0 (413)	39.2 (418)	40.3 (311)	36.6 (105)	40.5 (34)	39.2 (381)
Not very likely	17.4 (205)	16.6 (177)	14.4 (111)	22.3 (64)	11.9 (10)	17.1 (166)
Not likely at all	<u>5.6 (66)</u>	<u>4.4 (47)</u>	<u>3.5 (27)</u>	<u>6.6 (19)</u>	<u>2.4 (2)</u>	<u>4.4 (43)</u>
Total	100.0 (1179)	100.0 (1065)	100.0 (771)	100.0 (287)	100.0 (84)	100.0 (1056)
			($\chi^2 = 16.100$; $p < .001$; $n = 1058$)		($\chi^2 = 2.716$; $p = ns$; $n = 1056$)	
Strictness of penalties						
Very strict	28.6 (332)	24.1 (252)	25.3 (192)	20.0 (56)	32.1 (26)	23.5 (225)
Somewhat strict	44.0 (510)	48.1 (503)	49.5 (376)	45.0 (126)	43.2 (35)	48.6 (466)
Not very strict	22.2 (257)	22.9 (240)	20.8 (158)	28.6 (80)	19.8 (16)	23.3 (223)
Not strict at all	<u>5.3 (61)</u>	<u>4.9 (51)</u>	<u>4.3 (33)</u>	<u>6.4 (18)</u>	<u>4.9 (4)</u>	<u>4.7 (45)</u>
Total	100.0 (1160)	100.0 (1046)	100.0 (759)	100.0 (280)	100.0 (81)	100.0 (959)
			($\chi^2 = 10.450$; $p < .05$; $n = 1039$)		($\chi^2 = 3.166$; $p = ns$; $n = 1040$)	

Percentages may not equal 100.0% due to rounding

() Number of respondents

Table 5. Impact of public service messages on *speeding* and perceptions of law enforcement responses (N = 1,072)

	2010 Total	2011 Total	2011 Message in past 30 days...		2011 Ticket in past 12 months...	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
Violate 30 mph speed limit						
All the time	5.1 (60)	4.7 (50)	4.2 (26)	5.4 (23)	23.7 (18)	3.3 (32)
Most of the time	13.7 (161)	11.1 (118)	10.2 (63)	12.7 (54)	26.3 (20)	10.0 (98)
Some of the time	32.5 (383)	32.1 (341)	34.1 (210)	28.9 (123)	27.6 (21)	32.5 (319)
Rarely	37.0 (436)	36.8 (390)	37.2 (229)	36.2 (154)	19.7 (15)	38.0 (373)
Never	<u>11.8 (139)</u>	<u>15.3 (162)</u>	<u>14.1 (87)</u>	<u>16.9 (72)</u>	<u>2.6 (2)</u>	<u>16.2 (159)</u>
Total	100.0 (1179)	100.0 (1061)	100.0 (615)	100.0 (426)	100.0 (76)	100.0 (981)
			$(\chi^2 = 5.577; p = ns; n = 1041)$		$(\chi^2 = 95.514; p < .001; n = 1057)$	
Violate 70 mph speed limit						
All the time	6.6 (78)	4.1 (43)	3.6 (22)	4.7 (20)	19.7 (15)	2.8 (27)
Most of the time	16.2 (191)	12.8 (136)	12.5 (77)	13.6 (58)	31.6 (24)	11.4 (112)
Some of the time	28.4 (335)	31.8 (337)	32.2 (198)	30.7 (131)	32.9 (25)	31.8 (312)
Rarely	33.8 (399)	33.9 (360)	33.6 (206)	34.9 (149)	14.5 (11)	35.5 (348)
Never	<u>15.1 (178)</u>	<u>17.4 (185)</u>	<u>18.1 (111)</u>	<u>16.2 (69)</u>	<u>1.3 (1)</u>	<u>18.6 (182)</u>
Total	100.0 (1181)	100.0 (1061)	100.0 (614)	100.0 (427)	100.0 (76)	100.0 (981)
			$(\chi^2 = 1.833; p = .ns; n = 1041)$		$(\chi^2 = 94.783; p < .001; n = 1057)$	
Likelihood of ticket						
Very likely	48.2 (570)	45.1 (479)	49.5 (304)	38.6 (165)	48.7 (37)	44.8 (439)
Somewhat likely	41.8 (495)	46.2 (490)	45.4 (279)	47.8 (204)	44.7 (34)	46.4 (455)
Not very likely	8.4 (99)	6.0 (64)	3.3 (20)	9.6 (41)	1.3 (1)	6.4 (63)
Not likely at all	<u>1.6 (19)</u>	<u>2.6 (28)</u>	<u>1.8 (11)</u>	<u>4.0 (17)</u>	<u>5.3 (4)</u>	<u>2.4 (24)</u>
Total	100.0 (1183)	100.0 (1061)	100.0 (614)	100.0 (427)	100.0 (76)	100.0 (981)
			$(\chi^2 = 26.691; p < .001; n = 1041)$		$(\chi^2 = 5.434; p = ns; n = 1057)$	

Table 5. Impact of public service messages on *speeding* and perceptions of law enforcement responses (Continued)

	2010 Total	2011 Total	2011 Message in past 30 days...		2011 Ticket in past 12 months...	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
Strictness of penalties						
Very strict	40.5 (469)	38.9 (410)	42.2 (258)	33.6 (142)	58.7 (44)	37.3 (364)
Somewhat strict	49.1 (568)	50.5 (532)	50.5 (309)	50.8 (215)	36.0 (27)	51.7 (505)
Not very strict	9.0 (104)	9.4 (99)	6.9 (42)	13.2 (56)	5.3 (4)	9.6 (94)
Not strict at all	<u>1.5 (17)</u>	<u>1.2 (13)</u>	<u>0.5 (3)</u>	<u>2.4 (10)</u>	<u>0.0 (0)</u>	<u>1.3 (13)</u>
Total	100.0 (1158)	100.0 (1054)	100.0 (612)	100.0 (423)	100.0 (75)	100.0 (976)
			(χ ² = 22.509; p < .000; n = 1035)		(χ ² = 13.983; p < .01; n = 1051)	

Percentages may not equal 100.0% due to rounding
 () Number of respondents

Table 6. Frequency of reported alcohol consumption and impaired driving (N = 1,072)

Drink alcoholic beverages...	2010		2011		Drank alcoholic beverages <i>while driving</i> in past sixty days.... ^a	2010		2011	
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%
Daily	26	2.3	17	1.6	None	1015	90.5	904	92.5
A few times a week	94	8.2	89	8.6	1 time	41	3.7	18	1.8
Once a week	99	8.6	84	8.1	2 times	30	2.7	19	1.9
Every two weeks	70	6.1	47	4.5	3 times	12	1.1	8	0.8
Once a month	282	24.5	244	23.5	4 times	7	0.6	8	0.8
Never	<u>578</u>	<u>50.3</u>	<u>556</u>	<u>53.6</u>	5 or more times	<u>17</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Total	1149	100.0	1037	100.0	Total	1122	100.00	977	100.0

^a Mean = .34; SD = 1.988

Table 7. Impact of public service messages on *impaired driving* and perceptions of law enforcement responses (N = 1,072)

	2010 Total	2011 Total	2011 Message in past 30 days...		2011 Ever cited or received ticket...	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
Driven impaired past 60 days						
No	90.5 (1015)	92.5 (904)	93.4 (720)	89.0 (178)	75.4 (43)	93.5 (852)
Yes	<u>9.5 (107)</u>	<u>7.5 (73)</u>	<u>6.6 (51)</u>	<u>11.0 (22)</u>	<u>24.6 (14)</u>	<u>6.5 (59)</u>
Total	100.0 (1122)	100.0 (977)	100.0 (771)	100.0 (200)	100.0 (57)	100.0 (911)
			($\chi^2 = 4.392$; $p < .05$; $n = 971$)		($\chi^2 = 25.163$; $p < .001$; $n = 968$)	
Likelihood of arrest						
Very likely	58.0 (668)	53.8 (543)	56.0 (446)	45.4 (94)	63.9 (39)	53.1 (499)
Somewhat likely	31.6 (364)	35.5 (358)	35.8 (285)	33.8 (70)	31.1 (19)	35.9 (337)
Not very likely	8.6 (99)	8.4 (85)	6.7 (53)	15.5 (32)	3.3 (2)	8.7 (82)
Not likely at all	<u>1.8 (21)</u>	<u>2.3 (23)</u>	<u>1.5 (12)</u>	<u>5.3 (11)</u>	<u>1.6 (1)</u>	<u>2.3 (22)</u>
Total	100.0 (1152)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (796)	100.0 (207)	100.0 (61)	100.0 (940)
			($\chi^2 = 29.018$; $p < .000$; $n = 1003$)		($\chi^2 = 3.757$; $p = ns$; $n = 1001$)	
Severity of sanction						
Very strict	51.2 (580)	50.2 (499)	51.1 (401)	46.8 (96)	81.7 (49)	48.2 (447)
Somewhat strict	27.9 (316)	26.1 (260)	26.5 (208)	24.9 (51)	13.3 (8)	27.2 (252)
Not very strict	16.4 (186)	18.2 (181)	17.3 (136)	21.5 (44)	5.0 (3)	19.0 (176)
Not strict at all	<u>4.5 (51)</u>	<u>5.5 (55)</u>	<u>5.0 (39)</u>	<u>6.8 (14)</u>	<u>0.0 (0)</u>	<u>5.7 (53)</u>
Total	100.0 (1133)	100.0 (995)	100.0 (784)	100.0 (205)	100.0 (60)	100.0 (928)
			($\chi^2 3.329$; $p = ns$; $n = 989$)		($\chi^2 = 26.182$; $p < .000$; $n = 988$)	

Percentages may not equal 100.0% due to rounding

() Number of respondents

Table 8. Frequency of reported use of cell phones and texting devices while driving (N = 1,072)

	2010		2011			2010		2011	
Talk on cell phone while driving...	N	%	N	%	Text on cell phone while driving....	N	%	N	%
All the time	95	8.2	47	4.7	All the time	40	3.5	17	1.7
Most of the time	125	10.8	109	10.8	Most of the time	47	4.1	26	2.6
Some of the time	383	33.1	348	34.6	Some of the time	134	11.6	127	12.6
Rarely	316	27.3	299	29.7	Rarely	207	17.9	228	22.7
Never	<u>238</u>	<u>20.6</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>20.3</u>	Never	<u>729</u>	<u>63.0</u>	<u>607</u>	<u>60.4</u>
Total	1157	100.0	1007	100.0	Total	1157	100.00	1005	100.0

APPENDIX

West Virginia Department of Transportation
Division of Motor Vehicles
Governor's Highway Safety Office
2011 Driver Attitudes and Awareness Survey

1. What type of vehicle do you drive most often? (Check one)
 Passenger car
 Pick-up truck
 SUV
 Van
 Other

2. Your highest education level (Check one):
 Less than 12th Grade/Equivalent
 High School Graduate/GED
 Some College/Technical School
 College Graduate
 Post-Graduate Degree

3. Your race (Check one):
 White
 African-American/Black
 Asian
 Native American
 Middle Eastern
 Other

4. Approximately, how many miles did you drive last year?
 _____ (miles)

6. How often do you drink alcoholic beverages? (e.g., beer, wine, liquor, etc.)? (Check one)
 daily
 a few times a week
 once a week
 every two weeks
 once a month
 never

7. Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino? Yes No

8. Your gender: male female

5. Your age: _____ (# of years)

9. Your Zip Code: _____ (residence)

Safety Belts (Circle one answer for each)

How often do you use safety belts when you drive or ride in a car, van, sport utility vehicle or pick up?	All the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely	Never
<i>In the past 60 days</i> , have you read, seen or heard anything about seat belt law enforcement by police?	Yes	No			
What do you think the chances are of getting a ticket if you don't wear your safety belt?	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	
How strict do you think the penalties are for not wearing a seat belt?	Very strict	Somewhat strict	Not very strict	Not strict at all	
Have you ever received a ticket for not wearing a seat belt?	Yes	No			

Speed Limit (Circle one answer for each)

On a local road with a speed limit of 30 mph, how often do you drive faster than 35 mph?	All the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely	Never
On a road with a speed limit of 65 mph, how often do you drive faster than 70 mph?	All the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Rarely	Never
<i>In the past 30 days</i> , have you read, seen or heard anything about speed enforcement by police?	Yes	No			
What do you think the chances are of getting a ticket if you drive over the speed limit?	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	
How strict do you think the penalties are for speeding?	Very strict	Somewhat strict	Not very strict	Not strict at all	
Have you received a ticket for speeding <i>in the past 12 months</i> ?	Yes	No			

**West Virginia Department of Transportation
Division of Motor Vehicles
Governor's Highway Safety Office
2011 Driver Attitudes and Awareness Survey**

Impaired Driving (Circle one answer for each)

In the past 60 days, approximately how many times have you driven a motor vehicle within 2 hours after drinking alcoholic beverages?

Write in _____ (number of times)

In the past 30 days, have you read, seen or heard anything about alcohol impaired driving (or drunk driving) enforcement by police?

Yes No

What do you think the chances are of someone getting arrested if they drive after drinking?

Very likely Somewhat likely Not very likely Not likely at all

How strict do you think the penalties are for drinking and driving?

Very strict Somewhat strict Not very strict Not strict at all

Have you ever been cited or received a ticket for drinking and driving?

Yes No

Cell Phone and Texting (Circle one answer for each)

How often do you talk on a cell phone when driving your car, van, sport utility vehicle or pick up?

All the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

How often do you text on a cell phone when driving your car, van, sport utility vehicle or pick up?

All the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

Highway Safety PSA

In the past 60 days, have you ever heard or seen any of the following highway safety messages? (Check all that apply)

- Click it-or-Ticket Over-the-Limit, Under Arrest Buzzed Driving is Drunk Driving

--END--

THANK YOU FOR HELPING US KEEP OUR HIGHWAYS SAFE!