2018 Traffic Safety Culture Index

June 2019



Title

2018 Traffic Safety Culture Index

Authors

AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety

Foreword

The AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety has consistently demonstrated its commitment to improve traffic safety through work such as this report, the 11th annual *Traffic Safety Culture Index*. Results presented in this report are based on a nationally representative survey of more than 2,500 U.S. motorists that has been revamped and was conducted in 2018.

This report is a useful reference for researchers, practitioners and advocates of traffic safety who may utilize results to promote awareness of traffic safety challenges and influence changes.

C. Y. David Yang, Ph.D.

Executive Director AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety

About the Sponsor

AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety 607 14th Street, NW, Suite 201 Washington, D.C. 20005 202-638-5944 www.aaafoundation.org

Founded in 1947, the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety in Washington, D.C. is a nonprofit, publicly supported charitable research and education organization dedicated to saving lives by preventing traffic crashes and reducing injuries when crashes occur. Funding for this report was provided by voluntary contributions from AAA/CAA and their affiliated motor clubs, individual members, AAA-affiliated insurance companies and other organizations or sources.

This publication is distributed by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety at no charge, as a public service. It may not be resold or used for commercial purposes without the explicit permission of the Foundation. It may, however, be copied in whole or in part and distributed for free via any medium, provided the Foundation is given appropriate credit as the source of the material. The AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety assumes no liability for the use or misuse of any information, opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations contained in this report.

If trade or manufacturers' names are mentioned, it is only because they are considered essential to the object of this report and their mention should not be construed as an endorsement. The AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety does not endorse products or manufacturers.

Table of Contents

Foreword2
About the Sponsor2
Introduction
Summary of Major Findings5
Data Collection Methodology and Limitations7
Survey Instrument7
Sampling7
Weighting8
Limitations
Results10
Overall Results10
Perceived Danger of Driving Behaviors10
Perceived Risk of Arrest11
Personal Approval12
Social Approval13
Driving Behaviors in the Past 30 Days14
Support for Safety Countermeasures15
Results by Age and Gender17
Distracted Driving17
Risky and Aggressive Driving Behaviors21
Drowsy and Impaired Driving26
Discussion
References

Introduction

In 2017, there were 37,133 motor vehicle fatalities on U.S. roadways. This is a 1.8% decrease from the 37,806 people killed in 2016 (NHTSA, 2018). While there has generally been a downward trend in traffic fatalities over the past 40 years, the number of miles U.S. drivers travel continues to rise, increasing their exposure to crash risk. During 2016 and 2017, on average, American drivers spent 51 minutes driving approximately 31.5 miles, making 2.2 driving trips each day (Kim et al., 2019). Compared with 2014-2015, these statistics increased by minutes (6.3%), miles (5.4%) and trips (2.8%).

Driving is an important part of many Americans' lives. There are accepted and agreed-upon ways of behaving on the roadway. For the last decade, the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety has been committed to deepening our understanding of our nation's traffic safety culture. The first *Traffic Safety Culture Index (TSCI)*, a nationally representative survey, was conducted in 2008. Since then, this annual effort has continued to identify and assess key indicators of American drivers' value and pursuit of traffic safety. The questionnaire has been revamped, and the 2018 *TSCI* has more measures including perceived danger, risk of arrest, personal and perceived social approval of risky driving, support for laws and policies designed to curtail these behaviors, and self-reported engagement in these behaviors.

The revised 2018 *TSCI* once again reveals that people in the United States value traveling safely and seek strengthened laws that ensure safer roads. American drivers perceive distracted, drowsy, aggressive and impaired driving as dangerous. However, this year's survey again highlights the discordance between drivers' attitudes and their behaviors. For example, many drivers noted the serious dangers associated with holding and talking on cellphones while driving, while also admitting to having done so in the past month.

This document details changes to the *TSCI* questionnaire and the data collection methodology. It also summarizes the major national-level results of the 11th annual *TSCI*, which include the newly added annual tracker on Americans' attitudes and behaviors associated with driving.

Distracted Driving

- More drivers view reading (95.9%) or typing (96.7%) a text/email on a hand-held cellphone while driving to be very or extremely dangerous, compared with talking on a hand-held cellphone (79.8%). However, more respondents believe drivers risk being caught by the police for talking on a hand-held cellphone (47.3%) than they do for reading (43.3%) or typing (46.3%) a text/email on a hand-held cellphone.
- Over 17% of drivers personally approve of talking on a hand-held cellphone and about 20% believed that people who were important to them approved of talking on a hand-held cellphone while driving.
- A majority of drivers support laws against distracted driving, with almost 75% supporting a law against holding and talking on a cellphone and about 88% supporting a law against reading, typing, or sending a text or email while driving.
- Nevertheless, more than half of drivers (52.1%) report having driven while talking on a handheld cellphone at least once in the past 30 days. Fewer respondents report engaging in distracted driving by reading (41.3%) and typing a text/email (32.1%) on a hand-held cellphone while driving.

Risky and Aggressive Driving Behaviors

- About half of drivers (54.2%) indicate that speeding on a freeway is dangerous, while 64% of drivers perceived speeding on a residential street as dangerous.
- Nearly 66% of respondents felt that the police would catch a person driving 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway, yet almost 50% reported having done so in the past 30 days.
- Over 85% of drivers consider speeding through a red light to be very or extremely dangerous, and 55% felt that the police would catch a driver for running a red light.

Drowsy Driving

- Over 96% of drivers identify drowsy driving as very or extremely dangerous. However, only slightly less than 40% thought drowsy drivers risked being caught by the police.
- Less than 2% of drivers personally approve and nearly 3% of drivers believe friends/family would approve of drowsy driving.
- Despite high rates of perceived danger and personal/social disapproval regarding drowsy driving, about 27% of drivers admit to having driven while being so tired that they had had a hard time keeping their eyes open, at least once in the past 30 days.

Impaired Driving

- Most drivers (95.1%) perceive driving after drinking as very or extremely dangerous. However, almost 11% admitted to having done so in the past 30 days.
- Seventy percent of respondents consider driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana to be very or extremely dangerous. However, over 7% of drivers personally approve of driving shortly after using marijuana.
- Most drivers (87.3%) indicate driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs as very or extremely dangerous. About 45% of drivers consider that drivers driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs would be likely to be caught by the police.

• A majority of drivers support laws against impaired driving. Over 81% of respondents support for laws making it illegal to drive with a certain amount of marijuana in your system, and 76.3% support laws preventing the transport of a minor by a driver who has had any alcohol.

Survey Instrument

This year's TSCI underwent significant changes as listed below:

- Revisions to original questions were made to better reflect drivers' personal attitudes and behaviors. For example, the former question assessing how much of a "threat to personal safety" respondents considered certain traffic behaviors was revised to assess drivers' "perceived danger" of these events (in general). We then added an item to assess their personal approval of engaging in these driving behaviors. These revisions allow us to examine any discordance between the more general perceived danger (from others) and their own approval of engaging in these same behaviors.
- New questions were also added to understand drivers' fear of arrest and social approval of certain driving behaviors. These questions were modeled from existing and publicly available national and state surveys. These items help us understand the motivations behind drivers' engaging (or not) in these behaviors.
- Questions specifically related to engaging in problematic driving behaviors (distracted, risky and impaired) generally remained the same, only slightly adjusted for clarity.
- The additional items considerably increased respondents' time for completing the survey. To avoid respondents' fatigue and improve data quality, some items (i.e., perceived danger, fear of arrest, personal/social approval, and support for laws and policies) were randomly administered to a subset of participants. Therefore, not all items were answered by the entire sample population.
- An additional focus area now includes items related to emerging transportation technology. Specifically, these items are aimed at understanding drivers' expectations and acceptance of today's emerging transportation technologies. This allows us to compare drivers' perceived danger of traditional driving behaviors (e.g., distracted, aggressive, impaired driving, etc.) with those related to emerging technologies. A separate research brief focusing on this area will be published in 2019.

Key traffic safety topics such as distracted, drowsy and impaired driving remain in the updated survey so comparison with similar questions from previous versions of the survey can be made. The survey was available to participants in English and Spanish and was administered between Aug. 21 and Sept. 11, 2018.

Sampling

This study recruited a sample of 3,349 respondents ages 16 and older from KnowledgePanel[®], an online probability-based research panel maintained by Ipsos (formerly GfK). The panel was designed to be a representative sample of households in the United States and recruited using standard probability-based random digit dial (RDD) and address-based sampling method (GfK, 2016).

The sampling frame includes all U.S. households reachable by telephone or regular mail regardless of telephone or internet access or use. If a sampled household lacked internet access or an internet-capable computer, they were provided internet access and a netbook computer at no cost to the household. Individuals not sampled could not volunteer to join the panel. Statistics were weighted to reflect the entire population from which the sample was drawn in response to each individual respondent's probability of selection into the panel and the probability of selection for the survey.

For respondents 19 and older, age eligible adults across the nine census geographical divisions were sampled to ensure a minimum of 200 completed interviews per division. The questionnaire was sent to 4,188 panelists, with 2,432 completing the questionnaire. Selecting separate samples for each census division ensured a sufficient number of interviews for analysis by division.

For 16- to 18-year-old samples, random households with at least one 15- to 18-year-old present were sampled from KnowledgePanel[®]. The survey was sent to parents who had at least one age-eligible teen in their household. If there was more than one teen in this age range, one of the eligible teens was randomly selected. Parents were asked to provide consent for the selected teen and ask their teen to complete the remainder of the survey. Invitations were sent to 3,491 parents of teens ages 16-18, and 917 respondents completed the questionnaire.

Weighting

The data were weighted to account for several factors: (1) probability of selection for recruitment into KnowledgePanel[®], (2) probability of selection for the survey and (3) nonresponse at both stages. To align the characteristics of respondents to those of the population of residents ages 16 or older, a sample was drawn with respect to gender, age, race/Hispanic ethnicity, education, census region, metropolitan/non-metro status, number of people ages 16 and older in the household, and household income from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (2016). All analyses included in this study have been conducted using weighted data.

Limitations

This survey aims to estimate the prevalence of specific attitudes and behaviors among all drivers in the United States. However, the results of this survey may differ from true population values due to sampling error and possible sources of bias.

Sampling error measures the accuracy in which a population is estimated from a sample. Thus, in this survey, the sampling error reflects the extent to which estimates from a sample (e.g., this sample of 3,349 drivers) might be expected to differ from the results that would be obtained if the same data were collected from every member of the population (i.e., all drivers in the United States). For this survey, the margin of error is at the 95% confidence level, meaning that the range of estimates is expected to include the actual population value 95 times out of 100 when estimated from a sample of the same size and with the same design. The error margin varies depending on the number of responses for a survey question and the distribution of responses. A table below shows the approximate margin of error for

illustrative examples of statistics derived from the entire sample; the margin of error is larger for items asked of fewer respondents.

Percentages near	Approx. margin of error
90 or 10	± 1.4
80 or 20	± 1.9
70 or 30	± 2.2
60 or 40	± 2.3
50	± 2.4

Approximate margin of error (in percentage points) for selected percentages, at the 95% confidence level

The margin of error is larger in this survey than for a simple random sample of the same size because of the design of the panel and the stratification by census division and oversampling of respondents aged 16-18.

The margin of error reflects only the statistical variability associated with using the survey sample to draw inferences about the entire population. It does not reflect errors attributable to bias. Potential sources of bias in surveys include systematic non-coverage of certain segments of the population (e.g., people who cannot read in English or Spanish), non-response (i.e., either eligible respondents who cannot be contacted or refuse to participate), differences in respondents' understanding of survey questions or response options, or deliberate misreporting of information (e.g., under-reporting of behaviors that may be perceived as undesirable).

Results

This report presents results of the 2018 *TSCI* in two sections. The first section includes the "overall" results regarding perceived danger, perceived risk of arrest, personal and social approval, self-reporting of behaviors, and support of safety laws related to various problematic driving behaviors. The second section more closely examines these results considering demographic factors such as age and gender. Results were described in the context of three focus areas: 1) distracted driving, mainly with cellphone use including talking, texting, and emailing; 2) risky and aggressive driving, including speeding and running red lights; and 3) drowsy and impaired driving (by alcohol or other drugs).

Overall Results

Perceived Danger of Driving Behaviors

Respondents were asked how dangerous they felt certain driving behaviors were. Table 1 shows that across each of the driving behavior categories, most respondents viewed these behaviors as very or extremely dangerous. Almost 97% of respondents indicated that texting or emailing on a cellphone while driving was very or extremely dangerous. This reflects roughly a two-percentage point difference between the items pertaining to the dangers of persons driving after drinking enough to be over the legal limit (95.1%). With respect to drivers reading on a cellphone, 95.9% noted it as very or extremely dangerous. In contrast, when examining drivers holding and talking on a cellphone, only 79.8% of respondents perceived this behavior very or extremely dangerous.

Results also show differences in the perceived magnitude of the dangers of other risky driving behaviors. Only 54.2% of respondents felt driving 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway was very or extremely dangerous, while 64% of respondents perceived driving 10 miles per hour over the speed limit on a residential street as very or extremely dangerous. More than 85% of respondents perceived driving through a red light to be very or extremely dangerous.

Compared with the 95.1% of drivers indicating drinking and driving was very or extremely dangerous, and the 87.4% of respondents indicating driving after using prescription drugs as very or extremely dangerous, only 70% of respondents considered driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana to be very or extremely dangerous.

	Extremely dangerous	Very dangerous	Moderately dangerous	Slightly dangerous	Not dangerous at all
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Driving holding and talking on cellphones	50.6	29.2	15.0	4.7	0.7
Drivers reading on cellphones	79.4	16.5	3.6	0.3	0.2
Drivers texting or emailing on cellphones	76.4	20.3	2.6	0.6	0.1
Drivers speeding 15 mph over the speed limit on freeways	27.1	27.1	27.7	15.0	3.0
Drivers speeding 10 mph over the speed limit on residential streets	34.2	29.8	24.0	10.0	2.1
Driving through a light that had just turned red when you could have stopped safely	57.7	27.7	12.7	1.5	0.4
Driving aggressively	60.2	30.5	7.3	1.4	0.6
Driving while being so tired that they had a hard time keeping their eyes open	71.9	24.3	2.8	0.8	0.2
Driving after drinking enough alcohol to over the legal limit	78.3	16.8	3.7	0.8	0.4
Driving within an hour after using marijuana	43.9	26.1	16.5	10.3	3.2
Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs	62.6	24.8	10.5	1.7	0.5

Table 1. How dangerous do you feel the following driving behaviors are?

Perceived Risk of Arrest

Respondents were asked to report their perceptions on how likely they think it is a driver would be caught by police for certain driving behaviors. As shown in Table 2, their responses varied considerably by driving behavior. For all items related to cellphone use while driving, less than half of respondents reported that drivers engaging in such behaviors were somewhat or very likely to be caught by the police. For example, only 43.3% of respondents reported that drivers would be caught by the police for reading a text or an email on a cellphone while driving.

More than half of respondents thought that drivers engaging in risky behaviors, such as speeding on a freeway or on a residential street, driving through a red light and/or driving aggressively, would be somewhat or very likely to be caught by the police (Table 2). Nearly 60% of respondents reported that the police would be somewhat or very likely to catch drivers for engaging in aggressive driving, while 65.8% thought it was somewhat or very likely for drivers to be caught by the police for driving 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway. In contrast, only 37.5% of respondents thought that drivers were somewhat or very likely to be caught by the police for engaging in drowsy driving.

The likelihood of being caught by the police for certain behaviors also varied by source of impairment. Nearly 68% of respondents reported that drivers who drink enough alcohol to be over the legal limit would be somewhat or very likely to be caught by the police. However, only 45.4% felt drivers would be caught for driving while using potentially impairing prescription drugs, and only 31.9% thought that a driver would be caught by the police for driving (within an hour) after using marijuana.

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Driving while holding and talking on a cellphone	14.9	32.4	32.8	19.9
Driving while reading a text or an email on a cellphone	13.8	29.5	34.7	22.0
Driving while typing or sending a text message or email on a cellphone	14.8	31.5	34.0	19.7
Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on a freeway	23.3	42.5	22.9	11.1
Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street (neighborhood)	16.3	37.4	32.1	14.2
Driving through a light that had just turned red when you could have stopped safely	18.5	36.4	30.5	14.3
Driving aggressively	21.7	37.0	28.7	12.4
Driving while being so tired that they had a hard time keeping their eyes open	10.4	27.1	40.4	22.1
Driving after drinking enough alcohol to over the legal limit	27.1	40.5	21.3	11.1
Driving within an hour after using marijuana	10.3	21.6	39.6	28.6
Driving while using potentially impairing prescription drugs	13.9	31.5	35.3	19.3
Driving without wearing a seatbelt	15.0	33.6	32.7	18.5

Table 2. How likely is a driver to be caught by police for the following behaviors?

Personal Approval

Respondents were asked to report how much they personally approve of certain driving behaviors. Generally, the majority of respondents indicated disapproval of all problematic driving behaviors in this study (Table 3). However, approval for some behaviors was much higher than for other behaviors. For example, 17.5% of drivers approved of holding and talking on a cellphone while driving, whereas only 3.5% approved of driving while reading on a cellphone. With respect to typing or sending a text or email while driving, 5.4% approved of this behavior.

Drivers' level of approval varied by road type. Around a quarter (23%) of drivers personally approved of driving 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway, but only 10.9% of drivers approved of driving 10 miles per hour over the speed limit on a residential street.

Personal approval of impaired driving also varied by the type of impairment. Only 1.6% of drivers approved of drinking enough alcohol to be over the legal limit, and 1.2% approved of riding in a car driven by someone who had too much alcohol. However, a much higher proportion of drivers (7.4%) personally approved of driving shortly after marijuana use.

	Completely approve	Somewhat approve	Somewhat disapprove	Completely disapprove
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Driving while holding and talking on a cellphone	3.2	14.3	27.5	54.9
Driving while reading a text or an email on a cellphone	1.1	2.4	17.1	79.2
Driving while typing or sending a text message or email on a cellphone	1.2	4.2	13.4	81.3
Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on a freeway	3.2	19.8	35.4	41.7
Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street (neighborhood)	2.5	8.4	28.6	60.3
Driving through a light that had just turned red when you could have stopped safely	1.7	4.4	23.9	69.7
Driving aggressively	1.7	3.1	23.4	71.6
Driving while being so tired that they had a hard time keeping their eyes open	0.9	0.8	19.3	78.8
Driving after drinking enough alcohol to over the legal limit	0.7	0.9	6.2	92.2
Riding in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol	0.5	0.7	6.6	92.2
Driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana	2.7	4.7	19.5	72.9
Driving while using potentially impairing prescription drugs	0.9	2.1	13.5	83.3
Driving without wearing a seatbelt	3.1	5.0	17.9	74.0

Table 3. How much do you personally approve of each of the following behaviors?

Social Approval

Respondents were also asked to report how much they believe people who are important to them would approve of certain driving behaviors. Results were similar to those reported for personal approval. Table 4 shows the majority of respondents believed that people who were important to them would disapprove of engaging in problematic driving behaviors. For example, only about 6% of respondents believed that texting or emailing on a cellphone while driving would be socially approved of.

Comparatively, only about 3% of drivers believed that people who are important to them would approve of driving while being so tired that they had a hard time keeping their eyes open. Respondents socially approved the least of driving after drinking enough alcohol to possibly be over the legal limit (1.8%) and the most of driving 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway (22%).

Table 4. How much do you believe people who are important to you would approve of each of the following behaviors?

	Completely approve	Somewhat approve	Somewhat disapprove	Completely disapprove
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Driving while holding and talking on a cell phone	3.8	16.2	27.4	51.9
Driving while reading a text or an email on a cellphone	1.5	4.4	24.5	69.3
Driving while typing or sending a text message or email on a cellphone	1.4	4.5	20.1	73.8
Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on a freeway	3.4	18.6	31.7	46.3
Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street (neighborhood)	1.7	7.4	29.8	60.4
Driving through a light that had just turned red when you could have stopped safely	2.3	5.4	22.4	69.6
Driving aggressively	1.3	4.7	24.9	68.8
Driving while being so tired that they had a hard time keeping their eyes open	1.7	1.1	19.4	77.3
Driving after drinking enough alcohol to over the legal limit	0.8	0.9	7.9	90.4
Riding in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol	1.0	0.8	10.2	88.0
Driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana	2.6	5.4	14.5	76.9
Driving while using potentially impairing prescription drugs	1.6	1.4	13.0	83.4
Driving without wearing a seatbelt	1.5	4.3	19.5	74.4

Driving Behaviors in the Past 30 Days

Despite the perceived danger, risk of arrest, and personal and social disapproval, American drivers report engaging in a number of problematic driving behaviors. For example, in Table 5 we see that more than half of drivers reported having driven while talking on a hand-held cellphone at least once in the past 30 days prior to the survey. Compared with this, the prevalence of engaging in distracted driving while using a cellphone is less for reading (41.3%) and typing a text/email (32.1%). Almost half of drivers (49%) admitted to having driven 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway, while only about 17% of drivers reported having driven without wearing a seat belt.

The prevalence of engaging in impaired driving varied by the source of impairment. Table 5 shows that driving after drinking enough alcohol to be over the legal limit (10.9%) was more prevalent than driving either after using marijuana (6.6%) or after impairing prescription drugs (5.6%). Also, about 13% of respondents admitted to having ridden in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol at least once in the 30 days prior to the survey.

	Regularly	Fairly often	A few times	Just once	Never
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Held and talked on a cellphone while you were driving	4.0	8.0	29.6	10.5	47.9
Read a text or an email on a cell phone while you were driving	1.5	5.3	25.3	9.2	58.6
Typed or sent a text message or email while driving	1.2	3.8	19.2	7.9	67.8
Driven 15 mph over the speed limit on a freeway	4.2	8.2	27.7	8.8	50.9
Driven 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street (neighborhood)		5.8	23.4	8.5	59.9
Driven through a light that had just turned red when you could have stopped safely	0.4	1.4	11.8	17.8	68.5
Driving aggressively	0.6	2.1	12	10.1	75.1
Driven when you were so tired that you had a hard time keep your eyes open	0.7	1.3	11.9	13.1	72.8
Driven when you had enough alcohol that you thought you might be over the legal limit	0.6	0.4	4.3	5.6	89.0
Ridden in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol	0.4	0.6	6.4	5.7	86.8
Driven shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana	1.2	1.0	3.0	1.4	93.3
Driven when using potentially impairing prescription drugs	0.5	0.7	2.2	2.2	94.3
Driven without wearing your seatbelt	1.7	1.7	9.3	4.1	83.2

Table 5. In the past 30 days, how often have you done any of the following behaviors?

Support for Safety Countermeasures

Respondents were asked how strongly they supported or opposed specific traffic safety countermeasures. In general, most respondents expressed support for most traffic safety laws listed in Table 6.

For example, 74.9% of drivers supported a law against holding and talking on a cellphone while driving, and 87.5% of drivers supported a law against reading, typing, or sending a text or email while driving. However, less than half of drivers (46.8%) supported laws in support of using cameras to automatically ticket those who drive more than 10 mph over the speed limit on residential streets.

Over 81% of drivers indicated support for ignition interlock for all DWI (driving while intoxicated) offenders (i.e., all-offender ignition interlock laws) and 76.3% support laws preventing the transport of a minor by a driver who has had any alcohol (i.e., child endangerment laws). However only slightly more than half of drivers (52.8%) support laws lowering the legal limit for a driver's blood alcohol concentration (a measure of the amount of alcohol in a person's blood) from 0.08 to 0.05. Over 81% of respondents indicated support for laws making it illegal to drive with a set amount of marijuana in the body (i.e., marijuana per se laws) compared with 77.3% who support laws making it illegal to drive with any amount of drugs not legally prescribed (i.e., zero tolerance drug laws).

Table 6. How strongly do you support or oppose...?

	Support strongly (%)	Support somewhat (%)	Oppose somewhat (%)	Oppose strongly (%)
Having a law against holding/talking on a cellphone while driving, for all drivers regardless of their age	47.6	27.3	17.3	7.4
Having a law against reading, typing or sending a text message/email while driving	63.7	23.8	8.9	3.4
Having a law against using any type of cellphone while driving, hand-held or hands-free, for all drivers regardless of their age	34.4	19.9	28.4	17.0
Having a law using cameras to automatically ticket those who drive more than 10 mph over the speed limit on residential streets	20.2	26.6	27.4	25.4
Requiring all drivers who have been convicted to DWI* to use a device that won't let their car start if they have been drinking, even if it's their first time being convicted of DWI	50.8	30.6	12.3	6.3
Lowering the limit for a driver's blood alcohol concentration from 0.08 to 0.05 g/dL	28.0	24.8	24.0	22.8
Having a law making it illegal to have any alcohol in your system while transporting a minor (person under 18 years)	51.7	24.6	13.7	9.9
Having a law making it illegal to drive with more than a certain amount of marijuana in your system	58.4	23.1	11.0	7.0
Having a law making it illegal to drive with any drug (not legally prescribed) in your system	48.6	28.7	15.1	6.9
Requiring all new drivers under the age of 21 years to go through training, practice time, and a restriction period	44.2	36.0	13.8	5.3
Having a law allowing automated vehicles to test on public roads	14.1	28.4	31.4	24.9

*DWI = Driving while impaired

Results by Age and Gender

Distracted Driving

Distracted driving while using a cellphone includes hand-held/hands-free cellphone use and reading/writing a text or email. As shown in Table 7, the majority of participants considered cellphone use (e.g., talking, reading and writing) while driving to be very or extremely dangerous. However, a significant number of drivers self-reported using their cellphones while driving for talking or reading (Table 11).

Talking on Cellphones

Nearly 80% of drivers considered talking on a hand-held cellphone while driving to be very or extremely dangerous, while only 47.3% considered drivers talking on a hand-held cellphone to be somewhat or very likely to be caught by the police (Table 8). Only 17.4% somewhat or completely personally approved of talking on a hand-held cellphone (Table 9). The comparable proportion of drivers (20.2%) believed that people who are important to them somewhat or completely approved of talking on a hand-held cellphone (Table 10).

Despite the perceived danger, risks of arrest and personal/social disapproval regarding talking on a hand-held cellphone, more than half of drivers (52%) reported this behavior in the 30 days prior to the survey (Table 11). The proportion varies by age group. More than half (51.2%) of drivers 16-18 years old reported this behavior in the 30 days prior to the survey. The proportion increases with each age group up to 25-39 years old, of whom 63.2% reported the behavior in the past 30 days prior to the survey. The proportion then decreases, with drivers ages 75 years or older having the lowest proportion of drivers who talk on a hand-held cellphone (33.5%).

Text Messaging and Emailing

Most drivers reported reading (96%) and typing a text/email (97%) while driving to be very or extremely dangerous (Table 7). However, less than half considered reading (43.3%) and typing a text/email (46.3%) while driving to be somewhat or very likely an activity one would be caught by the police for (Table 8). This perceived danger and self-reported deterrence measure varies by age and gender. Drivers ages 19-24 showed noticeable differences in deterrence measures between reading (39.2%) and typing (60.7%) a text/email on a cellphone while driving, compared with other age groups.

The age group 19-24 years also has the highest proportion of drivers who personally approve of reading (12.6%) and typing (13.7%) a text/email while driving (Table 9). Further, nearly 7% and 13% of drivers in this age group, which are highest proportions again, believed that people who are important to them approve of reading and typing a text/email on a cellphone while driving, respectively (Table 10). It is noteworthy that there were no gender differences in the personal approval of reading a text/email: however, 7.1% of female drivers personally approved typing a text/email while driving, more than double that of male drivers (3.2%; Table 9). The same pattern was also observed for social approval (Table 10).

Despite high proportions of drivers reporting the perceived danger, risks of arrest, and personal/social disapproval regarding reading and typing a text/email while driving, 41.3% and 32.1% admitted to reading and typing a text/email while driving, respectively (Table 11). This proportion varies by age and

gender. Drivers ages 25-39 have the highest proportions who reported they read (59.9%) as well as typed (54.2%) a text/email while driving, while drivers ages 75 years or older have the lowest proportions who reported they read (11.4%) as well as typed (2.6%) a text/email while driving. A higher proportion of females admitted to reading (42.1%) and typing (33.5%) while driving than males.

		Held and talked on a cellphone (%)	Read on a cellphone (%)	Texted or emailed on a cellphone (%)
All drivers		79.7	95.9	96.7
	16-18	69.6	90.1	94.7
Q	19-24	77.4	95.3	93.1
luou	25-39	71.6	95.5	96.2
Age group	40-59	80.0	95.9	96.6
A	60-74	86.9	96.7	98.1
	75+	92.4	97.8	100.0
Gender	Male	77.4	94.3	95.9
Ger	Female	82.0	97.5	97.6

Table 7. Proportion of drivers who perceived distracted driving as very or extremely
dangerous

Table 8. Proportion of drivers who perceived distracted driving somewhat or very likely to be caught by police

		Held and talked on a cellphone	Read a text or an email on a cellphone	Typed or sent a text message or email on a cell phone
		(%)	(%)	(%)
All drivers		47.3	43.3	46.3
	16-18	45.9	43.2	47.3
Q	19-24	61.0	39.2	60.7
Age group	25-39	55.3	48.0	50.1
ige ç	40-59	43.8	38.7	42.5
4	60-74	39.7	47.9	41.0
	75+	50.9	39.0	50.5
Gender	Male	41.5	39.4	43.7
Ger	Female	53.0	47.2	49.0

Base: US residents ages 16+ with a driver's license who reported driving in past 30 days, weighted to reflect US population

Table 9. Proportion of drivers who personally approved of distracted driving somewhat or
completely

		Held and talked on a cellphone	Read on a cellphone	Typed or sent a text message or email on a cell phone
		(%)	(%)	(%)
All d	All drivers		3.5	5.3
	16-18	25.3	8.1	11.5
Q	19-24	24.6	12.6	13.7
Age group	25-39	18.9	4.4	9.0
ide ĉ	40-59	22.3	2.8	3.8
7	60-74	6.9	1.6	1.2
	75+	5.0	2.3	0.0
Gender	Male	19.9	3.5	3.2
Ger	Female	15.4	3.5	7.1

Table 10. Proportion of drivers who believed people who were important to them would approve of distracted driving somewhat or completely

		Held and talked on a cellphone	Read a text or an email on a cellphone	Typed or sent a text message or email on a cell phone
		(%)	(%)	(%)
All di	All drivers		6.0	5.9
	16-18	17.8	3.0	8.4
٩	19-24	25.3	7.3	13.0
Age group	25-39	22.5	6.7	8.9
ge g	40-59	23.4	6.4	1.7
4	60-74	14.0	4.6	6.6
	75+	7.5	5.9	6.0
Gender	Male	19.8	6.0	3.4
Ger	Female	20.5	5.9	8.2

Base: US residents ages 16+ with a driver's license who reported driving in past 30 days, weighted to reflect US population

Table 11. Proportion of drivers who reported distracted driving behaviors at least once in the	
past 30 days	

		Held and talked on a cellphone		Typed or sent a text message/ email on a cell phone
		(%)	(%)	(%)
All d	rivers	52.0	41.3	32.1
	16-18	51.2	41.7	33.6
٩	19-24	58.5	56.0	52.1
Age group	25-39	63.2	59.9	54.2
ide î	40-59	52.7	42.2	30.6
4	60-74	41.8	23.2	12.3
	75+	33.5	11.4	2.6
Gender	Male	52.0	40.4	30.6
Ger	Female	52.0	42.1	33.5

Risky and Aggressive Driving Behaviors

Speeding

Compared with other driving behavior issues (e.g., distracted, impaired, drowsy and other aggressive driving), smaller proportions of drivers perceived speeding to be dangerous. In addition, a smaller proportion of drivers indicated that speeding on a freeway (54.2%) to be less dangerous than on a residential street (64%). This proportion varies by age and gender (Table 12). Drivers ages 75 and older have the highest proportion of respondents who perceived speeding on either a freeway (65.3%) or residential street (81.5%) to be very or extremely dangerous. Drivers ages 40-59 have the lowest proportion of drivers who perceived speeding on freeways to be very or extremely dangerous (48.6%), while drivers ages 25-39 have the lowest proportion who perceived speeding on residential streets to be very or extremely dangerous (55.3%). In general, more females perceived speeding to be dangerous than males.

A significant proportion of respondents (65.9%) considered that drivers driving 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on freeways will be somewhat or very likely caught by police (Table 13). This could be because speeding would be easily observable and measurable on a roadside compared with other driving behaviors. Despite high-perceived risks of arrest, 22.9% of drivers, somewhat or completely, personally approved of driving 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on freeways. This number increased nearly to 33% for drivers ages 25-39, when breaking by age (Table 14). On the other hand, only 10.9% of drivers, somewhat or completely, personally approved of driving 10 miles per hour over the speed limit on residential streets. Broken down by age, drivers ages 16-18 have the highest proportion, 21.1%. Drivers showed a similar pattern on approval of peers or family regarding speeding (Table 15).

Drivers who self-reported speeding were in line with their personal and social approval pattern on speeding. Nearly half of drivers reported that they had driven 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway at least once in the 30 days prior to the survey (Table 16). Furthermore, drivers ages 19-24 have the highest proportion of speeding 15 miles per hour over the speed limit on a freeway (53.1%), while the youngest age group (16-18 years) have the lowest (37.7%). About 40% of drivers admitted to driving 10 miles per hour over the speed limit on residential streets in the 30 days prior to the survey, and these proportions vary by age and gender.

Red-Light Running

Over 85% of drivers reported speeding through a red light to be very or extremely dangerous. With respect to gender, a little over 81% of male drivers considered it very or extremely dangerous, while 89% of female drivers considered it very or extremely dangerous (Table 12). The proportion of drivers ages 25-39 years old were among the lowest to consider red light running very or extremely dangerous (76.7%), while those ages 60-74 have the highest (93.5%). Further, about 55% of drivers considered that drivers who run red lights will be somewhat or very likely to be caught by police, and this proportion varies by age and gender (Table 13).

Compared with speeding on freeways or residential streets, a much smaller proportion of drivers (6.1%) personally approved of red-light running (Table 14). This proportion was smaller for female drivers (5%) and older drivers (3.8% for ages 60-74 and 0.4% for ages 75 and older). On the other hand, teen drivers ages 16-18 have the highest proportion of respondents indicating personal approval of this behavior

(16.7%), followed by those ages 19-24 years (12.7%). Nearly 8% of drivers believed that red light running would be approved by peers/family. This proportion also varies by gender and age, which shows different patterns than those from personal approval (Table 15).

Although the majority of drivers perceived red light running as dangerous, about 3 in 10 male (32.6%) and female (30.2%) drivers admitted to having done so at least once in the 30 days prior to the survey. Drivers ages 19-24 have the highest proportion (37.4%) who self-reported red light running behaviors, and drivers ages 60-74 have the lowest (24.2%; Table 16).

		Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on freeway	Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street neighborhood	Speeding through a red light	Aggressive driving
			(%)	(%)	(%)
All d	rivers	54.2	64.0	85.4	90.7
	16-18	52.3	62.2	80.4	86.4
Q	19-24	57.2	59.9	80.0	88.9
Age group	25-39	52.8	55.3	76.7	87.9
ge ç	40-59	48.6	67.0	87.5	91.5
4	60-74	60.4	66.4	93.5	92.5
	75+	65.3	81.5	89.3	95.3
Gender	Male	49.5	61.3	81.4	87.7
Ger	Female	58.8	66.9	89.0	93.7

Table 12. Proportion of drivers who perceived risky/aggressive driving as very or extremelydangerous

Table 13. Proportion of drivers who perceived risky/aggressive driving somewhat or verylikely to be caught by police

		Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on freeway	Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street neighborhood	Speeding through a red light	Aggressive driving	Driving without wearing a seatbelt
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
All di	rivers	65.9	53.7	55.1	58.8	48.7
	16-18	69.0	63.3	58.7	61.7	43.9
٩	19-24	69.9	58.0	51.8	66.7	47.0
luou	25-39	73.7	58.9	60.5	60.7	53.4
Age group	40-59	64.3	50.5	53.4	58.6	49.9
4	60-74	61.8	50.9	52.0	59.3	47.2
	75+	50.5	53.1	55.0	41.5	33.4
Gender	Male	66.4	50.7	56.4	56.2	46.3
Ger	Female	65.5	56.5	53.8	61.2	51.0

Table 14. Proportion of drivers who personally approved of risky/aggressive drivingsomewhat or completely

		Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on freeway	Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street neighborhood	Speeding through a red light	Aggressive driving	Driving without wearing a seatbelt
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
All di	All drivers		10.9	6.1	4.8	8.1
	16-18	27.4	21.1	16.7	12.5	8.6
٩	19-24	31.6	3.4	12.7	3.5	12.2
lnout	25-39	32.8	17.5	7.8	6.6	8.7
Age group	40-59	23.8	11.0	5.8	4.3	9.7
4	60-74	12.5	5.9	3.8	4.3	5.0
	75+	7.8	2.6	0.4	0.0	2.4
Gender	Male	27.8	12.1	7.3	4.3	11.8
Ger	Female	18.2	9.6	5.0	5.3	4.3

Table 15. Proportion of drivers who believed people who were important to them would approve of risky/aggressive driving somewhat or completely

		Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on freeway	Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street neighborhood	Speeding through a red light	Aggressive driving	Driving without wearing a seatbelt
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
All di	rivers	22.0	9.2	7.7	6.1	8.1
	16-18	18.3	17.1	10.6	9.1	8.6
٩	19-24	23.1	0.0	7.6	10.1	12.2
luou	25-39	29.1	13.4	11.0	6.2	8.7
Age group	40-59	22.2	9.8	7.5	4.5	9.7
4	60-74	17.0	7.4	6.6	8.9	5.0
	75+	12.3	0.0	1.6	0.0	2.4
Gender	Male	21.9	9.3	7.0	3.3	11.8
Ger	Female	22.1	9.1	8.5	8.9	4.3

Table 16. Proportion of drivers who reported risky/aggressive driving behaviors at least once in the past 30 days

		Driving 15 mph over the speed limit on freeway	Driving 10 mph over the speed limit on a residential street neighborhood	Speeding through a red light	Aggressive driving	Driving without wearing a seatbelt
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
All di	All drivers		40.1	31.4	24.8	16.7
	16-18	37.7	41.4	33.0	29.3	15.7
٩	19-24	53.1	37.4	37.4	31.1	18.4
luou	25-39	49.3	45.7	35.2	31.9	19.8
Age group	40-59	52.6	39.9	33.1	23.9	17.0
4	60-74	44.3	34.7	24.2	19.1	13.5
	75+	45.5	39.8	25.6	13.7	12.5
Gender	Male	53.5	41.7	32.6	27.4	0.2
Ger	Female	44.7	38.5	30.2	22.3	0.1

Base: US residents ages 16+ with a driver's license who reported driving in past 30 days, weighted to reflect US population

Drowsy and Impaired Driving

Drowsy Driving

Regardless of age and gender, the majority (96.2%) of drivers perceived drowsy driving as very or extremely dangerous (Table 17). However, only 37.5% of drivers (34.7% of females and 40% of males) think drowsy drivers run the risk (somewhat or very likely) of being caught by police (Table 18). This proportion also varies by age: Drivers ages 25-39 have the highest proportion (48.4%), while drivers ages 75 or older have the lowest (22.1%).

Only a small proportion of drivers personally and/or socially approved of drowsy driving (Tables 19 and 20). Interestingly, the youngest group of drivers (16-18 years) have the highest proportions of both personal and social approval regarding drowsy driving, while all other age groups have relatively low proportions.

Despite high rates of perceived danger and personal/social disapproval regarding drowsy driving, 27.1% of drivers admitted, in the 30 days prior to the survey, to having driven at least once while being so tired that they had a hard time keeping their eyes open (Table 21). It is notable that drivers ages 19-24 who personally disapproved of drowsy driving have the highest proportion of respondents (34.5%) reporting the behavior at least once in the 30 days prior to the survey.

Alcohol-Impaired Driving

• Driving after drinking enough alcohol that they thought they might be over the legal limit

Regardless of age and gender, most drivers (95.1%) perceived driving after drinking (enough alcohol that they may be over the legal limit) as very or extremely dangerous (Table 17). All respondents ages 19-24 considered drinking and driving very or extremely dangerous. On the other hand, respondents ages 75 or older have the lowest proportion (91.5%) of drivers who perceived driving after drinking to be very or extremely dangerous. This finding is noteworthy because, compared with other groups, older drivers have generally perceived other driving behaviors such as distracted, risky or aggressive driving as greater dangers.

Overall, 67.7% of drivers think those who drive after drinking enough alcohol to be over the legal limit are somewhat or very likely to be caught by police (Table 18). More female (71.3%) than male drivers (63.7%) perceived risk of arrest. Drivers ages 19-24 have the highest proportion of perceived risk of arrest, and this proportion decreases as ages increase.

Although personal and social approval for driving and drinking enough alcohol to be over the legal limit was very low (1.6% and 1.7% respectively; Tables 19 and 20), almost 11% (12.9% male and 9% female drivers) admitted to having done so. The rates are low compared with other problematic driving behaviors (Table 21). This was particularly the case for drivers ages 25-39, who have the highest proportion at 16.7%.

• Riding in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol

Similar to results of drinking and driving, most drivers personally and socially disapproved of riding in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol (Tables 19 and 20). However, 13.1% of drivers admitted to having done so at least once in the past 30 days prior to the survey (Table 21). Drivers ages 25-39 have the highest proportion of having engaged in this behavior, at 17.2%, followed by drivers ages 75 or older at 14.3%.

Drug-Impaired Driving

• Driving shortly after using marijuana

Seventy percent of respondents considered driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana to be very or extremely dangerous (Table 17). Drivers ages 75 or older have the highest proportion (86.6%) of respondents indicating that this behavior is very or extremely dangerous, while drivers ages 19-24 have the lowest proportion (57.9%). Only 31.9% of respondents thought that those driving shortly after using marijuana would be somewhat or very likely to be caught by police (Table 18). This percentage is even smaller than that for driving while being so tired that they had a hard time keeping their eyes open (37.5%).

Over 7% of drivers personally approved of driving shortly after using marijuana (Table 19), which was higher than those who personally approved of drowsy driving (1.7%), alcohol-impaired driving (1.6%) and prescription drug-impaired driving (3.0%). This proportion does not vary by gender but does by age, with drivers ages 19-24 (16.1%) and 25-39 (10.1%) having the highest proportions of personal approval. Social approval for driving shortly after using marijuana also varies by age (Table 20). Drivers ages 19-24 have the highest proportion of drivers who approved of driving shortly after using marijuana (20.4%),

while the youngest driver group (ages 16 - 18) has the lowest proportion (4.9%). Women (9.5%) were more likely than males (6.6%) to approve of driving shortly after using marijuana.

Only 6.6% of drivers (8.2% of male and 5.0% of female drivers) admitted to having driven shortly after using marijuana in the past 30 days prior to the survey (Table 21). Drivers ages 25-39 have the highest proportion (13.7%) followed by drivers ages 19-24 (10.0%). Drivers ages 75 or older have the lowest proportion (1.0%) of respondents engaging in this behavior.

• Driving while using potentially impairing prescription drugs

Most drivers (87.3%), regardless of age and gender, perceived driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs to be very or extremely dangerous (Table 17). More than 92% of drivers ages 19-24 perceived such behaviors to be very or extremely dangerous. Those ages 25-39 have the lowest proportion of respondents perceiving driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs to be very or extremely dangerous — 85.2%. However, only 45.4% of drivers considered that those driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs would be somewhat or very likely to be caught by police (Table 18). This proportion varies by gender and, particularly, by age. Drivers ages 25-39 have the highest proportion with 53.8%, while those ages 75 or older have the lowest proportion (20.9%) of drivers who think that those driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs would be somewhat or very likely to be caught by the police.

Only 3% of drivers, both socially and personally, approved of driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs (Tables 19 and 20). Drivers ages 25-39 reported the highest proportions of both personal and social approval (6.8% and 6%, respectively). Drivers ages 19-24 or 75 and older did not approve of driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs, either personally or socially.

In spite of disapproval of driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs, 5.6% of respondents indicated having done so in the last 30 days of the survey (Table 21). Respondents ages 25-39 reported the highest proportions of both personal and social approval for driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs. This group also has the highest proportion (8.5%) of drivers admitting to having done this at least once in the 30 days prior to the survey.

Table 17. Proportion of drivers who perceived drowsy driving, alcohol-impaired and drugimpaired driving as very or extremely dangerous

		Driving while being so tired that they had had a hard time keeping their eyes open (%)	Driving after drinking enough alcohol that they may be over the legal limit (%)	Driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana (%)	Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs (%)
All d	rivers	96.2	95.1	70.0	87.3
	16-18	93.4	96.0	80.3	87.8
Q	19-24	95.3	100.0	57.9	92.1
Age Group	25-39	96.9	94.2	65.6	85.2
ge (40-59	96.5	95.3	67.6	86.8
4	60-74	95.2	95.8	75.0	88.8
	75+	96.9	91.5	86.6	87.4
Gender	Male	95.7	92.3	66.8	87.1
Ger	Female	96.6	98.0	73.3	87.6

Table 18. Proportion of drivers who perceived drowsy driving, alcohol-impaired and drugimpaired driving somewhat or very likely to be caught by police

		Driving while being so tired that they had had a hard time keeping their eyes open (%)	Driving after drinking enough alcohol that they may be over the legal limit (%)	Driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana (%)	Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs (%)
All d	rivers	37.5	67.7	31.9	45.4
	16-18	35.9	70.7	36.7	53.2
Q	19-24	41.3	74.1	35.1	49.3
Age Group	25-39	48.4	69.5	40.0	53.8
ge (40-59	34.9	66.5	26.8	45.6
A	60-74	34.7	65.8	29.9	40.6
	75+	22.1	64.6	29.3	20.9
Gender	Male	40.0	63.7	33.5	44.7
Ger	Female	34.7	71.3	30.4	46.2

Table 19. Proportion of drivers who personally approved of drowsy driving, alcohol-impaired and drug-impaired driving somewhat or completely

		Driving while being so tired that they had had a hard time keeping their eyes open (%)	Driving after drinking enough alcohol that they may be over the legal limit (%)	Riding in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol (%)	Driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana (%)	Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs (%)
All di	rivers	1.7	1.6	1.2	7.4	3.0
	16-18	8.5	0.7	1.1	6.4	4.5
Q	19-24	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.1	0.0
Brou	25-39	1.9	2.4	2.6	10.1	6.8
Age Group	40-59	2.2	2.0	1.4	6.1	2.2
4	60-74	0.0	0.9	0.0	5.9	1.2
	75+	1.9	1.2	0.0	4.8	0.0
Gender	Male	1.7	1.3	1.1	7.6	3.2
Ger	Female	1.7	1.9	1.3	7.3	2.9

Table 20. Proportion of drivers who believed people who were important to them would approve of drowsy driving, alcohol-impaired and drug-impaired driving somewhat or completely

		Driving while being so tired that they had had a hard time keeping their eyes open (%)	Driving after drinking enough alcohol that they may be over the legal limit (%)	Riding in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol (%)	Driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana (%)	Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs (%)
All drivers		2.8	1.7	1.7	8.1	3.0
Age Group	16-18	8.3	0.7	1.1	4.9	4.5
	19-24	2.7	0.0	4.5	20.4	0.0
	25-39	5.0	1.1	0.8	9.3	6.0
	40-59	2.4	2.6	3.1	8.3	1.7
	60-74	1.4	2.5	0.5	5.1	2.8
	75+	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0
Gender	Male	2.3	0.9	1.8	6.6	2.8
	Female	3.5	2.5	1.6	9.5	3.1

Table 21. Proportion of drivers who reported drowsy driving, alcohol-impaired and drugimpaired driving behaviors at least once in the past 30 days

		Driving while being so tired that they had had a hard time keeping their eyes open (%)	Driving after drinking enough alcohol that they may be over the legal limit (%)	Riding in a car driven by someone who has had too much alcohol (%)	Driving shortly (within an hour) after using marijuana (%)	Driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs (%)
All drivers		27.1	10.9	13.1	6.6	5.6
Age Group	16-18	22.2	5.5	9.9	7.3	4.5
	19-24	34.5	7.2	12.6	10.0	3.2
	25-39	34.2	16.7	17.2	13.7	8.5
	40-59	26.1	9.0	11.0	4.8	5.5
	60-74	21.9	9.8	12.3	2.1	3.0
	75+	18.7	9.7	14.3	1.0	5.9
Gender	Male	28.4	12.9	12.3	8.2	5.5
	Female	25.9	9.0	13.9	5.0	5.6

Discussion

Results from the *TSCI* suggest American drivers perceive distracted, aggressive, drowsy and impaired driving as dangerous. Driving after drinking enough alcohol to be over the legal limit and distracted driving behaviors related to reading and sending text messages on cellphones are considered particularly dangerous. Speeding, either driving 10 miles over the limit on a residential street or driving 15 miles over the limit on a freeway, is regarded as the least dangerous.

Of particular interest is the concordance (or lack thereof) between attitudes toward risky driving and self-reported behaviors. Often there is also a concordance between perceived risk of arrest and/or social approval. For example, the public regards drinking and driving as extremely dangerous, and people rarely report engaging in this behavior. They believe that the police will catch a person drinking and driving and that individuals close to these drivers would completely disapprove of partaking in this behavior. On the other hand, speeding is regarded as the least dangerous of the driving activities in the survey and the most commonly cited self-reported risky driving behavior. Speeding is also socially most likely to be approved. The previous study conducted by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (2016) also found that drivers who reported having speeded on a freeway or on a residential street were more likely to have reported engaging in aggressive driving (e.g., tailgating, honking to show annoyance/anger, blocking another driver from changing lanes) than those who did not report having speeded.

There is a stark contrast between the public's attitudes toward cellphone use and self-reported behaviors. Many drivers noted the serious dangers associated with holding and talking on cellphones while driving, while also admitting to having done so in the past month. To some extent, social disapproval for this behavior was also low (relative to impaired driving). However, contrary to self-reported behaviors and social approval was that a large percentage of respondents indicated they would strongly support policies to curtail reading, typing or sending a text message/email while driving. This is an interesting finding from an advocacy perspective, since studies completed by the AAAFTS consistently show increased crash risks associated with distracted driving (Owens et al., 2018).

The perceived dangers and risk of arrest for driving after using potentially impairing prescription drugs and using marijuana were surprisingly low. It should be noted that self-reported engagement in these activities was also low. A previous study (Banta-Green and Williams, 2016) noted that cannabis is less stigmatized than, for example, alcohol. Thus, drivers may be more likely to believe that it has a limited effect on driving performance. Additionally, drivers' perceptions of dangers associated with aggressive driving and red light running were somewhat lower than expected, although perceptions on risk of arrest were fairly high.

References

AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (2018). 2017 Traffic Safety Culture Index. Washington, D.C.: AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety. Available: <u>https://aaafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/TSCI-2017-Report.pdf</u>.

AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (2017). 2016 Traffic Safety Culture Index. Washington, D.C.: AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety. Available: <u>https://aaafoundation.org/wp-</u> content/uploads/2017/11/2016TrafficSafetyCultureIndexReport.pdf

AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (2016). Prevalence of Self-Reported Aggressive Driving Behavior: United States, 2014. AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety.

Banta-Green, C. and Williams, J. (2016). Overview of Major Issues Regarding the Impacts of Alcohol and Marijuana on Driving. AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety.

GfK (2016). KnowledgePanel[®] Design Overview. Palo Alto, CA: GfK. <u>https://www.gfk.com/fileadmin/user_upload/dyna_content/US/documents/GfK_KnowledgePanel_</u> <u>Overview.pdf</u>.

Kim, W., Anorve, V. and Tefft, B.C. (2019). American Driving Survey, 2014-2017. AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety.

National Center for Statistics and Analysis. (2018, October). 2017 fatal motor vehicle crashes: Overview. (Traffic Safety Facts Research Note. Report No. DOT HS 812 603). Washington, D.C.: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Owens, J.M., Dingus, T.A., Guo, F., Fang, Y., Perez, M. and McClafferty, J.(2018). Crash Risk of Cell Phone Use While Driving: A Case – Crossover Analysis of Naturalistic Driving Data. *AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety.*

U.S. Census Bureau (2016). Current Population Survey: March 2016. Washington, D.C. <u>http://www.bls.gov/cps/.</u>