

Cragg Ross Dawson

**RESPECT ON THE ROAD:
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH
TO EXPLORE PUBLIC
ATTITUDES TOWARDS, AND
PARTICIPATION IN,
ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR
ON THE ROADS**

REPORT
DoC 4/1/32

Prepared for:

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
76 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DR

May 2006

779 rp

Contacts at
Cragg Ross Dawson:

Ben Toombs
Tim Porter

Cragg Ross Dawson
Qualitative Research
18 Carlisle Street
London W1D 3BX
Tel +44 (0)20 7437 8945
Fax +44 (0)20 7437 0059
research@crd.co.uk
www.craggrossdawson.co.uk

CONTENTS

Page no

A.	BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	1
	1. Background to the research	1
	2. Research objectives	2
B.	METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE	4
	1. Research methodology	4
	2. Sample summary	5
C.	MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	7
D.	MAIN FINDINGS	14
	1. Context – perceptions of respect	14
	2. Conceptions of respect on the road	19
	3. The effect of being in a car	23
	4. Reactive disrespect	30
	5. Passive disrespect	37
	6. Who is disrespectful?	45
	7. Does disrespect matter?	48
E.	RECOMMENDATIONS	52
	1. The challenges	52
	2. Reactive disrespect	52
	3. Passive disrespect	55
	4. Terminology	57
	5. Issues for further research	58
Appendix:	Government definition of respect	
	Discussion guide	
	Recruitment questionnaire	

A. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

1. **Background to the research**

The Government's Respect Action Plan is a cross-departmental initiative aimed at addressing the problems caused by 'a lack of respect for values that almost everyone in this country shares – consideration for others, a recognition that we all have responsibilities as well as rights, civility and good manners'.¹ The Plan advances six main strands through which to deal with the minority who demonstrate this 'lack of respect'. These focus on families and parenting, schooling and activities for young people, and strengthening and protecting community life.

But the Government's overall conception of 'respect' is wider than this, and includes attitudes to people working in the public services, relations between the generations and race and faith groups, and the need to engender the feeling among all young people that they are valued members of society. In short, it seeks to uphold and promote 'the basic decencies in behaviour which should be the hallmark of all our encounters with others'.²

The Department for Transport wished to understand how this wider conception of respect relates to behaviour on the road, how respectful attitudes can be encouraged, and how the factors which influence disrespect can be addressed. There is evidence to suggest that road users are displaying an increasing lack of respect towards others; in December 2005, DfT considered this issue and identified a number of activities which should be considered disrespectful because they are either illegal or conducive to anti-social behaviour. The Department wished to understand how these and other such activities are viewed by the public, and the influences on those who partake and disapprove of them. Qualitative research was required to explore these issues.

¹ *Respect Action Plan*: foreword

² Respect on the Road – Market Research Spec: Annex A

2. Research objectives

The overall requirement for this research was twofold. First, it was to inform DfT's understanding of public attitudes towards respect on the road, and the factors influencing these attitudes...

- what, in the public's view, constitutes respectful and disrespectful behaviour on the road; what are their opinions about the prevalence of each
- why do people behave in a respectful way, and how can this be encouraged
- what factors lie behind disrespectful behaviour, and what can the Government do to address these
- which influencers, communication channels, enforcement measures and other means would have the strongest effects on behaviour change

Second, it was, as far as possible, to provide DfT with concrete and useable recommendations for ways in which to increase respect on the road, based firmly on the findings of the research. It was envisaged that the most effective approach will involve a combination of communications and legislative measures; this view needed to be validated or challenged.

In addition, the research was required to...

- explore and identify relationships and/or disparities between levels of respect on the road and elsewhere
- gauge differences between the various types of road user (car and van drivers, motorcycle riders, cyclists, pedestrians) and explore the reasons for these differences
- investigate attitudes to road traffic laws and law enforcers (police, parking attendants), and the reasons for the rise in contested speeding and parking penalties; and distinguish between levels of respect for 'authority' and other road users

- gauge attitudes towards illegal parking in particular, and awareness of its consequences; and discover what might make people see it as anti-social, if they do not already
- explore and identify relationships between low-level disrespect on the road and illegal driving practices (vehicles which are uninsured, untaxed, without an MOT etc)

These issues needed to be viewed in the context of people's awareness and perceptions of the concept of respect more generally. The research also needed to account for any changes in attitude in the light of exposure to, and discussion of, the issues.

B. METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE

1. **Research methodology**

The fieldwork involved a mix of group discussions and individual depth interviews, as follows...

- 14 group discussions, each lasting 2 hours and involving 6 respondents
- 12 individual interviews, 6 reflecting demographic variables and 6 with 'extreme' cases

The groups and interviews made extensive use of stimulus materials to engage respondents and promote consideration and discussion of the issues; these included...

- two conceptual mapping exercises depicting aspects of respect off and on the road
- a summary of the Government's definition of respect, taken from the Respect Action Plan
- a free-association exercise involving various aspects of the driving experience
- a self-completion questionnaire on which respondents could record private views on their own driving
- agree/disagree and 'What happens when...' exercises to investigate respondents' attitudes and actions in various situations

Fieldwork took place between 13th and 23rd March, and was moderated by Lisa Malangone, Tim Porter, Catherine Taylor and Ben Toombs.

2. Sample summary

2.1 Group discussions

Group	Age	Sex	SEG	Road use	Location
1	17-24	male	B	car	SE, urban
2	17-24	male	C1	car	Mid, small town
3	17-24	female	C1	car	Mid, urban
4	17-24	male	C2DE	car	North urban
5	25-34	male	C1	car	SE, small town
6	25-34	male	C2DE	car	Mid, urban
7	25-34	female	B	car	North, rural
8	25-34	male	C1	van	SE, urban
9	35-49	male	B	car	North, rural
10	35-49	female	C1	car	SE, small town
11	35-49	male	-	bicycle	SE, urban
12	35-49	male	-	motorcycle	North urban
13	50-65	female	BC1	car	SE, urban
14	50-65	mixed	C2DE	pedestrian	Mid, small town

2.2 Depth interviews

- **1 no-risk empty nester^{*}** : BC1 women; aged 55+; married/cohabiting, home-owner, risk averse, sedate lifestyle
- **1 safer striver**: C1 man; aged 17-35; has children of 4 and under, risk accepting, active lifestyle
- **2 crash-happy thrill seekers**: both C1 men; 1 aged 25-29 with no children, 1 aged 30-34 with children over 5; both enjoy sport and driving, risk loving, active social lives

^{*} segment definitions from NOP's 2005 research on the Think! campaign

- **2 deluded danger-masters:** both B men, 1 aged 17-29, 1 aged 30-44; both like cars, risk neutral, cultured lifestyles
- **1** car driver, recently responsible for a **road accident**
- **2** car drivers, with nine or more **points on licence**
- **1** car driver, convicted of a **driving offence**
- **2** car drivers, cautioned for, or convicted of, an offence related to **anti-social behaviour**

C. MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Context – perceptions of respect

1. Anti-social behaviour among young people was widely thought to be increasing across the UK. The term 'respect' was used spontaneously by some to describe this behaviour; others did not volunteer it, but were happy to use this word in discussion. Respect had a number of connotations (for other people; for older people; for the possessions of others; for the law and authority; and for the local environment), and the effects of a lack of it were seen in both physical and attitudinal terms. Most respondents were more concerned about 'indirect' disrespect towards the community and local environment than 'direct' disrespect towards individuals. The Government's definition of respect met with widespread approval, although few respondents were aware of the Action Plan itself; most felt the Government is taking the issues seriously.

Conceptions of respect on the road

2. Respondents' general ideas about respect informed their initial feelings about behaviour on the road. Most described themselves as respectful because they did not demonstrate the type of inconsiderate behaviour that they characterised as disrespect elsewhere. But disrespect was thought to be much more common and widespread on the road than off it. The reason for this disparity seemed to lie in some fundamental differences between the off- and on-road situations which result in varying conceptions of respect.
3. Off the road, a lack of respect was seen as attitudinal, and at the root of the behaviour of the anti-social minority; on the road, it was seen as much less fundamental and a symptom of the driving situation and environment which could affect almost anyone. Once they appreciated these differences, almost all respondents acknowledged that they sometimes behaved less respectfully on the roads than they would elsewhere.
4. This disrespect on the road falls into three categories: active, reactive and passive. *Active* disrespect involves the type of inconsiderate behaviour that most respondents expected from the generally

disrespectful minority. *Reactive* disrespect comprises impatience and impersonal aggression on the part of the generally respectful majority. *Passive* disrespect involves breaches of the law which are seen as inconsequential and rewarding, again on the part of the respectful majority. The latter two forms were seldom acknowledged initially, but on reflection were thought widespread.

The effect of being in a car

5. The combination of the on-road environment and the act of driving seems to raise the threshold of acceptability (what people are prepared to do and have done to them) on the road, and in particular to make people prone to impatience and aggression, more prepared to vent these feelings, and more confident in their own judgement and experience. When on the road, drivers often become frustrated at being held up when in a hurry and may feel tension because of the inherent danger of the environment. This creates the potential for impatience and aggression, feelings which would normally be suppressed by social inhibitions and fear of the consequences but which are, for a number of reasons, given freer reign by the impression of security and anonymity that being in a car provides. The result is reactive disrespect: a propensity to act in a more 'primal' way than when off the road, where this combination is less evident.
6. This impression of security and isolation from other people also seems to increase drivers' confidence in their own judgements of what is safe and acceptable in a given situation, and seems likely to obstruct their appreciation of the 'community' effects of their actions. These factors, together with the impatience generated by the road environment and a lack of experience of their judgements on safety being proved wrong, seem to make it more likely that drivers will believe that they, and not the authorities or road laws, know best. The result is passive disrespect.

Reactive disrespect

7. Disrespectful behaviour on the road was nearly always said to be a response to something that someone else had done, and was often justified as such. It was distinct in respondents' minds from 'road rage' (thought to involve an undesirable escalation of disrespect in which

security and anonymity are removed), inconsiderate driving and patently illegal behaviour, all of which were seen as being largely restricted to actively disrespectful minorities.

8. Among the examples of disrespectful behaviour included in the stimulus material, those of reactive disrespect (tail-gating, impatience, hooting, flashing headlights) were widely thought common and unserious, and were the activities that respondents were most likely to admit to doing themselves. By contrast, it was much less common for respondents to admit to low-level *active* disrespect (legal but lacking consideration for others). This pattern seems to confirm the argument that reactive disrespect is acceptable because it is justified as a response to someone else's mistakes or actions, whereas active disrespect is less acceptable because it involves an unjustifiable lack of thought or consideration.
9. The types of action which might elicit reactive disrespect seemed to have three things in common: the person reacting believes that he or she would not have done the same thing; the situation involves two different interpretations of how it is acceptable and appropriate to drive; and the person 'provoking' the reaction does so unintentionally. Although most reactive disrespect does not involve obviously illegal behaviour, and most respondents claimed to abide by most of the rules of the road, the way in which the Highway Code is interpreted in different types of environment seems to be a grey area. Reactive disrespect can arise when someone's idea of how best to drive in a given situation conflicts with that of someone else. Such conflict seems particularly likely where there is a disparity of personality types, knowledge of the area or age.

Passive disrespect

10. The types of behaviour which comprise passive disrespect were thought commonplace, and many respondents were happy to admit to them. But most found it difficult to accept that these actions were in fact disrespectful, or even problematic because, in their experience, they confer advantages and have no adverse consequences.
11. Respect for the Highway Code and the authorities which enforce it was largely based on two factors: the safety rationale of the law, and the

threat of penalties for breaking it. Where this safety rationale was obvious and recognised, breaches of the law were widely thought dangerous, unacceptable and disrespectful or anti-social; few would admit to doing so. But where the safety rationale was less obvious, and less commonly recognised, the influences of the road environment noted above seemed to have the potential to induce otherwise law-abiding drivers to reject or ignore the law and drive as they see fit.

12. The most common example of this was exceeding the speed limit by a small proportion: most were happy to admit to doing so on occasion, and to acknowledge that this involved breaking the law. Many felt that the speed limits on major roads in particular could be higher while remaining safe, and were confident in their own ability to drive faster but still safely. This lack of recognition of the safety rationale for the limits meant that the main reason for respecting these laws was the threat of being penalised. However, the reward of faster journey times (attractive, given the impatience generated by the road environment) often seemed more significant than this threat, leading many to follow their own judgements about safety, and to exceed the speed limit.
13. Using mobile telephones was a similar, if less widespread example. Lack of experience to the contrary meant that the safety rationale was not recognised; this erosion of respect for the law in the face of a perceived need to use mobiles in this situation meant that many were happy to do so.
14. Laws which are not intended to protect people's safety tended to be respected even less than those with a safety rationale which was not recognised. The primary example was parking law: respondents, possibly blinkered by the isolation of the driving situation, did not perceive the 'community' impact of illegal parking and saw a reward in terms of convenience; they also had little respect for the authorities (parking wardens), who were seen to be enforcing the law for their own good rather than that of the public. As before, these laws were often respected only in the face of the threat of penalties.
15. A second aspect of passive disrespect was a lack of regard for the decisions of the authorities, illustrated by the likelihood of appealing against a penalty. This seemed most likely in cases where the recipient does not recognise safety rationale and feels he or she is

being punished unreasonably, thinks there is a chance of success, and is aware that others have been successful in similar cases. Exceeding the speed limit by a small proportion met the first criterion, but few said they would appeal because the law is clear and there would be little chance of success. Penalties for illegal parking, however, were widely thought to be open to contest: recipients of a fine tended to be indignant towards the authorities; the rules were thought unclear and variable, and therefore arguable; and many had been successful in the past, or knew of others who had been.

16. Few were surprised that the number of appeals is rising. This was largely attributed to an increasing litigiousness in society, an erosion of respect for systems which were seen as self-serving, and wider trends in society which persuade people to be more questioning and independent-minded. It may also be related to the higher threshold of acceptability on the road: if drivers consider minor offences normal and acceptable, they are likely to have more respect for the norms of the road than for some of the laws.

Does disrespect matter?

17. Few felt much concern about the effects of reactive disrespect: although sometimes irritating, it was widely thought inconsequential, commonplace and acceptable. Likewise, passive disrespect was not thought to matter greatly, despite its illegality, because there was no perceived victim. Indeed, respondents often found it difficult to see the latter form as disrespectful at all. On the face of it, there also seems to be good reason to believe that neither form will create a propensity for more serious disrespect or illegal behaviour, either on or off the road. On this evidence, both reactive and passive disrespect are symptoms of the specific conditions of the on-road and in-car environments; clear distinctions were drawn between this situation and situations in which these conditions are absent.
18. Despite these distinctions, however, there are reasons for wanting to address both types of disrespect. It does seem possible that there are links between the acceptability of these types of disrespect on the road and other forms of undesirable behaviour elsewhere. The propensity to appeal against parking penalties is fuelled by an erosion of respect for the aims of the law and the motives of the authorities: it is possible

that the perceived acceptability of challenging authority in this way on the road will influence attitudes to authority elsewhere. Equally, the acceptability of impatience and aggression on the road may be a factor behind respondents' reports of increasing impoliteness in general life. Most obvious, however, is the fact that passive disrespect *can* have wider repercussions than respondents were able or willing to perceive: the challenge lies in persuading them to recognise this.

Recommendations

19. The perceived inconsequence and ubiquity of reactive and passive disrespect means that it is likely to be extremely difficult to influence people on these issues. But there are reasons for wanting to do so. In the case of reactive disrespect, we feel the focus should be on lowering the threshold of acceptability to bring it into line with situations elsewhere. This is a task which is difficult to tackle head-on as the issues are not top of mind, but respondents did come to recognise and acknowledge them as the group discussions progressed.
20. The most profitable approaches are therefore likely to be long-term and extended: influence (from parents, partners, bosses, the media); and education in the form of sessions which replicate the journey of self-discovery made by respondents in the group discussions. Advertising and other forms of immediate communication, although effective in other situations, seem unlikely to be successful here: it would be very difficult to force sufficient consideration of the issue; and advertisements would be likely to lack the necessary impact and credibility. If communications are to be planned, we would recommend that the Government does not take an overt role in them, given the perceived inconsequence of the issues when compared with other, more pressing matters. Legal intervention was widely rejected as inappropriate for the same reason, and as unpoliceable anyway.
21. Passive disrespect involves illegal actions and has safety ramifications. The challenge is twofold: to persuade drivers to take this seriously; and to disabuse them of the rewards it seems to offer. As above, influence and education are likely to have a role to play in this – speed awareness sessions were suggested by some.

22. But there also seems to be scope for communications which address these two challenges. Communications which query drivers' confidence in their abilities to control a car at speed or while on the telephone, and which call into question the perceived value of the rewards for taking such risks, may be effective.
23. A second communications approach would aim to query the argument that passive disrespect is acceptable because 'everybody does it'. The related principle of social norming suggests that participation in illegal behaviour can be bolstered by the perception that this behaviour is widespread and rewarding, and that challenging this perception can reduce levels of participation.
24. Illegal parking is likely to be very difficult to address, as it lacks the safety rationale of speeding and mobile telephone use, and the reasoning behind the law is rarely personally motivating. It may be, however, that respect for the authorities could be increased, and the number of appeals against penalties reduced, if the widespread perception that this authority is being abused could be addressed.
25. We would recommend that the word 'respect' is not used in communications in this context. Its connotations of illegal and anti-social behaviour of the type demonstrated by the actively disrespectful minority seem to be too strong for it to be immediately credible, relevant or even acceptable to the majority of people who consider themselves respectful in general life.

D. MAIN FINDINGS

1. **Context – perceptions of respect**

The sample for this research covered a wide demographic and geographic spectrum. It included male and female respondents aged 17 to 65, from social classes B to E, from regions in the South East, Midlands and the North of England, and from urban, small town and rural areas. Across the breadth of this sample, respondents consistently and often spontaneously expressed the impression that anti-social, inconsiderate and intimidating behaviour among young people was widespread and increasingly evident in their neighbourhoods. Such behaviour was experienced locally but thought to be present across the UK, although in some areas more than others; it was felt increasingly to be a feature of modern life.

“It is affected throughout the whole of England – anti-social behaviour in say Sheffield or Manchester, I don’t just think it is concentrated in London.”

“I think the north have got it worse. I would say the areas up north are a lot worse, generally because of the poverty.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

The term ‘respect’ (or a lack of it) was often used spontaneously by respondents in B and older groups to describe this type of behaviour. Others were less comfortable with the word and did not volunteer it, but they fully understood what it meant in this context and were happy to use it in discussion. For most, the term implied one or more of five things. Respect for other people was one of the most common – treating others as you would want to be treated yourself. This was relevant to most types of respondent, but was especially evident in the younger (17-34) groups.

“Treating each other as you want to be treated.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

Respect for older people – deference and a sense of hierarchy – on the other hand was (perhaps unsurprisingly) most commonly mentioned by older (35+) respondents. The same was true for respect for someone else’s possessions.

“[Young] people are happy to challenge you, whereas previously there would be a decent level of respect.”

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

"You respect your elders, don't you? Kids these days, they are so rude."

Group 10: female, 35-49, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

"It means to me just people being polite, being aware that we're not all the same. You need respect, definitely. Having worked in a school I know what it's like with some kids, they're diabolical. But I respect people, you know, on a tube or a bus I'll get up if there's someone older than me. It's just how you're brought up... I think young people should be more aware of it, but they don't seem to be any more. Quite a lot of kids just don't seem to care."

Depth 1: female, 55+, BC1, 'risk averse', South East

Regard for the law and punishment – a respect for authority – and respect for the local environment and surroundings were frequently mentioned across the age and social range.

"There's no respect, there's no respect for the authority at all. I mean, when I was growing up, if you was in trouble and you see a policeman, you know, you were scared. If you were taken home to your Dad, you knew what your Dad might do to you, and you wouldn't do it. But nowadays kids are not afraid of the police – even if they do get arrested, they still know that the law's going to be on their side, so they don't care."

Group 11: cyclists, urban, South East

In all these senses, respect was widely felt to have been decreasing for some time, although the pace of change was often thought to have quickened in recent years. Conversely, a less positive, 'street' conception of respect, in which young people seek approval from their peers by demonstrating anti-social behaviour, or show deference to those who do so, was often thought by younger respondents to be a rising phenomenon.

"Everyone has respect for people but it is different things. Like take mugging, muggers get respect from other people in the street gangs."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

WHAT IS RESPECT?

"Well, you know, when you can walk the walk, not just talk it, when you can walk it. And also, if you're a straight up person, no bullshit. It doesn't take long for people to find that out. That's where a lot of respect comes in. People don't like bullshitters, you lose maximum respect."

Depth 11: male, anti-social behaviour, South East

“Younger people are trying to show off.”
“They are trying to earn respect by disrespecting other people.”
“They just care what their mates think about them.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

For most respondents, disrespect was seen both in physical terms (damage, violence, breaking the law, active intimidation) and, apparently less notably but more commonly, in lower-level, attitudinal terms (constant ‘hanging around’, and the way in which people interact). A lack of ‘manners’ and ‘courtesy’ was also used to describe it in this second sense.

“Just hanging around. It is not that they haven’t got anything to do, they’re just loitering and it is intimidating. You see people crossing the road to avoid them. I think the girls are worse than the boys, their language and attitude.”

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

“There’s a problem with teenage kids at the moment. Graffiti and hanging round. I suppose every town has it but it kind of stands out here.”

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

Disrespectful behaviour of both types was generally thought to involve a conspicuous minority, mostly comprising teenagers. Even the youngest in the sample (17-24) tended to implicate people younger than themselves; although some C1 and C2DE younger men felt that young people are generally more respectful than their elders make out.

“Hanging round street corners. Quite intimidating sometimes. Particularly a lot of young people, they are about 16 or 17.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

“Every week you get a lot more people hanging around on the street corners and stuff.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

“Respect has always been there. I think that kids respect people, they don’t go out of their way to piss people off. I think young people have a lot more respect than people make out they do.”

“They don’t get a chance the younger ones, the older ones are moaning about what they have been doing and what they are not doing. So they don’t know any different. They are being told they are always making trouble and they just carry on making trouble.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

"Teenagers I guess, that hang out at local shops and things like that, giving people grief."

Group 11: cyclists, urban, South East

At a lower but more widespread level, however, people in general were thought to be less patient and polite than they used to be; respondents who noted this tended to be in the older half of the sample.

"I think [impatience is] a growing problem."

"I think if people don't get their own way, for example in a shop, if they take something home and it's not performed as well as they want, they have no problem in really laying into somebody in the shop. It's pathetic."

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

"I think it's selfishness. I think everybody is just trying to get to where they want to be or do what they want to do, and it doesn't matter who gets in the way."

Group 10: female, 35-49, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

The first conceptual mapping exercise suggested that many (and especially the youngest and oldest respondents) were more concerned about 'indirect' disrespect towards the community than about 'direct' disrespect towards individuals. Of the examples of disrespectful behaviour included in this exercise, the most common and serious were frequently thought to be 'urinating, vomiting, spitting in the street', 'swearing in public' and 'dropping litter'.

"I think some of the behaviour is threatening. The spitting and swearing, that's almost violent, in a way, and it makes me feel uncomfortable. I'm six foot and if a little old lady walks past, it's not good."

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

"[Swearing in public], that is disrespectful. If someone has kids you don't want to hear that... I think it happens quite a lot as well."

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

"[Dropping litter], that is disrespect. Respect of the neighbourhood, the environment. It is common and disrespectful."

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

This may be because they had not had much contact with direct disrespectful behaviour, but were still aware of the impact of indirect, environmental disrespect on their surroundings.

"I think it is harder when it affects your own family, so if somebody did something to your gran or your granddad, I think it would affect you."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

"[Incidents] are very few and far between. I don't think that many of us have many stories to tell relating to us, it doesn't affect many people in their day-to-day life."

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

More direct expressions of disrespect, such as 'getting impatient with someone and being rude' and 'making an obscene gesture while driving' were generally thought either less common or less serious.

"You are only doing it [making an obscene gesture] because somebody disrespects you in the first place... It is more of a reaction. I don't drive round making the gesture."

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

"Everybody does it [gestures while driving] and it makes you feel better."

Group 6: male, 25-34, C2DE, car drivers, urban, Midlands

"It [gesturing while driving] is common and disrespectful but if a bus cuts you up it is fair play."

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

Most respondents agreed with the Government's definition of respect (see Appendix), and many thought that (in their experience) the four influences – poor parenting, truancy, deprived surroundings, drug and alcohol misuse – were extremely relevant: only a few said this list was overly restrictive. There was a widespread feeling that 'people like us' are not the problem.

"The majority of people that are involved are in deprived surroundings."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

Some, however, disputed the perceived suggestion that good parenting and more privileged surroundings are guarantees against this type of behaviour, or that any of the four influences somehow make disrespect inevitable or predictable.

"I think the poorer parenting would be right in some instances but you wouldn't be able to class everybody the same. I know people that have come from a good background and they are still arseholes."

Group 6: male, 25-34, C2DE, car drivers, urban, Midlands

“There are plenty of single mothers who are raising good kids that aren’t doing all these things. There are those that do but they come from regular backgrounds as well. That is a completely stereotypical view of everything.”

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

Few were aware of the Respect Agenda or Action Plan in particular, but most felt the issues involved are important to the Government, and that some effort is being made to address these types of behaviour and their underlying causes (although there was often some cynicism about how successful this effort is, or can hope to be).

2. Conceptions of respect on the road

2.1 Initial positions

These general ideas about disrespect seemed largely to inform respondents’ initial feelings about behaviour on the roads. As elsewhere, ‘disrespect’ on the road was thought to be increasingly common, and was seen basically to be the result of a lack of manners, courtesy and consideration for others. On this understanding, most initially described themselves as respectful and courteous drivers because they did not feel they demonstrated the type of overtly illegal and actively inconsiderate behaviour that would be called disrespect elsewhere. As in other walks of life, disrespect on the road was something which, for many, was displayed by ‘other people’; ‘people like us’ were not thought to be the problem.

WHAT DOES RESPECT ON THE ROAD MEAN TO YOU?

“Basically you give way at junctions, showing general respect to other drivers, lane discipline, not speeding, not drink driving, also drug driving which is more common now. I think people who drive while on their phones is a big problem. People that smoke while they are driving, all those factors are signs of disrespect... People seem to want to shout and scream.”

Depth 5: male, 17-29, B, ‘risk neutral’, South East

It was also clear, however, that disrespect on the road was thought far more common than comparable behaviour elsewhere, and to involve a much broader section of the population. The reason for this contradiction (much greater numbers of disrespectful people, but still not ‘people like us’), seems to lie in some fundamental differences between the off- and on-road situations which result in varying conceptions of respect. Once respondents had appreciated the

implications of these differences, almost all rejected their initial position of innocence, and acknowledged that, whatever their views on behaviour elsewhere, they did indeed behave disrespectfully on the road in certain situations.

“Before, I wouldn’t have thought it over, but now I think it is quite important. It makes you realise, it makes you realise how common a lot of it is.”

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

2.2 What is disrespect?

Off the road, respect or a lack of it was widely seen as being at the root of people’s behaviour. A conspicuous minority of people was considered basically disrespectful: they think only of themselves or their peer group; they lack respect in all or many of the five forms described above; and they do not consider the effects of their actions on others. Most people, however, were thought to be basically respectful: although they can sometimes be selfish, and may be influenced by alcohol, peers or other factors, they usually refrain from consciously doing things which hurt, annoy or upset other people. These basic attitudes influence the way in which people act, what they feel it is acceptable to do and what they are prepared to accept from others. For this reason, it was expected to be very difficult to persuade the former type to behave more respectfully.

This research suggests, however, that disrespect on the road is usually much less fundamental, with most disrespectful actions resulting from a combination of the on-road environment, and the effect of driving situation. This combination, discussed in detail in section 3 below, seems to have the potential to induce almost anyone (with the possible exception of the oldest and most unflappable drivers) to behave less respectfully towards other people and the road laws when driving than they would elsewhere.

Although most people can be disrespectful to some degree on the road, three distinct types of disrespect emerged from the discussions which appear to be demonstrated by different sorts of people, and for different reasons. We have characterised these types as follows:

- *active* disrespect for others and the law (comprising illegal and inconsiderate activities such as joyriding, driving without insurance, abandoning cars and double parking), from the inconsiderate minority who demonstrate this type of behaviour both on and off the road
- *reactive* disrespect for others (impatience and impersonal aggression – see section 4), from the considerate majority who are usually respectful in other walks of life
- *passive* disrespect for the road law (breaches of the law which are seen as inconsequential and rewarding – see section 5), from the considerate majority who usually obey the law and authority elsewhere

The behaviour of the actively disrespectful was thought to be a result of their basic lack of consideration, and few saw any fundamental disparity between the way in which these people behave on and off the road. On this evidence, *active* disrespect on the road is a small subset of a wider range of behaviours, and is therefore not considered in detail here.

Many respondents, however, came to recognise a disparity in their own behaviour regarding respect off the road and disrespect on it. This disparity was often not acknowledged from the beginning. One reason for this was that the threshold of acceptability (what people are prepared to do and have done to them) seems to be higher on the road than off, so that many did not spontaneously see their behaviour as disrespectful. But there was also a second disparity between disrespectful and considerate driving, in which initial perceptions of the two were mutually exclusive (a driver could be disrespectful or considerate, but not both), and in which the latter was often more immediately obvious than the former.

Considerate driving was usually defined in pro-active terms (for example, letting other cars out of side roads, or being alert to what other drivers are doing); it was easy for respondents to remember that they did this, and thus to feel that they were considerate drivers. Their disrespect, however, was reactive or passive; since this type of

behaviour was not the result of any active thought, it was often not top of mind.

Most, therefore, initially saw themselves as considerate rather than disrespectful because they remembered the fact that they actively thought about others on the road, and forgot about their unthinking disrespect. On reflection, almost all these respondents did acknowledge that they sometimes behave in a less respectful way when driving than when not. But the distinction between consideration and respect was often maintained throughout the discussion: respondents came to see themselves as actively considerate but reactively or passively disrespectful, and saw no contradiction.

WOULD YOU CONSIDER YOURSELVES RESPECTFUL DRIVERS?

“Yes.”

“I let people go.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

“It said at the top [of the questionnaire] ‘Do you think you are a considerate driver’, and I do, I don’t think I am inconsiderate. But when I was writing what I didn’t like [other people doing], like speeding and revving up behind people, I do that to people and I can’t contradict myself. It makes you realise. It has made me really think.”

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

Respondents were remarkably consistent in what they felt constitutes, causes and justifies disrespect on the road. The variation across the sample came primarily in the degree to which they acknowledged that they behaved disrespectfully, their response to this realisation, and the extent to which they found such behaviour acceptable in others. These variations are explored in section 6 below.

The fact that respondents did not immediately characterise the disparity between their behaviour on and off the road as ‘respect’, and did not initially perceive themselves as disrespectful, is likely to have important implications for the way in which these issues might be addressed (see section D below).

3. **The effect of being in a car**

3.1 What is it about being in a car?

The common disparity between respect in general and reactive and passive disrespect on the road is widely attributable to a combination of two factors: the on-road environment; and the fact that the person involved is driving a car. In a number of senses, this combination has the effect of raising the threshold concerning the way in which people feel it is acceptable to behave on the road, and the behaviour that they are prepared to accept from others. In particular, it seems to make people more prone to impatience and aggression, more prepared to vent these feelings (within limits), and more reliant on and convinced of the value of their own judgement and experience. Broadly speaking, the first two effects have implications for reactive disrespect, while the first and third influence passive disrespect.

3.2 The on-road environment

The road itself was often thought to be an environment which encourages impatience and aggression, and in which people are more prone to this than they are elsewhere. The most common explanation for this effect was 'being in a hurry'. It was widely recognised that being in a hurry is a general feature of modern life, and that the road is by no means the only environment in which this is evident. But the frustration caused by an inability to reach a destination by road as fast as one would like seemed especially significant.

In other situations, people are either able to travel as fast as is physically possible (for example, when walking), or have no control over the speed at which they are moving (for example, when using public transport). When driving, however, they are theoretically able to move at relatively high speeds, and to control the speed at which they move. In practice, of course, speed limitations are imposed in traffic by other drivers and the road laws. This is frustrating in itself because it involves a loss of control, and because drivers know that they could be moving faster than they are; it also means that the driver who is holding them up is a ready target for any impatience and aggression generated by this frustration.

“Depends if you are in a hurry or not. If you are, then you are tense and frustrated and you get more and more frustrated.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

“I can’t stand buses, being behind a bus, or letting a bus out. They are the frustration I think, buses.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

“I think people are very different when they’re driving. I am. I’m quite impatient when I’m driving. I think it comes down to everyone is too busy and they want to get from A to B in the quickest possible time. People are just so impatient all the time... Some people go mad in a car, especially men. Some men are vile. My brother-in-law is a lovely man but, God, behind a wheel he is vile! He’s just ‘Get out of the way’, and he goes whoosh, whoosh between cars and lanes and he is just so aggressive. But he’s not like that naturally.”

Depth 7: female, recently responsible for a road accident, South East

Being the driver (and therefore in control of the car, if not the speed) seemed to be significant. Some respondents said they were much more aware of, and intolerant of, disrespectful driving if they witnessed it as a passenger than if they were driving themselves.

“I don’t think you realise how disrespectful you are being when you are actually driving, but when you are in the passenger seat next to somebody... I don’t know if it is that power thing of you being in charge of the car. Talking about it now we probably all realising we are more disrespectful than we really thought.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

For some, perhaps especially the youngest respondents, the road was also an inherently risky environment: the consequences of making a mistake are more serious than elsewhere. This has the effect of making people more tense, even if only subconsciously, and thus more ready to ‘snap’.

“I think everyone is just in a slightly higher state of tension when they are driving. You are more likely to snap when you are really angry as opposed to when you are walking down the street.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

“When you are in a car and you are driving, you know that if you make one mistake that is it. A catastrophe.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

3.3

Driving a car

3.3.1 *Impatience and aggression*

If the road environment creates the potential for impatience and aggression, being in (and, more specifically, driving) a car seems to make people more prepared to show these feelings, and to accept this from others, than they otherwise would. There are a number of reasons for this, but the common thread is that being in a car reduces or removes the social inhibitions and fear of consequences which are likely to help to prevent this type of behaviour elsewhere.

The car itself provides security and anonymity for the driver. On a physical level, being in a metal box makes people feel protected – both from other cars and from their drivers – and can give them a feeling of strength or confidence (and therefore willingness to express themselves or confront others) that they lack elsewhere. Indeed, many said that they react badly to criticism of their driving which seems to undermine this strength.

“You are protected by [being in a vehicle]. People will make gestures from behind a window, but not if walking in the street.”

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

The size of vehicle can have an effect on the level of this confidence. Van drivers’ descriptions of their behaviour when in their vans were noticeably less respectful than those of other drivers, but most said that they drive more respectfully when in a car. (These attitudes were also attributed to the fact that van drivers often do not pay for the insurance or repairs, and thus feel less responsibility than private car owners.)

“I do a lot of driving... I am in a white van and I don’t really care, I will just pull over in front of someone just the same as any other van would do. The people driving their own car will be a bit more careful... You just get used to driving like that. You have to. No one is going to notice another dent in a beaten-up white van.”

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

Being in a car also makes most confrontations which do occur very short-lived: those involved pass by quickly, or it is possible to make a quick getaway if the situation takes an unwanted turn.

“You wouldn’t think of it there and then but I think you do these things because you are in the safety of your own car and you can just drive off. If some bloke comes out and starts chasing you and comes up your arse and stuff, then that happens, but I think most of the time you can just drive off.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

“I think when you are on the road, because of the speed of things, if someone does something stupid or pulls out in front of you, you think, ‘Oh’, but it’s then over, isn’t it, because you’re going along on your journey?”

Depth 1: female, 55+, BC1, ‘risk averse’, South East

WHY DO YOU THINK PEOPLE CHANGE IN CARS?

“Maybe they feel safe that they can be someone else. They’re inside a car so they’re quite protected, so they can let off steam. You can make a hand gesture and drive off.”

Depth 7: female, recently responsible for a road accident, South East

This was especially true for motorcyclists, who had the advantage of being on a fast and more manoeuvrable machine. They knew that if the situation escalated to an uncomfortable level, they could disappear into the traffic with ease. Cyclists, on the other hand, knew that they could not get away so quickly, and tended to be more circumspect as a result.

“You’re less likely to do if you’re on a bike, really... Cyclists are not protected by their bicycles, they haven’t got the facility to just shoot off and go away.”

Group 11: cyclists, urban, South East

On a social level, confrontations are usually impersonal because the car protects the driver’s anonymity. Sustained eye contact is rare, even through windscreens, and other drivers tend to be seen as objects, not people. As a result, aggression is often vented on the car rather than the driver, and few are greatly bothered by being shouted at by others – certainly much less concerned than they would be if they were out of the car.

“I just feel it changes you because it is less personal. It is just another car.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

“It’s like a lot of people can be more abrupt over the telephone.”

Group 7: female, 25-34, B, car drivers, rural, North

This was especially true in urban areas, where there is little chance that the protagonists will know each other. Some respondents in rural

locations suggested that the fact that drivers know and recognise one another is one explanation for higher levels of respect in these areas.

The corollary of this anonymity, however, is that it is much more difficult to defuse situations which do arise by apologising or smiling. Cyclists argued that it is rare to see cyclists squaring up to each other because they can easily make eye contact and apologise; and some drivers claimed that if they are able to apologise when they know they are in the wrong, it does indeed defuse the situation.

"I'll tell you that goes a long way with me. If someone puts their hands up and says they're in the wrong, it gets instantly forgotten about."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

Aggression and impatience are also usually contained within the car, making them private, not public, and therefore more socially acceptable as well as inconsequential.

"I think a lot of people are more aggressive when in a car than what they usually would be, if they are stuck in close proximity."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

The upshot of all these factors seems to be that the on-road environment is conducive to impatience and aggression, and the fact of being in a car makes many people less concerned about the social and physical consequences of displaying this type of behaviour. This combination of environment and security means that many people are prone to act in a more 'primal' way than they otherwise would. Indeed, it does seem possible that people have a latent capacity to be disrespectful, but are persuaded to be respectful by fear of the consequences and social inhibition. By removing this danger and inhibition, the driving situation allows them to fulfil their 'natural' urge to be disrespectful.

"Better to get mad with them inside your car rather than getting out and shouting etc."

Group 6: male, 25-34, C2DE, car drivers, urban, Midlands

"When people are in their cars they think they're immune. They think: 'I can shout at them, gesture at them, and no one is going to do anything about it.' They're cut off. They wouldn't think of doing it at home, or in the office, or in a pub, but because they're in their car they think: 'Who's going to care?'"

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

In light of this, it was notable that B and some C1 respondents in particular said that although they often showed their irritation and impatience inside the car, they were reluctant to allow it outside the car (for example, by opening the window and speaking to another driver) for fear of the consequences.

*"I would walk away from stuff when I am out of my car, but much more likely to start shouting when in my car."
"I don't want confrontation out of my car."
"When somebody starts getting out of their car, that is when it starts to get bad."*

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

*"I think I'm more confrontational when I'm driving, more than I would be face-to-face with someone."
"You have more bottle in the car to turn round and tell someone..."
"You wouldn't do that in a pub, well, maybe some people would but I wouldn't do it in a pub."
"They can't get to you in your car so you feel, you've got more confidence in some ways... Become that little bit braver, I suppose."*

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

"I haven't got out of my car but I have lost my temper in my car with my windows shut. I wouldn't dare lose my temper outside my car."

Group 10: female, 35-49, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

More than one respondent put it differently, spontaneously referring to a 'Jekyll and Hyde' situation: being in a car and on the road changes you, but only temporarily.

"People change when they get into a car; it is like Jekyll and Hyde. I like to think of myself as quite a nice guy in general, but when I get behind the wheel, then no. I am all right until somebody cuts me up or does my head in, and then I just flare up. Then I am all right, once I have had my little bit, once he is out of my way, then I am all right again."

Group 6: male, 25-34, C2DE, car drivers, urban, Midlands

"Even the most placid of people get fired up in the car."

Depth 9: male, nine or more points on a licence, South East

"You can get wound up in your car about something that happened in your car. Once you get out your car, I just don't think about it any more. I wouldn't get wound up and go home and be really annoyed about something that had happened."

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

In support of the influence of social inhibition, many older respondents said that they were more restrained in their behaviour when the

anonymity and privacy of being in a car is removed by the presence of passengers. It should be noted, however, that the presence of peers was said to fuel disrespect and shows of bravado among younger C2DE men. Equally, loud and fast music was also said to make some young men and women more aggressive or pushy.

“If I was in the car with three lads who are all drivers, you tend to not drive safely, have a bit of fun, show off; you are the better driver or whatever.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

3.3.2 Confidence in judgement and experience

The impression of security and isolation which leads to a greater willingness to show impatience and aggression also seemed to have an effect on respondents' confidence in their judgement and their ability to imagine the implications of their actions for other people.

Many believed that they (and not other people or the law) were the best judges of what was safe or advisable to do in a given situation (particularly regarding the speed limit and use of mobile telephones while driving). This confidence in their ability to make these judgements often appeared to stem from two arguably illusory sources: the feeling of power and protection generated by being behind the wheel; and their lack of experience of these judgements being proved wrong. This pattern was noticeably more evident among men than women, but was relevant across the sample.

“I wouldn't speed if I thought it was dangerous. If I feel it is OK and there is no one about then I think [it is fine].”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

“Everything you do in life, you do your own risk assessment on, don't you? Whether it's can you get through the gap, is it safe to do 80? That's basically how you get through life.”

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

It was also notable that those who had had their confidence undermined in the past were more circumspect about making judgements about safety, or trusting those of others.

“Once you have had a couple of crashes, whether they be your fault or someone else’s fault, one does become that much more hesitant. I think I have become a better driver as a result of that. The first time you have your life in danger, you really start to think about it; you are not going to get that many more chances if it keeps going that way.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

The effect of the driving situation on respondents’ ability to appreciate the implications of their actions was harder to discern, but it did seem that, to some extent, isolation within the car and the impersonal nature of any interaction with others had a blinkering effect. In the context of disrespect towards others, the most obvious sign of this was respondents’ willingness to abuse other people (albeit usually in a low-key, private, impersonal manner) without having too much concern about the immediate effect this might have on them. But it also seems likely to have led to the type of single-mindedness which obstructs appreciation of the ‘community’ effects of actions which appear to have little significance on an individual level, such as illegal parking, marginal speeding and using mobile telephones.

4. **Reactive disrespect**

4.1 What constitutes reactive disrespect?

As far as the generally respectful majority was concerned, disrespect on the road was primarily reactive: it was almost always said to be shown in response to something that someone else had done. It was rare for people to admit that disrespect was ‘their fault’, or that ‘they started it’; many justified their behaviour to themselves with this abnegation of responsibility. (Although many admitted that their state of mind on getting into the car was also important: if they were wound up or angry, they would be more prone to reactive disrespect than if they were calm.)

“You don’t suffer fools easily. That’s a lot of it. It depends on what mood you are in.”

Group 10: female, 35-49, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

“If you have had a hard day at work, or you’re wound up, you will still be wound up in your car... The slightest thing you take it out on him.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

It is important not to confuse or conflate reactive disrespect with ‘road rage’, which is also reactive but was commonly believed to involve confrontations which become personal and therefore escalate beyond what most people saw as acceptable or desirable. On this understanding, road rage was often thought to be related to active disrespect: it was widely thought primarily to involve people who are actively disrespectful in general, and therefore prone to this type of behaviour.

WHAT DO YOU DEFINE AS ROAD RAGE?

“Seeing somebody that has cut you up and then going after them and following them home for miles and miles on end, and waiting for them. That would be road rage.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

“There is a certain type of person, like a white van man, who may get out of their car and try to kick your car or whatever, or pull the window. I think that is very much 5% of people in society will do that, and that same individual would be the same person who would attack you in the pub over something.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

“People who lose their rag in everyday situations, I can’t imagine them being calm in a car. They’d probably be much worse. I think a car brings out a side of you that’s not very nice and if you are that way anyway it escalates it. If you are naturally not like that, the car can bring it out in you.”

Depth 7: female, recently responsible for a road accident, South East

Evidence from respondents with convictions for anti-social behaviour (ASBOs) seemed to confirm this belief: their descriptions of their driving behaviour were noticeably less respectful than most – although some of this could perhaps be characterised as extreme *reactive* disrespect rather than *active* disrespect.

WOULD YOU DRIVE DIFFERENTLY IF YOU’RE IN A HURRY?

“Yes. Instead of being patient for the amber, I’m going through the amber... I wouldn’t be very courteous. I wouldn’t be letting anybody in or out or across the road... Me first. If somebody’s not speeding up in front of me I’d be on the horn. I’m a very impatient driver... I’m like a man demented.”

Depth 11: male, anti-social behaviour, South East

“When they won’t join the queue and then try to cut in. That is disrespecting everybody else’s waiting time... I start cursing; I say: ‘You twat, why did you let him in?’ I’m not really upset with the person that has cut in, I am upset with the person that let him in. I’m not upset at all with that person because he’s tried his luck and he knows that he’s going to get some weak heart who’s going to let him in. But if it was me, he wouldn’t be getting in. I’m moving up and he ain’t getting an inch. That’s me, he ain’t getting in.”

Depth 11: male, anti-social behaviour, South East

Another type of actively disrespectful driving was attributed to a different minority, and was thought to relate to an arrogance which derived from the size or ‘quality’ of a driver’s vehicle. Examples of those who were thought to drive inconsiderately as a result of this arrogance included: middle-class, middle-aged men in large cars, who consider it their right to jump queues; middle-class mothers in 4x4s who drive selfishly and ignore the needs of others; and van drivers who see the road as their workplace and feel they have more of a right to be there than others, and the right to use the road as they would like.

“You get someone that stops dead in the middle of the road and start unloading all their kids out of the car.”

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

“I work in London, and I get a lot of people with their 4x4s double parking outside the school. It just causes a massive, massive traffic jam, and it’s a pain in the arse, and then you get the next person doing it and they’re all doing it because they all live in Chelsea.”

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

It is also important to note that reactive disrespect does not tend to involve obviously illegal behaviour, or to be a response to it. Reactive disrespect is therefore defined as un-premeditated, low-level, impersonal impatience and aggression which is directed towards another driver in response to something he or she has done. The second conceptual mapping exercise included four key examples of this type of disrespect: tail-gating, impatience, hooting and flashing headlights. These were consistently thought to be among the most common types of disrespectful behaviour on the roads, and to be relatively unserious (compared with illegal, dangerous activities such as drink driving and joyriding). Indeed, some had trouble imagining flashing headlights as disrespectful at all. They were also the activities that respondents were most likely to admit to doing themselves.

Impatience was generally said to be contained within the car: it might involve verbal abuse, gestures or silent fuming, but usually nothing that can be heard or even seen easily outside the car. Few accepted the suggestion that this type of impatience seriously affected the way in which the car was driven. A comparison of the two sets of conceptual maps suggested this action was widely thought less serious and more common than becoming impatient with someone and being rude to them in a personal manner (off the road).

"I'd personally swear to myself and probably call them every name under the sun under my breath or in my brain sort of thing."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

Tail-gating, hooting and flashing are of course external, but they are impersonal in that the driver remains within the car, and uses the car to make his or her point.

"Tend to do it [tail-gating], in the fast lanes get people to shift."

"You flash your lights a bit."

"I just overtake on the left."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

The reactive, unthinking nature of these actions was often illustrated by a disparity between what people do and what they dislike others doing to them (compare the quotation below with the one above, from the same source).

WHAT DO YOU HATE ABOUT OTHER PEOPLE'S DRIVING?

"Not letting you out."

"Tail-gating."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

Tail-gating was irritating to most when it happened to them (a common reaction was to slow down a little, at least partly to annoy the driver behind and 'get their own back'). But many said that they often did it themselves – especially younger C2DE respondents and van drivers when in a hurry. Interestingly, there was a tendency for those who tail-gate to see the car in front as being disrespectful as well, for driving too slowly.

There was a widely held initial assumption that flashing headlights in particular is a positive action – signalling 'after you' or 'thank you' – and most drew a clear distinction between gentle and aggressive forms.

Few saw anything wrong with a brief toot or flash to raise someone's awareness – for example, at traffic lights which turn green unnoticed.

More aggressive forms were seen as less acceptable, particularly by older female respondents. Others felt they are justified if the situation demands them; this might be if the car in front is driving too slowly or in the wrong lane, or if another driver does something which irritates them. Flashing headlights in this way was widely seen simply as a less aggressive form of hooting.

Examples of low-level *active* disrespect (ie, legal but lacking consideration for others) such as inconsiderate parking, loud stereos and queue jumping were also consistently thought to be common, and less serious than illegal actions; but many fewer respondents admitted to doing these themselves.

"I would expect someone with a loud stereo to be less considerate."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

Despite this, it was notable that (impersonal) queue jumping in traffic was widely thought to be more common and less unacceptable than queue jumping elsewhere, which involves personal contact.

JUMPING A QUEUE?

"That's disrespectful."

"Yes, that's what a queue is for."

DO YOU EVER DO THAT?

"No."

DOES ANYONE DO IT IN A CAR?

"Yes, of course, you do."

"Yes, everybody jumps the queue."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

"Talking about people jumping queues, in a supermarket you don't really get it but in a traffic jam you do. People don't care, they just want to get there a little bit faster."

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

Jumping a queue of traffic was widely thought one of the most irritating things that people do; it was one of the few actions which seem to rile the most unflappable respondents, such as older B women. (Although many of these also said that they do jump queues from time to time, if they are in a hurry or simply make a mistake.) A common reaction was to refuse to allow the offending driver into the queue of traffic – and

often anger was directed at those in front who do let the driver in, rather than the driver in question.

"I get really annoyed when people in front haven't seen what they have done and just let them in."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

This seemed to confirm the explanation above of why reactive disrespect was seen as acceptable to the generally respectful majority: it is justified as a response to someone else's mistakes or actions, whereas inconsiderate parking, for example (which was seen as just as common), indicates an unjustifiable lack of thought for others.

"It is a reaction to anyone else. You don't want to have to shout at people, you just want to get there without any dawdlers. When they do something stupid you just think they have held up your journey, it is frustration. They bring it on themselves."

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

Loud stereos were rarely seen as a significant annoyance, as instances where the volume is high enough to be really irritating were thought uncommon, and the experience is usually very short-lived as the car drives past. Indeed, it was often seen as rather pathetic, especially where the intention is clearly to make the stereo heard.

"It is people who are showing off their sound systems, you think what is the point?"

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

Younger respondents were most likely to say their stereos are probably audible outside the car, especially during the summer; but quite a few also said they become embarrassed if their stereo is too loud in built-up areas, and turn it down so others do not judge their taste or character.

4.2 What triggers reactive disrespect?

The types of action which might elicit a disrespectful response were varied, but they often seemed to have three things in common. First, the person reacting believes that he or she would not have done the same thing (although this may not in fact be the case). Second, the situation involves two different interpretations of how it is acceptable and/or proper to drive in that particular environment. Third, the person whose initial action 'generates' the disrespect is not aware that he or she is doing so, and can therefore do little about it.

"Nine times out of 10 they haven't moved because they just haven't seen, because they're not visually aware that you're there."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

As noted, most reactive disrespect does not involve obviously illegal behaviour, and is not a response to it; most claimed to know the basic rules of the road and to abide by them. But the way in which the Highway Code is interpreted and regarded in different types of environment seemed to be a grey area. For example, the degree of pushiness and speed which is thought to be required and acceptable varied between London and other cities, and less urban areas; likewise, the degree to which people were prepared to be pushy also varied within an area. Reactive disrespect often arises when someone's interpretation of how best to drive in a given environment conflicts with that of someone else. This can work in a number of directions, with the reactor believing either that the other person is being too pushy, inconsiderate or fast for the environment, or that the other person is dithering or being too cautious, slow or considerate.

"Slow drivers can be just as dangerous as fast drivers."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

"You think he is doing it to piss you off."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

DRIVERS WHO GET IN THE WAY OR HOLD YOU UP SHOULD BE TOLD TO GET A MOVE ON?

"Yes."

"It depends if you are in a rush."

"If they are holding you up and you are in a rush."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

In a link to passive disrespect, the most appropriate or acceptable way to drive was not always thought to be defined by the Highway Code. Even if someone is actually obeying the letter of the Code (for example, by sticking to the speed limit), they might be breaking the local interpretation of that law if others want to drive faster.

"I speed not because I like the sound of my car, but because I am in a rush, I have to get somewhere. So if somebody is driving at the speed limit, I think they are driving slowly so I will be disrespectful... I will show a little bit more disrespect then because I think he is doing it to me."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

“Whatever our own standard of driving is, we give people respect, but the moment we’re in a rush that all goes out the window, and I quite happily do a ton off the motorway.”

“Yes, and swear at everybody who gets in front of me and is sort of driving normally and like have a go at the old biddie that’s driving at 70 miles an hour.”

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

“My wife drives and we often find that when she sticks to the speed limit a lot of people come up behind and flash their lights and blow their horns and shake their arms. She is partly disabled and so she drives within the speed limit.”

Group 14: mixed, 50-65, C2DE, pedestrians, small town, Midlands

This situation is perhaps particularly likely where there is disparity between personality types, knowledge of the area or age. Drivers who use a route regularly, for example, seemed to want to use the road differently from those who do not know it well; the same goes for those who drive as part of their work and for leisure.

“I drive to Stratford quite a lot, so I tend to beep at them and then I always try to overtake. They drive at 30 mph and I know the road by heart.”

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

“I have been out on the night before and I have woken up late. I have like a 15-minute drive to get to work and I leave at 10.55 and I have work at 11.00, and I am driving and it is probably because I am in a rush but they are sitting there doing 20 mph.”

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

5. **Passive disrespect**

5.1 What constitutes passive disrespect?

By comparison with *reactive* disrespect, which most respondents recognised, admitted and often regretted, the concept of *passive* disrespect was difficult for many to accept. This is not to say that the types of behaviour described below were uncommon, or that respondents were reluctant to admit to them; if anything, they were thought more commonplace than reactively disrespectful actions. But most respondents were reluctant to view them as being disrespectful, or even problematic, both initially and after consideration.

Across the sample, a clear distinction was drawn between behaviour which involves interaction with another person (reactive disrespect), and breaches of the road law which are perceived as minor and

thought to give the driver some advantage, and where, in the driver's personal experience, there is no perceived victim or safety consequence. It is this (limited) lack of regard for authority which constitutes passive disrespect.

WOULD YOU ALL AGREE WITH 'I AM A CONSIDERATE DRIVER'?

"Yes."

WORST HABITS?

"Speeding."

"Driving without a speed belt."

"Texting while driving."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR OWN DRIVING?

"Well, we are women aren't we?"

"We know what we are doing!"

CAREFUL, CONSIDERATE, WHAT ELSE? WHAT OTHER WORDS?

"I do drive fast."

"I think women can drive fast."

"We are low risk. Statistically. Apparently."

Group 10: female, 35-49, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

"Nobody's good all the time. At some stage you are going to break the law in some small way. OK, you may drive in the bus lane when you're not supposed to or you might just go through that amber light just as it's turning to red – that's against the law but you've just got to beat that light! Silly stuff like that. It's a very fine line."

Depth 10: male, driving offence, South East

"I think I have more respect for people on the road than I have for the law, in a way. I don't stick to the speed limit but only on certain roads, like you say."

Group 6: male, 25-34, C2DE, car drivers, urban, Midlands

It is important to note that, in the great majority of cases, passive disrespect was restricted to breaches of the law which were perceived as minor. Despite the fact that the acceptability of some aspects of driving practice seemed to be a grey area, and to vary between locations, there was in fact widespread respect for much of the Highway Code and the authorities which enforce it.

In most cases, this respect was based on two factors: first, a recognition that the laws are there to promote safety, and are therefore enacted and enforced for the good of the public; and second, a desire to avoid penalties from the authorities (points, fines, convictions) as a result of being caught. Thus, examples of patently illegal and dangerous driving practices included in the second conceptual mapping exercise (such as drink and drug driving, joyriding, driving

without insurance and 'serious' speeding) were widely considered unacceptable and disrespectful or anti-social; unsurprisingly, few would admit to any of them.

"I think the majority of people do respect the law when they are driving. I think they do because they don't want to get smashed up or you don't want to be in a car crash."

Depth 10: male, driving offence, South East

On receiving a penalty for contravening any of these aspects of the Code (the most common example would have been serious speeding, an inexact term taken here to mean driving at more than 20mph over the limit in a built-up area and 30mph on derestricted roads), many would be sanguine. If they were to be annoyed at anyone, it would be at themselves for their actions; and some, especially women, imagined that they would feel guilty, mortified, embarrassed or some other personal emotion.

5.2 Respect in the absence of a safety rationale

Aspects of the road law in which safety (and therefore the impact on other people) is less obviously an issue were a different matter. Just as the on-road environment and the feeling of being secure and anonymous could induce drivers to be more impatient and aggressive than they otherwise would, so the conjunction of being on the road, feeling powerful and confident in one's own judgements, and lacking personal experience of the possible consequences seemed to have the potential to induce otherwise law-abiding drivers to demonstrate passive disrespect by breaking the law.

"The trouble is that I consider myself as law abiding but we break laws in the car."

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

"I've never been caught but my husband says: 'For God's sake, look at the clock!' I am quite fast and I do tend to go over the speed limit sometimes, I admit that. Not drastically, but I find it difficult to keep to the speed limit, like 40 miles an hour, when I know there's not much traffic around... I think I'm quite careful apart from being a bit fast sometimes when I shouldn't be."

Depth 1: female, 55+, BC1, 'risk averse', South East

The most common example of this was what was seen as minor speeding (exceeding the limit by a small proportion, such as 35mph in a 30mph zone, or 85mph in a 70mph zone). Almost all respondents

(although especially C1 and C2DE men aged 17-49, and most motorcyclists) were happy to admit that they regularly broke the speed limit in this way – especially on major roads – and therefore broke the law. In most cases, this willingness to break the law, and to admit to doing so, seemed to spring from the perceived absence of one of the two bedrocks of respect for the law mentioned above: safety.

Many felt that speed limits on major roads in particular are too low, and that their contribution to safety would not be reduced if they were raised a little. These respondents' confidence in the judgement that exceeding the speed limit to a small degree is safe seemed to be informed by the factors noted above: they felt secure in their cars, empowered by the ability to move fast, and ignorant (on a personal level) of the possible consequences of doing so. Indeed, some (mostly men) explicitly stated that they were the best judges of how fast they could safely drive. These respondents were not unaware of the dangers of speeding – many mentioned previous communications and aspects of the Think! campaign – but the fact that they had not experienced disastrous consequences for themselves seemed to have dulled the impact and reduced the expectation of these dangers.

"I think it is safer speeding on the motorway, doing 80 mph. If someone is stuck on the inside lane doing 50 mph or 60 mph. I think it is safer to be following a line of traffic, if you know what I mean."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

"I find I am the worst driver when I am driving slow or doing the speed limit. It is such a long journey and you switch off and make more mistakes."

Group 6: male, 25-34, C2DE, car drivers, urban, Midlands

This judgement that excessive speed is safe, and has no impact on other people, is likely to be compounded by the feelings of impatience and being in a hurry when on the road. Although this was not articulated in the discussions, it seems likely that the urge to reach a destination as quickly as possible, combined with the belief that an extra few miles per hour will bring the reward of a shorter overall journey time, is a common spur to excessive speed.

"I think I drive safely, I don't drive like an idiot, but I drive quite quickly. I'll let people in and out but I'll move quite quickly and I'll move close to the outside line. It really winds me up when other people don't do that."

Group 7: female, 25-34, B, car drivers, rural, North

The fact that the safety aspect of speed limits is undermined in this way meant that, for many respondents, the primary reason to adhere to them was the threat of being caught and penalised. On receiving a penalty for speeding, therefore, many had felt annoyed at the 'system' for catching them and punishing them unreasonably, rather than at themselves for breaking the law.

"If I was doing 62 in a 50 mph, I would think fair enough they have got me. If it was 55, I would feel pissed off."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

"I was quite cheesed off because I actually got done by a police van. He came down and onto like an overflow, and he was sat out of sight on that corner. It's just, it's sneaky, pure sneaky."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

Another breach of a safety-related law (more common among younger respondents) was the use of mobile telephones while driving. This issue was more divisive than minor speeding, with some respondents complaining about it in others because of the dangers it posed. But a number admitted to making calls on their mobiles without using a hands-free set, or even composing and sending text messages while driving (as with minor speeding, this was one of the most common activities entered into the private questionnaires under 'My worst habit when driving is...'). The reasons for breaking this law were articulated less clearly, but seemed to be related to those for speeding: no personal experience of the safety consequences; confidence in the ability to use the mobile safely; and a perceived need to do so.

"I never phone somebody, I have got a hands-free, but I do text, which is worse. I am looking at my phone and not at the road."

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

"You don't think about the consequences, do you? You just get in your car and go: it is something you do every day, it is just habit, you just do it. I do talk on my mobile while driving. I will be on my mobile and smoking and driving. It is stupid."

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

Even less respect was reserved for laws which are not intended to protect people's safety, and are not seen to affect other people. The primary example here was parking rules: respondents, possibly blinkered by the influences of driving described above, did not recognise the 'community' impact of illegal parking (there will be

insufficient spaces if cars park for longer than they should), and heeded the rules solely because of the threat of penalties.

“Poor parking. It is not serious. Not life threatening.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

“If you think you can get away with it [illegal parking], you would do, wouldn't you?”

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU NEED TO PARK FOR FIVE MINUTES BUT THERE'S NO SPACES?

“I'm going to park anyway.”

YOU'RE JUST GOING TO DOUBLE PARK?

“If it's on the pavement or whatever. I wouldn't double park but I'd find somewhere to park. Even if it's illegal to park there, I'm going to park there.”

WHY'S THAT?

“Because I've come to a destination, I'm not going to go home because I can't find any parking.”

Depth 11: male, anti-social behaviour, South East

The exception which proves this rule is double parking, which was widely seen as unacceptable and inconsiderate, even for a very short time. Few said they would consider doing it themselves, even if they freely admitted to other forms of illegal parking. As with other forms, the primary reason for not double parking which most gave was the threat of a fine; but underlying this was the clear impact that double parking has on other people – both the car that is boxed in and the traffic which is obstructed – and the conclusion that you would be both lazy and selfish to do it.

“We have got one street where you see hundreds of people double parked. You shouldn't really do it.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

A significant exception to this rule was van drivers, who drove as part of their job and tended to feel they had the right to double park because the road is part of their workplace. A few younger C2DE men also admitted to it, or to parking in a disabled bay if necessary, but only for a few minutes.

“The worst thing is all the car parks here you have to pay and if I was just dropping in for five minutes you think I don't want to pay £1.50 for the hour.”

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

There was little respect for the authorities, the wardens, who were seen to be enforcing the rules for their own good (their commission) rather

than the good of the public, and were considered inflexible, unreasonable and unmerciful, probably for the same reason. On receiving a penalty for illegal parking, most were angry at the parking warden who gave it to them and the system in general, rather than at themselves. Very few said they would feel guilty or embarrassed, as they might have done had they recognised a safety rationale for the law they had breached.

5.3 Respect for the decisions of the authorities

A second aspect of passive disrespect was lack of regard for the decisions of the authorities; this was illustrated by the likelihood of an appeal against a penalty for breaching the law. Penalties seemed most likely to be contested when the recipient is indignant towards the authorities, thinks there is a chance of success in that particular case, and is aware that other people have contested similar cases successfully.

Few said they would appeal against penalties with a recognised safety rationale. They respected the reasons for which the law had been enacted and is enforced, and recognised that if they breached such a law they would be likely to have endangered others. Penalties for serious speeding offences fell into this category – the danger to others was clear.

Although the safety rationale for minor speeding penalties was often questioned, few said that they would contest these either, in this case because they did not expect to be successful. Most accepted that, legally, speed limits are black and white, and generally well signposted. Transgressors may be annoyed at having been caught, but since the rules are clear and they were in the wrong, they saw little chance of a successful appeal. Moreover, most recognised that they would have broken a law which has safety in mind (whether or not they agreed with this), and that some form of punishment was to be expected.

“If you are speeding and you get done I think you have to hold your hands up.”

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

For the reasons described below, many were not surprised to find that appeals for speeding penalties are becoming increasingly common.

They would, however, be surprised if the number of *successful* appeals is rising commensurately.

Parking penalties, however, were said to be contested frequently, sometimes it seemed almost as a matter of course. As noted, respect for the rules was based solely on the threat of a penalty; once the penalty has been applied, that threat is removed and there is no recognition of a safety or community rationale to prevent an appeal on 'moral' grounds. In addition, respect for the authorities themselves was often negligible because they were seen as self-serving.

The rules were also thought to be open to contest. They were often said to be unclear – they vary between locations, and are often not obviously signposted – and many respondents had launched successful appeals in the past, or knew of others who had done so, and believed that they could be successful again.

"It was a new system that they had introduced and they didn't actually make it terribly clear... They said free parking for an hour and I duly thought that I could just park for an hour and come back again. I didn't know I had to get a ticket and stick it in the window...so I objected on that basis and they let me off it."

Group 10: female, 35-49, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

"I got one cancelled. I hadn't paid the money in a pay-and-display because the machine was out of order, so it said use the nearest machine, which I did, which was nearly 40 feet to the left, but it turned out the machine that I used was for the neighbouring borough. And the parking warden was just standing there giving people tickets and watching people park their cars, go to the machine and soon as they go give them another ticket."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

Few were surprised to learn that the number of appeals against speeding and parking penalties is on the rise. In the minds of most, this was largely attributable to two factors: an increasingly litigious, no-win-no-fee, may-as-well-have-a-go society; and, more significantly, decreasing respect for systems which are perceived as self-serving, rather than acting in the public interest. Some also pointed to trends in society in which people are persuaded to be more questioning and independent-minded, and not simply accepting of the judgements of others, including those of the authorities.

"I think people are almost encouraged to complain, it's always someone else's fault. If they trip up on the street, it's the council's fault. If their child has been naughty at school, it's the teacher's fault. Blame culture."

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

A further explanation for people's readiness to contest penalties which are not perceived to have a safety or community rationale may be the higher threshold of acceptability which operates on the road. Minor speeding in particular was widely thought to be acceptable, and was rarely considered disrespectful because respondents did not feel it affected anyone else. If breaking the law in this way is widely considered acceptable and commonplace (in contrast to the situation off the road), it is perhaps unsurprising that many drivers have more respect for the norms of the road than they do for some of the laws. This is also why so few respondents were prepared to regard passive disrespect as 'disrespect' in the familiar sense.

6. Who is disrespectful?

Respondents who acknowledged their reactive and passive disrespect most readily tended to be younger (34 and under), male and further down the social scale (C1 or C2DE); and it did seem that these types of people are likely to be more disrespectful than others. But they were also least likely to be concerned about their driving behaviour, and least likely to see reactive or passive disrespect as something which can or should be addressed.

"My driving is shocking. You cut corners. As soon as I passed my test it was one hand on the steering wheel, not that ten-to-two. You are more confident and your speed goes up as you get more confident. I think everyone speeds."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

Older, B and female respondents were more reluctant to admit to this type of behaviour (although, to some extent, most did in the end). They were also more concerned about it, and disappointed in themselves when they are made to consider their own driving.

"I have just realised that what I do every day, day to day, is a bit out of order really."

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

Motorcyclists and cyclists were similar to one another in their attitudes and responses, and tended to feel that they were a different category of road user from drivers. For them, safety was a much higher priority than disrespect, since they often felt vulnerable and physically at risk from disrespectful behaviour on the part of drivers.

“You do feel more vulnerable sometimes. You’re not protected by your steel box. I think if someone gets really annoyed, all they’ve got to do is swerve, cut you up. You’ve got no chance, so you have got to have your wits about you.”

Group 11: cyclists, urban, South East

Motorcyclists in particular tended to regard disrespect from motorists as commonplace and largely a result of motorists’ dislike for them.

“I flashed a couple of cars to get them to move over. As I went past, one of them gave me the finger.”

Group 9, motorcyclists, Manchester

“Car drivers seem to like to intimidate you. It’s a power thing.”

Group 9, motorcyclists, Manchester

Cyclists tended to be more annoyed about impatient motorists pulling out or overtaking them, especially in urban areas where they would catch up when the traffic stopped. But there was still a feeling that some motorists were inconsiderate, and viewed them as second-class road users.

*“Because you can’t go as fast as they can...”
“Their journey is more important than yours.”*

Group 11: cyclists, urban, South East

“If you’re cycling along and a car’s waiting to come out, and he thinks he can get out before you can get there, he pulls out. That is one of the things that annoys me.”

“They think they can get past and obviously they can’t, so they’re aware of what they’re doing. It’s not something that they’ve done by accident, they’re aware what they’re doing... They wouldn’t do it to another car, would they? They wouldn’t pull in front of another car.”

Group 11: cyclists, urban, South East

While blaming the motorists, however, many freely admitted to taking the law into their own hands, and to demonstrating disrespectful behaviour which reflected their different circumstances. Motorcyclists could speed, undertake or pull off risky manoeuvres when making their way through heavy traffic, and they had fewer inhibitions about doing

these things than most drivers. All, irrespective of the type of motorcycle they rode, openly admitted to riding above the limit on a regular basis, when and where they felt it was safe.

“You know your limits, you know what you can get away with, you’ve learned. So you do go fast when you can, you do cut through the traffic. It’s part of the reason for having a bike.”

Group 9, motorcyclists, Manchester

“It’s a toy and you’re playing with it. But if you’re in the right place it’s safe and you’re not putting anyone at risk.”

Group 9, motorcyclists, Manchester

Likewise, many cyclists said they were perfectly happy to jump red lights where they thought it safe to do so.

“I think you know, as a cyclist, if you got a set route, you know the lights where you can jump and you know the lights that you can’t jump.”

Group 11: cyclists, urban, South East

It was these types of riding practice which annoyed the motorists, because they considered them illegal and irresponsible.

“They’re the people that are weaving in and out, coming on the wrong side of you in through traffic, and then they say to us: ‘Look out for them.’ Well, why don’t they drive properly, we won’t have an issue? They’re their own worst enemies sometimes.”

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

“Three or four of them [cyclists] blocking the whole road. I have got more metal than you, move!”

Group 6: male, 25-34, C2DE, car drivers, urban, Midlands

Pedestrians tended to feel that the road is a place for cars, and that those on foot should stay off it apart from at designated crossing points. For the most part, they had little to add to motorists’ views on disrespect, as they were seldom affected by it directly. But they did tend to be less tolerant of inconsiderate, thoughtless driving than other drivers, perhaps because they were not in a position to do it themselves.

7. Does disrespect matter?

7.1 Are people bothered by it?

Although many thought that the roads would be more pleasant if reactive and passive disrespect could be reduced, few felt much concern about its effects. This was for a number of the reasons explored above.

"I think if everyone was really respectful in their car then the world would be a much better place."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

The behaviour covered by reactive disrespect is not strictly illegal, and was thought to pose few safety risks to others, although it can be irritating or frustrating. It was also thought to be very common, with most people being likely to demonstrate it at some point; reactive disrespect was often regarded almost as an integral part of the modern driving experience.

"I am most at fault for being impatient and rushing about, but that is not what annoys me about other people. It is people's lack of due care and concentration."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

"I think it is just accepted now isn't it, I don't think people really take it to heart? It is just a ruder version of pointing out where they went wrong."

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

HOW MUCH DOES DISRESPECT ON THE ROAD BOTHER YOU?

"It's part of everyday life. Everybody is used to it."

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

Each incident was thought to be very short-lived and impersonal, with little or no lasting impact on either side; and the effects of being in a car and on the road raise the threshold of what is acceptable to include this type of behaviour.

"You are not hurting anybody by getting impatient inside your car."

"If you get out of the car and start being aggressive, then it is different."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

"It has made me realise that I do the odd thing but I am not going to change."

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

“You know you shouldn’t really do it but it doesn’t really come under being disrespectful.”

Group 8: male, 25-34, C1, van drivers, urban, South East

Passive disrespect was seen as equally inconsequential, despite the fact that it involves breaking the law. Indeed, as noted, respondents often found it difficult to see minor speeding and illegal parking as disrespectful at all because there were no perceived victims or wider effects. To a large degree, their guides to what types of behaviour are acceptable were the norms of the road and the attitudes of other drivers, rather than law and the authorities.

“I find a lot of them [motoring convictions/fines] unjust. You know, criminal offences are completely different but motoring offences are mainly to make money.”

Depth 11: male, anti-social behaviour, South East

“I don’t think there’s a lot of consequences, really [of low level offences].”

Depth 11: male, anti-social behaviour, South East

7.2 Is there a danger of escalation?

On the face of it, there seems to be good reason to believe that neither reactive nor passive disrespect are symptoms of, or precursors to, more serious types of disrespect or illegal behaviour on or off the road. Both types of disrespect, as noted, are symptoms of the on-road environment and the influence of driving a car, and are widely seen as inconsequential, acceptable, justifiable and (perhaps above all) normal. In both cases, clear distinctions were frequently drawn between this situation and situations on and off the road in which any of these factors are absent.

7.2.1 *On the road*

With regard to the road, there appears to be little danger that the perceived acceptability of the minor breaches of the law which constitute passive disrespect will increase people’s propensity to break the law in more serious ways. Many respondents happily admitted to minor speeding while strongly condemning drink driving and driving without a valid MOT or insurance. They perceived a qualitative difference between the two types of behaviour which made the former seem widespread, acceptable and hardly illegal at all, and the latter unacceptable and something which they, as (otherwise) law-abiding

citizens, would not countenance. As noted, a large part of this difference appeared to be whether they rejected or recognised the safety rationale for the law in question.

The type of behaviour which constitutes reactive disrespect on the road is also qualitatively different from serious breaches of the law. For the most part, it is not illegal. It is also a response to the actions of someone else, whereas illegal behaviour on the road (of the type explored here) tends not to be prompted by interaction with others.

"I am always late for things so I will tail-gate. I won't drink and drive or take drugs and drive. A lot of people's weakness is if they are in a rush."

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

It also seems unlikely that the acceptability of either type of disrespect will encourage people to be more actively disrespectful towards others on the road. Active disrespect was seen as fundamental and attitudinal: the minority of 'other people' who behave in this way on the road are believed to take this attitude onto the road with them; most people were thought not to share these attitudes, and were not expected to behave in this way.

7.2.2 Off the road

In the off-road environment, the factors which encourage reactive and passive disrespect are largely absent. People are not protected or anonymous, and their confidence is not bolstered in the way that it is on the road; neither are they so frustrated at their inability to move as fast as they would like. In the absence of these factors, aggression towards others and breaking the law were seen as unusual, unjustified and inadvisable by the majority.

However, despite the distinctions noted above, it does seem possible that there are links between the acceptability of these types of disrespect on the road and other forms of undesirable behaviour. The propensity to appeal against penalties for parking offences in particular stems from a lack of respect for the aims of the law and the motives of the authorities, and is likely to be fuelled by an increasing litigiousness in society and lack of community sense. This erosion of respect for authority on the road may drive a similar erosion elsewhere: if it is acceptable to challenge authority on the road, why not off it as well?

Equally, the fact that the threshold of acceptability is higher on the road than off it may be a factor behind the increase in impatience and impoliteness in general life reported by many respondents. Again, if it is acceptable to behave in this way on the road, why not off it as well?

“If the kids are in the back of the car watching you shout at someone in another car, will they think that’s a normal part of the way to behave and just carry it on? Start shouting at their friends at school. I think there is responsibility when driving to behave as you would at any other time.”

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

“It could be that the lack of respect is because nobody necessarily knows anyone as well as they used to, and that is like the roads. You don’t know the bloke in the car next to you. That’s what kids think: ‘They don’t matter to me so it doesn’t matter how I’m behaving.’”

Group 9: male, 35-49, B, car drivers, rural, North

Finally, and perhaps most obviously, passive disrespect *does* involve dangerous behaviour, whatever drivers may think. The difficulty in addressing such behaviour lies in making drivers appreciate this.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **The challenges**

It must be noted at the outset that it is likely to be extremely difficult to influence people on the issues of reactive and passive respect, and to persuade them to change their behaviour. Reactive disrespect was certainly acknowledged by respondents, but it was seen as endemic, inconsequential and largely acceptable and justifiable; it was also far from the top of their minds (even compared with the related – but distinct – issue of considerate driving). It was therefore difficult for respondents to see reactive disrespect as an issue which can or should be addressed.

“People tend to think that they drive all right... Unless you sit in a room like this and think what you do yourself.”

Group 4: male, 17-24, C2DE, car drivers, urban, North

Passive disrespect, meanwhile, was often not recognised as disrespect at all in the conventional sense, as there is no perceived victim. On the contrary, one of the reasons why drivers break the law in this way is that they are rewarded for doing so with faster journey times and more convenient telephoning and parking.

There are, however, good reasons for wanting to address both types of disrespect. As noted, reactive disrespect may impinge on people's attitudes and views of what is acceptable in situations off the road; and passive disrespect involves breaches of safety laws which are inherently dangerous, whatever individual drivers may think.

2. **Reactive disrespect**

In the case of reactive disrespect, we feel the focus should be on lowering the threshold of acceptability on the road (what people feel it is acceptable for them to do, and what they are prepared to accept from others), and bringing it into line with situations elsewhere. There are two issues here: impatience and aggression are seen as the norm rather than the exception; and drivers do not perceive the effects of their behaviour on others. We would suggest that there are, concomitantly, two ways in which these issues might be approached: influence and education.

If it is possible to change drivers' attitudes to what is normal and acceptable on the road, the influence of the people and media which inform these attitudes will play an important part in doing so. For the youngest respondents, an important influence on driving style and attitude was often said to be the way in which their parents drive. Good and bad habits are noted, assumed to be normal, and picked up; this is the first suggestion of what is seen as acceptable.

"In the first place it is your guardianship."

"Parents. You can pick up bad habits from them."

"I would say family. You are picking things up before you are driving."

"Up until you have passed your test, it is your family, but as soon as you get behind the wheel you are on your own."

Group 2: male, 17-24, C1, car drivers, small town, Midlands

The media also has a role to play, although it is difficult to assess its significance. Magazines such as *Max Power* and TV programmes such as *Top Gear* seemed to have some influence over some younger (under 35) male respondents. This media influence is probably negative with regard to this issue, as it glorifies speed and aggressive driving (although, as some noted, *Top Gear* usually does so in specifically off-road situations), but some saw potential for influence in a positive direction instead.

Respondents in the middle age bands (men in particular) seemed to be open to influence from passengers – in particular, their partners, parents or even their bosses, who have influence anyway. As noted, passengers were said to be less tolerant of disrespect than drivers, and their presence punctures the bubble of anonymity which promotes reactive disrespect. All but the youngest respondents said that they tend to be less impatient and aggressive when someone is in the car with them.

"I think I'd only listen if the boss was in the car with me. It's a company car."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

"If the people you insured your car with were sitting next to you for a day, I do think it would change your driving habits for that day. Quite an interesting idea."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

Older respondents were less likely to feel that they could be influenced on the issue of reactive disrespect; but they were some of the strongest

advocates of an educational approach. Drivers' propensity to be reactively disrespectful, and the effect that this might have on other road users, was usually far from top of mind and difficult to address head-on. But the two-hour group discussions did force respondents of all ages to reconsider their behaviour and its implications, and to recognise a disparity between what was acceptable on and off the road.

As some went on to suggest, this 'educational' effect might be replicated in a workshop or other extended session as part of the driving or theory test. For many, the advantage of this was the opportunity to 'catch them young'; but one or two also suggested retests for older drivers who would have missed out on the current theory test.

For the same reason, advertising and other forms of immediate communication were widely rejected as an influence on reactive disrespect. In the time available, it would be very difficult to persuade people to give sufficient thought to their own driving to make them appreciate that consideration and disrespect are different, and that they might demonstrate both.

"They need to think about it more and their actions, and how their actions affect other people. I don't think just putting it on TV is going to do it, I think people need to sit down and they need to be aware."

"It is when you sit down and talk about it. It is not something that can be done through advertising."

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

Moreover, although advertising was thought very successful with regard to illegal driving practices, almost all recognised that it relies heavily on disastrous consequences to drive its point home. As noted, the great majority of respondents felt that reactive disrespect has no consequences, disastrous or otherwise. Attempts to portray the effects are therefore likely to lack credibility; but attempts to persuade without them are likely to lack impact.

"There is no real type of long-term consequence for flashing your headlights; whereas with drink driving there is a long-term consequence if someone dies."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

"It would be very hard for them to do it successfully. I can't think of a way that they could get across, for minor things. If it is stuff like putting on your seat belt, they can put on shocking TV ads of people dying."

Group 1: male, 17-24, B, car drivers, urban, South East

There was also scepticism about the Government taking an overt role in this type of communication. Some were cynical about the success with which the more serious issues of respect elsewhere and illegal driving are dealt with; it would seem odd for the Government to be seen to be turning its attention to reactive disrespect before these have been sorted out. For others, the issue at face value was so inconsequential that the idea of Government involvement raised thoughts about the 'nanny state'. Legal intervention from the Government was widely thought inappropriate for the same reasons – and most suspected that any new laws would be unpoliceable anyway because reactive disrespect is so widespread and low-level.

If a communications campaign of any sort is to be considered, it would be more acceptable to many if fronted by a relevant charity or NGO.

3. **Passive disrespect**

In some senses, passive disrespect is likely to be easier to address, as the behaviour it involves is illegal and has safety ramifications. The challenge, however, belies this simplicity, and is twofold: to persuade drivers to take this illegality and danger seriously; and to disabuse them of the speed and convenience 'rewards' that passive disrespect seems to offer. It seems likely that the influence and education approaches described above will have a part to play in this.

"If my wife told me to slow down I think I would, yes. If she looked sort of scared or something, yes, I'd certainly slow down."

Group 5: male, 25-34, C1, car drivers, small town, South East

Some respondents suggested sessions to educate drivers about the dangers of speeding in particular; one or two were aware of such courses being offered in place of a speeding fine.

“Warwickshire have this thing, this speed aware thing so if you get caught speeding then instead of getting a fixed penalty you can go to a session. You can only do that once in three years.”

Group 3: female, 17-24, C1, car drivers, urban, Midlands

But there may also be scope for communications which address passive disrespect, and challenge the notion that widespread participation makes illegal behaviour acceptable and rewarding.

This evidence suggests that previous communications campaigns which have attempted to address illegal driving by portraying its disastrous consequences have been successful in extreme cases (drink driving, seat belts etc), but may not have been sufficiently credible in minor cases. In these cases, the safety rationale behind laws regarding speed limits and mobile telephone use is widely recognised, but it is often not respected. The problem is not that drivers do not understand why they should not speed or make calls; rather, their personal experience and confidence in their own abilities allows them to deflect this rationale so that they can enjoy the rewards which are believed to accrue.

As noted, the confidence and belief in rewards which support attitudes based on personal experience are largely a product of the empowerment and impatience generated by the on-road situation. It may be, therefore, that communications would be strengthened if they tried to shake drivers' confidence in their abilities to control cars at speed or while on the telephone, and called into question the perceived value of the reward for taking such risks. A comparison between someone's attitudes to safety and the law inside and outside a car may be effective in this sense.

Personal experience, confidence and belief in the value of rewards are compounded by the argument that such behaviour is acceptable or even desirable because 'everybody does it'. On the direct basis of respondents' views, there is little to recommend as a means of combating this argument. But there are distinct parallels here with the concept of social norming: the idea that participation in a type of behaviour is bolstered by the belief that it is widespread, and can be reduced if this impression is challenged. This principle is particularly influential in attempts to reduce underage alcohol consumption in

US educational institutions, which is incorrectly thought by students to be widespread and rewarding. A related approach, in which communications challenge the belief that minor speeding is widely acceptable, may be successful in this case.

Illegal parking lacks the safety rationale of speeding and mobile telephone use, and is likely to be very difficult to address. There is little respect for the rules or the authorities; only the threat of penalties prevents widespread abuse of the system. The reasoning behind the rules – rationing parking spaces and the concept of paying for the use of a public good – is seldom recognised and rarely personally motivating, so there seems to be little scope for communications or influence.

Enforcement of the parking law generates a certain degree of obedience, but its over-zealous application and unclear signage fuels drivers' willingness to appeal decisions. The appeals, at least, might be reduced, and respect for authority raised, if the widespread perception that this authority is abused and open to contest could be addressed.

4. **Terminology**

Respect is a widely understood term, and was used spontaneously by some. But it was almost always used to refer to behaviour which differs from that which has been considered here. For most respondents, 'respect' was attitudinal, a fundamental influence on the way in which people behave; in this sense, it was much more closely related to active disrespect than the reactive or passive forms. Perhaps unsurprisingly, therefore, almost all respondents continued to regard themselves as respectful, no matter how much reactive or passive 'disrespect' they admitted to. Indeed, it often seemed that they were prepared to accept the term 'disrespect' to describe their behaviour only because of the length of discussion and depth of exploration of the issue that the groups allowed.

For this reason, we would recommend that the word 'respect' is not used for communications in this context. Its connotations of anti-social, inconsiderate behaviour, and attitudes possessed by 'other people',

seem to be too strong for it to be immediately credible, relevant or even acceptable to the majority of people.

5. **Issues for further research**

Among the issues arising from this research, it might be profitable build on the findings by conducting:

- a more in-depth examination of *active* disrespect on the road among the disrespectful minority: in this work, we have primarily been able to approach this from the partisan point of view of the respectful majority
- an exploration of the possible link between a higher threshold of acceptability on the road and rising low-level disrespect elsewhere: as this is a tentative conclusion of this research, we have not been able to investigate it here
- a closer examination of the perceived benefits of addressing reactive disrespect, to behaviour on and off the road: the focus here has been on the factors generating disrespect, restricting the amount of time which could be dedicated this issue
- an investigation into possible long-term influences, with pre-prepared solutions to focus and stimulate respondents' minds: in this research, the overwhelming conclusion that there is little to address may have clouded respondents' judgements about these influences

Appendix

Respect relies on a shared understanding and clear rules, and is strengthened by people acting together to tackle problems and improve their lives.

Disrespectful behaviour can take many forms, from playing loud music in the early hours of the morning, graffiti, and offensive and threatening remarks, to dumping rubbish, harassment and intimidation.

A range of factors are associated with this type of behaviour, including poor parenting, truancy, deprived surroundings and drug and alcohol misuse.

We should build a culture of respect for the modern age, based on values of shared responsibility rather than deference and hierarchy.

1. Introduction and warm-up

- name, age, occupation, household make-up, length of time living in current area
- description of neighbourhood, strength of local community, any problems, recent changes in situation

2. Context

2.1 Latent awareness of Respect

- domestic issues in the news, current affairs (listen but do not prompt for mentions of respect, anti-social behaviour etc)

2.2 Understanding of Respect

- what does 'respect' mean to them; is it a word they would use
- is there enough respect (as they understand it) in their communities; what is the effect of having enough or too little

'RESPECT/DISRESPECT' MAP EXERCISE 1 – SHOW AND DISCUSS BOARDS

- which of these actions do they consider respectful and disrespectful; why; how prevalent are they where they live and across the UK as a whole
- would they naturally use the words 'respect' or 'disrespect' to describe these actions; if not, what would they use
- how interested do they think the Government is in these actions; rationale – where have they heard this, why do they think this

'RESPECT/DISRESPECT' MAP EXERCISE 2 – ASK RESPONDENTS TO PLACE BOARDS ON A SEVERITY/PREVALENCE AXIS

- discuss the order: why are some actions better or worse than others

PHOTOGRAPH THE MAP

Awareness of Government's definition of Respect

SHOW BOARD WITH (BLINDED) GOVERNMENT DEFINITION

- what do they think of this definition of respect; is it different from how they would describe it; how so
- what do they think the Government means by 'respect'; if different from their understanding, why
- have they heard of the Govt's Respect Agenda; if so, where have they heard about it, what do they think of it

TELL RESPONDENTS THAT THE BOARD IS THE GOVERNMENT'S DEFINITION

- are they surprised by this; if so, why; does it seem like the type of thing the government would be interested in

SUMMARISE VIEWS ON GRID, AND PRESENT OVERVIEW

3. Conceptions of respect on the road

3.1 General understanding

- what does 'respect on the road' mean to them; how do they relate it to respect elsewhere
- what constitutes respectful and disrespectful road use; how prevalent are both of these in their areas

3.2 Personal experience

'FREE ASSOCIATION' EXERCISE – RESPONDENTS' IMMEDIATE THOUGHTS ON SEEING A SERIES OF WORDS AND PHRASES ON BOARDS

- how concerned are they about 'low-level' disrespect, as opposed to illegal or overtly offensive behaviour
- how significant/serious is respect on the road to their wider understanding of respect

SHOW MEDIA STORIES

- discuss the issues they raise: seriousness, who is to blame, reasonable outcome, etc

SUMMARISE VIEWS ON GRID, AND PRESENT OVERVIEW

4. **Views on respondents' own road use**

SELF-COMPLETION EXERCISE – ASK RESPONDENTS TO FILL IN A SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE AND ASSURE THEM THAT IT IS PRIVATE/ANONYMOUS

4.1 In general

- how would they describe their own driving and road use; how does being in a car or van (or on a motorcycle or bicycle) affect their attitudes to, and treatment of, others on the road
- are there any reasons why their attitudes to others on the road differ from those to people elsewhere (if they do)

4.2 Specific situations

'WHAT HAPPENS WHEN' EXERCISE – SHOW BOARDS WITH SCENARIOS AND ASK RESPONDENTS TO DESCRIBE COLLECTIVELY WHAT GOES THROUGH THEIR MINDS AND HOW THEY REACT

- why do they react or think in these ways; what do they think the effect on others is; what do they think the opinion of others might be; do they have any concerns about either of these

'AGREE/DISAGREE' EXERCISE – ASK RESPONDENTS FOR THEIR IMMEDIATE REACTIONS TO STATEMENTS ON BOARDS

- follow discussion which arises

'CONCEPTUAL MAP' EXERCISE 1 – SHOW AND DISCUSS ISSUES ON BOARDS

- how serious and/or prevalent do they think each action is; have they ever committed them; if so, when and how frequently
- what do they think the consequences are for others; how concerned are they about the effects on and opinions of others

- what do they think of others who commit these actions

'CONCEPTUAL MAP' EXERCISE 2 – ASK RESPONDENTS TO PLACE BOARDS ON A SEVERITY/PREVALENCE AXIS

- are there any issues which have been missed – if so, use blank cards and add to the map
- how would they describe (unprompted) what connects all the issues on the map – disrespectful, discourteous, dangerous etc

PHOTOGRAPH THE MAP

SUMMARISE VIEWS ON GRID, AND PRESENT OVERVIEW

5. Influences on behaviour

5.1 Negative – excuses/reasons for behaviour

- how prevalent are the examples of disrespectful behaviour they have given; how significant do they seem in their area
- does the 'blame' lie partly elsewhere – poor driving on the part of others, late for an appointment

5.2 Positive influences

- who/what do they listen to with regard to behaviour in general – friends, family, media, remote or local authority; would the same influencers have weight with regard to the road
- for young people: which role models would have an influence (celebrity or otherwise); how could new media channels play a part
- what type of information would change the way they act on the road; who should be responsible for disseminating this?
- what role should/could Government intervention have in promoting respect on the road

SUMMARISE VIEWS ON GRID, AND PRESENT OVERVIEW

6. **Attitudes to authority**

- how effectively do they think anti-social behaviour on the roads is dealt with; which authority figures are good and bad at this
- what is their general opinion of police, parking wardens etc
- what are their opinions of speeding, parking and other fines; have they ever received these (if not already covered)
- what is their emotional reaction to receiving a fine or points on the licence – do they feel guilty, contrite, embarrassed, annoyed, stupid, nothing etc
- what is their practical reaction – do they pay up and move on, appeal or contest the decision, do nothing; if they reject a decision, why is this
- do they see a difference between respect for the law and respect for other road users; if so, what effect does this have on their road use; do they think there should be a difference

SUMMARISE VIEWS ON GRID, AND PRESENT OVERVIEW

7. **Final summary**

- have their views on respect on the road changed over the course of the discussion; if so, why

GIVE OVERVIEW OF ENTIRE DISCUSSION

- how do they account for any shifts in opinion or perception; what do they attribute these to
- do they acknowledge any disparity between what they disapprove of in others and what they do themselves; which part of the discussion highlighted this

THANK AND CLOSE

CONTACT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:

Address:

..... Tel:

Sex: Male () Female ()

Age: 17-24 () 25-34 () 35-49 () 50-65 ()

Marital status: Single () Married/cohabiting ()

Children living at home: No () Yes () *write in ages*.....

Occupation (HoH):

SeS: B () C1 () C2 () D () E ()

UK citizen: Yes () No () **CLOSE**

.....
HELLO, I WORK FOR A MARKET RESEARCH COMPANY CALLED CRAGG ROSS DAWSON AND WE ARE CARRYING OUT SOME RESEARCH ON DRIVING. MAY I ASK YOU A FEW QUICK QUESTIONS?

QA Could I just check, do you, or any of your close friends or relatives work in any of the following fields?

Marketing	()
Market Research	()
Advertising	()
Journalism	()
Public Relations	()
Driving/riding (e.g. cabbie, courier, bus and truck drivers)	()
Emergency services	()
Local or central government	()
A motorists breakdown/recovery organisation	()

CLOSE IF YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, OTHERWISE GO TO QB.

QB Are you a member of any of the following?

ROSPA	()
The Institute of Advanced Motorists	()
The Motorcycle Action Group	()
Forest	()
Greenpeace	()

CLOSE IF RESPONDENT IS A MEMBER OF AN INTEREST OR LOBBY GROUP, I.E. ROSPA, THE INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED MOTORISTS, THE MOTORCYCLE ACTION GROUP. OTHERWISE TO QC

QC Have you ever been to a market research group discussion or interview?

Yes () TO QC No () TO Q1

QD How long ago was the last time?

WRITE IN _____
CLOSE IF ATTENDED WITHIN THE LAST TWELVE MONTHS.

QE What subject(s) was/were the group(s)/interview(s) on?

WRITE IN _____
CLOSE IF RELATED TO THIS RESEARCH TOPIC. OTHERWISE TO Q1.

Q1 How often, if at all, do you do any of the following?

	Never	Less than once a week	Once a week or more
Drive a car	()	()	()
Ride a motorcycle	()	()	()
Ride a bicycle	()	()	()
Drive a van	()	()	()

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUPS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11 AND 13 (CAR DRIVERS)** SHOULD DRIVE A CAR AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK.

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUP 8 (VAN DRIVERS)** SHOULD DRIVE A VAN AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK.

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUP 9 (MOTORCYCLISTS)** SHOULD RIDE A MOTORCYCLE AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK BUT SHOULD DRIVE A CAR OR VAN INFREQUENTLY (LESS THAN ONCE A WEEK) OR NOT AT ALL.

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUP 12 (CYCLISTS)** SHOULD RIDE A BICYCLE AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK BUT SHOULD NOT DRIVE A CAR OR VAN OR RIDE A MOTORCYCLE.

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUP 14 (PEDESTRIANS)** SHOULD BE INFREQUENT (LESS THAN ONCE A WEEK) OR NON-DRIVERS OF CARS OR VANS.

CAR DRIVER GROUPS TO Q2 IF APPROPRIATE. ALL OTHERS TO Q3.

Q2 **CAR DRIVERS ONLY.** Which of the following statements would you say is most true of you?

- A) *"I am happy taking risks – it's exciting and the rewards can be great"* ()
- B) *"I don't mind taking risks, as long as the end result justifies them"* ()
- C) *"I don't consider myself a risk-taker – it's just not necessary"* ()
- D) *"I don't like to take too many risks because I would rather not have to live with the consequences of something going wrong"* ()

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUPS 1, 2, 3 AND 4** (AGED 17-24 YEARS) AND **DEPTHS 3 AND 4** SHOULD BE 'RISK LOVING' AND SHOULD AGREE WITH STATEMENT A.

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUPS 5, 6 AND 7** (AGED 25-34 YEARS) AND **DEPTH 2** SHOULD BE 'RISK ACCEPTING' AND SHOULD AGREE WITH STATEMENT B.

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUPS 10 AND 11** (AGED 35-49 YEARS) AND **DEPTHS 5 AND 6** SHOULD BE 'RISK NEUTRAL' AND SHOULD AGREE WITH STATEMENT C.

RESPONDENTS IN **GROUP 13** (AGED 50-65 YEARS) AND **DEPTH 1** SHOULD BE 'RISK AVERSE' AND SHOULD AGREE WITH STATEMENT D.

TO Q3 IF APPROPRIATE.

Q3 ASK ALL. Do any of the following situations apply to you?

- E "I have recently been involved in a road accident for which I was responsible" ()
- F "I have nine or more points on my driving licence" ()
- G "I have been convicted of a driving offence" ()
- H "I have been cautioned for, or convicted of, an offence related to anti-social behaviour" ()
- I "None of these situations applies to me" ()

IN ALL GROUPS, DO NOT RECRUIT RESPONDENT IF ANY OF THE ABOVE SITUATIONS APPLIES TO THEM.

THE RESPONDENTS FOR **DEPTH 7** SHOULD HAVE RECENTLY BEEN INVOLVED IN A ROAD ACCIDENT FOR WHICH THEY WERE RESPONSIBLE – STATEMENT E ABOVE.

RESPONDENTS FOR **DEPTHS 8 AND 9** SHOULD HAVE NINE OR MORE POINTS ON THEIR LICENCE – STATEMENT F ABOVE.

FOR **DEPTH 10**, THE RESPONDENT MUST HAVE BEEN CONVICTED OF A DRIVING OFFENCE – STATEMENT G ABOVE.

FOR **DEPTHS 11 AND 12**, THE RESPONDENTS MUST HAVE BEEN CAUTIONED FOR, OR CONVICTED OF, AN OFFENCE RELATED TO ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR – STATEMENT H ABOVE.

TO Q4 IF APPROPRIATE.

Q4 And finally, do you have any special requirements that would need to be met in order for you to participate in this market research if it were to be held in a venue with stairs or without disabled access?

No ()

Yes (please write in) _____ (please contact the office, so that we can make sure the venue is suitable for the respondent).

RECRUIT AS APPROPRIATE