

**The Illinois Statewide Labor Day 2005
Alcohol Impaired Driving Enforcement Campaign Surveys**

Conducted for



Division of Traffic Safety

Conducted by



**Survey Research Office
Center for State Policy and Leadership
University of Illinois at Springfield**

Updated Summary Report

Field Interviewing: June and September 2005

Supplemented with April 2005

Report: Fall, 2005 (October / November with December update)

Written by

Richard Schuldt, Director, UIS/SRO

With assistance from

Mark Winland, Interviewing Lab Manager

Introduction

The Illinois Department of Transportation, Division of Traffic Safety, contracted with the Survey Research Office, located in the Center for State Policy and Leadership, at the University of Illinois at Springfield to conduct several statewide telephone surveys from April through September, 2005. The first survey was conducted in April prior to the Memorial Day weekend, and the second was conducted in June, immediately after the Memorial Day weekend. A third survey was conducted in September, after the Labor Day weekend.

The April survey focused on questions regarding seat belt-related opinions and behaviors and took place prior to a seat belt enforcement and media campaign that took place in a time period surrounding the Memorial Day weekend. The June survey included a full set of both seat belt and DUI-related questions as did the September survey. The September survey took place after a DUI enforcement campaign that took place in a time period surrounding Labor Day weekend. Thus, the April survey served as a “pre-test” for the Memorial Day seat belt enforcement and media campaign, with the June survey serving as a “post-test” for this

campaign. Similarly, the June survey served as a “pre-test” for the Labor Day DUI enforcement campaign, with the September survey serving as a “post-test” for this campaign.¹

Methodology

The sampling methodology for the three surveys was similar to that of other recent telephone surveys on seat belt and DUI initiative topics conducted for IDOT’s Division of Traffic Safety. The state was first stratified into the Chicago metro area and the remaining Illinois counties, known as “downstate.” The Chicago metro area was further stratified into the City of Chicago and the Chicago area suburbs, which included the Cook County suburbs and the suburbs in the five “collar” counties. The downstate area was further subdivided into north/central Illinois and southern Illinois. Thus, the statewide surveys had four stratified geographic regions: City of Chicago, Chicago suburban counties, and the downstate counties, subdivided into north/central Illinois and southern Illinois. Random samples of telephone numbers were purchased for each of the four stratification areas (City of Chicago, Chicago suburban counties, north/central Illinois, and southern Illinois).

Actual field interviewing for the April survey was conducted from April 13–30, 2005 with over 550 licensed drivers (557-580). Field interviewing for the June survey was conducted from May 31 – June 25, 2005 -- again with over 550 licensed drivers (539-563). And, field interviewing for the September survey was conducted from September 6 to October 4, 2005 -- with over 500 licensed drivers (538-564).²

The numbers of completions for each stratification group are presented below for each of the three surveys. It should be noted that statewide results have been weighted to correct for the intentional over/under-representation of the respective regions.

	2005 Seat Belt “Pre-Test” <u>April 2005</u>	2005 Seat Belt “Post-Test” / DUI “Pre-test” <u>June 2005</u>	2005 DUI “Post-test” <u>September 2005</u>
<i>TOTAL</i>	580	563	564
Chicago metro area	325	312	334
<i>City of Chicago</i>	147	165	172
<i>Chicago suburban counties</i>	178	147	162
Downstate counties	255	252	230
<i>North/central Illinois</i>	145	137	117
<i>Southern Illinois</i>	110	114	113

¹ In addition to the statewide surveys, a rural county component was added to both the April and June surveys, and a separate rural county survey was conducted in mid-May. Results for the rural county surveys can be found in a separate report.

² There was some attrition during the interviewing. The higher number in each range is the number responding to the first substantive question, and the lower number is the number responding to the last question.

The sampling error for the April and June statewide results is +/- 4.1 percent (at the 95th confidence level), and the sampling error for the September statewide results is +/- 4.2%.³ The error for subgroups in all surveys is, of course, larger.

Each telephone number in the samples was called a maximum of six times, at differing times of the week and day. Within households, interviewers asked for the youngest licensed driver 75 percent of the time, because earlier experience showed that we under-represent younger drivers. In the other 25 percent of the time, interviewers asked for a licensed driver who was male/female (varying at random) and who had the next birthday. Replacements were accepted if that designated household member was not available. The average length of completed interviews was about 10 minutes for the April survey (median = 10 minutes) and somewhat under 15 minutes for the June and September surveys (median = 13 minutes).

In the following summary, the statewide results for each of the surveys have been weighted to arrive at a proper distribution by region and by gender. No other weighting has been applied.⁴

Comments on Results

In the results that follow, we focus on those questions most pertinent to the DUI initiative surrounding Labor Day weekend, 2005. We also focus on the statewide and regional results, specifically highlighting the results and changes that occurred in and between the June and September surveys (the DUI initiative “pre-test” and “post-test” surveys). However, for the statewide results, we at times comment on the April results when they appear to add understanding to the later results/changes.⁵ In this summary report, percentages have often been rounded to integers, and percentage changes (i.e., +/- % with parentheses) refer to percentage point changes unless specifically noted.⁶

The full results are presented in the file titled **IDOT 2005 Statewide Survey Tables** (an Excel file), compiled for the project. Separate worksheets are included for: the statewide results; regional results; results by gender; results by age group (three categories of up to 29, 30s and 40s, and 50 and over); results by race (white/non-white); and relevant results for those who had an alcoholic drink in the recent past. The worksheet for the statewide results includes the percentage point changes from the April to June surveys and changes from the June to September surveys.

³ The sampling errors (and number of completion numbers) presented here are based on the average between partial and full completion numbers.

⁴ Despite the fact that the interviewer asks to speak to the youngest licensed driver three-quarters of the time, it appears the surveys still under-represents the youngest drivers. In addition, it appears the surveys somewhat over-represents licensed drivers with at least a four-year college education and somewhat under-represents those with at most a high school education. Neither has been corrected for in these results, but there is a good-to-great deal of consistency in the distributions across all three surveys (with the largest differences noted below). Thus, trends/changes between any two surveys or across the three surveys generally cannot be attributable to changes in these characteristics.

⁵ The full array of DUI-related questions was not asked in the April 2005 survey.

⁶ When the decimal is .5, we round to the even integer. Decimals are sometimes reported when percentage numbers are small and they add to understanding of changes/differences.

Time frame in question wording. The time frame for the recall questions in each of the surveys is the same, that of 30 days. For both the June and September surveys, this time period covers the most recent enforcement/media campaign for respondents.

Demographic characteristics of the June and September samples. Before reporting the DUI-related results, it is worth noting that the June and September 2005 samples, overall, are very similar with regard to the demographic characteristics asked about. The largest differences are found for age category and whether or not the respondent has children. Compared to the June sample, the September sample has about 4 percent fewer in the youngest age group of up to 29 years of age and about 6 percent more in the middle age group of 30 to 49 years of age. Consistent with this, the September sample has just over 4 percent more who have children than does the June sample.

THE RESULTS

Behaviors relating to drinking and driving

Frequency of drinking. *“How often did you drink alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days?”* Statewide, very few September respondents reported drinking every day while about one in ten (10.5%) reported drinking *at least* several days a week. One-quarter (25%) reported drinking either “once a week or less” or “only on weekends.” One-fifth (20%) reported drinking only on celebrations or special occasions, and just over four of ten (42%) reported not having had a drink in the recent past. *During the remaining portions of this report, we sometimes refer to those who indicated ever having drunk in the past thirty days as “drinkers” or “recent drinkers.”*

About the same number of September and June respondents reported drinking *at least* several times a week (11.9% in September vs. 10.5% in June). Somewhat more September than June respondents reported drinking “once a week or less” or “only on weekends” (25% vs. 20%) while slightly fewer September than June respondents reported “never” drinking during the time span (42% vs. 45%). The proportion saying “only on celebrations or special occasions” is about the same in both September and June (20-21%).

Regional results. The September results show that more than one in ten respondents in the City of Chicago (15%) reported drinking *at least* several days a week while about one in ten reported such in the Chicago suburbs and north/central Illinois (9% and 10%) and half as many did so in southern Illinois (5%). The percent who reported either drinking “once a week or less” or “only on weekends” is highest in the Chicago suburbs (33%) followed by southern Illinois (25%), the City of Chicago (23%), and then north/central Illinois (18%).

At the other end of the scale, the percent who reported “never” drinking is greatest in southern Illinois (55%) followed by north/central Illinois (48%) and the City of Chicago (42%) and then the Chicago suburbs (36%). And, the percent who reported drinking only “on celebrations or special occasions” is just over one-fifth for north/central Illinois and the Chicago suburbs (22% and 21%) and is somewhat less than this in both the City of Chicago (18%) and southern Illinois (15%).

In terms of those who said they drink at least several times a week, there is a decrease from June to September in southern Illinois (-6%) and in the Chicago suburbs (-5%). There is a small increase in this percentage for north/central Illinois (+4%) while there is virtually no change for the City of Chicago proportion here.

For those who said they drink once a week or less (including only on weekends), there are increases for both the Chicago suburbs (+13%) and southern Illinois (+7.2%) but little change for the other two regions.

The percent who indicated drinking only on special occasions (or celebrations) increased in north/central Illinois (+5%), declined in both southern Illinois and the Chicago suburbs (-6% and -4%), and declined to an even lesser extent in the City of Chicago (-2%).

And, in terms of those who said they had “never” had a drink in the past thirty days, a sizeable decrease is found in north/central Illinois (-10%) while a smaller increase is found in southern Illinois (+5%). Little change is found in the two Chicago regions.

Drinking and driving. *“Have you ever driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking alcoholic beverages?” [For the approximate 53 to 57 percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* Just over one-fifth of the September respondents (22%) who drank alcoholic beverages in the recent past reported they had driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking during this time period. This is slightly lower than the approximate one-quarter of such drivers who said so in June (25%).

In September, the percent of *drinkers* who reported having recently driven within two hours after drinking an alcoholic beverage is greatest in the City of Chicago (32%) and lowest in north/central Illinois (14%), with southern Illinois (26%) and the Chicago suburbs (20%) falling in between. In terms of the June-to-September change in this percentage, we find a substantial decrease for north/central Illinois (-15%) and an increase for the City of Chicago (+7%). Smaller to slight decreases are found for the Chicago suburbs (-4%) and southern Illinois (-1%).

Number of times. *“About how many times [in this time period] did you drive within two hours after drinking?” [For the approximate 13% of total sample members who had an alcoholic beverage in the recent past and who indicated they had driven a motor vehicle after drinking.]* For those who had driven a motor vehicle within two hours of drinking in the recent past, more September than June respondents indicated doing so once (51% vs. 42%), twice (30% vs. 24%), and five to nine times (5.4% vs. 1.6%). Fewer September respondents reported do so three or four times (13.6% vs. 25.5%) or 10 or more times (0.7% vs. 6.3%).

Number of drinks on last occasion. *“On the most recent occasion (driving within two hours of drinking), about how many drinks did you have?” [For the approximate 13% of total sample members who indicated they had driven within two hours of drinking.]* The pattern in the September and June surveys is quite consistent with the results above. Slightly more relevant September than June respondents reported having had one drink (31% vs. 28%), and more September respondents also reported having had two drinks (41% vs. 32%) – while slightly fewer September respondents reported having had three or four drinks (28% vs. 31%). No September respondent reported having had five or more drinks compared to 8 percent who reported such in June.

Frequency drive when too much to drink. *“About how many times [in this time period] did you drive when you thought you had too much to drink?” [For the approximate 53 to 57 percent of total sample members who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* In the September survey, just over 96 percent of those asked the question (those who drank in the past thirty days) reported never having had too much to drink when they drove in the past thirty days compared to just under 94 percent in June. The percent who said

“once” and the percent who said more than once are both slightly higher in June than in September (4.3% vs. 2.6% for once; 2.1% vs. 1.17% for more than once).

Reports of *never* having done so in the past thirty days are most frequent in the suburban Chicago area (99%) followed by north/central Illinois and the City of Chicago (94%) and then southern Illinois (89%). Just over one in ten (11%) southern Illinois respondents who have a drink in the past thirty days reported having driven when they thought they had too much to drink.

Assessed trend in personal drinking and driving. *“Compared to three months ago, are you now driving after drinking: more often, less often, or about the same?” [For the approximate 53 to 57 percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* Hardly any respondent in either survey reported that they now drink and drive “more often” than they did three months ago, while the proportion who said they drive after drinking “less often” is lower in September than in June (5.8% vs. 10.5%). The proportion who said they do so “about the same” is virtually the same in both surveys (19.6% and 19.4%), while the percent who said they “never drive after drinking” is higher in September than in June (73% vs. 64%).

In September, the percent of “drinking” respondents who said they “never” drive after drinking is around three-quarters (72-76%) for all regions but the City of Chicago, where it is a lower 63 percent. The percent who said they are now driving “less” after drinking is sizeable only in southern Illinois (22%). It is substantially less in the City of Chicago (7%), north/central Illinois (5%), and the Chicago suburbs (4%). The City of Chicago is the only region where a few report driving after drinking “more” often (3%).

From June to September, substantial increases in the percent of “drinking” respondents who said they “never” drive after drinking are found for three of the four regions: north/central Illinois (+16%); the Chicago suburbs (+11%); and southern Illinois (+9%). A smaller decrease in this percentage is found in the City of Chicago (-6%).

For north/central Illinois and the Chicago suburbs, this is accompanied by a decrease in the percent who reported driving after drinking “less” often now (-7% for north/central and -6% for the Chicago suburbs). Southern Illinois shows a small increase in this percentage (+4%), and there is basically no change in this percentage for the City of Chicago. For those reporting driving after drinking “more” now, the City of Chicago shows a small increase (+3%) and the Chicago suburbs shows a small decrease (-2%).

In terms of the percent who reported their driving-after-drinking behavior “is about the same,” there are decreases for both southern Illinois (-13%) and, to a lesser extent, for north/central Illinois (-6%) and a small increase for the City of Chicago (+4%). Even less change occurred here for the Chicago suburbs (+2%).

Perceptions of and attitudes about police presence and enforcement

Perceptions of DUI enforcement. Three questions in the interview solicited respondents’ perceptions about general police presence on roads and police enforcement of DUI laws. In the first question, respondents were asked how likely it is they would be stopped if they drove after having too much to drink. In the second question, respondents were asked about the relative frequency they see police on the roads they drive (compared to three months ago). And, in the third question, respondents were asked another relative question, this time being how

likely it is that a driver who had been drinking will be stopped, compared to three months ago.⁷ (Also see the next section for questions specifically relating to roadside checks.)

Police enforcement of drinking laws -- a hypothetical, personalized-wording question. *“If you drove after having too much to drink to drive safely, how likely do you think you are to be stopped by a police officer?”* For the results of this question, we will focus on the results for those respondents who gave a substantive answer to the question.⁸

Of relevant September respondents statewide, under one-tenth (8.4%) said that being stopped by police would be “almost certain,” and about one-quarter (25%) said it would be “very likely.” Over four in ten (42%) said it would be “somewhat likely,” while about 15 percent (15%) said it would be “somewhat unlikely.” Just under one in ten (9.3%) said it was “very unlikely.”

Compared to the June results, these September results are found to contain slightly more who believe it is either “almost certain” or “very likely” that you will be stopped (34% vs. 31%) and somewhat fewer who believe it is either “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” (24% vs. 28%). Further examination shows that the results for both surveys are actually quite similar at the extremes but differ in the adjacent categories (i.e., differ for “very likely” more than “almost certain,” and differ for “somewhat unlikely” rather than “very unlikely”).

Interestingly, it is the April results that show perceptions of likelihood the greatest – with nearly four in ten (38%) believing it is either “almost certain” (14%) or “very likely” (24%) that you will be stopped. In this survey, less than one in five (18%) believed it is either “very unlikely” (13%) or “very unlikely” (5%).

For the September results, *recent drinkers* were much less likely than non-drinkers to say that their likelihood of being stopped is either “almost certain” or “very likely” (27% vs. 45%) and are much more likely to say this likelihood is “somewhat likely” (49% vs. 30%). The same pattern is present in the June results, but with less differences (25% vs. 39% for either “very certain” or “very likely” and 45% vs. 36% for “somewhat likely”).

In terms of regions, the September percent who said it would be either “almost certain” or “very likely” that they would be stopped is higher in the two downstate regions (40% for north/central; and 37% for southern Illinois) than it is in the two Chicago area regions (33% for Chicago suburbs; and 27% for the City of Chicago). At the other end of the scale – and consistent with these results, we find the percent who said it would be either “somewhat” or “very” unlikely is highest in the City of Chicago (35%) followed by the Chicago suburbs (24%) and then the two downstate regions (around 18% for each).

From June to September, the combined percentage for the top two likelihood categories (“almost certain” and “very likely”) does not show much change except for north/central Illinois where there is a 6 percentage point increase. The Chicago suburbs show a decline of 6 percentage points for those who said “almost certain” but also a decline of 9 percentage points for those who said either “somewhat” or “very unlikely.”

⁷ Because of possible question order effects here, we kept the order of these questions the same as in the national survey template.

⁸ Across the three surveys, about 2-4% said “don’t know” or refused to answer. However, more respondents in the June DUI pre-test survey compared to the September DUI post-test survey or the earlier April 2005 survey were coded as “not drinking so they cannot relate to the question” (21% vs. 16% and 14%). For future surveys of this sort, it might be better not to personalize the question. That is, instead of asking, “if you drove after having too much to drink . . .,” it might be better to ask respondents how likely police are to stop drivers who do this behavior. This is in line with the wording of the third question in this section.

Police presence on roads. “ *Compared with three months ago, do you see police on the roads you normally drive more often, less often, or about the same?* “ Just over three-quarters (77%) of the September respondents reported seeing police “about the same” on the roads they normally drive, while about one in six (17%) said they police “more often” and just under one in twenty (4.4%) said “less often.” These results do not differ much from those in June.

Again, it is in the April survey where we see perceptions of police presence the greatest. In this earlier survey, nearly one-quarter reported seeing police “more often” (24% compared to 19% in June and 17% in September) while about 70 percent said “about the same” (somewhat lower than the 76 to 77% who said so in June and September).

When analyzed by recent drinking activity, we find there is not much difference between recent drinkers and non-drinkers for the September results. In June, somewhat more drinkers said they see police “about the same” (78% vs. 73%) while slightly more non-drinkers said they see police “more often” (21% vs. 18%).

In September – by region, the percent who said they see police “more often” ranges only from a low of about 15 to 16 percent in both north/central Illinois and the City of Chicago to a high of about 18 to 19 percent in southern Illinois and the Chicago suburbs. And, about three-quarters (75-78%) said “about the same” in each of the four regions. The percent who said “less often” ranges from 3 to 6 percent.

The September results for the two Chicago area regions do not differ much from those in June. For southern Illinois, an increase (+8%) is found in the percent who said they see police “about the same,” and this accompanied by similar decreases in the percent who said “more often” (-4%) and “less often” (-4%). For north/central Illinois, there is a decrease in the percent who said “more often” (-6%) accompanied by quite similar and small increases in the percentages who said “less often” and “about the same.”

Police enforcement of drinking laws -- comparative, general evaluation. “ *Compared to three months ago, do you think a driver who had been drinking is now more likely to be stopped by police, less likely to be stopped, or is this about the same?*” Statewide, the percent who said “more likely to be stopped” dropped from June to September (29% to 24%) while the percent who said “about the same” increased from 62 percent to 68 percent. In the earlier April survey, 26 percent said “more likely to be stopped” and 66 percent said “about the same.”

When analyzed by recent drinking activity, we find that both the June and September results show recent drinkers are somewhat less likely than non-drinkers to say it is “more likely” they will be stopped (23% vs. 36% in June; and 20% vs. 29% in September). And, drinkers are more likely than non-drinkers to say the likelihood of being stopped is “about the same” (68% vs. 55% in June; and 75% vs. 59% in September).

By region, the September results show similar results for all regions in the percent who said “more likely to be stopped” (a range of only 21 to 26%). The June to September survey results for “more likely” show little change for the two Chicago area regions (-3% for the City of Chicago and virtually no change for the suburbs). However, decreases in this percentage are found for southern Illinois (-6%) and particularly north/central Illinois (-16%).

Evaluations of penalties given to DUI offenders

Two questions in the interview solicited respondents' evaluations of the penalties given to DUI offenders. One dealt with first offenders, and the other dealt with repeat offenders. These were asked for the first time in the January 2004 survey.

Evaluations of penalties for first offenders. *“Do you think the penalties given to drivers your area who are guilty of their first offense for alcohol-impaired driving are: too lenient, too harsh, or about right?”* By about a four to three margin, a plurality of the September statewide respondents reported the penalties for first offenders are “about right” as opposed to “too lenient” (39% vs. 29%). Only one in twenty (7%) said they were “too harsh,” and about one-quarter (26%) did not express an opinion. These results are very close to the results found in the June 2005 survey (and also to those in the September 2004 survey).

Analysis by recent drinking activity. Both the June and September results show that recent drinkers are somewhat less likely than non-drinkers to say penalties are “too lenient” (28% vs. 35% in June; and 24% vs. 35% in September). In June, recent drinkers were more likely to say the penalties are “about right” (42% vs. 32%), but the difference between the two groups in September had basically disappeared (39% vs. 38%). In June, drinkers were somewhat less likely to say “don’t know” while the reverse is true in September (23% for drinkers vs. 28% for non-drinkers in June; 29% vs. 22% in September).

Analysis by region. In three of the regions, the percent who said “about right” outnumber the percent who said “too lenient” by about a four to three margin (38% to 28% for the Chicago suburbs; 38% to 30% for north/central Illinois; and 37% to 31% for the City of Chicago). A majority for the “about right” response is found in southern Illinois (51% vs. 21%). The largest June-to-September changes here are found in southern Illinois, where there is an increase of 19 percentage points for those who said the penalties are “about right” and a 13 percentage point decrease for those who said the penalties are “too lenient.”

Evaluations of penalties for repeat offenders. *“Do you think the penalties given to repeat offenders of alcohol-impaired driving are: too lenient, too harsh, or about right?”* For this question about repeat offenders, a bare majority of September respondents (50.2%) said the penalties are “too lenient” while about one-quarter (25.5%) said “about right” and hardly any (1.7%) said “too harsh.” Just over one in five (22.6%) did not express an opinion. These results are very close to the results found in the June survey. Compared to last year’s September 2004 survey, we find somewhat more 2005 respondents believing the penalties are “too lenient” (50% vs. 46%) and somewhat fewer who believe the penalties are “about right” (26% vs. 31%).

Analysis by recent drinking activity. Both the June and September results show that recent drinkers are somewhat more likely than non-drinkers to say penalties are “about right” (27.5% vs. 22% in June; and 28.4% vs. 20.5% in September). For other response categories, the differences are less – and there is not much change from June to September for either group.

Analysis by region. In September, a majority of respondents in both the Chicago suburbs and in north/central Illinois said penalties for repeat offenders are “too lenient” (52-54% vs. 24-25% for “about right”). A plurality for this response is found in both the City of Chicago (44%

vs. 26%) and in southern Illinois (45% vs. 33%). The largest June-to-September differences are found for the City of Chicago, where there is a decrease of nearly 10 percentage points for those who said “too lenient” and an increase of 9 percentage points for those who did not know. For southern Illinois, an increase of nearly 8 percentage points is found for those who said “about right.”

Roadside safety checks

Respondents were asked about their awareness and experience with roadside safety checks in general. Later in the survey instrument, they were asked about their awareness and experience with safety checks whose primary purpose was to check for alcohol-impaired driving.

It should be noted that this departs a bit from the national survey template. This was done intentionally for reasons of obtaining comparable Illinois trend data and because Illinois roadside checks are somewhat different than those in many other states.⁹

General roadside safety-check questions

In interpreting June-to-September change here, it should be noted that there was a sizeable increase from *April* to June in the percent who had seen/heard about roadside checks in the past thirty days (27% in April to 54% in June).¹⁰

Awareness of roadside safety checks. The percent who indicated that, “*in the past (thirty) days,*” they had “*seen or heard of anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks where they stop to check drivers and vehicles*” declined from somewhat more than half in June to somewhat less than in September (54% to 46%). This is still substantially higher than the approximate one-quarter (27%) who indicated such in April.¹¹

Analysis by recent drinking activity. For both recent drinkers and non-drinkers, there is a decline in awareness from June to September. The decline for non-drinkers is much greater than that for recent drinkers (56% to 46% for non-drinkers; 51% to 45% for drinkers). Note that in June, drinkers were somewhat less likely than non-drinkers to be aware of the safety checks, but in September this difference in awareness had virtually disappeared.

Analysis by region. For September, a bare majority of north/central Illinois respondents (52%) reported seeing/hearing about a roadside safety check, slightly more than was the case in the Chicago suburbs (46%), which in turn was slightly more than for either the City of Chicago or southern Illinois (39% and 41%, respectively). These September results represent sizeable decreases from June for three of the regions (-16% for southern Illinois; -14% for City of

⁹ In terms of obtaining comparable data, we had asked the general roadside check question for the past several surveys. The wording itself is a bit different from the national template because of the nature of Illinois roadchecks, checking vehicles which pass through a roadcheck for all possible traffic violations. To make the Illinois data comparable, we added a later question which asked about road safety checks which appeared to be primarily targeted for alcohol-impaired driving. We believe these questions reflect the actual situation in Illinois while also giving us comparable data.

¹⁰ The April 2005 survey was the “pre-test” survey for the Memorial Day seat belt initiative. For these results, see the Memorial Day 2005 Seat Belt Initiative Survey Report.

¹¹ For awareness of roadside safety checks, we used the final percentages after a follow-up question that confirmed the meaning of “roadside safety checks.”

Chicago; and -8% for the Chicago suburbs) and a very small decrease for north/central Illinois (-2%).

Sources of awareness. Of those who had seen or heard anything about roadside safety checks, the September percentages for three of the awareness sources range from one-quarter to one-third: newspapers (33%), friends and neighbors (27%), and television (25%). Radio (14%) is less frequently mentioned.

The results for newspapers and friends/neighbors do not change much from June to September. However, from June to September, there are declines for both television (42% to 25%) and radio (28% to 14%).

In both the June and September surveys, those who mentioned each of the three mass media sources (television, radio and newspaper) were far more likely to say they had heard of the safety checks from news stories than from advertisements.

Of those who had seen or heard anything about roadside safety checks, the statewide percent who indicated they had personally seen such checks increased slightly from June to September (45.8% to 49.6%).¹² (Here, the June result is only slightly higher than the earlier April result).

Analysis among those who were aware of roadside safety checks by recent drinking activity. The incidence of personally seeing a check is very stable for recent drinkers in the two surveys (52% and 50%), but there is an increase in this incidence for non-drinkers from June to September (43% to 53%).

Analysis among those who were aware of roadside safety checks by region. The percent of applicable respondents who had personally seen a check is highest in the two Chicago metro regions (57% for City and 54% for suburbs), followed by southern Illinois (50%) and then north/central Illinois (39%). Here, increases of 4 to 6 percentage points are found for all regions but southern Illinois where there is a 6 percentage point decrease.

When these results are based on all sample members (and not just those aware), we find the percent who have seen a roadside safety check increased from just over one in ten in April (11.7%) to a proportion between one-fifth and one-quarter in both the June and September surveys (24.5% and 22.6%).

Analysis by recent drinking activity. For all recent non-drinkers, the percent who said they had personally seen a roadside safety check is stable between June and September at about 24 percent. This incidence decreased somewhat for recent drinkers (26.4% to 22.7%).

Analysis by region. Again, when the percent is based on all sample members (and not just those who were aware), the September percent who reported personally seeing a roadside check ranges from a low of 20 percent in the two downstate regions to a high of 25 percent in the Chicago suburbs, with the City of Chicago at 22 percent. This represents a decline of 11 percentage points from the June results for southern Illinois and a decline of about half this amount for the City of Chicago (-6%). The April-to-September results show sizeable percentage point increases in those who personally reported seeing a roadside check for the Chicago suburbs (+16%), southern Illinois (+12%), and north/central Illinois (+9%). There is only a slight increase for the City of Chicago (+2%).

¹² Again, we used the final percent after a follow-up question to confirm the meaning of “roadside safety checks.”

When *those who had personally seen a roadside check*, were asked whether they have “*personally been through a roadside check in the past (thirty) days, either as a driver or as a passenger,*” the results across the three surveys are not far apart. In the first two surveys of April and June, about 53 to 54 percent of these respondents say they had personally been through a roadside check, and this climbs to 58 percent in September. *Calculated on the basis of all sample members*, this translates into just over one in twenty who said they have recently been through a roadside check in the April survey (6.4%) and 13 percent for the June and September surveys (13.0% and 13.1%).

By recent drinking activity. For those who had seen a safety check, the percent who said they had actually gone through a check increased somewhat for recent drinkers (57% to 62%) and slightly for non-drinkers (48% to 50%) from June to September. Based on all sample members, the percent who indicated having gone through a check increased slightly for drinkers (14.9% to 16.8%) and even less for non-drinkers (11.3% to 12.2%).

By region. When the percentage of *all sample members* who indicated having gone through a safety check in the past thirty days is examined for the September survey, we find that the incidence ranges only from a low of 11 percent in north/central Illinois to a high of just over 14 percent in the City of Chicago (14.5%). For the Chicago suburbs, the September and June results here are close. For north/central Illinois, there is a small increase in this percentage from June to September (8.3% to 11.3%), and for the City of Chicago and southern Illinois, there are small decreases in this percentage (18.5% to 14.5% for the City of Chicago; and 18.2% to 13.7% for southern Illinois).

Drinking-related roadside check questions (later in the interview)

Awareness of “DUI” roadside safety checks. The percent who indicated that, “*in the past (thirty) days,*” they had “*seen or heard anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks that were used primarily to check for alcohol impaired driving,*” was similar in the June and September surveys, at about one-quarter (24% in June and 27% in September).

By recent drinking activity. The results show a small increase in awareness for recent drinkers (24% to 28%) and an even smaller increase in awareness among recent non-drinkers (24% to 26%) between June and September.

By region. More than one-third (36%) of the respondents reported awareness in southern Illinois compared to one-quarter or somewhat more in the other three regions (28% for north/central Illinois; 27% for the City of Chicago; and 25% for the Chicago suburbs). These results reflect a double-digit percentage point increase in awareness for southern Illinois respondents (+12%) since June and also increases in awareness for respondents in north/central Illinois (+8%) and the City of Chicago (+5%). They reflect a small decrease in awareness since June for respondents in the Chicago suburbs (-3%).

Of those who had seen/heard of such roadside checks, the percent of those who indicated “*having personally gone through [these] checks*” almost doubled from June to September (10.1% to 17.7%). This percentage increased by nearly 5 percentage points for recent drinkers (11.9% to 16.5%) and more than doubled for non-drinkers (8.5% to 21.7%).

Among all sample members. For the statewide results, this amounts to just over 2 percent of all sample members for the June survey and about 5 percent of all sample members for the September surveys (2.5% and 4.8%). Results for recent drinkers and non-drinkers are not much different.

In September, we find the regional incidence (based on all sample members) to be higher in the two downstate regions (7.3% for southern Illinois and 6.4% for north/central Illinois) than in the two Chicago metro areas (4.8% for City of Chicago and 3.6% for the Chicago suburbs). These results represent increases of nearly 4 and nearly 3 percentage points since June for north/central Illinois and southern Illinois, respectively, and even smaller increases for the two Chicago area regions.

Messages about alcohol-impaired driving

Awareness of messages about alcohol-impaired driving. The percent who indicated that, “*in the past (thirty) days,*” they had “*read, seen or heard anything about alcohol impaired driving in Illinois,*” increased from 56 percent in June to two-thirds (67%) in September. Interestingly, in April, it was also at about two-thirds (69%).

By recent drinking activity. The results for both recent drinkers and non-drinkers reflect the statewide results for both June and September, with each group showing an increase in awareness of 11 to 13 percentage points.

By region. In September, the awareness level is very similar – around 68 to 70 percent -- across all regions but the City of Chicago where it is just over 60 percent (61%). Compared to the June results, this reflects an increase of nearly 20 percentage points for north/central Illinois (+18%), and there is also a double-digit increase for the Chicago suburbs (+11%). Smaller increases are found for southern Illinois (+8%) and for the City of Chicago (+6%).

Sources of messages. *Of those who had seen or heard such messages,* by far the greatest exposure source in both September and June is found for television (67% in September, 75% in June). In both surveys, the same additional four sources have exposure percentages that are within ten percentage points of each other: *for September,* billboards/bus signs (42%), newspapers (41%), radio (39%), and posters/bumper stickers (34%); *and for June,* newspapers (49%), billboards/bus signs (46%), posters/bumper stickers (40%), and radio (40%). In both surveys, friends/relatives trail all the previously-identified exposure sources (17% and 24%, for September and June) followed quite closely by brochures/pamphlets (14% and 21%).

Respondents who said they were exposed through television, radio, or newspapers were asked whether this was through a commercial/advertisement, through a news program or story, or something else. The results show that television and radio exposure is divided quite equally between advertisements and news stories while newspaper exposure is primarily through news stories.

The following presents results by region and based on those who are aware of any messages.

For television, September exposure among those who have seen/heard messages is at three-quarters (77%) in the City of Chicago, about two-thirds in the Chicago suburbs (66%) and southern Illinois (68%), and just over six in ten for north/central Illinois (61%). This reflects a decrease since June in all regions (-16% for City of Chicago; -11% for southern Illinois; and about -6% for both the Chicago suburbs and north/central Illinois).

For radio, September exposure is higher in the Chicago suburbs and southern Illinois (43-44%) than in the City of Chicago (35%) and north/central Illinois (33%). A small increase

from June to September is found in southern Illinois (+4%) while a small decrease is found in the City of Chicago (-5%).

For newspapers, September exposure is the highest in southern Illinois (58%) and lowest in the Chicago suburbs (35%), with exposure being about the same in the City of Chicago and north/central Illinois (around 44%). From June to September, the Chicago suburbs show a double-digit decrease in this percentage (-17%) while a much smaller decrease is found for north/central Illinois (-6%) and a small increase is found for southern Illinois (+4%).

For billboards or bus signs, the September exposure percentage is highest in north/central Illinois (56%) and lowest in the Chicago suburbs and southern Illinois (32-34%), with the City of Chicago at just over four in ten (42%). The southern Illinois results here show a double-digit decrease since June (-18%), and the Chicago suburbs show a decrease about half this size (-8%).

For posters or bumper stickers, the September exposure percentages are somewhat higher in the two Chicago area regions (36-39%) than in the two downstate regions (30% each). Compared to June, these represent decreases for all regions (-8% for the City of Chicago; -7% for southern Illinois; -5% for the Chicago suburbs; and -4% for north/central Illinois).

For brochures or pamphlets, the September exposure percentages are somewhat higher in the two Chicago area regions (15-17%) than in the two downstate regions (10-12%). Since June, these reflect a double-digit decrease in the Chicago suburbs (-12%) and smaller decreases in both southern Illinois (-8%) and the City of Chicago (-7%).

For friends or relatives, the September exposure is over one-fifth for both the City of Chicago and southern Illinois (each at about 23%) and is lower in both north/central Illinois (16%) and the Chicago suburbs (14%). In the Chicago suburbs, this reflects a 12 percentage point decrease from June.

Reported trend in number of messages. *Those who said they were exposed to messages about alcohol impaired driving (about 56% to two-thirds of the respondents) were asked whether "the number of messages that [they] have seen or heard about alcohol impaired driving in the past (thirty) days is more than usual, fewer than usual, or about the same as usual."* In September, the statewide percent of these respondents saying "more than usual" was about 17 percent, actually somewhat less than that found in either June (21%) or April (20%). Almost three-quarters of the September respondents (74%) said "about the same as usual," a proportion virtually the same as that found in both June and April (73% and 75%). About 8 percent of the September respondents said "fewer than usual," a proportion slightly higher than that in June (5%) and April (3%).

By recent drinking activity. In September, recent drinkers were somewhat less likely than non-drinkers to say the numbers of messages was "more than usual" (14% vs. 20%) and somewhat more likely to say the number was "about the same as usual" (76% vs. 71%). The same basic pattern was found in June (19% vs. 23% for "more than usual"; and 76% vs. 70% for "about the same").

By region. The September results show that the percent who said "more than usual" is slightly greater in the two Chicago area regions (18% in the Chicago suburbs and 17% in the City of Chicago) than in north/central Illinois (15%), which in turn has a percentage slightly greater than that in southern Illinois (13%). For all but the Chicago suburbs – where not much change from June is found, the September "more than usual" percent is less than that found in June (-8% in southern Illinois; -7% in the City of Chicago; and a smaller -4% in north/central Illinois).

Awareness of selected traffic safety slogans

The September results and recent trends. Respondents were asked about their awareness of fifteen selected traffic safety “slogans,” asked in a random order. Eight explicitly relate to seat belts. The following Table S-1 presents the results, ordered by the sizes of the difference in awareness from the June to September 2005 surveys. The table also presents the April to June differences. Most slogans clearly related to DUI are in italics, and the most recent slogan is in non-italic bold, “**You drink and drive. You lose.**”¹³

**Table S-1: Awareness Levels of Slogans
Ordered by Change from June to September, 2005**

<i>Slogans</i>	<i>April Pre- test</i>	<i>June Post- test</i>	<i>April- June Diff.*</i>	<i>Sept. 2005</i>	<i>June- Sept. Diff.*</i>
You drink, you drive, you lose	70%	66%	-5%	76%	+10%
<i>Drive hammered, get nailed</i>	37%	33%	-4%	37%	+5%
<i>Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers*</i>	53%	48%	-5%	52%	+4%
<i>Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars *</i>	29%	21%	-8%	25%	+4%
<i>Step away from your vehicle</i>	14%	13%	-1%	15%	+2%
Buckle Up America	52%	45%	-7%	46%	+2%
Checkpoint Strikeforce	12%	8%	-3%	10%	+2%
<i>Drive smart, drive sober</i>	60%	57%	-4%	58%	+1%
<i>Friends don't let friends drive drunk</i>	86%	82%	-5%	82%	-1%
Smart motorists always respect trucks	10%	8%	-1%	8%	-1%
<i>Cell phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunk driver</i>	35%	40%	+5%	38%	-2%
Operation A-B-C	4%	5%	+1%	3%	-2%
<i>Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number</i>	22%	20%	-3%	18%	-2%
Children in back	20%	22%	+1%	18%	-4%
Click It or Ticket	81%	91%	+10%	86%	-5%

*Differences are based on actual differences, not the rounded integer results presented. These are percentage point increases/decreases.

**In earlier surveys, these were presented as one slogan.

An examination of the most recent June to September differences shows that the slogan, “*You drink and drive. You lose,*” is the only slogan with a double-digit percentage point increase in awareness from June to September (+10%, 66% to 76%). An earlier 4.5 percentage point decrease from April to June accompanies the most recent gain, for a total gain of 6 percentage points from April to September (from 70 to 76%).

¹³ The previous variant of this slogan is “You drink and drive, you lose.” This wording was used through the January 2004 survey and was changed starting in May 2004.

In terms of September results, awareness of the slogan, “*You drink and drive. You Lose,*” is the third-best known slogan, behind the slogans of: “*Click It or Ticket*” at 86 percent (up from 81 percent in April, but down from 91% in June); and “*Friends don’t let friends drive drunk*” at 81 percent (down from 86% in April and 82% in June).

Further analyses for major campaign slogan. We focus on the major slogan in the recent 2005 Labor Day holiday initiative, “*You drink and drive. You lose,*” for our further subgroup analyses.

By recent drinking activity. The September 2005 survey results show similar awareness levels for both recent drinkers and non-drinkers, at about 76 percent. This represents an increase from the June awareness levels for both groups. Since the June awareness level for drinkers was somewhat higher than that for non-drinkers (68% vs. 64%), the June-to-September increase is less for drinkers (+7 percentage points vs. +12 percentage points).

By region. The September 2005 survey results show awareness levels at or just under 80 percent for all regions but the City of Chicago (southern Illinois at 80%; north/central Illinois at 80%; and Chicago suburbs at 78%). Awareness was at 66 percent for the City of Chicago. [See Table S-2.]

From June to September, we find double-digit percentage point increases in awareness for the Chicago suburbs (+16%) and for southern Illinois (+13%) and also a sizeable increase for north/central Illinois (+8%). Awareness in the City of Chicago from June to September shows only a small increase (+3%).

Looking at the entire survey period of April to September, we find substantial awareness increases in the slogan for both the Chicago suburbs (+10%) and for southern Illinois (+9%). Here, we find only a very small increase for north/central Illinois (+3%). Awareness levels for the City of Chicago are basically constant across the entire three surveys.

Table S-2
Awareness of Major DUI Slogan of 2004 Labor Day Weekend Campaign,
“You drink, you drive, you lose”*

<i>Region</i>	<i>April 2004- Survey</i>	<i>June Pre- test</i>	<i>April to June diff.*</i>	<i>Sept Post-Test 2005</i>	<i>June to Sept. diff.*</i>	<i>Total Diff.</i>
STATEWIDE	70%	66%	-5%	76%	+12%	+6%
City of Chicago	65%	63%	-2%	66%	+3%	+1%
Chicago suburbs	68%	62%	-6%	78%	+16%	+10%
Downstate	76%	72%	-4%	80%	+9%	+5%
North/central Illinois	77%	72%	-5%	80%	+8%	+3%
Southern Illinois	70%	67%	-4%	80%	+13%	+9%

*Differences are based on actual differences, not the rounded integer results presented. These are percentage point increases/decreases.

The 2002 through 2005 trends. Because there were media/enforcement campaigns going back to calendar year 2002 for which we have pre-test and post-test information for numerous selected traffic safety slogans, it is worth presenting the full cross-sectional trend results. These are presented in Table S-3, according to level of awareness in the September 2005 survey. The most recent DUI-related slogan is in bold; other DUI-related slogans are in italics.

Table: Slogans - 3
Awareness of Selected Traffic Safety Slogans,
April 2002 through September 2005

Slogan	April 2002 Pre-test	June 2002 Post-test	Nov 2002 Pre-test	Dec 2002 Post-test	May 2003 Pre-test	June 2003 Post-test	June 2003	January 2004	May 2004 Pre-Test	June 2004 Post-test	Sept 2004	April 2005 Pre-Test	June 2005 Post-test	Sept 2005
Click It or Ticket	41%	71%	67%	71%	67%	85%	83%	87%	84%	90%	88%	81%	91%	86%
<i>Friends don't let friends drive drunk</i>	na	na	na	na	na	89%	89%	86%	85%	90%	85%	86%	82%	81%
You drink and drive. You lose	na	na	na	na	na	55%	62%	78%	68%	73%	78%	70%	66%	76%
<i>Drive smart, drive sober</i>	61%	62%	58%	62%	65%	67%	66%	68%	65%	67%	63%	60%	57%	58%
<i>Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers*</i>	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	48%	50%	54%	51%	55%	54%	53%	48%	52%
Buckle Up America	60%	60%	53%	54%	48%	53%	55%	53%	52%	64%	51%	52%	45%	46%
<i>Cell phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunk driver.</i>	36%	41%	45%	44%	39%	46%	42%	40%	43%	46%	36%	35%	40%	38%
<i>Drive hammered, get nailed</i>	na	na	na	na	na	30%	52%	46%	45%	46%	41%	37%	33%	37%
Children in back	20%	25%	19%	21%	22%	24%	25%	24%	20%	26%	20%	20%	22%	18%
<i>Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars*</i>	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	24%	30%	30%	27%	30%	28%	29%	21%	25%
<i>Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number</i>	na	na	na	na	na	22%	24%	26%	24%	24%	22%	22%	20%	18%
<i>Step away from your vehicle</i>	na	na	na	na	na	na	16%	na	13%	14%	16%	14%	13%	15%
Smart motorists always respect trucks	6%	12%	8%	11%	11%	11%	12%	9%	12%	10%	9%	10%	8%	8%
Checkpoint Strikeforce	na	na	na	na	na	na	9%	na	10%	9%	8%	12%	8%	10%
Operation A-B-C	4%	6%	4%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	4%	5%	3%

*Prior to the June 2003 Post-test survey, this was one slogan.