



ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

REPORT NUMBER: FHWA-AZ88-261

DRIVER IMPROVEMENT INDEX

Final

Prepared by:
National Public Services Research Institute
8201 Corporate Drive, Suite 220
Landover, Maryland 20785

June 1988

Prepared for:
Arizona Department of Transportation
206 South 17th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
in cooperation with
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Arizona Department of Transportation or the Federal Highways Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. Trade or manufacturer's names which may appear herein are cited only because they are considered essential to the objectives of the report. The U.S. Government and the State of Arizona do not endorse products or manufacturers.

TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT NO. FHWA-AZ88-261		2. GOVERNMENT ACCESSION NO.		3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NO.	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Driver Improvement Index				5. REPORT DATE June 1988	
				6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE	
7. AUTHOR(S) James A. McKnight				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Arizona Department of Transportation Highways Division 206 South 17th Ave. Phoenix, AZ 85007				10. WORK UNIT NO.	
				11. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. HPR-PL-1-33 Item 261	
12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS Arizona Department of Transportation 206 South 17th Ave. Phoenix, AZ 85007				13. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final	
				14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE	
15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared in Cooperation with the U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.					
16. ABSTRACT This study provides an analysis of the current Driver Improvement Program and the associated traffic violation point reduction scheme for Arizona. The analysis is accomplished under five main tasks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To review the current literature and ongoing research regarding alternative programs of point allocation for traffic violations and to review alternative driver improvement programs. 2. To conduct a complete inventory of the Arizona driver improvement system and compare it to systems used by other states. 3. To perform an analysis of the effectiveness of point allocation systems and develop an effective and feasible system for Arizona. 4. To perform an analysis of the effectiveness of driver improvement educational programs and develop improvements for the driver improvement educational program structure for Arizona. 5. To perform an experimental evaluation of the effectiveness of an improved Arizona driver improvement educational program as a deterrent to accidents and violations. 					
17. KEY WORDS				23. REGISTRANT'S SEAL	
18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT					
19. SECURITY CLASSIF. (of this report) Unclassified		20. SECURITY CLASSIF. (of this page) Unclassified		21. NO. OF PAGES 109	22. PRICE

PREFACE

This report was prepared by Dr. A. James McKnight, National Public Service Research Institute in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. Others participating in the program development were:

- o Mr. Kevin Halcik, Motor Vehicles Division, Arizona Department of Transportation
- o Dr. Francis C. Kenel and Mr. Charles A. Butler, American Automobile Association
- o Mr. A. Scott McKnight, Ms. Ruth T. Freitas, and Ms. Yvonne P. Mattocks, National Public Services Research Institute.

The content of this report reflects the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The content does not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Arizona Department of Transportation or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation. Trade or manufacturer names which may appear herein are cited only because they are considered essential to the objectives of the report. The United States Government and the State of Arizona do not endorse products or manufacturers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
Comparison of Arizona System to Alternative Systems.....	4
Point Allocation Systems.....	4
Driver Improvement Structure.....	6
Analysis of Alternative Point Allocation Systems.....	13
Individual Violations and Driving Record.....	17
Point Accumulation and Driving Record.....	19
Influence of Driver Characteristics Upon Relationships...	20
Analysis of Driver Improvement Programs.....	24
Warning Letters.....	24
Group Programs.....	27
Individual Contact.....	38
License Suspension.....	39
Determination of Driver Improvement Standards and Procedures.....	44
Warning Letters.....	45
Driver Improvement Course.....	46
Suspension.....	50
Recommendations and Implementation Strategies.....	51
Appendix A: References.....	52
Appendix B: Letters of Warning.....	59
Appendix C: Traffic Violator School Curriculum Guide.....	65

INTRODUCTION

Most drivers attempt to abide by the laws that regulate traffic, although they occasionally may violate a law—such as exceeding the speed limit—in their haste to get from one place to another. Some violations are inadvertent; some are deliberate. There is, however, a subgroup of drivers, whose frequency of traffic violations sets them apart from the general public.

The attempt to deal with persistent traffic violators is primarily a State responsibility since it is almost entirely at a State level that the records needed to identify such drivers are kept. Of course local courts can, and some do, take action against traffic violators based upon records obtained from State agencies. However, such local and individual actions are rarely sufficiently structured or consistently enough applied to match the driver improvement "system" operated by State agencies.

TRAFFIC VIOLATOR PROBLEM

Persistent violators of the law, at least those apprehended and convicted, make up a relatively small fraction of the driving population. This group generally makes up about 5% of the population. This relatively small group of drivers certainly does not account for all or even a major portion of the accidents that occur within the State. However, traffic violators are a legitimate target for driver improvement action for several reasons.

The first and most important reason for attempting to improve the performance of traffic violators is their relatively high accident involvement. While they may not account for the majority of the driving traffic accidents, they are certainly responsible for more than their share. The correlation between traffic convictions and accident frequencies has been demonstrated consistently (Brezina, 1969; Burg, 1968; Campbell, 1958; Flowers et al., 1980; Harano, Peck and McBride, 1975; Harrington, 1971; Peck, McBride and Coppin, 1971; Schuster and Guilford, 1964). These studies show that as a group, drivers with two or more traffic violations in a year—"6 points" in Arizona—are 3 to 4 times more likely to be involved in an accident than drivers with conviction-free records.

Specific Deterrence

Singling out traffic violators because they have more accidents presumes that driver improvement can do something to affect behavior of drivers, that is, that it constitutes a specific deterrent to further violations and accidents. The effectiveness of driver improvement in this regard will be discussed later in connection with specific driver improvement actions under Task 4 "An Analysis of the Effect of Various Driver Improvement Programs and Developments upon Improvements for Arizona."

General Deterrence

In addition to serving as a deterrent to recidivism among convicted offenders, driver improvement is generally believed to play a role in deterring many in the driving population at large from even becoming offenders. To be sure, the same role is probably played by the fines and other court actions that accompany individual offenses. Yet, it is likely that the prospect of having to attend a Driver Improvement School or Special Examination, along with the prospect of increased insurance rates, helps encourage law abiding behavior, particularly on the part of those who have already been convicted once and for whom driver improvement action is less than a remote possibility.

Punishment

Whether or not driver improvement is a deterrent, general or specific, it represents a punitive action that has been earned by the flagrant traffic violator. Society punishes wrong-doers simply for doing wrong, whether or not it deters other or the same wrong-doers. In this day of litigation, failure of motor vehicle administrations to take action can even become grounds for a negligence suit by some third party whom the traffic violator injures.

DRIVER IMPROVEMENT NEEDS

Under contract to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), National Public Services Research Institute (NPSRI) identified the requirements for effective driver improvement action and organized them into a formal system (McKnight, Simone, and Weidman, 1982). This system was adopted by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators as its recommended program and incorporated into a set of guidelines.

Several States are in the process of modifying their driver improvement program to correspond more closely with the AAMVA recommended system. This system was designed specifically to overcome the shortcomings described in the preceding section and to make use of driver improvement actions that have demonstrated their effectiveness through controlled research studies.

While the AAMVA/NHTSA driver improvement system is designed to overcome the violation problem described in the preceding section, it cannot be simply "installed" in Arizona. Like any other State, Arizona has its own unique laws and regulations which any driver improvement system must be tailored to accommodate. It also has its own drivers. While the needs of drivers obviously do not change at the State line, there are significant differences among States, if not in the types of problems that drivers face, at least in the magnitude of those problems. For example, the problem represented by older drivers with diminished driving capacities is much greater in Arizona than in most other States.

While we are far from knowing all there is to know about the improvement of drivers with excessive numbers of traffic accidents and violations, we certainly know more than is reflected in the current Arizona driver

improvement system. The means by which the current system may be improved is what will be addressed by the present report.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study may be summarized as follows:

1. To review the current literature and ongoing research regarding alternative programs of point allocation for traffic violations and to review alternative driver improvement programs.
2. To conduct a complete inventory of the Arizona driver improvement system and compare it to systems used by other States.
3. To perform an analysis of the effectiveness of point allocation systems and develop an effective and feasible system for Arizona.
4. To perform an analysis of the effectiveness of driver improvement educational programs and develop improvements for the driver improvement educational program structure for Arizona.
5. To perform an experimental evaluation of the effectiveness of an improved Arizona driver improvement educational program as a deterrent to accidents and violations.

STRUCTURE OF REPORT

This report is organized in terms of the tasks under which the work was carried out. The tasks, in turn, follow the objectives of the study. They are:

Task 1 - Review of the Literature

Task 2 - Comparison of Arizona System to Alternative Systems

Task 3 - Analysis of Alternative Point Allocation Strategies

Task 4 - Analysis of Driver Improvement Programs

Task 5 - Determination of Driver Improvement Standards and Procedures

Task 6 - Recommendations and Implementation Strategies

Task 1, Review of the Literature, involved an activity that supported the other project tasks and is, therefore, not written up separately. The results of the literature review will be incorporated into the discussion of other tasks in connection with those topics to which they apply.

COMPARISON OF ARIZONA SYSTEM TO ALTERNATIVE SYSTEMS

The first step in the attempt to improve the Arizona driver improvement system was to analyze the systems employed by other States. The analysis examined two aspects of driver improvement systems:

- o Point allocation systems
- o Driver improvement structure

Information concerning point allocation was obtained through direct contact with State licensing agencies. Information about other aspects of driver improvement was obtained from a comparative study of licensing systems carried out by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA 1985).

POINT ALLOCATION SYSTEMS

An analysis was made of the point allocation systems employed by various States in selecting drivers for the different stages of a driver improvement system. Point allocation refers to the number of points that are assigned for different types of offenses. By themselves, "points" are meaningless—simply arbitrary numbers. They only assume meaning in relation to specific driver improvement actions. The fact that one State may assign two points for speeding while another assigns six points provides practically no information. The State that assigns two points per violation may suspend a license on six points, while the State that assigns six points may not suspend the license even at 24 points.

Basis of Comparison

More meaningful than simply comparing points is a comparison of States in relation to specific driver improvement actions for comparable traffic offenses. Comparable driver improvement actions might include the points at which (1) the first warning is sent, (2) the first contact with the driver improvement agency is required on the part of the driver (e.g., a meeting, course, interview, hearing), and (3) the point at which a license is suspended. Of these three levels of action, license suspension is the only one that is common to all jurisdictions. Several States have no contact with traffic offenders until their licenses are eligible for suspension.

In order to make comparisons with respect to various driver improvement actions, it is desirable to settle upon a particular traffic offense as a basis for comparison. Probably the best common denominator among traffic offenses is the speeding offense of 10-19 mph over the speed limit. In almost all state driver improvement systems, it is possible to determine the number of such speeding offenses that would result in a license suspension action.

For comparison purposes, all offenses were accumulated over a one-year period. This is the most common interval for accumulating traffic offenses

under a driver improvement program. All other periods of time were reduced to their one-year equivalents. For example, if a State suspended a driver's license for six speeding offenses in two years, this was considered the equivalent of three speeding offenses in one year.

Requests for up-to-date driver license manuals were sent to the 50 States plus the District of Columbia. Information on each State's point allocation system was collected from the driver manuals. Telephone interviews were then conducted with driver improvement personnel in each of the 51 jurisdictions in order to clear up ambiguities and fill gaps in the information provided by the manuals.

State Point Allocation

The results of the survey of State point allocations appear in Table 1 on page 7. The specific entries in this table are as follows:

Count Points or Violations--Whether the State assigns points to various violations or simply counts the number of violations for the purposes of driver improvement action.

Points for Speeding--Number of points for a mid-range speeding offense, i.e., 10-19 mph over limit.

Warning Letter--The number of points at which a warning notice is sent to violators, if the State sends one.

Suspension Level--The number of points at which license suspension is first introduced, even though it may be routinely waived for participation in a hearing, meeting, or course.

Accumulation Period--The number of months over which points are accumulated for action.

Speeding Violations per 12 Months for Suspension--The number of mid-range speeding violations for a 12-month period resulting in suspension.

In comparing Arizona's point allocation system with other States', the most informative column is "Speed Violations per 12 Months for Suspension". These figures express point allocation in terms of most common traffic violations rather than in terms of arbitrary points. Using speeding violations as a measure, we can see that 48 of the 51 reporting jurisdictions will suspend a license on the equivalent of three speeding violations in 12 months $\pm 50\%$. Arizona is clearly with the rest of the country in this comparison. At first glance, it might appear that there is as much similarity among States in point count as there is in number of violations per 12 months. However, if the period of time over which offenses are accumulated is taken into account, it is apparent that the States vary widely in point count.

While most States have the authority to suspend licenses for three violations in a year, few of them actually do. Like Arizona, most States allow drivers with point totals at the suspension threshold to retain their licenses by enrolling in a driver improvement course. While the survey of States did not include data on what happens after participation in a course, the practice in those States for which information is currently available is to suspend the license should the driver be convicted of another traffic offense within 12 months after completing the course. This is the same practice that is employed in Arizona.

The point allocation system employed by Arizona not only follows that used by the rest of the States, but generally complies with the provisions of the driver improvement guidelines issued by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators. The AAMVA system appears to make one less distinction than Arizona, 1 or 2 points rather than 1, 2 or 3 points. However, it doesn't really do so since there are no 1 point violations. In any case, these two systems produce similar action after the same number of offenses.

The survey of States made no attempt to examine the dispensation of alcohol-related offenses. However, most of the state driver improvement systems for which data were available to the project do not mingle alcohol offenses with other moving violations. Rather, driver control action is taken by the state licensing agency on the basis of individual alcohol offenses. While Arizona has included alcohol offenses in its point allocation system for driver improvement action in the past, pending legislation would mandate certain driver control actions on the basis of individual alcohol offenses. Therefore, there is no need to maintain alcohol offenses in the point system. However, alcohol violations will be discussed further in connection with driver improvement activities to be dealt with in later tasks.

DRIVER IMPROVEMENT STRUCTURE

The second aspect of the driver improvement system to be addressed by the present study was its structure; that is, the series of driver improvement actions triggered by various point accumulations. A comprehensive survey of all the driver improvement actions taken by the various States was beyond the scope of the present project. However, a comparison of the Arizona driver improvement structure with what is going on nationally could be performed using information available from the published literature.

The discussion of driver improvement structure will be organized in terms of the following elements:

- o Levels of driver improvement action
- o Special driver improvement groups
- o Exit from the driver improvement system
- o Administrative-judicial coordination

TABLE 1
STATE POINT ALLOCATIONS

STATE	POINT VS. VIOLATIONS	POINTS FOR SPEEDING	WARNING LEVEL (POINTS)	SUSPENSION LEVEL (POINTS)	ACCUMULATION PERIOD (Months)	SPEED VIOLATIONS/12 MONTHS FOR SUSPENSION
AK	POINT	4	NOT USED	12	12	3
AL	POINT	3	9	12	24	2
AR	POINT	6	9	14	18	1.5
AZ	POINT	3	NOT USED	8	12	2.7
CA	POINT	1	2	4	12	4
CO	POINT	4	NOT USED	12/18	12/24	3
CT	POINT	2	7	11	36	3.7
DC	POINT	4	NOT USED	8	36	0.8
DE	POINT	4	NOT USED	8	36	0.8
FL	POINT	4	NOT USED	12/18/24	12/18/36	2
GA	POINT	3	9	15	24	2.5
HI	POINT	3	6	12	12	4
IA	VIOLATION	1	NOT USED	3	12	3
ID	POINT	3	8	12/18/24	12/18/36	2
IL	VIOLATION	1	2	3	12	3
IN	POINT	4	12	17	24	2.1
KS	VIOLATION	1	3	3	12	3
KY	POINT	6	NOT USED	12	24	1
LA	POINT	1	2	10	60	2
MA	VIOLATION	1	NOT USED	3	12	3
MD	POINT	2	3	8	24	2
ME	POINT	5	7	15	36	1
MI	POINT	4	4/8	12	24	1.5
MN	VIOLATION	1	2	3	12	3
MO	POINT	3	4	8	18	1.8
MS	VIOLATION	1	3	5	24	2.5
MT	POINT	3	7	15	36	1.7
NC	POINT	3	7	12	36	1.3
ND	POINT	6	NOT USED	12	LIFE	2.6
NE	POINT	2	NOT USED	12	24	3
NH	POINT	3	8	12	LIFE	4
NJ	POINT	4	6	12	24	1.5
NM	POINT	4	NOT USED	12	12	3
NV	POINT	2	6	12	12	6
NY	POINT	3	4	11	18	2.4
OH	POINT	2	6	12	24	2
OH	POINT	2	NOT USED	10	60	1
OR	VIOLATION	1	2	5	18	3.3
PA	POINT	3	NOT USED	11	LIFE	4
RI	VIOLATION	1	NOT USED	NOT USED	N/A	N/A
SC	POINT	2	6	12	24	3
SD	POINT	2	8	15	12	3
TN	POINT	3	6	12	12	4
TX	VIOLATION	1	NOT USED	4	12	4
UT	POINT	55	70/120	200	36	1.2
VA	POINT	4	6	12	12	3
VT	POINT	3	5	10	24	1.7
WA	VIOLATION	1	3	4	24	2
WI	POINT	3	6	12	12	4
WV	POINT	6	6	2	24	1
WY	VIOLATION	1	3	4	12	4

Levels of Driver Improvement Action

The most common progression of driver improvement actions involves the following three steps:

- o Warnings
- o Interaction
- o Suspension

These activities will be discussed in considerable detail in a later section, "Analysis of Driver Improvement Programs." This discussion identifies what the various actions are and which States employ them.

Warnings

Advisory or warning notices represent the first driver control action taken on the basis of a poor driving record. Their purpose is to notify drivers of their status relative to the driver improvement structure and the actions that may be taken if their driving records do not improve.

At the present time, 41 out of 51 jurisdictions send out warning notices. Arizona is not among them, although issuance of warning letters is being contemplated. Thirty-five States reported point values at which advisory letters are sent. Expressed in terms of numbers of speeding violations, 18 States send out notices on the second violation while 15 send them out on the third violation; the remaining 2 States send them out on the first and fourth violations.

Interaction

The next most serious action taken for a poor driving record is the requirement imposed upon drivers to participate in some form of interaction with the driver license agency or some designated service provider. Among those States which provide warnings, interaction is usually required for a violation within 12 months following receipt of the warning letter.

The level at which interaction takes place is typically that at which licenses are eligible for suspension, the threat of suspension being the primary means by which drivers are induced to participate. The number of violations leading to some form of interaction can, therefore, be identified in Table 1 by referring to the "Speeding Violations for 12 Months for Suspension" column.

Interaction between licensing agencies and drivers can take any one of three forms:

Individual Interview--A one-on-one interview intended to diagnose individual driving problems and recommend individual solutions.

Group Interview--A small group interaction intended primarily to disseminate information that will help drivers recognize their problems and overcome them.

Courses--A large group educational program intended to develop knowledges and attitudes that will lead to more safe and lawful driving.

The length of the interaction typically varies with the number of drivers involved, individual interviews rarely taking more than an hour, group interviews typically running one-two hours, and courses up to eight hours.

Interviews

Thirty-nine jurisdictions report carrying out individual interviews as a driver improvement action. Arizona is not one of the States. Unfortunately, from information provided by States it is difficult to distinguish between interviews, conducted to identify and correct driver deficiencies, and "hearings", held to allow drivers to contest some driver improvement action. Typically, the interview is mandatory, while the hearing is held at the request of the driver. Using this as a guide, it is judged that only 21 jurisdictions hold true interviews. Hearings will be discussed later.

In addition to the individual interviews given, some 23 States provide group interviews. These are similar in purpose to the individual interview, but focus less upon individual problems and more upon general information dissemination.

Courses

Forty-three out of the 51 jurisdictions include some form of driver education course among driver improvement actions. In 23 of the States, participation in the course is mandatory, under the threat of suspension, while in the other 19 States drivers may elect to participate, with satisfactory completion being considered in the decision as to whether or not to suspend the license. In 19 States the course curriculum is established by the State while in the remaining States the curriculum must only be approved by the State. Where States do not establish the curriculum, the National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course (DDC) is the single most commonly used curriculum, with the American Automobile Association's Driver Improvement Program being the next most common.

In 14 of the States, the curriculum is administered by the State, while in the remaining 28 it is offered by private service providers. There is little relationship between who establishes and who administers the course. Among those States that administer the course, half give their own program, while half use a publicly available curriculum such as DDC. In the States where the course is administered by private agencies, the course given is almost equally divided between State and publicly available programs. In 25 States, the costs of the course are borne by the participants through payment of a fee.

Of the 42 jurisdictions in which courses are taught, 27 report that they offer a point reduction for successful completion of the program. The remaining States simply suspend licenses for those who do not participate. The distinction between the two systems is a subtle one; under either system, failure to participate results in license suspension.

Suspension

All states suspend licenses when the number of violations or points exceed some level. Table 1 provided the suspension levels for various States expressed both in terms of point total and number of speeding violations.

No attempt was made to ascertain the duration of suspension. Within each State, the length of suspension depends upon the driver's point or violation accumulation and previous driver improvement actions taken.

An important element of license suspension is what must be done to reinstate the license, specifically whether special SR-22 insurance coverage is required. Such a requirement typically results in the failure of many drivers to seek reinstatement when a period of suspension is over. The result is a de facto suspension that may extend the regular suspension right up to the point of renewal. Arizona is one of five States that requires SR-22 coverage for reinstatement of all licenses. An additional seven States require it under specific conditions, such as DWIs, mandatory suspension, and other circumstances.

Special Groups

In several States, driver improvement actions are differentiated by category of driver. The most common basis for making such distinctions is driver experience. In certain States, new drivers on "provisional" or "probationary" licenses are subject to lower thresholds for driver improvement actions, including warnings, interviews, courses, and suspension. Three states known to have such differential thresholds are California, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

The only other use of differential point criteria to emerge from the survey is the use of a higher point total for professional drivers. This practice is employed in California, where drivers who compile more than 25,000 miles a year are permitted a higher point accumulation before action is taken than are lower mileage drivers.

Exit from Driver Improvement System

Just as a worsening driver record results in greater exposure to driver improvement action, so an improving record should result in decreased exposure to driver improvement action. This decrease in exposure to driver improvement, resulting in eventual exit from the driver improvement system, occurs through the removal of points from a driver's record over periods of time without violations. While a large number of systems are used to remove points from the driver record, they may be classified in the following three categories:

Progressive Point Reduction--Under this system, employed by 11 States, each year of violation-free driving results in removal of a specified number of points from the driver's record. The number of points removed per year range between one and six, but are generally the equivalent of two to three speeding violations.

Expiration of Accumulation Period--In most of the remaining States, including Arizona, it is not point totals, but the number of points over a specified period that leads to driver improvement action. Under such a system, expiration of accumulation period will mean that points no longer count. For example, where points are accumulated over 12 months, the points for a particular violation will not count beyond 12 months after that violation. Twelve months after the last violation, the driver has "0" points as far as driver improvement activity is concerned.

Scheduled Phase-out--The system proposed by AAMVA phases drivers out of the system by moving them down a level in the driver improvement ladder for each specified period without traffic violations.

The progressive point removal system has the disadvantage of keeping some drivers "trapped" at high point levels. A driver whose license is at a suspension level and who continues to get one violation a year, may never realize a reduction in point level. The disadvantage of simply accumulating points over a limited period, and dropping those that occurred before that period, is that a driver who succeeds in avoiding a violation for an interval equal to the accumulation period (e.g., 12 months) can go from an extremely high point total to no points at all. Thus, where another violation would have brought a 12-month license suspension on one date, it won't even lead to a warning notice a few months later. The AAMVA system was proposed as a means of avoiding the disadvantages of the two other systems by providing a gradual exit from the driver improvement system based upon demonstrated improvement in performance.

Administrative-Judicial Coordination

The driver improvement system operated by the licensing administration in every State is paralleled by driver improvement systems operating under referral from individual courts. Lack of coordination between these two systems can result in the following:

Duplication--Drivers may be suspended or sent to an instruction program by both the court and licensing agency for the same offense.

Escape--When courts allow violators to avoid conviction by participating in training, the violations fail to appear on the driving record and frequent traffic violators cannot be identified for appropriate action.

To help reduce the extent of this problem, a number of States post a record of participation in driver improvement programs to the driver license file. Almost all States maintain a record of actions carried out under the state driver improvement program, including participation in driver

improvement courses. This permits courts to have such information on hand at the time they are considering action for any individual violator.

In the AAMVA report, some 32 States also reported making participation in court referral programs part of the driver record. This number is probably an overestimate since one of the States identified as using this practice is Arizona and the analysis of the Arizona system carried out under this project discloses no such practice. Since participation in court referral programs is typically made in lieu of conviction for a traffic violation, the report of participation in a course is the only indication that an offense has occurred. Generally, information concerning participation in court referral programs comes from the organizations providing the instruction rather than from the courts.

Summary

The Arizona Driver Improvement System does not differ markedly from the systems employed by most other States. Major points of similarity and dissimilarity involve the following:

Points of Similarity

- o Assigning points for various categories of traffic violations including points for determining appropriate driver improvement action.
- o Allowing licenses to be suspended at the equivalent of three speeding violations in a year.
- o Permitting drivers at the threshold for suspension to retain their licenses by participating in a driver improvement course.
- o Suspending licenses of drivers who are convicted of a traffic violation within 12 months following completion of the course.
- o Not imposing a lower point threshold for driver improvement action upon new or youthful drivers.
- o Not providing a system for gradually phasing drivers out of the driver improvement system as their violation record improves.

Points of Dissimilarity

- o Not sending out warning letters to drivers after two to three violations in a year and before taking driver improvement action.
- o Requiring special SR-22 coverage before allowing reinstatement of suspended drivers' licenses.

These issues will be further addressed in later sections as modifications to the structure and content of the Arizona driver improvement system are recommended.

ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE POINT ALLOCATION SYSTEMS

At the same time the Arizona point allocation system was being compared with systems employed by other States, an analysis was undertaken to assess the extent to which the Arizona point allocation system was attaining its own objectives. While the objectives of the point system are not explicitly stated in any of the materials available to the project staff, they can be readily inferred. The presumed purpose in having a point system is to allow the MVD to take driver improvement action on the basis of an operator's overall driving record rather than on the basis of a single offense. The two actions available to the MVD are license suspension/revocation or required attendance at a driver improvement school.

According to section 28-446 of Arizona Transportation Laws, these two actions can be taken when a driver "has been convicted with such frequency of serious offenses against traffic regulations governing the movement of vehicles as to indicate a disrespect for traffic laws and a disregard for the safety of other persons on the highways." Accordingly, a driver improvement system would be fulfilling its objectives to the extent that it is capable of identifying drivers who can be accurately characterized as evidencing disrespect for the law and disregard for the safety of others.

While such terms as "disrespect" and "disregard" involve subjective judgment, they are not without some objective basis. Disrespect for the law should manifest itself in large numbers of violations, while disregard for the safety of others should reveal itself in a long term pattern of accidents. A valid point system should be one that identifies, as quickly as possible, drivers who have a high potential for future accidents and violations. In order to assess the relationship between point allocation and the likelihood of future violations and accidents, a study was undertaken employing a sample of Arizona drivers. The specific objectives of the study were to:

- (1) Determine the relationship between point values assigned to specific violations and the risk of future accidents and violations.
- (2) Determine the relationship between numbers of points accumulated and the likelihood of future accidents and violations.

METHOD

To permit the various relationships identified in the formation of any enumerated objectives to be validly ascertained, a sample of 10,000 drivers holding valid Arizona licenses was drawn. The record included the following in the period 1984-1986:

- o Gender
- o Date of birth
- o Date of assignment to traffic survival school
- o Date of completion of traffic survival school
- o Date and code of every violation
- o Date and time of every accident
- o Severity of every accident

Sample Selection

All data items except for accidents were obtained from the driver record maintained by MVD for every licensed driver in the State. Since accidents are not posted to the driver file, they were obtained from accident files maintained by the Arizona Highway Safety Office.

In drawing driver license records, only drivers with one or more violations were included in the sample. Given the purposes of the study, drivers with no violation record would not furnish any information of value. In drawing the sample, every driver meeting the criterion of one or more violations with a point count greater than 0 was selected until the required 10,000 records were obtained. Since the order in which names appear in the file is essentially chance, the sample can be accepted as representative of Arizona drivers in general. From each driver's record, the specific items identified earlier were transferred to a separate magnetic tape which became the study sample file.

In generating the accident data, the Arizona Highway Safety Office extracted from the accident files of 1984-86 each accident along with the date and the driver's license number.

The separate license and accident records were turned over to the NPSRI project staff, which performed the following operations:

- o Matching the license and accident files to extract the date of each accident for the 10,000 drivers making up the project sample.
- o Consolidating all accident and violation data into an individual driver record.¹
- o Transferring the record from magnetic tape to the hard disk of the microcomputer for subsequent analysis.
- o Performing various statistical analyses with the aid of the SPSS program.

¹ This was rendered a difficult and laborious task by the fact that Arizona drivers are assigned a new identification number each time they renew their licenses, change license class, or receive an endorsement. As a result, drivers can be identified by several different identification numbers on various violation and accident records. All of the records belonging to an individual driver had to be brought together and assigned a separate project identification code number.

Analysis of Individual Violations and Driving Record

An analysis was performed to assess the relationship between individual violations and overall driving record [objective 1]. The point value assigned to a violation should be a reflection of the level of danger presented to the public by that violation. Unfortunately, there's no readily available objective measure of the level of danger represented by a violation. However, presumably drivers who are cited and convicted for a particular violation are frequent perpetrators of that violation. The consequences of such repeated violations should show up in the frequency and severity of accidents in which drivers committing a particular type of violation are involved. For example, if violations involving unsafe speeds (3 points) are truly more serious than those involving traffic signal violations (2 points), drivers who speed should, in the mean, have a greater number of and more serious accidents than drivers who violate stop signs.

To assess the relationships between specific violations and subsequent accidents, drivers were classified on the basis of the first violation appearing on their records during the year 1984. In order to obtain a more meaningful and readily understood result, the 109 individual violation codes were reduced to 10 by combining subcategories of the same codes. Combining categories produced a minimum of 100 violations per category. The 10 codes involved violations of regulations concerned with:

2-point violations

- Obeying traffic signals
- Obeying the specific signal legend (e.g., red light, yellow light etc.)
- Complying with the posted speed
- Safe passing
- Signals and positions in turns
- Right-of-way
- School crossings
- Stop signs

3-point violations

- Maximum safe speed

8-point violations

- Alcohol violations

For each identified violation, the mean number of subsequent violations, the mean number of accidents, and mean accident severities were calculated. In addition, tests of statistical significance were performed to determine whether the differences among the various violations were anything more than chance variations.

Analysis of Point Accumulation and Driving Record

Under Arizona Transportation Law, drivers may be required to attend a driver improvement program, or have their licenses suspended whenever their driving records evidence disregard for the law and for the safety of others. In the Arizona Driver Improvement system, such "disregard" is equated with 8

or more points in a 12-month period. This number was apparently arrived at subjectively; there is no evidence of any empirical basis for it.

In order to study the relationship between point accumulation and driving record, drivers were categorized by the number of violations occurring in a 12-month period. Five categories were employed: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 or more violations per 12 months. For each category, the mean numbers of accidents and violations were calculated. The counting of accidents began immediately after the first violation. However, violations were only counted at the end of the 12-month period following the first violation. (Since it was violations within 12 months that created the driver categories, the categories could only be compared in terms of accidents occurring after the 12-month period was over.)

Influence of Driver Characteristics Upon Relationship Between Points and Record

A number of driver characteristics have been shown to be associated with safety of motor vehicle operation. Foremost among these are age and sex. The fact that these same characteristics are also associated with violation means that drivers who present the greater safety risks are the ones who tend to find their way into driver improvement programs.

The analysis of point accumulation and driving record described in the previous section was performed not only for the sample as a whole, but also with data disaggregated by age and by sex. The purpose of the analysis was to identify driver characteristics that interact with prior driving record in influencing a driver's level of risk. An example of such an interaction would be a finding that elderly drivers have a greater risk of accident involvement than younger drivers at the same point level.

RESULTS

The results are presented separately for each of the analyses performed.

Analysis of Individual Violations and Driving Record

The relationship of each of the 10 most common violations to violations, accidents and accident severity appears in Table 2.

TABLE 2
MEAN VIOLATIONS, ACCIDENTS AND SEVERITIES
FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF THE 10 MOST COMMON TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS

Violation Category	N	Mean Violations	Mean Accidents	Mean Severity
<u>2 point</u>				
Traffic signal: general	473	.60	.32	.55
Traffic signal: specific	697	.86	.40	.70
Posted speed	1,814	.74	.23	.43
Passing	538	.87	.43	.72
Turns, signals	242	.54	.54	.86
Right-of-Way	464	.48	.75	1.37
School crossing	119	.58	.24	.43
Stop signs	438	.83	.37	.66
<u>3-point</u>				
Unsafe speed	3,632	.85	.42	.72
<u>8-point</u>				
Alcohol Related	802	.97	.37	.70
ALL	9,224	.79	.39	.68

Before discussing the results, two aspects of the analysis need to be mentioned. First, the means presented in the right side of the table are based upon all the violations and accidents occurring within that portion of the 3-year period '84-'85 following the first violations. This was done to maximize the number of subsequent accidents and violations included in the analysis, a necessity given the limited numbers of cases in some of the violation categories. Obviously the period of time varied from one driver to the next depending upon when during the period the first violation occurred. These small differences in the periods of time over which mean accident and violation occurred would not bias the comparisons between violation categories.

The second item to note is the 776 missing cases (10,000 - 9,224). These involved drivers whose first violation was one of the few violations that could not be combined with other categories and who had too few occurrences to allow reliable comparisons.

It is evident that sizeable differences appear in the mean numbers of subsequent violations, accidents, and accident severities² of drivers convicted of various types of violations. Analysis of variance shows the differences among violation categories to be significant for mean violations ($F=9.91$; $P<.01$), mean accidents ($F=33.07$, $P<.01$), and mean severity ($F=23.71$, $P<.01$).

There appears to be a weak relationship between mean subsequent violations and the point value assigned to the violation category. The 8-point alcohol violation has the highest mean subsequent violation rate (.97). The mean violation rate for the 3-point "unsafe speed" violation is approximately equal to the highest violation rate for 2-point violations, and certainly higher than the average violation rate across all 2-point violations. While the relationship between point value and mean violations is in the right direction, differences in means count are far from being proportional to differences in point value.

The three violations with the lowest mean subsequent violation rate involve turns and signals, right-of-way, and school crossings. These are the violations that one would think are most likely to occur through oversight rather than being deliberate. This might help explain why drivers guilty of these violations are less likely to have subsequent violations than drivers convicted of the remaining types of violations.

Turning to accidents, we see a somewhat different picture. It is very likely that this picture is clouded by the inclusion of violations that occurred in connection with accidents. For example, it is almost certain that the high accident rate for people cited with right-of-way violations results from citations issued because of accidents. Indeed, right-of-way citations are rarely issued except in connection with accidents. While an attempt was made to remove this spurious relationship by eliminating accidents occurring on the same day as a violation, it is very likely that some accidents and violations bearing different dates actually do involve the same event.

The 8-point alcohol violations were included just for general interest. They are totally different from the other violations in that they result less from unsafe driving than from an unsafe consumption of alcohol before driving. One would not necessarily expect those convicted of an alcohol offense to have an appreciably higher accident or violation rate than other drivers. The 8 points assessed for this violation reflect the potential severity of drinking-driving accidents rather than expected frequency of future accidents or violations.

²In this case, Mean Severity refers to the total accident severity per driver, not per accident. It is equal to the mean number of accidents times the mean severity per accident. It is therefore proportional to the total subsequent accident loss experienced by drivers convicted of a particular violation.

Analysis of Point Accumulation and Driving Record

The relationship between the number of points on a driver's record and the likelihood of having additional accidents and violations is shown in Table 3. Since almost all of the violations under consideration involve 2 points, the table shows the number of violations rather than point count.

TABLE 3
MEAN ACCIDENTS, VIOLATIONS AND SEVERITIES
BY NUMBER OF PRIOR VIOLATIONS

Number of Prior Violations	N	Mean Violations	Mean Accidents	Mean Severity
1	8,042	.46	.17	.32
2	1,134	.76	.22	.36
3	199	1.08	.34	.54
4+	71	1.85	.43	.69

As explained in the earlier discussion of methodology, prior violations refers to the number of violations occurring in 1984. Mean numbers of violations and the mean number of accidents are accumulated over the two year period 1985-86. The total number of cases shown in the table is 9,444. The remaining (10,000 - 9,444 =) 556 drivers were those who did not have a violation in 1984.

One can see a marked increase in the mean numbers of subsequent accidents and violations and in accident severity as the number of violations in 1984 increased. The relationships shown in Table 3 indicate clearly that the worse an individual's driving record has been in the past, the worse it is likely to be in the future. It provides ample justification for intervention on the basis of the driving record. Unfortunately, it doesn't identify any one point in the increasing number of violations at which intervention is most appropriate.

Seemingly, there is no basis upon which to challenge the present intervention level which, for most of the violators in the sample, would have occurred after the third violation in a year. If one examines the progression of mean violations, the rate of increase is largely the same from one to three violations, but jumps considerably after the third violation. What is discouraging is that this jump in rate of increase occurs despite the fact that those who receive four violations within a year were, presumably, either suspended or referred to Traffic Survival School.

Influence of Driver Characteristics Upon Relationships.

The analysis just described shows that drivers referred to improvement courses are the ones who should be there. The question is, are there certain categories of drivers who are more deserving of referral than others? We know that younger drivers and male drivers (including young male drivers) are over-represented in accidents. However, they are also the ones who fill the driver improvement courses. The question is whether they should be represented in the driver improvement courses to a greater extent than they already are. To answer this question, the analyses presented in Table 3 were stratified by both age and gender. The age breakdown appears in Table 4.

TABLE 4
MEAN ACCIDENTS AND VIOLATIONS BY NUMBER OF PRIOR VIOLATIONS
AND AGE GROUPS

Number of Violations	AGE								
	ACCIDENTS			VIOLATIONS			SEVERITY		
	<25	26-55	>55	<25	26-55	>55	<25	26-55	>55
1	.26	.17	.14	.82	.46	.23	.50	.31	.27
2	.28	.19	.19	1.07	.69	.44	.48	.33	.31
3+	.35	.26	.15	1.45	1.15	.54	.73	.47	.31
TOTAL	.26	.17	.14	.91	.50	.24	.51	.31	.27

It is apparent that the over-representation of younger drivers in violations and accidents is found among traffic offenders to about the same extent that it is found among the general population. A youthful traffic offender is more likely to have accidents or violations in the future than an older driver with the same prior violation record. The fact that drivers in different age groups have the same number of prior violations does not render them equal with respect to risk of future accidents and violations. In the case of accident risk, drivers under age 25 with a single violation have about the same likelihood of being involved in an accident as someone in the middle age group with 3 prior violations.

The over-55 age group is fairly similar to the 26-54 age group with respect to accidents, but has far fewer violations. (We should not be distressed by the apparently low accident rate of .15 for >55 age group with 3 prior violations as it involved only 13 drivers.) Any concern that older drivers' traffic violations betray some deficiency, placing them at high risk, is not supported by the data. Older traffic offenders show no greater risk of accidents than their younger counterparts and have a decidedly lower risk of future violations.

A more detailed breakdown by age and/or number of violations might reveal greater or lesser differences among the subcategories. However, the numbers of drivers in the extreme age groups are too small to permit disaggregation.

An analysis similar to that just described for age is shown for gender in Table 5.

TABLE 5
MEAN ACCIDENTS, VIOLATIONS, AND SEVERITIES BY NUMBER OF
PRIOR VIOLATIONS AND GENDER

Number of Prior Violations	AGE					
	Accidents		Violations		Severity	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1	.18	.15	.53	.31	.34	.28
2	.21	.20	.79	.60	.36	.38
3+	.26	.43	1.18	1.43	.53	.61
TOTAL	.19	.16	.59	.34	.35	.29

Except for the group with 3 or more violations, males consistently have higher violation and accident rates than females. The exception can be largely disregarded since females with more than 3 violations numbered only 28 cases. Differences between males and females are consistently significant for both accidents ($F=6.21; P=.013$) and for violations ($F=113.0; P<.01$).

While the accident and violation rates for males are worse than those for females, the differences are surprisingly small. While males outnumber females in the violation sample by over 2 to 1 (6,708 vs. 2,738), the difference in accident rate is only, .19 vs .16. The difference in subsequent violation rate of .59 vs .34 is considerably larger. The two results combined indicate that male traffic violators, like males in general, are more likely to violate traffic laws, but are not appreciably more likely to be involved in accidents.

Differences between males and females appear to become smaller as the number of prior violations increases. In the case of violations, this manifests itself in a significant interaction between gender and prior violations ($F=3.56; P=.03$). The interaction for accidents falls somewhat short of statistical significance ($F=2.63; P=.07$). While the accident violation rates for females with 3 or more prior violations actually appears to exceed that of males, the small number of drivers involved ($N=28$) makes the statistic somewhat unreliable. The interaction in the case of severity falls far short of significance ($F=.90; P=.41$).

Summary

There is nothing in the analysis just described that would lead to any substantial revision in the driver improvement system currently employed by the State of Arizona.

Point Values

With respect to the point values assigned to various violations, the results do not suggest any distinctions beyond those already made. The differences in numbers of subsequent accidents and violations associated

within various categories of prior violations, while statistically significant, are not large enough to warrant different values. While there may be small differences among violations in their implications for subsequent driving record, they are certainly not of such a magnitude as to warrant assigning different point values.

If any change in point values is indicated by the results of the analysis, it is to eliminate point values altogether. If 3-point speeding violations are more serious than the remaining moving violations, it doesn't show up in subsequent violations or accidents. The same is true of alcohol violations. While assigning 8 points to this violation has the result of initiating driver improvement action on the basis of a single violation, the same result is obtained by recently enacted legislation directly mandating some form of intervention for those convicted of alcohol-related offenses. The change has the added advantage of referring alcohol offenders to a form of intervention that is more appropriate than the Traffic Survival School to which alcohol offenders are referred under the driver improvement program.

Confining all moving violations to 2 points, and removing alcohol offenses from the driver improvement program, would allow the driver improvement program to be greatly simplified. Presumably, it would allow driver improvement actions to be taken on an easily understood basis--number of violations--rather than on the basis of arbitrary "points."

Accumulating Points

Turning from individual to accumulated offenses, results indicate that the greater number of prior violations a driver has, the greater is the likelihood of future violations. While there is no one clear point at which intervention is indicated, the current practice of intervening at the 8-point level, between 3 and 4 violations in a year, is reasonable. If "points" are eliminated, intervention would be based upon the number of violations rather than the number of points. The number of violations at which intervention is most appropriate will be dealt with later in the discussion of the "point system" in the section "Determination of Driver Improvement Standards and Procedures."

The one finding that could legitimately influence the point level at which intervention occurs is that involving the relationship between age and point level. The fact that young violators have a substantially greater likelihood of subsequent accidents and violations than their older counterparts would justify initiating driver improvement action at a lower level. Indeed, there is justification for subjecting younger drivers with one violation to the same action as would be taken toward older drivers with 3 violations.

Subjecting younger drivers to a lower threshold for driver improvement action than that employed with drivers in general is not unusual. A number of States currently employ such a practice. In almost all instances, the younger drivers subject to the lower threshold are novice drivers operating on provisional or probationary licenses. While the actual threshold varies from one State to another, it is typically one or two violations lower than that for drivers in general.

ANALYSIS OF DRIVER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Concurrent with the "Comparison of Arizona System to Alternative Systems" and the "Analysis of Alternative Point Allocation Systems", the project staff undertook an analysis of the programs that have been designed to remediate the problems of drivers identified as requiring improvement. The analysis of remedial treatment has drawn primarily from the state-of-the-driver-improvement-art.

The analysis of driver improvement programs will address the following:

- o Warning letters
- o Group programs
- o Individual contact
- o License suspension

The discussion will not address "incentive" programs, that is, programs in which traffic violators are rewarded for good records rather than having adverse action taken because of bad records. Studies by Marsh (1978) and Kadell et al. (1980) found that while the "incentive" of renewing licenses by mail reduced subsequent accidents and corrections, the reduction came entirely from those violators who did not qualify for the incentives. Other studies, (Kelsey and Janke, 1983) found that the main benefit of renewing licenses by mail is reduced administration cost rather than improved record. In their extensive review of driver improvement, Donelson and Mayhew (1987) found no support for incentive oriented programs.

WARNING LETTERS

Warning letters are the first rung on the driver improvement ladder. Their primary function is to introduce the driver improvement system to drivers whose frequency of violation constitutes cause for concern.

Effectiveness of Warning Letters

Early studies by Campbell (1958), King (1960), Kaestner, Warmoth, and Syring (1967), and McBride and Peck (1970) showed warning notices to be effective in reducing accidents and further violations. Later California studies (Kadell and Peck, (1979); Kadell et al. (1980)) found the accident-reducing effects of warning letters to be small and of marginal significance, and studies by Temple and Ferguson (1958) and by Lynn (1982) failed to find a significant effect at all.

While the effect of warning letters may be small, the expense is so slight that any detectable improvement is sufficient to make the action worthwhile. Indeed, the magnitude of a cost-beneficial effect is so small that it takes a sample of inordinate size to detect its presence. The

studies by Temple and Ferguson (1958) and Lynn (1982) involved samples that were far too small to have detected a cost-beneficial effect.

In addition to their direct countermeasure value, warning letters are important to the effectiveness of subsequent driver improvement actions. A study by Marsh (1978) showed that the effectiveness of instructional treatments may not appear if they are not preceded by a warning letter.

Research indicates that for maximum effectiveness the warning letter should be brief, readable, intimate, non-threatening, and informative. As to content, a study by Kaestner et al. (1967) found that personalized letters were significantly more effective in reducing subsequent violations and accidents among drivers aged 25 and under. Consequently, it would seem desirable to address drivers by name rather than by license number and to maintain a tone of personal interest throughout. Similarly, McBride and Peck (1970) found low-threat warning letters to be more effective in reducing subsequent accidents and convictions among violators.

Epperson and Harano (1974) found that the effectiveness of a warning letter was enhanced by including information on the specific nature of driver improvement actions and other possible consequences of repeated violations. Not consistently found to be effective are personalized advisory letters (McBride and Peck, 1970), warnings in lieu of suspension (Kaestner and Speight, 1975) and reinforcement letters to those who commit no violations following receipt of a warning letter (Epperson and Harano, 1974).

Time of Issuance

Advisory letters need to be sent early enough to prevent a large accumulation of points, yet not so early as to be viewed as an overreaction by the recipients of the letters. It is best that warning letters be sent at a level in the driver improvement system just below that at which the first driver improvement action (e.g., meeting, course, interview, etc.) occurs. If no action were to occur on the next violation, the letter would be seen as an empty gesture.

Most States send advisory letters after two or three violations in a year. The AAMVA guidelines recommend that it be sent after the second moving violation within a year. Under the Arizona point system, an appropriate point level would be 5-7 points. This point level would include all drivers with two speeding violations and eligibility for driver improvement action (school or suspension) on the next speeding violation.

Content of Warning Letters

From the research reviewed we may conclude that the content of the advisory letter should include the following items:

- o The individual driver's point level

- o The driver improvement system, i.e., point count and specific driver improvement actions
- o Details concerning actions which will occur with the next violation
- o An address or phone number to which questions concerning the driver record and driver improvement actions can be addressed

Some States also provide a transcript of the driver's record. This helps to prevent time-consuming follow-up telephone calls by drivers who think there has been some mistake. However, it necessitates computer preparation of individualized letters, adding substantially to the cost of preparation. Given the marginal benefits of warning letters, and the fact that prior research has not shown individualized letters to be of advantage, the cost of providing driver records cannot be justified. Rather, a single, mass-reproduced "Dear Driver" letter would be sufficient.

The "tone" of the letter is also important. The research cited earlier has generally shown that encompassing, positive sounding letters are more effective than those that are threatening. Certainly a non-threatening approach is appropriate where the letter is to be sent at the relatively low 5-8 point count that is recommended.

GROUP PROGRAMS

The first improvement step requiring action on the part of drivers is typically participation in some form of group program. Group programs may be divided into the following categories:

Meetings--Brief programs (1-2 hours) in which drivers are given information concerning their driving records and the driver improvement system.

Courses--Longer programs (4-8 hours) in which drivers are provided education in a broad range of topics related to safe driving.

Counseling--Programs similar in length to courses, but using discussions, role-playing, and other group processes to modify attitudes and emotions.

The current Traffic Survival School (TSS) represents a "course" and is the first action required of drivers under the Arizona driver improvement system.

Meetings

As used here, the term "meetings" refers to a fairly brief encounter in which traffic violators review their records and the driver improvement system. Often called "group interviews", meetings typically last 1-2 hours.

Content of Meetings

The typical meeting includes a review of each driver's record, the driver improvement system, and the specific sanctions that may be imposed if additional violations occur within a specified time. Some meetings also include safety rules, concepts, and practices, although the limited time available severely curtails the coverage of such subjects.

In contrast with a course, the purpose of a meeting is not primarily to educate drivers in safe operation of motor vehicles, but rather to motivate drivers to use what they know about safe driving in order to operate within the law. Recognizing that the next violation will likely result in license suspension, the driver is expected to exert an effort to drive lawfully in order to avoid an additional violation and possible license suspension.

A 1961 study by Coppin pronounced California's "Group Driver Improvement Meeting" effective in reducing both accidents and convictions, although a later study (Coppin, Marsh and Peck, 1965) found it to be effective only with respect to convictions. Another California study (Marsh, 1971) found a meeting to be a highly cost-effective accident countermeasure. This meeting was adopted as part of the State driver improvement system.

Subsequent evaluations of California's meetings through 1979 have been uniformly favorable. Marsh (1978) and Kadell and Peck (1979) found the 1-1/2 hour group meeting to provide the greatest margin of benefits (accident costs saved) minus costs of all driver improvement actions assessed in the study. Salzberg et al. (1985) found meetings to be effective in reducing accidents and violations.

Lynn (1982) found the Virginia meeting to have a significant effect upon violations but not accidents. However, her sample was small and would not necessarily have detected a cost-beneficial effect. Interestingly, when the meeting was combined with other driver improvement actions, a significant overall benefit was obtained, indicating that part of the problem may lie in the small samples involved in the evaluations of individual effects.

Curiously, although the California driver improvement meeting was found to be an effective accident and violation countermeasure, it was discontinued by California in its most recent evaluation (Peck and Kadell, 1983) because effectiveness appeared to be decreasing. It is noteworthy that the cost of the California meeting is borne by the Motor Vehicle Department rather than the individual driver. It is very likely that a reduction in the costs of driver improvement had a lot to do with discontinuing this apparently effective program.

Courses

As used here, the term "courses" refers to longer programs that are intended to educate drivers in safe driving practices. As noted earlier, the Arizona Traffic Survival School is a course.

Effectiveness of Courses

Several studies reporting favorable results for courses have lacked the statistical control needed for very conclusive findings. In studies by the Sacramento Safety Council (1975) and Prothero (1978), the drivers assigned to the driver improvement program were different from those in the control group to begin with, making it impossible to attribute any subsequent differences in accidents and violations solely to the effects of the program. An evaluation of improvement courses among volunteers (non-offenders) by Planek, Schupack and Fowler (1972) has been frequently quoted, but lacked any statistical control at all. An evaluation by Pollard and Thomas (1980) failed to find favorable results, but employed a quasi-experimental design that would have made small effects difficult to detect.

Well-controlled studies by Coppin, Marsh and Peck (1965), Henderson and Kole (1967), House and Waller (1976), Salzberg and Klingberg (1978), Ulmer (1978), Peck et al. (1980), Koppa and Banning (1981), and Lynn (1982) failed to show driver improvement courses as being effective accident countermeasures. On the other hand, studies of the National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course showed it capable of reducing accidents and violations (Kaestner, 1979, Hill and Jamieson, 1978). Studies by Harano and Peck, (1971), Brown (1975), Edwards and Ellis (1976), and Payne et al.

(1984) appeared to show such programs as succeeding, but only among certain specific age/sex groups of drivers. All of the studies cited evaluated existing driver improvement programs, many of which were characterized by questionable instructional content, lack of professional instructors, and absence of any formal mechanism to assure that assigned offenders completed, or even attended, the courses.

A 1961 study by Coppin, conducted in a research setting with the aid of highly qualified instructors, specially prepared materials, and procedures assuring participation, yielded favorable results in terms of reducing accidents and violations. The major disadvantage of the program studied by Coppin was its cost, primarily the result of the 18 hour course length. On the whole, this study offered hope that a soundly developed and administered driver improvement course could be effective in reducing accidents and violations.

Content of Educational Programs

As pointed out in an earlier section of this report, the National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course is the course most frequently given to traffic offenders. The second most common course is the American Automobile Association's Driver Improvement Course. Some States give their own course, tailoring the content to State requirements and saving themselves the fees often charged for the use of commercially available programs. Most courses consume eight hours, the range running from four to ten hours (the only ten-hour program being the Arizona Traffic Survival School).

The content of driver improvement courses tends to focus upon rules of the road and safe driving practices. This is certainly true of the two courses most widely used for traffic violators, the National Safety Council's Defense Driving Course and the American Automobile Association's Driver Improvement Program. The concentration on safe driving information reflects an assumption that traffic violators are deficient in knowledge of such content. However, research shows that this is simply not true (McKnight and Green, 1976). Simply presenting safe driving information will not necessarily overcome the motivational problems that lead to traffic violations.

Most traffic violations are the result of haste. This is certainly true of the single most frequent violation—speeding. It is also true of running traffic lights and stop signs, making illegal turns, and most other offenses. Haste reflects the desire of drivers to get where they are going quickly—the basic reason for driving a car in the first place. As much as we might wish it to be true, simply telling drivers that these maneuvers are unsafe and against the law is not sufficient to overcome the incentives that lead to breaking the law. The only thing that appears to have been effective in overcoming the willingness of certain drivers to violate the law in order to get where they were going quickly is the threat of strong sanctions in the event of future violations. This is the content that underlies the meetings that have been shown to be effective as an accident and violation countermeasure.

Not only are courses of questionable effectiveness, there is evidence that they may be counter-productive where the threat of strong future sanctions is tempered by the instruction given in the course. One California study found that suspended drivers who were called in for a non-threatening session on safe driving practices prior to reinstatement had worse subsequent driving records than those who were reinstated without the "benefit" of such instruction. In any case, where safe driving practices are addressed, the instruction should focus more upon the reasons underlying these practices than the practices themselves. Most drivers are aware of the practices that define safe driving. Often, however, they are not aware of the hazards or the consequences of failing to observe them.

Requirements for an Effective Group Program

While the published research literature provides little conclusive information as to the essential ingredients of an effective improvement program, a cautious interpretation of research results permits some insight into the most promising approaches to driver improvement. Aspects of group programs to be discussed include:

- o Objective and content
- o Instructional method
- o Driver record information
- o Participant achievement
- o Duplication of courses
- o Course administration

Objectives and Content

The objectives and content of driver improvement programs seem to fall into two categories. The objectives of most school courses are largely to apprise drivers of hazards that lie in the highway traffic environment and provide them a set of principles and procedures for dealing with them. The goal is clearly one of self protection, as is evident in such titles as "defensive driving" and "traffic survival." The objectives of most meetings, on the other hand, are primarily to deter traffic violators from additional offenses, primarily through a review of their individual traffic records and the sanctions that may be imposed if their records become worse. The goal appears to be protection of the public rather than self-protection.

While the literature does not clearly establish which type of program is more effective as a program for traffic violators, the following considerations appear to favor programs which, like meetings, are concerned with the protection of the public rather than the protection of those assigned to the program.

Need The only apparent justification for requiring a certain group of drivers to participate in an educational program is that they have a clear need for it. However, violators referred to group programs under a State driver improvement program are as knowledgeable in the safe driving procedures and practices that make up the objectives and content of most courses as the public at large (Miller and Dimling, 1969; McKnight and Green, 1976). Like the public at large, they could stand improvement. However, if they have a deficiency, it doesn't involve knowledge but rather their willingness to adhere to traffic laws. That is the deficiency that most driver improvement meetings attempt to address.

Effectiveness While the results of research are far from conclusive, studies reviewed by Donelsen and Mayhew (1987) seem to indicate that content which attempts to deter traffic violators from further offenses by using the threat of future sanctions has a better record of success than subject matter that largely involves safety education. As Koppa and Banning (1981) point out, "a driver improvement course may improve their knowledge, but motivation and attitudes are still influenced more by the perception of law enforcement or judicial surveillance than by educational techniques, at least as imparted by the particular training program used in (his) demonstration."

Relevance Whether or not violators have demonstrated a need for an educational program, the objectives and content of any program for violators should at least appear relevant to them. A program that seeks to help traffic violators "defend" themselves or to "survive" may not only be perceived as irrelevant to violators' needs, but could mislead them as to the seriousness of their situation. Evidence to this effect comes from research showing that suspended drivers required to participate in an educational program as part of their license reinstatement had worse subsequent records than those who were reinstated without participating in the program.

While these three considerations do not argue against attempting to educate traffic violators in safer operation of their vehicles, it certainly suggests that the primary objective of driver improvement programs for traffic violators should be deterring them from future violations in order to make driving safer for the public rather than just helping them assure their own survival.

Instructional Methods

There has been very little controlled study of instructional methods for driver improvement courses. McKnight, Simone and Weidman (1982) compared instructional methods involving three classroom methods and two levels of classroom instruction:

Classroom Methods

Presentation -- one-way communication of information by the instructor and audio-visual presentations.

Application -- use of presentations followed by instructor-student interaction involving the application of information to traffic situations.

Discussion -- information presentation and application along with student-student interaction involving discussion of traffic safety issues.

Amount of Classroom Instruction

All Classroom -- all eight hours of instruction took place in the classroom.

Home Study -- four hours of classroom instruction are combined with extensive home study assignments.

The most significant result was the clear superiority of the combined classroom-home study instruction over classroom alone. This outcome was attributed by instructors to the fact that the home study approach was coupled with a brief quiz at the beginning of each session. Students were apparently motivated to study in order to pass the quiz. In the case of classroom instruction, all they had to do was attend.

Regardless of where instruction was given, the application approach produced better results than the other two approaches. The best single approach was a combination of application and home study, in which students acquired information through printed material at home and devoted classroom time to its application. Both the instructors and the students considered straight presentation to be "boring." The instructors attributed the inferiority of a group discussion to the fact that it consumed large amounts of time while producing little consensus.

The results of the McKnight et al. study are consonant with generally established principles of learning under which a purely presentational "lecture" approach is considered inappropriate to students who are:

Adults -- adult learners are generally less inclined than their younger counterparts to sit for long periods of time without speaking.

Experienced -- the lecture method does not take advantage of the experiences that drivers have to share.

Attitude -- while presentation is an efficient way to communicate information, it is not the best approach for bringing about a change in the attitudes considered to be at the root of the behavior leading to traffic violations.

The dubious value of presentation as an instructional method for driver improvement is particularly deserving of note in view of the fact that the instructional program most often used in driver improvement--the National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course--is almost entirely devoted to information presentation. Its failure to promote the active involvement of participants in the program is one of the criticisms most frequently leveled at this program.

Driver Record Information

Most States furnish drivers with an abstract of their driving record at the time they are notified of the need to participate in a group program. This step has both administrative and educational advantages.

Administratively, providing a copy of the driver record helps avoid requests for clarification or hearings due to confusion over the record. Drivers frequently forget earlier violations or are unaware that violations which occurred outside the State or for which they forfeited collateral, are still assessed points.

Educationally, instruction would be benefited by the availability of a violation record to remind participants of the circumstances surrounding their traffic violations and help them bring their experience into group discussions.

The current print statement to Arizona violators eligible for the TSS apparently does not have enough room to accommodate the addition of violation records. However, most of the information making up the print statement is common to all addressees and could equally well be preprinted in the same manner as the general information that is provided on the reverse side of the statement. The most efficient approach would be to use the computer to print that information which varies from one addressee to another and preprint information that is common to all. This is the practice generally employed by other States (see Appendix B) where computer-printed information is confined to that information which differs from one person to another and the rest of the letter is preprinted. There does not appear to be anything in Arizona law that would ban use of preprinted rather than computer-printed statements.

Regardless of how it is done, drivers should be provided abstracts of those violations figuring in the point totals that result in a requirement to participate in a group program.

Participant Achievement

Section 28-446 of the Transportation Laws of Arizona states that the Department may "require any licensee to attend, and successfully complete, (our emphasis) the course. However, the print statement assigning drivers to the TSS requires only that they "attend". This distinction is particularly important in that no provision for assuring successful completion of the TSS is set forth in the curriculum and discussions with representatives of individual schools reveals no attempts to assess success. All that is required is mere physical presence.

A review of the driver improvement literature discloses no study specifically addressing means of assuring "successful completion." Indeed, few of the descriptions of the courses studied ever reveal whether any attempt was made to assess student achievement.

In educational programs taken by students in order to fulfill some requirement, tests are almost universally given to ascertain whether the requirement has been fulfilled. Such is certainly true of elementary, secondary, and higher education as well as most employment related programs. Even in programs that are totally elective, taken by students for their own benefit, tests are often given because of the learning incentives they are believed to provide. Certainly a program given under a requirement for successful completion calls for some sort of test.

Where successful completion of a course is contingent upon passing an achievement examination, some provision must be made for those who fail the test after completing the course. Unfortunately, there is nothing in data or logic to indicate what this provision should be.

Were the objective of a course for frequent offenders merely the acquisition of knowledge, those who fail could be offered the opportunity to pass the course simply by retaking the test. However, where the objective of the course is primarily attitude change, and the role of knowledge is chiefly to provide a basis for classroom activity leading to attitude change, acquisition of knowledge after the course is over would obviously be of little use in this regard.

Given the role that knowledge is expected to play, the achievement test should provide a strong incentive to pay enough attention to what is going on in class to acquire the information needed to pass the test. To provide this incentive, participants should be led to understand that failure to pass the test will mean having to repeat the course. However, to minimize the extent to which participants are put to this inconvenience, the test should be designed so that it can be passed by anyone who has been an active class participant. It should not be a test of scholastic aptitude, reading ability, or anything other than simple understanding of the course material. It should be both theoretically and practically possible for 100% of well-motivated participants to pass the test.

Duplication of Courses

In Arizona, as in most States, the state driver improvement system is paralleled by efforts to improve driver improvement carried on by the courts. Group information and education programs form components of both court-sponsored and state-sponsored driver improvement efforts. As a result, many of the drivers participating in the TSS have previously participated in a similar program under referral by the courts. Indeed, it may be the same program run by the same school. It is hard to see how anything can be gained by requiring a traffic violator to retake a program that was obviously unsuccessful the first time. The MVD prohibition on attending TSS twice in any two-year period reflects the view that return engagements are not profitable.

There are probably some judges and administrators who truly believe that repeated exposure to a course would be productive. They may think that the objective of the course is to develop skill and that one trip around may not be sufficient. Or, they may view course participation as a form of punishment which will eventually wear down the most stubborn offender. However, most instances of repetition are probably unintentional and result from lack of communication. Since no record of participation in TSS is entered on a driver's record, there's no way to identify those who have already attended it. In fact, since most courts do not even report the offense that resulted in referral to the course, there's nothing to indicate that an offense ever occurred.

Some States now require schools administering driver improvement programs, whether for the courts or the state driver improvement system, to report the names of all drivers referred for instruction. School referral is entered on the driver's record so that any judge or driver improvement analyst will be aware of the driver's previous participation in an educational program and therefore be disposed to employ some alternative action such as probation or suspension.

Maintaining a record of driver improvement course participation on the MVD license record could be difficult to do at the present time given (1) the lack of any means to require schools outside of the MVD driver improvement system to report the names of participating drivers, and (2) limitations in file space on the current driver record. More feasible would be maintenance of a separate course attendance file, maintained by MVD, to which various jurisdictions would voluntarily report their court referrals. This idea was briefly discussed with the City of Phoenix court system and received favorable response.

A voluntary "clearinghouse" to which various jurisdictions subscribed would allow each court to find out if and when a violator had previously attended some form of driver improvement group program before offering the violator a referral to a course. The file could easily be maintained by the office currently responsible for the TSS with the aid of an inexpensive microcomputer. The use of a microcomputer rather than the MVD mainframe would provide a quick response to inquiries without burdening the driver license record system.

Posting of Violations

The primary incentive for Arizona traffic violators to participate in court-referred driver improvement courses is the opportunity it provides to escape conviction for a traffic offense. Many courts will allow "diversion" to courses in lieu of conviction. The rationale for such a step is the belief that the "positive" effects of participating in a safety-oriented driver improvement course are more likely to lead to safe and lawful driving than are the "negative" effects of punishing drivers for offenses that have been committed.

One side effect of diversion programs is the failure of violations to appear on a driver's license record. Since citations are dismissed, there

is no conviction to report. As a consequence, some individual drivers could conceal a string of violations, enough to warrant license suspension under the Arizona driver improvement system, and yet present what looks like a "clean" driving record. While courts often limit the number of times a driver can elect diversion, this limitation can only be imposed upon the violations that the courts know about.

It has been difficult to assess the actual impact of court diversion programs upon the subsequent driving of traffic violators in the absence of any record of who these violators are. However, California has been able to study diversion owing to legislation requiring that the names of those participating in diversion programs be reported to the Department of Motor Vehicles for research purposes. Comparison of accident records subsequent to diversion for those drivers with no prior convictions on their records and a comparable sample of drivers drawn at random (with a single violation on their record) showed that the diverted drivers have 50% more accidents (Gebers, Tashina, and Marsh, 1987). This result suggests that diversion programs are less effective as a safety measure than other actions taken with respect to convicted drivers in general.

While diversion programs appear to be deleterious to the safety of the public, the magnitude of the problem may not be as great as some people fear. California statistics show that only about 3% of traffic violators who had charges dismissed for agreeing to participate in a court referral program were given the opportunity twice within the same year, and only 10% were diverted twice within a three-year period. The number participating four or more times within a three-year period represented only 1% of those participating in a diversion program.

While the numbers abusing the diversion program may be small, they are nonetheless deleterious to the public safety. The "clearinghouse" mentioned in the previous section would at least allow courts to identify violators who were previously diverted. The courts could also be encouraged to employ court referral programs in addition to, rather than instead of, conviction. In many States and cities, the practice is not to dismiss charges, but to offer participation in a course as a means of reducing the size of fines.

Course Administration

Let us turn now from the characteristics of courses themselves to the way in which they are administered. Three aspects of TSS administration that warrant concern are course length, session length, and class size.

Course Length

At 10 hours, the TSS is the longest group program given under a State driver improvement system. The most common length is 8 hours. Unfortunately, research fails to provide any insight as to optimum length of a driver improvement course. The 10-hour TSS is the only driver improvement course in excess of 8 hours.

If the purpose of the driver improvement course is to educate, even 10 hours is not enough to do a comprehensive job. If, on the other hand, the

purpose is primarily to motivate compliance with the law and includes only that education that is relevant to the law, it is likely that either an 8-hour or 10-hour program would also be adequate.

Session Length

The length of driver improvement sessions ranges from one hour to an entire day. The most common session length is two hours. A session of this duration is generally considered optimum in that sessions of shorter duration are hardly worth the travel time, while longer sessions are generally considered to be something of an "overdose" for adult learners. The typical practice is to administer an 8-hour program in four 2-hour sessions spread out over a month. If accompanied by an opportunity for review, such spaced learning tends to facilitate retention.

At the present time, there are no constraints on the schedule length of the TSS. The program is often given in a single day to accommodate participants who want to "get it over with" quickly. Such a practice is not likely to lead to maximum learning.

Since individual schools are competing for the same drivers, they are pushed to offer whatever schedule drivers prefer. If standards are to be maintained, they must be established and enforced by the MVD. A maximum of two hours per session should impose no hardship except in outlying areas where participants must drive great distances. In such cases, four-hour sessions might be offered. While limiting the duration of sessions may prove inconvenient, the fact that participants are attending because they violated the law should make their personal convenience a less important consideration than the effectiveness of the program in protecting the public.

Class Size

The size of classes currently administered the TSS range up to 50 participants. While such large classes might be acceptable for a lecture course, they would not allow the individual participation needed for the interactive kind of a program that has been recommended. For a truly interactive course, classes should not exceed 25 participants. This is the most common size for driver improvement classes.

The financing of the TSS encourages large classes. Since the costs of instruction are largely fixed, the instructor's salary accounting for the major expense item, the more students that can be assembled in a class, the more money there is to be made. If classes are to be kept small for effective learning, class size must be restricted by the MVD. The importance of class size to effective interaction would seem to justify such a step.

Administrators of several schools have complained that classes of 25 or fewer students will not pay for the program under the present fee limitations. While a reduction in course length from the 10 hours of the TSS to the 8 hours proposed for a traffic violator school would provide

some savings, it is likely that the maximum fee will have to be raised if classes are to be limited to 25 students. Given the long record of traffic violations that characterizes most of those assigned to the course, a fee in excess of the present \$25 seems justified.

INDIVIDUAL CONTACT

This section will address driver improvement efforts that involve one-on-one interactions between traffic violators and representatives of driver license agencies. Two types of interaction will be discussed:

Interviews -- Interaction intended to identify sources of problems, determine appropriate actions, and provide information.

Hearings -- Interactions intended to allow traffic violators to contest a predetermined course of action.

These two types of contact are frequently confused with one another, interviews being called hearings and vice versa. What distinguishes the two is the manner in which improvement is sought. In an interview it is the contact itself that seems to improve driving, while in a hearing it is the legal action giving rise to the hearing (e.g., suspension) that is expected to bring about the improvement.

Interviews

Interviews, as the term is used here, refers to interactions in which a representative of the licensing agency attempts to inform, educate, and/or counsel traffic violators in ways to avoid additional traffic violations. The effectiveness of interviews in this regard has been evaluated by Kaestener and Syring (1968), Henderson and Kole (1967), Peck and Kadell (1983) and Eavy et al. (1987) and generally found to be effective in reducing subsequent accidents and violations.

What has been an issue is not the effectiveness of interviews, but the cost at which their effects have been achieved. Obviously, the expense of one-on-one interviews greatly exceeds that of the group programs described earlier. Unfortunately, there have been no direct comparisons of group and individual approaches involving the same populations of traffic violators. However, individual interviews have not been shown to offer any advantages over group processes. Given their significantly greater cost, interviews cannot be recommended either as a substitute or an adjunct to the Traffic Survival School currently employed in the State of Arizona.

Hearings

As defined in this discussion, a hearing is fundamentally a legal process, an opportunity afforded traffic violators under "due process" to contest an action that can result in loss of the right to drive.

While hearings have been associated with reductions in accidents and future violations (Kadell and Peck, 1979) these findings may be somewhat misleading. First of all, many of the "hearings" evaluated were really

interviews where license suspension was threatened but rarely actually employed. Second, even where true hearings were under study, it may not be the hearing that was truly evaluated. Where hearings serve as a prelude to license suspension it is reasonable to believe that the suspension is more important than the hearing. Evidence of relative importance of these two components comes from the study by McKnight and Edwards (1978) alluded to earlier, in which drivers given the short term suspension had fewer subsequent accidents and violations than drivers who participated in an interview. Additional evidence comes from Sherman and Ratz (1979) who found that placing negligent drivers on probation by mail was as effective in reducing subsequent accidents and convictions as requiring drivers to come in for an interview.

Drivers whose licenses are liable for suspension must be offered an opportunity to be heard. However, if the hearing is of as little value in reducing accidents and violations as research suggests, then cost benefit considerations argue for reducing hearing requests to the extent possible by informing suspended drivers of the bases of the suspensions and the purposes of the hearings thus avoiding requests arising out of misunderstandings as to why the license was suspended and what can be done about it. Discouraging unnecessary requests will thus reduce the burden upon MVD hearing officers and spare drivers the lost work time involved in futile appearances. This need is particularly great where an alternative to suspension has already been offered in the form of a driver improvement course or meeting.

LICENSE SUSPENSION

The most extreme step that can be taken by the driver improvement system is suspension or revocation of the opportunity to drive. In this discussion, we will treat suspension and revocation of the license as being functionally the same since their implications for driver improvement are essentially equivalent.

Effectiveness of License Suspension

A wealth of research has established the effectiveness of license suspension in reducing the frequency of accidents and violations among traffic violators. Comparisons of drivers whose licenses have been suspended with those who are legally permitted to drive have consistently shown the suspended drivers to have fewer accidents and violations during the period of suspension (Epperson, Harano and Peck, 1975; Hagen, 1977; Hagen et al., 1978, Sadler and Perrine, 1984; and Tashima and Peck, 1985).

The fact that those suspended continue to have accidents and violations at all means that they are continuing to drive. Several of the studies have found that somewhere around two-thirds of suspended and revoked drivers continue to drive fairly regularly (Coppin and Van Oldenbeek, 1965; Hagen, Williams, and McConnell, 1980). However, they are apparently driving less frequently or more safely (Hagen et al. 1980).

The only category of violations unaffected by suspension is alcohol violations. The most plausible and widely accepted reason for this exception is that alcohol violations result primarily from alcohol problems, which license suspension really does nothing to help overcome.

What is unclear is the extent to which license suspension acts as a deterrent to further traffic offenses. Two types of deterrent effects have been postulated for license suspension:

General Deterrence--The deterrent effect upon the general public--in this case the effect that the threat of license suspension has upon drivers in general.

Specific Deterrence--The deterrent effect upon those specific drivers who have previously experienced this sanction--in this case the effect that having one's license suspended has upon recidivism.

License Suspension as a General Deterrent

It is very difficult to assess the effect that fear of license suspension may have upon the general motoring public. Since license suspension is a sanction that applies either to everyone or no one (within a jurisdiction), it is hard to experiment. While it is possible to make a comparison between jurisdictions having different license sanctions, the results can be misleading. Fundamental dissimilarities between the jurisdictions, would be likely to obscure the differences in license sanctions.

The best opportunity to assess the general deterrence value of license suspension is afforded by changes in the law within a given jurisdiction, changes that allow comparisons to be made on the same population of drivers before and after the change. Since the public is generally not well informed about driver license sanctions, changes in the law have to be accompanied by extensive publicity. A study reported by Compton (1987) found that the imposition of license suspension, accompanied by a widespread public information program, led to a reduction in alcohol-related offenses among the general driving public.

A study by McKnight and Edwards (1987) involved traffic violators rather than the general public, but addressed only those violators whose license has not been previously suspended. Among females, the threat of license suspension proved an effective deterrent. However, among males it had no effect.

The safest conclusion is probably that license suspension serves as a deterrence to traffic violations among the general public where the threat would be more or less immediate, as is the case of alcohol offenses, where licenses can be suspended on the first occurrence. However, license suspensions under a driver improvement program are a rather remote threat to drivers in general. The paradox is that the drivers for whom the threat is most immediate are those least likely to be intimidated by the threat of license suspension, that is, drivers with long records of traffic violations.

License Suspension as a Specific Deterrent

Most of the research dealing with license suspension has been focused upon its specific deterrent effect on drivers whose licenses have actually been suspended. Studies that have already been cited show that violations are reduced during the period of suspension. However, none of the studies mentioned have shown an effect beyond the period of actual suspension. It is true that several of the studies have detected reductions in accidents and violations beyond the specified periods of suspension. However, as pointed out by Sadler and Perrine (1984) and Salzberg and Voas (1987), the reduction can easily be attributed to the fact that the majority of suspended drivers failed to seek reinstatement of their licenses when the period of suspension was up. It is particularly true in States which, like Arizona, require SR-22 insurance coverage of drivers whose licenses have been suspended. Drivers who can't afford the insurance just continue to operate on a suspended license. Whatever deterrent effect there is comes not from fear of having the licensing suspended, but the fact that their license is already under suspension.

One study that did show license suspension to be a true specific deterrent is that of McKnight and Edwards (1987) cited earlier. Those males who were undeterred by the threat of future suspension and committed some additional traffic violations had fewer violations following their suspensions than drivers who were not suspended (but attended an interview instead). In other words, actually experiencing suspension had a deterrent effect on future violations. While the same result was found in the case of females, the numbers were not sufficient to establish a statistically significant result.

Summary of Findings

License suspension appears to be an effective means of reducing accidents and violations among those who are actually suspended. The effect is not to keep traffic violators "off the road" but rather to lead to fewer and safer episodes of driving. As a deterrence to future traffic violations, the benefits are less well established. As a general deterrent, suspension seems to have some small effect where the prospect of suspension is fairly immediate, including (1) an effect on the general public with respect to offenses that carry suspension for the first violation (e.g. alcohol) and (2) an effect upon traffic violators approaching the point where they are eligible for suspension. As a specific deterrent for drivers who have previously been suspended, license suspension seems to have some small effect on non-alcohol offenses for certain categories of drivers.

Hardship Licenses

Arizona, like all but 11 States, offers hardship licenses to drivers whose licenses have been suspended or revoked. The hardship license allows limited, work-related driving. The primary reason for offering a hardship license is to avoid the severe financial hardship that could result from the inability to drive to and from one's job. The major objection to hardship licenses is the possibility that it may undermine the deterrence value of

license suspension by removing the biggest inconvenience of all, trying to get back and forth to work.

Effect on Employment

Just how much financial hardship is suffered by suspended drivers is not known. A few studies have been directed toward drivers suspended for DWI. In studies by Voas and McKnight (1988) and by Wells-Parker and Cosby (1987), 5-10% of suspended DWIs claim to have lost their jobs because of suspensions. Since those claiming job loss authorized verification of their claims, the figures are probably fairly accurate. However, Wells-Parker and Cosby also found the same level of job loss among convicted DWIs whose licenses were not suspended, suggesting that the loss of jobs resulted from the drinking that led to the violation rather than from the suspension.

There is no way of knowing whether the findings generated from suspensions for DWI can be generalized to suspensions for point count accumulation. However, if the mere fact of license suspension did not cause DWIs to lose their jobs, there is no reason why it would cause those with excessive point counts to lose theirs either. It is very likely that those individuals who face job loss due to license suspension simply continue to drive and that any job loss is due to the factors that led to the suspension rather than the suspension itself.

Effect on Deterrence

A more important issue than job loss is whether hardship licensing undermines the deterrent effects of license suspension. There is no question that during the period of suspension, drivers operating on hardship licenses have more accidents and violations than those whose licenses are fully suspended. This is apparent from the suspension studies cited earlier, where most of the drivers not suspended were operating on hardship licenses. The reason for the worse records of those issued hardship licenses would be rather obvious. Driving back and forth to work accounts for the major portion of the average driver's mileage. Those allowed to drive legally probably do so more often than those who must drive illegally with the result that they face exposure to arrests and accidents.

As far as general deterrence is concerned, it is difficult to believe that the availability or non-availability of a hardship license would affect the average driver's compliance with the law; research has shown that the average driver does not even know that hardship licenses are available (Voas and McKnight, 1988).

Whether the availability of a hardship license undermines the deterrent effect on later violations is not clear. Johns and Pascarella (1971) and Popkin et al. (1983) found that drivers issued hardships licenses had more subsequent accidents and violations than drivers whose licenses were fully suspended. However, as we have seen, even the decrease in accidents and violations for fully suspended drivers may not be a real effect, but simply a reflection of the numbers of drivers who never reinstated their licenses.

The effect of hardship licenses is compounded by the requirement for SR-22 coverage. Where such coverage is required for a hardship license, only the more affluent and responsible drivers tend to seek it. Studies carried out in Washington and Virginia (Voas and Salzberg, 1987; Voas and McKnight, 1988), both of which are SR-22 States, show that drivers holding hardship licenses tend to have significantly better prior driving records and better records once licenses have been restored, than have those drivers who did not obtain hardship licenses. Whatever effect the hardship license may have had in diluting the deterrence effect of license suspension was more than offset by the fact that hardship licenses tended to be obtained by drivers who were better risks to begin with.

It can be reasonably concluded from the available evidence that the decision of whether to issue a hardship license or not is largely inconsequential. It has a negligible impact upon either the economic or deterrence effect of license suspension since both effects are negligible in the first place.

DETERMINATION OF DRIVER IMPROVEMENT STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

Based upon the analyses that have been described in the preceding sections, a set of driver improvement standards and procedures have been prepared. The standards and procedures will include the following:

- o Point system
- o Warning letter
- o Driver improvement course
- o Suspension

POINT SYSTEM

There is no clear, empirical justification for the differential point values assigned to various violations under the present Arizona driver improvement system. While what are currently 3-point violations may have more serious consequences than 2-point violations, it is not evident in either the accidents associated with the violations themselves or in any tendency of the drivers to have more accidents and violations or more severe violations.

The assignment of 8 points to alcohol violations served the purpose of assuring that drivers would be assigned to an educational program on the basis of a single violation. However, the assignment serves little useful purpose since the course to which they are referred has little to do with their alcohol violation. In any case, recent legislation requiring that alcohol offenders participate in an educational or treatment program would seem to eliminate the need to treat the alcohol violations under the driver improvement program.

Violation Counting

The driver improvement program could be greatly simplified by treating all violations as equal and simply counting the number of violations. Those violations that carry no points at the present time would not be considered violations for the purpose of the driver improvement system. The simplicity of counting violations instead of points is of relatively little benefit to MVD since the point counting process is automated. However, the simplification would make the driver improvement system much easier for Arizona drivers to comprehend.

How would the change from counting points to counting violations affect driver improvement action?

Presently, the only action taken on the basis of point count is referral to a driver improvement course (currently the Traffic Survival School). This action occurs at 8 or more points. Licenses are also eligible for suspension at this point level. However, the authority to suspend licenses is used primarily to induce drivers to participate in the driver improvement course. The number of violations corresponding to 8 points would be either three or four, depending on whether the violations are 2-point or 3-point.

Available evidence suggests that referring drivers to an improvement course on the basis of three violations within 12 months will yield greater benefit than waiting until the fourth violation. Driver improvement courses have been more effective in reducing subsequent accident and violations among low-violation and no-violation drivers than among high violation drivers. This general finding is supported by the data presented earlier (Table 3) showing that the jump in mean subsequent violations for those having between 3 priors and 4 priors is over twice the jump in those having between 2 priors and 3 priors.

System Impact

The suggested change in course assignment criteria should have minimal impact upon numbers of drivers in the program. From the sample of 10,000 drivers used in the analysis of the point system, we find that 941 had three or more non-alcohol violations within any one year period. Of this number, 423 or about half had 8 or more points and would have been referred to the course. The remaining half would not. We can therefore project a two fold increase in drivers referred to a course were the referral criterion changed from 8 or more points to 3 or more violations.

Offsetting the increase in drivers with non-alcohol violations would be the loss of drivers having 8-point alcohol violations, who would be referred to a special DWI course rather than the driver improvement course. The magnitude of the loss is difficult to estimate. Within the 10,000 drivers sampled, 1,562 had 8-point alcohol violations. Since this number greatly exceeds the 941 drivers with 3 or more violations, the loss would appear quite large. Some 212 of the 8-point violators would still be eligible for referral to the driver improvement course because they had two other non-alcoholic violations in the same year. However, it would seem that, despite the twofold increase in drivers referred because of accumulated offenses, the total number of drivers eligible for referral to the driver improvement course would drop from $(423 + 1,562 =) 1,985$ to $(941 + 262 =) 1,203$. A 40% drop in eligible referrals is not necessarily a drop in actual referrals.

Within the study sample, only a third of the drivers eligible for referral because of point count were actually assigned to driver improvement courses. What happened to the rest is undeterminable from the data. In any case, it would appear that the change in referral criterion from points to violations would have far less impact than would a tightening up of procedures to assure that all who were eligible for referral were actually referred. If this were done, the number of drivers assigned to the driver improvement course above should increase despite the fact that the number eligible for referral dropped by some 40%.

WARNING LETTERS

While the effectiveness of warning letters as a deterrent to future accidents and violations is marginal, they are inexpensive and help pave the way for later driver improvement action. We therefore urge that a warning letter be sent to all Arizona drivers at a point just prior to their eligibility for license suspension. If the present point system were

maintained, the 5-7 point level would be appropriate for issuance of the letter. If the point system were replaced by a violation count, then the appropriate point for issuance of the letter would be the second violation (within 12 months).

In the interest of minimizing the expense involved in issuing warning letters, a form letter is recommended over an individualized, computer-generated letter. A sample warning letter appears below. The contents of this letter is based upon (1) those elements of advisory letters appearing in scientific and technical literature which have been found to be associated with a reduction in accidents and further violations, and (2) samples of advisory letters obtained from several states.

SAMPLE WARNING LETTER

Dear Arizona Driver:

Your driving record shows that you have compiled more than four points under the Arizona driver improvement system over the past 12 months. Statistics show that drivers in this category are twice as likely to have traffic accidents as are Arizona drivers in general.

My purpose in writing is to encourage you to improve your driving so as to avoid adding more points to your record. Drivers who compile 8 or more points in a year may have their licenses suspended. Bear in mind that points are assessed for violations even when they occur in another state or when the fine is paid by mail.

The Arizona Driver's Manual contains information that can help you drive lawfully and defensively. You may pick up a copy at any branch office of the Motor Vehicles Division.

Please help make Arizona a safe place to drive.

Sincerely,

DRIVER IMPROVEMENT COURSE

The need for a driver improvement course better suited to the needs of traffic violators was described earlier. A Traffic Violator School (TVS) program was designed to meet the needs described. The course has been documented in an Instructor Guide prepared and submitted to the Arizona Department of Transportation in May 1988. Since the Traffic Violator School (TVS) course constitutes the most significant driver improvement action by far, and it presents the most significant result of the study being described, it is included in its entirety in Appendix C of this report.

This section will summarize the major characteristics of the Traffic Violator School (TVS) course.

Objective

The stated objective of the TVS is "to reduce the likelihood of further traffic violations among frequent traffic offenders." The objective of preventing further offenses is certainly a logical one for a group that is under official sanction because of prior offenses. However, it stands in contrast with the objective of most courses for traffic violators which are concerned largely with the protection of the violators themselves, as is evident in such titles as "defensive driving" and "traffic survival."

Since the purpose of most traffic laws is to assure the public safety, any course that promotes compliance with the law also promotes safety. However, the emphasis upon prevention of traffic offenses has a significant impact upon the contents and methodology of instruction, an impact that will be evident in the following description of the TVS.

Program Structure

The structure of the TVS has been oriented specifically toward achievement of the courses objective just stated. It involves the following four major units:

Problem Recognition -- The first step in obtaining change on the part of anyone is to get him to recognize that he has a "problem," and that his present behavior is unacceptable. Problem recognition in the TVS is sought by a series of activities designed to help frequent traffic offenders to recognize their behavior is atypical.

Problem Definition -- Once participants recognize they have a problem, the next step is to help them see what it is: the conditions leading up to it, its effect upon the safety and rights of others, and the consequences if the problem is not corrected, including forfeiting the opportunity to drive.

Problem Correction -- This unit makes up the heart of the program, describing the laws that are most frequently violated, the reasons behind these laws, and the practical steps that participants can take to avoid being unsafe and illegal.

Problem Resolution -- In the concluding unit, participants discuss their own personal strategies for resolving their problems.

Content

The content of the TVS may be summarized as follows:

Problem Recognition

Introduction -- Welcome, purpose and organization of the course.

Testimonials -- Participants take turns describing their offenses, recognizing their own deficiencies in the "excuses given" by others.

Background -- The reasons behind the course and their attendance.

Responsibilities -- Requirements for punctuality, sobriety, and achievement.

Nature of the Problem (Problem Definition)

Arizona accident statistics and accident costs.

The relation of violations to accidents.

Consequences of additional violations including fines, insurance, and suspension.

What it's like to be without a license; AV presentation and class discussion.

Overcoming the Problem (Problem Correction)

Problem of being in too much of a hurry

- Speeding
- Disregarding signals
- Avoiding being in a hurry

Problem of inattentiveness

- To the path ahead
- To things on the sides
- To vehicles behind
- Being more attentive

Problem of failure to yield

- Following too closely
- Passing
- Entering traffic
- Avoiding tickets for failing to yield

Problem of failure to signal properly

- Signaling intentions
- Signaling presence
- Avoiding signaling violations

Problem of Alcohol

- Drinking and driving
- The effects of alcohol
- Controlling drinking and driving

Conclusion (Problem Resolution)

Strategies for avoiding another violation

Final examination

Method

The TVS employs a highly interactive learning approach, as opposed to the use of lecture. Use of an interactive approach is based upon both general principles of adult learning, which discourage one-way communication as a teaching technique, and the fact that the participants are all drivers and have experiences to share.

The burden of communicating information is borne by audiovisual presentations designed specifically for the program. The presentations are integrated into the program, being introduced at thirteen different points in the eight hours of instruction. Each presentation is followed by a period in which various elements of the presentation are discussed by participants.

Administration

The TVS incorporates those administrative provisions described earlier as important to an effective course. These involve the following:

Session length -- Sessions are limited to two hours in length, with no more than one session being given in a day except where participants must travel great distances.

Class size -- Because of the need for interaction, it is recommended that class sizes do not exceed 25 participants. Confining the audiovisual presentation to a video format, as opposed to film or slide cassette, is intended to encourage small classes.

Achievement -- A 25-item test is furnished as a part of the TVS course. It is recommended that students be required to pass the test in order to have "satisfactorily completed" the course.

Driver record -- For drivers to participate actively in the TVS, they must be informed of the specific violations that resulted in their course assignment. This information is best provided at the time the assignment letters are being prepared from the driver record. Sending this information along with the assignment, or requiring students to obtain it themselves, would also help prevent the misunderstandings that result in requests for hearings, requests that are wasteful of everyone's time.

Monitoring

Administration of the TVS by service providers should be closely monitored by the Motor Vehicles Division to assure compliance with the curriculum. At present, the course taught as the Traffic Survival School bears little resemblance to the published curriculum. However, the fact that the curriculum is rather out of date encourages such departures.

Monitoring adherence to the TVS curriculum is particularly important in view of the extent to which it differs from its predecessor and from improvement courses generally in use (with non-violator populations). However, strict adherence to the TVS curriculum is facilitated by (1) the detailed

guidance provided in the lesson plans, which include not only content but instructional methods, and (2) the provision of audiovisual materials as a part of the program itself, avoiding the differences in subject matter resulting from the use of differing instructional materials.

SUSPENSION

No significant change is recommended in the license suspension procedure currently employed by Arizona. Under the present system, drivers convicted of a violation within one year after assignment to the course are eligible for suspension. This would continue whether assignments were based upon point count, as items are at present, or upon violation count as has been proposed. However, the length of time for which a license is suspended for a conviction at the completion of the course currently varies depending upon point count. It is suspended for three months for 14 points or less and six months for 15 points or more.

In switching from points to violations as a basis for suspension, a license could be suspended for three months if there were one violation within 12 months after the course, and suspended for six months if there were a second violation within 12 months. Drivers who succeed in staying "clean" for 12 months after completing the driver improvement course are out of the driver improvement system and start all over again. However, should they reach the 8-point--or 3-violation--level during the second 12 months, they would be suspended rather than referred to a driver improvement course since they are not allowed to repeat the course within 24 months after taking it the first time.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

A driver improvement system suitable for implementation in Arizona was described in the previous section. This section will summarize the activities that will be needed to implement the system that has been described.

1. Revise Point System and Criteria

Given the lack of any empirically-justified basis for distinguishing the seriousness of moving traffic offenses, the simplicity of simply counting violations makes it the preferred method of determining when driver improvement action is appropriate. All that is required is the revision of the computer programs now used to trigger driver improvement action so as to tabulate the number of violations. Only those violations currently carrying point values (2, 3, or 8) would be included. The others would not be counted. As is presently the practice, only those violations occurring within 12 months of the recent violation would be included in the count.

Under the violation-counting system proposed, assignment to the driver improvement course would occur on the occasion of the third violation within a 12-month period. While this change in assignment criterion can be expected to double the number of drivers referred for accumulated moving violations, the increase will be more than offset by the absence of drivers formerly assigned on the basis of a single alcohol violation. (This will now be handled outside of the driver improvement system.)

2. Institute Traffic Violators School Program

In addition to being better suited to use in a driver improvement setting than the current Traffic Survival School course, the Traffic Violator School's program has the added advantage of uniformity. It is recommended that implementation of this program begin immediately. However, a phased implementation is suggested in order to permit the deterrent value of the TSS to be assessed.

An assessment of the relative value of the Traffic Violators School (TVS) and Traffic Survival School (TSS) in deterring drivers from subsequent violations requires only the random assignment of drivers to alternative programs. This is best handled by making the differential assignment on the basis of some random digit in an existing code rather than creating a separate randomization process. Use of an existing code makes it easy to determine at any time to which of the two courses a driver has been assigned.

It is recommended that the differential assignment process be carried on for a period of two years. At the end of this time, all of those trained during the first year will have compiled complete one year driving records. These records will be analyzed to determine if there are any significant differences in the subsequent driving records of those assigned to the two programs.

3. Require Satisfactory Performance

While the law under which driver improvement courses operate requires successful completion of courses, no formal system of measuring success is currently in use. It is recommended that a final examination be administered by schools to each participant and that a score of 75% or better be achieved before a license is restored. While the deterrent effect of any driver improvement course rests primarily upon changes in attitude rather than acquisition of knowledge, the primary route to attitude change in a driver improvement course is enlightenment, improvement in what participants know about safe and lawful driving. Since knowledges can be validly assessed in a test situation while attitudes cannot, the measure of knowledge provides the only acceptable means of assessing "successful completion."

Recognizing the importance of knowledge acquisition to effective participation in the course, those who fail the test should be required to repeat the entire course, not just the test. However, the need for course repetition should be minimized by designing the test such that it can be passed by anyone who participates actively in the course.

4. Limit Session Length and Class Size

The effectiveness of any instructional program is influenced by the duration of instructional sessions and by the size of classes. It is recommended that schools be required to administer the Traffic Violators School course in sessions not exceeding two hours in length, with no more than one session being given in any 24-hour period. It is well accepted that students are not prepared to absorb much more than two hours of material in any one subject in a single sitting. An exception to the 2-hour limit should be offered to students in outlying areas, who must commute over one way distances of 100 miles or more.

It is also recommended that class size be held to 25 participants or fewer. The highly interactive program needed to effect a change in attitudes cannot be carried out effectively with classes of any greater size. Fixing class size at a maximum of 25 participants may force schools currently scheduling larger classes to increase their fees to offset the effects of a lower student/teacher ratio. Schools changing from the 10-hour Traffic Survival School to the 8-hour Traffic Violator School will realize some cost reduction to help offset the effects of smaller classes. In any case, class size limitations are applied to all schools so no one school is placed at a disadvantage.

5. Monitor Course Administration

The Traffic Violator School course should be monitored to assure adherence to the content and methodology of the TVS curriculum. Schools should be advised of the existence and purpose of the monitoring program. However, spot checks should be made on an unannounced basis.

APPENDIX A

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Brezina, E. H. (1969). Traffic Accidents and Offenses: An Observational Study of the Ontario Driver Population. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 1, 373-397.
- Brown, K.B. (1975). Traffic Court School Countermeasure. Sacramento, CA: Sacramento Safety Council.
- Burg, A. (1968). Vision Test Scores and Driving Records: Additional Findings. (Report No. 68-27). Los Angeles: University of California, Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering.
- Campbell, B. J. (1958). Driver Improvement: The Point System. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Coppin, R.S. (1961). A Controlled Evaluation of Group Driver Improvement Meetings. (Report No. 9). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Coppin, R. S., Marsh, W. C. and Peck, R. C. (1965). A Re-evaluation of Group Driver Improvement Meetings. (Report No. 17). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Coppin, R. S. and Van Oldenbeek, G. (1965). Driving Under Suspension and Revocation: A Study of Suspended and Revoked Drivers Classified as Negligent Operators. (Report No. 18) Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles, Division of Administration.
- Donelson, A. C. and Mayhew, D. R. (1987). Driver Improvement as Post-Licensing Control: The State of Knowledge. Downsview: Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications.
- Edwards, M. L. and Ellis, N. C. (1976). An Evaluation of the Texas Driver Improvement Training Program. Human Factors.
- Eavy, P. W., Edwards, M. and Lee-Gosselin, M. E. H. (1987). Group Interviews for Probationary Drivers with Low Violation Levels: An Evaluation of the Traffic Safety Impact.
- Epperson, W. V. and Harano, R. M. (1974). An Evaluation of Some Additional Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Warning Letters. (Report No. 45). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Epperson W. V., Harano, R. M. and Peck, R. C. (1975). A Customized Approach to the Drinking Driver (Senate Concurrent Resolution 44-Harmer). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

- Flowers, R. J., Sparks, D. W., Sitton, S. C. and Cook, J. M. (1980). Prediction of Accident Likelihood Using Poisson Regression. Prepared by the Texas Transportation Institute for Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation.
- Gebbers, M. A., Tashima, H. N. and Marsh, W. C. (1987). The Traffic Violators School Dismissals: The Effects of Citation Masking on Accident-Risk Assessment and the Volume of Department of Motor Vehicles License Control Actions. (Report No. CAL-DMV-RSS-87-113). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Hagen, R. E. (1977). Effectiveness of License Suspension or Revocation for Drivers Convicted of Multiple Driving-Under-the-Influence Offenses. (Report No. 59). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Hagan, R. E., Williams, R. L. and McConnell, E. J. (1980). The Traffic Safety Impact of Alcohol Abuse Treatments as an Alternative to Mandated Licensing Controls. Alcohol Analysis and Prevention, 11(4), 275-292.
- Hagen, R. E., Williams, R. L., McConnell, E. J. and Fleming, C. W. (1978). An Evaluation of Alcohol Abuse Treatment as an Alternative to Driver License Suspension or Revocation. Final Report. (Report No. CAL-DMV-RSS-78-68). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Harano, R. M. and Peck, R. C. (1971). The Effectiveness of a Uniform Traffic School Curriculum for Negligent Drivers. (Report No. 37). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Harano, R. M., Peck, R. C. and McBride, R. S. (1975). The Prediction of Accident Liability Through Biographical Data and Psychometric Tests. Journal of Safety Research, 7(1), 16-49.
- Harrington, D. M. (1971). The Young Driver Follow-Up Study: An Evaluation of the Role of Human Factors in the First Four Years of Driving. (Report No. 38). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Henderson, H. I. and Kole, T. (1967). New Jersey Driver Improvement Clinics: An Evaluation Study. Traffic Safety Research Review, 11(4), 98-105.
- Hill, P. S. and Jamieson, B. D. (1978). Driving Offenders and the Defensive Driving Course - an Archival Study. Journal of Psychology, 98, 117-127.
- House, E. G. and Waller, P. F. (1976). Driver Improvement Measures: An Evaluation Based on Conviction and Crash Records. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Johns, T. R. and Pascarella, E. A. (1971). An Assessment of the Limited Driving License Amendment to the North Carolina Statutes Relating to Drunk Driving. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Highway Safety Research Center.

- Kadell, D. J. and Peck, R. C. (1979). Post Licensing Control Reporting and Evaluation System: Negligent Operator Program Costs and Effectiveness. (Periodic Status Report No. 4). Sacramento: Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Kadell, D. J., Peck, R. C., Fong, S. and Marsh, W. C. (1980). Post Licensing Control Reporting and Evaluation System: Negligent Operator Program Costs and Effectiveness. (Periodic Status Report No. 5). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Kaestner, N. (1979). The Effectiveness of Two Alternate Warning Letters. Salem: Oregon Motor Vehicles Division.
- Kaestner, N. and Speight, L. (1975). Successful Alternatives to License Suspension: The Defensive Driving Course and the Probationary License. Journal of Safety Research, 7(2), 56-66.
- Kaestner, N. and Syring, E. M. (1968). Follow-up of Brief Driver Improvement Interviews in Oregon. Traffic Safety Research Review, 12, 111-117.
- Kaestner, N., Warmoth, E. and Syring, E. (1967). Oregon Study of Advisory Letters: The Effectiveness of Warning Letters in Driver Improvement. Traffic Safety Research Review, pp. 67-72.
- Kelsey, S. L. and Janke, M. K. (1983). Driver License Renewal By Mail in California. Journal of Safety Research, 14(2), 65-82.
- King, G. F. (1960). A Test of the Effectiveness of Instruction and Probation. Part II of Reports of Studies on Driver Improvement Procedures, East Lansing: Michigan State University, Highway Traffic Safety Center.
- Koppa, R. J. and Banning, K. R. (1981). Young Problem Driver Improvement Project. (Report No. DOT-HS-704-104). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA.
- Lynn, C. (1982). An Evaluation of the Impact of the Virginia Driver Improvement Program on Negligent Driving: 12-month Report. Virginia Department of Transportation Safety.
- Marsh, W. C. (1978). Educational Approaches to Driver Improvement: An Experimental Evaluation with Negligent Drivers. (Final Report). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Marsh, W. C. (1971). Modifying Negligent Driving Behavior: Evaluation of Selected Driver Improvement Techniques. (Report No. 36). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

- McBride, R. S. and Peck, R. C. (1970). Modifying Negligent Driving Behavior Through Warning Letters. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 2, 141-174.
- McKnight, A. J. and Edwards, R. (1978). Safe Driving Knowledge Dissemination and Testing Techniques, Vol. II, Final Report Supplement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA.
- McKnight, A. J. and Green, M. A. (1976). Safe Driving Knowledge Dissemination and Testing Techniques. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA.
- McKnight, A. J., Simone, G. A. and Weidman, J. R. (1982). Development of Driver Improvement System for Traffic Violators and Accident Repeaters. Volume I, Developmental Research. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA.
- Miller, L. and Dimling, J. A., Jr. (1969). Driver Licensing and Performance, Vol. 1, Research Review and Recommendations. Lexington, KY: Spindletop Research Incorporated.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (1985). Comparative Data, State and Provincial Licensing Systems. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents.
- Payne, S. Brownlea, A., and Hall, A. (1984). Evaluation of Queensland Defensive Driving Course. Nathan, Australia: Griffith University.
- Peck, R. C., and Kadell, D. (1983). California's Post-Licensing Control Reporting and Evaluation System -- a Summary of the First Three Years of Results. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Peck, R. C., Kelsey, S., Ratz, M. and Sherman, B. (1980). The Effectiveness of Accredited Traffic Violator Schools in Reducing Accidents and Violations. Journal of Safety Research, 12,(2), 68-77.
- Peck, R. C., McBride, R. S. and Coppin, R. S. (1971). The Distribution and Prediction of Driver Accident Frequencies. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 2(2), 243-299.
- Planek, T. W., Schupack, S. A. and Fowler, R. C. (1972). An Evaluation of the National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course in Selected States. (Research Report). National Safety Council, Research Department.
- Polland, R. J. and Thomas, H. B. (1980). Plans and Processes for Designing a Statewide Evaluation of the Driver Improvement Schools: Interim Progress Report and Administrative Evaluation on Task 3.a of the Highway Safety Management Analysis Project. Prepared for the Florida Bureau of Highway Safety.

- Popkin, C. L., Li, L. K., Lacey, J. H., Stewart, R. J. and Waller, P. F. (1983). An Initial Evaluation of the North Carolina Alcohol and Drug Education Traffic Schools: Vol. 1, Technical Report. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Highway Safety Research Center.
- Prothero, J. C. (1978). Evaluation of an Experimental Treatment for Problem Drivers. Human Factors, 20(4), 489-493.
- Sadler, D. C. and Perrine, M. W. (1984). An Evaluation of the California Drunk Driving Countermeasure System: Vol.2. The Long-Term Traffic Safety Impact of a Pilot Alcohol Abuse Treatment as an Alternative to License Suspensions. (Report No. 90). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Sacramento Safety Council (1975). Traffic Court School Countermeasure. Sacramento, CA.
- Salzberg, P. M. and Klingberg, C. L. (1978). Special Adjudication of Enforcement (SAFE). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Transportation, NHISA. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia.
- Salzberg, P. M., Ryser, M. R., Muse, R. H., and Paulsrude, S. P. (1985). Effectiveness of the Goal Setting Program: An Intervention For High Risk Drivers. Olympia, Washington: Department of Licensing.
- Salzberg, P. and Voas, R. (1987). Effect of Hardship Licensing and Failure to Reinstate Licenses on Offense and Accident Rates. A report to Transportation Research Board.
- Schuster, D. H. and Guilford, J. P. (1964). The Psychometric Prediction of Problem Drivers. Human Factors, 6, 393-421.
- Sherman, B. and Ratz, M. (1979). An Evaluation of Probation-by-Mail as an Alternative to Mandatory Hearing Attendance for Negligent Operators. Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. L. and Peck, R. C. (1985). An Evaluation of the California Drunk Driving Countermeasure System: Volume 3. An Evaluation of the Specific Deterrent Effects of Alternative Sanctions for First and Repeat DUI Offenders. Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Temple, A. F. and Ferguson, T. G. (1959). Safety Letter Survey. Austin, Texas: Department of Public Safety.
- Ulmer, R. G. (1978). State of Rhode Island Special Adjudication for Enforcement - Volume II: Evaluation of Driver Retraining Schools. Analytic Study. Final Report. (Technical Report No. DOT-HS-803-586). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, NHISA. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA.

- Voas, R. B. and McKnight, A. J. (1988). An Evaluation of Hardship Licensing for DWIs. Volume II: Effect on General and Special Deterrents. (No. DINH22-84-C-07292). Prepared for U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In Press.
- Wells-Parker, E. and Cosby, P. J. (1987). Impact of Drivers License Suspension on Employment Stability of Drunken Drivers. (Social Research Report Series 87-3), Mississippi State University, Social Science Research Center, Mississippi Alcohol Safety Education Program.

APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF WARNING



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Motor Vehicles

2300 West Broad Street

Te1. (804) 257-0538

DONALD E. WILLIAMS
COMMISSIONER

MAIL ADDRESS
P. O. BOX 17412
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23269

Mr. Dis J Workrecord
Broad St
Richmond, Va

April 14, 1986

Dear Mr. Workrecord:

The recent traffic conviction entered on your driving record, as shown below, has brought you into the Virginia Driver Improvement Program. You are now part of a group of Virginia drivers which studies have shown to have a 26% chance of being in an accident within the next two years.

My purpose in writing this letter is to make you aware of the risks-- financial costs, inconvenience, and possible injury to yourself or others. I want to encourage you to drive both legally and defensively, and remind you that DMV may suspend your driving privilege if you receive 12 demerit points within one year or 18 demerit points within a two-year period.

Your local DMV branch office can give you a copy of the Virginia Driver manual and other materials which may be helpful. Please drive safely-- protect yourself and your driving privilege.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Williams
Commissioner

Conviction Date	Type Conviction	Offense Date	Demerit Points
2/ 1/86	DR,SUSP BEFOR PROOF OF FINANCIAL RESPONS	1/ 1/86	6
Total demerit points			6
Safe driving points			0
Balance			6



BUREAU OF MOTOR VEHICLES

MICHAEL J. MCCULLION
REGISTRAR

P.O. BOX 16520, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43286-0020

OHIO DEPT. OF HIGHWAY SAFETY

WILLIAM M. DENIHAN
DIRECTOR

STATE OF OHIO
RICHARD F. CELESTE
GOVERNOR

*** THIS IS A WARNING ***

NOT A SUSPENSION

The following entries and demerit point values show that you have an accumulation of at least six points.

LICENSE NO.	OFFENSE DATE	CONVICTION DATE	COURT NAME	COURT TYPE	COURT CASE NUMBER	OFFENSE	POINTS
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]					
KEY NO.							
SSN							
DOB							
FILE NO.	MAILED BY						
NAME							
ADDRESS							
CITY							

VOID

The Bureau of Motor Vehicles is required by law to notify every driver who has accumulated in excess of five points under Section 4807.021(J) of the Ohio Revised Code. If your present point accumulation does not exceed eleven points, and you have never been granted credit for completion of a remedial driver course, you may undergo the driver instruction course to obtain a two-point credit on your driving record. Any Ohio Highway Patrol Examination Station can provide a current listing of commercial driving schools offering the approved remedial driving course.

An accumulation in excess of eleven points within any two year period will result in the suspension of your driving privileges for up to six months in addition to the re-examination and financial responsibility requirements.

The above listing of convictions is to make you aware of your record of increasing points. Each time you drive, your safety and the safety of other people is in your hands. It is your responsibility to be an alert, law abiding driver.

Please do your part to make Ohio's Highways safe.

BMV-2817 Rev. 12/86

SINCERELY,

Michael J. McCullion

MICHAEL J. MCCULLION - REGISTRAR

DRIVING HISTORY OR POINT NOTICE

N-19 REV. 8-84

PRETISS JR GRANVILLE I
68 ALDEN AVE
ENFIELD CT

OPERATOR'S LICENSE NO.
 (OR CASE NO.)
CT174177588

09 28 87

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
 DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES
 60 STATE STREET, WETHERSFIELD, CONN. 06109-1896
 FOR INFORMATION CALL: (203) 566-5250

PAGE 01

POINT NOTICE

In the event you accumulate 10 or more points within 3 years, you will be summoned to a DMV Driver Improvement Clinic. Your points are shown below. Drive safely and keep your license.

OTHER NAMES:

DRIVING HISTORY		POINT NOTICE	
TYPE OF NOTICE			

BIRTH DATE	05	04	62
	MO.	DAY	YR.

ARREST OR WARNING DATE			LOCATION SEE CODE	INCIDENT	REASON SEE CODE	STATUTORY CITATION	DATE OF COURT			P L E A	JGMT SEE CODE	APPR	INCL	ABSTRACT OR DOCUMENT FILE NO.	POINTS	M. V. DEPARTMENT CONTROL ACTION	EFFECTIVE DATE OF DEPT. ACTION			ITEM AFFECTED	DURATION	CONDITIONS (SEE CODE)				
A	D	Y					M	D	Y								A	D	Y							
07	10	84	049	VIOLATION	007	14-299	08	24	84	2	01			H274686							13-184718					
01	02	85	165	VIOLATION	165	14-242	01	18	85	3	01			A214516	01						13-193845					
01	10	85	049	VIOLATION	073	14-217	02	04	85	1	01			B054527							13-194414					
01	10	85	049	VIOLATION	158	14-236	02	04	85	1	01			B054527	01						13-194414					
12	22	85	139	VIOLATION	030	14-219	01	09	86	1	01			A104541	02						13-214186					
11	22	86	049	VIOLATION	030	14-219	12	09	86	1	01			L115113	02						13-230710					
08	01	87	049	VIOLATION	158	14-236	09	22	87	3	01			I235082	01						13-234251					
TOTAL POINTS															07											

INDEX TO CODE NUMBERS - LOCATION CODE

Andover	22	Centerbury	43	East Hartford	64	Hartford	85	Meriden	106	Old Saybrook	127	Shelton	148	Wallingford	169	Woodstock	190	Minnesota	211	Utah
Ansonia	23	Canter	44	East Haven	65	Hartford	86	Middletown	107	Orange	128	Shelton	149	Warren	170	Alabama	191	Mississippi	212	Vermont
Ashford	24	Chaplin	45	East Lyme	66	Hartford	87	Morris	108	Orange	129	Somers	150	Washington	171	Arizona	192	Missouri	213	Virginia
Avon	25	Cheshire	46	East Lyme	67	Hartford	88	New Britain	109	Plainfield	130	Southbury	151	Waterbury	172	Arkansas	193	Montana	214	Washington
Barkhamsted	26	Clinton	47	East Windsor	68	East	89	New Britain	110	Plainville	131	Southington	152	Waterford	173	California	194	Nevada	215	West Virginia
Berlin Falls	27	Clinton	48	Ellington	69	Ellington	90	New Canaan	111	Plainville	132	South Windsor	153	Waterford	174	Colorado	195	Nevada	216	Wisconsin
Berlin	28	Colchester	49	Enfield	70	Killingworth	91	New Canaan	112	Plainville	133	Sprague	154	Westbrook	175	Delaware	196	New Hampshire	217	Wyoming
Bethany	29	Colchester	50	Enfield	71	Lebanon	92	New Hartford	113	Portland	134	Stafford	155	West Hartford	176	District of Columbia	197	New Jersey	218	Alaska
Bethel	30	Columbia	51	Enfield	72	Lebanon	93	New Haven	114	Proctor	135	Stafford	156	West Haven	177	Florida	198	New Mexico	219	Hawaii
Bethlehem	31	Cornwall	52	Farmington	73	Litch	94	New Haven	115	Prospect	136	Stafford	157	Weston	178	Georgia	199	New York	220	Puerto Rico
Bloomfield	32	Cornwall	53	Franklin	74	Litchfield	95	New London	116	Purvis	137	Stafford	158	Westport	179	Idaho	200	North Carolina	221	Canada
Bolton	33	Cromwell	54	Glastonbury	75	Lyme	96	New Milford	117	Ridgely	138	Stafford	159	Wethersfield	180	Illinois	201	North Dakota	Superior Court or Common Pleas Court of	
Branford	34	Danbury	55	Goshen	76	Madison	97	Newtown	118	Ridgefield	139	Stafford	160	Willington	181	Indiana	202	Ohio	222	Fairfield County
Bridgewater	35	Darien	56	Granby	77	Manchester	98	Newtown	119	Roch Hill	140	Thomaston	161	Williston	182	Iowa	203	Oklahoma	223	Hartford County
Bridgewater	36	Deep River	57	Granby	78	Manchester	99	North Branford	120	Rosbury	141	Thompson	162	Winchester	183	Kansas	204	Oregon	224	Litchfield County
Bridgewater	37	Deep River	58	Granby	79	Manchester	100	North Canaan	121	Salem	142	Tolland	163	Windham	184	Kentucky	205	Pennsylvania	225	Litchfield County
Bridgewater	38	Derby	59	Granby	80	Middletown	101	North Haven	122	Salisbury	143	Torrington	164	Windsor	185	Louisiana	206	Rhode Island	226	Middlesex County
Bridgewater	39	Derby	60	Granby	81	Middletown	102	North Haven	123	Salisbury	144	Trumbull	165	Windsor Locks	186	Maine	207	South Carolina	227	New London County
Bridgewater	40	Derby	61	Granby	82	Middletown	103	North Haven	124	Salisbury	145	Union	166	Wolcott	187	Massachusetts	208	South Dakota	228	New London County
Bridgewater	41	East Haddam	62	Hamden	83	Middletown	104	North Haven	125	Sharon	146	Vernon	167	Woodbridge	188	Massachusetts	209	Tennessee	229	Tolland County
Bridgewater	42	East Hampton	63	Hampton	84	Milford	105	Old Lyme	126	Shelton	147	Vernon	168	Woodbury	189	Michigan	210	Texas	229	Windham County



CODE .
DOB :

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
SAINT PAUL 55155

OML

WARNING NOTICE

A SECOND TRAFFIC VIOLATION COMMITTED BY YOU WITHIN A TWELVE MONTH PERIOD HAS RECENTLY BEEN REPORTED TO US BY THE COURT. THE LAW REQUIRES THAT WE ENTER THE CONVICTION ON YOUR DRIVING RECORD AND KEEP IT THERE FOR A MINIMUM PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS. (THIS APPLIES ALSO TO CONVICTIONS IN OTHER STATES.)

WE HOPE THAT YOU DO NOT COMMIT ANY FURTHER VIOLATIONS, HOWEVER IF YOU DO, THE LAW MAY REQUIRE THAT YOUR DRIVING PRIVILEGES BE WITHDRAWN OR RESTRICTED.

SINCE THE TRAFFIC LAWS, SIGNS AND REGULATIONS ARE SIMPLE RULES OF SAFETY, CONSCIENTIOUS OBSERVANCE OF THEM WILL NOT ONLY PROTECT YOUR DRIVING PRIVILEGES BUT WILL CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO INCREASING SAFETY ON THE HIGHWAYS.

DRIVER AND VEHICLE SERVICES DIVISION
MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55155

SECRETARY OF STATE
DRIVER SERVICES DEPARTMENT
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS

Dear Driver:

This is a courtesy reminder of your driving record, which indicates that you have been convicted of the following moving violations committed within a twelve (12) month period:

<u>Date of Offense</u>	<u>Date of Conviction</u>	<u>Traffic Violation</u>	<u>Ticket/ Case No.</u>	<u>Reporting Court/State</u>	<u>Telephone Number</u>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

If you feel either violation was reported in error, you must contact the reporting court/state who must advise our office in writing before our records may be changed or amended.

Additional traffic violation(s) issued within a year to the day of your first violation will result in the suspension or revocation of your drivers license and driving privileges.

Remember, driving is a privilege, not a "right". Abuse that privilege and you will lose it. Only you can prevent the suspension of your driving privilege. I sincerely urge you to drive carefully and observe all traffic laws, not only for your safety but also for the safety of the other highway users.

Sincerely,



Joseph P. Rockford, Director
Driver Services Department

APPENDIX C

TRAFFIC VIOLATOR SCHOOL

INSTRUCTOR GUIDE



T RAFFIC V IOLATOR S CHOOL

Instructor Guide



PREFACE

This Instructor Guide was prepared for use by instructors engaged in teaching Traffic Violator School under the driver improvement program for the Motor Vehicles Division, Arizona Department of Transportation. The *Guide* was prepared by National Public Services Research Institute. The development of the TVS was supervised by Dr. A. James McKnight. Others participating in the development include:

- Mr. Kevin Halcik, Motor Vehicles Division, Arizona Department of Transportation
- Dr. Francis C. Kenel and Mr. Charles A. Butler, American Automobile Association
- Mr. A. Scott McKnight, Ms. Ruth T. Freitas, and Ms. Yvonne P. Mattocks, National Public Services Research Institute.

INTRODUCTION

This Instructor Guide provides lesson plans for the Traffic Violator School (TVS) program designed for drivers required to complete an instructional program to fulfill requirements under the Arizona Driver Improvement Program. The Instructor Guide provides a description of the subject matter to be taught and the methods to be used in teaching it.

OBJECTIVE OF THE TRAFFIC VIOLATOR SCHOOL (TVS) PROGRAM

The objective of the TVS program is to reduce the likelihood of further traffic violations among frequent traffic offenders. The ultimate goal is to protect the Arizona motoring public from drivers whose record of prior offenses establishes them as a threat to public safety.

While the goal of the TVS can only be fulfilled by improving the safety with which its students operate their vehicles, the immediate objective of the program is preventing future traffic violations. It is because of their traffic violation records that drivers are required to participate in the TVS. While the prevention of traffic offenses is certainly a step toward safer driving, there are many elements of driving safety that are not related to traffic offenses and are, therefore, not dealt with in the TVS. An example is "defensive driving," intended primarily to protect the student from others, rather than protecting the public.

Since the TVS was designed primarily for administration to frequent traffic offenders, it is not appropriate as a volunteer course for the public in general. Nor is it suitable for drivers who have been required to participate in driver improvement because of a single offense, such as drivers referred by an individual court.

STRUCTURE OF THE TVS PROGRAM

The TVS program follows a structure designed to bring about behavioral change on the part of frequent traffic violators. The sequence of instruction is as follows:

- I. Problem Recognition--The first unit is intended to convince participants that they represent a problem population--frequent traffic offenders.
- II. Nature of the Problem--The next unit is intended to show the effect of the traffic violator's problem upon the safety of the public and upon the public's willingness to allow them to continue driving.
- III. Overcoming the Problem--This unit, the heart of the program, describes the laws that are most frequently violated, the reasons for these laws, and the practical steps that participants can take to avoid being cited for violations in the future.
- V. Conclusion--In this brief unit, participants are called upon to outline strategies for avoiding traffic citations in the future and are then administered a final examination covering the subject matter of the entire program.

METHODS

The TVS employs a highly interactive instructional approach. The great majority of instructional time is spent in discussion of various topics related to safe and lawful driving. The role of the instructor is primarily to guide instruction. The presentation of information concerning various aspects of safe and lawful driving is handled by a series of audiovisual presentations that are integrated into the program.

The emphasis upon interaction is based upon the following considerations:

- Research showing that traffic offenses are primarily the result of motivational rather than knowledge deficiencies and the importance of interaction in overcoming motivational problems.
- The wealth of driving experience that TVS participants have and which may be exploited as a basis for interaction.
- The particular importance of interactive instructional methods to effective adult learning.

CONTENTS OF GUIDE

This Instructor Guide contains a series of lesson plans providing guidance on carrying out instruction. Two forms of guidance are involved:

Subject Matter--Information bearing upon safe and lawful driving, to be used by instructors in guiding discussion (not as lecture notes).

Instructions--Guidance to the instructor on ways of initiating discussion. Instructions appearing in shaded areas to distinguish them from subject matter guidance.

COURSE SCHEDULE

The TVS is designed to be administered over an eight-hour period. Since the program employs highly interactive methods, the amount of time to be devoted to each specific subject will vary somewhat depending upon the composition of the class. However, the following general allocation of time is suggested:

SESSION 1

I. Problem Recognition	
Introduction	10 minutes
Testimonials	30 minutes
Why the Course	10 minutes
Course Responsibilities	10 minutes
II. Nature of Problem	
Accident Statistics	5 minutes
Relation of Violations to Accidents	15 minutes
Consequences of Additional Violations	10 minutes
License Suspension	30 minutes

SESSION 2

III. Overcoming the Problem	
Introduction	5 minutes
Being in Too Much of a Hurry	115 minutes

SESSION 3

Being Inattentive	60 minutes
Failure to Yield	60 minutes

SESSION 4

Failure to Signal Properly	45 minutes
Alcohol	45 minutes
IV. Conclusion	
Strategies	30 minutes
Final Examination	30 minutes

ADMINISTRATION

Session Length--Except where otherwise authorized by MVD, the course will be administered in four sessions of two hours each. Shorter sessions are hardly worth the travel time while longer sessions tend to be unproductive for adult learners. Longer sessions can be authorized in locations where participants have to travel long distances (e.g., an hour or more), however, no more than four hours of instruction should be given in a single day.

Class Size--Given the highly interactive methods needed for effective driver improvement instruction, class sizes will be limited to a maximum of 25 students. If classes are any larger than this, "participants" become an "audience."

Materials--A series of video presentations has been designed for use with the program. Those schools not able or not wishing to use the videos may present the same information in other ways, using the description of "key elements" of the presentation appearing in the lesson plans.

The time to be devoted to each topic appears in () after the topic title. The cumulative time up to a given topic appears at the far right to help instructors keep track of time.

SESSION 1

1. PROBLEM RECOGNITION

INTRODUCTION (10 min)

0:00

Introduce yourself by name and job title.

Explain reasons for assignment.

- Participants have been assigned to Traffic Violator School because of their records.
- All participants have compiled at least 8 points under the Arizona point system.
- They have been given copies of their driver records so they can see what is on them.¹
- Some participants will think that violations don't count if:
 - they were gotten in another state.
 - they forfeited collateral rather than appear in court.
 - the judge waived a fine.

TESTIMONIALS (30 min)

0:10

The purpose of this portion of the program is to get the drivers in the class to recognize that they are "problem" drivers. They are not just unlucky or the victims of police with a quota of tickets to hand out. While participants may not recognize that they have a problem, most will see it in their fellow participants after hearing their lame explanations of their traffic violations.

Get several drivers to talk about their most recent violations. Begin by calling on someone who has demonstrated a willingness to talk up, i.e., someone who has already asked a question about his or her record. Repeat this with 3-4 drivers, if time allows.

Ask class members why they are there.

Ask participants to describe each ticket.

Ask if what they were doing was dangerous.

- If positive response, ask why they did what they did.
- If negative response, ask the others if they see anything potentially dangerous in that situation.

After testimonials, ask if there is anyone who thinks he/she doesn't belong in the course-- that he/she is a really safe driver.

Ask them to explain their violations.

- Ask others to comment.
- Probe to see how often they broke the law and didn't get caught.
- Ask if they were lucky not to have gotten even more tickets.

If an individual denies unticketed violations, ask him if he has broken the law only times and was caught each time. If he persists, ask the group what they think of this hard-luck story.

¹ MVD is currently attempting to provide this information with print notice of school assignment.

WHY THE COURSE (10 min)

0:40

Class members are not "typical" or simply "unlucky" drivers.

Ask participants what proportion of drivers they think pick up as many traffic tickets as the class members did in the average year.

- It's not true that "everyone gets tickets".
 - Fewer than 1 of every 7 drivers gets a single ticket in a given year.
 - About 98 of every 100 drivers have fewer tickets than anyone in the class.
- That's something they have in common--they are among the bottom 2% or so of the drivers in the state.
- When we see even a couple of tickets, we know that a driver's been breaking the law. For every ticket drivers get, we know they've broken the law dozens of other times.
- The MVD is required by law to take action when they have cause to question a driver's fitness to drive.

COURSE RESPONSIBILITIES (10 min)

0:50

Describe the responsibilities of participants including the following:

Punctuality. No one will be admitted after the scheduled beginning of class. Participants should treat the class schedule like an airline schedule--if they arrive late, they will have to re-schedule for another time. Encourage them to arrive at least 15 minutes early to allow for possible traffic jams.

Sobriety. Anyone who, in the opinion of the instructor, is under the influence of alcohol will be denied admittance to the class.

Achievement. A test will be given at the end of the course. Participants must score 75% or better in order to successfully complete the TVS. Those who fail the test must make arrangements to retake it.

II. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

ARIZONA ACCIDENT STATISTICS/COSTS (5 min)

1:00

In Arizona:

- Nearly 175,000 accidents a year
- Four out of 10 accidents results in an injury
- Over 900 deaths
- Over 60,000 injuries
- Over \$600 million a year cost to the public

RELATION OF VIOLATIONS TO ACCIDENTS (15 min)

1:05

General Relationships

Violations are a good indication of accident likelihood.

- Studies show drivers with several tickets are 3 times more likely to have an accident as drivers with clean records.

Ask how many participants have been in an accident in the last 12 months. It doesn't have to have been the participant's fault.

- Statewide, about 175,000 drivers have an accident in a given year.
 - That's about one in every 12 drivers.
 - Yet, in this class, ___ of ___ have had an accident in the last 12 months.

Supply figure from show of hands in response to preceding question. If fewer than 3 raised their hands, comment on the fact that this is the first group in some time in which fewer than 3 members have had recent accidents.

-- That ought to say something about accident risks.

- The *average* driver has a 1 in 3 chance of being injured sometime in a lifetime of driving.
- Statistics show that drivers who continue to pick up traffic tickets every year have about a 1 to 1 chance of being badly injured in an automobile accident sometime during their lifetimes.

Specific Violations

Briefly review the relation of particular kinds of violations to accidents. Try to get participants to identify accidents resulting from various violations. Do NOT get involved in a lengthy discussion of any of the violations.

Excessive Speed

- Increases braking distance; can't stop in time.
- Decreases traction; "lose it" in corners or on bad surfaces.

- Decreases time to react to emergencies; don't have as much time to respond to someone who pulls out.
- Excess speed figures in 1 of every 6 traffic crashes.
- Excess speed is a factor in more than 2 of every 5 crashes in which someone is killed.
- The odds of living through a crash at 55 mph are twice as good as surviving a 65 mph crash.
- At 75 mph, the risk of being killed is 3 times greater than at 55 mph.

Failure to Yield Right of Way

- Someone pulls out at an intersection without looking (well enough). Another car has the right of way.
- Someone tries to squeeze into a line of traffic and doesn't make it.

Disregard of Signal/Stop Sign

- High number of accidents at change of signal points to importance of not running yellow light or anticipating green light.

Following Too Closely

- Can't react quickly enough if car ahead stops suddenly.
- Following too closely major cause of rear-end collisions.

CONSEQUENCES OF ADDITIONAL VIOLATIONS (10 min)

1:20

Expense

Emphasize the personal impact of each of the following on each participant.

Fines

All that's needed is one more ticket and class members will be in a lot of trouble--at least when it comes to money.

-- Right away, fines have to be paid.

-- If tickets are contested to keep charges from going on driving records, class members pay in terms of time lost from work and the general inconvenience of a court appearance.

Insurance rates

Fines are small compared to the cost of insurance premiums if license gets suspended.

-- Rates are probably high now.

-- In sum, when it comes to insurance, class members will be paying big money for that next ticket for a long, long time to come.

Legal Judgment

- If the violation leads to an accident, the damages could exceed the limits of the insurance policy. The driver would be liable for the additional amount.
- Drivers who do not have the money can lose their homes and other property, and have their wages garnished.

Loss of License

- Money isn't the only thing that tickets can cost.
- They can cost drivers their licenses.
 - 8 or more points on a driving record and the driver will be placed on a 1-year probation.
 - If another violation is incurred any time in that 12-month period, the license will be suspended.
 - Suspension is certain. Going to Traffic Violator School won't be an option.

Length of suspension:

- 3 months, if point total doesn't exceed 14.
- 6 months, if point total is 15 points or more.

LICENSE SUSPENSION (30 min)

1:30

A/V Presentation**Play "Paul's Story"**

Introduce presentation by telling the participants that many of the drivers taking this course will end up being suspended and that the tape you are going to play was made by such a driver.

Class Discussion

Select individual participants and ask where they drove yesterday, beginning with the first trip and continuing in order through to the last trip made. Briefly note trip lengths and destinations on chalkboard.

Begin discussion with questions geared to making participants realize the drawbacks of not being able to drive themselves. For instance:

- If they couldn't drive, how would they make these trips?
- If drivers suggest letting a spouse or friend drive, ask how they would feel about bugging people for rides day after day for three months.
- If driver suggests hitchhiking or taking a bus, ask about convenience, reliability, travel time, etc.

Repeat this exercise with several participants. Then, summarize discussion results as follows.

- Driving is an important part of day-to-day living.
- Not being able to drive can really put a crimp in your lifestyle.
- A suspended license means a lot of frustration, extra expense, lost time and lost opportunities.

MVD suspends solely because the driver's record shows a person to be unwilling or unable to drive in a reasonably safe manner.

- The purpose in suspending is not to make life miserable for a driver.
- But when a driver's record tells us that he drives unsafely, MVD will suspend the license *regardless* of the personal problems it may cause him.
- MVD's job is to protect the safety of *all* motorists in this state.
- Participants don't have to lose their licenses.
- But to keep them, they will have to change the way they're driving.

2:00

III. OVERCOMING THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION (5 min)

0:00

- Participants are the only ones who can prevent further tickets.
- The rest of the course will deal with ways to avoid getting another ticket.
- We will look at each of the major reasons for getting a ticket and what needs to be done to prevent recurrences.

BEING IN TOO MUCH OF A HURRY (1 hr, 55 min)

0:05

- The single most important thing that can be done to protect a license is to take just a little more time while driving.

Cite three earlier examples among participants, naming names and tickets. If possible mention one non-speeding ticket and place it in the context of haste, e.g.:

- "Mr. Smith, you didn't take the time to come to a full stop at a stop sign."
- "Mr. Wilson, you tried to force your way into traffic rather than wait a minute until a large enough gap occurred."

Speeding (1 hr, 15 min)

Reasons for Speeding (15 min)

Speeding is the most common response to being in a hurry.

Ask why people speed. Mention the reasons or, if some "reasons" for speeding emerged in the initial discussion, jot them down on the chalkboard first. Then ask if there are other reasons.

Write "reasons" on the chalkboard as they are suggested. After a few minutes of suggestions, discuss the following reasons, circling those that have been mentioned.

"To Save Time."

- The most common reason.
- How much time?
 - On a 50-mile trip, you could save 6 minutes by driving 75 mph as opposed to 65 mph--but only if you could keep up a steady 75 mph.
 - You can't maintain a steady 75 mph in real world traffic. You must slow down for other cars. You end up saving only about 3-4 minutes for each 50 miles.
 - Most trips made are less than 10 miles long--the savings is only seconds.
 - In the meantime, constant slow-down speed-up costs gas plus wear and tear on car.

"It's not dangerous/I can handle it."

- We've already seen how high speeds increase the chances of having an accident and dying in it.
- Even if you think you can handle high speeds, remember, a lot of other drivers can't handle your speed.
 - They expect you to obey the speed laws and may pull in front of you or make some other move without realizing how fast you are going.
 - You have to handle risks they throw your way, not just the risks you create for your self. The greater your speed, the less time you leave yourself to spot problems and react to them safely.

"Everybody else speeds."

- National studies show that most drivers drive within a few miles of the posted limit.
- If you maintain the speed of traffic and "go with the flow", you'll be driving at the safest speed.
- Most speeding tickets are issued to drivers who are driving faster than traffic. If you stay with the pack, you'll be less likely to get a ticket.

"Interstates were designed for higher speeds"

- While interstates are designed for high speed, not all drivers are. Drivers make mistakes. The faster the speed, the less chance a driver has to recover from the other guy's mistake. No highway is safer at 75 mph than at 65 mph.
- Design speed is not the same as safe operating speed, which depends on traffic and roadside conditions.

There Are Good Reasons for Speed Limits

- Traffic engineers gear their decisions on speed limits to things like:
 - Whether there are dangerous curves and intersections
 - The kinds of things happening at the sides of the road
 - How well drivers can see what's ahead
 - How much traffic is usually on the road, and what kind it is (freeway, city street, etc.)
 - How people park on the road
 - How pedestrians use the area
 - The number and kinds of accidents that have happened there.

Speed and Visibility (20 min.)

:20

Put on the first segment of the Speeding presentation, dealing with stopping distance and site distance. After it is over, have students review key elements of the presentation.

Speed and Stopping Distance

- Your speed will determine how long -- in time and feet -- it will take you to stop. The higher the speed, the more distance required to stop.
- Each tire covers an area about the size of your hand. You have four "hands" on the road to stop two tons of vehicle.
- Braking distance increases disproportionately with speed
 - Many drivers believe that if they drive twice as fast, their stopping distance will be twice as long. But it doesn't work that way.
 - For instance, if the speed is 40 mph instead of 20, the stopping distance will not be twice as long. *Three times* the distance to stop (150 feet instead of 50 feet) will be required.
 - If the speed is 60 mph instead of 30, the situation is even worse. Stopping will take *four times* the distance (360 versus 90 feet).

Speed and Sight Distance

You have to be able to stop within the distance you can see ahead. So, the less you can see of the road ahead, the slower you should go. If your vision is blocked or limited by weather conditions or by the road itself--you must adjust your speed to deal with the problem.

- Let's say you're driving at 45 mph.
 - It will take you about 200 feet to stop (on dry pavement).
 - If you can see only 100-150 feet ahead on the road, you'll need to reduce your speed to 35 mph.
- Many things make it hard for drivers to see.
 - Darkness. Never drive so fast that you cannot stop within the distance you can see ahead with your lights. **YOUR HIGH BEAMS LET YOU SEE CLEARLY ONLY ABOUT 250 FEET AHEAD.** Since it takes 250 feet to stop a car traveling 50 mph, you can't safely drive faster than 50 mph. If you do drive faster, you will be "driving blind".
 - Sun glare. When you're driving straight into low sunlight, it's hard to see what's on the road. Cut your speed so you'll have time to react to hazards hidden by glare.
 - Rain, fog, or snow. It takes about 100 feet to stop your car when you are going 30 mph. In very heavy rain, a snowstorm or thick fog, you may not be able to see more than 100 feet ahead. When you can't see any farther than that, you cannot safely drive faster than 30 mph. In a very heavy downpour, you may not be able to see well enough to drive at any speed. If this happens, pull off the road and wait until it clears.
 - Hills and curves. You never know what's on the other side of a steep hill or a sharp curve. If a car is stalled on the road just over the hill or around a curve, you must be going slowly enough to stop. When you come to a hill or curve, adjust your speed so you can stop if a car is there.
 - Intersections. Trees, bushes, or buildings at intersections can block your view of cars coming from the side. You need to approach a "blind" intersection slowly enough to be able to stop if a car pulls out suddenly.
 - Parked cars. Cars parked along the side of the road block your view. People may be ready to get out of a car or walk out from between parked cars. Besides giving parked cars plenty of room, you need to be going slowly enough to stop quickly.

Speed and Road CONDITIONS (20 MIN)

0:40

Put on the second segment of the Speeding presentation, dealing with Speed and Road Conditions. When it is finished, have participants review key elements of the presentation.

- Just because someone is doing the posted speed limit doesn't mean they're not speeding
- Drivers must take traction and braking distance into consideration when determining how fast to drive.
- Roadway surface conditions can greatly affect stopping distance. If the road is wet or slick, stopping distance can be doubled!
- Wet roads.
 - Allow more stopping distance.
 - Drive at least 5 to 10 mph slower on wet pavement than you would on dry
 - Wet roads are *most* dangerous on hot days, *just after the rain has begun.*
 - For the first 10-15 minutes, the rain combines with oil and dirt on the road and creates a slick mixture.
 - Intersections can get especially slippery since cars have stopped there and left more oil on the road.
 - Where water has collected on the road, the vehicle may hydroplane.
- Icy and snowy roads
 - Plan on it taking further to stop.
 - **REDUCE YOUR SPEED BY HALF ON PACKED SNOW. SLOW TO A CRAWL ON ICE.**
 - Packed snow and ice are most slippery when the temperature is just at freezing (32). (Lower temperatures make ice drier. Ice and snow are trickiest just as they are about to melt.
 - Shady spots may still be icy. They thaw after the rest of the roadway does.
 - Overpasses and bridges are the first to freeze and the last to thaw. (They don't get heat from the earth, like the rest of the road does.)
- Adjusting speed for the layout of the road is as important as adjusting speed for slippery surfaces.
 - When you are driving straight and you come to a curve, the car still tends to keep going straight.
 - The faster you are moving, the greater the car's tendency to continue straight ahead.
 - If you go too fast on a curve, your tires can lose their grip, and your car can skid or run off the road.
 - Always lower your speed *before* you enter a curve. It's a bad idea to brake *in* a curve

- Plan ahead. Watch for roadside signs that warn you when a curve is coming up. Often a sign will tell you how fast you should take it.
- If you come to a curve while traveling downhill, remember, gravity is working against you. Begin braking sooner, and approach the curve more slowly than you would on level ground.

Speed and Traffic (20 min.)

1:00

Put on the third segment of the Speeding presentation, dealing with Speed and Traffic. When it is over, have participants review key elements of the presentation.

Another important thing that should influence how fast to drive is the speed of other traffic on the road. The safest and most basic rule for sharing the road with other drivers is to: *Travel at the speed of traffic*__

Driving faster than other traffic usually means you end up zig-zagging in and out of traffic lanes to pass others.

- Every time you pass another car, there is a chance for a collision (e.g., the car you are passing may suddenly change lanes).
- If you pass one car after another, the chances begin to add up.

Pick the lane where traffic is moving at a comfortable, legal speed. Use left lanes for faster and right lanes for slower speeds.

On expressways use:

- left lane for passing
- center lane for cruising with traffic
- right lane for entering or leaving.

Keep an even speed.

- A lot of accidents occur when drivers constantly brake and then speed up.

Speed and Accidents

- As speed goes up, so do the chances of getting into an accident. The chances are further multiplied if the road is slippery or it's hard to see the road well ahead.
- The speed also affects your chances of getting out of an accident - alive.
- National statistics show that the chances of someone dying in a car crash *double* as the speed of the car increases from 55 to 65 mph. The chances *triple* as speed increases from 55 to 75 mph.
- The faster the speed, the longer it takes to stop safely or make a quick maneuver to avoid a collision.

Disregard Signal/Stop Sign (20 min.)

1:20

The preceding section dealt with speeding. That is the violation most often resulting from being in a hurry. Two others are not coming to stop at a stop sign or stop light.

Stop Signs

- Many drivers feel that simply slowing down for a stop sign, i.e., making a "rolling stop", is safe enough.
- There are sound reasons for laws that say you must come to complete stop at stop signs.

Studies show that it is much harder to distinguish a moving object such as an approaching car when you yourself are moving.

- An approaching vehicle can be hidden from view behind your door post.
- Keep moving and an approaching car can remain hidden.
- Come to a complete stop and a moving vehicle must emerge from behind the door post.

Stop Lights

- Most often, drivers run a light when they know it's about to turn red, but think they'll either make it through on time or close enough that it "isn't really running a red light".
- Arizona state law says that if you are entering an intersection when the light is red, you are running a red light.
- The most dangerous time to be in an intersection is when the light has just changed.
 - Drivers who are rushing to beat the light are usually going even faster than usual.
 - Drivers at cross streets may jump the gun, edging into the intersection anticipating green.
 - looking at the light rather than other traffic.
 - maintaining speed to hit the intersection just as the light turns green.

Right Turn on Red

- Rolling through a right turn on red is like rolling through a stop sign, *only more dangerous.*
- Since stop lights are usually at major intersections, speed of approaching cars is greater. It's harder to judge speed while moving.
- Some drivers only look "upstream" for cars coming from the left.
- Oncoming cars may have left turn arrow and may turn into the same lane as violator.
 - Pedestrians crossing from the right have a green light or "walk" signal and aren't expecting anyone to enter the intersection.
- Unless you come to a complete stop and make sure that it is absolutely safe to proceed, you cannot make a safe or legal right turn on red.

How to Avoid Being in a Hurry (15 min.)**1:40**

Discuss ways of overcoming the need to hurry. Cite situations mentioned in earlier discussions and continue questioning participants until they mention the methods listed below.

- Leave earlier
 - Leaving just 5-10 minutes earlier can make all the difference in the world.
 - You won't feel you *have* to speed.
 - With time to spare, you will even find yourself being a model of courtesy, e.g., letting others in line.
- If you think you will be late, call ahead to let people know, and then don't worry about it.
- Simply force yourself to avoid those "little" infractions that save you no more than a few moments and leave you open for another traffic ticket.
 - Driving 5 miles over the speed limit.
 - "Rolling" through a stop sign.
 - Trying to beat a yellow light.
- Ask others (spouse, friend) to remind you when you're breaking the law. You won't resent it as much if you asked for it.
- Always being in a hurry costs:
 - energy
 - wear and tear
 - worry
 - licenses
- Is the time saved worth it?

Summary of "Being Too Much In A Hurry" (5 min.)**1:55**

Briefly summarize the dangers involved in being in too much of a hurry--speeding and dis-regarding traffic controls--and the ways that were given to prevent having to hurry.

SESSION 2

III. OVERCOMING THE PROBLEM (CONT)

BEING INATTENTIVE

0:00

- Inattention is a major source of traffic tickets.
- Many drivers who are ticketed as a result of accidents or near-accidents are charged with "inattention" or "failing to give proper attention" to driving.
- Being inattentive can be divided into two basic categories:
 - Not paying enough attention to the right things
 - Paying too much attention to the wrong things.

Not Paying Enough Attention to the Right Things (45 min.)

Some drivers get in trouble because they don't give their attention to the right things. Giving attention to the right things requires good seeing habits or "good visual search."

Put on the first segment of the Inattention presentation, dealing with failure to exercise good visual search. When it is finished, have participants review key elements of the presentation.

The Path Ahead (15 min.)

0:05

Drivers must be attentive to events developing in their path.

A common mistake drivers make is focusing their attention on the road right in front of the car instead of looking far enough ahead.

- At 50 mph, something you spot 100 feet ahead is only 1.4 seconds away.
- Drivers who don't look far enough ahead end up making last minute lane changes and panic stops.

Looking farther ahead helps you drive smoothly and safely.

- It gives you a chance to spot trouble before it happens.
- The earlier you can spot certain driving situations, the better you can safely adjust to them.
- Adjusting to problems ahead doesn't necessarily mean simply *stopping* for them. Many times it's better to avoid problems by going around them.
- Looking far enough ahead gives you time to:
 1. *Spot* a problem.
 2. *Decide* what is the smoothest way to avoid it (i.e., decide whether to change lanes or stop).
 3. *Check* for any traffic that might keep you from making your move.
 4. *Make your move*.

How far ahead to look

- Drivers need to look about *10-12 seconds ahead*.
 - *In the city* you will travel about *1 block* in 10-12 seconds.
 - *At highway speeds*, 10-12 seconds is about *1/4 of a mile* (or 3 blocks).

Point out that, while drivers rarely get ticketed for not looking far enough ahead, good visual lead time can help prevent tickets. Ask participants to identify which of their tickets might have been avoided had they been more attentive to what was happening further up the road. If no one brings it up ask how many would have spotted the cop that ticketed them had they been looking further ahead.

Seeing to the Sides (15 min.)

0:15

Put on the next segment of the Inattention presentation. When it is over, have participants review key elements of the presentation.

Though it's important to look near and far ahead, you also have to "scan" or glance to the sides of the road.

All the time

- Look to the sides often, especially where others may cross or enter your path.
- Make it a habit--do this where others are supposed to yield the right of way to you.
- It's especially important to see to the sides at crosswalks and intersections.

At intersections

- Look to the *left* first--traffic coming from that direction will hit you first.
- Then look to the *right*--you have a lane to cross before you'll meet traffic coming from that direction.
- Then look *left* again, to catch the guy who wasn't there before.

At Crosswalks

- Keep an eye out for pedestrians, bicyclists, mopeds, etc.
- Watch in all directions, but *especially to the right*. Pedestrians and bicyclists to your right are usually the *CLOSEST* to you.
- *When turning right*, watch for anything between your car and the curb. Glance over your right shoulder for a bicyclist.
- *When turning on a green light*, remember pedestrians crossing the street you are turning into have a green light, too. Yield the right of way to them.

Seeing Behind (15 min.)

0:30

Drivers need to check behind periodically as well as when changing lanes or slowing down unexpectedly.

Put on the next segment of the "Inattention" presentation, dealing with checking behind. When it is over, have students review key elements of the presentation.

Changing Lanes

"Changing Lanes" means anytime you change position.

- Moving from one lane to another.
- Entering a freeway or highway from an entrance lane.
- Entering the road from the curb or shoulder.

Ask which participants have been ticketed or gotten into an accident because of a lane change or entering the road from the roadside. Ask how many have had near misses

Slowing Unexpectedly

- If you have to slow down quickly, check traffic behind to see how close it is and how fast it is coming toward you. If you have a choice, you might want to change your mind about slowing down or stopping.

Some situations where one might slow down or stop unexpectedly:

- Slowing down for something in the road ahead that the driver behind can't see. (For example, you come around a corner and see a car stalled in the road.)
- Getting ready to turn into a side road or driveway, particularly when you plan to turn just before or after an intersection. (Make sure drivers behind you understand why.)
- Planning to pull into a parking space. (Angle space *and* parallel parking.)

Blindspot

There are times when mirrors can't give the whole picture of what's going on behind you.

- There are two blind spots, both big enough to hide another car.
 - Explain left and right side blindspots.
 - Use picture or diagram if possible.
- Drivers *will not* get a view of what's in the blind spot through their mirrors (even if they lean forward in the seat).
- The only way to get a really good view of what's in the blind spots is to turn the head and look over the shoulder.
- Four visual checks:
 - *Mirrors*--Use both the side and rearview mirrors.
 - *Shoulder check*--Turn the head and glance over the shoulder to view the blind spot.
 - *Look fast*--Don't keep the eyes away from the road in front for more than an instant.
 - *Check far lanes*--On a highway with many lanes, someone in another lane may plan to move into the same space you want.

Giving Too Much Attention to the Wrong Things (5 min.)

0:45

- Some drivers get into trouble because they pay attention to the wrong things when they drive.

Inquire how many participants have had an accident because of a momentary distraction. Have them describe the circumstances. Did they get a ticket? How many have had close calls?

- If it's necessary to light cigarettes, tune radios, etc. while you drive, do it when it isn't necessary to divide attention.
 - At a stop light.
 - Pull off the road.

How to be More Attentive (10 min.)

0:50

Have participants discuss what they can do to prevent another ticket because of inattentiveness. Call on those who have received a ticket due to inattentiveness. Lead toward practical schemes, not simply statements like, "I'm going to pay more attention."

Make sure to include at least the following:

- Enlist help of passengers.
 - "If I get another ticket, I'm going to get grounded."
 - "Please don't get me engaged in conversation."
 - "Let me know if I'm about to do something dumb."
- Get your act together beforehand.
 - Tune radio to the right station.
 - Check map or directions.
 - Have personal items handy.

FAILURE TO YIELD (60 min)

1:00

Lots of drivers get ticketed when they invade the space that belongs to someone else and count on the other person to watch out for them. These situations include the following:

- Following too closely
- Illegal passing
- Unsafe crossing/entering.

All of these involve failure to yield the right of way to another driver, although the ticket may actually be called something else.

Following Too Closely (20 min.)

- "Following too closely" is one of the leading cause of auto accidents.

- When the car ahead stops suddenly, the tailgater may not have enough room to stop or swerve and then there's a rear-ender.
- The tailgater gets a ticket for "following too closely".

If any participants have been ticketed for following too closely, have them describe the circumstances. Did the driver ahead stop "without warning"? If there were no sudden stops, describe such a situation. Why should the following driver get a ticket when the driver ahead stops without warning?

The following driver is the only one who can control the distance between vehicles.

- True, the driver up ahead shouldn't stop suddenly. But sometimes he can't help it; a car, bicycle, or pedestrian can force him to stop suddenly.
- The only one who can prevent an accident in such a situation is the following driver. That's why the law holds him responsible.
- The space behind a vehicle belongs to that vehicle. Any one who invades it risks getting a ticket if an accident occurs.

What is a legal following distance?

Explain that the next presentation will describe what is a legal and safe following distance. Put on the first segment of the "Right of Way" presentation, dealing with following distance. When it is over, have participants review the key elements.

The 2-second rule is an easy method for allowing enough space in front. Here's how the 2-second rule works:

- When the rear bumper of the car ahead passes a shadow or pavement marking (in the diagram, the tree), start counting the seconds it takes you to reach the same spot on the road.
- Count "one-second-one, two-seconds-two."
- If you pass your marker before you finish counting, then you are following too closely.

Whenever more space is needed:

- On slippery roads. If the car ahead should slow or stop, you will need more distance to stop.
- When following motorcycles. If the motorcycle should fall, you will need extra distance to avoid the rider. The chances of a fall are greatest on wet or icy roads, metal surfaces such as bridge gratings or railroad tracks, and on gravel. Remember that motorcycles can stop more quickly than cars.
- When the driver behind you wants to pass. Slow down to allow room in front of your car to help the driver pass.
- When you have a heavy load or are pulling a trailer. The extra weight increases your braking distance.
- At night. It's harder to tell when you're overtaking a car ahead at night.
- When following large vehicles that block your view ahead. You need the extra room to see around the vehicle and to the sides.

Passing (15 min.)

1:20

When passing on a two-lane road, drivers must enter a lane that belongs to oncoming cars.

The right of way belongs to the other cars.

Drivers can get ticketed for being in a lane belonging to oncoming drivers if:

- The law says they are not allowed to be there--e.g., "no passing" zone.
- They don't see, or misjudge the distance of, an oncoming car and create an accident situation.

Put on next segment of presentation dealing with Passing. When it is over, discuss key aspects of illegal passing.

Violating No Passing Zones

Find out if anyone has been ticketed for violating a no passing zone. If not, ask if anyone has ever passed in a no passing zone. Discuss with participants the reasons for violating and the need for observing a no passing zone.

Reasons for Violations

- If they don't see anything coming, nothing is coming.
- They know better than the Highway Department whether it's safe to pass there or not.
- Driver ahead is going so slow that this is a "special case" where markings can be ignored.
- They are in such a big hurry that markings can be ignored.
- Some violators interpret the boundaries to suit themselves. As long as they start in a passing zone, they figure it doesn't matter where they end up.
- Drivers may think that they have enough room, but find that it takes longer than they thought. Rather than abort, they violate the no passing zone.
- To pass legally, a driver must begin and end a pass *completely* within the passing zone.

Reasons for Observing No Passing Zones

- Passing another car on a two-lane road is one of the most dangerous things you can attempt when behind the wheel--since you have to enter a lane that belongs to oncoming cars.
- Like speed limits, no passing zones are decided upon by people who study the road carefully and take into account many things that a driver on that road isn't aware of.

Violations in Legal Passing Zones

Even in a legal passing zone, it is illegal to pass unless the road ahead is clear.

- At highway speeds around 50 mph, you need about 1/3 of a mile to complete a pass.
 - That means you need a 1/3 of a mile gap in oncoming traffic to pass safely

- If you can tell that a car is coming closer, it is probably too close for you to start to pass.
- Any time your view is blocked by a curve or a hill, you should assume an oncoming car is just out of sight. You can't pass if you are within 1/3 of a mile of a hill or curve.
- It is dangerous to pass at crossroads. A driver turning onto the road won't expect to find you in his lane and may not even look your way.
- Before you pass, you need to look ahead for road conditions and traffic that may cause the car you're passing to move over into your lane:
 - pedestrians or bikers near the road
 - a narrow bridge,
 - a patch of ice, broken pavement, or something on the road.
- It's dangerous to pull out to pass without space to return.
- Before you return to the driving lane, be sure to leave enough room between yourself and the car you have passed. One way to do this is to look at the car in the rearview mirror. When you can see both headlights, you have enough room to pull back in.

Entering Traffic (15 min.)

1:35

- Many drivers entering or crossing a highway put themselves in a position in which other drivers must change speed or direction to avoid hitting them.
 - Entering traffic from a cross street
 - Crossing traffic from a side street.
 - Left turns across oncoming traffic.
 - Merging onto a highway.

Forcing Entry

- Driver waits what he considers to be "long enough" for a break to enter traffic, says "To heck with this, they're just going to *have* to make room for me," and barges in.
- Drivers who force their way into or across traffic are trusting that other drivers will avoid them. An accident occurs when other drivers don't accommodate fast enough to avoid an accident.
- Forcing other drivers to change speed or direction is failure to yield the right-of-way.
 - The other drivers have the right of way. They have the right to continue in their path unobstructed. A driver forcing them to change speed or direction to avoid him is interfering with their rights. It is invading their "space".
 - The forcing driver is at fault in an accident. If he gets caught violating the law, he can be ticketed.

Getting Hung Up

- Driver waiting to make a left turn off main road across oncoming traffic starts as soon as there's a gap in traffic only to find a pedestrian blocking his way into the side street. Driver ends up stuck in the path of oncoming traffic.

- The fact that something caused the driver to violate someone else's right of way doesn't absolve the driver of responsibility for:
 - An accident
 - A ticket.

Inability to See

A common accident situation is one in which a vehicle is hidden from the view of approaching drivers.

- Blind intersection--Trying to enter a street when hidden by parked cars, trees, buildings, or shrubs at the intersection.
- Stalled traffic--Trying to cross a main highway when cars stopped in traffic obscure the view of vehicles approaching from the left or right.
- Trying to make a left turn where oncoming vehicles also preparing to turn left obscure the view of vehicles approaching in the far lane.

If a vehicle starts to enter or cross a traffic stream and is struck, the driver of the struck vehicle is cited for failure to yield right-of-way.

Best solutions are to avoid the problem by waiting until traffic clears or choosing another intersection.

Where it's absolutely necessary to cross traffic from a hidden position, stick the nose out just enough to be visible and wait several seconds to give approaching vehicles a chance to respond by slowing down or tooting the horn.

Find out if any of the participants have been ticketed or had an accident where they were entering or crossing a stream of traffic. If there are no accidents or traffic tickets, let them recall instances in which they forced another driver to change speed or direction. Have them imagine what would have happened if the other driver:

- Didn't see them (wasn't looking, glare, dirty windshield).
- Couldn't stop (bad brakes, slick surface).
- Decided to speed up (beat them or bluff them).

How to Avoid Ticket for Failing to Yield (10 min.)

1:50

Have a discussion of ways in which participants can keep from being ticketed for failure to yield the right of way--following too closely, illegal passing, or illegal crossing/entering. Again, require them to come up with practical strategies, not simply resolutions. Possibilities include the following:

Switching Places

One possibility is to have violators mentally "switch places" with the driver of the other vehicle. Imagine how they would react if someone else:

- Tailgated them.
- Pulled out to pass, forcing them to swerve or brake.
- Pulled out in front of them, cut across the street in front of them, or made a left turn across their path, almost causing an accident.

Be a Cop

They might imagine that the car that they're tailgating, pulled out to pass illegally, or pulling in front of is an unmarked police car,

Who's at the Wheel!

Ask participants to imagine that the driver they are tailgating, or about to pull in front of is the worst driver they know, for example, brother-in-law, sister, or so on. Do they really want to trust their lives to the way some people drive, or do they want to allow plenty of room.

Summary

Briefly summarize ways in which drivers fail to yield--following too closely, illegal passing, at crossing/entering--and the ways in which participants will avoid violations and tickets.

SESSION 3

III. OVERCOMING THE PROBLEM (CONT)

FAILURE TO SIGNAL PROPERLY (45 min)

0:00

The previous section dealt with failure to yield. Sometimes the failure to yield is inadvertent--the driver didn't see the other vehicle. When the driver of the other vehicle doesn't respond, there may be an accident.

Even a driver who fails to yield might avoid an accident and a ticket by *signaling*. The other driver would have a better chance of recognizing and making up for the first driver's mistake if he knows what the first driver intends to do. This section will deal with ways in which the chances of a ticket can be reduced by proper signaling.

Failing to signal properly includes two aspects of signaling:

- Signaling intentions
- Signaling presence.

Signaling Intentions (20 min.)

If anyone was cited for failing to signal properly, have him/her describe the circumstances. Help participants to see the danger in failure to signal.

Danger of Failing to Signal

- Unseen vehicle--Signaling warns the driver of an unseen vehicle in time for him/her to sound the horn or move out of the way.
 - Changing lanes (including leaving the curb) into another vehicle's path.
 - Making a left turn across an oncoming vehicle's path.
 - An advance warning may prevent an accident for which the driver would be charged.
- Conflicting intentions--When another driver is about to do something that conflicts with what you are about to do, it warns him not to.
 - A driver who's getting ready to pass you just as you decide to change lanes.
 - A driver who plans to enter the same lane you are entering.

Need to Signal all the Time

- Some participants may complain that they didn't signal because there was no other car around.
- If you could always count on seeing other vehicles, you probably wouldn't have to signal.
- It's the car that you don't see that you end up in an accident with.

Put on Signaling presentation. When it is over, review key elements of the presentation

Signaling Early Enough

- You need to signal early enough to allow other drivers time to adjust.
- Last-minute signals are no help.

How often have participants gotten caught behind a driver who signaled a left turn only after he was already stopped.

Making Intentions Clear

- If there are several places where turns could be made, delay the signal until just before you reach the turn you plan to make.

Example:

You plan to turn into a parking lot beyond an intersection. If you signal before the intersection, another driver may think you're going to turn *at* the intersection and pull into your path.

- It is dangerous to leave signals on. If another driver trusts the signal and there's an accident, the driver with the signal on could get ticketed for *improper* signaling.

Signaling Presence (15 min.)

0:20

- Signals not only tell other drivers what you plan to do, they also tell them where you are.

Put on presentation Signaling Presence. When it is finished, review the key elements of the presentation.

- Poor visibility--Dusk, rain, fog.
- Stopped by the side of the road at night, over a hill, or beyond a curve.

Poor Visibility

How to make a car easier to see in low visibility--the headlights.

When does Arizona law require that lights be turned on? (From dusk to dawn.)

Lights can also improve visibility in rain, fog, snow, or on dark days.

Useful guide--When you have a hard time spotting other cars, their drivers will have a hard time spotting you.

What lights to use?

- Parking lights?
 - Hard to see
 - Misinterpreted
 - Look farther away than they are.
 - Look like a parked vehicle.
- High beams can cause glare even in the daytime.
- Low beam headlights are the best.

Stopped by the roadside

Many accidents occur when somebody runs into a car parked by the roadside.

- For repair
- For a rest stop

The driver of a stopped car can be ticketed if proper precautions aren't taken:

- Move as far from the traveled portion of the road as possible
- Use flashers
 - Not parking lights.
 - Some drivers have mistaken parking lights for taillights and tried to "follow" the parked car.
 - Use flares or reflectors if parked on the paved surface.
 - Place flares or reflectors well behind the vehicle.
- Approaching drivers need time to adjust; placing flares directly behind the vehicle is useless.
- Avoid parking just over a hill or just around a curve where the car is invisible to approaching drivers

How to Avoid Signaling Violations (10 min.)**0:35**

Have a discussion on how participants can avoid tickets for not signaling, as well as for failure-to-yield violations. Call upon students ticketed for failure-to-yield violations that could have been prevented by signaling, and ask them how they can avoid similar mistakes in the future.

- The best way to remember is to make a response automatic.
- Practice never turning wheel if the signal lever is horizontal.
- Practice cancelling signals with countersteer--don't trust to memory.

ALCOHOL (45 min)**0:45**

- The most important element in the task of driving is the driver.
- Knowing all the safety information and driving techniques will be useless if you're not in good condition to drive.
- One thing that can seriously affect your condition is alcohol.

Drinking and Driving (20 min.)

Put on Alcohol presentation. When it is finished, review the key points.

Alcohol Violations

Anyone stopped for DWI in Arizona can be asked to take a chemical test.

- You will agree to take a test when you apply for your license--it is implied in your application (hence, "implied consent").

- If you refuse, you will lose your license for 12 months.
- License will be taken by police and suspended by police for 90 days.
- If you submit to test and your BAC is .10 or over, you will lose your license for 90 days for a first offense.
- License suspension is immediate; arresting officer will take your license on the spot.

Anyone convicted of DWI on the first offense is subject to the following:

- Mandatory 90-day license suspension. May be eligible for a restricted license after 30 days, but the first 30 days is full suspension.
- A mandatory one-day jail term (must serve 24 consecutive hours).
- Minimum fine of \$250. Could go up as high as \$1,000.
- If caught driving on a suspended license, there is a mandatory two-day jail term.

Seriousness of the Problem

- Alcohol is a factor in more than half of all fatal traffic accidents.
- Each year approximately 25,000 people are killed in alcohol-related crashes.
- Almost 500 people are killed in alcohol-related crashes in Arizona alone.
- The death toll is rising every year.
- Ask how many in class personally knew someone who was killed in an accident involving alcohol.

The Effects of Alcohol (15 min)

1:05

Have participants discuss the effects of alcohol.

What Does Alcohol Do?

- A lot of people know alcohol messes up coordination. *But* long before coordination is affected, *judgment* is affected. (A lot of times without our even knowing it.)
- Most drinking-driving is done at night, which makes the problem worse. We need all our skill to drive safely at night.

How Much Alcohol Does it Take?

- BAC is expressed by the amount of alcohol in the system.
 - BAC stands for *Blood Alcohol Concentration* or the % of alcohol in the blood stream.
 - In most states, the legal blood alcohol limit is .10% (one drop of alcohol for every 1000 drops of blood).
- At a BAC of .02-.04, the average person's driving is *affected*.
 - Begins to feel overconfident.
 - May take unnecessary risks.

- At a BAC of .05 to .08 (2 to 3 drinks):
 - Begins to show poor judgment.
 - Perception (ability to understand and process information) has deteriorated.
 - Vision is poorer, particularly night vision.
- At a BAC of .08 to .10, the average driver is *intoxicated*.
 - Vision deteriorates.
 - Coordination is poor.
 - Ability to judge clearance and speed of other cars is poor.

How Many Drinks Does it Take?

The number of drinks it takes to become impaired or intoxicated depends on:

- The number of drinks consumed
- The length of time a person has been drinking

Number of Drinks

- To keep track of BAC, you need to know how many drinks you have had.
- The following contain the SAME amount of alcohol. They are each considered to be *one drink*:
 - One shot of liquor
 - One 5-oz. glass of wine
 - One 12-oz. can of beer.

Length of Time a Person Has Been Drinking

- The human body "gets rid" of one drink each hour.
- The number of hours someone has been drinking equals the number of drinks the body has gotten rid of.

Use this formula to figure out how many drinks you have in your system:

number of drinks minus number of hours of drinking = number of drinks left in system.

Example:

You've had four drinks at a party (drinks = 4)

You've been there for two hours (hours = 2)

How many drinks are still in your system?

Answer:

Number of drinks 4

Number of hours -2

Drinks left in system 2

Controlling Drinking and Driving (10 min)

1:20

Have participants discuss ways to prevent drinking and driving, including both (1) not becoming too impaired to drive and (2) not driving after becoming impaired.

- Most people don't plan on drinking more than they should.
- The problem with alcohol is a lot like sunburn: by the time you feel it, it's already too late.
- It's important to set a limit for yourself in advance and stick to it.

Ways to Control the Effects of Alcohol

Space out your drinks. This keeps alcohol from building up in your blood.

- Don't bunch up a lot of drinks in a short period of time.
- Taper off as time passes.
- Don't drink in the hour before you drive.
- Never have "one for the road."

Know what you are drinking.

- Measure your drinks.
- If someone else is making drinks that are too strong, make them yourself or drink wine or beer so that you know how much you're drinking.

Eat some food.

- Food slows the absorption of alcohol.
- Eat before and during drinking.
- High protein foods (meat, cheese) are best for absorbing alcohol.
- Starchy foods are good, too (chips, crackers, bread).

Don't hold on to your drink. If you put it down now and then, you're less likely to keep sipping on it.

Engage in activities. Activities such as games or dancing provide something to do besides drink.

Ways to Separate Drinking from Driving**Let someone else drive.**

- Get a ride with someone who won't be drinking.
- If you feel you may have had too much, get a ride home with someone who hasn't been drinking, even if it means you have to come back later for your car.
- If you suspect ahead of time that you may drink too much, leave your keys with someone you can trust (party host, friend).
- Arrange with friends to take turns being the "designated (sober) driver" at parties.
- Remember, you can always take a cab.

Stay put

--If you suspect you may have had too much to drink, spend the night where you are, or at least stay several hours until the alcohol has left your system.

--Plan ahead to stay the night.

--Once you get where you're going (bar, party) and start drinking, don't go anywhere (bar hopping, beer runs) until a while after your last drink.

CONCLUSION (30 min.)**Strategies (15 min.)**

1:30

Point out that on the average, a quarter of those in the room, will have their licenses suspended within a year because of an additional traffic violation.

Go around the room asking participants individually if they are going to be the ones who get another ticket. If they say, "No", and almost all of them will, ask them to describe their strategies for avoiding another ticket. Push for strategies that are based upon changes in their manner of driving, not simply pledges to obey the law. The major cause of traffic violations will have been being in a hurry. Attempt to get participants to describe the strategy for avoiding situations that make it necessary to hurry.

Once all the participants have had an opportunity to describe their strategies, offer your hopes that this will be one of those few classes in which nobody gets suspended.

Final Examination (15 min.)

Pass out copies of the final test. Describe the procedure by which participants can find out if they passed the test and are eligible to have their licenses returned. Inform them that they may turn in their papers and leave when they've completed the test.

TRAFFIC VIOLATOR SCHOOL**FINAL EXAMINATION**

1. **If a driver wants to see cars in his "blind spots", he should:**
 - a. Check in the inside rearview mirror
 - b. Check in the outside rearview mirror
 - c. Check over the shoulder
2. **As you merge onto a highway, you should continually watch cars on the highway by looking:**
 - a. Over the shoulder
 - b. In the inside mirror
 - c. In the outside mirror
3. **You are in the right lane of a freeway. As you come up on an entrance ramp, you can see a car about to enter. The safest thing to do is:**
 - a. Change lanes to the left
 - b. Slow down
 - c. Maintain your speed and position
4. **If you have had three beers, about how long will it take for all the alcohol to leave your bloodstream?**
 - a. One hour
 - b. Two hours
 - c. Three hours
5. **You should allow extra following distance behind big trucks because:**
 - a. You need the extra space to see the road ahead.
 - b. Other drivers tend to pull behind trucks before they try to pass them.
 - c. If you follow too closely, you will get caught in the truck's slipstream.
6. **The first driving ability affected by alcohol is:**
 - a. Coordination
 - b. Skill
 - c. Judgment

7. **The amount of alcohol in a mixed drink with a one and one-half ounce "shot" of liquor is the same as that in:**
 - a. One can of beer
 - b. Two cans of beer
 - c. Three cans of beer
8. **You are driving on a freeway and see an accident ahead. You should warn the driver behind you by:**
 - a. Tapping the brake pedal several times
 - b. Turning on emergency flashers
 - c. Waving your hand up and down
9. **You are driving on a rainy day and it's hard for people to see you. You should:**
 - a. Turn on the parking lights
 - b. Turn on the high beam headlights
 - c. Turn on the low beam headlights
10. **You are going too fast if you can't see:**
 - a. 12 seconds ahead
 - b. 6 seconds ahead
 - c. 4 seconds ahead
11. **Which of the following will help you sober up?**
 - a. Fresh air
 - b. Coffee
 - c. Time
12. **You are driving in fog. Which of the following is most important for deciding how fast you should drive?**
 - a. How far you can see
 - b. How quickly you can stop
 - c. The amount of traffic
13. **You are on a two-lane road and want to pass. A car is coming toward you. It is unsafe to pass if:**
 - a. The oncoming car seems to be standing still
 - b. The oncoming car seems to be getting closer
 - c. The oncoming car seems to be going the other way

14. **How many seconds ahead should you look when you drive?**
 - a. 5-10 seconds
 - b. 10-15 seconds
 - c. 15-20 seconds
15. **Passing near an intersection is unsafe because:**
 - a. An entering driver won't be looking for you
 - b. You have to pass through the other driver's blind spot
 - c. There may be a stop sign at the intersection
16. **If you pull off the road at night you should signal your presence with:**
 - a. Tail lights
 - b. Flashers
 - c. Flares or reflectors
17. **On a hot day, when will the road be most slippery?**
 - a. Just after it starts to rain
 - b. After it has been raining a few hours
 - c. After it has stopped raining
18. **You should increase your following distance when you are behind a:**
 - a. Passenger car
 - b. Station wagon
 - c. Motorcycle
19. **You intend to turn into a driveway just after an intersection. When should you signal?**
 - a. Before you enter the intersection
 - b. As you enter the intersection
 - c. At the driveway
20. **Under normal conditions, you need to keep a following distance of:**
 - a. 1 second
 - b. 2 seconds
 - c. 3 seconds

**TRAFFIC VIOLATOR SCHOOL
FINAL EXAMINATION ANSWER SHEET**

Name: _____

Date: _____

Please circle the correct answer.

1. a b c

2. a b c

3. a b c

4. a b c

5. a b c

6. a b c

7. a b c

8. a b c

9. a b c

10. a b c

11. a b c

12. a b c

13. a b c

14. a b c

15. a b c

16. a b c

17. a b c

18. a b c

19. a b c

20. a b c

**TRAFFIC VIOLATOR SCHOOL
FINAL EXAMINATION
ANSWER KEY**

Question	Correct Answer	Where Taught
1.	C	Seeing Behind
2.	C	Seeing Behind
3.	A	Speed and Traffic
4.	C	Drinking and Driving
5.	A	Following Too Closely
6.	C	Drinking and Driving
7.	A	Drinking and Driving
8.	A	Signaling Intention
9.	C	Signaling Presence
10.	C	Speed and Sight Distance
11.	C	Drinking and Driving
12.	A	Speed and Sight Distance
13.	B	Passing
14.	B	The Path Ahead
15.	A	Passing
16.	C	Signaling Presence
17.	A	Speed and Road Conditions
18.	C	Following Too Closely
19.	B	Signaling Intention
20.	B	Following Too Closely