

TEEN DRIVERS' ATTITUDES, KNOWLEDGE AND MOTOR VEHICLE
VIOLATIONS IN RELATIONSHIP TO WISCONSIN'S GRADUATED LICENSE LAW

by

Wade J. Erickson

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Master of Science in Education Degree

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

Research Advisor

The Graduate School

University of Wisconsin-Stout

August, 2003

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751

ABSTRACT

Erickson, Wade J.

Teen Drivers' Attitudes, Knowledge And Motor Vehicle Violations In Relationship To
Wisconsin's Graduated License Law

Master of Science in Education Degree

Dr. Brian J. Finder August, 2003 61 pages

American Psychological Association, 5th edition

The purpose of this research was to determine the extent that restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system are being followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers. As a result of present data which indicates that Wisconsin's GDL law appears to be working, the researcher was interested in three questions which served as the basis for the study:

1. To what extent are Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers knowledgeable about Wisconsin's Graduated License law?
2. What are the general attitudes of Polk and Burnett County teens concerning the Graduated License law?

3. To what extent are the restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system being followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers?

The study was conducted by using questionnaires for data collection. There were 481 questionnaires sent out, 124 of those were returned, and 122 were used in the study. Data was collected during June 2003 from subjects age eighteen having a birth date between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, from ten out of the eleven public high schools in Polk and Burnett Counties of Wisconsin.

Results of this study revealed that Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers were very knowledgeable about Wisconsin's GDL law. Interestingly, findings in this area produced no major discrepancy between genders in their responses. It was also found that the subjects' attitudes varied according to the graduated licensing stage and the data revealed a gender gap. In addition, data revealed exceedingly high GDL law violation percentages to comparably low citation percentages during both the instructional permit and probationary license phases. Here again, gender differences surfaced in GDL violation percentages as well as in respect to citation percentages and extended license restrictions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

There are many people whom I would like to acknowledge for making my educational dream of a masters degree a reality. First, I would like to thank my parents for encouraging me to attend college to obtain my undergraduate degree, and for all the support that they offered to me at that time. I would also like to thank Professor Jill Stanton, my former program director, for encouraging me to attend UW-Stout and for all her help in selecting an educational path that would best meet my needs. She was always kind, courteous, and encouraging. Likewise, Dr. Amy Gillette was an outstanding influence and positive role model during my educational journey. Dr. Gillette guided me through several classes where she taught me both the art and the science of teaching. She displayed incredible work ethic and patience, which I shall never forget. Thank you to the 10 schools that assisted in the questionnaire process. I sincerely thank Dr. Brian Finder for being my research advisor, for he is truly a special person. He demonstrated enormous patience, great ideas and leadership in my study, as well as flexibility, and dedication throughout the countless hours he invested in me. I can't thank Dr. Finder enough. Also, thank you to Dennis Crowe for playing a key role in formatting and proofreading this study. This study turned out to be more complex than I expected and his help was truly appreciated. Lastly, I would like to thank my immediate family for all of their support and patience during this endeavor, especially my wife Rachel, who tolerated the many days of my absence and for being a good listener who provided me with ideas to explore regarding this study. Also, to my daughters, Hannah and Mara; I hope they someday may have similar educational opportunities so their dreams can also be realized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
.....	
Abstract.....	ii
List of tables.....	vii
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Introduction.....	1
Problem.....	4
Purpose.....	4
Research questions.....	4
Significance of the research.....	5
Limitations of the study.....	5
Assumptions of the study.....	5
Definition of terms.....	5
 CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Literature review.....	7
Introduction.....	7
The GDL system.....	7
Wisconsin's GDL system, including three levels and restrictions for each level.....	8
The need for GDL and GDL's positive results.....	11
GDL reactions of parents, teens, driving public and insurance companies.....	12
Compliance of GDL laws and enforcement of GDL laws.....	15
Conclusion.....	16

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Methodology.....	18
Introduction.....	18
Objectives of the study.....	18
Research questions.....	18
Subjects.....	19
Instrumentation.....	19
Data collection.....	20
Data analysis.....	21
Limitations.....	22

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Results.....	23
Study's purpose and objectives.....	23
Results.....	23
Summary of findings.....	38

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary, conclusions, and recommendations.....	41
Summary.....	41
Conclusions based upon the collected data.....	42
Recommendations.....	46
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDIX A.....	52
APPENDIX B.....	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Questionnaires sent out and returned; data from questions 1-5.....	24
Table 2: Subjects GDL knowledge.....	27
Table 3: Subjects GDL attitudes.....	29
Table 4: Violations during instructional permit phase.....	32
Table 5: Violations during probationary license phase.....	34
Table 6: Violations of GDL and enforcement.....	37

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Graduated licensing is a multistage process of earning a driver's license, usually consisting of three stages. Those three stages that serve as a national model for graduated licensing were developed by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS), the National Safety Council (NSC), the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances (NCUTLO), and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Novice drivers must demonstrate responsible driving behavior in order to advance to the next stage, each of which includes specific components and restrictions that gradually introduce driving privileges to beginning drivers. Stage one of graduated licensing is the learner's permit, while the second stage is the intermediate (provisional) license. Finally, the third stage is full licensure (NHTSA, 1999). This multistage process makes up most graduated licensing systems found throughout the United States.

So far there have been 47 states that have adopted some form of graduated driver licensing (Gains, 2002). As of 1999, the NHTSA received evaluation studies from Florida, California, Maryland, and Oregon which demonstrated the benefits of graduated licensing (NHTSA, 1999). More recently, graduated driver licensing also appears to be working in the state of Wisconsin. Data analysis of Wisconsin's Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) law released by Wisconsin's Department of Transportation (WisDOT) showed a downward trend in crash rates and fatalities of sixteen-year-old drivers during the first full year of implementation running from September 2000 to August 2001 (Gains, 2002).

Several authors found data supporting graduated licensing. For example, data that Lorenzi (1997) found from the IIHS explained that most nighttime crashes involving sixteen and seventeen-year-old drivers took place prior to midnight. Many states, like North Carolina, have placed nighttime driving restrictions on drivers with a limited provisional driver's license to address this issue. Due to these restrictions, the senior vice president of IIHS credits North Carolina with a superior graduated licensing system (Lorenzi, 1997). Williams (1997) also notes that the risk of being in a motor vehicle crash is quite high for young, novice drivers in the United States. When calculated per miles driven, the sixteen year-olds' crash data was eight times more than drivers aged 20 and older. According to Williams, the graduated licensing is addressing these numbers by providing inexperienced drivers with initial driving experience in lower risk situations. Another researcher of graduated licensing, author Ann Tyson (1997) suggests that graduated licensing is a good idea. She noted that a disproportionate number of accidents are due to teens being inexperienced and immature. Tyson (1997, n. p.) continues in his article with an NHTSA statistic:

Nationally, traffic accidents are the leading cause of death for 15-to 20-year-olds. Although teenagers make up only 7 percent of the licensed driving population, they represent 13 percent of the drunken drivers and a quarter of the speeders who are involved in fatal crashes.

While state and national researchers and officials find data to support graduated licenses, some of this researcher's fifteen-and-one-half-year-old students and their parents had a different viewpoint of the Wisconsin Graduated License law, which took effect on September 1, 2000. Some students were angered by the new law and had many

questions to ask the researcher. They felt that turning sixteen and obtaining their driving license without any restrictions was the independence and freedom they had desired for a long time. Some of the students' questions included: Why is the law changing now? Why is the Graduated License law going to be implemented in rural Polk County when it should be only implemented in the urban areas of Wisconsin? Will sixteen-year-olds actually follow the Graduated License law? If a birthday is on September 13, will the person be able to get a license on September 13? Many of this researcher's students had already formed their own answers to those questions. The researcher knew the resentment many students felt about the Graduated License law, but was curious about how their parents felt about the topic. Therefore, the class was asked what their parents thought about the Graduated License law. The students who responded told the researcher their parents were against the new law. One girl said her parents want her to get her driver's license as soon as she turns sixteen and not be required to hold her instructional permit for six months because she is needed to pull wagons and gravity boxes on the farm. Another girl said her parents were against it because it would restrict her from transporting the children she baby-sits. A boy replied that his parents think he should be able to be free of restrictions if he passes the driver's road test examination just like when the parents were sixteen.

Although some parents and teens have negative feelings about the Graduated License law, one could question if they really understand its intent of saving lives of beginning teenage drivers. In a matter of fact, beginning drivers do have crashes in Polk and Burnett Counties of Wisconsin. For example, recently the *Inter-County Leader* newspaper (2002) reported a tragic car crash that killed three teenage girls in an article

titled, “Stormy Accident Fatal for 3 Local Teens.” The car the teenage girls were riding in slid into the path of an oncoming vehicle during a rainstorm. The teenage driver was sixteen and in violation of passenger restrictions of her probationary driver’s license, which she held for only a month and a half prior to the crash. The *Inter-County Leader* (Milberg, 2002) noted in the article, “Community Grieves Again,” that the girls’ high school assistant principal, described them as quality, positive, and active individuals at the school. Due to the many newspaper reports of teen crashes, the students’ questions, and the views of some of the students’ parents gave the researcher a desire for more detailed information on the topic of the Graduated License law. A concern of interest for the researcher was whether or not teenage drivers obey the Wisconsin Graduated License law.

Problem

News reports as well as complaints from various teenage students and their parents indicate that various Wisconsin GDL restrictions are not being adhered to when such students possess a probationary license.

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to determine the extent that restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system are being followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers.

Research Questions

There are three research questions in this study:

1. To what extent are Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers knowledgeable about Wisconsin’s Graduated License law?

2. What are the general attitudes of Polk and Burnett County teens concerning the Graduated License law?

3. To what extent are the restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system being followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers?

Significance of the Research

All phases of the Wisconsin Graduated License law took effect on September 1, 2000. This law was passed to address the problem of teen drivers' and passengers' who have a high percentage of crashes compared to other age groups (WisDot: Safety and Consumer Protection, 2002). Therefore knowledge on the extent that teenage drivers are following Wisconsin's Graduated License law is an important part of the ongoing effort to reduce teenage crashes.

Limitation of the Study

The study was limited to eighteen-year-old students with a birth date between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, who had recently graduated from public high schools in Polk and Burnett Counties in northwest Wisconsin.

Assumptions of the Study

There are two assumptions which are apparent in this research. First, it is assumed that the students taking the questionnaire will read each question carefully. Second, it is assumed that all questions will be answered honestly.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are being defined to help establish effective communication between the reader and the researcher.

Full (Regular) licensure: The third stage of the GDL system (NHTSA, 1999).

Graduated Driver License (GDL) system: “The Graduated Driver Licensing system is a program that allows novice drivers to gain knowledge and driving experience while under supervision of an experienced mentor as they progress through the learning stages” (WisDOT: Division of Motor Vehicles, 2000, n. p.).

Intermediate (Provisional or Probationary) license: The second stage of the GDL system (NHTSA, 1999).

Learner’s permit (Temps): The first stage of the GDL system (NHTSA, 1999).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Graduated driver licensing affects practically everyone. All drivers share the same road as someone who is progressing through the GDL stages. Many people are asked to mentor someone who is progressing through the GDL stages. There are also many new drivers and they may feel the new GDL system has robbed them of the freedom for which they waited so long. Regardless of how people relate personally to the new GDL system, there are some pros and cons to it. Different people have different opinions about the GDL system. Also, various states have different GDL laws.

Wisconsin's GDL Law is of special importance to this researcher and his students.

Wisconsin's GDL law, which is similar to the national model developed by the IIHS, the NSC, the NTSB, the NCUTLO, and the NHTSA, will be discussed in detail and compared to other states that have a GDL system (NHTSA, 1999). Ultimately, this research will be used to determine the extent that restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system have been followed by Polk County and Burnett County teenage drivers.

The GDL System

According to the Wisconsin Division of Motor Vehicles, the general purpose of the Graduated Driver Licensing system is to provide the opportunity for beginning drivers to gain knowledge and driving experience while under supervision of an experienced mentor as they progress through the learning stages (WisDOT, 2000). Most GDL systems generally have three basic stages; the learning permit, the intermediate

license, and the full license. The learning permit stage affects youths aged fifteen or sixteen in several ways. First, they must be supervised by their parents or other adults for several months, then pass a driver's education course and stay conviction-free of any moving traffic violations (Tyson, 1997). In the intermediate license stage, youths age sixteen or seventeen are also required to complete more adult-supervised driving hours, as well as staying conviction-free of any moving traffic violations. The final stage, called full licensing, generally takes place when the driver is age eighteen and has passed the previous stages without any traffic violations. States other than Wisconsin may also have restrictions for night driving, seat-belt usage, number of passengers, and zero tolerance of alcohol use (Tyson, 1997).

Wisconsin's GDL System, Including Three Levels and Restrictions for Each Level

The Wisconsin GDL system is based on three similar levels. They include the instruction permit, the probationary license, and the regular license. There are specific requirements for advancement to the next level.

The first level is the instruction permit.

1. To get an instruction permit, you must:
 - be at least 15 years, 6 months of age, **and**
 - pass the knowledge test and vision screening.
2. If you are under 18, you are required to:
 - have completed or be enrolled in an approved behind-the-wheel driver ed course which begins within 60 days of the date your driver ed instructor certifies your application.
 - have your adult sponsor sign the application. The sponsor's signature must be witnessed by either a notary public or an authorized DMV employee (WisDOT, 2001, p. 2-3).

The holders of the instructional permit have the following restrictions. Such individuals may drive only when they

1. are accompanied by a person with two years driving experience who holds a valid **regular** license (cannot be a probationary or occupational) and who sits in the front passenger seat **and is**
 - a qualified instructor 19 or older. (Up to three others may ride along if the car is equipped with dual controls), **or**
 - a parent, guardian, or spouse 19 or older (your immediate family members may ride along in the back seat), **or**
 - a person 21 or older. (If you are under 18, this person must be designated in writing by your parent or guardian prior to accompanying you while driving a vehicle.) (WisDOT, 2001, p. 3)

The second level is the probationary license. If you are under 18, in order to qualify for your probationary license, in addition to all of the driver license requirements, you must meet the following:

1. completed an approved driver education class, and
2. held an Instruction Permit for a minimum of six months, **and**
3. accumulated 30 hours of behind-the-wheel driving experience (ten of the 30 hours must be at night), **and**
Note: Up to five hours of behind-the-wheel driving experience with a qualified instructor may be double counted. For example, three hours will count as six hours.
4. no moving traffic violations resulting in a conviction for the six months prior to the date of application for this license, **and**
5. have your parent or adult sponsor certify (on the driver license application) the completion of 30 hours of driving experience (ten at night), **and**
6. pass a driving skills test, **and**
7. pay the required fees (WisDOT 2001, p. 4).

The holders of the probationary license have the following restrictions.

If you are under 18, for the first nine months of holding your probationary license you can drive but with the following restrictions:

1. From 5 a.m. to midnight, you can drive alone and travel anywhere. In addition, any number of your immediate family members (including legal guardian) and the following people can also ride with you:
 - one person who holds a valid regular (non-probationary) license with at least two years of licensed driving experience **and** who is one of the following:
 - a qualified instructor or spouse 19 or older, **or**
 - a person 21 or older
 - **one** other person

2. From midnight to 5 a.m.
 - **If driving between home, school, and/or work you can drive alone.** The same people as listed in number one above can be with you.
 - **If driving anywhere else, you must have one of the following people seated beside you:**
 - a parent or guardian
 - **one** person who holds a valid regular (non-probationary) license with two years of licensed driving experience **and** who is one of the following:
 - a qualified instructor or spouse 19 or older, **or**
 - a person 21 or older
 - In addition, you can have any number of your immediate family members and one other person ride with you.
3. Restrictions will be extended 6 months if:
 - you are convicted of a moving traffic violation, **or**
 - you violate any of the restrictions, **or**
 - your license is revoked or suspended for any reason(WisDOT, 2001, p. 5).

The third level of the Graduated Driver Licensing system is the regular license. This license is obtainable after holding the probationary license for two to three years and the driver must be at least nineteen years old (WisDOT, 2003). The probationary license may be renewed up to ninety days before it expires and upon renewal the driver is issued a regular license that is valid up to eight years (WisDOT, 2001).

Wisconsin's GDL law has some important structural components to enhance its effectiveness and thus reduce the high crash rates of young beginning drivers. It may reduce the crash exposure for beginning drivers and provide many months of supervised driving experience during the instruction permit level. Well structured GDL programs contain limits of passengers, experienced supervising drivers, a permit holding period that isn't too short, a specific minimum number of practice driving hours, and night driving restrictions which don't start too late (Foss & Goodwin, 2003). One modification that could possibly strengthen Wisconsin's GDL law would be to start the night driving

restriction at 10:00 p.m. instead of midnight. Chen, Baker, Braver, & Li (2000) report that fatal crash risks are nearly three times higher for sixteen- and seventeen-year-old drivers from 10 p.m. to midnight than during daylight and early evening hours (6 a.m. to 10 p.m.). Despite this, two-thirds of the states with GDL laws start their nighttime driving restrictions at midnight or later (Foss & Goodwin, 2003).

The Need for GDL and GDL's Positive Results

Statistics demonstrate a need for GDL laws because the leading cause of death and injury among teenagers is a result of motor-vehicle crashes (Hedlund, Shults, Compton, 2003). Teenagers lack driving skills and experience in recognizing risky driving situations due to being a beginning driver (Hedlund et al., 2003). Therefore, the combination of immaturity, inexperience, and risk-taking behavior produces high crash risks for teenage drivers. These factors are addressed in GDL laws by phasing in on-road driving, allowing beginning drivers to get their initial experience under lower-risk conditions (Hedlund et al., 2003).

Hedlund et al. (2003) reported that all evaluations of the GDL programs in the United States and abroad demonstrate positive results. They note studies from California, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania by Shope and Molnar (2003); California, Connecticut, Florida, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, and the Canadian provinces of Nova Scotia, Ontario, and Quebec by Simpson (2003); in Maryland by McKnight (2003) and Preusser and Leaf (2003); in Oregon by McKnight (2003); and New Zealand by Begg and Stephenson (2003). Hedlund et al. (2003) reported that it isn't possible to combine the results of the above studies into a single numerical measure of GDL effectiveness, due to the differences in GDL programs and

evaluation methods. However, the evaluation results of these studies show that GDL programs are effective regardless of their specific details (Hedlund et al., 2003).

GDL Reactions of Parents, Teens, Driving Public and Insurance Companies

While many adults in Iowa supported Governor Brandstad's GDL legislature, there was significant parental opposition to it. Many rural families opposed adding restrictions to the driver's license for teens because that would mean an extra year of driving their child to school activities (Sandbulte, 1999). During a GDL debate in the Iowa House of Representatives, rural lawmakers argued that many rural children are fully prepared to drive with a school permit at age 14 because they drive farm machinery at an early age (Sandbulte, 1999). These Iowa legislative debates showed that the viewpoints of the GDL system vary according to geographical location. The urban representatives were generally in favor of the GDL system, whereas the rural representatives were opposed to it. These differing viewpoints are not surprising because representatives are elected by their constituents to represent their viewpoints. Some of the same parental views from Iowa can also be found in rural Wisconsin in Polk and Burnett Counties.

Parents in other states, however, have shown support for even more strenuous GDL restrictions than those adopted by either Wisconsin or Iowa. Foss & Goodwin (2003) interviewed 1,253 parents of teens in North Carolina, who indicated a full year was considered a reasonable period of time to require adult supervision of beginning drivers. Also, 82 percent of parents indicated that 12 months was "about right" and 11 percent said that 12 months was not long enough for the duration of the learners permit phase in GDL. These results show that some parents want a strong GDL system. Also, some parents in California, a state with a relatively strong GDL program since 1998,

surveyed by Williams, Nelson, & Leaf (2002), showed 79 percent of parents strongly favored their new GDL program. These parents had children who were subject to the new requirements.

The negative reactions this researcher heard from his students about Wisconsin's GDL law aren't an uncommon reaction from teenagers. The driving privilege is highly valued by most people in today's society. Placing restrictions on a person's driving privilege, no matter what his/her age, can contribute to serious financial, social, and emotional impacts on the person (Sandbulte, 1999). Teenagers start dreaming at an early age of the day that they can drive. It isn't uncommon for teenagers to start saving for a car or even own a car before they even obtain their license (Sandbulte, 1999). The driver's license means that the teenager can treat friends to a ride and has the freedom to date without a parent as a chauffeur. In the fall of 1997, Iowa Governor Terry Branstad proposed graduated driver's licensing for his state. Teenagers used editorial pages of local newspapers to express their feelings concerning the Governor's GDL legislation (Sandbulte, 1999). According to Sandbulte (1999), 25 teenagers signed an editorial in the Opinion section of *The Des Moines Register*, December 20, 1997. It requested that good teenage drivers not be punished for the irresponsibility of a small percentage of teen drivers. Another quote Sanbulte (1999) noted from the Opinion section of *The Des Moines Register*, February 23, 1998, surfaced during a driver's education class and was directed at lawmakers requesting them to put themselves in the teens' shoes. Students also expressed their opinions that postponing their driver's license will only postpone the accidents and that restricting nighttime driving would not be effective because nobody would be paying any attention to the curfew while they are at dances, athletic events, and

work (Sandbulte, 1999). Missy Idso, a high school junior, also expressed in the article “Curfews Unnecessary” in *The Des Moines Register*, March 3, 1998, that nighttime driving restrictions would have little impact and that it is more dangerous to drive during rush hour due to stress, aggravation, and high volumes of traffic. Missy noted in the article that the levels of darkness at 10:30 p.m. and midnight are practically identical. She also expressed her concerns that government would be interfering in the parent-child relationship if nighttime driving restrictions were added for teenagers (Sandbulte, 1999). However, the general driving public, made up of parents, non-parents, and teenage drivers, has shown support for including nighttime driving components in GDL programs. Foss & Goodwin (2003) conducted a survey of 500 licensed drivers (including teens) in which 73 percent approved of a night driving restriction for novice drivers.

Many young drivers support restrictions common to a variety of GDL programs. Williams, Nelson, & Leaf (2002) conducted a recent survey of California teenagers and found 84 percent of teenagers in the new GDL program favored the 6-month holding period and 89 percent favored the requirement that parents must certify that the probationary drivers have completed at least 50 hours of supervised driving. Another survey conducted in Florida by McCartt, Leaf, Farmer, Ferguson, & Williams (2001) involved juniors and seniors from eight different high schools before (1996) and after (1998) the GDL implementation. This survey found teen support for the six-month learner’s permit at 56 percent in 1996 and 67 percent in 1998.

For many years, the insurance industry has been instrumental in promoting GDL laws. Insurance professionals have an interest in the safety on our highways, including that of young drivers, a concern for automobile insurance costs, and the impact GDL

legislation has on all people. In 1994, the National Association of Independent Insurers (NAII) developed a GDL model bill. The IIHS has studied and published articles on driver licensing practices and statistics on teenage traffic accidents. NAII and IIHS have both worked extensively with the NHTSA in researching, developing, and promoting GDL as a solution to reduce teenage traffic accident rates and to improve highway safety (Sandbulte, 1999).

Compliance of GDL Laws and Enforcement of GDL Laws

There have been very few studies conducted on teenage compliance of GDL laws. There is relatively little known about young drivers' compliance of the three common protective restrictions; driving alone during the initial and intermediate license stages, nighttime driving, and the number of passengers that may be transported (Foss & Goodwin, 2003). In North Carolina, 17 percent of young drivers reported that they violated the supervision rule (Foss, Goodwin, Rodgman, & Feaganes, 2002). Also, in Nova Scotia and California, about 40 percent of teens report having violated the night driving restriction while 12-15 percent report doing it often (Mayhew, Simpson, Ferguson, & Williams, 1998; Williams, Nelson, & Leaf, 2002). North Carolina teenagers reported greater nighttime driving violations than Nova Scotia and California, due to perhaps the 9 p.m. driving restriction compared to the midnight restrictions in Nova Scotia and California (Foss & Goodwin, 2003). Hedlund et al. (2003) noted there is a high-priority research need on the topic of GDL compliance of passenger restrictions. Also, recent data from California showed frequent violations of its zero-passenger restriction in more than half of teen drivers (Williams et al., 2002).

There are two important sources of enforcement of GDL laws; parents and law enforcement officers. Parents are able to carefully monitor supervision and nighttime driving restrictions but have far less information about the passengers in the vehicle. Surveyed parents and teenagers reported more frequent passenger restriction violations than nighttime driving violations (Foss & Goodwin, 2003). One noteworthy finding comes from California in which about half of parents indicated that they permitted their teen to violate the no-passenger restriction of the GDL law (Williams et al., 2002). Besides the recent data from California, researchers know very little about how parents enforce GDL restrictions. Even less is known about the enforcement of GDL laws by law enforcement officers. GDL restriction violations are hard to detect because the law enforcement officer doesn't know the teen's license level (Foss & Goodwin, 2003). However, law officers could check on possible GDL violations when they stop a teenage driver's vehicle for a routine traffic stop (Hedlund et al., 2003). In Wisconsin, it appears that law enforcement officers are issuing citations for GDL violations, although these are just a fraction of one-percent of total convictions. During the period January-November 2002 in Wisconsin, there were 445 GDL passenger violation convictions representing .06 percent of the total convictions and 248 GDL curfew violation convictions representing .03 percent of the total convictions (WisDOT, Traffic convictions, 2002).

Conclusion

The Graduated Driver Licensing system is intended to allow novice teenage drivers more monitored driving experience before receiving a regular license without restrictions. The GDL law of Wisconsin, which is similar to the three-tiered national model, addresses issues that directly relate to teenage crash data. As with any change,

there is some resistance from various groups of individuals. Ultimately, the enforcement of the GDL law may save lives. As the research unfolds in this study, new data about Polk and Burnett County teen drivers' attitudes, knowledge and violations of the Wisconsin GDL law will be revealed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent that restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system have been followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers. This chapter discusses the methods and procedures of the study. Included is a list of specific objectives, the research questions, and a description of the subjects. In addition, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis procedures will be presented. The chapter will conclude with some of the methodological limitations.

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study include the following:

1. To identify the extent that Polk and Burnett County teens are knowledgeable of the Wisconsin GDL law when they possess a probationary or regular driver license.
2. To identify the attitudes of Polk and Burnett County teens concerning the Wisconsin GDL law.
3. To identify the extent that Polk and Burnett County teens are abiding by the Wisconsin GDL law when they possess a permit or probationary license.

Research Questions

As a result of present data which indicates that Wisconsin's GDL law appears to be working, the researcher was interested in three questions which served as the basis for the study:

1. To what extent are Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers knowledgeable about Wisconsin's Graduated License law?

2. What are the general attitudes of Polk and Burnett County teens concerning the Graduated License law?

3. To what extent are the restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system being followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers?

Subjects

The subjects in this study are all drivers age eighteen having a birth date between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, who recently attended a Polk or Burnett County public high school. They currently hold a probationary or regular driver license and held an instructional permit after Wisconsin's GDL law went into full effect on September 1, 2000. The subjects were selected because of their age and geographical location. The age was important because all eighteen year old drivers having a birth date between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, were affected by Wisconsin's new GDL law. The geographical location was of special importance because the researcher teaches Driver's Education to students who live in Polk and Burnett Counties of Wisconsin.

Instrumentation

The study was conducted using a questionnaire (see Appendix A) which was developed by the researcher. The questionnaire contained 26 questions that focused on the knowledge and attitudes of the subjects relating to Wisconsin's Graduated License law as well as to what extent the law was being followed by the subjects. Subjects were asked to circle a response for each question. The first five questions on the questionnaire asked about background information of the subjects. This included the subjects' age, gender, the county of the high school at which they recently attended school, the type of driver license they currently had, and if they took Driver's Education from a private

company. Question six asked the subjects how thoroughly they felt the Driver's Education course covered the graduated license law. Questions seven through ten were related to the subjects' knowledge of Wisconsin's GDL law. Questions 11 through 14 asked the subjects what their current attitudes were about Wisconsin's GDL restrictions. Questions 15 through 20 asked the subjects about violations of the GDL law during their permit licensing stage. Questions 21, 22, 25, and 26 all asked the subjects about violations of the GDL law during their intermediate license phase. Question 23 asked the subjects if they had violated a part of the GDL law at least one time. If the subject answered yes to that question then the subject was requested to answer question 24. This question asked the subjects if an increase in police attention toward stopping and citing violators of the GDL law would have made them violate more often, the same, or less often.

Data Collection

The researcher asked several public high schools in Polk and Burnett Counties of Wisconsin to participate in the study. Each school was asked for permission to send a cover letter, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope to the eighteen year olds having a birth date between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, who recently attended their school. The school was provided a cover letter (see Appendix B) and a questionnaire to examine. The cover letter explained the study and stated that by completing and returning the questionnaire the subject was expressing his/her consent. The questionnaire was developed to be self explanatory and relatively short. This self explanatory nature made it possible to mail out the questionnaires without the researcher meeting the subjects or even seeing their names. This was designed to provide complete

confidentiality. Also, by waiting until after graduation, many of the seniors would fit the subject group. The self-addressed stamped envelope had the researcher's name in both the mailing address and the return address location so that the subjects would not put their address on the return envelope which could identify them. The researcher personally placed labels on the envelopes and the school mailed out the envelopes which contained the questionnaires. The school was asked to provide mailing labels of the eighteen year olds with birth dates between the dates of September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, who recently attended the school. The researcher folded the self-addressed stamped envelope, questionnaire, and cover letter and placed them in an empty envelope with the researcher's return address and with the correct postage already on it. The cover letter was on top with the return envelope and the questionnaire inside it. Next, the researcher sealed the envelope and stuck the subject's mailing label on it. Then, the school mailed the envelopes. There will not be a follow-up survey.

One school elected to add its own cover letter stating that the school administration fully supported the research topic. It continued to state that a final summary of the research would be requested and used in the school's driver education program. The administrator offered to answer any questions subjects may have about the survey.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed to compute frequency counts and percentages. The variables of gender, county of the school attended, and the type of driver's education class were also analyzed. This data helped investigate whether the GDL law was being

followed by teenage drivers in Polk and Burnett Counties of Wisconsin. It was also used to find out teenagers' knowledge and attitudes of the GDL law.

Limitations

One limitation of the study is that the researcher hasn't had face to face contact with the subjects to explain the study. This might lower the response rate that the researcher receives. Another limitation is that the researcher doesn't know if the subjects are providing truthful responses.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Study's Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent that restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system have been followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers. The specific objectives of the study include the following:

1. To identify the extent that Polk and Burnett County teens are knowledgeable of the Wisconsin GDL law when they possess a probationary or regular driver license.
2. To identify the attitudes of Polk and Burnett County teens concerning the Wisconsin GDL law.
3. To identify the extent that Polk and Burnett County teens are abiding by the Wisconsin GDL law when they possess a permit or probationary license.

Results

Data was collected during June 2003 from subjects age eighteen having a birth date between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, from ten out of the eleven public high schools in Polk and Burnett Counties of Wisconsin. Table 1 illustrates the makeup of the questionnaires that were sent out and returned in relationship to the gender of the subject, the county of the school which the subject attended, the type of license the subject held at the time of the survey, and the type of Driver's Education program the subject completed. These data were related to questions one through five and were calculated into percentages. All percentages in this study are reported to the nearest whole number, which in some cases has caused small rounding errors.

Table 1 Questionnaires Sent Out and Returned; Data from Questions 1-5

		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Questionnaires sent out		481	100%
Questionnaires returned		124	26%
Questionnaires used		122	25%
	(Two subjects were not eighteen.)		
Gender	Male	49	40%
	Female	73	60%
County	Polk	97	80%
	Burnett	25	20%
License type	Instruction permit	0	0%
	Probationary license	43	35%
	Regular license	77	63%
	No license	1	1%
	No response	1	1%
Drivers Education program	Private company	42	34%
	Public school	80	66%

There were 481 questionnaires sent out from the schools; 124 subjects responded. This was approximately a 26 percent response rate. Two of the subjects who returned questionnaires responded that they weren't 18, one of whom wrote "older than" by Question 1 asking if they were 18. Therefore, these two subjects were not included in the study and only 122, approximately 25 percent, of the questionnaires were used. Of the subjects used, 49 were males making up approximately 40 percent, and 73 subjects were females, approximately 60 percent. Ninety-seven of the subjects were from Polk County, approximately 80 percent, and 25 subjects were from Burnett County, making up approximately 20 percent. It should be noted that there were 388 questionnaires sent to subjects who attended Polk County schools and only 93 sent to subjects who attended Burnett County schools. This was due to the difference in school populations in the two counties. No subjects indicated that they had an instructional permit. Forty-three subjects, approximately 35 percent, indicated they had a probationary license; 77

subjects, or approximately 63 percent, had a regular license; one subject, approximately one percent, didn't have a license; and one subject, approximately one percent, didn't respond to the question asking the subject's type of license. There were 42 subjects, or approximately 34 percent, who attended a private Driver's Education program while 80 subjects, approximately 66 percent, attended a public school Driver's Education program.

Questions 6 through 10 focused on the knowledge of each subject about Wisconsin's GDL law as a whole. The data were disaggregated by response and by gender, as illustrated in Table 2. Questions 6 and 10 both asked the subjects how they felt about their knowledge of the GDL law. Question 6 asked the subjects how well they felt their Driver's Education course covered the Graduated License law. Fifty-one subjects out of 120 responded "very adequate," approximately 43 percent; 66 out of 120, approximately 55 percent, responded "adequate"; and 3 out of 120, approximately 3 percent, responded "not adequate" to Question 6. When looking at Question 6 according to gender, 19 out of 49 males, or approximately 39 percent, responded "very adequate"; 30 out of 49, approximately 61 percent, responded "adequate"; no males responded "not adequate." There were 32 out of 71 females, or approximately 45 percent, who responded "very adequate"; 36 out of 71, approximately 51 percent, responded "adequate"; while 3 out of 71, or approximately 4 percent, responded that their Driver's Education course was "not adequate" in covering the Graduated License law.

In Question 10, subjects responded to the statement, "I feel I am knowledgeable about Wisconsin's Graduated License law." Twelve subjects out of 122, approximately 10 percent, responded "strongly agree"; 73 out of 122, approximately 60 percent, responded "agree"; 29 out of 122, or approximately 24 percent, responded "neither agree nor

disagree”; 7 out of 122, approximately 6 percent, responded “disagree”; while 1 out of 122, approximately 1 percent, responded “strongly disagree.” When looking at gender, 5 out of 49 males, or approximately 10 percent, responded “strongly agree”; 29 out of 49, approximately 59 percent, responded “agree”; 12 out of 49, or approximately 25 percent, responded “neither agree nor disagree”; 3 out of 49, approximately 6 percent, responded “disagree”; while no males responded “strongly disagree.” Seven females out of 73, or approximately 10 percent, responded “strongly agree”; 44 out of 73, or approximately 60 percent, responded “agree”; 17 out of 73, approximately 23 percent, responded “neither agree nor disagree”; 4 out of 73, or approximately 5 percent, responded “disagree”; and 1 out of 73 females, approximately 1 percent, responded “strongly disagree” that they felt knowledgeable about Wisconsin’s GDL law.

In Question 7, the subjects were asked, “How many months do you have to hold your instructional permit before you can try for your probationary driver license?” The subjects were given a choice of three, six, nine, or twelve months. Forty-four out of 49 males, approximately 90 percent, made the correct response of six months. Sixty-two out of 73 females responded correctly, approximately 85 percent. Looking at all subjects, 106 out of 122 responded correctly, approximately 87 percent.

In Question 8, the subjects were asked, “What is the minimal number of hours of supervised practice a parent must verify that has been completed during the instructional permit driving phase?” The subjects were given a choice of 15, 30, 45, or 60 hours. Thirty-five out of 49 males responded with the correct answer of thirty hours, approximately 71 percent. Sixty out of 73 females responded correctly to the question,

approximately 82 percent. Looking at all subjects, 95 out of 122, approximately 78 percent, responded with the correct answer.

Table 2 Subjects GDL Knowledge

Question #6 (Feelings about Driver's Education course covering GDL law)

	<u># very adequate</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># adequate</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># not adequate</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	19	39%	30	61%	0	0%
71 Females	32	45%	36	51%	3	4%
120 Total	51	43%	66	55%	3	3%

(Two non-respondent females weren't included in the percentages.)

Question #7 (Number of months required to hold instructional permit)

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	44	90%
73 Females	62	85%
122 Total	106	87%

Question #8 (Minimal number of hours of supervised practice)

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	35	71%
73 Females	60	82%
122 Total	95	78%

Question # 9 (Number of non-family passengers during probationary license)

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	42	86%
73 Females	61	84%
122 Total	103	84%

Question #10 (Feelings about how knowledgeable subject was about GDL law)

	<u># st. agree</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># agree</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># neither</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># disagree</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># st. disagree</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	5	10%	29	59%	12	24%	3	6%	0	0%
73 Females	7	10%	44	60%	17	23%	4	5%	1	1%
122 Total	12	10%	73	60%	29	24%	7	6%	1	1%

In Question 9, the subjects were asked, "How many non-family passengers are you allowed in your vehicle while you are driving during the probationary driving phase?" The subjects were given a choice of zero, one, two, three, or four passengers.

Forty-two out of 49 males responded with the correct answer of one passenger, approximately 86 percent. Sixty-one out of 73 females, approximately 84 percent, responded with the correct answer. Looking at all subjects, 103 out of 122, or approximately 84 percent, responded correctly.

Questions 11 through 14, illustrated in Table 3, relate to the attitudes of the subjects concerning Wisconsin's GDL law. In Question 11, the subjects were asked, "Do you support at least a six-month holding period for the instructional permit driving phase?" The subjects were given a choice of yes or no. Forty out of 49 males, approximately 82 percent, responded "yes," while 9 out of 49, approximately 18 percent, responded "no." Sixty-six out of 73 females, or approximately 90 percent, responded "yes," while 7 out of 73, approximately 10 percent, responded "no." Looking at all subjects, 106 out of 122, approximately 87 percent, responded "yes," while 16 out of 122, or approximately 13 percent, responded "no."

In Question 12, the subjects were asked if they favored a minimum requirement of 30 hours or longer of supervised driving during the instructional permit driving phase: yes or no. Thirty-nine out of 49 males, or approximately 80 percent, responded "yes," while 10 out of 49, approximately 20 percent, responded "no." Sixty-seven out of 73 females, approximately 92 percent, responded "yes," while 6 out of 73, approximately 8 percent, responded "no." Looking at all subjects, 106 out of 122, approximately 87 percent, responded "yes," while 16 out of 122, approximately 13 percent, responded "no."

In Question 13, the subjects were asked if they supported the night driving restriction during the first nine months of the probationary license phase. Twenty-five

out of 49 males, or approximately 51 percent, supported the night driving restrictions, while 24 out of 49, approximately 49 percent, did not support it. Thirty-eight out of 72 females, or approximately 53 percent, supported the night driving restriction, while 34 out of 72, approximately 47 percent, did not support it. Looking at all subjects, 63 out of 121, or approximately 52 percent, supported the restriction while 58 out of 121, or approximately 48 percent, did not support the night driving restriction. One female subject who did not respond to the question was not included in the percentages.

Table 3 Subjects GDL Attitudes

Question #11 (Support of 6-month holding period of instructional permit)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	40	82%	9	18%
73 Females	66	90%	7	10%
122 Total	106	87%	16	13%

Question #12 (Favor minimum 30 hours supervised driving during instructional permit)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	39	80%	10	20%
73 Females	67	92%	6	8%
122 Total	106	87%	16	13%

Question #13 (Support of night driving restriction first 9 months of probationary license)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	25	51%	24	49%
72 Females	38	53%	34	47%
121 Total	63	52%	58	48%

(One female non-respondent wasn't included in the percentages.)

Question #14 (support GDL law on passenger restrictions)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	29	59%	20	41%
71 Females	44	62%	27	38%
120 Total	73	61%	47	39%

(Two female non-respondents weren't included in the percentages.)

In Question 14, the subjects were asked if they supported the current GDL law on passenger restrictions. Twenty-nine out of 49 males, approximately 59 percent, supported the GDL law on passenger restrictions, while 20 out of 49, or approximately 41 percent, did not support it. Forty-four out of 71 females, or approximately 62 percent, supported the restrictions, while 27 out of 71, approximately 38 percent, did not support the passenger restrictions. Looking at all subjects, 73 out of 120, or approximately 61 percent, favored the passenger restrictions, while 47 out of 120, or approximately 39 percent, did not support the restrictions. Two female subjects did not respond to this question and were not included in the percentages.

Questions 15 through 20, illustrated in Table 4, involve the violations of the subjects during their instructional permit driving phase. In Question 15, the subjects were asked if they had been convicted of a traffic violation during their instructional permit driving phase. Three out of 49 males, or approximately 6 percent, were convicted of a traffic violation, while 46 out of 49, or approximately 94 percent, were not convicted. Two out of 73 females, approximately 3 percent, were convicted of a traffic violation, while 71 out of 73, approximately 97 percent, were not convicted. Looking at all subjects, 5 out of 122, or approximately 4 percent, were convicted of a traffic violation, while 117 out of 122, or approximately 96 percent, were not convicted.

In Question 16, the subjects were asked to respond to the statement, “I violated the supervision restriction by driving alone during the instructional permit phase: often, seldom, or never.” Three out of 49 males, or approximately 6 percent, responded “often”; 10 out of 49, or approximately 20 percent, responded “seldom”; and 36 out of 49, or approximately 73 percent, responded “never.” Three out of 73 females, or

approximately 4 percent, responded “often”; 13 out of 73, or approximately 18 percent, responded “seldom”; and 57 out of 73, or approximately 78 percent, responded “never.” The data for all subjects showed that 6 out of 122, or approximately 5 percent, responded “often”; 23 out of 122, approximately 19 percent, responded “seldom”; and 93 out of 122, approximately 76 percent, responded “never.”

In Question 17, the subjects were asked if they violated the supervision restriction by driving with a non-parent supervisor under the age of 21. Eight out of 49 males, or approximately 16 percent, responded “yes,” while 41 out of 49, approximately 84 percent, responded “no.” Sixteen out of 73 females, approximately 22 percent, responded “yes,” while 57 out of 73, approximately 78 percent, responded “no.” Looking at all subjects, 24 out of 122, or approximately 20 percent, responded “yes,” while 98 out of 122, or approximately 80 percent, responded “no.”

In Question 18, the subjects were asked if they violated the supervision restriction by allowing a non-parent over the age of 21 to supervise them without prior parental written permission. The three choices were “often, seldom, and never.” One out of 49 males, or approximately 2 percent, responded “often”; 8 out of 49, approximately 16 percent, responded “seldom”; and 40 out of 49, or approximately 82 percent, responded “never.” One out of 73 females, or approximately 1 percent, responded “often”; 17 out of 73, or approximately 23 percent, responded “seldom”; and 55 out of 73, approximately 75 percent, responded “never.” The data for all subjects showed that 2 out of 122, approximately 2 percent, responded “often”; 25 out of 122, approximately 20 percent, responded “seldom”; and 95 out of 122, approximately 78 percent, responded “never.”

Table 4 Violations during Instructional Permit Phase

Question #15 (Convicted of a traffic violation?)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	3	6%	46	94%
73 Females	2	3%	71	97%
122 Total	5	4%	117	96%

Question #16 (Violated the supervision restriction by driving alone?)

	<u># often</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># seldom</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># never</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	3	6%	10	20%	36	73%
73 Females	3	4%	13	18%	57	78%
122 Total	6	5%	23	19%	93	76%

Question #17 (Violated the supervision restriction by driving with non-parent under 21)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	8	16%	41	84%
73 Females	16	22%	57	78%
122 Total	24	20%	98	80%

Question #18 (Violated the supervision restriction with non-parent over 21 without written permission)

	<u># often</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># seldom</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># never</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	1	2%	8	16%	40	82%
73 Females	1	1%	17	23%	55	75%
122 Total	2	2%	25	20%	95	78%

Question #19 (Violation for a non-immediate family member as a passenger)

	<u># often</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># seldom</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># never</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	4	8%	17	35%	28	57%
72 Females	8	11%	32	44%	32	44%
121 Total	12	10%	49	40%	60	50%

(One female non-respondent wasn't included in the percentages.)

Question #20 (Completion of required supervised hours)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
47 Males	40	85%	7	15%
73 Females	61	84%	12	16%
120 Total	101	84%	19	16%

(Two male non-respondents weren't included in the percentages.)

In Question 19, the subjects were asked, "Did you allow a non-immediate family member to ride with you?" The three choices for this question were "often, seldom, or

never.” Four out of 49 males, or approximately 8 percent, responded “often”; 17 out of 49, or approximately 35 percent, responded “seldom”; and 28 out of 49, approximately 57 percent, responded “never.” Eight out of 72 females, or approximately 11 percent, responded “often”; 32 out of 72, or approximately 44 percent, responded “seldom”; and 32 out of 72, or approximately 44 percent, responded “never.” The data for all subjects showed that 12 out of 121, or approximately 10 percent, responded “often”; 49 out of 121, or approximately 40 percent, responded “seldom”; and 60 out of 121, or approximately 50 percent, responded “never.” One female subject didn’t respond to the question and wasn’t included in the percentages.

In Question 20, the subjects were asked, “Did you complete the required parental supervised driving hours during the instructional permit phase?” Forty out of 47 males, approximately 85 percent, responded “yes,” while 7 out of 47, approximately 15 percent, responded “no.” Sixty-one out of 73 females, approximately 84 percent, responded “yes,” while 12 out of 73, approximately 16 percent, responded “no.” The data for all subjects showed that 101 out of 120, or approximately 84 percent, responded “yes,” while 19 out of 120, or approximately 16 percent, responded “no.” Two male subjects didn’t respond to this question and were not counted in the percentages.

Questions 21 and 22, illustrated in Table 5, involve violations by the subjects during their probationary license phase. In Question 21, the subjects were asked to respond to the statement, “I violated the passenger restrictions during the probationary license phase: often, seldom, or never.” Eight out of 49 males, or approximately 16 percent, responded “often”; 25 out of 49, or approximately 51 percent, responded “seldom”; while 16 out of 49, approximately 33 percent, responded “never.” Twenty out

of 72 females, or approximately 28 percent, responded “often”; 36 out of 72, or 50 percent, responded “seldom”; and 16 out of 72, approximately 22 percent, responded “never.” The data for all subjects showed that 28 out of 121, or 23 percent, responded “often”; 61 out of 121, approximately 50 percent, responded “seldom”; while 32 out of 121, or approximately 26 percent, responded “never.” There was one female subject who did not respond to the question, which was not included in the percentages.

Table 5 Violations during Probationary License Phase

Question #21 (Violations of passenger restriction)

	<u># often</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># seldom</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># never</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	8	16%	25	51%	16	33%
72 Females	20	28%	36	50%	16	22%
121 Total	28	23%	61	50%	32	26%

(One female non-respondent wasn't included in the percentages.)

Question #22 (Violations of nighttime driving restriction)

	<u># often</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># seldom</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># never</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	8	16%	25	51%	16	33%
72 Females	11	15%	27	38%	34	47%
121 Total	19	16%	52	43%	50	41%

(One female non-respondent was not included in the percentages.)

Question 22 asked the subjects if they had violated the nighttime driving restriction during the probationary license phase. Eight out of 49 males, or approximately 16 percent, responded “often”; 25 out of 49, or approximately 51 percent, responded “seldom”; while 16 out of 49, approximately 33 percent, responded “never.” Eleven out of 72 females, approximately 15 percent, responded “often”; 27 out of 72, or approximately 38 percent, responded “seldom”; while 34 out of 72, or approximately 47 percent, responded “never.” Data for all subjects show that 19 out of 121, approximately

16 percent, responded “often”; 52 out of 121, or approximately 43 percent, responded “seldom”; while 50 out of 121, or approximately 41 percent, responded “never.” One female subject did not respond to this question and was not included in the percentages.

Questions 23 through 26, illustrated in Table 6, involve subjects’ previous violations and attitudes toward enforcement of the GDL law. In Question 23, the subjects were asked if they violated some part of the Graduated License law at least one time. These data were disaggregated by gender, county of school attended, and public or private Driver’s Education program. Thirty-three out of 49 males, or approximately 67 percent, responded “yes,” while 16 out of 49, approximately 33 percent, responded “no.” Fifty-five out of 72 females, or approximately 76 percent, responded “yes”; while 17 out of 72, or approximately 24 percent, responded “no.” Twenty out of 25 Burnett County subjects, or 80 percent, had violated some part of the GDL law at least one time, while 5 out of 25, or 20 percent, did not indicate a violation. Sixty-eight out of 96 Polk County subjects, or approximately 71 percent, reported that they violated the GDL law at least one time, while 28 out of 96, or approximately 29 percent, did not document a violation. Thirty out of 41 private school subjects, approximately 73 percent, violated the GDL law at least one time while 11 out of 41, or approximately 27 percent, reported they did not violate the GDL law. Fifty-eight out of 80 public school subjects, or approximately 73 percent, violated the GDL law at least one time while 22 out of 80, or approximately 28 percent, did not violate the GDL law. The data for all subjects showed that 88 out of 121, or approximately 73 percent, responded “yes,” while 33 out of 121, approximately 27 percent, responded “no.” One Polk County female did not respond to the question and was not included in the percentages.

All subjects that violated some part of the GDL law at least one time were asked to respond to Question 24. Out of 121 subjects, 33 males, or approximately 67 percent, and 55 females, approximately 76 percent, had violated the GDL law at least one time. In Question 24, the subjects were asked, "If police officers would have increased their focus on stopping and citing violators of the GDL law while you were under those restrictions, would you have violated 'more often,' 'the same,' or 'less often.'" One out of 32 males, or approximately 3 percent, responded "more often"; 22 out of 32, or approximately 69 percent, responded "the same"; while 9 out of 32, or approximately 28 percent, responded "less often." No females responded "more often"; 25 out of 51, or approximately 49 percent, responded "the same"; while 26 out of 51, or approximately 51 percent, responded "less often." The data for all subjects showed that 1 out of 83, or approximately one percent, responded "more often"; 47 out of 83, or approximately 57 percent, responded the "same"; while 35 out of 83, or approximately 42 percent, responded "less often." There were 17 non-violating males who did not respond and 22 non-violating females who did not respond.

In Question 25, the subjects were asked if they had been convicted of a traffic violation during the first nine months of their probationary license phase. Five out of 49 males, or approximately 10 percent, responded "yes," while 44 out of 49, or approximately 90 percent, responded "no." Five out of 73 females, or approximately 7 percent, responded "yes," while 68 out of 73, approximately 93 percent, responded "no." The data for all subjects showed that 10 out of 122, or approximately 8 percent, responded "yes," while 112 out of 122, or approximately 92 percent, responded "no."

Table 6 Violations of GDL and Enforcement

Question #23 (Violation of GDL law at least one time)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	33	67%	16	33%
72 Females	55	76%	17	24%
25 Burnett	20	80%	5	20%
96 Polk	68	71%	28	29%
41 Private	30	73%	11	27%
80 Public	58	73%	22	28%
121 Total	88	73%	33	27%

(One Polk County female non-respondent wasn't included in the percentages.)

Question #24 (Increased police enforcement of GDL reduce violations?)

	<u># more often</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># the same</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># less often</u>	<u>%</u>
32 Males	1	3%	22	69%	9	28%
51 Females	0	0%	25	49%	26	51%
83 Total	1	1%	47	57%	35	42%

(17 male non-respondents and 22 female non-respondents)

Question #25 (Traffic convictions first 9 months of probationary license)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
49 Males	5	10%	44	90%
73 Females	5	7%	68	93%
122 Total	10	8%	112	92%

Question #26 (License restrictions extended at least 6 months for subjects with conviction)

	<u># yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u># no</u>	<u>%</u>
5 Males	1	20%	4	80%
5 Females	4	80%	1	20%
10 Total	5	50%	5	50%

(44 males without conviction and 68 females without conviction)

All subjects who were convicted of a traffic violation during the first nine months of their probationary license phase were asked to respond to Question 26, which asked if the license restrictions were extended at least six months longer due to a traffic violation conviction during the first nine months of the probationary license. One out of 5 males with convictions, or 20 percent, had their license restrictions extended while 4 out of 5, or

80 percent, did not. Four out of 5 females with convictions, or 80 percent, had their license restrictions extended, while 1 out of 5, or 20 percent, did not. Looking at the totals, 5 out of 10, or 50 percent, had their license restrictions extended while 5 out of 10, or 50 percent, did not.

Summary of Findings

The researcher's questionnaire addressed four main areas of data for this study. These included the subjects' background information, the subjects' knowledge of Wisconsin's GDL law, the subjects' attitudes toward Wisconsin's GDL law, and the subjects' past GDL violations and enforcement issues surrounding those violations. Each question was analyzed collectively as well as by gender. In Question 23, the data were also analyzed according to what type of Driver's Education course the subject attended, public vs. private, and in which county the subject attended school. The results in the second through fourth areas proved to be rather consistent with each other and differences between genders were found in some results.

The first main area the researcher's questionnaire focused on the subjects' background information. Subjects recently attended a school in either Polk or Burnett Counties in Wisconsin and included males and females whose birth dates were between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985. Subjects had also received Driver's Education training in either a private or a public school setting. The variety of the subjects' background produced noteworthy data to be reported.

The second main area the researcher's questionnaire focused on the subjects' knowledge of Wisconsin's GDL law. Responses to Questions 6 through 10 were analyzed according to gender and as a whole, as illustrated in Table 2. A strong majority

of subjects responded that the GDL law was presented “adequately” or “very adequately” in their Driver Education courses. When asked if they felt knowledgeable about Wisconsin’s GDL law, another high percentage of subjects indicated that they did. When asked specific questions about Wisconsin’s GDL law requirements subjects were found to be very knowledgeable. Therefore, the findings suggest that the subjects felt they were taught adequately about the GDL law, they felt they were knowledgeable about the GDL law, and they demonstrated their knowledge in their responses in Questions 7, 8, and 9.

The third main area the researcher’s questionnaire focused on the subjects’ attitudes towards Wisconsin’s GDL law. The results for this section are found in Table 3. In Questions 11 through 14, the subjects’ support for the different components of the GDL law varied significantly. Looking at all subjects, there was strong support for the GDL law involving the instructional permit requirements, while only marginal support for the restrictions during the probationary license phase. There was also strong subject support for the minimum requirement of 30 hours of supervised driving during the instructional permit phase; however, there was only marginal support from the subjects regarding the GDL restrictions during the first 9 months of the probationary license phase. The subjects also gave marginal support for the GDL law on passenger restrictions addressed in Question 14. Overall, in Questions 11 through 14, a majority of the subjects supported the GDL requirements of the instructional permit phase and the restrictions during the probationary license phase with the exception of the nighttime driving restriction.

The fourth main area of the researcher’s questionnaire was the subjects’ past GDL violations and the enforcement issues surrounding those violations. The percentage of

subjects who violated specific components of the GDL law during the instructional permit phase was generally low and was similar between genders, as found in Table 4. However, Question 19 revealed a contrast to those low violation percentages. The difference between genders was also noticeable when approximately 43 percent of the males and approximately 56 percent of the females violated the passenger restrictions. The percentage of subjects who violated specific components of the GDL law during the probationary license phase, as found in Table 5, increased significantly and differed between genders, compared to the violations during the instructional permit phase of driving. Question 23 asked the subjects if they violated the GDL law at least one time and revealed similar results as the passenger restriction violations. The final questions of this section took a look at the enforcement of the GDL law. The findings in this area revealed a relatively low number of violations during the instructional permit phase with a marked increase of violations in the area of passenger and nighttime driving restrictions during the probationary license period. The findings concluded with interesting attitudes toward law enforcement of the GDL law and a significantly low number of traffic citations reported.

Each of the four main areas of data for this study produced interesting results. Subjects displayed an adequate amount of knowledge regarding the Wisconsin's GDL law as well as definite feelings about specific restrictions. Data also uncovered subjects' attitudes toward restrictions and violations which, when compared by gender, revealed differences as well as a number of close similarities.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Inexperienced teenage drivers have created concern throughout the nation due to the high percentage of fatal crashes involving sixteen-year-old drivers. In an effort to address these issues, a large number of states have adopted multi-staged driver licensing systems, which gradually introduce the novice driver to operating a vehicle on the road. At the same time, beginning drivers have limits on nighttime driving hours and numbers of passengers allowed in their vehicles. Wisconsin's Graduated Driver Licensing law went into effect September 1, 2000, and is similar to many graduated licensing laws found in 46 other states (Gains, 2002). As with any new law, there are varied attitudes and viewpoints held by those most affected by the law, including teenage drivers and their parents. Therefore, this research has focused on teen knowledge, attitudes and compliance of the Wisconsin GDL law in Polk and Burnett Counties.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent that restrictions imposed by the Wisconsin Graduated Licensing system have been followed by Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers. Specifically, the study addressed how knowledgeable these teens were about the Wisconsin GDL law when they took the researcher's survey, what their attitudes toward that law were, and to what extent they were abiding by the law when they possessed a permit or probationary license. The questionnaire developed by the researcher consisted of 26 questions; there were a total of 481 questionnaires mailed to students that recently attended 10 out of the 11 public high schools in Polk and Burnett

Counties of Wisconsin. The subjects were made up of 122 students with birth dates between September 1, 1984, and June 20, 1985, an approximate 26 percent response rate to the total number of surveys sent out. Data were analyzed and presented by gender, and in one question data were presented in additional categories, including public school Driver's Education courses, private Driver's Education courses, as well as the counties in which the subjects attended school. Forty-nine males and seventy-three females participated in the study. Limitations of the study included the lack of face-to-face contact, and subjects were on their honor to provide truthful answers.

Conclusions Based Upon the Collected Data

Research Area One: Subjects' Knowledge of Wisconsin's GDL Law

The Wisconsin GDL law is a multi-faceted law with numerous restrictions and guidelines. Even though the content of this law is rather complex, research area one revealed that Polk and Burnett County teenage drivers were very knowledgeable about Wisconsin's GDL law. Interestingly, findings in this area produced no major discrepancy between genders in their responses. A majority of the subjects felt their Driver's Education courses covered the law adequately, and they also felt well versed in the requirements of the GDL law. Survey data revealed a consistency between subjects' feelings about their knowledge and their actual performance on the questions regarding the GDL law.

Research Area Two: Subjects' Attitudes Regarding Wisconsin's GDL Law

In response to questions regarding support for driving restrictions, both genders revealed a highly favorable attitude which supported the six month holding period and supervised driving requirement of 30 hours in the instructional phase. Females, however, favored these requirements to a stronger degree than males. These findings closely corresponded with the results of the Williams, Nelson, & Leaf (2002) study conducted in California. Driver support was not consistent over time, however. One of the most interesting shifts of attitudes was revealed when subjects drastically decreased their support for restrictions once they progressed to the probationary license phase. A large number of subjects displayed a desire to increase their nighttime driving freedoms. Even though this decrease was significant, support for nighttime driving restrictions was still slightly more than half the subject group. Again, females displayed slightly stronger support for the restriction. Another sharp decline in support occurred when subjects were questioned about their support on passenger restrictions; however, a majority of the subjects still felt there was a need for these restrictions. The gap between gender responses was minimal and females, once again, displayed stronger support.

Research Area Three: Subjects' Violations and Enforcement Issues

Data collected regarding violations and enforcement issues of the GDL law indicated various results from which several conclusions were made. Differences in gender ranged from very few violations, as in the case of the supervision restriction, to a significant number of violations in passenger restrictions during the probationary license phase. A significant number of subjects indicated they violated the GDL law in the instructional phase; however, an extremely small number of them were convicted. The

area with the highest percentage of violations in the instructional permit phase was that of passenger restrictions, where half of the subjects indicated at least one violation.

Although it is difficult to conclude whether parents of the subjects knew about the violations regarding a non-immediate family member as a passenger with the student that held the instructional permit, data revealed that a number of parents falsified information and signed official documents which indicated the required amount of supervised hours were completed when, in actuality, they were incomplete. Parental non-support of the law was also found in a noteworthy study from California in which about half of parents indicated that they permitted their teen to violate the GDL law (Williams et al., 2002). Perhaps one reason for this might be a perceived lack of time for parents to directly supervise their children's driving. These circumstances change, however, as these novice drivers move from the instructional permit phase to the probationary license phase.

One of the most significant conclusions of this study was revealed when subjects reported the violations they committed during the probationary license phase. Males significantly increased their violation percentage of passenger restriction violations, which equaled the same percentage of their nighttime driving violations. However, just over half of the females, a slight increase from the permit phase, reported nighttime driving restriction violations. When compared to reports of teens in Nova Scotia and California, the Polk and Burnett County teens displayed almost the same percentage of drivers who often violated the nighttime driving restrictions. However, there was a contrast in the percentage of subjects who indicated violating the law at least one time. The Nova Scotia and California teens reported only a 40 percent violation rate, while the Polk and Burnett County teens reported a 59 percent violation rate (Mayhew, Simpson,

Ferguson, & Williams, Nelson, & Leaf, 2002). This finding contrasts the theory of Foss and Goodwin (2003) where they suggested that the North Carolina teenagers reported greater nighttime driving violations than Nova Scotia and California due to the earlier (9 p.m.) driving restriction compared to the midnight restrictions of Nova Scotia and California. The nighttime driving restriction in Wisconsin is also midnight; therefore, the higher percentage of nighttime violations in Polk and Burnett Counties is not due to a difference in the restriction, but could possibly be due to the rural setting of the two counties.

Besides nighttime driving restrictions, passenger restrictions were also violated. Hedlund et al. (2003) noted there is a high-priority need for research on the topic of GDL compliance of passenger restrictions. In the researcher's study, the gender gap was most evident in reports of females that violated passenger restrictions in the probationary license phase; the percentage of these violations significantly increased from the permit phase. Collectively, almost three-quarters of Polk and Burnett County teens violated the passenger restriction law at least once. Many factors may have been involved in creating the high percentage of violations in this area, including a lower percentage of support for the passenger restrictions, limited parental control, and, again, the rural setting of the two counties. Similar findings were revealed when subjects were asked if they had violated the GDL law at least one time. It should be noted that this study revealed an inconsistency in the female responses regarding the violations of the GDL law. In the passenger restriction question, approximately 78 percent reported violating the law, and in the question regarding violating the GDL law at least one time approximately 76 percent of the females reported violating the law. Data indicated no difference in the

percentage of violations between subjects that attended a public Driver's Education course and those that attended a private Driver's Education course. The highest percentage of violators were from Burnett County schools (only 25 subjects) followed by female subjects, then Polk County subjects. Results show that the male subjects from Polk and Burnett Counties had the lowest percentage of violations of the GDL law.

Because there appears to be a significant rate of violations, data on enforcement is highly relevant. Data revealed that increased police enforcement of the GDL law would deter the females from violating the law considerably more so than the males. Even though the violation percentages were relatively high in this study, the number of citations issued during the first nine months of the probationary license was noticeably low. An interesting result that surfaced from the questionnaire was that even though the females reported a higher percentage of violations, the males received a higher percentage of citations. However, female violators were significantly more likely to have their license restrictions extended than the males.

Recommendations

The results of this study suggest the need for further research regarding the GDL law. The suggestions are as follows:

1. A very concerning point of interest uncovered in this study was the high percentage of passenger restriction violations during the probationary license phase. Further studies need to be conducted to see if high rates of passenger restriction violations continue.

2. The highest percentage of passenger restriction violations were reported from the female subjects. Results indicated that a large portion of the female violators would have decreased their violations if police officers would have increased their focus on stopping and citing violators of the GDL law. Therefore, it would be beneficial to conduct a study regarding whether passenger restriction violations can be reduced during the probationary license phase through increased law enforcement. The results of this study should be analyzed collectively as well as by gender and geographic area (urban/suburban/rural).
3. Both males and females indicated, to some extent, that increased law enforcement would influence their behaviors. Further research using random check points for enforcing the GDL law should be investigated.
4. A significantly low number of citations were reported in comparison to the number of violations being committed. A study should be initiated to see if the methods police officers employ when stopping a teen driver is a factor in such a low percentage of citations. Gender differences in the number of citations issued and whether GDL restrictions are extended for each gender should also be analyzed. Another concern that needs to be addressed in further study is whether police officers check for GDL violations during routine traffic stops.
5. Since a number of parents were found to be noncompliant with the GDL requirements in the instructional permit stage, and subjects surveyed revealed a high percentage of GDL violations, it would be beneficial to study what

factors might increase student and parent support for the GDL law. The study should include a look at the Driver's Education programs to determine the extent teachers educate and promote support for the GDL law. In addition, it should address how teachers can involve the parents in order to enable them to take ownership in modeling positive driving behaviors and respect for the GDL law as it relates to the teenage driver.

6. The researcher's study revealed a high percentage of males violating the nighttime driving restriction during the probationary license phase. According to Chen, Baker, Braver & Li (2000), fatal crash risks are nearly three times higher for 16- and 17 year-old drivers from 10 p.m. to midnight than during daylight and early evening hours (6 a.m. to 10 p.m.). Further study of nighttime driving crashes involving teen drivers and the limitation of the restricted hours is needed.

REFERENCES

- Begg, D., & Stephenson, S. (2003). Graduated driver licensing: The New Zealand experience. *Journal of Safety Research, 34*(1), 99-105.
- Chen, L., Baker, S.P., Braver, E. R., & Li, G. (2000). Carrying passengers as a risk factor for crashes fatal to 16- and 17-year-old drivers. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 283*, 1578-1617.
- Foss, R., Goodwin, A., Rodgman, E., & Feaganes, J. (2002). *Development and evaluation of the North Carolina graduated driver licensing system*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center.
- Foss, R., & Goodwin, A. (2003). Enhancing the effectiveness of graduated driver licensing. *Journal of Safety Research, 34*(1), 79-84.
- Gains from graduated licensing. (2002, July/Aug). *AAA Wisconsin Home & Away, 4A*.
- Hedlund, J., Shults, R., & Compton, R. (2003). What we know, what we don't know, and what we need to know about graduated driver licensing. *Journal of Safety Research, 34*(1), 107-115.
- Lorenzi, N. (1997, September). Graduated licensing law restricts teenage driving. *Professional Safety, 42* (9), 13-15. Retrieved March 3, 2000, from EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite.
- Mayhew, D. R., Simpson, H. M., Ferguson, S. A., & Williams, A. F. (1998). Graduated driver licensing in Nova Scotia: A survey of teen-agers and parents. *Journal of Traffic Medicine, 26*(1-2), 37-44.

- McCartt, A. T., Leaf, W. A., Farmer, C. M., Ferguson, S. A., & Williams, A. F. (2001). Effects of Florida's graduated licensing program on the behaviors and attitudes of teenagers. *Journal of Safety Research*, 32(2), 119-131.
- McKnight, A.J. (2003). Graduated driver licensing and safer driving. *Journal of Safety Research*, 34(1), 81-85.
- Milberg, T. (2002, July 31). Community grieves again. *Inter-County Leader*, p. 3.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (1999). Graduated driver licensing system. *State Legislative Fact Sheet*, January 2000. Retrieved June 16, 2000, from WORLDCAT database on ReadersGuideAbs NetFirst.
- Preusser, D. F., & Leaf, W. A. (2003). Provisional license. *Journal of Safety Research*, 34(1), 45-49.
- Sandbulte, L. (1999). Graduated driver licensing. *CPCU Journal*, 52 (4), n. p. Retrieved June 13, 2000, from EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite.
- Shope, J. T., & Molnar, L. J. (2003). Graduated driver licensing in the United States: Evaluation results from the early programs. *Journal of Safety Research*, 34(1), 63-69.
- Simpson, H. M. (2003). The evolution and effectiveness of graduated licensing. *Journal of Safety Research*, 34(1), 25-34.
- Stormy accident fatal for 3 local teens. (2002, July 31). *Inter-County Leader*, p.2.
- Tyson, S. A. (1997). In many states, teens get license to drive, bit by bit. *Christian Science Monitor*, 89 (46), p. 3. Retrieved March 3, 2000, from EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite.

- Williams, A. F. (1997, November/December). Earning a driver's license. *Public Health Reports, 112* (6), p. 453-463. Retrieved March 3, 2000, from EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite.
- Williams, A. F., Nelson, L. A., & Leaf, W. A. (2002). Responses of teenagers and their parents to California's graduated licensing system. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 34*(6), 835-842.
- Wisconsin Department of Transportation. (2003). *Drivers & Vehicles: Regular license*. Retrieved May 26, 2003, from <http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/drivers/drivers/gdl/teengdl.htm>
- Wisconsin Department of Transportation. (2002). *Drivers & Vehicles: Traffic convictions*. Retrieved January 3, 2003, from <http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/drivers/drivers/points/traff-convictions.htm>
- Wisconsin Department of Transportation. (2002). *Safety & Consumer Protection: GDL/teen driving safety*. Retrieved April 28, 2003, from <http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/safety/motorist/teendriving/index.htm>
- Wisconsin Department of Transportation. (2000, January 31). *Wisconsin's GDL changes for new licensing drivers: frequently asked questions*. Retrieved March 2, 2000, from <http://dot.state.wi.us/dmv/gdlfaq.html>
- Wisconsin Department of Transportation. (2001). *Wisconsin motorists' handbook*. Madison, WI: Author.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Circle the correct response:

1. Are you 18 years old?: Y N
2. Gender: M F
3. The high school which I just attended is in what county?: Polk Burnett
4. Currently I have the following driver license?:
instructional permit probationary license regular license no license
5. Did you take Driver's Education class from a private company?: Y N
6. How did you feel your Driver's Education course covered the graduated license law?:
very adequate adequate not adequate
7. How many months do you have to hold your instructional permit before you can try
for your probationary driver license?: 3 6 9 12
8. What is the minimal number of hours of supervised practice a parent must verify that
has been completed during the instructional permit driving phase?: 15 30 45 60
9. How many non-family passengers are you allowed in your vehicle while you are
driving during the probationary driving phase?: 0 1 2 3 4
10. I feel I am knowledgeable about Wisconsin's Graduated License law:
strongly agree agree neither agree or disagree disagree strongly disagree
11. Do you support at least a 6-month holding period for the instructional permit driving
phase?: Y N
12. I favor a minimum requirement of 30 hours or longer of supervised driving during
the instructional permit driving phase: Y N
13. Do you support the night driving restriction during the first 9 months of the
probationary license phase: Y N
14. I support the current graduated license law on passenger restrictions: Y N
15. Did you get convicted of a traffic violation during your instruction permit driving
phase?: Y N

over please

16. I violated the supervision restriction by driving alone during the instructional permit phase: often seldom never

17. During the instructional permit phase, did you violate the supervision restriction by driving with a non-parent supervisor under age 21?: Y N

18. During the instructional permit phase, did you violate the supervision restriction by allowing a non-parent over age 21 to supervise you without prior written permission of your parent: often seldom never

19. During the instructional permit phase, did you allow a non-immediate family member to ride with you while you were driving: often seldom never

20. During the instructional permit phase, did you complete the required number of supervised hours including those at night?: Y N

21. I violated the passenger restrictions during the probationary license phase:
often seldom never

22. Did you violate the nighttime driving restriction during the probationary license phase: often seldom never

23. I violated some part of the graduated license law at least one time: Y N

24. If you answered No to question #23 skip this question. If police officers would have increased their focus on stopping and citing violators of the graduated license law while you were under those restrictions would you have violated:
more often the same less often

25. Were you convicted of a traffic violation during the first 9-months of your probationary license phase?: Y N

26. If you answered No to question #25 skip this question. Because you were convicted of a traffic violation during the first 9-months of your probationary license, was your license restrictions extended at least 6 months longer?: Y N

APPENDIX B

Dear recent high school student,

The researcher is a Driver's Education teacher at Frederic High School. He is doing research on Wisconsin's Graduated Driver License law. The study includes the knowledge, attitudes, and previous violations of individuals age 18 that were affected by Wisconsin's Graduated Driver License law. The researcher decided to study this topic due to the many recent crashes involving teen-age drivers in Polk and Burnett Counties. The results of this study may provide important information that could be used to make Polk and Burnett County roads safer, as well as, insight for the researcher when teaching Driver's Education. The study has been approved by the Instructional Research Board at UW-Stout. The researcher wants this study to be completely confidential.

The researcher would like to encourage you to volunteer and be part of this study. Please complete both sides of the questionnaire by circling your response. Answer all questions and do not write your name on it or anything else that could be used to identify you. On the return envelope, the researcher has his name in the mailing address location and on the return address location. Don't put anything on the envelope that could identify you. After you complete this short questionnaire please mail it in the addressed envelope postmarked by June 27, 2003.

I understand that by returning the questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the basic nature of the study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner so that only minimal identifiers are necessary and so that confidentiality is guaranteed. I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation up until the time the questionnaire is returned will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.

NOTE: Questions or concerns about the research study should be addressed to Wade Erickson, the researcher, at (715) 327-5589 or Dr. Brian Finder, the research advisor, at (715) 232-1422. Questions about the rights of research subjects can be addressed to Sue Foxwell, Human Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Instructional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 Harvey Hall, Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

Thank you for your time and support.

The researcher,

Wade Erickson