



WMCRP Public Attitude Survey

1.0 Introduction

Following the decision to carry out a public attitude survey in June, Performance Review were commissioned to carry out a phone survey of 500 people in the WM region, to gauge public perceptions of the use of safety cameras. The reason for conducting such a survey at this stage of the Partnerships life was in order to provide a baseline measure of peoples attitudes before any major Partnership campaign work had been carried out. This would provide a measure for all future surveys.

2.0 Explanation of survey

A standard random population distribution was utilized to legitimate wider inferences about the entire population. In addition a number of surveys were undertaken in each of the LA regions, to further ensure an effective demographic distribution.

Birmingham	15%
Dudley	14%
Coventry	14%
Sandwell	15%
Solihull	14%
Smethwick	14%
Wolverhampton	15%

Partnerships throughout the country are required to ask the public seven questions, as developed by PA and DfT.

We added 5 questions to this list:

- Cameras should be installed only where the speed limit is 30mph
- Camera placement is the responsibility of the Police
- Cameras should be installed where communities are concerned about road safety
- When I see a safety camera sign, I slow down
- When I see a yellow safety camera I slow down

We also added a further question to ascertain the times at which people most often think about the speed they are traveling at.

In addition, respondents were asked if they had previously committed a driving offence so that we could observe any difference in responses between groups.

3.0 “The 7 questions”

Question	Agree Disagree	Offender YES (NO)	Overall (%)
Cameras are a way of making money out of motorists	A	40% (28%)	30%
	D	43% (63%)	59%
Fewer accidents are likely to happen on roads where cameras are installed	A	66% (72%)	70%
	D	18% (18%)	18%
Cameras mean that more dangerous drivers are more likely to get caught	A	66% (78%)	75%
	D	24% (16%)	17%
The primary aim of safety cameras is to save lives	A	65% (87%)	83%
	D	22% (7%)	10%
There are too many cameras in my local area	A	24% (10%)	13%
	D	59% (72%)	70%
Cameras are there to encourage drivers to driver carefully, not punish them	A	63% (83%)	79%
	D	20% (10%)	11%
The use of safety cameras should be supported as a method of reducing casualties	A	89% (93%)	92%
	D	7% (3%)	4%

3.1 Supportive questions

Question	Agree Disagree	Offender YES (NO)	Overall (%)
Cameras should be installed where communities are concerned about road safety	A	85% (93%)	91%
	D	7% (4%)	4%
Cameras should only be installed where the speed limit is 30mph	A	33% (33%)	33%
	D	57% (62%)	60%
Camera placement is the responsibility of the Police	A	57% (62%)	61%
	D	18% (19%)	19%
When I see a safety camera sign , I slow down	A	80% (79%)	79%
	D	15% (14%)	14%
When I see a yellow safety camera , I slow down	A	79% (76%)	77%
	D	12% (14%)	14%

3.2 Key Information

- Almost all responses show a marked difference between drivers who have been penalized for an offence and drivers with clean licences.
- 40% of offenders agreed that cameras were a way of making money out of motorists (28% non-offenders).
- 66% of offenders said fewer accidents were likely to happen where cameras were in use, compared with 72% of non-offenders.
- 24% of offenders felt cameras did not mean dangerous drivers were more likely to get caught (7% of non-offenders).
- 65% of offenders thought the primary role of cameras was to save lives compared with 87% of non-offenders.
- Twice as many offenders disagreed with the statement “cameras are there to encourage drivers to drive carefully, not punish them” as non-offenders.

3.3 Supportive questioning

- 91% of respondents felt that cameras should be placed where communities are concerned about road safety. This strongly suggests that the Partnership must implement strong community concern site selection and enforcement criteria. To this end it is believed that guidance notes for the selection of these sites should be developed and implemented, rather than made discretionary to each LA.
- There is a negligible difference between the drivers’ attitude towards camera signage and the camera itself. This suggests that the Partnership should look towards the further use of both official camera-site signage, and also further informational signage regarding, for example, the number of casualties in the area in the previous six months. Some LA’s already use similar signage, however we should look to develop a standard sign.
- 60% of respondents disagreed with the statement “safety cameras should only be installed where the limit is 30mph”. This would suggest that people are aware that speed is a causal factor in collisions, and that collisions do not only occur in urban/residential/mass populated areas.

4.0 Extra questions

A further set of questions was included in the survey to ascertain drivers’ perceptions of when speeding is not acceptable. The reason behind this questioning was to better develop and target communications campaigns at certain driver groups.

When do you think about the speed you are driving at?

Question	Always	Sometimes	Never
When I see a safety camera	87%	8%	6%
	75%	8%	11%
When I see Police	78%	17%	6%
	77%	10%	13%
When I am driving through a town or city	62%	30%	8%
	60%	26%	14%
When I am driving past, or near a school	86%	9%	5%
	85%	7%	8%
When I am late for work, or another event	39%	35%	26%
	42%	27%	31%
When I see pedestrians or cyclists on the road, or waiting to cross	70%	21%	10%
	76%	17%	8%
If I have recently seen, or heard about, an accident on the road	43%	26%	31%
	48%	30%	22%

- Being late for an event does not stimulate thoughts about speed
- Hearing or seeing accidents do not stimulate thoughts about speeding
- Driving through towns or city's do not stimulate thoughts about speeding

If these scenarios are not largely considered to stimulate thoughts about the speed a vehicle is driving at, there is the suggestion that focusing campaigns that reflect on these issues, in the first instance, is not immediately identifiable to motorists as “**their**” problem.

- Schools, Police, and Speed cameras stimulate the respondent to consider speed more frequently.

Two possible approaches to marketing and publicity can be identified from this data:

1. Partnerships at the incubation stage of development should be focusing their publicity materials on the aspects of travel that already stimulate a response about speed.
2. Partnerships at a later developmental stage should be focusing on the areas in which motorists do not consider their speeds to stimulate appropriate behaviour.

It is the belief of the Communications Officer that no Safety Camera Partnership has successfully achieved the secondary point of organisational development in terms of public awareness. Therefore the assertion that images of crashed vehicles stimulate the viewer to consider their actions is not founded on statistical fact.

5.0 Conclusions

The survey has provided a rudimentary benchmark with which to measure the future success of the Partnership. In general a large proportion of the population are in favour

of the use of cameras as a means for reducing road casualties and thereby improving road safety. Having said this there are notable differences between the perceptions/views of drivers that have committed an offence, to those drivers with clean licences. In addition the research has suggested that some of the traditional forms of publicity may not be successfully targeting road users.

In this context, there are the following recommendations:

- The Partnership looks at the possibility of using offender information held on record for targeting offenders. Offenders typically register less positive responses than non-offenders. We need to make the distinction between the two groups.
- The Partnership investigates methods with which to target local community groups. This may be done with face-to-face liaison but it would be beneficial to explore non-enforcement equipment/techniques. 91% of respondent view community concern as significant in the use of cameras. To gain public support we can look to capitalize on this.
- The Partnership should not necessarily adopt similar marketing campaigns as other Camera Partnerships and Road Safety teams. The survey has suggested that images incorporating cameras, police and schools should be looked at. In addition we should look to question the constant depiction of crashes occurring in urban areas. We should explore alternative image usage.
- There is little evidence to support the notion that shock images have a positive effect on driver behaviour.

It is the firm belief of the Communications Officer that further research be commissioned into specific market research on the effectiveness of advertising campaigns. To this end it is intended to submit a budget in the new Operational Case, specifically for further research in this field.