

**The Illinois Statewide Labor Day 2006  
Alcohol Impaired Driving Enforcement Campaign Surveys**

*Conducted for*



**Illinois Department  
of Transportation**

Division of Traffic Safety

*Conducted by*



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

**Summary Report / Draft for Review**

Field Interviewing: June and September 2006

(Supplemented with Selected Findings from April 2006 Survey)

Draft Report: October, 2006

*Written by*

Richard Schuldt, Director, UIS/SRO

*With assistance from*

Mark Winland, Interviewing Lab Manager

## **Introduction**

The Illinois Department of Transportation, Division of Traffic Safety, contracted with the Survey Research Office, located in the Center for State Policy and Leadership, at the University of Illinois at Springfield to conduct several statewide telephone surveys from April through September, 2006. The first survey was conducted in April prior to the Memorial Day weekend, and the second was conducted in June, immediately after the Memorial Day weekend. A third survey was conducted in September, after the Labor Day weekend.

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

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

## Methodology

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

Actual field interviewing for the April survey was conducted from April 4 - May 7, 2006 with over 500 licensed drivers (501-514). Field interviewing for the June survey was conducted from June 5 – July 3, 2006, with over 550 licensed drivers (525-566). And, field interviewing for the September survey was conducted from September 5 to October 8, 2006, again with over 550 licensed drivers (540-561).<sup>2</sup>

The numbers of completions for each stratification group are presented below for both the April and June surveys. It should be noted that statewide results reported in this summary have been weighted to correct for the intentional over/under-representation of the respective regions.

	<b>2006 Seat Belt Pre-Test <u>April 2006</u></b>	<b>2006 Seat Belt Post-Test / DUI Pre-Test <u>June 2006</u></b>	<b>2006 DUI Post-Test <u>Sept. 2006</u></b>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>514</i>	<i>566</i>	<i>561</i>
Chicago metro area	291	319	311
<i>City of Chicago</i>	<i>153</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>130</i>
<i>Chicago suburban counties</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>169</i>	<i>181</i>
Downstate counties	223	247	259
<i>North/central Illinois</i>	<i>111</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>138</i>
<i>Southern Illinois</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>111</i>

---

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

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

The sampling error for the April statewide results is +/- 4.4 percent, and the error for both the June and September statewide results is +/- 4.2 percent (at the 95<sup>th</sup> confidence level).<sup>3</sup> The error for subgroups in all surveys is, of course, larger.

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

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

## Comments on Results

In the results that follow, we focus on those questions most pertinent to the DUI initiative surrounding Labor Day weekend, 2006. We also focus on the statewide and regional results, specifically highlighting the results and changes that occurred in and between the June and September surveys (the DUI initiative “pre-test” and “post-test” surveys). However, for the statewide results, we at times comment on the April results when they appear to add understanding to the later results/changes.<sup>5</sup> In this summary report, percentages have sometimes been rounded to integers, and percentage changes (i.e., +/- % within parentheses) refer to percentage point changes unless specifically noted.<sup>6</sup>

The full results are presented in the file titled **IDOT 2006 Statewide Survey Tables** (an Excel file), compiled for the project. Separate worksheets are included for: the statewide results; regional results; results by gender; results by age group (three categories of up to 29, 30s and 40s, and 50 and over); results by race (white/non-white); and relevant results for those who had an alcoholic drink in the recent past. Worksheets includes results for the April, June and September surveys as well as percentage point changes from the April to June and from June to September.

---

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

<sup>4</sup> The age categories used for weighting purposes are: up to 29 years old; 30s and 40s; and 50 and older. The statewide proportions for each age category were derived from data on the age distribution of Illinois licensed drivers provided by IDOT’s Division of Traffic Safety. This is the first year that age has been used in the weighting of the results, and its usage was driven by the fact that we consistently under-represent the youngest drivers despite the fact that the interviewing protocol directs interviewers to ask to speak to the youngest licensed driver three-quarters of the time.

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

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

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

***Demographic characteristics of the June and September samples.*** Before reporting the DUI-related results, it is worth noting that the June and September 2006 samples, overall, are similar with regard to most of the demographic characteristics asked about. The largest differences are found for education level, household income, and the incidence of having children. Compared to the June sample, the “weighted” September sample:

- has fewer with “some post high school education” as their highest level of education (-7.7%) while having somewhat more at “both ends” of the education categories [less than high school diploma (+3.8%) and a four-year college degree or more (+3.6%)];
- has more in the three highest income categories (+15.3%), fewer in the two lowest income categories (-7.5%), and fewer who did not give an answer (-5.1%); and
- has more respondents who have children (+4.7%).

## THE RESULTS

### Behaviors relating to drinking and driving

**Frequency of drinking.** “*How often did you drink alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days?*” Statewide, very few September respondents reported drinking every day while about one in ten (11%) reported drinking *at least* several days a week. One-quarter (25%) reported drinking either “once a week or less” or “only on weekends.” Almost one-fifth (19%) reported drinking only on celebrations or special occasions, and over four of ten (43%) reported not having had a drink in the recent past. *During the remaining portions of this report, we sometimes refer to those who indicated ever having drunk in the past thirty days as “drinkers” or “recent drinkers.”*

The number of respondents who reported drinking *at least* several times a week is only slightly less in September than in June (11.0% vs. 14.3%), while the results for those who reported drinking “once a week or less” or “only on weekends” is even closer (24.9% in September vs. 23.1% in June) – as are the results for those who said “only on celebrations or special occasions” (18.7% in September and 20.1% in June). Slightly more September than June respondents reported “never” drinking during the time span (43% vs. 39%).

**Regional results.** The September results show that reports of drinking *at least* several days a week are higher in the two Chicago metro regions (15.5% in City of Chicago and 12% in the suburbs) than in the two downstate regions (6 to 7%). The percent who reported either drinking “once a week or less” or “only on weekends” is also higher in the two Chicago metro regions (27% in both Chicago and the suburbs vs. 21% in north/central Illinois and 18% in southern Illinois).

At the other end of the scale, the percent who reported “never” drinking is greatest in north/central Illinois (56%) followed by southern Illinois (49%), the City of Chicago (40%) and then the Chicago suburbs (36%). And, the percent who reported drinking only “on celebrations

or special occasions” approaches one-quarter for southern Illinois (23%), is almost as much for the Chicago suburbs (21%), and is about one in six for both the City of Chicago and north/central Illinois (about 16% for each).

In terms of those who said they drink at least several times a week, there are decreases in the frequency of these reports in both the Chicago suburbs (18.2% to 12.4%) and in north/central Illinois (13.9% to 6.3%). Small increases are found for both the City of Chicago (12.3% to 15.5%) and southern Illinois (4.6% to 7%).

For those who said they drink once a week or less (including only on weekends), there is an increase from June to September in the City of Chicago (19% to 27%) and a decrease in southern Illinois (25% to 19%). The frequency of these reports are more stable in both the Chicago suburbs (27% for each month) and in north/central Illinois (19% to 21%).

The percent who indicated drinking only on special occasions (or celebrations) declined in the City of Chicago (26% to 16%) and increased modestly in southern Illinois (18% to 23%). Here, a small increase was found for the Chicago suburbs (18% to 21%) while an even smaller decrease was found for north/central Illinois (18% to 16%).

And, in terms of those who said they had “never” had a drink in the past thirty days, increases are found in both north/central Illinois (47% to 56%) and the Chicago suburbs (30% to 36%). Here, only a small decrease is found in southern Illinois (52% to 49%) and virtually no change is found for the City of Chicago (40.8% to 40.3%)

**Drinking and driving.** *“Have you ever driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking alcoholic beverages?” [For the approximate 55 to 57 percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* Just over one-third of the September respondents (36%) who drank alcoholic beverages in the recent past reported they had driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking during this time period. This is just slightly higher than the number of such drivers who said so in June (34%).

In September, the percent of *drinkers* who reported having recently driven within two hours after drinking an alcoholic beverage is somewhat higher in north/central Illinois (nearly 40%) than in the other three regions (36% for the Chicago suburbs and 33% for both the City of Chicago and southern Illinois). From June to September, a sizeable decrease is found in this percentage for drinkers in southern Illinois (45% to 33%) while an increase is found for City of Chicago drinkers (27% to 33%). Very small changes here are found for both the Chicago suburban drinkers (34% to 36%) and north/central Illinois drinkers (39-40% in each month).

**Number of times.** *“About how many times [in this time period] did you drive within two hours after drinking?” [For the approximate 20% of total sample members who had an alcoholic beverage in the recent past and who indicated they had driven a motor vehicle after drinking.]* For those who had driven a motor vehicle within two hours of drinking in the recent past, more September than June respondents indicated doing so once (44% vs. 31%) while more June than September respondents indicated doing so twice (36% vs. 22%). The number who said three or four times does not differ much (21% in September and 18% in June), and neither does the number who indicated more often than this – about 9 percent in both surveys. [Among the latter, slightly more June than September respondents indicated 5 to 9 times (4.5% vs. 1.5%) while slightly more September respondents indicated 10 times or more (7.4% vs. 4.9%).]

**Number of drinks on last occasion.** *“On the most recent occasion (driving within two hours of drinking), about how many drinks did you have?” [For the approximate 13% of total sample members who indicated they had driven within two hours of*

**drinking.]** About one-third of the relevant respondents in both surveys reported having had one drink (33% in June and 30.5% in September) while the number who reported having had either one *or* two drinks is somewhat higher in September than in June (73% vs. 67%). Somewhat more June than September respondents reported having had three or four drinks (20% vs. 14%) while about one in ten indicated having had five or more drinks in both June (9.8%) and September (11.9%).

**Frequency drive when too much to drink.** *“About how many times [in this time period] did you drive when you thought you had too much to drink?” [For the approximate 55 to 57 percent of total sample members who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* In both the September and June surveys, just over nine in ten of those asked the question (those who drank in the past thirty days) reported never having had too much to drink when they drove in the past thirty days (91.9% in June and 92% in September). In September, just over 3 percent (3.2%) indicated having done so either once (2.4%) or more than once (0.8%) -- while in June, nearly 5 percent (4.8%) said they had done so either once (3.6%) or more than once (1.2%). The number who did not give an answer is larger in September than June (4.9% vs. 2.3%).

Reports of *never* having done so in the past thirty days are more frequent among recent drinkers in the two Chicago metro areas (95% for City of Chicago and 93% for suburban Chicago) than they are in the two downstate regions (90% for southern Illinois and 86% for north/central Illinois).

**Assessed trend in personal drinking and driving.** *“Compared to three months ago, are you now driving after drinking: more often, less often, or about the same?” [For the approximate 55 to 57 percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* No respondent in June and hardly any in September reported that they now drink and drive “more often” than they did three months ago, while the proportion who said they drive after drinking “less often” is about the same in both surveys (8% in June and 7% in September). The proportion who said they “never drive after drinking” is also about the same in both surveys (each at about 62%). Fewer September than June respondents indicated doing this “about the same” now (21% vs. 28%) while more September respondents did not offer a response (8% vs. 2%).

In September, the percent of “drinking” respondents who said they “never” drive after drinking is about two-thirds for both the City of Chicago (68%) and southern Illinois (67%) followed quite closely by the Chicago suburbs (63%) and then by north/central Illinois (52%). The percent who said they are now driving “less” after drinking is about one in ten for the two downstate regions (9.5%-11.1%) and about half this number in the two Chicago metro areas (5.1%-6.7%). The region with the largest number who report driving after drinking “more” often is north/central Illinois (3.2%).

From June to September, a substantial increase in the percent of “drinking” respondents who said they “never” drive after drinking is found for southern Illinois (40% to 67%) while a modest decrease in this percent is found for north/central Illinois (60% to 52%). Results in the two Chicago metro areas are more stable (66% to 68% for City of Chicago; 62% to 63% for the Chicago suburbs).

During this same time span, the percent of drinkers who reported driving after drinking “less often” increased in north/central Illinois (5% to 11%) and decreased in both the City of Chicago (13.5% to 6.7%) and southern Illinois (15% to 9.5%). It was far more stable in the Chicago suburbs (6.5% and 5.1%).

In terms of the percent who reported their driving-after-drinking behavior “is about the same,” there are sizeable decreases for the two downstate regions: - 12 percentage points for north/central Illinois (31% to 19%) and an even greater – 31 percentage points in southern Illinois (45% to 14%). At the same time, only modest declines here were found in the two Chicago metro areas (20% to 17% in the City of Chicago and 28% to 25.5% in the Chicago suburbs).

For this question, it should also be noted that quite sizeable increases occurred from June to September in the frequency of the “don’t know/refuse to answer” category in three of the regions: City of Chicago (0% to 8%); north/central Illinois (4.1% to 14.3%); and southern Illinois (0% to 9.5%).

## **Perceptions of and attitudes about police presence and enforcement**

**Perceptions of DUI enforcement.** Three questions in the interview solicited respondents’ perceptions about general police presence on roads and police enforcement of DUI laws. In the first question, respondents were asked how likely it is they would be stopped if they drove after having too much to drink. In the second question, respondents were asked about the relative frequency they see police on the roads they drive (compared to three months ago). And, in the third question, respondents were asked another relative question, this time being how likely it is that a driver who had been drinking will be stopped, compared to three months ago.<sup>7</sup> (Also see the next section for questions specifically relating to roadside checks.)

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

Of relevant September respondents statewide, over one-tenth (12.8%) said that being stopped by police would be “almost certain,” and about one-quarter (25%) said it would be “very likely.” About four in ten (40%) said it would be “somewhat likely,” while about one in five (21%) said it would be either “somewhat unlikely” (15%) or “very unlikely” (7%). The June results are very close to these September results.

Interestingly, it is the April results that show perceptions of likelihood the greatest – with over four in ten (44%) believing it is either “almost certain” (15%) or “very likely” (29%) that you will be stopped. In this survey, less than one in five (18%) believed it is either “somewhat unlikely” (12%) or “very unlikely” (6%).<sup>9</sup>

For the September results, *recent drinkers* were much less likely than non-drinkers to say that their likelihood of being stopped is either “almost certain” or “very likely” (31% vs. 48%) and are more likely to say this likelihood is “somewhat likely” (43% vs. 35%). The same pattern

---

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

<sup>8</sup> Across the three surveys, about 2-3% said “don’t know” or refused to answer, and another 12% in each survey were coded as “not drinking so they cannot relate to the question.” For future surveys of this sort, it might be better not to personalize the question. That is, instead of asking, “if you drove after having too much to drink . . .,” it might be better to ask respondents how likely police are to stop drivers who do this behavior. This is in line with the wording of the third question in this section.

<sup>9</sup> This April finding relative to the June and September results here was also the case in last year’s surveys. For a possible explanation, see the results for the next question.

is present in the June results. From June to September, more change actually occurred here for non-drinkers than for drinkers. First, the percent of non-drinkers who expressed substantive answers increased a bit from September to June (72% to 76%). And, for those who did give a substantive answer, somewhat more of the September than June non-drinkers said that it would be either “very likely” or “somewhat likely” they would be caught (59% to 67%) while somewhat fewer of them said it would be either “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” (23% to 17%).

*In terms of regions*, the September percent who said it would be either “almost certain” or “very likely” that they would be stopped ranges only from a low of 35 percent for the City of Chicago to a high of 41 percent in north/central Illinois – with the Chicago suburbs at 36 percent and southern Illinois at 39 percent..

At the other end of the scale, we find the percent who said it would be either “somewhat” or “very” unlikely is about one-quarter for three of the four regions (25% in both the Chicago suburbs and southern Illinois and 23% in the City of Chicago) and a somewhat lower 17 percent in north/central Illinois.

From June to September, the combined percentage for the top two likelihood categories (“almost certain” and “very likely”) does not show much change in any of the four regions. (The largest change is an increase of 3% in the Chicago suburbs.

**Police presence on roads.** “*Compared with three months ago, do you see police on the roads you normally drive more often, less often, or about the same?*” About three-quarters (76%) of the September respondents reported seeing police “about the same” on the roads they normally drive, while about one in five (20%) said they police “more often” and under one in twenty (3%) said “less often.” These results do not differ much from those in June.

Again, it is in the April survey where we see perceptions of police presence the greatest. In this earlier survey, just over one-quarter reported seeing police “more often” (26% compared to 19% in June and 20% in September) while nearly 70 percent (69%) said “about the same” (somewhat lower than the 75 to 76% who said so in June and September).<sup>10</sup>

*When analyzed by recent drinking activity*, we find the June results were virtually the same for drinkers and non-drinkers. In September, somewhat more drinkers said they see police “about the same” (79% vs. 73%) while slightly more non-drinkers said they see police “more often” (23% vs. 18%).

*In September – by region*, the percent who said they see police “more often” is above one in five for both the Chicago suburbs (23.5%) and north/central Illinois (21%) and somewhat lower in both southern Illinois (17%) and the City of Chicago (15%). About eight in ten said “about the same” in all regions but the Chicago suburbs where seven in ten said so. The largest number of those who said “less often” is found in southern Illinois (4.8%) and then the Chicago suburbs (3.9%).

Comparing June and September regional results shows little change for southern Illinois here. For north/central Illinois, we find an increase in the percent who said “about the same” (66% to 78%) and a decrease in the percent who said “more often” (28% to 21%). For the Chicago suburbs, the reverse is the case – with an increase in “more often” (15% to 23%) and a decrease in “about the same” (80% to 71%). For the City of Chicago, we find an increase in

---

<sup>10</sup> Again, this result was found in last year’s surveys as well.

those who said “about the same” (75% to 81%) and small decreases in every other response category.

**Police enforcement of drinking laws -- comparative, general evaluation.** “*Compared to three months ago, do you think a driver who had been drinking is now more likely to be stopped by police, less likely to be stopped, or is this about the same?*” Statewide, the percent who said “more likely to be stopped” increased somewhat from June to September (24% to 28%) while the percent who said “about the same” decreased just slightly (68% in June and 66% in September). In the earlier April survey, 30 percent said “more likely to be stopped” and 63 percent said “about the same.”

*When analyzed by recent drinking activity*, we find that both the June and September results show recent drinkers are somewhat less likely than non-drinkers to say it is “more likely” they will be stopped (30% vs. 20% in June; and 31% vs. 26% in September). And, drinkers are more likely than non-drinkers to say the likelihood of being stopped is “about the same” (74% vs. 59% in June; and, to a lesser extent, 68.5% vs. 64% in September). Recent drinkers showed more change from June to September, showing a 6 percentage point increase in those who said “more likely to be stopped” (20% to 26%) and an accompanying decrease in those who said “about the same” (73.5% to 68.5%).

*By region*, the September “more likely to be stopped” responses number about three in ten for both north/central Illinois (31.5%) and the Chicago suburbs (29%) and about one in four for southern Illinois (26%) and southern Illinois (23%). Increases in this percentage from June to September are found for both the Chicago suburbs (19.5% to 29%) and southern Illinois (19% to 26%). Little to no change in this percentage is found in the other two regions.

## **Evaluations of penalties given to DUI offenders**

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

**Evaluations of penalties for first offenders.** “*Do you think the penalties given to drivers your area who are guilty of their first offense for alcohol-impaired driving are: too lenient, too harsh, or about right?*” By about a margin of 45 percent to 26 percent, a plurality of the September statewide respondents reported the penalties for first offenders are “about right” as opposed to “too lenient.” Only 7 percent said they were “too harsh,” and just over one in five (22%) did not express an opinion. These results do not depart much from those in the June 2006 survey (the biggest difference being a decrease of 4% for those who did not express an opinion).

*Analysis by recent drinking activity.* Both the June and September results show that recent drinkers are somewhat less likely than non-drinkers to say penalties are “too lenient” (19.5% vs. 36% in June; and 22% vs. 32% in September). For the percent who said penalties are “too harsh,” the June results do not show much difference between the two groups (about 7% for each), but in September drinkers were more likely to say this than non-drinkers (11% vs. 3%). For those who said the penalties are “about right,” the June recent drinkers were somewhat more

likely to say the penalties are “about right” than non-drinkers (45% vs. 38%), but the difference between the two groups in September had largely disappeared (46% vs. 44%). And, for those not expressing an opinion (don’t know or refuse), June drinkers outnumber non-drinkers here (29% vs. 19%) but no differences are apparent in September (21-22%).

*Analysis by region.* In three of the regions, the September percent who said “about right” outnumbers the percent who said “too lenient” by margins ranging from 2.5 to 1 (50% vs. 20% for City of Chicago) to 4 to 3 (41% vs. 29% in north/central Illinois), with a 2 to 1 margin found in the Chicago suburbs (46% vs. 23%). However, somewhat more September southern Illinois respondents said “too lenient” than said “about right” (44% vs. 37%).

From June to September, the largest change in these results is found in southern Illinois where the percent who said “too lenient” climbed from 33 percent to 44 percent. This was accompanied by smaller declines in the no response and “about right” categories.

**Evaluations of penalties for repeat offenders.** *“Do you think the penalties given to repeat offenders of alcohol-impaired driving are: too lenient, too harsh, or about right?”* The results are virtually reversed when we move from the question about penalties given for first offenders to this question about repeat offenders. Here, by a margin of 46 percent to 29 percent, a plurality of the September respondents is found to believe that penalties are “too lenient” as opposed to “about right.” Hardly any (1.7%) said “too harsh” while almost one-quarter (24%) did not express an opinion. These results are very close to the results found in the June survey.

*Analysis by recent drinking activity.* Both the June and September results show few differences between recent drinkers and non-drinkers. In both months, only slightly more non-drinkers than drinkers said the penalties are “too lenient” (49% vs. 45% in June; 48% vs. 44% in September).

*Analysis by region.* In September, a majority of respondents in both downstate regions said penalties for repeat offenders are “too lenient” (55% vs. 26% for “about right” in southern Illinois and 50% vs. 32% in north/central Illinois). A plurality for this response is found in both Chicago metro areas (45% vs. 26% for the Chicago suburbs and 39% vs. 32% in the City of Chicago). For the City of Chicago, this was a reversal from the June narrow plurality which indicated “about right” rather than “too lenient” (37% vs. 33%). The only other change at all sizeable here was the increase in “about right” responses found in north/central Illinois (+8%, accompanied by smaller decreases in each of the other categories).

## **Roadside safety checks**

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

It should be noted that this departs a bit from the national survey template. This was done intentionally for reasons of obtaining comparable Illinois trend data and because Illinois roadside checks are somewhat different than those in many other states.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> In terms of obtaining comparable data, we had asked the general roadside check question in surveys for the past several years. The wording itself is a bit different from the national template because of the nature of Illinois roadchecks, checking vehicles which pass through a roadcheck for all possible traffic violations. To make the

## General roadside safety-check questions

In interpreting June-to-September change here, it should be noted that there was a sizeable increase from *April* to June in the percent who had seen/heard about roadside checks in the past thirty days (28% in April to 47% in June).<sup>12</sup>

*Awareness of roadside safety checks.* The percent who indicated that, “*in the past (thirty) days,*” they had “*seen or heard of anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks where they stop to check drivers and vehicles*” declined from almost half in June to under 40 percent in September (47% to 38%). This is still substantially higher than the 28 percent who indicated such in April.<sup>13</sup>

*Analysis by recent drinking activity.* For non-drinkers, there is a decline in awareness from June to September, from 56 percent to 35 percent. In both months, about 40 percent of recent drinkers reported awareness.

*Analysis by region.* For September, somewhat less than half of southern Illinois respondents (46%) reported seeing/hearing about a roadside safety check while just about 40 percent did so in both the Chicago suburbs (40%) and north/central Illinois (37%) and nearly one-third did so in the City of Chicago (32%).

These September results represent a sizeable decrease *from June* for north/central Illinois (59% to 37%) and, to a lesser extent, for the Chicago suburbs (48% to 40%). Less change from June to September is apparent for the City of Chicago (35% to 32%) and southern Illinois (48% to 46%).

Compared to April results, the September awareness levels are substantially higher in both the Chicago suburbs (22% to 40%) and southern Illinois (30% to 46%). The September levels are slightly higher in both north/central Illinois (33% to 37%) and the City of Chicago (28% to 32%).

*Sources of awareness.* *Of those who had seen or heard anything about roadside safety checks,* the September percentages for three of the awareness sources range from one-quarter to one-third: newspapers (32%), friends and relatives (30%), and radio (25%). Television (43%) is more frequently mentioned.

The results for newspapers and for radio do not change much from June to September. However, from June to September, there is an increase for television (34% to 43%) and a decrease for friends/relatives (38% to 30%).

In September survey, those who mentioned each of the three mass media sources (television, radio and newspaper) were far more likely to say they had heard of the safety checks from news stories than from advertisements (83% vs. 14% for newspapers; 72% vs. 27% for television; and 56% vs. 36% for radio).

---

Illinois data comparable, we added a later question which asked about road safety checks which appeared to be primarily targeted for alcohol-impaired driving. We believe these questions reflect the actual situation in Illinois while also giving us comparable data.

<sup>12</sup> The April 2006 survey was the “pre-test” survey for the Memorial Day seat belt initiative. For these results, see the Memorial Day 2006 Seat Belt Initiative Survey Report.

<sup>13</sup> For awareness of roadside safety checks, we used the final percentages after a follow-up question that confirmed the meaning of “roadside safety checks.”

*Of those who had seen or heard anything about roadside safety checks*, the statewide percent who indicated they had personally seen such checks is only slightly higher in September than it was in June (50.6% to 52.4%).<sup>14</sup> And, both are somewhat higher than the 44 percent who said so in April.

*Analysis among those who were aware of roadside safety checks by recent drinking activity.* The incidence of personally seeing a check is very to quite stable for both recent drinkers and non drinkers in the two surveys. Also, in each month somewhat more non-drinkers than drinkers reported awareness (54% vs. 48% in June; 57% vs. 49% in September).

*Analysis among those who were aware of roadside safety checks by region.* The percent of applicable respondents who had personally seen a check is just short of 60 percent in the two Chicago metro regions and about 40 percent for the two downstate regions (41% for north/central Illinois and 37% for southern Illinois). Here, a double-digit increase from June is found for the Chicago suburbs (+19%), but double-digit decreases are found for both downstate regions (-13 to 14% pts.). The City of Chicago proportion dropped 6 percentage points.

*When these results are based on all sample members* (and not just those aware), we find the percent who have seen a roadside safety check increased from just over one in ten in April (12.4%) to almost one-quarter in June (24.0%) and then dropped some to nearly one-fifth in September (19.7%).

*Analysis by recent drinking activity.* For all recent drinkers, the percent who said they had personally seen a roadside safety check is stable between June and September at about 20 percent. This incidence decreased for recent non-drinkers (30% to 20%).

*Analysis by region.* Again, when the percent is based on all sample members (and not just those who were aware), the September percent who reported personally seeing a roadside check ranges from lows of 15 to 17 percent in the two downstate regions to a high of 24 percent in the Chicago suburbs, with the City of Chicago at 19 percent. This represents a decline of 17 percentage points from the June results for north/central Illinois (32% to 15%) and a decline of less half this amount for southern Illinois (-7%, from 24% to 17%). Meanwhile, a small increase occurred from June to September in the Chicago suburbs (+4%, from 19% to 24%), and a small decrease occurred in the City of Chicago (-4%, from 23% to 19%).

Compared to the proportions of sample members who indicated having seen roadside safety checks in April, we find that the September level is substantially higher only in the Chicago suburbs (7% to 24%). A small increase from April to September is found in southern Illinois (12.5% to 17%) while the April and September levels for the City of Chicago (18% to 19%) and north/central Illinois (14% to 15%) are very similar.

*When those who had personally seen a roadside check*, were asked whether they have “personally been through a roadside check in the past (thirty) days, either as a driver or as a passenger,” the results across the three surveys are not far apart. In the last two surveys of June and September, about 53 to 54 percent of these respondents say they had personally been through a roadside check, and this was slightly less than the 57 percent who said so in April. Calculated on the basis of all sample members, this translates into about one in twenty who said they have recently been through a roadside check in the April survey, 12 percent for June (12.2%), and one in ten (10.3%) for September.

*By recent drinking activity.* For those who had seen a safety check, the percent who said they had actually gone through a check increased somewhat from June to September for both recent drinkers (52% to 55%) and non-drinkers (52% to 57%). Based on all sample members,

---

<sup>14</sup> Again, we used the final percent after a follow-up question to confirm the meaning of “roadside safety checks.”

the percent who indicated having gone through a check decreased slightly for non-drinkers (15.7% to 11.5%) and remained the same for drinkers (10.3% and 10.8%).

*By region.* When the percentage of all sample members who indicated having gone through a safety check in the past thirty days is examined for the September survey, we find that the incidence is about 13 percent in both Chicago metro areas, drops to about half this amount for north/central Illinois (7.3%), and is minimal in southern Illinois (2.4%).

The incidence of going through a roadside safety check dropped about 10 percentage points from that in June for both downstate regions while the City of Chicago incidence increased slightly (10.4% to 13.3%) and little change was found in the Chicago suburbs (11.9% to 12.9%). Compared to April, the September proportion who indicated they had gone through a roadside safety check increased substantially among Chicago suburban sample members (3% to 12.9%), decreased somewhat among southern Illinois sample members (7.5% to 2.4%), and showed little change among both City of Chicago (14.4% to 13.3%) and north/central Illinois (5.6% to 7.3%) sample members.

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

*Awareness of “DUI” roadside safety checks.* The percent who indicated that, “in the past (thirty) days,” they had “seen or heard anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks that were used primarily to check for alcohol impaired driving,” increased from 22 percent in June to nearly 30 percent in September.

*By recent drinking activity.* The results show a small increase in awareness for recent non-drinkers (24% to 28%) and a larger increase in awareness among recent drinkers (20% to 30%) between June and September.

*By region.* About one-third of the respondents reported awareness in southern Illinois (33%), the City of Chicago (31%) and north/central Illinois (31%) while somewhat fewer did so in the Chicago suburbs (27.5%). These results represent a 12 percentage point increase for the City of Chicago and somewhat smaller increases for southern Illinois (+8%), the Chicago suburbs (+7%) and north/central Illinois (+6%).

*Of those who had seen/heard of such roadside checks,* the percent of those who indicated “having personally gone through [these] checks” is very similar between June and September (17.9% and 19.0%). This percentage increased by 10 percentage points for recent non-drinkers (16% to 26%) and decreased justly slightly for drinkers (18% to 15%).

*Among all sample members.* For the statewide results, this amounts to nearly 4 percent of all sample members for the June survey and over 5 percent of all sample members for the September surveys (3.9% and 5.6%). June results for recent drinkers and non-drinkers are similar (both at just under 4%), but September non-drinkers show a larger percent than drinkers (7.4% vs. 4.4%).

In September, we find the regional incidence (based on all sample members) to be highest in north/central Illinois (8.4%) followed by the Chicago suburbs (5.7%). The incidence for the City of Chicago (3.9%) is next followed by that for southern Illinois (2.3%). These represent an increase for the Chicago suburbs (1.8% to 5.7%) and a decrease for southern Illinois (5.0% to 2.3%) with less change found in the other two areas.

## Messages about alcohol-impaired driving

**Awareness of messages about alcohol-impaired driving.** The percent who indicated that, “*in the past (thirty) days,*” they had “*read, seen or heard anything about alcohol impaired driving in Illinois,*” increased from 56 percent in June to 64 percent in September. Interestingly, in April, it was also at about the September level (65%).<sup>15</sup>

*By recent drinking activity.* In September, recent the awareness level for recent non-drinkers is slightly higher than that for drinkers (67% vs. 63%). For non-drinkers, awareness increased by 6 percentage points (61% to 67%) from June to September while it increased by 9 percentage points for drinkers (54% to 63%).

*By region.* In September, the awareness level is about three-quarters in north/central Illinois (75%) and about 60 percent in the other three regions (63% in the Chicago suburbs, 60% in southern Illinois, and 57% in the City of Chicago). Compared to June, a double-digit increase is found for north/central Illinois (+15%) while increases of about half this amount are found for both Chicago metro areas (+7% in each). A small decrease is found for southern Illinois (-2%).

**Sources of messages.** *Of those who had seen or heard such messages,* by far the greatest exposure source in both September and June is found for television (79% in September, 68% in June). In both surveys, four additional sources have exposure percentages that equal or surpass 40 percent: *for September,* billboards/bus signs (55%), radio (50%), newspapers (41%), and posters/bumper stickers (40%); *and for June,* posters/bumper stickers (59%), billboards/bus signs (52%), newspapers (41%), and radio (41%). In both surveys, friends/relatives trail all the previously-identified exposure sources (22% and 24%, for September and June) followed by brochures/pamphlets (14% and 16%).

Respondents who said they were exposed through television, radio, or newspapers were asked whether this was through a commercial/advertisement, through a news program or story, or something else. For newspapers, relevant respondents are primarily exposed through news stories rather than commercials (88% vs. 16% in both September and June). For radio, relevant respondents more frequently identified advertisements rather than news stories (67-72% vs. 36-42%). For television, relevant September respondents more frequently identified advertisements rather than news stories (65% vs. 48%), but relevant June respondents were basically evenly divided (at 56-57% for each).<sup>16</sup>

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

*For television,* September exposure among those who have seen/heard messages is just above 80 percent for the two Chicago metro areas, is about three-quarters for north/central Illinois and about 60 percent for southern Illinois. This reflects an increase since June for both the Chicago suburbs (-16%) and north/central Illinois (+13%).

*For radio,* September exposure is very similar across the four regions, ranging from a low of 47 percent in the City of Chicago to a high of 51 percent in the Chicago suburbs. This reflects an increase since June for the City of Chicago (+14%) and somewhat smaller increases for the Chicago suburbs (+9%) and north/central Illinois (+8%).

---

<sup>15</sup> The increase from June to September and the similarity in the April and September results here were also found for the 2005 surveys.

<sup>16</sup> Note that percentage results for commercials and news stories can add to more than 100 percent because respondents could indicate they were exposed through both types.

*For newspapers*, September exposure is the highest in north/central Illinois (46%) followed quite closely by southern Illinois (42%) and the Chicago suburbs (41%). It is lowest in the City of Chicago (33%). This reflects an increase since June for north/central Illinois (+8%) and decreases for both southern Illinois (-11.5%) and the City of Chicago (-7%).

*For billboards or bus signs*, the September exposure percentage is highest in north/central Illinois (63%) and at a level approximating one-half in the other three regions (55% for City of Chicago; 50% for southern Illinois; and 48% for the Chicago suburbs). This reflects double-digit percentage point increases since June for both southern Illinois (+17%) and the City of Chicago (+11%).

*For posters or bumper stickers*, the September exposure percentage is highest in southern Illinois (46%) followed closely by the Chicago suburbs and north/central Illinois (42% and 40%) and then the City of Chicago (34%). Since June, this reflects a double-digit increase since June for southern Illinois (+13%), a smaller increase for north/central Illinois (+6%), and a small decrease for the City of Chicago (-6%).

*For brochures or pamphlets*, the September exposure percentages are slightly higher in north/central Illinois and the Chicago suburbs (16% and 14.5%) than in the City of Chicago (11%), which in turn is slightly higher than in southern Illinois (8%). Since June, the largest change is a decrease found for the City of Chicago (-6%).

*For friends or relatives*, the September exposure approaches one-quarter (23%) for all regions but the Chicago suburbs, where it is slightly lower at 19 percent. This reflects a small increase for the City of Chicago (+5%) and small decreases for both southern Illinois (-6%) and the Chicago suburbs (-4%).

**Reported trend in number of messages.** *Those who said they were exposed to messages about alcohol impaired driving (about 56% to 64% of the respondents) were asked whether "the number of messages that [they] have seen or heard about alcohol impaired driving in the past (thirty) days is more than usual, fewer than usual, or about the same as usual."* In September, the statewide percent of these respondents saying "more than usual" was just over one in five (22%), more than that found in either June (15%) or April (15%). About seven in ten (70%) of the September respondents said "about the same as usual," a proportion less than found in either June (76%) or April (81%). Almost 6 percent (5.9%) of the September respondents said "fewer than usual," a proportion only slightly less than in June (7.8%) but higher than that in April (1.8%).

*By recent drinking activity.* In September, recent drinkers were more likely than non-drinkers to say the numbers of messages was "more than usual" (28% vs. 16%) while the reverse was true in June (13% vs. 18%). In both months, non-drinkers were somewhat more likely to say the number was "fewer than usual" (8% vs. 4% in June; 9% vs. 5% in June). September drinkers were less likely than non-drinkers to say the number was "about the same as usual" (66% vs. 74%), and consistent with the above "more than usual" finding, the reverse was true in June (81% of drinkers said "about the same" vs. 72% for non-drinkers).

*By region.* The September results show that the percent who said "more than usual" is just higher than one-quarter for the City of Chicago (27%) and just under one-quarter for both southern Illinois (23%) and the Chicago suburbs (22%). About one in six respondents responded with the "more" response in north/central Illinois (17%). Compared to June, the greatest increase is found in the City of Chicago (+17%) followed by southern Illinois (+8%) and then the Chicago suburbs (+6%). Little change is found in north/central Illinois.

## Awareness of selected traffic safety slogans

**The September results and recent trends.** Respondents were asked about their awareness of fifteen selected traffic safety “slogans,” asked in a random order. Nine are related to drinking and driving, with eight explicitly related. The following Table S-1 presents the most recent September results, ordered by level of awareness. The DUI-related slogans are in italics, except for the most recent slogan which is in non-italic bold, “**You drink and drive. You lose.**”<sup>17</sup>

This table shows that the “*You drink and drive. You lose*” slogan ranks third in awareness level, at 76 percent. The only two slogans above this in awareness are “Click It or Ticket” and “Friends don’t let friends drive drunk.” And, this slogan is far ahead of the slogan which ranks fourth in awareness.

**Table Slogans-1: Awareness Levels in September 2006**

Order	Slogan	Sept level
1	Click It or Ticket .....	88.3%
2	<i>Friends don’t let friends drive drunk</i> .....	80.5%
3	<b>You drink. You drive. You lose.</b> .....	<b>76.3%</b>
4	<i>Drive smart. Drive sober.</i> .....	56.6%
5	<i>Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers</i> .....	48.9%
6	Buckle Up America .....	45.8%
7	<i>Drive hammered, get nailed.</i> .....	41.2%
8	<i>Cells phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunken driver</i> .....	38.6%
9	<i>Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars</i> .....	21.7%
10	<i>Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number</i> .....	21.0%
11	Children in back .....	19.1%
12	<i>Step away from your vehicle</i> .....	13.8%
13	Checkpoint Strikeforce .....	6.9%
14	Smart motorists always respect trucks .....	6.5%
15	Operation A-B-C .....	3.0%

The following Table S-2 presents the April, June and September results, ordered by the sizes of the difference in awareness from the June to September 2006 surveys. The table also presents the April to June differences. Again, the slogans related to DUI are in italics, except for the most recent slogan which is in non-italic bold.

This table shows that largest percentage point increase from June to September occurs for the “*You drink and drive. You lose*” slogan, experiencing an increase of nearly 7 percentage points in awareness. And, when analyzed in terms of each slogan’s potential for increase (i.e., in terms of the percentage point increase it would take for the June awareness level to reach 100% awareness), this slogan is found to have an increase of 22 percent of its potential, far ahead of the next two slogans in this regard (each with 6 to 7 percent of their potential increase).

<sup>17</sup> The wording of this slogan used through January 2004 was “You drink and drive, you lose.” This wording was changed starting in May 2004. Currently, both variants of this slogan can be seen in Illinois.

**Table Slogans-2: Awareness Levels – April, June and September 2006,  
Ordered by June to September Change in Awareness**

<i>Slogans</i>	<i>April survey (pre-test)</i>	<i>June Pre- test</i>	<i>June - April Diff.*</i>	<i>Sept. Post- test</i>	<i>Sept - June Diff.*</i>
<b>You drink, you drive, you lose .....</b>	<b>74.2%</b>	<b>69.5%</b>	<b>-4.7%</b>	<b>76.3%</b>	<b>+6.8%</b>
<i>Cell phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunk driver .....</i>	<i>36.9%</i>	<i>34.5%</i>	<i>-2.4%</i>	<i>38.6%</i>	<i>+4.1%</i>
<i>Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers* ....</i>	<i>48.8%</i>	<i>45.2%</i>	<i>-3.6%</i>	<i>48.9%</i>	<i>+3.7%</i>
<i>Drive hammered, get nailed .....</i>	<i>37.1%</i>	<i>38.6%</i>	<i>+1.5%</i>	<i>41.2%</i>	<i>+2.6%</i>
<i>Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number .....</i>	<i>19.5%</i>	<i>18.6%</i>	<i>-0.9%</i>	<i>21.0%</i>	<i>+2.4%</i>
<i>Step away from your vehicle .....</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>12.0%</i>	<i>-5.1%</i>	<i>13.8%</i>	<i>+1.8%</i>
<i>Children in back .....</i>	<i>22.2%</i>	<i>18.9%</i>	<i>-3.3%</i>	<i>19.1%</i>	<i>+0.2%</i>
<i>Friends don't let friends drive drunk .....</i>	<i>85.7%</i>	<i>82.2%</i>	<i>-3.5%</i>	<i>80.5%</i>	<i>-1.7%</i>
<i>Operation A-B-C .....</i>	<i>4.9%</i>	<i>5.0%</i>	<i>+0.1%</i>	<i>3.0%</i>	<i>-2.0%</i>
<i>Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars * .....</i>	<i>23.1%</i>	<i>23.8%</i>	<i>+0.7%</i>	<i>21.7%</i>	<i>-2.1%</i>
<i>Click It or Ticket .....</i>	<i>83.9%</i>	<i>91.2%</i>	<i>+7.3%</i>	<i>88.3%</i>	<i>-2.9%</i>
<i>Smart motorists always respect trucks ....</i>	<i>11.5%</i>	<i>9.7%</i>	<i>-1.8%</i>	<i>6.5%</i>	<i>-3.2%</i>
<i>Checkpoint Strikeforce .....</i>	<i>10.4%</i>	<i>10.5%</i>	<i>+0.1%</i>	<i>6.9%</i>	<i>-3.6%</i>
<i>Drive smart, drive sober .....</i>	<i>53.6%</i>	<i>59.5%</i>	<i>+5.9%</i>	<i>55.6%</i>	<i>-3.9%</i>
<i>Buckle Up America .....</i>	<i>50.1%</i>	<i>50.0%</i>	<i>-0.1%</i>	<i>45.8%</i>	<i>-4.2%</i>

\* These are percentage *point* increases/decreases.

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

**Further analyses for major campaign slogan.** We focus on the major slogan in the recent 2006 Labor Day holiday initiative, “You drink and drive. You lose,” for our further subgroup analyses.

*By recent drinking activity.* The September 2006 survey results show very similar awareness levels for both recent drinkers and non-drinkers, at about 76 to 77 percent. This represents an increase from the June awareness levels for both groups. Since the June awareness level for drinkers was somewhat lower than that for non-drinkers (67% vs. 72%), the June-to-September increase is more for drinkers (+9 percentage points vs. +5 percentage points).

*By region.* The September 2006 survey results show awareness levels at or just above 80 percent for downstate Illinois and in the low to mid 70 percent range for the Chicago Metro region. [See Table S-3.]

From June to September, we find a double-digit percentage point increase in awareness for the Chicago suburbs (+14%) and very small increases of 1 to 2 percentage points in the other three regions.

Looking at the entire survey period of April to September, we find moderate awareness increases in the slogan for both the City of Chicago (+6%) and for southern Illinois (+6%), a very small increase (+2%) for north/central Illinois, and virtually no change for the Chicago

suburbs. However, it should be noted that the latter hides the sizeable decrease from April to June in the suburbs combined with the sizeable increase that occurred from June to September.

**Table S-3**  
**Awareness of Major DUI Slogan of 2006 Labor Day Weekend Campaign,**  
**“You drink, you drive, you lose”\***

<i>Region</i>	<i>April 2006- Survey</i>	<i>June Pre- test</i>	<i>April to June diff.*</i>	<i>Sept Post-Test 2006</i>	<i>June to Sept. diff.*</i>	<i>Total Diff.</i>
<b>STATEWIDE .....</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>+6%</b>	<b>+2%</b>
Chicago Metro .....	72%	65%	-8%	74%	+10%	+2%
City of Chicago .....	66%	70%	+4%	72%	+2%	+6%
Chicago suburbs .....	75%	61%	-15%	75%	+14%	+0%
Downstate .....	78%	79%	+1%	81%	+2%	+3%
North/central Illinois .....	78%	78%	+0 <sup>+</sup> %	80%	+1%	+2%
Southern Illinois .....	77%	81%	+4%	83%	+2%	+6%

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

**The 2002 through 2006 trends.** Because there were media/enforcement campaigns going back to calendar year 2002 for which we have awareness information for numerous selected traffic safety slogans and for both seat belt-related and DUI-related campaigns, it is worth presenting the full cross-sectional trend results. These are presented in Table S-4, according to level of awareness in the September 2006 survey. The most recent DUI-related slogan is in bold; other DUI-related slogans are in italics.

**Table: Slogans - 4**  
**Awareness of Selected Traffic Safety Slogans,**  
**April 2002 through September 2006**

Slogan	April 2002	June 2002	Nov 2002	Dec 2002	May 2003	June 2003	July 2003 Post	Janu-ary 2000 Post	May 2004	July 2004 Pre-test	Sept 2004 Post-test	April 2005	June 2005 Pre-test	Sept 2005 Post-test	April 2006	June 2006 Pre-test	Sept 2006 Post-test
Click It or Ticket	41%	71%	67%	71%	67%	85%	83%	87%	84%	90%	88%	81%	91%	87%	84%	91%	88%
<i>Friends don't let friends drive drunk</i>	na	na	na	na	na	89%	89%	86%	85%	90%	85%	86%	82%	80%	86%	82%	80%
<b>You drink and drive. You lose</b>	na	na	na	na	na	55%	62%	78%	68%	73%	78%	70%	65%	77%	74%	70%	76%
<i>Drive smart, drive sober</i>	61%	62%	58%	62%	65%	67%	66%	68%	65%	67%	63%	60%	57%	57%	54%	60%	56%
<i>Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers*</i>	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	48%	50%	54%	51%	55%	54%	53%	47%	51%	49%	45%	49%
Buckle Up America	60%	60%	53%	54%	48%	53%	55%	53%	52%	64%	51%	52%	45%	45%	50%	50%	46%
<i>Drive hammered, get nailed</i>	na	na	na	na	na	30%	52%	46%	45%	46%	41%	37%	32%	38%	37%	39%	41%
<i>Cell phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunk driver.</i>	36%	41%	45%	44%	39%	46%	42%	40%	43%	46%	36%	35%	40%	37%	37%	34%	39%
<i>Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars*</i>	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	24%	30%	30%	27%	30%	28%	29%	21%	25%	23%	24%	22%
<i>Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number</i>	na	na	na	na	na	22%	24%	26%	24%	24%	22%	22%	19%	18%	20%	19%	21%
Children in back	20%	25%	19%	21%	22%	24%	25%	24%	20%	26%	20%	20%	22%	18%	22%	19%	19%
<i>Step away from your vehicle</i>	na	na	na	na	na	na	16%	na	13%	14%	16%	14%	13%	16%	17%	12%	14%
Checkpoint Strikeforce	na	na	na	na	na	na	9%	na	10%	9%	8%	12%	8%	10%	10%	10%	7%
Smart motorists always respect trucks	6%	12%	8%	11%	11%	11%	12%	9%	12%	10%	9%	10%	8%	7%	12%	10%	6%
Operation A-B-C	4%	6%	4%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%	3%

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