

The following is only an abstract of one of our earlier reports. An email request for a printed or PDF copy of the complete report can be generated by clicking on the **Report Number** of this report in the table of reports on the [Research Studies and Reports](#) page. The PDF copy of the complete report was created by scanning an original, printed copy, and thus is only *partially* searchable and *is not* accessible, but is fully printable.

A printed or PDF copy of our studies and reports may also be requested by mail or phone at:

Department of Motor Vehicles  
Research and Development Branch  
2570 24th Street, MS H-126  
Sacramento, CA 95818-2606  
(916) 657-5805

For a request by mail, please include the report number and your name, address, and phone number. Also, please state whether you are requesting a printed copy, a PDF copy, or both. For a PDF copy, please include your email address.

TITLE: Suspension and Revocation Effects on the DUI Offender

DATE: July 1980

AUTHOR(S): Roger E. Hagen, Edward J. McConnell, & Rickey L. Williams

REPORT NUMBER: 75

NTIS NUMBER: PB80-226137

FUNDING SOURCE: Departmental Budget

PROTECT OBJECTIVE:

(1) To assess the ability of first, second, and third DUI offenders to avoid future DUI convictions or traffic accidents; (2) to survey drivers being reinstated following a DUI suspension or revocation in order to gather information concerning admission of driving during the action, transportation alternatives used while under the licensing action, and reactions of the driver to both the action and the changes in life style which resulted thereby; and (3) to assess the incidence of driving while under licensing action as reported by drivers themselves, and by the presence of any driver record update.

SUMMARY:

The first objective was met by a survival rate analysis. All drivers who received a DUI conviction during 1974 and received the appropriate licensing actions were identified in 1979. A 10% sample of these records (1,769 first offenders, 1,808 second offenders, 911 third offenders) was then analyzed. The proportions of drivers surviving (not receiving an accident or DUI conviction) were collected and tested for four years. First offenders, who had no licensing action, were more likely to accrue a subsequent DUI conviction during the first year of the 4-year follow-up. A superior survival rate for second offenders during year one probably reflected the impact of the 12-month license suspension that existed during that time frame. By the end of the third year, the DUI survival rates of first and second offenders were virtually identical. Third offenders had the lowest DUI survival rate at the end of three years even though they were under a 3-year license revocation. Accident survival rates of first offenders were the worst during the first year. Otherwise, the accident survival rates were remarkably similar across groups and years. Third offenders showed superior accident survival during the final year of licensing action (year three) but a similar pattern was not evidenced in their DUI recidivism.

To meet the second objective, survey questionnaires were mailed to 2,500 drivers being reinstated from mandatory DUI suspensions (12 months) or revocations (36 months). The reported patterns of driving prior to the licensing action (for those with no self-admission during the action) and during the licensing action (by those admitting so) included predominantly driving to and from work on city streets, during daylight hours. Drivers who did not admit driving reported reliance on public transportation, friends or family to get to work, and on family members for shopping. Of those who admitted driving during the licensing action, 74% drove more than 20 times. Over 65%, however, reported reducing their driving exposure, with 29% reporting up to a 75% reduction. A majority of all admitted drivers said they were more careful. Drivers generally perceived the mandatory licensing actions as fair, although many stated that economic difficulties, changes in life style, or inconvenience resulted. Many expressed a need for a limited driving privilege to maintain employment. Drivers generally had an accurate impression of the fines and jail sentences which result from repeat Dill convictions. More of those who did not report driving believed that a future conviction while suspended or revoked would result in license cancellation.

Finally, a driving incidence analysis was conducted using two methodologies. Survival analyses indicated that 32% of suspended second offenders and 61% of revoked third offenders acquired some form of driver record update. The driver survey, on the other hand, produced admission rates ranging from 55% (drivers with a license suspension who did not acquire additional driver record updates) to 84% (revoked drivers with at least one record update). In general, 80% of all

those with a record update admitted driving during the licensing action while, of all drivers admitting driving, only 49% showed some record update.

IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Subsequent to publication of this report, the legislature passed AB 54:1. Some aspects of that bill were congruent with the recommendation of this and two other previously reported studies by Hagen et al.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Two articles were published in *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 16(5/6), 333-388 and 339-350, 1984. The first, entitled a driving record analysis of suspension and revocation effects on the drinking-driving offender. The second, a survey of suspension and revocation effects on the drinking-driving offender, both by Williams, Hagen, and McConnell.

See Hagen, R. E., Williams, R. L., & McConnell, E. J. "Effectiveness of license suspensions or revocation for drivers convicted of multiple driving under the influence offenses-An overview of three studies," *Proceedings of the Symposium on Traffic Safety Effectiveness (Impact) Evaluation Projects*, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and National Safety Council, Rosemont, Illinois, May 19-21, 1981, and Hagen, R. E., Williams, R. L., & McConnell, E. J., "Effectiveness of license suspensions or revocation for drivers convicted of multiple driving under the influence offenses-An overview of three studies," *Traffic Safety Evaluation Research Review*, 1(5), 10-29, 1982.