A SURVEY OF DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE SCHOOLS OF HAWAII

By

EARL ERIC HANSEN

Bachelor of Science in Physical Education
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas
1968

Master of Education
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas
1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1980

A SURVEY OF DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

IN THE SCHOOLS OF HAWAII

Thesis Approved:

Milton D Rhoads
Thesis Adviser

Bill F Elsom

J Kenneth St Clair

John F Rooney, Jr

Norman N Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study is concerned with the status of driver education in schools of Hawaii. The primary objectives were to contact all secondary schools in Hawaii concerning the present driver education program being offered, and to survey driver education teachers in Hawaii that taught driver education during the 1976-1977 school year concerning their preparation, experience, and choice of future courses related to driver education.

The author wishes to express appreciation to his parents, Arthur P. and Gladys E. Hansen, who gave support, understanding, many sacrifices, and a great amount of love. It is with deep emotion and sorrow that this task was not accomplished prior to the passing of my father.

A note of appreciation is given to Dr. Milton D. Rhoads and Dr. Kenneth St. Clair who served as major advisers. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Bill F. Elsom and Dr. John F. Rooney.

Mr. Samuel Gon of the Hawaii Department of Education receives a special thanks for his assistance and guidance, not only for this work but for his never ending support of the endeavors.

Thanks are also extended to Charlene Fries for typing and assistance. Additional appreciation is extended to the directors of driver education programs in all of the states that furnished data for the study.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to my wife, Yuko, for her understanding and many sacrifices, and to my three sons, Eric, Russell, and Brett.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Challenges to Driver Education

Areas in traffic safety education, like other areas of education, are being severely challenged and critically analyzed. The area receiving the highest degree of scrutiny is driver education. McGuire (55) has been widely quoted and acclaimed by the critics of driver education as the writer of the McGuire report, as has Jones (40) for her California Driver Training Evaluation Study. Thus, traffic safety educators have been considerably upset with the publicity resulting from the McGuire and Jones reports, and have accepted the challenge to show the effectiveness of their programs. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is sponsoring four pilot projects designed to determine which traffic skills are most important and how to best teach them. These programs when completed may furnish the first step toward the development of a more standardized, effective approach to traffic safety education. The project will be completed in 1981; until that time the validity of the programs will be questioned.

In 1966, the United States Legislature passed, and the President signed, Public Law 89-564.80, known as the Highway Safety Act of 1966. This act specified 16 areas related to highway safety that would receive preferential emphasis nationally. One of the acts focuses specifically

on driver education, requiring that each state offer driver education to high school age students.

Program Development

Driver education is a relatively new course in the school curriculum. Some programs were begun as early as the mid-1930's; it was not until after World War II that driver education generally began receiving widespread acceptance in the school systems of the United States (23). This early development was encouraged by numerous studies. Considerable publicity was given to favorable reports in Delaware, Illinois, Oregon, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia (62). Additional studies completed in South Carolina (100), Tennessee (49), Ohio (10), and Arizona (11, 57) have also been positive in the evaluation of driver education programs in their respective states. Even with these favorable reports, Goldstein (17) demonstrated that the young drivers are over-involved in motor vehicle crashes.

The studies conducted in other states indicated positive accident and violation reductions for the trained driver as compared with the untrained driver. These studies were accepted at face value by most educators, insurance firms, and the general public. Few questions concerning the basic methods of research were raised when they were first completed.

The growth of driver education was aided by other factors as the concept of such a program was advanced after World War II. Incentives in the form of reduced insurance rates for young drivers satisfactorily completing a course in driver education were offered by insurance

companies. The financial reward often resulted in parental pressure for the institution or expansion of driver education programs.

Financial assistance in the form of supplementary financial aids provided another motivation to program development. This varied from state to state, but provided a valuable boost to driver education programs. At the time of this study, 37 states provided financial assistance to public school driver education programs (67).

Program development continued at a fast pace throughout the nation during the 1950's and 1960's. An early leader, Michigan, was the first state to claim 100 percent enrollment in driver education for its public school students (54). Legislation, commonly referred to as the "Eighteen Year Old Law," was largely responsible. This legislation stipulated that a young person could not receive his driver's licence until he was eighteen unless he successfully completed an approved driver education course. Successful completion allowed him to obtain his licence at age sixteen. The strong motivation to drive in our mobile society generally made the two-year wait unacceptable.

Driver education developed rapidly in spite of handicaps. Certification standards were non-existent, teachers had to be recruited from other disciplines, and institutions of higher education were not prepared to offer teacher preparation courses. Few states could offer consultant services from within their departments of education. Textbooks and other resources were extremely limited and of questionable quality. Initial courses, for the most part, were offered as a portion of other courses.

The Changing Role of Driver Education

Driver education was founded on the basic tenet that a trained

driver is a better, safer driver than the "untrained" driver. Because of this belief, programs prospered. In fact, the secondary school curriculum accepted driver education on the basis of this philosophy.

Driver education was accepted freely in the nation's schools, and few programs were subjected to a critical analysis of their content. However, as programs began to grow in number and quality, various phases of driver education began to improve. Formalized curriculum development, teacher preparation, improved course offerings, and better organization and administration occurred.

The basic function of driver education remained consistent throughout its development. The preparation of trained, knowledgeable drivers able to travel safely in a complex traffic environment was the basic goal. The reduction of motor-vehicle accidents has been paramount in the organization of all programs. As important as this goal has been, other outcomes and learnings are now being deemed important as well.

Behavioral evaluation is undergoing close scrutiny at the present time. All domains of learning are being considered: affective, cognitive, and psychomotor. Experiences and materials are being organized to effect behavioral change. Curriculum development has undergone considerable revision in an attempt to further behavioral adjustment.

The importance of the automobile, two-wheel vehicles, commercial carriers, pedestrians, and related forms of transportation to modern life are being stressed. The fact that one of every six small businesses deal directly with the automobile indicates the importance of vehicle study (54). In order to fully appreciate one's role as owner and driver, one needs to understand the role of the automobile. Related to this area is Hartman's emphasis on "traffic citizenship" in his publication, Driver

Education in the Schools (22). He indicates that the driver education student as a traffic citizen will become a vital part of the entire pattern of life in the nation and the world. He will take his place as a voter, worker, taxpayer, and consumer. As such, he must be prepared to meet his responsibilities concerning related problems associated with the automobile. Since Hartman's publication, the authors of high school driver education textbooks have emphasized this concept as well as career opportunities in traffic safety related areas.

The "traffic citizen" has many responsibilities, including being a taxpayer. The role of the motor vehicle as a revenue source must be clearly understood by students. This source of revenue can better be appreciated when it is shown that automobile and personal driver's licenses in Hawaii in 1978 brought in revenue in excess of 3 million dollars (31, 32). Hawaii state gasoline taxes were in excess of 46 million dollars (25). In addition, the federal excise taxes on vehicles for the same year were in excess of 20 billion dollars (26).

Pollution and the extensive use of natural resources has been closely related to the automobile (86). Traffic citizens are being asked to make critical decisions regarding types of vehicles to use, mass transit systems, types of fuel, and government restrictions. So, driver education must prepare future traffic citizens to make sound decisions in these areas of concern.

Additional problems face future drivers. Congestion, parking problems, traffic enforcement, traffic engineering, desecration of the nation's beauty, physical fitness, and morality are a few problems linked closely with the automobile.

The need for quality driver education programs is great.

Hawaii Driver Education Development

Driver education was introduced into the Honolulu schools in 1947. The courses were conducted during the regular school hours. They were academic courses, and credit was given for successful completion of the fifty-hour classroom and the four-hour behind-the-wheel experience (18).

Teacher preparation courses were offered on a workshop basis and in-service credits were awarded for the completion of the workshop. The basic and the advance courses were taught by Amos Neyhart, Marland Strasser, and other pioneers in the field from areas where driver education had been firmly established (18).

Hawaii has not shown a favorable growth pattern in driver education programs. In 1978, 9 percent of the eligible high school students participated in the standard 30 hours of classroom and 6 hours of in-car instruction in a driver education course. The program is offered in 37 of 38 public high schools in the state (18). The national average for students completing an approved driver education course is 81 percent (67). From 1947 through 1978, there had been little significant increase in the number of high school students receiving driver education in Hawaii (18).

The growth of the Hawaii driver education program in terms of number of students and programs has been negative. The major contributing factor is the state law passed in 1966 that established the program in 1967. Section 299-1 states that the Department of Education may establish and administer a motor vehicle driver education and training program to be conducted at each public school in the state after regular school hours, on Saturdays, and during the summer recess. Hence driver education classes are taught after regular school hours, on Saturdays and holidays, and during the recesses.

The Problem

The actual state-of-the-art of driver education in Hawaii is unknown. The amount of interest of teacher preparation courses in driver education completed by Hawaii's certified driver education teachers is unknown. Nor are there any indications of the needs of these teachers as they relate to curriculum content in driver education. No studies have been conducted in relation to the type of course offered in driver education in Hawaii.

Purpose of the Study

No evaluation of the driver education portion of the traffic study education program in the state of Hawaii can be made until a comprehensive study of the personnel and program within the state has been conducted. Therefore, it is the purpose of this study: (1) to survey the literature concerning studies of driver and traffic safety education programs; (2) to ascertain the state-of-the-art of driver education programs in Hawaii public schools for the year 1976-1977; (3) to determine a profile of the Hawaii driver education instructor; (4) to determine the instructor's attitude toward college courses in driver and traffic safety education; and (5) to determine the instructor's attitude toward higher certification requirements in teaching driver education.

Related Literature

A search of related literature revealed that considerable information is available concerning driver education programs, but little information is available concerning the instructor, his preparation, his teaching task, and his performance. The information that is available

is found in the form of short articles and opinions in newsletters and journals.

In stressing the importance of a study, the number of accidents in the United States should be pointed out. For example, in 1975, there were over 16 million motor-vehicle accidents in which 8,600 pedestrians and 37,400 passengers and drivers for a total of 46,000 were killed and nearly 2 million were seriously injured (64). These figures are alarming, although a better appreciation of the magnitude of the problem can be gained by comparing highway accidents with other death-causing factors. Traffic accidents are the leading cause of accidental death for all ages. Motor-vehicle accidents account for 94 percent of all transportation-related deaths, and each year they kill more Americans than were killed in the Vietnam war in ten years (87). The societal costs in terms of property damage, medical expenses, wage loss, and insurance administration from 16,500,000 accidents in 1975 were estimated by the National Safety Council to be 21.2 billion dollars, almost the same cost as all other types of accidents combined (64).

The accident situation worldwide is even more alarming. By dividing the number of accidents by the amount of driving conducted on the highways of the United States, it is found that the United States has the lowest accident fatality rate in the world: 3.61 fatalities per year every 100 million vehicle-miles. The rate in Japan is three times higher than that of the United States, and the fatality rate is even higher in less developed countries. Kenya's fatality rate is more than 22 times greater than that of the United States (92). Depending upon the statistics used, the accident problem can be considered serious or very serious; but as long as it exists, it cannot remain unconsidered.

Scope of Study

This study has tried to encompass every certified driver education teacher in the state of Hawaii. This was done so that more accurate and detailed record-keeping procedures and statistics could be developed for identifying the driver education teachers and their needs in the state. From this process, a teacher preparation program at the University of Hawaii for driver education teachers can be established.

The study was primarily concerned with two aspects of the Hawaii driver education program. First, every instructor was questioned regarding their initial teacher preparation, advanced preparation, assigned time to driver education, and additional duties. Second, the public school program was surveyed as to the type of program offered. The study was concerned with the various phases of the program offered. The survey also divided the program into classroom and laboratory experience.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms used in this study were defined as follows:

Accident: An unplanned event resulting in death, injury, property damage, or inconvenience involving the use of a motor vehicle.

Advanced Preparation: Teacher preparation courses beyond the basic cerfication course required by the State of Hawaii Department of Education as of 1976.

After School Program: The driver education program taught exclusively after regular school hours.

Basic Course: Initial course required for certification to teach driver education in Hawaii.

Certification: A legal requirement established by the Department of Education in the State of Hawaii which must be met before a license will be issued to teach in a particular discipline.

Class Load: The number of teaching hours, either per day or per week, assigned to a teacher by the employers.

Classroom Phase: The portion of driver education program that is taught in the classroom setting.

Contact Hours: The number of students enrolled in a class to receive instruction in a given amount of time.

Elective: A course offering that may be chosen by the student in addition to other required course offerings.

Extra-Curricular Assignment: An assignment given to a teacher in addition to regular classroom teaching.

Full-Time Driver Education Instructor: A teacher assigned 80 percent or more of his teaching load to driver education.

Laboratory Phase: The phase of driver education employing "actual" driver experiences. Included within this definition are simulation, off-street driving range, and on-road driving experiences conducted singly or in conjunction with others.

Minimum Standards: The minimum number of hours accepted by the State of Hawaii for classroom and laboratory instruction will determine the minimum standards for this study. Present driver education standards conform to the national minimum standards: 30 hours of classroom and 6 hours of practical laboratory experience.

Part-Time Driver Education Instructor: A teacher assigned less than 80 percent of his teaching load to driver education.

Sample: For the purpose of this study, "sample" will refer to the schools and personnel returning the questionnaire to the source.

Simulation: A teaching-learning device utilizing electronic driving components, moving pictures, and a teacher control station in a classroom setting.

State Supervisor: The State Supervisor of Driver Education within the Hawaii Department of Education.

School-Year Program: The driver education program taught during regular school hours during the regular school year.

Summer Program: The driver education program taught during the summer recess.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

A comprehensive review of literature is reported in Chapter II. The historical aspects of previous studies in driver education are reported as well as current studies in driver education. Studies concerning statewide programs involving driver education are emphasized.

Chapter III further explains the selection of the sample, the preparation of the questionnaire, and the methods used in processing the data.

Chapter IV contains factual presentation of the data. A narrative description of the results of the data is included with individual tables showing the statistical analysis of each of the questionnaire items. This chapter is divided into two major divisions: program developments and individual instructor information. These major subdivisions are further broken down into major categories as shown in the Table of Contents.

Based upon the findings reported in Chapter IV, the conclusions and recommendations will be presented in Chapter V.

The study concludes with the references used as resource material and the basic sources of information used by the author. The questionnaire used for this study is also included.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Pertinent literature was reviewed that concerned program evaluation, teacher certification, as well as federal and state standards. Additional literature allied to traffic safety education, and driver education in specific, were also read. Concerns such as licensing, legislation, administration, and kindergarten through high school educational concepts were covered. A review of traffic safety education programs in Hawaii was conducted.

Studies and Evaluations

Studies have been made regarding driver education on local, state, and national levels. This section contains studies and programs conducted in the United States.

Literature relating to Hawaii studies and evaluation regarding traffic safety education in general, and driver education in specific, are nonexistent except for the "Annual Fact Sheet" (27) put together by the Hawaii Department of Transportation and a Hawaii Department of Education listing of certified driver education programs. Consequently, literature from other states was reviewed along with individual and governmental literature.

The Hawaii Department of Education did not have a current listing of certified driver education teachers employed by state, private, or

commercial driver education programs; therefore, a survey of those persons known to be teaching driver education in Hawaii between September, 1976, and August, 1977, was conducted. Related disciplines of traffic safety in Hawaii were also searched. The Hawaii Motor Vehicle and Traffic Laws (including Motor Vehicle Registration Laws)(23, pp. 115-116) provided the necessary background information about the legality of approved programs, the registration of driver education vehicles, the legal definition of certified instructors, and the restrictions pertaining to various licenses.

Educational limitations, standards, and guidelines were investigated through the Department of Education (24, p. 63). Material from the Department clarified many definitions, regulations, and concepts used in this study. Facts and opinions were gained from that agency's interpretation of classroom participation, scheduling restrictions, laboratory limitations, and instructor certification.

Certification

Basic to a study of programs and/or instructors in driver education is an understanding of the amount of preparation for the teachers and supervisors in the program. Certification standards for driver education teachers have been one of the major influences of his education; therefore, they were investigated at both the national and state levels.

National Education Association

The National Education Association provided some guidelines toward certification in their publication, Policies and Practices (81, p. 5). The recommendations for preservice preparation of teachers included:

A four year program of study at an accredited teacher preparation institution; completion of a minor in safety and driver education or its equivalent; experiences that assist prospective teachers to improve their own driving ability, learn teaching techniques for laboratory instruction, and gain competence through supervised practice teaching.

Federal Government Guidelines

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in its Highway Safety Manual on Driver Education (63, pp. 10-12) required the states to meet the following certification requirements for driver education instructors:

1. Necessary physical and mental capabilities
2. A bachelor's degree or equivalent
3. A valid driver's license from the state in which they will teach
4. A satisfactory driver record as defined by the state education agency
5. Required courses, totaling at least 12 semester hours, including: Safety education (80) and Driver education and Highway safety (11)
6. Required courses including specialization in simulation, multimedia, research, teaching materials, and literature in the field
7. Elective courses in the behavioral sciences
8. Additional preservice preparation with experiences in supervised student teachings; teaching specific driving knowledge; advanced skills for handling driver emergencies
9. Direction, where possible, of the prospective driver education teacher's academic preparation to the specific field of driver and highway safety education.

Primary responsibilities of the state education agency and institutions of higher education were spelled out.

Hawaii Certification

Hawaii increased requirements for driver education instructors in 1968. To become certified as a driver education instructor, the following requirements must be met:

1. Every driver education instructor shall have a valid Hawaii driver's license and at least two years of driving experience.
2. Teachers shall have successfully completed one course in driver education teacher preparation.
3. A teacher should also have a driving record free from accidents for which he was judged to be at fault or moving violations for the past two years (23:115-116 and 153-154).

Prior to 1968, there were no certification requirements for a driver education teacher in the state of Hawaii. At that time a one-course requirement was established for certification purposes.

Driver education in Hawaii has a low priority as dictated by law. There is no person with full-time responsibility in traffic safety education within the Hawaii Department of Education. The person in charge of driver education at the state level also has duties in civil defense and school health services. These demands on the state coordinator of driver education, if met, require a full-time person to deal with each of the other areas (18). At the district level, driver education curriculum specialists have little or no formal experiences in driver education, and have other curriculum areas of responsibility; neither do all of the high school driver education coordinators have experience as driver education teachers (18).

Other States

A comparison of certification standards of college level courses with other states showed that Minnesota requires 12 quarter hours, New Hampshire requires 12 semester hours, Oklahoma requires 21 semester hours, Louisiana requires 12 semester hours, Pennsylvania requires 12 semester hours, and Wisconsin requires a minor of 22 semester hours. Certification in North Carolina, Iowa, and Illinois requires a Driver and Safety

Education minor (24 semester hours), or its equivalent, in addition to an acceptable driving record. This is considerably more demanding than Hawaii's standards. From the author's correspondence with the Driver Education Coordinator of each state and Puerto Rico, it was found that only Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, and Connecticut had requirements for teachers of high school driver education that were as low or lower than those in Hawaii.

State Driver Education Studies

An investigation of driver education studies carried on in other states was made. This investigation revealed two types of information: comprehensive studies carried on within a state by an outside agency or an individual, and on-going programs conducted by the state education agencies.

Comprehensive Studies by Outside Agencies and/or Individuals

Several states have undergone comprehensive studies relating to driver and traffice safety education programs. Studies of this nature were commonly contracted to a consulting firm. The Automotive Safety Foundation was a leader in this type of evaluation process. In most cases, all areas of traffic safety were evaluated with driver education being one area within the total study. Student enrollment, financial structure, supervision and administration, as well as legislation, were the common areas of concern.

Arizona

The Automotive Safety Foundation conducted a study in Arizona in 1968 (54). This study revealed that 9,618 of the 31,046 eligible tenth grade students were not receiving a driver education program. The study also revealed that no adequate state level authority to administer and regulate a comprehensive and uniform statewide program was present. The study urged that financial support be given for such a program and position. Three recent pieces of literature indicate that such support has taken place in Arizona. The development of the Mesa, K-12 Traffic Safety Education Project (88) is noteworthy, as well as two surveys conducted by the Arizona Department of Education: the first (57) demonstrated that the Arizona taxpayers were in favor of high school driver education, the second (11) demonstrated that school administrators were also in favor of high school driver education.

California

The Jones study (40) compared the teaching effectiveness of paraprofessionals and professionals. The validity of this study has been challenged because of the design feature of the study. The author requested volunteers from the paraprofessional driving schools and had those volunteers complete a specific preparation course prior to the beginning study. The professional educators were selected without the option of not being a part of the study, nor did they receive any preparation prior to or during the study. She found no significant differences between the groups trained by public school instructors and commercial instructors in terms of citations on the drivers' subsequent driving records. Nor was there a significant difference in the rate of reported

accidents between long and short programs, either public or commercial. Jones also found a very wide cost difference among public schools and among commercial schools, with commercial schools being less expensive than were public schools.

Jones made no attempt to insure uniform curriculum content on teaching techniques for students in the various comparison groups. The study failed to determine whether any particular behind-the-wheel program is similar to any or all of the other programs that students were exposed to in the study. Finally, all of the commercial school instructors in the study had completed a special 41-hour driving-instructor's course prior to being part of the study. Hence, the findings would not apply to programs in which commercial instructors had not received the special training.

Iowa

Comparative differences between types of programs, times programs were offered, and the location of programs were examined in the Iowa Driver Education Study (38). It was recommended that driver education be offered in the school year and not only in the summer; also stressed was the better use of in-car observation. It concluded that the type of course a student was enrolled in did make a significant contribution toward explaining driver record variations.

Maryland

The Automotive Safety Foundation conducted a driver education study for the state of Maryland in 1969 (50). Numerous problems in teacher certification were identified. Only three colleges and one university

had any course work available. There was an absence of in-service and no means of evaluating the effectiveness of the driver education programs.

Michigan

Nolan and Gustafson conducted an in-depth study of driver education in 1966, in Michigan (75). This study was critical of the lack of programs for the handicapped and the drop-out, the grading practices, the lack of credit, the quality of local programs, the qualifications and preparation of instructors, and the large number of part-time instructors.

In 1978, the Michigan Department of Education conducted an additional study that reviewed driver education programs in Michigan. This study recommended that teachers pay greater attention to classroom performance objectives, that schools adopt a three-phase driver education program with prepared instructors, that students complete driver education as near to their sixteenth birthday as possible, and that students taking the high school course in the summer recorded higher classroom achievement than those taking the course during the regular school day.

Minnesota

Matthias, of St. Cloud State University, conducted a survey of Minnesota driver education in 1970 (54). It was most helpful in establishing guidelines and the development of the questionnaire used in this study. The Minnesota Department of Education supplied information regarding Minnesota driver education programs; this included funding, curriculum content, vehicle procurement, scheduling, and teacher certification requirements.

Nevada

Neyhart conducted a 1967 study (70) in Nevada that identified major concerns for driver education in that state. Among the problems noted were the small population, distance between cities, and the limited state resources.

North Dakota

A number of agencies cooperated in a study of state governmental functions for North Dakota (76). The study revealed that 31 percent of the high schools offered the 6-hour, behind-the-wheel program; and that 41 percent of the high schools had qualified driver education teachers. It also revealed that all of the high schools required the minimum 30-hour classroom course for graduation.

Ohio

A study conducted by the Ohio (78) Department of Education in 1973 reflected that high school driver education can significantly improve knowledge levels and attitudes conducive to safe driving. High school driver education students were given pre- and post-knowledge and attitude tests, and the results were in favor of positive changes in these measures for up to six months.

Pennsylvania

A Pennsylvania study (84) made recommendations for improving the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of Pennsylvania driver education and driver licensing programs. The study recommended the requirement of driver education for obtaining a driver's license for anyone under 18

years of age, a reimbursement to schools for those students completing a high school driver education program, and that the state commit to a strong high school driver education program, that all driver education teachers (public, private, and commercial) be required to successfully complete 12 university semester credits in driver education. It also recommended the addition of real driving conditions to the road test for securing a driver's license.

South Carolina

A study (100) conducted in 1973 showed that only 39 percent of the driver education teachers had received any form of advanced driver education preparation in South Carolina. It also indicated that only 35 percent of driver education teachers surveyed were teaching driver education as their principal teaching assignment.

Texas

Two studies conducted in Texas were reviewed. The first (39) compared the effectiveness of paraprofessionals and certified instructors in the Behind-the-Wheel phase of the Texas driver education program. The second study (94) reported a positive correlation between the amount of formal teacher preparation and the subsequent performance records of students.

Insurance Institute for Highway Safety

Robertson and Zador (85) claimed that driver education was the cause of teenage traffic accident involvement in the United States. They revised their statement a number of times as other researchers proved them

wrong in their findings. Unfortunately, this particular study was picked up by the news media prior to retractions by the authors. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety alleged that annually 2,000 deaths result from the increased licensure of 16 to 17 year olds because of driver education. In November, 1977, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (85) informed the media: "If the age of licensure were raised to age 18, the adverse effects of driver education would be removed" (p. 91). Furthermore, "It is likely that driver education has led to increased licensure because parents have been misled to believe that driver education decreased the risk of their children's involvement in crashes" (p. 91). Finally, ". . . raising the age of licensure to age 18 or eliminating driver education, separately or in combination, would prevent at least 2,000 fatal crashes per year in the United States" (p. 91).

In December, 1977, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (85) stated that:

> . . . the Institute's work made no finding that driver education should be abolished--indeed, if driver education is to be expected to reduce the fatal crash involvement of young drivers, it must be thoroughly researched to determine whether improvements are possible, and the best way to implement them. Nor did the research in any way suggest that driver education is not needed as a way of teaching young people to drive. . . (p. 94).

On-Going Programs

The supervisor of driver education in 49 states and Puerto Rico (see Appendix A) received a letter requesting information concerning present programs, certification, and instructors. A large amount of material was received in response to this request and the information is presented by

state. Presented in Appendix B are the certification requirements in each state.

Correspondence from all state coordinators of driver education explained that the states intended to develop a state curriculum guide in driver education as well as in bicycle and pedestrian safety. The author judged the quality of the guides as varying from state to state, with Arizona, Iowa, California, Florida, North Carolina, and Illinois having the ones done in greater detail. All states sent information regarding the certification requirement of driver education teachers. This information indicated an increase in university course requirements to exceed 12 semester credit hours. Information was received from all of the states regarding driver licensing requirements; a number of states furnished information regarding the funding of driver education in their respective states. Funding was either a state Department of Education budget item or done on a reimbursement basis. Some states, such as Nevada, do not fund driver education, so that the programs cannot function without additional fees being charged the students enrolled in the driver education course.

Studies have been conducted in some states regarding the status of driver education, with the studies indicating that driver education is an integral part of the educational program of their high school students. Oregon, Utah, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Tennessee studies showed a positive correlation between a good driving record and the successful completion of a certified driver eduation course.

The majority of the curriculum guides and the teacher certification programs are based on the completion of a specific number of contact hours. Exceptions to this concept were noted in the teacher preparation

programs in Wisconsin and North Carolina. Both of these states use a competency-based program in the preparation of teachers, and the course work requires the completion of more than 12 semester hours for certification.

Other Literature Reviewed

In reviewing literature related to traffic safety education, one finds numerous studies revelaing information regarding high school driver education.

High school driver education is the primary means by which annually more than 3.2 million students, or 81 percent of this country's youth, gain the knowledge needed to obtain their driver license (67). The federal government has taken the position that a quality high school driver education program is capable of a 10 to 15 percent effect in terms of reducing the probability of crash involvement among persons exposed to the quality driver education program (92).

Absolute numbers are discussed when highway safety problems are reviewed. In 1973 (93), there were approximately: (1) 55,800 highway fatalities, (2) 2 million persons suffered disabling injuries in traffic crashes, (3) $15,300,000 in property damage, and (4) over $20 billion lost in highway crashes. In order to establish the need for highway safety, a comparison between traffic accidents and other forms of national trauma may be done. Such a comparison shows that (65) traffic accidents are the leading cause of death for Americans under the age of 40; traffic accidents are the leading cause of accidental death for all ages; traffic accidents account for 94 percent of all transportation-related deaths in the United States; and (65) traffic accidents kill more Americans in one year than were killed in the Vietnam war in ten years.

Voas (96) discussed the exposure factor in traffic accidents as it relates to young drivers, and Goldstein (17) discussed the characteristics affecting the young drivers involved in accidents. Goldstein also pointed out that young drivers are disproportionately involved in single vehicle crashes, and that young male drivers account for approximately 80 percent of all traffic accidents. Goldstein also identified the major error types that differentiate young drivers from older drivers. The Goldstein review further pointed out that the motorcycle fatality rate is at least five times as great as for automobiles. His study showed that motorcycling is predominantly a young male activity, and the two-thirds of all motorcycle accidents involve drivers under the age of 15.

The Fifth National Conference for Traffic Safety Education in December, 1973, demonstrated that national thrusts were underway in traffic safety education (92). A 1964 questionnaire analysis (22) of the quality and content of safety education programs offered by major colleges and universities concluded that the states were not meeting minimal requirements for teacher preparation and certification, that introductory preparation courses for driver education instructors were varied in quality, quantity, and emphasis. It was also noted that few of the university instructors offering teacher preparation courses have sufficient experience in traffic safety education.

There were few driver education teachers available when the high school driver education movement began in the early twentieth century. Consequently, teachers from other disciplines were used to teach driver education to supplement their incomes, and most of these "borrowed" instructors received no more than a short course to prepare them as driver educators. Many received no formal preparation at all. Hence, driver

education was established as a teaching endeavor of secondary importance to instructors and administrators (46, 74). It has been revealed in other studies that driver education teachers with certain undergraduate degrees (e.g., physical education) are less productive as high school driver education teachers than teachers with other undergraduate degrees (94). This could possibly be explained by the extra-curricular activities in which the teachers surveyed were involved.

A major issue that confronts driver education (92) is the contention that the 30 hours of classroom instruction and 6 hours of behind-the-wheel (laboratory instruction (30+6 formula) are not adequate in the preparation of safe drivers. As a result, changes in emphasis have developed in high school driver education. Programs that include classroom, multi-media usage, simulation, multiple vehicle concepts, and behind-the-wheel instruction are utilized around the country. Comprehensive kindergarten through grade twelve safety education programs that include pedestrian, bicycle, skateboard, and motorcycle concepts, as well as changes from time-based curriculum to a curriculum based on performance are all in use in various parts of the United States.

The 30+6 formula was recommended in 1949 by the National Education Association. It has been recommended by the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association that it be updated to 90 hours of classroom instruction. Unfortunately, the 90-hour program has not be adopted by many states (92).

A study by the Federal Highway Administration in California claims that the distribution of traffic safety materials was clearly not effective in improving driver performance. The licensed drivers in California were mailed materials regarding seat belt usage at various intervals.

The drivers were to do what they wanted with the materials, but it was hoped they would read the materials. The traffic records of the persons receiving the information indicated that over 70 percent were not utilizing their seat belts (13).

Richards conducted a study entitled The Role of the University in Wisconsin in the Professional Preparation of Traffic Safety Specialists. This comprehensive study determined the strengths and weaknesses of higher education preparation programs in Wisconsin (92). The findings indicated a strong interest in additional course work by the driver and traffic safety personnel in the field. A total of 62.5 percent indicated a desire to take additional work with a preference for courses in accident prevention, traffic enforcement, and administration ranked in that order.

Richards, on the basis of his research, recommended that the preparation of driver and traffic safety specialists be concentrated in a few select higher education institutions. These schools should develop highly specialized programs, employ qualified specialists, and concentrate on fewer but more highly trained graduates.

Summary

The review of related literature was undertaken to gain a greater understanding of program development, teacher certification, and instructor performance. Information concerning driver education programs was more readily available in other states than in Hawaii. Information regarding teacher certification was readily available on the state and national levels. Information concerning the individual instructor was more difficult to obtain.

Chapter II was divided into several sections. The first section pertained to information regarding traffic safety education in Hawaii. The second section concerned certification. Certification guidelines were investigated on a national as well as a state basis.

The greatest depth of investigation concerned information from other states. In-depth studies conducted by consultants were investigated. Information received from individual states in the form of annual reports, legislative guidelines, fact sheets, curriculum guides, national studies, and individual pieces of information was examined.

Chapter III will present the study design and procedures for the study.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY

This chapter is devoted to the presentation of the sources of data, the methods used in obtaining the data, and the procedures used in evaluating the information.

Selection of Sample

The State Coordinator of Driver Education in the Department of Education was asked to fill out a questionnaire pertaining to the State of Hawaii driver education program in the study. In addition, copies of an individual questionnaire were sent in September, 1977, to each driver education instructor in the public schools. The individual questionnaire was also sent to all private school driver education teachers and to commercial school driver education teachers.

A cover letter signed by the State Coordinator of Driver Education was sent with each individual questionnaire. This letter urged an immediate reply from all Department of Education personnel (see Appendix A).

All driver education teachers employed by the State who were currently teaching driver education or had taught driver education during the previous school year or summer were provided questionnaires. This list of names was provided by the State Coordinator of Driver Education. No attempt was made to contact former driver education teachers.

The 1976-1977 teachers of driver education in the private secondary

schools and the current driver education instructors employed by commercial driving schools received copies of the individual questionnaire. No attempt was made to contact former driver education teachers of private secondary schools, or former instructors of commercial driving schools.

Preparation of Questionnaire

The driver education program was divided into two integral parts: the instructor and the instructional program. Consequently, two questionnaires, one related to each part, were prepared for this study.

The development of the questionnaire included the following steps:

1. A review of literature.
2. Adaptation of other questionnaires to form the questionnaire used in this study.
3. Review of similar studies and additional literature.
4. Review by doctoral committee.
5. Review by Hawaii Department of Education.

Program Questionnaire

The program questionnaire was basically designed to determine the administrative and functional aspects of the public school driver education program. Among the objectives of this phase of the study was the determination of the number of full-time programs, summer programs, and after-school programs. Financial aspects of the program were questioned. The structure of the course was investigated, with specific questions devoted to grades, credit, class size, and related areas. General questions pertaining to the driver education staff and their qualifications were also included.

The responsibility of filling out the program questionnaire was given to the state driver education supervisor. It was thought that this person could best answer items pertaining to the total number of teachers, finances, and future programs.

Individual Questionnaire

The individual instructor questionnaire was designed to gain information concerning the experience, professional preparation, and desire for future educational improvement of the driver educator. Information was also gathered as to the instructor's present teaching assignments, both curricular and extra-curricular. This questionnaire was filled out by the individual instructors and returned by mail to the author. A total of 180 questionnaire were mailed out, with 162 being returned.

Follow-Up Letter

A follow-up letter from the State Driver Education Coordinator was sent in December, 1977, to the various persons who did not return the questionnaires at the designated time of return. This second letter was instrumental in gaining the return of 15 questionnaires.

Processing Data

Records had not been maintained by the State Department of Education as to the actual number of certified teachers actively involved in driver education for previous years. It was estimated by the Department of Education that 180 teachers had been active in driver education during the previous year (1975-1976). Based upon this estimate, a 90 percent return

was obtained since 162 Department of Education instructors returned their individual questionnaires.

The Department of Education identified 20 active private secondary school driver education teachers in the state. Based upon this number, a 100 percent return was obtained, since 20 questionnaires were returned from this group.

The Department of Education estimated that there are 40 active commercial school driver education teachers in the state. Of this number 32 returned the questionnaire for an 80 percent return.

Based upon the total of 240 individual questionnaires sent out and the total return of 214 questionnaires, there was an 89.16 percent total return of all individual questionnaires.

The questionnaires, program and individual, were taken to the Academic Evaluation Office of the University of Hawaii, where frequency tables were made for each. Each of the tables showed total numbers and responses for each question.

In addition to the frequency findings as established within a computer, a cross tabulation was conducted for all questions within a questionnaire. The use of the cross tabulation process provided an insight into relationships between items that could only have been esimated before.

The data were placed into individual tables for the separate questions in the two questionnaires. The total number of responses for each question and the percentage of active responses were presented. This percentage was figured on the basis of the number of districts or of individual instructors who indicated they are actively involved in the area of concern. The number who indicated they were not involved and

those who failed to respond to the question were not calculated in the percentage of response.

Summary

Every Hawaii public high school sub-district and every Hawaii active Department of Education teacher of driver education was contacted for the purpose of this study. All active private secondary school driver education teachers and all active commercial driving school operators as identified by the State Department of Education were also contacted for the purpose of this study. A program questionnaire was sent to each Department of Education sub-district and to each known active driver education instructor in the state.

These questionnaires had been prepared with the assistance of information obtained from other studies conducted by other states. These questionnaires were also refined with the consultant assistance of the Hawaii Department of Education, Dr. Gerald A. Meredith of the Academic Evaluation Office of the University of Hawaii. A review of literature and the author's committee aided in the development process.

A 100 percent return (1 of 1) of the state program questionnaire was obtained. An 89.16 percent return (214 of 240) of individual questionnaires was obtained from driver educators in the state. Such a high return could possibly be attributed to the fact that the majority of the driver education teachers in the state were personally contacted by the author at the time of the survey.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA FROM THE STUDY QUESTION

Chapter IV is devoted to an analysis of the data from the questionnaires. In the analysis, each question on the two questionnaires was treated separately. A narrative description of the analysis was followed by a table presenting the data.

In the first section of the study concerning individual instructor information, the tables contain 214 responses. This represents the number of responding instructors. In the second section of the study concerning program information, each table contains the total summary of seven responses. This represents the total answers for each question as they were submitted by each school sub-district in the state.

The percentages were compiled on the basis of total responses. The number of "no responses" were not calculated in the tabulation of percentages.

This chapter is divided into two divisions: individual instructor information and program information (see Appendix C).

The first major portion of the chapter is concerned with the data on individual instructors. These data were subdivided as follows:

1. The instructor's undergraduate professional preparation, his major and minor, and the number of credits in driver education.

2. His years of experience as a teacher and as a driver education teacher.

3. The teacher's present role in driver education in relation to the various driver education programs. Extra-curricular tasks were also investigated.

4. The teacher's degree of interest in a series of suggested professional courses in the field of traffic safety education.

The second major portion of the chapter was concerned with the data on programs. The program data were divided into sections that conformed to the original organization of the questionnaire (see Appendix C). The various sections were as follows:

1. School size as measured by the number of eligible driver education students at the time the questionnaire was gathered (Spring, 1978).

2. Special programs offered by the participating school districts, including specific information concerning programs for the drop out, the educable mentally retarded, and the physically handicapped.

3. Fees and cost of programs.

4. Resources, credits, and grades. Curriculum guides, credits, and grades were covered in this portion of the study.

5. Classroom and laboratory phases of the program. These received attention as separate sections. Each section was further broken down according to the time of program offerings during the school year, after-school, and during the summer.

6. Special laboratories information. The use of simulation and off-street during ranges was covered in this section.

7. Staff administration functions. Staff designation was determined in addition to the number of staff positions. Certification was included in this section.

Driver Education Instructors

This portion of the study presents the data on the 214 instructor returns. Presentation of the data will be organized into major divisions concerning professional preparation, experience, teaching assignment, and concern for future college courses.

Educational Background

The educational preparation of the driver education personnel in the state was a concern of the study. Both general and specialized course work was investigated.

Table I contains the levels of higher education attainment for the driver education personnel in the state. Presented in Table II is information regarding the instructors' major and minor fields of preparation.

TABLE I

HIGHEST LEVEL OF HIGHER EDUCATION ATTAINMENT
(ITEM 1)

Amount of Education	Number	Percent
Less than a bachelor's degree	44	20.6
Bachelor's degree	14	6.5
Bachelor's degree plus some graduate work	117	54.7
Master's degree	32	15.0
Master's degree plus work toward a higher degree	7	3.3
Doctorate	--	--
More than a doctorate	--	--
Total	214	100.0

TABLE II

MAJOR AND MINOR FIELDS OF PREPARATION FOR HAWAII DRIVER EDUCATION INSTRUCTORS (ITEMS 2 AND 3)

Subject Area	Major		Minor	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Administration	10	4.7	7	3.3
Agriculture	3	1.4	2	0.9
Business Education	1	0.5	2	0.9
Elementary Education	10	4.7	1	0.5
English	7	3.3	7	3.3
Foreign Language	5	2.3	5	2.3
Guidance and Counseling	6	2.8	6	2.8
History	18	8.4	18	8.4
Industrial Arts	19	8.9	15	7.0
Mathematics	6	2.8	6	2.8
Physical Education	75	35.0	12	5.6
Sciences	5	2.3	49	22.9
Social Studies	11	5.1	13	6.1
Others	14	6.5	35	16.4
Multiple Response	6	2.8	2	0.9
No Response on Returned Questionnaire	18	8.4	42	19.6
Total	214	100.0	214	100.0

Level of Higher Education

Data concerning the educational attainment of Hawaii driver education personnel is presented in Table I. Forty-four teachers of driver education (20.6%) do not have a bachelor's degree. The majority of instructors, 117 (54.7%) have some graduate work beyond their bachelor's degree but do not have a master's degree. A master's degree was earned by 32 respondents (15.0%), and 7 respondents (3.3%) indicated additional work beyond their master's degree.

Major and Minor Fields of Preparation

A wide diversification of major and minor fields of preparation was evident from the returns of the study. Thirteen subject areas were listed on the questionnaire and instructors indicated basic preparation in all categories. Table II presents the various areas of professional preparation.

Physical education was the dominant basic preparation field with 75 returns from that area. This represented 35.0 percent of the total return in the major areas of preparation. Industrial arts with 19 (8.4%) was the next largest area.

In the minor field of preparation, science had 49 returns for 22.9 percent, which was considerably more than any other specific area. The area that came closest to science was "others," with 35 returns for 16.4 percent.

The college/university at which their driver education preparation was received is reported in Table III, while the last year in which college credit for a driver education course was received is shown in Table IV.

TABLE III

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY WHERE MOST COLLEGE PREPARATION IN DRIVER EDUCATION RECEIVED (ITEM 5)

School	Number	Percent
University of Hawaii--Manoa	114	53.3
BYU--Hawaii	3	1.4
University of Hawaii--Hilo	5	2.3
University of Hawaii--Cont. Ed.	17	7.9
Department of Education--State of Hawaii	49	22.9
A school in the State of California	4	1.9
A School in the State of Oregon	2	0.9
A School in the State of Washington	1	0.5
A School in the State of Arizona	--	--
A School in the Midwest	7	3.3
A School in the East	--	--
A School in the South	2	0.9
A School in a Foreign Country	--	--
Schools Outside of Areas Mentioned	1	0.5
I Have Received Equal Number of Credits From Two or More of the Above Schools	5	2.3
I Have Never Taken Any College-Level Courses in Driver Education	4	1.9
Total	214	100.0

TABLE IV

LAST YEAR RECEIVING COLLEGE CREDIT FOR A DRIVER EDUCATION COURSE (ITEM 6)

Year	Number	Percent
1977	123	57.5
1976	6	2.8
1975	13	6.1
1974	8	3.7
1973	7	3.3
1972	1	0.5
1971	4	1.9
1970-1967	6	2.8
1966-1963	5	2.3
1962-1960	1	0.5
1956-1959	1	0.5
1952-1955	--	--
1948-1951	--	--
1944-1947	--	--
Before 1944	--	--
I Have Never Taken Any College Courses in Driver Education	38	17.8
No Response	1	0.5
Total	214	100.00

The closing tables reveal the total number of college semester hour credits in driver education and an evaluation of college preparation. Table V represents the information on the certification of driver education teachers.

College/University Preparation in Driver Education

A determination of the school or university at which the instructor received his initial training in driver education was made a part of this study. This information is presented in Table III.

The University of Hawaii, the largest university in the state, provided the largest number of driver education instructors for the state with 114 instructors (53.3%). The Hawaii Department of Education, which offered the certification course prior to 1974, furnished 49 instructors (22.9%), and the University of Hawaii College of Continuing Education supplied 17 instructors (7.9%). Schools outside of the state furnished 17 instructors (7.9%), and 4 persons had never taken any college-level courses in driver education.

Last Year of Driver Education Credit

The recency of college courses in driver education was determined by asking the last year that college credit for any driver education course was received. Table IV is a tabulation of this data.

Thirty-eight responses indicated no college courses for credit had been taken. This group most likely were certified through non-credit work shops offered by the State Department of Education. The year 1977 had the largest number of responses, 123 (57.5%). A total of 13 respondents had not taken any driver education courses since 1970, and

some of those respondents had not taken a course since 1956. This represented 6.07 percent of the total responding to this question. By contrast, 39 (18.2%) had taken a driver education course in the last seven years.

Certification in Driver Education

Table V is a tabulation of the number of respondents that hold certification in driver education. Of the 214 respondents, only 10 (4.7%) are not certified.

Number of Credits in Driver Education

The next section should be prefaced with a reiteration that Hawaii had a minimum certification standard at the time of the study. One course in driver education was required, although the State Coordinator of Driver Education wanted to raise the standard for certification to 12 college semester credit hours. A wide range of credits earned in driver education in the State of Hawaii are shown in Table VI. The study requested the number of semester hours of credit in driver education or related subjects. Individual interpretation of the term "related" might explain some of the diversification of this item. The data on college semester hours are presented in Table VI.

Forty-three instructors (20.1%) indicated they had received no credit. The next classification, 1 to 3 credits, showed 32 respondents (15.0%), with the 4 to 6 credit category showing 36 respondents (16.3%). The largest category was 7 to 9 credits, with 80 instructors (37.4%) having indicated this category.

TABLE V

CERTIFICATION IN DRIVER EDUCATION
(ITEM 4)

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	204	95.3
No	10	4.7
Total	214	100.0

TABLE VI

COLLEGE SEMESTER HOUR CREDITS IN DRIVER EDUCATION
(ITEM 7)

Credits	Number	Percent	Credits	Number	Percent
0 Credits	43	20.1	16-18 Credits	2	0.9
1-3 Credits	32	15.0	19-20 Credits	--	--
4-6 Credits	36	16.8	22-24 Credits	1	0.5
7-9 Credits	80	37.4	25 or More Credits	--	--
10-12 Credits	14	6.5		--	--
13-15 Credits	5	2.3	No Response*	1	0.5
			Total	214	100.0

*Median hour credits in driver education = 6.1.

The median hour credits in driver education in Hawaii for driver education teachers is 6.1.

Prior to the initiation of the traffic and safety education program at the University of Hawaii, the State Department of Education offered in-service credits for courses in preparing driver education teachers. A total of 136 instructors (63.6%) received 1 to 3 credits in workshops sponsored by the Department, and 68 instructors (31.8%) had not taken any in-service courses in driver education. Table VII is a tabulation of these data.

Evaluation of Driver Education Preparation Courses

A personal evaluation of the adequacy of the courses taken in college driver education preparatory courses was requested by the survey. The questionnaire asked how well the courses prepared the instructor to teach driver education. The largest response, 126 (58.9%), indicated the course work was satisfactory. Another 76 instructors (35.5%) indicated the courses prepared them for their instruction very well. Ten respondents (4.7%) felt their course work had poorly prepared them to teach driver education. These data are tabulated in Table VIII.

Teaching Experience

The teaching experience of Hawaii driver education instructors was examined by the study. Questions dealt with both the total teaching experience and the driver education teaching experience. Additional information was gathered concerning the percent of time spent teaching driver education during the school day. These data are presented in Table IX.

TABLE VII

IN-SERVICE CREDITS EARNED (D.O.E.)
(ITEM 8)

Credits	Number	Percent
0	68	31.8
1-3	136	63.6
4-6	8	3.7
7-9	2	0.9
10-12	--	--
13-15	--	--
Total	214	100.0

TABLE VIII

EVALUATION OF DRIVER EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION BY HAWAII DRIVER EDUCATION TEACHERS
(ITEM 9)

Degree of Preparation	Number	Percent
Very Well Prepared	76	35.5
Satisfactorily Prepared	126	58.9
Poorly Prepared	10	4.7
I Have Not Taken Any Driver Education Courses	2	0.9
Total	214	100.0

TABLE IX

TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF HAWAII DRIVER EDUCATION TEACHERS
(ITEMS 10 AND 11)

Years of Experience	Total Teaching Experience		Driver Education Experience	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less Than 1 Year	6	2.8	10	4.7
1 Year	5	2.3	17	7.9
2 Years	--	--	15	7.0
3 Years	4	1.9	14	6.5
4-6 Years	31	14.5	99	46.3
7-9 Years	102	47.7	34	15.9
10-12 Years	26	12.1	16	7.5
13-15 Years	12	5.6	5	2.3
16-18 Years	13	6.1	3	1.4
19-21 Years	6	2.8	1	0.5
22-24 Years	6	2.8	--	--
25 or More Years	3	1.4	--	--
Total	214	100.0	214	100.0

Median for total teaching experience = 8.3 years.

Median for driver education experience = 5.0 years.

Years of Teaching Experience

The data in Table IX reveal that the median for total teaching experience is 8.3 years. The median for driver education experience is

5.0 years. These figures represent 102 instructors (47.7%) that have 7 to 9 years of total teaching experience. Ninety-nine instructors (46.3%) had 4 to 6 years experience in teaching driver education. The majority of the driver education instructors, 195 (90.6%), were in the 1 to 16 years range of experience.

Driver Education Involvement During the School Year

The instructor's work in driver education for the year previous to the study (1976-1977) and the year of the study (1977-1978) was investigated. The number and percentage of instructors employed on a part-time or full-time basis for the two stated years are shown in Table X.

TABLE X

DRIVER EDUCATION INVOLVEMENT DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR
(ITEMS 12 AND 13)

Assignment	1976-1977 School Year		1977-1978 School Year	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Full-Time (80% or More of Time)	45	21.0	46	21.5
Part-Time (Less Than 80% of Time)	151	70.6	148	69.2
Did Not Teach During School Year*	18	8.4	20	9.3
No Response	--	--	--	--
Total	214	100.0	214	100.0

*Only teaches driver education in the summer time.

1976-1977 found 151 instructors classified as part-time driver education instructors with less than 80 percent of their time assigned to driver education. This represented 70.6 percent of the total responding to this item. For 1977-1978, the number of teachers who did teach during the school year increased by one. The number of full-time driver education teachers is shown at 46 (21.5%); this figure is misleading. The teachers participating in the survey who answered this item possibly were considering full-time involvement as their day from when they arrived at work to their return home, which could also include the teaching of driver education after the regular school day had ended.

Of the 214 respondents in the survey, 40 are active commercial school instructors who teach deriver education during the regular work day. During the 1977-1978 school year, 20 of the respondents (9.3%) did not teach driver education, and 148 (69.2%) taught it on a part-time basis.

Driver Education Teaching Inventory

A teaching inventory listing the number of hours involved in teaching, the days per week involved, and tasks outside the normal teaching day was developed. These data are presented in Tables XI through XV.

Normal Teaching Load

The data in Table XI indicated the normal teaching load of the districts as indicated by the respondents. A six-hour-per-day teaching load was indicated by 105 instructors (49.1%). A five-hour daily teaching load was indicated by 31 instructors (14.5%). Twenty-eight instructors (13.1%) taught in districts requiring seven hours as teaching load,

and eighteen instructors (8.4%) taught less than four hours a day.

TABLE XI

NORMAL TEACHING LOAD OF HAWAII DISTRICT TEACHERS
(ITEM 14)

Teaching Load	Number	Percent
Less Than 4 Hours	18	8.4
4 Hours	4	1.9
5 Hours	31	14.5
6 Hours	105	49.1
7 Hours	28	13.1
8 Hours	21	9.8
More Than 8 Hours	3	1.4
No Response	4	1.9
Total	214	100.0

Median teaching load = 6 hours.

School Day Driver Education

Whereas Table XI was concerned with the normal teaching load, Table XII is concerned with teaching load in relation to driver education during the school day. Sixty-six instructors (30.8%) indicated that they do not teach driver education during the normal school day. Although nine instructors (4.2%) did teach more than seven hours per day, the greatest number taught less than three hours of driver education per day. Eighty-three (38.8%) indicated that they taught between two to three hours of driver education per day. Seven (3.3%) indicated that they

taught less than one hour a day. Seventeen (7.9%) indicated that they tuaght between 1 to 2 hours a day. Eleven (5.1%) taught driver education 7 to 8 hours a day, and nine (4.2%) indicated that they taught driver education 8 or more hours a day. These 20 (5.1% and 4.2%) instructors are the private commercial driving school teachers.

TABLE XII

TIME SPENT IN TEACHING DRIVER EDUCATION
DURING SCHOOL DAY
(ITEM 15)

Time	Number	Percent
Less Than 1 Hour	7	3.3
1 Hour to 1 Hour, 59 Minutes	17	7.9
2 Hours to 2 Hours, 59 Minutes	83	38.8
3 Hours to 3 Hours, 59 Minutes	13	6.1
4 Hours to 4 Hours, 59 Minutes	1	0.5
5 Hours to 5 Hours, 59 Minutes	3	1.4
6 Hours to 6 Hours, 59 Minutes	3	1.4
7 Hours to 7 Hours, 59 Minutes	11	5.1
8 Hours or More	9	4.2
I Do Not Teach Driver Education During the School Day	66	30.8
No Response	1	0.5
Total	214	100.0

Number of Days Per Week

Reported in Table XIII is information pertaining to the number of days per week that driver education instructors taught during the summer

driver education program. This table reveals that 43 (20.1%) instructors did not teach during the summer of 1977. Of those who did teach, 86 (40.2%) taught five days per week. Twenty-six (12.1%) worked a six-day week.

TABLE XIII

NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK TAUGHT DURING THE SUMMER OF 1977
(ITEM 16)

Days	Number	Percent
1 Day	2	0.9
2 Days	8	3.7
3 Days	11	5.1
4 Days	10	4.7
5 Days	86	40.2
6 Days	26	12.1
7 Days	25	11.7
Did Not Teach Last Summer	43	20.1
No Response	3	1.4
Total	214	100.0

Median days taught in summer = 5.1.

Number of Hours Per Week

Revealed in Table XIV is the number of hours driver education instructors taught per week in the summer driver education program. Based upon the 214 instructors who responded to this item, 89 (41.6%) taught between 21 to 30 hours per week. The range of 11 to 20 hours per week

was reported by instructors (11.2%). The respondents who did not teach driver education during the summer of 1977 were 45 (21.0%).

TABLE XIV

NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK DURING THE SUMMER OF 1977
(ITEM 17)

Hours	Number	Percent
1-10 Hours	16	7.5
11-20 Hours	24	11.2
21-30 Hours	89	41.6
31-40 Hours	18	8.4
41-50 Hours	16	7.5
51-60 Hours	3	1.4
More Than 60 Hours	--	--
Did Not Teach Last Summer	45	21.0
No Response	3	1.4
Total	214	100.0

Median hours per week taught in summer = 25.3.

After School Driver Education Experience

Table XV is concerned with the number and percentage of instructors employed during the after school program during the year of the study (1977-1978) and the previous year. The number and percentage of instructors teaching the after school program did not vary much between the two years. A slight decrease from 188 instructors (87.9%) in 1977 to 181 instructors (84.6%) in 1978 is noted.

TABLE XV

AFTER SCHOOL DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAM EXPERIENCE
(ITEMS 18 AND 19)

Response	1976-77 School Year		1977-78 School Year	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	188	87.9	181	84.6
No	25	11.7	32	15.0
No Response	1	0.5	1	0.5
Total	214	100.0	214	100.0

Saturday Driver Education Program

Presented in this section are the data concerning Saturday programs for the 1976-1977 and 1977-1978 school years. Table XVI reveals data showing that in 1976-1977, 180 instructors (84.1%) taught a Saturday program. This decreased to 169 (79.0%) in 1977-1978.

TABLE XVI

SATURDAY DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAM EXPERIENCE
(ITEMS 20 AND 21)

Response	1976-77 School Year		1977-78 School Year	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	180	84.1	169	79.0
No	34	15.9	45	21.0
No Response	--	--	--	00
Total	214	100.0	214	100.0

When comparing these data with the data on after school programs contained in Table XV, it can be noted that fewer teachers were involved in Saturday programs in 1977-1978. During the 1976-1977 school year, 183 or 87.9 percent of the teachers taught after school, and 180 or 84.1 percent taught on Saturdays.

In 1977-1978, the number of teachers in after school programs decreased to 181 (84.6%), whereas the number of teachers in Saturday programs decreased to 169 (79.0%).

Sunday Driver Education Program

Presented in this section are the data concerning Sunday programs for 1976-1977 and 1977-1978 school years. Table XVII presents data showing that in 1976-1977, 80 instructors (37.4%) taught in the Sunday program. This decreased to 73 (34.1%) in 1977-1978.

TABLE XVII

SUNDAY DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAM EXPERIENCE
(ITEMS 22 AND 23)

Response	1976-77 School Year		1977-78 School Year	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	80	37.4	73	34.1
No	133	62.1	140	65.4
No Response	1	0.5	1	0.5
Total	214	100.0	214	100.0

Teaching Responsibilities

Information concerning responsibilities in addition to driver education was a concern of the study. The various disciplines of the school curriculum were listed on the questionnaire and the instructors were to indicate the amount of time per school day devoted to each area. The numbers involved and the percentage of time devoted to each teaching area was thus determined and is indicated in Table XVIII.

In examining the various disciplines, it is seen that 19 driver education teachers were also school administrators 10 percent of the time. Six (2.8%) indicated that they were school administrators 11 to 20 percent of the time. One (0.5%) driver educator is a full-time administrator.

Three instructors were agriculture educators, and one instructor was a business education teacher. It was found that ten instructors were elementary education teachers, with eight indicating full-time employment (over 80% of their teaching assignment) as elementary school teachers. Five instructors teach English, with the time spent teaching English varying considerably; five of the driver educators also are foreign language teachers. Twenty-four of the driver education instructors also worked in guidance and counseling, with seven of them (3.3%) being full-time guidance workers. Ten instructors teach history, and twenty-four instructors classified themselves as industrial arts teachers. The amount of time spent teaching industrial arts ranged mostly over 70 percent of the time. Fifteen instructors indicated they were mathematics instructors, and eight instructors indicated they were junior high school teachers. Eleven instructors teach science and ten instructors teach social studies.

TABLE XVIII

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF DRIVER EDUCATION INSTRUCTORS
(ITEMS 24 THROUGH 39)

Responsibility	Not Applicable		Percentage of Time									
			1-20		11-20		21-30		31-40		41-50	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Administration	171	79.9	19	8.9	6	2.8	4	1.9	1	0.5	2	0.9
Agriculture	204	95.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Business Education	207	96.7	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	--	--
Driver Education	27	12.6	104	48.6	32	15.0	9	4.2	2	0.9	2	0.9
Elementary Education	198	92.5	1	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
English	203	94.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	--	--
Foreign Languages	203	94.9	1	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Guidance, Counseling	186	86.9	5	2.3	3	1.4	2	0.9	1	0.5	--	--
History	194	90.7	--	--	1	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--
Industrial Arts	185	86.4	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	--	--
Junior High School	203	94.9	1	0.5	--	--	1	0.5	1	0.5	--	--
Mathematics	193	90.2	2	0.9	4	1.9	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5
Physical Education	136	63.6	2	0.9	--	--	1	0.5	--	--	1	0.5
Sciences	197	92.1	1	0.5	1	0.5	--	--	1	0.5	--	--
Social Sciences	198	92.5	1	0.5	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	--	--
Other	182	85.0	5	2.3	5	2.3	3	1.4	1	0.5	--	--

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Responsibility	Percentage of Time										No Response	
	51-60		61-70		71-80		81-90		91-100			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Administration	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	3	1.4	1	0.5	4	1.9
Agriculture	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.9	1	0.5	7	3.3
Business Education	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	2.8
Driver Education	3	1.4	--	--	5	2.3	2	0.9	23	10.7	5	2.3
Elementary Education	--	--	1	0.5	--	--	5	2.3	3	1.4	6	2.8
English	1	0.5	2	0.9	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	6	2.8
Foreign Languages	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	2	0.9	1	0.5	6	2.8
Guidance, Counseling	--	--	1	0.5	5	2.3	--	--	7	3.3	4	1.9
History	--	--	--	--	3	1.4	8	3.7	2	0.9	6	2.8
Industrial Arts	2	0.9	1	0.5	2	0.9	6	2.8	9	4.2	5	2.3
Junior High School	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	--	--	1	0.5	6	2.8
Mathematics	1	0.5	1	0.5	2	0.9	1	0.5	1	0.5	6	2.8
Physical Education	1	0.5	1	0.5	5	2.3	62	29.0	1	0.5	4	1.9
Sciences	--	--	1	0.5	3	1.4	2	0.9	2	0.9	6	2.8
Social Sciences	1	0.5	2	0.9	--	--	3	1.4	2	0.9	6	2.8
Other	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	2	0.9	3	1.4	9	4.2

The largest discipline in combination with driver education was physical education. Sixty-two (30.5%) were full-time physical education teachers (by definition). The remainder were evenly distributed over the various time intervals. Other discplines involved 20 instructors. Five of these instructors (2.34%) taught other subjects more than 80 percent of their time.

Extra-Curricular Activities

Instructors were asked to indicate the amount of extra-curricular time devoted to a selected number of activities listed in the questionnaire. This information provided the number of instructors so involved and the amounts of time (on a percentage basis) devoted to these activities. Table XIX contains this information.

Forty-eight instructors (22.4%) were also coaches. This percentage was not as great as that indicated in other studies. A possible reason for the lower percentage of coaches in Hawaii teaching driver education may be attributed to the after school driver education program being conducted at the same time as coaching activities. An additional reason may be the fact that some athletic coaches in Hawaii schools are not employed by the schools for purposes other than athletics. Of the 48 instructors who coach, 28 of them (or 13.1% of the respondents) coach full-time.

Twenty-three instructors were associated with such organizations as speech, journalism, photography, riflery, science, and service organizations.

TABLE XIX

EXTRA-CURRICULAR RESPONSIBILITIES DURING SCHOOL YEAR
(ITEMS 40 THROUGH 45)

Percent of Time	Coaching		Speech/ Debate		Dramatics		Clubs		Journalism		Other Activities	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1-10	2	0.9	1	0.5	--	--	8	3.7	1	0.5	5	2.3
11-20	4	1.9	1	0.5	--	--	7	3.3	--	--	3	1.4
21-30	1	0.5	2	0.9	--	--	--	--	2	0.9	1	0.5
31-40	3	1.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
41-50	2	0.9	--	--	--	--	2	0.9	2	0.9	5	2.3
51-60	3	1.4	1	0.5	--	--	1	0.5	--	--	2	0.9
61-70	3	1.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
71-80	2	0.9	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	--	--	2	0.9
81-90	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.5	--	--	2	0.9
91-100	28	13.1	--	--	--	--	3	1.4	--	--	10	4.7
Does Not Apply to Me	163	76.2	203	94.9	208	97.2	186	86.9	203	94.9	177	82.7
No Response	3	1.4	6	2.8	6	2.8	5	2.3	6	2.8	7	3.3
Total	214	100.0	214	100.0	214	100.0	214	100.0	214	100.0	214	100.0

Driver Education Courses and Certification

To gather information on the interest of Hawaii driver education teachers in taking additional driver education courses, a list of 14 possible subjects was presented on the questionnaire. Each teacher was asked to indicate his interest in these courses by stating they were very interested, somewhat interested, or not interested.

Additional information was gathered concerning the instructor's willingness to take additional driver education courses and whether or not the certification standard should be raised. These data are presented in Tables XX through XXIII.

Interest in Driver Education Courses

The numbers in each interest category for the suggested courses and the "interest percentage" for each course are shown in Table XX. The course title that attracted the greatest amount of interest (153 very interested, 41 somewhat interested) was the course, "Innovative Methods in Driver Education." This represented 90.7 percent interest. "Alcohol and the Driver" also attracted a high amount of interest; positive responses totaled 193 (127 very interested, 66 somewhat interested), resulting in a 90.1 percent interest. "Problems in Driver Education" showed 184 responses indicating interest (130 very interested, 54 somewhat interested). This represented 85.9 percent interest. The instructors showed a 85.5 percent interest in "Principles of Accident Prevention." This interest was divided into the following categories: 131 very interested and 52 somewhat interested. "Driving Behavior and Personality" created an 86.0 percent interest showing. Teachers indicated they were very interested in 61 responses and somewhat interested in 123

TABLE XX

INTEREST LEVEL IN SUGGESTED TRAFFIC SAFETY COURSES
(ITEMS 46 THROUGH 59)

Suggested Topic	Very Interested		Somewhat Interested		Not Interested		No Response	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Driving Behavior and Personality	61	28.5	123	57.5	28	13.1	2	0.9
Highway Engineering and Traffic Controls	20	9.3	107	50.0	83	38.8	4	1.9
Motor Vehicle Administration	18	8.4	96	44.9	96	44.9	4	1.9
Basic Auto Mechanics and Auto Systems	35	16.4	99	46.3	76	35.5	4	1.9
Principles of Accident Prevention	131	61.2	52	24.3	29	13.6	2	0.9
Alcohol and the Driver	127	59.3	66	30.8	18	8.4	3	1.4
Methods of Teaching Motorcycle Education	98	45.8	36	16.8	76	35.5	4	1.9
Transportation Systems	15	7.0	43	20.1	152	71.0	4	1.9
Research Techniques as Related to Traffic Safety	18	8.4	100	46.7	92	43.0	3	1.4
Motor Vehicle Law and Enforcement	42	19.6	99	46.3	70	32.7	3	1.4

TABLE XX (Continued)

Suggested Topic	Very Interested		Somewhat Interested		Not Interested		No Response	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Administration and Supervision of Safety Education	97	45.3	71	33.2	43	20.1	3	1.4
Innovative Methods in Driver Education	153	71.5	41	19.2	18	8.4	2	0.9
Basic Simulation and Range Instruction	40	18.7	98	45.8	73	34.1	3	1.4
Problems in Driver Education	130	60.7	54	25.2	27	12.6	3	1.4

The four most interesting topics were: Innovative Methods in Driver Education, Alcohol and the Driver, Problems in Driver Education, and Principles of Accident Prevention.

responses. Interest dropped to 78.5 percent for the course "Administration and Supervision of Safety Education." The remaining course titles varied in interest level, with "Transportation Systems" having the lowest interest.

Willingness to Take Future Courses

Following the listing of possible traffic and safety education courses, instructors were asked if they would take future courses in traffic safety if they were offered. An overwhelming 200 instructors (93.5%) indicated they would take such courses. These data are presented in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI

WILLINGNESS TO TAKE FUTURE TRAFFIC SAFETY COURSES
(ITEM 60)

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	200	93.5
No	12	5.6
No Response	2	0.9
Total	214	100.0

Instructor's View Toward Higher Certification

The individual instructor survey concluded with a determination of the instructor's feeling toward higher certification standards. Table

XXII presents these data. Data in Table XXII indicate that higher certification standards were favored by 166 instructors (77.6%) even though no standards were suggested.

TABLE XXII

DRIVER EDUCATION INSTRUCTORS' VIEWS TOWARD HIGHER CERTIFICATION STANDARDS (ITEM 61)

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	166	77.6
No	47	22.0
No Response	1	0.5
Total	214	100.0

Driver Education Program

Information in this portion of the study was furnished by the Hawaii State Coordinator of Driver Education.

School Population

The first area of concern in the driver education program was the size of the eligible driver education population represented in the study. This was defined as the number of students enrolled, and the number eligible to enroll, in driver education courses in the grade level where instruction was given in the school system.

The total number of public school students who were eligible (16 to 18 years old) to participate in the state's driver education program during the 1976-1977 school year was 52,978. Of this number, only 5,270 or ten percent completed the program. These 5,270 students completed both the classroom and laboratory phases of the state program.

There were 10,400 parochial-private school students who were eligible to participate in driver education during the 1976-1977 school year. Just under 35 percent (34.7%) of these students completed a driver education course. These 3,500 students combined with the other 5,270 students gave a total of 8,770 students completing driver education in Hawaii schools during the year of the study. Of the 63,378 students eligible to receive driver education during the 1976-1977 school year, 8,770 completed such a course. This amounted to a total of 13.83 percent of the total eligible driver education population in Hawaii completing a high school driver education course. These figures are found in Table XXIII.

Special Programs

Special programs in driver education were available to drop outs. No separate driver education program for the deaf, physically handicapped, nor the educable mentally retarded students were available in the state during the 1976-1977 school year (18).

Finances

The study identified that it costs a student $10.00 to take a driver education course. To teach one student to drive costs the State of Hawaii $60.50 (18).

TABLE XXIII

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING A SECONDARY SCHOOL DRIVER EDUCATION COURSE (ITEMS 1 THROUGH 8)

Items 1-4			Items 5-6		
Eligible Public School Driver Education Students			Eligible Private, Parochial Driver Education Students		
Number	Completed	Percent	Number	Completed	Percent
52,978	5,270	10.05	10,400	300	34.66

Item 7	Item 8	
Total Eligible Secondary School Driver Education Students	Total Completing a Secondary Driver Education Course	Percent of Completion
63,378	5,570	11.37

Resources, Credits, and Grades

Certain aspects of the driver education program were examined in relation to the administration of the program. Aspects of the program concerning curriculum guides, textbooks, credit, grades, and permanent records were investigated by a personal review by the author.

Curriculum Guides

At one time there was a state driver education curriculum guide. When the study was conducted, it was determined that the curriculum guide was out of print and was eleven or more years old (18).

Textbooks and Materials

The second area concerning resources for the driver education program was based on the availability of textbook resources for all students. All of the driver education programs in the state have sufficient textbooks and instructional materials for all students (18).

It was found that 62 driver education cars were used by the public schools of Hawaii during the 1976-1977 school year. These cars were obtained from new car dealers on a loan basis. The dealers charged $1.00 a year per car for use in a driver education program (18). A written agreement is maintained between the State and the automobile dealers.

Credit

No credit is given for any aspect of the driver education program in the state. Pass-fail grades are used in evaluating the student's progress in the course.

Permanent Records

Each school is required to maintain the permanent records of all students having completed a driver education program. The schools forward information on the number of students completing the program to the State Coordinator of Driver Education.

Classroom Phase

The classroom phase of driver education is an elective and taught as a separate subject, offered after the regular school hours. It is also offered on weekends and during the summer. The average classroom

time after school hours is 51 to 60 minutes. On weekends and during the summer, the classroom phase is 91 to 120 minutes in length.

When the course is taught after the regular school day and during the summer, the students attend class five days a week. On weekends the students meet one time period only. The classroom phase of the program is 30 hours in length whenever it is taught.

Laboratory Phase

The laboratory phase of the high school driver education program was analyzed as a separate section of this study. Most of the basic information in the previous section was repeated for the laboratory section.

The laboratory section is an elective, offered out of the regular school day. It is also offered, at the instructor's discretion, immediately after the classroom phase has been completed. Once the student has successfully completed the classroom phase, he may take the laboratory portion whenever he is able.

There are usually three students assigned to a driver education vehicle during each instructional period. This activity takes place after the regular school day on weekends and during the recess. The behind-the-wheel portion of the instructional phase is limited to 20 to 30 minutes for each student after the regular school day. On weekends and summers, this time is 51 to 60 minutes in length. The student receives two laboratory instructional sessions a week during the after school program. On weekends they receive one session a week, and during the summer they receive three sessions a week. No special units concerning emergency situations are taught during the laboratory phase,

although emergency concepts are mentioned in the lecture portion of driver education.

Simulation

No simulators are used in the Hawaii driver education program. Simulators were once used in the State's program, but were too expensive for only an after-school program. The state has a slight interest in utilizing simulators once more (18).

Driving Ranges

Another instructional method that has found increased acceptance involves off-street driving ranges utilizing multiple car concepts. This concept is used in Hawaii, although there are no formal driving range programs. The off-street driving areas are school parking lots used after school hours, on weekends, during the summer recess, and on holidays. There is no interest on the part of the Hawaii Department of Education to incorporate off-street driving ranges into the driver education program (18).

Staff Administration

An integral part of any educational system is the administrative, supervisory and training component. The final aspect of this portion of the survey investigated staff administration.

There are no full-time public high school driver education instructors and/or supervisors employed in the state. Ninety part-time driver education instructors and/or supervisors were identified by the Department of Education as being employed during the 1976-1977 school year.

Forty-seven driver education teachers were identified as teaching driver education during the summer of 1977. These same figures of 90 (fall) and 47 (summer) were given for the 1977-1978 school year.

Certification, Salary, and In-Service Training

The state coordinator was asked to identify the number of instructors who were not certified under the state certification requirement of the one course requirement at the time of the study. All Hawaii Department of Education driver education teachers met the minimum requirement for certification at the time of this study. All instructors are paid on an hourly rate when they teach either the classroom or laboratory phases of driver education, and no special orientation programs for driver education teachers are offered at the beginning of each program.

Summary

Chapter IV presented data concerning the Hawaii driver education program. The data were presented in both narrative and table form.

The data were divided into the same categories as the questionnaires, one for individual instructor information and one for program information. The instructor questionnaires were filled out by the individual instructors. The program information questionnaire concerned the Department of Education program and was filled out by the State Coordinator of Driver Education.

The instructor data were divided into various sections. The first major concern was the level of higher education attained by Hawaii driver education teachers. Seventy-nine percent of the instructors had at least a bachelor's degree with 73.0 percent having some education beyond that

level. Driver education teachers represented many fields of preparation, with physical education being dominant. The University of Hawaii and the Hawaii Department of Education prepared the majority of the students in driver education.

Thirty-eight instructors (17.8%) had never taken a college level driver education course and only 3.3 percent had not taken a course in the last ten years. It must be noted that the typical certified driver education teacher in the survey had 6.1 college credits in driver education courses. Only 4.7 percent of the instructors reported lacking the certification level of one course. In-service credits in driver education had been earned by 68.2 percent of the instructors.

The median Hawaii driver education teacher had a teaching experience of 8.3 years. The median for driver education experience was 5.0 years. The majority of the driver education instructors (90.6%) were in the 1 to 16 year range of experience.

During the 1976-1977 school year, no driver education instructors that teach full-time with the Department of Education taught driver education on a daily full-time basis. 1976-1977 found 151 instructors classified as part-time driver education teachers. This represented 70.6 percent of the total responding to this item.

Only ten respondents (4.7%) felt their course work had poorly prepared them to teach driver education. One hundred twenty-six respondents indicated that their college preparation course in driver education was satisfactory in preparing them to teach the subject.

Driver educators shared responsibilites with numerous disciplines in the school system. The largest number of driver education teachers had responsibilities in physical education. Upon investigating

extracurricular activities, it was found that 13.1 percent of the instructors were also coaches.

The instructors showed the greatest interest in taking future college courses pertaining to innovative methods in driver education, alcohol and the driver, problems in driver education, and principles of accident prevention. An overwhelming 93.5 percent of the instructors indicated that they would take additional courses in traffic safety education.

A majority of the instructors (77.6%) favored an increase in the driver education certification requirement from one course.

The program information questionnaire concerned the driver education program in public schools of Hawaii, and was filled out by the State Coordinator of Driver Education.

The program data were divided into various sections. It was noted that only ten percent of the students eligible (52,978) to receive a high school course in driver education did so. Of the 10,400 parochial-private school students eligible to take driver education, 34.7 percent did so.

Since the driver education program in Hawaii schools is offered after the regular school day, it is considered an extra-curricular activity. Students are charged a $10.00 fee to take driver education in Hawaii public schools. The cost per student to the state of Hawaii to complete a driver education course is $60.50.

No credit is given for completion of a driver education course, nor is there a current curriculum guide for driver education teachers.

The driver education program obtains cars from automobile dealers on a loan basis for $1.00 a year per vehicle. During the 1976-1977

school year, 62 driver education cars were used in the state program in Hawaii. Thirty hours of classroom instruction and six hours of behind-the-wheel instruction comprise the standard offering. The program is offered after the regular school day, on weekends, during the summer recess, and on holidays.

There are no simulation units or driving ranges in use by the Hawaii Department of Education. No full-time driver education teachers are employed by the State and no administrator has only one assigned area of driver education.

The only special program in the state is for the drop outs. Special student populations receive no specific preparation in driver education.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Chapter IV contained a summary of the data of the study. It was presented in two sections, the individual instructor data and the program data. This chapter will summarize the study, draw conclusions based upon the data, and offer recommendations.

Summary

The purpose of this study was: (1) to survey the literature concerning studies of driver and traffic safety education programs; (2) to ascertain the state of the art of driver education programs in Hawaii public schools for the year 1976-1977; (3) to determine a profile of the Hawaii driver education instructor; (4) to determine the instructor's attitude toward college courses in driver and traffic safety education; and (5) to determine the instructor's attitude toward higher certification requirements in teaching driver education.

A review of relevant literature was made. It included studies of driver education programs conducted by state educational organizations, private organizations, and individuals. Additional studies related to teacher certification, federal and state standards, the education of traffic and safety specialists, and the role of driver education in the school were also reviewed.

Questionnaires regarding the individual driver education teachers

were prepared and provided to every known certified driver educator in Hawaii. A driver education program questionnaire was also prepared and sent to the state coordinator of driver education. A total of 214 individual questionnaires were returned: a 89.16 percent return.

The data that pertained to individual instructors were divided into the following sections: educational background, teaching experience, driver education teaching inventory, driver education courses, and certification.

The portion of the study that pertained to the state program was organized into the following sections: eligible population, special programs, administration and resources, classroom phase, laboratory phase, staff, and administration.

Narrative descriptions were written and frequency tables were made for various questions of the study instrument. The number of responses and the percentage of the total number of active responses was shown in each table.

The major findings of the study are:

1. Seventy-nine percent of the driver education instructors had at least a bachelor's degree.

2. The majority of the responding instructors received teacher preparation in physical education.

3. Thirty-eight instructors had never taken a college-level driver education course.

4. No driver education program in Hawaii public schools was offered during the regular day.

5. Ninety-five percent of the driver education instructors indicated that courses in preparing them to teach driver education were satisfactory.

6. The suggested driver and traffic safety courses that created the greatest interest among the driver educators were Innovative Methods in Driver Education; Alcohol and the Driver, Problems in Driver Education, and Principles of Accident Prevention.

7. Over 93 percent (93.5%) of the instructors indicated that they would take additional course work in traffic safety education.

8. Seventy-seven percent of the instructors favored an increase in the driver education certification requirement.

9. Only ten percent of the eligible public school students received a high school driver education course; and 34 percent (34.6%) of the eligible private school students received a high school driver education course.

10. Driver education in the Hawaii public schools is taught only after the regular school day, on weekends, holiday, or during the recess.

11. No credit is given toward high school graduation for taking driver education.

12. It costs a student $10.00 to take driver education, and it costs the state $60.50 per student to offer it.

13. The basic 30-hour classroom and 6-hour behind-the-wheel program is the only program offered in the state.

14. No courses are offered to special populations.

15. High school drop outs may take driver education.

Discussion of Findings

Based on the stated purpose of this study, the conditions under which it was conducted, and the findings from the analysis of the data, the following discussion is provided.

Instructors

1. The "part-time" driver education program is widely accepted in Hawaii public schools. Part-time driver education teachers, usually teaching driver education during their own time, show little concern toward curriculum development, innovation of new programs, and administration of the course. Little pressure has been created by administrative staff toward professional improvement of individual staff members. Since the program is taught outside the school curriculum, a part-time instructor, paid on an hourly basis, is accepted.

2. The program being offered outside the regular school day had an established hourly pay schedule for instructors. The hourly pay schedule was based on driver education teaching experience.

3. Many instructors were teaching driver education with minimal traffic safety education preparation. It has been noted previously that 43 instructors (20.1%) reported not having completed a college level course of teacher preparation in driver education. Ten instructors (4.7%) were not certified to teach driver education. Of the 214 instructors responding to the questionnaire, 191 had received nine or less semester hours of credits in driver education.

4. Many teaching disciplines were represented by the driver educators in Hawaii. Driver educators in Hawaii represent all the regular

teaching disciplines. The desire for extra financial assistance in the after-school, Saturday, and summer programs, and the relative ease in obtaining certification was attractive and encouraged teachers from all subject areas to move into this field.

5. The level of experience and the amount of education other than in driver education in Hawaii driver educators was commendable. The Hawaii driver educator possessed 8.3 years (median) of total teaching experience, and 5.0 years (median) of driver education teaching experience. The Hawaii driver educator has distinguished himself by obtaining additional university credit hours over the bachelor's degree. These advanced credits, however, have seldom been in the areas of traffic and safety education.

6. Most Hawaii driver educators received their basic driver education professional education preparation in Hawaii at the University of Hawaii-Manoa or through the Department of Education. As recently as 1974, it was not possible to take any courses in driver and traffic safety education in Hawaii above the basic course. This would account for the absence of any extensive advanced preparation among Hawaii driver educators. One program has been developed since 1974, offering 24 university semester hours in traffic and safety education at the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

7. Most instructors in the state began teaching driver education at a later date than they began teaching. This fact can be explained in part by the relatively new position of driver education in the schools of Hawaii. Since no college course work was offered in driver education in Hawaii, the students did not take courses to prepare them to teach high school driver education. Many instructors were teaching in other subject

areas prior to being attracted to this field, usually for financial reasons.

8. The teachers of driver education in Hawaii teach the courses at times other than during the regular school day. The possibility that the instructor working at a second job is less dedicated to the job than to his primary responsibility is a valid concern. Another concern, discovered through conversations with Hawaii driver education teachers, is the fact that students receive the classroom phase from one instructor and the laboratory phase from a different instructor. The possibility of a lack of coordination between the two is feared.

9. Interest in simulation and ranges differed considerably from instructors to the state administration. Very little interest was shown at the state level in incorporating simulation and/or off-street driving ranges into the state driver education program. Over 64 percent (64.5%) of the instructors indicated an interest in taking basic simulation and range courses, if offered.

Officials indicated that they were not interested in such programs because of the expense involved. This may indicate that the administration is content with the present program.

10. Courses in traffic safety education would be taken by driver educators in Hawaii if the right provisions could be made. It is easy to blame the instructors for not taking the initiative in obtaining more course work. The absence of course work at available institutions of higher education must also be recognized. The study indicated the willingness of driver educators to take additional course work.

11. Although the majority of the instructors in the state met the minimum standards of 1977, most of them favored higher certification for

the future. The need for more professional preparation in driver education was evident to most instructors in the field. This fact, coupled with the previous conclusion, would tend to show the need for the development of more traffic safety education programs and courses. The before mentioned evidence, along with the certification standards from other states (summarized in Appendix B), indicate a need for the Department of Education to review the minimum driver education certification standard in Hawaii.

Programs

1. Hawaii driver eduation programs are taught after regular school hours, on weekends, on holidays, and during the school recess. This is possibly the major factor of causing so few Hawaiian high school students to take driver education.

Because of a state law, driver education cannot be taught during the regular school day in Hawaii. Hence, only 10 percent of the public school students eligible to receive driver education training do so. Only 13.83 percent of the entire eligible students to receive driver education do so.

2. The only special programs in driver education are for school drop outs. No specific number is available since the students are found in adult night classes and in the afternoon classes. No special classes are conducted for the physically handicapped, mildly mentally handicapped, or hearing-impaired students.

As might be expected with minimum resources being devoted to driver education, very few special programs were in existence in Hawaii schools.

It would appear that any special students, handicapped, educable mentally retarded, deaf, etc. were expected to fit into the regular programs.

3. Due to an absence of supplemental funds, the state program charged the students a $10.00 fee to take driver education.

Hawaii did not have a supplemental aid program. Thus, the state subdistricts absorbed the costs of the program into their regular budget.

4. Although basic administrative support (permanent records and the provision of textbooks) appeared adequate, definite weaknesses were noted in areas of in-service education, orientation, and the use of curriculum guides.

Permanent records are required by the Department of Education and the provision of textbooks has become a basic part of the educational process. Consequently, the State kept records on the number of students enrolling and completing the driver education program and provided texts as well. In-service education, orientation, and the development of curriculum guides demand special attention. Since no full-time person is assigned to driver education, at the state or local school level these special aspects of the program are neglected.

5. No grade and no credit is given for driver education.

No credit is given for any aspect of the driver education program in the state. Pass-fail grades are used in the evaluation of students in the course.

6. The classroom and the laboratory portions of the program are of the national recognized minimum standard of 30 hours classroom instruction and 6 hours in car instruction.

The average classroom session after school is 51 to 60 minutes in

length. On weekends and during the summer, the classroom phase is 91 to 120 minutes in length. The classroom phase is 30 hours in length.

The laboratory phase is 6 hours in length. This portion of the program is offered at the discretion of the instructor--with the incentive of extra pay being a factor in this portion of the program being extended throughout the year. The behind-the-wheel phase of instruction is limited to 20 to 30 minutes for each student after the regular school day. On weekends and summers, this time is 51 to 60 minutes in length.

7. The state has very little interest in implementing simulation or driving range programs. The driving range concept is employed by a few instructors on various parking lots, although these lots are not marked off or secured as driving ranges.

No simulators are employed by the state driver education program. Once there were simulators used by the Department of Education, but they were not shown to be economically feasible for an after-school program. The United States Army at Schofield Barracks has simulators for their personnel, and the Rehabilitation Hospital of the Pacific is purchasing simulators for their program. Neither of these offerings is part of the Department of Education program.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the evidence and conclusions derived from the study and the experience, observations, and interviews conducted by the author.

1. The state law banning driver education during the regular school day should be repealed. This would allow for more students to take the

course, and to take it at a time when less traffic is on the roadways.

2. Supplemental financial aid is needed for public high school driver education. This appears to be a major hope in achieving the goal of expanded programs, full-time personnel, and full-year programs. This financial aid should be allocated in such a way that a quality program will be rewarded for offering more learning experiences, utilizing more highly prepared instructors, and in general offering a more complete curriculum.

3. Encouragement for special driver education programs (handicapped, EMR, etc.) must come from all sources: the public, higher education, state and federal levels of government.

4. Additional manpower is needed in the Department of Education to handle administrative work necessary in curriculum, certification, and program development.

5. A driver education program administrative guide should be developed and distributed to all driver education teachers and administrators of driver education.

6. A driver education curriculum guide for the instructors needs to be developed, field tested, and utilized in the high school program.

7. Requirements for teacher certification need to be increased to the national minimum recommendation of 12 semester credit hours.

8. The development of a comprehensive teacher preparation program in traffic safety education at institutions of higher learning is needed --possibly a graduate program would be most attractive.

9. Extension courses and workshops should be arranged for the present driver education teachers.

10. The implementation of driver education into the full-time school program with the full-time driver education teachers should be encouraged.

11. The availability of consultant assistance for local driver education programs must be encouraged and promoted by educational institutions, public and private agencies, and various levels of governmental educational agencies.

12. A state professional organization of traffic safety educators should be started.

13. The Department of Education should organize a "blue-ribbon" committee of educators, public support personnel, and outside resource persons to study this report and make recommendations as to future courses of action.

14. An educational campaign should be organized to create a greater public interest in and understanding of traffic safety education in general, and of driver education in particular.

15. The Department of Education should keep more accurate and detailed records to facilitate future research and evaluation.

16. Records need to be maintained at the state level to determine the need for new driver education teachers.

These recommendations, although based on the study of the Hawaii program and personnel, may well apply to other states. It is hoped that other states consider these recommendations in the light of their programs.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further research are made as a result of findings of this study.

1. A similar study should be conducted in all states.

2. A follow-up, comprehensive study should be conducted in Hawaii for the purpose of evaluating future programs. Results from this study could provide an initial overview.

3. An evaluation of the effectiveness of driver education when taught by full-time driver education teachers compared to part-time driver education teachers is needed.

4. An evaluation of the effectiveness of driver education when taught by professionals and para-professionals that have had the same teacher preparation courses.

5. An evaluation of other traffic safety education programs in Hawaii in regard to their availability and effectiveness.

6. Additional research is suggested to investigate driver education effectiveness. This research may be expanded to include the depth and recency of driver and traffic safety education course preparation.

7. Research into the effectiveness of driver education related teaching by non-professionally prepared driver educators in subject matter closely related to driver education is suggested. An examination of the effectiveness of the teachers employed in driver improvement programs, defensive driving courses, and the preparation of professional drivers in Hawaii should be conducted.

Driver education evolved from a recognition that preparation to drive through effective education and training programs is basic to safe motor vehicle operation. For many years insurance companies have been giving reduced rates to persons completing an approved high school driver education program. The safe and efficient movement of people and goods over the nation's highway transportation system is fundamental to social

and economic process in the United States. Accidents needlessly and tragically retard this program through injuries, deaths, and economic loss among highway users.

The average number of motor vehicle deaths per 100,000,000 miles driven in the United States in 1977 was at the rate of 3.38 (67). In 1978, that rate was 3.39 (66). The State of Hawaii in 1978 averaged 3.4 deaths per 100,000,000 miles driven (67). Between January and April of 1979, the State of Hawaii had 70 highway fatalities, which placed the average number of deaths per 100,000,000 miles driven at 4.9 (27). It is estimated that the national death rate will be even higher in 1979 than the previous year (29).

Education has always been viewed as the fundamental instrument in shaping the citizen, for the school is the most universal of all social institutions. The final analysis is that the purpose of schools is to help young people develop. School is the only social institution that seeks contact with all young persons. Since the American society is oriented to the use of motor vehicles, it appears that one of the most effective means to educate persons who will operate such vehicles is to conduct comprehensive programs in traffic safety education in the schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) State of Alabama. A Driver Education Handbook. Division of Administration and Finance, State Department of Education, Montgomery, Alabama, 1968.

(2) State of Arizona. Arizona Driver Education Curriculum Guide. Department of Education, Phoenix, Arizona, 1975.

(3) State of Arkansas. A Report of a Study of Driver Education in Arkansas. Prepared by Educators Consulting Services, Inc., Conway, Arkansas, 1977.

(4) Budig, Ronald L. A Study of the Costs of Driver Education Programs in the Public Schools of Illinois. Normal: Illinois State University, 1976.

(5) Budig, Ronald L. Personal communication. Driver and Safety Education, Missouri Department of Education, June 21, 1978.

(6) Claffin, Richard E. Personal communication. Driver and Safety Education, Michigan Department of Education, June 27, 1978.

(7) Cole, Fred A. Personal communication. Driver Education and Safety, Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services, June 14, 1978.

(8) Coxe, Raymond L. Personal communication. Alaska Department of Education, Juneau, Alaska, July 3, 1978.

(9) State of Delaware. Delaware Driver Education Policy Guide, and the state Administrative and Organizational Guidelines for Motorcycle Safety and Driver Education. Department of Education, Dover, Delaware, 1974.

(10) DeLellis, J. D. Driver Education--What Kind of Teacher?" Journal of Traffic Safety Education, Vol. 21, No. 2 (January, 1974), pp. 9, 12.

(11) Demester, Robert J., Jr., and Richard K. Metzger. "What Do Arizona Taxpayers Think About Driver Education?" Journal of Traffic Safety Education, Vol. 22, No. 3 (October, 1976), pp. 12, 37.

(12) Diaz, Gilbert Terres. Personal communication. Driver Education Department of Education, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico, August 14, 1978.

(13) Federal Highway Administration. The Effectiveness of Traffic Safety Materials in Influencing the Driver Performance of the General Driving Population. National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia, 1978.

(14) State of Florida. Florida Driver Education Status Report, 1977, and the Florida Bicycle Education Curriculum Guide. Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 1978.

(15) Frani, Louis J. Personal communication. Safety Education, New York Department of Education, Albany, New York, February 7, 1979.

(16) State of Georgia. Georgia Driver Education Annual Report, 1977. Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, 1978.

(17) Goldstein, L. G. Behavioral Aspects of Highway Safety Relevant to Preparation of the Beginning Driver: A Review of Research. California Traffic Safety Education Task Force, Sacramento, California, 1973.

(18) Gon, Samuel M. Personal communication. Hawaii Department of Education, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1975.

(19) Graybill, Marjie R. Personal communication. Driver Education Section, Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio, June 22, 1978.

(20) Hahn, Curt. Personal communication. Montana Department of Education, Helena, Montana, June 1, 1978.

(21) Hall, James E. Personal communication. Safety and Driver Education, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina, June 29, 1978.

(22) Hartman, Charles H. "Teacher Preparation in Driver Education in Colleges and Universities of the United States." Traffic Safety Research Review, Vol. 8, No. 2 (June, 1964), pp. 8-9.

(23) State of Hawaii. Revised Status, Chapter 37, Act 42. Honolulu: State Printing Office, 1976.

(24) State of Hawaii. Revised Status, Section 286-91. Honolulu: State Printing Office, 1977.

(25) State of Hawaii. Government in Hawaii. Honolulu: Tax Foundation of Hawaii, 1979.

(26) State of Hawaii. Hawaii Financial Statistics. 26th ed. Honolulu: Tax Foundation of Hawaii, 1979.

(27) State of Hawaii. Major Traffic Accidents, State of Hawaii, 1978. Motor Vehicle Safety Office, Honolulu, Hawaii, June, 1979.

(28) Hiblar, William F. Personal communication. Traffic Safety Education, Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington, February 7, 1979.

(29) Highway Users Federation. News. 1776 Massachusetts Ave, N.W., Washington, D.C., December 15, 1978.

(30) Hirsch, Robert M. Personal communication. Nevada Department of Education, Las Vegas, Nevada, February 12, 1979.

(31) City and County of Honolulu. City and County of Honolulu Annual Report: Drivers License Section. Drivers License Section, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1978.

(32) City and County of Honolulu. State of Hawaii Tax Records. Motor Vehicle Control Division, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1978.

(33) State of Idaho. Idaho Driver Education Administrative Guide, Idaho Driver Education Instructional Guide, and 1978 Driver Education Annual Report. Department of Public Instruction, Boise, Idaho, 1977.

(34) State of Illinois. Illinois Driver Education Curriculum. Illinois Office of Education, Springfield, Illinois, June, 1975.

(35) State of Illinois. Driver Education for Illinois Youth. Illinois Office of Education, Springfield, Illinois, June, 1976.

(36) State of Illinois. Supervisors Guidebook: Driver and Traffic Safety Education. Illinois Office of Education, Springfield, Illinois, June, 1978.

(37) State of Iowa. Driver Education for Iowa Schools. Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa, 1971.

(38) State of Iowa. Iowa Driver Education Evaluation Study. Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa, 1975.

(39) Janzen, W., and D. L. Clark. A Comparative Analysis of Teacher Effectiveness of Teaching Assistants Versus Certified Driver Education Instructors in Texas. Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1971.

(40) Jones, Margaret H. California Driver Training Evaluation Study. Department of Motor Vehicles, Sacramento, California, 1970.

(41) Josie, Darrell H. Personal communication. Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah, March 5, 1979.

(42) State of Kansas. Kansas Driver Education Curriculum Guide. Department of Education, Topeka, Kansas, 1971.

(43) Kelso, Washington School District. Pursuing the Human Side of Driving. Kelso School District, Kelso, Washington, 1976.

(44) State of Kentucky. Report of the Kentucky Driver Education Program. Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky, 1975.

(45) Larson, Brian. Personal communication. Driver and Traffic Safety Education Coordinator, Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck, North Dakota, June 12, 1978.

(46) Little, A. D. The State of the Art in Traffic Safety. Cambridge, Mass.: Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1966.

(47) Logan, George L. Personal communcation. Driver and Traffic Safety Education, Kentucky Department of Education, Lexington, Kentucky, July 5, 1978.

(48) State of Louisiana. Safety for Louisiana Schools. Department of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1977.

(49) Lyle, Kathryn. A Comparative Study of Traffic Violations of Selected Students in the Memphis City School System. Memphis City School System, Memphis, Tennessee, 1976.

(50) State of Maryland. State of Maryland Highway Safety Study. Automobile Safety Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1969.

(51) State of Maryland. The Maryland Driver Education Study. Department of Fiscal Services, Annapolis, Maryland, September, 1978.

(52) Mason, Robert W. Personal communication. Department of Education, Providence, Rhode Island, February 5, 1979. February 5, 1979.

(53) State of Massachusetts. Massachusetts Driver Education Curriculum Guide. Department of Education, Boston, Massachusetts, 1971.

(54) Matthias, Howard E. "The State of the Art of Driver Education in Minnesota Public Schools." (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1971.)

(55) McGuire, F. L., and R. C. Kersh. An Evaluation of Driver Education: A Study of History, Philosophy, Research Methodology, and Effectiveness in the Field of Driver Education. Berkeley: University of California Publications, 1969.

(56) Metzgar, Richard K. Personal communication. Driver and Safety Education, Arizona Department of Education, Phoenix, Arizona, February 7, 1979.

(57) Metzgar, Richard K., and Robert J. Demester, Jr. "What Do Arizona School Administrators Think About Driver Education?" Journal of Traffic Safety Education, Vol. 23, No. 1 (July, 1976), pp. 23-24.

(58) State of Michigan. Driver Education Performance Objectives. Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan, 1976.

(59) State of Michigan. Michigan Driver Education Evaluation Project. Evaluation and Assessment Services, Michigan Department of Education Research, Lansing, Michigan, March, 1978.

(60) State of Minnesota. Statistical Report of the Minnesota Driver Education Program. Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1970.

(61) State of Missouri. Missouri High School Driver Education Status Report. Department of Education, Jefferson City, Missouri, 1977.

(62) National Commission on Safety Education. Results of Studies Evaluating Driver Education. National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1964.

(63) National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Highway Safety Program Manual, Driver Education. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C., 1966.

(64) National Safety Council. Accident Facts. Chicago, Illinois, 1976.

(65) National Safety Council. Accident Facts. Chicago, Illinois, 1978.

(66) National Safety Council. Accident Facts. Chicago, Illinois, 1979.

(67) National Safety Council. Driver Education Status Report. Chicago, Illinois, 1978.

(68) State of Nebraska. Nebraska Driver Education Curriculum Guide. Department of Education, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1972.

(69) Nelson, Joseph M. Personal communication. Traffic Safety Education, Oregon Department of Education, Salem, Oregon, April 15, 1978.

(70) State of Nevada. Evaluation of the Driver Education Program for the State of Nevada. Department of Education, Carson City, Nevada, 1968.

(71) State of New Hampshire. Driver Education Standards. Department of Education, Concord, New Hampshire, 1977.

(72) State of New Mexico. New Mexico Driver Education Guide. State Board of Education, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 1977.

(73) State of New York. Guidelines for the Professional Preparation of Secondary School Driver Education Teachers in New York State. Richard D. Ellis, ed. State Department of Education, Albany, New York (no date).

(74) Noffsinger, E. R. "The Crisis in Driver Education." Traffic Safety, Vol. 60, No. 1 (1962), pp. 10-12.

(75) Nolan, R. O., and R. E. Gustafson. How to Improve Michigan Driver Education Programs. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1966.

(76) State of North Dakota. Guidelines for Highway Safety in North Dakota. Prepared for the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Legislative Research Committee, Bismark, North Dakota, 1966.

(77) O'Brien, Terence F. Personal communication. Vermont Department of Education, Montpelier, Vermont, June 12, 1978.

(78) State of Ohio. The Development and Validation of Attitude, Knowledge, and Performance Tests for Evaluating Driver Education Curricular. Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio, 1974.

(79) State of Oregon. Oregon Driver Education Study. Department of Transportation, Salem, Oregon, 1976.

(80) Peavy, Glenn. Personal communication. Traffic Safety Education, Texas Department of Education, May 18, 1979.

(81) Policies and Practices for Driver and Traffic Safety Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964.

(82) Pyle, Erine. Personal communication. Traffic Safety Education, Colorado Department of Education, Denver, Colorado, June 13, 1978.

(83) Randolph, Fred M. Personal communication. Indiana State Department of Education, Indianapolis, Indiana, June 14, 1978.

(84) Reightler, Joel. Review of Pennsylvania Driver Education/Driver Licensing System. The Franklin Institute Research Laboratories, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1977.

(85) Robertson, Leon, and Paul Zador. Driver Education and Fatal Crash Involvement of Teenaged Drivers. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Washington, D.C., 1977.

(86) Rocks, Lawrence, and Richard P. Runyon. The Energy Crisis. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1972.

(87) Shinar, David. Psychology on the Road. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1978.

(88) Smith, Jay. "Developing a Realistic K-12 Highway Safety Education Program." Journal of Traffic Safety Education, Vol. 24, No. 4 (July, 1977), pp. 23-24.

(89) Tice, Travis. Personal communication. Oklahoma Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June 28, 1978.

(90) Towle, Matthew. Personal communication. Bureau of Research and Assessment, Department of Education, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Springfield, Massachusetts, June 14, 1978.

(91) Tullos, Wyatt. Personal communication. Driver and Safety Education, Mississippi Department of Education, Jackson, Mississippi, June 14, 1978.

(92) U.S. Department of Transportation. The Driver Education Evaluation Program (DEEP) Study. A report to Congress. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington, D.C., July, 1975.

(93) State of Utah. Driver Education in Utah. Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1975.

(94) Vernon, R. J., and M. B. Phillips. A Study of Public School Driver Education in Texas. Texas Transportation Institution, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1972.

(95) State of Virginia. Curriculum Guide for Driver Education in Virginia. Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia, 1975.

(96) Voas, R. B. Alcohol, Drugs, and Young Drivers. Washington, D.C.: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1974.

(97) State of Washington. Traffic Safety Education Administrative Manual. Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington, 1978.

(98) State of Washington. Washington Driver and Traffic Safety Education Project. Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington, 1969.

(99) State of West Virginia. Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Program in West Virginia. Department of Education, Charleston, West Virginia, 1976.

(100) Williams, J. D. "A Survey of Teacher Preparation and Performance." Journal of Traffic Safety Education, Vol. 20, No. 4 (June, 1973), pp. 33-34.

(101) State of Wisconsin. Major in Safety Education. Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, Wisconsin, 1969.

(102) State of Wyoming. Driver Education Program Appraisal. State Department of Education, Cheyenne, Wyoming, 1979.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY REQUEST

University of Hawaii at Manoa

College of Education
Curriculum & Instruction
Wist Hall Annex 2 • 1776 University Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 • Cable Address: UNIHAW

September, 1977

Dear Fellow Driver Educator:

I am conducting research on the State-of-the-Art of Driver Education in the State of Hawaii. The purpose of this research is to define the needs of the driver education teacher of Hawaii; and upon defining these needs, have the University of Hawaii move to meet the needs.

It is my opinion that the active driver education teachers of Hawaii have needs that they think should be met by the University. The data collected from this survey will have a direct influence on the courses that are offered for certification of driver education teachers in Hawaii.

Your taking ten minutes of your time to complete the attached questionnaire and return it in the attached stamped and addressed envelope will enable the University of meet your needs. This is your opportunity to state your needs and desires regarding the course offerings for driver education teachers in Hawaii.

Thank you for your assistance and professionalism.

Sincerely,

Earl E. Hansen

Earl E. Hansen, Director
Traffic and Safety Education

EEH/cf

Enclosures

GEORGE R. ARIYOSHI
GOVERNOR

CHARLES G. CLARK
SUPERINTENDENT

STATE OF HAWAII

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 2360
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

September 15, 1977

Dear Educator:

Mr. Earl Hansen, Director of Traffic and Safety, University of Hawaii, is conducting a survey to determine the state of Driver Education in Hawaii.

Please take some of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the prepaid envelope. Your contribution will play an important part in which direction the driver education program in Hawaii should be moving.

Thank you for your time and professionalism in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

S. M. Gon

Samuel M. Gon
Program Specialist
Student Services

SMG/ds

Enclosures

GEORGE R. ARIYOSHI
GOVERNOR

STATE OF HAWAII

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 2360
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

CHARLES G. CLARK
SUPERINTENDENT

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

December 8, 1977

Dear Educator:

In September, 1977, Mr. Earl Hansen, Director of Traffic & Safety Education, University of Hawaii, sent you a survey form to gather data for use to determine the state of the driver education program in Hawaii.

Your participation will contribute greatly in the effort to develop some ways for the improvement of driver education programs in the State. If you have not yet returned the completed survey form to Mr. Hansen, please do so in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided for your convenience.

Thank you for your contribution in the search for improvement in our driver education program.

Sincerely,

S. M. Gon

Samuel M. Gon
Program Specialist
Student Services

SMG/ds

University of Hawaii at Manoa

College of Education
Curriculum & Instruction
Wist Hall Annex 2 • 1776 University Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 • Cable Address: UNIHAW

January 25, 1979

Mr. Duane Schmidt
Traffic Safety Department of Education
233 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Mr. Schmidt:

In conducting research, I am requesting specific information regarding the driver education program in your state. Please answer the questions that follow:

1. How many university or college credits are required for teacher certification in your state?
2. Have any studies been conducted in your state? If so, may I have a complete copy of the study if possible; or a synopsis of the study?

The earliest response to the above questions will greatly assist the State of Hawaii in evaluating the certification standards for driver education students.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Earl E Hansen

Earl E. Hansen, Director
Traffic and Safety Education

EEH/ln

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

A survey of the certification requirements for driver education teachers in 49 states and Puerto Rico showed the following requirements:

State	Credit
1. Alabama (1)	Minor--18 semester hours
2. Alaska (8)	11 semester hours
3. Arizona (going to 12 hrs) (56)	6 or 9 semester hours depending on institution
4. Arkansas (3)	6 semester hours
5. California (67)	12 semester hours
6. Colorado (82)	12 semester hours
7. Connecticut (67)	18 quarter hours
8. Delaware (9)	12 semester hours
9. Florida (14)	Meet state competencies
10. Georgia (16)	15 quarter hours
11. Idaho (33)	4 semester hours
12. Hawaii (11)	1 course
13. Illinois (36)	16 semester hours
14. Indiana (83)	12 semester hours
15. Iowa (37)	15 semester hours
16. Kansas (42)	12 semester hours
17. Kentucky (47)	12 semester hours
18. Louisiana (48)	12 semester hours
19. Maine (7)	12 semester hours
20. Maryland (50)	Professional Certificate--18 semester hours Paraprofessional--150 hours workshop
21. Massachusetts (90)	18 semester hours
22. Michigan (59)	8 semester hours
23. Minnesota (54)	12 quarter hours
24. Mississippi (91)	12 semester hours
25. Missouri (5)	21 semester hours
26. Montana (20)	12 quarter hours
27. Nebraska (68)	6 semester hours, subject to change
28. Nevada (30)	5 semester hours
29. New Hampshire (71)	12 semester hours
30. New Jersey (67)	3 semester hours

State	Credit
31. New Mexico (72)	12 semester hours
32. New York (73)	Professional Certificate--6 semester hours
	Permanent--12 semester hours
33. North Carolina (21)	30 semester hours
34. North Dakota (45)	30 semester hours
35. Ohio (19)	6 semester hours or 9 quarter hours
	Paraprofessional--120 instructor's hours
36. Oklahoma (89)	21 semester hours
37. Oregon (79)	12 quarter hours
38. Pennsylvania (84)	12 semester hours
39. Puerto Rico (12)	1 high school course
40. Rhode Island (52)	3 semester hours
41. South Carolina (67)	6 semester hours
42. South Dakota (67)	8 semester hours
43. Tennessee (67)	15 quarter hours
44. Texas (80)	6 semester hours for high school teacher
	9 semester hours for high school supervisor
	12 semester hours for paraprofessional
45. Utah (41)	22 quarter hours
46. Vermont (77)	12 semester hours
47. Virginia (95)	6 semester hours
48. Washington (28)	12 quarter hours; 8 semester hours
49. West Virginia (99)	15 semester hours
50. Wisconsin (101)	22 semester hours
51. Wyoming (102)	12 semester hours

APPENDIX C

INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTOR AND PROGRAM INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRES

Individual Instructor Questionnaire

Instructions: The questionnaire has been designed so that the letter answers may be transferred from the questionnaire to computer data cards.

Please answer all of the questions with only one letter in each blank provided.

__ 1. How much education have you completed as of August, 1977?

a. Less than a bachelor's degree
b. Bachelor's degree
c. Bachelor's degree plus some graduate work
d. Master's degree
e. Master's degree plus some work toward a doctorate
f. Doctorate
g. More than a doctorate

Please use the letters of the responses to answer the next two questions.

__ 2. What is your major field?

__ 3. What is your minor field?

Responses:

a. Administration
b. Agriculture
c. Business Education
d. Elementary Education
e. English
f. Foreign Language
g. Guidance and Counseling
h. History
i. Industrial Arts
j. Mathematics
k. Physical Education
l. Sciences
m. Social Studies
n. Other

__ 4. Are you certificated to instruct driver education in Hawaii?

a. Yes b. No

__ 5. Where did you receive the major part of the college/in-service credits you have in driver education courses?

a. University of Hawaii--Manoa
b. BYU--Hawaii
c. University of Hawaii--Hilo

(Continued on next page)

d. University of Hawaii--Continuing Education
e. Department of Education--State of Hawaii
f. A school in the state of California
g. A school in the state of Oregon
h. A school in the State of Washington
i. A school in the state of Arizona
j. A school in the Midwest
k. A school in the East
l. A school in the South
m. A school in a foreign country
n. Schools outside of areas mentioned
o. I have received equal numbers of credits from two or more of the above schools
p. I have never taken any college-level courses in driver education

__ 6. What was the last year in which you received college credit for any driver education course?

a. 1977
b. 1976
c. 1975
d. 1974
e. 1973
f. 1972
g. 1971
h. 1970-1967
i. 1966-1963
j. 1962-1960
k. 1956-1959
l. 1952-1955
m. 1948-1951
n. 1944-1947
o. Before 1944
p. I have never taken any college courses in driver education

__ 7. How many semester credit hours have your earned in driver education or related subjects?

a. 0
b. 1-3
c. 4-6
d. 7-9
e. 10-12
f. 13-15
g. 16-18
h. 19-21
i. 21-24
j. 25 or more

__ 8. How many D.O.E. "B" in-service credits have your earned in driver education or related subjects?

a. 0
b. 1-3
c. 4-6
d. 7-9
e. 10-12
f. 13-15

__ 9. How well would you say the courses you have taken in driver education have prepared you to teach the subject?

a. Very well
b. Satisfactorily
c. Poorly
d. I have not taken any driver education courses

__ 10. How many years have you been a teacher in any subject:

a. Less than 1
b. 1
c. 2
d. 3
e. 4-6
f. 7-9
g. 10-12
h. 13-15
i. 16-18
j. 19-21
k. 21-24
l. 25 or more

__ 11. How many years have you been a driver education instructor?

a. Less than 1
b. 1
c. 2
d. 3
e. 4-6
f. 7-9
g. 10-12
h. 13-15
i. 16-18
j. 19-21
k. 21-24
l. 25 or more

__ 12. What was your involvement with the driver education program at your school during the 1976-1977 school year?

a. Full-time (80% time or more)
b. Part-time (less than 80% time)
c. I did not teach driver education last year

__ 13. What is your involvement with the driver education program at your school this year?

a. Full-time (80% time or more)
b. Part-time (less than 80% time)
c. I am not teaching driver education this year

__ 14. What is the normal daily teaching load for your school district?

a. Less than 4 hours
b. 4 hours
c. 5 hours
d. 6 hours
e. 7 hours
f. 8 hours
g. More than 8 hours

__ 15. How much time during the normal school day do you spend teaching driver education?

a. Less than 1 hour
b. 1 hour-1 hour, 59 minutes
c. 2 hours-2 hours, 59 minutes
d. 3 hours-3 hours, 59 minutes
e. 4 hours-4 hours, 59 minutes
f. 5 hours-5 hours, 59 minutes

(Continued on next page)

g. 6 hours-6 hours, 59 minutes
h. 7 hours-7 hours, 59 minutes
i. 8 hours or more
j. I do not teach driver education during the normal school day

__ 16. How many days per week did you teach driver education last summer?

a. 0--I did not teach driver education last summer.
b. 1
c. 2
d. 3
e. 4
f. 5
g. 6
h. 7

__ 17. How many hours per week did you teach driver education last summer?

a. 0--I did not teach driver education last year
b. 1-10
c. 11-20
d. 21-30
e. 31-40
f. 41-50
g. 51-60
h. 61-70
i. 70 or more

__ 18. Did you teach driver education after school during the September 1976 to June 1977 school year?

a. Yes b. No

__ 19. Are you teaching driver education after school during the current school year?

a. Yes b. No

__ 20. Did you teach driver education on Saturdays during the 1976-1977 school year?

a. Yes b. No

__ 21. Are you teaching driver education on Saturdays during the current 1977-78 school year?

a. Yes b. No

__ 22. Did you teach driver education on Sundays during the 1976-1977 school year?

a. Yes b. No

__ 23. Are you teaching driver education on Sundays during the current school year?

a. Yes b. No

We are interested in determining the general responsibilities of driver education instructors. Please indicate the percentage of time you are devoting during the current school year to each of the following activities by placing the appropriate letter in each of the blanks provided. The total should add to 100 percent. (Mark a for each activity that does not apply to you.)

Responses:

a. 0%--does not apply to me
b. 1-10%
c. 11-20%
d. 21-30%
e. 31-40%
f. 41-50%
g. 51-60%
h. 61-70%
i. 71-80%
j. 81-90%
k. 91-100%

__ 24. Administration

__ 25. Agriculture

__ 26. Business Education

__ 27. Driver Education

__ 28. Elementary Education

__ 29. English

__ 30. Foreign Language

__ 31. Guidance and Counseling

__ 32. History

__ 33. Industrial Arts

__ 34. Junior High School

__ 35. Mathematics

__ 36. Physical Education

__ 37. Sciences

__ 38. Social Studies

__ 39. Other

We are also interested in the involvement of driver education instructors in extra-curriculum activities. Please indicate the percentage of time you are devoting during the current school year to each of the following extra-curricular activities by placing the appropriate letter in each of the blanks. The total should add to 100 percent. (Mark a for each activity that does not apply to you.)

Responses:

a. 0--does not apply to me
b. 1-10%
c. 11-20%
d. 21-30%
e. 31-40%
f. 41-50%
g. 51-60%
h. 61-70%
i. 71-80%
j. 81-90%
k. 91-100%

__ 40. Coaching

__ 41. Speech and/or debate

__ 42. Dramatics

__ 43. Clubs

__ 44. Journalism

__ 45. Others

The following is a list of possible courses in the area of Traffic and Safety Education. Please indicate your interest in taking individual courses by placing the letter corresponding to your degree of interest in the blank provided. Be sure to indicate a choice for each blank.

Responses:

a. Very interested
b. Somewhat interested
c. Not interested

__ 46. Driver Behavior and Personality

__ 47. Highway Engineering and Traffic Controls

__ 48. Motor Vehicle Administration

__ 49. Basic Auto Mechanics and Auto Systems

__ 50. Principles of Accident Prevention

__ 51. Alcohol and the Driver

__ 52. Methods of Teaching Motorcycle Education

__ 53. Transportation Systems

__ 54. Research Techniques as Related to Traffic Safety

__ 55. Motor Vehicle Law and Enforcement

__ 56. Administration and Supervision of Safety Education

__ 57. Innovative Methods in Driver Education

__ 58. Basic Simulation and Range Instruction

__ 60. Would you actually take any of the above courses if they were made available to you?

a. Yes b. No

__ 61. Do you favor higher certification for driver education instructors and supervisors?

a. Yes b. No

Program Information Questionnaire

State Driver Education Program

_____ 1. What is the total number of public school students who were eligible to participate in your state's driver education program last year? (September 1976 to August 1977.)

_____ Of those public school students who were eligible for your state's driver education program last year (see previous question), how many completed?

_____ 2. Both the classroom and laboratory phases?

_____ 3. The classroom phase only?

_____ 4. The laboratory phase only?

_____ 5. How many parochial-private school students were eligible to participate in your state's driver education program last year?

_____ 6. Of those parochial-private school students who were eligible for your state's driver education program last year (see previous question), how many completed any aspect of the program?

_____ 7. What is the total number of public school students who are eligible to participate in your state's driver education program this year? (September 1977 to August 1978.)

_____ 8. How many parochial-private school students are eligible to participate in your state's driver education program this year?

_____ 9. Is driver education in your state available to drop outs?

a. Yes b. No

_____ 10. Is there a separate driver education program in your state for special education students (Educable Mentally Retarded)?

_____ 11. Is there a separate driver education program in your state for physically handicapped students?

a. Yes b. No

We are interested in knowing whether or not you charge any special fees for those who participate in your state's driver education program and, if so, how much you charge.

Please use the letters identifying the following responses to answer each of the next three questions.

Responses:

a.	Nothing	h.	$30.01-$35.00
b.	$5.00 or less	i.	$35.01-$40.00
c.	$5.01-$10.00	j.	$40.01-$45.00
d.	$10.01-$15.00	k.	$45.01-$50.00
e.	$15.01-$20.00	l.	$50.01-$55.00
f.	$20.01-$25.00	m.	$55.01 and above
g.	$25.01-$30.00	q.	Question is not applicable

Question:

How much do you charge for your driver education program when the student:

_____ 12. Receives both classroom and laboratory instruction during regular school hours?

_____ 13. Receives classroom instruction during regular school hours and laboratory instruction at some time other than during regular school hours?

_____ 14. Receives both classroom and laboratory instruction outside of regular school hours?

_____ 15. Do you have a written curriculum guide in driver education for your state?

a. Yes
b. Not at the moment; however, one is being prepared
c. No
d. Out of print

_____ 16. How current is your written curriculum guide in driver education?

a.	1-3 years old	c.	8-10 years old
b.	4-7 years old	d.	11 or more years old

_____ 17. Are enough textbooks and instructional materials available so that each student has a copy?

a. Yes
b. We have materials available but not separate copies for each student
c. No

_____ 18. How many driver education vehicles does your state have available?

a.	0	i.	71-80

(Continued on next page)

b. 1-10
c. 11-20
d. 21-30
e. 31-40
f. 41-50
g. 51-60
h. 61-70
j. 81-90
k. 91-100
l. 101-110
m. 111-120
n. 121-130
o. 131-140
p. 141 or more

_____ 19. How do you obtain your driver education vehicles?

a. Purchase
b. Lease
c. Loan
d. a and b
e. a and c
f. b and c
g. a, b, and c
h. We have no vehicles available

_____ 20. Do you have written agreements with car dealers on loaned vehicles?

a. Yes
b. No
c. We have no loaned vehicles as indicated in the last question.

_____ 21. Is credit toward graduation given for the driver education program?

a. Yes. Credit is given only for the completed unit which includes both the classroom and laboratory phases.
b. Yes. Credit is given for both the classroom and laboratory phases separately.
c. Credit is given for the classroom phase but not the laboratory phase.
d. Credit is given for the laboratory phase but not the classroom phase.
e. No. Credit is not given for any aspect of this program.

_____ 22. How many credits is it possible to receive for driver education?

a. 0--no credit is given for any aspect of the program.
b. 1/4
c. 1/2
d. 3/4
e. 1
f. More than 1

_____ 23. Are students in your driver education program graded?

a. Yes. One grade is given for the completed unit which includes both the classroom and laboratory phases.
b. Yes. Both the classroom and laboratory phases are graded separately.
c. The classroom phase is graded but the laboratory phase is not.

(Continued on next page)

d. The laboratory phase is graded but the classroom phase is not.
e. No. Grades are not given in any aspect of this program.

_____ 24. What type of grades are used in your driver education program?

a. No grades are given for any aspect of this program as noted in the last question.
b. Pass-fail grades are used where grades are given.
c. Letter grades are used where grades are given.
d. Pass-fail grades are given for the classroom phase and letter gardes are given for the laboratory phase.
e. Pass-fail grades are given for the laboratory phase and letter grades are given for the classroom phase.

_____ 25. Are permanent records maintained for all students having completed your driver education program?

a. Yes b. No

Classroom Phase

_____ 26. The classroom phase of driver education is:

a. Required
b. An elective
c. Not offered

_____ 27. The classroom phase of driver education is taught as:

a. A separate subject
b. A unit within another subject
c. Not offered

_____ 28. At what grade level(s) is classroom instruction in driver education offered during the regular school year?

a. Grade 9
b. Grade 10
c. Grade 11
d. Grade 12
e. Grades 9 and 10
f. Grades 10 and 11
g. Grades 11 and 12
h. Grades 9, 10, and 11
i. Grades 10, 11, and 12
j. Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12
k. Classroom instruction is not offered during regular school year

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next four questions.

Responses:

a. 1-20
b. 21-25
h. 51-75
i. 76-100

(Continued on next page)

c. 26-30
d. 31-35
e. 36-40
f. 41-45
g. 46-50
j. 101-125
k. 126-150
l. 151 or more
m. The classroom phase is not offered at this time

Question:

How large is the average size class in the classroom phase when instruction is offered:

_____ 29. During the regular school day?

_____ 30. After school?

_____ 31. On weekends?

_____ 32. During the summer?

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next four questions.

Responses:

a. 20-30 minutes
b. 31-40 minutes
c. 41-50 minutes
d. 51-60 minutes
e. 61-75 minutes
f. 76-90 minutes
g. 91-120 minutes
h. Longer than 120 minutes
i. The classroom phase is not offered at this time

Question:

How long is the average class period in the classroom phase when instruction is offered:

_____ 33. During the regular school day?

_____ 34. After school?

_____ 35. On weekends?

_____ 36. During the summer?

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next four questions.

Responses:

a. 1
b. 2
c. 3
d. 4
e. 5
f. 6
g. 7
h. The classroom phase is not offered at this time

Question:

How many times per week do the students meet for instruction in the classroom phase when instruction is offered:

_____ 37. During the regular school day?

_____ 38. After school?

_____ 39. On weekends?

_____ 40. During the summer?

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next four questions.

Responses:

a. Less than 29
b. 30
c. 31-36
d. 37-45
e. 46-50
f. 61-90
g. 91 or more
h. The classroom phase is not offered at this time

Question:

What is the total number of hours of instruction in the classroom phase when instruction is offered:

_____ 41. During the regular school day?

_____ 42. After school?

_____ 43. On weekends?

_____ 44. During the summer?

Laboratory Phase

_____ 45. The laboratory phase of driver education is:

a. Required
b. An elective
c. Not offered

_____ 46. At what grade level(s) is the laboratory phase of driver education offered during the regular school year?

a. Grade 10
b. Grade 11
c. Grade 12
d. Grades 10 and 11
e. Grades 10, 11, and 12
f. Laboratory instruction is not offered during the regular school year

_____ 47. How is the laboratory phase of your driver education program offered?

a. Concurrently with classroom instruction
b. Immediately after the classroom phase has been completed
c. The laboratory phase may be taken at any time after the classroom phase has been completed
d. a and b
e. a and c
f. b and c
g. a, b, and c
h. The laboratory phase is not offered

_____ 48. How many students are normally assigned to a driver education vehicle during each instructional period?

a. 1
b. 2
c. 3
d. 4
e. 5
f. Laboratory instruction is not offered

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next four questions.

Responses:

a. Less than 20 minutes
b. 20-30 minutes
c. 31-40 minutes
d. 41-50 minutes
e. 51-60 minutes
f. 61-90 minutes
g. 91-120 minutes
h. 121-150 minutes
i. 151-180 minutes
j. Longer than 3 hours
k. The laboratory phase is not offered at this time

Question:

How long is the behind-the-wheel instructional period for an individual student during a single laboratory session when instruction is offered:

_____ 49. During the regular school day?

_____ 50. After school?

_____ 51. On weekends?

_____ 52. During the summer?

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next questions.

Responses:

a. 1
b. 2
c. 3
d. 4
e. 5
f. 6
g. 7
h. More than 7
i. The laboratory phase is not offered at this time

Question:

How many times a week does an individual student attend laboratory sessions when instruction is offered:

_____ 53. During the regular school day?

_____ 54. After school?

_____ 55. On weekends?

_____ 56. During the summer?

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next four questions.

Responses:

a. Less than 5
b. 5-6
c. 7-8
d. 9-10
e. 11-12
f. 13-14
g. 15-16
h. 17-18
i. More than 18
j. The laboratory phase is not offered at this time.

Question:

How many periods of instruction per student constitute a complete unit in the laboratory phase when instruction is offered:

_____ 57. During the regular school day?

_____ 58. After school?

_____ 59. On weekends?

_____ 60. During the summer?

_____ 61. How much actual behind-the-wheel driving experience does each student receive in the laboratory phase?

a. Less than 3 hours
b. 3 hours
c. 4 hours

(Continued on next page)

d. 5 hours
e. 6 hours
f. 7 hours
g. 8-9 hours
h. 10-11 hours
i. 12 hours or more
j. The laboratory phase is not offered

_____ 62. Are special units concerning emergency situations taught during the laboratory phase?

a. Yes
b. No
c. The laboratory phase is not offered

_____ 63. Are driving simulators used in your instruction?

a. Yes. All students receive instruction on simulators
b. Yes; however, they are not available to all students
c. No

_____ 64. At the present time, what is your state's feeling toward the incorporation of simulation into your driver education program?

a. Not interested
b. Somewhat interested
c. Strongly interested
d. We already use simulators as indicated in previous question
e. b and d
f. c and d

_____ 65. Do you utilize an off-street driving range in your instructions?

a. Yes. All students receive instruction on an off-street driving range
b. Yes; however, this type of instruction is not available to all students
c. No

_____ 66. At the present time, what is your state's feeling toward the incorporation of an off-street driving range into your driver education program?

a. Not interested
b. Somewhat interested
c. Strongly interested
d. We already use an off-street driving range as indicated in previous question
e. b and d
f. c and d

Staff and Administration

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the next five questions.

Responses:

a.	0	j.	131-140
b.	1-20	k.	141-150
c.	21-40	l.	151-160
d.	41-60	m.	161-170
e.	61-80	n.	171-180
f.	81-100	o.	181-190
g.	101-110	p.	190-200
h.	111-120	q.	201 and above
i.	121-130	r.	Not applicable. This district did not have a driver education program at this time

_____ 67. How many full-time driver education instructors and/or supervisors (80% time or more) were employed in your state during the last regular school year? (September 1976 to June 1977.)

_____ 68. How many additional part-time driver education instructors and/or supervisors (less then 80% time) were employed in your state during the last regular school year? (September 1976 to June 1977.)

_____ 69. How many instructors and/or supervisors were employed (full- or part-time) in your state's driver education program last summer (1977)?

_____ 70. How many full-time driver education instructors and/or supervisors (80% time or more) are employed in your state for the current school year?

_____ 71. How many part-time driver education instructors and/or supervisors (less than 80% time) are employed in your state for the current school year?

_____ 72. Of all the driver education instructors employed in your state at any time last year (September 1976 to August 1977), how many were fully certificated? (Based upon present certification of one course in Driver Education.)

a.	0	j.	131-140
b.	1-20	k.	141-150
c.	21-40	l.	151-160
d.	41-60	m.	161-170
e.	61-80	n.	171-180
f.	81-100	o.	181-190

(Continued on next page)

g. 101-110
h. 111-120
i. 121-130
p. 191-200
q. 201 and above

Please use the letters of the following responses to answer each of the eight questions included in the next two sets of questions.

Responses:

a. On the same basic salary schedule as all other teachers
b. On the basis of a percentage of their regular yearly salary
c. On the basis of the number of students taught
d. By the day
e. By the hour
f. On the basis of their experience in driver education
g. Other methods
h. Combinations of the above
i. We do not offer this phase of the driver education program at this time

Question:

How are the teachers who instruct the classroom phase of your driver education program paid when the instruction occurs:

_____ 73. During the regular school day?

_____ 74. After school?

_____ 75. On weekends?

_____ 76. During the summer?

Question:

How are the teachers who instruct the laboratory phase of your driver education paid when the instruction occurs:

_____ 77. During the regular school day?

_____ 78. After school?

_____ 79. On weekends?

_____ 80. During the summer?

_____ 81. Are special orientation programs for driver education instructors offered at the beginning of each program?

a. Yes b. No

_____ 82. How often are in-service training programs for driver education instructors conducted?

a. Not at all
b. Annually
c. Semi-annually
d. Quarterly
e. Monthly
f. Weekly

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

VITA

Earl Eric Hansen

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A SURVEY OF DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE SCHOOLS OF HAWAII

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Port Chester, New York, May 1, 1942, the son of Mr. and Mrs. A. P. Hansen.

Education: Graduated from Arlington High School, Arlington, Texas, in May, 1961; attended the University of Texas, 1961; received the Bachelor of Science degree in Health, Physical Education, and Recreation from North Texas State University, 1968; received the Master of Education in Secondary Education from North Texas State University in 1971; enrolled in non-degree program at San Diego State University in 1973; enrolled in non-degree program at the University of Hawaii in 1976; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1980.

Professional Experience: Materials estimator at Ling-Temco Aeronautics, 1968-69; Physical Director of the Arlington, Texas, YMCA, 1969; teacher and athletic coach, Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, Texas, 1969-1972; graduate teaching assistant and assistant baseball coach, Oklahoma State University, 1972-1973; Assistant Professor in Safety Studies at North Carolina A&T State University in Greensboro, North Carolina, 1973-1975; Director of Traffic and Safety Education, College of Education, University of Hawaii, 1975-1979; Director of Center for Safety Studies and Assistant Professor of Industrial Arts at the State University of New York at Oswego, 1979-1980; Professional Baseball Scout, Philadelphia Phillies Baseball Club, 1976-1980.

Professional Organizations: Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Epsilon Kappa, American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, National Education Association, American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association, American Association of University Safety Educators, American College and University Professors Association, Hawaii Association for Safety and

Traffic Education, North Carolina Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association, American Society of Safety Engineers, New York Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association, and American Society of Transportation Engineers.